There are two possibilities; they depend upon the meaning of ἐστὶν γὰρ ἀπ'
εὐκτίτου Λέσβου in lines 5–6. (1) If that statement is taken at face value as a
complimentary allusion to the girl's origins, then κόμην is to be understood with
ἄλλην in line 6, and Anacreon's revenge consists solely in the use of an unflattering
expression (χάσκειν πρός) to describe her misdirected attentions (as he sees it).
The poem is heterosexual on this reading; the sense is acceptable. (2) If the
statement that the girl is from Lesbos intimates that she is a lesbian—and that
would not become apparent (deliberately so) until the final verse—then ἄλλην
refers to a woman and the παρὰ προσδοκίαν is even more pronounced. If this
interpretation is correct, Λέσβου and ἄλλην are each intentionally ambiguous: one
should not then insist, with most scholars, that ἄλλην must refer *either* to "hair"
*or* to "a girl" to the exclusion of the other. It may refer, at different levels, to
*both*. In support of this reading of the poem is the fact that, if such were not
Anacreon's intention, it would be a remarkable coincidence that both Λέσβου and
ἄλλην admit of such pointed ambiguity.

Nevertheless, when all is said and done, we shall never be quite sure of Anac-
reon's meaning, for we are no longer in a position to know with certitude which
of the two interpretations of ἐστὶν γὰρ ἀπ' εὐκτίτου Λέσβου is correct. And if such
a conclusion appear unsatisfactory to some, I can but refer them to Grotius:
"nescire quaedam magna pars sapientiae est." To end on a more positive note, it
seems to me perfectly safe to assert that one or the other of these two interpretations
of the poem must be correct. There is no *tertium quid;* all other proposals are to
be rejected.[17]

R. RENEHAN
*University of California,
Santa Barbara*

17. Readers who notice no reference to L. Woodbury, "Gold Hair and Grey, or The Game of Love:
Anacreon Fr. 13:358 *PMG,* 13 Gentili," *TAPA* 109 (1979): 277–87, should ascribe the omission to simple
ignorance on my part, and I am grateful to Prof. Anthony Podlecki for remedying it some time after
the present article had been accepted by *CP.* Although I do not agree with Prof. Woodbury's conclusion,
I believe that his article is a serious contribution to the study of this poem.


## PERSONAL DISAGREEMENTS IN THE MANUSCRIPTS
## OF TERENCE

When copying ancient dramatic texts, scribes frequently changed, consciously
or unconsciously, the personal endings of verbal forms. A systematic study of the
apparatus in editions of tragedies and comedies would produce a long list of
variants similar to those which appear, for example, in the manuscripts of the
*Medea* of Euripides: 85 γι(γ)νώσκεις ~ γινώσκει; 267 δρᾶσον ~ δράσω; 551 μετέστη
~ μετέστην; 640 προσβάλ(λ)οι ~ προσβάλοιμι; 746 ὄμνυ ~ ὄμνυμι; 1135 τέρψειας
~ τέρψειαν.[1] An obvious reason for these "personal disagreements" is that there

1. I include cases where a second person imperative form is found in the tradition alongside a first or
third person form in a different mood.

is a much greater frequency of first and second person forms of the verb in drama than in most other literary works. Moreover, in the swift flow of dialogue the verbal subject often shifts from one person to another and back again. When one remembers, in addition, the far from clear method of indicating a change of speaker in the early texts, the possibility for miscomprehension of the text by a scribe and thus for unconscious alteration of verbal forms hardly seems remote.[2]

Errors involving the change of the personal endings of verbs could have occurred at any stage in the transmission—from the period prior to the archetype down to the fifteenth century. In this article the focus will be on the personal disagreements in the manuscripts of Terence. Attention will first be given to the variants which appear in the tradition where the erroneous reading must have originated in the postarchetypal stage (although it is not impossible that the archetype itself recorded some variants). Then the possibility that similar corruptions were already present in the text of the archetype itself will be considered. In the latter case, of course, the surviving manuscripts are all in agreement.

