the generous admiration of it manifested by Caecilius. A similar instance of the recognition of rising genius by a poet whose own day was past is found in the account given of the visit of Accius to the veteran Pacuvius. The next play was the *Hecyra,* first produced in 165, but withdrawn in consequence of its bad reception, and reproduced in 160. The *Heauton Timorumenos* appeared in 163, the *Eunuchus* in 161, the *Phormio* in 161, and the *Adelphoe* in 160 at the funeral games of L. Aemilius Paulius. Of these six plays the *Phormio* and probably the *Hecyra were* drawn from Apollodorus, the rest from Menander. After bringing out these plays Terence sailed from Greek parts, either to escape from the suspicion of publishing the works of others as his own, or from the desire to obtain a more intimate knowledge of that Greek fife which had hitherto been known to him only in literature and which it was his professed aim to reproduce in his comedies. The latter is the more probable motive, and *we* recognize in this the first instance of that im­pulse to visit the scenes familiar to them through literature which afterwards acted on many of the great writers of Rome. From this voyage Terence never returned. According to one account he was lost at sea, according to another he died at Stymphalus in Arcadia, and according to a third at Leucas, from grief at the loss by shipwreck of his baggage, containing a number of new plays which he had translated from Menander. An old poet quoted by Suetonius states that he was ruined in fortune through his intimacy with his noble friends. Another account speaks of him as having left behind him gardens, to the extent of about twelve acres, close to the Appian Way. It is further stated that his daughter married a Roman knight.

No writer in any literature, who has contented himself with so limited a function, has gained so great a reputation as Terence. He lays no claim to the position of an original artist painting from life or commenting on the results of his own observation. His art has no relation to his own time or to the country in which he lived. The chief source of interest in the fragmentary remains of Naevius, Ennius, Pacuvius, Accius and Lucilius is their relation to the national and moral spirit of the age in which they were written. Plautus, though, like Terence, he takes the first sketch of his plots, scenes and char­acters, from the Attic stage, is yet a true representative of his time, a genuine Italian, writing before the genius of Italy had learned the restraints of Greek art. The whole aim of Terence was to present a faithful copy of the life, manners, modes of thought and expression which had been drawn from reality a century before his time by the writers of the New Comedy of Athens. The nearest parallel to his literary position may be found in the aim which Virgil puts before himself in his *Bucolics.* He does not seek in that poem to draw Italian peasants from the life, but to bring back the shepherds of Theocritus on Italian scenes. Yet the result obtained by Virgil is different. The charm of his pastorals is the Italian sentiment which pervades them. His shepherds are not the shepherds of Theo­critus, nor are they in any sense true to life. The extraordinary result obtained by Terence is that, while he has left no trace in any of his comedies of one sketching from the life by which he was surrounded, there is perhaps no more truthful, natural and delicate delineator of human nature, in its ordinary and more level moods, within the whole range of classical literature. His permanent position in literature is due, no doubt, to the art and genius of Menander, whose creations he has perpetuated, as a fine engraver may perpetuate the spirit of a great painter whose works have perished. But no mere copyist or verbal translator could have attained that result. Though without claims to creative originality, Terence must have had not only critical genius, to enable him fully to appreciate and identify himself with his originals, but artistic genius of a high and pure type. The importance of his position in Roman literature consists in this, that he was the first writer who set before him­self a high ideal of artistic perfection, and was the first to realize that perfection in style, form, and consistency of conception and execution. Living in the interval between Ennius and Lucilius, whose original force and genius survive only in rude and inartistic fragments, he produced six plays, which have not only reached our time in the form in which they were given to the world, but have been read in the most critical and exacting literary epochs, and still may be read without any feeling of the need of making allowance for the rudeness of a new and un­developed art.

While his great gift to Roman literature is that he first made it artistic, that be imparted to “ rude Latium ” the sense of elegance, consistency and moderation, his gift to the world is that through him it possesses a living image of the Greek society in the 3rd century b.c., presented in the purest Latin idiom. Yet Terence had no affinity by birth either with the Greek race or with the people of Latium. He was more dis­tinctly a foreigner than any of the great classical writers of Rome. He lived at the meeting-point of three distinct civiliza­tions—the mature, or rather decaying, civilization of Greece, of which Athens was still the centre; that of Carthage, which was so soon to pass away and leave scarcely any vestige of itself; and the nascent civilization of Italy, in which all other modes were soon to be absorbed. Terence was by birth an African, and was thus perhaps a fitter medium of connexion between the genius of Greece and that of Italy than if he had been a pure Greek or a pure Italian; just as in modern times the Jewish type of genius is sometimes found more detached from national peculiarities, and thus more capable of repro­ducing a cosmopolitan type of character than the genius of men belonging to other races.

The prologues to Terence’s plays are of high interest. Their tone is for the most part apologetic, and indicates a great sensitiveness to criticism. He constantly speaks of the malevo­lence and detraction of an older poet, whose name is said to have been Luscius Lavinius or Lanuvinus. The chief charge which his detractor brings against him is that of *contaminatio,* the combining in one play of scenes out of different Greek plays. Terence justifies this practice by that of the older poets, Naevius, Plautus, Ennius, whose careless freedom he follows in preference to the “obscura diligentia ” of his detractor. He recriminates upon his adversary as one who, by his close adherence to his original, had turned good Greek plays into bad Latin ones. He clears himself of the charge of plagiarizing from Plautus and Naevius. In another prologue he contrasts his own treatment of his subjects with the sensational extravagance of others. He meets the charge of receiving assistance in the composition of his plays by claiming as a great honour the favour which he enjoyed with those who were the favourites of the Roman people. But the gossip, not discouraged by Terence, lived and throve; it crops up in Cicero and Quintilian, and the ascription of the plays to Scipio had the honour to be accepted by Mon­taigne and rejected by Diderot.

We learn from these prologues that the best Roman literature was ceasing to be popular, and had come to rely on the patronage of the great. A consequence of this change of circumstances was that comedy was no longer national in character and senti­ment, but had become imitative and artistic. The life which Terence represents is that of the well-to-do citizen class whose interests are commonplace, but whose modes of thought and speech are refined, humane and intelligent. His characters are finely delineated and discriminated rather than, like those of Plautus, boldly conceived. Delicate irony and pointed epigram take the place of broad humour. Love, in the form of pathetic sentiment rather than of irregular passion, is the chief motive of his pieces. His great characteristics are humanity and urbanity, and to this may be attributed the attraction which he had for the two chief representatives of these qualities in Roman literature—Cicero and Horace.

Terence’s pre-eminence in art was recognized in the Augustan age; and Horace expresses this opinion, though not as his own, in these words (Epistles II. i. 59):—

“ Vincere Caecilius gravitate, Terentius arte.”

The art of his comedies consists in the clearness and simplicity with which the situation is presented and developed, and in the