

and *Elucidations*) is ingenious but has not won support.

Ellis defends *tubam* with misplaced erudition. Following Voss, he cites Polyaeus *Strategemata* 1. 1 (Διόνυσος κυμβάλοις καὶ τυμπάνοις ἐσήμαινεν ἀντὶ σάλπιγγος) and adds Justin 41. 2: "signum his [sc. the Parthians] in proelio non tuba sed tympano datur." From these parallels he deduces a metaphorical meaning, that the tympanon "plays the same part in the *cultus* of the Mother as the trumpet in other rituals." Neither passage supports his explanation, but both provide the clue. The tympanon, or at least its function as a signal, was apparently remarkable enough to warrant an explanation. That explanation has crept into the text here.

Tubam may have glossed *typanum* in either line 8 or line 9. I think the latter more likely, in which case the line began *leve typanum*. Repetition of either the end of one line at the

beginning of the next (cf. 12–13, 59–60), or of one word in a prominent position (cf. 21–25, 49–50, 62–64, 65–66, 68–71, 91), is a feature of the poem, but still unusual enough to explain how the gloss became incorporated in the line. Catullus' ingenuity with the meter in this poem makes the *typanum* / *tympanum* variation acceptable here: "leve tympanum Cybelle, tua mater initia."

If the gloss comes from line 8, we have a larger and probably insoluble gap. But note the association of *typanum* with *cymbalum* at lines 21 and 28. In the opening description it would be particularly apt. *Cavum* is the epithet of *cymbalum* at line 28. Catullus' fondness for alliteration in this poem supports it here: "cava cymbala o Cybelle, tua mater initia."

R. D. SCOTT

UNIVERSITY OF MELBOURNE

A NOTE ON TERENCE *HECYRA* 670

The pressure on Pamphilus to take back his wife, Philumena, has been increased by the discovery made by his father-in-law, Phidippus, that Philumena has given birth to a child. Laches considers that the birth no longer leaves his son room for choice in the matter, but Phidippus is still prepared to leave the decision in the hands of Pamphilus, merely requiring some guidance as to what will become of the child. Laches certainly has no doubts:

LA. ridicule rogas:
quidquid futurumst, huic suum reddas scilicet
ut alamu' nostrum. PA. quem ipse neglexit pater,
ego alam? LA. quid dixti? eho an non alemu',
Pamphile?
prodemu' quaeso potiu'? quae haec amentias?

[*Hecyra* 668–72]

It has become customary to accept the reading *ipse* in the comment of Pamphilus and to punctuate after *pater*. Such is the reading of the current Oxford Classical Text of Terence, following the better manuscripts.¹ There is, however, a variant reading: "PA. quem ipsa neglexit, pater, / ego alam?"

1. R. Kauer, W. M. Lindsay, and O. Skutsch, *P. Terenti Afri comoediae*² (Oxford, 1958).

This reading is attested and even preferred, although no reason for the preference is given, in the fourth-century commentary of Donatus² on *Hecyra* 670:

1 UT ALAMUS NOSTRUM scilicet Pamphili filium, nepotem meum, utrumque 'nostrum'. 2 QUEM IPSE NEGLEXIT si 'ipsa' legeris, clare dictum est, si 'ipse' pater, lentius dictum est. et videbitur senex ob murmurationem eius intellexisse [non] quod nolit puerum tolli, et ideo appositum 'quid dixti?' 3 QUEM IPSE NEGLEXIT legitur et 'ipsa'. et hoc est melius, ut sit 'pater' vocativus casus. 4 QUEM IPSE NEGLEXIT PATER EGO ALAM hic sibi obmurmurans vultu et verbis ostendit nolle suscipere filium.

Both readings would appear to have their difficulties. Pamphilus has promised to keep secret the unfortunate circumstances of his wife's confinement and the details given to him by his mother-in-law (402). If the reading *ipse* is accepted, it would seem that Pamphilus is referring to the father of the child as someone other than himself. Yet this surprising piece of new information is not seized upon by the old

2. The text quoted is taken from the edition of P. Wessner, *Aeli Donati commentum Terenti*, II (Leipzig, 1905), 311–12.

men. Donatus explains this by suggesting that Pamphilus speaks in a low voice which prompts the comment *quid dixti?* from Laches. Other scholars³ have considered that his statement is an aside from which Laches overhears only the last two words, picking them up for his reply, "eho an non alemu', Pamphile?" Schadewaldt disagrees with both these interpretations and believes that the words are spoken by Pamphilus in a temporary loss of self-control.⁴ Yet, if this is so, it is strange that the old men fail to pick up the new information concerning the paternity of the child given in the first part of the comment, especially when they have been pressing the young man to give a reason for his refusal to take back his wife. Moreover, by making such a statement to the old men, Pamphilus is acting out of character in breaking his promise to Myrrhina, a thing which he has studiously avoided, not without great difficulty, throughout the play. There is a similar difficulty if the line is spoken in a low voice or as an aside. The line is not a true aside as at 638 and 648 f. Laches is able to hear some part of the statement. Thus, although the old men have not heard the crucial first phrase, Pamphilus has run the risk of letting the secret out, and his promise to Myrrhina would have been broken but for the poor hearing of the old men.

If the reading *ipse* is retained, there are further problems concerning the precise meaning of the phrase "quem ipse neglexit pater." Neither Pamphilus nor any other character in the play knows anything positive about the identity of the real father of the child at this stage. It is difficult to see how the rapist can be referred to as neglecting or slighting the child since he has no way of knowing that he ever had a child, having departed in some haste immediately after his crime.

