

AN INTERPOLATED LINE OF TERENCE AT CICERO, *DE FINIBUS* 2.14

Hanc quoque 'iucunditatem', si vis, transfer in animum ('iuvare' enim in utroque dicitur, ex eoque 'iucundum'), modo intellegas inter illum qui dicat

Tanta laetitia auctus sum ut nihil constet
et eum qui

Nunc demum mihi animus ardet,
quorum alter laetitia gestiat, alter dolore crucietur, esse illum medium [Quamquam haec inter nos nuper notitia admodum est] qui nec laetetur nec angatur, itemque inter eum qui potiat corporis expetitis voluptatibus et eum qui crucietur summis doloribus esse eum qui utroque careat.

The words I propose to delete form the opening line of Terence's *Heautontimorumenos* ('The Self-Tormentor': line 53, after 52 lines of prologue). They are not properly integrated into the structure of Cicero's sentence, which runs very smoothly without them; and they do not show the speaker to be 'neither glad nor upset' in the way that the other passages quoted do show their speakers to be respectively glad and upset. To make them in any way relevant, we have to suppose that Cicero expects us to think of the man who speaks them in Terence's play (Chremes) as one who does not feel either of the strong emotions expressed by the other speakers; and it is true that Chremes is well contrasted in the opening scene with Menedemus, the Self-Tormentor after whom the play is named, and that he cannot himself be said particularly to display either emotion in that scene. Also, later in the play, at 505–6, Menedemus wonders whether the reason Chremes is (as they both believe) a better judge of his (Menedemus') affairs than he is himself might be *quia in re nostra aut gaudio / sumus praepediti nimio aut aegritudine*.

But this seems forced. It is no surprise to see Chremes characterized by Cicero as *non inhumanus* at *De Fin.* 1.3, since this is how he (famously) presents himself in line 77, *homo sum: humani nil a me alienum puto*. Nor would it be surprising to see him characterized as *curiosus* (though Cicero contrasts him with the *curiosi* at 1.3), since that is how Menedemus sees him in 75–6 and most of us see him (in spite of his self-presentation) in the play as a whole. But there is no particular appropriateness in singling him out as an example of mental equilibrium; that is not one of his most striking characteristics, and if Cicero had meant us to think specifically of lines 505–6 (or of some other passage, if there is one that would make the point more effectively) he would surely not have contented himself with quoting line 53. He is capable of singling out the lines that are relevant to his argument, as at *De Fin.* 1.3 where he quotes line 69, and 5.28 where he quotes lines 147–8 (adapting the syntax to fit his own sentence) and also line 80.¹

It is surely more likely that a reader who saw Cicero referring to someone who *dolore crucietur*, and to someone who *crucietur*² *summīs doloribus*, was put in mind of Terence's well-known play 'The Self-Tormentor' (in which Chremes applies the verb *cruciare* to Menedemus at line 81) and wrote its opening line in the margin—to refer to this play as providing a further example from comedy of someone who tortures

¹ J. S. Reid claims in his commentary on *De Finibus* 2.14 that 'The three persons are three fathers exhibited on the comic stage...; the father who is delighted with his son, the father who treats his son ill, and the tolerant, indifferent, father'. But we do not know that the first speaker is a father, and the fact that the second speaker is a father is not relevant to Cicero's point in this context (unlike *Pro Caelio* 37).

² Manuscripts are divided between the readings *crucietur* and *excrucietur*. Prof. L. D. Reynolds tells me that he will read *crucietur* in his forthcoming Oxford Classical Text of *De Finibus*, as do most editors.

himself, not an example of someone who feels neither gladness nor grief.³ From the margin, it crept into the text.

The point was really seen by H. Rackham, in a note to his Loeb translation (p. 94): 'Chremes' mild interest in his new neighbour, the Self-Tormentor, is rather oddly instanced as an illustration of the neutral state of emotion intermediate between mental pleasure and pain.' Oddly enough, I think, and clumsily enough, to justify deletion.

Trinity College, Oxford

P. G. MCC. BROWN

³ For the common ancient practice of referring to a literary work by quotation of its opening words, even when the work was also known by a title, see E. Nachmanson, *Der griechische Buchtitel* (Göteborg, 1941, repr. Darmstadt, 1969), pp. 37–49, E. J. Kenney, 'That Incomparable Poem the *'Ille ego'*', *CR* NS 20 (1970), 290. Admittedly the examples there discussed are not of dramatic works, except that the opening of Ennius' *Medea* is quoted by Cicero at *De Finibus* 1.5 shortly after he has referred to the work by its title. But Greek dramatic hypotheses commonly quote the opening words of a play in addition to giving its title. Terence's prologues are so clearly separate from the dramatic action that it would (I think) be quite natural to regard line 53, rather than line 1 of the prologue, as the opening of the play. I have not found an example of the use either of the first line of the opening scene or of the first line of the prologue to refer to one of Terence's plays, so perhaps I have not hit on the right explanation; but that does not weaken my conviction that the line has been interpolated at this point in Cicero's work.

ME AUTEM NOMINE APPELLABAT: AVOIDANCE OF CICERO'S NAME IN HIS DIALOGUES

Cicero's dialogue *De Finibus* depicts three conversations between the author and his friends.¹ In the course of these conversations Cicero depicts himself as addressing his interlocutors directly, using the vocative case,² on 45 occasions;³ the other characters, however, never address Cicero at all. What is the reason for this imbalance?

An obvious answer to this question might be that Cicero, who is not known for his modest, self-effacing character, simply assigned himself the biggest role in his dialogues, so that the other characters could not get a word in edgewise. Closer examination of the issue, however, suggests that other factors may be at work. Cicero's favouritism towards his own persona is most obvious in the first dialogue of the *De Finibus* (books 1 and 2), in which he speaks 70% of the time, the other two characters,

¹ Quotations and statistics in this paper are taken from the Oxford text of Cicero's letters and the Teubner text of his philosophical works, with the exception of the *De Legibus*, which was only available to me in a Loeb text. References and abbreviations follow the conventions of the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*.

² I am using 'to address' in its technical, linguistic sense (= 'to use a word referring to the person to whom one is speaking') rather than in the general sense of 'to talk to'. For the purposes of this paper, the noun 'address' is synonymous with 'vocative' (including not only names, but also any other vocative addressed to a character in the dialogue), or what linguists refer to as 'free forms of address' (see F. Braun, *Terms of Address: Problems and Patterns of Address Usage in Various Languages and Cultures* [Berlin, 1988], pp. 11–12). Cicero's dialogues often contain addresses other than those from one character to another, such as addresses to the dedicatee of the work (e.g. 'Brute', *Fin.* 1.1), or to a philosopher or other figure not actually present (e.g. 'Epicure', *Fin.* 2.21). Such addresses are not relevant to the current discussion and are not included in any statistics given in this paper.

³ 1.15, 1.25, 1.27, 2.16, 2.18, 2.20, 2.23, 2.44, 2.48, 2.51, 2.60, 2.67, 2.69, 2.74, 2.80, 2.99, 2.103, 2.107, 2.109, 2.113, 2.116, 3.8, 3.11, 3.12, 3.40, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.14, 4.19, 4.24, 4.37, 4.44, 4.50, 4.60, 4.62, 4.65, 5.4, 5.6, 5.8, 5.75, 5.76, 5.78, 5.85, 5.95.