Classical Quarterly 57.1 117–124 (2007) Printed in Great Britain
doi:10.1017/S0009838807000109

TERENTIANA

With one exception, which is noted, the Oxford Classical Text of Lindsay *et al*. serves as point of departure.[1] I have not, however, reproduced the exact spelling of the manuscripts or the spelling and punctuation of the Oxford editors. When variants are given, mistakes of the Oxford apparatus have been corrected.

ANDRIA 612–14

On the advice of the slave Davus, Pamphilus has agreed to the marriage arranged for him, believing it would not come to pass. He has now learned that the marriage is to be celebrated that very day, and there is no longer any way out of it. Lines 612–14 as transmitted:

> Nam quid ego nunc dicam patri? negabon uelle me, modo
> qui pollicitus sum ducere? qua fiducia id facere audeam?
> nec quid nunc me faciam scio.
>
> **613** pollicitus sum $\Pi^{b}DLp$: sum pollicitus $GCPEv\eta$|
> id facere $DGLp$: facere id $\Pi^{b}CPEv\eta$

The fourth foot of 613 shows an inadmissible split anapaest. In his edition of 1857 Alfred Fleckeisen proposed *audacia* for *fiducia*, allowing the line to scan acceptably, with lengthening of the final in *ducere*. When the Oxford Classical Text of Lindsay and Kauer was printed in 1926 its apparatus announced that *audacia* was supported by indirect tradition—a fifteenth-century glossary kept at the Biblioteca Riccardiana in Florence under the shelfmark 3607. It would be very surprising—and full of implications for the history of the Terence-tradition—if indeed such a late witness conserved the truth against all others. In fact the Oxford edition just misreported its source. The entry in question, on fol. 18*v* of the glossary, reads 'fidutia : audatia'. *Fidutia* is the lemma, and it is what the compiler of the glossary saw in his copy of Terence.[2] We are thus left where we were in 1857.

Even as a conjecture, *audacia* is still tempting. But *qua fiducia* should not be let go of lightly, for it exemplifies an unusual Old Latin idiom that would not readily enter the text by error or interpolation. Plautus, *Epid.* 697–8:

> PERIPHANES Qua fiducia ausu's primum quae emptast nudiustertius
> filiam meam dicere esse? EPIDICVS lubuit, ea fiducia.

Qua fiducia there would seem to mean 'On what grounds did you …' or 'What allowed you to …', an extension of *mea/tua/eius fiducia* 'at my/your/his risk'. This rare expression should be kept at *Andria* 613 and the fault sought elsewhere. I propose:

[1] 1st edn. (1926); 2nd rev. edn. (1958).

[2] I cannot trace where the Oxford editors derived their information on the Riccardian glossary. The misunderstanding will be due to Lindsay rather than Kauer, who correctly noted *audacia* as a gloss in his school-commentary (*P. Terentius Afer, Andria* [Bielefeld–Leipzig, 1930], ad loc.).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000109 Published online by Cambridge University Press

negabon uelle me, modo
qui pollicitus sum accipere? qua fiducia id facere audeam?

I have chosen a 'safe' alternative to *ducere*. Others, more exotic, are imaginable: *capere*, for example (cf. Plautus, *Trin.* 64, *si ignotam capiam* [sc. *uxorem*]; *Amph. Arg. I*.1–3, *in faciem uersus Amphitruonis Iuppiter … Alcmenam uxorem cepit usurariam*; Terence, *Hec.* 537, *cum illum generum cepimus*).

HEAUTONTIMORUMENOS 579–82

Syrus has caused Chremes to believe that Bacchis is not the mistress of his son Clitipho but rather that of Clitipho's friend Clinia. Chremes has now seen Clitipho fondle Bacchis in Clinia's presence. He lectures Clitipho on his duty toward his friend. Syrus, who has been listening at a distance, then approaches Chremes and Clitipho and joins in:

SY quid istic narrat! CLIT perii! SY Clitipho, haec ego praecipio tibi?
hominis frugi et temperantis functu's officium? CLIT tace sodes. 580
SY recte sane. CLIT Syre, pudet me. SY credo, neque id iniuria. quin
mihi molestumst.

