Duplicate Copy

THE INFLUENCE OF
- LATIN DRAMA -
ON
ELIZABETHAN DRAMA.

I N T R O D U C T I O N.

The age intervening the two great epochs of dramatic activity - namely, the Elizabethan period and that when the drama of Greece and Rome flourished - is enshrouded in almost impenetrable obscurity and mystery. On this account, it is generally known in literature as the "Dark Ages". The whole drama of Greece and Rome shows a continuous development, and in the Elizabethan drama we have a reproduction of the whole classical drama without its limitations. The end of the classical drama is coincident with the general moral degradation which is evidenced in the theatrical tastes of the people who preferred the more sensational and spectacular entertainments of the circus, rope-dancers, and the performance of "Fabulaetabernariae", those coarse farces into which comedy had degenerated. Then begins the long reign of darkness - at any rate with regard to drama. The main literary phenomenon of this age is that drama ceases to be the popular literature or amusement.

We are accustomed to regard the drama of Shakespeare and his immediate predecessors as a sudden growth and merely one of the products of the great Renaissance upheaval. It is true that the revival of letters was the single impulse which transformed mediaeval drama to Elizabethan drama, but the former had its origin much further back in history, and though

there is no evidence of the existence of any dramatic work before the Norman Conquest, yet an unbroken thread of continuity can be traced right from the Roman drama through the chaotic intervening period with its pageants, rustic festivals, and religious dramatisations, out of which grew the Moralities and Interludes, to the great Elizabethan drama in all its variety, complexity, and magnificence. If drama was not the literature of the people during this early period, classical drama was preserved in the monasteries by the monks who constituted the literary section of society; while for the strolling actors and entertainers, who went under such names as jongleurs, mimes, troubadours, or minstrels, a line of descent can be traced straight from the Latin mountebanks.

That a relation exists between the ancient and modern drama, and that the latter is indebted to the former, is generally acknowledged; but the importance of this relation has been both under-estimated and exaggerated. There is a tradition, which has been the ground of an age-long controversy, that Shakespeare owed nothing to the Greek and Roman classics, that he could lay no claim to classical scholarship, and that all his knowledge of the classics was derived from English versions and translations or from "Lyly's Grammar". We are not without evidence, however, that Shakespeare could almost certainly read Latin, and that through Latin versions he was

intimately acquainted with some, at least, of the principal Greek classics. Whether Shakespeare was or was not influenced by ancient drama is not a vital matter; and even if it could be proved that he owed nothing to it, that would not dispose of the theory that the study of classical models was one of the main forces which moulded Elizabethan drama.

It is not an easy matter to estimate the precise importance and extent of this classical influence, because it was only one of many diverse and seeming antagonistic forces which, combined and harmonised by the natural genius of the country, made possible the existence of a drama in its most perfected form, as given us by the immortal Shakespeare. These causes may be sought in religion, in politics, in the circumstances and social conditions of the time, in the character of the men of the period, as well as in the humanising and diffusion of letters consequent upon the Renaissance. The Reformation, the translation of the Bible, the discovery of the New World, all gave a powerful impulse and an increased activity to thought, and reacted upon literature in all its forms, but upon drama in particular. Thus with Hazlitt we agree that "it might be said without much extravagance, that every breath that blew, that every wave that rolled to our shores, brought with it some accession to our knowledge, which was engrafted on the national genius"[1].

Of all these influences which were pre-requisite

1. "Elizabethan Literature" - Hazlitt. P. 25

to the growth of English national drama, the most indispensable was the example of Latin classic models, as provided by Plautus and Terence in comedy, by Seneca in tragedy. Classical influence on English drama came almost exclusively through the study of Latin not Greek models, for in the early days of the Renaissance, Greek classics were practically inaccessible , and even when English scholars became more acquainted with the Greek language, they still preferred to study Greek classics in the Latin versions and adaptions, for they found the Roman spirit much more akin to their own than was the Hellenic spirit. The strength of the Plautine influence is manifested in the numerous comedies both Latin and English, which flourished in the Universities and Schools throughout the period from the appearance of Udall's "Ralph Roister Doister" about 1566, and Gascoigne's "Supposes" to the "Ignoramus" of James's reign. Shakespeare's "Comedy of Errors", which is directly based upon the "Menaechmi" of Plautus, and is the stock example of the Latin influence on English drama, is but one of many instances.

The difficulty of estimating the extent of the indebtedness of Elizabethan to ancient drama is again increased by the fact that it was the result not only of a direct study of the Latin plays , but also of a wide-spread perusal of the works of Italian and, to a less degree, of French imitators, who added to the mythology and plays of Greece and Rome an atmosphere of romance, and thus enriched and adapted them to contem-

-porary life and interests.

In order to trace the influence of the Latin drama on Elizabethan drama, and to show how it modified or determined the development of the latter, it is proposed to follow in outline the origin and growth both of the Roman drama, such of it as has come down to us in the works of Plautus, Terence and Seneca, and of English drama from its beginnings to its culmination in Shakespearian drama. The relation between the two dramas will be a guiding consideration throughout the essay.

L A T I N D R A M A.

CHAPTER 1. THE ROMAN THEATRE BEFORE PLAUTUS.

From the very beginnings of Roman drama, native forms seem to have existed alongside the forms of foreign importation, and the two kinds probably influenced each other in their development. The same phenomenon is apparent in the development, centuries later, of the English drama which was destined to be the great modern rival in literary importance of the ancient classical drama. Another feature which Roman drama had in common with English drama, and, indeed, with all great national dramas, was the religious sanction of its origin. Thus the earliest dramatic performances at Rome were associated with expiatory or thanksgiving services. The first occasion of the performance of a tragedy and comedy on a Roman stage was the public celebration of the great victory which terminated the First Punic War. This was in 240 B.C., at the "ludi Romani" which were held with unusual splenfour, in consequence of the national triumph. The author of the tragedy and comedy was Livius Andronicus, the earliest known Roman playwright. He appeared on this occasion as an actor in the play, and thereby originated a practice which was continued by succeeding dramatists. The days

appointed for the national games became the recognized State occasions for dramatic entertainments. Other opportunities for the acting of plays were religious celebrations, weddings, and funerals. Thus Terence's "Adelphi" was performed at the funeral games of Aemilius Paulus. The rural festivities which accompanied any religious celebration, gave ample scope for the development of such elements as the dance, the jocular, crude, and often abusive improvisations of song, speech, and dialogue, all of which contained germs of the regular drama.

As the games at Rome continued several days, it was the custom to have one play performed each day. In Greece, the practice of playing several pieces in immediate succession had obtained. It is significant that, though the performance of plays was sanctioned and encouraged by the State, Rome had no permanent theatre for many generations; the stage therefore was but a temprrary one, and in consequence the conventionalities of the stage were confined to very narrow limits, for there could be little machinery and frequent change of scene was rendered impossible. In the days of Plautus, performances were still conducted in the open air.

The stage, or "pulpitum" as it was called, was a long narrow platform of some fifty or sixty yards in length. The usual background, or scaena, of comedy represented the front of two houses separated by an alley or "angiportus". The

characters of the play were the occupants of the two houses. This convention again limited the range of characters. For tragedy the scaena was the front of a temple or palace. It was also the custom to have an altar on the stage; in comedy it was on the left-hand, in honour of Bacchus; in tragedy on the right hand, in honour of Apollo. It was understood by the audience that the exit to the left of the actor, as he faced them, led to the forum or city; and that to his right led to the harbour or country. All the externals of the Roman stage were plainly borrowings from the Greek, and the setting of the plays which were acted was also thoroughly Greek., The chief personages of comedy were tunics or "pallia" after the Greek fashion, to suit their particular characters; and, as in Greek drama, the sandal in comedy made a contrast in footwear to the buskin or "cothurnus" of tragedy. There seems to be some doubt whether, according to Hellenic usage, masks were worn on the Roman stage.[1] Female rôles, which were comparatively few, were taken by men until a very late date. This phenomenon is largely accounted for by the special social conditions relating to women at that time.

Originally the dramatist produced his own play, but when poets ceased to be actors, this custom grew less practicable and the management of the play passed into the hands of the

---

1. According to Wight-Duff, they were not introduced till after Terence's death.)Literary History of Rome, page 157)

"dominus gregis" who bought the play from the writer and contracted with the aediles for its performance. Most of the players were slaves in the ownership of the manager, who was himself a freed man. Consequently, the actors were liable to punishment for bad acting.

The two lines of development which Roman drama took resulted in a popular native drama, represented by Saturae, Fabulae Atellanae, Mimi, and other species of native growth, and a regular classical drama of foreign inspiration. Of these two forms, the latter only has come down to us. Roman drama, probably more than any other branch of Roman literature, was an inheritance from Greece. The earliest literature of Rome took the form of translations from Greek poetry both epic and dramatic; the success which Livius Andronicus achieved by his translation of the Odyssey gave a new impulse to an activity already begun in trying to master and adapt Greek structures and versification. By taking Greek tragedies as the models for his own tragedies, Andronicus inaugurated a fashion of close adherence to Greek drama, from which succeeding Roman dramatists never deviated.

The forms of native drama were in existence long before the regular drama of Rome was established. In the earliest Roman drama, two elements are traceable; one represented in the solemn mimic dance which came from Etruria and gave rise to tragedy, the other in the farcical scenes of daily

life introduced in Rome by Oscan performers. The Etruscan players or "istriones" as they were called at Rome, were brought into Rome when the scenic games were first held there in 364 B.C. They also popularised and developed a very rudimentary form of drama known as the "satura", or "satura fabula" which already existed at Rome. The Satura seems originally to have been a dramatic performance consisting of a medley of scenes or incidents without any plot.[1] Under Etruscan influence it was acted with a flute accompaniment and corresponding gestures. According to Livy, the satura never developed into a play with a regular plot. So popular was this species that even after the establishment of the regular drama, it came to be performed as an after-piece or exodium.

The "Fabulae Atellanae" were farces which the Oscan players had introduced. They were generally improvised delineations of social conditions and low life in small towns, and were replete with witticisms and buffoonery. The plot was extremely simple, while the dialogue was left to the invention of the performers. This form of farce was imitated and later monopolised by the Roman youths of free birth, who regarded all professional actors with contempt. Originally, when the "Fabulae Atellanae" were in the hands of the Oscans, they were acted in the Oscan dialect, but gradually they came to be written in the Roman language. Many such

---

1. Livy 7. 2. 4.

pieces are cited by the ancient grammarians, and those of the writer Lucius Pomponius, in the time of Sylla, are extolled by Cicero and Seneca. They were very much in vogue at Rome until they were superseded by the "Mimi" of Taberius and Publius Syrus.

The "Mimus" too was a species of drama peculiar to the town and of very early origin. The mimic or gesticulatory element of the regular drama may be ascribed to the influence of the "mimi". They were of the nature of loose farces which seem to have been performed both independently and as after-pieces. The Roman youths used also to act short pieces called Exodia, and probably the Tabernariaetoo, both of which kinds were of a still lower order than the "mimi". We have no record of the process by which the stage was gradually occupied by the atellana, mimus, pantomimus, and exodium, but the mimus and pantomimus at a later stage in their history began to treat mythological subjects and thereby lost much of their former vulgarity and grossness , and by the time of Ennius the satura had become exclusively a literary form.

Although various elements from all these crude native forms of drama were gradually assimilated into the drama of Greek inspiration, the forms themselves as they existed separately were little affected by Greek influences. They could scarcely rise to the rank of literature, but constituted

a response to an insatiable demand of a people who delighted immeasurably in spectacular display, farce, vulgarity, and even obscenity. They continued to be performed throughout the period of the regular drama, which they finally superseded, and lived on until they themselves yielded to the greater attractions and excitement of the circus during the Imperial period. The chief contribution which these quasi-dramatic entertainments made to classical comedy of Rome lay in the whole range of characters which are met under different names in all the plays of Plautus and Terence; for their principal personages had gradually assumed a fixed and conventional character, and thus certain definite types were established.

The serious drama which arose from the mimic dances of the Tuscan actors, came under Greek influences from the first. Roman tragedy was ever a much less national form of art than Roman comedy. The first written tragic pieces were taken from the Greek, and even when Roman dramatists chose subjects from their own history, they closely followed Greek models in their treatment.

Titus Livius Andronicus, a native of Tarentum, was the first to attempt to establish a regular theatre at Rome, and the success which his plays achieved is testified by the fact that a building was assigned to him on the Aventine Hill. Little else beside titles and a few passages of these first contributions to regular drama have come down to us; but we know

that, despite Cicero's adverse judgment upon their merit, they long continued to be popular at Rome, and to be read in Schools during the Augustan age. The subjects were taken from mythology, Greek life or contemporary Roman history. Livius Andronicus originated the curious practice whereby one actor sang to a flute accompaniment while another danced or performed the corresponding gesticulations; but he is chiefly important in the history of Roman drama, because his plays mark the beginning of the cultivation of theatrical representation as an independent art, and as being the province of professional players. With him also began the division of the drama into tragedy and comedy, according to Greek practice.

The next writer to further the development of the regular drama was Gnaeus Naevius, a native of Campania. He left both the epic and the drama thoroughly established. He wrote tragedy and comedy, but by Cicero he was accounted a better comic than tragic poet. Although only fragments of his work, including the titles of his tragedies, are extant, they give sufficient evidence of their being for the most part translations or adaptations. He made an innovation, however, by choosing characters from Roman legends and history for the plays of Iphigenia, Andromache, and Danae. His originality was further manifested in the strong personal satire and abuse which he is said to have directed against the vices and even

the corporeal defects of consuls and other eminent figures in politics. In one of his verses which have come down to us, he libelled the Metelli, insinuating that they obtained their high office not by their virtues but by the cruelty of the Roman face - "Fato Metelli Romae fiunt consules". The penalty for his unlicensed and unceasing abuse of the Metelli and the nobility was imprisonment, during which he wrote his comedies, the "Dardanus" and "Leontes". All the compositions of Naevius were written in the rough, irregular, Saturnian verse, the most ancient metre employed in Roman poetry.

The tragedies of Quintus Ennius marked a great advance on the drama of Naevius. According to Cicero he was a much more elegant and finished writer. Judging from the fragments which remain of his twenty tragedies, he far excelled his predecessors in poetical genius and the art of versification Ennius was a native of Rudiae, in Calabria, and lived from 239 to 168 B.C. He instructed the Patrician youth in Greek, and was the favourite poet of the noble families. He became the literary exponent of the Hellenising tendencies which were in progress in the Roman society of his day, and he earned the title of "Father of Roman Song", for he was a prolific epic writer as well as dramatist. His plays were probably translations from Sophocles and Euripides, rather than original tragedies. The "Medea" which he based upon the "Medea" of Eur-

-ipides, was considered his best production. This story of Greek antiquity was very popular with Latin dramatists. Attius, Varro, Ovid, and Seneca, successively imitated, and improved on, the "Medea" of Ennius.

Comedy as well as tragedy, came under Hellenic influence, and began to be studied and cultivated in the light of the Greek masters. The numerous and laborious translations from the Greek set a literary and dramatic standard for Roman dramatists, and from a union of all the best elements of the already existing crude forms of comedy, under the refining Greek influence, arose the regular comedy of Rome. Although the names of no less than eleven Roman comic writers are recorded, we only know Roman comedy as represented by the works of Plautus and Terence, for their comedies alone have survived the ravages of time.

CHAPTER 2. THE COMEDY OF PLAUTUS.

Titus Maccius Plautus was born of humble parents, probably in 254 B.C., in the Umbrian town of Sarsina. Plautus was a sobriquet bestowed upon him on account of his splay feet, a defect which is said to have been common to all Umbrians. Very little is known of Plautus's early life; but a traditional biography based mainly on brief statements by Cicero, Gellius, and Jerome, is the generally accepted one. He seems to have begun his career in the menial capacity of stage carpenter at

Rome, and there probably he acquired his theatrical taste and ambition for producing plays of his own composition. Much uncertainty attaches to the subject of his early education, but it is highly probable that his literary pursuits were maintained at the expense of much hard manual toil amid adverse circumstances. His extraordinary literary fertility is almost irreconcilable with the accounts of his life of hardship and poverty, and can therefore be attributed only to the greatness of his genius, which gave him so complete a mastery of the Latin language, ~~both in diction~~ and metre, and made him the great exponent of Latin comedy based on Greek life.

It was about 224 B.C. when Plautus began his career as a dramatist. He continued to write for the stage almost without a rival in popularity until his death, forty years later, when Terence was but a boy. One hundred and thirty comedies have been attributed to him by ancient writers, but all except twenty-one are rejected as spurious by Varro. Of these, the "Vidularia" exists only in a very fragmentary form. Some of the others, too, have come down to us in an abridged or mutilated form, a circumstance accounted for by the long period during which the plays were preserved only in stage copies. They probably also underwent further distortion and alteration in the hands of classical scholars during the Renaissance revival. The prologues seem to have suffered most in this respect. The twenty-one genuine plays of Plautus were

probably written during the two last decades of his life.

The "Captive" is perhaps the most interesting , though not one of the most humourous, of the Plautine comedies. it certainly is the noblest and tenderest in sentiment, despite the total absence of female characters and of the romantic element, a circumstance which relieved the play of that indelicacy and coarseness which is regrettably present in most of the other plays. The interest is rather pathetic than comic; wit and humour are superseded by domestic sentiment and pathos. The relations and affectionate devotion existing between Tyndarus and Philocrates, two finely wrought characters, have made the plot a notable example of fidelity and self-sacrifice. The claim that the speaker of the Epilogue makes for the play, that its morality is of the simplest and purest kind, is very well merited. The development of the plot has won praise from all critics; the author's own praise of it in the Prologue reveals his satisfaction in having accomplished something not achieved in his other plays, though at the same it pronounces condemnation on plays of the type of the "Casina" or "Truculentus;" whose vulgarity makes them offensive to modern readers.

"Non pertractate facetast neque item ut ceterae, neque
"spurcidici insunt versus immemorabiles. Hic neque periurus
"lenost nec meretrix mala neque miles gloriosus" Prologue
"55-58.

Hegio is an excellent portrayal of a respectable rich old citizen, who professes to have been driven into unrelenting cruelty by the way the world has served him in depriving him of his two sons. There are many very fine passages, such as that in which the disguised slave Tyndarus appeals to Hegio for lenient treatment during his captivity.

"Tam ego fui anti liber quam natus tuus.
"Tam mihi quam illi libertatem hostilis eripuit manus
"Tam ille apud nos seruit, quam ego nunc hic apud te servio,
"Est profecto deus, qui quae nos gerimus auditque et videt.

"Quam tu filium tuum, tam pater ne meus desiderat"

"Captivi" 310-316

Ergasilus is a fairly typical Plautine parasite, speaking a good deal in soliloquy.

