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The purpose of this Thesis is to give a clear picture of the role of the slaves in Terence's plays.

Roman Comedy presents us, in general, with a world whose hero is the slave. He provides much of the action and the humor of the play. So the slave as a character is indispensable.

Though Terence and Plautus differ in aim and thought, a comparison between them does help us to form an idea about Terence's displaying of his characters.

We speak in the first chapter about the slaves' status in real life and comedy. The chapter ends by pointing out the reason why Roman comedians have depicted the character of the slave in such a way as we find in their writings.

The function of the slave in Roman comedy is two-fold:

(1) to manage the intrigue  (2) to provide humor.

In Chapter II, accordingly we show how Terence's "servi cellidi" manage the intrigue and explain their methods of cunning and deception and how far Terence's slaves are individuals.

The faithfulness of the slave in comedy towards the different members of the family strikes us. Some are devoted to the young masters, others to the old. We speak about these two types in Chapter III.

Chapter IV. concerns the comic situations. In it we explain the purpose of humor in comedy and examine briefly the different theories of laughter and show how Terence makes his slave provide
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the humour in the light of these theories and whether the laughter aroused by Terence's slave is an aim or an end in itself.

We mention in Chapter V, the other slaves in Terence who do not play major roles as "servi callidi". We explain Terence's technique in introducing such characters and show their place and value in the drama.

Is Terence, in fact, an original dramatist? In Chapter VI, we conclude our subject by summarising the chief features of Terence's slaves and the ways in which our dramatist differs from his originals and his predecessors in portraying his characters.
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Chapter I

STATUS of the SLAVE

Roman comedy shows us an array of slaves. The great majority of these slaves have been acquired by purchase. Most of them have come from the various Greek colonies. Their names in comedy show these different origins, e.g. Syrus from Syria, Phrygia from Phrygia, Devus (Dacus) from the Daci, tribes living on the banks of the Danube. Some of these purchased slaves were captives of war or kidnapped (cf. the prologue of Plautus' Captivi). There are also the slaves who are born in the household and grow up in the family with the master's children and known as "Vernae".

History shows us the wretched condition of the slaves. The slave was a tool in the hands of his master who could use him for any purpose he wanted(1).

(1) "Quum in servum omnia liceant." Seneca, D. Clem. 1. 18.
He was an animated instrument, an inferior member of society. He was a piece of property belonging to his master. Contempt for a slave was a natural attitude and very common. Cato classes slaves with the cattle, the asses, and the work-implements in making the inventory of a country estate, and Polybius puts cattle and slaves "among those commodities which are the first necessaries of existence"(1). Polybius in describing a certain state speaks of it as "populous as well as richly furnished with slaves and other property"(2). Slaves had no legal existence, and therefore, they had neither parents nor relations(3). Their masters had also the right of casting them off by speedy sale when they became sick or old after long years of service(4). The slaves sometimes escape punishment by running away but if they are recaptured they might be put to death(5).

There were special markets for the slaves where

(1) Polybius, IV, 38.
(2) Polybius, IV, 73.
(3) Cato, R.R.X.
(4) Cf. Cat. R.R. 11. 7; Flut. Cat. maj. 4.
(5) Polybius, I, 69: "runaway slaves might be put to death with torture in accordance with the law."
many of them were offered for sale. In Rome, besides
the public markets, the slaves were also sold near
the temple of Castor (1). Such trade was a lucrative
business. Wallon points out that as the Greeks had
the advantage of the Romans in long experience, they
therefore were more prominent in the slave traffic in
Rome than the Romans themselves, but it is evident
that Romans of the same high rank as Cato the elder
did not disdain to profit by it (2).

We can see the same miserable condition of the
slaves in the plays of Roman comedy especially Flautus.
Ergasilus of the 'Captivi' (98-99) refers to the slave
traffic indignantly as a "quaestus in honestus". The
slave trade and those who were occupied in such busi-
ness were legally protected (3). This was because of
the profits which were gained from it. According to
law the slave had no legal rights but was regarded as
a piece of property. He had neither parents nor re-

---

(1) Seneca, ad Seren. 13. 4.
(2) Wallon, Histoire de l'esclavage, vol. 11, p. 48; Plut.
Legal marriage did not exist for slaves, but unions might be contracted with the consent of the masters since a slave's marriage was to the interest of his master. The slave was not permitted to give evidence. His testimony was not accepted as legal evidence unless through torture. The slave, on the other hand, had the right to amass a personal fortune or 'Peculum' (cf. Plautus, Rud. 152 (peculium), Asin. 541, Pers. 192, Trin. 434, Cas. 457-58).

Punishment is a constant subject in these plays. The Roman comedians tell us about the different instruments and methods of torturing the slaves. They tell us about fotters, tread-mills, dungeons and jails, all forms of lashing and the rods with which the slaves are flogged.

Flogging is the most common punishment. The stick

---

(1) Cf. Plautus' Captiv. 574 (When Aristophantes asks Tyndarus: "Quem patrem qui servus est?" he recalls the melancholy fact that a slave had no parentage in the eyes of the law).
(2) Plaut. Cas. 68-70.
(3) Terence's Adel. 973: "Phrygium ut uxor meum una mecum videam liberram!", Plautus' Cas. 254: "super ancilla Casina, ut detur nuptum nostro vilico".
(4) Cf. Terence, And. 771, Phcem. 292-93.
plays a great part in comedy from Aristophanes to Terence. Three kinds of instruments are mentioned according to the severity of the flogging to be administered: (1) rods or switches (ulmee virgae), (2) leather whips (lora), (3) whips of knotted cords combined with strips of metal (flagra). 'Malum' (Terence, And. 431) and 'infortunium' (Terence, Hesut. 688), which mean retribution, are the usual names by which slaves speak of the beatings they are in the habit of receiving at the hands or by order of their irascible masters. In Hesut. Tim. 672 the slave says "si licet me latere tecto abscedere", "with my sides covered". The reference is to a possible flogging. He alludes to a custom of tying up the slaves by their hands, after stripping them naked, when, of course, their 'lateres' or 'sides' would be exposed and come in for a share of lashes. The slaves were tied to a high post and whipped (Terence, Phorm. 220, cf. also Sun. 1021). There are also other expressions of slaves for a sound beating, cf. Phorm. 76 'scapulas perditid'.

---

(1) Cf. Plautus' Asin. 341, Rud. 636 (virgae); Capt. 658 (lora); Cas. 123, Amph. 1020 (flagra).
'I ruined my shoulders', cf. also Plautus, Epid. 91
'Corium perdidi', Cas. (955-956): "Nam salus nulla est seculum, si domum redeo." Usually there is a
lorarius in every house to flog the guilty slaves (cf. Dromo of the 'Andria'). There is a considerable
list of other afflictions enumerated in Plautus' Asinaria, 549 f:
qui edorum, stimulos, lemnines, cruscaque compedesaque,
nervos, catenas, carcere, numellas, pedias, boias.

The Roman comedians mention also the 'furca' and
the 'maniacae'(1).

There are other forms of punishment such as
shutting up the slaves in the underground dungeon
('puteus'), where they are often bound to a post, or
sending them to work in the tread-mill or quarries, or
condemning them to hard labour in the country(2).

'Verbena', 'mastigia' and 'furcifer' (associael) are

---

(1) Cf. Cat. 248, Cas. 389, Menæch. 943, Pers. 854
(furca), Pers. 854 (maniacae) for the description
of all these implements see, Allen: On 'as
columnatum' and ancient instruments of confine-
ment, Harv. Stud. in Philol. VII, 1896, pp. 57-64.

(2) Cf. Plaut. Poen. 355: 'puteum ... ad robustum
odicem', Terence, Phorm. 249-85:
 molestum esse in pistrinc, vapulandum, habendae
compedae, opu'ruci faciandum, . . ." cf. also Plautus,
Captiv. 112 ff, 357, Asin. 546-53, Most. 1065,
Epid. 121, Pers. 22, Poes. 827-8, Terence, And.
600, Heraut. Tim. 330.
common forms of addressing the slave\(^1\). Female slaves are also exposed to punishments\(^2\). The slave in comedy is threatened by punishment for every slight fault. The ghost of the stick, lashes and tread-mill is always standing in his way. We have seen the many instruments and methods of torture mentioned by Plautus and Terence, but what strikes us is that the slave is rarely punished. He often escapes punishment, and enjoys a curious immunity. In comedy a 'servus collidius' may be guilty of all sorts of mischief, of every imaginable rascality, without being punished.

The cunning and rascality of the 'servi collidi' strike us as their most common characteristics. They delight in being rakes. They are also impudent and unperturtable liars and show a lack of reverence for everybody, including their masters. They have full freedom of speech and stand on almost the same level as their masters. They take liberties with the free men and sometimes converse with them in a cordial

\(^{1}\) cf. Terence, And. 618.


\(^{3}\) We shall use the term 'servus collidius' for the slaves who show craftiness and shrewdness in carrying on their intrigues. In Roman comedy the epithet 'collidius' (cunning, skilful) is usually assigned to such slaves (cf. And. 197, Eun. 1011, Amph. 268).
In spite of their rascality and audacity the slaves generally escape punishment and are rewarded by being set free at the end of most of the plays. We hear the phrases 'manu emittere' (e.g. Captiv. 408, 713, Rud. 1218, 1388, Asin. 411, Cass. 284, Most. 975, cf. also Terence, Adel. 975), 'adserere manus' (e.g. Curc. 708). The 'vindicte' (Curc. 218) and 'festus' (Rud. 761), the staff with which the slave is touched in the ceremony of manumission are also mentioned. We can also notice the words of the master, 'liber esto' (e.g. Epid. 730, Rdm. 1149, Adel. 970).

Such loyal slaves as Geta (Adelphi), Tyndarus (Captivi), Grumio (Hostellarus), Messenio (Mensaehmi) serve their masters faithfully and deserve freedom but we are struck by the number of those daring and mischievous slaves who cheat and dupe the head of the family, yet escape punishment.

Slaves in comedy show lack of consistency. They sometimes oppose the frivolous activity of the young men, but mostly they assist their young masters in their amours (cf., for example, Geta in the 'Phormio').

(1) Rud. 415 ff; Pseud. 1259 ff; Stich. 128 ff.
Thus they sometimes show their dread of punishment\(^{(1)}\),
but at other times they scorn flogging, chains and the various punishments\(^{(2)}\). So they express two contradictory attitudes: (1) the slaves fear punishment,
(2) they at the same time despise such punishment.

When the intrigue is directed against a braggart
soldier or a rescallly 'lence' the slave's machinations
have the approval of the other characters and the
sympathy of the spectators. There is no question of
punishment in such trickery. It is different when
the 'senex' is the object of the deception. Then the
slave is threatened with punishment when the trick is
disclosed.

But such threats are not fulfilled. There are
exceptional cases where the relation of master and
slave seems far less pleasant. Staphylus, for example,
suffers at the hands of Euclio (Aul.42), but in most
cases the slave escapes punishment. These threats
also are not taken seriously by the slave. Tyndarus

\(^{(1)}\) Most.857 ff., Aul.538 ff., Menech.965 ff.

\(^{(2)}\) Asin.315 ff., 546 ff., 574 ff., Bacch.366
Cæptiv.650, ... etc.
in the 'Captivi' describes the tremendous toil in the
quarries which he has undergone (998 ff.), yet he is
not too exhausted to make a pun about the crow (bar)
that is given to him for amusement. We know the joke
of Syrus in the 'Hesaut. Tim.' after his old master
has discovered his trick and has threatened him with
punishment (Hesaut. Tim. 981).

Why did the comic writers make the slave despise
the punishment? It seems that the comedians wanted
to combine the reality of life with the conventional
features of comedy. The essential feature of the
comic play is to create laughter. The boldness, the
cunning, the deception and the rascality which the
slave in comedy shows while he is carrying on his
intrigues arouse laughter. Thus the situation we
find in the plays is a strange mixture of reality and
stage convention.

In accordance with what is natural and with epi-
sodes of everyday life the slave seeks for a precator
or the youth himself appears as a precator or promises
to do so (cf. And. 955, Hesaut. Tim. 1066 ff., cf. 1002,
Phorm. 140 f., Captiv. 938 ff., Bacch. 521 ff., cf. 522 f.,
But the slave's attitude when he scorns such punishment is undoubtedly a rarity in real life and is calculated to arouse comic effect.

There is another side to his character which is also a rarity in real life and that is his cleverness. A few tosses of the head, a few frowns, and a plan worked out in all its details springs from his brain. It seems that the comic writers hardly ever make fun of a dull slave. Scealedrus in the 'Miles' is the only specimen of the kind in Plautus and in Terence. The young masters of comedy think themselves sure of success as soon as they appeal to the slave's slyness. They consult him and put their fortune into his hands.

The cunning slave in comedy, therefore, is fertile in resource and daring. Though he speaks about torture, he is rarely punished.

Why do writers of comedy depict the slave in such a light? There are various possible explanations:

(1) Legrand, Loeb., p. 105.
(2) Cf. Legrand, op. cit., p. 106.
(1) The Roman comic writers must avoid tragic action as they are writing comedies. Disgusting action is tolerable in tragedy but not in comedy. Accordingly we do not see in any play a real punishment but in most cases the slave is readily pardoned. Though the comic slave always fears and mentions the several elements of punishment, he does not worry about them and proceeds to carry on his intrigues with amazing audacity and he generally enjoys a curious immunity in the end. This is, without doubt, a rarity in real life and here the motive is to maintain the conventional features of comedy. The comic writer must avoid unpleasant consequences.

(2) The slave as a trickster appears conspicuously in Roman comedy.

In fact slaves who have a part in the plots of the plays are found in comedy before Menander. We find them, for example, in Aristophanes, but the slaves of the Old comedy lack the craftiness of their descendants. It seems that the slave began to perfect himself in that direction in the Middle comedy(1). Though

---

the intriguing slave is present in a fairly fully developed form in New comedy, (e.g. Holax), yet if we compare the Greek fragments with the plays of Plautus and Terence, we notice that the Roman dramatists were more elaborate in portraying trickery than Greek playwrights, even Menander, and that is one of their original contributions to comedy. The extent fragments of Menander do not contain such intrigue of the Roman type as they are more sentimental and concerned with love affairs rather than trickery.

Plautus may make trickery the chief interest in his plots, regardless of its relative unimportance in his originals. So it is possible that the trickery which we find in Plautus' plays does not come 'in toto' from his originals (1).

The misbehaviour, impudence, cunning and audacity of the intriguing slave can hardly have been possible in real life, though the Roman poets try to make excuses for these characteristics. They show us some of the forces which drive the slave to do wrong. Frequently it is compulsion. A young master commands his

servant to procure money or a woman for him. Occasionally he protests, tries to talk sense to his master and makes clear to the young men the risks that he runs in serving him\(^1\), but the youth does not care for advice nor for complaints\(^2\). And so the slave is standing between two dangers. At last he averts the nearer danger by obeying the youth and trusts to luck or to his shrewdness to avoid the more distant one when the time comes (cf. Pseud. 502-503). Sometimes the slave himself takes the initiative and embarks on dangerous ventures for his master's sake; witness Syrus, in the 'Hes. Tim.'. Besides, something like the pride of the specialist prompts him to hatch the most complicated plots, and he delights in knowing that he is the author of so many schemes\(^3\). The comic writers then try to show that the motives of the rascally slaves are compulsion, personal interest, vainglory and affection for their young masters. Whatever these motives are, they are a little on the far

\(\text{(1)}\) Cf. Epid. 146; Eur. 381
\(\text{(2)}\) Eur. 389
\(\text{(3)}\) Hes. 813, Pseud., 574 ff., Most. 775 ff., Hes. Tim. 709-711
side of probability.

It seems that comic writers depict the slave for the interest of the spectators. The Roman spectator likes this kind of trickery which seems rather an inheritance from the earlier forces of Italy\(^1\). To the Romans the machinations of a slave are just as interesting as the wiles of Ulysses or of Sion\(^2\) were to their ancestors. The Roman playwrights make use of various methods to produce more complex and ingenious plots. There are cases where several attempts to solve the plot fail completely before one succeeds, or else where it cannot be solved at one stroke. Accordingly the slave makes use of several renewed tricks, witness Syrus \(\text{Hesunt, Tim.}\), Davus \(\text{Andria}\), and Chrysalus \(\text{Bacchides}\). Some critics mention that perhaps the failure of Terence's 'Hecyra' is due to its lack of the usual intrigue and the wily slave.

