Reception of Terence's 'Homo sum...' from Antiquity to the Renaissance in the History of Humanisms*

TSUTSUI Nobuyasu

Terence

The famous verse 'Homo sum: humani nihil a me alienum puto' from the beginning of Terence's *Heauton timorumenos*,[1] written in 163 BCE, is highly evocative. Taken out of its original context, the Latin phrase has given rise to an extremely wide range of meanings. This great polysemy is undoubtedly due to its keyword *homo*, which, according to Nietzsche, is a false *aeterna veritas* that can change in a short time.[2] Its multivocality is reflected in the history of several humanisms (visions of man), from antiquity to modernity.[3] In particular, it has been used since Ludwig Feuerbach in 1843 as the motto of an

---

* This work is a revised and enlarged version of Tsutsui (2021) published in French. The classical Latin texts are from OCT editions, and for the later periods they have been modernized by distinguishing *i* and *j*, *u* and *v*, avoiding the ligatures *æ* or *œ*, and using capital letters after full stops. Translations are my own, unless otherwise noted. Abbreviations for classical authors and texts are the *OCD*'s.

1) First act, first scene, v. 77.

2) *Menschliches, Allzumenschliches*, aph. 2, in Nietzsche (1973) vol. 1 p. 234. See also below n. 343.

3) Davies (1997) deals with the ideological, philosophical and literary history of European humanism from the 18th century onwards. See below nn. 102 et 280. Høgel (2015) has studied it from antiquity to the Renaissance. Unfortunately, it is written in awkward English, and its insistence on the *humane* meaning of Terence's verse—the supposed ethical foreshadowing of human rights (pp. 9–10)—through the relations with the so-called 'Scipionic Circle' (pp. 34–5) is misleading. See below n. 33.

atheistic 'humanism' (philosophy of Man),[4] but neither 'humanism' in this sense nor the humanistic meaning of the Terentian verse existed in antiquity and subsequent periods. This paper traces the reception of the verse from antiquity to the Renaissance. It has not been fully studied, even with the supposedly complete list of quotations compiled by Eckhard Lefèvre,[5] nor with H.D. Jocelyn's attempt to trace it succinctly throughout antiquity.[6]

---

4) Feuerbach (1843) p. 81 [§56 of *Principles of the Philosophy of the Future*]: '*Homo sum, humani nihil a me alienum puto*—dieser Satz, in seiner universellsten und höchsten Bedeutung genommen, ist der Wahlspruch des neuen Philosophen' (... this phrase, taken in its most universal and highest sense, is the motto of the new philosopher). This kind of atheist ideology, which sees humanity as the sole concern of philosophy, and as its corollary the vision of Renaissance humanism as the emancipation of Man from the *Entfremdung* of fossilized scholastic theology—e.g. Burckhardt (2014) p. 335: '[Renaissance culture] first discovers and brings to light the whole substance of man' [original in German], or Dornseiff (1943) p. 111: 'The opposite idea of Italian Renaissance humanism is the clerical narrowness of the Church' [original in German]—is an invention of the 19th-century Germany, cf. Davies (1997) *passim* and and Hankins (2007) pp. 30–31. See below n. 280. Renaissance men like Erasmus, Rabelais or even Pico della Mirandola did not think of the emancipation of the atheist Man but of the Christian.

