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](#)

Terentiana

J. S. Phillimore

The Classical Review / Volume 32 / Issue 5-6 / August 1918, pp 98 - 102

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00011562, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00011562

How to cite this article:

J. S. Phillimore (1918). Terentiana. The Classical Review, 32, pp 98-102 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00011562

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

four historical (or legendary) events in their proper sequence, then in vv. 73, 74 he seems to be summing up the whole course of Roman history. The original phrase, of which 'Romuli matrem' is a corruption must have applied to some person or persons who was or were representative of the period of the Roman Republic. 'Romulum patrem' (Mackail) does not seem to clear up the difficulties of the paragraph, wherever lines 73, 74 are placed, and I suggest that the author wrote 'Romuli Patres' or, with less probability, 'Romulam gentem.' In the former case the translation is 'that she might bring into existence the Ramnes and Quirites, and as descendants of Romulus afterwards the Senators and Caesar. his latest descendant'; in the latter case the author (whose familiarity with classical writers is pointed out by Mr. Clementi) is recalling Horace C. IV. 5, 1, C.S. 47, and a very easy translation results: 'Romulus' would be the proper adjective with 'gens' as 'Romuleus' would be with 'nuptiae.' 'Romulo Patres (for rhythm) and 'posteram Romuli gentem' (for lucidity) are very attractive alternatives for these two suggestions.

Yet I plead for accepting the form of the composition as given by the MSS. with a minimum of rearrangement. There is one undoubted case where a line must be transposed, viz. v. 58 ('et recentibus,' etc.), an error whose source is explained by Mr. Clementi, and the line is undoubtedly restored to its right place when it is inserted between vv. 39 and 40. The succeeding

line of the MSS. v. 59 ('cras erit quum primus Aether,' etc.) should probably be transposed also, and, if so, it should stand, as most editors place it, between vv. 8 and 9; but I cannot see that any further transpositions improve the text in any way; I do not trust the writers at all in such a matter, but I do not find that any of the suggested transpositions improve the logical sequence of the thoughts expressed, while all of them seem to me to impair the poetical representation of them. In especial I believe that the two clerks placed, though they could not copy, the refrain correctly; in Virgil, Catullus, and Theocritus a refrain regularly occurs at unequal intervals, marking (except in its last occurrence at the end of the poem) the beginning of a new paragraph in the composition; and this seems to be the method used in the *Pervigilium*.

The poem clearly had a great vogue for several centuries; it will be read again largely whenever it becomes known, as it has become accessible, and when its text again assumes a settled form.

P.S.—The possibility of retaining the MS. reading with the substitution only of 'prosperam' for 'posterum' in v. 73 should also be considered. A better scholar than myself doubts whether the Latin can be translated as I translate it, but the result, if it is possible, is attractive 'that she might bring to life the R. and Q., and make fortunate in their offspring both the mother of Romulus and his descendant Caesar.'

J. A. FORT.

TERENTIANA.

I.

THE QUESTION OF PLAGIARISM IN THE PROLOGUE TO THE *EUNUCHUS*.

AFTER the aediles had bought the rights of Terence's play, Luscius managed to be present at the rehearsal and interrupted the performance with a loud protest:

23. Exclamat furem, non poetam, fabulam
dedisse et nil dedisse uerborum tamen:

Colacem esse Naeui, et Plauti ueterem
fabulam;
Parasiti personam inde ablatam et militis.

Ver. 25 has long been matter of dispute. Some have held that the *Colax* was produced in collaboration between Naevius and Plautus; others, that

Plautus modernised Naevius' version. The former view seems unlikely, because the fact is unexampled (*Fabia*); the latter because Plautus only outlived Naevius by fifteen years: a play would hardly go out of date so soon. The punctuation which I have given above represents Vissering's explanation: viz., 'the *Colax* is by Naevius, and there is an old play by Plautus: it is from these that Terence has stolen the characters of the Parasite and the Soldier.' This accounts for the plural *eas fabulas* in ver. 33.

But *Fabia* objects that it would be odd of Luscius to name Naevius' play and only vaguely to designate that of Plautus. The objection is not insoluble, for it would be evident enough what play of Plautus' was intended, and Terence actually uses the words *miles gloriosus* in ver. 31. It seems to me more credible that Luscius' protest, or Terence's report of that protest, was as Vissering took it, than that Plautus should have modernised one of Naevius' pieces, and the piece be described as belonging to them both.

