ISSUE 3. April 2020

JOLCEL

Journal of Latin Cosmopolitanism and European Literatures

THEME

Schooling and Authority

Advisory Board
Paolo Borsa, *State University of Milan*
Walter Cohen, *University of Michigan*
Rita Copeland, *University of Pennsylvania*
Anders Cullhed, *Stockholm University*
Roland Greene, *Stanford University*
Andrew Laird, *Brown University*
Han Lamers, *University of Oslo*
William Marx, *University of Wales Trinity Saint David*
Ingela Nilsson, *University of Uppsala*
James I. Porter, *University of California, Berkeley*
Wim Verbaal, *Ghent University*
Françoise Waquet, *Centre national de la recherche scientifique*
Jan M. Ziolkowski, *Harvard University*
Irene Zwiep, *University of Amsterdam*

Editorial Board
Jeroen De Gussem, *Ghent University*
Chrysanthi Demetriou, *Open University of Cyprus*
Tim Noens, *Fordham University*
Stijn Praet, *Ghent University*
Maxim Rigaux, *Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona*
Klazina Staat, *Ghent University*
Thomas Velle, *Ghent University*
Ivo Wolsing, *Radboud University*
Dinah Wouters, *Huygens ING, Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences*

Guest Editors
Olivier Bodart, *Ghent University*
Tim Ongenae, *Ghent University*
Jessica Van Wynsberge, *Ghent University*

Design and Copy Editing
Jeroen De Gussem, *Ghent University*
Thomas Velle, *Ghent University*

The *Journal of Latin Cosmopolitanism and European Literatures* (*JOLCEL*) (ISSN 2593-743X) is an online peer-reviewed open access journal, published multiple times a year.

The journal's contents are closely linked to the activities of the research group RELICS (*Researchers of European Literary Identity, Cosmopolitanism and the Schools*), an international network of researchers interested in the themes developed throughout the journal issues.

For more information, visit the *JOLCEL* website, or contact `relics@ugent.be`.

Subscriptions (membership, newsletter, upcoming events, call for papers): `relicsresearch.com/contact/`.

Submissions: `jolcel.ugent.be/submissions`.

Cover image: The ass at school, Pieter van der Heyden, after Pieter Bruegel (I), 1557, engraving, h 232mm × w 296mm, licensed under Creative Commons (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0).

© 2020

Contents

Editorial Note iv

Dialogue

Chrysanthi Demetriou
Controversial Topics in Literature and Education: Hrotswitha and Donatus on Terence's Rapes 2

Brian Møller Jensen
The Meaning and Use of *fabula* in the *Dialogus creaturarum moralizatus* 24

Lucy C.M.M. Jackson
Introite, pueri! The School-Room Performance of George Buchanan's Latin *Medea* in Bordeaux 43

Response Piece

Rita Copeland
Latin Education and Classical Reception: the Minor Genres 62

Editorial Note

We are pleased to offer you the third issue of *JOLCEL*, a journal devoted to the study of Latin literature from a European and diachronic perspective. Thus far, we have published two thematic issues. In the first issue, we put a spotlight on the often neglected role of Latin education in the production of literature that is regarded as culturally central. Conversely, in the second issue, we looked at contexts where Latin literature occurs as a marginal phenomenon. In these contexts, Latin literature owes its presence to the enduring centrality of Latin education. In this third issue, thematically entitled "Schools and Authority," we delve deeper into the mediating role that school authorities—teachers, authors, and commentators—played in the reception of classical authorities.

The school curriculum institutionalised during Antiquity bequeathed to the later history of Latin education a number of authorities who were read as models and as handbooks. Thus, not only were texts from Roman and Greek Antiquity a constant presence in the creation of literary texts, they were also an essential part of school curricula. To take this element into account is to gain an enhanced view on the literary reception of classical texts. The interaction between school and literature is not just a matter of transmission, but also of evaluation, negotiation, and transformation. The goals of Latin education were much broader than teaching how to read and write literature. As Rita Copeland states it in her response to the articles gathered in this issue, Latin education "was the foundation on which reception could be built," but it "encompassed far more than classicism: theology, the production of new literature, new scientific and philosophical thought, and networks of civil bureaucracy and ecclesiastical administration." It therefore offers a broader frame from which to study the reception of classical literature in European literary history.

The three articles in this issue exemplify this approach. First, Chrysanthi Demetriou (Open University of Cyprus) looks at the presence of the school author Terence in the plays by the tenth-century playwright Hrotswitha. She opens up a new perspective on this relation by reading through the lens of Donatus' hugely influential *Commentaries* on Terence. In particular, she discusses Hrotswitha's treatment of rape scenes and links it to Donatus' use of them as an ideal instance for moral instruction. Second, Brian M. Jensen (Stockholm University) discusses the first book ever printed in Sweden, the *Dialogus creaturarum moralizatus*. With particular reference to fables attributed to Aesop, he shows how the presentation of these fables depends on pedagogical considerations. In the third and last article of this issue, Lucy Jackson (Durham University) studies the Latin school

play *Medea*, a translation of Euripides' play by the sixteenth-century humanist George Buchanan. In Buchanan's version, Medea becomes more of a rhetorician than a sorceress, thereby holding up a model of Latinity to the schoolboys performing the play. Finally, Rita Copeland (University of Pennsylvania) brings these three papers together in a critical response piece.

For further information about RELICS and announcements about forthcoming issues of *JOLCEL*, you can consult our websites at `relicsresearch.com` and `jolcel.ugent.be`.

The JOLCEL Editorial Board
April 2020

J O L C E L
JOURNAL OF LATIN COSMOPOLITANISM AND
EUROPEAN LITERATURES.

CURRENT CONTRIBUTION

Chrysanthi Demetriou, “Controversial Topics in Literature and Education: Hrotswitha and Donatus on Terence’s Rapes,” *JOLCEL* 3 (2020): 2–22. DOI: 10.21825/jolcel.vi3.8251.

*

NOTE

This contribution is part of a larger dialogue of three articles and one responding piece that form the current issue of *JOLCEL*. The other contributions are “The Meaning and Use of *fabula* in the *Dialogus creaturarum moralizatus*” by Brian Møller Jensen (pp. 24–41) and “*Introite, pueri!* The School-Room Performance of George Buchanan’s Latin *Medea* in Bordeaux” by Lucy C.M.M. Jackson (pp. 43–61). The response piece is “Latin Education and Classical Reception: the Minor Genres” by Rita Copeland (pp. 62–66).

*

Controversial Topics in Literature and Education: Hrotswitha and Donatus on Terence's Rapes*

Chrysanthi Demetriou

Open University of Cyprus

Abstract

The paper examines the way Terence's comedy was received and exploited by the dramas of Hrotswitha of Gandersheim. The discussion focuses on a particular comic motif: rape. After the examination of the way Hrotswitha transforms Terentian rapes and incorporates them into her dramatic composition, the paper focuses on a very important spectrum of Terence's survival: education. Specifically, it explores how rape was read and interpreted by the most important treatise of Terence's exegesis: the commentary of Donatus. All in all, the paper aims at identifying possible common approaches between the educational and literary sources under examination, while, at the same time, investigates the extent to which the educational context of Terence's reception affected the literary products that used Terence as their prototype.

***

1 Introduction

Terence's comedies have survived over the centuries not only as literary readings,[1] but also as school texts. They were extensively quoted by late antique Latin authors, including Christian Church fathers such as Jerome, who studied Terence's comedy at school. At the same time, Terence's influence upon Christian literary production was already evident in the fourth century.[2] Within this framework, Terence constitutes the prototype for the dramatic

* I would like to thank the RELICS research team for organizing the conference 'Telling Tales out of School: Latin Education and European Literary Production' at the University of Ghent in September 2017. Many thanks are also due to the anonymous reviewers of *JOLCEL* for their very useful suggestions.

1 See, e.g., the influence of Roman comedy on Shakespearean drama, discussed by Robert S. Miola, *Shakespeare and Classical Comedy. The Influence of Plautus and Terence* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).

2 On the use of Terence by late antique authors, including Christians (and, of course, Jerome), see Andrew

works of Hrotswitha of Gandersheim, the "first known dramatist of Christianity."[3] Although various Terentian echoes in Hrotswitha's medieval dramas have already been examined,[4] in this paper, I will focus on a specific comic motif: rapes. First (in section 2), I will explore Hrotswitha's rape incidents in light of Terence's comedies in order to show that Hrotswitha's exploitation of rape incidents reflects the canoness's deep engagement with Terentian drama. More specifically, this analysis strives to demonstrate that Hrotswitha has a firm knowledge of the principles that govern Terentian rapes, while her use of this motif is much more sophisticated than often noted at first glance.[5] Secondly (in section 3), I will investigate the acquaintance of Hrotswitha and her audience with Terentian comedy by focusing on one prominent aspect: education. In this context, I will examine Donatus' interpretation of Terentian rapes (section 4). The aim of this parallel examination is to investigate whether the testimony of Donatus' commentary, the most important witness to Terence's exegesis, can be a useful tool for studying Hrotswitha's exploitation of this dramatic motif (section 5).

2 Hrotswitha's Terentian drama: what about rapes?

Hrotswitha was a tenth-century canoness in the Benedictine monastery of Gandersheim in Saxony.[6] Being part of an intellectually stimulating environment,[7] she produced, among other

Cain, "Terence in Late Antiquity," in *A Companion to Terence*, ed. Antony Augoustakis and Ariana Traill (Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013), 387–94; see also Patricia McIntyre, "Comedy of Prayer: The Redemption of Terence through Christian Appropriation," in *Latin with Laughter: Terence through Time*, ed. Phyllis R. Brown and Stephen L. Wailes, accessed online at `http://www.umilta.net/terence.html`, where she compares Jerome's interest in female virginity with the representation of Terentian virgins. McIntyre also suggests that themes of Terentian plots are traced in *The Life of St Marythe Harlot*, a hagiographical work of the fourth century, attributed to Ephraem of Edessa; the study points to the similarities between that work and Terence's *Heautontimorumenos* as well as Terence's presence in Christian authors more generally.

3 Katharina M. Wilson, "The Saxon Canoness. Hrotsvith of Gandersheim," ed. Katharina M. Wilson (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984), 30.

4 For an early examination see Cornelia C. Coulter, "The "Terentian" Comedies of a Tenth-Century Nun," *Classical Journal* 24, no. 7 (1929): who, apart from comic themes, also points to Hrotswitha's use of Terentian vocabulary, see 527. Coulter concludes that "the connections with Terence remain few in number," on 528. On the other hand, see the informative analysis of Terentian elements in Abraham and Pafnutius by Carole E. Newlands, "Hrotswitha's Debt," *TAPA* 116 (1986): 369–91. A good examination of Hrotswitha's exploitation of various Terentian themes is also found in Robert Talbot, "Hrotsvit's Dramas: Is there a Roman in these texts?," in *Hrotsvit of Gandersheim: Contexts, Identities, Affinities, and Performances*, ed. Phyllis R. Brown, Linda A. McMillin, and Katharina M. Wilson (Toronto/Buffalo/London: University of Toronto Press, 2004), 147–59. Judith Tarr, "Terentian Elements in Hrotsvit," in *Hrotsvit of Gandersheim: Rara avis in Saxonia?*, ed. Katharina M. Wilson (Ann Arbor: Marc Publishing Co., 1987), focuses on the divine element. See also Peter G. McC. Brown, "Interpretations and Adaptations of Terence's *Andria*, from the Tenth to the Twentieth Century," in *Terence and Interpretation*, ed. Sophia Papaioannou (Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014), on verbal and thematic parallels between Terence's *Andria* and Hrotswitha's *Gallicanus*.

5 As it will become evident below, I agree with the succinct statement of Albrecht Classen, "Sex on the Stage (and in the Library) of an Early Medieval Convent: Hrotsvit of Gandersheim. A Tenth-Century Convent Playwright's Successful Competition against the Roman Poet Terence," *Orbis Litterarum* 65, no. 3 (2010): 172 that "Hrotsvit actually became more Terentian herself than [...] she would have like to admit."

6 On Hrotswitha and her works, see, e.g., Antony Augoustakis, "Hrotsvit of Gandersheim Christianizes

works, six plays with hagiographical themes.[8] As she states in the Preface to her dramas, Terence is the model of these plays (Praefatio, fol. 78r, 4–13):[9]

> Sunt etiam alii sacris inherentes paginis • qui licet alia gentilium spernant • Terentii tamen fingmenta frequentius lectitant • et dum dulcedine sermonis delectantur nefandarum notitia rerum maculantur • Unde ego Clamor Validus Gandeshemensis • non recusavi illum imitari dictando • dum alii colunt legendo • quo eodem dictationis genere • quo turpia lascivarum incesta feminarum recitabantur • laudabilis sacrarum castimonia virginum iuxta mei facultatem ingenioli celebraretur.[10]

Hrotswitha, however, admits that, although Terence's work is quite popular among Christians,[11] it presents potentially harmful subjects. This remark is also encountered in

Terence," in *A Companion to Terence*, ed. Antony Augoustakis and Ariana Traill (Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013), 399–400; and Mary-Kay Gamel, "Performing Terence (and Hrotsvit) Now," in *A Companion to Terence*, ed. Antony Augoustakis and Ariana Traill (Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013), 468; Tara A. Bonds, "Voice in the Dramas of Hrotsvit of Gandersheim" (PhD diss., Florida State University, 2014), 7–14 gives a good synopsis of the testimonies on Hrotswitha and her cultural environment; also Stephen L. Wailes, "Hrotsvit and her World," in *A Companion to Hrotsvit of Gandersheim (fl. 960). Contextual and Interpretative Approaches*, ed. Phyllis R. Brown and Stephen L. Wailes (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2013), 3–21; Wilson, "Saxon Canoness," 30–63 is a highly informative introduction to Hrotswitha and her work.

7 On the special status of Hrotswitha's monastery, both intellectually and politically, and the prominent position of the canoness's work in the cultural and political developments of her time, see Jane Stevenson, *Women Latin Poets. Language, Gender, and Authority, from Antiquity to the Eighteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 96-103; On Hrotswitha's milieu as well as Hrotswitha's work as a form of contemporary 'feminist' discourse, see Helene Scheck, *Reform and Resistance: Formations of Female Subjectivity in Early Medieval Ecclesiastical Culture* (Albany: SUNY Press, 2008), 121–41.

8 On Hrotswitha's works, their production and transmission, see Walter Berschin, "Hrotsvit and her Works," in *A Companion to Hrotsvit of Gandersheim (fl. 960). Contextual and Interpretative Approaches*, ed. Phyllis R. Brown and Stephen L. Wailes (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 23–34; and Katharina M. Wilson, *Hrotsvit of Gandersheim: A Florilegium of her Works* (Rochester, NY: Boydell / Brewer, 1998); On Hrotswitha's plays, their transmission, plots, sources and interpretation, see Stephen L. Wailes, "Hrotsvit's Plays," in *A Companion to Hrotsvit of Gandersheim (fl. 960). Contextual and Interpretative Approaches*, ed. Phyllis R. Brown and Stephen L. Wailes (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2013), 121–45; on the generic fusion of Hrotswitha's works, combining hagiology and drama, see Wilson, *Florilegium*, 111–18.

9 On this passage in relation to the question of Terence's popularity, see Wailes, "Hrotsvit and her World," 4–6. Hrotswitha's self-representation and the notion of 'rivalry' might even evoke Terence's own prologues; see Phyllis R. Brown, "Hrotsvit's Apostolic Mission: Prefaces, Dedications, and other Addresses to Readers," in *A Companion to Hrotsvit of Gandersheim (fl. 960). Contextual and Interpretative Approaches*, ed. Phyllis Brown and Stephen L. Wailes (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 244; and, more extensively, Florence Newman, "Strong Voice(s) of Hrotsvit," in *A Companion to Hrotsvit of Gandersheim (fl. 960). Contextual and Interpretative Approaches*, ed. Phyllis R. Brown and Stephen L. Wailes (Toronto/Buffalo/London: University of Toronto Press, 2013), 291–92; also see Wilson, *Florilegium*, 118, who makes a parallel with Terence's use of Greek models.

10 "Others, though they are deeply attached to Sacred writings and scorn most pagan works, make an exception in favor of the stories of Terence, and charmed by the sweetness of the words, they are corrupted by the wickedness of the subject. Therefore I, the Strong Voice of Gandersheim, have not hesitated to imitate in my writings a poet whose works are so widely read, in order to glorify the admirable chastity of Christian virgins within the limits of my poor talent, in the same dramatic form as has been used to describe the shameless charms of sinful women." Hrotswitha's texts throughout this article are quoted from Hrotswitha of Gandersheim, *Hrotsvit: Opera Omnia*, ed. Walter Berschin (Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 2001); and their translations are taken from Hrotswitha of Gandersheim, *The Plays of Hrotswitha of Gandersheim: Bilingual Edition*, ed. Robert Chipok, trans. Larissa Bonfante (Mundelein: Bolchazy-Carducci, 2013).

11 However, Dronke reads Hrotswitha's claims about Terence's popularity as an exaggeration. Interestingly,

similar Christian discussions.[12] For instance, in *Confessiones* 1.16.26, Augustine, specifically refering to the rape episode in Terence's *Eunuchus*, expresses his concerns about reading a passage that mentions a rapist's expression of joy:[13]

> non omnino per hanc turpitudinem verba ista commodius discuntur, sed per haec verba turpitudo ista confidentius p<erpetratur. Non accuso verba quasi vasa electa atque pretiosa, sed vinum erroris quod in eis nobis propinabatur ab ebriis doctoribus [...].[14]

Augustine's metaphor of 'glass and wine' evokes Hrotswitha's contradistinction between form and content. However, unlike Augustine, Hrotswitha does not reject Terence altogether. Rather, she skillfully approaches this pagan work in a 'selective' way.[15] As she explains, while keeping the 'form' of her original, she simultaneously transforms Terence's 'disturbing' themes into a Christian product which celebrates the chastity of Christian virgins.[16] Interestingly, Hrotswitha's portrayal of women is often dexterously enriched by the exploitation of the theme of rape, a particularly controversial topic, as Augustine's testimony suggests.[17] However, Hrotswitha explains that even though some male actions are 'disturbing,' they serve her purposes, since she deals with 'the madness of unlawful love' in order to glorify chaste women who triumph over it (Praefatio, fol. 78r, 13-24):

> Hoc tamen facit non raro verecundari • gravique rubore perfundi • quod huiusmodi specie dictationis cgente detestabilem inlicite amantium dementiam • etmale dulcia colloquia eorum • quae nec nostro audituipermittuntur accommodari • dictando mente

Terence was considered 'compatible' with Christian principles even in the 20th century, see Peter Dronke, *Women Writers of the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 69-70; see for instance Gilbert Norwood, *The Art of Terence* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1923), 151; Boyle provides a good overview of how Terence was perceived as an example of Latin 'humanism' over the centuries. However, he rightly adds that some famous Terentian maxims were not 'humanistic' at all (e.g. *Adelphoe* 470–71, excusing rape, quoted on 5), see Anthony J. Boyle, "Introduction: Terence's Mirror Stage," *Ramus* 33, nos. 1–2 (2004): 1–6; for Terence's popularity through the centuries and, at the same time, Christian criticism of him, see also Classen, "Sex on the Stage," 171.

[12] See Wilson, *Florilegium*, 177, on Hrotswitha following the relevant Christian tradition, mostly represented by Augustine and Tertullian; see also Bonds, "Voice in the Dramas," 17 on the parallel with Isidore of Seville, who points to both the benefits and the 'dangers' of the study of classical authors (including Terence).

[13] Publius Terentius Afer, *Eunuchus*, in *Comoediae*, ed. Robert Krauer and W.M. Lindsay (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963), 584–91.

[14] "It is definitely not the case that such words as these are more conveniently learned through this kind of immorality. Rather, using such words gives greater self-assurance to carry immorality off. I am not blaming the words themselves, for they are select and precious vessels. Nonetheless, drunken teachers prepared the wine of error in them for us to drink [...]." Text and translation are quoted from Augustine of Hippo, *Confessions, Books 1–8*, ed. and trans. Carolyn Hammond (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014). On Augustine's references to Terence, including the particular passage, see Andrew Cain, "Terence in Late Antiquity," in *A Companion to Terence*, ed. Antony Augoustakis and Ariana Traill (Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013), 391–92. On Augustine's criticism, see also Patricia McIntyre, "Comedy of Prayer: The Redemption of Terence through Christian Appropriation," in *Latin with Laughter: Terence through Time*, ed. Phyllis R. Brown and Stephen L. Wailes, `http://www.umilta.net/terence.html` (2018).

[15] Hrotswitha, unlike Augustine, does not see any dangers lurking in drama's performative form; see Michael S. J. Zampelli, "The Necessity of Hrotsvit: Evangelizing Theatre," in *A Companion to Hrotsvit of Gandersheim (fl. 960). Contextual and Interpretative Approaches*, ed. Phyllis R. Brown and Stephen L. Wailes (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2013), 152–55, who also notes Hrotswitha's innovation of using of the form of (pagan) theatre for 'evangelisation.' Zampelli argues that in her Preface the canoness "invokes the theatrical tradition critiqued by Augustine and explicitly places her own work in conversation with it," at 152.

[16] However, as Newlands rightly notes, Hrotswitha's association with Terence is not so much stylistic as

> tractavi • et stili officio designavi • Sed <si> hęc erubescendo neglgerem • nec proposito satisfacerem • nec innocentium laudem adeo plene iuxta meum posse exponerem • quia quanto blandicię amentium ad illiciendum promptiores • tanto et superni adiutoris gloria sublimior • et triumphantium victoria probatur gloriosior presertim cum feminea fragilitas vinceret • et virilis robur confusioni subiaceret •[18]

Terence's opus includes six comedies, four of which contain a rape incident in their plotline (*Adelphoe*, *Phormio*, *Hecyra*, *Eunuchus*).[19] Episodes with sexual violence are also found in other popular texts of Hrotswitha's time, which, like Terence, were included in school curricula.[20] Although one could question whether Hrotswitha's relevant episodes should be recognized as a Terentian element, I assume that the canoness's Preface indicates that she does expect from her readers to look at them from a Terentian perspective.[21]

Hrotswitha's versions do evidently not refer to the social context of Terence's rape incidents.[22] For instance, in classical texts, the concern for the rape's potential impact upon the victim's social status is often discussed more extensively than the negative aspects of the action itself. This does, nonetheless, not indicate that Terence is not interested in the victim's traumatic experience.[23] In fact, although the two authors were active in two chronologically and culturally diverse periods, the canoness was an erudite person, deeply

thematic: "[a]lthough Hrotswitha claims to be indebted to Terence for style and form [...] Hrotswitha has few linguistic borrowings from him; the predominant language of her plays is ecclesiastical rather than classical," see Newlands, "Hrotswitha's Debt," 370; similarly Dronke, *Women Writers*, 72; on Hrotswitha's 'methodology' as a part of a general tendency of Christian authors (late antique and medieval) who interpret pagan texts according to Christian morality, see Talbot, "Hrotsvit's Dramas," 148–50; focusing on Hrotswitha's use of the term *imitari*, Newman, "Strong Voice(s) of Hrotsvit," 307–8 points to Hrotswitha's antagonistic dialogue with Terence, which reflects the image of the contemporary empire as superior to that of Rome; on the latter see also Talbot, "Hrotsvit's Dramas," 157; on Hrotswitha's antagonistic treatment of Terence, see also Bonds, "Voice in the Dramas," 2; Jane Stevenson, "Hrotsvit in Context: Convents and Culture in Ottonian Germany," in *A Companion to Hrotsvit of Gandersheim (fl. 960). Contextual and Interpretative Approaches*, ed. Phyllis R. Brown and Stephen L. Wailes (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2013), 46; Joan M. Ferrante, *To the Glory of her Sex: Women's Roles in the Composition of Medieval Texts* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997), 179.

17 In fact, as Classen rightly notes, "in most of her plays we discover, curiously, an extraordinary emphasis on sexual crimes, perversions, and vices of various kinds." See Classen, "Sex on the Stage," 170.

18 "I have often been deeply embarrassed and blushed to turn my mind and my pen to subjects that we are not even allowed to hear, because I was forced by the task I had set myself to read and write about the dreadful madness of those driven by unlawful love and to relate their dangerously seductive arguments. But if I had avoided these subjects out of modesty I would not have been true to my intention, to praise the virtuous to the best of my ability: because the more seductive the speeches of unlawful lovers have been, the more marvelous has been the divine assistance, and the greater the merit of those who resist against such temptation, especially when it is weak women who triumph and cause strong men to retreat in confusion."

19 James considers Glycerium in *Andria* as a rape victim, but I think that Terence's text does not offer a clear indication of that. See Sharon L. James, "Gender and Sexuality in Terence," in *A Companion to Terence*, ed. Antony Augoustakis and Ariana Traill (Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013), 177.

20 E.g. Statius' *Achilleid* and Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*, see Marjorie Curry Woods, "Rape and the Pedagogical Rhetoric of Sexual Violence," in *Criticism and Dissent in the Middle Ages*, ed. Rita Copeland (Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996), who also notes that "[t]he commentators writing for the schools, particularly for the younger students, do not allegorize or moralize these texts," at 64.

21 On Hrotswitha's sources, see Wailes, "Hrotsvit's Plays," 127–8 on *Dulcitius* and on 129 on *Calimachus*; in both cases, Hrotswitha seems to have treated her (not always specified) material quite creatively. On a similar reading of the Preface, see Bonds, "Voice in the Dramas," 93: "Since Terence is the only source Hrotsvit mentions by name, it is difficult to try to determine what other sources she employed."

22 Augoustakis, "Hrotsvit of Gandersheim," 408.

23 Seminal for the exploration of Terence's intentions in this respect is the study by Sharon L. James, "From

acquainted with classical authors.[24] Hence, her exploitation of Terence is not one-dimensional. As Robert Talbot succinctly notes, "[t]he key to the recognition of Terentian elements within Hrotsvit is to notice the way she transposes them."[25] Essentially, Hrotswitha's correspondence with her *exemplum* is often a case of 'differentiation': the 'bad' characters in Hrotswitha are the pagans who threaten the innocent Christians' chastity, while comic *meretrices* (i.e., "sex-laborers") turn into women who eventually acknowledge their sinful life and convert to Christianity.[26] Within this heavily modified dramatic universe, Hrotswithian rapes constitute a potential martyrdom for Christian women who are eventually rewarded, not with a conventional marriage, as in the comic prototypes, but through their unification with God.[27] In fact, 'rape' in Hrotswitha has a special form: it is a case of intended—and in the end failed—sexual approach against unwilling Christian women.[28]

Thus, although at first sight Hrotswitha's plays might not reveal a strong thematic association with Terentian comedy,[29] a closer look at the canoness's treatment of the ancient playwright shows that her exploitation of dramatic motifs—including that of

Boys to Men: Rape and Developing Masculinity in Terence's *Hecyra* and *Eunuchus*," *Helios* 25, no. 1 (1998): which shows how the rape incidents of Terence's *Eunuchus* and *Hecyra*, deviating from the norms that govern New Comedy rapes, express a certain degree of criticism of the idea that sexual violence against women might be seen as a medium for a rapist to reach masculinity.

[24] On Hrotswitha's rich educational background, see Bonds, "Voice in the Dramas," 14–17; and Wailes, "Hrotsvit and her World," 6 (on both Christian and pagan texts); also Brown, "Hrotsvit's Apostolic Mission," 241–42; Newlands, "Hrotswitha's Debt," 378–82 discusses Virgilian echoes in *Abraham*; on this see also Dronke, *Women Writers*, 79-80; on the cultural framework in which Hrotswitha worked as well as the intellectual opportunities offered in her monastery, also in association with Terence, see McIntyre, "Comedy of Prayer"; see also Stevenson, "Hrotsvit in Context," 44-50 for the literary works Hrotswitha seems to have been acquainted with.

[25] Talbot, "Hrotsvit's Dramas," 148.

