The role of the Praenotamenta of Jodocus Badius Ascensius in shaping early modern dramatic criticism

GIULIA TORELLO-HILL ⓘD

Luis Alfonso de Carvallo in his dialogue *Cisne de Apollo* (Apollo's swan, 1602) has the allegorical character Lectura (Reading) respond to Zoilo's dismissive comment on the role of comedy with a powerful statement: 'comedy is an imitation of life, a mirror of customs and an image of truth' (*la comedia es una imitación de la vida, espejo de costumbres, imagen de verdad*).[1] This quote is attributed to Cicero but only known to us through the fifth-century treatise *De comoedia* (On comedy) by grammarians Donatus and Euanthius.[2] It elaborates the concept of verisimilitude that is inherent to the comic genre and essential in triggering an emotional response in the audience.

Verisimilitude, along with debate over the poetic creative process, or *poiesis*, and the role of the poet in society, is at the core of the treatises on poetics that flourished across Europe in the second half of the sixteenth century. This paper examines the often unacknowledged role played by the *Praenotamenta* (1502), the first published treatise on classical comedy written by Flemish scholar Jodocus Badius Ascensius (1462–1535), in the dissemination of classical poetics.[3]

[1] Luis Alfonso de Carvallo, *Cisne de Apolo*, ed. Alberto Porqueras Mayo (Kassel: Editions Reichenberger, 1997), 256 with n. 18.

[2] Donatus/Euanthius, *De comoedia*, v.1.

[3] The *Praenotamenta* were first printed as a preface to the Lyon edition of Terence at the press of François Fradin (15 June 1502). A second edition was published by Claude Many and Étienne Baland on the 18 December 1502. I consulted a copy of the latter edition, which is not catalogued in the USTC, at the Newberry Library in Chicago in 2018. Short excerpts from chapters 4, 6, 19 and 21 of *Praenotamenta* accompanied by an English translation are included in Harold W. Lawton, *Handbook of French Renaissance Dramatic Theory* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1972), 28–34. The text has also been translated in French by Maurice Lebel, *Préfaces de Josse Bade, 1462–1535: humaniste, éditeur-imprimeur et préfacier* (Louvain: Peeters Pub & Booksellers, 1988), 49–119 and in Spanish by José Manuel Ruiz Vila, '*Josse Bade De Asche, Praenotamenta*', in *Bartolomé de Torres Naharro, Teatro completo*, ed. Julio Vélez-Sainz (Madrid: Cátedra, 2013), 995-1082. For a discussion of the influence of the *Praenotamenta* on the poetics formulated by Luis Alfonso de Carvallo see Carvallo, *Cisne de Apolo*, 12, 17; Alberto Porqueras Mayo, 'Las ideas sobre el teatro de L.A. de Carvallo en su *Cisne de Apolo* (1602)', in Manuel V. Diago and Teresa Ferrer (eds.), *Comedias y comediantes: estudios sobre el teatro clásico español. Actas del congreso internacional sobre teatro y prácticas escénicas en los siglos XVI y XVII* (Valencia: Universitat de València, 1991), 307–20.

Scholarship has invariably credited Aristotle's *Poetics* for foregrounding the debate on early modern dramatic criticism. However, although the Aristotelian concepts of *mimesis* and *catharsis* were already known to Medieval and Renaissance intellectuals through other Aristotelian works, Aristotle's *Poetics* only started circulating in print in the second half of the sixteenth century.[4] Renaissance dramatic criticism, on the other hand, developed much earlier from notions disseminated in the classical and Late Antique sources that formed the paratext to the works of classical Roman playwright Terence.[5]

The Middle Ages saw the flourishing of an extensive commentary tradition to make the language of Terence, full of archaisms, accessible to contemporary readerships, and explain the references to ancient social and cultural customs in his plays. These commentaries are interspersed on the margins of a great number of manuscripts whose dating ranges between the ninth and the fifteenth century. From the Carolingian period onwards, manuscripts of Terence also incorporated a set of paratextual materials, consisting of a poem in elegiac couplets, the *Epitaphium Terentii* (Terence's epitaph), *didascaliae* (production notes), and plot summaries attributed to second-century grammarian Sulpicius Apollinaris.[6]

[4] See, for instance, Bernard Weinberg, A *History of Literary Criticism in the Italian Renaissance* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961) that only reserves a brief treatment to Badius's commentary on the *Ars poetica* of Horace (pp. 81–5) but does not mention his *Praenotamenta*; M.A.R. Habib, *A History of Literary Criticism and Theory from Plato to the Present* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2005), 240; Robert Bayliss, 'Serving Don Juan: Decorum in Tirso de Molina and Molière', *Comparative Drama*, 40 (2006), 191–215 in his discussion of decorum. Rolf Lohse, 'The Early Reception of Aristotelian *Poetics*', *Horizonte*, 2 (2017), 38–58 recognises the importance of Donatus/Euanthius' *On comedy* and Horace's *Ars poetica* towards the development of early Renaissance dramatic theory but disregards other important sources and does not mention Badius's *Praenotamenta*. Michael Hetherington, '*Non per instituir altri*? Attitudes to Rule-Following in Sixteenth-Century Poetics', in Vladimir Brljak and Micha Lazarus (eds.), 'Special Issue: Artes poeticae: Formations and Transformations, 1500–1650,' *Classical Receptions Journal*, 13 (2021), 9–30 mentions Badius's edition of Horace's *Ars poetica* but seems to be unaware of the *Praenotamenta*. No acknowledgement of Badius's influence on French poetics can be found in another essay in the same collection, Lucy Rayfield's 'The Poetics of Comedy in Jacques Peletier Du Mans's *Art poëtique* (1555)' (pp. 31–48). Notable exceptions are Bernard Weinberg, 'Badius Ascensius and the Transmission of Medieval Literary Criticism', *Romance Philology*, 9 (1955), 209–16; Maria José Vegas Ramos, 'Teoría de la comedia e idea del teatro: los *Praenotamenta* terencianos en el siglo XVI', *Epos: Revista de filología* 11 (1995), 237–59; Laure Hermand-Schebat, 'Le commentaire de Josse Bade aux comédies de Terence', *Exercices de rhétorique* 10 (2017), 1–11; Perrine Galand-Hallyn and Fernand Hallyn (eds.), *Poétiques de la Renaissance. Le modèle italien, le monde franco-bourguignon et leur héritage en France au xvie siècle* (Geneva: Droz, 2001),48. On the enduring legacy of Aristotle's *Poetics* see Bryan Brazeau (ed.), *The Reception of Aristotle's* Poetics *in the Italian Renaissance and Beyond. New Directions in Criticism* (London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2020).

[5] As already noted by Vegas Ramos, 'Teoría de la comedia', 238 who refers to sporadic comments on the importance of the commentary traditions of Terence interspersed in Marvin T. Herrick, *Comic Theory in the Sixteenth Century* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1964) and Harold W. Lawton, *Térence en France au XVIe siècle* (Paris: Jouve et Cie, 1926).