There are over two dozen examples where the Bembinus offers a verbal form with a different personal subject from that which appears in all the medieval manuscripts. These include the following, the Bembinus reading being given first: *Eun.* 300 *dicet* ~ *dices;* 388 *faciam* ~ *facias;* 503 *poteris* ~ *poterit;* 969 *subveniam* ~ *subveniat;* 1010 *possum* ~ *potest; Haut.* 223 *adfert* ~ *adfer;* 321 *potes* ~ *potis est* (*potis es* p²); 577 *videare* ~ *videar;* 600 *video* ~ *vide;* 854 *desponderis* ~ *desponderim;* 970 *conscivit* ~ *concivi;* 1008 *facias* ~ *faciam;* 1010 *redeam* ~ *redeat;* 1040 *inveneris* ~ *invenerit; Phorm.* 132 *vincat* ~ *vincam;* 294 *addo* ~ *adde;* 486 *audio* ~ *audi;* 554 *faxis* ~ *faxit;* 622 *componamus* ~ *componantur* (*-atur* p); 674 *potest* ~ *potes; Hec.* 64 *misereas* ~ *misereat;* 582 *habuerit* ~ *habueris;* 618 *nescio* ~ *nescias; Ad.* 595 *expostules* ~ *expostulant* (*-ent*); 696 *est* (also C¹) ~ *es.*

In some of these instances the scribe has probably been influenced by the person of the preceding forms: so at *Haut.* 1008 "at si rogem iam quid est quod peccem aut quam ob rem hoc facias, nescias," where the Calliopians read *faciam* for *facias;* cf. *Eun.* 300 *dicet* in the Bembinus for the correct *dices* after *hic vero est qui si occeperit; Haut.* 1040 *inveneris* (Bembinus) for *invenerit* after *quaeris . . . obsequare . . . serves; Hec.* 582 *habuerit* (Bembinus) for *habueris* after *narravit; Ad.* 595 *expostulant* or *expostulent* (Calliopians) for *expostules* after *putant* and *fecere; Phorm.* 554 *faxis* (Bembinus) for *faxit* after *quaere.*

Three examples where editors are not unanimous in their choice of variant are worth examining briefly. The first is at *Eunuchus* 388:

> PA. quid istic? si certumst facere, *faciam;* verum ne post conferas
> culpam in me. CH. non faciam.
>
> *faciam* A, *facias* Σ

---

2. Verbal forms, of course, were just as likely to be miscopied for the same reasons as other parts of speech. So, for example, *sequitur tuum* in E at Sen. *Ag.* 747 for *sequor nimium* has arisen from the misreading of *nimium* as *tutuum* and from transposition of letters; cf. *audio obsecro* for *audi obsecro* in the Bembinus at Ter. *Phorm.* 486 by dittography. One cannot be certain on every occasion about the cause of a corruption.

Parmeno had suggested to Chaerea at 369 ff. that he would take him into the house of Thais in place of a eunuch. When his suggestion is eagerly picked up by Chaerea, Parmeno becomes uneasy but gives in at 388 to Chaerea's arguments in its favor. Both *facias* and *faciam* in this verse give sense. But *facias* seems too dismissive and separates Parmeno from what is about to be done. With *certumst* one must understand *tibi,* and after *facere* it would be an easy error for a scribe to write *facias* instead of *faciam.* He would have been influenced by the logical subject of the conditional clause, just as the errors given in the preceding paragraph were prompted by the grammatical subject of preceding clauses.[3] Most editors print *faciam* (Kauer–Lindsay are exceptions) and are right to do so.[4]

A similar corruption has occurred at *Eunuchus* 969:

> PA. quid igitur faciam miser?
> quidve incipiam? ecce autem video rure redeuntem senem.
> dicam huic an non? ei dicam hercle; etsi mihi magnum malum
> scio paratum; sed necessest huic ut *subveniat.*
>
> *subveniat* Σ, *subveniam* A

Parmeno has seen the father of Chaerea and Phaedria approaching. The slave has just been tricked into believing that Chaerea has been caught by the brother of the young girl whom he raped when he was taken into the house of Thais as the eunuch. At 966–68 Parmeno wonders what he should do. Is he to tell the father (968 *huic . . . ei*) the news? At 968 he decides he must do so. In 969 *huic* must refer to Chaerea. The *lectio difficilior* is *subveniat* of the Calliopians, which must be correct: "but it is necessary that he help Chaerea." The perpetrator of the error in the Bembinus wrote *subveniam* because of the influence of the preceding first person forms and has jumped to the conclusion that the subject of the *ut*-clause must also be the speaker; he has quite naturally, but wrongly, understood *mihi* with *necessest.*

In the third example (*Haut.* 1050) the Bembinus shares a reading with C[1]PF[1] of the γ group of the medieval manuscripts:

> SO. mi vir, te obsecro
> ne facias. CL. pater, obsecro mi ignoscas. ME. da veniam, Chreme;
> sine te *exorem.* CH. egon mea bona ut dem Bacchidi dono sciens?
> non faciam.
>
> *exorem* C[2]δEF[2]νηε, *-rent* A (*-ret* Iov.), cett.