[26] In translating *meretrix*, I follow Serena S. Witzke, "Harlots, Tarts, and Hussies? A Problem of Terminology for Sex Labor in Roman Comedy," *Helios* 42, no. 1 (2015): 7–27; see her thorough study for a good survey of the various types of prostitution in Roman comedy and the manifold meaning of the particular term. On Hrotwitha's criticism of Terence's representation of women, see Scheck, *Reform and Resistance*, 131–32; on Hrotswitha's treatment of the *meretrix* type, see Evangelos Karakasis, "*Quantum mutatus ab illo*: Terence in Hroswitha," *Hellenika* 52 (2002): 290–91; for an extensive examination of Hrotswitha's female characters against those of Terence, see Bonds, "Voice in the Dramas"; based on the theological context of Hrotswitha's work, Macy notes that 'lascivious' could be any woman who has sexual intercourse, see Gary Macy, "Hrotsvit's Theology of Virginity and Continence," in *A Companion to Hrotsvit of Gandersheim (fl. 960). Contextual and Interpretative Approaches*, ed. Phyllis R. Brown and Stephen L. Wailes (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2013), 72; on the other hand, as Wilson notes, some of Hrotswitha's characters are in fact more 'wicked' than those of Terence. See Wilson, *Florilegium*, 117.

[27] For rapes resolving into marriage in ancient comedy, see, for instance, Menander's *Samia* and *Georgos*, Plautus' *Aulularia*, Terence's *Adelphoe*; see further Vincent J. Rosivach, *When a Young Man Falls in Love: the Sexual Exploitation of Women in New Comedy* (London/New York: Routledge, 1998), 14–23; for Hrotswitha's different versions of Terentian marriage, among which the case of *Dulcitius*, see Talbot, "Hrotsvit's Dramas," 153; on Hrotswitha's exploitation of the marriage motif as well as her influence by Augustine's relevant discussions, see Bonds, "Voice in the Dramas," 76–83.

[28] On Hrotswitha's transformation of the rape motif, see Karakasis, "Terence in Hroswitha," 285; Augoustakis believes that the contrast between the ridiculed, failed rapes of the pagans with those of comic tradition is an intentional play by Hrotswitha, see Augoustakis, "Hrotsvit of Gandersheim," 406; see also Florence Newman, "Violence and Virginity in Hrotsvit's Dramas," in *Hrotsvit of Gandersheim: Contexts, Identities, Affinities, and Performances*, ed. Phyllis R. Brown, Linda A. McMillin, and Katharina M. Wilson (Toronto/Buffalo/London: University of Toronto Press, 2004), on Hrotswitha's dramas celebrating chastity and virginity through the exposure of the female body, which is often placed in danger.

[29] See also Brown, "Interpretations and Adaptations," 246.

rape—is in fact multifaceted.[30] In this context, while several scholars have rightly pointed to Hrotswitha's preoccupation with presenting the facts from a female perspective,[31] we should not forget that Terence has also been praised for being particularly sensitive to the female characters' experience.[32] Although Terence's dialogues lack the Hrotswithian female protagonists' ardent speeches, Terentian women often do have a strong voice.[33] What is more, Hrotswitha's emphasis on female qualities such as virginity, although reflecting Christian principles,[34] corresponds to the central theme of rape in comic plots: comic victims are always 'good' citizen girls, and this is of course one of the reasons that the plays' happy endings reward them.[35]

In Hrotswitha's *Dulcitius*,[36] set in the fourth-century Roman empire under Diocletian, the eponymous character becomes obsessed with the beauty of three Christian virgins, Agapes, Chionia, and Hirena. When he arranges to meet them in order to 'satisfy' his lascivious desires, he is punished. This scene is witnessed by the virgins (fol. 91v-92r, IV.1-3, ll. 4–26), who witness Dulcitius losing his mind and 'embracing' the cooking pots instead of the girls.[37] Hirena acknowledges that he is *mente alienatus* ("[h]e's completely out

[30] For a good summary of various scholarly approaches to the extent to which Hrotswitha's work is informed by Terentian themes as well as on Hrotswitha's relationship with her prototype as a case of *aemulatio*, see Bonds, "Voice in the Dramas," 26–57; on Hrotswitha's exploitation of elements of classical comedy, see also Zampelli, "Necessity of Hrotsvit," 153, and his analysis of the plays on 159–97; on Hrotswitha's deep knowledge of Terentian motifs, see the analysis by Karakasis, "Terence in Hroswitha"; Gamel traces parallels between Terence's *Eunuchus* and Hrotswitha's *Pafnutius*, especially in regard to the treatment of women, see Gamel, "Performing Terence," 478–81; also McIntyre, "Comedy of Prayer," traces Hrotswitha's conscious use of Terentian motifs, such as the use of disguise in *Abraham*.

[31] On Hrotswitha's accentuation of female roles, often against her sources, and her challenging of 'traditional' ideas about women, see Scheck, *Reform and Resistance*, 143–65; see also Ferrante, *Glory of her Sex*, 181–3 on Hrotswitha's dramatic production focusing on female protagonists; on this innovation, see also Bonds, "Voice in the Dramas," *passim*, and 58–95 on how he transforms women from 'objects' (like those of Terence's plays) into 'subjects.' Hrotswitha even presents herself as a female author in correspondence with "male criticism"; see Brown, "Hrotsvit's Apostolic Mission," 246.

[32] Compare Thais' monologue in *Eun.* 197–203; also Bacchis in *Heautontimorumenos* 381–95, who describes men's selfish attitude towards *meretrices*; on Terence's portrayal of *meretrices*, see section 3 of this paper. Terence takes into consideration the female perspective in other instances too: Bacchis in *Hecyra* exposes the danger of being treated with suspicion by women of her profession (775–76) and, also, by men (820); also, in *Hecyra* 828–9 we learn how Myrina was violently raped by Pamphilus; similarly, we get a description of Pamphila's shocking rape experience in *Eunuchus* (657–59). In addition, in *Andria* 74–86 Simo narrates how a poor girl, Chrysis, was forced by circumstances to become a sex-laborer. On Terence's focus on the female perspective in the rape incidents of *Eunuchus* and *Hecyra*, see also James, "From Boys to Men," 41–45.

[33] Compare the case of Pamphila in *Eunuchus*, advocated by Pythias and Thais.

[34] As Macy points out, Hrotswitha's plays promotes 'virginity' even in marriage, see Macy, "Hrotsvit's Theology," 63–64, see *passim* for examples and Hrotswitha's theological background on this matter; on Hrotswitha's emphasis on virginity largely influenced by monastic culture, see also McIntyre, "Comedy of Prayer."

[35] See also Dronke, *Women Writers*, 72, who notes that virgins in both Terence and Hrotswitha are victims who are eventually saved.

[36] I disagree with Newlands, "Hrotswitha's Debt," 374 that *Abraham* exploits the theme of rape, since in that case we have a clear indication that Maria was seduced and thus had intercourse in her own free will (fol. 103r–103v, III.2, ll. 7–18).

[37] *Estimat se / nostris uti amplexibus— nunc sartagi-/nes et caccabos amplectitur • mitia libans oscula—* ("[h]e thinks he is embracing us! [n]ow he is fondling the pots / [a]nd hugging the frying pans to his eager breast, / [g]iving them all long, sweet kisses!"). As Classen, "Sex on the Stage," 176 explains, "both kisses and embraces are nothing but thinly veiled symbolic actions leading directly to sexual exchange, or, in this case, rape."

of his mind"), while Chionia names the episode as *ridiculum* ("the funniest thing").[38] Having become the object of ridicule, the enraged Dulcitius orders that the girls be publicly humiliated by being stripped naked. Miraculously, their clothes stay on and the girls' chastity is preserved.

Intended sexual violence is also noted in *Calimachus*, set in first-century Ephesus. The eponymous character, a pagan, is desperately in love with Drusiana, a noble Christian married woman. To escape Calimachus' malevolent advances, Drusiana prays to God, and is miraculously saved by death (fol. 96r–96v, IV). Calimachus, devastated, is easily induced by the greedy slave Fortunatus to 'use' Drusiana's dead body—still beautiful and attractive—as he pleases (fol. 96v–97r, VI.1; note Fortunatus' promises to Calimachus: *dedam illud / tuis usibus*—"I will give her body to you / [t]o do with as you please," [*a*]*butere ut libet*—"[u]se her as you will;" also, Calimachus' words in front of Drusiana's body: [*n*]*unc in mea situm est potestate • quantislibet / iniuriis • te velim lacessere*—"[n]ow it lies within my power to force you, / [t]o bruise you and injure you as much as I want."). While preparing to penetrate Drusiana's corpse, Calimachus suddenly dies (fol. 97r, VII.1). At the end, Saint John, urged by Christ, resurrects both Calimachus and Drusiana. Realising his fault, the pagan finally converts to Christianity (fol. 99r, IX.13, ll. 3–25).

In both *Dulcitius* and *Calimachus*, Hrotswitha creates a situation totally different from that of her prototypes: in this case, the (failed) rapist is the 'blocking character' who threatens the protagonist's chastity.[39] More importantly, whereas in classical comedies the rape is firmly associated with the play's happy ending, which ends with marriage, in Hrotswitha, the plot's positive outcome is secured by the *prevention* of rape.[40] In other words, while Hrotswitha alludes to several recurrent themes of comic rapes, her exploitation is manifold. Some of these themes are eventually presented from a different angle. For instance, the theme of marriage is evoked at the end of *Dulcitius*. However, we do not have a conventional marriage: Hirena, while dying, expects to enter Christ's wedding chamber (fol. 94v, XIV, ll. 6–18: *virgi-/nitatisque receptura coronam • intrabo aethereum aeterni / regis thalamum*—"And [I will] wear the crown of purity. / And I will enter the heavenly bridal chamber of the Eternal King").[41]

Furthermore, the virtue of virginity is singled out for praise in both plays. In *Calimachus*, although Drusiana is married, there is strong emphasis on her sexual abstinence (fol. 95v, II.3, l. 10), reflecting in this way the traditional view of rape victims as being chaste. In this play, however, Hrotswitha subverts the comic tradition of silent virgin victims, as Drusiana defends herself against the man who threatens her chastity (compare her reactions in fol. 96r,

[38] It has been rightly observed that this scene contains mime elements; see Dronke, *Women Writers*, 59; Wilson, *Florilegium*, 10; Zampelli, "Necessity of Hrotsvit," 167.

[39] On Hrotswitha's use of 'stock characters,' see Karakasis, "Terence in Hroswitha," 287–88. Here, I follow the wide use of the term 'blocking character' in the scholarship on Roman comedy to indicate the character that acts as an obstacle to the union of the young man with his beloved. This 'obstacle' might be the young man's father, as Simo in Terence's *Andria*, who does not want his son to marry a poor girl, or a pimp, like Cappadox in Plautus' *Curculio*, who keeps the object of the young man's desire enslaved at a brothel; for examples from Roman comedy, see David Konstan, *Roman Comedy* (Ithaca, London: Cornell University Press, 1983), 28-29. Following this categorisation, 'blocking characters' in Hrotswitha's dramas can be considered those who threaten the heroine's union with God.

[40] On Hrotswitha's hostile position towards rape, see Bonds, "Voice in the Dramas," 69-70. See also Augoustakis, "Hrotsvit of Gandersheim," 402, who notes the 'heroism' of the women-victims. See also Scheck, *Reform and Resistance*, 155–60 on how Hrotswitha's rape incidents accentuate the failure of the male rapists' wicked nature on the one hand and the women's strength on the other.

[41] On Hrotswitha's marriage taking a different form from comic tradition, see Augoustakis, "Hrotsvit of Gandersheim," 402; and Karakasis, "Terence in Hroswitha," 284.

III.1-5, ll. 4–32).[42] She even calls Calimachus a *leno* (l. 14); although here the term is used as an accusation,[43] it bears great significance in comic contexts: *lenones* are comic pimps, the blocking characters *par excellence*, who enslave good, chaste girls.[44] Moreover, Calimachus, although he does not manage to fulfil his initial plans, shares a common feature with some other—successful—comic rapists: he ultimately shows remorse (see his request for becoming a Christian in fol. 99r, IX.13, ll. 3–25).[45] Calimachus' reaction is contrasted with that of Dulcitius, who seems to be closer to the rapist Chaerea from Terence's *Eunuchus*. Chaerea even refers to his act in a rather triumphal tone.[46] In fact, Dulcitius and Chaerea not only fail to show any sign of regret concerning their actions, but they also present them as an act of justified violence against their victims: Dulcitius' single aim is to make possession of the girls and to overcome their resistance (fol. 91r, II.1-fol. 91v, III.1),[47] while Chaerea considers his attitude as a way to take revenge on the sex-laborer Thais, for her alleged crimes against men.[48]

Undeniably, Hrotswitha's rape incidents share striking parallels with *Eunuchus*' rape episode. Both Hrotswithian rapists follow Chaerea, *Eunuchus*' young rapist, in praising their (potential) victims' attractiveness.[49] Dulcitius stresses the girls' beauty (fol. 90v, I.1, ll. 3–14; also, fol. 91r, II.1, ll. 5 and 7),[50] which definitely constitutes one of the rapist's motives. Calimachus, whose role was compared to that of a comic *adulescens amans*,[51] reacts in a similar manner (fol. 95r, II.1, l. 11 and fol. 96r, III.1, l. 8). Indeed, the whole episode shows significant parallels in *Eunuchus*' subplot with regard to Chaerea.[52] In both plays, the 'rape' is prompted by a slave: like Chaerea, it is Calimachus who asks for the slave's help. However, I certainly do not argue that Hrotswitha in *Calimachus* follows Terence's

[42] On Drusiana against *Eunuchus*' silent Pamphila, see Bonds, "Voice in the Dramas," 69; Wilson, *Florilegium*, 121 suggests that the audience here would be able to trace the entertaining opposition between Drusiana and mythological passive victims; on the canoness subverting the stereotype of 'passive' Terentian girls, see also Newlands, "Hrotswitha's Debt," 372; on Hrotswitha assigning strong voice to her heroines, see also Newman, "Strong Voice(s) of Hrotsvit," 293–94.

[43] See the translation in Hrotswitha of Gandersheim, *The Plays*, for *leno nefande*: "[u]nspeakable man, you are no better than a flesh peddler"; see also the translation by Wilson, *Florilegium*, "vile seducer."

[44] On this stock character, see Richard L. Hunter, *The New Comedy of Greece and Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 71–72.

[45] For instance, Aeschinus in Terence's *Adelphoe* (471–74) and Lyconides in Plautus' *Aulularia* (738–39) admit that their actions were wrong and even ask for forgiveness.

[46] *Eun.* 549–56. Similarly, Diniarchus in Plautus' *Truculentus* is concerned only because his action was revealed; see his expression of fear in ll. 96–797, 818–20, 823–24, before he is forced to admit the truth and ask for forgiveness (ll. 26–828).

[47] On Dulcitius' reliance on his power and authority, see also Classen, "Sex on the Stage," 176.

[48] *Eun.* 382–87.

[49] On this play being particularly 'present' in Hrotswitha's plays, see various analogies discussed in Newlands, "Hrotswitha's Debt," e.g. 372–77, on *Abraham*; also Talbot, "Hrotsvit's Dramas," 154–55, on both *Abraham* and *Pafnutius*; and Gamel, "Performing Terence," 473 on *Pafnutius*, whose eminent *meretrix* is also called Thais.

[50] On Hrotswitha keeping the emphasis on the girls' beauty, see Karakasis, "Terence in Hroswitha," 284. On 285–86 he points to "love from the first sight" as another parallel.

[51] See Wailes, "Hrotsvit's Plays," 129, on the fact that "Calimachus represents the character of the hot-blooded young lover familiar from Terentian comedy"; similarly, Wilson, *Florilegium*, 121. The term *adulescens amans* ("young man in love") refers to a common character type of Greek and Roman New Comedy: a young man in his twenties, certainly not poor and thus able to enjoy romantic affairs; he is passionate and feels attracted to the physical beauty of a young girl, usually from a lower class; marriage usually marks the end of this state and the young man's transition to adulthood; see further Rosivach, *Sexual Exploitation in New Comedy*, 4-5. Phaedria in Terence's *Eunuchus*, deeply in love with Thais, a sex-laborer, is a typical example; also, Aeschinus in *Adelphoe*, son of Micio, in love with a poor girl, *Pamphila*.

[52] The similarity with *Eunuchus* has been already noted by Coulter, "Terentian Comedies," 523, who points

Eunuchus in every respect. For instance, Fortunatus' contribution to Calimachus' crime is much more significant than Parmeno's in *Eunuchus*. Hrotswitha's Fortunatus seems to follow a traditional slave pattern—i.e., a helper in a lover's affairs, a pattern that is, however, not fully followed by Parmeno in *Eunuchus*.[53] Calimachus is even presented as the treacherous slave's victim (fol. 99v, IX.22, ll. 5–18), while, in the case of *Eunuchus*, Chaerea is the one who victimises his slave: as a result of his actions, Pythias treats Parmeno in a harsh manner (942–70, 1002–29) and Phaedria beats Dorus (669, 716). In fact, although Parmeno suggests Chaerea's entrance into the girl's room (372–75) and later even boasts of this scheme (923–29), his contribution to Chaerea's actions is actually not that decisive.[54]

Despite the evident differences between the two plays, *Eunuchus*' influence on *Calimachus* can be discerned in some linguistic parallels. For instance, in both plays, the rape is described as a crime: both Andronichus and Calimachus refer to the rape by the term *facinus* (fol. 97v, IX.2, l. 11; fol. 98v, IX.10, l. 5; fol. 100r, IX.22, l. 18), a term also used for describing Chaerea's action.[55] Similarly, Saint John's reference to Calimachus' sins is made through the term *vitia*, in fol. 98v, IX.10, l. 3, which is also associated with the way in which comic rapes are depicted (compare the term *vitiavit* in *Eun.* 654). Even Calimachus acknowledges the brutality of his intended action (see fol. 97r, VII.1, l. 20, *iniuriis*), when he gives an explicit description of his plans (ll. 9–20: *Nunc in mea situm est potestate • quantislibet / iniuriis • te velim lacessere*—"Now it lies within my power to force you, / To bruise you and injure you as much as I want."). Although Chaerea does not provide such details, there is a similar, strong emphasis on the rapist's violent behaviour in *Eunuchus*, portrayed in the vivid description of Pamphila's negative experience.[56] What is more, Saint John refers to Calimachus' *dementia* and *insania* (fol. 98v, IX.10, l. 7), the elements of 'unlawful love,' as suggested in Hrotswitha's Preface (see second passage quoted above), evoking Chaerea's characterisation as 'mad.'[57]. In addition, Calimachus openly claims that he will come up with a trick to satisfy his desires (see the use of *insidiis*, in fol. 96r, III.5, l. 7), a point that, once again, calls to mind Terence's play. Indeed, in both *Calimachus* and *Eunuchus*, the two men approach their (potential) rape victims through a furtive entrance, which is part of a plan. Calimachus manages to enter the room where Drusiana's body lies by offering money to dexterous Fortunatus (fol. 97r, VI), while Chaerea manages to get into Pamphila's room only because he is disguised as a eunuch (see the exposition of Parmeno's plan in 369–77).

Given Terence's popularity and her own remarks in the preface of her work, Hrotswitha possibly expected her learned readers to be able to trace the manifold correspondence between classical texts and her own versions.[58] It would therefore be beneficial to explore some possible contexts through which Terence's comedies were read. As Terence was taught at schools and

to the love-theme of the play; she rightly finds a parallel between the expression of love to friends by both Calimachus and Chaerea; see also *passim* for other analogies between the *Eunuchus* and Hrotswitha's plays (e.g., in the use of disguise).

[53] On this comic stereotypic role and Terence's slaves, often deviating from the comic tradition as established by Plautus, see the comprehensive discussion by Evangelos Karakasis, "Slaves and Masters," in *A Companion to Terence*, ed. Antony Augoustakis and Ariana Traill (Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013), 211–22. On Terence's slaves and the playwright's modification of "the convention of the slave who manages the action," see the classic study by C.W. Amerasinghe, "The Part of the Slave in Terence's Drama," *Greece & Rome* 19, no. 56 (1950): quotation on 62.

[54] On Parmeno not being the traditional 'clever slave,' since he fails to take control of Chaerea's scheme, see Karakasis, "Slaves and Masters," 213.

[55] *Eun.* 644.

[56] *Eun.* 645–46, 659–60, 820.

[57] *Eun.* 301

[58] On Hrotswitha's audience having members also in the "imperial court," see Ferrante, *Glory of her Sex*, 175,

medieval monasteries, an overview of the most important exegetical treatise on Terence can be illuminating and enhance our understanding of how Terence's rapes were interpreted.[59]

3 The context: Terence in schooling

From early on, Terence's comedies formed a part of the Latin curriculum.[60] Fortunately, we can trace Terence's use in Latin education by means of a unique testimony, namely the commentary of Aelius Donatus, a grammarian of the fourth century, who was a prominent teacher in Rome, where Jerome was one of his students. Donatus' commentary covers a wide range of themes, discusses matters of style and language, often by quoting examples from other sources, such as Virgil, and elaborates on matters of content and plot.[61] A good example of the prominent position that Donatus' commentary held in the interpretation of Terence's work is the long debate on Terence's *meretrices*, who often deviate from the comic stereotype of the greedy sex-laborer.[62] For instance, in a comment on Terence's *Hecyra* (774.3), Donatus explains that the playwright treated this stock character in a special way, which stands in contrast to comic tradition. However, as Dwora Gilula argued forty years ago, the mere indication towards a *meretrix*'s positive characteristics cannot support the claim of creating a new stock type.[63] She has nevertheless pointed to the fact that the way comic *meretrices* are treated in modern scholarship is significantly influenced by Donatus' criticism.[64] Gilula adds that Donatus' approach of Terence's *meretrices* must also have been influenced by the cultural

also 176 and 179 for her aristocratic, erudite male readers; Dronke, *Women Writers*, 57-58 suggests that it is plausible that Terence's comedies were recited at the Ottonian court; also, in commenting Hrotswitha's sexual themes, Classen, "Sex on the Stage," 192 points out that "Hrotsvit's audience [...] was more worldly than in a standard monastic setting."

59 It seems that Terence was especially popular in the 10th century, see Bonds, "Voice in the Dramas," 14; on Terence's popularity in the Middle Ages because of the 'purity' of his language as well as the moral aspects of his work, see Karakasis, "Terence in Hroswitha," 279–80; on Terence in medieval education, including monasteries, see also Augoustakis, "Hrotsvit of Gandersheim," 397–99.

60 See Cain, "Terence in Late Antiquity," 382–83.

61 On the commentary and its themes, see Chrysanthi Demetriou, "Aelius Donatus and his Commentary on Terence's Comedies," in *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Comedy*, ed. Michael Fontaine and Adele C. Scafuro (Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 782–84; for the evidence on Donatus, see Robert A. Kaster, *Guardians of Language: the Grammarians and Society in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 275–78; Rainer Jakobi, *Die Kunst der Exegese im Terenzkommentar des Donat* (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1996), is the standard study of Donatus' exegetical method.

62 On Donatus' remarks on Terence's *meretrices*, see Chrysanthi Demetriou, "Crossing the Boundary of Dramatic Illusion in Terence: Courtesans in Terence and Donatus' Criticism," *Rosetta* 8, no. 5 (2010): 16–33.

63 Dwora Gilula, "The Concept of the *bona meretrix*: A Study of Terence's Courtesans," *Rivista di filologia e d'istruzione classica* 108 (1980): 142–65; over the following decades, Gilula's study has caused several diverse reactions. See e.g. John Barsby, "Donatus on Terence," in *Dramatische Wäldchen: Festschrift für Eckard Lefèvre zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Stärk Ekkehard and Gregor Vogt-Spira (Hildesheim, New York: Olms, 2000), 508 (and n. 17), who, although he identifies some stock 'meretricious' characteristics in Thais of *Eunuchus* (mainly in regard to her receipt of presents by her lovers), nevertheless, regards her as good-hearted; a similar approach is found in Ortwin Knorr, "The Character of Bacchis in Terence's *Heauton Timorumenos*," *American Journal of Philology* 111 (1995): 221 n. 1, who disagrees with Gilula. This paper rightly points out that much of Bacchis' negative characterization in *Heautontimorumenos* is given by biased male reports and that her portrayal by Terence is hardly one-dimensional; similarly Rosivach, *Sexual Exploitation in New Comedy*, 189 n. 4, who notes that *meretrices* "display a complexity of motivations that cannot be reduced to simple terms of 'good' and 'bad'." On the other hand James, "Gender and Sexuality in Terence," 190 rejects the distinction between *mala* and *bona* as a concept that expresses the "citizen perspective."

64 Gilula, "*Bona meretrix*," 142.

trends of his time. More specifically, Gilula notes that, for the Roman audience of Terence's comedies, the treatment of a character as 'good' or 'bad' was often determined by his or her social status and profession,[65] which was certainly not the case in Donatus' time, "which saw the victory of Christianity."[66]

Although we do not know whether or not Donatus embraced Christian beliefs himself,[67] the grammarian's students certainly included people who were acquainted with Christian ideas. Jerome is the most well-known example.[68] As Gilula points out, Donatus' commentary was composed under very different circumstances from those in which Terence's work was produced. Despite this chronological and cultural gap, the commentary undoubtedly played a central role in the way Terence was perceived throughout the centuries. There is evidence that Donatus' commentary circulated in medieval monasteries in Europe, including Germany; the rich library of Hrotswitha's monastery—which, however, was destroyed—probably held a copy.[69] It has been shown that Hrotswitha's adaptations of Terence's comedies include various elements of literary theory found in the commentary, such as the discussion on the arrangement of the plot.[70] Given this important evidence, we cannot exclude the possibility that the portrayal of Hrotswitha's 'good-hearted' *meretrices* was also informed by Donatus' reading.[71] In this context, it would be interesting to examine the commentator's thoughts on comic rapes. The ultimate purpose of this examination is to investigate whether Donatus' approach to this controversial theme might have informed the way Hrotswitha read—and subsequently used—Terence's rape incidents.

4 Donatus on Terence's rapes

Donatus' most extensive comments on rapes are found in the commentary on *Eunuchus*, the Terentian play with the most unusual—and thus perhaps most shocking—rape incident.[72]

65 Gilula, "*Bona meretrix*," 148: "[t]he *meretrix* by virtue of her profession was always *mala*." However, we do have references to 'good' *meretrices* throughout Roman literature; in such cases, the moral qualities of a *meretrix* surpass the negative implications of her profession and sometimes even improve her social status; for relevant examples, see Anise K. Strong, *Prostitutes and Matrons in the Roman World* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 42-61.

66 Quotation from Gilula, "*Bona meretrix*," 149.

67 Kaster, *Guardians of Language*, 70-95 gives a succinct overview of the evidence of the grammarians' relationship with Christianity. This evidence is in fact scarce: although some Christian testimonies reject 'classical' education, often associated with the elite and the pagan culture, there are also Christian fathers (including eminent Church leaders, both in the West and the East), who acted as grammarians.

68 On Jerome's dilemma, wavering between the values of his literary education and Christian faith, see the evidence in ibid., 81–83.

69 Karakasis, "Terence in Hroswitha," 280, n. 8.

70 Karakasis, "Terence in Hroswitha," *passim*; in defending Hrotswitha's deep knowledge of Terence Brown, "Hrotsvit's Apostolic Mission," 245 also points to the survival of a great number of Terence's manuscripts accompanied by Donatus' commentary. Of course, Donatus' grammatical work was also well-known; Wilson, "Saxon Canoness," 31-32 notes that Hrotswitha "shows familiarity with grammatical and metrical textbooks and commentaries, such as those of Donatus and Isidore of Seville"; on Hrotswitha's education and her awareness of "almost all of the figures and tropes discussed by Donatus," see also Wilson, *Florilegium*, 7.