[6] For an overview of the manuscript and illustrative tradition of Terence from Late Antiquity to the last quarter of the fifteenth century see Giulia Torello-Hill and Andrew J. Turner, *The Lyon Terence: Its Reception and Legacy* (Leiden: Brill, 2020), 24–66 with additional bibliography. More specifically on the illustrative tradition of Terence see Beatrice Radden Keefe, 'Illustrating the Manuscripts of Terence', in Andrew J. Turner and Giulia Torello-Hill (eds.), *Terence Between Late Antiquity and the Age of Printing. Illustration, Commentary and Performance* (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 36–66; Beatrice Radden Keefe, *The Illustrated Afterlife of Terence's Comedies (800–1200)* (Leiden: Brill, 2021).

The development of the printing press in the last quarter of the fifteenth century saw an acceleration in the dissemination of the works of Terence. The paratextual materials that already prefaced many of the more recent manuscripts were replicated in the first editions as early as 1476. Those were primarily the fragmentary treatise on comedy by Late Antique commentators Euanthius and Donatus and the *Vita Terentii*, a biographical note on Terence attributed to historian Suetonius. These prefatory materials were complemented by some extensive commentary on the comedies themselves. Donatus's commentary on Terence was routinely incorporated in these editions and supplemented by the commentary on *Heautontimorumenos* compiled by Giovanni Calfurnio (*c.* 1443–1503), and by a vast array of modern commentaries, starting from that of Guy de Jouenneaux (1492), which Badius himself used with some additional comments of his own in his 1493 and 1502 editions of Terence.

When Badius wrote his *Praenotamenta* for inclusion into his 1502 Terence edition, he had already acquired a considerable experience and fame as editor and commentator of classical authors, having worked for the best part of a decade (1491–1498) with Lyon-based printers Matthias Husz, Johannes Trechsel and Jean de Vingle. His editorial experience and network were further expanded when he moved to Paris in 1499 and a mark of his success was the founding of his own printing house, the Praelum Ascensianum, in 1503. From 1503 until the time of his death in 1535 he published a staggering 719 editions, including works of classical and Late Antique Roman texts, Medieval and Renaissance works, and his own literary production. Badius privileged editions of classical Latin texts, which were often accompanied by detailed commentaries that had a pedagogical purpose.[7] The short prefatory letter that precedes the *Praenotamenta* addressed to one of his patrons, the Lyonnais lawyer Hervé Bésin, indicates that Badius was fully aware of the pedagogical and commercial value of this work and that he had intended originally to publish his 'explanatory notes' (*elucidamenta*) in vernacular French.[8] Although this translation never materialised or has since been lost, its planning indicates Badius's adaptability in a volatile market, as well as his capacity to tailor his editions to a target readership.

Badius had extensive knowledge of Terentian drama and its commentary tradition, having published two editions prior to 1502. In his first 1491 edition at the press of Matthias Husz, the text, set out in verse, appeared in Gothic fonts and the mise-en-page was in the island format (or *textus inclusus*) with the main text in the middle of the page surrounded by the

---

[7] Paul White, *Jodocus Badius Ascensius: Commentary, Commerce and Print in the Renaissance* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 1, 61–106; Philippe Renouard, *Bibliographie des impressions et des oeuvres de Josse Bade Ascensius*, 3 vols. (Paris, E. Paul et fils et Guillemin, 1908) is still a valuable source of information on Badius.

[8] Terence 1502, aiv. Torello-Hill and Turner, *The Lyon Terence*, 99.

commentary of Donatus in smaller fonts and the additional commentary of Italian humanist Giovanni Calfurnio on *Heautontimorumenos*. This edition was not a commercial success; only three copies survive and Badius and Husz never collaborated again. Nevertheless, Badius had made some significant advances; these included a clear act division that only marginally diverge from modern-day editions and the introduction of running headers, a practice that is still commonly used in publishing.[9] His second edition of Terence published in Lyon by German printer Johannes Trechsel (active 1488–1498) built upon these advances. In terms of marketability, the so-called Lyon Terence was a very different product. Its 161 detailed woodcut illustrations made it a deluxe edition. The Lyon Terence started the new trend of producing illustrated editions of classical Latin works, while previously illustrations were restricted to vernacular texts. Although this edition targeted the niche market of the wealthy and the privileged, some of whom were Badius's patrons, it had vast resonance not only in France but also across the Alps. First of all, its iconography became the blueprint for subsequent illustrated editions of Terence, particularly in Italy.[10] Secondly, it included the commentary of Guy Jouenneaux, a prelate from Northern France who in 1492 had published a detailed commentary of the plays of Terence. Guy's notes were to become one of the four canonical commentaries of early sixteenth-century editions, along with Donatus, Calfurnio and Badius's own additional notes.[11]

The 1502 Terence prefaced by the *Praenotamenta* was by far the most commercially successful out of the three editions curated by Badius. In the next two decades the *Praenotamenta* were included in twenty-one Lyonnais editions of the plays of Terence.[12] To protect his intellectual property, Badius oversaw the production of most of the Lyonnais editions that included his *Praenotamenta*. He also exerted complete control over the 1504 reprint that appeared concurrently in Paris and in London at the press of Wynken de Worde. A German printer who had established himself in England in the service to William Caxton, de Worde commercialised a wide array of texts through the production of inexpensive editions mostly in English but partnered with established printers to publish Latin texts.[13] Besides the Paris-London edition, the

---

[9] Vera Sack, 'Die erste Lyoner Terenz-Ausgabe (1491) des Jodocus Badius Ascensius', *Gutenberg- Jahrbuch*, 47 (1972), 90–97; Louise Katz, 'La presse et les lettres: les épîtres paratextuelles et le projet éditorial de l'imprimeur Josse Bade (*c.* 1462–1535),' (PhD diss. École Pratique des Hautes Études, University of Paris, 2013), 6, 67; Torello-Hill and Turner, *The Lyon Terence*, 102–20.

[10] Torello-Hill and Turner, *The Lyon Terence*, 196–221.

[11] For a detailed analysis of Guy's commentary see K.O. Chong-Gossard, 'The Pope's Shoes: The Scope of Glosses in Guido Juvenalis's Commentary on Terence', *International Journal of the Classical Tradition*, 27 (2020), 193–214.

[12] For details of sixteenth-century editions that contain the *Praenotamenta* see Appendix B.

[13] On Wynkyn de Worde see Peter W.M. Blayney, *The Stationers' Company and the Printers of London, 1501–1557* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013); Henry Plomer, *Wynkyn de Worde and His Contemporaries from the Death of Caxton to 1535* (Folkestone: Dawson of Pall Mall, 1974).