Such then was the charge; what is Terence's reply? 'If there is a fault, it is a fault of inadvertence.' And he proceeds to justify this defence:

30. *Colax Menandri est; in east parasitus colax et miles gloriosus. Eas se non negat personas transtulisse in Eunuchum suam ex Graeca; sed eas fabulas factas prius Latinas scisse sese, id uero pernegat.*
 35. *quod si personis eisdem huic uti non licet, quid magis licet currentem seruum scribere, bonas matronas facere, meretrices malas [parasitum edacem, gloriosum militem], etc.*

(The last verse is bracketed by Loman, Dziatzko, and other modern editors.) That is to say:

"The *Colax* belongs to Menander—not to Naevius. From the original Greek, and not from Naevius' *Colax*, I borrowed not only the character of Gnatho but also that of Thraso, my *miles gloriosus*, who does not derive from Plautus' *uetus fabula*. The borrowing from Menander I do not deny: it is a case of *contaminatio*, which is allowed: what I do most stoutly deny (*pernego*) is . . . what?"

Our text makes Terence deny that he knew of the existence of Naevius' version of *Colax* and Plautus' *Miles Gloriosus*. This is so absurd that *Fabia* (Introd.

pp. 65-6) roundly accuses Terence of a clumsy lie. Is such enormous clumsiness credible, even if Terence's veracity were no higher than *Fabia* rates it? For mark how he continues: 'if stock characters may not lawfully be used, then what becomes of your *seruos currens*, etc.?' And in fact the New Comedy is all made of stock characters. Whether or no he knew of Naevius' and Plautus' plays, his line of defence is unimpaired: then why go out of his way to deny? Is it not inconceivable that a man of letters could tell his audience that he had never heard of Plautus' *Miles Gloriosus*? And what about his noble collaborators?

The real suspicion then falls not on the word *fabulas* in ver. 33, which *Fabia*, following Ritschl, alters to *ab aliis*, but on *scisse* in 34. And just here it jumps with a palaeographical suspicion, for (taking Umpfenbach's apparatus) we find:

- A. SCISSE SESE prius SE induxit
 corr. rec.
 D. scisse sese.
 B(C ?)EP. scissé se.
 G. scisse se.

The reading of G (*Decurtatus*) indicates an archetypal SCISSE: first SE, then SESE was thrown in to fill up a hole in the metre. The hole was caused by the shrinking of

LATINAS ASCIVISSE or LATINAS SE ASCIVISSE into LATINAS SCIVISSE.

If Terence wrote this, his argument is at least consistent, and he cannot be accused of lying: 'he has borrowed *personae* from Menander's *Colax*, but he has not appropriated the pre-existing Latin versions (*eas fabulas factas prius Latinas*) of *Colax* by Naevius or of *Alazon* by Plautus.

For the offending *scisse sese* one might also suggest *astulisse*, which would agree well with *ablatus* in ver. 26; but the corruption does not thus explain itself so readily.

On the other hand, no other instance of *ascisco* is found in Terence or in Plautus; if the tragic poet quoted by Cicero, *Tusc.* II. 10. 23,

louisque numen Mulcibri adsciuit manus

be Accius, he is the earliest author who can be cited for the word; otherwise the record goes no higher than Cicero himself. He has it often, and the archaising school (Sallust, Fronto, Apuleius) affect it. *Rescisco* is of course common in Terence.

II.

Heautontimorumenos 600-607 (and *Ad.* 216:

SYR. . . . Fuit quaedam anus Corinthia
Hic: huic drachumarum haec argenti
mille dederat mutuum.

CHR. Quid tum?

SYR. Ea mortuast:
reliquit filiam adolescentulam.
Ea relicta huic arraboni est pro illo
argento.

CHR. Intellego.

SYR. Hanc secum huc adduxit, ea quae est
nunc apud uxorem tuam.

CHR. Quid tum?

SYR. Cliniam orat sibi ut id nunc det: illam
illi tamen

606. Post daturam: mille nummum poscit.
Et prosit quidem.

CHR. Hui!

SYR. Dubium id est? ego sic putavi.

In 606 the MSS. read:

$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{et poscit} \\ \text{et poscet} \\ \text{et posciet} \\ \text{ex poscit} \end{array} \right\} \text{quidem.}$

and assign the words to Chremes; Dziatzko read *et possit*, which he construed as an impersonal, on the analogy of four passages, viz.:

Haut. 677 At sic, opinor. Non potest.

Phorm. 303 Non, non sic futurumst. Non potest.

Ad. 568 Non potuit melius.

Phorm. 818 Quo pacto id potuit?

But even if these examples (all negative or interrogative, and all present or perfect indicative) could support the inference, *et possit* has no aptitude here.

Syrus' cue is to recommend the proposed arrangement to Chremes as good business. This he does by saying *et prosit quidem* ('and it really would pay'). To this Chremes answers with a *Hui* of utter incredulity, which Syrus meets with a remonstrance, *Dubium id est?* (for which cf. *Haut.* 911).