At 581, *recte sane* cannot mean that Syrus agrees to be silenced, for he continues his criticism a moment later. It can only be taken ironically, either as a further comment on Clitipho's morals or as an answer to *tace sodes*: 'Very pretty indeed!' (Sargeaunt); [3] 'A fine thing to suggest!' (Barsby).[4] In other words the received speaker-division has, as so often, been assumed right, and the dialogue understood in such a way as to fit it. Once the text is viewed without its accrued *notae personarum* an easier solution suggests itself. Write 581–2 as follows:

CH recte sane, Syre. pudet me. SY credo, neque id iniuria. quin
mihi molestumst.

Chremes first approves Syrus' line of questioning, then explains 'I am ashamed (of my son)'.[5]

While on this passage I should like to draw attention to another problem, though no confident solution to it seems possible. At 579–80 all manuscripts and editors give *quid istic narrat* to Syrus, *perii* to Clitipho, then *Clitipho, haec …* to Syrus again. *Perii!* then expresses Clitipho's dismay that Syrus has appeared, ready to join the argument on Chremes' side. We could as easily imagine *perii* spoken by Syrus, affecting disgust at Clitipho: *CLIT quid istic narrat! SY perii! Clitipho, haec ego praecipio tibi? / hominis frugi et temperantis functu's officium?* Or *perii* may be said again by Syrus, but out of concern for his scheme, now endangered (cf. l. 564): *SY* (aside) *quid istic narrat! perii!* (then to the others) *Clitipho, haec …*

[3] Loeb Classical Library (London–Cambridge, MA, 1912).
[4] Loeb Classical Library (London–Cambridge, MA, 2001).
[5] *Syre pudet me* (though not *recte sane*) is indeed given to Chremes by the medieval manuscripts and some editors (Bentley, Fleckeisen, Dziatzko). The Oxford text, seen above, follows MS A (the ancient codex Bembinus).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000109 Published online by Cambridge University Press

HEAUTONTIMORUMENOS 1035–44

Disinherited, Clitipho confronts Chremes and Sostrata saying that he cannot be their son, for no real parents would treat their child so. Chremes answers his charge:

> CHR non, si ex capite sis meo
> natus, item ut aiunt Mineruam esse ex Ioue, ea causa magis
> patiar, Clitipho, flagitiis tuis me infamem fieri.
> SO di istaec prohibeant! CH deos nescio: ego, quod potero, sedulo.
> quaeris id quod habes, parentes; quod abest non quaeris, patri
> quo modo obsequare et ut serues quod labore inuenerit.
> non mihi per fallacias adducere ante oculos … pudet
> dicere hac praesente uerbum turpe; at te id nullo modo
> facere puduit. CLIT eheu quam nunc totus displiceo mihi,
> quam pudet! neque quod principium incipiam ad placandum scio.

Di istaec prohibeant has always been given to Sostrata in manuscripts and printed editions: she is horrified by the possibility of Clitipho's debauchery injuring Chremes' reputation. Such an expression of horror, in effect strengthening Chremes' case for disinheritance, makes no sense in Sostrata's mouth, for she has been taking Clitipho's side in the dispute. *Di istaec prohibeant* is spoken by Clitipho. He is shocked at the thought of wronging his father, preparing the way for his complete surrender and confession a few lines later.

EUNUCHUS 831–6

Chaerea has entered the courtesan Thais' household disguised as a eunuch slave, raped a young girl there and run off. Thais now upbraids her maidservant Pythias for not keeping closer watch over the newcomer. As they argue Chaerea reappears, still dressed as a eunuch.

> PY quid facerem ? ita ut tu iusti, soli creditast.
> TH scelesta, ouem lupo commisisti. dispudet
> sic mihi data esse uerba. quid illuc hominis est?
> PY era mea, tace tace obsecro, saluae sumus:
> habemus hominem ipsum. TH ubi is est? PY em ad sinist<e>ram.
> uiden? TH uideo. PY conprendi iube, quantum potest.