Editors are divided in deciding between *exorem* and *exorent.* Kauer–Lindsay preferred *exorem* and meter appears to be on their side, since the reading *exorent* gives a dubious trochaic septenarius (with a proceleusmatic in the third foot, *egon mea*).[5] But as in the previous example it seems more likely that *exorent* is correct and that a scribe has altered the personal ending of the verb so that the subject is the speaker himself; it makes good enough sense for Menedemus to say *sine*

---

3. In this context the approaching *conferas* at the end of the line may have contributed to the error.

4. The presence of *faciam* in 389 would provide a reason for the change of *facias* to *faciam,* but the corruption of *faciam* to *facias* is more likely.

5. Marouzeau and Prete, however, print the verse with *exorent,* without making any other change.

*(me) te exorem,* especially after his request *da veniam.*[6] Preference should be given to *exorent,* but what further change should be made to rectify the meter? Most editors who have printed *exorent* have followed Guyet and have removed *egon* as an intrusive gloss. Pronouns have not infrequently sneaked into the text of Terence, but in this line the collocation *egon mea* gives very appropriate emphasis to Chremes' sentiments. Here a better candidate than *egon* for the intrusive gloss is *te.* Read "sine exorent. egon mea bona ut dem Bacchidi dono sciens?," with the first syllable of *exorent* light by "iambic shortening."[7] The omission of *te* as the object of *exorent* hardly needs a parallel, but one is supplied by *Phormio* 515 *exoret sine.*

What of prearchetypal corruptions where the correct reading is concealed by the unanimity of the surviving witnesses? Few errors of this kind have been unmasked in the transmission of Terence. At *Hautontimorumenos* 461 the manuscripts read "omnis sollicitos habui—atque haec una nox" (so printed by Kauer–Lindsay). The hiatus is defensible, but Bentley's correction of *habuit* for *habui* has deservedly been adopted by most editors. The only other change of this kind which has been widely adopted from a very early period is the necessary *exclusti* for *exclusit* at *Eunuchus* 98, although the correct reading turned up later in p.

The editor of the Bipontine edition of 1779 suggested a possible emendation at *Hecyra* 842 which, if right, would add another example to the short list of archetypal or prearchetypal errors of this kind.

> PAM. vide, mi Parmeno, etiam sodes ut mi haec certa et clara attuleris,
> ne me in breve conicias tempus gaudio hoc falso frui.                    842
> PAR. visumst. PAM. certen? PAR. certe. PAM. deus sum si hoc itast.
>                                          PAR. verum reperies.
> PAM. manedum sodes: timeo ne aliud credam atque aliud nunties.

Pamphilus and Parmeno enter at 841 at a scene division. The audience knows from what has preceded that the slave has just given his master good news. Pamphilus had thought that his wife had been carrying another man's child, but he has learned that she was the very girl whom he had raped before his marriage. There is no need, therefore, for him to divorce his wife, as he had been planning to do.

The textual difficulty lies in *conicias* and in the syntax of 842. In his commentary Wagner wrote: "*conicias* is the reading of the MSS but *conicere gaudio frui* is a construction which cannot be defended." He was surely right, even though *conicias* is printed by Kauer–Lindsay, Marouzeau, and Rubio, of more recent editors. Paumier suggested *conlicias,* which has won wide support (Fleckeisen, Umpfenbach, Dziatzko, Tyrrell, Ashmore, Prete). But the verb appears to be a ἅπαξ, even though an infinitive construction with *conlicere* would be possible.[8] Bentley's *pellicias* is similar in intent but less likely paleographically.

---

6. One may compare *Ad.* 936, where Aeschinus says *sine te exorem.* (But *exoret* may perhaps be read here. Aeschinus has said nothing to persuade Micio except *mi pater* at 935. It is Demea who has been doing the persuading; cf. *Phorm.* 515, where Antipho pleads with Dorio to yield to his friend's requests: *Dorio, exoret sine.*)

7. For this shortening, cf. *Eun.* 506 *domi ādsitis.*

8. The verb *illicio* is followed by the infinitive or by an *ut*-clause: see *TLL* 7. 1. 374, 54 ff.; 375, 10 ff.

A suggestion in the Bipontine edition was to substitute *coniciam* for *conicias*.[9]
The verb would then have the sense "think, conjecture." The meaning of the
clause would be: "so that I do not think that this present joy of mine is false and
short-lived." The thought is to be seen against the background of the character-
ization of young men in New Comedy. They are sometimes reluctant to believe
news unless they are told it more than once or unless it is confirmed by an
eyewitness report. In the *Adelphoe,* for example, Aeschinus is told by Micio that
he is to marry the girl he wants to marry, but he is hesitant to believe this. The
reason, he says, is "quia tam misere hoc esse cupio verum, eo vereor magis" (*Ad.*
698). Here Pamphilus has heard the good news, has rejoiced at it, but wants
confirmation if he is not to begin doubting its truth. Note his need for reassurance
in 843.

