The Classical Quarterly

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

Additional services for *The Classical Quarterly*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Terentiana

J. S. Phillimore

The Classical Quarterly / Volume 16 / Issue 3-4 / July 2022, pp 163 - 175

DOI: 10.1017/S0009838800002731, Published online: 11 February 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009838800002731

How to cite this article:

J. S. Phillimore (1922). Terentiana. The Classical Quarterly, 16, pp 163-175 doi:10.1017/S0009838800002731

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

TERENTIANA.

(Continued from C.R., Vol. XXXIV., pp. 147-152.)

FROM the paper in which the Interrogatives were treated, by an inadvertency *an* was omitted. As there was every reason to expect, *an* is found to shorten a subjoined *hoc*, *id*, etc.

Ad. 337 *an hōc* proferendum tibi uidetur usquam? GE. Mi quidem non placet. (So the vulg. since Bentley; but A has *usquam esse*, and the Calliopians have *esse usquam*. Room could be found for both words by a transposition, thus: *an hōc* tibi uidetur proferendum esse usquam? etc.)

Phorm. 235 DE. Demiror. PH. Atqui reperiam: aliud cura. DE. Anne hoc dicet mihi? So, correctly, the Calliopians; edd. vulg. blindly following Bembinus, *an hōc*. A false quantity.

Eun. 382 PA. Flagitium facimus. CH. *An id* flagitiumst si in domum meretriciam.

Ad. 662 MI. Non. Æs. Obsecro, non? *An illam* hinc abducat, pater?
(*Ad.* 667 qui, infelix, *haud scio an illam* misere nunc amet belongs to a different category.)

Beyond these, there are two instances of *an ūt*:

Andr. 888 *an ūt* pro huius peccatis ego supplicium sufferam?

Phorm. 415 *an ūt* ne quid turpe ciuis in se admitteret?

Eho-an and *eho-an-non* are groups, or composite words, in which the force of the first syllable reduces the quantity of the second.

Phorm. 259 *eho ān* tu id suscenses nunc illi? GE. Artificem probum!

Andr. 500 mihin quisquam? DA. *Eho ān* tute intellexti hoc adsimulari? SI. Inrideor (*quisquam* unelided in hiatus after a pause at the change of speakers).

Andr. 766 *eho ān non* est? CHR. Recte ego semper fugi has nuptias.

Hec. 671 PA. Ego alam? LA. Quid dixti? *Eho ān non* alemus, Pamphile?

SED.

Having made good this omission, I can proceed on the lines indicated in my last paper. Let us take for our next point of departure an empiric fact, viz. that *hic* and *hoc* in Terence are never long after *sed*:

Andr. 43 *sed hōc* mihi molestumst: nam istaec commemoratio.

Andr. 462 *sed hīc* Pamphilus . . . SI. Quid dicit? MY. Firmavit fidem.

Haut. Prol. 13 *sed hīc* actor tantum poterit a facundia.

Haut. 875 *sed hīc* adiutor meus et monitor et praemonstrator Chremes.

Let us see whether other inflexions of this sensitive pronoun are also affected. Here are the examples:

(1) *Haut.* 870 *sed haec* uti sunt, cautim et paulatim dabis. Thus A, but BCFP give, or indicate, a reading *sed ut ut istaec sunt* . . . and ED have other variants. The reading of BCFP seems to me to give a preferable sense, and to explain palaeographically the existence of the other: one of the *ut*'s dropped out; the

resulting *sed ut istaec sunt* was read as *sed uti haec sunt*, which was duly cobbled, to make it scan, into *sed haec uti sunt*.

(2) *Eun.* 99 *sicin agis*, Parmeno? Age, *sed huc* qua gratia. Either the -o of *Parmeno* is in hiatus, in which case we have *sed hūc*; or elided, which would give *sed hūc*. But possibly *age* should be *apage*.

(3) *Phorm.* 891 *sed hinc* concedam in angiportum proximum.

No. (1) being disposed of, I can only call (2) doubtful, and (3), if sound, definitely adverse to a conclusion that *sed* has universally the force to shorten any subjoined case of *hic*. But there are degrees of intensity and degrees of recessivity: though *sed* may not be of force to abridge a syllable long by nature (as we have seen that *quis* can do), if it overrides position in the examples just cited '*sed hōc* mihi' and '*sed hūc* Pamphilus,' it is worth while to study its behaviour in collocation with *ille*, *iste*, etc.

Haut. 476 non nunc pecunia agitur *sed illud* quomodo (= τὸ ὄπως).

Haut. 790 fiat. Quaeratur aliquid. *Sed illud* quod tibi.

Haut. 898 *séd ille* tuóm quoqué Syrus ídem míre fínxit filium (an uncomfortable verse. In support of *quoqué* they cite *Phorm.* 725; but the supporter is shaky itself. I shall discuss its integrity when we come to consider *ipse*). One could mend the curious derangement of words in the phrase by reading:

sed ille <nóster> Syrus tuóm quoque . . .

(Cf. *Eun.* 974 *sed estne ille noster* Parmeno? A pure example of '*ille pro articulo*.') However, no suspicion attaches to the *sed ille*.