Above is the arrangement of all manuscripts and editors. *Quid illuc hominis est?* has generally been understood to express Thais' surprise on seeing somebody approach in the outlandish eunuch's costume: 'What sort of (i.e. what an odd-looking) man is that?' This interpretation goes back to Donatus: *non continuo agnoscit hunc meretrix* … In his recent commentary on the play, John Barsby interprets it differently: 'what sort of a man is that?', understanding 'who could do such a deed'.[6] This idea does not quite satisfy. It involves an abrupt change of subject, and we should in any case expect *erat*, not *est*. But before rallying straight back to the traditional interpretation, it were best to imagine how it would be played. Chaerea is entering from the left wing. Thais sees him first, though she does not recognize him right away. Now in order to see Chaerea before Pythias does, Thais must be standing stage right of her, looking left toward her as she talks. On hearing *quid illuc hominis est?* Pythias turns around, recognizes Chaerea, then gives her mistress the news that the man they want is

[6] *Terence, Eunuchus* (Cambridge, 1999), ad. loc.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000109 Published online by Cambridge University Press

approaching. When Thais asks 'Where is he?' Pythias answers 'Over there to the left'—an absurdity, for Thais has been looking down the left wing all along. Pythias ought instead to say 'Straight in front of you'.

Quid illuc hominis est? is indeed an expression of surprise at Chaerea's strange clothing. But it must be spoken by Pythias. She stands stage right of Thais, who only turns after line 835. Whoever assigned the speaking-parts was misled by *tace tace obsecro*, which he assumed to interrupt a speech in progress.

HECYRA 135–40

Pamphilus has married Philumena against his will. Parmeno tells Philotis how their marriage began:

PAR ut ad pauca redeam, uxorem deducit domum. 135
nocte illa prima uirginem non attigit;
quae consecutast nox eam, nihilo magis.
PH quid ais? cum uirgine una adulescens cubuerit
plus potus, sese illa abstinere ut potuerit?
non ueri simile dicis neque uerum arbitror. 140

Lines 138–9 have always been punctuated as above and translated as in the new Loeb:[7] 'What are you saying? A young man went to bed with a girl after plenty to drink and was able to keep his hands off her?' That must indeed be the meaning. The problem is getting it from the text as it is printed. The commentators have understood *ut* to mark a clause of result.[8] If that is so, this clause can only with great difficulty depend on the main verb of the sentence. If Terence had written *abstineret* or *abstinuerit*, we could see in it a limiting expression of result: 'He went to bed with her only in this sense / with this reserve, that he refrained from touching her.' But why should he have written *abstinere potuerit* instead? Moreover, a correlative such as *ita* is practically obligatory when the result clause states a limitation,[9] and here it is absent. A result clause dependent on *potus* ('What are you saying? A young man went to bed with a girl, too drunk to keep away from her?') is out of the question, since *ut* cannot stand for *quam ut* or *quam qui*. Nor will this be the concessive *ut*, which is not used in quite this circumstance, but rather sets a sort of precondition: *Hec.* 296, *ut taceam, quoiuis facile scitust* ('even granted that I keep silent', 'keep silent as I may'); Cic. *De or.* 2.18, *ut enim quaeras omnia … non inuenies.*[10] Punctuate as follows:

PH quid ais? cum uirgine una adulescens cubuerit
plus potus? sese illa abstinere ut potuerit?[11]

[7] John Barsby, trans. (London–Cambridge, MA, 2001).

[8] S. G. Ashmore, *The Comedies of Terence* (New York, 1908), ad loc.; P. Thomas, *P. Terenti Afri Hecyra* (Paris, 1887), ad loc.: 'la proposition consécutive apporte une restriction à la pensée exprimée dans la principale: *cubuerit, sed ita ut...*'

[9] R. Kühner and C. Stegmann, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache, 2: Satzlehre*, 2 vols., with corrections to the 4th edn. by A. Thierfelder (Darmstadt, 1962), 2, pp. 249–51.

[10] Examples in Kühner and Stegmann (n. 9), 2.2, p. 251; Leumann-Hofmann-Szantyr, *Lateinische Grammatik* (Munich, 1965), 2.647; *OLD ut* sense 35.