The comic writer, therefore, would make an appeal

\(^{1}\) Cf. Duckworth, the Nature of Roman Comedy, p.389

\(^{2}\) Legrand, Dacs, p.491.
to the imagination of an audience containing a large proportion of plebeian holiday-makers. These in their moments of relaxation would be prepared to forget the stern realities of life and would be ready to accept a character alien to their own ideas.

(2) Roman playwrights, especially Plautus, represent the slave in a disrespectful attitude. The slave, who is the organiser-in-chief of all knavery, acquires the right of speaking frankly to free men, of ordering them about and of lecturing them(1). This attitude arises from his associations with his masters. It is natural that the slave might become familiar when the master, especially a young master, confides his trouble and his weakness to him and asks him for help.

(4) Philosophy was gradually introducing broader and more humane ideas in contrast to the old conception of the slave as a thing. Though Aristotle says that a slave is as a living tool(2), he continues:

---


"qua slave there is no friendship with him, but there is qua man; for there seems to be a kind of justice subsisting in all men who can share in law and contracts and friendship in so far as he is a man". (N.E.1161b5)\(^1\). We find this feeling as well in comedy. There is a new humanity which appears in Menander’s fragment (602 Kock): "I count no one an alien if he is good. The nature of all is the same, and the affinity is made by character". Theophrastus extends the theory of kinship to include the animals\(^2\). We can notice from Menander that the good slave often has more ‘sophrosyne’ than his master, his body may be enslaved, but he has the mind of a free man\(^3\). Accordingly we can notice from the interpretation of the old antithesis between ‘Physis’ and ‘Humes’ that there is no essential distinction between free men and slaves\(^4\). In Plautus’ Asinaria (490) the slave is

---

\(^1\) Cf. Webster, Stud. in Men. p. 207


\(^3\) Cf. particularly the Feiburg fragment (Wil. Epitr., 107, 1).

\(^4\) Cf. Webster, Stud. in Men. p. 207
able to say to a man of higher station: "Tam ego homo sum quam tu". At the same time it seems that the comedians want to show that "equity is a correction of legal justice" as technically Aristotle defines it. Aristotle says that the equitable man 'does not demand everything that is legally due to him but is prepared to accept less, even when he has the law on his side' (E.E.1127 b 12, 1138 a 1). In the 'Rheut. Tim.' Syrus uses this idea to get money from Chremes. This idea of equity includes a humanity which is prepared to go beyond what the law or even prudence demands(1).

(3) Most of the knaves in Roman comedy are intriguing for their masters and not for themselves. Their behaviour does not reveal real malice. They try to help their masters, especially the youths. When they succeed in their tricks, the desire to do harm is rarely the motive that actuates them. We notice that they are occasionally imbued with sympathy, affection and devotion for the family which they serve or for one of its members (cf. Geta (Phormio), Davus (Andria)).

---

(1) Cf. Webster, op. cit. p.206
So the knave in comedy may be represented as an utter scoundrel, but this, as we have seen, is for creating the comic effect and for the interest of the spectators. Besides, the dramatists use this way of depicting him to express their ideas about humanity and ethical principles. The slave by his abusive language points out the follies and foppries of the other characters. When Syrus of the 'Adelphi' parodies Democ's moral teachings to his face, he mocks the latter's method of bringing up his children. Syrus of the 'Heaut. Tim.' compliments Chremes on his sharpness, sings the praises of Bacchis and in his presence finds fault with his neighbour Menades.

The Roman poet may be responsible for the excessive language and the bad manners in which his slaves indulge. He cannot attribute such disgusting manners to a free man. But he can attribute the shame to the slave. His low character helps the playwright to assign him these bad manners which are appropriate to his low nature.

Chremes, the old gentleman of the 'Heaut. Tim.' does not agree to the proposal of the slave Syrus to
pretend that he is giving his daughter to Clinia\(^1\). In the 'Trinummus' Callicles apologises for indulging in rascality, although his motive for doing so is a good one\(^2\). Pamphilus, the young master of the 'Andria', hesitates to lie in order to get out of a scrape\(^3\). The slave on the other hand has no such scruples. He is indiscreet, impudent and an imperturbable liar; he lies in order to deceive his opponent, he lies in order to gain the respect of his masters, he lies in order to hide his escapades, he lies in order to disguise the fact that he has lied. Legrand believes\(^4\) that we must here make allowance for a certain Pharisaism on the part of the poets and of the spectators, to whom it was distasteful to represent or to see free men in positions that were unworthy of them.

---

\(^1\) Naut. Tim. 780 ff.
\(^2\) Trin., 767
\(^3\) And. 383 ff.
\(^4\) New Gr. Com., Loeb, p.217
Chapter II.

**INTRIGUE**

Aristotle (Poet. 145 2a) says of tragedy that all plots which involve discovery or reversal are complex. Dr Duckworth says (1) that since misapprehension is at the very basis of the plots of Roman comedy and the plays contain both discovery and a solution of the difficulties leading to a happy ending, in the Aristotelian sense all the plots of the extant palliates may be said to be complex.

Deception and misunderstanding are interwoven during this complication. In Roman comedy most of the complication of the action is caused by the slave’s machinations.

In some of Aristophanes’ plays, for example, Xanthias and Carion enliven the action and herald the coming of the Syruses and Dervuses of the New comedy. Like the latter, they are greedy, lewd, lazy, mendacious and indiscreet. The only thing they lack is craftiness (2).

A terracotta of a pensive slave which can be dated from the first half of the fourth century (3)

---

(1) The Nature of Rom. Com., p. 161
(3) Cf. Webster, Stud. in Men. p. 167 f.
shows that the slave who carries on the intrigue was already established in comedy before Menander began to write (1). There are also some fragments of Greek plays of the Middle period which are to be considered intrigue plays where the intrigue is presumably carried on by the slave (2). We have no example of a complete intrigue comedy in the Middle period, though we can draw conclusions about the nature of the original of the Parzician as a special kind of intrigue play belonging to this period (3).

The brothel-keeper is tricked. This is satisfying to an audience that expects an intrigue play. But there is no general moral in this play, although there are patches of moralising in the parasite’s first speech and in the two scenes with his daughter. Nor is there much characterisation: the slaves are clever, the brothel-keeper shameless, the parasite sacrificial.

(1) Terracotta published by Bieber, History of the Ancient Theater, fig. 128; the set is proved to belong to the first half of the fourth century because some other examples were found at Clythus (IV. 326, 404; VII., 297, 304; cf. Webster, Stud. in Men. p. 167–68


(3) Cf. Webster, Stud. in Later Gr. Com. p. 74, 75.
his daughter for a good meal, the daughter is impos-
sibly full of wise-cracks, but these colours are all
superficial and the situation in each particular scene
is more interesting than the characters. In
the plays of the same general type of the New comedy
(e.g. Kolon) or in the Roman plays (Curculio, Ploculus,
Meaut. Tim.) the interest lies in the characters as
they appear in the successive situations in the play
and not chiefly in the situations themselves.
The plays of Aristophanes are not wholly given
up to the development of a plot and it is probably
that the plays of the Middle comedy have retained
something of this loose method. The writer of the
New comedy desires to give a clear picture of the
character and morals of his 'dramatic personae'. So it
seems to that writer that incidents of the plot are
not always sufficient for this purpose.

Greek New comedy and Roman comedy then surpass
the Middle comedy in this respect.

If on the other hand we compare the Greek frag-
ments of the New comedy with Roman plays we notice that

(1) Webster, op. cit. p. 79.
(2) Cf. Webster, op. cit. p. 79.
the Roman dramatists displayed the character of the
wily slave and made the interest lie in his machina-
tions more than the Greek writers did. They made use
of various methods, as we shall mention later, to
produce more complex and ingenious plots.

Intrigue and its nature in Terence

Trickery provides the main interest in most of
the comedies of Plautus and Terence. The Roman comic
writers are concerned with interesting ways of con-
structing the action and with invention of intrigue.

Cunning is one of the essential attributes of
Terence's slave. The planning of the ruse which is to
help the action to proceed and to arrive at a complica-
tion can usually only be the slave's work. The
slave is brought to account by his master for intending
to launch an intrigue against him (cf. And.
196 ff.). The master is always suspicious of the
slave and when he perceives knavery he thinks that the
slave is the source of the mischief (cf. And. 457 ff.).
Davus himself (And. 504-508) confirms this suspicion:
".... sed siquid tibi narrare cepisti, continuo deri
tibi verba censeas....................... .............."
The slave always boasts of his cunning and considers the success of his tricks certain. Syrus, for instance, boasts of being able to cheat the old men (Hes. Tim. 170 ff.), cf. also Adel. 209 ff., And. 743, Hes. Tim. 329. The slave schemes to get the better of the father. He does not hesitate to cheat and lie, to misrepresent and cajole.

In Terence the slave dupes the father. The aged parent likes his son and likes to hear him praised. Syrus in the 'Adelphi' is well aware of this fact (cf. 525 ff.). He easily deceives Demeas because the latter has implicit faith in his son's virtue. Donatus comments on 535 that no father is so harsh that he does not become mild when his son is praised:\(^{(1)}\). The father also is blind to the truth. Chremes in the 'Hes. Tim.' wishes to trick Menenius, not realising that he himself is the dupe. Simo in the 'Andria' believes that the birth of the baby is just a trick (470 ff., 490 ff.) He considers what is true to be falsehood and deludes himself by his unwillingness to accept the truth. Davus lets Simo deceive himself.

\(^{(1)}\) Donatus (ad Adel. 141) points out that Terence appears to favour 'lenissimi patres'. 
This blindness to the truth makes it unnecessary for the slave to concoct an elaborate and fanciful scheme for a cunning mixture of truth and falsehood is usually sufficient. (Yet Terence sometimes elaborates the slave's scheme; cf. Syrus' second plot in the Heaut. Tim. which is concocted for the interest of the spectators). The slave tells the truth and pretends it is a trick. Syrus in the 'Heaut. Tim.' says (710 ff.) "... I have such force and power of cunning in me that I shall deceive them both by telling the truth, and when your father tells our old master that Bacchis is his son's mistress, he will not believe it", and this is what in fact happens. Davus also (Andria, 747 ff.) pretends that the birth of the baby is a trick, realising that Chremes will not believe it. In such trickery which leads easily to the deluding or the self-deluding of the 'senex' the slave in Terence can dispense with the elaborate ruses used by the slave in Plautus.

Plautus and Terence are inevitably different in personality and therefore would choose different types of Greek plays and select different kinds of innovations to introduce. The handling of the intrigue is
one aspect of their difference. It is instructive to make comparison, however brief, between Plautus and Terence's methods in this respect.

In particular Plautus increases the farcical elements of fooling to suit the tastes of his audience. Thus in order to obtain and exploit the comic effect, Plautus, in his management of his plays, neglects the unity of the composition and psychological analysis. His persons display blindness which is difficult to accept, and make a superfluous use of ruses.

Terence, on the other hand, is preoccupied with the psychology of the persons who are acting in front of us. This action may be less vivid and less animated than that of Plautus, but it is also more coherent and more satisfactory.

The 'servus callidus' of Terence has not the cynical impudence and abusiveness of Plautus' slave. He does not act only under duress or from motives of self-interest, nor is he as much interested in acquiring glory, as is the slave of Plautus, but he acts with devotion and real affection. How magnificent, for instance, is Syrus of the 'Huact. Tim', who, with marvellous affection, offers himself to receive the
punishment which threatens Clitipho (cf. 973-974). This is not the slave who fears punishment, but he is the devoted slave of Terence. The devotion of Terence's slave excuses his ruses.

Terence aims at nuances. For instance in the 'Andria' most of the characters deceive either themselves or the other characters. Simo deceives himself when he does not want to believe that Davus' story about the child's birth is true. Charinus deceives himself when he believes that Pamphilus loves Chremes' daughter, while in fact Pamphilus loves Glycerium. Davus and Simo also deceive each other. Though the intrigue is based on misunderstanding, yet the idea of deception dominates the whole play. We can see in all the comedies of Terence subtlety of this kind. We find this taste for complications in Plautus also, but these complications are generally of an external character and the source of the intrigue is outside the persons. Terence seeks for these effects by means of simple human emotions. Plautus writes a play of action, Terence writes a psychological drama(1).

Terence cared for dualism of structure and the intricate interweaving of parallel problems in which the interest of the audience is divided between two love affairs. In most of Terence's plays we have the

---

double plot, or as Norwood terms it (1), the 'duality-method', and the 'servus callidus'intrigues to help the young man in his love affair.

The 'Bacchides' and the 'Poenulus' of Plautus contain a double love plot, but the duality method in these two plays appears in a rudimentary form and is not handled with success. In the 'Bacchides', for example, Pistoclerus' affection for one sister complicates the action and renders the first deception ineffective and in the 'Poenulus' the affair of the soldier is not only of a secondary interest but is poorly integrated into the action.

The situation is different in Terence's comedies. Five of his plays contain in each two similar problems. Donatus says of the 'Andria' that it is composed of the dangers and delights of two adolescents, and comments that only the 'Hecyra' is a comedy of one young man (2). Norwood even tries to find the same method at work in the 'Hecyra' (3). So Donatus and Norwood

(1) Art of Terence, p.143.
(2) Donatus ad. And. 977, ad Ad. 361.
(3) Plautus and Terence, p. 169
reveal Terence's procedure, that is to say the 'duality-method' which is a vital part of Terence's dramatic art. Terence favoured this method as a means of increasing intricacy of his plots.

Thus as Terence differed from Plautus in his use of stage conventions, so in his treatment of deception, we find a striking deviation from the practice of Plautus. In comedies like the 'Pseudolus', the 'Poece', and the 'Mostelleria', the adolescents and his problems cease to be the centre of interest as soon as the deceitful lies of the 'servus callidus' get under way. Plautus sometimes suppresses the sentimental love theme where the plight of the young man serves merely to motivate the activity of the intriguing slave.

In Terence, on the contrary, the trickery seems secondary to the difficulties of the young lovers. The love affairs of the young men are presented by Terence in a serious manner, but Plautus, by having the slave ridicule both his young master and the youth's sweetheart makes love a matter of comedy rather than of sentiment. It seems that in this respect Terence perhaps reflects more closely the sentimental tone of the
Greek originals.

"New Comedy had for its plot a love story and nearly all the Hellenistic types of poetry are marked by the emergence of love as a dominant theme. It was the humanistic attitude which prevailed in Athens in the fourth century B.C. that brought dignity to the theme of love. Individualism which swept to Athens in that period was ready to recognise love as a theme and assign it to its proper place in the higher types of literature. Rome in the third century B.C. was very far away from these tendencies"(1).

Terence does not approve of the cruder and more boisterous deceptions employed by Plautus. In fact the devices, the fantastic falsehoods and the impersonations of his predecessors' slaves resemble each other. It is true that Plautus lets the 'senex' play tricks and occasionally permits slaves to mingle truth with falsehood but such is not his regular practice. Deception in Plautus is generally aimed at the 'leno' or 'miles' and rarely at the 'senex'. His dupes accept willingly the most amazing fictions and they con-

sistently take falsehood as truth, unlike the dupes of Terence who believe truth to be falsehood. Such treatment of Plautus' deception provides a broad humour but does not show subtlety and variety.

Terence's plays, on the other hand, by his new method of handling the deception, present variations of refreshing novelty.

The characteristics of the intriguing slave

Generally Roman comedy adopted from Greek New comedy the use of types: "Ieno evarus, paresitus edax, sycophante impudens .... etc." (cf. Besant, Tim. Prol. 37 ff.).

Terence, however, adds various traits which individualize the particular men within the type by paying more attention to the characterization. It is in this mixture of the general and individual that Terence's poetic art is revealed.

In the following discussion we shall examine the most common characteristics of the slave as a trickster and see how far in Terence's comedies the individual
characterization makes itself felt in the figure of the slave in addition to the stock character.

(1) Dissimulation

The slave pretends to be honest and innocent in front of the old master.

He pretends to be an honest pedagogue. Syrus of the 'Hecut. Tim.' says to Glitipho (379) "...haec ego praeципio tibi?" "Is this the teaching I give you?" In reality Syrus refers to the compact between him and Glitipho that the latter should not go near Bacchis. Syrus then makes this claim and boasts before the father of his moral training of the son.