71 See Newlands, "Hrotswitha's Debt," 382–91, in regard to *Pafnutius*, on Hrotswitha's influence by the Terentian version of the 'good-hearted' *meretrix*; see also Karakasis, "Terence in Hroswitha," 290, on Hrotswithian *meretrices*' blandishments, a common characteristic of comic *meretrices*, according to Donatus.

72 On this rape, not following the traditional patterns of comic rapes, see Rosivach, *Sexual Exploitation in New Comedy*, 46; and James, "From Boys to Men," esp. 40-41; also, comparisons with other rape incidents of Terence are found in Louise Pearson Smith, "Audience Response to Rape: Chaerea in Terence's *Eunuchus*," *Helios* 21, no. 1 (1994): 21–38.

One of the commentator's most influential remarks is the indication that the victim had taken a shower before meeting her rapist, an act that evokes wedding ceremony procedures:[73]

> relictae nonnullae, ut lauari possit ea uirgo, quae sub uitii huius occasione nuptura est. hoc enim totum sic inducit poeta, ut non abhorreat a legitimis nuptiis [...][74]

Katerina Philippides, drawing on Donatus' comments, argues that Terence thus mitigates the negative effects of Chaerea's actions.[75] Although it is not really obvious whether Terence takes a positive approach to the incident,[76] the intention of Donatus' comments is certainly clear. As in the case of the aforementioned comic *meretrices*' representation, Donatus' comments are certainly intriguing, since they offer a more positive perspective on the incident.[77] For instance, Donatus argues that Chaerea's action was significantly prompted by a wall-painting at Thais' house:

> bene accedit repente pictura ad hortamenta aggredientae virginis, ideo quia non ad hoc uenerat Chaerea, ut continuo uitiaret puellam, sed ut uideret, audiret essetque una (see v. 26),[78] cum nihil amplius cogitare ausus fuerit, usque dum picturam cerneret.[79]

Donatus thus stresses that Chaerea had not thought of the rape in advance:

> hic ostendit non sibi haec primum nunc in mentem uenisse, sed tunc etiam cogitata, cum esset in meretricis domo.[80]

Although the commentator sympathizes with Chaerea's excuses, at the same time, he chastises the rapist's attitude towards the girl:

> non amore facit sed iniuria.[81]

[73] Donatus' text is quoted from Aelius Donatus, *Commentum Terenti*, ed. Paulus Wessner (Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1902–1905), *lemmata* are omitted. The translations are mine.

[74] Ibid., *ad. Eun.* 581.2. "Some girls were left behind. Consequently, the girl, who as a result of this crime will get married later, will be able to have a bath. For the poet presents the whole thing in such a way so that it does not differ from a legitimate marriage [...]."

[75] Katerina Philippides, "Terence's *Eunuchus*: Elements of the Marriage Ritual in the Rape Scene," *Mnemosyne* 48, no. 3 (1995): 272–84. As Hunter, *New Comedy*, 94 points out, "[i]t is clear that Donatus too was worried by Chaerea's action; a number of notes in his commentary seek to explain or mitigate this deed;" he gathers Donatus' relevant comments on 167, n. 20.

[76] I would rather agree with James, "From Boys to Men," 40, n. 37, that, in this instance, Terence's allusions to marriage reflect his critical approach to the incident: "Terence uses these elements of the wedding ritual to tighten the connection between rape and marriage in this play, and that given Terence's critical view of the connections between rape and marriage in Rome, wedding rites that are performed unwittingly—not to say unwillingly—by a young woman do not excuse rape."

[77] On Donatus' positive portrayal of Chaerea, see Barsby, "Donatus on Terence," 509; see also Smith, "Audience Response to Rape," 21 for a good summary of the diverse reactions by several scholars in the 20th century; Chaerea's characterization interestingly ranges from 'immoral,' 'selfish' and 'disingenuous' to 'charming' and 'resourceful.'

[78] Not part of Terence's original text, but Wessner's indication of a parallel.

[79] "The sudden appearance of the painting suitably encourages the attack on the girl; because Chaerea had not come with this intention, that is, of dishonouring the girl immediately, but, at first, he merely desired to look at, listen to and be with her [see *Eun.* 574]; since he would not dare to think of anything further, as long as he did not look at the painting." From Donatus, *Commentum Terenti*, *ad. Eun.* 584.1.

[80] "Here, it is shown that this had not entered his mind from the start, but he had thought of it at that time, that is, when he was at the sex-laborer's house," ibid., *ad. Eun.* 592.2.

[81] "He does this not because of love but with outrage," ibid., *ad. Eun.* 646.1.

> quid si uerberata est? sed non puderet queri. haec autem iniuria apud uirginem non habet nomen.[82]

A similar remark is found in the comments on *Phormio*, where Donatus stresses the negative aspects of the rapist's action again:

> bene 'compressit', quod interdum iniuriae est, non amoris.[83]

Evidently, the commentator is particularly interested in the moral dimension of the characters' attitude.[84] We could recall here the famous passage from *De comoedia*, attached to Donatus' commentary, according to which comedy presents both what should be imitated and what should be avoided.[85] In this context, he also comments on Chaerea's claim that deceiving *meretrices* is acceptable (*ad Eun.*):

> bene non 'iudicent', quia et hoc ipsum non satis probum est, id est meretricem fallere.[86]

Although this comment is not directly related to the rape incident, it forms one of the many examples that reveal Donatus' interest in accentuating moral paradigms or criticising anything not morally acceptable. Similarly, in the commentary on *Adelphoe*, Donatus explains that Aeschinus' act of rape is understandable, but this does not mean that it is acceptable:

> nihil iam de ea sumptum consuetudine est, quod non humanum. et hoc dicere solemus, ubi peccatum quidem non negamus, sed tolerabile esse dicimus.[87]

> id est: intelligit, sentit, quia superatus furore peccauerat et quia qui impulsione peccat, non peccat ratiocinatione.[88]

As in the case of Chaerea's portrayal, the commentator cannot refrain from stating that Aeschinus' action is of course not morally accepted:

[82] "What if she was beaten? But she wouldn't be ashamed to complain. This outrage against the girl, however, has no name," ibid., *ad. Eun.* 659.2.

[83] "Nicely *compressit*, which is occasionally used to denote outrage, not love," ibid., *ad Phorm.* 1018.1.

[84] See Kaster, *Guardians of Language*, 12: "Explication of the poets combined study of the language, as its larger part, with historical and ethical instruction. [...] The actions of men and gods were explained and judged in terms of accepted *mores* and so were used to confirm them." Also, on 14: "Whatever its other shortcomings, the grammarian's school did one thing superbly, providing the language and *mores* through which a social and political elite recognized its members."

[85] "Comoedia est fabula diuersa instituta continens affectuum ciuilium ac priuatorum, quibus discitur, quid sit in uita utile, quid contra euitandum," in *De comoedia*, V.1.

[86] Donatus, *Commentum Terenti*, 387.2. "It is right that *iudicent*, 'they judge,' is not used, because it is not honourable enough, that is, to deceive a sex-laborer." See further Sharon L. James, "*Fallite Fallentes*: Rape and Intertextuality in Terence's Eunuchus and Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*," *EuGeStA* 6 (2016): who rightly points out that the interrelation between deception and sexual violence against *meretrices*, epitomized in the manifold meaning of *ludere* (see esp. 101–4), is prevalent in the rape episode of *Eunuchus*; in this article, James convincingly shows that this theme, as exploited by Terence, is also evident in some instances of the first book of Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*.

[87] Donatus, *Commentum Terenti*, *ad Adel.* 471.1. "Nothing non-human is assumed from this habit. And we tend to say this when we do not of course deny that it is a mistake, but we say it is tolerable."

[88] Ibid., *ad Adel.* 471.2. "This is: he understands, he feels, because he has sinned, conquered by passion, and because the one who sins from impulse does not sin from reasoning;" *superatus furore* is proposed by *Hyperdonat*.

> consolatio ab exemplo. et 'boni' non: cum hoc facerent, sed: alias boni.[89]

Also, as in *Eunuchus*' commentary, Donatus is again particularly interested in the fact that a marriage eventually takes place:

> sollicita obsequela Hegionis ultima in loquendo ostendit impotentiorem personam contra Aeschinum; quo magis gaudium crescit comoediae, quando tali ac tanto pauperior puella sed tamen cupita iungetur.[90]

It has been rightly noted that Donatus considers the incident's social dimension.[91] However, the possible effects of the commentator's discussion on the actual audience of his treatise have not been adequately explored. As seen above, Gilula proposed that the rise of Christianity should constitute a central factor in our interpretation of Donatus' comments on various moral issues. The commentary, however, should not be read solely in relation to its different cultural context,[92] but also in light of its educational purposes. As far as rapes are concerned, Donatus' approach is twofold: while he accepts such incidents as unavoidable comic motifs which readers have to deal with or as actions that can occur under certain circumstances, at the same time, he expresses a fierce criticism against the rapists' attitudes. The commentator's critical approach is also evident in his effort of mitigation: in his teaching, the grammarian certainly tries to 'soften' disturbing aspects of 'controversial' topics. Again, the parallel with Augustine is illuminating. As seen above, the latter considers the teaching of rape episodes to young students to be particularly problematic. Although Donatus does not share Augustine's concerns, he still acknowledges the moral issues raised in these episodes.

5 Conclusion

Some parallels between Donatus' and Hrotswitha's approaches are evident. Both authors show a remarkable interest in the dramatic conventions that govern the rape motif: the emphasis on marriage is an indicative example. Another similarity is that, in both cases, rape is presented in a negative light (see the common use of the term *iniuria*). This negative evaluation of rape can be expected from a contemporary point of view. At the same time, however, both Donatus (see the *scholia* on *Adelphoe*) and Hrotswitha's *Calimachus* emphasise the 'human' aspect of the 'sinner': Andronichus, for example, claims that Calimachus eventually resurrects because he just acted *ignorantia* ("out of ignorance," fol. 98r, IX. 2, l. 20) and that he was *carnali deceptus delectacione* ("[d]eceived by love of

[89] Donatus, *Commentum Terenti*, *ad. Adel.* 688.2. "Consolation by example. And 'boni' is not 'when they did this', but 'good in other respects'."

[90] Ibid., *ad Adel.* 506. "Hegio's last words, anxious and obsequious, point to a character helpless against Aeschinus. The delight that derives from the comedy accentuates further when a poorer but nevertheless desirable girl gets married to someone of this sort and of such value."

[91] Rosivach, *Sexual Exploitation in New Comedy*, 20.

[92] Barsby, "Donatus on Terence," 510 rightly notes that Terence's audience would have less negative feelings about rape than Donatus' readers in the fourth century. Certainly, we have a significant time span here, from Terence's second century BCE to Donatus' fourth century CE; see Suzanne Dixon, *Reading Roman Women* (London: Duckworth, 2001), 45-55, on legislation on rape and its development from the first century BCE to the 6th century CE; although the rape of a freeborn girl was considered a case of criminal violence already from the Julian law of the first century BCE, Constantine's law in the 4th century clearly imposed death penalty in the case of a girl's 'abduction' (see esp. 51-52). However, this of course does not mean that Terence's audience would have been positive towards Chaerea's action; see Smith, "Audience Response to Rape," who notes that a girl's rape is considered an outrage in Roman society and argues that some members of the Roman audience would approach Chaerea's overall behavior in a negative way.

flesh," l. 19), while Fortunatus acted *malitia* ("out of wickedness," l. 20). So the moral conviction of rape is not completely negative. There still is a lot of understanding for the 'human nature' of the act. Furthermore, the parallel examination of Donatus' and Hrotswitha's readings of Terentian rape is significant not so much for revealing an identical treatment of this comic motif, but rather for investigating the extent to which the exegetical tradition, here represented by Donatus, informed Hrotswitha's exploitation of Terence (see the research question posed above). Undoubtedly, Hrotswitha's testimony reveals a process that was initiated with the inclusion of Terence's comedies in the educational curriculum, namely the challenge of dealing with 'disturbing' themes from classical texts.[93] In this context, Donatus' commentary constitutes the first extensive evidence of the way Roman drama was studied and interpreted in light of certain principles and purposes.[94] It is particularly important that, in both cases, the rape episodes are used as the ideal instances for moral instruction. It is also remarkable that, although the aim of Donatus' work is very different from Hrotswitha's, both cases present a certain level of 'acceptance' of a theme that possibly seems much more disturbing for later audiences. As seen above, Donatus' observations, although criticising some instances of the rapists' behaviour, give an idea of the action itself, without any hints of 'embellishment.'[95] Similarly, Hrotswitha's versions do not hesitate to exploit this ancient comic motif, again quite explicitly. The popularity of Donatus' work throughout the Middle Ages suggests that a common background,[96] or even a similar line of thought, between the *scholia* and Terence's adaptations could have existed. Thus, Donatus' testimony of how Terence's 'disturbing' themes would have been read at schools, and even at the monasteries of the Christian era, can be especially useful in the interpretation of particular aspects of Hrotswitha's Terentian adaptations. Given Hrotswitha's probable acquaintance with Donatus, we should not exclude the possibility that her treatment of Terence's rapes was influenced by the *scholia*.[97]

[93] For a parallel, from a contemporary perspective, see Gamel, "Performing Terence," 477, who expresses concerns on how we deal with the staging of a play to an audience of a different period, especially when this play presents incidents (such as rapes), which are disturbing for the audience; in terms of education, see Sharon L. James, "Talking Rape in the Classics Classroom. Further Thoughts," in *From Abortion to Pederasty. Addressing Difficult Topics in the Classics Classroom* (Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2014), 171–86, on how to deal with rape incidents found in classical literature–including Terence's comedy–in the framework of contemporary university or college teaching.

[94] As observed in Rita Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages. Academic Traditions and Vernacular Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 22, Servius' and Donatus' commentaries "reflect the major components of the exegetical techniques among the classical grammarians. They offer an indication of an early connection between paraphrase and literary exegesis, as the explication often takes the form of verbal recasting to deliberate on sense as well as on usage." Of course, later, medieval commentaries include more striking examples of how interpretation is linked to Christianity; see, e.g., the commentaries on Statius, discussed in Rita Copeland, "Gloss and Commentary," in *The Oxford Handbook of Medieval Latin Literature*, ed. Ralph J. Hexter and David Townsend (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 181–85; the commentators in fact claim new 'interpretations' for the poet's work, often by referring to later or contemporary contexts.

[95] Interestingly James, "Talking Rape," proposes a similar approach: avoiding the omission or euphemistic descriptions of such incidents, at 174, but at the same time treating them with sensitivity; as she succinctly states in addressing her students: "[y]ou can expect to be disturbed by what we're reading, but we can't avoid the subject," at 178.

[96] On the evidence of the presence of Donatus' commentary in German monasteries, see Karakasis, "Terence in Hroswitha," 280, n. 8.

[97] As Talbot, "Hrotsvit's Dramas," 149–50 has shown, Hrotswitha's 'subversive' use of Terence can be seen in connection with the tradition of the allegorical interpretation of Classical texts, which, despite their explicit pagan context, were used for moral instruction. See also Brown, "Hrotsvit's Apostolic Mission," 242, on Hrotswitha's acquaintance with "pedagogical commentaries and glossaries."

Although Hrotswitha's drama follows a specific religious agenda, we could nevertheless claim that her deep knowledge of not only Terence's text, but also the way this was studied by her readers has made her a much better interpreter of her prototype.

Hrotswitha's 'Christianisation' of Terence is, of course, not the only example of Terence's adaptation to the moral principles of each period.[98] In fact, Terence's comedy seems to have become 'more moral' over the centuries. For instance, some English school productions 'adjusted' the plays by omitting the 'disturbing' scenes, such as the rape incident. The Latin play of Westminster School in London forms a remarkable case. For a long time, Terence's *Eunuchus* was one of the most popular plays; at some point, possibly in the eighteenth century, Chaerea's narration of the rape incident was omitted, while later, in the early twentieth century, the whole play was substituted by an adapted version.[99]

The comparison between different adaptations of Terence extends beyond the scope of this paper. Nevertheless, the aforementioned example is remarkably indicative of the way pedagogical approaches to classical texts changed over time. Strikingly, as this case study suggests, instruction of 'disturbing' themes, like Terence's rapes, appears as much more controversial and difficult in a school of the modern era,[100] whereas ancient and medieval settings, such as those of Donatus' school and Hrotswitha's monastery, adhered more to the classical prototypes. In other words, although rapes seem to constitute a controversial theme for modern and contemporary audiences, especially in elementary or monastic education, Donatus' and Hrotswitha's testimonies might demonstrate that such episodes were approached rather differently in earlier periods. Earlier literature, such as Hrotswitha's important work, although serving a different purpose from that of Terence's comedy, nevertheless, dares to deal with rapes, a motif abundantly found in its prototypes. More interestingly, as the co-examination of Donatus' commentary suggests, Hrotswitha's direct approach of this otherwise disturbing theme was perhaps in line with similar educational practices of her time.

[98] See the title of Augoustakis, "Hrotsvit of Gandersheim." On Hrotswitha's work being the first case of several others that followed, which mainly consisted of 'expurgated' versions of Terence's texts, see Peter G. McC. Brown, "The *Eunuch* Castrated: Bowdlerization in the Text of the Westminster Latin Play," *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 15, no. 1 (2008): 16–28.

[99] On the 'adventures' of Terence's plays at Westminster school as well as the various reactions, adjustments and adaptations throughout Europe, see Brown, "*Eunuch* Castrated," who uses the *Eunuchus* as the main case study.

[100] Sanjaya Thakur, "Challenges in Teaching Sexual Violence and Rape. A Male Perspective," in *From Abortion to Pederasty. Addressing Difficult Topics in the Classics Classroom*, ed. Nancy Sorkin Rabinowitz and Fiona McHardy (Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2014), 152–55, drawing from his personal teaching experience, gives an interesting survey which demonstrates the suspicion with which incidents of sexual violence are treated in contemporary higher education, especially by male instructors, who feel particularly uncomfortable with such cases; see also *passim* for possible students' reactions. On the other hand Madeleine Kahn, *"Why are We Reading Ovid's Handbook on Rape?" Teaching and Learning at a Women's College*, 2nd ed. (London/New York: Routledge, 2016 (2005)), 18–56, with Ovid's Metamorphoses as a case-study, discusses the challenges of (and the students' reactions to) the teaching of rapes, with emphasis on a female college student audience.

References

Aelius Donatus. *Commentum Terenti*. Edited by Paulus Wessner. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1902–1905.

Amerasinghe, C.W. "The Part of the Slave in Terence's Drama." *Greece & Rome* 19, no. 56 (1950): 62–72.

Augoustakis, Antony. "Hrotsvit of Gandersheim Christianizes Terence." In *A Companion to Terence*, edited by Antony Augoustakis and Ariana Traill, 397–409. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013.

Augustine of Hippo. *Confessions, Books 1–8*. Edited and translated by Carolyn Hammond. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014.

Barsby, John. "Donatus on Terence." In *Dramatische Wäldchen: Festschrift für Eckard Lefèvre zum 65. Geburtstag*, edited by Stärk Ekkehard and Gregor Vogt-Spira, 491–513. Hildesheim, New York: Olms, 2000.

Berschin, Walter. "Hrotsvit and her Works." In *A Companion to Hrotsvit of Gandersheim (fl. 960). Contextual and Interpretative Approaches*, edited by Phyllis R. Brown and Stephen L. Wailes, 23–34. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Bonds, Tara A. "Voice in the Dramas of Hrotsvit of Gandersheim." PhD diss., Florida State University, 2014.

Boyle, Anthony J. "Introduction: Terence's Mirror Stage." *Ramus* 33, nos. 1–2 (2004): 1–9.

Brown, Peter G. McC. "The *Eunuch* Castrated: Bowdlerization in the Text of the Westminster Latin Play." *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 15, no. 1 (2008): 16–28.

———. "Interpretations and Adaptations of Terence's *Andria*, from the Tenth to the Twentieth Century." In *Terence and Interpretation*, edited by Sophia Papaioannou, 241–66. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014.

Brown, Phyllis R. "Hrotsvit's Apostolic Mission: Prefaces, Dedications, and other Addresses to Readers." In *A Companion to Hrotsvit of Gandersheim (fl. 960). Contextual and Interpretative Approaches*, edited by Phyllis Brown and Stephen L. Wailes, 235–64. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Cain, Andrew. "Terence in Late Antiquity." In *A Companion to Terence*, edited by Antony Augoustakis and Ariana Traill, 380–96. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013.

Classen, Albrecht. "Sex on the Stage (and in the Library) of an Early Medieval Convent: Hrotsvit of Gandersheim. A Tenth-Century Convent Playwright's Successful Competition against the Roman Poet Terence." *Orbis Litterarum* 65, no. 3 (2010): 167–200.

Copeland, Rita. *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages. Academic Traditions and Vernacular Texts.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

———. "Gloss and Commentary." In *The Oxford Handbook of Medieval Latin Literature*, edited by Ralph J. Hexter and David Townsend, 171–91. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Coulter, Cornelia C. "The "Terentian" Comedies of a Tenth-Century Nun." *Classical Journal* 24, no. 7 (1929): 515–29.

Demetriou, Chrysanthi. "Crossing the Boundary of Dramatic Illusion in Terence: Courtesans in Terence and Donatus' Criticism." *Rosetta* 8, no. 5 (2010): 16–33.

———. "Aelius Donatus and his Commentary on Terence's Comedies." In *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Comedy*, edited by Michael Fontaine and Adele C. Scafuro, 782–98. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Dixon, Suzanne. *Reading Roman Women*. London: Duckworth, 2001.

Dronke, Peter. *Women Writers of the Middle Ages*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Ferrante, Joan M. *To the Glory of her Sex: Women's Roles in the Composition of Medieval Texts*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997.

Gamel, Mary-Kay. "Performing Terence (and Hrotsvit) Now." In *A Companion to Terence*, edited by Antony Augoustakis and Ariana Traill, 466–81. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013.

Gilula, Dwora. "The Concept of the *bona meretrix*: A Study of Terence's Courtesans." *Rivista di filologia e d'istruzione classica* 108 (1980): 142–65.

Hrotswitha of Gandersheim. *Hrotsvit: Opera Omnia*. Edited by Walter Berschin. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 2001.

———. *The Plays of Hrotswitha of Gandersheim: Bilingual Edition*. Edited by Robert Chipok. Translated by Larissa Bonfante. Mundelein: Bolchazy-Carducci, 2013.

Hunter, Richard L. *The New Comedy of Greece and Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Jakobi, Rainer. *Die Kunst der Exegese im Terenzkommentar des Donat*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1996.

James, Sharon L. "From Boys to Men: Rape and Developing Masculinity in Terence's *Hecyra* and *Eunuchus*." *Helios* 25, no. 1 (1998): 31–47.

———. "Gender and Sexuality in Terence." In *A Companion to Terence*, edited by Antony Augoustakis and Ariana Traill, 175–94. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013.

———. "Talking Rape in the Classics Classroom. Further Thoughts." In *From Abortion to Pederasty. Addressing Difficult Topics in the Classics Classroom*, 171–86. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2014.

———. "*Fallite Fallentes*: Rape and Intertextuality in Terence's Eunuchus and Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*." *EuGeStA* 6 (2016): 86–111.

Kahn, Madeleine. *"Why are We Reading Ovid's Handbook on Rape?" Teaching and Learning at a Women's College*. 2nd ed. London/New York: Routledge, 2016 (2005).

Karakasis, Evangelos. "*Quantum mutatus ab illo*: Terence in Hroswitha." *Hellenika* 52 (2002): 279–93.

———. "Slaves and Masters." In *A Companion to Terence*, edited by Antony Augoustakis and Ariana Traill, 211–22. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013.

Kaster, Robert A. *Guardians of Language: the Grammarians and Society in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.

Knorr, Ortwin. "The Character of Bacchis in Terence's *Heauton Timorumenos*." *American Journal of Philology* 111 (1995): 221–35.

Konstan, David. *Roman Comedy*. Ithaca, London: Cornell University Press, 1983.

Macy, Gary. "Hrotsvit's Theology of Virginity and Continence." In *A Companion to Hrotsvit of Gandersheim (fl. 960). Contextual and Interpretative Approaches*, edited by Phyllis R. Brown and Stephen L. Wailes, 63–82. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2013.

McIntyre, Patricia. "Comedy of Prayer: The Redemption of Terence through Christian Appropriation." In *Latin with Laughter: Terence through Time*, edited by Phyllis R. Brown and Stephen L. Wailes. `http://www.umilta.net/terence.html`. 2018.

Miola, Robert S. *Shakespeare and Classical Comedy. The Influence of Plautus and Terence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Newlands, Carole E. "Hrotswitha's Debt." *TAPA* 116 (1986): 369–91.

Newman, Florence. "Violence and Virginity in Hrotsvit's Dramas." In *Hrotsvit of Gandersheim: Contexts, Identities, Affinities, and Performances*, edited by Phyllis R. Brown, Linda A. McMillin, and Katharina M. Wilson, 59–76. Toronto/Buffalo/London: University of Toronto Press, 2004.

———. "Strong Voice(s) of Hrotsvit." In *A Companion to Hrotsvit of Gandersheim (fl. 960). Contextual and Interpretative Approaches*, edited by Phyllis R. Brown and Stephen L. Wailes, 288–310. Toronto/Buffalo/London: University of Toronto Press, 2013.

Norwood, Gilbert. *The Art of Terence*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1923.

Philippides, Katerina. "Terence's *Eunuchus*: Elements of the Marriage Ritual in the Rape Scene." *Mnemosyne* 48, no. 3 (1995): 272–84.

Rosivach, Vincent J. *When a Young Man Falls in Love: the Sexual Exploitation of Women in New Comedy*. London/New York: Routledge, 1998.

Scheck, Helene. *Reform and Resistance: Formations of Female Subjectivity in Early Medieval Ecclesiastical Culture*. Albany: SUNY Press, 2008.

Smith, Louise Pearson. "Audience Response to Rape: Chaerea in Terence's *Eunuchus*." *Helios* 21, no. 1 (1994): 21–38.

Stevenson, Jane. *Women Latin Poets. Language, Gender, and Authority, from Antiquity to the Eighteenth Century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

———. "Hrotsvit in Context: Convents and Culture in Ottonian Germany." In *A Companion to Hrotsvit of Gandersheim (fl. 960). Contextual and Interpretative Approaches*, edited by Phyllis R. Brown and Stephen L. Wailes, 35–62. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2013.

Strong, Anise K. *Prostitutes and Matrons in the Roman World*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

Talbot, Robert. "Hrotsvit's Dramas: Is there a Roman in these texts?" In *Hrotsvit of Gandersheim: Contexts, Identities, Affinities, and Performances*, edited by Phyllis R. Brown, Linda A. McMillin, and Katharina M. Wilson, 147–59. Toronto/Buffalo/London: University of Toronto Press, 2004.

Tarr, Judith. "Terentian Elements in Hrotsvit." In *Hrotsvit of Gandersheim: Rara avis in Saxonia?*, edited by Katharina M. Wilson, 55–62. Ann Arbor: Marc Publishing Co., 1987.

Terentius, Publius Afer. *Comoediae*. Edited by Robert Krauer and W.M. Lindsay. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963.

Thakur, Sanjaya. "Challenges in Teaching Sexual Violence and Rape. A Male Perspective." In *From Abortion to Pederasty. Addressing Difficult Topics in the Classics Classroom*, edited by Nancy Sorkin Rabinowitz and Fiona McHardy, 152–70. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2014.

Wailes, Stephen L. "Hrotsvit and her World." In *A Companion to Hrotsvit of Gandersheim (fl. 960). Contextual and Interpretative Approaches*, edited by Phyllis R. Brown and Stephen L. Wailes, 3–21. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2013.

———. "Hrotsvit's Plays." In *A Companion to Hrotsvit of Gandersheim (fl. 960). Contextual and Interpretative Approaches*, edited by Phyllis R. Brown and Stephen L. Wailes, 121–45. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2013.

Wilson, Katharina M. "The Saxon Canoness. Hrotsvith of Gandersheim," edited by Katharina M. Wilson, 30–63. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984.