[11] In one of the most important Terence-manuscripts (D, or Florence, Bibl. Medicea-Laurenziana 38.24), *ut* is actually omitted by the first hand at line 139 (not reported by the editors), raising the possibility of two perfectly parallel questions, each without *ut*. But *ut* there has the support of Arusian GLK 7.457, and it is moreover unclear why it should have intruded. More interesting is Donatus' scholion to *Ad.* 470, where *Hec.* 138–9 are quoted. The citation is transmitted as follows: *cum uirgine una adulescens ut cubuerit plus potuisse abstinere ut potuerit non ueri simile dicis nec uerum arbitror.* Here is evidence for writing *PH quid ais? cum uirgine*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000109 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Our *ut* is that of indignant or incredulous questions.[12] Its postponement is nothing unusual: Plautus, *Curc.* 616, *mean ancilla libera ut sit, quam ego numquam emisi manu?*; Terence, *An.* 618, *oh, tibi ego ut credam, furcifer?* Charles Bennet, *Syntax of Early Latin* (Boston, 1910), 1.188, probably understood line 139 aright, though he rather confusingly cited it in the received punctuation.

HECYRA 314–24

Pamphilus has arrived from abroad. His wife Philumena is in the home of her mother Myrrhina. Myrrhina has thus far hidden Philumena's pregnancy from everyone; even Pamphilus is unaware of it. Pamphilus is in the street with his slave Parmeno when Philumena goes into labour.

PAM abi, Parmeno, intro ac me uenisse nuntia. PAR hem quid hoc est?
PAM tace.
trepidari sentio et cursari rursum prorsum. PAR agedum, ad fores
accedo propius. em sensistin ? PAM noli fabularier.
pro Iuppiter, clamorem audiui. PAR tute loqueris, me uetas.
(*MY intus*) tace obsecro, mea gnata. PAM matris uox uisast Philumenae.
nullus sum PAR quidum? PAM perii. PAR quam ob rem? PAM
nescioquod magnum malum
profecto, Parmeno, me celant. PAR uxorem Philumenam
pauitare nescioquid dixerunt: id si forte est nescio.
PAM interii; quor mihi id non dixti? PAR quia non poteram una omnia.
PAM quid morbi est? PAR nescio. PAM quid? nemon medicum adduxit?
PAR nescio.
PAM cesso hinc ire intro ut hoc quam primum quidquid est certo sciam?

314 PAR hem qu. h. e. PAM tace *ADLpCPEFηv*^{1}*:* PAR hem PAM qu. h. e. PAR tace *v*^{2} | **315** trep. *ADLpηv :* PAR trep. *CPEF* | PAR (*ante* ag.) *A : om. DLpCPEFηv* | **316** accedo *AD*^{1} *:* accede *D*^{2}*LpCPEFηv* | em *Ap*^{1} *:* hem *v*^{2}*CPEF :* PAR em *D*^{1} *:* PAR hem *D*^{2}*Lp*^{2}*ηv*^{1} | **320** celant *D*^{2}*L*^{1}*p*^{2}*CPEFηv:* celas *AD*^{1}*L*^{2}*p*^{1} | *hoc scito, ubique in hac fabula personarum notas codicis p a scriba omissas esse, a correctore postea illatas.*

The arrangement seen above, printed by all modern editors, derives from manuscript A (the codex Bembinus). Its weaknesses become apparent once we put ourselves in the position of the audience and especially of the playwright. Following the received assignment of parts, we must imagine Pamphilus and Parmeno to stand, initially, at some distance from Myrrhina's house. When ordered to go and announce his master's arrival, Parmeno begins to approach the house. He is startled by something. Pamphilus then hushes him, saying that he hears disturbing noises within. Parmeno agrees to move closer. He hears more of the noises. Pamphilus hushes him again. Pamphilus now hears Myrrhina begging Philumena not to cry out, and understands that something terrible is being hidden. He is angry that Parmeno has not told him all that he heard from within. Such a reconstruction offends against logic and above all against the economy that usually governs the movement of actors on stage. In writing the order *abi, Parmeno, intro ac me uenisse nuntia*, the dramatist meant to place Parmeno closer to Myrrhina's house than Pamphilus, so that he could

[una] adulescens ut cubuerit / plus potus? sese illa abstinere ut potuerit? But *ut cubuerit* may well be due to a scribe whose eye jumped one line down the page to *ut potuerit.*