Syrus of the Adelphi is also clever in this art of dissimulation. He says to Demea (375 f.): "Yes, on my word, sir, it is silly enough and to speak frankly, altogether absurd", cf. 379 f., 389 f. He pretends to oppose the frivolous life in Micio's house. We perceive that he cannot stand up against this sort of life (cf. 430 ff.) We can understand then why it is ironic and ridiculous when we hear Syrus
boast near the end of the play (962 ff.):
"ego ictos vobis usque a puerei curavi ambo sedulo: 
docui meni bene precepspi semper quae potui omnis".

Deus of the 'Andria' pretends to dissuade the 
son from marrying the lady of Andros (519 ff.):
"qui igitur omnis ille estraexit nisi ego? nun 
omnes nos quidem
'scinu' quam misere hanc eravit: nunc sibi uxorem 
expsit".
In the previous passage and also in his remark (521):
"In fine, do you instruct me with that affair; proceed 
however, as before, to celebrate the match, just as 
you are doing, and I trust that the gods will prosper 
this matter", he shows his capacity for dissimulation.
He lets the 'senex' believe in his innocence and urge 
him to see that his son returns to the right path.

595 ff:
Sinc: nunc te oro, Dave, quoniam solu' ni effecisti 
has nuptias..

Deus: ego vero solu'. Sinc: corrigere mihi gnatum 
porro enitere.

Deus: faciam hercle sedulo.

Geta (Phormio) pretends to be an honest and innocent
...pedagogue when he tells Demipho that Antipho's case worries him and that he has thought of a way out of the difficulty (615 f.) He makes different use of this art when he represents the intrigue against the 'senex' as the means of breaking off his son's liaison. He sometimes, on the other hand, is less accomplished in the art of dissimulation. When the master confides the duty of looking after his sons, he is content with merely stating that he is not responsible for what has happened and as a slave he is unable to intervene in the course of events (291).

A most effective dramatic motif is provided by the pretence of injured innocence. The old master is always suspicious of the slave and he thinks that the slave is the principal organiser of all knavery. But the slave protests that the 'senex' is not placing any confidence in him. This is evident in the 'Andria' when Devus protests that Simo does not trust him (504 ff.):

Devus: "The moment I have started telling you anything you make sure I am fooling you?"

Simo: "And are you not?"

Devus: "The result is, by Jove, sir, I have no longer the courage to open my lips."
The slave uses dissimulation to trap his opponent and let the latter have no inkling of any intrigue. When Chremes in the 'Hes. Tim.' brings his son on to the stage and attacks him in high indignation for his familiarity with Bacchis, the supposed mistress of Clinia, Syrus fears lest the truth may be revealed before he can get the money needed for Bacchis. Syrus quickly rises to the occasion, joins in abusing Clitipho and hurries him out of the way (885 ff.). The aim of Syrus is two-fold: first to get Clitipho out of the way so that he may not come near Bacchis, secondly to pretend that he is not involved in any intrigue.

The slave pretends to have acted purely in his master's interests. Geta, for instance, is sent by his old masters to summon Phormio, the pretended protector of Antipho's young wife, to a conference. Later Phormio enters with Geta ready for the interview. It is part of the scheme that the old men should come upon Geta and Phormio apparently unobserved so that they may hear Geta's pretended indignant defence of Demipho against Phormio's charge (cf. Phorm. 359, 372 ff.).

The slave sometimes asserts his versatility. Devis wants Myasis to put the child in front of Simo's doorstep so that he may have a clear conscience if he has to swear to his master that he has not done so (And. 728 f.). Syrus in the 'Hes. Tim.' wants Clinia to
tell his father the truth: that he loves Antiphila and
wants to marry her, and that the other girl is
Clitipho's (701 ff.).

(2) Knowledge of human nature

The success of the intrigue is often owing to the
slave's knowledge of human nature. He knows well the
basic principles according to which the 'senex' acts.
Syrus in the 'Adelphi' says to Otetespho (533): "When
he (Demeas) raves most violently, I can make him as
gentle as a lamb". Demeas's attitude is well-known to
him. Demeas likes to hear that his son's morals are
sound as a result of paternal up-bringing. Syrus
therefore assures him of this trait of character to the
development of which the old man attached a great deal
of importance (cf.404 f., 413, 433). Syrus reveals a
sound knowledge of psychology when he tells of Otetespho's
reaction to Aeschines' supposed affair (403 ff.). He
arouses Demeas's vanity by effective flattery (cf.385 f.,
392 f.). Syrus succeeds in producing the desired
effect on the old man, who, supposing himself a foun-

tain of wisdom, invites such flattery and is moved to
teers when Syrus praises the morals of his beloved
Ctesipho (cf. 409: "... oh Iacrumo gaudio !" cf. also
564). Demes is thus playing into the hands of Syrus.

The slave shows his understanding of human nature
by seeing through the weakness of the youths. He knows
that young men quickly fall in love with girls and can
no more control themselves than they can separate from
their loved ones (Thorm. 110 ff., Eun. 299 ff., Beaut.
Tim. 371). On the other hand his knowledge of human
nature may land him in trouble. Parmeno, who knows the
passionate nature of Chaereas (299 ff.), offers in a
moment of jest an adventurous suggestion without realiz-
ing the consequences it may have on the young man's
nature.

Davus forms a correct judgement of the situation
(And. 395) when he says to Pamphilus that perhaps the
latter thinks that no one will give him a wife because
of his character but that his father will find a
dowerless wife for him rather than allow him to be
corrupted by a mistress. Davus draws from the situation
a conclusion that corresponds to reality (387 f.). As
a rule, fathers in comedy regard their sons' marrying women without a dowry as one of the greatest calamities. Devus draws the conclusion that Simo would be unjust if he is angry now with Pamphilus before ascertaining his feeling (275 ff.). He draws the conclusion that if Pamphilus will agree to marry Chremes' daughter, he will disarrange all the plans of his father without any danger, for Chremes will not give him his daughter and his father will not be angry at him without reason (387 ff.). Devus also shows calm reflection and consideration (And. 370 ff., 380 ff., 395 ff.).

The slave presents a contrast to the timidity and hesitation of the young man (And. 387, Heaut. Tim. 719, Phorm. 696). Sometimes, however, there is a lack of realism which may lead to the failure of the slave's plans. In the 'Andria', Devus' first plan fails as he relies on Chremes' not giving his daughter. The same characteristic is betrayed by Syrus in the 'Heaut. Tim.' (709 ff.). His stratagem does not at first succeed (IV,5.).

There is another characteristic of the slaves which is an aspect of their knowledge of human nature,
and that is their experience of the world. This helps them in their trickery and gives them an opportunity for intrigue (cf. Hes. Tim. 344 ff., 364 ff.; Eur. 50 ff.; And. 885)

(3) Presence of mind.

There are various instances in which the intriguing slave is characterized by extraordinary presence of mind. Hermoc shows his presence of mind by his immediate adventurous suggestion to Chares (Eur. 370 ff.). Geta on one occasion helps Phormio by recollecting the name of Stilpo to Phormio's mind. (u)

The slave is able to save himself by a wily or evasive reply. Notice Syrus' evasive replies and his avoiding of awkward questions about himself. When he is thinking of laying a trap for the old man, he answers: "I am alright" in reply to Chremes' searching question: "what are you doing there?" (Hes. Tim. 519-19). Deyus in the 'Andrie' and Syrus in the

u Cf. Phorm. 387 ff.
'Adelphi' are also able to save themselves by wily replies (And.519, Adel.579).

In the Andria (III,4), Davus gets to hear of the failure of the intrigue that he has instigated. Possessing the necessary presence of mind he cannot be made to lose his composure and he recovers himself. Without much delay he reassures himself and sets to work to evolve a new plan. Hermogenes finds himself in a similar situation (Eun. V.4) but he is put in such a panic by Pythias that he gives away the whole plot to the 'senex'. Gets in the 'Thomis' is placed in a desperate situation when he hears the surprising news of the father's return. Completely lacking in spirit he would like best of all to clear out (190), though he reassures himself at last and prefers to stay for the sake of the youth.

Thus two characters may differ from each other in this respect. Even the same slave contradicts himself in meeting the impending danger.

(4) Self-confidence

Before the intrigue opens, the slaves boast of their skill and consider its success certain. This
typical situation is created by the slaves’ self-confidence.

Drusus has confidence in his own skill as he already announces at the end of scene ii, act IV (And. 703 ff.) that the intrigue has been devised. Syrus in the 'Heaut. Tim.' with a monstrous assurance brings Bacchis, Clitipho’s mistress, to the house of Chremes saying that one cannot do anything big or brilliant without risk (312-14). Before the intrigue opens, Syrus considers its success and boasts of his skill and presence of mind (Heaut. Tim. 329, 709 f.). By bringing Antiphila with Bacchis, he hopes to get money for Clitipho’s mistress. So in V. 329 Syrus assures Clinis that his mistress could live with him without alarm and that he will get the money by the same self-assurance and by the same audacious means. Notice also Syrus’ self-confidence in carrying on a plot when he says to Chremes (547-48): "For my part I can do so easily, if you command me. I know well in what fashion it is usually done." He also shows his self-assurance in saying that he can find out a new plot by seeking (674-75):

"... ratio de integro inaeundast mihi.
nil tam difficilest quin querendo investigari possisst."
From the first instant that Syrus of the 'Adelphi' appears on the stage he boasts of his skillfulness and self-confidence. He says to Ctesipho about dealing with Jennio the 'Ieso' (209 ff.):

"No more, sir! I myself will arrange with him. I will make him glad to take the money at once", cf. also Adel. 523 ff., 553. Cetes shows his self-confidence when he says (Phorm. 585): "Theodrie would be safe."

He is pleased when he sees Chromes who has returned from abroad standing with Demipho. This, he says, gives him an opportunity to carry out his intrigue. He will try to dupe Demipho, and if he fails, he will try to trick the other old man (Phorm. 601 f.).

Thus when the plans of the slaves suffer a reverse the failure and difficulties do not discourage the slaves from looking about for other new schemes nor make them lose hope.

A closer examination of some of the passages mentioned reveals special nuances in this characteristic. Davus, hearing that his intrigue has failed, at first loses all self-confidence (And. 599 ff.), then he appeases his indignant young master by envisaging fresh intrigue but for the moment he does not believe in the possibility of devising it (614 ff.).
Gradually, however, he gains confidence in his own shrewdness and at the end of the scene (703 ff.) he can already announce that the intrigue has been devised. The quality in question is developed quite differently by Syrus in the 'Hecut. Tim.' His plans suffer a reverse but at no moment does he lose his self-confidence (cf. 575). The nuances are clear when one considers the final result of the intrigue and the part the slave takes in it. The slaves show self-assurance by taking credit for the happy outcome of any conflict, while in reality someone else is mainly responsible. Thus Perimenon in the 'Hecyra' claims to have been deliberately instrumental in creating the young man's happiness (577, 579-580) while he has no part in it (cf. also And. 350, Thorm. 129). Syrus boasts of being able to cheat the old men without having to lie to them (Hecut. Tim. 709 ff.). In fact he dupes only Chremes.

Thus Terence by his treatment of the slaves in such a way as we have mentioned reveals his effort to give life to his characters and to individualize them without sacrificing the conventional characteristics (stock character) of the comic personages.
We can see in Roman comedy slaves who are devoted to the family which they serve, or to one of its members. There are two classes of slaves who profess these feelings, those who are faithful to the old masters, and those who are faithful to the young men of the family.

There are indeed other slaves whom we can call the ordinary ones, who never show any sympathy towards any member of the family, but just do the work which concerns them.

Terence's slaves, who are concerned about the welfare of their masters, especially the old masters, and to whom the words of Menander apply (fr. 644):

\[ \text{Ὅταν ἀτυχὴ τοῦ, ἑννοοῦντος οἰκέτου οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν κτήμα καλλιον βίῳ.} \]

are Seta in the 'Adelphi', Sosia and Dysia in the 'Andria', Centurers in the 'Adelphi', Sophrona in the 'Phormio', and Pythis of the 'Eunuchus'.

Such slaves have more real personality. Indeed,
if we compare them with the 'servi callidi' we find
them portrayed with considerable regard for realism.
We can call them 'servi bona fregi', just as Aulus
Gellius describes the faithful Peranon in the
They acted minor roles, and they did not carry on
intrigues as the 'servi callidi' did. We can say
that they were made to resemble the slaves in the to-
gates about whom Donatus says that they were not allowed
to appear cleverer than and superior in intelligence
to their masters (cf. Donatus ad Eun. 57).

So the trickery and the deceit which the Romans
permitted in the case of slaves in the 'palliata' were
not allowed in the 'tegata'.

We can find a reflection of this faithfulness in
some of the monologues of Pleutus' plays (cf. Messenio
in 'Menexenio' 966 ff., 'Astellario', 872 ff., 'Pseudolus',
1103 ff.). Messenio in his monologue says: 'This is
the proof of a good servant, who takes care of his
master's business, looks after it, arranges it, thinks
about it, in the absence of his master diligently to
attend to the affairs of his master, as much so as if
he himself were present or even better.....Therefore
it is sure that to be good is better than to be bad. Much more readily do I submit to words, stripes I do detest; and I eat what is ground much more readily than supply it ground by myself. Therefore do I obey the command of my master, carefully and diligently do I observe it; and in such manner do I pay obedience, as I think is for the interest of my back. And that course does profit me. Let others be just as they take it to be their interest, I shall be just as I ought to be. If I adhere to that, I shall avoid faultiness; so that I am in readiness for my master on all occasions, I shall not be much afraid. The time is near, when, for these deeds of mine, my master will give his reward.' Although in this monologue, it is only the fear of punishment which makes Messenio prefer to be faithful, it does give us nevertheless a picture of the faithful slave.

Sometimes we find a slave who is contented protesting that he is loyal: 'It is better to serve a good master than to live in freedom in a humble and miserable manner.' (1)

(1) Xen. fr. 1093 - Philem., fr. 227
Daos, in the Ἰππόωσ apparently sings the praises of Laches with a trustfulness that does honour to them both.

Syriscus, in the Ἐπιτρεπόντες side by side with him, however, Daos stands for rascality - declares that it is everyone's duty to secure, as far as he is able, the triumph of justice; he is charitable and unselfish.

Stratilax (Truculentus) is very much attached to his old master, and is very careful of the household property.

A similar sentiment is strongly expressed by Grumio(1) and it contrasts(2) with the sentiments of the person with whom he is talking. He is full of wrath at the scandalous conduct of Tranio(3).

These slaves are acquainted with the secrets and worries of the family. Geta of the 'Adelphi' knows the worries of Sostrata and her daughter. He is their supporter and forms a most pleasing picture of the

(1) Mostellaria, 16-19, 55-57, 59, 70.
(2) Mostellaria, 58.
(3) Mostellaria, Act1, Scene 1.
slave in his relation to his household. He shows his faithfulness to his old master, even after the latter's death (455 ff.). He is agitated and terrified after he sees the abduction of the music girl, and thinks that Aeschines has cut off his relation with his family, and will desert Parthina (299 ff.). He is longing to vent his righteous indignation on the head of Aeschines and his family (310 ff.). He has consecrated his life to serve the two poor women, and bears in his heart their distress. The honourable Hegic praises him (Adel. 480-482): 'Here is Geta, too, not a bad fellow as slaves go, and active enough. He supports them, he is the sole prop of the whole family....'

Ph. Legrand believes that Hegio's commending of Geta was not found in Terence's original (1). At any rate this commending is characteristic, and shows the tone of Terence in presenting the faithful slave for us.

With faithful slaves may be classed the freedman

---

Sosia of the 'Andria', the confidant of the old man Simo.

Terence mentions in his prologue to the 'Andria' V.13, that he transferred what is suitable in the 'Perinthia' to the 'Andria'. The poet also says that Menander was the author of both 'Andria' and 'Perinthia'. Donatus in his note on V. 13 declares that the exposition of the 'Andria' of Menander was a monologue by the senex, and that of the 'Perinthia' was a dialogue between the senex and his wife. Terence preferred the form of a dialogue, but he replaced the wife of Simo by the freedman Sosia, who took the part of the wife in the first scene of 'Perinthia'. In fact, the 'senex' must burden the person, in whom he confides, with the anxieties caused him by the conduct of Femphilus telling him that he must watch Femphilus, and frighten Davus, and be on guard against any projects which the young man and his slave might form. The Latin poet understood that the matrona, the mother of the young man, was not suitable
to play the part of a spy since she could not follow all that might happen(1).

