
Leider enthält die Trilogie auch zahlreiche die Lektüre erschwerende Druckfehler und wirkt eher eilig geschrieben. Gleichwohl wird jeder, der sich in Zukunft mit Platons Dialogen insbesondere in philosophischer Hinsicht befaßt, mit Gewinn K.s Darstellung zur Hand nehmen und im einzelnen viel von ihm lernen können. In einer allfälligen Neuauflage könnte ein Register der wichtigsten interpretierten Stellen hilfreich sein.

Luzern

Rafael Ferber


Books on the language of Terence are like London buses: you wait ages for one to arrive, and then three come in a short space of time. Hard on the heels of Roman Müller’s Sprechen und Sprache: Dialoglinguistische Studien zu Terenz (Heidelberg: Winter 1997, reviewed by me in this periodical 75, 2003, 19–23) comes Bagordo’s book, which has rather different aims: whereas Müller offers a systematic survey of the conversational features to be found in Terence’s plays, B. provides a less systematic but no less interesting series of observations, with questions of colloquialism and loan-translation particularly in view. Since I have been disgracefully slow to write this review (for which I apologise to both author and readers), I am able to mention that there is now also Evangelos Karakasis, Terence and the Language of Roman Comedy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2005), which claims to offer «a comprehensive examination of the language of Roman comedy in general and that of Terence in particular».

After an introductory chapter (pp. 9–36), B.’s book falls into three main sections: (1) discussion of some Terentian colloquialisms not included in J. B. Hofmann’s Lateinische Umgangssprache which B. believes to be native Roman colloquialisms and not based on Greek models (pp. 37–57); (2) discussion of some Terentian expressions which others (in most cases Hofmann) have believed to be colloquial but B. believes not to be (pp. 57–97); (3) discussion of some Terentian colloquialisms for which a Greek equivalent can be found and which may perhaps have come into the Latin language as translations of the Greek idiom (pp. 97–146). There are then two pages of concluding remarks, seven pages of bibliography, and over 21 pages of indices (18 of them listing passages cited, and two of them very helpfully listing expressions discussed). The bibliography is a selective list of the works cited in the notes.
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The argument of the introductory chapter is not always easy to follow. B. launches into a treatment of whether ancient authors discussed colloquialism without first defining what he understands by the term, and his definition when it does come is hard to grasp. Umgangssprache, he says, is not simply spoken language but a small sub-section thereof, consisting of «jene Elemente die, vom Gesprochenen stammend, einmal von der Literatursprache übernommen, eine stilistische Abweichung bewirken» (p. 22). This offers no guidance on which elements of the spoken language are to be labelled as Umgangssprache and which are not; he surely did not mean to offer as part of the definition of a colloquialism that it be accepted in literary language. The only further clues he offers are that he excludes proverbs and gnomic utterances from the category of Umgangssprache (p. 23) and that the type of colloquialism he is particularly interested in is «der idiomatische Ausdruck, die Formel» (p. 25: at the top of p. 142 he appears to distinguish between «Kolloquialismus» and «Formel», but perhaps I have misunderstood the point he is making there; I also do not know what to make of the remark on p. 132 that seno ore is «idiomatisch, also nicht unbedingt umgangssprachlich»). Apart from Plautus and Terence, he is (cautiously) prepared to search for Latin colloquialisms in Lucilius, Cicero’s Letters, Horace’s Satires and Petronius (p. 26) – the omission of Catullus from the list is unexpected. He then says «Ein Beleg bei Accius kann jeden Versuch beenden, einen Ausdruck als umgangssprachlich zu betrachten», which is startlingly bald as a programmatic remark: B. is well aware that colloquialisms are found in Greek tragedy, so why should they not also be found in Latin tragedy? This baldness is characteristic of some of his discussions in the second main section (pp. 57–97), and B.’s tendency to see things in stark ‘either – or’ terms is the one major weakness in a book which otherwise has a number of interesting and sensitive things to say. It also leads him into some crude polemics against Hofmann, whose book does not always deserve the harsh criticisms to which it is subjected here.