Hec. 155 *superbumst*: *sed illam* spero ubi hoc cognouerit.

These four, without an exception, seem to establish a rule: *sed ille* not *sed ille*.

Next *sed is*:

Phorm. 296 non fuit necesse habere: *sed id* quod lex iubet (with which contrast

Phorm. 409: *itidem* ut cognata si *sit*, *id* quod lex iubet). Why *sit id* but *sed id*? That is our main question in a nutshell. Why *ego illud* (*Andr.* 146) but *hoc illud* (*Andr.* 125)?

There is one other example of *sed is* which is subject to some reservation:

Phorm. 852 *séd isne* est quém quaero? Án non? Ipsust. Congredere actutum. Quid est?

At first sight one might expect the enclitic -ne to neutralize the action that *sed* exerts on *is*. But *sed isn'* is like *uidēn*=*uidesne*, which even the laws of dactylic verse did not proscribe. However, for a reason which shall be developed presently, one might be tempted to emend to *séd ēstne quém quaero* . . .

And the rest follow:

Andr. 321 PA. *Sed istuc* quidnamst? CH. Hodie uxorem ducis? PA. Aiunt. CH. Pamphile.

Haut. 358 *sed istunc* exora ut suam esse adsimulet. CLIN. Scilicet.

Haut. 648 male docet te mea facilitas multa. *Sed istuc*, quicquid est.

Eun. 990 si uiuo . . .! *Sed istuc*, quicquid est, primum expedi.

Eun. 359 *sed istam* Thaidem non sciui nobis uicinam. PA. Haud diust.

Andr. 174 *futuras* esse audiuit. *Sed ipse* exit foras.

Haut. 426 *sed ipsum* foras egressum uideo: ibo, adloquar.

Haut. 1023 *sed ipse* egreditur. Quam seuerus! Rem, quom uideas, censeas.

There seem to be no exceptions.

We may then collect the inference that, to put it no higher, our typically *recessive* syllables—pronouns unemphatic or actually standing *pro articulo*—have

great difficulty in saving their long quantity when subjoined to *sed*. Shall we venture to account for the phenomena by saying that *sed* has intensity?

We know now how to classify the following, to each of which we have found analogues in dealing with the effects of Interrogative Intensity:

Ad. 40 *atque ex me hic gnatus non est, sēd ēx-fratre* : is adeo.

Ad. 988 *sēd ēx-assentando, indulgendo, largiendo, Micio.*

Eun. 607 *sane hercle ut dicis. Sēd interim de symbolis quid actumst?*

Haut. 882 *sēd interim quid illic iamdudum gnatus cessat cum Syro?*

Andr. 277 *My. Sēd ūt uim queas ferre. PA. Adeo me ignauom putas? (so Bentley divined: sed uim ut MSS.)*

Haut. 168 *miseretque me eius. Sēd ūt diei tempus est.*

These lead us finally to consider a unique instance:

Ad. 142 *non nil molesta haec sunt mihi. Sēd ōstendere me aegre pati illi nolui.*

On metrical grounds *sēd ōstendere* may be defended as Terentian by the parallel of *ego ōstenderem* in *Phorm.* 793.

But, metrical grounds apart, does not one desiderate an object for *aegre pati*? Either *sed <ea> ostendere*, or *sed <id> ostendere*.

Two interesting combinations remain: *sed ēccum* (-am -os) invariably so scanned in fourteen examples (*Andr.* 605, *Haut.* 256, *Eun.* 79, 304, 395, 738, 788, *Phorm.* 464, 600, *Ad.* 361, 553, 720, 890, 923). But of course always *ēccum* (-am), (*Eun.* 776, 918, *Phorm.* 484, *Hec.* 449, *Ad.* 792), and *atque ēccum* (-am), (*Eun.* 455, *Hec.* 246, 352, 523).¹

And finally, *sed est* and *sed estne* :

Andr. 448 *nil propter hanc rem: sēd ēst quod suscenset tibi* (exactly like *quid-ēst-quod* : though *est* has the strong meaning, *sed* overrides it).

Of *sed estne* there are four examples :

Eun. 848 *sēd ēstne haec Thais quam uideo? Ipsast: haereo.*

Ad. 78 *sēd ēstne hic ipse de quo agebam? Et certe is est.*

Eun. 974 *sēd ēstne ill' noster Parmeno? Et certe ipse est.*

Ad. 569 *sēd ēstne frater intus? Sy. Non est. De. Ubi illum inueniam cogito.*

In the first three of these the length of *ēstn(e)* is preserved by elision; in the last, *sed* works its effect unchecked: for it can hardly be doubted that the verse is trochaic, occurring, as it does, in a long unbroken series of trochaic tetrameters.

AT.

There is no reason to expect that *at* should be inferior in intensity to *sed* and therefore behave differently in combination with a recessive word. The facts do not belie this expectation.