Praenotamenta featured in five other editions of Terence printed outside France. These included the 1513 edition of Giacomo and Giovanni Antonio da Legnano and their illustrated Terence printed in Milan in 1521. Both copies were pirated by Niccolò da Gorgonzola in 1514 and 1523 respectively.[14] In 1524 *Praenotamenta* also prefaced a Terence edition published in Zaragoza by German-born printer Jorge Coci.[15]

The French editions of Jacques Giunta (1535), Sébastien Gryphe (1537), Ambroise Girauld (1538) and Antoine Vincent (1541) were the last to feature the *Praenotamenta* along with novel commentaries. In these later editions the inclusion of the *Praenotamenta* was no longer openly acknowledged but referred to as Badius's 'very familiar discussion' (*expositio familiarissima*), perhaps in a deliberate attempt at maintaining the appeal of novelty.[16]

THE SOURCES OF THE *PRAENOTAMENTA*

The *Praenotamenta* consist of twenty-six chapters of variable length that aim to introduce the readers to the birth and development of classical drama, the generic features of tragedy and comedy (2–5) and issues of mise-en-scene (7–12). The second part of the treatise focuses entirely on comedy, discussing its structure, including act division, and the observance of the decorum or appropriateness in the design of comedy's plots, characters and play as a whole (13–23), concluding with chapters on Terence's life and artistry (24–26).[17]

In the *Praenotamenta*, Badius synthesises in masterly fashion classical, Late Antique and Renaissance sources written in Latin to create a coherent and accessible introduction to classical drama. Although he occasionally refers to Greek authorities such as Aristotle and Theophrastus, he seems to possess only indirect knowledge of these texts through Roman Late Antique sources, especially Donatus. At face value, his reticence to approach Greek sources directly could be attributed to his limited knowledge of Ancient Greek. However, given his acquaintance with key Italian intellectuals and his engagement with their works, it is unlikely that he would have not had any access to, or at least knowledge of, the Latin translation of Aristotle's *Poetics* by Lorenzo Valla. Valla completed his translation in 1489, although the work appeared in print only in 1498. This edition did not have the expected

---

[14] On the little-known edition by the Legnano brothers see Torello-Hill and Turner, *The Lyon Terence*, 207–9; Niccolò da Gorgonzola and the lawsuit launched against him is discussed by Arnaldo Ganda, *Niccolò Gorgonzola editore e libraio in Milano, 1496–1536* (Florence: Olschki, 1988).

[15] On Jorge Coci, a printer active in Zaragoza in 1515–1536, see Manuel José Pedraza Gracia, 'Los talleres de imprenta zaragozanos entre 1475 y 1577', *Pliegos de bibliofilia* 13 (2001), 33–42.

[16] On the marketing strategies of Terence's editors and printers see Paul F. Gehl, 'Selling Terence in Renaissance Italy: The Marketing Power of Commentary', in Christina S. Kraus and Christopher Stray (eds.), *Classical Commentaries: Explorations in a Scholarly Genre* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 253–74.

[17] For a full list of contents see the Appendix A.

traction and it is only in the 1540s, following the translation by Alessandro de' Pazzi (1536) and especially Francesco Robortello's 1548 extensive commentary, that the *Poetics* started impacting on treatises on poetics. Badius's lack of interest in the *Poetics* may be explained by the fact that Aristotle discussed mainly the features of tragedy, although he occasionally referred to other dramatic genres, including epic and comedy, while Badius aimed to illustrate the generic features and stagecraft of comedy. What is more, the *Praenotamenta* were always conceived as an introduction to acquaint readers with important aspects of classical comedy, preparing them to understand and appreciate the artistry of Terentian comedy. This pedagogical approach informs the selection of primary sources, which often relate to the historical and factual background to classical theatre. Prominent sources for the history of classical theatre are Horace's *Ars poetica* (Art of poetry), Donatus/ Euanthius' *De comoedia* (on comedy) and Diomedes's *Ars grammatica* (Art of grammar).

The *Ars poetica* of Horace is the classical source that is used most extensively in the *Praenotamenta*. Badius quotes it verbatim eleven times and three times refers to scholia on it that were attributed in his days to grammarians Acron (fl. end of second century CE) and Porphyrio (third century CE).[18] Horace's works had been an integral part of the school curriculum throughout the Middle Ages and their popularity continued in the Renaissance. The *Ars poetica* was printed both as part of Horace's complete works and individually in forty-four out of the sixty-nine editions of Horace published in the last quarter of the fifteenth century.[19] Badius had a close familiarity with this text; his own first edition was published in 1500 by the Parisian printer Thielman Kerver and dedicated to five former students from his time as a teacher in Lyon.[20] Badius's commentary on Horace's *Ars poetica*, along with those of Pseudo-Acro/Porphyrio, Cristoforo Landino and Antonio Mancinelli became canonical and was printed throughout the sixteenth century.[21]

The commentary on *Ars poetica* also represented a turning point in his pedagogical approach to classical texts. Up to that point Badius's main preoccupation had been to provide his readers with lexical and exegetical notes that could help them unlock classical texts and present the moral lesson that could be learnt from these texts. In his commentary to *Ars poetica*, however, Badius

---

[18] Most of these references are in chapter 1 on the poet's character and dignity.

[19] Karsten Friis-Jensen, 'Commentaries on Horace's *Art of Poetry* in the Incunable Period', *Renaissance Studies*, 9 (1995), 228–39 (p. 230). For an overview of the popularity of *Ars poetica* in the Middle Ages and Renaissance see Manuel Mañas Núñez, 'La *Epistula ad Pisones* de Horacio: su normalización como 'ars poetica' hasta el Renacimiento', *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica. Estudios Latinos*, 32 (2012), 223–46.

[20] ISTC ih00467000; White, *Jodocus Badius Ascensius*, 215-6. The importance of Badius's commentary on *Ars poetica* is discussed in Galand-Hallyn and Hallyn, *Poétiques de la Renaissance*, 381–6.

[21] Núñez, 'La *Epistula ad Pisones* de Horacio', 225–6. On Antonio Mancinelli (1452–1505), whose commentary was published in Venice in 1492, see Carla Mellidi, 'Mancinelli Antonio', *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 68 (2007).

formulates the first systematic classical poetics, drawing on Latin authors, including Donatus and Diomedes, that are the core of the dramatic poetics elucidated in the *Praenotamenta*.[22] In the *Praenotamenta*, Badius incorporates parts of his commentary on *Ars poetica*, quoting it almost verbatim. These mostly concern the origin and etymology of ancient comedy that features in chapter 6 (f. 25r = dir and 32r = eiir).

Other quotes that Badius extrapolates from his commentary on *Ars poetica* come from Diomedes's third book of the *Ars grammatica*.[23] These include his definition of comedy as 'the narration of the fate of men in private or public life without any life-threatening events' (f. 25r = dir) and the tripartite division of comedy into *cantica* (dialogues with musical accompaniment), *diverbia* (dialogues) and *choros* (lyrical parts, f. 26r = diir). Written in three books as a pedagogical treatise, the *Ars grammatica* contains references to a vast array of Greek and Roman sources, including Theophrastus, the lost *De poetica* (On Poetics) by Suetonius and Horace. The third book on poetry was regularly quoted by humanists writing on ancient poetics. Diomedes' treatment of the generic features of tragedy and comedy was incorporated in the prefatory materials of printed editions of Terence well into the sixteenth century. Badius further elaborates these definitions by stating that comedy differs from tragedy insofar as it displays 'the life of ordinary people' (*vita mediocrium personarum*), 'it does not start happily' (*neque habet letum initium)* but unlike tragedy has a happy ending.[24]

Badius's overview of the history of classical theatre is based on *De comoedia* (*On comedy*), an excerpted and interpolated text attributed to Donatus, which was conflated with a similar treatise written by his near contemporary Euanthius.[25] This treatise captivated humanist curiosity in classical comedy; out of a total of thirty-three extant manuscripts twenty-six were copied in the fifteenth century from a common sub-archetype.[26] *De comoedia* appeared both as part of the large paratextual materials that prefaced the plays of Terence and as a stand-alone text, complementing Donatus' commentary on Terence that became the most authoritative source on ancient theatre practices.