Legrand says (2) that confidences ought to be addressed to a person whom we believe not to be already acquainted with the facts, otherwise they would seem to be manifestly superfluous. Thaëdrie (Eumolpus) may, of course, know nothing of the past life, nor of the family of Theis, the foreign courtesan, nor need Chremes (Heaut. Tim.) know anything of the misfortune of Benedemus, who has recently become his neighbour. In Senecian's Περιβολία it was to his wife that the father gave a long account of the beginnings of Pamphilus' love affair, and of its consequences. But whatever one may think of an Athenian family, the young man's mother must have known all this, and it was a good idea of Terence's to let Sosia receive the confidences instead of the mother. Legrand concludes(3)

---

(2) Legrand, Loeb, p. 413-14.
that even the greatest of the comic writers of the new period sometimes ran upon the rocks.

But is the invention of the freedman Sosia based on the appearance of the wife in Menander's 'Perinthia'? Professor Beare says (1) that it is difficult to accept Donatus' suggestion that Terence's invention of the freedman in his 'Andria' is based on the appearance of the wife in Menander's 'Perinthia'.

The dialogue between the senex, and his freedman must have differed from the dialogue between Menander's senex and his wife (cf. 235 ff.). The idea of using dialogue form instead of a monologue may, for all Donatus or anyone else can tell, have occurred to Terence independently. Professor Beare seems correct in suggesting that Sosia was an independent character of Terence's invention. He says that Terence, in stressing the fact that he has borrowed from a second Greek play, wishes to divert attention from something more serious. He has made other alterations, not by borrowing but by free invention.

(1) Beare, The Roman Stage, p. 93.
Sosia is introduced for the exposition of the plot which is praised to a certain extent by the critics\(^1\). This sort of confidence is characteristically Roman. The status of the libertus at Rome was different from that of the \(\text{ἀπελευθερωμένος}\) in Athens. The Greek slave who has obtained or bought his freedom from his master could not be a citizen; he resembled the "metics." The slave in Rome who became free by the "manumissio" acquired all the rights of the Roman citizen\(^2\). It is probable that the \(\text{ἀπελευθερωμένος}\) who had no political authority in Athens, played a great part in the Greek Comedy. Pleatus did not show any libertus on the stage. Curcullio presents himself to Lyco the banker under the name of Summanus, a libertus of the captain Therapontigonus Platagiderus, who is in reality the parasite of the young man Phaedronus\(^3\). In the "Captivi" the old man Hagic speaks about his freedman Cordelus, who works in

---

\(^1\) Cicero (De Orat., II, LXXX); Fénelon (Lettre sur les occupations de l'Académie française, chap. VII.

\(^2\) H. De La Ville De Mirmont, Rev. de Phil. de Lit. et de Hist. Anc., p. 140 f.

\(^3\) Curc. III, 42.
the quarries, (1) but Cordelius has no role in the play.

Sosia who was bought by Simo in his childhood, receives his liberty since he is faithful and discreet, and shows the virtues of a free man. This former slave has now the dignity of a citizen. When Simo reminds him of his many benefits towards him, Sosia protests: 'Your recounting the circumstances looks like a reproach for ingratitude.' (2) But we feel that he takes a real interest in the affairs of the family, and the many questions with which he addresses his former master lead Simo to tell with extreme accuracy the whole history of the love affairs of Pamphilus and Glycereum. This information was, without doubt, for the interest of the audience. Sosia approves of the indulgent way in which Simo bred his son Pamphilus (61): '...in vita esse utile, ut nequid nimis.'

This shows that Terence is a deep student of human character. Gourde comments (3) on this line as follows: "What comment need we make upon such a

(1) Cap. III, V. 77.
(2) And. 43-44.
truth? What better spiritual advice could one adduce in behalf of moderation, and temperance than this dictum of Sosia." He owes to his experience in the world another observation (67-68): 

'*... namque hoc tempore
obsequium amicos, veritas odium perit.'*

This observation reminds us of that of Cicero in the 'De Amicitia', XXIV, 89, which is stated with regret: 

'In our time, complaisance makes friends, frankness is the mother of unpopularity.'

Sosia, with his signs of approbation, with his objections, and with his questions, leads the 'senex' to put his whole confidence in him.

As Sime is not delivering a direct unbroken address to the spectators, this is due to Terence who prefers to handle the situation in a dialogue rather than a monologue form[1]. It is Terence then who changes a monologue in the original to a dialogue, for which he is praised. On the other hand during a dialogue between the freedman, and the 'senex', Sosia

---

could show his approbation or objection and Simo could be sure of his faithfulness.

Professor Norwood says that Sosia interjects 'Hum!' and 'Ha!' and the like at intervals and that he is a needless person. In fact Sosia does not interject only 'Hum!' and 'Ha!' but he helps in conveying information to the audience; by his objection (44 ff.) he shows his faithfulness; also from his mouth comes the philosophy of Terence on human character (61, 67-68).

Terence was right in changing the monotonous monologue in Menander's 'Andria' into a lively dialogue by making Simo unburden himself to his elderly freedman. Terence's only fault in portraying the personage of Sosia is the latter's disappearance from the play after the first scene, despite Simo's request that he should help him in the marriage plot. This is a weakness in Terence from the technical point of view.

Besides these faithful slaves, there are a number of women servants, and old nurses who show an honest devotion to their masters - witness Myasis of the 'Andria', Canthera in the 'Adephi', and Sophrona of

(1) The Art of Terence, p. 32.
the 'Phormio'.

Mysis (Andria) asks herself in her trouble whether Pamphilus will keep his word to her mistress Glycerium. She shows her anxiety and is oppressed with grief when she hears Pamphilus speak of another wife:

'miserum me quod verbum audio', (240); or when Pamphilus’ words have struck her with fear in his monologue (241 ff.):

'oratio hece me miseram examinavit metu' (251).

She shows her faithfulness when she comments on Pamphilus’ passage (252 ff.) as follows: 'I am wretchedly afraid where this uncertainty is to lead. But now it is absolutely necessary either that he should see my mistress, or that I should say a word about her to him. When the mind is in suspense, it is swayed by a slight impulse one way or other (264 ff.).' How wonderfully she shows her sympathy, when she hears the assurance of Pamphilus that he would never forsake Glycerium: 'resipisco', 'I breathe again' (298).

Canthara, the old servant of Sostrata, becomes indignant, when she learns that Aeschines, who is the sole comfort in the household’s troubles (294), and
who swears that without her mistress he will not live a single day, has fallen in love with some one else.

The most cunning and shrewd slaves show their faithfulness towards the young masters. Ctes of the 'Phormio', shows his faithfulness towards Antipho by saying: "It is him I pity, him I fear for. It is he that now keeps me here". (555). He is indeed resolved to stand by the young men and bear all the unpleasantness, which may arise (137 f., 137 f.). In the 'Andria', Dauus says: "If I were to forsake Pamphilus, I should have to fear for his life". (210). He attempts to supply aid, comfort, and backbone to his young master, and to trick his old master Simo. Syrus helps the two young men of the 'Hecut, Tim.' and he does not even inform them about the intrigue, which he is undertaking for their benefit. He shows a curious affection when he offers himself to receive the punishment which threatens Glitipho (973-74). In the interest of the two brothers of the 'Adelphi', Syrus devotes his whole talent without any reservation. Parmeno of the 'Eunuchoi', induced to give assistance (297 f.), proves to be very helpful to Chaerea, and
well suited for the duty in a love intrigue (218 ff.).

These are the most mischievous knaves in Terence. Their attachment to their young masters drives them to their intrigues.

The slave's duty to two masters - senex and adolescens - creates a serious dilemma. Devus in his soliloquy (And., 206 ff.) is not clear which side to take after his old master Simo, who suspects that Devus would try to stop the marriage by trickery, has ordered him not to do anything rashly, as he says:

"And I am not clear which side to take, whether to help Pamphilus or obey the old man. If I desert Pamphilus, I am afraid for his life. If I help him, I am afraid of his father's threats."

Geta in the 'Phormio' opposes the wishes of Antipho and Phaedria, in an effort to be faithful to the senex (75 ff.). He would prefer to clear off (186 f.). He expresses the fear that things might go badly for him in the process (543 f.). This leads him to stress his innocence to the returning senex (289 ff.).

So the slave's faithfulness towards the young
master involves him in threats of punishment from the old master. But such threats are primarily meant to be comic and are seldom fulfilled, and the slave usually does not worry about them, and does everything in his power to help his young master. Davus is not deterred by the threats of the 'senex' from standing up for the young men (299 ff.); he takes a lively interest in the young master's joys and sorrows (338 ff., 964) and regards it as a slave's duty to risk his person for his master. And. 676 ff. The same frame of mind is evident in the slave's words in Ex. Pae. I No.11. 41:

\[ \text{διασωπεὶον τὸν τρωφίμων.} \]

Though the comic slaves derive great pleasure from deceiving characters like the 'senex', or the 'leno', it is in the first place attachment to their young masters that drives them into their intrigues.

Even in this trait Plautus and Terence differ from each other. Plautus' slave sometimes ridicules both his young master, and his beloved one (Asinaria Pseudolus, Poenulus, Curculio). So Plautus makes love more often a matter of comedy than of sentiment. But Terence makes his slave show a more respectful and
sentimental attitude when the slave is showing his faithfulness towards the young master in love affairs.

We can see in Roman comedy a curious trait of many slaves, the disrespectful behaviour towards the old men, e.g. Devus' attitude to Simo (And. 164 f.) when he mocks at the end. Suring of the 'Seunt. Tim' too takes great delight in teasing the senex in an ironical way, and making him ridiculous, 375 f., 415 f., 570. Again in this field of arrogant behaviour of the slave we notice a difference between Plautus and Terence. Plautus' slave is more impudent and shameless, sometimes the roles of master and slave being as it were reversed. In the 'Asin'. (I , i) and 'Cas'. (III,VI), for example, the slave commands, and the 'senex' has to obey. Libenus in the 'Asinaria' begins an enquiry into the attitude of his old master Demeasenetus, and threatens him lest he should be lying, 16 f., 29 f.), then he continues his ridicule ( 36 f.) culminating in the impudent remark (. 114):'quin te quoque ipsum facio heud magni, si hoc petro.' So the poets differ from one another in showing this disrespectful behaviour of the slaves towards the old men.
In real life slaves guilty of lying, cheating or stealing would have been whipped, or imprisoned, or condemned to hard labour. No respectable householder in Greece or Rome would have countenanced such freedom and insolence as the comic slaves display. Thus Roman comedy gives a distorted picture of reality. It is not without its dangers for portayers of manners, however skilful they may be, to restrict their sphere too closely, and allow the intervention of too many literary reminiscences between themselves, and the society whose image they wish to represent (1).

We understand from Latin and Greek literature that the extreme horror of old age is felt by the poets. One terse line of Hesiod expresses the Greek attitude in all history (2): "Work in youth, counsel in maturaity, prayers in old age"; such are the duties of life as expressed in this apothegm. Horace, (3) painting his typical old man, puts before us, not his venerable aspect, and his wise authority, but rather

---

(1) Legrand, Loeb, p. 240
(2) ἔργα νέων, βουλαί δὲ μέσων, εὐχαί δὲ γεροντῶν.
(3) Ars Poet. 169-74
his weakness, and querulousness

'Multa senem circumveniunt incommode, vel quod
enserit, et inventis miser abstinet, et timet uti:
vel quod res omnes timide gelidaque ministret:
Dilator, spe longus, iners, avidusque futuri;
Difficilis, querulus, laudator temporis acti
Se puero, censor, estigatorque minorum.'

The dramatists loaded old age with imprecations,
and reviled it as the most certain and most awful of
human miseries. With their keen love of enjoyment,
and appreciation of beauty, we can well imagine how
bitterly they felt the passing away of youth, and on
no subject have they at all times spoken with more
heartfelt utterance.

Both tragedy and comedy agree in painting the
contempt in which old men were held, and the consequent

(1) Mahaffy, Social life in Greece, p. 248.
(2) Cf. Terence’s Phorm. 575 (Senectus ipsae
morbust)
(3) Mahaffy, op. cit. p. 249.
misery of their position (1). Aristophanes, in the Parabasis of the 'Acharnians', makes a special complaint to the assembled people of the treatment of the older men by the newer generation (437b ff.). There is also a very similar attitude in the 'Wasps' of the same author (cf. the passages of the old diest). The indications in tragedies are not inconsistent with these passages. Euripides often puts forward the ridiculous and feeble aspects of old age, and makes them the comic elements of his tragedies.

This gloomy attitude might bear relation to reality and it might not be foreign to the thoughts of the audience. But the real reason why the comic writers painted such a dark picture of old age was their desire to provide their plays with humour.

Usually the slaves show lack of reverence for the 'senex' as long as they are carrying on the intrigues.

---

(1) Maheffy, op. cit. p. 244
In their eyes, cunning, impudence, perjury, lies are not reprehensible but glorious. This is for the interest of the spectators. When the slaves have perfected their intrigues, there is rarely any further attitude of malice.
Chapter IV

COMIC SITUATIONS

Laughter and Nature of Comedy.

We notice in the works of the Roman comedians that the bringing of characters into ludicrous situations may have an ethical function. The sight of moral disproportions on the stage may point a better way and laughter may enable the spectators to view moral issues more objectively.

For Plato and Aristotle laughter is the psychological effect of comedy. Aristotle looked upon amusement not as an end in itself but merely as a relaxation, a means to a life of happiness (Hic. Eth. 1.1177a).
Ben Jonson states that both comedy and tragedy delight and teach and that the general purpose of comedy is to teach, laughter is accessory only and not an end (1). Molière accepted the moral aim of comedy — to correct through amusement (2). Ridicule is more effective than set condemnation: "On souffre aisément des répréhensions, mais on ne souffre point la reillerie" (3). Meredith believes that the appeal of the comic is to the intellect and that its primary aim is the correction of folly. He in his "An Essay on the Idea of Comedy" expresses his admiration for Terence, Molière and Congreve, but there is little room in his

(1) "Timber or Discoveries" (1641), in Works, Gifford's edition, Vol. III, p. 482.
(2) Préface to Tartuffe (1664).
(3) Préface to Tartuffe; Molière's observation is a restatement of Horace's view (Sat. 1, 10, 14-15).
theory for Aristophanes, Plautus and Shakespeare. Meredith says that those writers were philosophers with a profound insight into life. The laughter of true comedy which Meredith called "High Comedy", as opposed to romantic Comedy, is more a smile than a laugh. Judged by this standard Terence, like Moliere, is superior to Plautus(1).

There are various theories of comedy amongst the modern critics, but almost all of them, as Smith states(2), are reducible to one of two categories, which he calls the superiority theory and the contrast theory.

The superiority theory is the theory of derision or degradation. When a person on the stage shows

---


(2) The Nature of Comedy, p. 31.
deformity or defect the laughter of the audience is aroused. The essential element in this laughter is the feeling of superiority over the mistakes and inadequacies of others. This is the ancient theory of scornful laughter. Aristotle says\(^1\): "the ludicrous being merely a subdivision of the ugly, it consists in some defect or ugliness which is not painful or destructive"). Cicero (De orat. II, 56, 235 ff.) and Quintilian (Inst. orat. VI, 3, 1 ff.) comment upon the nature of the laughable; they agree that the ridiculous arises from deformity and ugliness. Debasing of personages was one of the methods of producing laughter mentioned by the author of the

The feeling of superiority also occurs when the

\(^1\) Nic. Eth. IV, 9.

\(^2\) For the translation of the Tractate, see Cooper (An Aristotelian theory of Comedy, p. 224 ff.).
audience knows more information than the characters (Dramatic irony).

Roman comedy is fully conscious of this theory. We laugh, for example, at the 'senex' of comedy when he loses his dignity and common sense by being a trickster or in love or in anger at his son. The young men are ridiculous. They are extravagant, cowards and helpless. The slaves are also debased when they indulge in rascality and show arrogant and provocative attitudes towards their masters. There are also many examples in comedy, as we shall discuss later, where the spectators enjoy the comic irony when they know in advance more about the difficulties and confusions of the plot than do the characters.

The contrast theory is the theory of incongruity or disappointment. When we see persons or things
turn out contrary to expectation, they surprise and disappoint us as something incongruous or inconsequential develops instead. This unexpected thing arouses laughter. Among the causes of laughter in the Goislinian tractate are the inconsequential, the impossible and the unexpected.

