The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

The Andria and Heautontimorumenos of Terence *The Andria and Heautontimorumenos of Terence*, by Andrew F. West, Ph.D., Professor of Latin in Princeton College. (Harper's Classical Series, 1888.)

E. M. Pease

The Classical Review / Volume 3 / Issue 07 / July 1889, pp 297 - 299

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0019540X, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0019540X

How to cite this article:

E. M. Pease (1889). The Classical Review, 3, pp 297-299 doi:10.1017/S0009840X0019540X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

THE ANDRIA AND HEAUTONTIMORUMENOS OF TERENCE.

The Andria and Heautontimorumenos of Terence, by ANDREW F. WEST, Ph.D., Professor of Latin in Princeton College. (Harper's Classical Series, 1888.)

OUR Latin text-books fall more or less distinctly into two classes, those which aim to interpret their selections as literary master-pieces complete in themselves, and those which regard them as parts of a once great literature, the beauty and value of which we can best appreciate from the application of historical and comparative methods.

This book belongs to the former class, and we should do it an injustice if we applied rigidly to it the same standards of criticism that are applicable to such recent editions of Terence as Spengel's, Meissner's and Dziatzko's. The aim of this edition, as we learn from the preface, is 'to acquaint the student with Terence's Latin as a model of refined style, to make clear his truthful view of ancient domestic life, to define his place in the history of Roman literature in respect to his Latin predecessors and his Greek models, and to insure at least a general understanding of what kind of Latin he employed and of its bearing upon his metres.' The preface also suggests the excellent opportunity that the translating of Terence affords for improving one's English, and urges that much be made of it. This last thought has been constantly in the mind of the editor and the commentary is marked with spirited translations and skilful paraphrases.

The introduction of forty pages treats of the development of Greek and Latin comedy, theatres, public games, plots and characters in Terence's plays, language, style, metres, etc. in an entertaining way and, so far as it goes, will be helpful to the young student.

The explanation of the metres (which the editor in the preface claims is unusual in the text-books of Terence) seems to us too scanty, and, without further suggestions in the notes, hardly sufficient to enable the student to appreciate and overcome the difficulties of early scansion. We would gladly sacrifice the comparison with early English metres for more specific treatment of Terentian metres.

Here and there throughout the introduction we find an occasional slip or an opportunity for a difference of opinion. For instance, we would protest against

ranking the *Phormio* (p. x.) as the poorest play, or with the *Hecyra*. The testimony of Donatus, and the condition of the MSS. show that the ancients did not so regard it. It is not clear how much Professor West signifies by the order he gives to the plays when speaking of their merits; but if we were obliged to arrange them categorically in order of excellence, it would be *Eun. Phorm. And. or Adel. Heaut. Hec.* In the statement that actors were disguised by masks (p. xxi.), Professor West takes a position against the best authorities. We learn from *Phorm.* 210 and 890 that Terence did not contemplate masks, and the express statements of *Cic. de Or.* III. 221 and *Dion.* p. 489 confirm this opinion. Among the relics of archaic quantity (p. xxxvi.), *ūs* in the nom. sing. second declension is erroneously mentioned, and the ending *ūt* of the pres. ind. 3rd conjugation should not be given with the same assurance as the long vowels in the pres. subj. and perf. ind. We miss among other things any reference to hiatus. While Professor West is clearly wrong in assigning the date of some of the MSS. (they are not named) to the eighth century, we are pleased to see that Calliopius is placed back to the third, thus earlier than Donatus.

The merits of the book lie especially in the successful attempt to make clear to the student's mind the movement of the drama, and we shall therefore give proportionately as little consideration to the text as the editor has. It is 'substantially that of Umpfenbach's,' and the improvements of the last twenty years have received too little recognition. Both here, and in the notes, the editions of Bentley and Wagner—though valuable in their way—have exerted undue influence; and the consideration for the recent literature on early Latin has been far too slight. There is however a commendable advance over Umpfenbach in orthography and punctuation, though we have still such inconsistencies as the following: *exequar And.* 259 and *exsequi Heaut.* 635; *apponi And.* 331 and *adpone Heaut.* 89; *cum* is retained in *And.* 515 and 823, *Heaut.* 726 and 1024. *maxime Heaut.* 407; *libido Heaut.* 573; *siet* is read in *Heaut.* 1021 and *face* in *And.* 712 in disregard of Engelbrecht. *Primus And.* 512 and *mores Heaut.* 239 are misprints.