Haut. 1051 *non faciam. Mē. At id nos non sinemus. CL. Si me uiuom uis, pater (id om. BCP.)*

Eun. 693 *at ille alter uenit annos natus sedecim.*

Andr. 566 *at istuc periculum in filia fieri grauest.*

Haut. 88 *Mē. Dicetur. Ch. At istos rastros interea tamen.*

Hec. 469 *at istos inuidos di perdant qui haec lubenter nuntiant.*

(Contrast these with *at enim istuc* in *Eun.* 381 and *Haut.* 699.)

¹ I defer, or resign to anybody that will, the attempt to draw chronological inferences from the tabulation of stylo-metric facts which forms the stuff of these articles. A glimpse of possibilities appears here: in *Hevra* never *sed ēccum*

but three times *atque eccum*. The former is perhaps a vulgarism. It occurs seven times in the mouth of slaves; Thraso has it once; Chaerea once; the rustic Chremes of *Eunuchus* once, and the rustic Demea of *Adelphi* four times.

These are all certain enough, and there is no exception or adverse instance ; but with cases of *hic*, the following are open to question :

Phorm. 910 *at hic* dehortatus est me ne illam tibi darem.

Dziatzko-Hauler⁴ remarks that *dehortor* can be scanned as a trisyllable or a quadrisyllable, but says nothing of the shortening of *hic*. In view of the five instances of *id*, *istuc*, *istos*, etc., just cited, and the general analogy of behaviour in such pronouns when subjoined to an intensive word, I see nothing rash in supposing that the first foot is a tribrach *at hīc dēh/ortatus*. . . .

Hec. 790 *at haec* amicae erunt ubi quamobrem adueneris resciscent.

If the line were sure, the objection would be grave; but it is evidently an alternative version of the next, which A omits but Donatus knew :

at easdem amicas fore tibi promitto rem ubi cognorint.

The latter seems preferable, if for no other reason, because *tibi* can hardly be dispensed with.

Haut. 362 CLIN. Verum illa nequid titubet. SV. Perdoctast probe.

CLIT. At hoc demiror qui tam facile potueris.

Ad hoc is the reading of BCD¹. Surely it is right. 'I am still (*adhuc*) in wonderment how you managed it.' An adversative is not in point, for Clitipho is making no objection.

QUI.

There is another class of words near enough akin to interrogatives to make it worth while to study their behaviour for our purposes: pregnant (or generic) relatives, i.e. such as imply an unexpressed demonstrative. We use them chiefly in proverbs of course: Fr. *qui dort, dîne* or Ital. *In montagna chi non porta non magna*; so in German, *wer, was*.

To begin with, it is observable that this kind of pronoun is placed in the forte and not the faible of the foot, and, where necessary, is shortened but not elided in hiatus. (This particular colloquialism is familiar because Virgil ventured on using it in heroics—

Credimus? An *quī amant* ipsi sibi somnia fingunt?

Ecl. viii. 108.)

This is Terence's normal practice, which shall first be exhibited before considering whether it be capable of definition as an absolute rule.

Andr. 93 nam *quī* cum ingeniis conflictatur eius modi.

Phorm. (*Prol.*) 27 quia primas partes *quī* aget is erit Phormio.

„ 162 aliis quia deficit *quod* amant aegrest . . .

„ 703 interea amici *quod* polliciti sunt, dabunt.

Eun. (*Prol.*) 19 ita ut facere coepit. *Quām* nunc acturi sumus.

Hec. 343 nam *quī* a/mat *quōi* o/dio ipse est, bis facere stulte duco (*sic*, all but A, which adds *eum* after *est*).

Ad. (*Prol.*) 15 nam *quod* isti dicunt maleuoli . . .

„ 335 era lacrimas mitte ac potius *quod* ad hanc rem opus est porro prospice.

„ 706 ego eo intro ut *quāe* opus sunt parentur . . .

„ 454 nisi facient *quāe* illos aequomst . . .

„ 680 ét scio, nam te amo: quo magi' *quāe* agis curae sunt mihi.

Hec. 363 partim quae perspexi, his oculis, partim *quāe* āccepi auribus.

Haut. 537 eho quae so laudas *quī* eros fallunt?

„ 1039 quaeris id quod habes, parentes; *quod* abest non quaeris, patri.

Andr. 858 Quidnam adportas? DA. Nil equidem nisi *quod* illum audiui dicere.

To these add the following, which show that the practice is the same where such a relative does not imply but precedes its demonstrative:

Haut. 204 et *quód* illum insímulat dúrum, *id* nóñ est . . .

„ 974 quaeve améntia *quód* peccáui / égo *id* obéssé huic? CH. Illicet.

Phorm. 125 lex est ut orbae, *quí* sint genere proximi
eis nubant.

„ 221 sed *quód* modo hic nos Antiphonem monuimus id nosmet ipsos . . .

„ 960 nunc *quód* *ípsa* ex aliis auditura sit, Chremes.

{ „ 461 is *quód* mihi dederit de hac re consilium, id sequar.

„ 1046 *quód* is iubebit faciam. PH. Mulier sapiens es, Nausistrata.

Two eloquent examples. The second shows that the phrase scanned naturally ‘quód i’ iu/bébit,’ and not ‘quod ís /iubé/bit.’