Rediscovered by Nicholas of Cusa (1401–1464) in Mainz in 1433, the commentary of Donatus was circulated among Italian intellectual circles by

---

[22] Ann Moss, 'Horace in the Sixteenth Century: Commentators into Critics', in Glyn P. Norton (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, vol. 3 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 66–76 (p. 68); See also White, *Jodocus Badius Ascensius*, 215.

[23] First printed in 1475, the *Ars grammatica* of Diomedes (*fl.* end of the fourth century) was a popular pedagogical manual in the Renaissance, as discussed by Fatima El Matouni, 'La tradizione manoscritta umanistica dell'*Ars grammatica* di Diomede: prime esplorazioni', *Paideia* 77 (2022), 341–78.

[24] Heinrich Keil, *Grammatici Latini*, 8 vols (Leipzig: Teubner, 1855–80), vol. 1, 487–8.

[25] Carmela Cioffi, 'Ricerche sulla tradizione manoscritta del Commento di Donato a Terenzio', *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici*, 69 (2012), 145–183 integrates manuscripts that were unknown to Paul Wessner (ed.), *Donatus: Commentum Terenti*, 3 vols (Leipzig: Teubner, 1902–1908).

[26] Carmela Cioffi, 'Il *De comoedia* attribuito a Donato: una nuova edizione', *Latinitas* 8 (2020), 137–54 (p. 140).

Archbishop of Milan Francesco Pizzolpasso. His commentary on the plays of Terence, with the exception of the *Heautontimorumenos* that had been lost in transmission, began to be included in printed editions of Terence as early as 1476.[27] Badius amply draws on *De comoedia* to present his readers with a succinct history of classical theatre, a presentation of the generic features of comedy that includes a brief treatment of other classical dramatic genres and a discussion of the differences between tragedy and comedy. It should be noted that Badius gives particular emphasis to the information regarding the mise-en-scene of ancient performances, including backdrop, masks, costumes and musical accompaniment.[28]

Notably, the sources of the *Praenotamenta* include also works from Italian humanists, including Battista Spagnoli of Mantua (1447–1516), Filippo Beroaldo the Elder (1453–1505) and Giovanni Tortelli (*c.*1406/1411–1466).[29] The inclusion of contemporary authorities not only leveraged Badius's scholarship by situating him amid the scholarly discussion on poetics, but in some cases was a sign of reverence towards his patrons. Spagnoli and Beroaldo were both connected to the powerful religious order of the Carmelites, that had backed some of Badius's printing enterprises. Badius had in-depth knowledge of their works, having edited the first French edition of the *Orationes* of Beroaldo (1492), and included Spagnoli's *Contra poetas impudice loquentes* (Against the poets who speak unchastely) in his *Silvae morales* (1492), a miscellaneous collection of classical and humanist texts. He later published a selection of Beroaldo's poetry (Paris, 1508) and a commentary of Spagnoli's select works (Paris, 1507), while his commentary on Spagnoli's *Parthenice mariana* was also published as a stand-alone edition at the press of Jean Petit in 1510. Echoes of Battista Spagnoli's defence of poetry, as it is expressed in the *Apologeticon* that prefaced his *Parthenice Mariana,* are incorporated in the first chapter of the *Praenotamenta.*[30] This chapter discusses the civic role of the poet and are woven into Horace's contraposition between those poets who write to amuse (*delectare*) their readerships and those whose aim is to educate them

[27] Torello-Hill and Turner, *The Lyon Terence*, 59.

[28] Donatus/Euanthius, *De comoedia* iv.2, iv.5, v.1–5.

[29] Myron Gilmore, 'Beroaldo Filippo, senior', *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 9 (1967); Andrea Severi, 'Spagnoli Battista, detto Battista Mantovano, Battista Carmelita', *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 93 (2018); Mariarosa Cortesi, 'Tortelli, Giovanni', *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 96 (2019). Spagnoli had achieved international fame and his works had been widely published across Europe, as documented by Edmondo Coccia, *Le edizioni delle opere del Mantovano* (Rome: Institutum Carmelitanum, 1960).

[30] On the relations Badius entertained with religious orders see Katz, 'La presse et les lettres', 183–208. The role of Badius as a mediator of Italian scholarship is discussed by Silvia Fabrizio Costa and Frank La Brasca, 'La prefazione alla prima edizione francese delle *Orationes* di F. Beroaldo il Vecchio (Lione, settembre 1492): Josse Bade intermediario editoriale e culturale', in *Filippo Beroaldo l'Ancient, un passeur de humanité* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2005), 167–188 and White, *Jodocus Badius Ascensius,* 12–21. On Spagnoli's *Apologeticon* see Daniela Marrone, 'L'*Apologeticon* di Battista Spagnoli,' *Atti e Memorie, Accademia Nazionale Virgiliana di Scienze Lettere e Arti, Mantova,* 68 (2000), 19–155. On Badius's *Silvae morales* see White, *Jodocus Badius Ascensius,* 179–206.

(*docere*). Badius brands the former as 'useless' (*inutiles*) and quotes a passage from Spagnoli's *Contra poetas* that condemns such poets for wasting their talent on frivolous and immoral poetry (avr).

The longest verbatim quote in the whole of the *Praenotamenta* comes from Giovanni Tortelli's encyclopaedic entry on theatre in chapter 8. The librarian of Pope Nicholas V, Tortelli wrote the monumental *De ortographia* (On orthography, 1451) in which he listed alphabetically Greek words found in Latin writings, providing details of their etymology, spelling and pronunciation. Badius was well acquainted with the work of Tortelli, having amply used his antiquarian work in the Appendix of expressions in Greek of his own *De recte scribendi ratione* (Concerning the theory of writing correctly), published around 1500.

The extensive quote from Tortelli comes from his lemma on the word 'theatre' (*theatrum*).[31] It opens with the etymology of theatre as a place in which 'a gathering large crowd could see without an impediment.' Derived from Late Antique lexicographer Cassiodorus (*fl*. sixth century), this definition was incorporated in many fifteenth-century treatises.[32] The excerpt, which draws on a passage of Pliny's *Natural History*, traces the development of theatre back to ritual celebration in Archaic Greece and then moves on to discuss in detail Roman theatre buildings, from the theatres of Marcus Scaurus and Gaius Scribonius Curio to the first permanent Theatre of Pompey. Pliny's descriptions of the temporary theatre built by Roman consul Marcus Scaurus, which could seat 30,000 spectators and was decorated with 360 columns, 3000 marble statues and had seating capacity for 80,000 spectators, and of the rotating theatre of Gaius Curio captivated humanist antiquarian imagination.[33] Badius, however, brands these theatrical buildings as costly and profligate as they were temporary structures to be dismantled.