Besides the superior moral tone of the play, great interest attaches to it as being one of the most notable studies of dramatic irony in all literature. In this circumstance it is a striking illustration of a very important phenomenon in all plot development by Latin dramatists. One of the chief laws of dramatic art which descended from Greek to Latin drama was the strict observance of the unities of time and place. From this arose the impossibility of representing in action on the stage anything but the crisis of a story. In consequence all Roman comedy took one recognised form of dram-

atic action, according to which there was an opening situation of complication between various conflicting interests and actions; these were intricately interwoven and developed alongside the main plot and brought to a resolution in which all the interests were harmonised. Many of the Roman comedies are elaborate networks of intrigue. This opening situation may be any one of a number of various kinds; there is the situation of mistaken identity, technically called "error", which seems to have been a very favourite one both with Roman and Elizabethan playwrights. The classic example of this form is the "Menaechmi", the basis of Shakespeare's "Comedy of Errors". Other situations are those of contrast, as in the "Adelphi" of Terence; of intrigue, as in his "Phormio"; or as here, in the "Captivi", of irony, which depends on the "spontaneous, unlocked for, unconscious clashings in the course of events".[1] In this piece the dramatic irony brings about Hegio's merciless punishment of his unrecognised son.

As to whether or not the dramatic unities have been observed in the "Captivi", there has been much contention among critics and commentators[2]. Lessing represents the view that they have and declares this comedy the most perfect ever staged.

1. The Ancient Classical Drama - R.G. Moulton. page 417

2. See Dunlop's "History of Latin Literature" Volume 1. pages 177 and 178

In support of the negative opinion, it is maintained that Philocrates's journey to Elis from Aetoba, which took place between the opening and closing of the action, could not have been accomplished within the prescribed limit of time;moreover, certain inconsistencies and improbabilities are objected to as destroying the unities of action and place, such as the sudden appearance of Stalagmus, the fugitive slave, at the last act, and the mention of Roman names while the scene is laid in a town of Greece (Act IV. l 880). Here, as in most of his plays, Plautus, like Shakespeare, shows a disregard of historical and geographical trifles; it is a common practice of his to make his characters refer to all excesses in merry-making and drinking as "playing the Greek", as though the characters themselves were not Greek, He speaks of Triumvirs at Thebes, and builds a "Capitol" at Epidaurus.

The main plot of the "Captivi" has been repeatedly imitated in England and France; an old play entitled "The Case is Altered" and attributed to Ben Jonson, bears a striking resemblance to it, while Rotrou's "Les Captifs" is based on it.

The "Rudens", unique in its setting, is probably the most pleasing of all Plautine plays to modern readers. Here there is much of the same atmosphere of romance and poetry as is felt in "The Tempest" or "Winter's Tale". "Pericles, Prince of Tyre" recalls this Latin comedy, and indeed, is said to have borrowed from it. The origin of the "Rudens" as is

suggested in the Prologue, is probably a play of Diphilus and the unmistakable Greek atmosphere has been preserved to a more than usual degree in the process of adaptation and translation. The plot is conceived and worked out in quite a different vein from all the other plays of Plautus. It is not accounted a perfectly constructed drama because in the conclusion we are not told what becomes of Ampelisca and Trachalio; moreover, Sceparnio disappears from the scene of action too early in the play; Daemones also, in inviting the crafty and villainous Labrax to his table, violates the usual rules of dramatic retribution by which Labrax would have deserved to lose all his gains. The beauty and grace of the language,however, the lightness of treatment, the refinement of sentiment and the wild scenery, all contribute to the charm of the comedy. The romantic note is struck at the outset by Arcturus, the "splendens stella candida signum" the speaker of the Prologue , and is maintained throughout the play. The Prologue, unlike many of the Prologues to plays of Plautus, is probably genuine; it is thus written in a higher poetic strain than the others. Arcturus gives a key to the opening situation, though not a summary of the whole plot such as is given in the Prologue to "Captivi". The scenic arrangements must have been much more picturesque and elaborate than usual; the stage represents a part of the coast near the city of Cyrene, and is thus supposed to be overgrown with bullrushes and other plants[1] ; in the back-

1. C.f. Act II Scene 6. l. 523 (O Scirpe,Scirpe -----)and Act III Sc 2 l 630 (Sirpe et lasserpicium)

-ground is the Temple of Venus with an altar in front of it;[1] near by is the cottage of Daemones; the sea is supposed to be visible to the actors[2], while the door to the left of the spectators probably served for entrance from Cyrene and its harbour, and that to the right for entrance from the sea-shore.

The play opens during a storm, in much the same manner as "The Tempest". There is a succession of vivid incidents right up to the point where Labrax discovers that the two damsels, his lost booty, are in the temple of Venus and rushes in to seize them; but tedious scenes follow which are laden with quaint conceits, witticisms and bandying of words between the fisherman and Trachalio, the slave of Plesidippus; the scene in which the contest between these two takes place would however be very amusing in the representation. The "Ruseus" was probably first acted in the year 192 B.C.

One of Plautus's earlier and minor plays, the "Cistellaria" turns upon the same theme as the "Rudens", that of the accidental recognition of a lost child through the discovery of a casket; but it has probably been very much mutilated and the copies are very imperfect.

The "Mostellaria" one of the best of Plautus's plays, is, like all his others, based on a Greek original. In this case, it was a play called "The Ghost", probably the work of Philemon, from whom Plautus borrowed the plot of his "Trin-

---

1. Act III Sc. 3 l. 688
2. Act 1. Sc. 2 lines 148-155.

umnus" and "Mercator". The scene is laid in a public street, in Athens, of which two houses separated by an "Angiportus" are represented on the back of the stage.

In this piece, which is not introduced by any Prologue, the comic element is paramount. The ingenuity and great inventive genius of the dramatist are abundantly attested in the character of the slave Tranio whose clever intrigues and roguerie form the mainspring of the action. It is a common thing in Plautus, as it was in Menander, to make the slaves the centre of the comic element; thus many plays are wholly dependent on the unscrupulous and witty slave for their action and humour. The plot of the "Mostellaria" consists of a series of ready lies forged by Tranio in his determined and continued effort to prevent his master, at all costs, from entering his house where his dissolute son is indulging himself and his companions in unlicensed merriment and debauchery. Tranio's fund of invention and resource is inexhaustible; one absurdity leads on to another situation still more absurd, until both the credulous and foolish master Theoripedes and his neighbour Simo become puppets in Tranio's hands. The whole fabrication breaks down through an untoward incident, but by his assumption of indifference to the threats of Theoropides, which he answers with impudent retorts, Tranio comes off with impunity.

This play is illustrative of the style in which Plautus excelled: witty repartee, spirited dialogue, broad humour

are all here exhibited to great advantage. Act II, Scene 2, is a good example of this style. Plautus's skill in character drawing is also greatly manifest in this piece. The sketch of Philematium, with her simplicity of character, fondness of dress and cosmetics, and her devotion to her lover and benefactor, is very pleasing and lifelike. Theoropides is a type of man often met with in Plautus - the short-sighted weak-willed father, who easily falls victim to the knavery and superior wit of his slave and the prodigality of his spendthrift son despite his own avarice and covetousness. Simo, too, is of a class much derided by Plautus, namely, husbands who are the dupes and slaves of domineering wives whom they have married for money. The minor characters are all portrayed in a realistic manner, but Philolaches, whose indecorous conduct was the foundation of the whole plot, is perhaps the least effective of all the characters. His long soliloquy, in which he regrets his recent extravagance and dissipation, reprcaches himself and compares the upbringing of a young man to the building of a new house, is not unlike, in its sentiment, the famous speech of Jacques in "As you like it", beginning "All the world's a stage". Philolaches plays very little part in the action which finishes a little unsatisfactorily, for we are not told what happened to the lovers, Philematium and Philolaches; interest in their relations yields completely to

that created by Tranio, who becomes the real hero.

The "Mostellaria" has found many imitators and borrowers. It was the basis of "Le Retour Imprevu",a one-act play by Regnard, a great French comic dramatist. This adaptation was the immediate source of Henry Fielding's "The Intriguing Chambermaid", acted at Drury Lane in 1733. In "The English Traveller" a tragi-comedy by Thomas Heywood (1633) there is a bye-plot which, taking up about half of the whole action, appears to be a mere reproduction of the "Mostellaria". A comparison of Shakespeare's "Taming of the Shrew" with the "Mostellaria" seems to indicate that Shakespeare was much indebted to the Latin comedy, although he based the plot of "The Taming of the Shrew" on an earlier play of the same name (1594); but this point will be dealt with later in discussing the general relation of classic to Shakespearean drama. There are many other modern plays, Italian, French, and English, which are thought to be more or less indebted to the "Mostellaria" such as Ben Jonson's "Alchemist" or Addison's "The Drummer or the Haunted House".

The "Menaechmi" although not one of the best Plautine plays, is well known as the origin of Shakespeare's "Comedy of Errors" and will also be treated in that connection later. The play hinges upon the favourite theme of mistaken identity. The plot is improbable in the highest degree, but the happy invention of the twin brothers creates endless opportunities for humourous incidents and situations. Here again is the

ever-present parasite.

The source of the "Menaechmi" is again Greek, as we are told in the Prologue; but the author of the original is unknown. Epicharmus, a Sicilian dramatist, is thought by some to be this author, probably only because the brothers Menaechmi came from Sicily; but the general tone of the play is much more in keeping with the new Attic comedy, and therefore Menander or any other exponent of the new comedy might more reasonably be the author of the original which inspired Plautus's "Menaechmi". No Latin play has ever been so frequently imitated on the modern stage, particularly the Italian. It was first translated into English by William Warner in 1595. Many Italian and French versions of it exist, notably Regnard's "Les Menechmes ou Les Juneaux".

The "Miles Gloriosus" is chiefly interesting as being a clever portrayal of that dramatic character which was introduced and brought to perfection by Philemon and Menander in the new Attic comedy, and bequeathed as a stock type to modern drama. The braggart captain became one of the most notorious personages on the early Italian, French and English stage. The boasting coward obsessed with vanity was a favourite hero of a Roman audience. The stories of the vainglorious captain of this play are exceeded in extravagance only by the ironical flatteries of his obsequious toady, who swears to the truth of all that his master says. The first act of the play has little to do with the plot, but serves to acquaint

the audience with this central character, Pyrgopolinices. His confirmed conviction that every woman is in love with him forms a principal part in the intrigue, while the ingenuity with which the secret communication between the two houses is carried on must have made the piece highly amusing in the representation. Pleusides is a very insipid lover and an uninteresting character; but the agreeable old Periplectomenes is perhaps the best wrought character of the play. Durazzo in Massinger's "Guardian" is a very similar type, and the fact that the cook in the same play bears the same name as the one employed by Periplectomenes, lends support to the conjecture that Plautus was Massinger's model in this instance. The immortal Falstaff has been accounted a combination of the Roman parasite and "Miles Gloriosus," but with infinitely more wit than either. His humour and genial disposition enlist sympathy and excite both laughter and approbation, while his Latin counterpart excites ridicule along with the laughter. In "The Merry Wives of Windsor" he has more affinity with the Plautine captains, by his absurd notion that all women are enamoured of him. Other examples of the braggart soldier in Elizabethan drama we find in Pistol in "Henry V", Bessus in Beaumont and Fletcher's "King and no King", and Bobadil in Ben Jonson's "Everyman in his Humour".

The "Trinummus", like the "Captivi" is a comedy of more psychological interest than most of the Plautine plays and incident is here subordinate to character. The domestic

comedy of middle class life, such as Menander wrote, is here introduced into Latin drama. The plot is unusually well-constructed; the incidents arise from each other very naturally. The sentiments of the characters are so uniformly virtuous as to become a little wearisome, but the tedium is relieved by the unflagging exuberance of the author; nor is the play without a certain grace and charm. The good sense and good feeling of respectable people is made paramount. The plot is borrowed from the Greek of Philemon, and is in the original more aptly called "The Buried Treasure" The moralising tendency displayed in the allegorical prologue is an important feature of Roman comedy, and is traceable to the influence of the Greek chorus whose functions were for the most part, taken over by the Roman prologue and epilogue.

The "Amphitruo" stands apart from the other plays of Plautus. It shows much more affinity to the brilliant burlesques of Aristophanes than to the later school of Menander. It is the only surviving example of the burlesque in Latin drama, and still remains a masterly specimen of the kind. Fresh currency was given to it by Moliere's version of the same play, though much of the Plautine spirit was lost in the process of translation. In the prologue Plautus calls his play a "tragico-comoedia" and this is probably the only occasion in which ~~the~~ tragi-comedy is mentioned by any of the ancient authors.

According to the explanation put into the mouth of Mercury, the term is used in a far different sense from that which we apply to it; for the only reason that the play is thus termed seems to be the indecorum or even sacrilege of calling that a comedy in which gods and kings appear; gods were generally introduced into tragedy alone. The prologue is much longer than in other Plautine plays, but it takes on the same rôle, that of explaining to the audience the action of the play. The plot hinges upon the much used motive of mistaken identity. The character of Alemena is beautifully portrayed and in her distress at the suspicions of the real Amphitryon, she resembles Desdemona when placed in similar circumstances.

The reference in the prologue to the "corium" or leather mask of the player is rather interesting, for it is supposed that the use of the mask, according to Greek practice, was not adopted until after Terence's day. If that is true, then "corium" must here have another meaning, and perhaps refers to the actor's own skin, which would suffer on being flogged.

The "Aulularia" or "Pot of Gold", is one of the mediocre plays of Plautus, but its commonplace story provides a fremework for the brilliant and lively character sketch of Euclio, in whom critics have said we have the pure miser, who neither has desire to increase his store or enjoy it, but is a very slave to it, and in constant dread of losing it. This character was the original of Moliere's "Harpagon" in "L'Avare"

and of many other misers on the modern stage. The text of this play is very imperfect and the end is not extant at all.

It is impossible to judge the extent of Plautus's originality , since all but mere fragments and titles of these Greek plays which are known to have been his originals, are themselves lost. Plautus and Terence alone remain to us the exponents of the new Attic comedy, whose great master was Menander. It is remarkable that none of the Roman dramatists exercised their dramatic power and genius in the creation of original plays, but invariably either closely imitated or borrowed entire, the plots of the Greek dramatists. Indeed, the more closely Latin dramas adhered to Attic models, the more perfect were they deemed, and when later these models were abandoned, the poets incurred the great disapproval and ridicule of their critics. It was in consequence of the great facility with which the finest specimens of art could be procured by plundering the Greek towns that Rome could lay claim to but few artists. At this period, the productions of Greek literature were almost as new to the Romans as the most original compositions would have been. The dramatic works, therefore, of the Latin writers, especially those of the period when the regular Latin drama was first emerging, possessed as much novelty for the audiences as if their plots were new.

Plautus, even more than his predecessors, availed

himself of the inexhaustible resources which lay in the field of Greek drama. It was natural that he should choose the new Attic Comedy, which had reached its highest perfection in the hands of Menander just about half a century before Plautus was born, rather than the Old or Middle comedy; for it was more in keeping with the Roman spirit. The Old Greek comedy, represented by Aristophanes, was excessively bitter, libellous, and often obscene; great license was allowed in the dramatists, who under the pretence of public zeal, spared no part of public conduct. When the people lost their political influence, comic writers perforce began to restrain their former license by introducing fictitious titles for the real persons whom they wanted to satirise and hold up to public scorn. The Middle Comedy, as this species came to be called, soon grew as offensive and dangerous as the Old Comedy, and finally writers of comedy were driven to the employment of fictitious characters and subjects and comedy became a more general imitation of the common manners and events of life. Personal invective was abandoned, and the chorus, which had been the chief vehicle of censure and satire, was removed. Thus the New Comedy of Manners, though lacking the fire and variety of the Old and Middle Comedy, is generally held to have been superior in delicacy, morality and refinement of sentiment.

The most ancient plays of Rome, notably those of Naevius, were formed on the older Greek Comedy, but the fate of

Naevius and the failure of his plays intimidated succeeding dramatists too much for them to follow his example. Moreover, this spirit which pervaded ancient comedy, offended the more serious and dignified taste of the Romans. Thus Plautus, in whom a genuinely national as well as popular feeling was very strong, turned for inspiration and models to the new Attic Comedy as represented in the works of Diphilus, Philemon, and Menander, though a few of his comedies, such as the "Amphitruo" are more in the style of the Middle Comedy. All the chief characteristics, merits and faults of the New Comedy are probably the same as those of all the extant Latin Comedy as represented by Plautus and Terence.

It is to the prologues that we are chiefly indebted for our knowledge of the relation between Roman plays and their Greek originals. Neither Plautus nor Terence made any attempt to give a Roman colouring to their plays; they did not alter the scene of action or give Roman names to their characters, but preserved every circumstance which could convey the Greek spirit to their countrymen. Their great object was to give to the Romans in their own language what was the acted drama of the educated classes of Greece, and in doing so, they raised conversational Latin to the dignity of a literary style.

Plautus's originality then is not to be found in his actual plots, but in his free and independant handling of

those plots which he found ready for his purpose in the Greek comic dramatists: and over these he spread an atmosphere of exuberant animation, merry wit, and cordial good humour that was certainly his own; much of the Roman tone and spirit is present. The plays teem with anachronisms, and many of the social conditions, institutions, and usages, which are depicted as Greek, are equally characteristic of the Roman society of the age for which Plautus and Terence wrote. Plautus was therefore no servile translator, but an independent adapter. His boldness and apparent carelessness in the handling of plots seems to have prevented his becoming a consistent artist; for in his interweaving of two or more plots to form one to his own taste, there is evident an indifference to complete harmony. But Plautus was responding to a popular demand; he knew exactly what would suit the tastes of the people, and therefore contrived his plots accordingly. He realised that it was ludicrous and clever intrigue, incidents of eating and drinking, ready wit and humourous dialogue and spectacular effect, rather than unity of plot, elegance, or refinement of sentiment that would make the strongest appeal to his Roman audiences.

The prevailing spontaneity of wit and dialogue in Plautine plays could not come by way of translation. Though in the process of adaptation, much of Menander's purity and polish of style has been lost, the "vis comica" is retained in full measure. This quality Julius Caesar missed in Terence

but because he had preserved the Attic grace and elegance, Caesar chose to call him "Menander halved"; Plautus might be justly called the other half of Menander. Plautus had dramatic genius; like his Greek master he was a close and sympathetic observer of human life. He could thus bring to Greek materials natural endowments and personal experiences. He was essentially the dramatist of the people, especially of the lower and middle class, whose interests and misfortunes he shared. His originality is also seen in his introduction of alliteration and assonance into the Greek metres and in the effect which he produced by a rapid and frequent change of metre.

We do not find in the drama of Plautus that same diversity of character as in the modern drama; life itself had not acquired its present variety and complexity; its range of types did not provide such as those which modern professions and trades have created. The characters of Alcmena, Euclio and Periplectomenes, however, are novel and not repeated in any of the other dramas; but even in the stock characters which he has most frequently employed, often without even change of name, there is much variety. There is the well-to-do father, a man of leisure, who may be either of the indulgent and easy-going type or of the rigid and avaricious type. In most cases he is not possessed of a large fund of common sense, but easily falls a prey to the extravagances of a spendthrift son and the wiles of an unscrupulous slave in whom he puts all his confidence. In most of the comed-

-ies, the central figure is the slave on whom the action of the play most frequently depends. Both in the Greek and the Roman comedy, the slaves provide the comic element, and , by their fertility of wit and expedient, the interest of the play. They are generally superior in intelligence to their masters, and are recognized by them as such. The familiarity which existed between master and slave is very remarkable; but so it existed in the Roman life of the time, and may be accounted for by the fact that the slave was often a Greek captive and of as good birth and education as the master.

