



**DONATUS' COMMENTS ON CHARACTER-PORTRAYAL
IN TERENCE AND THEIR RELATION
TO THE ANCIENT RHETORICAL TRADITION**

ROBERT MALTBY
UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

Abstract

The chapter investigates Donatus' comments on consistency of character, stereotypical or stock characters and appropriate or true to life characters in Terence in the light of ancient rhetorical teaching on character portrayal going back to Aristotle's *Poetics*. Donatus argues for consistency of character in Terence, even in the case of Demea in the *Adelphoi*, whose apparent change of character in the last act he sees as not genuine. He allows that Terence occasionally diverts from stereotypical characters in the interest of characters that are nevertheless appropriate or true to life and whose actions are well motivated.

Résumé

Cet article examine les commentaires de Donat sur la cohérence du personnage chez Térence, sur les personnages stéréotypés ou fréquents et sur les personnages crédibles, à la lumière de l'enseignement rhétorique antique sur la représentation des personnages remontant à la Poétique d'Aristote. Donat plaide pour la cohérence du personnage chez Térence, même dans le cas de Déméa dans les Adelphes, dont il considère que le changement apparent de caractère dans le dernier acte n'est pas authentique. Il admet que Térence manipule parfois les stéréotypes dans l'intérêt des personnages, dont les actions restent cependant vraisemblables et bien motivées.

This chapter will investigate a selection of notes in Donatus' Terence commentary concerning character-portrayal in order to discover how they relate to ideas on depiction of character in such rhetorical works as Aristotle's *Poetics* (chapter 15) and Horace's *Ars Poetica*¹. A concern for consistency of character from the beginning to the end of a play, as in:

Aristotle *Poetics* 15.6: *περὶ δὲ τὰ ἦθη τέτταρά ἐστιν ὧν δεῖ στοχάζεσθαι ... τέταρτον δὲ τὸ ὁμαλόν. κἄν γὰρ ἀνώμαλός τις ἢ ὁ τὴν μίμησιν παρέχων καὶ τοιοῦτον ἦθος ὑποτιθεῖς, ὅμως ὁμαλῶς ἀνώμαλον δεῖ εἶναι.*
 'Concerning character there are four points to aim at ... Fourthly it should be consistent. Even if the original be inconsistent and offers such a character to the poet for representation, still he must be consistently inconsistent',

and

Horace *Ars Poetica* 126-7:
personam formare nouam, seruetur ad imum,
qualis ab incepto processerit, et sibi constet.

is reflected, for example, in Donatus' comment on Ter. *Ad. Praef.* III 6:

seruatur autem per totam fabulam mitis Micio, saeuus Demea, leno auarus, callidus Syrus, timidus Ctesipho, liberalis Aeschinus, pauidae mulieres, grauis Hegio.

By contrast the idea that characters should be 'true to type', in other words conforming to a set dramatic stereotype:

Aristotle *Poetics* 15.5: *περὶ δὲ τὰ ἦθη τέτταρά ἐστιν ὧν δεῖ στοχάζεσθαι ... τρίτον δὲ τὸ ὅμοιον*
 'Concerning character there are four points to aim at ... Thirdly it should be like (sc. its dramatic type)',

and

Horace *Ars Poetica* 316:
reddere personae scit conuenientia cuique.

is sometimes challenged, according to Donatus, as for example by Terence's character-portrayal in the play *Hecyra*:

¹ For earlier discussions of Donatus' comments on characterisation in Terence see HILGER 1970, p. 101-161, JAKOBI 1996, p. 158-177, DEMETRIOU 2014a, p. 784-789, 2014b, p. 223-239; on such comments relating specifically to *Eunuchus* see BLUNDELL 1987, p.47, BARSBY 2000, p. 506-509.

Don. Ter. *Hec. Praef.* I 9: *in tota comoedia hoc agitur, ut res nouae fiant nec tamen abhorreant a consuetudine: inducuntur enim beniuolae socrus, uerecunda nurus, lenissimus in uxorem maritus et item deditus matri suae, meretrix bona.*

Analysis of such comments reveals Donatus' awareness that Terence normally follows rhetorical precepts on stock types, but may, on occasion, have good reason for diverting from them, provided that these innovations remain 'true to life' *nec abhorreant a consuetudine*². This 'true to life' (as opposed to 'true to type') concept is referred to by Aristotle as τὸ ἀρμόττον:

Aristotle *Poetics* 15.4: *περὶ δὲ τὰ ἦθη τέτταρά ἐστιν ὧν δεῖ στοχάζεσθαι ... δεύτερον δὲ τὰ ἀρμόττονα· ἔστιν γὰρ ἀνδρεῖον μὲν τὸ ἦθος, ἀλλ' οὐχ ἀρμόττον γυναικίῳ τὸ ἀνδρεῖον ἢ δεινὴν εἶναι.*
 'Concerning character there are four points to aim at ... The second point is that characters should be appropriate. There is such a thing as a manly character, but it is not appropriate for a woman to be manly or clever.'