The alternative reading with *ipsa* may be translated in two ways. The easiest solution is to regard *nostrum* as the antecedent of *quem*,

translating, "When its mother herself has neglected the child, father, am I to bring it up?" However, this translation too demands a strained interpretation of *neglexit*. Philumena has not neglected or slighted the child.⁵ Her initial action in returning to the home of her parents cannot be seen in this light. We have no knowledge that she herself intended any harm to the child, although she knew that it was a bastard. Moreover, since the birth, Philumena has been in no condition to neglect or slight the child. The only harm it could ever have suffered, namely exposure, would have fallen to it at the hands of Myrrhina (400), and this possibility has now been obviated by the instructions of Phidippus (563 ff.).

There is, however, a further possible translation of the reading with *ipsa*: "Am I, the one she has neglected, to bring up the child, father?" Such a translation does permit a more customary use of *neglexit*, since Pamphilus has indeed been neglected by a wife who has left his house. In addition, this reference to his wife follows from his previous statement in which he contends that his wife has slighted him (655 ff.). The one difficulty might seem to be the antecedent to *quem*, which would appear most easily to be *nostrum*. However, a closer consideration of this sentence will show that, whereas *nostrum* is of some significance in denoting the affinity which the old man sees between himself and the child,⁶ the emphasis of the sentence is on *huic*. The demonstrative pronoun is strengthened by the juxtaposition of *suom* and the two words create an important dramatic effect. The old man is stressing his son's paternity of the child, while the audience knows that the son is convinced that the child is not his and has been at pains to avoid accepting it, although he has found this more and more difficult because of his promise to Myrrhina and the insistence of the old men. The pointed dramatic effect of *huic suom* makes it easier to see *huic* as the effective antecedent of *quem*.

3. Notably A. H. Westerhoff, *P. Terentii Afri comoediae sex* (The Hague, 1726), p. 997; P. Thomas, *P. Terentii Afri Hecyra* (Paris, 1887), p. 74; S. G. Ashmore, *The Comedies of Terence*² (New York, 1910), p. 241.

4. W. Schadewaldt, *Hermes*, LXVI (1931), 9, n. 3. He is followed by S. Stella, *Hecyra*, *con introduzione e commento*

(Milan, 1969), pp. 18 f., who suggests "Lachete e Fidippo non intendono."

5. See Westerhoff, *op. cit.*, p. 997.

6. See Donatus (above) and J. Marouzeau, *Tèrence*, III (Paris, 1949), 72, n. 1.

Thus this translation follows not only from the earlier words of Pamphilus but also from the emphatic reference in the words of Laches. Pamphilus stresses the pronoun in the first person singular *ego*, as it is a tie between himself and the child which he seeks to avoid (648 f.). The words *ego alam?* suggest to Laches that there is an alternative solution. But, because Laches has never considered that the child does not belong to his son, he cannot conceive that there is an alternative to *ego*. To him the alternative must be between raising and abandoning the child, although he is hardly prepared to do the latter, *prodemu' quaesio potiu'?*

The reading *ipse* has difficulties arising from the use of *neglexit* and, of more importance,

from the characterization of the young man. The reading *ipsa* is capable of two interpretations. However, if *nostrum* is taken as the antecedent of *quem*, it is even more difficult to see the precise relevance of *neglexit*. The second interpretation requires *huic* as the effective antecedent of *quem*, not the obvious solution but one easily brought out by an actor on stage. It alone provides a suitable context for *neglexit*, and it does appear to fit into the structure of the argument at this juncture. For these reasons it may be seen as a more likely reading and interpretation of what Terence wrote.

DAVID SEWART

UNIVERSITY OF HULL

"NO ART AT ALL": A NOTE ON THE PROEMIUM OF APULEIUS' *METAMORPHOSES*

Polonius: My liege, and madam, to expostulate
What majesty should be, what duty is,
Why day is day, night night, and time is time,
Were nothing but to waste night, day and time.
Therefore, since brevity is the soul of wit,
And tediousness the limbs and outward flourishes,
I will be brief; your noble son is mad:
Mad I call it; for, to define true madness,
What is't but to be nothing else but mad?
But let that go.

Gertrude: More matter, with less art.

Polonius: Madam, I swear I use no art at all.

[*Hamlet*, II, ii, 86-97]

It is perhaps a safer generalization than most that, when dealing with an Asiatic or mannerist rhetorician, such as Polonius or Apuleius, one should believe only what he does and not at all what he says he is doing. Although Polonius does not deceive Gertrude about the very florid nature of his rhetoric, Apuleius' Lucius, the narrator of the *Metamorphoses*, has baffled a number of scholars over a period of many years. The confusion about what Lucius is saying and who Lucius is has taken two major forms: the first is the identification of Lucius with Apuleius, and,

hence, the belief that Apuleius is actually apologizing for his defective Latin in the proemium of the *Metamorphoses*. This confusion has resulted in dating the *Metamorphoses* early in Apuleius' career when he was supposedly learning Latin at Rome.¹ The second type of confusion is of a more sophisticated critical nature than the first, since scholars understand that Lucius and Apuleius are two different people, but they underestimate the subtle intention of Apuleius' teasing proemium.²

In actuality, Lucius says at the beginning of the *Metamorphoses*:

1. For an expression of this view, see E. H. Haight, *Apuleius and his Influence* (New York, 1927), p. 49. For further discussion of the dating of the *Metamorphoses* during the Roman stay, see the various scholarly opinions stated in M.

Bernhard, *Der Stil des Apuleius von Madaura* (Stuttgart, 1927), pp. 357-60; and P. G. Walsh, *The Roman Novel* (Cambridge, 1970), pp. 248-51.

2. See, e.g., Walsh, *op. cit.*, pp. 64 and 149.