Hec. 73 aut *quá* uia te captent *eadem* ipsos capi.

„ 308 . . . nam saepe est *quibus*-in-rebus alius ne iratus quidem est
cum *de-eadem-causa*.

„ 581 teque ante *quód* me amare rebar, *ei rei* firmasti fidem.

„ 616 séd non mínuam méum consílium: ex úsu *quód* ést *id* persequar.

Or is *pro demonstratiuo* :

Ad. 191 minis uiginti tu illam emisti—*Quá*e res tibi uortat male.

Hec. 98 . . . *Quód* ego núnquam crédidi.

„ 445 quo pacto hoc celem: *quód* me orauit Myrrhina.

Haut. 330 *quód* ut efficerem orando surdas iam auris reddideras mihi.

Phorm. 158 neu me cupidum eo impulsisset. *Quód* mihi principium malist.

Hec. 775 opórtet: *quód* si pérfició, non paénitét me fámae.

Haut. 791 sed illud quod tibi

dixi de argento: *quód* ista debet Bacchidi

id nunc reddendumst illi.

Ad. 816 de summa nil decedet: *quód* hñc accesserit.

Is this merely a preferential practice of Terence's, or does it deserve the name of a rule? To this question belongs the discussion of a number of disputed readings, to the determination of which we are now bringing a new evidence. But the general principle is clear that—

1. *Qui* in the sense of Ital. *chi*, German *wer*, stands in the forte of the foot, bating one exception that we have seen continually in effect: unless it is in the first foot of the verse or of the sentence. This is very common (e.g. *Andr.* 10, 13, 18, 39, 47, 80, 140, 810, *Eun.* 43, etc.). Likewise when *qui* is *pro demonstratiuo* (e.g. *Andr.* 177, 208, 341, 620, 691, etc.). To the same category I refer *Eun.* 120: ‘ego cum illo quocum tum uno rem habebam hospite abii huc. *Qui* mihi reliquit haec quae habeo omnia’ (a full stop, or at least a colon, is the reasonable punctuation), and *ib.* 477 ‘fac in palaestra, in musicis: *quae* liberum.’ The heavy pause after the second metron is equivalent to the end of a verse.

And *Phorm.* 417:

ut cum uno aetatem degeret. *Quód* tú uetas.

And here should be classified—

Ad. 53:

alii clanculum

patrés *quae* faciunt

for the actor must make his pause, not after *clanculum* but after *patres*, to be intelligible.

There are not a very large number of instances of such a *qui* in the contrary position; but amongst these certain principles of exception begin to manifest themselves:

(a) We find that where *qui* follows a conjunction (*an, ut, nisi, quin*) the position is regularly reversed; witness the following:

Andr. 525 atque haud scio *án*, *quae* dixit, sint uera omnia.

Eun. 790 quí scis *án*, *quae* iubeam, sine ui faciat. . . .

Andr. 967 et quidem ego. DA. More hominum euenit *út*, *quod* sim nactus mali.

Hec. 590 haud facies, neque sinam *út*, *qui* nobis, mater, male dictum uelit.

Phorm. 272 non causam dico *quín*, quod meritus sit, ferat.

Phorm. 538 *quín*, quod opust, beneficium rursus ei experiemur reddere.

Hec. 399 *quín*, quod ueri similest, ex te recte eum natum putent.

Hec. 728 nec pol me multum fallit *quín*, quod suspicor sit quod uelit.

Hec. 794 quid est quód mihi málim *quám*, (quod huic intellego euenire)—(it should be so punctuated).

Ad. 99 qui *nísi*, quod ipse fecit . . .

Haut. 885 quid ait? ME. Gaudere adeo coepit *quási*, *qui* cupiunt nuptias.

Hec. 768 requires separate notice :

nil apud me tibi
defieri patiar quin quod opus sit benigne praebeatur.

(Variant, opus est E.)

Umpfenbach gives the line as trochaic :

défierí patiár quin quód opus sít benígne praébeátur.

Dziatzko, transposing (followed by Ashmore) :

defieri pátiar quín benígne quód opust praébeátur.

Bentley, instinctively—

defieri patiar quin, quod est, benigne praebeatur,

which is admirable for sense, as well as correct in the metrical idiom of a phrase with *quin*, *quod* . . .

The rationale of this exceptional sub-principle is plain enough. What we indicate in ordinary punctuation by a comma between the *an* (*ut*, *quin*, *nisi*, etc.) and the following pregnant relative is a pause in speech. This pause is sufficient to necessitate a certain intensification of the following syllable: consequently we have the same licence of a naturally emphatic word being nevertheless placed in the faible of the foot, as we exemplified at the beginning of a verse and the beginning of a sentence. You may call it a fact of speech or a principle of elocution. I will merely recall Bentley's words, which have been unduly neglected :

'Illud tantum monebo ; quod ante me opinor nemo ; in primo fere uersuum pede et parcius alias licentiam hanc exercuisse Nostrum : idque rectissimo iudicio ; cum Actor, in fine prioris uersus anima recepta, plenum rapidumque spiritum posset effundere.'—*De Metris Terentianis*, p. xii (Cambridge, 1726).