Badius's discussion of the characteristics of ancient theatre buildings that draws on ancient sources, in particular Pliny the Elder and Vitruvius, is interesting on many levels. On the one hand, his treatment is an exemplary case of Badius's process of selecting of primary sources, which is often driven by the knowledge he himself acquired through his editorial experience. On the other hand, it is clearly moulded by the Italian humanist ongoing debate over the model of a Roman theatre that could be implemented in modern times.

---

[31] ISTIC iv00047100, ff. y4v-y5r. Gemma Donati, *L'Orthographia di Giovanni Tortelli* (Messina: Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Umanistici, 2006). For the resonance of Tortelli's scholarship in the sixteenth century see Antonio Manfredi, Clementina Marsico and Mariangela Regoliosi (eds.), *Giovanni Tortelli primo bibliotecario della Vaticana* (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 2016).

[32] Giulia Torello-Hill, 'The Exegesis of Vitruvius and the Creation of Theatrical Spaces in Renaissance Ferrara', *Renaissance Studies*, 29 (2015), 227–246 (p. 245).

[33] Pl. *nat. hist.* xxxvi.24.101–25. See Peter Fane-Saunders, *Pliny the Elder and the Emergence of Renaissance Architecture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 122–7.

THE POET AS A *VATES*

The first and most extended chapter of the *Praenotamenta* focuses entirely on the definition of poetic 'madness' (*furor*) and the identification of the poet with a prophet (*vates*) infused with divine knowledge. This philosophical tenet elevates poetry, intended as composition in verse, above all other forms of written expression as carrier of divine truth while sanctioning the civic role of poets and their engagement with their communities.

The concept of poet-theologian was already rooted in fourteenth-century poetics, as discussed in detail by David Lummus.[34] Poetry began to be equated to theology in disquisitions on poetics disseminated in the works of fourteenth-century authors, such as Dante's letter to Cangrande della Scala or Boccaccio's more extensive discussion of the role of poets and categorisation of poetic genres that takes up most of book 14 of his *Genealogia deorum gentilium* (*Genealogy of the pagan gods*). For them the civic duty of the poet consisted in 'communicat[ing] historical, moral, and higher truths hidden in verisimilar allegorical fictions.'[35] The concept of the poet-theologian is a pervasive theme among humanist intellectuals through the mediation of the Neoplatonic doctrines of Florentine philosopher Marsilio Ficino. Particularly notable is Ficino's Christianisation of the Platonic term of *furor*, or divine inspiration, that is applied to biblical texts that are inspired by God. Ficino's theories circulated widely in France, thanks to a network of contacts the Florentine philosopher built with French intellectuals, including Lefèvre d'Etaples, and in 1496 Robert Gaguin could claim that Ficino's works were taught even in small universities across France.[36] In France, Ficinian philosophy was often mediated through the works of Cristoforo Landino, Battista Spagnoli and Filippo Beroaldo. The works of Spagnoli and Beroaldo provided Badius with a vast array of exemplary cases to illustrate the divine qualities of the poet, that are drawn from pagan oracles, biblical and Christian writings.[37]

Besides the Platonic notion of poetry as divinely inspired and therefore immortal, Badius introduces the idea of the redeeming power of poetry, which can cleanse the soul of sinners. The civilising function of language is exemplified through the myths of Orpheus and Amphion, the mythical builder of the Theban walls, which Badius faithfully transposes from Horace's *Ars poetica* (391–407), this being the most extensive quote from

---

[34] David G. Lummus, *The City of Poetry: Imagining the Civic Role of the Poet in Fourteenth-Century Italy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020).

[35] Lummus, *The City of Poetry*, 8.

[36] Galand-Hallyn and Hallyn, *Poétiques de la Renaissance*, 120–2. Badius edited Ficino's translations of Platonic dialogues in 1518.

[37] For references to the poet as theologian see Felipe González Vega, '*De poetica theologica*: presencias de alegorismo platónico en la exegesis humanista y mediación de las *Silvae Morales* de Badio Ascensio (1492)', in *Humanismo y pervivencia del mundo clásico: homenaje al profesor Antonio Fontán (Las artes literarias en el Renacimiento)*, 2 (2002), 799–810 (p. 803) and White, *Jodocus Badius Ascensius*, 268–71.

this work. Further elaborating on Horace's passage, Badius celebrates Orpheus's ability to tame wild beasts 'with his sweet chant' (*dulci suo eloquio*) and to persuade humankind 'to build cities' (*ad construendam civitatem*).[38]

The concept of poetry as a vehicle of divine truth is still current in Thomas Sébillet, *Art Poétique François* (French poetics, 1548) and Pierre de Ronsard's *Abregé de l'art poétique François* (A brief on the art of French poetry, 1565) who discusses poetry as embedding allegorical theology that allows man to comprehend divine truths. Sir Philip Sidney's *Apologie for poetrie* (1580–01), England's first treatise of literary criticism, revived the concept of the poet-*vates* and reiterated poetry's chief purpose to educate and entertain.[39]

THE CONCEPT OF VERISIMILITUDE AND THE FEATURES OF COMEDY

In chapter 6, Badius recalls the definition of classical comedy reported by Donatus and mentioned above, according to which 'comedy is an imitation of life, a mirror of customs and an image of truth' (*comoedia est imitatio vitae, speculum consuetudinis et imago veritatis*). The quote is accompanied by a brief discussion of literary genres, that echoes the treatment in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (Rhetorics for Herennius), which was the main manual of rhetoric used in school education throughout the Middle Ages and the Renaissance.[40] In the quoted passage (Pseudo-Cicero, *Rhet ad Her*. 1.8.13), literary genres are subdivided into factual accounts of past events (history), fictional stories that might happen in real life (comedy), fictional stories that are neither true nor probable (tragedies) and fictional stories that are neither true nor believable and as such should be avoided as they are 'false and deceptive.'

It is precisely the intrinsic generic quality of comedy as a mirror of everyday life that makes it the ideal pedagogical tool for the youth, teaching them to live a virtuous life and warning them against vice. Statements on the pedagogical value of classical comedy in teaching the young moral lessons by exposing

---

[38] The myth of Orpheus and Amphion as paradigm of the civilising power of poetry can be found in the introduction to the commentaries on Dante's *Divine Comedy* and Vergil's *Aeneid* by Florentine Cristoforo Landino, who was associated with Ficino's Platonic Academy. See Gabriele Bugada, (ed.) *Cristoforo Landino, in Quinti Horatii Flacci artem poeticam ad Pisones interpretationes* (Florence: Sismel, Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2012), 6, 9–10. For Landino's influence on Badius *Praenotamenta* see Juan F. Alcina, 'The Poet as God: Landino's Poetics in Spain (from Francesc Alegre to Alfonso de Carvallo)', in Barry Taylor and Alejandro Coroleu (eds.), *Latin and Vernacular in Renaissance Spain* (Manchester: Manchester, Spanish and Portuguese Studies, 1999), 131–48.