Indeed the theory of superiority contains incongruity. We contrast the character of the low type with ourselves and then we find incongruity which arouses laughter. But when writers on comedy speak of a theory of contrast, incongruity or disappointment, they use the term 'contrast' in a different sense - the contrast between what the audience expects and what it actually does hear and see. (1)

Roman comedy provides us with numerous instances of this incongruity. The incongruities of actions, situations and characters, of life itself serve as the base for the largest bulk of humorous productions in comedy. There is incongruity, for example, when the slave deceives his master or misbehaves towards him, or when he runs on the stage or appears drunk and banquets on it. There is incongruity when the slave often speaks of punishment and shows his fear of it and yet he boasts of heroic achievements and becomes a trickster and domineering. Such conduct would strike us as highly incongruous and clash violently with the realities of everyday life.

The function of the 'servus' in comedy is twofold: (1) to manage the intrigue(1), (2) to provide

(1) This is already considered in ch. II.
humour.

Let us see now how Terence makes his slave provide the humour in the light of the main theories of comedy.

Comic irony, incongruity, reversal, surprise, perplexity, exaggeration and buffoonery are stimuli to laughter and played a great part in all comic theories.

(1) Comic Irony

The traditional comic irony is a device which puts in the mouth of a character language whose full significance is not perceived by himself but only by his hearers, who know, as he does not, the doom that awaits him. So comic irony happens when the

spectators know more information than the characters know. The audience, then, enjoy the comic irony which is possible by their superior knowledge.

There are two main sources of comic irony: (1) the foreknowledge which the audience acquires from the narrative prologue, (2) the foreknowledge which comes more naturally from the exposition of the plot and development of the action within the play itself.

The prologue discloses the outcome to the audience and provides the sense of superiority (comic irony) when the spectators know in advance the reason why the characters are consciously stumbling. Terence entirely breaks away from this convention. He eliminated the expository prologue which provides information for the audience and enlightens them as

to the situation in the play. He did not do as
Plautus or Euripides did, nor did he, as in the case
of Menander, reveal a secret at the end of the first
act. He used the prologue only to defend himself
against his opponents.

As Terence eliminated the narrative prologue,
is irony possible in his plays?

If we look carefully at Terence's plays we
notice that he has not entirely deprived his audience
of irony created by revealing the secret of identities,
which the prologue usually involves. Terence
gradually reveals the mysteries of his plays and
during this progressive revelation irony is caused (1).

The chief source of irony is the working out
of the intrigue. The misunderstanding and trickery
within the dramatic action creates the irony.

(1) Cf. T. Frank, Life and Literature in Roman
Republic, 1930
There is comic effect arising from misunderstanding based upon deception. In the 'Coelianian tractate' deception or ἀπατη is one cause of the laughter. When Syrus of the 'Heaut. Tim.' deceives Chremes by his fiction about Antiphila that she has been pledged to Bacchis for one thousand Drachmas, the spectators feel superiority because of this deception as they know this is only a trick. Later, also, Syrus resuscitates the story of Antiphila when she has been recognised as Chremes’ daughter (790 f.). Simo of the 'Andria' is deceived by his self-delusion. He fails to recognise the truth of the slave’s information that a child has been born. Devus lets him deceive himself.

We see Deme trying to remember the fantastic journey which Syrus prescribes for him and declaring after a long time that he is tired out(1). Tenney

(1) Adel. 572 ff., 713 ff.
Frank comments upon the 'Adelphi' as follows: "The audience, acquainted with a situation that Demes still fails to comprehend, can proceed for several scenes to enjoy the dramatic irony involved in these circumstances"(1). There is irony in the 'Phormio' when the slave Geta rebukes Phormio after they have seen the 'senex' Demipho with his friends Hegio, Cratinus and Crito, the advocates, whom Chremes has procured to witness his interview with Phormio (Act II, sc. iii), entering the stage. They pretend not to see the old man and his friends and continue their conversation, so that Chremes shall overhear them. Geta wants to deceive Chremes and to make him believe that he is on his side but the fact is the opposite and the audience knows this is a trick of which Chremes is ignorant. In the scene

between Syrus, Clitipho and Chromes in the 'Beaut. Tim.' 563 ff. Syrus pretends before the 'senex' to be a pedagogue and boasts of his moral training of the son when he says to his young master Clitipho (579): "Clitipho, haece ego praecepio tibi?". "Clitipho, is this following my instructions?" or when he says (590): "at tu pol tibi istas posthae comprimito manus!" "Well, sir, just mind another time you keep those hands of yours off." Chromes thinks that Syrus is upbraiding Clitipho for his intimacy with Bacchis but the audience quite understands that he refers to the compact between Clitipho and himself that the former must not come near to Bacchis. The moment that Terence reveals any part of the plot irony may appear. Persano, for instance, calls the false eunuch 'a perfect gentleman'. Thea and her household little suspecting that he
veritably is one.

So there are many passages in Terence where the irony is possible through the superior knowledge of the spectators.

(2) Contrast and Incongruity.

This theory is defined by the difference between what the audience expects and what it actually does see and hear. It is the theory of incongruity applied to social standing. It is the incongruity of character, actions and situations.

There is incongruity when we see the slave humiliating his master or even showing disrespect towards him. The slave's impertinence and misbehaviour towards his old master and his impunity for the mischief he has done clash with what we see in real life. Syrus of the 'Adelphi' is the best example for showing this incongruity. He deceives the 'senex' Domes by prescribing a fantastic journey for him (572 ff.). He parodies the old master when he says that he uses the moral training of Domes and schools the other slaves to look into the dishes as into a mirror (cf. 415 ff., 419 ff.). He also shows his disrespect of the same old man in his monologue (419 ff.) where he proceeds to give orders to the cook and does not heed what Domes wants to say. He shows his impertinence towards the same Domes and mocks him even in his cups (cf. 769). Is it not incongruous that after all this Syrus, at the end of
the play, not only escapes punishment but is also liberated?

The slave who runs on the stage, or who delays the delivery of an important message to his master by jests, or the slave who does not recognise his master until he has been called several times and only then does he stop and look around, shows without doubt/some incongruity (And. 338 ff., Phorm. 841 ff., Adel. 299 ff.).

There is incongruity when the slaves utter sound moral precepts, e.g. Syrus in the 'Hesaut. Tim'. says to Clinia (314):

"non fit sine periculo facinu' magnum nec memorabile",
"you cannot do anything big or brilliant without risk".

The same Syrus wants Clinia to tell the truth about Bacchis and Antiphila to his father but Clinia hesitates and fears his father, then Syrus addresses
him has in follows (719):
"quid si redec ed illos qui sunt 'quid si nunc caelum rust'?
"What if I have recourse to those who say 'What now if the sky were to fall'?, cf. Phorm. 138, Adel. 967. Donatus comments (ad Phorm. 138, 'Whatever fortune may bring, I will bear it with firmness.') that serious statements are ridiculous when they are spoken by slaves and are inserted for this reason. Donatus also says on Adel. 967 (o lepidum caput!): "all this is uttered in seriousness that it may be seen the more laughable".

(3) Reversal Surprise

We mean by the reversal surprise a feeling caused by an incident that occurs παρὰ προσδοκιάν
"contrary to expectation", which may create laughter. It is felt when an anticipated event does not occur and something else unexpected happens. Aristotle speaks of the element of surprise when things turn out contrary to what one expects\(^{(1)}\). He says also (Probl. 965a) that 'laughter is a sort of surprise and deception'. Cicero notices that the defeat of expectation occasions laughter\(^{(2)}\). Quintilian calls attention to the laugh that arises from surprise or the defeat of the expectation, and from the turning of another person's words to express a meaning not intended by him. These are the happiest jokes of all\(^{(3)}\).

There is a dialogue in the Beaut. Tim. (978 ff.)

---

\(^{(1)}\) Rhet. 14.12a.
\(^{(2)}\) De oratore, II, 71.
\(^{(3)}\) Instit. Orat. vi, 5.
between Syrus and the young men after the 'senex' has seen through their intrigue and has reproached him for it:

Syrus: "He has gone, has he? Dash it, I wish I could have asked him...."

Clitipho: "What?"

Syrus: "Where I am to get my daily bread, he has so utterly cut us off. You, I see, have a refuge at your sister's."

Clitipho: "Think of its coming to my being in danger of starving, Syrus."

Syrus: "Well, if one may only live, there is hope...."

Clitipho: "What of?"

Syrus: "...of our having tidy appetites" (that we shall be hungry enough).

So, Syrus' last reply is contrary to that which Clitipho expected. Clitipho imagined that Syrus was about to indicate some way out of the difficulty, but on the contrary he answered by that "Rapà"
There is also a scene in the 'Adelphi' (569 ff.) between Demeas and Syrus when the latter narrates the fictitious story of the joiner's shop where Demeas can find his brother Micio. When Syrus ends his story and the 'senex' departs Micio enters the stage a minute later. Micio's entrance comes as a surprise to the spectators though they understand that the fiction is false.

(4) Perplexity

Perplexity is a feature that supplies amusing scenes. Leo Gourde says(1): "Much spice is added to the
Humour of Terence by the predicaments into which the characters inveigle themselves. When old Demipho of the 'Phormio', a typical example of the outraged parent who is hoodwinked at every turn by some enterprising rogue of a slave, seeks to undo the marriage of his son to his supposed relative, he is repulsed by the categorical injunction:

'actum ne esse', 'settled once, settled for ever'.

In the 'Andria' there is a scene where Lysis is bewildered because of Devus (731 ff.). In this scene Devus tells Lysis to lay the new-born child on Simo's doorsteps, which is part of Devus' plan to put a stop to the marriage and rescue Pamphilus from his difficulties. Then Chremes appears. Devus darts off stage leaving the confused Lysis alone without any preparation. She is greatly perplexed at being left alone, and in her confusion she neglects to
answer the old man's question (743). A moment later Davus returns and quarrels with Lysis for putting the child at his master's door. But Lysis is utterly surprised and tries to defend herself and her mistress. At the end of this scene Chremes is convinced that the child is really Pamphilus's and Davus is successful in his trick. What is amusing in this scene is Lysis' bewilderment. She is caught unawares and she is confused and tries to escape from her tormentor by any means (1).

The slaves are put in difficulty when the 'senex' sees through their intrigues (cf. Syrus of the 'Esaet. Tim.' 975 ff.) or when their masters come from abroad unexpectedly (Geta, Phorm. 140 ff.). They

---

(1) Miss Wilmer (O.J. 46, 1930-31, p.169) comments on this scene as follows: "The slave-girl's distress and confusion claim little sympathy from the audience that sees no disaster in the circumstances. It is the irony of life, as Stephen Leacock (Humour: Its Theory and Technique, Dodd, Mead and Co., New York, 1925) would see, in a scene of comedy, not tragedy - an 'appearance of disaster where no real disaster is.'"
are bewildered and lose their temper for a time as they fear punishment. To oppose such difficulties the slaves sometimes give themselves out to be honest pedagogues and call on a large number of Gods and Goddesses as witnesses to the truth of their allegations, and by their false assertions try to secure the confidence of the 'senex'. So the perplexity of the slave itself is comic and helps to produce comic effect.

(5) Exaggeration and Force

Exaggerated and farcical action develops into scenes of buffoonery and slapstick.

The 'servus currans', when he runs on the stage or delays a message in idle jests, displays
buffoonery

The slave sometimes boasts of his achievements and cleverness in a ludicrous way (cf. Syrus in the 'Hecut. Tim.' 709 f.). But Terence was restrained in showing the slave's vainglory. We can see how Chryselus in the 'Ecclesides' 925 ff. gives a detailed comparison between his intrigues and the siege of Troy and says that he will storm his master without a fleet, without an army, without so great an array of soldiers. Elsewhere the slave compares himself with Agathocles or Alexander (1). Plato says that

vainglory when it is

(1) Cf. Davus in the 'Andres' (338 ff.), Geta in the 'Phormio' (841 ff.), Syrus in the 'Adelphi' (299 ff.).

powerful, is to be hated (1). As Greig says: "We are ready to accept the suggestions of self-love which the figure of the vain person offers us, it needs only the lightest trigger pressure to release that kind of behaviour in us" (2). Scenes of drunkenness also have comic effect though Terence rarely shows such scenes on the stage. Syrus of the 'Adelphi' (763 ff.) is just tipsy having drunk some wine off the stage. On the other hand Callidamates (Nestorialis, 306 ff.) or Pseudolus (Pseudolus, 1246 ff.) under the influence of wine staggers and stumbles on the stage and indulges in all sorts of eccentricities. This is a comic effect of vulgar nature and this Pleutine vulgarity and exuberance is different from Terence's restraint. Even the beatings and blows which Sannio

---

(1) Philebus, 47-50.
receives (Adelphi, 159, 170 ff.) are not as grave as those which Flautus' slaves receive.

The series of abusive terms which the slave heaps upon his opponents is amusing. Quintilian states that verbal attack (sic unitis) may be one of the forms of laughter. But we notice that much of the laughter which is created by the abusive terms of Terence's slave is accessory and not an end. He either mocks the theories of his opponents about life (senses) or renders their methods ridiculous (parasite, courtesan, slave dealer... etc.).

In the course of the dialogue the wily slave shows arrogant and provocative behaviour towards the 'senex'. We have many instances of impudence and abuse which are hurled by a slave at his old master.

Devus of the 'Andria'; for example, mocks Simo

(1) De Instit. Cret. VI. 3.
(201-202) as we hear the latter say (204): 'inridera?'
"You laugh at me, do you?" Notice the ironical echo of 'quam sis callidus' (198), which is said by Simo, when Davus says: "immo callide" (201) and how Davus says 'ita aperte' with sarcastic reference to Simo's words 'aperte' (195). There is a comic repetition of Simo's 'laudo' (445) when Davus says (452): 'non laudo', cf. Syrus in the 'Hesaut. Tim.' (419 ff.) who parodies Democ (415 f.). Laughter is caused by such repetition which is tinged with impertinence. The slave ironically compliments the 'senex' on his sagacity (cf. And. 360, 566, 589, 756; 'Hesaut. Tim.' 375, 392 f., 398, 412; 'Pharm.' 718). The slave takes delight in teasing the 'senex' in an ironical way and making him ridiculous (cf. Ades. 769, cf. 521; 'Hesaut. Tim.' 520, 776).

There is humour in the arrogant and provocative behaviour of the slave towards those who are not in
the family, especially towards the Hetaira, the pander, the braggart soldier and the parasite.

The filthy ways of the courtesans fill him with disgust and make him tease them mockingly (cf. 'Eunuchus' 98, 121, 122). There is much that is amusing in the behaviour of Parmeno towards the parasite Gnatho and the braggart soldier Thrase (cf. 'Eunuchus', 271, 279, 283 ff., 466, 474 f., 480 ff., 489 ff., 494 f.). In all these examples Parmeno sneers at Thrase and his parasite and shows his contempt for them.

The slave also shows his contempt of the 'tend' because of the latter's disgusting trade. Cete shows his arrogant behaviour towards him when he says to Dorio the slave-dealer of the 'Phormio' (519): 'di tibi omnes id quod es dignus duint!', 'The powers above deal with you as you deserve!'

When Dorio breaks his promise to Echedria and wants to give the music girl to another man because the
latter is ready to pay soon, Geta addresses Dorio with the word 'sterculinum', 'you muckheap' (526). Syrus of the 'Adelphi' also mocks the 'iavo' Sannio (cf. Act II, sc. iii). Sannio receives blows from the slave Dromo and is treated badly (cf. Adel. 158 ff.).

There are short monologues in which the slave refers to the intrigue on hand usually together with typical jokes corresponding to the situation.

In the 'Andria' (180 ff.), Davus says:
"That was his game (Simo's game), to lead us on, off our guard like, by a groundless joy, all in hope, all fear out of the way, and while we were asleep then to jump on us, so that I might not have time to cast about for upsetting the match: cunning old dog!"

When Syrus of the 'Resut, Tim', enters at V. 512, wishing to swindle the old man out of money, he says: "Run to and fro in every direction: still, money, you must be found: I must set a trap for the old man".
There is a humour in the provocative behaviour of Geta of the 'Adelphi' against Syrus and his family. Notice what Geta says in his monologue 310 ff.:

"...First, I would stop the breath of the old man himself who gave being to this monster; then as for his prompter, Syrus, God! how I would tear him! I would catch him by the middle up aloft, and dash him head downwards upon the earth, so that with his brains he would bestrew the road: I would pull the eyes of the young man himself, and then hurl him over a precipice. The rest of them I would rush upon, drive, drag, crush, and trample them under foot".