A frequent though not prominent character in the comedies is the respectable mother of a family, eager in the pursuit of her daughter's interests; she is sometimes the terror of her husband, and sometimes the victim of his tyranny. The range of female characters is limited ; a limitation due to the special social conditions which prevailed with regard to women. Though love is the mainspring of most of the plays, female characters play a very small part in the action; in fact, the heroine in some pieces never appears at all before the audience, and all events connected with her are narrated by other characters. Among the other female characters are the heartless and rapacious courtesan, with her craving for showy toilette and cosmetics, the waiting maid, lively and glib of tongue, the garrulous but faithful nurse. There is also a separate group of girls, kidnapped in infancy and rescued from shame by the opportune discovery of their free birth by means

of a casket; they are always represented as of irreproachable character and conduct and of great personal charm. There is a notable absence of love-scenes and display of tenderness, and what love there is, is conducted for the most part on themost matter-of-fact and mercenary principles.

The parasite, or professional diner-out, ever on the search for a meal, is a character peculiar to ancient drama, for he never found his way into modern drama. He was a very common figure in Roman Society. The boasting soldier is also a favourite character in the Plautine plays, and one generally exaggerated. The loathsome and unprincipled slave-merchant figures only too frequently. His rôle is one of the most repulsive in all Roman drama. The young men are headstrong and repulsive; self indulgent, sensual but good natured; few show much of the heroic quality. Tyndarus and Philicrates,however, are exceptions. Changes of society and customs prevent us from appreciating fully the slave, parasite and pander; but in the fathers and sons, Plautus has portrayed ever living types.

The morality of Plautine plays may often appear very lax to modern readers; much shameless deceit and unlicensed sensuality is condoned, and sympathy is always with the enamoured youth rather than with his mistress. But it must be considered that the standard of morality was necessarily much lower in the pagan than in the Christian world. The institution of

slavery was responsible for much of this moral laxity. There is,however, in Plautus, a distinct appreciation of morality; and probably his morality showed an improvement on that of the older poets. Lover is no longer a mere animal passion, fidelity between husband and wife is recognized, the worst vices are made to appear repulsive. Moreover, we meet frequent examples of positive virtues. Many of the utterances of the noble Tyndarus are o of a moral tone not surpassed in modern drama. That speech, already quoted (Act II Sc II) in which he declares "Surely there is a god who hears and sees what we do" shows Plautus a master of pathos as well as of humour. Then Tyndarus's entreaty to Hegio that he will not take unfair advantage of his wealth calls forth Hegio's inherent generosity, and Hegio declares his abhorrence of riches in these words:-

"Non ego omnino lucrum omne esse utile homini existumo.
Scio ego, multos iam lucrum lutulentos homines reddidit :
Est etiam ubi profecto damnum praestat facere quam lucrum.
Odi ego aurum: multa multis saepe suasit perperam"

The "Captivi" abounds in such expressions of noble sentiments. None of Plautus's plays are so indelicate as many plays which belong to James the First's reign. Plautus has drawn good men and good women. He had an intimate knowledge of

his fellow men in their general relations with each other, if not of their deeper spiritual or emotional life. Behind all his rollicking humour, merry wit and trickery, there is a serious vein, and although his main object was to amuse, he is something of a moralist, too.

It cannot be claimed that Plautus is nowadays widely read, outside the inner circle of his scholars, for whom his works provide a wide field of linguistic as well as literary study. Farcical comedy is not the best adapted for permanence, since the humour of one age is very apt to lose its force and become mere weariness to the next. But Plautus must ever remain one of the great outstanding influences in literary history, and his title to fame is not wholly nor even half linguistic; for the qualities which make him the great dramatic genius of Rome are not only his complete mastery of language and metre, but his extraordinary spontaneity and inventiveness of situation, his exuberance of spirits and overflowing mirth, and his power of brilliant repartee.

CHAPTER III. THE COMEDY OF TERENCE.

In the generation which elapsed between the time of Plautus and that of Terence, dramatic development seems to have been carried on by Caecilius, Afranius, Lavinius, Attilius, Trabea, and others, but unfortunately, these remain little more than mere names to us, for the ravages of war and the intervention of a period of barbarism or some untoward fate has deprived us of their

dramatic works. We can therefore judge of their merits and demerits only from such sparse fragments and opinions that have been preserved to us of ancient critics and grammarians, who lived while the works of these dramatists were extant. Judging from such evidence, Caecilius seems to be the dramatist of first importance in this dark age. Of his thirty comedies, only a few disjointed passages are accessible. Born a slave, and a native of Milan, he seems to have attained to great dramatic distinction, and to have become a friend of the poet Ennius. According to the second Prologue to the "Hecyra" the first representation of some of his plays met with a rude reception. Terence speaks of his success in bringing into favour the rejected plays of Caecilius, who had then been excited to new efforts in the poetic art. Like his great predecessors, he was a follower of Menander. Cicero charges him with impropriety of language and style, yet places him at the head of comic poets. But Horace seems to have been expressing the popular sentiment with regard to Caecilius's plays when he said:-

"Vincere Caecilius gravitate, Terentius arte"

The term "gravitas" is probably used in respect of plots for dignity and seriousness are qualities to which no one can lay greater claim than Terence.

Lucius Afranius was a writer of "togatae", a species of drama which flourished between 170 and 80 B.C., for though he treated his plays in the spirit of Menander, he chose national

1. Epistle to Augustus l. 59

subjects. He acknowledged his debt to Menander and other Greek dramatists in a surviving fragment:-

"Fateor, sumpsi non a Menandro modo
"Sed ut quisque habuit quod conveniret mihi
"Quod me non posse melius facere credidi"

He must have been a prolific playwright for titles of no less than fortysix plays have come down to us. Cicero calls him an ingenious and eloquent writer and Ausonius in an epigram speaks "facundi Afrani". It may have been on account of the flagitious love intrigues which he represented on the stage and for which Quintilian censured him, that his writings were committed to the flames by Pope Gregory.

Luscius Lavinius is most known to us as the notoricus literary opponent of Terence whom the latter makes a butt for contempt in his prologues. In the "Eunuchus" he charges him with turning good Greek plays into bad Latin plays. "Bene vertendo et eosdem scribendo male"[1] Terence seems to have maintained a literary war with Lavinius, for he alludes to him in all his prologues save those of the "Hecyra" Lavinius copies both the "Phasma" and "Thesaurus" of Menander. The "Baccharia", "Caecus" "Cornicularia" "Parasitus" are names of plays probably written by Turpilius, Trabea, and Attilius.

The production of such a great mass of dramatic writings in the age of the Republic must be largely accounted

---

1. Prol. to Eunuchus v. 4.

for by the fact that supplying the stage with popular entertainment was practically the only means for a poet to gain a livelihood; at that time, literature at Rome had not obtained the patronage of a distinguished individual, and before the days of printing, literary works could not have a wide circulation and thus receive the support of a reading public.

At the time when Terence lived, Rome had become much more impregnated with Greek culture than in Plautus's day, for Greece was now Rome's captive, but in the lull which followed the end of the second Punic War, B.C. 201, Greece was leading her captivity captive, and bringing the whole force of her art and culture to bear upon her uncultured conqueror. Terence was recognized as a valuable ally by the renowned Scipionic circle - that body of cultivated, able, and influential men whose avowed mission was the purification and improvement of the Latin language, and thus make more complete the establishment of the Greek standard of life and art.

Publius Terentius Afer, as his name implies, was probably a Carthaginian by birth; Afer is a sobriquet which became permanently attached to him. But such biographical record as we have of him unfortunately cannot be regarded as trustworthy, for many anecdotes attach to his name which have a suspicious colouring; consequently we cannot vouch for the authenticity of the details even of Suetonius's "Life of Terence". It is pretty certain, however, that he was born in slavery.

Suetonius says he could not have been taken prisoner in war, as he was born and died between the end of the second Punic War and the beginning of the third. He was probably born in 185 B.C. Judging from the extreme purity of his Latinity, and its freedom from all trace of barbarism, he must have left Africa at an early age. He was brought up in the household of a rich and educated Roman Senator, Terentius Lucanus, whose name he took. By him, he was manumitted and educated. He was probably allowed ample opportunities of instruction, but his early admission into an intimate association with Scipio and Laelius must have been a much more potent factor in the matter of his education. Out of this intimacy arose the charge brought against Terence by his detractors that his patrons shared in the composition of his plays. The poet himself seems to have given encouragement to the popular notion, for in the Prologue to the Adelphi he treats it as a compliment that he could merit the assistance of such distinguished men:-

"Nam quod isti dicunt malivoli homines nobiles"-----

We have it on the authority of Donatus that the poet here alludes to Laelius and Scipio, but doubt is entertained on the matter. Cicero thought it probable that his illustrious friends helped him, though perhaps only by judicious hints and corrections.

Only six comedies of Terentian authorship have come

down to us despite the fact that Terence is supposed to have been a prolific writer. In the midst of his dramatic career he left Rome for Greece, probably with the purpose of studying at first hand Greek customs and language, though according to one tradition, his purpose was to escape the carping criticism of his detractors. From this voyage he seems never to have returned. Tradition says that he was drowned on returning home, and that his precious manuscripts, consisting of more than a hundred translations of Menander's plays, perished with him. Another story is that he himself escaped from the wreck, but died of grief for the loss of his manuscripts.

Of the six extant plays of Terence, the "Andria" is the first in point of time, and is generally accounted the first in merit. It was acted at the Megalensian games in 166 B.C. As stated in the prologue, it was compounded of two plays of Menander, "The Andrian" and "The Perinthian". According to Donatus, the commentator of Terence, the first scene is almost a literal translation from the "Perinthian" of Menander. The characters on which the underplot is founded are probably of his own invention. The play opens with a long narrative of striking beauty and grace, which serves as a panegyric on Pamphilus, and explains all the circumstances leading up to the opening situation. The heroine Glycerium does not appear, but we are assured of her irreproachable beauty and virtue. Chrysis with her amiable qual-

-ities is unlike the usual type of courtesan. Poverty has compelled her to make a livelihood out of her beauty. In Simo we have the model of an excellent father who, contrary to the old men of Plautus's depicting, is not so much the dupe of his slave. He is neither over-indulgent nor excessively harsh. Davus is another example of the shrewd and tactful slave on whose cunning devices and inventions the action of the play turns. He is perhaps the best representation throughout classical comedy of his class. The timely arrival of Crito provides the necessary solution of the situation "The Andrian" is the most pathetic of all Terence's plays. Steele's "Conscious Lovers" is the best known imitation of "The Andrian".

In the "Eunuchus" we have a play of a distinctly different character. "The Andrian" makes its appeal by virtue of the grace and delicacy with which the characters are sketched and the tenderness and constancy of the lovers; but the "Eunuchus" is a play full of vivacity, clever intrigue and amusing circumstances. This comedy alone proves that Terence was not, after all, destitute of that "vis comica" the lack of which Caesar regrets in him. In Rome it seems to have been by far the most popular of Terentian comedies and according to Suetonius and Donatus, the poet received for it from the Aediles eight thousand sesterces (about sixty

pounds sterling) a larger sum than had previously been paid to any poet. According to Suetonius, it was performed in 161 B.C. twice on the same day. The chief part of the play is taken from one of the same title by Menander, but the characters of the Parasite and Captain are transferred from "Colax" another play of Menander.

The characters are very happily sketched. Thraso is the only braggart captain of Terence's comedies, and from his resemblance to Plautus's Pyrgopolinices, it would seem that Plautus and Terence drew from the same source, but commentaries are not agreed on this point. Thraso is certainly more refined than the other, while they both have full assurance of their own powers and intimacy with the great, and both have the foible of thinking all women in love with them; they are different in their manner and speech. Thraso excites mirth without the aid of the extravagant bluster of Pyrgopolinices. A new feature in Terence's Thraso is the delight which he takes in repeating his own jests desiring to be deemed a wit as well as a warrior. The scene in the fourth act in which Thraso pretends to marshal his forces before the house of Thais, is highly amusing; to cloak his cowardice in taking up a position behind the second rank, he cites the classical example of Pyrrhus. In Phaedria as the fond and froward lover, we have a very human character. The

first scene in the third Act led Colman to make the assertion that Shakespeare must have been acquainted with this play when writing "Love's Labour's Lost"[1]

Addison (Spectator No. 170) has remarked that Phaedria's request to his mistress on leaving her for a few days is inimitably beautiful and natural:-

"Egone quid velim?
"Cum milite isto praesem, absens utsies- "

Fontaine's "L'Eunique" is founded upon this comedy. The only English imitation of it, and that not a successful one, is "Bellamira" or the "Mistress" by Sir C. Sedley, 1687.

The termination of the play is disappointing; that Phaedria should have admitted Thraso to a share of the favours of his mistress in order merely that he might share the expenses which she entailed, is not consistent with the manners of a disinterested lover.

The "Phormio" appeared in the same year as the "Eunuchus". It was an adaptation of the "Epidicasomenos" of Apollodorus, the latest representation of the New Comedy of Athens. The principal character is the parasite who is the most skilfully drawn of all the parasites in Old Latin Comedy. In him, we find all the traits characteristic of that class: a gluttonous appetite, plenty of self interest,

---

1. "And his general behaviour vain, ridiculous , and thrasonical" Act V. Scene 1.

shrewdness rather than honesty, no qualms of conscience and yet withal a generous heart. The subtle scheming of Phormio and Geta, the confidential slave, constitute the main action of the comedy. Antipho and Phaedra are representative lovers, eager to gratify passion, but in constant dread of parental wrath. Nausistrata is a lively sketch of a shrewd practical wife endowed with plenty of common sense, while Chremes is an excellent example of a husband who meekly submits to a domineering wife.

In this comedy too there is much vivacity and intrigue; it gave rise to an adaptation though somewhat burlesqued which was the most farcical of all Molière's productions, "Les Fourberies de Scapin" But in the opinion of Mr. Dunlop the comedy is unduly protracted after the principal interest is exhausted.

The "Adelphi" or "The Brothers" seems to have been a favourite Terentian comedy with the Westminster actors. Its originals are plays of Menander and Diphilus. The intrigue of most of the play according to Mr. Dunlop is more cleverly conducted than any other play of Terence. But the German scholar Schmeider deemed the concluding scenes spurious on account of their great incongruity and inconsistence.

There is an admirable contrast between the father of the two boys and his bachelor brother; the contrast between the two junior brothers is shewn to be the result of the differ-

ent modes of education pursued by two guardians of diametrically opposite character; the one a believer in rigid discipline who piques himself on the success of his methods, while his son, the object of such pride, has already fallen a victim to passion and sensuality; the other an easy going jovial tolerant fellow whose attitude to his adopted son is one of easy indulgence. The contrast is perhaps too direct and too often obtruded on the attention: Terence certainly had a didactic purpose in this. By showing the resulting disadvantages of each system of upbringing, he could inculcate the doctrine of the golden mean, and recommend a moderate license of parents towards their sons. Aeschinus is a very finely sketched character; at one time he has all the air and elegant ease of a fine gentleman; at another, we see him a tender, anxious, and passionate lover.

This comedy has been frequently imitated by modern dramatists; the sentiments, especially those of the philanthropic Micio, occur again and again. Those of Knowell in Ben Jonson's "Every man in His Humour" have a particular resemblance to them. His speech beginning "There is a way of winning more by love" (Act 1 Scene 1) is a direct imitation of the celebrated passage:-

"Pudore et liberalitate liberos"[1]

The "Heautont imorumenos" or "Self-tormentor" was borrowed from a lost comedy of Menander. It is the least

1 Prologue l. 32.

pleasing of all Terentian comedies as being most foreign from modern manners. There is also want of mirth but this is compensated by the introduction of many beautiful and moral maxims and by that extraordinary smoothness, elegance, and purity of style which is the great excellence of Terence. It is in this comedy that occurs that famous line at the delivery of which , St. Augustine tells us, the theatre resounded with applause:-

"Homo sum; humani nihil a me alienum puto "

This gives the keynote to all Terence's philosophy and attitude towards mankind, as it does to that of his great model, Menander. This comedy has been the ground for much contention amongst critics, as to whether or not the unities of time and place have been observed.

The convention of dividing drama into tragedies and comedies according to the dénouement would place the plays of Terence among comedies, but their general lack of the "vis comica" and their sentimental trend puts them into the category which the French call "genre serieux" and "comédie larmoyante" The events which are outlined are neither intensely pathetic nor ridiculous. The Hecyra specially belongs to this class. Here is no buffoonery nor ridiculous parasite nor bombastic captain, but a beautiful and pleasing picture of private domestic life . Though its moral is excellent, it is not such as would recommend itself to modern

taste and manners. Some of the scenes are rich in dramatic power. We have the poets own testimony to its unpopularity; in the Prologue he tells us its history, how on its first representation it was hissed off the stage.

It was based upon a play of Apollodorus. It has a simpler fable than the others in which there is a double plot. The "Second Prologue" written for what seems to have been its third representation, informs us of its want of success on its first and second representations. The cause is attributed to the more powerful attractions of the rope dancers and gladiators. Most of the old critics and commentators deem it greatly inferior to other Terentian comedies on account of a lack of skilful management in the conduct of the plot and because here, more than anywhere, there is a preponderance of soliloquy.

From these six plays the only extant monuments of his genius we must investigate wherein lie the excellences and limitations of Terence as a playwright. In the dramatic art, management and plot are first in importance. Though a strict observer of the unities of time and place, Terence nowhere observes unity of action. This was prevented by his habitual practice of combining two or more plots to form a single play - a process known as "contaminatio" - and an expedient which Terence employed more assiduously than any other Latin comedian, and in so doing incurred the censure of many of his contemporaries. Terence probably felt that the practical and uncultured mind of the Roman could not appreciate the simplicity and exact unity

of the Greek comedies. The disadvantage of the double plot is that, when the principal intrigue is unravelled, the subsidiary plot becomes uninteresting, or if the minor plot of episodical parts come first, the chief characters enter afterwards in a meaningless way while undue prominence is given to episodical characters. Neither the "Andria", the "Self-tormentor" nor the "Phormio" maintain the interest of the action to the end of the play. Thus Terence, as he tells us in the Prologue to the "Phormio", is criticised for having written plays - "tenui esse oratione et scriptura levi"

In spite of this deficiency, Terence's plots on the whole are skilfully handled: the incidents are happily chosen and knit together with that inimitable art which characterises all his works. There is no coarseness or obscenity which mars so much of Plautus. There is nothing either in incident or in the characters but what the refined taste and high literary standard of his learned patrons would approve for his great object was not to win popular applause by any cheap means, but to gain the approbation of the learned few: thus Terence became the dramatist of the aristocracy while Plautus was the dramatist of the people. As Terence declares in the Prologue to the "Phormio", he avoids extravagances, ridiculous situations, and improbabilities, and aims at a quiet type of play. His unceasing subservience to correctness and propriety robs his plays of that impetuosity and daring vigour of action which is so predominant in Plautus and explains that

lack of "vis comica" which Julius Caesar declared wanting in Terence. There is occasionally a tameness in his dialogues, while his soliloquies and moral declamation become so frequent and heavy as to pall on the reader.