5) On the reception of the verse, Otto (1890) pp. 165–6 and Büchmann (1905) p. 441 (with many other editions) are quite inadequate. Lefèvre (1986) and the extended version Lefèvre (1994) pp. 26–54 offer a large number of quotations up to 1982, but do not provide a comprehensive analysis. His list omits Ariosto, Robert Burton and Francis Bacon (see below). For later centuries there is a considerable lack: *Singularia historiae imperatoriae* (1705) p. 1306; König (1712) Vor-Gericht, fol.)*(3^{v}; Lehmann (1740); *Wöchentliche* (1740) p. 187 (see below n. 269); John Wesley, *Primitive Physick*, London, Strahan, 1761^{9}, title page (previous eds. having no citation); Louis Joseph Masquelier, after Jean-Michel Moreau le Jeune, 'Homo sum; humani nihil a me alienum puto,' 1773. Engraving (see Bellhouse (2006) pp. 753–6) which was the frontispiece of Bernardin de Saint-Pierre's *Voyage à l'Ile de France*, see Delon (1984) pp. 284–5; Francis Glasse, *A Life of George Washington, in Latin prose*, New York, Harper, 1835, p. 202. On the other hand, Lefèvre (1994) p. 28 mentions Petronius, *Satyricon* 75 'nemo ... nostrum non peccat. homines sumus, non dei' as an alleged 'Anspielung auf Terenz', but this is irrelevant. See below n. 309.

6) Jocelyn (1973). His assessment of the reception was cursory.

Before getting to the main issue, it is worth looking at the phrasing of the verse. Broadly speaking, there are two different forms of the words offered in manuscripts: 'Homo sum: humani nihil a me alienum puto' or 'Homo sum: humani a me nihil alienum puto'. The latter reading was transmitted only by the *γ* group of MSS (represented by Codex C, 9th century, Vatican Library Vat.lat.3868, fol. 36v, and Codex P, same century, BNF Paris lat.7899, fol. 69v) and was prevalent in Renaissance editions.[7] The former is the reading of the oldest surviving manuscript, *Codex Bembinus* (Codex A, 4th or 5th century, Vatican Library Vat.Lat.3226, fol. 32r), or of the quotations in antiquity,[8] and has been generally authenticated since the mid-seventeenth century.[9] A small but vexing problem is the difference between 'nihil' and 'nil'. The best MSS including A, C and P read 'nihil', and most of the major editors of Terence from the seventeenth century onwards adopt this spelling,[10] but two of them from the late nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries, Karl Dziatzko and Wallace Lindsay (and his co-editor Robert Kauer)[11] choose 'nil' with no indication of variant,[12] and the

7) On the *γ* group and Renaissance editions, see below n. 270. Images of codices A and P are available on the Internet:
https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.lat.3868
https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b84525513/f142.item

8) On codex Bembinus, see below n. 270. See its image at
https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.lat.3226
On the word order in the quotations, see Terence (1979–90) vol. 2 p. 23 apparatus criticus.

9) See below n. 270.

10) Friedrich Lindenbrog, Richard Bentley, A.H. Westerhovius, Franz Umpfenbach, Alfred Fleckeisen and Jules Marouzeau adopt this form: Terence (1623) p. 205, id. (1726) p. 168, id. (1732) p. 594, id. (1870) p. 192, id. (1916) p. 55 (Teubner) and id. (1979–90) vol. 2 p. 23 (Budé) respectively.

11) Whitaker (2007) p. 125 shows Kauer's limited contribution: 'When the edition was published Kauer effectively disowned some of the readings which Lindsay had retained against his advice'.

12) Dziatzko's Terence (1884) p. 55; Kauer and Lindsay's OCT editions of Terence (1926) and id. (1958) n. pag. [O. Skutsch's revision is not involved here]. Lindsay says in his *Prefatio* n. pag.: 'Semper scripsi ... *nil*' without further explanation. To these may be added R.Y. Tyrrell's old OCT edition: Tyrrell (1902) n. pag. All British and American non-critical editions published in the late 19th and early 20th

majority of students of Terence follow their choice.[13] In this third foot of an iambic senarius,[14] there seems to be three possible forms: '[huma]-nĭ *nīl*' (an Iambus), '-nĭ *nĭhīl*' with a long *-hīl* (an Anapaest),[15] and '-nĭ *nĭhĭl*' with a short

centuries adopt *nil*: Wagner (1869) p. 122, id. (1872) p. 34, Shuckburgh (1877) p. 6 [though stating to be based on Fleckeisen's text, *ibid.* p. vii], West (1888) p. 67 [though stating in the preface to follow Umpfenbach's], Rolfe (1891) p. 10 [stating in the preface to follow Dziatzko's], Gray (1895) p. 8 [though stating to follow Fleckeisen's, *ibid.* p. vii], Ashmore (1908) p. 56. Followers are Sargeaunt and Barsby in their Loeb editions [Sargeaunt (1918) p. 124, Barsby (2001) p. 186], and Brothers (1998) p. 48, who declares himself as for the 'spelling ... *nihil/nil* ... [to] have ... followed the Oxford Text' (p. 25). Since the late 19th century, the reading of *nil* has been firmly established in the Anglo-Saxon world. Curiously, none of these editors explain the reason for *nil*.

