

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

TERENCE *ADELPHOE* 60–63

venit ad me saepe clamitans "quid agi", Micio?
 quor perdis adulescentem nobis? quor amat?
 quor potat? quor tu his rebu' sumptum suggeris,
 vestitu nimio indulges? nimium ineptus es."

The text and punctuation above are those of Kauer–Lindsay; Marouzeau places his final question mark after *suggestis*, and makes *vestitu nimio indulges* a declarative statement parallel to *nimium ineptus es*.

The difficulty here is with *vestitu nimio indulges* (63). Editors disagree on whether *vestitu* is ablative or dative. If *vestitu* is ablative, the clause would be translated: "you indulge (him) with excessive clothing."¹ There seems, however, to be no parallel example of *indulgeo* so constructed with an instrumental ablative. If *vestitu* is taken as dative,² the clause must be translated: "you indulge (his) excessive clothing." This statement is intelligible only if we take *vestitu* in the sense of "taste in clothing" or "desire for clothing," but the noun *vestitus* is never used with either of these meanings elsewhere. If we assume that one or both of these meanings could be supplied from the context, parallels for *indulgeo*, "indulge," with an abstract noun in the dative can be cited from other authors,³ but the usage is contrary to Terence's practice elsewhere, in which the dative with *indulgeo* refers only

to the person indulged.⁴ In either event, whether *vestitu* is ablative or dative, the excessiveness in clothing must be that of the *adulescens* Aeschinus, but nowhere else in Roman comedy is excessiveness in clothing a vice of *adulescentes*. Only women are indulged with clothing,⁵ and excesses in clothing, in both style and amount, are associated only with *meretrices*.⁶ The role of the *adulescens* is limited to providing clothes, or the money for same, to his *amica*.⁷ The *adulescens* does not indulge himself with clothing nor is he indulged.

Stylistically, the quote which Micio attributes to Demea begins with a movement from the general (*quid agi*?, Micio?), to the more specific (*quor perdis adulescentem nobis*?), to the most specific (*quor amat*? *quor potat*?). This movement is matched by a contrasting pattern in the latter part of the quote from the specific (*quor amat*? *quor potat*?) to the more general (*quor tu his rebu' sumptum suggeris*?), to the most general (*nimium ineptus es*). This latter pattern is broken by *vestitu nimio indulges* which, with its specific reference to clothing, would come appropriately

1. Arusianus (GLK, VII, 478) incorrectly identifies *vestitu* here and *conubitu* at Verg. *Georg.* 4. 198 as ablatives "governed" by *indulgeo*, apparently not realizing that the dative may also end in final -u (see n. 2); cf. Priscian (GLK, II, 363), who similarly includes *conubitu* at Verg. *Georg.* 4. 198 in a list of datives ending in final -u which he incorrectly identifies as ablatives used for datives *metri gratia*.

2. On this form of the dative in final -u, see F. Bücheler, *Grundriss der lateinischen Declination* (Bonn, 1879), p. 110, §285; F. Plessis, *P. Terenti Afri Adelphoe* (Paris, 1884), p. 13, ad 63.

3. E.g., *indulge valetudini tuae*, Cic. *Fam.* 16. 18. 1; *indulgent consules legionum ardori*, Liv. 9. 43. 19; *Philippi odio in Romanos cui Perseus indulgeret*, Liv. 40. 5. 5. This use of *indulgeo* + dative in the sense of "indulge" must be clearly distinguished from its use in the sense of "indulge in, give oneself over to,"

e.g., *insano iuvat indulgere labori*, Verg. *Aen.* 6. 135; *indulgere theatris*, Ov. *Rem. am.* 751; *somno indulsit*, Tac. *Ann.* 16. 19. 4.

4. *Heaut.* 861, *Eun.* 222; the accusative is used in a similar sense at *Heaut.* 988, on which see n. 10. The verb *indulgeo* is not used by Plautus.

5. In such cases, *vestis* is usually coupled with *aurum*, showing that the clothing in question is a luxury; *Heaut.* 248, 252, 452, 778, 855, 893. Also Plaut. *Cist.* 487; *Curc.* 348, 435, 488; *Epid.* 222; *Men.* 121, 801; *Miles* 1099, 1302; *Pseud.* 182; cf. also *Pers.* 669.

6. E.g., *Epid.* 222 ff.; *Heaut.* 248 ff. contrasted with *Heaut.* 286 ff.

7. The most notable example of this is Menaechmus I, who steals his wife's *palla* to give to Erotium in *Men.* I. ii–iii. Cf. also *Heaut.* 451 ff., 777 ff.; *Miles* 1099 f., 1302 ff.

before, rather than after, the more general *quor . . . suggeris*.⁸ Furthermore, in the Kauer–Lindsay version of the passage, the asyndeton between *quor . . . suggeris* and *vestitu . . . indulges* is harsh, and we would expect either another *quor* or at least an *et*, but, metrically, there is room for neither.⁹ The harshness of the missing *quor* or *et* is eliminated in the Marouzeau version of the passage, but *vestitu . . . indulges* becomes a weak, almost parenthetical, statement before what seems to be the real answer to Demea's rhetorical questions, *nimum ineptus es*.