[39] Thomas Sébillet, *Art poétique François*, ed. Félix Gaiffe (Paris: Librairie Nizet, 1988), 7–15. On Sidney, see Habib, *A History of Literary Criticism*, 261–2.

[40] Harry Caplan, *Cicero. Rhetorica ad Herennium* (Cambridge, MA: Loeb Classical Library, 1954). In his introduction Caplan discusses extensively the identity of the anonymous author of the treatise which he dates to 86–82 BCE based on internal evidence (see p. xvi), as well as translations of this work in vernacular Italian, French and Castilian (pp. xxxv-vi). Badius disputed the attribution of this work to Cicero in an introductory note (*Disquisitio ascensiana*) to his own 1508 edition.

those vices that should be avoided, occur routinely in Renaissance commentaries to the plays of Terence. This cathartic process can only occur by virtue of the fact that comedy is a 'narrative without any life-threatening danger' (*sine periculo vitae comprehensio*).[41]

Chapters 16–19 elaborate Donatus's treatment of the constitutive parts of comedy or what, in modern terms, is called the dramatic arc. This consists of the prologue (*prologus*), the beginning of the action or dramatic arc (*prothesis*), complication (*epithasis*) and resolution (*catastrophe*).

The prologue (chapter 17) is presented in its four types: the 'commendatory' (*commendativus*), the 'relative' (*relativus*), which concerns the accusations the poet hurled at his detractors or his defence against such attacks, the 'enunciative' (*argumentivus*) that provides details of the plot and it seems to absolve 'the proper function of a prologue,' and the 'mixed' (*mixtus*), which contains the features of the other prologues. The second type (*relativus*) is deployed by Terence in all his six plays. The poet, through the words of the Prologue character rejects in turn accusations of plagiarism (*Eunuchus, Adelphoe*), of combining different Greek models according to a practice known in antiquity as *contaminatio* (*Andria, Heautontimorumenos*), of being a figurehead (*Heautontimorumenos, Adelphoe*) and of lack of inventiveness (*Phormio*). Terence, on the other hand, never wrote enunciative prologues, and although summaries of his plotline (*periochae*) survive both in manuscripts and in printed editions, these were added by grammarian Sulpicius Apollinaris and became integral part of Terence's textual tradition only at a later stage. As Badius remarks in the introductory notes to *Andria* that follow the *Praenotamenta*, these summaries are not part of the original plays and should not be performed, since revealing the plot at the beginning of the performance may prompt the audience to leave the theatre before it ends (b5v). The *prothesis* (chapter 18) is the 'start of the action' (*principium actionis*) in which, as Badius says, only some elements of the plot should be revealed to keep the audience engaged with the performance. The second part, the *epithasis*, is the core of a play, the 'entaglement of the plot' (*involutio argumenti*), while with the *catastrophe* all the events are resolved into 'happy endings' (*ad iucundos exitus*) that are typical of comedy.

After the tripartite division of the plot follows a short treatment of act divisions. Badius starts with Horace's highly influential prescription that plays should not exceed five acts (*Ars poetica*, 189–90). He then quotes the authority of Donatus who viewed in the five-act division a natural evolution from Greek drama in which each act was demarcated by choral parts and lamented that the absence of a chorus in Roman drama caused difficulties in determining act divisions.

---

[41] Badius, *Praenotamenta* 4, who quotes Diomedes, *Ars grammatica* cf. Keil, *Grammatici Latini*, vol 1, 488. In chapter 21, Badius again emphasizes how comedy is devoid of 'sorrowful deaths or extreme misfortunes' (*tristes mortes aut maxima infortunia*).

THE HORATIAN DECORUM

Chapters 20–23 of the *Praenotamenta* focus on decorum, or propriety, a concept that Badius extrapolates and further develops from Horace's *Ars poetica*. As argued by Jean Lecointe, although the concept is discussed at various stages in the *Ars poetica*, Horace refers to it as *proprietas* rather than *decorum*. Likewise, Horace's Late Antique and Medieval commentators use synonyms such as *dignitas* and *proprietas*; only a gloss by Porphyrio preserves the cognate *decor*. The first mention of *decorum* occurs in the commentary of Cristoforo Landino that Badius used as one of his major sources for his 1500 edition of *Ars poetica*.[42]

Landino's terminology is quite fluid and oscillates between *proprietas* and *decorum*. It is only in Badius's commentary on the *Ars poetica* (1500), and later in the *Praenotamenta,* that decorum becomes an overarching and canonical term. According to Badius, in a poetic composition decorum is three-fold and encompasses the structure of the plotline (*decorum rerum*), the characterisation of characters (*decorum personarum*) and the composition (*decorum verborum*).[43] In chapter 21, Badius discusses decorum in comedy alone, returning to the importance of verisimilitude. As comic plots must be resembling the truth (*verisimile*s), stories that are the pure product of imagination (*fabulosae*) cannot be staged in comedies. For this reason, plays must observe decorum in the portrayal of characters that must always conform to their role in 'their age, sex, disposition and fortune' (biir). Characterisation is a fundamental aspect of drama that it is not limited to textual composition but extends to delivery, encompassing diction and gestures.

The concept of decorum or propriety is at the core of sixteenth and seventeenth-century treatises on poetics.[44] Thomas Sébillet in his 1548 *Art Poétique Français*, mentions decorum (*décore*) as a well-known Horatian tenet, thus implicitly revealing his knowledge of the *Praenotamenta*.[45] Sébillet's discussion focuses particularly on the decorum of drama characters (*décore des personnes*), stressing the importance of creating characters that are believable to an audience. The importance of character verisimilitude is still one of the essential elements of comedy writing in the later

---

[42] Jean Lecointe, 'Josse Bade et l'invention du decorum horatien', *Camenae*, 13 (2012), 1–12; Hermand-Schebat, 'Le commentaire de Josse Bade', 8–9.

[43] As noted by Lecointe, 'Josse Bade', 6, the term occurs thirty-four times in Badius's commentary on *Ars poetica*.

[44] Marta Albalá Pelegrín, 'El *Arte nuevo* de Lope de Vega a la luz de la teoría dramática italiana contemporánea: Poliziano, Robortello, Guarini y el Abad de Rute', *eHumanista*, 24 (2013), 1–15 (Spain); Rebecca Wiseman, 'A Poetics of the Natural: Sensation, Decorum, and Bodily Appeal in Puttenham's *Art of English Poesy'*, *Renaissance Studies*, 28 (2014), 33–49 and Colleen R. Rosenfeld, *Indecorous Thinking: Figures of Speech in Early Modern Poetics* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2018) (England). On decorum in sixteenth and seventeenth-century dramaturgy see Bayliss, 'Serving Don Juan' (France and Spain).