(b) Where the relative is subjoined to a necessarily more emphatic pronoun, or other word to which the point of the sentence gives particular emphasis :

Andr. 922 nam EGO *quæ* dico uera an falsa audierim . . .

Haut. 1038 di istaec prohibeant ! Deos nescio, EGO *quòd* potero . . .

Phorm. 478 eu Phormio ! EGO *quòd* potui porro . . .

Phorm. 1050 Phormio ! At ego ecastor posthac TIBI *quòd* potero . . .

Eun. 480 atque HÆC *quì* misit, non sibi soli postulat.

Hec. 217 multo melius HIC *quæ* fiunt quam illi ubi sum adsidue, scio.

Hec. 867 non fieri hoc itidem ut in comoediis,

omnia omnes ubi resciscunt. HIC *quòd*-*fuera*t par resciscere.

(But the reading *Hì* quos is well supported.)

Phorm. 345 EA *quì* praebet, non tu hunc habeas plane praesentem deum ?

Haut. 1000 quid hoc autem? Senex exit foras: ego fugio: ADHVC quodd-
factumst.

miror non ilico adripi iusse.

Hec. 739 nam si facis facturae es, BONAS quodd facere par est.

Ad. 386 istuc est sapere, NON quodd ante pedes modost
uidere sed etiam illa quae futura sunt
prospicere!

Phorm. 165 ita me di bene ament, ut mihi liceat TAMDIV quodd amo frui,
iam depecisci morte cupio.

Hec. 763 nam non sunt solae arbitratae haec: ego quoque etiam credidi.
NUNC quàm ego te esse praeter nostram opinionem comperi,
fac eadem ut sis porro.

(But the variant *nunc cum ego* is quite probable.)

I have not the space to expound each passage at length. A careful reader will hardly deny that my capitals would guide an actor to the correct emphasis. And indeed for what other reason besides emphasis does any other word ever precede the relative in a relative clause?

To this category remain to be added the examples of *nam—qui*:

Andr. 187 iniqui patris est: *nam quodd ante hac fecit*, nil ad me adinet.

Haut. 416 haud faciam: *nam quodd potero adiutabo senem*,
and (a case treated above) *Andr.* 922 will belong here, if we read with BC and Priscian
nam quæ dico uera an falsa . . .

It will have been seen that these exceptions readily allow themselves also to be classified under the principle of Intensity. The residue of refractory cases is so small that we are entitled to say that this kind of *qui* was normally pronounced *cum accentu*, and therefore, by the nature of comic verse, placed in the forte of the foot. That residue deserves a separate examination.

(c) *Andr.* 195 nempe ergo aperte *uis quæ* restant me loqui? . . .

Haut. 322 uis amare, uis potiri, *uis quod* des illi effici.

(The figure gives especial energy to the *uis, uis, uis* in this latter; in the former one I have nothing to plead in extenuation, unless that it would be easy to read *uis me quæ* restant.)

Haut. 1048 ipsos uideo. CH. Ehem, Menedeme, cur non accersi iubes
filiam, *et quod* dotis dixi, firmas?

Hec. 241 dúcere uxorem; *et quæ* uobis placitast condicio datur (*ea quæ* would be easy).

„ 264 noui *et quæ* dicis omnia esse ut dicis animinduco.

„ 460 fuit dum uixit, *et qui* sic sunt haud multum heredem iuuant.

„ 557 *et quæ* me peccasse ais. Abi solum solus conueni.

Observe that four out of these five bad—or, at least, abnormal—verses are found in *Hecyra*. It would take some hardihood to amend them all; and instead of forcing the facts to get an absolute rule, it is more reasonable merely to take note of a prevalent frequency of practice.

I conclude with a line which may be described in Propertius' words: *hic tibi pallori . . . uersus erit!* It stands in *Phorm. Prol.* 4:

qui ita dictitat, quas antebac fecit fabulas
(ante DG).

Bentley observed that *hic* is necessary to the sense if Terence is to be distinguished from his calumniator. But we can now recognize a metrical flaw: there is nothing to justify the position of *quas* (a pregnant relative) in the faible of the foot. I suggest that the history of our MS. reading is this: originally

QVI DICIT ITA QVAS ANTE HIC FECIT FABVLAS

it became by a common blunder

QVI ITA DICIT ITA QVAS, etc.,

and finally, by patching,

QVI ITA DICTITAT QVAS

Lucius' censure of Terence's pieces is 'ita sunt tenui oratione.' They are so plain.

The position of *quas* in the faible of the foot will then be regularized by the emphasis on *ita*.

Haut. 338 mane, habeo aliud si istuc metuis : quod āmbo confiteamini.¹

To recapitulate : An experiment upon *qui* pregnant relative has succeeded in showing that it is regularly, with very few exceptions, placed in the forte of the foot. From this I infer that there was a difference in enunciatory force between these forms when, on the one hand, either implying or anticipating their suppresst or deferred demonstrative, and when, on the other, following an expressed demonstrative ; such a difference we define by calling a *qui-quae-quod*, in these special significations, intense. We can next, then, proceed to a further experiment : Do they also exercise on the properly susceptible words and combinations those effects that we are familiar with, namely to abridge 'positional' and sometimes even natural length in a vowel ?