———. *Hrotsvit of Gandersheim: A Florilegium of her Works*. Rochester, NY: Boydell / Brewer, 1998.

Witzke, Serena S. "Harlots, Tarts, and Hussies? A Problem of Terminology for Sex Labor in Roman Comedy." *Helios* 42, no. 1 (2015): 7–27.

Woods, Marjorie Curry. "Rape and the Pedagogical Rhetoric of Sexual Violence." In *Criticism and Dissent in the Middle Ages*, edited by Rita Copeland, 56–86. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Zampelli, Michael S. J. "The Necessity of Hrotsvit: Evangelizing Theatre." In *A Companion to Hrotsvit of Gandersheim (fl. 960). Contextual and Interpretative Approaches*, edited by Phyllis R. Brown and Stephen L. Wailes, 147–99. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2013.

JOLCEL

Journal of Latin Cosmopolitanism and European Literatures.

Current Contribution

Brian Møller Jensen, "The Meaning and Use of *fabula* in the *Dialogus creaturarum moralizatus*," *JOLCEL* 3 (2020): 24–41.
DOI: 10.21825/jolcel.vi3.8304.

Note

This contribution is part of a larger dialogue of three articles and one responding piece that form the current issue of *JOLCEL*. The other contributions are "Controversial Topics in Literature and Education: Hrotswitha and Donatus on Terence's Rapes" by Chrysanthi Demetriou (pp. 2–22) and "*Introite, pueri!* The School-Room Performance of George Buchanan's Latin *Medea* in Bordeaux" by Lucy C.M.M. Jackson (pp. 43–61). The response piece is "Latin Education and Classical Reception: the Minor Genres" by Rita Copeland (pp. 62–66).

The Meaning and Use of *fabula* in the *Dialogus creaturarum moralizatus*

Brian Møller Jensen

Stockholm University

Abstract

The first book printed in Sweden in 1483 was the North-Italian compilation *Dialogus creaturarum moralizatus*, usually dated to the middle of the fourteenth century and attributed to Nicolaus of Bergamo in some manuscripts and to Mayno di Mayneri of Milano in others. In his preface the author uses the practise of Jesus to justify his intentions, since "Jesus once used *fabulis Palestinorum more* to lead human beings to the road of truth through parables." Claiming that his book might prove useful to preachers against spiritual fatigue, the author will "introduce moral teaching in an entertaining way to exterminate vices and promote virtues," a view that reflects Phaedrus' motto *risum movere et vitam docere* in the prologue to his first Book of fables as well as e.g. Gregory the Great's use of exempla, "The examples of the faithful sometimes convert the minds of the listeners better than the words of the teachers."

***

The main subject of this paper is the first book printed in Sweden, Johan Snell's publication of the North-Italian compilation of exempla and fables in 122 chapters, entitled *Dialogus creaturarum moralizatus* (hereafter *DCM*). In the early 1480s, the archbishop Jacob Ulfeson of Uppsala invited the German printer Johan Snell to continue his activities in Sweden and print the missal for the archbishopric, after Snell had printed a prayer book in Odense as the first Danish book in 1482. While preparing the practical aspects of the publication of the liturgical *Missale Upsalense*—a huge and complicated production which then appeared in 1484—Snell took the initiative to print the above-mentioned non-liturgical *DCM* at his own expenses. The printing process was completed on the vigil of the apostle Thomas, i.e., on December 20, 1483, as expressed in the colophon of the book, which also presents the title of the book and an indication of some of its contents.[1]

[1] *Dyalogus Creaturarum Moralizatus 1483 – Skapelsens sedelärande samtal 1483*, commentary by Johan Bernström, translation by Monica Hedlund (Uppsala: Almquist & Wiksell, 1983), (hereafter *DCM 1483*). The book is a facsimile edition of Johan Snell's edition including a modern Swedish translation, which was published to celebrate the 500 years jubilee of the first printed book in Sweden.

"Presens liber dialogus creaturarum appellatus, iocundis fabulis plenus, impressus per Johannem Snell artis impressorie magistrum, in Stockholm inceptus et munere dei finitus est, anno domini mccclxxxiii, mensis decembris in vigilia Thome."[2] Snell was most certainly inspired by the Dutch printer Gheraert Leeu, who had published the *editio princeps* of the Latin text in Gouda in 1480. Comparing the two editions, it seems quite evident that Snell copied or imitated the woodcuts which decorated each of the 122 chapters in Leeu's edition, representing the creatures of the chapter. Moreover, Leeu had published reprints of his edition in 1481 and 1482, also in Gouda, and later in Antwerp in 1486 and 1491, as well as four editions of the fourteenth-century Dutch translation of *DCM* in the 1480s.[3] Judging from the sheer number of editions and translations in the 1480s, the *DCM* appears to have been a popular work and the book market both promising and lucrative at the time when Snell decided to publish his edition of the work. Otherwise, he probably would not even have considered investing his own money in printing the *DCM* as the first book in Sweden.[4]

The title of my paper is partly inspired by the formula "iocundis fabulis plenus" in the above-mentioned colophon at the end of the book, and by the meaning of the phrase "salvator noster [...] fabulis Palestinorum more usus est" in the prologue of Leeu's and Snell's editions quoted below.[5] In this text, which is missing in the medieval manuscripts transmitting *DCM*,[6] the editors present the aim and purpose of the book with a direct reference to the didactic practice used by Jesus Christ, "praedicatorum perfecta forma" ("the perfect model for preachers"), because he in the Gospels "fabulis Palestinorum more usus est, ut rerum similitudine ad viam veritatis perduceret."[7]

Leaving aside the expression *Palestinorum more*, a term which according to the medieval contexts in which the phrase occurs seems to indicate aspects of Christ's use of *similitudes* in his preaching,[8] the word *fabulis* appears in both the above cases to have a more general significance such as 'tale' or 'story' similar to the rather pejorative meaning of the verb *fabuletur* in the leonine hexameter "meretrices propulsentur nec cum ipsis fabuletur" in *DCM* 31 (*De mandragora et Venere*, "About the mandrake and Venus"),[9] and the adjective

2 "The present book is entitled *Dialogus creaturarum*, full of joyful stories, printed by Johan Schell, master of printing, undertaken in Stockholm and finished with the help of God on the vigil of St Thomas in December 1483." Unless otherwise indicated, the translations in this study are my own.

3 See the information in Carmen Cardelle de Hartmann, *Lateinische Dialoge 1200–1400: Literaturhistorische Studie und Repertorium*, Mittellateinische Studien und Texte 37 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2007), 524–29.

4 A non-critical edition of the Latin text of the incunables is included in Johann Georg Theodor Grässe, *Die beiden ältesten lateinischen Fabelbücher des Mittelalters: des Bischofs Cyrillus Speculum Sapientiae und des Nicolaus Pergamenus Dialogus Creaturarum* (Hildesheim: G. Olms, [1880] 1965).

5 "[F]ull of joyful stories"; "our Saviour [...] used fables/told stories according to the Palestinian/Eastern tradition"

6 See Gregory Kratzman and Elizabeth Gee, *The Dialogues of Creatures Moralyzed: A Critical Edition*, Medieval and Renaissance Texts 4 (Leiden: Brill, 1988), 9.

7 "Salvator enim noster olim, praedicatorum perfecta forma, fabulis Palestinorum more usus est, ut rerum similitudine ad viam veritatis perduceret." / "Once our Saviour, the perfect model for preachers, used fables/told stories according to the Palestinian/Eastern tradition in order to lead people to the road of truth through parables."

8 According to the database Library of Latin Texts, the expression appears in only two ninth-century texts: the anonymous Irish (?) commentary *Anonymi in Mattheum*, ed. Bengt Löfstedt, *CC CM* 153 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003), 18:23, 232: "Secundum historiam more Palestinorum loquitur euangelista," and the glosses of the German Benedictine Otfrid von Weissenburg, *Glossae in Matthaeum*, ed. Cesare Grifoni (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003), 18:23, 232: "Iuxta morem Syrorum et maxime Palestinorum parabolam posuit, ut quod per simplex praeceptum teneri ab auditoribus non potest, per similitudinem teneatur."

9 "Prostitutes should be repelled and one should not share gossip with them." *DCM 1483*, fol. 67v.

fabulosus in the phrase *verba fabulosa* ("fictive, false, empty words") in, for example, *DCM* 51 (*De herodio et milvo*, "About the bird herodius and the kite") and 86 (*De leone qui uxoravit duos catulos*, "About the lion who married off two sons").[10] Elsewhere, in the seven cases where *fabula* appears in the compilation itself, the word signifies the specific literary term 'fable,' which is also the basic meaning of the noun *fabulator* ("fable author") in *DCM* 58 (*De carflancho, qui voluit se regulari*, "About the gerfalcon who wanted to live as a monk")[11] and the five cases of the verb *fabulatur* ("to tell a fable") in *DCM* 46, 76, 86, 100, and 117.[12]

But before we turn to the analysis of the actual use of fables in the single chapters, let me start with a short presentation of the compilatory character of the *Dialogus creaturarum moralizatus*. Transmitted in a dozen of manuscripts and attributed in one manuscript to Nicolaus of Bergamo and in others to the Milanese physician Mayno de Mayneriis,[13] *DCM* is a compilation of biblical, Christian and classical exempla, stories, and moral sentences, and it is usually dated to the middle of the fourteenth century. The manuscripts reveal that there are two versions of the compilation, a *versio longa* and a *versio breva*,[14] but only a few of these manuscripts include a short prologue, the contents of which are similar to the contents of the prologues in Leeu's and Snell's editions, as can be seen in the following transcription of the prologue in Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, ms. I 64 Inf.: [15]

> Sicut de palea granum et de saxo extrahimus aquam, sic ex verbis similitudinariis et fabulosis extrahere possimus et aluere nos pane vite et intellectus et aquam sapientie salutaris potare. Idcirco nullus nostris fabulis deroget, sed ad utilitatem earum attendat, quia dicit apostolus ad Romanos: Quaecumque scripta sunt ad nostram doctrinam scripta sunt. Nullus autem ignoret hoc esse Domini de divinis scripturis. Verumtamen quaque scribuntur per similitudinem narrantur ea quae legentibus sunt utilia et audientibus delectabilia, sicut ex terra colligimus aurum et de spinis rosam et de apibus etiam extrahimus etiam.[16]

The length of the text in some chapters varies in the two versions of *DCM*, but both contain 122 *dialogi* and have structured them in the same sequence. The 122 chapters can be divided in seven parts according to the subject(s) of each chapter in the following manner: Planets and stars (1–12), gems and metals (13–24), herbs and trees (25–36), fish, reptiles, and sea

[10] *DCM 1483*, fol. 70r and fol. 105v.

[11] Ibid., fol. 77v.

[12] Ibid., fols. 54r, 96v, 109r, 125v, 143r. See also the various meanings of these words in the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, ed. P. G. W. Glare (Oxford: Oxford University Press) 1982, 665.

[13] See the detailed discussion on the authorship of *DCM* in Pio Rajna, *Intorno al cosidetto Dialogus creaturarum ed al suo autore* (Torino: Loescher, 1888).

[14] Regarding the manuscripts, see Carmen Cardelle de Hartmann and Estrella Pérez Rodríguez, "Text im Wandel und editorische Praxis: Der lateinische *Contemptus sublimitatis* (*Dialogus creaturarum*) in der handschriftlichen Überlieferung," in *Didaktisches Erzählen. Formen literarischer Belehrung in Orient und Okzident*, ed. Regula Forster and Romy Günthart (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2010), 28–29.

[15] My transcription of the prologue in Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, ms. I 64 Inf., fol. 1.

[16] "Just like we extract grain from the chaff and water from the stone, so we should be able to extract and nourish ourselves with the bread of life and knowledge from the words of similitudes and fables and drink the healthy water of wisdom. Therefore, no one shall detract from our fables but attend to their usefulness, since the apostle says in his letter to the Romans (15:4): 'For what things so ever were written, were written for our learning.' And no one shall ignore that this is the Lord's words about the Holy Script. However, whatsoever is written, through similitudes are told the things which are useful for those who read and pleasant for those who listen, just like we gather gold from the earth and extract the rose from the thorns as well as honey from the bees."

monsters (37–48), birds and winged creatures (49–84), animals and human beings (85–120), and the life of mankind (121–22).

In order to give some impression of the general structure and the various elements of the single *dialogi* of the compilation, I have chosen to present and analyse *Dialogus* 54 (*De strutione et cirurgico*), the main characters of which are an ostrich and a physician. In order to facilitate the analysis of the single elements of this particular *dialogus*, I have added a rubric in bold to indicate the significance of these elements.

> *De strutione et cirurgico, dialogus LIIII.*
>
> **[Definition:]** Strutio est avis magna et potens, pennata et alata, tamen in astra elevare se non potest propter imbecillitatem alarum suarum.
>
> **[Dialogus:]** Erat enim strutio quidam satis pulcher et decorus, qui alas habebat fortissimas et venustas, tamen in alis pennas duas baiulabat retortas, de quibus plurimum tristabatur. Quapropter ad cirurgicum perrexit dicens: Satis egregius sum et venustus, sed pennas istas retortas, volo, quod amputes mihi, quoniam aliquantulum me deturbant. Cirurgicus autem pennas retortas illi amputavit et cum tali unguento ei alas unxit, quod aliae pennae alarum ceciderunt. Propter quod semper impotens fuit ad volandum. Strutio vero amaricatus usque ad mortem ploravit dicens: Sicut nos plasmavit, stemus, Deus, nunquam nos immutemus.
>
> **[Author's comment:]** Sic enim nonnulli curiosi et vani dum a conditore suo satis sunt bene formati, non referunt gratiam conditori, immo si aliquam maculam haberent in corpore, student modis omnibus eam mederi, de maculis quoque animae nihil mederi procurant.
>
> **[Arguments 1–3:]** Sed sicut dicit Augustinus: Non enim exteriorem pulchritudinem requirit invisibilis sponsus. Ideo dicitur Proverbiorum XXXI: Fallax gratia et vana est pulchritudo. De talibus ait Augustinus: Ecce omnia pulchra sunt cum hominibus et ipsi sunt turpes.
>
> **[Argument 4:]** Unde quidam rex fecit convivium principibus suis, et cum non esset aliquis angulus in domo eius, qui non esset coopertus purpura et aliis rebus preciosis, affuit quidam philosophus, qui cum vellet exspuere, exspuit in faciem regis. Et cum ministri propter hoc vellent eum ducere ad suspendendum, non permisit rex, sed quaesivit a philosopho, quare hoc fecisset. Cui respondit: Vidi alia loca plena argento et auro et gemmis et purpuris pretiosis, et ideo in barbam regis incrassatam et ex pinguedine et cibo immundam exspui, non enim vidi locum minus nitidum. Quod audiens rex compunctus est et humiliatus. Illi vero, qui se decorant et ornant ex auro vel alio ornamento, cito exspoliantur.
>
> **[Argument 5:]** Prout refert Esopus, quod quaedam cornix deformis et nigra, perrexit ad nuptias, sed antequam ad nuptias intraret, a qualibet ave accepit plumam unam et ornavit se. Erat itaque pulchra valde non natura, sed arte. Et dum intraret domum nuptiarum, mirabantur ceterae aves, quae illic convenerant, pulchritudinem illius. Venerunt autem aves illae, quarum plumas furata erat, et acceperunt singulae plumas suas et sic cornix remansit nigra et deformis ut prius.
>
> **[Argument 6:]** Accidit Parisiis, in generali processione, quod quaedam simea cuiusdam dominae trecias alienis crinibus, quas deferebat, coram omni populo abstraxit, et turpis ac decapillata ad modum cornicis depositis alienis plumis remansit, et iudicio Dei hoc accidit.[17]

[17] *DCM 1483*, fols. 72r–73r. "**[Definition:]** The ostrich is a large and powerful bird, with feathers and wings, but it cannot lift itself to the stars because of the weakness of its wings. **[Dialogus:]** Once there was

Almost every chapter begins with a brief presentation or definition of the creature(s) mentioned in the headline. In this chapter, the ostrich is described as a large and powerful bird equipped with both feathers and wings. However, it is said to be unable to fly "propter imbecillitatem alarum suarum," a rather peculiar expression. The meaning of *imbecillitas* is 'weakness' and 'feebleness,' and this significance is valid with regard to both body and mind, as well as 'helplessness,' 'lack of power' and 'imbecility,' concerning personal skills and abilities. Although only the ostrich's bodily weakness is described in the initial presentation, its lack of mental power is manifest in the subsequent interaction with the physician, who agrees to operate the bird according to its demands but fails to fulfil its desire. The ostrich's self-conscious words when approaching the physician for his help, "satis egregius sum et venustus, sed [...]," might be interpreted as a sign of the mental 'imbecility' which compelled it to deliberate an operation at all and think that the physician would be able to solve its problem. The adversative conjunction *sed* is important in this context and carries momentum and significance. Comparing the self-presentation of the opening to the concluding *sens moral*, which the ostrich expresses in its leonine hexameter as the end of the *dialogus*, we may observe that although the operation failed to cure the presumed bodily weakness, it did none the less prove to be a more successful cure with regard to the ostrich's mental imbecility.

In this specific case, the author only mentions the ostrich's lack of wings and its inability to fly as the prelude to the subsequent dialogue between the bird and the physician, without indicating his source of information. However, he does in a number of cases quote and/or refer to classical, Christian and medieval authorities, for instance to the medieval authors Radolphus Brito and Papias of Hierapolis with regard to the green colour of the emerald in

an ostrich, rather beautiful and fair, and she had very strong and comely wings, but she did not like two backwards-turned feathers in the wings, which made her very sad. Therefore, she went to the physician and said: 'I am sufficiently honourable and beautiful, but I want you to amputate these backwards-turned feathers,' because they frustrated her somewhat. Then the physician amputated the feathers for her and anointed her wings with such an ointment that the other feathers on the wings fell off. Because of that she was forever unable to fly. The ostrich was very bitter and cried till she died while saying: 'Let us remain as God formed us, and let us never change.' **[Author's comment:]** Likewise some curious and vain people, although they are sufficiently well-equipped by their creator, do not give him due honor, but rather if they have some defect on their body, they are eager to remedy it by any means, but they seek no remedy for the defects of their souls. **[Arguments 1–3:]** But like Augustine says: The invisible spouse requires no external beauty. Therefor it says in Proverbs 31: Favor is deceitful and vain is beauty. About these things Augustine says: Look, everything is beautiful about human beings, but they are themselves vile. **[Arguments 4:]** Likewise, some king held a feast for his leaders, and since there was not any corner in his house that was not covered with purple and other precious things, some philosopher, who was present, spat the king in his face when he wanted to spit. When the servants wanted to drag him away in order to hang him, the king did not allow it but instead asked the philosopher why he had done that. He responded: I saw all other places full of silver and gold, gems and purple and precious clothes, and therefore I spat in the king's stout beard, which is filled with fatness and food, because I did not see any place less glittering. When the king heard that, he felt compunction and humiliation. Thus, those who decorate and ornate themselves with gold or other kinds of ornamentation are quickly undressed. **[Arguments 5:]** Likewise, Aesop tells us that some deformed and black crow went to a wedding, but before it entered the festivities, it took a feather from any other bird and dressed itself with them. Consequently, it was beautiful, not in a natural but in an artificial way. When it entered the house of the wedding, the other birds that had come together there admired its beauty. Then came the birds, whose feathers she had stolen, and each single bird took back their feathers, and so the crow remained black and deformed as it was before. **[Arguments 6:]** It happened in Paris, in a secular procession that a monkey pulled off the fake plaits, which some lady was wearing, in front of all people. And she was left standing ugly and without hair like the crow, having lost its feathers. And it happened through the will of God."

DCM 14 (*De smaragdo et anulo*, "About the emerald and the ring"),[18] to the Roman poet Horace concerning the substance and medical use of the wormwood plant in *DCM* 28 (*De abrotano et Lepore*, "About the wormwood plant and the hare")[19] and to the late antique or early medieval Christian authors Isidore of Sevilla and Ambrose of Milan in order to describe the deceitful and fraudulent character of the thievish partridge in *DCM* 79 (*De perdice fure*).[20]

The second part of the *dialogus* contains the dialogue and/or interaction of the creatures involved, and although this part of the chapters is never described or defined as *fabula*, its literary elements are comparable to similar stories in medieval bestiaries and collections of fables.[21] This section of the chapters normally concludes with a leonine hexameter (or two) expressed by one of the characters to present the *sens moral* of the story. As mentioned above, the ostrich in the present case deplored the bodily consequences of its attempt to change the natural form and characteristics of its body through an operation, and subsequently exclaims: "Sicut nos plasmavit, stemus, / Deus, nunquam nos mutemus,"[22] which in the early modern English translation of *DCM* from ca. 1530 becomes: "As Godde hath ordeynyd vs in euery pointe, /let vs continewe and not owre self disioynte."[23]

Considering the very title of my paper, the second parts of the 122 chapters appear the more interesting from a literary point of view. In this often larger part of the *dialogi*, the author not only offers his own analysis of the moral of the dialogue and its concluding leonine hexameter(s) but also illustrates and expands it with quotations from and references to the vast arsenal of antique and medieval Latin and Greek literature, often with a quotation from the Bible as his first example or argument.

If we then apply to our analysis of *DCM* the prevailing medieval hermeneutic model of the four senses, which originated in Late Antiquity and soon became the model to read and interpret the books of the Bible, and which later on was applied as the primary model to interpret Christian texts, we should read the first part of each chapter according to the *sensus literalis* or *historicus*, while the second part should be read according to the *sensus spiritualis*. The latter might be divided further into the *sensus allegoricus* or *typologicus*, the *sensus moralis* or *tropologicus* and the *sensus anagogicus*, as it is expressed in a short epigram quoted by the Franciscan friar Nicolas of Lyra in his *Postilla in Galatas* (4, 3) and sometimes attributed to the Dominican monk Augustinus de Dacia:[24]

> Littera gesta docet, quid credas allegoria,
> Moralis quid agas, quo tendas anagogia.[25]

Let us continue the analysis of the second part of *DCM* 54 and apply this hermeneutic model to the various elements of this section. In his own reflection upon the *sensus spiritualis* or figurative meaning of the ostrich's fate and the lesson learned, as it is expressed in its

[18] *DCM 1483*, fol. 27r.
[19] Ibid., fol. 46v.
[20] Ibid., fol. 99r.
[21] See, e.g., Baudoin van den Abeele, "L'allégorie animale dans les encyclopédies latines du Moyen Âge," in *L'animal exemplaire au Moyen Âge*, ed. Jacques Berlioz and Marie Anne Polo de Beaulieu (Paris: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 1999), 123–43.
[22] "Such as God has formed us, let us remain, and let us never change ourselves."
[23] Kratzman and Gee, *The Dialogues of Creatures Moralyzed*, 141.
[24] See Henri de Lubac, *Exégèse médiévale: Les quatre sens de l'écriture*, vol. I (Paris: Aubier, 1961), 3.
[25] "The letter teaches events, allegory what to believe, morality what to do, anagogy where to aim for." See Nicolas of Lyra, *Prologus … de commendatione sacrae Scripturia in generali*, in *Postilla super totam Bibliam* (Migne, *Patrologia cursus completus, series Latina* (hereafter *PL*) 113.28D); and *Ejusdem Nicolai de Lira Prologus*, ibid. 113.33D.

leonine hexameter, the author picks up the significance of the ostrich's opening statement about its bodily status compared to its mental imbecility, when he says that many "curiosi et vani" ("curious and vain people") are sufficiently well-built with regard to their bodies. However, in their vainness they fail to thank the Creator for this natural condition and instead do their utmost to remedy even the tiniest bodily defect. But such vain human beings should have cared more about their mental and spiritual defects ("maculae animae nihil mederi procurant"), instead of worrying about some small bodily defect ("aliquam maculam in corpore"), as the author deplores when he applies the *sensus moralis* to the story of the ostrich and the physician.

In order to corroborate his argument, the author introduces six different authorities and stories, which all attest that Christ is looking for the inner and not the exterior beauty. The first three elements are purely quotations, which may serve almost as one-liners presenting Christian values and beliefs. The first one is about Christ, who is described as the invisible bridegroom seeking the inner beauty of his bride, in a quotation attributed to Augustine,[26] which is actually an abbreviated quotation from chapter 6 in Hugh of St. Victor's *Expositio in regulam sancti Augustini*.[27] The second argument is a quotation from *Proverbs* 31:30 ("Favour is deceitful and vain is beauty"), and the third one a modified quotation of the statement about human beings in Augustine's *Confessiones* 5, 2: "Ecce pulchra sunt cum eis omnia, et ipsi sunt turpes."[28]

To counterbalance these three short statements, the author presents three stories which serve as exempla in the second part of his analysis. Without indicating the source of his fourth argument, he introduces an exemplum about a rich king who got spat in his face by a philosopher when he was throwing a party in his golden palace. Although the servants immediately caught the culprit in order to hang him, the king himself was eager to learn the reason for this behaviour. When asked by the king, the philosopher told him that he could not find any place less glittering ("non vidi locum minus nitidum"). Once again, we may observe the exterior shallowness in the king's golden palace as opposed to the inner mental strength of the philosopher's reply, an immaterial strength which leaves the king speechless, ashamed, and humiliated in his material wealth. Just like the ostrich, the king learns his lesson the hard way. Although both persons and settings in this story are portrayed as secular, the reaction of the king is described in purely Christian terms, "compunctus et humiliatus" ("remorseful and humiliated"), which underlines the significance of the above-mentioned Christian-tinged one-liners.

As his fifth argument, the author presents the well-known and wide-spread fable about the crow and its borrowed feathers (Barry Index 101).[29] In this chapter, it is attributed to Aesop, but it is also known in variant versions in Greek by Aphtonius (no. 31) and Babrius (no. 72), and in Latin by Phaedrus (I 3), Adamar of Chabannes (no. 26), Odo of Cheriton (no. 89) and Walter of England (no. 35). In the present prose version, the crow enters a wedding party dressed in coloured feathers, which she had collected from a number of other birds. In her new outfit, the crow is described as beautiful "non natura sed arte" ("not in a natural but in an artificial way"), and once again the adversative *sed* should be observed

[26] Regarding the complex question of authenticity and attribution see Francois Dolbeau, "Critique d'attribution, critique d'authenticité. Reflexions préliminaires," *Filologia mediolatina* vi-vii (1999–2000): 33–61.

[27] Hugh of St. Victor, *Expositio in regulam sancti Augustini* (Migne, *PL* 176.897, chap. 6).

[28] "Behold, everything about them is beautiful, yet they are themselves vile." Augustine of Hippo, *Confessiones*, ed. Luc Verheijen, *CC SL* 27 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1981), 5, 2, 1.

[29] See B.E. Perry, ed., *Babrius and Phaedrus*, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard University Press, 1975), 441.

as a specific marker. At first she is admired by the other guests. But when the owners of the borrowed feathers arrive at the wedding party, they begin to retrieve their lost feathers and leave the crow standing "nigra et deformis ut prius" ("black and ugly as it was before"), defeathered by the other birds.

Finally, probably as a contemporaneous illustration and parallel to Aesop's fable, the author concludes the second part of *dialogus* 54 by telling the story of an incident which had taken place in Paris. In the middle of an official, secular procession a monkey pulled off the fake plaits of a certain lady and left her standing "turpis ac decapillata" ("ugly and hairless"), just like the crow after it had been stripped off its borrowed feathers ("ad modum cornicis depositis alienis plumis"). And this was the will of God, concludes the author, thereby reaffirming the truth formulated in the ostrich's leonine hexameter.

Turning to the specific use and the figurative and didactic function of the literary fables in *DCM*, the phrase "refert Esopus" ("Aesop says"), sometimes with *prout* or *unde*, appears eleven of the seventeen times that the Greek fabulist is mentioned and indicates the introduction of a specific fable. The references are probably to fables included in the late antique or early medieval collection entitled *Aesopus latinus*, which contains a large number of recycled prose versions of the poetic fables of Phaedrus, the Roman fabulist. Besides the name of Aesop, we find the noun *fabula* used five times and *fabulator* once, as indicated above, as well as the verb *fabulatur* five times to introduce the fable that follows.