Syrus of the 'Adelphi' mocks the old man Demeas after the latter has gone out 387 ff.:

"i sane; ego te exercerbo hodie, ut dignus es, silicernium". He also mocks Demeas who has dashed into Maio's house: "He has gone! A noisy unbidden guest, and a damnable unwelcome one too, especially to Ctesipho(1)". The

(1) Adel. 784 ff.
abuse is also hurled when the slave catches sight of his old master, coming on to the stage (cf. Phorm. 601).

There are many interesting and humorous cases in which an eavesdropper comments on the traits displayed by the characters before his eyes. Stage conditions seem to justify the inability of the subject to hear others talking about him. We find typical jokes corresponding to the situation in the words of the slave which he says aside and which show his wit and firm hope of success and his malicious pleasure that the opponent is falling into his trap.

Davus (And. 425), for example, says: "sum verus?" "Am I a true prophet?"
He says that when Sico has been pleased with his son Pamphilus, who, according to Davus' plan, has not opposed his father's wishes and has no objection to marrying. In Andr. (495), Davus comments aside
on Simo's saying that the child's birth is pretence: "By jove it is he who deceives himself now, not I". Or when Davus says (493):

"I see his (master's) blunder: that shows me how to "act" (cf. also And. 421, 432, 456, 463, 597; 'Hecat. Tim'. 541 f., 556 f.; Phorm. 225, 259, 310, 715; Adel. 401, 521, 544 ff.).

The slave also sneers, when he is outside, at those who are not in the family. He mocks Onatho's method (cf. Eun. 254, 265). He mocks Thrasoe's stupidity and tastelessness (cf. Eun. 418 f., 457 f.). He shows his hope of success and pleasure that the slave dealer is falling into his trap (cf. Adel. 227, 239; Phorm. 491).

From this brief discussion we see that much of the humour of the comedy is provided by the slave. And if we have a deep look at what the slave has done in this sphere, we notice that he does not play the buffoon or indulge in force but humiliates the other
characters; that humiliation provokes derision which is a result of our feeling of superiority. Indeed the slave humiliates the follies of the other characters. He renders their vices ridiculous and sneers at their incongruous social standing.

Terence’s slave does not reveal broad and cruel humour. He does not give rise to funny situations for their own sake but he is voicing the dramatist’s emotions and reflections.

New Comedy is a “mirror of life”, and comedy in general is an imitation of the comic errors of ordinary life which the comic writer represents in the most ridiculous fashion so that no beholder could be content to play such a role in his own life, as this might give him, in the words of Plato, the reputation of a bomolochus (Repub. 606c).

The slave is the mirror of that comedy. Through him Terence reflects these errors of life and through
him makes them ridiculous.

Laughter for Terence is a means rather than an end. He is interested most of all in the way of life and the happiness of his people, and not in "movements" or "comic effect" which they display. This interest in the very life of society is based upon the doctrine of human fellowship. He employs his "servus" through his dramatic structure to show human dignity behind the comic façade.
There are several slaves in the plays of Terence who have minor roles and do not play a great part in the plot or in the successive situations of the play. In other words, they do not play a major role as do the 'servi cellidi' whom we have described in the chapter on 'Intrigue' and who continue through the play and are closely interwoven in the web of the plot. We shall call such minor roles 'inorganic'(1). Our treatment of such slaves will involve male and female slaves and also those who do not appear on the stage at all. We shall examine their general characterisation and the extent and technique of this characterisation.

The first group of these roles is that of the so-called 'protatic slaves'. These characters are mechanically

---

and temporarily employed at the very beginning of the play. They are alien to the later action and serve to advance the exposition. The prostatic actor is introduced in such a way that the audience becomes acquainted with the actors and the action before they are presented in the course of the plot. The comic playwright lets these characters appear to be inquisitive and ask for information. Accordingly the prostatic character himself seldom narrates and expounds. This frequently leads to using slaves or persons of inferior rank who are by nature indiscreet and garrulous, for the purpose of the exposition(1). The general complexity of comic plots of intrigue makes the range of the mechanical prostatic role wider in comedy than in tragedy(2).

Davus of the 'Phormio' has nothing to do with the later action of the play. He has no relation to the plot and seems to know nothing of the events that lead up to it. So the plot of the play is disclosed

(1) Cf. the slave Davus (Phormio), the freedman Socia (Andria), the courtesan Philotis (Hecyra).

by the device of making Davus ask Geta questions and get in return a statement of the situation. He provides an ear to listen to the exposition by Geta who tells him how the two young masters Antipho and Phaedria, who are left in his charge after their fathers have gone abroad on business, have fallen in love, and how Phaedria loves a music-girl, Pamphila, owned by Dorio, the slave-dealer, but has no money to buy her freedom. Antipho meantime marries an orphan girl as a result of a scheme hatched by Phormio and is now anxiously looking forward to the return of his father. Davus assists in the expositions. The skill of portraying a protatic character lies in not letting him know anything of the situation at the beginning of the play. Davus does not know the events that lead up to the plot and so there is little risk that the detailed explanation mentioned by Geta will appear superfluous. Geta also secures a promise of secrecy from Davus. There are sententious remarks in Davus' monologue and his dialogue with Geta (cf. Phorm. 40 ff., 71, 77-8-9). During the dialogue Davus' agitated feeling is subtly indicated. Though Davus wisely encourages Geta in his
behaviour towards the two young masters and shows his admiration for the latter's audacity (cf. Phorm. 77-8, 79, 138-9, 140), he at the same time reminds him of the punishment that awaits him (cf. 137).

Davus does not assist only in the exposition but he also helps in the character delineation. He reveals the character of Geta, the young men and the 'senex' of the play. He shows the boldness of Geta, the loose life of Phaedria and Antipho and the avarice of Demipho through his philosophising. In the first scene of the 'Phormio' there is hardly anything to which one can raise objection. Davus' entrance relates to the subject of the play as he gives Geta the loaned money for the purpose of buying Antipho a wedding gift. Geta addresses confidences to Davus as the latter is one of his fellow slaves and one of his friends who lends him money. They speak frankly as friends. Terence portrays Davus as inquisitive and agitated while he portrays Geta as eager to speak. Their conversation has relation to what follows: Chremes' trip to Lemnos is directly connected with the play; Geta later devises a trick to provide money for Phaedria to buy the music
girl. After Davus' mission is fulfilled - to pay the debt and to listen to Geta's story and assist in exposition - he leaves the stage. Though the motivation cannot disguise the mechanical function of the role, Davus' entrance and exit is managed with great skill.

Sosia is also a protatic character serving to start the 'Andria'. We have discussed his general characterisation and his magnificent role before. We can add here some consideration of Terence's technique in introducing his role as an expository character. Simo trusts him with the private affairs of his family as Sosia is a responsible and faithful slave before he is liberated. Simo has rewarded him by setting him free for his faithfulness and good behaviour. So it is natural for his master to address such confidences to him. Simo is not sure of the behaviour of his son, so he wants a trustworthy person to seek his advice and to ask him for help. Terence finds such a person in the character of this devoted slave. Terence could have chosen the wife of Simo for

---

(1) Cf. Chap. III 'Faithfulness'.
playing this part as in Menander's 'Perinthia' but he prefers Sosia whose opinion would be objective and would not be affected by maternal passion as would have happened if he chose Pamphilus' mother. Simo, on the other hand finds Sosia useful for spying upon Pamphilus and Davus, while Simo's wife would not have been suitable for such a role.

The protatic character must know nothing of the situation at the beginning of the play in order to avoid superfluity. So it is safer to choose Sosia and not Pamphilus' mother who might know something about her son's passion. Sosia reveals his ignorance of the situation. In addition to the past history of the plot which is revealed through the conversation between Simo and his freedman, we learn something about what will follow and gain an insight into the character of Sosia himself, his old master, Pamphilus and the slave Davus. The only fault that Terence makes in depicting the character of Sosia is that Sosia is instructed to perform certain duties which are not fulfilled in the subsequent action.

In order to emphasise the initial situation and
to draw a detailed picture, the comedians employ mechanical and temporary roles even beyond the first scene of the play. Canthera of the 'Adelphi' is an example of this. The real dramatic problem is not indicated until Geta denounces Aeschinus (Adel. 299 ff.). From the dialogue of Sostrata and Canthera (236-298) we learn that the girl is about to bring forth a child and that Aeschinus is their only stay in their troubles (294). Canthera shows optimism (293) and reveals the good character of Aeschinus (296-97). In the following scene with Geta where the dramatic action begins, she is agitated when she learns that Aeschinus has fallen in love with someone else. But she shows timidity in contrast with Sostrata (336-37, 343) and then is put off the stage to call the midwife.

Terence also employs slaves to assist in the plot or to promote comic incident. Parmeno enters (Adel. II sc. 1) with Aeschinus after the abduction of the cithern-player. Parmeno's character is not drawn in detail. He speaks only two words. His function is

(1) Some editors give the words "omittre mulierem" Adel. 172 to Parmeno, others to Aeschinus.
to administer punishment to the 'Leno'. Though he is a slave of Micio, yet he is not active on behalf of Aeschines and Ctesipho as Syrus the 'servus callidus' of the play is. This may be due to Terence's addition to his original. Prescott says that it is not unlikely that Parmeno is the slave who was active throughout the whole of Diphilus' play from which this first scene of the second act is taken, while Syrus had the same function in Menander's play\(^{(1)}\). Parmeno appears only in this scene and Syrus seems to duplicate his role. In the same play there are two other inorganic roles Dromo and Geta. Dromo, the slave of Micio, speaks only a few words (776) and plays the part of an errand-boy, but Geta has a more extended part and his character is drawn with genuine interest. We have said\(^{(2)}\) that he is a faithful and responsible slave. The effect of the incidents in the play is revealed in his monologue (299 ff.). He becomes indignant when he learns that Aeschines has deserted his mistress, though

---


\(^{(2)}\) Cf. chap. III. "Faithfulness".
it is, of course, a false assumption. He is zealous to vent his righteous indignation on Aeschinus and his family. Terence's interest in the attitude of responsibility gives this monologue a serious tone. Geta is mechanically introduced in two scenes and he receives in both of them information of which he is not already cognisant. He contributes to the pathos of the situation more than to the action. But we must not forget that Geta's natural misinterpretation of Aeschinus' raid starts the train of action (1) which leads to Nicio's visit and Aeschinus' marriage.

Sosia of the 'Hecyra' (415-430) enters and leaves the stage mechanically. Sosia converses with Parmeno in reference to the hardships of a sea voyage. Donatus comments on the utterance of Sosia by saying (2):

"alia ratio est currentis ad argumenta, alia actuum comicorum, sed perfecti poetae est ut servire argumento ut tamen spectator novis delectationibus tenetur. Nam in hoc scena, donec perveniet ad Pamphilum Parmeno, hoc Εὐρημα inducitur cum

(1) Cf. Webster, Studies in Menander, p. 177.
(2) Cf. Donat, on Hec. 415.
ostenditur quid meli sit navigatio

So this scene may be employed, as Donatus thinks, for the interest of the audience, but it may also be for saving time. Pamphilus has suddenly seen Parmeno and does not want to give him a chance to stay for fear that he may perceive the truth of the secret (the child's birth, cf. 413-14). So it is possible that Terence wants to give time to Pamphilus to think of a way to dismiss Parmeno and he lets Parmeno converse with Seisie in these fifteen verses of dialogue. The inconsistencies in Pamphilus' word-portrait show that he is not careful in his choice of descriptive epithets (440-41) and that even the fifteen verses were not enough to invent a complete story.

Dromo of the 'Andria' (861 ff.) is a flogger of slaves. He is but a convenient pawn. He does not expound the plot but provokes interest and amusement by the revelation of his own character. His stupidity arouses the laughter of the audience. When his master wants to punish Devus and tells him: "Carry this man into the house," he asks: "quem?" "Whom,
sir?" Of course there were not on the stage at that
time more than three persons, Davus and his master
Simo and the old gentleman Chremes.

We have some women slaves who play a greater
part in the plot. Some of them appear in more than
one scene. Lysis of the 'Andria' comes out of
Glycerium's house to fetch the midwife. She describes
in her monologue (228 ff.) the character of the
obstetrix Lesbia and lets us learn that a child is
about to be born. Later she shows her agitation when
she learns that Pamphilus is forced to marry Chremes'
daughter and deserts her mistress (240, 251) and
reveals her character as a responsible and wise slave
(cf. her monologue 252 ff.). After she finishes her
conversation with Pamphilus she leaves the stage to
fulfil her mission in seeking the midwife. We see
Lysis again in an interesting scene with Davus (716 ff.).
In that scene she assists Davus in removing an obstacle
to the marriage. So she provokes the laughter of the
audience and helps in the promotion of the action. In
her last scene with Crito (600 ff.) she helps in the recognition as she meets Crito, the 'homo ex machina' of the play, and leads him to see her mistress. Pythias and Doris in the 'Eunuchus' are female slaves of the courtesan Thais. They have a considerable part in the second half of the 'Eunuchus'. Pythias is supposed to be a responsible slave as Thais orders her to look after the music girl Pamphila while the former is absent from home (500-501). Pythias in a tragic style promotes the action by telling Phaedria that his eunuch whom he gave Thais as a present has seduced Philumena (643 ff.). Hearing this Phaedria hastens to the house and brings the eunuch and interrogates him through an amusing scene. The eunuch himself has an inorganic role and he provokes laughter by his bewilderment and through the gradual revelation of the truth and the punchings which are heaped on him by Phaedria. Pythias helps in the revelation of the plot (622 ff.) when she tells Thais that the one who seduced the girl is Cheerea.
She also provides entertainment; we remember her amusing scene with the slave Parmeno where she puts him in a ridiculous panic after her mechanical entrance (941 ff.).

The chief function of Dories is to relate an off-stage action. She relates in her monologue (615 ff.) how a quarrel has arisen between her mistress Thais and the soldier Threso during a party at the latter's house. Though she is present with her fellow maidservant Pythias in scene III, act IV, the latter dominates her as Dories speaks only one verse (664).

Now we come to Parmeno of the 'Hecyra' who has suffered much at the hands of the critics. Kuiper, for example, says that Parmeno does not have an independent function in this comedy, he is nothing but the patented messenger and he has the role of eternal-boy(1). Let us now see the general

(1) Cf. Kuiper, Two Plays of Apollodorus of Carystos, Terence's Hecyra and Phormio: Mnemosyne, Suppl. I, Leiden Brill, 1938, p. 29
characteristics of the play and find what was the nature of Parmeno's part in it.

Professor Sorwood says of the 'Hecyra': "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."(1) It is a complex play. This complexity is not used to expound a special doctrine as in most of Terence's plays but expounds the suffering of the human beings. It is a play of pathos. It fills the spectators with pity towards the chief actors of the play especially the women. It is significant that not only are the spectators moved by pity but the actors themselves are affected by it. Parmeno is explaining(2) the gradual transference

---

(1) Cf. Art of Terence, p. 91.
(2) Sec. 164-168.
of Pamphilus' affection from his mistress to his wife, a transfer caused mainly by the noble conduct of the wife during their separation and such conduct arouses pity in her husband (1). The complication in the play is based on two misconceptions and misinterpretations which run through the play. Firstly Sostrata, as the normal mother-in-law, hates her daughter-in-law Philumena. Secondly Pamphilus is still in love with the courtesan Bacchis. In the first scene Parmeno mentions that there is a quarrel between Sostrata and Philumena (178) and that Pamphilus used to visit Bacchis in the early days of his marriage. But at the same time Parmeno points out that in spite of Philumena's dislike of Sostrata the latter always tries to have a chat with her and that there is no complaint on either side (180). Parmeno also tells Philotis that Bacchis became grudging and unamiable when Pamphilus used to visit her after his marriage (158). What is the difficulty then? The trouble which

puzzles all of the actors is why Philumena leaves the house of Laches. This difficulty leads them to these two mentioned conceptions. These misinterpretations provide the motive of the plot. The 'Hecyra' is a slow piece and the audience remains ignorant of the secret on which the complications are based for a longer time than anywhere else in Terence's plays. In this drama of sentiment and conscience the action proceeds only slowly while the actors are trying so hard to solve their problems and struggling on as they do in a flow of consultation. The dramatist tries to keep the mysteries accumulated without any key to the solution for a considerable long time. This explains to us why the playwright does not give Parmeno the chance to perform the conventional role of the comic slave. He does not let him help his young master in his troubles. Every time this unhappy slave enters, eager to do what is expected of him, he is ordered off the stage to leave room for the play(1).