13) Gleye (1896), Norwood (1923) p. 152, Körte (1942) p. 101, Dornseiff (1943) p. 110, Pohlenz (1943) p. 270, Laidlaw (1938) p. 53, Primmer (1966) p. 294, Gaiser (1967) p. 31, Duckworth (1971) p. 155 n. 37, Jocelyn (1973), Steidle (1974) p. 248, Büchner (1974) p. 440, Radice (1976) p. 16, Hunter (1985) p. 139, Lefèvre (1986) p. 39, id. (1994) p. 11, Goldberg (1986) pp. 14 and 137 and Bettini and Ricottilli (1989). To these may be added dictionary citations, *OLD* p. 809 (based on OCT edition, see *ibid.* p. xix), *TLL* vol. 6 p. 3090 l. 53; on the other hand, a minority adopts 'nihil': Walzer (1935) p. 200, Bickel (1941), id. (1942) p. 186, Delcourt (1960) p. 257, Prete (1961) p. 119, Grimal (1979) p. 175, Delon (1984) p. 279, Dumont (1992) p. 39, Néraudau (1996) p. 118, and Nowak (2020), most of whom are Franco-Belgian scholars, probably under the influence of the Budé edition.

14) Terence (1958) 'Conspectvs Metrorvm' s.v. *Haut.* 1–174. On 'homō', see Terence (1979–90) vol. 2 p. 97 and Laidlaw (1938) p. 53, who says 'possibly' and also mentions '(? *homŏ sūm*)', i.e.

homō | s(um); hūmā|ni nīl [nihil] | ā m(e) ali|ēnūm | putō

or

(?) homo sūm; | hūmā|ni nīl [nihil] | ā m(e) ali|ēnūm | putō

15) Plautus and Ovid occasionally used nĭhīl, Lachmann (1855) p. 27 n. 159–160. When its first pair of short syllables was divided between words (as in this case), an Anapaest was avoided 'unless the words were so closely connected in thought and pronunciation that the break was scarcely perceptible, and the whole foot ran smoothly', according to Laidlaw (1938) p. 34. Of the close connection he gives an example from Ter. *An.* (155) 'prop-*ter amo*-rem' (preposition and noun forming a word-group), *ibid.* On the Anapaest, see also Lindsay (1922) pp. 86–8. Drexler

-*hĭl* (a Tribrach). But Karl Lachmann[16] drew a rule that in Ovid and other poets, including Terence, the disyllabic *nihil* should be used neither with a short -*hĭl* nor before vowels (so here before *a me*). Dziatzko and Lindsay seem to have preferred to follow this rule to the MSS reading.[17] Nevertheless, Lachmann rule is partially refuted by A.E. Housman, who cites some twenty examples of Ovid with *nĭhĭl* (short -*hĭl*) before vowels, and by J.P. Postgate.[18] On the other hand, W.A. Laidlaw argues that Terence has '*Nihĭl* Haut. 896, Phor. 940; otherwise *nīl*', on the authority of Lindsay, who 'emphasizes (*E.L.V.* 118) the fewness of short consonant-endings in the time of Plautus'.[19] But this

(1939) p. 138 warns against Laidlaw's hypothetical arguments including this one. In this foot there is a grammatically close connection between the genitive case of a substantival neuter adjective (*humani*) as 'modifier' and a neuter pronoun (*nihil*), Pinkster (2015) p. 1020.