If *coniciam* is read, there is a contrast in 841–42 between Parmeno's report
and Pamphilus' interpretation of it. As it is pointed out in the Bipontine edition,
the same antithesis occurs in 844: "timeo ne aliud *credam* atque aliud *nunties*."
The error in the manuscripts was probably caused by the influence of the preceding
second person forms *vide* and *attuleris*. The appearance of *me*, which a scribe
took to be the direct object of the verb and not the subject accusative of *frui,*
may also have contributed to the change.

I believe that *coniciam* correctly restores the text of *Hecyra* 842 as Terence
wrote it. It is surprising that it is not even mentioned in the apparatus of the
major editions of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Another example of this type of corruption is detectable at *Andria* 919:

> SI. sycophanta. CR. hem? CH. sic, Crito, est hic: mitte. CR. videat qui siet.
> si mihi perget quae volt dicere, ea quae non volt audiet.                920
> ego istaec moveo aut curo? non! tu tuom malum aequo animo feras!

Simo has just been accusing Crito of encouraging young men (he means his son
Pamphilus) to misbehave. Simo is suspicious of the timeliness of Crito's arrival
in Athens, since his appearance brings about the discovery that Glycerium, Pam-
philus' lover, is an Athenian citizen. Pamphilus, therefore, will be able to marry
her. Simo thinks that the "recognition" is part of a trick. At 919 he turns on Crito
and calls him *sycophanta,* much to Crito's annoyance. Chremes, a *senex,* tries to
assuage Crito by excusing Simo and asks him to overlook the other's shortcomings.
Crito's response is *videat qui siet,* and he says that Simo will be on the receiving
end of some frank remarks from him. He then turns to Simo (*ego istaec moveo
. . .*).

The meaning of the words *videat qui siet* is a little puzzling. Most have taken

them in an idiomatic sense to mean "that's his business."[10] This interpretation seems to give too casual a response to Crito, as if he were unconcerned by Simo's accusation, and does not sit well with his words at 921 when he addresses Simo directly. Literally, the words mean: "let him see what kind of man he is." If Crito then proceeded to denounce Simo's faults to his face, no problem would exist. But Crito does not do this, although admittedly there is implicit criticism in 921 of Simo for blaming his troubles on others.

I would change the text to read *videat qui siem:* "let him see what kind of man I am." This response to *sic, Crito, est hic: mitte* not only heightens the dramatic tension of the confrontation but also leads naturally into 920, where Crito says that he will "give as good as he gets." The corruption may have been prompted simply by the preceding form *videat* in the third person, although a scribe may have miscopied *siem* when his eye caught *audiet* at the end of the following verse.[11]

The last passage to be discussed is well known (*Haut.* 75–80):

> ME. Chreme, tantumne ab re tuast oti tibi
> aliena ut cures ea quae nil ad te attinent?
> CH. homo sum: humani nil a me alienum puto.
> vel me monere hoc vel percontari puta.
> rectumst: ego ut faciam; non est: te ut deterream.
> ME. mihi sic est usus; tibi ut opus factost face.

Chremes has been expressing concern at how his neighbor Menedemus works from dawn to dusk and suggests that this energy would be better expended in supervising the work of others (73–74). Menedemus resents the interference, asking Chremes if he has so much time at his disposal that he can concern himself with other people's business. Chremes replies, somewhat pompously, with the famous line "homo sum: humani nil a me alienum puto." He then continues, "I am just giving advice and making inquiries. That's how you should take what I am doing." The standard interpretation of the next verse (79) is reflected in its punctuation as printed above. The verse is broken into two sections, each with two parts in parataxis. The first colon in each section is equivalent to a conditional clause, the second to an apodosis.[12] The meaning then is: "If it is right, so that I may do it; if it is not, so that I may dissuade you." The verb *faciam* refers, therefore, to devotion to work.