Indeed the plot of the 'Heccyr' differs from any other comic plot. It contains no intrigue and it does not need complications or underhand dealings created by a wily slave such as we usually find in Terence's plays. In the 'Heccyr' Pamphilus is already married; the complications are already present. The 'Heccyr' resembles the usual kind of comic play only in the recognition. Terence reserves the key-fact (that Philumena has been violated at the festival during a dark night and that the violator is Pamphilus himself) till near the end of the play (529). But even this 'anagnorisis' differs from the usual recognitions. It relates to a married man and happens after his wedding, while in comedy it usually helps to marry a couple at the end of the play. So the knot of the 'Heccyr' is its secret and the playwright must keep this secret safe so that the plot may run through. To let the conventional slave direct or even help such a plot may endanger it.

Misddeeds within the family must be hushed up at any cost (Phaedris, for example, in the 'Eunuchus' cuffs
the poor eunuch and tries his best to pretend, and to get the maid-servant Pythias to believe, that it is the eunuch who is really guilty; cf. Eur. 716). In the 'Heocyra' the wife and her mother are keeping the child's birth decently concealed. When Pamphilus discovers that he himself has been guilty of the pecadillo, he tries to conceal it. And so the threatening scandal is always hushed up because it has been done to a girl within the family. This may have pleased Terence even more than the essential virtue of the story(1). So Parmeno is immediately driven from the scene or commanded to hold his tongue if he stays(2). Parmeno in the first scene shows flippancy and indiscretion when he entrusts to Philotis the secrets of the family, though he secures a promise of secrecy before he starts blabbing (112-114). These blabblings suit the slave Parmeno

who is of inferior rank and who is by nature indiscreet and garrulous, for the purpose of the exposition. This vulgarity and indiscretion is an unmistakable advantage. Thus Parmeno must have no hand in the plot because he might endanger it. It becomes clear now how Parmeno's role or rather lack of role between 443 and 799 is the result of his flippancy and indiscretion. He knows too much, even more than the other members of the family, because of his close relation to Pamphilus. Thus the dramatist must put him in an alley during the execution of the complication. Parmeno has an undesirable role and is eliminated as a witness. His chief function is to help in the exposition. He reveals the past history of the plot and its present complication. He gives us information about the character of the chief actors especially the mother-in-law (Sostrata) and the courtesan (Bacchis). Apart from that he does little but run. It is true that he provides us with the farcical scene (431-43) in which Pamphilus sends him to meet
some imaginary person. His dialogue with Sosia (415–30) may be also designed for comic effect. Parmeno is without doubt an inorganic slave, but as he is the only chief slave in the 'Hecyra', may this lead us to think, as some critics point out, that Terence does not acknowledge the part of the slave or he at least is averse to using the slave as the chief factor of the plot? Recently Amerasinghe has written an article about 'The part of the slave in Terence's drama' (1) in which he says that Terence endeavours to dispense with the traditional convention and that the goal towards which Terence had been moving is the liberation of the action from the deus ex machina (the slave) (p. 71) and that this process is gradual (p. 63). 'Beginning with a half-hearted acceptance of the convention, which being half-hearted results in a conflict (Andria), he moves forward to a position in which he seems desirous of banishing the

slave from the stage (Hecyra), but ends with a compromise between convention and design (Adelphi)' (p. 63).

We shall discuss this theory in the following chapter. But what now concerns us is his referring to the 'Hecyra' which is the basis on which he founds his theory and it suits his purpose more than the other plays of Terence (p. 63). He means to say that Terence, by keeping Parmeno in the dark, wants to abolish the part of the slave from his comedy.

Amerasinghe forgets that Terence adapted this play from a Greek original and whatever Terence has made by way of changes, he does not change the plot. From our previous discussion we can notice that Parmeno cannot play the conventional role of the 'servus callidus' in such a plot, which is not in need of the slave's machination. This does not mean that Terence does not acknowledge the part of the slave or wants to abolish it. He chooses this play because it suits

(1) cf. Terence's criticism of Flautus, Adel. proo. 6-7.
his taste for creating the suspense which is his chief procedure. It deals also with pathos and humanity which are desirable to Terence's art.

The 'Hecyra' is a play nearer to Tragedy than Comedy. Either Apollodorus or Terence can do without Parmeno in such a tragic play, but they, as comedians, present him, though in a minor way, to keep the general features of comedy. The slave is a necessity for comedy. If Parmeno does not carry on any intrigue like the usual slave in comedy, he is the only person who provides humour in the 'Hecyra'.

There are two other slaves who are of a special type, Byrris ('Andrie') and Dromo ('Heaut. Tim'). They are introduced for contrast.

Contrast is one of the comic elements in the theatre of Terence and it can be found in one and the same character or between two characters. In the 'Heaut. Tim' Kenedemus changes his manner of life when Clinia goes away to the wars. The sudden change of Demes in the 'Adelphi' from the stern father to an indulgent one is an obvious example.
A balanced pair of characters is a recurrent phenomenon in the Roman comedy(1). These two characters are of the same sex or age or social status. Old men, young men, wives, courtesans and slaves are contrasted. Usually one member of the pair is a foil for the other. In every play of Terence there are two character contrasts. These pairs are familiar in Terence's comedies as a result of his duality method (a double plot).

The 'Adelphi', for example, weighs the old men in the balance. Demes and Micio have opposing theories. Demes is stern and a pessimist, Micio is indulgent and an optimist. See also Chremes/Simo (Andria), Demipho/Chremes (Phormio), Menedemus/Chremes (Helen. Tim.), Phidippus/Laches (Hecyra). The same is the case with the young men, who go in pairs with some variation: Pamphilus/Charinus (Andria), Phaedria/Antipho (Phormio), Phaedria/Chaerèa (Eunuchus).

Clinis/Clitipho (Hes. Tim.), Aeschinus/Ctesipho (Adelphi).

In two comedies of Terence, the 'Andria' and the 'Hes. Tim.', the contrast between two slaves is obviously clear. One is a foil for the other: Byrris sets off the wily Davus (And.), Syrus dominates Dromo (Hes. Tim.).

Byrris acts in concert with Davus. Both of the young men have the same difficulty: they want to obtain the girl whom they love, but some obstacles stand in their way and they work together with their slaves to find a way out of this difficulty. We have seen what the resourceful Davus did to help his master Pamphilus. Let us see now the role of Byrris. At his first entrance (301 ff.) he brings bad news to his master Charinus. He tells him that Pamphilus will marry Philumena to-day. Charinus who is in love with Philumena is agitated and paralysed at this news, but the faint-hearted Byrris consoles him only with commonplace consolations of slight effect and coarse humour. He cannot give him valuable advice in this
trouble (315-317). We are expecting Byrris to contrive some plan but, on the contrary, Charinus contrives one for himself (312 f.). At v. 337 Charinus dismisses Byrris contemptuously by saying: "As for you, I swear you have not given me an ounce of counsel except what was dead useless. Away with you". If we compare this with what Pamphilus says about Davus (v. 336, "quouius consilio fretus sum") we can see how inferior is Byrris to Davus.

In Act II, scene v. (412 ff.) Byrris reappears. He has been sent by his master to watch Pamphilus' activities and to see if he is true to his assertion that he does not care for Philumena (332). He overhears the conversation between Simo and Pamphilus, in which Pamphilus agrees to do his father's bidding and shows his (pretended) acquiescence in marrying Philumena. The result of this eavesdropping is to carry again this bad information to his master. It is, however, significant that his presence is given some natural motive. Byrris's perplexity and disgust for Pamphilus are natural.
That is the whole role of Byrris in the play. He is loosely attached to the plot. He does not invent or manage any scheme to help his master who always puts his fortune into the hands of Davus (373, 704, 705) after realising Byrris’s helplessness. Only bad news is brought by Byrris. Charinus receives the good news from the other characters. Byrris’s clumsiness, stupidity and helplessness give the superiority to Davus who is a typical representative of the slave who takes the part of the young master and schemes to get the better of the father and takes on himself the responsibility of his acts.

The same is the case with Dromo in the 'Hesauton Timorumenos'. He also plays in concert with Syrus. They work together to bring the lovers of their young masters on to the stage. But we see that Dromo is only working under the leadership of his fellow. He disappears quickly from the action and leaves it to Syrus to manage.

Characters are revealed also by description. This description is revealed in a monologue or a
dialogue. Micio in the 'Adelphi' compares his brother's method with his own (Adel. 34 ff.) as does Demes (355 ff.). The traits of Philotis and Syra at the beginning of the 'Hecyra' are naturally introduced through their conversation. The contrast here between the two courtesans is successfully depicted. Chremes of the Hesaut. Tim. describes the slave Dromo as a slave not worthy of the name. Though Dromo and Syrus are plotting together on the sly (Hesaut. Tim. 471-474, 514) yet Chremes says about Dromo, 514 ff.: "That servant of Clinia's is somewhat dull; therefore that task has been transferred to this one of ours (Syrus)." He is also described as stupid and worthy of the mill as he cannot contrive some stratagem to help his young master (cf. the dialogue between Chremes and Syrus, 530 ff.).

We usually see at the end of the play a character introduced to help in recognition. Terence introduces Crito (Andria) and Hegio (Adelphi) for this purpose. Such characters are catastrophic roles or "hombres ex machina" who are used for the denouement.
Grito and Hegio are introduced as new characters in the final chapters of the plays to solve the complications resulting from the intrigues of the slaves and to give turn to events by rapid recognition of a lost child. Terence introduces also Sophrona (Phorm. 728 ff.) and the nurse of the 'Hecat. Tim.' (614 ff.). Sophrona the maidservant of Chremes' daughter recognises Chremes and the nurse of the 'Hecat. Tim.' examines the ring which leads to the identity of Antiphile.

Terence's plays contain some mute slaves who are lifeless and provide no activity. The scene headings and text are not always explicit(1).

(1) Cf. the slaves who follow Bacchis of the 'Hecat. Tim.' 361 or Thais of the 'Eunuchus' (506); the slaves who carry victuals and enter behind Simo (Andria, 28); Gnatho who accompanies a slave girl with Pamphila (Eunuchus); Thraco who enters (Eunuchus, 771) with an army of slaves (Syriscus, Simelio, Donax, Sanga and Sannio). Some of these slaves are introduced to promote comic effect or to portray the manner of life rather than to assist in the action. It is only Sanga in the 'Eunuchus' who speaks and shows some activity.
We can notice also a number of slaves who are called or mentioned by the actors but who do not appear on the stage. The purpose of introducing them is to illustrate the manner of life. Archilis is a housekeeper (Andrius, 228), Storax (Adelphi, 26) is one of the slaves who used to escort their masters home after a banquet. Donatus calls such slaves 'aduorsitores' or (Aduersitores, Wessner). Dromo and Stephanic (Adelphi, 376, 380) are slave-cooks. Scirtus is called by Parmeno (Hecyra, 78) to give an excuse for Parmeno's absence if his master asks for him.

So Terence presents in addition to the 'servi callidi' an array of servants, servi and ancillae. They are employed at the beginning or through the course of his plays. Such servants do not contribute much to the main action but they are loosely attached to it.
Chapter VI

Terence's Originality in the Portrayal of the Slave

Latin Comedy contains a limited number of typical characters, parents, sons, lost children, courtesans, braggart soldiers, besides the angry old man, the running slave, the greedy parasite, the brazen sycophant, the avaricious 'leno' (Hes. Tim. 37-39).

So the Roman playwright is restrained by this limited number of characters. He has been restrained also by the convention of the plot and the convention of the scenes of the play. He also has to observe the Aristotelian canons of the limitations of time and place. Accordingly we cannot expect a great development in character under these conditions as it is impossible for a comic writer to show his actors
developing through this limited time (generally one day), and unchangeable single scene (a street with three houses in a particular town). The modern dramatist is not restrained by such conventions but has a wider freedom in portraying his characters.

In spite of all these restrictions, Terence's characters show some conversion through the course of the play. But unfortunately, owing to the limited time, this change is violent. We know the sudden change of Demes in the 'Adelphi', who from a stern old man becomes indulgent and generous. Chaeve of the 'Enuchus' is changed from a dashing, irresponsible youth to a man of responsibility.

Though Terence's characters are stock characters, he is not satisfied with these mere types. His artistic instinct rises above his restrictions. He makes his characters well-defined.

There is unity in his characters as well as in his plot. All the characters of one family, fathers,

---

sives, sons and slaves, are working for its solid stability. The slave and father differ in methods but both are working for the stability of the family. The father, by his filial love, wants to effect a reform in his son, the slave by his devotion, extricates his young master from a scrape.

The seal which Terence's slave shows in helping his young master is an ardent devotion. He has a sense of duty and responsibility towards the youth.

Davus takes himself quite seriously as being responsible for his young master's happiness (cf. And. 205 ff.). He is worried about the turn his master's affairs have taken. The courtesan (Glycerium) is to have a baby, and his fool of a master actually intends to acknowledge it. He will have to go and tell his master about his father's plans to get him married. In the 'Hes. Tim.' the slave Syrus has taken the initiative (Hesut. 310 ff.) in attempting to extricate his young master, Clitipho, from financial and amatory embarrassments (cf. also Hesut. 973-74, where Syrus takes the responsibility for what
his young master has done).

Terence's slave, unlike the slave of Plautus, never makes fun of his young master's love but shows always a sense of respect. Terence shows his artistic delicacy of sentiment and respect for unity by portraying his slave with this sympathetic characterisation. There is none of Plautus' bold conception of character drawing, but rather a sympathetic insight into and appreciation of men. There is nothing forced or twisted to bring the slave within the limit of the scheme. Sympathy and pity, for instance, lead Geta of the 'Phormio' to stay to help his young master in his trouble, otherwise he would pack his things and take straight to his heels (Phorm. 177 ff.). It is the same Geta who relates the pathetic story of the orphan girl at the beginning of the play. This sympathy leads Terence to long details and calm scenes. Plautus has little taste for outbursts of sentiment. He himself informs us in the 'Casina' that he left out the role of the
youthful lover(1), while in the 'Asinaria', the 'Aulularia' and possibly other plays as well, he must have cut down his part(2). His chief desire is to lend life to the action. In the opening scenes of the 'Stichus' Plautus gives promise of a charming character comedy; but he soon gets tired of a subject that was no doubt too mild for him. He neglects Pinciacum and Banegyris, who have both wit and heart, and introduces Gelesimus, who is merely full of spirit. Then he neglects Gelesimus and introduces merry slaves who drink and brawl and cut capers. Elsewhere also his characters play the buffoon at the most solemn moments and in a most unnatural way(3). Plautus' purpose is to interest his audience by making his characters indulge in boisterous farce. His slave manages the intrigue with impetuous audacity, always crying, running,

(1) Casire, Prolog. 64-68.
gesticulating. He is more dramatic than realistic. He lacks the sympathy and depth of Terence's slave. Plautus portrays him as indiscreet and with much malice. He has no restraint in language and displays much buffoonery. He brings about a lively action but Terence's slave brings about a calm effect and reveals Terence's conscious art. "Terence is far closer to the contemplative, sentimental 'criticism of life' of Menander himself" (1).

Falsestrio of the 'Miles Gloriosus', for example, does not help to produce anything better than farce and so the plot is careless. It seems that Plautus scorns to portray passion and sentiment. Terence, on the other hand, has artistic scruples about plot construction and strives to portray his characters with sympathy and humanity. He likes portrayal of sentiment. He gives his spectators a lesson on humanity. He attempts to make human action

---

(1) M. Grant, Roman Literature, Cambridge, 1954 p. 29.
the significant result of character and situation.

When Philhellenism began to flourish in Rome, some of the Roman intellectuals wanted to add a humanising touch derived from Greek literature and philosophy after the stern qualities instilled by the old discipline, especially by Cato. They wanted to blend the typical Roman qualities with the Greek ideal of character (1). As Professor Fraenkel says: 'Rome contained in herself great potentialities (Δυναμική) for the most extraordinary spiritual achievements, but merely potentialities. To release and to transform them into activity (Ενέργεια) there was needed the liberating energy of Greek form' (2). The Roman training prepared one for the practical conduct of family and state affairs, while the Greek added an understanding of the spiritual and

---


moral responsibility of men to men; thus the combination of the two would seem to have had the potentiality of moulding the superior character. In the case of the Scipionic Circle this very thing happened. Terence was the spokesman of this group of cultivated men. This intellectual society was especially interested in the humanistic aspect of Hellenic culture. As Jean Cousin says: "Le cercle des Scipions a joué un rôle important dans le développement de cette notion d'humanités qui a déterminé pour des siècles un idéal de civilisation et de culture, Polybe et Panaeas, Laelius et Scipion ont annexé à l'interprétation stoïcienne de la vieille virtus Romana une conception nouvelle de l'humanités', un idéal vraiment gréco-romain... cet idéal s'oppose à la crudelités, l'arrogantia, la superbia, l'acribitas, la duritas."