It is easier to follow the discussion in the introductory section of loan-translations (Latin idioms created in imitation of Greek idioms), and B. sensibly observes on p. 29 that we can hardly ever be quite certain whether an idiom is native to the Latin language or an imitation of Greek. He builds on F. Leo’s observation in Plautinische Forschungen (2nd ed., 1912, p. 124) that the latter is likely to be the case when an idiom found rarely in Latin comedy seems to be the equivalent of one found more frequently in Greek literature. Not everyone will share B.’s belief that Terence was not a native Latin speaker (pp. 17, 32), but that makes no difference in practice to his discussions of the idioms in question. It is not always clear to me whether he wants to claim that it was Terence himself who was responsible for introducing (or trying to introduce) the idiom into Latin, but at least sometimes that is the obvious implication.

The discussions in the three main sections of the book are generally clear, as B. discusses in turn the 103 Latin expressions listed in his index, as well as a handful of stylistic phenomena.

The first section claims the following as native Latin colloquialisms: cantare as at H.T. 260; garr as at Ph. 496; noster as used at H.T. 1061 and Ad. 768 (but he should not have included Eun. 974, Ph. 63 or Ad. 439, and n. 93 suggests that he does not realise Parmeno in Eunuchus is a slave); forma bona (but is Sosia’s bona at An. 119 really a
«witziger Einwurf»? I see it as a rather feeble completion of Simo’s sentence; *numquid vis? me vide; beare as at An. 106; bona verba (I am not convinced that this is «unbedingt unhöflich»; *scin quam? *sex septem; annum est at H.T. 249; *ibi esse at H.T. 472 and 983 (I think the usage at 106) is rather different and should not have been included); *id agere; *nil supra; *rem habere cum; *mirum ni; *alid cura (the scenic situation at Ph.235 is totally misrepresented on p. 513; noli at Hec. 109 and Ad. 780; *captus est and *habet at An. 82–3; neuer *huius at Eun.222; *ibi tum; the indicative in indirect questions as an example of parataxis; ellipses such as *paeceis te vo!o. (B. himself refers to discussions of the last two phenomena in Hofmann’s book, so their inclusion here is not quite true to the programme he announced at the top of p. 26.) Many of these have been identified as colloquialisms by other scholars already, and it does not seem controversial to suggest that in using them Terence is reproducing idioms of conversational Latin. B. does not always discuss the question of their possible relationship to Greek idioms, or sometimes he tucks the discussion away in a brief footnote; occasionally he mentions equivalent Greek expressions, but still without going into the question that he had proclaimed on p. 25 as part of his programme for this section. This does not greatly matter: it leaves the section as a collection of miscellaneous observations rather than a sustained argument, but there is probably not a great deal more to say about the relationship to Greek idioms in any case.

In the second section B. discusses (if I have counted correctly) 33 expressions and usages which have been claimed to be colloquial (usually by Hofmann, but occasionally by others). In nearly all cases he is at least right to ask whether the pattern of distribution of the phenomenon in surviving Latin literature does support the claim that it is colloquial. He is sometimes a bit reckless in ruling the possibility out: can we really be sure that the phenomenon in surviving Latin literature does support the claim that it is colloquial.

He is sometimes a bit reckless in ruling the possibility out: can we really be sure that the phenomenon in surviving Latin literature does support the claim that it is colloquial. Without going into the question that he had proclaimed on p. 26, many of these have been identified as colloquialisms by other scholars already, and it does not seem controversial to suggest that in using them Terence is reproducing idioms of conversational Latin. B. does not always discuss the question of their possible relationship to Greek idioms, or sometimes he tucks the discussion away in a brief footnote; occasionally he mentions equivalent Greek expressions, but still without going into the question that he had proclaimed on p. 25 as part of his programme for this section. This does not greatly matter: it leaves the section as a collection of miscellaneous observations rather than a sustained argument, but there is probably not a great deal more to say about the relationship to Greek idioms in any case.

Many of these have been identified as colloquialisms by other scholars already, and it does not seem controversial to suggest that in using them Terence is reproducing idioms of conversational Latin. B. does not always discuss the question of their possible relationship to Greek idioms, or sometimes he tucks the discussion away in a brief footnote; occasionally he mentions equivalent Greek expressions, but still without going into the question that he had proclaimed on p. 25 as part of his programme for this section. This does not greatly matter: it leaves the section as a collection of miscellaneous observations rather than a sustained argument, but there is probably not a great deal more to say about the relationship to Greek idioms in any case.