The use of *hui!* is just like *Ad.* 216:

SYR. Age, scis quid loquar?
pecuniam in loco negligere maximum
interdumst lucrum.

SAN. Hui!

where the editors make nonsense by giving the word to Syrus. *Hui* is Sannio's expression of astonishment at this incredible new doctrine of Syrus: 'Come now, I'm telling ye. Sometimes nothing pays better than to let money take care of itself.' 'Whew!' says Sannio.

III.

Phormio 368.

Phormio has been letting his imagination run free on the merits of the departed Stilpo.

367.

PHOR. At quem uirum! quem ego uiderim in
uita optimum.

GETA. †uideas te atque illum† ut narras!

PHOR. I'n malam crucem!
nam ni ita eum existimassem, num-
quam tam grauis
ob hanc inimicitias caperem in uostram
familiam,
quam is aspernatur nunc tam inlibera-
liter.

GETA. Pergin ero absenti male loqui, im-
purissime?

PHOR. Dignum autem hoc illost.

GETA. Ain tamen, carcer? . . .
. . . bonorum extortor, legum con-
tortor! . . .

For Geta's words in ver. 368, the MSS. offer no variant. The commentators invite us to believe that they have a meaning. 'Just look at yourself and him, as you describe him' (Ashmore, p. 211). It is a meaning of a sort, but quite at odds with the tenor of the dialogue; neither is Phormio's retort relevant, nor Geta's rejoinders pitched in the same key. Phormio's retort *nam ni* implies that Geta has doubted his word; and Geta's rejoinders are a series of bad names, *impurissime*, *carcer*, etc. The sense will be restored by reading for

VIDEASTEATQVEILLVMVTNARRAS
QVID, STERQVILINVM, narras?

Geta applies the same term to Dorio in ver. 526. *Quid narras?* is too common a formula of incredulity to need illustration. Phormio answers the bad name with an oath, and the disbelief with an asseveration *nam*.

IV.

Eun. 317.

Haud similis uirgost uirginum nostrarum quas
matres student
demissis umeris esse, uincto pectore, ut gracillae
sient.

Siquae est habitior paulo, pugilem esse aiunt,
deducunt cibum;
tametsi bonast natura, reddunt curatura iuncea:
itaque ergo amantur.

Donatus read this line as we read it, and laboured to explain it: either *itaque*, *inquit*, *nemo illas amat*, i.e. ironically, or *atque ita fit ut amentur non naturae merito sed industria*, i.e. ἐργῶ.

Fabia notes that *itaque ergo* occurs in Livy I. xxv. 2, III. xxxi. 5, etc. It does, as a resumptive formula of narrative in certain (archaistic) passages, with the sense, 'Well, so . . . I invite anybody who in his secret heart sees in the would-be irony of *itaque ergo amantur* nothing but a flat piece of stupidity, to consider whether Terence did not probably write:

ITA QVERCORANTVR (*querer—
querquerantur*),

meaning, 'Any girl that is naturally a jolly creature they reduce by treatment till they're only the thickness of a rush—so aguish do the girls become.'

The existence of an adjective *querquerus* is attested by the grammarians with quotations from Lucilius:

<febris> *querquera consequitur capitisque dolores*

and

iactans me ut febris querquera . . .

and Plautus frag. *Frivolariae*,

is mihi erat bilis, aqua intercus, querqueratus, where the editors read

querquera tussis.

Out of the ruins of a page of Festus (ed. Lindsay, p. 308) glimmers the fact that Santra derived the word from a Greek κάρκαρον. Hesychius has the glosses

κάρκαροι . τραχεῖς
καρκαίρει . ψοφεῖ
κάρκαίρει . ἰδιῶμα ἤχου
ἐκάρκαρον . ψόφον τινα ἀπετέλουν.

The last three refer to the Homeric verb=to rattle, to clatter, to crack. There seems to be no attestation of such a verb in Latin, but one may venture to say that, considering *καρκαίρειν*, its existence is theoretically

probable. The onomatopoeic origin indeed seems to require a verb.

For its deponent form cf. *conscreeor*, *murmuror*, *muissor*, *ructor*; for the fashion in meagre anaemic beauty cf. the use of *febriculosus* in Catull. VI. 4 and Lucr. IV. 1155 *ischnon eromenion tum fit cum uiuere non quit prae macie*; *rhadine uerost iam mortua tussi*. And add Martial I. x. 4 for the cough as a synonym for phthisis.

V.

Eun. 1011:

nunquam pol hominem stultiorem uidi nec uidebo. Ah, non possum satis narrare quos ludos praeberis intus.

At *etiam primo* callidum et disertum credidi hominem.