The parallels *Heaut.* 861 (*nimum illi, Menedeme, indulges*) and *Eun.* 222 (*nimi' mihi*¹⁰ *indulgeo*) suggest that, rather than *vestitu*, we should have here the dative of some pronoun referring to Aeschinus.¹¹ The simplest emendation would be to read *isti tu* for *vestitu*, but this emendation does not explain the initial *v* found in the manuscripts, and the use of *isti*, rather than *illi*

as in the parallel of *Heaut.* 861, is strange. It is possible that the text originally read *illi tu* and that some scribe, perhaps influenced by *iste tuos* (referring to Aeschinus) at 139, wrote *isti* as a variant reading introduced by an abbreviated *vel* (VL):¹²

VLISTI

ILLITV . . .

A second scribe, misinterpreting the variant reading as a correction, would have read *veistitu*¹³ and would have "corrected" it to *vestitu*, possibly thinking of *discidit vestem: resarcietur* (120–21).¹⁴ The *nimum* which we would expect from the parallel of *Heaut.* 861 would have been "corrected" in turn to *nimio* to agree with the dative or ablative *vestitu*. The original of 62–63 would have read:

quor potat? quor tu his rebu' sumptum suggeris?
*illi tu nimum indulges: nimum ineptus es.*¹⁵

VINCENT J. ROSIVACH

FAIRFIELD UNIVERSITY

8. It must be remembered that it is Micio who is quoting Demea. It would be out of keeping with the benign and civil character of Micio to move clauses out of their natural order and to make Demea sound illogical or silly, since such low humor would only distract the audience from Micio's purpose in quoting Demea, namely to describe Demea's concern for Aeschinus.

9. Nowhere else in either Terence or Plautus is one *quor* used to introduce two questions with different verbs without either an *et* or an *aut* joining the two questions. There are two such uses of *quid = quor* in Plautus (none in Terence): "sed quid ego hic properans concessio pedibus, lingua largior?" *Asin.* 290, and "sed quid ego hic in lamentando pereor, ad navim non eo?" *Merc.* 218. Neither of these cases is really parallel to the asyndeton at *Ad.* 62–63, which occurs at the end of a series of questions, each introduced by its own interrogative. Furthermore, in both cases in Plautus the two questions are sharply contrasted ("why do I do A instead of B?") in a way that *quor . . . suggeris* and *vestitu . . . indulges* are not.

10. *Mihi* is the reading of the manuscripts; Donatus (*ad loc.*) reads *me*, continuing: "sic veteres, quod nos 'mihi.' alibi [*Heaut.* 988] 'te indulgebant, tibi dabant.'" If Donatus means by this that *indulgeo* governed only the accusative in archaic

Latin, we should also read *illum* (rather than *illi*) at *Heaut.* 861 and in the emendation proposed below.

11. The use of both *sumptus* and *vestitus* in *Capt.* 322 ("me saturum servire apud te sumptu et vestitu tuo") is an inadequate reason for retaining *vestitu* in *Ad.* 63. The two passages are in fact quite different, with *vestitu* in *Ad.* 50 referring to clothing as an indulgence, while *vestitu* in *Capt.* 322 refers to clothing as a necessity (as, e.g., at *Heaut.* 968). Furthermore, *vestitu* and *sumptu* are closely linked in *Capt.* 322, while *vestitu* in *Ad.* 63 is, if anything, parallel to *his rebu'* (i.e., wenching and drinking) in *Ad.* 62, and not to *sumptum*.

12. For the use of abbreviated *vel* (vl) to introduce variant readings, see W. M. Lindsay, *An Introduction to Latin Textual Emendation* (London, 1896), p. 64.

13. Although vl is most frequently misread as *ut* (Lindsay, *op. cit.*, p. 97), an *l* with crossbar could be misread as *e* in many forms of rustic capitals (e.g., the *exemplum* given by E. M. Thompson, *A Handbook of Greek and Latin Palaeography*³ [London, 1906], p. 188). The misreading of vl as *ve* is the most reasonable explanation of the Ambrosian palimpsest's reading of *vestiut* for *sciunt* at *Plaut. Pers.* 6.

14. The *vestem* of 121 is Sannio's, not Aeschinus'.

15. I would like to thank the referee for his suggestions and comments on an earlier draft of this note.

THE BLIND BARD OF CHIOS (*HYMN. HOM. AP.* 171–76)

A natural misreading of *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* 171–76 has led scholars into unnecessary confusion. The Hymn was ascribed to Homer in antiquity (Thuc. 3. 104; Aristid. Quint. 2. 558; Paus. 10. 37. 5; Steph. Byz. s.v. "Teumēssos"; Eustath. 1602. 25) and was

taken to include an autobiographical reference to his blindness (172). However, modern scholarship denies Homeric authorship and takes the Hymn to be by a different, but probably very early, bard. The most likely candidate is Cynaethus of Chios, "who first