The answer is given in the following list :

Ad. Prol. 15 nam, *quod* isti dicunt maliuoli. . . .

Haut. 791 . . . *quod* ista debet Bacchidi.

Phorm. 43 *quod* ille unciatim . . .

Haut. 204 et *quod* ille insimulat durum . . .

Phorm. 535 cui minus nihilost ? *Quod* hīc si pote fuisset exorari.

Ad. 816 de summa nil decedet : *quod* hīc accesserit.

Phorm. 161 dum expecto quam mox ueniat *quī* hānc mihi adimat consuetudinem
(so BCEFP *longe concinnius*, as Bentley said).

Phorm. 960 nunc, *quod* ipsa ex aliis auditura sit, Chremes.

Haut. 577 ne ineptus, ne proteruos uidear : *quod* illum facere credito.

Ad. 835 *quod* illōs sat aetas acuet.

And just as we have quid *ego* ex hac inopia (*Phorm.* 167), *ego* excludor (*Eun.* 159), *ego* in portu (*Andr.* 480), *ego* ut faciam (*Haut.* 79), so have we

Eun. 401 *Quod* in tēst. Habes. Rex te ergo in oculis ? Scilicet :

Phorm. 449 DE. TE. CRA. *Quāē* in-rem tuam sint, ea uelim facias : mihi. . . .

(So A ; the rest wrongly add *ego* before *quae*.)

Phorm. 733 *quod* ut facerem egestas me impulit . . .

Eun. 737 correxit miles *quod* intellexi minus . . .

Ad. 667 should probably be scanned

quī (infelix !) haud scio an illam misere nunc amet.

We have now a new principle by which to discuss certain questionable readings.

Ad. 309

non intellego

satis quae loquitur (A)

loquatur (*Call.*).

¹ Whether *quod* āmbo is possible Plautine, I dare not say : it is quite incredible in Terence ; and even those for whom the blessed symbol 1KG settles all doubts, have been driven here to accept Bentley's 'mane, habeo aliud, si iste est mētus, quod āmbo. . . .' I suggest that

QVODAMBO is merely DABOQVOD gone amiss : *dabo* = *dicam* is a favourite idiom : 'Mane, habeo aliud, si istuc metuis : dabo quod confiteamini : *ādbo quōd* is legitimated by the heavy pause (full stop or colon) before *dabo*.

The Calliopians are right: whether *quae* be interrogative or = *ea quae*, it must be placed in the forte, unless *satis* carried some especial emphasis: which plainly it does not.

Haut. 966 ubi cui decuit primo tibi non licuit per te mihi dare,

abii ad {proximum A } tibi qui {erat A } : ei commisi et credidi.
 {proximos Call.} {erant Call.}

Whether *proximum* or *proximos* is right, the sentence is surely misdivided. Read 'abii ad proximum tibi. *Qui erat*, ei commisi,' etc. 'I went to the next person. To the available man (τῷ ὄντι) I entrusted, etc. *Qui erat* is like the *quod est* (τὸ παρόν) in *Hec.* 768 (as corrected by Bentley).

Eun. 77 neque praeterquàm quas ipse amor molestias
 habet, addas; et illas quas habet, recte feras.

Is *praeterquàm* *quas* to be classed with *ut, quas-quín, quas-nísi, quas?* or should we read?—neque praeter *quasquas* ipse amor molestias.

Hec. 311 Quaprópter? Quía enim *qui eos* gubernat animus infirmum gerunt.

It is a hardly conceivable accentuation. Omit *eos* and all is well. 'The governing mind is weak in them.'

Andr. 191 Hoc quid sit? Omnes *qui amant* grauiter sibi dari uxorem ferunt.

Perhaps the rhythm guides us to a shade of differentiation in meaning: *omnes qui amant* . . . = 'lovers always dislike getting married.' But were the sense 'All that are in love, dislike getting married,' it would be *omnes q' amant*.

Similarly in

Hec. 287 omne quod est interea tempus . . . Does it mean 'All the interval is gain,' or 'The interval is all gain'?

If the latter, I believe we must scan

ómne / quód ęst in/terea . . .

and not

omne quod / ęst in/terea.

HIC-QVI AND IS-QVI.

From interrogatives we have proceeded to *quasi*-interrogatives or pregnant relatives, and from Terentian management of them in verse we have collected that they had a tone of their own in pronunciation. If the pronoun *qui* was pronounced 'cum accentu' in certain significations, obviously this was to differentiate it from the same word in other significations: just as in English we raise the tone of *who?* interrogative and pronounce it flat when relative. We started with a hint of evidence drawn from beyond Terentian verse, viz. the grammarians' statement about interrogatives; but that statement extends to relatives as well, informing us that they were *not* 'cum accentu.' We have next to apply this to the test of Terence. How are they placed in the verse? And do they exercise the power of abridging certain long syllables when subjoined?