[45] Sébillet, *Art poétique François*, 142, as remarked by Leiconte, 'Josse Bade', 1.

treatise *Arte nuevo de hacer comedia in este tiempo* (The new art of writing plays in this age) by Lope de Vega (1609) who insists on the importance of the alignment between a character's delivery and his social status. A king must express himself with gravity, an old man with sententious modesty. This pluralism of voices also creates the tension that triggers the unfolding of the plot. As Robert Bayliss remarks in reference to early seventeenth-century French comedy, the decorum is 'both literary and social insofar as it prescribes a hierarchical social order both for the spectacle onstage and for the audience witnessing it.'[46] By regulating the consonance between character and diction, appearance and body language, decorum enables audiences to understand their status and role in society. The concept of decorum is inextricably linked with the social function of theatre, as well as with the chief purpose of poetry itself, which is to educate and entertain (*docere et delectare*), as Badius emphasises in chapter 24. Poetry's didactic role, as exemplified in the Horatian formula, still has a prominent role in the influential sixteenth-century treatises on poetics written by Julius Caesar Scaliger and Philip Sidney.[47]

Chapter 24 of the *Praenotamenta* contains a praise of Terence's artistry, preparing the reader to appreciate his plays. Badius frames his discussion by means of an Aristotelian model of causality that started informing scholastic introduction to texts from the thirteenth century and that Alastair Minnis labelled 'Aristotelian Prologue.' According to Aristotle, four are the causes that originate a work: the efficient (*efficiens*) that brings potentiality into being, the final (*finalis*) which is the objective aimed at by the creator, the material (*materialis*) that consists in the sources of the work and the formal (*formalis*) or structure of the work.[48] Badius approaches this established framework with the vision and mentality of the Renaissance scholar and publisher. In his view, the efficient cause is sometimes the writer and sometimes the printer, the material can be paper, papyrus, parchment or book and the formal is the form that is utilised by the creator. Lastly, the final cause is the purpose intended by the creator which can be profit (*lucrum*), knowledge (*scientia*) or enjoyment (*delectatio*). In this brief digression, Badius's reference to the printer (*impressor*) as the efficient cause in equal terms as the writer and to profit as the finality of someone's work suggest that he was reflecting on the reality of book production of his own time. Next, Badius reverts to Terence and further discusses the final cause of his works. Quoting once again a passage from the *Ars poetica* (333–4), in which Horace contrasts poets who aim to benefit their audiences (*prodesse*) with those who wish to entertain them

[46] Bayliss, 'Serving Don Juan', 192; Herrick, *Comic Theory*, 136–44.

[47] Habib, *A History of Literary Criticism*, 266.

[48] Aristotle, *Physics* 2.3 and *Metaphysics* 5.2. On the 'Aristotelian Prologue' see Alastair J. Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages*, second edition (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988), 11–39, especially 28–9. Badius uses the four causes of the Aristotelian prologue in other introductions to his editions, as noted by White, *Jodocus Badius Ascensius*, 78–9.

(*delectare*), Badius remarks that dramatists, and particularly comedy writers, aspire to achieve both aims. Comedy fulfils its pedagogical purpose teaching the youth exemplary behavior and warning parents against being too complacent with their children:

> per exempla ostendunt iuuenibus quam pericolosum sit stultis amationibus incumbere, parentibus non obedire, rem delapidare, pompas facere, cessare, potare, et id genus exercere vitia.

> By examples they show youngsters the danger of succumbing to silly love intrigues, disobeying parents, squandering patrimonies, being flamboyant and lazy, drinking and engaging in this kind of vices.

The pedagogical value of the plays of Terence in teaching good morals was addressed specifically by Donatus and became the staple of Terence's revival and adaptations in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century. The moral lessons comedy can teach were one of the elements that elevated classical comedy to models for the developing national theatres across Europe.

CONCLUSION

The *Praenotamenta* were written as a pedagogical tool that could assist both students and educators to glean an overview of classical drama and gain a deeper understanding of Terence's plays. Although it followed a consolidated format that had been established in late antiquity, the *Praenotamenta* were pathbreaking in providing a synthetic and systematic treatment of dramatic criticism. The *Praenotamenta* circulated widely across Europe, making the neglect that they have suffered from contemporary scholarship all the more surprising. This oversight can perhaps be explained by the largely Aristotelian-centred approach that has dominated the study of dramatic criticism.

Badius did not live to see the publication of the Latin translation of Aristotle's *Poetics* by Alessandro de' Pazzi. In Italy, the influential commentary on the *Poetics* published in 1548 by Francesco Robortello determined the canonisation of the three dramatic unities that remained current throughout the seventeenth century amidst ongoing controversy. If on the one hand the *Poetics* seemed to limit playwrights' freedom and creativity, on the other hand it greatly broadened the discussion on dramatic genres. In previous decades, dramatic criticism revolved around classical comedy and the authority of Donatus. With the wide circulation of the Aristotelian treatise, tragedy also entered the equation along with other poetic genres, such as epic and lyrical poetry. Aristotle's discussion of poetic genres afforded poets generic experimentation and cross-contamination. From the 1540s onwards the ideological debate over the role of the poet in society and the legitimisation of a national literature in the vernacular intensified across Europe. This spurred the production of a flurry of treatises on *Poetics* in Italy,

France, Spain and England. The increasing popularity that Aristotle's *Poetics* enjoyed from the mid sixteenth century, however, did not undermine the chief principles of decorum, verisimilitude and the strong belief in the pedagogical value of poetry. Aristotelian notions were blended into the new poetics in accordance with the humanist syncretic approach to the classical past.

The didactic function of poetry continued being at the centre of the poetics in the treatises of Giambattista Giraldi and Marco Girolamo Vida whose *De arte poetica* (On the art of poetry) was conceived to provide advice to young poets.[49] The pseudo-Ciceronian definition of comedy and Horace's concepts of decorum that Badius had regarded as essential to the success of a dramatic play were echoed by theorists in Italy (Giambattista Giraldi and Francesco Robortello's *De comoedia*), Spain (Alfonso de Carvallo, Lope de Vega) and England (George Puttenham). These two notions remained central to discussions of poetics in treatises as well as in playwrights' poetic expositions (proemial or metatheatrical) throughout the seventeenth century. By way of example, playwright Lope de Vega deploys the Ciceronian definition of comedy as 'mirror of customs' to advocate the move to a 'new comedy' that avoids imitating classical models, but changes over time to suit the taste of its contemporary audiences.[50]

Notwithstanding the profound influence that Robortello's commentary on the *Poetics* exerted on subsequent poetics treatises across Europe, Flemish scholar, editor and printer Jodocus Badius Ascensius played a key role in the dissemination of the tenets of classical poetics. The *Ars poetica* of Horace, the treatise *De comoedia* of Donatus/Euanthius and Diomedes's categorisation of the features of tragedy and comedy were already known to humanist intellectuals. However, the *Praenotamenta* offered the first succinct and systematic treatment of texts whose accessibility and understanding had remained until then the privilege of a highly educated readership, thus paving the way to sixteenth-century dramatic criticism.