So the precise characteristics of this humanity are the benevolencia, mansuetudo, suavitas, clementia, which colour the comedies of Terence. Our poet as a member of the Scipionic Circle, introduced courageously a new literature and began to "initier la foule aux finesse de sentiments et aux déliciostesses de goût de son aristocratique et intellectuelle société stoicienne."\(^{(1)}\)

Terence certainly was influenced by this humanity. He likes psychological description and portrayal of morality. Psychological observations and moral discussions prevail in Terence's plays which are a study of sentiment and characters. They are written for a 'Psychological Theatre'. Varro praised him for this: 'in ethesin poscit palam'.\(^{(2)}\) Terence employs the slave to a great extent for this sort of analysis.

---


\(^{(2)}\) Nonius Marcellus, p. 374 N.
Syrus of the Adelphi, for example, reveals the character of Demea. He knows the weakness in his character. Demea likes, Syrus says, to hear his son praised, so the experienced slave will make Ctesipho appear to his father as an angel (Adel. 535-6).

Syrus on every occasion he meets Demea shows him that his son is of good moral character as a result of his paternal upbringing (cf. Adel. 410, 413, 433, 534 f.). Demea's vanity is aroused by Syrus' effective flattery (cf. Adel. 365 f., 392 f.). The passage (422 f.) where Syrus parodies Demea's words is magnificent. He shows in this passage how rigorous and strict is Demea's method of training his child. Notice what Terence has put into the mouth of Syrus when the latter says to Demea at the end of this passage: "According as the man is, so must you humour him". Terence's chief object is to give a picture of the character and morals of his 'dramatis personae' and not to portray their customs and habits as Plautus does. Terence does not allow his slaves to make banquets on the
stage, drink, make love and revel (cf. Plautus, Stich. 446-48).

The characters of Terence also display moderation and realism. Terence is certainly something different from and greater than a mere fashionable writer. His comedies are portrayed in a manner true to nature. The ancients called him 'medioaris'. This moderation is not only expressed in his characters but even in his language and style. Terence himself says (Phormio, prol. 5): "tenui esse oratiane et scriptura levi". From Suetonius we learn that Caesar described Terence's writings as "lenia scripta" and Cicero said about him "come loquens atque omnia dulcia miscens". This moderate tone results from his mixing with the polite and noble society in Rome, the Scipionic Circle(1).

Terence, without doubt, improves on his predecessor, Plautus, by reproducing the urbane speech

---

of the upper classes. Jehannann comments: "This means under the then existing conditions of the Latin literary language, a new creation and a linguistic achievement". The language of his persons does not differ: men or women, old or young, masters or slaves, wives or courtesans reveal themselves in the language of the author. There is a smooth elegance of diction, little buffoonery, little word-play; the metrical effect is subdued, the language is restrained, the sentiments are proper.

Terence, inspired by the Scipionic Circle, prefers moderation and restraint in expression. Eventhius says (p. 20 w.): "eius fabulæ eo sunt temperamenta ut neque extumescant ad tragiam celsitudinem neque abiciantur ad minimum utilitatem". Terence declares against the boisterous farce (which Donatus

calls 'fabula motoria') that contains a noisy action
and prefers a quiet play (fabula stateria)¹ which has more marked features than the liveliness of
the action. In the circle of Terence the Latin
literature was struck at the root by the fatal disease
of mediocrity. But in Terence himself this mediocrity
is, indeed, golden - mediocrity full of grace and
charm accompanied by careful and delicate portraiture
of character, and by an urbanity to which the world
owes a deep debt for having set a fashion².

Moderation prevails through Terence's plays. He
always expects of his characters good temper and
moderation. They interest the audience by exact
conformity to everyday life.

Terence sometimes corrects his original and makes
some changes. These changes show us his sense of
moderation and realism. In one of the fragments of
333 = And. 956-68) the Greek dramatist let his slave

(1) Cf. Heaut. Tim. 36.
(2) Mackail: Latin Literature, London, 1924
p. 23.
Does be tortured by fire, our moderate dramatist lets his Davus be fettered by Dromo. Though Terence nowhere claims independence of his original, yet we know from Donatus' commentary on the plays of Terence that the latter makes a lot of divergences which prove his improvement on the Greek.

In the 'Adelphi', Demes, who is angry with his brother, does not answer the greeting of Micio when he comes upon the stage. Donatus declares that this is a bit of rudeness which was not to be found in the original. When Simo of the 'Andria' thinks that he is being deceived by his son, Terence represents him as being more unhappy than he is in Menander's play. In the 'Adelphi', Ctesipho intends to go into exile as he is not allowed to have his music-girl, but in 'Menander' he contemplates suicide. Micio shows more resistance, when Demes attempts to induce him to marry the aged Sostrata, than in Menander's

---

(1) Donat. ad. v. 81
(2) Donat. ad. v. 891
(3) Donat. ad. v. 275
The same is the case when adapting Apollodorus (Donatus ad Phormic 339)\(^2\). Donatus also notes changing of phrasing to suit Roman taste (cf., for instance, Donatus ad Phorm. 49, 91, 482, 647).

From these changes and others we can notice that Terence portrayed his characters more faithfully than his original. He depicted them in a sympathetic, realistic and moderate way. He portrayed them as true to life and brought out their character with emphasis and naturalness.

Terence cared for portraying his characters and situations more than he cared for the vigour of the 'sermo' and the action. This is the point for which Varro praises him in comparison with Caecilius and Plautus:

\begin{quote}
Caecilius
"in argumentis poscit palam, in ethesin Terentius, in sermonibus Plautus".\(^3\)
\end{quote}

\(^1\) Donatus ad. v. 938.
\(^3\) Varro, Sat. Men., 399B.
Professor Webster maintains that there is some evidence that the lines were harder and more satirical in the 'Perinthia' than in the 'Andria'. The drunken midwife and the burning of Deos belong to the category of boisterous comedy. The 'Perinthia' was in fact in Donatus' (and probably also Terence's) phraseology 'motoria' as distinct from 'stateria'. It seems that Terence likes to choose the 'fabula stateria' as it suits his aim (cf. Prol. Hesut. Tim., 35-47). He himself sometimes feels the quietness of his plays and is obliged to add some changes to give them vividness. He adds to the 'Adelphi' the abduction scene (scene I, Act II), to the 'Eunuchus' the characters of Onatho and Thraso. He changes sometimes a monologue into a dialogue (cf. the dialogue of the senex' with his freedman Scias while Menander's 'Andria' commences with a monologue of the senex', cf. also the note of Donatus on Eun. 359: bene inuenisse personas (Antiphontes) est cui narrat Chaeae, ne unus diu loquatur, ut apud Menander). But even by adding such parts he does not reach the vividness of Plautus'
In this atmosphere of moderation, Terence introduces his slaves. They are not noisy and ferocious, they often arouse natural comic incidents and far from exaggerated unforeseen laughter. They know human nature well. Both the slaves of Terence and Plautus make a mess but Plautus' slaves work with a bold audacity and show lack of moderation in their ruses, and manage them with extraordinary machinations, while those of Terence carry on the intrigue with a justifiable fear. Terence's slaves are genuine rather than dramatic. "Their affinity", in the words of Norwood (1), "lies in 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". It is the slave in Terence who says: "I am Davus, not Oedipus"(2), while the slave

---

(1) Art of Terence, p. 151.
(2) And. 194.
of Plautus compares himself with the heroes of the Homeric age. Terence does not want to feed his public on farce by vulgarity and the 'verborum gravitate scribiore'. We must confess that Terence's slave sometimes speaks with 'verborum gravitate scribiore' but this is for a purpose. It is designed to reflect the errors of life and the defect of the social behaviour of the person thus reproved and not for the sake of the reproach itself. Terence uses this style in the mouth of some of the other characters. The father in Terence, for example, uses this harsh style. Most of the harsh words of the slaves are said aside or in their monologues and few in the face of the person reproved, witness P DISTRIBUTION OF THE 'Eunuchus'. The slave of Terence is used as a commentator on the faults of the human being. Even in dealing with his opponents, the slave uses other ways rather than words of a coarse nature, witness how Syrus of the 'Adelphi' in his dialogue with the slave-dealer uses psychological analysis as he knows

(1) Bech, 949.
the nature of the 'leno'. Syrus contributes a bit of
not-too-wild comedy\(^1\). Sometimes the father in
Terence uses harsh language, but his aim is to effect
reform in his son. This is one aspect of the plain
style of the Scipionic circle\(^2\) and is accepted in
their writing as a result of the teaching of Panætius.
It is Panætius who says: "Indeed real anger must be
far from us" (cf. De oficiis 1.136).

Terence eschews virile, harsh, coarse words in
favour of mild synonyms.\(^3\) He does not feed his public
on force but on an action with a moral outcome and
humanity.

The characters of Terence at first sight are stock
characters indeed but on closer inspection they are
individuals. They often possess an individual
disposition and way of thinking.

The 'leno' of the 'Thormio' is different from that
of the 'Adelphi', the parasite of the 'Sosanchus' is
not like the parasite of the 'Thormio', we cannot

\(^1\) Dunkin, Post Aristophanic Comedy, Illinois

\(^2\) Cf. Fiske, The plain style in the Scipionic
Circle, Tracts, Oxford, 1916, p. 298

\(^3\) Moderation, 'ne quid nimis' in Sosia's words
(And. 61), is the golden rule of life.
confuse the courtesan of the 'Heaut. Tim.' with Bacchis of the 'Hecyrs'. Though Terence has toned down much of the original colour, Menecmus and Chremes in the 'Heaut. Tim.' remain perfectly distinct from Micio and Democ in the 'Adelphi'. He sees them as individuals and gives them a value, which may be quite different from the conventional value of the comic stage or in everyday life(1).

Similarly the slaves show differences from one another. The very nature of the slaves' intrigue, their ways of deception and of arousing misunderstanding, the way in which they tease the old master, the manner in which they deal with their other opponents and their way of solving difficulties, show peculiarities. If we examine these different ways and opinions, we discover in Terence's slave a psychological individuality. We have seen that when they appear in combination, one dominates the other. In the 'Andria', for example, there are Davus, Byrris, Simo and Dromo.

---

(1) Cf. Webster, Stud. in Men., p. 216.
Xtevus dominates Byrris, Scaia and Dromo are of different types. There is a distinct diversity in the character of each of them. If we take them separately as they appear in the various plays, we meet similarly slaves who display individual temperament. Terence's striving for individual characterisation is evident. Xtevus in the 'Andria' does not take great liberties in teasing the 'senex' in an ironical way as does Syrus of the 'Adelphi'. We cannot confuse the method of deception of the same Syrus in the 'Adelphi' with the method of his namesake in the 'Hecat. Tim.'. Fermone in the 'Hecyra' is indiscreet and inquisitive while his namesake in the 'Enuchus' shows some cowardice, though he is a good moraliser. Oenone of the 'Thermic' is a good actor. Syrus of the 'Hecat. Tim.' is a clever trickster. So Terence by his own methods, especially contrast and psychological analysis, portrays his slave with individuality.

Here it is suitable to examine again the suggestion of 'hersasinghe(1) - that there is a frequent conflict

between Terence and the dramatic conventions of his day and that there was one convention against which, above all others, Terence consistently rebelled, namely the convention of the slave who manages the action (p. 62). He points out that Terence moves in a gradual progress to a position in which he seems desirous of banishing the slave, but ends with a compromise between convention and design. Amerasinghe bases his suggestions on two considerations: a) the part of Formeno in the 'Heocyra', b) on the supposed order of Terence's plays.

We have said enough about the situation of Formeno in the 'Heocyra'(1). Terence's reply to Lenuvinus (2) that Plautus omitted a scene from 'Synapothesaecontes' is itself a criticism and shows that Terence does not suppress his original to such a great extent as to banish a chief character like Formeno if he played the part of the 'servus callidus' in Apollodorus. Furthermore, it is difficult to found

(1) cf. Chp. 5 "Slaves with inorganic roles".
(2) cf. Adel. prol. 6-7.
any theory as to Terence's literary development on
the supposed order of his plays(1). It is admitted
by all that the order of Terence's plays is uncertain.
Each commentator has his own arrangement. Yet it is
agreed that the first play is the 'Andria' and the
'Adelphi' is the last play which Terence wrote. If we
accept Amerasinghe's order we cannot accept his conclusions.
Instead we can notice a progress and improvement in
portraying the character of the slave.

When Deyus in the 'Andria' hears that his
intrigue has failed, he frankly admits his failure
and declares that he really deserves to be punished
(III, 5; IV, 1). Though he devises a second

(1) Beare, Roman Stage, p. 86.
successful scheme, yet he cannot save himself when he has been caught by Simo coming out from Glycerium's house and finally the plot is really completed by the timely arrival of Crito.

Syrus in the 'Hesat: Tim.' develops his schemes quite differently. He is more crafty than Davus and carries out his plots with greater skill and impunity. His plans suffer a reverse as do Davus' plans but at no moment does he lose his self-confidence. His scheme has come to full success.

Parmeno of the 'Eunuchus' does not manage the intrigue of the play. But he shows Chaereas the way for an adventurous scheme. He is a plotter by nature,
but not by intention. Terence reveals him as a
moraliser rather than a trickster (notice his
words to Phaedra, Act I, sc. i, 57-68; Act II,
sc. ii, where he analyses the character of Gnatho
and Thraso).

In Terence's work, without doubt, there is a
conflict between the dramatist and the dramatic
conventions of his day. Terence is aiming at
moderation, moralising and psychological analysis.
But he does not seem desirous of abolishing the
slave entirely from the stage as Amerasinghe thinks
(p. 63). Terence is in need of the slave to put
into his mouth the new method of moralising and
psychology. He adds new features to his character
rather than the old fashioned ways of exaggerated
unforeseen deception and laughter.

Terence adds a new quality to the slave in the
'Phormio'. He does not only put the pathetic story
of Phanium into his mouth, but he makes him an
effective character. Gets is eloquent and convincing;
witness his masterly fiction which he tells to the
'scenes'(619 ff.). He, besides, has a structural value and is as much a scheme as a born actor. His schemes are not complicated as are those of his fellow slave in the 'Heaut. Tim. '

We need not say much about Syrus of the Adelphi. Most of the commentators, and Amerasinghe is one of them, appreciate his tricks and agree that he is a precious scoundrel. But we must emphasise here that the nature of his deception is of a different type which we have not noticed before. He always sends Demea on a wild-goose chase. This effrontery in lying and the impudence with which he satirises Demea to his face, give him a distinctness of character.

So we can see that every slave in Terence has his own peculiar quality, the subsequent is better than the antecedent. Each of them shows a new development in character-drawing. These qualities together give us a well-defined picture of the slave. Terence, as is his usual method in portraying the other characters, is always innovating and making
progress in depicting the character of the slave. He always tries to add to him a new special value in the subsequent course of his writings and he does not desire to abolish him from his plays. Terence is in need of him. The slave is indispensable to Terence's comedies, except the slave of the 'Hecyra'. Without him Terence could not show to his audience or to his readers what he aims at. Terence's moderation, urbanity, morality, psychology, humanity are always on the tongue of the slave. If Terence displays the slave with features different from the traditional ones, this does not mean that he wants to abandon him. On the contrary, he appreciates his character. The slave is the soul of the Roman Comedy. If we lose him, we lose all.

This brief survey shows us that Terence has an artistic talent which now stands unquestioned. He is an innovator. All his characters are touched by his hand. Even if we suppose that he has borrowed the two characters Gnaetho and Thraseo from the 'Eolax',

the adaptation has to be done by Terence(1). The part to be borrowed would have to be written afresh; otherwise it would be meaningless in a different context. Terence was not a mere translator. He carries on the idea of his originals and develops it with a world of different thought and sentiment. Reading Terence we find ourselves in a world which is neither characteristically Greek nor aggressively Italian, but independent of place and time(2). He is much greater than a mere fashionable writer because he endeavours to raise his comedy to a high level and in this he shows his true originality as a dramatist.

(1) Cf. Beare, Roman Stage, p. 103.
(2) Beare, op. cit. p. 98.
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