In the second section B. discusses (if I have counted correctly) 33 expressions and usages which have been claimed to be colloquial (usually by Hofmann, but occasionally by others). In nearly all cases he is at least right to ask whether the pattern of distribution of the phenomenon in surviving Latin literature does support the claim that it is colloquial. He is sometimes a bit reckless in ruling the possibility out: can we really be sure that the use of *etiam atque *etiam in rhetorical passages did not originate in spoken Latin? It would be implausible to claim that no rhetorically effective expression ever did so. But B.’s discussions do bring out one difficulty that readers have had with Hofmann’s book, that it blurs the boundaries between Umgangssprache and higher forms of literature; and perhaps B.’s assertions are no more arbitrary than Hofmann’s original claims. Thus, he points out that Ennius, Lucretius, Sallust, Livy and Tacitus all use *egregie to qualify an adjective; although it does not inevitably follow that the usage did not originate in conversational Latin, this pattern of distribution makes it entirely reasonable to ask why we should believe that it did originate there. B. is right to ask about the use of *defit at Ph. 162, and also about Terence’s use of *departare (though one occurrence of this verb in Accius is surely not enough to settle the matter). He makes the attractive suggestions that *emungere = ‘to cheat’ was not a colloquialism but a lively comic expression imitated from Greek comedy (pp. 62–4), and that *nil nimis at H.T. 519 is not a colloquialism but an allusion to the Greek proverbial expression ιδον τινα (pp. 74–5). He presents a strong case against taking *quid with the partitive genitive of people or gods as a colloquialism (and Lindsay Watson in his commentary on Horace, Epode 3.1 [Oxford 2003] agrees with him, at least for that and some other passages); and he is clearly right that *quid quaeris? at H.T. 62 is not an example of a ‘half-mechanised’ formula. He shows on pp. 87–9 that Hofmann had lumped together different usages of *nullus, not all of which are colloquial. Other expressions about which we shall have at least to be cautious in future include *minus in the sense of *non, *minime, *haudquaquam, the double negative *neque *baut, *quisnam, ad *atiquid *esse, adverb + *esse, the infinitive of exclamation, *quid me *faciat and similar expressions, *in illis . . . , *in illis (in place of *in his . . . , *in illis), *cautiose = *cavendum est, personal *ande (B. could have added Eun. 113 to his examples on p. 90), and expressions like *vella *mercenario at Ad. 441. In general, B. is right to insist that expressions in comedy need to be studied in their context (p. 27).

Some discussions in this section are less satisfactory. (1) The treatment of *beus *beus on pp. 57–9 is vitiated by a careless reading of Charisius 315.18–23 Barwick (= Keil I 242.15–9): Charisius quotes Eun. 84 followed by the comment *adfectus *ob *amorem, then the tragic quotation *beus *beus, *pater, *beus *Hector followed by a *dolore *mentis *adfectae, then a further quotation followed by *cupiditatis *adfectus *est. B. has been misled by Keil’s and Barwick’s punctuation into thinking that the words *adfectus *ob *amorem are a comment on the tragic quotation that follows rather than the passage from Eunuchus that precedes, and
this leads him to make strange claims for the tone of _beus beus_ at H.T. 348. (2) B. gives no reason for his claim on p. 60 that _Eun._ 455: _o Thais mea, meum savium_ is in elevated style, and in n. 178 he wrongly claims that this and _Poën._ 1127 are in passages with musical accompaniment. He may be right that _animum_ at H.T. 406 has literary rather than colloquial colouring, but can we be sure that this is not how lovers addressed each other in real life? (3) Pp. 61–64 misrepresent Hofmann, who gave H.T. 85 _crede inquam mihi_ as an example to illustrate that the addition of _inquam_ is _besonders eindrucksvoll_, not as an example of a _verblasste Wendung_. (4) B. is probably right on pp. 66–77 that _habuit_ at An. 85 is not used elliptically, but it does not follow that it is not colloquial. The erotic use of _ēstē_ in Hellenistic epigram is of course no argument against its being colloquial in Greek either. (5) He may be right that _-que et_ is not colloquial (p. 82), but he is wrong to adduce Horace, Sat. 1.4.58 as an example. (6) It is not clear to me that Hofmann was suggesting colloquialism in _Eun._ 72–3, as claimed on pp. 92–3. (7) His claims that pleonasm (p. 79), anacoluthon (p. 82) and _aposiopesis_ (pp. 94–5) are less at home in conversation than in elevated or poetic style seem to me misguided; and he has not seen that in _Menander_, _Samia_ 325, the _aposiopesis_ marks the point at which _Demæas_ cuts short his tragic declamation and is not itself part of the tragic style. (8) He seems not to have defined to himself exactly what is at stake in his discussion of _prosit obvit_ at H.T. 643 (pp. 95–7); the Greek expressions adduced in n. 352 are not the same, and I cannot see the relevance of the passages cited on p. 97 in which _profasse_ and _obesse_ are contrasted.