The notes are placed after the text and, though some in the *Andria* are very diffuse, they are in the main clear and concise

Every effort is made to keep the changes in the dramatic situations clear in the student's mind; and this is done so persistently by analysing the state of mind of the characters and by interpreting pronouns, etc., as to give the impression that Terence was one of the most obscure of dramatists.

Considerable space in the *Andria* is devoted to the subject of antiquities; and occasionally the notes fail to give 'the truthful view of domestic life,' by describing Roman customs when the text suggests Grecian ones. Everywhere that it is possible, Professor West very successfully points out the obligations of Terence to Menander, and displays the process of *contaminatio*. The explanation for the changes in metre showing the harmony of thought and metre is made quite a feature. If the notes seem too scanty for such an author as Terence, it is because so little attention is paid to the subject of language and style. We shall not complain of the neglect to mention some of the notable peculiarities of early Latin, or to trace the history of forms and constructions through other authors; this is plainly not the purpose of the book; but it is in the comparatively few attempts of this kind that we find most to criticize. In the hopes that it may be of use in an early revision we venture to give a brief list of details. The date for the aediles on p. 125 is probably a misprint; we can, at least, find no warrant for thinking that the aediles should have received the *Andria* so long before it was brought out. P. 126: the spelling *tibis* of the notes, or its equivalent *tibIs*, is preferable to *tibis* in the text, which is not in accordance with Plautine or Terentian usage. *Tota*, always puzzling to the student, should have a note. If FACTA I means 'performed for the first time,' what does FACTA VI in the *Adel.* mean? The note on *personae* gives the impression that they have MSS. authority. P. 128: *Lanuvinus* is the generally accepted form for the name of the *vetus poeta*. The statement on *And.* 5 contains the long current errors concerning *utor*, *fruo*, etc. These verbs cannot be thrown into the same category in their early use. In Plaut. and Ter. *utor* regularly takes the abl., and *fruo* always takes it with but one exception; *fungor* always has the acc., excepting possibly *Adel.* 603; *potior* is used with the gen. twice, abl. twice, and acc. twice, in Plautus; and three times with the acc., and once with the abl. in Terence. These verbs are thoroughly treated by Langen in the 3rd vol. of the *Archiv.* v. 18: the account of Naevius and Plautus

in the introduction renders a long note here unnecessary. v. 44: the statement that 'nouns in *ius* and *ium*' have the gen. in single *i*, is true of classical Latin as well as early Latin, though we should distinguish between substantives and adjectives. The note on v. 69 contains two errors: *abhinc* is associated with the ablative not only twice but many times; and its future use is by no means confined to 'pre-classical Latin,' cf. Ploen, *Archiv.* vol. 4. A glance in any Lexicon would correct the misstatement that *conflictor* (v. 93) is always found in the passive voice except in *Phorm.* 505. v. 144: *postridie* is regarded a locative by the best authorities. v. 150: the obsolete derivation of *cedo* from *ce + dato* is once more presented; and the explanation of *nunciam* (v. 171) as a compound of *nunc-iam* is very doubtful. v. 173: the use of *modo* in present time is not limited to 'pre-classical Latin,' cf. Hand's *Tursell.* In consideration of a number of instances in Cicero's Letters as well as in other authors, the note on v. 183 should read, '*astute*, a word rarely found outside of familiar writers' (instead of 'pre-classical writers'). This illustrates a failure to distinguish the *sermo familiaris* noticeable throughout the commentary. Another error on the same verse is the statement that *prae-video* is not found in Cicero. Two undoubted instances are *Att.* 6, 9, 5 and *Verr.* v. 22. v. 199: *Verberibus caesum* refers to the beating that Davus will receive before he is sent to the mill. On v. 211 we think Professor West is wrong in regarding *hoc* as a neuter acc., instead of the masc. gender in agreement with *amore*. On v. 328 he appears to say that the use of *haec* as an alternative fem. plur. for *hae* is limited to old Latin, when it is of course known to occur more than once in Cic. Caes. Verg. and Liv. The familiar use of *nullus* in v. 370 is pronounced 'not classical,' and such comic parallels are cited as *Eun.* 216 *etsi nullus moneas*. If this is granted as a fair parallel, what objection could be made to *Philotimus nullus venit* Cic. *Att.* xi. 244, and similar expressions in Cicero's Letters? Cf. Haupt *Opusc.* I. 75ff. In speaking of *coram* on v. 490 as 'an adverb here,' the editor might have added 'and elsewhere till the time of Cicero.' v. 580: there have been many attempts to explain the derivation of *ecce*, but none so novel as this: *ce* is an intensive enclitic; a proclitic is formed by reversing the *c* and *e*; *ecce* is proclitic plus enclitic—a sort of reduplication. v. 637: the personal use of *udent* has a parallel in Lucan 8, 495 (Harper's Lex.). v. 679: the derivation of