Had not Terence been so close an observer of the unity of place he could probably have added dramatic power to some of his situations by allowing a change from street to the interior of a dwelling. A license of this kind would have made a situation in the Eunuchus highly comical, for then the audience could have witnessed the father's discovery of his of his son, in the eunuch's garb, in the house of Thais.[1] It has also been brought as a charge against Terence that he too frequently makes his heroine turn out to be an Athenian citizeness.

Thus with regard to Terence's treatment of plot, we have to confess serious shortcomings, but in his choice of language, treatment of character and manners, we find the secret of his great genius and in this, he was considered by the ancients as surpassing all the comic poets. "In Argumentis" says Varro "Caecilius palmam poscit, in ethesis Terentius" In the plays of Terence we are introduced into the same society as that which Plautus put upon the stage. We meet with the same types of people and stock characters, but yet there is a very marked difference in tone and spirit. This phenomenon is explained by Terence's very much closer adherence to his models than Plautus had shown: he introduced far less of Roman col-

1. See "Dunlop" Page 290.

-cur and sentiment. His scenes are uniformly laid in Athens. He exercised less of the inventive faculty and was less daring in the matter of anachronism. Plautus had conceded much more to popular taste by a freer use of national customs and by a greater indulgence of the inherent passion of his countrymen for spectacular effect and broad farce. But Terence's almost unswerving adherence to Menander brought into his plays much more of Menander's spirit and enabled him to transplant Greek life more entire. Like his great master, he excelled in character painting. In careful and delicate portraiture lay his genius. His plays are a true and lively representation of human nature for he had a no less comprehensive and sympathetic knowledge of the ways and humours of mankind than Plautus had possessed. His characters are throughout consistent with themselves with one exception already referred to in the Adelphi. The reading of the play leaves us with no vivid impression of any one character; the use of the same names for the different characters in other plays would prevent this; thus we have presented to us typical slaves, slave-dealers, courtesans and old men.

These stock characters in the hands of Terence have undergone a refining process. The life in which Terence himself moved had stamped itself upon the dramatic world which he represents, and accounts for the prevailing urbanity of all his plays. The "dramatis personae" are more subtle and refined, more humane and less virile than those of Plautus.

His slaves, captains and parasites are not so farcical, nor his panders and courtesans so coarse. For the broad, rollicking humour, and brilliant wit of Plautus, Terence has substituted a minuter psychology, a deeper feeling, and more pathos. Though still the relations between the sexes are treated in too convential a manner to admit of romance. There is none of Plautus's exuberance and gaeity of spirit. Everywhere one is conscious of restraint and repression, but such as can only be exercised by a great artist. The courtesans, instead of being wicked and selfish, are often good and capable of genuine feeling, as for instance Chrysis in the "Andria". The women for the most part are modest and virtuous. The pander too is less repulsive. The youths exhibit more affection for their fathers, and slaves more respect for their masters.

Terence's style and diction are eminently suited to his characters and manners, and exhibit all those qualities of elegance, grace, smoothness, and correctness, which belong to our best eighteenth century literature. It was the great achievement of Terence to give to the Roman comedy the highest Hellenic polish. His absolute mastery of the Latin language and consummate art and perfect simplicity in the use of it, are all the more remarkable as coming from a foreigner. Though only a "half Menander" by reason of his inability to combine richness of humour and vigour of action with artistic finish, he was yet a perfect half. For charm of language he was second

only to his great original. Here is Julius Caesar's tribute to him:-

"Tu quoque tu in summis, O dimidiate Menander,
Poneris, et merito, puri sermonis amator:
Lenibus atque utinam scriptis adjuncta foret vis
Comica ut aequato virtus polleret honore
Cum Graecis, neque in hac despectus parte jaceres
Unum maceror et doleo tibi deesse Terenti "

He won the commendation of the most noted of the ancient critics, but that just quoted is the most famous of all. Cicero paid his tribute:-

"Tu quoque qui Latium lecto sermone, Terenti,
Comis et astricto percurris pulpita socco,
Ad nova vix memoram diverbia coge senectam."

Again he characterises him as:-

"Quic quid come loquens, ac omnia dulcia dicens"

For Varro, he was the model of "Mediocritas" by his attainment of a style that was neither florid nor too simple. Modern critics too, have praised his Attic grace and elegance. His metres are skilfully and carefully handled and always consonant with the sense: there is nothing bizarre or harsh to interrupt the even flow of his harmonious numbers. He was re-

-garded by his critics as the model of correct composition; he very well exercised that restraint which was so essential to Greek art; there is elegance without ostentation, and familiarity without coarseness. Like Addison, whose great prototype was Terence in the matter of style, he pleases most when most studied, and in consequence Terence is more appreciated by the student in the closet than by the untutored people in the theatre. Terence is not above recording commonplaces so long as they are set forth in elegant form. An atmosphere of simplicity, grace and delicacy pervades all his plays. There is an inimitable ease of dialogue which never subsides into vulgarity or grossness, while it never rises higher than the level of polite conversation. The narratives especially are beautiful in their simplicity, and that at the beginning of the "Andria" has called forth lavish praise from Cicero in his "De Oratore" while the great French critic Diderot speaks of Terence's style as "une onde pure et transparente, qui coule toujours egalement"

His pursuit of correctness and refinement does not allow colloquialisms, puns or alliterations, and in consequence variety and originality have to be sacrificed and his plays do not excite to merry laughter. On the other hand, his plays abound in sententious phrases, and proverbial sayings which are eminently quotable for their pith and point. Though these

are not the product of his own invention, to him is due the credit of giving to Menandrian maxims and epigrams a fresh currency by the brevity and force of his translation. Some of the expressions are mere colloquial proverbs, while others are fraught with common sense and wisdom. Thus we have "In fortune, prepare for misfortune", or "life is like a game of dice; if luck goes ill, correct by skill" and the celebrated line already quoted in another connection:-

"Homo sum: humani nil a me alienum puto"

We have said that Terence lacked Plautus's richness of humour; but his characters were not such as to excite laughter. In accordance with Terence's inviolable law of consistency, the humour must be of a quiet kind, and exactly in keeping with the characters; thus in place of Plautus's animated repartee and buffoonery, Terence substitutes genial satire. His humour consists of contrast of character rather than in exuberant fun. Such humour is the outcome of the restraint and Menandrian moderation which pervades all Terence's comedies.

We have no better example of Terentian humour than that clever little scene (beginning with line 445) in the Third Act of the "Phormio", intended to satirise friendly advisers. Such a scene Plautus would have worked up to a much higher comic pitch. The parasites account of his gaining a livelihood in the "Eunuchus" is very entertaining, as is also the clos-

-ing scene of the "Phormio" and the Third Act of the "Adelphi" where Demea's self righteous maxims are provided by the slave Syrus with such comic effect.

As to the merits of Terence as a metrist there is a great diversity of opinion. Priscian, the grammarian, said that he used greater license of versification than any other Roman poet; but most modern commentators are agreed that his prosody is more regular than that of Plautus. Terence certainly chose metres eminently calculated to contribute to that smoothness and ease which are the characteristic qualities both of his style and versification. The prosody of Plautus and Terence exhibits the same fundamental principles. Thus we find that the accent of spoken Latin plays a great part in regulating scansion.

The term "prologue" as used in its modern sense is the same as used in the Roman Comedy. Its sources are as various as its functions. In the transition from the Greek to Roman Drama, the chorus which gave to the former its chief distinctiveness had gradually fallen into disuse partly on account of the difficulty in finding volunteers to undertake the great expense entailed by choral performances. In the Greek drama, the chorus had been the means of combining lyric with dramatic effects, and of preserving dramatic unity; it had been the foundation of the ancient drama as an alternation of odes and episodes. The loss of the chorus, however, did not

mean the total loss of the lyric element in the Roman Comedies, for it survived in the use of lyric metres which were employed with such consummate skill and artistic effect by Plautus. On the other hand, the loss of the chorus made a free change of scene possible, and instead of being a continuous whole, Latin Comedy is divided into a series of separate scenes or Acts, generally with a Prologue and an Epilogue, and in consequence unlimited intervals of time could be assumed between the Scenes. These changes constitute one of the most distinct phases of the transition from Ancient to Modern drama. Between the Acts musical performances were provided.

The functions of the chorus were absorbed by the Prologue and Epilogue. Thus the Latin prologue could be explanatory of the opening circumstances of the play and be a means of establishing a direct relation between performers and audience, or could give an outline of the whole action of the play as that prefixed to the "Captivi", or could become a convenient vehicle for defending the author against some charge, as it was in the hands of Terence; the origin of the play is regularly noted in the Prologues, and thus they threw much light on the sources of the plays. Sometimes the Prologue was allegorical; the most famous example is that of the "Rudens." Moral reflections and soliloquies which are not only in the Prologues but

also interspersed throughout the plays together with metrical variation, are also survivals of the Greek chorus. Since clearness is the primary requisite for the introduction of a play, many expedients have been adopted to secure this feature. The tragedians often employed a long narrative monologue. The Euripidean Prologue was of this form, and was spoken by one of the characters of the play. The poets of the ancient Comedy followed Sophocles in explaining all preliminary circumstances in the course of the action, whence it has been considered that the old Greek Comedies have no Prologue. In the Middle and New Comedy, the necessary exposition of the plot is even more closely interwoven with the action. Thus from these two kinds of Prologues, the Romans evolved a species peculiar to themselves, which was always quite apart from the main action of the Drama. It was not assigned to any personage of the play but was an abstract speech or external comment on the Drama. Diverse functions were assigned to it. In his Prologues, Plautus approached more closely to Euripides than to the Greek comic writers, who were his ~~own~~ avowed models in other respects Plautus did not always place the Prologue at the opening of a piece.

Terence employed the Prologue very differently. In it, he seldom announced the subject matter but made personal appeals to his audience, informing them of his sources, or

Plautus himself was a Plebeian, while Terence moved in patrician society; their tastes had been moulded in very different schools the sole purpose of one was to excite the merriment of people of little refinement, the other was chiefly desirous of winning the approbation of a select few who were recognized as men of learning and sound judgment, the dread of whose censure ever kept him within the bond of propriety. Again, a dramatic generation had elapsed between the dates of Plautus and Terence, during which there had been a movement towards refinement and correctness, of which Terence received full benefit.

In treating of the intrinsic merits of their respective productions, points of similarity or contrast have been noted in passing. There is much less resemblance between the two dramatists than one would on first perusal suppose. Though as we have seen, there is apparently the same range of characters in both works, in plot development, manners and language, they are widely divergent. Plautus must claim superiority in vivacity of action, and variety of incident and power of invention, Terence in management of plot and correctness of style. Both handled their plots with great address, but while Plautus's animation and fire maintain dramatic action to the end, Terence's plays are apt to languish. In Plautus we have broad humour and rollicking fun, in Terence more sentimentality and

defending himself against the insults of professing literary rivals. He laid his induction in the first scene of the play. It has been brought up as a serious charge against Plautus that by explaining the plot before-hand he destroyed interest in the action; but surely knowledge of events to follow would rather enhance than detract from the interest of the action; to have witnessed the performances of a Shakesperian play does not prevent our enjoying a second or third performance of it. However, much doubt has arisen as to the genuineness of many of the Plautine Prologues. .

Fortunately, there is no such difficulty with regard to those of Terence. They request a favourable hearing from the audience, and indulge, with one exception, in recriminations against spiteful old Luscius. In the "Phormio" he asserts that he avoids extravagances and improbabilities.

In giving an estimate of the merits and demerits of Terence, the tendency to compare or contrast him at every turn with his great forerunner in the dramatic art, is almost irresistible, yet often unfair and dangerous, for the relative circumstances of their years and of the age in which each lived must be taken into account. There was a great disparity in the ages of the two dramatists; Plautus having produced most of his plays at the mature age of fifty, while Terence could have been only thirtyfive at the most, and perhaps only twenty-five, when he died. They moved in different circles;

closer study of mankind. Plautus excels in low comedy, Terence in depicting just characters. In the matter of language, that of Plautus is rich, luxuriant and unrestrained, but less chaste than that of Terence; it is laden with puns, alliterations, comic turns of expression; but Terence's diction is distinguished by its extreme purity, elegance, artistic finish and sense of regression. "In short", says Crusius, "Plautus is more gay, Terence more chaste" Plautus was the better comedian and truer genius, and Terence a finer artist and poet. Plautus would appeal to best advantage on the stage - Terence in the study.

Terentian comedy in relation to Roman literature seems to mark a turning point. Plautus and Ennius had made the imitation of Greek models a means, not an end; but with Terence seems to have originated the doctrine that emulation of the Greek was an end in itself and that the attainment of perfection lay not in developing native qualities, but in a faithful and assiduous reproduction of the Greek life, manners, and art; hence propriety of sentiment and elegance of style became the acknowledged standards of excellence. But Terence's Attic Comedies were too "subtly artistic" to retain the favour of the populace. With him Comedy became patrician and withdrew from the theatre. But the effect of his classic purity and "urbanity" on contemporary men of letters was immediate and on literature inestimable. Terence won panegyrists and imitators. Horace was indebted to him, and Cicero was

fond of quoting him. With Terence, the development of Latin Comedy culminated; that which came after his death never took rank as literature. It degenerated into farces and "fabulae tabernariae" - comedy of very low order - and even these gave way to the more popular rope dancing, circus games, and gladiatorial shows. Literary effort was diverted to other channels; a great movement towards the development of prose, particularly satire, was afoot.

The works of Terence, however, were not destined to oblivion, for they had the good fortune to be preserved in many MSS. M.S.S. in the monastic libraries of the Middle Ages, and became the main link between the Ancient and Christian drama. His influence was maintained by being studied and acted in all the schools of the Middle Ages. His influence especially contributed to the inculcation of the observance of dramatic unities When in 1477 the Plautine MSS. were discovered, Plautus and Terence were the models of all comic writers in the different nations of Europe. Their works were the prototypes of the regular Italian Comedy, and of our earliest English Comedies.

CHAPTER IV. ROMAN TRAGEDY.

Tragedy never attained the same popularity at Rome as Comedy; the latter was a much more national form of art.

Roman comedy, though but an adaptation of the Greek, dealt with a kind of social life that was the same at Greece and Rome, and therefore did not fail to appeal to the Roman dramatists. But it was not so with tragedy, for the subjects of which Roman dramatists had constant recourse to foreign mythology and unknown history. Thus the Romans never had a truly national tragedy. Mr. Godley suggests several reasons for this; perhaps it was because colloquial Latin was different from the literary Latin, or because the audience, whose favourable reception of a play is always a determining factor in its success, preferred something at once agreeable and practical. Tragedy, by reason of its very nature and concern with lofty subjects and deep emotions, requires a certain cultivation of mind and emotional sympathy in the hearer. This was not consonant with the practical spirit of the Roman. Plebians and patricians alike thronged to the theatre for merriment and light recreation. Nor were those few tragedies which treated of native subjects any more successful than the mythological tragedies, despite the commendation bestowed on them by Horace in the "Ars Poetica". Their own annals were probably too recent and familiar to the Romans for the dignity essential to tragedy. Moreover, Roman kings and princes were not of the same heroic and magnanimous type as those of Greek history. Under the imperial rule, interest in contemporary life and

thought was hampered; freedom of speech and action was prohibited and participation in politics was dangerous. Mythology alone seemed a safe subject; but drama which had recourse to mythological subjects was foredoomed to mediocrity; particularly since the legends of remote antiquity, in the treatment of the more practical Roman dramatists, could not acquire that poetic charm which the fertile and vivid imagination of the Greek writers had given to them. But in spite of the mediocrity of the mythological tragedies of Seneca, which alone represent to us Roman tragedy, their historical importance is incalculable. Although Seneca, who lived as late as the first century A.D. represented classical tragedy, to Renaissance scholars, he could not have been representative of true Roman tragedy written by the older poets, Ennius, Pacuvius, and Accius. Of this, however, we can only judge by its surviving fragments and the criticisms of ancient commentators. When the Greek original of a Latin tragedy was known, the play was reconstructed by piecing together fragments of both.[1] In this way, the plot of the "Medea" of Ennius was known from a statement by Cicero that the "Medea" of Ennius was a verbal translation of the "Medea" of Euripides.

The very earliest Roman dramatists who came before Plautus had written both comedy and tragedy. Tragedy passed from the hands of Ennius to those of his nephew, Marcus Pacuvius, who was the first Roman dramatist to devote himself exclusively

---

1. See "History of Latin Literature" - Simcox. Vol.1. Chap. II.

to tragedy. He lived at the beginning of the third century B. C. Though Cicero blames his style and characterises him as a poet "male loquutus" he considers him the head of Roman tragedians. His chief excellence seems to have been in his polish of versification and constructive skill . According to Horace - "Ambigitur quoties uter utro sit prior, aufert Pacuvius docti famam senis, Attius alti". Names of about twenty tragedies of Pacuvius are preserved, of which "Antiope" is one of the most distinguished. All except the "Paulus" were imitations or translations from the Greek. The "Paulus" was the first Latin tragedy formed on a Roman subject.

Lucius Attius (or Accius) born in 170 B.C., was the next dramatist to carry on the history of Roman tragedy. The existence of fortyfive titles of tragedies ascribed to him give evidence of his great dramatic productivity. A high opinion of his works seems to have been generally held. Horace in the lines above quoted, alludes to his loftiness. Pacuvius attempted two tragedies, "Brutus" and "Decius" on native Roman subjects. These "Praetextae", as those tragedies were called, which introduced a Roman subject, were apparently his most famous works, judging from the praise which Horace has bestowed upon them; but Horace always approved experiments which departed from the usual close following of Greek example. With Attius Roman acted tragedy came to an end. Decline of

tragedy had set in after its short lived popularity. A growing national feeling at Rome caused a diminution of interest in the oft-told tales of Hellenic heroes and heroines. In consequence tragedies of Greek inspiration became more and more more literary survivals. Tragedy continued to be written and acted right on till the close of the Republic, but the new age, with its own native interests, was finding fresh forms in which to cast its best thought and art. Other writers of tragedy during the Republic were C. Julius Strabo, Q. Tullius Cicero, and C. Julius Caesar. Cicero is said to have written four plays in sixteen days. The tragedy which flourished under the Emperors was written simply for recitation not for stage representation. The theatre was superseded by the more sensational circus games. In the judgment of Quintilian the declamatory tragedies of the imperial period were very inferior so far as plan and structure went, to the older tragedy which had its life on the stage.