This interpretation goes back to Eugraphius: "ad superiora pertinet sensus ut intellegi possit: 'vel percontari puta: si rectum est, ideo quaero ut faciam; si non est rectum, ut te deterream.' " Faernus acknowledged a debt to Jeronimo Zurita

---

10. McGlynn (*s. video* VI) quotes Ruhnken: *h.e. ipse sciat qui sit, ad me non pertinet, nec curo qui sit.* Fairclough's translation ("let him beware of his manner") would suit the context better than others, but it is doubtful whether quite so much can be extracted from *videat qui siet.*

11. I have altered the punctuation of 820 so that *non* is Crito's answer to his own question. If *non* is taken with what follows, *feres* must, I think, be read and not *feras.* But *non tu . . . feres?* is decidedly weaker than *tu . . . feras.*

12. Cf. *Eun.* 252 *negat quis: nego; ait: aio; Ad.* 117 ff. See Kühner–Stegmann 2:2. 164 ff.; Leumann–Hofmann–Szantyr 2:657.

for the same interpretation, given at greater length,[13] and so the verse has been understood by almost every editor since.[14] The only variation is that some have followed Bentley and made *rectumst* and *non est* interrogative.

The natural interpretation is to take *ego ut faciam* to be dependent on *rectumst* and to refer *faciam* to Chremes' actions in giving advice and asking questions: "it is right that I should do so." Indeed, by the Eugraphian interpretation of parataxis one would expect *rectumst: faciam; non est: deterrebo*, whereas here the apodoses consist of *ut*-clauses which are in fact dependent on verbs in the preceding sentence. I know of no parallel for this kind of paratactic construction. The reason for the Eugraphian explanation is that, if the *ut*-clauses are taken as dependent on *rectumst* and *non est*, the second half of the line does not make much sense: "it is not right that I should deter / dissuade you." How can Chremes say this, when that is exactly what he is trying to do?[15]

The difficulties of syntax and sense are removed if the second half of the verse is emended to read *non est tu ut deterreas:* "it is not right that you should deter me from doing so" (i.e., from giving advice and making inquiries). Chremes is answering the retort of Menedemus at 75–76, where he is virtually told to mind his own business. Chremes' answer, as emended, smacks of self-importance and pomposity, but that is in keeping with his characterization.[16]

<div align="right">

JOHN N. GRANT
*University of Toronto*

</div>

13. For Jeronimo Zurita, see *Enciclopedia de la cultura española*, vol. 5 (Madrid, 1963), p. 733.

14. The punctuation adopted by Kauer–Lindsay in the OCT suggests that they did not follow the standard interpretation of the line.

15. One could get round the difficulty if *deterrere* contained the idea of intimidation, but that sense is rare (cf. Cic. *Sest.* 89). Moreover, that sense is irrelevant here. There is no thought that Chremes would or could prevent Menedemus from doing what he wanted by threatening him.

16. Some support for taking Menedemus to be the subject of the verb *deterrere* in this context comes from *Ad.* 144 ff.: "quom placo, advorsor sedulo ac deterreo, / tamen vix humane patitur." The speaker is Micio, who is describing how he attempts to deal with the continual criticism leveled at him by his brother Demea with respect to how he is rearing his adopted son. Micio is saying that he has no success in dealing with Demea, whether he tries to placate him or whether he opposes him energetically and tries to deter him. Micio is in the same position as Menedemus in *Haut.* Both are on the receiving end of unwanted advice. If *Haut.* 79 is emended as suggested, the verb *deterrere* is used then of the attempts of both to stop similar interference.


## CONTEMPORARY POLITICS IN CICERO'S *DE REPUBLICA*

The History That Cicero Never Wrote is an eternally fascinating subject for students of the Roman Republic.[1] As is clear from the introductory dialogue of the *De legibus*, he would have preferred to write the history of his own times; one of the reasons offered is that this would have enabled him to glorify Pompey.[2]

1. See E. Rawson, "Cicero the Historian and Cicero the Antiquarian," *JRS* 62 (1972): 33–45; P. A. Brunt, "Cicero and Historiography," in Φιλίας Χάριν. *Miscellanea di studi classici in onore di Eugenio Manni*, vol. 1 (Roma, 1980), pp. 311–40.

2. Cic. *Leg.* 1. 8 (Quintus speaking): "ipse autem aequalem aetatis suae memoriam deposcit, ut ea complectatur, quibus ipse interfuit." Atticus' reply includes the observation: "tum autem hominis amicissimi, Cn. Pompei, laudes inlustrabit."