In general, I have found that the author is quite loyal to the contents of the antique fables in his use and analysis of the examples he has chosen. This is the case, for instance, for Phaedrus I 5 concerning the dangers of forming a *societas leonina* in *DCM* 20 (*De auro et argento*, "About gold and silver"),[30] Phaedrus I.24 about the frog that wants to be as large as the cow in *DCM* 42 (*De sturione qui ad mare perrexit*, "About the sturgeon who swam to the sea"),[31] and the fable about King Midas and his magic touch in *DCM* 87 (*De grife tyranno*, "About the tyrant griffin").[32] In almost all these cases, the function of the selected fables is to illustrate the *sens moral* of the chapters in which they appear, i.e., the s*ensus tropologicus/moralis* of the medieval hermeneutic model.

Only in one case do I suspect that the author has misunderstood or misinterpreted one of the included fables of Phaedrus, which I believe is the case regarding the first fable in Phaedrus' collection about the wolf and the lamb included in the above-mentioned *DCM* 51 (*De herodio et milvo*). In *DCM* 51, two birds of prey are the main characters, the mysterious *herodius* bird and the smaller kite, who keeps offending his stronger opponent. After the kite has ignored all warnings issued by the *herodius* and continued his offensive behaviour, the latter bird attacks and kills the kite. Due to the kite's provocation and his own reaction in self-defence, the *herodius* then utters his leonine hexameter: "Qui vult infestare fortem, perit atque quaerit mortem," which in the early modern English translation becomes: "He that wyll fight and stryue with the stronge, Perisshith many tymes and sekyth his deth amonge."[33] Considering the difference in physical power between the two birds of prey as well as the moral aspects of the story, the kite, although being the inferior, is characterized as the offending party, and the retaliation of the stronger and offended *herodius* comes as no surprise to the reader. In order to support this view the author introduces a biblical proverb from *Ecclesiasticus* or *Sirach* 8:1: "Non litiges cum homine potente, ne forte incidas in manus

30 *DCM 1483*, fol. 36r.

31 Ibid., fol. 50v.

32 Ibid., fol. 110r.

33 "He who wants to harass someone stronger than himself perishes and seeks death." Kratzman and Gee, *The Dialogues of Creatures Moralyzed*, 138.

illius" ("Do not strive with a powerful man, lest you fall into his hands"), as well as the above-mentioned fable, which here is attributed to Aesop ("unde refert Aesopus," "as Aesop notes"), in the following version:

> Unde refert Esopus, quod quidam lupus bibebat in flumine et agnus quidam subtus bibebat cum eo simul, levavitque lupus post eum vocem dicens: Turbas tu aquam potus mei. Cui agnus: Domine, non facio vobis iniuriam neque turbo. Et lupus: Mihi dampna minaris? Nescis quid feci patri tuo, nondum sunt sex menses? Cui agnus: Tanto nunc vixi tempore. Tunc clamavit lupus: An loqueris, furcifer (id est, villane)? Ac irruit in eum ac devoravit. Sic faciunt potentes seculi minoribus, quia sine occasione devorant eos et disperdunt.[34]

Comparing this prose version of the fable with the poetic one by Phaedrus, it seems quite obvious that the latter cannot be used to illustrate and support the story of the *herodius* and the kite, because Phaedrus intentionally characterizes the stronger wolf as the offender and the naïve and innocent lamb as the offended part. This is manifest in the last lines in their dialogue and in the description of the attack as "iniusta nece" (Phaedrus I.10–13):

> Ante hos sex menses male, ait, dixisti mihi.
> Respondit agnus: Equidem natus non eram.
> Pater hercle tuus, ille inquit, male dixit mihi.
> Atque ita correptum lacerat iniusta nece. [35]

Comparing the dialogue of the two animals in *DCM* and in Phaedrus' text, we can say that the author of *DCM* has changed the order of the dialogue considerably and seems to violate the moral expressed in Phaedrus' concluding *epimythium* in 14–15 ("Haec propter illos scripta est homines fabula / qui fictis causis innocentes opprimunt"), when he makes the lamb appear as the offending party. [36] In retorting the wolf's initial accusation, the lamb in *DCM* is challenging the natural physical power of his stronger opponent. This offence gets even worse when the lamb fails to listen to the following warning: "Do you threaten me? Don't you know what I did to your father, not more than six months ago?" But instead of understanding the danger hidden in the wolf's questions, the lamb replies like a smart street punk: "I have only lived just that long."

This answer infuriates the wolf and thereby gives him, as the in his opinion offended party, an evident reason to punish the lamb by killing and eating it, while in Phaedrus' version he does not know how to properly answer the lamb's truthful answer: "I was not born six month ago," and instead, as his excuse for killing the lamb, just utters: "But your father did certainly slander me."[37] Perhaps the author of *DCM* had been influenced by earlier medieval versions of the fable like the poetic exemplum 647 under the heading *Potentia* in

[34] *DCM 1483*, fol. 70v. "Thus Aesop says that some wolf was drinking in the river and further down some lamb was drinking at the same time. And the wolf raised its voice and said to him: Are you disturbing the water I drink? The lamb answered: My lord, I do not make any harm to you, not do I disturb. And the wolf said: Are you threatening me? Don't you know what I did to your father, not more than six months ago? The lamb responded: I have barely lived that long. Then the wolf exclaimed: Are you talking back, you rascal (that is, villain)? Then he attacked the lamb and devoured it. This is what the mighty of the world do to their subjects, because they devour them without reason and destroy them."

[35] "The wolf said: You talked evil about me six months ago./ The lamb responded: I was not even born then./ Then your father talked evil about me for sure, said the wolf./ And then he grabbed the lamb and tore it to pieces in an unjust killing," *Babrius and Phaedrus*, 192

[36] "This fable is written because of those who oppress innocent people with fictive charges," ibid.

[37] See my analysis of *dialogus* 51 in Brian Møller Jensen, "Fables of Phaedrus Recycled in Medieval Latin

Arnoldus of Serain's *Alphabetum narrationum*,[38] or the version of Vincent of Beauvais which is included among the twenty-nine prosaic fables in his *Speculum doctrinale* III.114 in order to illustrate his definition and description of the literary fable.[39] In Vincent's version, the lamb is less timid and the wolf obviously more inclined to find excuses for his attack and slaughter than in the poetic version of Phaedrus:

> Agnus et lupus sitientes ad rivulum e diuerso venerunt, sursum bibebat lupus longeque inferior agnus. Lupus ut agnum vidit, sic ait: Turbasti mihi aquam bibenti. Agnus patiens dixit: Quomodo aquam turbavi tibi; a te ad me decurrit. Cui lupus: Et maledicis mihi, inquit. At ille: Non maledixi. Lupus vero: Pater, inquit, tuus multa mala mihi ostendit. In fine autem altercationis, lupus improba voce dixit: Et adhuc mihi loqueris latro. Statimque in eum direxit, et innocenti vitam eripuit.[40]

Considering the sources to the stories and exempla quoted in the explanatory and allegorical second part of each chapter of *DCM*, the number of fables included makes this genre one of the main contributors to this part of the compilation. Another classical author of exempla is the Roman historian Valerius Maximus, who is quoted as the source of more than thirty stories of antique Greek and Roman heroes and virtuous men, whereas the anonymous medieval collection *Vitae patrum* and John Cassian's *Collationes patrum* contribute a large number of stories of monks and other Christian exempla intended to illustrate the dialogues and actions in the *dialogi*. In fact, the complete list of references and quotations amounts to more than three hundred, almost half of which are to various books of the Old and the New Testament, and more than 80 classical, late antique and medieval authors and works are quoted or referred to in *DCM*.

Summarizing the contents of the moral aspects of the sentences, stories and exempla in the figurative and allegorical parts of the 122 *dialogi* or chapters, we find a moral philosophy of the more practical and elementary kind. Instead of elaborate arguments in matters of doctrine or allegoric aspects of contemplative mysteries, the author expresses his moral philosophy primarily as proverbs and concise statements.

We find one of the most evident expressions of this view in the long and complex *DCM* 105 (*De lepore iurista*, "About the hare as a lawyer"), about the hare that had studied law in Paris and then is employed as a legal expert by the lion king.[41] During the job interview, the two animals take a walk in the woods, and at each incident the lion asks the hare to formulate a proverb to match the incident. The hare shows his skills by coining various judicial (and

Literature," in *Fiction and Figuration in High and Late Medieval Literature*, ed. Marianne Pade et al., Analecta Instituti Danici, Supplementum xlvii (Roma: Edizioni Quasar, 2016), 89–90.

[38] Arnoldus of Serain, *Alphabetum narrationum*, ed. Elisa Brilli et al., *CC CM* 160 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2015), exemplum 647, 360: "Agnus et lupus sitientes ad riuulum conuenerunt./ Sursum bibebat lupus, inferius autem agnus./ Dixit autem lupus agno: 'Tu mihi turbasti aquam.'/Agnus ait: 'Quomodo turbaui tibi aquam? At te ad me decurrit.'/ Cui lupus: 'En maledicis mihi!' Et ille: 'Non maledixi.'/ Ad hec lupus: 'Pater tuus multa mala intulit mihi, et me modo uindicabo,' et insiliens in | eum strangulauit./Hoc etiam ualet ad occasionem et principes."

[39] Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum Doctrinale* (Venice: Hermann Lichtenstein, 1494), III,114, fols. 42–43.

[40] "A lamb and a wolf were thirsty and came down to a river from opposite directions, the wolf standing higher up the stream and the lamb further below. When the wolf saw the lamb, he said: You trouble the water I am drinking. The patient lamb said: How could I trouble the water for you; it is running down from you towards me. The wolf said to him: And you talk evil about me. But the lamb said: I did not talk evil. The wolf said: You father did many bad things to me. Putting the discussion to an end, the wolf said in an improper voice: And you are calling me a thief! And at once he jumped in the direction of the innocent lamb and ripped his life away."

[41] *DCM 1483*, fols. 130v–132r.

moral) sayings in leonine hexameters, such as: "valet contra ictum mortis esse sapiens quam fortis" ("against the blow of death it is better to be wise than strong") and "multum melius tacere est quam male respondere" ("it is much better to be silent than to answer badly"). Like in the other *dialogi*, the hare's judicial hexameters might be read as expressions or paradigms of the kind of wisdom which the book as a whole promotes and respects so highly.[42]

Moreover, it is possible to observe two different ways of viewing the world and mankind's relation to God expressed in *DCM*, namely an optimistic and a pessimistic point of view, which might be compared to the confrontation of opinions and ideas between the ascetic old and blind Benedictine monk Jorge and the pragmatic Franciscan friar William of Baskerville in Umberto Eco's novel *Il nome della rosa*, published in 1980. According to the pessimistic approach, all worldly and secular activities are regarded from the perspective of the last judgement and the subsequent damnation; therefore, all joyful aspects of God's creation are considered to be mere distractions from the pursuit of holiness. Such views are expressed in the leonine hexameters in *DCM* 77 about the solitary pelican (*De pelicano solitario*): "Qui vult Deum contemplari, solus debet commorari" ("Whoever wants to contemplate God ought to stay alone"),[43] and in *DCM* 84 (*De rustico et apibus*, "About the farmer and the bees"): "Debet dura sustinere, qui de dulci vult habere" ("He ought to sustain hard times, who wants to obtain the sweet fruits").[44] In both these chapters we also find some quotations by Bernard of Clairvaux, which express the principal arguments for the necessity of solitude for a person to be able to contemplate God according to the quotation from one of his sermons on *Cantica canticorum* in the above-mentioned *DCM* 77 about the solitary pelican: "O sancta anima, sola esto, ut soli domino omnium serves te ipsam, quem ex omnibus elegisti, fuge creaturas, si creatorem habere desideras, fuge mundum, si vis esse mundus."[45]

The optimistic world view, on the other hand, which may be associated with the Franciscan way of thinking, represents the respect and the delight in God's creation as well as a humane way of obtaining knowledge such as it is exemplified in a story from John Cassian's *Collationes patrum* quoted in the prologue. According to Cassian's collection, a man is said to have rebuked John the evangelist for playing and enjoying life with his disciples.[46] Since the man was carrying a bow and some arrows, John asked him to draw his bow. When he had done this a few times, John asked him if he could keep it drawn continuously and got the answer that the bow would then either break in two or there would be less power in the arrow. The man's response made John conclude that the human mind might likewise be broken if it does not relax once in a while. This bow story is obviously a *fabula vagans*, since we find it told in many and various versions in both antique and medieval literature, e.g., about the Egyptian Pharao Amasis in Herodotus II 173, about Aesop among the Athenians in Phaedrus III 14, and about the hermit St. Antonius in chapter 21 of Jacobus de Voragine's *Legenda aurea*.

[42] The author obtains a literary effect in combining the similarities of the two words *lepus* (*-oris*), "hare," and *lepor/lepos* (*-oris*), "wit, humor, charm."

[43] *DCM 1483*, fol. 96v.

[44] Ibid., fol. 105v.

[45] Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones super Cantica canticorum*, in *Bernardi opera I-II*, ed. Jean Leclercq, Charles Hugh Talbot, and Henri Marie Rochais (Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1957–1958), II, 40, 4, 27: "O holy soul, be alone, that you may keep yourself to the Lord alone, whom you have chosen before all others, flee all things created, if you desire to have the creator of all things, flee the world if you want to be pure."

[46] Johannes Cassianus, *Collationes Patrum* (Paris: Cerf, 1959), XXIII 21. Thomas Aquinas's comments on Cassianus' version of the story in his *Summa theologiae* (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1964–1980), II 2, 168, 2.

The Franciscan tone in *DCM* is probably due to one of the sources, which the author of *DCM* used for a number of his stories and exempla. In his detailed study of *Breviloquium de virtutibus*, a collection of exempla on the virtuous activities and statements of ancient rulers, philosophers and other prominent figures by the Franciscan scholar John of Wales (d. ca. 1285), Albrecht Diem states that the *DCM* manifests a not yet recognized dependence on John's *Breviloquium*, especially with regard to the exempla related to the classical authors and works, e.g., Valerius Maximus' *Facta et dicta memorabilia*. In his comparison of the ancient exempla, Diem states that the *DCM* author has quoted them often literally from and with exact source references to John of Wales' collection, and concludes: "The *Dialogus* quotes at least 83 chapters of the *Breviloquium*, about a third of the text. It is clear that the author saw the *Breviloquium* indeed as a *florilegium* of classical material rather than as a treatise on the cardinal virtues."[47]

Let us return to the didactic aspects of the initial quotation from the prologue in Leeu's and Snell's editions: "Our Saviour once used fables according to Palestinian tradition that he might lead people to the road of truth through parables." Using this reference to the practice of Jesus in his times as their main argument for the edition of the compilation, the two editors proceed to present the didactic aim and explicit moral purpose intended with the book, which is not only to "nos docere nostrosque mores corrigere" ("to teach us to correct our morals") but even "in extremium vitiorum et uirtutum promotionem" ("to exterminate vices and promote virtues"). With reference to Thomas Aquinas's *Summa theologiae* 2:2, 168 as the primary argument for the use and choice of stories and exempla in the chapters of the *DCM*, the editors present the benefits of the book:

> Auctor ergo libri presentis iocundo modo morales doctrinas in extremium vitiorum et virtutum promotionem introducit, quod utique licet et expediens est, ut dicit doctor sanctus […] si fictio exterior interiori devotioni et dispositioni bonae conveniat. Utilis est ergo presens liber predicatoribus et aliis quibusque intelligentibus contra fatigationem animalem, ut per delectationem iocundae materiae aliqualiter intermissa intentione ad insistendum rationis studio simplicium animi ad altiora trahantur.[48]

This didactic approach is in line with Gregory the Great's argument for using contemporary exempla to illustrate his exegesis of the gospel text. In his *Homilia in euangelia* 38 on Matthew 22: 1–14, which tells the parable about the king arranging the wedding of his son, Gregory concludes his exposition of the often quoted *sens moral* of Jesus' parable, "Multi sunt vocati, pauci vero electi" ("Many are called, but few are chosen"), by telling the story of the different lives of his father's three sisters, Tarsilla, Gordiana, and Emiliana: "Omnes tres uno prius ardore conversae sunt, sed non in uno eodemque studio permanserunt."[49] Gregory motivates the inclusion of this and similar exempla in other homilies on the gospel texts in the following

[47] Albrecht Diem, "A Classicising Friar at Work: John of Wales' *Breviloquium de virtutibus*," in *Christian Humanism. Essays in Honor of Arjo Vanderjagt*, ed. Alasdair A. Macdonald, Zweder Rudolf Willem Maria von Martels, and Jan Veenstra (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 94.

[48] *DCM 1483*, fol. 1v: "The author of the present book introduces moral teaching in an entertaining way in order to exterminate vices and promote virtues, which is allowed and expedient according to the holy master's Summa, […] provided that the exterior fiction matches the inner devotion and good disposition. Therefore, the present book is useful to preachers and other intellectuals against spiritual fatigue, that the simple souls be attracted to reach a higher level of moral reasoning through the pleasures of the entertaining subject."

[49] "At first all three converted because of the same passion, but they did not persist in one and the same pursuit." Gregorius Magnus, *Homilia in euangelia*, ed. Raymond Étaix, *CC SL* 141 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1999), 38, 15, 376.

didactic manner: "Nonnumquam mentes audientium plus exempla fidelium quam docentium verba convertunt."[50] Although they avoid the term *fabula*, Gregory's statement is repeated and reformulated by a number of late medieval authors, who defended the use of fictional exempla to enable preachers to convey the sayings and parables of Christ to a (mainly) illiterate congregation or community.[51] Preaching to this kind of communities, which was among the primary activities of the mendicant orders, the Franciscans and the Dominicans, called for a change from the monastic and scholastic tradition towards a more popular and accessible kind of material, which was intended to instruct as well as to kindle and retain the attention of the listeners. Thus, it is not surprising to find two of the main teachers and important authors of these two orders repeating the words of Gregory in an abbreviated form. The Franciscan Bonaventure places his focus on the moral aspects of preaching: "In moribus enim plus movent exempla quam verba,"[52] while the Dominican Thomas Aquinas puts the focus on the human activities: "In actibus hominum plus movent exempla quam verba."[53]

In addition to these two theologians and authorities we might observe other thirteenth-century authors who defended their use and/or collections of exempla by quoting or referring to Jesus and his teaching in the gospels. Alongside these practical tools for preachers, a great number of more theoretical handbooks appeared, defining and describing the rules and practice of the *ars praedicandi*, some of which James Murphy describes and evaluates in his presentation of this significant genre from the High and Late Middle Ages in the second half of his book entitled *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages*.[54] Among the collections appearing in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries listed by Gregory Kratzmann and Elisabeth Gee in their introduction to the late medieval English translation of *DCM* are, in addition to the ones mentioned above, the works of, e.g., Odo of Cheriton, Jacques de Vitry, Adam of Liège, Jacques de Cessoles and Étienne de Bourbon.[55]

In the prologue to his treatise *Tractatus de diversis materiis praedicabilibus*, the latter author rephrased and extended the arguments of Gregory with reference to the prologue in the church father's *Dialogi*:[56]

> Magis, ut probat beatus Gregorius in Dyalogorum libro, docent facta quam uerba et magis mouent exempla quam predicamenta; ideo summa Dei sapientia, Christus Ihesus primo docuit factis quam uerbis, et subtilitatem predicationis et doctrine grossam quasi corpoream et uisibilem reddidit, muniens et uestiens eam diuersis similitudinibus, parabolis, miraculis et exemplis, ut eius doctrina citius caperetur, facilius cognosceretur, fortius in memoria retineretur et efficacius opere

[50] "The examples of the faithful quite often convert the minds of the listeners better than the words of the teachers." Gregorius, *Homilia in euangelia*, 373.

[51] See, e.g., the statement by the Piacenza-born Fulco Scotti (1164–1229), bishop of Piacenza and Pavia, in the prologue to his book of sermons: "Grex qui pastoris vocem moresque sequitur, per exempla melius quam verba gradiatur." ("The community that follows the voice and behaviour of its shepherd progresses more through examples than through words." See Marco Petoletti, "I sermoni di Fulco Scotti, vescovo di Piacenza e Pavia," in *I misteri della cattedrale. Meraviglie nel labirinto del sapere*, ed. Emma Cavazzini and Elisa Bagnoni (Milano: Skira, 2018), 128.

[52] "With regard to morals examples move more than words." Bonaventure, *Sermons de diversis I-II*, ed. Jacques Guy Bougerol (Paris: Les éditions franciscaines, 1993), I.33, 25, 419.

[53] "In human actions examples move more than words," in Thomas Aquinas, *Super euangelium Iohannis reportatio*, in *Opuscula Theologica*, ed. Raphael Cai (Taurini-Rome: Marietti, 1975).

[54] James Joseph Murphy, *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974).

[55] Kratzman and Gee, *The Dialogues of Creatures Moralyzed*, 4–6.

[56] Stephanus de Borbone, *Tractatus de diversis materiis praedicabilibus*, in *CC CM 124*, ed. Jacques Berlioz and Jean-Luc Eichenlaub (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002), prologue.

> adimpleretur.[57]

Similarly, the English author Odo of Cheriton refers to Gregory's arguments in the preface to his collection of *Fabulae*, which he published ca. 1219–21: "Et quoniam, ut dicit Gregorius, plus quandoque compungunt exempla quam verba, aperiam in parabolis os meum, et similitudines et exempla que libencius audiuntur, memorie firmius quam verba commendatur, proponam."[58]

Although the advantages and subsequent respectability of the use of exempla (and fables) in preaching were presented and defended by the above authorities as obvious consequences of the new religious and social context after the turn of the millennium, we find a more hesitant view with regard to preachers using fables and exempla in their exegesis and preaching expressed by the Dominican encyclopaedist Vincent of Beauvais (1190–1264). In the prologue to his presentation of the fable genre, he admits that the fables of Aesop may give the reader or listener a good laugh as well as sharpen the mind: "Nam etsi legenti vel audienti misceant risum, acuunt tamen ingenium."[59] However, the concluding remarks to his selection of the twenty-nine Aesopian fables in both his *Speculum historiale* and his *Speculum doctrinale* clearly point in another direction. While the inclusion of the fable selection in the *Speculum historiale* might seem strange as a part of the events taking place in the reign of the Persian king Cyrus,[60] the section included in the *Speculum doctrinale* appears both logical and obvious as an illustration of his definition of the *fabula poetica*, and in both his works Vincent concludes the presentation of fables with the following warning:

> Hec de fabulis Esopi excerpere volui, quas etsi forte plerumque liceat in sermonibus publicis recitare, quod etiam nonnulli prudentium faciunt propter audientium tedia relevanda, qui talibus delectantur simul, et propter integumenta subiuncta, quae aliquid edificationis habere videntur, numquam tamen nisi caute et parce id estimo faciendum, ne qui verbis sacris ad luctum penitentie Deique devotionem provocari debent, ipsi per huiusmodi nugas et risum magis atque lasciviam dissolvantur. Simul etiam ne ad narrandas fabulas quasi licenter exemplo predicantium male informentur.[61]

57 "As Gregory proves in his *Dialogi*, facts teach better than words and exempla move more than allegorical preaching; thus, as the highest wisdom of God, Jesus Christ at first taught through facts rather than words, and he made the simple subtleties of his preaching and teaching almost corporeal and visible, fortifying and dressing them with various similitudes, parables, miracles and exempla, in order that his teaching should be understood faster, be recognized easier, be kept in mind stronger and be more efficiently performed in deeds."

58 "And because exempla always make people feel remorse more than words, according to Gregory, I open my mouth to parables and put forward similitudes and exempla, which are listened to more freely and entrusted to the memory more firmly than words." See Léopold Hervieux, *Les fabulistes latins* (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1896), IV, 173.

59 "For even though they [i.e., fables] may cause the reader or listener to laugh, they sharpen the mind as well." Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum Doctrinale*, III.14.

60 Ibid., III.8.

61 "These are the stories I wanted to excerpt from the fables of Aesop. Although it should be permitted often to quote them in public sermons, which many intelligent people also do because of their wish to relieve the tediousness of the listeners, who delight in such stories, and because of the underlying coverings, which seem to contain some kind of edifying, I assess however that this should be done only cautiously and rarely in order to avoid that people, who ought to be provoked to grief, penance, and devotion to God through the holy words, might be led astray through this kind of nonsense, laughter, and lasciviousness. Similarly, they should not be instructed to tell fables, as if this were permitted by the badly used examples of some preachers."

Concerning the character and benefits of fables, Vincent acknowledges their generic gifts as they are indicated by Phaedrus in the prologue to his first book of fables, “risum movere et vitam prudenti consilio monere,” just like Gregory and many of the above-mentioned authors as well as the compiler of *DCM* indirectly do in their selection and use of the genre.[62] But unlike these writers, whose main focus is on the didactic aspects and moral lessons to be learned in the fables, Vincent appears more concerned with the dangers inherent in bad use of the genre by some preachers, since fables might create laughter, cause distraction from the true subject of the sermon, and thereby prevent the listeners’ understanding of the words of Scripture. Although Vincent admits that fables may be useful in preaching, his view on fables as fictional texts and comparable to *nugae*, *risus*, and *lascivia* (“gossip, laughter, and lascivity”) appears quite in line with the late antique and early medieval view on and scepticism against the poetic *ficta* and *fabula*, which were regarded as equivalent to lies and falsities and therefore should be avoided, as we may observe in Vincent’s quotation of Isidore of Seville in *Speculum doctrinale* I.35:

> Isidorus in libro sententiarum: Ideo prohibentur Christianis poetarum figmenta legere, quia per oblectamenta fabularum nimium mentem excitant ad incentiva libidinum. Non enim solum thura offerendo demonibus immolant, sed etiam eorum dicta libentius capiendo.[63]

Another typical example of this particular Christian view, which even may be compared to Plato’s view on poetic wisdom and knowledge in the *Apologia Socratis* and his relegation of the poets in his description and construction of his ideal state in the last book of his *Res publica*, is formulated by the early medieval author Caesarius of Arles in his *Sermo* 55: “In ecclesia quando venitis, nolite vos fabulis occupare. Qui in ecclesia fabulis agit, per linguam suam poenandus erit.”[64]

Although a friar in the Dominican order, the official name of which is the *Ordo praedicatorum*, Vincent appears to adhere to the ascetic and monastic view on and approach to “scurrilitates vel verba otiosa et risum moventia” (“vulgarity or gossip and words creating laughter”), as stated in chapter six of St Benedict’s *Regula monacorum* and in some of the statements by Bernard of Clairvaux quoted and referred to in *DCM*.[65]

On the other hand, the author or compiler of *DCM* is in line with a number of the authors mentioned above in defending his use of fables and other genres in the classical Latin and Greek literature as well as secular medieval authors with his direct reference to the didactic practise of Jesus Christ to convey his message.

Relying on Christ as the “perfect model for preachers,” the late medieval editors Leeu and Snell emphasize in the prologues to the 122 *dialogi*, with reference to Thomas Aquinas, that

[62] “To create laughter and to give good advice in life.” See Phaedrus, *Prologus*, I, 3–4: “Duplex libelli dos est, quod risum movet/ et quod prudentivitam consilio monet” (“The gift of this little book is twofold: to create laughter and to advice prudence”), *Babrius and Phaedrus*, 190.

[63] “Isidore says in his book of *Sententiae*: Therefore, Christians are forbidden to read the fiction of poets, because they excite the mind too much to the incentives of desire through the pleasures of fables/stories. They sacrifice to demons not only by offering incense, but also by accepting their words too willingly.”

[64] “When you come to the church, do not occupy yourself with fables/fiction. Whoever uses fables/fiction in the church will be punished through his tongue.” Caesarius of Arles, *Sermones*, ed. Germain Morin, *CC SL* 103 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1953), 55a, 3.