Here, then, Donatus' point is that Terence may on occasion divert from one Aristotelian principle, τὸ ὅμοιον, in the interests of another, τὸ ἀρμόττον. A character which is true to life need not always conform to the recognized stock type of drama.

Aristotle's discussion of ἦθος 'character' in *Poetics* 15 is, of course, concerned with characterization in tragedy³, but its precepts would apply equally well to comedy, as is shown by their application by Donatus to Terence's comic characters. Donatus himself would have had a long scholiastic tradition behind him in which such concepts would have become commonplace⁴. The four aims of characterization discussed by Aristotle, are in order: (1) that the character should provide a 'good' χρηστόν example of behavior for his/her type, *Poet.* 15.2; (2) that the character should be 'true to life' or 'appropriate' ἀρμόττον, *Poet.* 15.4; (3) that the character should be 'like' or 'typical' ὅμοιον of his/her stock type or known dramatic character, *Poet.* 15.5 and (4) that the character should be 'consistent' ὁμαλόν from the beginning to the end of the play, *Poet.* 15.6. Donatus' comments are concerned mainly with items 2-4 of the Aristotelian list and the majority of such comments are concerned with the question of consistency (item 4)⁵.

² On the use of *consuetudo* in this context see JAKOBI 1996, p. 167.

³ It is unknown whether the missing second book on comedy would have contained a discussion of comic character.

⁴ See VIKTOR 2013, p. 353-358.

⁵ For a discussion of the few comments in Donatus relating to item 1, χρηστόν, see JAKOBI 1996, p. 172-174

The present investigation will consequently begin with Donatus' comments on consistency of character and will then move on in the second part to discuss comments concerned with Terence's use of lifelike and stock character types⁶.

As far as consistency of character is concerned, the usual pattern in Donatus' commentaries is that the general characters of individual *dramatis personae* are set out in the prefatory comments to the play, as in the *Adelphoe* preface comment quoted above:

Don., *Ad. Praef.* III 6: *seruatur autem per totam fabulam mitis Micio, saeuus Demea, leno auarus, callidus Syrus, timidus Ctesipho, liberalis Aeschinus, pauidae mulieres, grauis Hegio.*

and then individual notes on each character's actions in the course of the play tend to confirm these initial descriptions and to illustrate how their characters remain unchanged from the beginning to the end of the play. The main controversy in the *Adelphoe* concerns the real or apparent change of character by the old man Demea at the end of the play from a severe to a lenient father. Does Terence present the old man's character as consistent or does it change in the final scenes?

Before discussing Demea in more detail it will perhaps be helpful to see how this methodology works out in the case of less problematic characters. The *leno*, Sannio, for example, is described in the preface as *auarus* 'greedy', and this is confirmed by the individual note on line 246:

Don., *Ad.* 246.1: *ETIAM INSVPER DEFRAVDAT ἀδξήσις apta lenoni auaro, nam honestior persona non hunc ordinem faceret.*

Here Sannio complains that he has been beaten up by the young man Aeschinus, but what is more serious to Sannio is that Aeschinus is also about to swindle him out of money *etiam insuper defraudat*. This sense of priorities, in which being swindled is considered as more serious than being beaten up, is seen by Donatus as a sign of the character's *auaritia*.

Similarly the description of Demea's son Ctesipho in the preface as *timidus* is backed up by a series of notes on his character throughout the play:

Don., *Ad.* 282.2: *lenonem autem timet Ctesipho ut rusticus, ut sub patre duro, ut amator.*

Don., *Ad.* 517.1: *AIN PATREM HINC ABISSE RVS hic ostenditur timiditas boni adolescentis et reuersi ad peccandum ex delicti conscientia et reuerentia parentis.*

Don., *Ad.* 539.1: *SI QVIS ROGABIT NVSQVAM TV ME magna uirtute Terentius rudem, simplicem timidumque inducit Ctesiphonem ab initio, ut is sit, qui mox opprimetur cum meretrice accumbens interuentu patris ob imprudentiam et rusticitatem suam.*

⁶ For a general discussion of Donatus' notes on these three types see JAKOBI 1996, p. 160-172.