16) Lachmann (1855) p. 27 n. 159–160 and Lachmann (1876) p. 59. Cf. *Der Neue Georges* (2019) p. 3264 'Form nīl, Hor. u. a. Dichter', which still refers to Lachmann's rule as intact. H. Diels in his ed. of Lucretius (Berlin, 1923–4) deliberately violates the rule with 'a stronger belief in the possibility of reproducing the poet's spelling', Bailey (1972) p. 50.

17) Neither explicitly refers to Lachmann. Lindsay (1922) p. 121's explanation on *nīl* and *nĭhĭl* does not fully justify this change, for he himself recognizes that Terence used *nihil* (*Haut.* 896 and *Phorm.* 940).

18) Housman (1919) p. 57, Postgate (1920) pp. 52–63, Postgate (1921). See Housman (1920), who is much more cautious than Postgate, and only makes it clear that Ovid used *nihil* in the fall of the first foot. He goes on: 'Beyond the first foot certainty does not extend. That in the third foot, ... where *nil* in the fall is 5 times followed by a consonant, Ovid always used *nihil* instead if following letter was a vowel, is neither ascertained nor intrinsically probable; though the preponderance (about 4 to 1) of following vowels over following consonants lends countenance to the opinion' (p. 163). On their controversy, see Butterfield (2009) pp. 125–6 and his conclusion: 'neither this [Housman (1920)], nor Postgate's subsequent rebuttal [Postgate (1921)], brought an advance in metrical knowledge'. It should also be noted that their discussion concerns only Ovid, not Terence.

19) Laidlaw (1938) p. 53. I fear that, as a disciple of Lindsay, he is using the OCT edition for his count, in which Lindsay 'semper scripsi[t] ... *nil*' (see above n. 12), and ignoring MSS. If so, his statement about 'otherwise *nīl*' is a circular argument. In any case, the MSS refute his statement. Moreover, his authority Lindsay (1922) p. 118 admits short endings caused by the law of *brevis brevians* and, as

argument is not convincing against the MSS evidence. Moreover, *nihil* is closer to its etymology, *ne-hīlum*, but 'everyday talk reduced [nihĭl] to nīl', as Lindsay remarks.[20] One might have preferred *nil* in the comic texts as a closer approximation to spoken language. However, the earlier Latin, such as that of Terence, may have used the more etymological form *nihil*. Without knowing the extent to which Lachmann's rule applies to Terence, nor having any compelling reason to prefer Dziatzko and Lindsay's text, as well as Laidlaw's questionable precept, I will provisionally stick with the MSS reading 'although the propensity of scribes to write *nihil* for *nil* is notorious'.[21] Indeed, the OCT editions have *nihil* in the verse quotations: Cic. *Leg.* 1.33 (ed. J.G.F. Powell), *Off.* 1.30 (ed. M. Winterbottom), Sen. *Ep.* 95.53 (ed. L.D. Reynolds).

The play, entitled in Greek Ἑαυτὸν τιμωρούμενος (*The Self-Tormentor*), is an adaptation of Menander's play of the same name, now lost: ex integra Graeca integram comoediam | hodie sum acturus Heauton timorumenon (It's a fresh comedy from a fresh Greek source I'm going to put on today, *The Self-Tormentor*) *Prologus* 4–5.[22] Given the loss of the Greek source, the original meaning and context of the verse are not so easy to grasp, as the interpretation has been very controversial among scholars and there are still divergences.

mentioned above at n. 17, he does not give sufficient reason for *nīl*, saying only: 'There is no clear trace of the disyllable *nihil* in Plautus, but Terence certainly twice uses it to end a line' (p. 121). This statement has been repeated more emphatically by many scholars, such as Jocelyn (1999) p. 361 n. 124: 'Terence has *nihil* at the end of senarius *Phorm.* 940 and the trochaic septenarius *Haut.* 896. There is no clear trace elsewhere in comedy of dissyllabic *nihil*'.