The tragedies ascribed to Seneca (4 B.C.? - 65 A.D.) are very different from the old Latin tragedies of Ennius, Pacuvius, and Attius, which were an avowed attempt to reproduce on the Roman stage the Greek drama with such modification as was necessary to make it intelligible to a Roman audience. Seneca, however, used old plots for the rewriting of plays in the literary manner of his day, which aimed mainly at rhetorical

effect. Seneca seems to have used the matter of Greek tragedies for moral declamation - an art very much practised in the rhetorical schools of the day. His plays present a series of situations connected by a thin thread of a story which provides little more than a framework. In spite of the wide divergence of Senecan plays from Greek drama they represented ancient classical tragedy to the Elizabethan age and came midway in the course of development from ancient to modern drama.

The life of Lucius Annaeus Seneca was one of "singularly dramatic contrasts and vicissitudes". Born about the beginning of the Christian era at Cordova in Spain, he was early brought to Rome. At this time he seems to have been a sickly boy; he remained an invalid more or less all his life. He was probably of an ardent and enthusiastic temperament, and early acquired the great rhetorical skill to which all his works bear ample testimony. At the age of sixteen, he became possessed with a passion for asceticism which together with a stoicism that was almost morbid, was little consonant with the accumulation of riches which his political career brought him.

The official career on which he entered as Quaestor in 37 A.D. led him away from studious pursuits into publicity. He became a man of fashion and a courtier. Early in the reign of Claudius A.D. 41 he was exiled to Corsica on the

charge of an intrigue with the Emperor's niece. But after seven years, he was recalled through the influence of Agrippina, the wife of Claudius, and he became tutor to her son Domitius, afterwards the Emperor Nero. After the death of Claudius, he and Burrus the prastorian prefect, governed the Roman Empire for five years - a period known as the famous "quinquennium Neronis" which was long afterwards quoted as a model of enlightened and popular administration. It is generally considered, however, that Seneca's power was gained by an excessive indulgence of Nero's caprices and vices. Honours and wealth were showered upon him. On the death of Burrus in 62 A.D. Seneca felt his position insecure and therefore went into retirement where he gave himself up to the writing of philosophical treatises. The end to his chequered career was probably hastened by the disgrace of being accused of complicity in the Pisonian conspiracy.

Seneca was a prolific writer in all literary forms. Throughout his works there is a remarkable incoherence and lack o of plan. In tragedy, where organic structure and logical sequence are most essential, this deficiency is particularly marked. Indeed his tragedies have been thought so unworthy of his reputation as to have raised doubts as to their genuineness. They are certainly below the level of his prose works. The authenticity of nine tragedies which have come down to us

under his name, is now fairly established.

Seneca the tragedian is more than anything else a rhetorician, and it is his consummate rhetorical skill that is the prevailing feature of all his tragedies. Rhetorical excellence under the emperors had become the great end and aim of all education; the influence of the rhetorical schools and of the practice of recitation, baneful as it was in imperial literature in general, was specially mischievous in drama. Seneca is typical of his age; whether we look into his plots, character, or dialogue, we find the rhetorical element conspicuous throughout. His power has been expended in declaiming on a given situation,not in developing a plot. Thus in Seneca's plays we have brilliant criticism of situation, often with undue emphasis of parts, and frequent ornamental and moral digressions which impede the progress of the action. The dialogue is very brilliant but not employed so much for elucidation of the plot as for moral or philosophic disquisitions; it takes the form of stichomythia which is eminently adapted to the stating of pros and cons which Seneca piles one upon another, more for effect than for the purpose of convincing.

It is therefore not remarkable that Senecan tragedy is singularly undramatic. Moreover, as has already been stated it did not lend itself to stage acting, on account of its mythological subjects. It was probably never meant to be

acted, only to be read or recited for the delectation of a select circle of cultured men. In form, it adheres to the convention of division into five acts which probably originated in the three acts with the prologue and Epilogue of Euripidean tragedy. The dramatic scenes are frequently interspersed with the cantica or lyric odes which are consigned to the chorus A very singular practice obtained by which the cantica were sung by a boy while the actor performed the corresponding gesticulations. The musical element does not seem to have attained so full a development as in Greek tragedy. The choruses only differ from the speeches by being written in lyric metres instead of iambic. Each Senecan tragedy has a Greek counterpart.

Seneca's characters like those of the old Latin comedy, are types rather than individuals. Thus in Medea we have a personification of revenge, in Phaedra of lust, in Antigone of filial devotion, in Deianira of jealousy. Each is a type of passion and talks accordingly. Consequently, there is much exaggeration, pomposity and hyperbole; the human note is conspicuously absent. There is no character in action, which is essential to true drama; all speech is declamatory. All the characters hurl epigrams at each other without settling anything. The stichomythia consists of a series of aphorisms and sententious precepts on life and conduct, all,

for the most part, stoic in tone. An instance of Seneca's fatal tendency to accentuate a particular circumstance at the expense of the movement of the action is found in the "Medea"[1] where a whole Act is taken up with a minute and vivid account of the dreadful enchantments by which Medea prepares her revenge. Just as he over-emphasises situations, so he unduly accentuates feeling, especially that of agony or remorse, as in the characters of Andromache, Medea, and Oedipus.

Seneca's innate fondness for gross physical horrors never allowed him to miss any opportunity of representing them. In this, he deliberately outdid his originals and also ministered to the same fondness in the Roman people.[2] Thus Medea slaughters her children on the stage,[3] and Theseus gathers together the fragments of Hippolytus' mangled body. Despite this gruesomeness, there is little real pathos in these tragedies except in a few instances such as when Andromache entreats Ulysses to grant her a last embrace of her son. In general, the characters do not excite pity; their prevailing note is bombast, defiance of tyranny, praise of suicide and contempt of death, which to them is the end of all life.

In his tragedies, Seneca is as much a philosopher as

---

1. Act IV.
2. C.F. "Daughters of Troy" Act V. Sc. 1. line 1156
   "The fickle common crowd
   Condemn the crime, but feast their eyes on it"
3. Act V. Sc 2 line 946 and Scene 3. line 995.

a rhetorician; stoic principles are constantly reiterated by the dramatis personae who in them find balm for all their woes. Senecan tragedy belongs to the literature of revolt. Stoic philosophy had passed out of the schools into a wider field and had almost become a religious creed providing a practical code of morals for every-day use; but it had passed through a period of persecution, which culminated in the banishment of philosophers by the edict of 94 A.D. Two years later, however, a government imbued with stoic principles was established, and Seneca was one of the chief promoters of the revolution.

It is doubtful whether the tragedies of Seneca are the expressions of his own convictions, since much of his conduct seems incongruous with such professions. They are an elaborate protest against things in general and especially against the injustice of fate. There is a pervading tone of bitterness and cynicism. Though this hard and inhuman stoicism is unmistakably present throughout the pieces, it is in the choruses that it is most directly stated. Some of the odes sung by the chorus, particularly those in the "Troades," are very poetic and beautiful despite their sceptical philosophy. Here there is more simplicity and less superficial adornment and ponderous language. In one of the choric songs of the "Troades"[1] is a refutation of the doctrine of

---

1. Act II Sc. IV.

immortality:-

"Must misery still endure.
Longer life beyond? Does not all perish
When the fleeting spirit fades in air
Cloudlike?"

asks the poet. Then follows a passage which suggests a contrast with Wordsworth's:-

"Our birth is but a sleeping and a forgetting - - - "

"As the sordid smoke from smoldering embers
Swiftly dies, or as a heavy cloud,
That the north wind scatters, ends its being
So the soul that rules us slips away;
After death is nothing; death is nothing
But the last mete of a swift-run race,

Ask you whither go we after death?
Where they lie who never have been born"

To meet adversity and all ill fortune, Seneca advocates a calm and philosophic endurance that yields to no emotion. Andromache thus declares:- "The grief is light that has the power to weep"

and-

"Oerwhelmed and crushed, I bear unmoved
Whate'er befalls, for I am stunned with grief"

Other stoic sentiments which Seneca propounds are the superiority of virtue to all externals; tyranny and oppression only serve to strengthen it; all popular goods are really misfortunes. Happiness as the result of virtue apparently does not come into this scheme at all. Seneca's philosophy was callous and inhuman, contradicting all natural laws. All these sentiments are expressed in terse and eminently quotable lines.

In point of style, Seneca's tragedies are generally acknowledged to be inferior to his prose works, but according to Quintilian his prose has every fault that a prose style can have; if this be true, no very high praise can be accorded to his poetry. He certainly had certain characteristics of style very alluring to contemporary writers and to men who lived centuries later. They epitomised all the tendencies of the day which were all the outcome of the rhetorical schools. Hence there is everywhere a slavish subservience to rhetorical effect with a resulting artificiality and exaggeration. The style is very epigrammatic but often the same thought recurs differently expressed. Seneca's learning is not always well managed; it often becomes oppresive. Pomposity and grandeur are the prevailing characteristics though on occasion when the poet lays aside his erudition and rhetorical flourishes we have a really poetic passage of unadorned simplicity. In some of

the soliloquies we have such passages, but here also we find some of his worst vices. The great merit of his style is its brilliant antithetic dialogue - one of the most important classical characteristics which Seneca has bequeathed to Elizabethan drama

The versification of Seneca is far stricter than that of the Old Latin Tragedians. It is often rendered monotonous by the constant coincidence of the pauses with the end of the line or the occurrence of the caesura in the middle of the third foot. The lyric metres of the odes are musical yet still too often monotonous.

The chief immediate significance of Seneca's tragedies was their introduction of declamation and philosophy into literature. Notwithstanding all their grave deficiencies in style and structure, they had sufficient merit to inspire or strongly influence all the tragedies which were attempted during the Renaissance period. No classic writer is so important in the history of modern drama as Seneca. He "served as a conveyer of the sacred fire" of Greek tragedy to early French and English dramatists. The main reason for the adoption of Senecan tragedy by Renaissance scholars as their model was that it was the only accessible model at that time; moreover, they were much more familiar with the Latin language than with the Greek, and even when greater proficiency in Greek was attained and the Greek masters had become more accessible, Roman tragedy was preferred. Its sensational situations, physical horrors,

moral edification and sceptical philosophy, were all very alluring to the Elizabethans; its general spirit was more in accord then the Hellenic spirit with the tastes of the English. The very fact that Senecan tragedy was not a truly national drama made it more universal in its appeal, while its salient characteristics readily lent themselves to imitation. Seneca bequeathed an all important principle to modern drama, namely a regularity of structure by which five Acts always constituted a drama. In Plautian and Terentian drama there was originally no division into acts; this was added by editors of the Renaissance period in accordance with Senecan and Horatian rules. The chorus and certain stock characters of Elizabethan drama also owed their existence to him.

CHAPTER V. EARLY ENGLISH DRAMA.

The history of English drama shows a very logical development though the processes of its growth are still uncertain. Few traces of its growth can be found earlier than the Norman Conquest. Although the Miracle, Morality, Interlude, and Academic plays mark distinct stages in the development of Elizabethan drama they did not rise out of each other; each, to a great extent, had an independent birth, and English classical drama would have been created even had the mediaeval drama not been already in existence. The earlier forms continued to exist alongside the later ones, each assimilating cer-

-tain characteristics of all the others.

The main forces leading to the reappearance of the theatrical art were the minstrels, folk festivals, and plays; liturgical drama and the Renaissance. The Minstrels and all those itinerant entertainers which were such a feature of mediaeval life cannot be called the main source of the drama, but they provide one of the few connecting links between the end of the ancient and the beginning of the modern drama ; they were probably the direct descendants of the Latin mountebanks . They spread themselves throughout European nations, and became the purveyors of stories drawn from the traditions of all peoples. This mass of European stories and balladry came to be summed up under the term "Romance" and became the source from which later drawn drama drew many of its plots. The chief service of the minstrels to the growth of English drama was their keeping alive in the hearts of the people the taste for tragedy and comedy by their puppet plays and stories of romance. During the early part of the sixteenth century many of them settled in the theatres and became the actors of Elizabethan drama.

Like the drama of Greece and of Rome, that of England sprang originally from the ceremonial of religious worship, which was eminently dramatic in spirit. The relations between religion and drama are a very important phenomenon throughout the history of English drama. The circumstance that the

ritual was conducted in Latin naturally led to its being supplemented on particular occasions with the dramatisation of sacred scenes. The mimetic performances and saturnalian revelries, which attended all the festivals of the Holy Church, merely fostered and administered to popular theatrical instinct. The custom of commemorating all the church festivals by the dramatising of scenes from the Gospels, in action and dialogue, was well established by the end of the twelfth century. In consequence, a body of liturgical drama or miracle plays was soon in existence.

With the growing popularity of miracles, it was inevitable that the acting of the drama should be transferred from the interior of the Church to the outside and finally to the streets and squares of the town, in order to cope with the growing audiences. Coincident with these changes in the place of performance were changes in the performers; the presentation of the Miracle plays passed from the hands of the clergy and church officials into those of the laity, and particularly the Trade Guilds, which were so important a feature of mediaeval industrial life[1]. These Guilds often took over the entire management of the performance. In 1210 an edict was passed forbidding clergy to appear on the stage. Thus began a cleavage between the Church and the theatre. The secularisation of the drama had begun as a result of these changes

1. See "The Economic organisation of England" pages 28 to 31 W.J.Ashley

and a consequent broadening of the human aspect took place; from being merely symbolic and a part of the ceremonial, drama assumed a more didactic purpose,and became not only an illustration of the scriptures but also a censor of morals and conduct. The aim was both to teach and amuse the people. Texts of existing plays were amplified, new scenes added, more attention was paid to dress and spectacular effect, and the process culminated in the formation of those dramatic cycles of which the York, Chester, Coventry and Towneley Plays are the most famous.

Very little of the classical dramatic literature passed over into early mediaeval drama. There were a few early religious dramas based on classical models, but their influence on the growth of drama in England was slight. They were essentially literary efforts made chiefly by the Christian Fathers of the monasteries. The most notable examples of this early classic drama are the Terentian comedies of Hrotsirtha, the Abbess of Gandersheim, in Saxony. Their influence passed into French territory, and after the Norman Conquest, into England. A religious drama based on classic models now probably began to be cultivated in the English monasteries.

Innumerable Miracle plays were performed during the two or three centuries preceding the accession of Elizabeth.

They were an incoherent, disjointed, and anarchromistic mass, with little dramatic unity. During their development, there was a gradual substitution of the vernacular for the Latin tongue, and at the same time a gradual breaking away from the church services out of which they had grown.

The Morality Plays form the second distinct stage in the development of the popular drama. They became prominent about the reign of Henry VI and together with the Miracles lived on till the reign of Elizabeth. Their object was to teach the same religious truths as the earlier plays had done, but not by direct representation of Biblical or legendary events and personages but by allegorical means; thus the characters are personifications of the various virtues and vices. They preserve much of the breadth and realism of the older plays. "Hycke Scorner" is one of the earliest productions of this type, but "Everyman" is the most famous. A step in the direction of plot was taken by the substitution of acted allegorical scenes for simple reproduction of events. Under the influence of the Renaissance, the scope of the Moralities gradually widened to include all kinds of secular, intellectual notions. They dealt less with God and more with man. True Elizabethan drama,however, cannot be said to have sprung from the Morality; while the latter dealt with types and abstractions, the former dealt with individuals and real persons. The Moralities prepared the way for regular drama by making plays

more dramatic and less narrative in form, and by insisting more on dramatic unity.

The transitional stage which carried drama right on to the regular Elizabethan Drama was that of the "Interludes" which became the monopoly of the Minstrels. At first, they were moral in tendency, but later they shook off their didactic and allegoric purpose and became an imitation of manners introducing social types. They were not so comprehensive in design as the early Moralities and Miracles, but gave much greater freedom to the writer; the plots of the Miracles were pre-determined since they were based on Biblical or legendary events; but writers of "Interludes" had to invent their framework, and in consequence the characters became more human and contemporary, though they still remained types rather then individuals. They belong specially to the reigns of Henry VIII and Mary.

John Heywood is the most famous producer of them. He was probably much influenced by the farces and sotes of France, which were a product of the classical revival which till now had scarcely spread to England. The "Interludes" of Heywood then bring us to that strongest force of all, probably, which contributed to the making of Elizabethan drama.

Classical influence filtered into English drama in various ways. It did not act upon popular drama immediately, but was responsible for a new and quite independent species of drama, namely, scholastic and academic drama. It has

been noted that Terence had never completely lost a hold upon the mediaeval world, but the re-discovery of the twelve lost comedies of Plautus in 1427 added a new interest to the study of the classical dramatisation on the continent. The result was a great wave of translations and imitations of their works. The new wave of intellectualism and humanism first reached England through its two chief centres of learning, Oxford and Cambridge, and showed itself most potently in the study and imitation of the Roman drama. There were various circumstances and events which all concurred in stimulating the growth of this nascent drama. In the early Renaissance period came the great extension of the College system and college lecturing, and almost coincident with this change came a greater activity in dramatic performances for the entertainment of the students.

The changes in the educational curriculum, consequent upon the revival of learning, were also favourable to the cultivation of the dramatic art, in as much as they gave a new significance and use to the college stage. The foundation of Duke Humphrey's library at Oxford in 1444, with its store of classical and Italian works, had done much for the spread of learning in England. The Statute books and registers of several colleges indicate that Plautus was even more popular than Terence, and that not only their comedies were produced but also many of the neo-classic dramas which on the continent

in France, Italy, and Germany, had multiplied with great rapidity. Continental Latin plays or Biblical subjects were acted at Cambridge, but there is no record of their performance at Oxford, though they influenced the work of the first Oxford dramatist. - Nicholas Grimald, who in 1543 wrote the play "Christus Redivivus, comoedia- tragica, sacra et nova" , the text of which is unfortunately lost; indeed texts of very few of these early academic comedies are extant; nothing survives of any in the vulgar tongue. On Elizabeth's first visit to Cambridge, the "Aulularia" of Plautus was performed. On the following evening, the King's College men acted a tragedy by Edward Halwell, which was probably a close adaptation of the Virgilian story of Dido. During the same visit "Ezechias" a tragedy by Nicholas Udall, was produced.

The immediate effect of the first upheaval in letters and religion upon the popular drama was a refinement in its tone It had brought in a taste for serious themes, but for structure and technique the drama remained dependant upon native pre-Renaissance convention. The chief contribution of the Miracles, Moralities, and Interludes to the regular drama was the preserving and popularising of certain stage conventions and technique and the introduction of national life. At the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, English drama as represented by Heywood's "Interludes" had developed as far as it could without external assistance. This was at hand in the

structural rules and models provided by the study of ancient Roman comedy and tragedy. Greek drama was at that time much too little known to exert influence upon the popular or even upon the purely academic stage.

The influence of Latin drama during the Elizabethan age was thus manifested in the actual representation of the plays of Plautus and Terence, then in the numerous translations of these and Seneca's plays and, more important still, in the imitation and adaptation of these classical models. In 1559, Richard Tottel had printed a translation into English verse of six tragedies of Seneca by Jasper Heywood. The "Thyestes " and "Hercules Furens" were also translated by the same hand. This imitation was effected in two ways. Authors either based their plays immediately upon the Roman classic comedy or tragedy or upon the Italian classic drama Italian imitators had already adapted Latin plot and precepts to contemporary interests and conceptions, and had enriched them with stories of romance. The difference in effect of the direct classical influence and that exerted through Italian medium is seen by a comparison of Shakespeare's "Comedy of Errors" based directly upon the "Menaechmi" of Plautus, and his "Taming of the Shrew" inspired by the "Suppositi" of Ariosto.