Sedulo given by Donatus and Servius as coming from *se* (*sine*) and *dolo* has been long given up; probably the most satisfactory is from root *sad*; $\xi\delta$; *sed*. In the note on v. 803 and elsewhere, both in the notes and text, the distinction is not maintained between the demonstrative (acc.) *em* (*en*), and *hem* which expresses sorrow or joy. All the later MSS. have confused the two, cf. Brix' exhaustive note on Pl. *Trin.* 3. In saying on p. 207 that 'in Terence *Chremes* is always the name of a *senex*,' Professor West forgets the tipsy youth in the *Eunuchus*. The error, so common in editions and in some of our grammars, of confusing those widely different constructions—the adverbial acc. and the acc. of specification—is found on *Heaut.* 16. v. 40: we do not see why actors would be obliged to exert themselves more in order to

be heard at a *fabula motoria* than at a *f. stataria*. Would not the attention of the audience be held more closely by a play which is lively from beginning to end? v. 161: *faxo* and *faxim* are now regarded as perfects, or more strictly speaking aor. subj. and aor. opt.; cf. Stolz, *Lat. Gram.* § 110.

At the close of each play there is a group of 'Textual Notes' embodying, with others, the variations from Umpfenbach. In an edition of this kind when the different MSS. are not even mentioned textual discussion seems rather out of place. The value of these notes is also much lessened by the large number of erroneous and misleading statements in them. The volume closes with a very good index.

E. M. PEASE,
Bowdoin College.

DE OFFICIIS DI M. TULLIO CICERONE.

I tre libri de officiis di M. Tullio Cicerone commentati da REMIGIO SABBADINI. Torino: Ermanno Loescher. 1889.

THIS edition—forming a volume of the excellent Turin *Collezione di Classici Greci e Latini con note Italiane*—contains an Introduction pp. xxxviii, with Text and annotations pp. 187 followed by a short grammatical Index p. 188—p. 191. The Introduction treats on the Method of the Commentary, the literary aids, the date of the work and its sources, notice of Cicero's Son to whom it is dedicated—but not of the systems of philosophy which the Author followed, points in connexion with these being reserved for the notes. It contains also the Editor's conjectures and emendations and treats of the MSS generally and of one in particular preserved in the Ambrosian Library at Milan—a parchment MS of the XIIth Century (**M**), which the editor has collated and classes with the best MSS—being closely allied to **B**, though it has many points of contact with the second or inferior group. By the aid of this MS the editor restores the probably true reading in several passages, e.g. I c. 3 § 8 where the *quod* of **M** for the vulgate *quoniam* suggests the correct reading *perfectum officium rectum, opinor, vocemus, quod Graeci κατόρθωμα. hoc autem commune καθήκον vocant.* The word *officium*, commonly read before *καθήκον*, arose from the false reading *cathicon*, the Latin transcription of

the Greek word. Thus we have Orelli's conjectural reading of the passage confirmed by this MS. The latest German editor, on the other hand, omits *καθήκον*. In I c. 7 § 21 *eo plus si quis sibi adpetet* is a great improvement on the vulgate *e quo si etc.* In I c. 21, 72 it gives the true reading *nihil minus*, where the other MSS have all *nihil minus*. On the *locus vexatus* I c. 29, 104 new light is thrown by the unique reading of **M**, *alter est, si tempore fit, haud remisso animo, homine dignus*, where the usual reading is *ut (et) si remisso animo*. In c. 38, 138 Signor Sabbadini proposes to read *ut quique aderunt* for the *utcumque aderunt* of the MSS. The conjecture is a plausible one. In II c. 3, 10 he solves the difficulty of *haec tria genera (genere) confusa* by supposing that *tria* arose from the abbreviation *nā* or *nra* for *natura*, and he thinks that the following passage—supposed by C. W. Müller also and others to be spurious—was an interpolation due to the false reading *tria*. In II c. 7, 24, **M** alone preserves the true reading *ut eris*, which Baiter restored. The conjecture *alae veliti* 'a flying squadron' in II c. 13, 45 for *alae alteri* is ingenious: most editors suppress the *alteri*, which they cannot explain. Signor S. contributes another ingenious emendation of a well known difficult passage III. c. 6, 28, where he substitutes *quae salva fiant iustitia* for *quae vacent iustitia*. The commentary is ample and exhaustive, without being unnecessarily long; it deserves special praise for