[12] Usually indignation and incredulity are both present, but incredulity alone is possible: Plaut. *Persa* 131–2 *TOXILVS hic leno neque te nouit neque gnatam tuam. SATVRIO me ut quisquam norit nisi ille qui praebet cibum?*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000109 Published online by Cambridge University Press

hear things inaudible to Pamphilus; that he indeed heard such things is plain from 320–2. Yet it is Pamphilus who at 314 hears enough to know that he must silence Parmeno. In addition, Parmeno's offer to go closer at 315–16 rather defeats the purpose of Pamphilus' order at 314: Parmeno draws toward the house in two stages, and two devices have been used to move him, when one should have been enough.

Redistribute the speaking parts as follows:

> PAM abi, Parmeno, intro ac me uenisse nuntia. PAR hem quid hoc est? tace.
> trepidari sentio et cursari rursum prorsum. PAM agedum, ad fores 315
> accedo propius. PAR em sensistin? PAM noli fabularier.
> (*PH intus*) pro Iuppiter! PAM clamorem audiui. PAR tute loqueris, me uetas.
> (*MY intus*) tace obsecro, mea gnata! …

Parmeno starts toward the house after *nuntia* in 314. There is a pause in the dialogue as he walks; he speaks *hem quid hoc est?* after arriving at the entry. There is again a pause after *propius*, allowing Pamphilus to reach the entry. There may be others, too, after 314 and at 315 after *rursum prorsum*, as Parmeno puts his ear to the door or otherwise pantomimes eavesdropping. These pauses are long enough to let Parmeno catch bits of conversation from within.

The γ-manuscripts CPEF reflect rather a better understanding of the stage action than does A: they give Pamphilus *tace* in 314, but make everything from *trepidari* to *sensistin* a speech by Parmeno, who arrives at the entry, listens (presumably), then invites Pamphilus to draw closer, saying *accede*, which they read in place of *accedo*. But *accedo*, if spoken by Pamphilus, is preferable, since the scene has been conceived to heighten his pathos by showing him anxious and impatient. It has almost always been assumed that *tace* at 314 had the same function as *noli fabularier* in 316—to hush Parmeno. One medieval reader, however, whose hand is seen in Valenciennes, BM 448 (v), saw that *tace* at 314 was said by Parmeno, though he gave Pamphilus *quid hoc est?* (contradicting the reason behind Parmeno's movement—to allow him to hear what Pamphilus cannot).

The assignment of *pro Iuppiter* to Philumena, proposed by Palmerius but not adopted by the editors, is sound.[13] Without this change Pamphilus must say he hears a shout when the text has contained no shout. Though more typically male, *Iuppiter* can be exclaimed by a woman (Plautus, *Poen*. 1122). The dramatist has chosen a less conventional oath to keep Pamphilus in the dark as to Philumena's condition (the game would be given away were she to call on Juno Lucina).

One last point: at 320 *celas* (A and the δ-manuscripts before correction[14]) is better than *celant* (γ and the vulgate). Granted, Pamphilus' state of mind is not rational. Still he has no reason to think that Myrrina's household are conspiring to keep anything from him. He has not yet seen them or tried to; the issue has not arisen. But he does suspect Parmeno of withholding bad news.

[13] J. M. Palmerius, 'Spicilegia in Terentium', in J. Gruterus, *Lampas siue fax artium liberalium, hoc est thesaurus criticus* (Frankfurt, 1602–34), vol. IV (1604), 717–62, 821–71; the conjecture in question appears on 738.

[14] Note that L (Leipzig, Universitätsbibl. Rep. I 4° 37) belongs in this play to the γ-class of manuscripts.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000109 Published online by Cambridge University Press

HECYRA 367–8

postquam me aspexere ancillae aduenisse, ilico omnes simul
laetae exclamant 'uenit', id quod me repente aspexerant.