Phorm. 515 Optundisne? Haud longumst *id quod* orat . . .

(optundis A, optunde Call., obtundes Fleckeisen).

„ 519 Neque ego neque tu. Di tibi omnes *id quod* es dignus duint.

„ 590 Donec tibi *id quod* pollicitus sum effecero.

„ 618 Mihi Phormio. Qui Phormio? *Is qui* istanc. . . . Scio (*qui* elided).

„ 785 Ut sua uoluntate *id quod* est faciundum faciat. Faciam.

„ 1013 Lemni? Haecin erat *ea quae* nostros minuit fructus uilitas?

Hec. 6 Et *is qui* scripsit . . .

„ 14 In *eis quas* primum. . . .

Hec. 295 Tamen nunquam ausus sum recusare *eām quam* mihi obtrudit pater.

„ 368 Laetae exclamant ‘Venit!’, *id quod* me repente aspexerant.

(But *Call.* have *quod me derepente*, perhaps rightly, for *me* ought to be enclitic.)

„ 457 Átque adeo *id quod* maxumumst . . .

„ 674 Nam cogis *éa quae* nolo . . .

„ 676 Aut quid sit *id quod* sollicitere . . .

I suppose these are sufficient to entitle us to call *hic-qui* and *is-qui* groups, fully coalesced into a dissyllable. The apparent exceptions to a rule that is abundantly attested are few and readily curable.

(a) *Phorm.* 737 Qui est eius pater. Adeo? Maneo dum *haec quae* loquitur magis cognosco.

The opening of the verse is deplorable, and the metres give an uncertain sound, but this much is plain: if *haec* be read, it is fem. sing., not plur. neut. antecedent to *quae*. But it follows that *quae* should be a pregnant relative and therefore placed under the ictus. Consequently Romain (cited by Dz.-H.⁴) was right in accepting from the *Call.* the reading *dum ea quae loquitur*.

(b) *Hec.* 463 PA. Quicquid est *id quod* reliquit, profuit. LA. Immo offuit.

Id quód shows that our punctuation and interpretation of the verse are at fault. We must read

Quicquid est *id—quod* reliquit, profuit.

‘Whatever it comes to, we’re the better for what he has left.’ *Quód reliquit* becomes correct.

(c) *Hec.* 745 mane: nondum etiam dixi *id quod* uolui: hic nunc uxorem habet.

Bentley’s sarcasm upon the conjector ‘qui ne *id quidem* sensit se *id* agere ut Iambicus sit qui ab Auctore Trochaicus exhibat’ did not deter Umpfenbach from printing such an insult to humane ears as Bothe’s

mane: nondum etiam dixi *id quód* uolui: hic nunc habet uxorem.

But Bentley had, with his usual almost faultless sense of Terentian rhythm (quoting *Andr.* 29 and 536), proposed

mane: nondum etiam dixi *id quód* te uolui . . .

Idiom and good sense, and also the saving of the metre: for though *id quód uolui* is monstrous *id—quód—te* is correct, the enclitic shifting the accent of the wordgroup. Flukes of a maestro: ὡς τοῖσιν ἐμπείρουσι καὶ τὰς ξυμφόρας . . .

Cf. *Haut.* 924 Quid faciam? *Id quód* me fecisse aiebas parum.

(d) *Haut.* 121 ubi comperi *ex eis qui* ei fuere conscii,

Phorm. 917 nunc quo redibo ore *ad eam quam* contempserim,

are a pair of examples showing the usual transference of accent to a preposition combining with a case of *is*.

There remains a small number of verses where the metres swither between an *id quod* and a *quod*, elision making either metrically possible so far as the syllables are concerned.

Hec. 776 Solam fecisse *id quód* aliae meretrices facere fugitant.

id om. BD.

id in the faible, *quod* in the forte: impossible. BD are right.

Phorm. 513 tríduom hóc dum *id quód* est promíssum . . .

No variant; nevertheless *id* is *de trop*: *quód est promissum* is correct.

Haut. 867 Tanto ocius te ut poscat et tū *id* quod cupis.

Id seems to be right. As in

Phorm. 698 Tū *id* quod bonist excerpis . . .

and

Phorm. 296 Sed *id* quod lex iubet.

the intensity of *tu* and *sed* overrules.

Andr. 764 Mys. Tu nescis? DA. Mitte *id* quod scio; dic quod rogo.

The *id* is misplaced: read either

Tu id nescis?—mitte quod scio,

or

Tu nescis?—mitte quod scio, *id* dic quod rogo.

Where other words intervene between the two members of the group (a case analogous to Tmesis), the rule is that the Demonstrative Antecedent must have the ictus, the Relative may or may not.

Eun. 344 In hanc nostrum plateam.—Mirum nī hānc dicit, modo
Huic quae datast dono.

Phorm. 124 Quid is fecit? Hōc consilium quod dicam dedit.

„ 412 An ne hōc quidem ego adipiscar quod ius publicumst?

„ 657 Dare quantum ab hāc accipio quāe sponsast mihi.