The third section, in its search for idioms derived from Greek, discusses the following: _ambula_ at H.T. 380 (cf. _βάρκας_); _ocins_ as at _An._ 724 (cf. _θάττος_; but I do not see why _ocins_ should not mean _‘schneller’_ at _Eun._ 912); _intus_ meaning _‘at home’_; _abire_ as at H.T. 978 (but can we really believe that this is not native Latin? _φαῦσα_ _εἰς_, which is adduced as the equivalent Greek expression, has a different structure); ironic _verum_? at _Eun._ 1019; _sævis_ at _Ph._ 411; ironic _bonus var_; _videre_ in the sense of _‘meet’_; _sin_ and _nostin_ (but he seems confused between _Fraenkel’s_ claim that _Terence_ is following his Greek models closely when he uses these words in certain dialogue-sequences and the question of whether his use of the words is alien to the Latin language); _hunc non vides_? at _Eun._ 463; _factum_ and _fiét_ meaning _‘yes’_; _sic est_; _recte aut commode_ (but this is not in fact closely modelled on _ὁρθὸς_ _τὸν δικτύος_; the expression is derived from B.: only the first word has the same meaning); _immo enim si scias_ (again, when _Fraenkel_ claimed _τὸ δὴ_ _επιθύμητε…_ _πάντες_ as an equivalent Greek expression, he cannot possibly have meant that the Latin expression was borrowed from the Greek: _immo enim_ does not reproduce anything from the Greek idiom); _res indicabit_ at _Eun._ 469; _merito te anno; bene factis; nisi molestum est_; _si tibi videtur_ at _Ph._ 448 (though B. speculates that this may in fact be Latin legal terminology); _quid dicam aliquid resicio_ at _An._ 746; _non sum apud me_; _enicas_ at _Ph._ 384 and _836_ (but _πολεμίζεις_ has a different tense); _nemon…_; _derides_; _irides_; _miliens audire_; _nisi dicis_ at _Eun._ 221; _sævis_ _sanus est_ (but B. adduces no Greek equivalent of _sanum_); _si νοσο_, _dico tibi_ and _edic_ _tibi_ in threats; _tibi dico_ as at _Hec._ 423; _male ureo_ (_δέχεσθαι_ does not seem very similar, however); _etiam nunc pasilam_ (again, when _Fraenkel_ spoke of translation in this dramatic context he did not necessarily mean that he thought the idiom itself derived from Greek, and it is not clear that B. himself thinks that either); _nisi alud nisi_ at _An._ 306 (but the inclusion of _volo_ surely makes this different from the Greek idiom _ὀτιώκειν_ _άλλο ἥς_; _minus minusque_; _hoc vide_ at _H.T._ 316; _uno ore_ and _bona dicere_ at _An._ 96–7; _da te mihi_ at _H.T._ 688 and _Ad._ 838; _haud clam me est_ (but what is proved by pointing out that _λυγιώσειν_ is the equivalent Greek verb?); _quiduin_? (but nothing here corresponds to the _χαῖρε_ in _πᾶσι_ _χαῖρε_ _οι_!); _baut sic aufertem_ at _Ad._ 454 (where the dramatic situation is multiply misrepresented at the top of p. 138); _sic est hoc_ at _An._ 919; _hoc ille est_ at _An._ 125; _qua ratione_ (but _τὸ μεθύσαι_ is quite different in structure); _quid… malit_? (B. cites _Eun._ 1029 but not 547; the expression was already identified as a _Græzismus_ by _Leo_, but _τοῦτο_ _τὸ τοῦτον_; does not show the same use of the genitive); _dixit hoc fore?_; _quid_ as at _H.T._ 317; _ut omne reddat_ at _Ad._ 280; _vis_ (2nd singular) plus subjunctive.