In the Oxford text as in some others the paradosis is retained and the trochaic septenarius rescued by supposing the first syllable of *omnes* short. Such a shortening could be admitted after a monosyllable, as at Plautus, *Mil.* 55 (senarius) *quid tibi ego dicam quod omnes mortales sciunt*, but another remedy should be sought here.[15] *Omnes ilico* for *ilico omnes simul*, proposed by Bentley in his commentary, though not printed in his text, has been the least violent thusfar. The transmitted text is better accounted for by reading

postquam me aspexere ancillae aduenisse illo, omnes simul
laetae exclamant 'uenit', id quod me repente aspexerant.

The local adverb *illo* is very subject to correction: it is often given by only a minority of manuscripts, as at *An.* 362; and it must not seldom be read conjecturally, as at Plautus, *Aul.* 705.

ADELPHOE 143–7

Micio soliloquizes on his difficult brother Demea and how best to handle him:

nam itast homo:
quom placo aduorsor sedulo et deterreo;
tamen uix humane patitur; uerum si augeam
aut etiam adiutor sim eius iracundiae,
insaniam profecto cum illo.

Modern scholarship on these lines divides into two camps. Some understand *placo*, *aduorsor* and *deterreo* as three parallel verbs within the *quom*-clause, which they take to be concessive (explaining that only *aduorsor* and *deterreo* are joined by *et* because they are closer in meaning).[16] Others end the *quom*-clause, now temporal, with *placo*.[17] Neither give us a speech that reads acceptably.

Micio's point is that Demea must be calmed. The contrast is between calming him (*placo*), which leads to success (*deterreo*), and provoking his irascible nature (*augeam … iracundiae*), which would only throw both brothers into fruitless turmoil (*insaniam cum illo*). Such a run of sense cannot be had if *quom … deterreo* is made one long concession: what should be the main thrust of the concession, *placo*, is then hidden amid two irrelevancies. If *quom* is made temporal and its scope limited to *placo*, then the right contrast can be seen, but only dimly, for *aduorsor sedulo* intrudes upon

[15] As for *Hec.* 867 *omnia omnes ubi resciscunt* (adduced by W. M. Lindsay, *Early Latin Verse* [Oxford, 1922], 209) the *i* of *omnia* could as easily be consonantal as the *om* of *omnes* shortened after a *brevis brevians*, and in any case what is allowed in the first foot is no precedent for the middle of the line.

[16] C. Conradt, *Die metrische Composition der Comödien des Terenz* (Berlin, 1876), 62; K. Dziatzko and R. Kauer, *Ausgewählte Komödien des P. Terentius Afer, II: Adelphoe* (Leipzig, 1903), ad loc.; Ashmore (n. 8), ad loc.; B. Schneider, 'Zwei Bemerkungen zu den Adelphen des Terenz', *RhM* 127 (1984), 133–40, esp. 133–5.

[17] So R. H. Martin, *Terence: Adelphoe* (Cambridge, 1976), ad loc.; J. Ashley and R. Clark, 'Sense and punctuation at Terence, *Adelphoe* 141–147', *RhM* 129 (1986), 260–6, esp. 264–6; U. Gärtner, 'Terenz, *Adelphoe* 144–147', *RhM* 139 (1996), 355–7.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000109 Published online by Cambridge University Press

deterreo and muddles the thought: Micio should not say 'when I calm him I argue carefully and stop him from his course' but simply 'when I calm him I stop him from his course'. In no case should *deterreo* be understood in its etymological sense of 'frighten off';[18] to do so destroys the contrast between success and failure.

Read

> quom aduorsor, placo sedulo et deterreo;
> tamen uix humane patitur.

When I oppose him I take care to keep him calm, and I stop him from his course. Even so he's barely reasonable about it.

At an ancient stage of the transmission either *aduorsor* or *placo* was omitted, then added back in the wrong place.

The truth was nearly hit upon long ago, when J. M. Palmerius conjectured *placo cum aduersor sedulo*.[19] But this solution invites the reader (indeed all but forces him) to construe *sedulo* with *aduersor/aduorsor*, again obscuring the point.

Centre d'études classiques, Université de Montréal BENJAMIN VICTOR
benjamin_victor@hotmail.com

[18] So for example Dziatzko and Kauer (n. 16), ad loc., A. S. Gratwick, *Terence, The Brothers* (Warminster, 1987), ad loc.
[19] Palmerius (n. 13), 729.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000109 Published online by Cambridge University Press