20) Lindsay (1922) p. 121: 'Perhaps the Brevis Brevians Law ... changed nihīlum into nihĭlum, and the dropping of the word's tail left nĭhĭl, which everyday talk reduced to nīl'.

21) Housman (1920) p. 162. See also id. (1922) p. 82: 'In particular, scribes will alter a less familiar form to a more familiar ... If meter allows, or if they do not know that meter forbids, they will alter ... *nil* to *nihil*...'

22) Transl. Brothers (1998) p. 45. On the meaning of *integer* (fresh), see Brothers (1980) pp. 97–8 and Brothers (1998) p. 161 n. 4. The *Didascalia* gives Menander's name as the original author and the date of first performance (M'. Iuventio Ti. Sempronio cons[ulibus] = 163 BCE). Webster (1974) p. 10 places the creation of Menander's play in 298 BCE. Therefore, 'a fresh Greek source' does not refer to the novelty of the model but to its novelty on the Roman stage.

The Latin play opens with a conversation between two elderly neighbours who have recently become acquainted. Chremes kindly asks Menedemus why, although he is a rich sexagenarian, he punishes himself 'on [his] farm digging or ploughing or carrying something about'[23] instead of his slaves, but Menedemus replies curtly:[24] tantumne ab re tuast oti tibi | aliena ut cures ea quae nihil ad te attinent? (have you got so much time free from your own affairs that you worry about things which are no concern of yours and have nothing to do with you?) 75–6.[25] Chremes responds wisely with this line: I am a man: I consider nothing that is human alien to me.[26] And he continue: vel me monere hoc vel percontari puta: | rectumst? ego ut faciam; non est? te ut deterream. (Regard this either as a warning I'm giving, or as a question—so that I can do it myself if it's right; so that I can put you off if it's not.) 78–9.[27] Thus, in the speaker's intention, the verse is a warning from a kind friend, his

23) Brothers (1998) p. 49.

24) Menedemus' curtness is a consensus among West (1888) p. 213, Norwood (1923) p. 37, Körte (1942) p. 101, Mewaldt (1942) p. 167, Primmer (1966) pp. 294–5, Büchner (1974) p. 172, Goldberg (1986) p. 137, and Brothers (1998) p. 168 n. 75–6. In contrast, Jocelyn (1973) p. 30 interprets Menedemus' reply as a 'measured courtesy' or 'gently uttered word', as does Delcourt (1960) p. 257. But this seems awkward. For the latter critics, calling one by name ('Chreme'), as Menedemus did, is all courtesy or politeness?

25) Transl. Brothers (1998) p. 49. Mewaldt (1942) p. 168 insists on a strong correspondence between vv. 76 and 77. Indeed, there is a repetition of 'nihil', an answer of 'alienum' to 'aliena', and of 'a me' to 'ad te'. Primmer (1966) p. 295 also mentions 'die Antithese res tua—res aliena'. Jocelyn (1973) p. 31 rather emphasizes 'a unit' of the three verses 77–9 (repetition of 'puto / puta' at vv. 77–8) and the weight of the last line, saying: 'It must not ... be thought either that *a me alienum* has the sense of *quod ad me non attinet* or that *humani* has that of *quod ad hominem attinet*', for '[the] addition of *a me* to *alienum* merely strengthened the literal force of the adjective' (p. 36).

26) The line is rightly described by Norwood (1923) p. 42 as having 'striking power'. Forehand (1985) p. 65 says: 'That single line has been the center of the debate: is Chremes a concerned humanitarian or a self-satisfied busybody?'