Of particular interest here is the emphasis in note 539.1 on the fact that Ctesipho's timidity has remained a consistent feature of his behaviour *ab initio* from the beginning, right through the play. Phrases of this kind are common in Donatus' discussion of consistency of character⁷.

As a final example of this kind of comment on consistency of character we can take the reference to *pauidae mulieres* in the *Adelphoe* preface, which is picked up in the body of the play by comments on the fearful complaints of the *matrona* Sostrata:

Don., *Ad.* 291.2: *NEMINEM HABEO SOLAE SVMVS GETA AVTEM HIC NON ADEST muliebriter queritur et ex perturbatione sua aestimans metu multa facit ea quae pauca sunt.*

Don., *Ad.* 291.4: *MISERAM ME proprium est mulierum, cum loquuntur, aut aliis blandiri, ut (Aen. 4.634) 'Annam, cara' aut se commiserari, ut (Aen. 4.420-421) 'miserae ... mihi'. nam haec omnia muliebria sunt, quibus pro malis ingentibus quasi in aceruum rediguntur et enumerantur nullius momenti querelae.*

Moving finally to the two old men in the play, Micio is described in the preface as *mitis* 'mild', 'easy-going', and Demea as *seuerus* 'strict'. It is the contrast between these two character types and its effects on the education of their two sons that lie at the heart of the play, as is made clear by Donatus' comment on line 81 at the beginning of the play:

Don., *Ad.* 81.1: *in hoc actu diuersi homines, diuersi patres, diuersa studia praeponuntur: hic lenis hic amarus, hic facetus hic impolitus, hic facilis hic pertinax et difficilis in delictis.*

And later at 787:

Don., *Ad.* 787.1: *PARATA A NOBIS SVNT ITA VT DIXI SOSTRATA in hac scaena collatio est personarum mitis ac saeui parentis.*

Micio's easy-going character in relation to his adoptive son, Aeschinus, even when finding fault with him (see notes on 692 and 693), is remarked upon by Donatus in a series of notes throughout the play:

Don., *Ad.* 36.2: *NE AVT ILLE ALSERIT uide quam teneri sit amoris hic timor, in iuvene praesertim.*

Don., *Ad.* 36.3: *NE AVT ILLE ALSERIT AVT VSPIAM nimium tenere amat, qui et haec in iuvene pertimescit, quae circa infantulos cauere solent.*

⁷ See *per totam fabulam* in *Ad. Praef.* III 6 (quoted above), and cf. DON., *An.* 533.5: *placabilis et lenis amicus per totam fabulam inducitur Chremes, Hec.*193.3: *curiosus est Parmeno et idem garrulus, nam per totam fabulam talis inducitur.*

Don., Ad. 51.2: *NON NECESSE HABEO OMNIA PRO MEO IVRE AGERE etsi licet, non necesse est patrem saeuire, quia pater est.*

Don., Ad. 51.4: *et mire ostendit ius suum nisi necessitate non esse seruandum.*

Don., Ad. 610.1: *DISCRVICIOR ANIMI (Aeschinus) hoc loco χαρακτηρα amantis immodice iuuenis et senis facit indulgentis et lepidissimi patris.*

Don., Ad. 692.2: *PRODIDISTI ET TE ET ILLAM uide festiuum senem, quantum se adulescenti accommodet ... prius dicendo 'prodidisti te' quam 'illam'.*

Don., Ad. 693.1: *DORMIENTI HAEC TIBI CONFECTVROS DEOS quam mitis, quam faceta obiurgatio! uide ut satis Micio sit ille ante descriptus.*

For example, at 36, where the only thing he worries about if his son stays out late at night is that he will catch cold; at 51 in comments on Micio's monologue about his educational methods; and at 610, 692 and 693 when he finds out that Aeschinus has been involved in the abduction of a girl.