Hec. 600 Sine me obsecro hōc effugere, uolguis quod male audit mulierum.

„ 727 Non hōc de nihilo quod Laches . . .

Ad. 141 Nec nil nec omnia hāc sunt quāe dicit: tamen.

Phorm. 771 Planissime.—Eis nunc praemiūmst qui recta praua faciunt.

Haut. 403 Quis nam hic adulescens est qui intuitur nos? . . .

Hec. 402 Pollicitus sum et seruare in eo certumst quod dixi fidem.

A few verses require explanation:

Phorm. 215 Sed hic quis est senex quem uideo in ultima platea? Ipsus est.
Sed quis hic (*Call.*).

In either case the right of *hic* to be in the forte is overruled by the intensity of *sed* initial or of *quis*.

Phorm. 516

Idem {hic AD } tibi quod {boni A } promeritus fueris, conduplicauerit.
 {hoc Call. } {bene Call. }

The right reading is Bentley's

idem hic tibi quod bene

for (1) *boni* may be Plautine but is hardly Terentian, and (2) *idem hōc . . . quod* must necessarily be so accented. And we can see further that the right emphasis is

Idem hic TIBI quod bene promeritus fueris conduplicauerit.

Haut. 21 licere [*id*] facere quod illi fecerunt putat.

Id om. BD rightly.

Hec. 391 ceterum de redducenda *id* facias quod in-rem sit tuam.

Either omit *id* or read:

ceterum id de redducenda facias.

Eun. 400 labore alieno magno partam gloriam

uerbis saepe in se transmuēt qui habet salem.

Whether we read *qui sal habet* with Bentley, or retain the unpleasing synaloepha *qui habet*, the *qui* is abnormal. Being a pregnant relative, it should have stood in the forte; placed in the faible, it shows that a demonstrative is missing. And, as

very improbable. Therefore Bentley's *merito-tuo té-amo* is almost certain. His *Quid? Ego dicam* is also much better than Muretus' *Quid? Quid ego dicam?* So far good. The last words remain to be explained: Dziatzko's reading involves no abnormality in the *hóc . . . quód*; Bentley's '*ego dicam hoc cum fit quod*' does: the *hoc* has a right to be in the forte of the foot. Also the evidence for *confit* is strong. All can be put right by a change of punctuation, reading:

DE. *Ego dicam (Hoc confit!) Quod uolo . . .*

He feigns a hesitation. He begins: 'Thanks ever so much! But . . . Mi. Well? DE. I'll tell you. (*Aside*, It's coming off!) What I want is . . . Mi. What next? What is there to come?' By making *Hoc confit* an aside, you justify *hoc* having no ictus on it. And this interpretation of *Quod uolo . . .* agrees with Micio's next words *Quid nunc? Quid restat?* which show that Demea is hesitating. But it is a further possibility that (*Hoc confit!*) belongs to Aeschinus: in which case Demea's sentence would run *ego dicam . . . quod uolo*, with an interruption.

Ad. 236 *iamne enumerasti id quod ad te rediturum putes?*
id om. BCFP.

Which is the right reading? The scruple that moved me to look more closely into this verse led in the first instance to the answer that BCFP are right: *id quód* is unlawful. But a further question arose: is *quód ad te* lawful? You have *Quod in test* in *Eun.* 401, but that is the first foot of the line: otherwise it must conform to *Haut.* 845 *serua quod in-test filium*.

But once you come to scrutinize the passage, you see that Sannio is calculating not the figure of his profits, but the probable date of his return from Cyprus. The sense therefore requires

iamne enumerasti quoad te rediturum putes?

Cf. *Phorm.* 148 *Quoad expectatis uestrum?* and *ib.* 462 *Percontatum ibo ad portum quoad se recipiat.*

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

My best thanks are again due to Mr. C. J. Fordyce, of Balliol College, for reading my proofs and correcting my references.

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF PLINY'S *EPISTLES*.

THE following notes are based on the *apparatus criticus* in the edition of E. T. Merrill (Teubner, 1922):

I. 20. 5 'uides ut statuas, signa, picturas, hominum denique *multorumque* animalium formas, arborum etiam, si modo sint decorae, nihil magis quam amplitudo commendet.' Why 'many *animals*' and not 'many men' and 'many trees'? Read *mutorum*; with 'animalia,' a standing opposition to 'homines,' as in Seneca, *Ep.* 76. 26 'ea quae tam homini contingunt quam mutis animalibus,' where also it has been corrupted to *multis* as in many other places.

IV. 3. 4 (in a compliment to Arrius Antoninus upon his poems) 'quantum ibi humanitatis, uenustatis, quam dulcia illa, quam *antiqua*, quam arguta, quam recta.' This is the reading of BF, but MVD have *amantia*, which can scarcely be a corruption of *antiqua*. The variants are much better explained by 'antiqui<tatis> *amantia*,' or 'antiqui<tatem> *amantia*'; for the accusative is correct, though less common, Cic. *Att.* I. 19. 1 'ciui amanti patriam.' So Seneca, *N.Q.* 6. 12. 1 'Archelaus anti-