Thus Pythias, making merry at Parmeno's expense. Unfortunately the current of her wit is interrupted by a block of gibberish, for *etiam primo* has no sense. The commentators furnish a delicious example of exegesis in agonies for want of the simplest emendatory operation. Mons. Fabia, whose book is in general a model of a Terentian play well edited, here notes that '*etiam porte sur credidi* "je suis allée jusqu'à croire."' If *etiam* bore on *credidi*, why should not the line have run

At *etiam credidi hominem primo callidum et disertum.*

No: *etiam* must bear upon *primo*, and *etiam primo* can only mean 'even at first,' which here is nonsense. Mr. Ashmore remarked that 'the additory force is weakened to the point of being untranslatable, except by a vocal stress upon the modified word (*primo*); "and yet I formerly took you, etc." But, to begin with, *primo* does not mean 'formerly'; and, once the mind is degermanised, it sees that when the force of a word, whose function is to give emphasis, is weakened to the point of being untranslatable, then the sense of a phrase is weakened to the point of being nonsense. Sense and Nonsense doubtless meet in a higher Stoj. It is not impossible that Terence wrote nonsense, but very improbable; much more improbable that he wrote nonsense than that his words have been misreported.

Read:

At *Parmenonem* callidum et disertum credidi hominem.

Parmenonem was misread into *primo* a compendium of *etiam*. The resulting *primo etiam* would not scan: remedy—transpose the words; read rapidly, without close attention, *etiam primo* will keep for a long time.

VI.

Eun. 326.

The vulgate text violates a law of Terentian scansion in each of these places.

324. CHAEREA.

nec quemquam ego esse hominem arbitror cui magis bonae felicitates omnes auorsae sient.

326. Quid hōc est sceleris? Perii. PA. Quid factumst? CH. Rogas?

So the editors give it, lengthening *hōc*; but it can be shown by the following collection of instances that the intensity of the interrogative always abbreviates any following case of 'hic.' Such of course is usually the effect of interrogative intensity on a following *iste*, *istic*, and *ille*; whether without exception is a point which I pass by for the present: but it may be hoped that the twenty-two examples here produced will be sufficient to prove that the unique exception to the rule of *quis hīc* is corruptly reported:

quid hīc uolt? *And.* 184.

quis hīc loquitur? *ib.* 267 (and 783, also H. 517, E. 86, P. 739).

quid hīc respondent, *ib.* 419.

quid hīc uolt uetator sibi? *ib.* 457.

quid hīc sensisse ait? *ib.* 470.

quid hōc morbist? *Eun.* 225.

sed quis hīc est qui huc pergit? *ib.* 228.

quid? hūc non uidēs? *ib.* 463.

¹ This is exceptional, since *Quid?* is here an interjection. I suspect *hūc* is interpolated, as a word sometimes has been, to explain what, on the stage, a gesture made plain enough without. It is hard to believe that *hūc* could be shortened after the intervening pause.

quid hōc hominis? quid hīc ornatist? *ib.* 546.
sed quid hōc quod timida, *ib.* 642.
quis hīc est homo? *ib.* 677.
quid hīc conterimus operam? P. 209 (*ib.* 215 doubtful).

quid hīc coēptat? *ib.* 626.

quid hīc narret, *ib.* 846.

sed quid hōc negotist, *Hec.* 97.

quid hōc est? tace, *ib.* 314.

quem ego hīc audiui loqui? *ib.* 453.

quid hūc hic est rei? *ib.* 807.

quid hōc reist? *Ad.* 175.

quid hōc malum infelicitatis? nequeo satis decernere, *ib.* 544.

quid hūc hic negotist? *ib.* 638.

quid hīc negoti, *ib.* 642.

For *hōc* to be lengthened, a word must come between it and *quid*: e.g.

quidnam hōc est rei? *And.* 457.

quisnam hīc adulescens, *Haut.* 403.

Ver. 326 should accordingly be read

quidnam hōc est sceleris? etc.

VII.

Eun. 978. Here we are concerned with another instance of the shortening effect that interrogative intensity exercises on the next word, viz. the phrase *quid est quod*. Our texts give *quid est quod* *trepidas*? *satine salve*? *dic mihi*? which is impossible, for *quid est quod* is always an anapaest or a tribrach, e.g.

māne mane quid est quod tam a nobis grauiter crepuerunt fores? *Haut.* 613.

Chaerea, quid est quod sic gestis? *Eun.* 558.

quid est quod laetus es? *ib.* 559.

quid est mihi quod malim quam quod huic intellego euenire? *Hec.* 794.

For *est* to be lengthened after *quid*, a fullstop is necessary, e.g.

Quid est? te mi ipsum iam dudum optabam dari, *Haut.* 758.

Or, a passage which certifies the obvious correction of 978:

Era quid est? Quid *trepidas*? *Ad.* 323.

Read then here:

Quid est? Quid *trepidas*?

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

The University, Glasgow.