A parallel series of notes comment on Demea⁸ as a *pater seuerus*:

Don., Ad. 355.1: *DISPERII CTESIPHONEM AVDIVI FILIVM hic osenditur, quod seueri homines ac recti et honesti tenaces uel ridiculi sint uel odio habeantur, quoquo accesserint. magno autem affectu et quasi exclamans addidit 'filium', quasi causam redderet, cur dixerit 'disperii'.*

Don., Ad. 445: *VIVERE ETIAM NVNC LIBET ex hac delectatione ostenditur Demea et quam peccantibus sit amarus ac saeuus et quam facile huius incusationi tamquam graui testimonio crediturus sit et quantum doliturus sit pro Aeschino, qui distat a talibus uiris.*

Don., Ad. 380.3: *in tota comoedia opera danda est, ut stomachetur Demea, excepto quod se ipse in fine commutat. haec ergo causa est, quare Syrus quoque illi obicitur magnifice inferens se ut luxuriosum licentemque seruum, praesertim qui adolescentum paedagogus fuerit.*

For example at 355 where he hears his son Ctesipho has been involved in the abduction of a girl; at 445 where he praises the upright old man Hegio and contrasts such men with Micio's adoptive son, Aeschinus, and at 380 where he is mocked by the slave Syrus; but this note on 380 also looks forward to Micio's change at the end of the play *excepto quod se ipse in fine commutat*.

This apparent change of heart takes place in a monologue delivered towards the end of the play at 855-881 in which Demea states in lines 859-861:

⁸ For a discussion of other notes by Donatus on Demea's character, see JAKOBI 1996, p. 161-165.

*...nam ego uitam duram quam uixi usque adhuc
prope iam excurso spatio omitto. id quam ob rem? re ipsa reperri
facilitate nil esse homini melius neque clementia.*

that he is abandoning his former harsh life, since he has found that generosity and an easy-going attitude have a better outcome. How then does Donatus treat this apparent change of heart, that goes against strongly held ancient views on consistency of character? His first comment 855.1 on the opening of the soliloquy makes some interesting points:

Don., Ad. 855.1: *NVMQVAM ITA QVISQVAM BENE SVBDVCTA RATIONE
in hac scaena exemplum inducitur hominum, qui uirtutem taedio deserunt ob
contemptum eius apud omnes saeculumque uitiosius. et adeo fauet Terentius
clementioribus atque mitissimis patribus, ut hunc quoque ducat ad
sententiam Micionis, non tamen hoc sentientem quod ita fieri oporteat, sed
quod ita res cogat.*

These may be listed as follows:

1. Demea is an example of a man who abandons virtue because he is condemned for it by others in a wicked age.
2. The change is brought about because the author, Terence, favours easy-going fathers such as Micio.
3. Demea does not believe this is the right thing to do, but is compelled to do it by the necessity of the situation.

There is an interesting disjunction here between the author, who favours easy-going fathers, and the character, who is abandoning virtue, according to Donatus, and is acting not in accordance with what he thinks is right, *quod ita fieri oporteat*, but simply by the compulsion of circumstances *quod ita res cogat*. In Donatus' view, then, Demea here is not acting in conformity with his true character. In fact Donatus sees traces of Demea's original *seueritas* remaining even at the end of the play:

Don., Ad. 881: *DEERIT ID MEA MINIME REFERT uide remanere in
Demea non penitus eiectam seueritatem.*

Don., Ad. 883: *O SYRE NOSTER SALVE QUID FIT iam non haec blanda
sed dura sunt, nam 'salue' dixit ei non solum quem saepe uiderit, sed cum
quo totiens litigauerit, et 'quid fit? quid agitur?' cum et sciat et condemnet
actus eius.*

According to Donatus, Demea is acting *praeter naturam* 'against his real nature / character':

Don., Ad. 885: *PRAETER NATVRAM plus dixit quam si diceret 'praeter
consuetudinem'.*

Don., *Ad.* 886.1: *SERVVM HAVD INLIBERALEM dura et importuna commutatio ex tanta uituperatione in laudem Syri ostendit contra naturam suam niti Demeam.*

Don., *Ad.* 895.2: *ET TIBI OB EAM REM SI QUID VSVS VENERIT defectus quidem rustici est praeter naturam blandientis cogi dicta repetere sine gratia. hae autem promissiones ad hoc praemittuntur ut cum in subiectis agi a Demea huiusmodi res coeperint, non sit absurdum spectatoribus Demeam tam cito esse mutatum.*

For Donatus' use of *natura* in this sense of 'real character' at 886.1 and 895.2 we may compare his note on *Phorm.* 206, where the timid youth Antipho is said to be unable to change his nature:

Don., *Phorm.* 206.3: *NON POSSVM IMMVTARIER ... ostendit enim naturae suae timiditatem nullis adhortationibus eici posse.*

At 986 f. Demea, as the play ends, appears to reject his new assumed character, telling Micio that such easy-going behavior is simply the product of weakness, indulgence and extravagance:

Ter. *Ad.* 986-988 (Demea):
*ut id ostenderem, quod te isti facilem et festiuom putant,
 id non fieri ex uera uita neque adeo ex aequo et bono
 sed ex assentando, indulgendo et largiendo, Micio.*

Four notes by Donatus on this section of the play show that in his view Demea's change of heart was simply a pretense, brought about by the circumstances, whereas in truth his character had remained *seuerus* throughout:

Don., *Ad.* 984: *QVID ISTVC QVAE RES TAM REPENTE MORES MVTAVIT TVOS animaduertendum est, qua calliditate Terentius quaerens finem fabulae complere laetitia, per ipsum Demeam muneratur uniuersos, qui in tota comoedia tristis ac saeuus interturbauit et uociferatus est.*

Don., *Ad.* 986.3: *QVOD TE ISTI FACILEM ET FESTIVOM PVTANT bene in postremo dignitas personae huius seruata est, ne perpetuo commutata uideretur, ut Truculenti apud Plautum.*

Don., *Ad.* 991.2: *FACITE QVOD VOBIS LIBET prope rediit rursus ad amaritudinem pristinam.*

Don., *Ad.* 992: *QVAE VOS PROPTER ADVLESCENTIAM MINVS VIDETIS hic ostendit Terentius magis Demeam simulasse mutatos mores quam mutauisse.*

We do not know how Demea was characterised in the Menandrian original, but as Petrides (2014) 157 points out, inconsistency or self-contradictory behaviour was a feature of certain character types in Menander, namely young men (*neaniskoi*) and old men (*pappoi*). The immaturity of the former and the

moral decline of the latter could cause these characters to be, in Aristotle's terms (*Poetics* 15.6), ὁμαλῶς ἀνώμαλον 'consistently inconsistent'. This, however, is not a line pursued by Donatus. In his view Demea's true character remains *seuerus* to the end and Terence is not guilty of violating the rule of consistency of character, Aristotle's ὁμαλόν. On the question of whether Donatus' use of the name *Terentius* in notes 984 and 982 above implies that Terence changed his Menandrian original in these places see Sandbach (1978).

This is not to say that Donatus never criticizes Terence for lack of consistency in character portrayal. The young man Chremes in the *Eunuchus* is characterized in the Menandrian original as a slow-witted rustic, as Donatus tells us in his note on 507:

Don., *Eun.* 507.1: *PROFECTO QVANTO MAGIS MAGISQVE COGITO haec persona apud Menandrum adulescentis rustici est.*

and a whole series of subsequent notes confirms this consistent rustic portrayal of Chremes in Terence throughout the play:

Don., *Eun.* 532: *DICO EGO MIHI INSIDIAS FIERI blandimentum rusticus insidias putat.*

Don., *Eun.* 736.1: *EHO NONNE ID SAT ERAT (Pythias) adeo simplex hic inducitur adulescens, ut a Pythia reprehendi possit.*

Don., *Eun.* 745: *AD ME QVID QVASI ISTVC et rusticus et timidus et pudens commotus est meretriculae dicto.*

Don., *Eun.* 755.1: *QVANTAS COPIAS ADDVCERE ... conuenit tamen rudi et rustico adulescenti sex homines 'copias' dicere.*

Don., *Eun.* 769.4: *ATTOLLE PALLIUM (Thais) uel quia simplex est uel quia ebrius, trahit pallium Chremes.*

But at line 736 Donatus thinks Chremes makes a remark that is too witty to be consistent with his character. Donatus' note here is interesting:

Don., *Eun.* 736.3: *NISI QVIA CORREXIT MILES QVOD INTELLEXI MINVS hoc uidetur sapientius et facetius dici quam ab ebrio rustico adulescentulo debuisset. hoc uitium tunc fit, cum ingenium suum poetae in personas conferunt.*

This remark, he says, is too witty for a drunken young rustic. It is a mistake of characterization *uitium*, which arises from the fact that Terence (or Menander, the use of *poetae* leaves this question open) has conferred upon his character his own wit, even when it is inappropriate in the mouth of the character concerned.