[65] See Brian Møller Jensen, “*Tacere et audire discipulum convenit*: Smaragdus of Saint-Mihiel, Hildegard of Bingen and Juan de Torquemada comment on chap. 6 *De taciturnitate* in *Regula Benedicti*,” in *Quod ore cantas corde credas: Studi in onore di Giacomo Baroffio*, ed. Leandra Scappaticci (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2013), 51–63.

the perfect balance between the exterior fiction and the interior devotion and disposition is the main condition to present "moral doctrines in an entertaining way" in order to "exterminate vices and promote virtues." Considering the apparent need for this kind of books among preachers and the profitable possibilities thanks to the new printing technique, Leeu and Snell published the late medieval compilation, which is entitled *Contemptus sublimitatis* in most manuscripts, and gave it the now usually quoted title *Dialogus creaturarum moralizatus*. Presenting a balanced mixture of fables, exempla and stories from the Bible, from ancient pagan authors and from antique and medieval Christian authors and church fathers, the author of *DCM* compiled a collection which was intended to be edifying and useful for medieval preachers and at the same time to be amusing and entertaining to medieval (and modern) readers. He appears to have learned his lesson and is indeed telling tales out of school!

References

Arnoldus of Serain. *Alphabetum narrationum*. Edited by Elisa Brilli, Coleta Ribaucourt, Jacques Berlioz, and Marie Anne Polo de Beaulieu. *CC CM* 160. Turnhout: Brepols, 2015.

Augustine of Hippo. *Confessiones*. Edited by Luc Verheijen. *CC SL* 27. Turnhout: Brepols, 1981.

Bernard of Clairvaux. *Sermones super Cantica canticorum*. In *Bernardi opera I-II*, edited by Jean Leclercq, Charles Hugh Talbot, and Henri Marie Rochais. Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1957–1958.

Bonaventure. *Sermons de diversis I-II*. Edited by Jacques Guy Bougerol. Paris: Les éditions franciscaines, 1993.

Caesarius of Arles. *Sermones*. Edited by Germain Morin. *CC SL* 103. Turnhout: Brepols, 1953.

Cardelle de Hartmann, Carmen. *Lateinische Dialoge 1200–1400: Literaturhistorische Studie und Repertorium*. Mittellateinische Studien und Texte 37. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2007.

Cardelle de Hartmann, Carmen, and Estrella Pérez Rodríguez. "Text im Wandel und editorische Praxis: Der lateinische *Contemptus sublimitatis* (*Dialogus creaturarum*) in der handschriftlichen Überlieferung." In *Didaktisches Erzählen. Formen literarischer Belehrung in Orient und Okzident*, edited by Regula Forster and Romy Günthart, 21–40. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2010.

Diem, Albrecht. "A Classicising Friar at Work: John of Wales' *Breviloquium de virtutibus*." In *Christian Humanism. Essays in Honor of Arjo Vanderjagt*, edited by Alasdair A. Macdonald, Zweder Rudolf Willem Maria von Martels, and Jan Veenstra, 75–102. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Dolbeau, Francois. "Critique d'attribution, critique d'authenticité. Reflexions préliminaires." *Filologia mediolatina* vi-vii (1999–2000): 33–61.

Dyalogus Creaturarum Moralizatus 1483 – Skapelsens sedelärande samtal 1483. Commentary by Johan Bernström, translation by Monica Hedlund. Uppsala: Almquist & Wiksell, 1983.

Grässe, Johann Georg Theodor. *Die beiden ältesten lateinischen Fabelbücher des Mittelalters: des Bischofs Cyrillus Speculum Sapientiae und des Nicolaus Pergamenus Dialogus Creaturarum*. Hildesheim: G. Olms, [1880] 1965.

Gregorius Magnus. *Homilia in euangelia*. Edited by Raymond Étaix. *CC SL* 141. Turnhout: Brepols, 1999.

Hervieux, Léopold. *Les fabulistes latins*. Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1896.

Hugh of St. Victor. *Expositio in regulam sancti Augustini*. *PL* 176.881–925. Paris: Migne, 1879.

Jensen, Brian Møller. "*Tacere et audire discipulum convenit*: Smaragdus of Saint-Mihiel, Hildegard of Bingen and Juan de Torquemada comment on chap. 6 *De taciturnitate* in *Regula Benedicti*." In *Quod ore cantas corde credas: Studi in onore di Giacomo Baroffio*, edited by Leandra Scappaticci, 51–63. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2013.

———. "Fables of Phaedrus Recycled in Medieval Latin Literature." In *Fiction and Figuration in High and Late Medieval Literature*, edited by Marianne Pade, Anders Cullhed, Anders Hallengren, and Brian Møller Jensen, 83–91. Analecta Instituti Danici, Supplementum xlvii. Roma: Edizioni Quasar, 2016.

Johannes Cassianus. *Collationes Patrum*. Paris: Cerf, 1959.

Kratzman, Gregory, and Elizabeth Gee. *The Dialogues of Creatures Moralyzed: A Critical Edition*. Medieval and Renaissance Texts 4. Leiden: Brill, 1988.

Löfstedt, Bengt, ed. *Anonymi in Mattheum*. *CC CM* 153. Turnhout: Brepols, 2003.

Lubac, Henri de. *Exégèse médiévale: Les quatre sens de l'écriture*. Vol. I. Paris: Aubier, 1961.

Murphy, James Joseph. *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974.

Nicolas of Lyra. *Prologus*. In *Postilla super totam Bibliam*. *PL* 113:25B–36A. Paris: Migne, 1879.

Otfrid von Weissenburg. *Glossae in Matthaeum*. Edited by Cesare Grifoni. Turnhout: Brepols, 2003.

Oxford Latin Dictionary. Edited by P. G. W. Glare. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.

Perry, B.E., ed. *Babrius and Phaedrus*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Petoletti, Marco. "I sermoni di Fulco Scotti, vescovo di Piacenza e Pavia." In *I misteri della cattedrale. Meraviglie nel labirinto del sapere*, edited by Emma Cavazzini and Elisa Bagnoni, 128–29. Milano: Skira, 2018.

Rajna, Pio. *Intorno al cosidetto Dialogus creaturarum ed al suo autore*. Torino: Loescher, 1888.

Stephanus de Borbone. *Tractatus de diversis materiis praedicabilibus*. In *CC CM 124*, edited by Jacques Berlioz and Jean-Luc Eichenlaub. Turnhout: Brepols, 2002.

Thomas Aquinas. *Summa theologiae*. London: Eyre / Spottiswoode, 1964–1980.

———. *Super euangelium Iohannis reportatio*. In *Opuscula Theologica*, edited by Raphael Cai. Taurini-Rome: Marietti, 1975.

van den Abeele, Baudoin. "L'allégorie animale dans les encyclopédies latines du Moyen Âge." In *L'animal exemplaire au Moyen Âge*, edited by Jacques Berlioz and Marie Anne Polo de Beaulieu, 123–43. Paris: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 1999.

Vincent of Beauvais. *Speculum Doctrinale*. Venice: Hermann Lichtenstein, 1494.

JOLCEL

Journal *of* Latin Cosmopolitanism *and* European Literatures.

Current Contribution

Lucy C.M.M. Jackson, "*Introite, pueri!* The School-Room Performance of George Buchanan's Latin *Medea* in Bordeaux," *JOLCEL* 3 (2020): 43–61. DOI: 10.21825/jolcel.vi3.9256.

Note

This contribution is part of a larger dialogue of three articles and one responding piece that form the current issue of *JOLCEL*. The other contributions are "Controversial Topics in Literature and Education: Hrotswitha and Donatus on Terence's Rapes" by Chrysanthi Demetriou (pp. 2–22) and "The Meaning and Use of *fabula* in the *Dialogus creaturarum moralizatus*" by Brian Møller Jensen (pp. 24–41). The response piece is "Latin Education and Classical Reception: the Minor Genres" by Rita Copeland (pp. 62–66).

Introite, pueri! The School-Room Performance of George Buchanan's Latin *Medea* in Bordeaux*

LUCY C.M.M. JACKSON

Durham University

ABSTRACT

Performances of Latin drama had become a widespread phenomenon in European schools by the middle of the sixteenth century. The potential for these dramas to have a significant impact on the students who performed or watched these plays was recognised at the time. Memories of participating in these performances would linger in the pupils' minds, as Michel de Montaigne clearly shows in his own reminiscences of his leading roles undertaken at the Collège de Guyenne in Bordeaux. The lessons learnt in performance were thought to be thoroughly complementary to the program of classroom Latin education across Europe. But learning in performance, this article contends, also yielded crucially different lessons as well, not least concerning the manipulation of sentiment through rhetoric and the often violently differing results in action. In this article I examine the 1543 production of George Buchanan's translation of Euripides' *Medea* from four angles: its 'Greekness', the Latinity of the translation, the pedagogical context for the performance, and the medium of performance itself. Using these four angles to create a matrix of meaning, I argue that Latin translations such as Buchanan's warrant greater appreciation than has been awarded them so far, and demonstrate the potential that lies within these understudied texts.

***

In 1543, a local audience gathered in Bordeaux to witness a school play—a production of Euripides' *Medea*.[1] This production was to be performed in Latin, and the translator responsible for the text was the Scottish humanist George Buchanan, a scholar renowned

* This article was written during a Leverhulme Early Career Fellowship and I would like to acknowledge with gratitude the support of the Leverhulme Trust.

[1] At the end of the text of the 1544 Paris edition, published by Vascosan, we find printed: "Acta fuit Burdegalæ an M.D.XLIII."

for his fluency and facility in both Latin and ancient Greek.[2] The play's cast was made up of students from the Collège de Guyenne and the audience would have included humanist poets and scholars such as Elie Vinet and Gentien Hervet who worked and taught alongside Buchanan. Moreover, this school was presided over by André de Gouveia—"le plus grand principal de France."[3] The text of Buchanan's play was to be published a year later by Michel Vascosan in Paris, along with Euripides' *Hecuba* and *Iphigenia at Aulis* translated into Latin by Erasmus (first published in 1506).[4] Buchanan's *Medea* later appeared in many editions of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, both in collections of his works and in anthologies of Greek tragedies.[5]

Although the text of Buchanan's *Medea* would go on to have a long and varied life with a range of readerships, there are a number of things that make this production in 1540s Bordeaux unusual and significant. First, the Medea in Euripides' play cuts quite a different figure to the more familiar character depicted in Ovid and Seneca,[6] or the versions of her in medieval literature.[7] Although multiple editions of Euripides' Greek play and a few Latin translations of the work were already in existence (or were coming into existence) as Buchanan began work on his version,[8] the realisation of Medea as she would appear on the stage of Bordeaux, would have, to this local audience, marked out a distinct and different territory. Perhaps most striking in performance (and Buchanan's Latin translation is the first recorded *performance* of Euripides' *Medea* in the modern era) would be the fact that her skill as a sorceress, in Euripides' version, fades before her manifest rhetorical and persuasive skill. In light of Buchanan's wide and influential network of humanist contacts, his translation, and this production, marks an important beginning for the wider dissemination of this different Euripidean Medea. The second feature of this noteworthy production is the quality of Buchanan's Latin. Not only was the text fluent, literary, and rich in poetic references, it also aimed at rejuvenating the dramatic and ethical potential of Euripides' play through its sophisticated use of intertextual allusion. Refracted or 'unintentional' meanings, meanings shaped by contemporary scholastic and religious debate, would have been liberated through the play's new Latinate form.[9]

2 Ian D. McFarlane, *Buchanan* (London: Duckworth, 1981), 31–34; Philip Ford, *George Buchanan. Prince of Poets* (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University, 1982), 1–2.

3 See Michel de Montaigne, *Essais*, in *Oeuvres completes*, ed. Albert Thibaudet and Maruice Rat (Paris: Gallimard, 1962), I, 26, p. 176. For Bordeaux as "un centre provincial de l'humanisme" between 1530–50, see Robert Boutruche and Jacques Bernard, *Bordeaux de 1453 à 1715* (Bordeaux: Fédération Historique du Sud-Ouest, 1966), 186–211.

4 Michael Vascosan, ed., *Hecuba, et Iphigenia in Aulide, Euripides tragoediae, in latinum tralatae Erasmo Roterdamo interprete. Medea eiusdem, Georgio Buchanano Scoto interprete* (Paris, 1544).

5 See McFarlane, *Buchanan*, 498–500, 509–10, which lists 24 editions containing the text of Buchanan's *Medea*. On some of the different receptions of Buchanan's plays more generally, see Hannah Crawforth and Lucy Jackson, "Greek Tragedy and the University Stage: Buchanan and Euripides," in *Gathering Force*, ed. Kristen Poole and Lauren Shohet (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019), 340–55.

6 Lucius Annaeus Seneca, *Hercules, Trojan Women, Phoenician Women, Medea, Phaedra*, ed. and trans. John G. Fitch (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002).

7 See Ruth Morse, *The Medieval Medea* (Cambridge: Boydell & Brewer, 1996), 185–236.

8 Ancient Greek editions: *Tragoediae Quattuor: Medea, Hippolytus, Alcestis, Andromache*, ed. Janus Lascaris (Florence: Laurentius de Alopa, 1495); *Euripidis tragoediae septendecim*, ed. Aldus Manutius (Venice: Aldus, 1503); Latin translations: *Euripidis … tragoediae XVIII nunc primum … per D. Camillum et Latio donatae et in lucem editae* (Basel: Winter, 1541), *Medea Euripidis Petreio Tiara Frisio interprete* (Antwerp: Crom, 1543).

9 Of relevance to Buchanan's *Medea*, but foregrounded more deliberately in two of his other plays (*Jephthes* [1554] and *Alcestis* [1556]), would have been the contemporary debate about "the vow," and whether clergy should be expected to adhere to their vows of celibacy or be allowed to marry and have children.

Such refractions would depend on the audience for the production, and the schoolroom context makes for a third significant feature of the 1543 performance. Students at the college were primed to pay attention to the shape and quality of the Latin and the rhetorical strategies deployed (a dominant concern in most school curricula at the time), which invites closer scrutiny of the text as it models an ideal form of Latinity. But these students would also have experienced a play like this as a synthesis of their entire educational experience, formal and informal, combining rhetoric, a familiarity with classical (and those we might now term 'post-classical') authors, and, most importantly, the exploration of ethical action together with these worthy words. This was a time when classical learning and scholarship were under intense scrutiny, and the consequences for any perceived mis-step were severe. In the 1530s, the establishment of Royal Readerships in Paris prompted a swift and damning response from the orthodox Sorbonne, which sought to minimise the importance of knowing Greek and Hebrew for asserting theological authority. Scholars who "attached greater value to their philologically based interpretation of biblical texts than to the Vulgate" were duly arraigned before the French *Parlement* in January 1534.[10] Such scrutiny would have been felt at the schoolroom level too, adding a dangerous significance to any engagement with a Greek text, albeit one in Latinate form.

The fourth and final element of interest in this particular production is the very fact that the play was, indeed, performed, as opposed to being solely read and circulated as a text. The performance of Latin plays (those of Plautus and Terence, but also newly composed plays)[11] was a fairly common practice across Europe, and granted students the opportunity to put into action the performative aspects of rhetorical training, memorisation (*memoria*) and delivery (*pronuntiatio* or *actio*) in particular.[12] However, while neo-Latin dramatic performance abounded, including at the *Collège de Guyenne* itself, performances of Greek tragedies in Latin remained scarce.[13] The combination of the unusual dramatic and ethical content in Buchanan's Medea with public performance of those ambiguous, at times thoroughly disturbing, ethical discussions prompts some intriguing questions concerning the wider impact of such performances on both performers and audience.

All four of these aspects interlink with one another. The style and forms of the Latin used were shaped by and for the purpose of teaching students how to express themselves in Latin with ease and elegance. The Greek content of the play was enhanced and informed by the interest in Greek authors and the study of many Greek texts that was ongoing in Bordeaux during this time.[14] The understanding of the allusions and poetry of the Latin text, as well as its 'Greekness,' would have depended on the knowledge of the audience present for that performance in 1543. In the following exploration of these four angles, I do not propose four discrete ways of reading this, or any, performance of a Latin translation of Greek drama.

[10] See McFarlane, *Buchanan*, 39–40.

[11] Titus Maccius Plautus, *The Merchant, the Braggart Soldier, the Ghost, the Persian*, ed. and trans. Wolfgang de Melo (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011); Publius Terence, *Phormio, the Mother-in-law, the Brothers*, ed. and trans. John Barsby (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001).

[12] For the widespread phenomenon of neo-Latin dramatic performances see: Jan Bloemendal, "Receptions and Impact: Early Modern Latin Drama, Its Effect on the Audience and Its Role in Forming Public Opinion," in *Neo-Latin Drama: Forms, Functions, Receptions*, ed. Jan Bloemendal and Philip Ford (Hildesheim, Olms: Noctes Neolatinae, 2008), 7–22; Jonathan Walker and Paul D. Streufert, *Early Modern Academic Drama* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2008); Jan Bloemendal and Howard B. Norland, *Neo-Latin Drama and Theatre in Early Modern Europe* (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2013).

[13] For performances of Latin plays based (possibly or probably) on Greek models see Tanya Pollard, *Greek Tragic Women on Shakespearean Stages* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 270–77.

[14] See, e.g., Ian D. McFarlane, "French Humanism," in *Humanism in France at the End of the Middle Ages and in the Early Renaissance*, ed. Anthony H. T. Levi (New York: Manchester University, 1970), 295–319.

Rather, I provide an example of how one can create a matrix of meaning, and one that goes beyond current models for analysing these important translated texts.

Analysis of Latin translations of Greek plays such as Buchanan's *Medea*, and the study of neo-Latin drama more generally, has tended to focus on the impact the *text* had on its readers. Performances of these texts, however, create new layers of meaning. A precise grasp of what these meanings were and the immediate impact of a performance in the sixteenth century, as with all performance, is impossible.[15] And yet, however difficult it is to gauge, we are still able to recognise the dynamics at play when a text is publicly performed, particularly in terms of bringing contemporary political and social concerns, which were brought into the performance space with the audience, into sharp focus. These four aspects of the 1543 performance of *Medea*—its uncommon portrayal of the central character and the play's dramaturgical content, its rich and suggestive Latin, its pedagogically primed audience, its potential to elicit sharper reactions through the medium of performance—make this production worthy of closer inspection.

One possible reason for the underappreciation of the production's significance is the fact that Buchanan's translation stays very close to Euripides' Greek play. Such apparent 'faithfulness' to the Greek has allowed Buchanan's artful translation, and the intervention in meaning that comes with any act of translation, to fade from view. Following the welcome rise of Translation Studies and increased familiarity with the range of theories and approaches that can be deployed in analysing translations and translators, an appreciation of such literary Latin translations in the sixteenth century has begun to grow over the past two decades. [16]

However, current studies of Latin translations in the sixteenth century still lag far behind those of original works in Latin or European vernaculars: "too scholarly to receive the attention of literary historians, and too literary to interest the historians of scholarship" noted Paul Botley in 2004.[17] In light of this dearth, still, of scholarship on Latin translations as literary works in their own right, this article aims to foreground the changes Buchanan has made in his dexterous Latin *Medea*. The need to address these changes has become more pressing in recent years, when a number of scholars have been looking to explain the "strange relationship"[18] and subterranean presence of themes and figures from Greek tragedy in the work of authors with limited access (one way or another) to the language of Greek itself.[19] In order to enrich their arguments about the presence of Greek

[15] See Bloemendal, "Receptions and Impact," 18–20; for a broader treatment of the ephemerality of performance, but the importance of its study nonetheless, see Erika Fischer-Lichte, "Performance as Event — Reception as Transformation," in *Theorising Performance*, ed. Edith Hall and Stephe Harrop (London/New York: Bloomsbury, 2010), 29–42.

[16] Fundamental is Lawrence Venuti, The Translator's Invisibility (London/New York: Routledge, 1995); a recent and wide-ranging overview of Translation Studies can be found in Susan Bassnett, *Translation* (London/New York: Oliver and Boyd, 2014). See also the collection of essays in the special issue by Andrew Taylor, ed., *Neo-Latin and Translation in the Renaissance*, in *The Canadian Review of Comparative Literature / Revue Canadienne de Littérature Comparée* 41, no. 4 (2014).

[17] Paul Botley, *Latin Translation in the Renaissance. The Theory and Practice of Leonardo Bruni, Giannozzo Manetti and Desiderius Erasmus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2004), 1.

[18] Michael Silk, "Shakespeare and Greek Tragedy: Strange Relationship," in *Shakespeare and the Classics*, ed. Charles Martindale and Andrew B. Taylor (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 241–57.

[19] See, for example: Louise Schleiner, "Latinized Greek Drama in Shakespeare's Writing of "Hamlet," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 41, no. 1 (1990): 29–48; Inga-Stina Ewbank, "'Striking Too Short at Greeks': The Transmission of *Agamemnon* to the English Renaissance Stage," in *Agamemnon in Performance 458BCE to AD 2004*, ed. Fiona Macintosh, Pantelis Michelakis, and Edith Hall (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 37–52; Tanya Pollard, "What's Hecuba to Shakespeare?," *Renaissance Quarterly* 65, no. 4 (2012): 1064; the appeal to Latin translations goes at least as far back as the beginning of the twentieth century, see John Churton Collins, *Studies in Shakespeare* (Westminster: A Constable, 1904), v.

tragedy in early modern vernacular traditions, further attention must be paid to the Latinity of the translations they point to as (so far, neutral, if not outright inferior) vehicles for images, themes, and dramaturgy of Greek plays.

The analysis that has been conducted of Buchanan's literary translation of Euripides' *Medea* focuses, in general, on the literary 'borrowings' from and allusions to classical authors.[20] In this article I seek to reassert the contingency of meaning in this translation and the production of 1543 by uniting linguistic, social and cultural factors, and begin to root this translation in a particular historical and social moment. In doing so, I situate this study firmly within classical reception studies, translation studies, and performance studies. Some of the readings I suggest must, perforce, remain theoretical or speculative, but this should not deter us from the exercise of recognising the considerable potential that lies within Buchanan's Latin translation. The aim of this article is to add to our appreciation of the potential range of meanings within this Latin translation. Although tightly focused on this one play, one translation, one audience, and one performance, the readings I give here might be taken as indicative for at least some of the kinds of readings possible in other Latin translations of Greek tragedies. Having seen how these readings contribute to our understanding of the significance of the production, we can turn to the broader question of the place of ancient Greek drama, or literature and culture more generally, within early modern Europe.

The Euripidean *Medea*

The Euripidean Medea differs in two major ways from the collection of characters that made up the myths as they were generally known at the beginning of the fifteenth century. The first difference is the rhetorical brilliance of the figure of Medea. Her intelligence and skill may have been widely accepted, but thanks to the prominent versions of her character in Ovid and Seneca and the preference for tales focusing on her adventures with the Argonauts, her character was defined by her skill as a sorceress. It is important to note that Euripides' Medea relies to a much greater extent than might be expected on her wits and words to achieve her aims. [21] Over the course of the play she must persuade the chorus to keep secret her desire to take vengeance on her faithless husband, Jason, for abandoning her at the prospect of a new marriage in Corinth; she must secure a day's grace from the King of Corinth, Creon; she must then secure a safe haven for herself from Aegeus, who happens to be passing through Corinth just at her time of need; and, lastly, she must argue with herself before finally committing the act of filicide for which she is so infamous. Her use of poison to murder Creon and his daughter is present in the text (translated by Buchanan the first three times as *pharmacum*, a postclassical word, and the latter three times as *venenum*), but is functional and secondary to her immense rhetorical skill. The second facet of the Euripidean Medea is the multiplicity of

[20] Peter Sharratt, "*Euripides Latinus*: Buchanan's Use of His Sources," in *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Bononiensis. Proceedings of the Fourth International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies* (Binghamton, NY: Center for Medieval & Early Renaissance Studies, 1985), 613–20; Jean-Fréderic Chevalier, "George Buchanan and the Poetics of Borrowing in the Latin Translation of Euripides' *Medea*," in *George Buchanan: Poet and Dramatist*, ed. Philip Ford and Roger Green (Swansea: Classical Press of Wales, 2009), 183–95, considers Buchanan's classical allusions as well as linguistic and metrical approaches, focusing on lines 271–356; Zoé Schweitzer, "Buchanan, helléniste et dramaturge, interprète d'Euripide (*Medea* et *Alcestis*)," *Études Épistémè: revue de littérature et de civilisation (XVIe-XVIIIe siècle)* 23 (2013): goes much further and considers some of the pedagogical and philosophical goals manifest in the translation.

[21] "[...] the restraint of Euripides in deploying this motif [skill in magic] is noteworthy," see Donald J. Mastronarde, *Medea* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2002), 24–6.

motivations awarded to her actions, by Medea herself and the characters around her: anger, jealousy, and passion are prominent in the Senecan *Medea*, but the Euripidean text includes other rationalisations for Medea's actions: the demands of divine justice, the precepts of a heroic code, and the protection of her children from slaughter at others' hands.

We might make a more general observation of the greater stage time and space awarded to female characters in many Greek tragedies. In the Greek tragic corpus as a whole, female characters frequently provide the meat of a play's conflict, rhetoric, and poetry. The observation is all the more striking when comparison is made with the characters and plots of Senecan dramas, and even the comedies of Plautus and Terence, where women breaking out of their societal constraints, though present (Seneca's *Medea* being an obvious example) are in general few and far between. In light of Erasmus' choices of *Hecuba* and *Iphigenia at Aulis*, a plausible case has been made for the Greeks being viewed as legitimate sources for a different kind of protagonist beyond the relatively restricted gender paradigms of the biblical canon.[22]

These differences take on a greater significance in light of the fact that this play, and indeed the genre of Greek drama, was sought after, certainly by Buchanan himself, precisely because it presented an alternative model of theatre and morality to its sixteenth-century (school) audiences. In discussing his motivations for composing the kinds of plays he did for his schoolroom performers and audiences, he says he does so, "ut earum actione iuventutem ab allegoriis, quibus tam Gallia vehementer se oblectabat, ad imitationem veterum, qua posset, retraheret."[23] What is focused on by Buchanan in his recollections, is an anti-allegorical mode which is found readily in Greek tragedies. The awareness of difference was no doubt enhanced by the fact that so many classical Greek texts constituted a pagan 'other', simultaneously a safe haven for scholars to think with and transgressive in their presentation of gods, women, and morality.[24]

More tentatively we might include within Buchanan's desire for a different model of theatre the fact that the conditions for the creation of Attic dramas such as Euripides' *Medea* were geared towards a theatre audience, something that may be seen in the dramaturgy of the work (and, again, might be contrasted with the Senecan form of tragedy). Too much weight cannot be placed on this difference in original dramaturgical context, but it adds to our picture of what it was, aside from the words themselves, that Buchanan was translating, i.e., not words alone but a new model of theatre, open, discursive, and ethically ambiguous.

Buchanan's Latin *Medea*

The unusual elements in the Euripidean *Medea* were significant and, indeed, sought after by Buchanan for his dramatic projects in Bordeaux. But these differences within the Greek play could not be preserved in their entirety in a Latin translation. Even in the most 'literal' of translations, the frames of reference are shifted so as to imbue translated terms with new meanings drawn from the target language and culture, in this case Latin language and

[22] Schweitzer, "Buchanan," 16; Pollard, *Greek Tragic Women*, 19–20.

[23] "[...] in the hope that by acting in such plays the youth of Bordeaux might be weaned from the allegories then so very popular in France and recalled as far as possible to imitate the models of the ancients." From Buchanan's own account of his life, printed in McFarlane, *Buchanan*, 542. All translations from Latin are my own.

[24] See Carmel McCallum-Barry, "Why Did Erasmus Translate Greek Tragedy?," *Erasmus Studies* 24, no. 1 (2004): 52–70.

culture.[25] While eschewing some of the larger changes made by other translators of Euripides' play (e.g., the Roman dramatist Ennius), Buchanan nevertheless transforms the play through Latinising it.[26] The choices made in translating the Greek, although most seem slight when taken individually, provide a fascinating instance of early modern reception in and of itself, but also, in light of the play's wide public dissemination, will have had a significant impact on how Euripides' Medea was to be received by early modern readers.