English literature throughout its history has been very powerfully affected by foreign influences and in no branch more than in drama; but national spirit and genius proved too strong to become servile to alien force. The struggle

between spontaneous national instinct and external forces is one of the most remarkable phenomena in the whole history of English drama. National genius combined all the best elements of native and foreign drama, and the resultant of all the diverse intermingling forces was Elizabethan drama, unique in its kind and splendour.

Chapter VI.

Early Classical Comedy and Tragedy.

It is a remarkable phenomenon that many of the early Renaissance dramatists were scholarly men; it must also be noted that the practice of acting old Latin dramas as a pedagogical instrument had spread from the colleges to schools. Nicholas Udall the writer of our very earliest printed comedy "Ralph Roister Doister" was a schoolmaster who wrote this play for his scholars to perform. It seems not to have appeared until 1566 but it had probably been written in 1550. The importance of this comedy is mainly historic although it has considerable merit of its own. It illustrates all the tendencies of the age and the classical influence is here seen in full force; its model was the "Miles Gloriosus" of Plautus. The two chief characters, Ralph a pusillanimous and foolish braggart, and Matthew Merygreeke a needy parasite, are types directly borrowed from the Roman stage and adapted to conditions of life in Tudor age. The play is well constructed and proves that the classic influence brought to English drama just that combination of plot, dialogue and action which Heywood's interludes lacked. It is not difficult to see in it a foreshadowing of the "Merry Wives of Windsor". Though originally intended for school performance it is of no austere or pedagogic character. It turns upon the courtship of Dame Christian Custance and is

throughout pervaded with a genuine and unforced merriment devoid of all coarseness.

"Ralph Roister Doister" is probably the most enlightening illustration extant of the influence of Latin precedent upon English comic practice. It is probably after the "Comedy of Errors" the most careful imitation of Plautine drama produced during the sixteenth century in the English vernacular though it cannot be said to be an adaptation of any one particular Roman play as the "Comedy of Errors" was of the "Menaechmi". It is rather an independent English Comedy in classic style. Udall adapted consistently the ancient rules of act and scene division and tried to build up his play in accordance with classical and scholarly conceptions of comedy. The characters though of classic origin possess qualities which both differentiate them from Plautine characters and show them strangely akin to those of the interludes. Udall was too familar with the native drama not to be strongly influenced by it.

The manner and humour in the play are essentially English but easily adaptable to Plautian characters and no doubt the lower order of English Society such as that found in the London taverns, provided many characters of the Plautian type. The braggart soldier who was such a favourite figure in Roman comedy was equally popular in English Comedy because life-like.

In "Ralph Roister Doister" then we have the evidence of the first fundamental gift of Latin Drama to English

Drama. This was the division of plays into five acts and the subdivision into scenes, a practice which kept in check the excessive exuberance of the Elizabethan playwrights. The early morality was a long serious performance often lasting all day. A distinct advance was made by the interlude which was much shorter and much more farcical, but it was the adoption of the ancient practice which gave a fixed limit to the length of an English Comedy.

In the mediaeval drama there had been no distinctions of tragedy and comedy. The early liturgical drama was serious throughout, but as drama became more and more secularised it included more of the comic element; both serious and comic elements existed side by side until in the interludes drama became pure farce, with the amusement of an audience its chief aim. It was the study of classic models which led to the recognition by English playwrights of a definite cleavage between Comedy and Tragedy. This principle was not so rapidly and thoroughly assimulated as that of act division: for amongst early Renaissance drama were many plays which could be rightly termed tragical comedies or comical tragedies, so heterogeneous were they in subject matter. Udall's play then is our first extant comedy in the Latin sense. In the prologue, another borrowing from classic drama, the poet refers to his play as a "Comedy" or "Interlude" evincing the vagueness of the term as it was then used. He here uses the Prologue not to give an outline of the plot but merely to establish a friendly

relation with the audience and vindicate the advantages of innocent mirth; for confirmation of this he quotes Plautus and Terence, and incidentally shows their great popularity in his day. Finally the prologue serves to proclaim the satiric purpose of the comedy.—

"Which against the vain-glorious doth inveigh, whose humour the roisting sort continually doth feed".

Another school drama of similar type and based on Plautus is the anonymous "Jacke Jugeler" which probably appeared in 1562. It is a farce avowedly inspired by the first scene of the Amphitruo. Their is much broad humour and jocularity. This early classical adaptation illustrates that very important phenomenon, already referred to, namely the predominance of the national and domestic spirit over alien influence; and the author has with considerable success accomplished an adaptation of a remote theme to suit contempory conditions and interests.

"Gammer Gurton's Needle" of doubtful authorship, is a better known comedy which appeared about 1566. It provides a very interesting contrast with "Ralph Roister Doister". It is inferior in conception and execution despite its five-act division. Its portrayal of low country life admits of gross coarseness. There is no connected plot but it turns upon a single farcical incident which seems unsuited to an academic stage. But though there is here less classic restraint and careful attention to foreign rules of structure than in "Ralph Roister Doister", it is more spontaneous, less imitative

and, in short, more original. In the two plays are the same dramatic method and comic materials but the "atmosphere" is different. There is a more vigorous and better sustained action in the latter play.

In the same year, 1566, as "Gammer Gurton's Needle" was performed at Christ's College there was presented at Grays Inn a play which provides one of our earliest illustrations of classical influence derived through the medium of Italian imitators of the Roman dramatists. This was Gascoigne's translation of Ariosto's "Gli Suppositi" which like "Ralph Roister Doister" is a play constructed from materials supplied by Plautus and Terence and overlaid with native touches. In both plays the characters are suggestive of Plautian types and yet essentially national. This play of Ariosto marks an advance on Udall's comedy and "Gummer Gurton's Needle", in that it engrafted on toa Roman framework a romatic love story and thus raised comedy to a higher level than that of farce. The importance of Gascoine's "Supposes" then in the history of English drama is the inauguration of a taste for Italian character and plot by which a study of Italian drama could give models of classic rule and structure with the added charm of Romance, which was not obtainable through a direct study of the ancients. The "Supposes" is also important as having suggested part of the plot of the "Taming of the Shrew". Moreover it was the first humourous play in prose. In Gascoigne's (?)"Misogonus" wehave another Italian adaptation. The characters and setting are completely

anglicised; the play combines realistic portrayal of common life, which is a purely native element, with classic structure and a story from Petrarch and Baccaccio. Perhaps the first finished English comedy of Italian inspiration is an anonymous play entitled "The Bugbears".

The imitation of classical tragedy followed very closely on the imitation of classical comedy; but the effect of the classical influence in the two branches of English drama, except in certain technical points, was very different. It has been shown that in our early English Comedy as represented by "Ralph Roister Doister", "Gammer Gurton's Needle" and Gascoigne's adaptations, there was a large infusion of the native element; the classical and Italian influences had been nationalised; thus, English Classical Comedy was popular from thebeginning. In our early tragedy however the absorption of the classical and alien forces by the domestic and national element was not nearly so rapid. The first imitations of Latin tragedy received no popular applause; they appealed to no established taste such as had been preserved in comedy by the interludes. Hence early English drama was distinctly academic and wholly independent of the popular stage; and thirty years of Elizabeth's reign elapsed before any wide-spread public interest was roused in genuine tragedy. Hence since the English tragedians had no popular demand and tastes to cater for they were able to observe a much closer adherence to their originals than the writers of English classical comedy.

The growing national spirit and the passion for experiment and adventure gave a new interest to English history and legends and play wrights attempted to cast them into dramatic form. Moreover a new series of chronicles had appeared during this century and given rise to the Chronicle Play, a species of drama peculiar to England. It showed little trace of classical influence, for it was based upon the morality and was very popular, John Bale's "King Johan, shows this advance towards the historical play. The chronicle play formed a link between the development of Comedy and the development of tragedy for it was not long before it came under Senecan influence. The Arthurian legends and all the lore of Geoffrey of Monmouth's "Historia Britonum" and the chronicles of Holinshed, Harding, and Hall, were soon found to yield subjects which were eminently suited to treatment on Senecan lines. They became one of the most fruitful sources of Elizabethan plot. Here was not only an atmosphere of Romance but there were also accounts of the same kind, of sanguinary and murderous conflicts and gruesome horrors, as those which the Greek legends had yielded to Seneca.

The first real English history play is probably a product of the university stage and the work of Thomas Legge. It is entitled "Richardius Tertius" and was probably first produced at St. John's College in 1579. The subject is the struggle between the houses of Lancaster and York, but in language, treatment, psychology, and technical points it is predominantly

Senecan; the play is written in Latin. The fundamental law of the unities however is violated for the dramatist has brought upon the stage the main events between the death of Edward IV in April 1483 and the Battle of Bosworth in August 1485; the names of the personages are Latinised. Their number however is greater than was customary in the Senecan plays. The classical chorus, in its moralising capacity is replaced by a song at the end of each of the three Actiones, which were intended to be performed on successive evenings.

As in Comedy, Latin tragedy exercised an indirect control through Italian Renaissance tragedy. Renaissance Italy had much in common with the Neronian Age. Seneca's tragedies were studied and imitated with unswerving diligence. The Senecan boom soon spread from Italy to France and later to England, where, between the dates of 1559 and 1566, five authors had translated Seneca's play and in 1581 a complete edition was published. The Hellenic spirit never contributed much to the making of tragedy in England. Modern drama developed earlier in Italy than in any other European country.

Apart from the vogue of Senecan imitation in Italy, Seneca offered much that was alluring to the Elizabethans; his tragedies, being free from local restrictions were universal in their appeal; they treated the most sensational and blood curdling stories of Greek mythology which turned upon murder, lust, passion for revenge and punishment of monstrous crimes, with all of which Elizabethans had been made familiar by contempory

events. Thus Seneca appeared to the Elizabethans, as Schelling puts it, "the most romantic of the classics, and the most modern of the ancients". His compositions then represented to them classical tragedy, though they were but inferior rhetorical and undramatic imitations of Greek tragedy; but, as Rupert Brooke aptly remarks "the worst art has always been great enough to inspire the best". Though Seneca's pieces were probably never intended for stage representation and forsooth were probably never acted in Rome, they were taken by Elizabethans for models of stage plays. English academic playwrights sought to 'establish English tragedy on purely Senecan lines in structure, theme and style, and though the public theatres attracted poets of independent genius who preferred the licence of public taste to the narrow laws of scholars yet Seneca provided a standard for all our early tragic pieces which Sidney called neither "right tragedies" nor "right comddies". Moreover it was from the schools and Court that true drama ultimately took its rise.

The first extant tragedy on classical lines in English vernacular was the combined work of two young members of the Inner Temple, Thomas Norton and Thomas Sackville. Their play was called "Gorboduc" and was first produced in 1561 at the Christmas recreation of the Templars. Here the treatment was completely in the Senecan manner; there is no character in action and no development of intrigue or incident on the stage; but the much used revenge motive is dominant while

there is no lack of bloodshed and physical horrors; the characters utter long sententious monologues and the purpose of the whole play is avowedly didactic.

The classic usage of division into five acts is followed, and again in accordance with Senecan example, each act except the last is followed by a chorus which moralises on the events of the preceding act. The theme is serious and the treatment is dignified. In short to quote from Sidney's "Apologie for Poetrie", "it is full of stately speeches and well sounding phrases, clyming to the height of Seneca his style, and as full of notable moralitie which it doth most delightfully teach and so obtayne the very end of Poesie". But Sidney deplores its violation of the unities, the one defect which would prevent it from being an "exact model of all Tragedies. For it is faulty both in place and time, the two necessary companions of all corporal actions. For where the stage should always represent but one place, and the uttermost time presupposed in it should be, both by Aristotle's precept and common reason, but one day there is both many dayes, and many places, inartificially imagined".

Except for the chorus the measure which Norton and Sackville adopted for their tragedy was blank verse which had been introduced by Surrey in his translation of the "Aeneid" and experimentad upon in Italy. Hitherto, and even after the appearance of "Gorboduc" the more familar forms of rhyming verse were used. Blank verse was destined to a glorious existence as the most suitable measure for dramatic themes but "Gorboduc"

cannot be said to have determined its adoption by English dramatists. It was developed by Shakespeare and Milton into a national measure, In this its first instance however, the use of blank verse was due to the conscious imitation of Senecan tragedy.

The plot of "Gorboduc" is simple, consisting of a story taken from the Annals of legendary British history. It cannot however be called a true historical play, in the sense that the later "Richardius Tertius" is, for its main purpose is didactic and patriotic.

"Gorboduc" then, in subject is mythical English history while in treatment it is a conscious though not servile imitation of Senecan tragedy. The structure, choruses, counsellors and messengers the rhetorical style, the revenge passion, the moralising and the stage proprieties, are all contributions of the Roman dramatist. The plot, though drawn from native story, is strangely similar to that of Seneca's fragmentary "Thebais". A reminisence of the moralties is traceable in the interminable debates and in the narration of events. The dumb shows constitute an element quite alien to classical drama, though in Italy the "intermedii" or spectacular entertainments were the invariable accompaniments of the early comedies, but in tragedies they were displaced by the choruses. In "Gorboduc" the dumb shows are connected with the subject, and therefore have one of the functions of the Latin Prologue. The independence which Norton and Sackville

showed in their choice of a native theme and spirit and in their disregard of Horatian and Senecan theories of unity, secured for English Tragedy at the outset a liberty which it never lost, despite the insistence on the observance of the unities by Sidney and his fellow classicists.

An official edition of "Gorboduc" was printed in 1587 under the title of "Ferrex and Porrex". "Gorboduc" marks an enormous advanee in the development of tragedy. Its success bred imitation but its immediate successors are much less imporbant in the history of English tragedy. They constitute the first stage in theevolution of regular tragedy but they show little classical influence except in subject. In structure and treatment they go back to Mediaeval tradition; They belong to the category of tragi-comedies. The first of these is "Cambyses" written by Thomas Preston. It is said to have been acted in 1561 as early as "Gorboduc". It retains the allegorical characters of the morality. The list of 'dramatis personae' shows how numerous rôles are distributed amongst eight actors. The Prologue has taken over one of the functions of the classical prologue, in setting forth the purpose of the play. The piece closes with an epilogue which contains a personal appeal of the poet to the audience urging loyalty to the Queen, Richard Edward's "Damon and Pythias", which was acted before the Queen at Christmas 1564 - 5, at Whitehall by the children of Her Majesty's Chapel, marks a certain advance by its lack of abstract characters. This play was not printed till 1582. No division into acts was indicated, but it naturally falls into

five divisions. In the Prologue the author speaks of his intention of departing from interlûdes:-

"A sudden change is wrought :
For lo, our author"s Muse that masked in delight
Hath forced his pen against his kind, no more such sports to write"

ahd justifies that comedy which is written in conformity to the rules of Horace. His piece he calls a "Tragical Comedy".

In John Pickering's "Horéstes" printed in 1567 is an attempt to copy Seneca's "Stichomythia" and a passage is borrowed from the "Octavia". None of these pieces have any real tragic interest or much literary value but they were all popular in their time.

Through the study of Italian Renaissance Tragedy came not only Senecan influence but also connection with Euripides. Gascoigne's "Jocasta" which was acted at Gray's Inn, in the same year as Gli Suppositi", 1566, was modelled upon Lodovico Dolce's "Giocasta", which again was a direct imitation of the "Phoenissae" of Euripides. "Jocasta" however was not the work of Gascoigne alone, as the full title shows; "Jocasta a tragedy written in Greek by Euripides, translated and digested into acte by George Gascoigne and Francis Kinwelmershe of Grayes Inne and there by them presented". This was the first acted version of a Greek play. The chorus in the usual Senecan manner is used only for closing each act. Like "Gorboduc" it is written in blank verse, but with more grace and ease. Dumb shows are again introduced, probably to suit the requirements

of the Gray's Inn Festival for they had no counterpart in Dolce's version. "Jocasta" does not mark an advance on "Gorboduc"; it is less original.

"Palamon and Arcyte" another of Edward's productions was founded upon Chaucer's "Knight's Tale", possibly through an intermediate Latin version. Edwards had no great skill in character drawing and fortunately he did not attempt to introduce the tragic passions and sensational situations of Seneca. It was the popular element of tragedy which Edwards helped to develop and the setting of a serious theme amid scenes of rough humour; indeed his dramatic talent lay rather in the direction of comedy than of serious drama.

So far English tragedy had not made use of romantic passion which was so dominant in Italian tragedies, but when at last it was employed by the members of the Inner Temple in their production of "Gismond and Salerne" they made a distinct advance in the evolution of English Tragedy. One of the authors was probably Robert Wilmot. It was acted at the Inner Temple in 1567-8. It is the first English love tragedy that has survived, though probably not the first written. It employs the classical machinery of Prologue, chorus and messenger and the principal incidents, except the death of the heroine, take place off the stage. For the story the authors drew upon the Italian of Boccaccio, Dolce's "Didone" and also the "Phaedra" and other tragedies of Seneca. Unity of place is observed but the play is inferior to "Jocasta" in dramatic effect; the treatment of the plot is episodical, a feature

which is characteristic of English tragedy, which generally aims at representation of the whole course of action rather than a particular situation as in Seneccin Italian and French Tragedy. The popular device of dumb shows is again present But they are realistic rather than allegorical. Senecan sensationalism is not lacking. It is chiefly important as the first play which represented a union of a romantic subject with the gravity and dignity of classical tragedy. Gascoigne struck out a new path in which later dramatists followed with infinitely greater art.

John Lyly was the first of that group of university men - Lyly, Peele and Greene - who carried on the progress of English Comedy. He marks a new era in which new interest attaches to the personality and individuality of the dramatist rather than to the dramatic species; but the same threads of influence are still traceable in their plays, and the eight plays of Lyly illustrate the strength of Latin influence upon English Comedy, though in a far subtler fashion than their predecessors. The six plays most representative of Lyly's dramatic work fall into two groups. The first includes "Endymion", "Sapho and Phao" and "Midas", all of which are derived from classical mythology and are allegorical in character. The second group includes "Gallatheae", "Loves Metamorphosis" and "The Woman in the Moon" which have in the main, original pastoral plots and are not symbolic but are inferior in execution. It was chiefly by the first group that Lyly made his great contri-

bution to the progress of English drama; this lay in the change which he effected in its relation to classical literature. When he entered upon his dramatic career about 1580, dramatic rules and form derived from the study of Plantus and Terencehad been incorporated in the English drama by his predecessors. Terentian imitation had long been in vogue. Lyly's aim was to depart from the usual method of procedure and give a completely new turn to English drama. In all his plays except "Mother Bombie" there is a striving after the unique and graceful; he sought fresh subjects and found them in the non-dramatic classics consequently there is a deep tincture of classical influence derived from Ovid, and, to a less extent, from Pliny. In the first group of plays, however, Plautine influence is unmistakably present; purely farcical scenes are interwoven with pastoral scenes. In "Endymion" acted in 1585, one of the best and most typical of Lyly's plays, pert pages chaff the ridiculous braggart, Sir Tophas, and keep up witty dialogue. The early Elizabethan comic writers had endeavoured to bring the structure of English Comedy into conformity with Latin rule and example but Lyly succeeded in forcing Latin story into harmony with current interests and native tastes. But classic structure and form had been so thoroughly assimilated to English drama as to appear indigenous, hence Lyly adopted this usage unconsciously and his plays show the complete domestication of classic rules, but a less close adherence to Roman dramatists.