In a similar case at *Eun.* 446 where the *miles gloriosus* figure Thraso is made to say something sensible, Donatus comes up with a different explanation:

Don., *Eun.* 446.2: *SIQVIDEM ME AMARET TVM ISTVC PRODESSET GNATHO (Thraso) hoc miles ut sapiens locutus est. ergo meminisse conuenit ridiculas personas non omnino stultas et excordes induci a poetis comicis, nam nulla delectatio est, ubi omnino qui deluditur nihil sapit.*

In his view stupid people should not be characterized as completely without sense, otherwise there would be no pleasure (*delectatio*) on the audience's part in seeing them tricked. Again this practice is seen not as specific to Terence, but as a characteristic of comic poets in general (*a poetis comicis*).

Again throughout the rest of the play, Thraso is indeed characterized as stupid, as Donatus' notes on 391, 615, and 616 argue:

Don., *Eun.* 391.1: *MAGNAS VERO AGERE GRATIAS THAIS MIHI (Thraso) (sc. haec scaena) continet ... stultitiam gloriosi militis.*

Don., *Eun.* 615.1: *ITA ME DI AMENT QVANTVM EGO ILLVM VIDI (Doris) ea persona quaesita est, quae terribilem credit militem, ut eo magis in experiundo uanus ac ridiculus esse possit.*

Don., *Eun.* 616: *NEQVAM ILLE HODIE (Doris) 'illum' et 'ille insanus' sic affertur, ut omnibus insuauis miles esse noscatur.*

The final part of this chapter will turn from consistency of character (Aristotle *Poetics* 15.6 ὁμολόν) to the question of stock character-types (Aristotle *Poetics* 15.5 ὁμοιον) and appropriate or 'true to life' characters (Aristotle *Poetics* 15.4 ἀρμόττων). Should characters always conform to a set dramatic stereotype? Can a character who departs from this stock-type nevertheless be appropriate or 'true to life'? A clear account of what these stereotypes are as far as comedy is concerned is given by Terence in his prologue to the *Eunuchus* lines 35-39:

*quod si personis isdem huic uti non licet,
qui magis licet currentem seruom scribere,
bonas matronas facere, meretrices malas,
parasitum edacem, gloriosum militem,
puerum supponi, falli per seruom senem?*

As we saw earlier in the note on the *Hecyra* preface Terence, in Donatus' view, departs from these stereotypes on occasion:

Don., *Hec.* Praef. I 9: *in tota comoedia hoc agitur, ut res nouae fiant nec tamen abhorreant a consuetudine: inducuntur enim beniuolae socrus, uerecunda nurus, lenissimus in uxorem maritus et item deditus matri suae, meretrix bona.*

So in the *Hecyra* he presents a good-hearted mother-in-law, a truthful nurse, a good courtesan and a gentle and faithful husband, all contrary to the norms for these characters. What explanation does Donatus offer for Terence's departure from these common types? In the *Hecyra* preface note Donatus emphasizes the

fact that although Terence is introducing unusual types *ut res nouae fiant*, he is nevertheless careful to ensure that these do not depart from *consuetudo* common custom *nec tamen abhorreant a consuetudine*. What does Donatus mean by this?

The same point about not departing from *consuetudo*, in this case in the depiction of Thais as a good courtesan, is made in his note on *Eun.* 198:

Don., *Eun.* 198: *ATQVE EX ALIARVM INGENIIS NVNC ME IVDICET* (Thais of Phaedria) *hic Terentius ostendit uirtutis suae hoc esse, ut peruulgatas personas noue inducat et tamen a consuetudine non recedat, ut puta meretricem bonam cum facit, capiat tamen et delectet animum spectatoris.*

A further clue is perhaps contained in the note on *Hecyra* 774 where Donatus argues that Terence alone should be given complete freedom in this area, that is in departing from the *Eunuchus* 37 stereotypes, because he applies such *uigilantia causarum et rationum momenta* 'close attention to causes' and 'weight of argument':

Don., *Hec.* 774.3: *HAEC RES HIC AGITVR* (Bacchis) *multa Terentius feliciter ausus est arte fretus, nam et socrus bonas et meretrices honesti cupidus praeter quam peruulgatum est facit. sed tanta uigilantia causarum et rationum momenta subiungit, ut ei soli merito uideatur totum licere. nam hoc contra illud est, quod alibi (Eun. Prol. 37) ait, commune iam esse omnibus comicis 'bonas matronas facere, meretrices malas'.*

a point also made in his note on *Hecyra* 840:

Don., *Hec.* 840.1: *MVLTA EX QVO FVERINT COMMODA EIVS ratio, cur noue omnia fiant et contra officium meretricis.*

In other words Terence can make a good case for their portrayal in uncharacteristic ways. One way he seeks to do this, as Donatus argues in his note on *Hecyra* 58, is to introduce in this play not one but two good courtesans, so that the more examples there are the truer to life they will seem:

Don., *Hec.* 58.3: *PER POL QVAM PAVCOS animaduertendum est in hac fabula Terentium bonam meretricem inducturum, ne id contra morem uideatur facere, etiam aliam meretricem non malam inducere, ut id exemplis fiat tritius et usu uerisimile.*

At *Hecyra* 727 there is again, as in the note on *Hecyra* 774 quoted above, a reference to *consuetudo* in the depiction of uncommon types, in this case a good courtesan and a mild old man. Donatus argues here that Terence aims to move away from common dramatic stereotypes without distancing himself from real life usage (*consuetudo*) in the depiction of action *in actu*:

Don., *Hec.* 727.1: *NON HOC DE NIHILO EST QVOD LACHES NVNC rarus hic uitae color in hac allocutione miscetur a poeta, nam meretrix loquitur et senex (sc. Laches) et, quod est admirabilius, bona meretrix, mitis senex, ut intellegas laborasse Terentium, ut et a lege comicorum recederet et in actu tamen consuetudinem retineret.*

At *Hecyra* 756 Terence is said to give prior warning to his audience when diverging from stereotypes:

Don., *Hec.* 756: *QVOD POL SI ESSET ALIA EX HOC QVAESTV uigilanter poeta, ne non uerisimile uideretur id ullam fecisse meretricem, ipse lectorem praeuenit. et sic fere in omnibus Terentius, quae minus peruulgata sunt quaeque abhorrent a consuetudine, agit.*

and at *Hecyra* 840 there is again, as in the note on *Hecyra* 774 (quoted above) an appeal to *ratio*. Here he gives as the reason why a courtesan acts with unusual kindness towards her client the fact that she has enjoyed a good time with the young man in the past:

Don., *Hec.* 840.1: *MVLTA EX QVO FVERINT COMMODA EIVS ratio, cur noue omnia fiant et contra officium meretricis.*

In conclusion we can say that as far as consistency of character is concerned Donatus would argue that Terence follows rhetorical precepts, even in the case of Demea in the *Adelphoe*, whose apparent change at the end of the play is only feigned and not in accord with the character's true *natura*. As far as departure from stock stereotypes is concerned Donatus agrees that on occasion Terence does do this in the interests of entertaining and pleasing his audience, but in so doing he is careful to preserve a credible and well-reasoned motivation for his characters who diverge from the stock dramatic type.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BARSBY J.A. 2000, "Donatus on Terence: the *Eunuchus* commentary", in *Dramatische Wäldchen. Festschrift für Eckard Lefèvre zum 65 Geburtstag*, E. Stärk and G. Vogt-Spira (eds.), Hidesheim, p. 491-513.
- BLUNDELL J. 1987, *A Commentary on Donatus, Eunuchus 391-453 and 471-614*, Diss. University of London.

- DEMETRIOU C. 2014a, "Aelius Donatus and his commentary on Terence's comedies", in *The Oxford handbook of Greek and Roman comedy*, M. Fontaine and A. Scafuro (eds.), Oxford, p. 582-799.
- 2014b, "Performing Terence's characters: a study of Donatus' interpretation", in *Terence and interpretation*, S. Papaioannou (ed.), Newcastle, p. 223-240.
- HILGER M.J. 1970, *The rhetoric of comedy: comic theory in the Terentian commentary of Aelius Donatus*, Diss. University of Nebraska.
- JAKOBI R. 1996, *Die Kunst der Exegese im Terenzkommentar des Donat*, Berlin.
- PETRIDES A.K. 2014, *Menander, New Comedy and the visual*, Cambridge.
- SANDBACH F.H. 1978, "Donatus' use of the name Terentius and the end of Terence's *Adelphoe*", *BICS* 25, p. 123-145.
- VIKTOR B. 2012, "History of the text and scholia", in *A companion to Terence*, A. Augustakis and A. Traill (eds.), Malden MA, Oxford, Chichester, p. 346-363.