Running throughout the text we can identify the places where words with a cultural significance in a Greek context are transmuted or supplemented by elements from Roman life that invite comparison (although not direct equation). When Medea laments offstage her present plight, "*φεῦ φεῦ· θανάτῳ καταλυσαίμαν/ βιοτὰν στυγερὰν προλιποῦσα*" (E.146–47),[27] Buchanan inserts the figures of the Roman Fates (*Parcae*), frequently invoked in Latin poetry, and shifts the first person verb into a second person appeal to these figures: "eheu, longis tristem curis,/ Parcae, miseram abrumpite vitam" (157–58).[28] He introduces the Roman household gods, the Penates, at 846, sharpening and reorienting the meaning of the Greek *δόμοι πατρῷοι* (E.801). Buchanan adds a Roman epithet used of Hecate, *triformis*, to Medea's entreaty to the goddess at 421 (E.397), a choice that activates possible connections with Seneca's Medea (7) and Phaedra (417), where the same address is found and also placed at the beginning of an iambic verse line.[29] The messenger uses a term, familiar from everyday Roman life as depicted in comedy, *gynaeceum* (1196), to describe the women's quarters ("*στέγαι γυναικῶν*" in Euripides' Greek), an elegant translation by virtue of its preservation of a Hellenic flavour (a Latinised form of a Greek word) and presence in Plautus and Terence (a more elegant translation, we might note, than that chosen by Erasmus when faced with the same Greek phrase in the Hecuba).[30] Buchanan's easy use of Latin idiom, e.g., *solum vertere* ("to leave as an exile") (838) for "*ἔξειμι γαίας*," ("I will leave the country") (E.795, a phrase with no particular signification in the Greek),[31] demonstrates how he enriches the Greek text with new cultural and language-specific meaning. The Latin text also displays an awareness of tone in the kinds of Latin used. For example, the messenger speech in Buchanan's text (1188–1290) features a large number of words common in Roman comedy (e.g., *pedisequa* 1226, *eiulare* 1228, *silicernium* 1267), a choice that shapes an audience's engagement with his long narrative through tone and at a crucial point in the play.

All these effects go some way to achieve a 'domesticating' effect, that is, bringing the Greek world of Euripides' play closer to the more familiar Roman world (albeit one that combines over a millennium of Latin-speaking cultures). The recasting of the play in a

[25] An excellent articulation of this is found in Jorge Luis Borges, "Pierre Menard, Author of the *Quixote*," in *Labyrinths: Selected Stories and Other Writings* (New York: New Directions, 1964), 36–44.

[26] See Anthony J. Boyle, "Introduction: Medea in Greece and Rome," *Ramus* 41, nos. 1–2 (2012): 1–32.

[27] "Ah, ah! may I find my rest in death and leave behind my hateful life." Line numbers prefaced with 'E' signal references to Euripides, *Fabulae, Vol. 1: Cyclops; Alcestis; Medea; Heraclidae; Hippolytus; Andromacha; Hecuba*, ed. James Diggle (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984). All others are to Buchanan's Latin in Peter Sharratt and Peter G. Walsh, *George Buchanan Tragedies* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1983), and all translations from the Greek are from David Kovacs, ed. and trans., *Euripides, Cyclops; Alcestis; Medea* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001).

[28] "Ah! You Fates, sever my wretched life, unhappy in its relentless anguish."

[29] Note two other uses of the epithet in Ovid *Met.*7 lines 94 and 177 at two different points in the Medea and Jason story.

[30] See Plautus *Most.* 755, 759, 908 and Terence *Phorm.*862. Erasmus translates this phrase as *spoliorum tentoria* although arguably the use of *tentorium* is more appropriate for the temporary camp in the Hecuba.

[31] Sharratt and Walsh, *George Buchanan Tragedies*, 304, see Lewis and Short B.1.

Roman light, however, is not, and could never have been, complete. The alterity of the central character has already been noted above, and it is tempting to imagine her ethical dissonance with early modern models of morality, framed as pagan 'other.' Small details appear in the language, supporting this 'foreignizing' effect. From inside the house, Medea cries out to Artemis, rather than Diana (170),[32] an address unparalleled among classical Latin authors. The chorus, in their ode to the goddess of love (665–703), invoke not Venus but *Cypris* (668, 671, 681), an appellation for the goddess also not found in classical Latin but, as with the appeal to Artemis, a direct transliteration from the Greek of Euripides. The way the Latin is shaped, too, takes on new forms as Buchanan captures a sense of the Greek. Jean-Frédéric Chevalier demonstrated the depth of his lexical engagement with the Greek language, showing where Buchanan has taken a single word, the rare adjective *σκύθρωπος* (E.271, 'gloomy'), and mined its meanings to create the Latin phrase, used by Creon of Medea, "torva vultu taetrico" ("scowling with sullen face") (291). Such a phrase opens up resonances with Euripides' *Hippolytus*, *Alcestis*, *Phoenissae*, Martial, and Seneca, all of which work to foreshadow the outcome of the play.[33] A highly poeticised tone is created through the inclusion of recondite Latin vocabulary (e.g., *circumrotari*, 1230) which, while not 'foreignizing,' does work in concert with other effects that distance the world of the play from that of the audience. Finding these unusual terms, or creating new Latin terms (e.g., *perpetratrix* 1172) and offering them up for students of Latin must have contributed to the kind and quality of Latin used (or aspired to) by the students, creating a lasting standard for their Latinity.[34]

The combination of domesticating and foreignizing effects in Buchanan's Latin translation would have been clear, too, in the poetic rhythms deployed. Buchanan seems to have paid very close attention to the rhythms of the Greek text and sought to mirror them in the construction of his Latin verse. Although iambic *senarii* are expected in the speech of Roman drama, it is significant that Buchanan opts to render the spoken verse in iambic trimeter, the difference between the two identifiable and audible through an avoidance of 'resolution' (that is, the use of two short syllables where a long might stand).[35] This approach to the spoken metre illustrates amply Buchanan's attention to the multiple aspects of translation beyond the linguistic alone.[36] More than this, his pursuit of Greek rather than the standard Horatian models of prosody signals a commitment more generally to providing an alternative model of drama and of poetry for his students.[37]

The small shifts in vocabulary and word choice render some considerable alterations in terms of characterisation in the play. We saw above how unusually even-handed Euripides is in the presentation of Medea—she is not out of her mind, nor controlled by dark and supernatural forces in contrast to, for example, her presentation in Seneca. We can see a tendency in Buchanan's translation, however, to elide this openness of Medea's rationale. For example, when Medea tells the chorus of her now-formed plan to murder her children (834–37), Buchanan chooses the verb *mactare*, used of general slaughter (e.g., in *Aeneid* 10.413) to be sure, but also redolent with religious and sacrificial overtones. Such a choice lends a grandiosity to Medea's perception of her actions in Buchanan's translation, something

[32] "O magna Themi atque Artemi sancta" ("Oh mighty Themis and holy Artemis").

[33] Chevalier, "Poetics of Borrowing," 186–88.

[34] Ibid., 192, frames this as a conscious project of Buchanan's.

[35] Sharratt and Walsh, *George Buchanan Tragedies*, 335, do not highlight this difference, labelling the verses as *senarii*—a not incorrect label, but one that obscures a Greek aural effect in Buchanan's Latin.

[36] See Chevalier, "Poetics of Borrowing," 183–84 for analysis of the Latin iambic trimeter.

[37] Ford, *Prince of Poets*, 36.

which is not evoked in the Greek verb of Euripides, *κατακτείνω* (E.792).[38] Similarly Medea's judgement a few lines later of her abandonment of her home in Euripides is that she made a mistake (*ἡμάρτανον*, E.800), but Buchanan opts for the Latin *insanii* (845). Within such choices creep the moral and social attitudes of Buchanan's day, as well as already-formed impressions of her character gained from his wide reading of other texts.

There is a temptation to link this altered presentation specifically to the influence of Seneca and his portrayal of the Colchian. The stunning image of Medea rejoicing in all her crimes that we find in Seneca's play, and especially her use of the verb *iuvare* four times in as many lines,[39] lies close behind Buchanan's rendition of the Greek Medea's line "*λύει δ' ἄλγος, ἢν σὺ μὴ 'γγελᾷ*" (E.1362) as "Modo ne dolentem irrideas, iuvat dolor" (1430).[40] It is interesting that Sharratt and Walsh in their note on this line assert–incorrectly–that Buchanan has misunderstood the Greek here, so marked is the counter-intuitive sentiment Medea speaks here.[41] Buchanan's translation quite correctly builds on and hones this typically Euripidean declaration of pain being a pleasure in certain circumstances, shifting Medea's feelings from release in this pain to positive delight.

Seneca clearly hovers in the foreground at this point in the text. And yet, as some scholars have noted, there is less Seneca than expected woven into Buchanan's language and imagery.[42] Such an expectation might be mediated when we note that Erasmus, too, in no way reshaped Greek tragedy translations in a Senecan mould.[43] We should be sensitive to any temptation to see Seneca as the only obvious and inviting model for humanist scholars writing drama in the first half of the sixteenth century. This seems particularly true for Buchanan who, as we have seen, draws out elements from Euripides' Greek that go against the prevailing dramatic forms, rooted in Roman dramatic practice.

We are better served acknowledging as full a range of intertexts as possible, rather than pinning Buchanan reductively to Senecan 'influence.' Virgil, Cicero, Plautus, Ovid, and many others provide just as much material for the Scotsman's intertextual weavings. Reading Ovid's account of a young Medea (*Met.* VII.19–21) alongside Buchanan's version of the last lines in her great self-deliberation speech (1026–1129), we see how allusion can work in tandem with the tendencies already apparent in the translator's linguistic choices, in this case how the remarkable self-possession of Euripides' heroine is undermined in Buchanan's text. Although the final lines of Medea's speech are often reduced and misinterpreted as straightforwardly setting passion against reason (with passion winning out), we should note that the meaning of the Greek here (E.1078–80) is a good deal more ambiguous; there is too much in Medea's speeches elsewhere in the play that demonstrates her absolute command of reason to allow for such a reductive interpretation.[44] Buchanan, as he does elsewhere, downplays her agency in his translation: where Euripides' Medea says she will dare to do such evils ("*οἷα τολμήσω κακά*" E.1078), Buchanan's distances herself a little, saying that she sees how wicked a deed it is that will be carried out (1127). But the echoes from Ovid strengthen the subversion of

38 See 399 where she uses the same verb of her three initial intended victims, Creon, Glauce, and Jason.

39 "Medea nunc sum: crevit ingenium malis./ *iuvat*, *iuvat* rapuisse fraternum caput,/artus *iuvat* secuisse et arcano patrem/ spoliasse sacro, *iuvat* in exitium senis/ armasse natas. quaere materiam, *dolor*," my emphasis. Seneca, *Medea*, 910–14. See Schweitzer, "Buchanan," 11–13.

40 "The pain is worthwhile if you cannot mock me" (Greek); "But if you cannot mock me in my grief, then grief is a delight" (Latin). For further Senecan concepts in Buchanan's plays, see Helen Slaney, *The Senecan Aesthetic: A Performance History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 48–49.

41 Euripides, *Medea*, ed. Donald J. Mastronarde (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), n. *ad loc.*

42 Chevalier, "Poetics of Borrowing," 183.

43 Erika Rummel, *Erasmus as a Translator of the Classics* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1985), 31.

44 Euripides, *Medea*, 393–97.

Medea's agency in her crime.[45] By connecting two points in Medea's story, her first sight of Jason and her love-induced decision to help him as told in Ovid, and her decision, several homicides later, to murder her own children, the maturation of her criminal mind and action is diminished. The presence in both Latin texts of the opposition of passion and reason (*cupido* and *mens* in Ovid, *furor* and *ratio* in Buchanan), then, mutually reinforce this picture of an emotionally-driven character. At other points, however, the setting side by side of Greek source and Latin intertext provokes new and suggestive philosophical and ethical questions. Chevalier has explored how a fresh take on the question of 'envy' (*invidentia*) in the public sphere, encompassing Virgil, Dante, Cicero, and the historian Florus, is offered by Buchanan's reshaping of a line in Medea's initial speech to the Corinthian women.[46] Such passages lend themselves as starting points for the kinds of formal or informal discussions amongst pupils and audiences that the humanist education prized so highly.

The act of translating Euripides' Greek in Latin did, in the ways gestured to above, transform the play as a whole, either setting the action in the cultures summoned by the cosmopolitan language of Latin, or heightening a sense of alterity in certain elements such as the gods or the poetry of the language itself, or inviting different kinds of conversations about ethical or philosophical concepts through the allusions, signalled at verbal and imagistic levels, to a range of other Latin authors. A full account of these changes would take up considerably more space, but the recognition that the text is anything but a neutral vehicle for 'a Greek play' is nevertheless valuable in and of itself. How much of the richness offered by this translation would be appreciated depends, as always, on the audience and/or reader, and it is to this pedagogical context that we turn now.

Pedagogical Contexts

We are fortunate enough to have a fairly accurate guide as to what was on the syllabus at the *Collège de Guyenne* around the time that Buchanan was teaching there and producing plays. In Elie Vinet's published account of the teaching and texts used at the school, we see the unsurprising choices of Cicero, Terence, and Ovid featuring prominently, as well as a focus on verse composition, taught using the popular text book, Despauterius' *Ars Versificatoria*.[47] Only in the upper two classes would pupils read more widely: Virgil, Lucan, Persius, Quintilian, Justin, Eutropius, Livy, and others. Seneca, we should note, was only taught to the highest class at the school. This serves to show how even amongst the students in the audience, the appreciation of some of the allusions noted above would have been varied. In terms of linguistic resonances, many students could have identified the adjective *anxiferae* used by the Chorus (1358) as typically Ciceronian, and the same for the verb *exaggerare*, used by Jason (552), although those in the upper classes would have seen it also in Quintilian. Only these upper orders, too, might have caught the Virgilian echoes in "ineluctabile fatum" (386, "unavoidable fate," see *Aen*.8.334) or "quo nos trahit fatum, sequamur" (1109–11, "Let us follow where fate draws us," see *Aen*.5.709: "nate dea, quo fata trahunt retrahuntque, sequamur"),[48] or a moment of Horace in Jason's use of *blaterare* (475, see *Sat*.2.7.35). And on the level of more sweeping parallels, the third *ordo*, who would have read the *Metamorphoses*, could have appreciated the dissonance between the young Medea depicted at the beginning

[45] For these echoes see Schweitzer, "Buchanan," 9–10.

[46] Chevalier, "Poetics of Borrowing," 189–92.

[47] See Louis Massebieau, *Schola Aquitanica. Programme d'études du Collège de Guyenne au XVI siecle* (Paris: Libr. Ch. Delagrave, 1886).

[48] "Goddess-born, let us follow where the Fates, in their ebb and flow, draw us."

of book seven and the powerful, mature Medea in Euripides' play. Few students are likely to have heard the echoes of Seneca's Medea where they can be found in Buchanan's text.

The general orientation of the curriculum towards the teaching of rhetoric puts a further, important frame around the experience of this particular play. While many (if not most) neo-Latin dramas sought to provide rhetorical exempla to enrich the performer's grasp of the construction and performance of persuasive speech, the entirety of the dramatic action in Euripides' play is propelled by Medea's rhetorical skill. Such a showcase of ability and strategy recasts Medea as, in this respect, a thoroughly positive exemplum; a pedagogical paradigm, almost. The awfulness of her murderous acts recedes within such a frame, where rhetoric is her primary occupation and the audience's prime concern. The concern with speech and persuasiveness is already present in Euripides' Greek, but translating such sentiments into Latin, the undisputed language of eloquent disquisition, praise, or appeal in the first half of the sixteenth century (and hearing them amongst peers aware of the expediency of such skill) adds a sharpness, a (to their ears) modern frisson to the drama.

Medea's speech to Creon (313–39) is a beautiful exemplar for students of rhetoric, as she tackles the charges levelled against her by recasting the negative reaction to her reputation (*fama*) as jealousy (325),[49] as opposed to justified horror at her prior acts of betrayal, fratricide and incitement to murder. But the lesson is made more explicit through Creon's reaction to it and his explicit denunciation of the 'specious and alluring' words and techniques he knows he has just heard (340).[50] Other such meta-commentary on the play's exploration and exposition of rhetorical skill are recurrent: Medea's insistence on clarity (498);[51] Jason's *captatio benevolentiae* at the beginning of his defence against the (justified) charges laid by Medea (548);[52] the chorus' verdict on the excellence of Jason's speech, but his failure to obscure his guilt (609);[53] Medea's intention to speak winning words (819).[54] Set in a context where the formation of speech in Latin that was excellent, persuasive, flattering if necessary, successful where possible, was an overarching goal and daily objective for which the *Medea* offers a very rich, if peculiar (in our eyes) prospect.

The didactic aim of this production is likely to have been dominated by the potential for practical examples of rhetorical success or failure, and discussion of why those examples succeeded or failed. But the question of what ethical lessons might be drawn from the play must also have been at issue, although we can be fairly certain that while exemplary in terms of rhetorical skill, Medea could hardly have been viewed as any kind of positive ethical model. The choice to translate a play with a protagonist like Medea is, in many ways, a surprising one, as Buchanan himself obliquely acknowledges in his preface to his other translation of a Greek play, *Alcestis*.[55] There he assures Princess Margaret, his dedicatee, that "parricidii vero et veneficii et reliquorum quibus aliae tragoedia plenae sunt scelerum nulla prorsus hic mentio."[56] There is something important here in the choice of so dubious a set of figures as Medea and Jason, which speaks to the kind of education offered by the Collège de Guyenne and the way these kinds of Greek texts were received more generally by humanists.

The inclusion of authors that provided alternatives to the dominant ethical models

[49] "[P]erita cum sim, hos urit invidentia" ("since I am skilled, they burn with envy").

[50] "[S]peciosa sunt haec blandaque auribus" ("these words are beautiful and easy on the ears").

[51] "[E]t primum, ut a primis initiis ordiar" ("first, since I shall begin from the very beginning").

[52] "Me, ut video, oportet eloquendi esse haud rudem" ("I see I must speak eloquently, not rough and ready").

[53] "Haec pulchre, Iason, perpolita oratio est" ("This is, Jason, a beautifully polished speech").

[54] "[O]ratione blandiore colloquar" ("I shall speak a very soothing speech").

[55] See n. 8 above, however, for other editors and translators who had been drawn to the figure of Medea.

[56] "[T]here will be no mention beyond this point of parricide and poisoning and of all the other wickedness with which other tragedies are filled," Sharratt and Walsh, *George Buchanan Tragedies*, 211 (lines 6–7).

exemplified in Christian texts and the couching of these novel ethical models in new forms (classically structured drama) was central to the humanistic project, particularly in early sixteenth-century Europe.[57] Audiences at this time were not, it seems, invited to condemn or approve of the pagan material offered up by Euripides in any straightforward way. Rather, the presentation of dubious ethical exempla in the forms of Jason and Medea would have chafed against contemporary Christian conventions; the results of this productive friction for the broader reception of Medea, and Greek tragedy as a whole, as far as such Latin translations as Buchanan's go, are still waiting to be uncovered.[58] The fact that such dubious exempla were no cause for undue concern, and in a pedagogical context at that, speaks to the atmosphere of the time, when the production of a play such as this was drawing on and feeding into a vibrant exchange of ideas and questions, both literary and religious. The school context for this production in 1543 was intimately linked with the larger context of scholarly activity taking place in and around Bordeaux. Buchanan himself was part of a network of scholars who lived in or near Bordeaux, including Julius Caesar Scaliger and Nicolas de Grouchy (titans in the field of Aristotelian scholarship),[59] and fellow dramatist Marc-Antoine Muret, often regarded, together with Buchanan in fact, as one of the founding fathers of French drama.

The significance of Buchanan's dissonant ethical models in the *Medea* comes all the more clearly into focus when we note that it would be another five years until the publication of Robortello's influential commentary on Aristotle's *Poetics* in 1548 and the beginning of a more widespread discussion and dissemination of the description of tragedy's ethical impact in that work. Buchanan's *Medea* stands as a rare example of drama in Latin thoroughly (although far from completely) drawn from Greek models and apparently independent of the Horatian-influenced Aristotelian precepts that would so critically define the reception of Greek drama in the second half of the century and beyond.[60] The potential at this moment with broader, humanistic discussions both in and out of the classroom provide a further rich context for any reading of the 1543 production.

Potential in Performance

Remembering that the text of the play alone is "like a musical score" brings us to the fourth and final aspect of this production's significance: its performance.[61] The humanist scholars of the sixteenth century were acutely aware of the difference in impact a performance might have to reading the text alone or studying it seated in the classroom. This commitment was made manifest in the statutes of universities and colleges across Europe that set down requirements for at least one performance a year.[62] The reformers Luther and Melanchthon valued the performance of drama for its ability to entertain, and its consequent appeal as a vehicle for

[57] This theme is identified in many of the chapters in T. C. Earle and Catarina Fouto, *The Reinvention of Theatre in Sixteenth-Century Europe: Traditions, Texts and Performance* (Leeds: Legenda, 2014).

[58] The monograph by Heavey Katherine, *The Early Modern Medea: Medea in English Literature, 1558-1688* (Hampshire/New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), is excellent, but focuses on English-language instantiations of the character with little space given to Latin texts. See also Pollard, *Greek Tragic Women*, 43–88 for the impact of Greek models (transmitted via Latin and vernaculars) in English contexts.

[59] McFarlane, "French Humanism," 296, 299–300.

[60] See Bruce R. Smith, *Ancient Scripts and Modern Experience on the English Stage, 1500–1700* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988), 12–58.

[61] Bloemendal, "Receptions and Impact," 15.

[62] At the Collège de Guyenne, it seems to have been more "custom" (*consuetudo*) than requirement, see McFarlane, *Buchanan*, 542; on Petrus Ramus' counter-cultural resistance to the academic drama, see Walter J. Ong, "A Ramist Translation of Euripides," *Manuscripta* 8, no. 1 (1964): 25.

leading audiences to particular views or courses of action, perhaps even more effectively than sermons and sermonising.[63] Buchanan himself writes of the positive experience of producing such plays for his students in the dedicatory preface to his translation of *Alcestis*: "actio enim rerum sermone et spiritu paene animate acrius quam nuda praecepta sensus impellit, et facilius in animos influit et illabitur; atque ubi illapsa fuerit, firmius haeret et quasi radices agit."[64] The practice of performance, and its ennobling potential for those who participated, would be vigorously defended by the next generation of humanist writers, including one of the colleges most famous alumni, Michel de Montaigne: "et ay veu nos Princes s'y adonner depuis en personne, à l'exemple d'aucuns des anciens, honnestement et louablement. Il estoit loisible mesme d'en faire mestier aux gens d'honneur en Grece: *Aristoni tragico actori rem aperit: huic et genus et fortuna honesta erant; nec ars, quia nihil tale apud Graecos pudori est, ea deformabat*."[65] William Gager was to highlight the ethical training that came with the performance of such academic dramas, and the opportunity afforded to pupils to inhabit that language, to test and try their own voices and opinions, and their own approaches to moral questions or potential actions: "to trye what mettell is in evrye one, and of what disposition thay are of; wherby never any one amongst us, that I knowe was made the worse, many have byn much better."[66]

We are lucky enough to have a hint of the resilient impression made by Buchanan's plays in performance, along with others that were performed around the same time, in Montaigne's recollections. He recalls playing "les premiers personnages" in the tragedies of Buchanan, Guerente, and Muret and, as we just saw, testified to the "louabilité" of such performance. And while Montaigne did not seem to have quoted Greek tragedians in his writings,[67] attempts have been made to trace the impact of a Greek (but not Aristotelian) model of tragic character or *ethe*.[68] This is but one small example we happen to have some evidence for, but we do well to keep in mind the potential of performance in general to shape and inform, at both conscious and unconscious levels, the world views of those in the audience.

The fact of performance will also have sharpened and heightened the moments where the distinctions between the world of the play and the world of the actors and audience, sometimes quite suddenly, collapse. The physical space where the play was performed may have laid some important groundwork. It is likely that the largest space in the school would have been used for the production, the room known as the 'aula,' a room large enough to house the most numerous class, the ninth *ordo*. In his description of this space, Vinet on two occasions compares it to a theatre and, indeed, says that it was commonly referred to

[63] See *Epistola de legendis Tragoediis et Comoediis* (written in 1545) in Philip Melanchton, *Opera quae supersunt omnia*, ed. Karl Gottlieb Bretschneider (Schwetschke: Halis Saxonum, 1834–60), 319; see also Bloemendal, "Receptions and Impact," 19.

[64] "For a performance, almost given a soul with its dialogues and liveliness, stimulates the senses more vividly than bare rules do, and more easily it flows into one's mind and inspires it. Plus, when it gets taken in, it sticks more firmly and acts like a 'root'." Sharratt and Walsh, *George Buchanan Tragedies*, 211 (lines 17–20).

[65] "And I have since seen our Princes take part in it in person, following the example of some of the ancients, honorably and commendably. It was even praiseworthy for persons of honor to make a profession of it in Greece: 'He disclosed the matter to the tragic actor Ariston. This man was worthy both in family and in fortune; nor did his art spoil this worthiness, since nothing of this kind is considered shameful among the Greeks'" Montaigne, *Essais*, I, 26, 176 B (quoting Livy).

[66] Quoted in Frederick S. Boas, *University Drama in the Tudor Age* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914), 235–36.

[67] John R. C. Martyn, "Montaigne and George Buchanan," *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 26 (1977): 140.

[68] Hervé-Thomas Campagne, "Tragic *Ethe* in Montaigne's *Essais*," in *"Revelations of Character": Ethos, Rhetoric and Moral Philosophy in Montaigne*, ed. Corinne Noirot-Maguire and Valerie M. Dionne (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2007), 87.

as "the Theatre" ("quod et veterum theatra quodammodo refert, et ideo Theatrum vulgo dicitur").[69] In such an environment, moments in the play such as the Nurse's call to Medea's children—"Introite, pueri…!" ("Come in, children!" 93)—must have suddenly called to mind the speaking of Latin to the boys of the college, and blurred the lines between the world of the play and the experiences of the students in the audience, past and present. There are a considerable number of passages in this play which could have had a similar effect on the audience: discussions of education and its value (315–17);[70] of the nature of the young (52);[71] or the trials of parenthood (the fourth choral ode, esp. 1140–66).

Sharper in performance, too, would be the exempla of the failure of rhetoric, and the need for acts to work with words to achieve the desired goal. As noted above, Medea's initial conciliatory speech to Creon fails, as the king is all too aware of the blandishments and strategies she is using. It is at that point that Medea uses physical action to further her cause; she supplicates him, a gesture not without weight even transposed from a Greek into a Christian context.[72] The scene leads the audience through a range of reactions to both characters, and in doing so offers up possible lessons on persuasive rhetoric (as seen in her exchange with Creon as she tries multiple angles of approach), and also, the limitation of rhetoric alone. Action is also needed.

But the lesson ('deeds and words,' perhaps) does not end here. After Creon has left, the chorus express their pity for Medea, with a near overdose of mournful alliteration (a favourite technique for Buchanan in his translations) and psalmic echoes in the repetition of miser: "infelix mulier, misera malis,/ miseris obnoxia, quo tandem te vertes? […] traxit ineluctabile fatum/ in mare te, Medea, malorum" (381–87).[73] Medea's *volte face* in the lines that follow carries considerable drama in it, as she dismisses their lyric in spoken trimeter before mocking their credulity (392–94). Her energy here is amplified in Buchanan's translation, as a single rhetorical question in the Greek is extended into a series of stinging retorts that undercut the feigned sincerity of her suppliant act: "supplex fuissem? contigissem illi manum?"[74] In this dramatic moment, previous lessons are undercut, and the ways in which deeds and words can be manipulated are laid bare.