Classical imitation was thus becoming less conscious and English drama more completely national. Lyly's debt to Roman Literature lies in his subjects rather than in form or treatment of the plot. He divides his plays into acts and scenes as a matter of course and introduces the popular Latin theme of servant trickery but they are not dramatic in the true sense; they are spoilt by his conceits and euphuism. The plot, dialogue and characters are alike artificial. None of the university wits are supposed to have had a greater influence on Shakespeare's. "Love's Labour'sLost" is closely modelled on "Endymion"; others indebted to it are "Midsummer Night's Dream" and "The Two Gentlemen of Verona".

"Mother Bombie" stands quite apart from the other plays of Lyly. This is essentially Plautine and here alone he has followed Latin precedent and adapted a Roman comic type to an English setting. All the plays of Lyly except the "Woman in the Moon" are written in prose.

George Peele was far more successful than Lyly in the realm of mythological pastoral plays. He wrote plays of various kinds - tragedies, histories and comedies, including a court play "The Arraignment of Paris", which is partly a pastoral and partly a masque; in this his first play Peele comes nearest to Lyly, but the "Arraignment of Paris" is althgether a more dramatic, lively and less concentrated work than anything of lyly. Peele by virtue of his true poetic genius brought the English pastoral play to a much fuller

development than Lyly while all his pieces show a much greater command over blank verse than any of his predecessors or contempories. Wit and humour are by no means lacking. Perhaps the most interesting and original play of Peele is "The Old Wives Tale" acted about 1590 which provided Milton with the subject of "Comus". It is typical of the great freedom which Elizabethan playwrights exercised in bringing on the stage a variety of incidents andscenes. Like Lyly Peele drew upon ancient history and mythology through the non-dramatic classics; the predominant classical influence in Peele is not Ovid but Virgil. Peele then also illustrates the growing tendency to turn from the cold realism of Roman Comedy to the more romantic narrative poets such as Ovid and Virgil, a tendency largely the result of Italian influence. Thus a great change had come about in the relation of Elizabethan drama to the Classics;from being a mere mechanical agent for the establishment of ancient rules of dramatic structure classical influence came to show itself in more imaginative and romantic dramas; it was present now both in the contents and in the form though the latter had passed completely into common usage and had become less indicative of its origin. The general deepening of the Romantic cast of drama was the chief phenomenon which English Comedy exhibited during the great decade between 1590 and 1600.

The contribution of Robert Greene to Elizabethan Comedy is the development of the romantic element and the dramatic representation of sentimental love and idealised

female character. Green's heroines are more human than those of any contempory dramatists. In "Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay" there is a blending of history with the supernatural in a pretty love story. "James IV" is a pseudo-historical play showing affinity with Shakespeare's romantic comedies. In Greene's plays there is less of that bombast and grandiloquence, an inheritance from Seneca which is common to all university wits. Greene's dramatic power however is ill sustained. His plays are fewer in number and inferior in merit to his prose pieces and poems. In the production of one of his plays "A Looking Glass for London and England" he collaborated with Thomas Lodge anotherof the university group of writers, but his dramatic productivity is small. This play is printed without division into acts.

Greene, Peele, Lodge, Nash, Kyd and Marlow all have outstanding characteristics in common. All their plays show a craving for bombastic expression and violent, high sounding, language. Another common fault, one also traceable to their education, particularly their study of the classics, is the frequency of classical allusions which overweight their plays. Certain beauties however are equally common to them all; poetry of the highest perfection and charm, though perhaps not long sustained, flashes out in occasional lines and passages. They all exhibit the many sided activity of the Elizabethan drama and mark a very great advance on "Gorboduc" "Ralph Roister Doister", and the "Misfortunes of Arthur".

The last mentioned though of so late a date as 1588 shows no improvement on "Gorboduc" of 1561. The subject is drawn from the same source - Geoffrey of Monmouth's Chronicle of English Kings - and probably Malory's "Morte D'Arthur". Thomas Hughes the author made no change in structure or theory and was even a more servile imitator than Norton and Sackville had been. His play lacks action, while the dumb shows are of extreme complexity and allegorical significance. The oneinnovaton which Hughes made in his tragedy was the recitation of a six lined stanza by each of the four persons of the Chorus in turn. Earlier dramatists had attempted to imitate the staccato style of antithetical epigrammatic dialogue. Hughes was more successful than his predecessors in this respect. Stichomythia is a classical device which affected Elizabethan tragedy throughout its history and is of frequent occurrence especially in later tragedy. (Cf, Opening scenes of "Hamlet" and second Scene of Richard 111) The characters in Hughes's play frequently utter Senecan aphorisms and commonplaces but the character of Arthur is not a conventional type. The blank verse moves with more energy though it is still monotonous.

The Seneca ideal of tragedy continued in favour for two decades longer, but in the "Cornelia" of Kyd, and in the works of a small group of minor dramatists - Samuel Daniel, Fulke Greville; Sir William Alexander - Senecan influence has come through a different channel, not directly from Seneca or his Italian imitators but through

Robert Garnier the French Senecan dramatist. Garnier like most of the French classicists studied Seneca as a model of correctness and in his own productions he strove to surpass his model in all that pertained to correctness and to intensify lyric effect; he always avoided the rhetorical and sensational element, which hitherto had been the feature, most alluring to English Senecan imitators.

Samuel Daniel was the chief of the imitators of Garnier and his "Tragedy of Cleopatra" is the finest play of this type. Greville's "Alaham" and "Mustaphia" adhered strictly to classical forms but were original in content. The four plays of Alexander are not suitable for representation but belong to this group of French senecan tragedies. All these plays except Greville's two original tragedies, are based on ancient history and have for their purpose the portrayal of actual figures and situations. The source of such subjects was Plutarch who in later Elizabethan drama became the chief classical influence. Thus the chief contribution of Garnier's imitators to the development of English tragedy was the diverting of interest from sensational horror and declamation to the romance of history, while still adhering with no less tenacity to the Horatian rules and Senecan models. Thus academic tragedy in choice of subject had come nearer popular drama.

Chapter VII.

Popular Classical Tragedy.

The link between English Senecan tragedy and popular tragedy was forged by Thomas Kyd who therefore occupies a very important position in the history of English tragedy. "The Spanish Tragedy", the one play on which Kyd's fame rests, achieved an enormous and instantaneous popularity. Compared with this, his later play, "Cornelia", was a mere experiment in French classical treatment of tragedy.

The period between 1585 and 1590 witnessed a sudden outburst of pupular national tragedy which made tragedy the most varied, powerful and expressive of all species of drama. This sudden rise into pre-eminence and popularity had only been made possible by the example of the Latin tragic model. The imitations and study of Seneca and Horace had exerted a potent influence both in moulding the form of English tragedy and in creating a public taste for realistic excitement. The Senecan movement alone however would have produced a purely academic, flat and lifeless tragedy; but true natural tragedy was a result of a compromise between native and classic elements. The best elements of academic and of popular tragedy were sifted out, harmonised and revitalised by Kyd and Marlowe. This amalgamation however, resulted not from an attempt to graft a classic theme and treatment upon the irregular form of the native interlude or any other species

of popular drama, but from the thorough adaptation of the Latin Model to contemporary English life and subjects. In dealing with this remarkable emergence of national tragedy Rupert Brooke in his characteristically forceful and impetuous Style, says that Kyd filled Seneca's veins with English blood and gave his audience living people, strong emotions, vendetta, murder, pain, real lines of verse and stiffly enough the stateliness of art; that Kyd and Marlowe blew life, strength and everything else into tragedy.

The "Spanish Tragedy" printed 1592 and acted in 1588 is perhaps a truer representative of Seneca than avowed imitations like "Gorboduc". The Senecan elements are-the main theme of revenge on which the play hinges, the technique, the Chorus represented by the Ghost and Revenge, the introspective philosphising and soliloquies, the rhetorical antitheses and stichomythia. But Kyd was a born playwright and on this work is stamped a strong individual genius. He was only below Marlowe because Marlowe's genius was more literary and therefore longer lived. Kyd supplanted the archaic mythological plot by a modern story of love and political intrigue and successfully reproduced the spirit of classical tragedy. Ben Jonson's appellation of "Sporting Kyd" in his lines to Shakespeare could only have been a play on his name, since neither in the "Spanish Tragedy" nor in the "Cornelia" is there a vein of humour. The former is a strange medley of ghosts, blood, treachery and horror of every description, and a morbid craze for vengeance. There is still that extravagant bombast and absurdity of situation from which Shakespeare rescued

the English drama.

Kyd's success brought him many immediate imitators. He was only second to Marlowe in influence upon Elizabethan writers of tragedy, but unfortunately his play is greater than any of those which it inspired. In the "Spanish Tragedy" character portrayal is completely subordinate to the creation of Spectacular and melodramatic effect. "Titus Andronicus", Marlowe's "Jew of Malta" "The Tragedy of Solyman and Perseda", also attributed to Kyd, "Hamlet" and "Locrine" are all plays of Kyd's School. All the many revenge tragedies which followed are distinguished by the same predominantly melodramatic characteristics. Ben Jonson, Chapman, Webster, Shirley, and all the later Elizabethan dramatists brought to the species which Kyd had created, greater poetry and a deeper psychological analysis which deprived tragedy of that artificiality and insipidity which was the besetting fault of many of the imitations of the "Spanish Tragedy".

Christopher Marlowe was born in 1564 the same year as Shakespeare. When Shakespeare came to London poor and unknown and joined the Black-friars' Company, Marlowe suddenly leaped into flame as a dramatist by the production of "Tamburlaine the Great", which was probably acted in 1586. As he announces in the prologue he begins his career as a dramatist by renouncing rhyme and the rough jesting of clowns -

> "From jigging veins of rhyming mother-wits,
> And such conceits as clownage keeps in pay,
> We'll lead you to the stately tent of war."

"Tamburlaine" was the first notable English poem in blank verse that was also essentially a play. "Gorboduc" lacked

life and vigour, and its blank verse was monotonously regular. Peeles "Arraignment of Paris" was full of poetry and of almost cloying sweetness, but still lacked dramatic vigour and action. "Tamburlaine" is full of energy and action and in its employment of blank verse proved for the first time that measure to be the one most suited to dialogue. Thus in his first play Marlowe showed himself a great poet and a great master of metre and language as well as a dramatist. Marlowe brought drama to the highest point, then reached and developed blank verse to its best form before it was perfected by Shakespeare. Marlowe probably did more than any single man for English drama. He determined the form which tragedy was permanently to assume. He contributed to it a far richer and more sustained vein of poetry than any of his predecessors; to this he added a spirit of romance, the fire and intensity of a mighty genius and an enthusiasm for new, grandiose and revolutionary ideas; he exercised a refining influence upon dramatic form. His plays abound in classical imagery, not even Shakespeare has surpassed in poetic beauty some of the famous passages of Marlowe, such as that in which Faustus apostrophises Helen of Troy and those at the close of the same play.

The tragedy of "Tamburlaine the Great" was first acted either in 1587 or 1588. Its avowed object was to revolutionise drama as the opening lines indicate. It immediately stirred up a storm of ridicule, and abuse among critics who included him among the "idiot art masters" ---------- who (mounted

on the stage of arrogance think to outbrave better[1] pens by the swelling bombast of braggart blank verse". Such adverse criticism did not prevent the play from achieving an immediate popularity and Marlowe was recognised as the reigning dramatist of the day. Marlowe however was a greater poet than dramatist. Both in this play and in "Doctor Faustus" the faults of Seneca are intensified; "Tamburlaine" is over rhetorical with its thundering, sonorous speeches. The third scene of the second act is typical of the bombastic strain in which the monstrous Tamburlaine spoke, eg:-

"For fates and oracles of heaven have sworn,
To royalise the deeds of Tamburlaine,
And make them blest that share in his attempts"

All the characters, like those of Seneca are super human while Tamburlaine towers o'er all the rest like a gigantic monster who thinks of "nought but blood and war". The diction is no less grandiose and pompous than the subject, which in its immensity and grotesqueness is eminently suited to treatment in the Senecan style. Tamburlaine has much in common with the "Miles Gloriosus" of Plantus but excites terror and awe instead of ridicule in those whom he addresses; all fall victims to his persuasive eloquence: he frequently falls to philosophising and justifying his own deeds by classical examples. Thus he justifies his insatiable ambition and treacherous usurpation of Cosroe's throne in these and the following lines:-

"Nature that fram'd us of four elements,
Warring within our breasts for regiment,
Doth teach us all to have aspiring minds."

Act.11. Sc. V11.

1. See Nashe's Prefatory Epistle to Greene's "Menaphon" 1589. The attack is supposed to have been originally directed against Kyd in particular.

In this tragedy Marlowe has forsaken the much used revenge motive of Senecan tragedy but throughout there is the same lack of restraint, and the dramatic unities are wholly disregarded for in the successive scenes the reader is transported from Persia to Scythia, from Scythia to Georgia and thence to Morocco. There is no true dramatic construction in either of the parts but the hero , the "Scourge of God" traverses a vast extent of country subduing or massacring kings and foes, using maidens with utmost violence, all to glut his overweening lust for conquest. His only human trait is his passion for the "divine Zenocrate" to whom he addresses some very poetic effusions, eg:-

"Zenocrate, the loveliest maid alive,
Fairer than rocks of pearl and precious stones."

Act.III. Scene III.

Thus the tragedies of Tamburlaine are permeated with Senecan influence. As in Senecan tragedy there is much ridiculous ranting and spectacular effect, provided by the violent and bloody actions; moral and philosophic reflections, physical horrors, gross extravagance improbability and stichomythic dialogue are all present, but there was more than this; in Tamburlaine appeared more genuine poetry than in all previous dramas put together. In the soliloquy of Tamburlaine beginning:-

"Oh. fair Zenocrate - divine Zenocrate'." 1.

Marlowe achieved the greatest height of blank verse.

In the "Tragical history of Doctor Faustus" the strong

---

1. "Tamburlaine" Part. 1. Act V. Scene 1.

poetic genius of Marlowe is perhaps even more pronounced and the Senecan influence less evident, although a chorus is here introduced, in Senecan fashion, as narrator of any part of the story that is not to be shown or told during the action. There is frequent stichomythic dialogue; practically the only gruesome detail is that part where Faustus stabs his arm, and with his blood writes a deed to bequeathe his soul to Lucifer. The tragedy is written in blank verse intermixed with scenes of prose; there is no division into acts and scenes. Here again the hero is a superhuman figure in quest of the impossible but this time by means of magic not by arms. Doctor Faustus and Mephistophilis are practically the only two characters. The play is of intense reality. The sublimity of the play is concentrated on those last passages in which Faustus half penitent is revealed in his study with one bare hour to live. They are full of pity and terror. The dénouement is sustained by lines of truest poetical inspiration. The play is marred by the buffooneries of the prose scenes; Marlowe was evidently destitute of the gift of humour. The piece probably appeared on the stage in 1589.

"The Jew of Malta" probably produced in 1589, as a dramatic composition exhibits a considerable advance. There is less rant and rhetoric but the cumulation of horrors, and the exaggeration of the Jew's character tends to destroy the human interest of the play. The plot is very elaborate and there is more attempt at characterisation. But Barabas is the only important and well drawn character though Abigail his daughter

has considerable merit. Barabas resembles Plautus's Euclio in his gloating over his ill-gotten riches. The spirit of revenge as in the "Spanish Tragedy" is brought into predominance and brings about much cold blooded murder and preposterous crime. Barabas is a monster like Tamburlaine or Faustus, though less inhuman, particularly in the earlier part of the play; like them he is the personification of a mastering passion, but of greed for wealth, not for royalty or magic; he justifies his foul deceit by subtle reasoning, eg.

"It's no sin to deceive a Christian;
For they themselves hold it a principle,
Faith is not to be held with heretics:
But all are heretics that are not Jews;

Act 11.

In accordance with classic example all his crimes he perpetrates without the least remorse. Bellamira the courtesan, and Ithamore the fawning slave who is party to the Jews treachery and his chief agent, are classical types. The Senecan reflective tendency is evident at times, as in Barabas' soliloquy at the opening of Act 11.

"Edward II" as a play, is generally considered Marlowe's best work. The limitations of a historical subject have imposed a restraint upon his over exuberant imagination. Its source was Holinshed's Chronicle, but structurally it is far superior to previous chronicle plays and its influence on Shakespeare's "Richard II" and other historical plays is very marked. Free from the monstrosities of the "Jew of Malta" and his earlier productions it also lacks their astonishing poetic excellences. The character of Isabella is incoherent; it is Marlowe's inability

to portray individual characters and his total lack of humour which leaves such a wide gulf between him and Shakespeare. "The massacre of Paris", and the "Tragedy of Dido" are of no importance among Marlowe's works; the former is chaotic and destitute of any outstanding beauties.

The success of the "Tragedy of Blood" inaugurated by Kyd and Marlowe gave rise to a very remarkable group of domestic tragedies in which the poetic element is subordinated to the luridly realistic. The tragedies had hitherto dealt with kings, princes, and their violent passions and all things on a big scale but now private new, domestic affairs, and contempory events became subjects for treatment "Arden of Feversham" whose authorship is uncertain is the earliest and most famous of the group. It was based on a true story of murder. The character of Arden is faint but those of his wife, Alice, and her lover, Mosbie, form the chief excellences of the play and are appallingly true to life. The influence of Marlowe and Kyd is evident and all the Senecan characteristics of cold realism, bloodshed and murder, rhetorical artificiality and soliloquy are in full play.

Chapter VIII.

Shakespeare in Relation to Roman Drama.

The problem concerning Shakespeare's classical knowledge and the extent to which he drew upon it is still unsolved; but the evidence that he was acquainted with the Latin language and, through that with the classics, is growing stronger while the view that his use of classic models was derived from contemporary translations and versions is gradually being rejected in the light of a wider knowledge of his works and of modern inquiry into the educational conditions and facilities of his time. Even critics who do not accept the theory of his indebtedness to the classics acknowledge that some of his works such as "The Comedy of Errors", "Lucrece", and various passages indicate a knowledge of Latin texts which in Shakespeare's time had certainly not appeared in published translations. Whatever may be the extent of Shakespeare's direct relation with ancient drama, Senecan influence is very marked on his earlier tragedies such as "Romeo and Juliet", "Richard II", "Titus Andronicus" and "Henry VI", though of the two last mentioned Shakespeare's authorship is doubted. Much of this influence undoubtedly came through the school of Kyd and Marlowe whose influence on Shakespeare is generally acknowledged. Certain classical devices and characteristics of style had passed into regular usage in English drama.