<div align="right">The University of New England</div>

APPENDIX A

PRAENOTAMENTA: TABLE OF CONTENTS

    1. *Quid sit poeta et quanta eius dignitas* (The character and dignity of the poet).

---

[49] Habib, *A History of Literary Criticism*, 267.

[50] Pelegrín, 'El *Arte nuevo*', 5.

2. *Quotuplicia sint poetarum scripta* (The many different types of poetic composition).

3. *De triplici carminum stilo et pedum ludentium ornamentis* (On the three styles of poetic composition and the patterns of dramatic metres).

4. *Descriptiones et differentiae tragoediae et comoediae* (Descriptions of tragedy and comedy and their differences).

5. *De origine et inventione satyrarum, tragoediarum et comoediarum* (On the origin and invention of satyr plays, tragedies and comedies).

6. *De comoedia antiqua* (On Ancient Comedy).

7. *De instrumentis et proscaeniis dramatum praecipue comoediarum* (On the scenic apparatuses and proscenia of plays and particularly of comedy).

8. *De theatro et eius constructoribus* (On theatre and its builders).

9. *De scaena et proscaenium* (On scene and proscenium).

10. *De personis et earum indumentis et coloribus* (On characters, their costumes and appearance).

11. *De proscaeniarum ornatu et instructione* (On the décor and configuration of the proscenium).

12. *De ludis romanis et festivitatibus in quibus agi consueuerunt comoedias* (On Roman games and festivals in which comedies used to be staged).

13. *De speciebus comoediarum* (On the types of comedies).

14. *De qualitatibus comoediarum* (On the qualities of comedy).

15. *De membris comoediarum* (On the parts of comedy).

16. *De partibus comoediarum et primum de tribus non principalibus* (On the parts of comedy starting from the three secondary parts).

17. *De prologis et eorum speciebus* (On the prologues and their types).

18. *De tribus partibus principalibus in comoedia* (On the three principal parts of comedy).

19. *De actibus et eorum distinctione in comoediis* (On acts and their division in comedy).

20. *De decoro et primum personarum* (On decorum, and firstly of characters).

21. *De rerum decoro* (On the decorum of the narrative).

22. *De verborum decoro* (On the decorum of words).

23. *De decoro totius operis* (On the decorum of the whole work).

24. *De quattuor causis huius operis* (On the four causes of his works).

25. *De Terentii vita* (On the life of Terence).

26. *De forma, operibus et laude Terentii* (On the appearance, works and praise of Terence).

Appendix B: Sixteenth-Century Editions Containing The *Praenotamenta*

	Publishing date	Publishing place	Printers/Publishers	Identifiers
1.	15 June 1502	Lyon	François Fradin	USTC 142806 PW 87859 Renouard 3, 283, n. 9
2.	18 December 1502	Lyon	Claude Many Étienne Baland	–
3.	30 March 1504	Lyon	Étienne Baland Simon Vincent	USTC 123537 PW 87861 Renouard 3, 284, n. 10
4.	15 July 1504	Paris London	Wynkyn de Worde Michael Morin and John Bray	USTC 500859 PW 87863 Renouard 3, 284–5, n. 12
5.	16 May 1505	Lyon	Étienne Baland Simon Vincent	USTC 123540 PW 87866 Renouard 3, 285, n. 13
6.	25 August 1506	Lyon	Étienne Baland Martin Boillon	USTC 143128 PW 87867 Renouard 3, 286, n. 14
7.	15 January 1507	Lyon	Étienne Baland Jean Bonnet	USTC 154987 PW 87871 Renouard 3, 286, n. 15
8.	30 July 1508	Paris	Nicolas des Prés Jacques Huguetan	USTC 123394 PW 87873 Renouard 3, 286–7, n. 16
9.	3 November 1508	Lyon	Johann Clein	USTC 156065 PW 87872 Renouard 3, 287, n. 17
10.	4 January 1509	Rouen	Laurent Hostingue Michel Angier & Jean Macé	USTC 112336 PW 87876 Renouard 3, 287, n. 19
11.	11 August 1509	Lyon	Étienne Baland Jacques Huguetan	USTC 123553 PW 87875 Renouard 3, 287, n. 18
12.	21 June 1510	Lyon	Pierre Mareschal Barnabé Chaussard	USTC 143564 PW 87877 Renouard 3, 288 n. 20
13.	19 April 1511	Lyon	Jacques Sacon Jacques Huguetan	USTC 143761 PW 87878 Renouard 3, 288, n. 21
14.	23 October 1512	Lyon	Étienne Baland Jacques Maillet	USTC 143910 PW 87880
15.	30 May 1513	Lyon	Jacques Mareschal Barnabé Chaussard	USTC 200027 PW 87882
16.	21 May 1513	Milan	Giovanni Giacomo da Legnano Angelo Scinzenzeler	USTC 858673 EDIT16 54665 Renouard 3, 289, n. 25

Appendix B Continued

	Publishing date	Publishing place	Printers/Publishers	Identifiers
17.	13 April 1514	Milan	Vincenzo Minuziano Niccolò Gorgonzola	USTC 858674 EDIT16 55260 Renouard 3, 290, n. 27
18.	20 February 1515	Lyon	Jacques Maillet	USTC 203530 PW 87885
19.	18 July 1515	Lyon	Pierre Mareschal Barnabé Chaussard	USTC 144387 PW 87884 Renouard 3, 290–1 n. 28
20.	23 November 1517	Lyon	Jean Marion Simon Vincent	USTC 144833 PW 87888 Renouard 3, 191–2 n. 31
21.	23 November 1517	Lyon	Jean Marion Constantin Fradin	USTC 144693 PW 87887
22.	23 November 1518	Lyon	Jean Marion Constantin Fradin	USTC 144863 PW 87889
23.	8 April 1520	Lyon	Jean de La Place Martin Boillon	USTC 145200 PW 87890 Renouard 3, 292–3 n. 33
24.	23 February 1521	Milan	Giovanni Giacomo da Legnano and brothers Agostino da Vimercate	USTC 858685 EDIT16 49412 Renouard 3, 293–4 n. 34
25.	6 October 1522	Lyon	Jean Rémy Simon Vincent	USTC 120974 PW 87894 Renouard 3, 294 n. 35
26.	8 August 1523	Milan	Nicolò Gorgonzola Agostino da Vi- mercate	USTC 858686 EDIT16 23943
27.	26 May 1524	Zaragoza	Jorge Coci	USTC 342017
28.	30 October 1525	Lyon	Jacques Myt	USTC 12372 PW 87897 Renouard 3, 295 n. 37
29.	1527	Lyon	Benoît Bonyn	USTC 145879 PW 87899
30.	22 April 1535	Lyon	Jacques-François Giunta	USTC 157041 PW 87919 Renouard 3, 297 n. 42
31.	June 1537	Lyon	Sébastien Gryphe	USTC 156873 PW 87926 Renouard 3, 397 n. 43
32.	1538	Paris	Ambroise Girault	USTC 186108 PW 87929
33.	September 1541	Lyon	Antoine Vincent	USTC 126523 PW 87958 Renouard 3, 298–9 n. 46