Such lessons were not just theoretical, and in an atmosphere of religious upheaval in sixteenth-century France the relevance would have resonated sharply with members of the audience. The students themselves were no doubt aware of the dangerous times they were living in and the risks that could attend a humanist education. The Collège de Guyenne, although at some remove from turbulent Paris, had been visited in 1540 and reformed on account of its overly lenient attitude towards religious instruction and discussion.[75] The vigour of humanist education did not seem to be materially curtailed as a result of this visitation, but the potential danger in discussing a great number of topics would have been discernible even for the school's pupils, and would have been even more clear to the wider audience

69 Massebieau, *Schola Aquitanica. Programme d'études du Collège de Guyenne au XVI siecle*, 10.

70 "[Q]uicunque vera praeditus prudentia est,/ ne disciplinis liberos impensius/ erudiat aequo, nec sapere doceat nimis" ("whoever is endowed with true wisdom,/ may they not educate their children in subjects / more than is reasonable, nor teach them to know too much").

71 "[P]uerilis animus gravibus haud curis patet" ("a boy's mind is not attentive to serious concerns").

72 Leah Whittington, *Renaissance Suppliants* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 1–45.

73 "Unhappy woman, suffering misfortune after misfortune, where will you turn to after this? […] Inescapable fate draws you, Medea, into a sea of ills."

74 "Would I have supplicated him? Would I have touched the hand of that man?"

75 Raymond Lebégue, *La tragédie religieuse en France: Les débuts (1514-1573)* (Paris: H. Champion, 1929), 200.

of the play, not only parents but also members of the general public.[76] It is the awareness of contemporary events, and the specific historical context of this performance of Medea, that raises the fact of its performance to a crucial level for our interpretation. We have already noted above that the character of Medea in Euripides' play develops in ways different from, even dissonant with, earlier models. But beyond this, the themes within the play–the power of speech and of silence, the importance of rhetoric, the dangers of education, and the miseries of exile–would have resonated acutely in 1540s France. Buchanan himself had to leave Scotland in 1538, shortly before he began teaching in Bordeaux, under a cloud of intrigue and accusations of heresy.[77] As he passed through England on his way to France, he was careful about what he said of his travel plans, fearing further suspicion and accusations, and even made it known to some that he was travelling to Germany, to throw any interested parties off the scent.[78] Beyond Buchanan's own personal experiences of exile and intrigue, all of France would have felt the effects of the *Affaires des Placards* in 1534 and the consequent end of conciliatory measures towards Protestants under Francis I. Drama was not deemed innocent of implication in the religious tumult of the period. In the mid-1540s, just after Buchanan's *Medea* was published, two scholars from Antwerp were convicted of heresy for the plays they had written and were sentenced to death.[79] While dangerous suggestions might be voiced in print or thought in the mind, the presence of an audience who are all aware of each other and their present circumstances will always add to the power, and danger, of the fact of performance.

Conclusion

The immediate impact of Buchanan's Medea may be difficult to discern. Although he was once hailed as one of the 'godfathers' of French tragedy, this claim has been qualified in recent times, leaving a question as to just how important his dramatic works as a whole were.[80] But what can be said with some certainty is that the contribution of his plays, especially his Latin translations of tragedy, to the early modern literary world does not conform to current models of understanding of 'influence.' Giacomo Cardinali has posited that what Buchanan does do, is demonstrate that these new kinds of tragedy need not be 'sterile' exercises in literary imitation and, second of all, encourage students to observe the tragedy from within the world of the play.[81] What I have sought to show here is that the *Medea*, by virtue of its pagan Greek otherness, is a persistent counterpoint to the more familiar rhythms and conventions of Roman drama that had and would continue to shape the way in which audiences received drama at the time. It is plays like Buchanan's *Medea* that challenge us to think in more theoretically sophisticated ways when we construe the role of Greek drama in Latin plays in school performances and, of course, in wider European literary production.

[76] See Bloemendal, "Receptions and Impact," 11.

[77] McFarlane, *Buchanan*, 66–77.

[78] James M. Aitken, *The Trial of George Buchanan before the Lisbon Inquisition* (Edinburgh/London: Oliver and Boyd, 1939), 10.

[79] Bloemendal, "Receptions and Impact," 13.

[80] Giacomo Cardinali, "George Buchanan 'Parrain' De La Tragédie Française? La Fortune De La Production Tragique De George Buchanan Auprès Des Dramaturges De Langue Française (1553–1573)," in Neo-Latin Drama: Forms, Functions, Receptions, ed. J. Bloemendal and P. Ford (Hildesheim: Olms, 2008), Giacomo Cardinali, "George Buchanan 'parrain' de la tragédie française? La fortune de la production tragique de George Buchanan auprès des dramaturges de langue française (1553–1573)," in *Neo-Latin Drama: Forms, Functions, Receptions*, ed. Jan Bloemendal and Philip Ford (Hildesheim: Olms, 2008), 35–36.

[81] "[d]'un point de vue intérieur," ibid., 52.

But how useful is it to focus on an example that, as I have argued at some length, was so unusual in its combination of literary and cultural contexts? An analysis of potential in the Latin translations of Greek drama is, I argue, a useful and worthy exercise, drawing on the data we *do* have concerning a particular production. For it is by addressing this potential that we might begin to recalibrate our approach to evaluating translations such as this. What I have worked through in this article is one method in such a reorientation, incorporating notions of the alternative ethical and dramatic patterns that are central within the world of Euripides' play, the significant shifts that occurs even in the most 'literal' or 'faithful' of translation acts, the more sophisticated pedagogical goals of Latin drama possible at the time, a didacticism that goes beyond the moralizing of other dramas, and the raised stakes that occur in any act of live performance, where politics and ethics can take on a real-life and occasionally dangerous edge.

References

Aitken, James M. *The Trial of George Buchanan before the Lisbon Inquisition*. Edinburgh/London: Oliver and Boyd, 1939.

Bassnett, Susan. *Translation*. London/New York: Oliver and Boyd, 2014.

Bloemendal, Jan. "Receptions and Impact: Early Modern Latin Drama, Its Effect on the Audience and Its Role in Forming Public Opinion." In *Neo-Latin Drama: Forms, Functions, Receptions*, edited by Jan Bloemendal and Philip Ford, 7–22. Hildesheim, Olms: Noctes Neolatinae, 2008.

Bloemendal, Jan, and Howard B. Norland. *Neo-Latin Drama and Theatre in Early Modern Europe*. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2013.

Boas, Frederick S. *University Drama in the Tudor Age*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914.

Borges, Jorge Luis. "Pierre Menard, Author of the *Quixote*." In *Labyrinths: Selected Stories and Other Writings*, 36–44. New York: New Directions, 1964.

Botley, Paul. *Latin Translation in the Renaissance. The Theory and Practice of Leonardo Bruni, Giannozzo Manetti and Desiderius Erasmus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2004.

Boutruche, Robert, and Jacques Bernard. *Bordeaux de 1453 à 1715*. Bordeaux: Fédération Historique du Sud-Ouest, 1966.

Boyle, Anthony J. "Introduction: Medea in Greece and Rome." *Ramus* 41, nos. 1–2 (2012): 1–32.

Campagne, Hervé-Thomas. "Tragic *Ethe* in Montaigne's *Essais*." In *"Revelations of Character": Ethos, Rhetoric and Moral Philosophy in Montaigne*, edited by Corinne Noirot-Maguire and Valerie M. Dionne, 85–97. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2007.

Cardinali, Giacomo. "George Buchanan 'parrain' de la tragédie française? La fortune de la production tragique de George Buchanan auprès des dramaturges de langue française (1553–1573)." In *Neo-Latin Drama: Forms, Functions, Receptions*, edited by Jan Bloemendal and Philip Ford, 35–53. Hildesheim: Olms, 2008.

Chevalier, Jean-Fréderic. "George Buchanan and the Poetics of Borrowing in the Latin Translation of Euripides' *Medea*." In *George Buchanan: Poet and Dramatist*, edited by Philip Ford and Roger Green, 183–95. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales, 2009.

Collins, John Churton. *Studies in Shakespeare*. Westminster: A Constable, 1904.

Crawforth, Hannah, and Lucy Jackson. "Greek Tragedy and the University Stage: Buchanan and Euripides." In *Gathering Force*, edited by Kristen Poole and Lauren Shohet, 340–55. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019.

Earle, T. C., and Catarina Fouto. *The Reinvention of Theatre in Sixteenth-Century Europe: Traditions, Texts and Performance*. Leeds: Legenda, 2014.

Euripides. *Fabulae, Vol. 1: Cyclops; Alcestis; Medea; Heraclidae; Hippolytus; Andromacha; Hecuba*. Edited by James Diggle. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.

———. *Cyclops; Alcestis; Medea*. Edited and translated by David Kovacs. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001.

———. *Medea*. Edited by Donald J. Mastronarde. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Euripidis … tragoediae XVIII nunc primum … per D. Camillum et Latio donatae et in lucem editae. Basel: Winter, 1541.

Euripidis tragoediae septendecim. Edited by Aldus Manutius. Venice: Aldus, 1503.

Ewbank, Inga-Stina. "'Striking Too Short at Greeks': The Transmission of *Agamemnon* to the English Renaissance Stage." In *Agamemnon in Performance 458BCE to AD 2004*, edited by Fiona Macintosh, Pantelis Michelakis, and Edith Hall, 37–52. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Fischer-Lichte, Erika. "Performance as Event — Reception as Transformation." In *Theorising Performance*, edited by Edith Hall and Stephe Harrop, 29–42. London/New York: Bloomsbury, 2010.

Ford, Philip. *George Buchanan. Prince of Poets*. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University, 1982.

Katherine, Heavey. *The Early Modern Medea: Medea in English Literature, 1558-1688*. Hampshire/New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

Lebégue, Raymond. *La tragédie religieuse en France: Les débuts (1514-1573)*. Paris: H. Champion, 1929.

Lewis, Charlton T., and Charles Short. *A Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1879.

Martyn, John R. C. "Montaigne and George Buchanan." *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 26 (1977): 132–42.

Massebieau, Louis. *Schola Aquitanica. Programme d'études du Collège de Guyenne au XVI siecle*. Paris: Libr. Ch. Delagrave, 1886.

McCallum-Barry, Carmel. "Why Did Erasmus Translate Greek Tragedy?" *Erasmus Studies* 24, no. 1 (2004): 52–70.

McFarlane, Ian D. "French Humanism." In *Humanism in France at the End of the Middle Ages and in the Early Renaissance*, edited by Anthony H. T. Levi, 295–319. New York: Manchester University, 1970.

———. *Buchanan*. London: Duckworth, 1981.

Medea Euripidis Petreio Tiara Frisio interprete. Antwerp: Crom, 1543.

Melanchton, Philip. *Opera quae supersunt omnia*. Edited by Karl Gottlieb Bretschneider. Schwetschke: Halis Saxonum, 1834–60.

Montaigne, Michel de. *Essais*. In *Oeuvres completes*, edited by Albert Thibaudet and Maruice Rat. Paris: Gallimard, 1962.

Morse, Ruth. *The Medieval Medea*. Cambridge: Boydell & Brewer, 1996.

Ong, Walter J. "A Ramist Translation of Euripides." *Manuscripta* 8, no. 1 (1964): 18–28.

Plautus, Titus Maccius. *The Merchant, the Braggart Soldier, the Ghost, the Persian*. Edited and translated by Wolfgang de Melo. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011.

Pollard, Tanya. "What's Hecuba to Shakespeare?" *Renaissance Quarterly* 65, no. 4 (2012): 1060–93.

———. *Greek Tragic Women on Shakespearean Stages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Rummel, Erika. *Erasmus as a Translator of the Classics*. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1985.

Schleiner, Louise. "Latinized Greek Drama in Shakespeare's Writing of "Hamlet." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 41, no. 1 (1990): 29–48.

Schweitzer, Zoé. "Buchanan, helléniste et dramaturge, interprète d'Euripide (*Medea* et *Alcestis*)." *Études Épistémè: revue de littérature et de civilisation (XVIe-XVIIIe siècle)* 23 (2013): 1–11.

Seneca, Lucius Annaeus. *Hercules, Trojan Women, Phoenician Women, Medea, Phaedra*. Edited and translated by John G. Fitch. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002.

Sharratt, Peter. "*Euripides Latinus*: Buchanan's Use of His Sources." In *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Bononiensis. Proceedings of the Fourth International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies*, 613–20. Binghamton, NY: Center for Medieval & Early Renaissance Studies, 1985.

Sharratt, Peter, and Peter G. Walsh. *George Buchanan Tragedies*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1983.

Silk, Michael. "Shakespeare and Greek Tragedy: Strange Relationship." In *Shakespeare and the Classics*, edited by Charles Martindale and Andrew B. Taylor, 241–57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Slaney, Helen. *The Senecan Aesthetic: A Performance History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Smith, Bruce R. *Ancient Scripts and Modern Experience on the English Stage, 1500–1700*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988.

Taylor, Andrew. "Introduction: The Translations of Renaissance Latin." *The Canadian Review of Comparative Literature / Revue Canadienne de Littérature Comparée* 41, no. 4 (2014).

Terence, Publius. *Phormio, the Mother-in-law, the Brothers*. Edited and translated by John Barsby. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001.

Tragoediae Quattuor: Medea, Hippolytus, Alcestis, Andromache. Edited by Janus Lascaris. Florence: Laurentius de Alopa, 1495.

Vascosan, Michael, ed. *Hecuba, et Iphigenia in Aulide, Euripides tragoediae, in latinum tralatae Erasmo Roterdamo interprete. Medea eiusdem, Georgio Buchanano Scoto interprete*. Paris, 1544.

Venuti, Lawrence. *The Translator's Invisibility*. London/New York: Routledge, 1995.

Walker, Jonathan, and Paul D. Streufert. *Early Modern Academic Drama*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2008.

Whittington, Leah. *Renaissance Suppliants*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

JOLCEL
Journal of Latin Cosmopolitanism and
European Literatures.

Current Contribution

Rita Copeland, "Latin Education and Classical Reception: the Minor Genres," *JOLCEL* 3 (2020): 62–66. DOI: 10.21825/jolcel.vi3.16176.

Note

This contribution is the response piece to a larger dialogue of three articles that form the current issue of *JOLCEL*. The other contributions are "Controversial Topics in Literature and Education: Hrotswitha and Donatus on Terence's Rapes" by Chrysanthi Demetriou (pp. 2–22), "The Meaning and Use of *fabula* in the *Dialogus creaturarum moralizatus*" by Brian Møller Jensen (pp. 24–41) and "*Introite, pueri!* The School-Room Performance of George Buchanan's Latin *Medea* in Bordeaux" by Lucy C.M.M. Jackson (pp. 43–61).

Latin Education and Classical Reception: the Minor Genres

Rita Copeland

University of Pennsylvania

The story of Latin education shares much common ground with classical reception. The two are not interchangeable, and Latin education covers a broader field than classical reception. Classical reception is certainly broad on its own terms: it concerns the assimilation and transformation of ancient Greek and Latin texts and cultural knowledge (here including art, architecture, philosophy, political thought, and natural sciences). But Latin education in the West from late antiquity through the early modern period (and beyond) was the foundation on which reception could be built. Latin education encompassed far more than classicism: theology, the production of new literature, new scientific and philosophical thought, and networks of civil bureaucracy and ecclesiastical administration. Until the middle of the twentieth century and Vatican II, Latin continued to ground theological education long after its role in other fields had faded in favor of modern languages. For more than a millennium Latin was the common linguistic vehicle of post-classical European culture.

Thus classical reception represents only one aspect of Latin education. Schools in the Christian West did not educate students into Latinity in order that they might read the Latin classics, but rather that they might command a scriptural, exegetical, and liturgical inheritance. Yet classical culture was nearly unavoidable. For example, medieval students would have been inducted into Latinity through Donatus' grammar, with its Virgilian and Ciceronian examples, through late antique Bible epics that imitate Virgilian form, and through general moralizing works like the *Disticha Catonis*. Masters during the later Middle Ages and the Renaissance were to rewrite the basic introductory grammars to serve the changing needs of their students, but they continued to teach with the Latin classics even as their dossiers of ancient texts to introduce the language expanded. Even if a renaissance student improved his Latin by reading an author like Catullus, virtually unknown during the long Middle Ages, the relationship to the Latin classics for both medieval and renaissance students was formative before it was aesthetic.

This brings us to a fundamental question: how do we read pedagogical readings of the Latin classics? Or to put it slightly differently: what happens when we read classical reception through a pedagogical lens? That is the question that the three essays in this issue of the *Journal of Latin Cosmopolitanism and European Literatures* set out to explore. Pedagogy has always figured in classical reception studies, but usually as the necessary

background to the largely aesthetic questions that occupy the foreground of reception histories.[1] Reading classical reception in a pedagogical framework redirects our attention to genres usually considered "minor" such as grammatical commentary and translations made for the classroom, or to humble genres such as the *fabula* or the proverb that have suffered from under theorizing despite their ubiquity. As pedagogical forms, such minor and humble genres were the most important vehicles of classical reception. They constituted the basic literary material that all students encountered before advancing to more challenging and sophisticated texts. And for many students who did not advance, such basic genres might represent the totality of their contact with classical antiquity. Thus to bring these genres to the front gives us a vastly different perspective on medieval and renaissance "classicisms. " Through these genres classical Latinity presents itself to us not as a pinnacle of aspiration but as a common tool. This approach brings with it a particular difficulty, that of grasping and defining processes that are dynamic and even volatile. The historical record gives us ample evidence of pedagogical practices and innovations: the copying and dissemination of manuscripts suggesting that later schoolmasters continued to value a particular strategy; the careers (and even renown) of individual schoolmasters; the printing of a compilation containing a pedagogical genre. But tracing the impact of these genres on the students who were their audiences is surprisingly difficult. The odd reminiscence, snatches of a phrase quoted by a preacher or a writer: such random relicts may point to the common fund of classroom teaching, but the wider effects of pedagogical causes remain elusive. Where literary reception studies can find its arguments in the palpable textual effects of imitation and allusion and in other tangible lines of influence, the footprints of broader educational impact lie buried and often erased under many layers of cultural sediment. For example, the theologians and philosophers of the medieval universities barely refer to their elementary educations in their writings: they would certainly have encountered some of the curricular literary authors when first learning to read Latin, but we do not know what they thought of those readings because they do not reflect on that stage of their training in their professional writings.[2] In other words, studying the pedagogical uses of the Latin classics poses questions about broad cultural impact that resist direct, concrete answers.

But through pedagogical readings we can often trace the ideological reshaping of the classical past. For example, medieval schoolmasters, presenting classical Latin poetry to their elementary students, provided brief introductions to the texts that can tell us a great deal about how readers were trained to appropriate certain themes. Such commentaries can illuminate the dark passageways of reception between the ancient texts and their medieval poetic imitations. Thus the poetry of Ovid, valued by schoolmasters as a source for grammatical and rhetorical usage, also had to be explained, indeed justified, as a source of ethical teaching. The *Ars amatoria* and the *Remedium amoris*, works primed to invite moral censorship, could be submitted to ethical reevaluation: the *Ars amatoria* might be explained as a book showing how young girls ought to be faithful in love, and the *Remedium amoris* seen as advising both boys and girls how to avoid the entrapments of unlawful love.[3] While

1 See, e.g., Charles Martindale and David Hopkins, eds., *Horace Made New: Horatian Influences on British Writing from the Renaissance to the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

2 See Sten Ebbesen and Irène Rosier-Catach, "Le *trivium* à la Faculté des arts," in *L'enseignement des disciplines (Paris et Oxford, XIIIe-XVe siècles*, ed. Olga Weijers and Louis Holtz (Turnhout: Brepols, 1997), 97–128.

3 See, for example, James G. Clark, "Introduction," in *Ovid in the Middle Ages*, ed. James G. Clark, Frank T. Coulson, and Kathryn L. McKinley (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 1–25; Robert Burchard Constantijn Huygens, *Accessus ad auctores; Bernard d'Utrecht; Conrad d'Hirsau Dialogus super auctores* (Leiden: Brill, 1970), 33–4.

there may seem a great distance between the cynical outlook of Ovid's erotic poetry and the idealizing of love as a potential ethical force in medieval poetry inspired by Ovid (e.g., Béroul, Chrétien de Troyes, Chaucer), the schoolroom was a transitional ground between the two poles, the place where Ovidian erotics were converted to a new moral purpose.

The three essays in the present issue of *JOLCEL* reflect the complexities of tracing the broad cultural impacts of Latin education. In different ways they also explore the ideological "refurbishment" of classical literature for the Middle Ages and the early Renaissance.

Chrysanthi Demetriou connects the representation of rape in the comedies of Terence and in Hrotswitha's Terentian dramas of the tenth century through the most influential pedagogical mediation of Terence, the commentaries by the fourth-century grammarian Donatus. Terence's comedies were continually in place in the medieval monastic curriculum. The availability of Donatus' close grammatical commentaries played no small part in keeping Terentian comedies present in medieval classrooms. We may read these commentaries to get a sense of how Terence was used to teach a colloquial Latin, or even to assess how early medieval readers, without a drama tradition of their own, might have understood the dynamics of theatrical performance and the generic form of comedy. These are the kinds of questions that one might ask of a schoolroom commentary. On the other hand, Hrotsvitha's remarkable plays modeled on Terence's comedies have commonly been read on the literary terms of classical reception. Hrotswitha's own preface calls attention to the changes her hagiographical rewriting has wrought on the charming stories of Terence, substituting the hard-won triumph of virtue for Terence's celebration of sensual gratification. Demetriou wisely directs our attention to the mediation of Donatus' commentaries on the comedies: she ups the stakes of pedagogical reading when she puts Hrotswitha's plays in conversation with Donatus' commentary. How was an early medieval reader to reckon with the controversial subject of rape in Terence's plays? Donatus' commentaries provide a moral mediation. Donatus seems to provide a diegetic voice that interprets the action, explicitly pointing to rape as a crime, even though the comic plots revolve around this motif. We may recall that Plato's Socrates was more tolerant of narration (*diegesis*) than of direct speech or impersonation (*mimesis*) because a narrator introduces some degree of critical distance between speaking characters and a gullible audience (*Republic* III, 392d-396e). In the "narrative" voice of Donatus' commentary Hrotswitha may have found her authority to question the entertainment value of rape in Terence's plots. Here the ideological reshaping in the schoolroom commentary tradition is a determining factor in classical reception. Demetriou brings this minor genre, grammatical commentary, out of the background to reveal how it may be informing (or indeed perhaps directing) the literary foreground.

Brian M. Jensen excavates the deep background of another minor genre, the fable. The genre was important enough to command the attention of the Swedish printer Johan Snell, who published a collection of fables and exempla, *Dialogus creaturarum moralizatus* in 1483. Why was it important? The usual answer, that such collections were useful to preachers on the model of biblical *parabolae*, is at best only partial. Medieval authorities were not at all agreed on the value of "nonsense" stories. Indeed, moral fables about talking animals who exhibit the moral deficiencies of humans cannot support a heavy structure of allegorical interpretation. Their very simplicity obviates the elaborate interpretive maneuvers that are intended to explain and justify them.[4] The moralizer must find his real theological-didactic material in Scripture, or must turn to yet more fables to complicate the rather simple

[4] On the proverb, see Christopher Cannon, *From Literacy to Literature: England, 1300-1400* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2016), 201–11.

message of the fable. In other words, in its very simplicity the non-biblical fable remains just beyond exegetical reach, eluding the preacher's explanatory arsenal. The fable may be read optimistically (the vain ostrich learns his lesson and reforms) or pessimistically (vanity gets its comeuppance). Fables may be justified on Gregorian terms as diversion for the illiterate or the tired, or they may be condemned on exactly the same grounds. But the greater truth of the fable's ubiquity is that it resists reading: its surface is all. This is, of course, the brilliant hermeneutical joke of Chaucer's "Nun's Priest's Tale," which impossibly complicates the Aesopic tale of the rooster and the fox, layering it like swirls of candy floss with virtually every literary genre: epic, romance, love lyric, de casibus narrative, mythography, hagiography, satire, advice to princes, proverb and exemplum, history and contemporary chronicle, tragedy, prophetic dream, dream theory, and philosophical discourse. But even such formal aggrandizement cannot account for or penetrate the hard transparent surface of the fable, which simply means what it says:

> But ye that holden this tale a folye,
> As of a fox, or of a cok and hen,
> Taketh the moralite, goode men.
> For Seint Paul seith that al that writen is,
> To oure doctrine it is yrite ywis;
> Taketh the fruyt, and lat the chaf be stille.[5]

The fable, whether silly or scurrilous, carries its meaning on its surface. It is already "the fruyt"; everything else that attaches to it is "the chaf." It resists theorizing, as Chaucer's Pauline joke suggests, and in its very pervasiveness it is a challenge to the depth machine of exegesis.

In her essay on schoolboy encounters with Euripides' *Medea* in sixteenth-century Bordeaux, Lucy Jackson acknowledges how difficult it is to discern the impact of a pedagogical initiative. She narrates an extraordinary episode in the history of Latin education: the performance by schoolboys of a Latin translation of *Medea* by the Scottish humanist George Buchanan. In his translation Buchanan underscored Medea's rhetorical skills, thereby enhancing the dramatic potential of the role. In its institutional context and in the influences that shaped it, Buchanan's translation epitomizes the dynamic between Latin education and classical reception which I outlined at the beginning. As an imitation of Euripides' play, Buchanan's version is also a response to the Ovidian and Senecan incarnations of Medea, a kind of Latin "domesticating" of the Greek play, despite Buchanan's fidelity to the original text. Buchanan's play was to have a long literary afterlife. But initial the institutional context frames his literary efforts: the play would have complemented a curriculum that was decidedly classical but that gave special emphasis to rhetorical teaching. The performance of the play, with the focus on Medea's speeches, would have reinforced that teaching. Humanist scholars often noted the pedagogical benefits of performance, whether for the players or the student audience. But the emphasis on Medea's rhetorical skill would have resonated with the ideological conflicts of the 1540s. Buchanan's translation draws out the themes of public speech and persuasion. A pedagogical setting is not a bubble protected from real-world concerns, and the live performance of a play about deception, flight and exile, divine justice, and murder would not be a merely innocent diversion. But Buchanan was also showing how literary Latin

[5] Quotation from Geoffrey Chaucer, *The Riverside Chaucer*, 3rd ed., ed. Larry D. Benson (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987), VII. 3438.

could become a vehicle of strong political rhetoric. The students performing this play were also internalizing a powerful message about their own potential roles as participants in public life.

As these essays demonstrate, and as I have suggested, reading pedagogical readings of classical antiquity cannot answer all the questions that it raises, but it opens questions that are rarely broached in classical reception studies. The ideological interface of commentary and new text, the ubiquity of a resistantly minor genre, the transformation of a school performance into an encounter between ancient tragedy and modern conflict: these are issues that can be apprehended when we look at classical reception through the wider lens of Latin education.

References

Cannon, Christopher. *From Literacy to Literature: England, 1300-1400*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Chaucer, Geoffrey. *The Riverside Chaucer*. 3rd ed. Edited by Larry D. Benson. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987.

Clark, James G. "Introduction." In *Ovid in the Middle Ages*, edited by James G. Clark, Frank T. Coulson, and Kathryn L. McKinley, 1–25. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Ebbesen, Sten, and Irène Rosier-Catach. "Le *trivium* à la Faculté des arts." In *L'enseignement des disciplines (Paris et Oxford, XIIIe-XVe siècles*, edited by Olga Weijers and Louis Holtz, 97–128. Turnhout: Brepols, 1997.

Huygens, Robert Burchard Constantijn. *Accessus ad auctores; Bernard d'Utrecht; Conrad d'Hirsau Dialogus super auctores*. Leiden: Brill, 1970.

Martindale, Charles, and David Hopkins, eds. *Horace Made New: Horatian Influences on British Writing from the Renaissance to the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1993.