It will be clear at a glance that some of the items in this list do not look like very plausible candidates for what B. is trying to find; in other cases (as some of my comments try to show) the difference between the Latin expression and its nearest Greek equivalent surely
indicates that Terence is using an embedded Latin idiom. B. himself does not always try to argue for a Greek origin, and it might have been better if he had presented this simply as a serious of miscellaneous observations on idioms for which there is an interesting Greek equivalent – which is in effect what this section amounts to. B. draws attention on p. 31 of his introduction to _nil dicis_ at Eun. 221 as the one example in comedy of an idiom that appears to be based on the Greek ἐδὲν ἠγαπᾷ and which did not subsequently thrive in Latin; his case here seems to be strong for claiming that Terence was imitating the Greek idiom. I am less convinced by his discussion on pp. 99–100 of _intus_ for 'at home' (cf. _EvDov_), singled out in the Rückblick on p. 148 as an «eindeutiger Gräzismus»: Varro de I.L. 7,12 is explaining the use of _videre_, not of _intus_, at Plautus Men. 352, and I cannot see what follows from the fact that Cicero at sen. 12 writes _intus domique_ to balance _in luce_ ... _atque in oculis civium_; Cic. de orat. 2,276 (quoted in n.372) seems to me to show that _domi esse_ and _intus esse_ are interchangeable expressions.

The first paragraph of the two pages of Rückblick (on p. 147) is rather odd. B. lists 22 words or expressions as examples of «bisher kaum beachtete Wendungen der römischen Umgangssprache» which «ausschließlich in die römische Sprache gehören und keine griechischen Vorlagen widerspiegeln». Of these, _bona dicere_ has been claimed on pp. 133–4 to derive from Greek; an equivalent Greek expression was quoted for _me vide_ on p. 43, for _beare_ on pp. 43–4, and for _bona verba_ on pp. 45–6; it is not clear which usages of _immo_ and _sic_ B. had in mind, but he has certainly claimed Greek origin for some uses of _sic_. This suggests that he may perhaps have changed his mind about some of these idioms in the course of writing the book, and it reinforces my feeling that the book's main value lies not so much in B.'s conclusions as in the fact that he has selected some interesting idioms to discuss. He has often taken his lead from earlier scholars, and he is always careful to acknowledge when he is doing so: as his own discussions show, half of the expressions in his list of 22 have previously been identified as colloquialisms, so «kaum beachtet» does not seem quite right. But it is very useful to have these scattered observations assembled between the covers of one book, and B. often fleshes out the observations on the basis of his own researches.

This is a book we shall consult with profit in spite of some shortcomings. On the whole, it is reliable and well produced. But I have indicated a number of errors _en passant_ above, and I have also noticed the following: p. 39 lines 4 and 5 'Phormio' for 'Phaedria'; p. 39 n.91 '16f.' for '18f'; on p. 40 Sosia in Andria is wrongly said to be a slave (he is correctly labelled as a freedman on p. 56); p. 41 line 10 'Simó' for 'Chremes'; on p. 49 Fraenkel's interpretation of Eun. 426 was shown to be wrong by J. Wright, Dancing in Chains: the Stylistic Unity of the Comedia Palliata (Rome: American Academy 1974), 25–7; on p. 83 it is no part of Aeschines' dilemma at Ad. 610ff. «sein Geheimnis dem Bruder enthüllen zu müssen»; p. 88 line 16 'handele' for 'handelt'; p. 112 penultimate line 'Moschion' for 'Demecas' – and the summary of the situation at Sam. 444 is wrong; p. 143 line 13 'beziehe' for 'bezieht'; p. 156 top 'Nesbit' for 'Nisbet'. The notes occasionally use 'a.O.' and 'ebd.', which merely make life difficult for readers and ought to have been banned from scholarly publications long ago.

Trinity College, Oxford

_P. G. McC. Brown_