The origin of the theory of Shakespeare's ignorance of ancient literature was of course Ben Johson's intended compliment in his famous memorial lines to Shakespeare:-

"And though thou hadst small Latine and lesse Greeke"

Andrew Lang in "Shakespeare, Bacon and the Great unknown" points out that by contemporary writers the great dramatist is called "Sweet", "Honey tongued", and "Mellifluous" but never scholarly. Milton's famous lines in "L'Allegro" did much to popularise the view, that Shakespeare owed nothing to 'art'[1]:-

"Or sweetest Shakespeare fancies childe,
Warble his native Wood notes wilde",

So did Dryden's epigram:-

"Shakespeare wanted not the spectacle of books
to read nature".

It seems to have been over-looked by contemporaries and some modern critics that Shakespeare could have had an intimate acquaintance with classic literature without having the exact scholarship of Ben Jonson. Nashe's preface to Greene's "Menaphon"[2] indicates the contempt in which men were commonly held who laid claim to learning and yet belonged to neither of the universities: Thus the contemporary view of Shakespeare's lack of learning is easily accounted for while the view that what classical learning he had came through English or French translations and Lyly's Grammar, can be as easily refuted.

---

1. "Shakespeare and Stoicism" Prof. E.A. Sonnenschein, in the "University Review" Vol. 1 No.1.

2. See P. 113 (of this essay).

It is now generally accepted that in the typical Elizabethan grammar school such as that at Stratford the instruction consisted mainly in the Latin language and literature; the language would be taught colloquially with the help of Lyly's Grammar in much the same manner as French is now taught. The "Sententiae Pueriles" seems to have been a favourite text-book and also the "Eclogues" of Mantuamus, a popular mediaeval poet. Seneca, Plautus and Terence, Virgil, Ovid and Horace were the standard poets for study. Shakespeare's acquaintance with the Latin language is acknowledged by the Latin which he puts into the mouth, of his schoolmasters, Holofernes in "Loves Labour's Lost" (Act V. Sc. 1.), Sir Hugh Evans in "Merry Wives of Windsor" (Act. 1V. Sc.1), and Lucentio in "The Taming of the Shrew" (Act. 111. Sc.1).

Of Shakespeare's knowledge of Greek we have much less evidence, for Greek was perhaps not commonly taught in the schools; but an acquaintance with Greek literature and mythology would come through Latin versions and translations. If Shakespeare drew his plots from current literature like Holinshed's Chronicle, North's Translation of Plutarch, and transformed plays already in existence, as he is known to have done, it is hardly probable that, with his strong dramatic instinct he would miss the opportunities of utilising so fruitful a field as that of the Roman drama, with which he would have become acquainted through his school studies.

Concerning his use of the "Menaechmi" of Plautus for his "Comedy of Errors" there is now no doubt, though by some he is still thought to have gone no further than William Warner's translations of the original, published in 1595. The "Comedy of Errors" may be fairly dated 1589-91, and certainly not later than 1594 and it is very improbable that Shakespeare had access to Wanner's manuscript, as has been supposed, for their is no resemblanc except that of subject, between this version and Shakespeare's play; the style and tone are quite different. No other translation is known to have existed before Shakespeare wrote his play. There was a possibility of its being founded on an old play no longer extant - "The Historie of Errors" which was acted in 1576-7 but that has been definitely rejected. Nevertheless the "Comedy of Errors" is by no means a mere copy of the "Menaechmi"; it is an adaptation with additions and modifications. Shakespeare has multipl: ed the opportunities for creating ridiculous situations by his addition of two Dromios, and other characters, Balthazas, Angelo, the Abbess and Luc'ana. Thus the "Comedy of Errors" is much more complex and even more improbable than the "Menaechmi". The very amusing first scene of the third act is almost certainly drawn from the "Amphitruo" (Act 1. Sc. 1 and Act IV. Scenes 1-6). But it is probable that Shakespeare did not read the "Amphitruo" in the original for the greater Part of Act 111. Sc. 1 is written in the seven foot metre which was familiar to the English comic drama of an earlier generation.[1] The same theme treating of the mistakes of identity arising from the likeness of twin born children is again used by Shakespeare in "Twelfth Night."

---

1. Ward's English Dramatic Literature. Vol. 2. Page 75.

In his "Studies in Shakespeare" Mr. J. Churton Collins has traced the history of the controversy concerning Shakespeare's debt to the classics; by a discussion of the educational conditions of the time, he has shown that Shakespeare must have had a good general knowledge of the standard classical authors, particularly the Latin poets. Then "to pass from conjecture to facts" as he says, he cites the example of the "Comedy of Errors" and the "Lucrece" which was based on Ovid, and gives a series of parallel passages from Shakespeare and the Latin poets - Ovid, Plautus, and Seneca. Of Plautus he infers that the imitation must have been direct since there was no record of any translations; with regard to Terence he cannot say so much although Shakespeare frequently recalls him, because the latter had access to Nicholas Udall's "Floures for Latin Speakinge" published 1560, which, together with the second edition contained a version of all the Terentian Comedies; and later to Richard Bernard's literal translation of all the comedies, 1598. Collins asserts that Shakespeare must also have read Seneca in the original not in the English version published by Newton in 1581, because the latter bears no resemblance whatever to the style of Seneca, while in the earlier plays of Shakespeare "where the influence of Seneca is most perceptible, Shakespeare's style is often as near a counter part in English of Seneca's style in Latin as can well be".[1] The enormous influence which his tragedies exercised on the predecessors of Shakespeare shows that Seneca was more widely read then than now. Andrew Lang in "Shakespeare, Bacon and the

---

1. "Studies in Shakespeare". Page 26.

Great Unknown" devotes a whole chapter (IV.) to a destructive criticism of Collin's theory and method of proceedure in proving it. At the outset he declares that Shakespeare's Latinity is the opinion usually held by people who approach the subject and have had a classical education, though Mr. Collins is an exception. This may be true but it seems an argument in favour of, rather than against, the theory of Shakespeare's Latinity for / is not this circumstance due to the fact, that such people having a wider and more intimate knowledge of the classics are more likely to discern any parallels or resemblances between modern and classic -al literature? Lang says Collins was a wide reader of poetry, had a retentive memory, and a native tendency to find coincidences in poetic passages which to some did not even seem coincidental, and to explain coincidences by conscious or subconscious borrowings. But surely it is as safe to infer direct imitation from parrallel passages as it is to explain such coincidences merely by "natural affinity", or "congruity of genius", by which Lang says Shakespeare approached and resembled the great Athenians. Collins is fully alive to the risks attending his method of treatment,[1] and admits that similarity of sentiment might recur under similar circumstances at another time, and in another person and thus explain coincidences. There are certain sentiments which have been common to humanity in all ages and places; but the parallel passages in Shakespeare and the classics are too close and numerous to be wholly disposed of in this manner.

---

1. See pages 15 and 21 in "Studies in Shakespeare".

Lang also criticises Collins for taking most of his illustrations from plays, whose Shakespearian authorship is uncertain. While Lang acknowledges that some passages and the "Comedy of Errors" show knowledge of Latin texts he lends support to the theory that Shakespeare owed little to classical learning.

Although the "Taming of the Shrew" is of Italian inspiration it shows that Shakespeare very probably knew the "Mostellaria" in the original for he borrowed the names of two characters, Tranio and Grumio, names which do not occur in the earlier play, called the "Taming of the Shrew" (1594), on which Shakespeare based his play; the Tranio of Shakespeare is remarkably like the Tranio of Plautus. The amusing scene between Grumio and Petrucio in "Taming of the Shrew":-

Pet: Villian, I say, knock me here soundly.

Gru: Knock you here sir? why sir, what am I, sir, that I should knock you here, sir?" (Act 1 Sc. 2.)

was probably suggested by the lines in the "Mostellaria"-

Tranio: Apscede ab ianua

Em: Hocine volebas? Grumio: Perii. Quor me verberas?

Tranio: Quia vivis". (Act 1. Sc. 1 L. 8-11). [1]

The characters of the pedant and boasting soldier are favourite figures in Italian comedy. In the "Comedy of Errors" (Act 111. Sc. 1.) the play on the word "crow" is very similar to that on the word "upupa", meaning either a bird or a mattock, in the "Captivi" (Act V. Sc.111) [2] Shakespeare's famous lines on the poet, in the "Midsummer Night's Dream (Act. V. Sc. 1.)

"And, as imagination bodies forth
The forms of things unknown, the poet's pen
Turns them to shapes, and gives to airy nothing,
A local habitation and a name".

---

1. Introduction to the Mostellaria edited by E.A. Sonnenschein PXV11.
2. Studies in Shakespeare. P.21.

seem a very close but beautiful rendering of a passage in the "Pseudolus" (Act 1. Sc. 4. 7-10) of Plautus:-

"Sed quasi poeta, tabulas quom cepit sibi,
Quaerit quod nusquam est gentium reperit tamen;
Facit illud verisimile quod mendacium est."[3]

A line already quoted from "Love's Labour's Lost" (Act V. Sc.1.):- "his general behaviour vain, ridiculous, and thrasonical" and the whole scene suggests a knowledge of the "Eunuchus". The resemblance between Shakespeare's Falstaff and Plautus' Pyrgopolinices has already been noted; Parolles, Pistol, Nym and Bardolph are very Plautian characters. The "Tempest" in form preserves many of the characteristics of a classical play; it observes the Unities of time and, in essentials, of place; Act 1 Scene 11 as far as line 375 is practically equivalent to the classical Prologue; for in the conversation of Prospero with Miranda, Ariel and Caliban the preceding events necessary to the understanding of the action are related,

Professor Sonnenschein has contributed further evidence of Shakespeare's acquaintance with Latin originals by his discovery of striking parallels between Portia's noble speech on Mercy ("The Merchant of Venice" Act 1V. Sc. 1) and Seneca's prose treatise "De Clementia". Two of the passages compared are:- "Nullum clementia ex omnibus magisquam regem aut principem decet" (1.3.3.) and:- "it becomes
The throned monarch better than his crown"
In the lines:-
"Consider this-
that in the course of justice, none of us should see salvation"
it is pointed out that not only is there the same idea but also a very similar grammatic construction, as in Seneca's passage:-

3. Studies in Shakespeare p. 22.

"Cogitato ----- quanto solitudo et vastitas futura sit si nihil relinquitur nisi quod iudex severus absolverit"

(1.6.1.)

All the leading ideas of Portia's speech are certainly contained in this treatise of Seneca. Professor Sonnenschein also discusses the strong resemblance of many of Shakespeare's ethical and religious conceptions to Seneca's stoicism.

Senecaninfluence is very marked in "Richard III." The dialogue between Lady Anne and Gloycester (Act 1. Sc. 2 from L. 68) is one of the best Shakespearian examples of Senecan stichomythia. Other notable instances are found in the conversation between King Richard and Queen Elizabeth (Act 1V. Sc. 1V.) In the same play are frequent examples of tragic irony (e.g. Act 1. Sc. 11. 26..) adevice much employed in Greek and Senecan tragedy. Richard's opening speech, like the classical prologues, sets forth the whole situation of the play. The concentration of interest upon the single figure of the hero is probably due to the influence of Marlowe though this and many other Shakespearian tragic characters might equally well have owed something to Senecan characters.

Mr. Collins quotes passages from Shakespeare which he shows to have been reminiscences or imitations from Seneca[1]. He says that "Titus Andronicus", and the three parts of "Henry V1" are saturated with the influence of Seneca and that the same influence is traceable in "King John", "Hamlet" and Macbeth", according to Mr. J.W. Cunliffe "Titus Andronicus" rather than the "Spanish Tragedy" represents the attainment of perfection in the Senecan

---

1. Studies in Shakespeare pp. 24-26.

style for in addition to its superior versification and poetic merit it shows a great advance on the "Spanish Tragedy" in characterisation.

Although it cannot be denied that classical influence on Shakespearian drama is traceable in actual borrowings and reminiscences yet for the most part it shows itself in a far subtler fashion. Indeed the most valuable part of Shakespeare's inheritance from Roman drama lay in his perfecting of a dramatic form of art, derived from classical precept and practice and ada -pted to contemporary life and interests by that long line of his predecessors of whom Kyd and Marlowe were the chief, and in his masterly treatment and transformation of certain classical themes, plot material, and stock characters which had already been put to hard use. In his practice of the dramatic art he was indifferent to classical theory and precept and only employed them when it suited his purpose to do so.

CONCLUSION.

It has been seen that the influence of Roman drama first manifested itself in numerous direct imitations and adaptations, resulting in a mass of academic or neo-classic drama; later classical influence fused with other streams of influence, and came also indirectly through various foreign channels, imbibing new qualities as it came. Hence in the drama which was the outcome of all these diverse forces classical influence became less easy to trace; but it was present not only in the technicalities of structure, which had now become thoroughly conventional, but in theme, style and treatment.

To a certain extent, chiefly in regard to structure and form Roman tragedy and comedy exercised an identical influence on English drama. Imitation of Seneca soon followed imitation of Plautus and Terence; but it has been shown that in comedy the amalgamation of native and classical elements was immediate and that classical comedy was very soon popular; that classical tragedy remained purely scholastic and academic until a generation later when it was popularised by Kyd and Marlowe, that the result was a closer adherence to classic models in tragedy than in comedy.

The first fundamental gift of Roman to English drama was a strict dramatic form, that is, a division of every drama into five acts; this acted as a regulative force to excessive Elizabethan exuberance and redundancy; the laws of the unities

which had restricted the scope of ancient drama were much less rigidly observed by Elizabethans than by the ancients. Elizabethan drama began with the multiplication of actions with which Roman drama had ended, and its conception of unity came to be harmony of the different actions. When classical influence came to English drama through the study of Italian neo-classic drama it brought the Italian atmosphere of Romance which broke down the absoluteness of the unities, and gave a greater elasticity of treatment to English dramatists.

The second great borrowing from classical technique was the recognition of the cleavage between comedy and tragedy. Henceforth they were cultivated as two distinct species of drama. The Prologue and Epilogue were classical devices much employed in Elizabethan drama. The metrical flexibility which the Chorus gave to Roman tragedy, the Elizabethans secured by the interchange of prose and verse. Stichomythic dialogue, or the rapid interchange of studied repartee, was the most important characteristic of style which descended from ancient to modern drama.

The introduction of classical models broadened the range of English drama as much as it developed dramatic art. From Plautus and Terence English comic writers learnt to cultivate a more intellectual species of wit in place of their former crude buffoonery and to adapt many of the Roman stock characters to English life; thus the old ethical abstractions were discarded. Characters like the old men, and their spendthrift sons and artful servants, as well as the "miles gloriosus" proved very attractive to Elizabethans and were well suited to that kind of

comedy which depicted and satirised contemporary life and manners. The motives of Roman comedy, especially those of mistaken identity and the intrigues of slaves, were put to very extensive and varied use on the Elizabethan stage, which could never have produced a drama of such diversity and complexity without the example and tutorship of Latin drama.

The great contribution of Senecan Tragedy to Elizabethan drama was blank verse. Though it was the genius of Marlowe that permanently established blank verse as the most suitable medium for dramatic dialogue and that of Shakespeare, which brought it to its highest perfection, it probably would have been long before English playwrights discarded the old "fourteeners" without the example of Roman Tragedy. The prologising ghost, the revenge motive, the tendency to introspective philosophising and moral disquisition, love of sententions epigram and sensational realism, poetical embellishments, in short, all the outstanding characteristics of Senecan tragedy were transplanted into Elizabethan tragedy - Kyd and Marlowe were indebted to Seneca for the type of tragedy which they made popular. The rhetorical element of Roman tragedy was reinforced by the modern rhetoric of euphuism introduced by Lyly. As in comedy certain interests of matter and stock characters were adopted by English Senecan imitators; Seneca's idea of Fate became the idea of providence and tragic irony was put to very frequent and effective use by Shakespeare; oracular interest was secured by witchcraft, magic, and other superstitious practices; crude horrors and exaggerated passions were preserved with even greater intensity in Elizabethan tragedies. The most

regrettable inheritance of pre-Shakespearian tragedy from classical Tragedy was the almost universal sacrifice of characterisation to the achieving of melo-dramatic effect. It was only in the hands of Shakespeare that the portrayal of character in action became the chief purpose of drama. Senecan tragedy was of vast use as an ideal and criterion to Elizabethan dramatists; it did much to mould dramatic form and to raise drama to the dignity of a conscious art as well as to shape public taste.

Thus the most valuable part of the Elizabethan inheritance from Latin drama consists less in the obvious technical and structural devices, which were the first fruits of classical study and imitation, than in certain ideals and conceptions which this study created and without which English drama could never have attained the perfection to which Shakespeare carried it, had it been left to evolve, unaided, from English mediaeval drama.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

History of Roman Literature	-	Dunlop.
History of Latin Literature	-	Simcox.
History of Roman Literature (Literary History of Rome)	-	Wight - Duff.
Latin Literature	-	J.W.Mackail.
History of Latin Literature	-	Marcus.S.Dimsdale.
Horace and the Elegiac Poets	-	Sellar.
Plantus and Terence	-	Rev.W.Lucas Collins
Quintilian (for references to Latin Poets)		
Horace's "Ars Poetica" and "Epistles"		
Suetonius ' "Life of Terence"		
The Roman Satura	-	H. Nettleship.
Tragedies of Seneca - translated by	-	E.Isabel Harris.
The "Menaechmi" in 'Shakespeare Classics'.		
Texts of Plays of Plautus and Terence.		
The Tudor Drama	-	C.F.Tucker-Brooke.
University Drama in the Tudor Age	-	F.S.Boas.
Shakespearian Drama	-	F.S.Boas
Shakespeare and His Predecessors	-	F.S.Boas.
Webster and the Elizabethan Drama	-	R.Brooke.
Elizabethan Drama	-	Schelling
Cambridge History of English Literature		Vol. 5.
Elizabethan Literature	-	Hazlitt.
Studies in Shakespeare	-	J.Ch.Collins.
Dramatic Literature	-	A.W.Ward.

Early English Classical Tragedy	-	J.W.Gunliffe.
The Ancient Classical Drama	-	R.G.Moulton.
History of English Literature	--	Andrew Lang.
Shakespeare, Bacon & the Great Unknown		A. Lang.
Apologie for Poetry	-	Philip Sidney.
Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama 1559 - 1642	-	F.G.Fleay.
History of English Dramatic Poetry	-	J.P.Collier.
Dryden's "Essay of Dramatic Poetry".		
Ten Brink's Lectures on Shakespeare		
Encyclopaedia Britannica		
A Life of William Shakespeare	-	Sidney Lee.
Elizabethan Literature	-	Prof. Saintsbury.
A First Sketch of English Literature		Prof. H. Morley.
English Plays edited by Morley		
Dictionary of National Biography		
Latin as an Intellectual Force in Civilisation by Prof. E. A. Sonnenschein (in National Review - June 1906)		
Shakespeare and Stoicism (in University Review Vol.1.)	-	Prof. Sonnenschein.
Shakespeare's England.		
Minor Elizabethan Drama Vols. 1 & 2) Plays of Christopher Marlowe.)		In Everyman.