27) Transl. Brothers (1998) p. 49. For a pair of question marks at v. 79 added by Bentley and Marouzeau, see Brothers (1998) p. 169 n. 79.

mild interference,[28] but not at all a statement about the philosophy of Man.[29] The humanist view 'cannot be right'.[30] According to H.D. Jocelyn, in classical Latin, *homo* and *humanus* were 'used commonly in the same area as *misericors* and ... *beniuolens*', which differs from the current universal meaning of *human*, for unlike the Greek ἄνθρωπος, *homo* was a much less favourable term than *vir*, and in his excuse for rudeness, a sense of guilt as a busybody makes Chremes resort to these modest terms in order to 'ward off the suspicion'.[31] Indeed, for Terence *homo* and its derivatives always have 'either neutral or negative' connotations, devoid of any universal *humanistic* meaning.[32] In the play, these words are used in this way 25 times: at v. 61 (a cliché), 77 twice (our verse), 99 ('*humanitus*' kindly), 193 (neutral statement), 205 ('tolerant man'), 313 (scornfully), 356 (self-mockingly), 380 ('*hominem felicem*' enviously), 422 and 503 (both neutral), 530

28) Brothers (1998) p. 168 n. 77. West (1888) p. 213, Goldberg (1986) p. 143 and Richardson (2006) p. 29 mention *meddle* or *meddling*. Bickel (1941) p. 352, Körte (1942) p. 101 (see below n. 113), Mewaldt (1942) p. 168, and Pohlenz (1943) pp. 272 and 274 speak of *Einmischung* or *Sicheinmischen*.

29) See above n. 4. Brunetière (1905) vol. 1, p. 28, who took this line for a full definition of humanism, was criticized by Babbitt (1908) pp. 8–9 [see also C.K. (1918) p. 145 n. 1]. The criticism is repeated by Delcourt (1960) p. 258.

30) Brothers (1998) p. 19. On the contrary, a misleading *humanistic* view is taken by Mewaldt (1942) pp. 170–71 with his attempt to catalogue Menandrian fragments on ἄνθρωπος in order to prove the *humanism* in *Homo sum* (pp. 172–4), as well as by Büchner (1974) p. 440: '*humaniziert*'. B. Radice's translation (below n. 37) is in the same vein.

31) Jocelyn (1973) pp. 33–6. Regarding the unfavourable meaning of *homo*, it might be assumed that there is evidence against this in Enn. *Ann.* 363–5 Sk [= Cic. *Off.* 1.84], *Unus homo* [= Fabius Cunctator] *nobis cunctando restituit rem* | ... | *Ergo postque magisque viri nunc gloria claret*, asserting that *homo* is a laudatory synonym of *vir*. However, *homo* means an ordinary man and *vir* means a brave man or hero: '*a man* has saved our country... glory shines for *the hero*'. Livy, 24.34.1–2 '... nisi *unus homo* Syracusis ea tempestate fuisset. *Archimedes is* erat...' is of the same cloth.

32) Jocelyn (1973) p. 33. On the less favourable meaning of *homo* than *vir*, in that the noun and its adjective *humanus* imply an inferior or unreliable status of the addressee, or an excuse on the part of the speaker, see *ibid.* pp. 34–5.

(disparaging), 552 (neutral), 567 (speaking about a friend of the son's), 580 (ironic), 585 (humble), 666 (neutral), 731 (referring to a man sitting at the same table), 780 (referring to an unsuitable suitor), 825 ('*homo fortunatus*' in self-congratulation), 848 (astonishment at a nonsensical speaker), 883 (speaking about the neighbour's son and slave), 887 (referring to participants in Syrus' plot), 1003 ('*tu homo*' accusing the husband),[33] 1046 ('*inhumane*' to speak of Chremes' cruelty to his son). Therefore, as Sander Goldberg puts it, 'that widely cited statement of Terentian *humanitas*, 'homo sum: humani nil a me alienum puto' (*HT* 77), is only a busybody's excuse for his prying'.[34] To sound natural, some translators prefer to paraphrase: 'I am a man, I hold that what affects another man affects me',[35] 'Common humanity, Sir, obliges me to be so concerned',[36] 'I'm a normal human being; nobody's business is

33) Sostrata usually refers to Chremes as '*mi vir*' at 622, 1005, 1015 and 1048.

34) Goldberg (1986) p. 14. And he says: 'Finally, we have lost the comforting idea of a new *humanitas.* Both the word and the concept in Latin date only from Cicero's time' (*ibid.*). Ludwig (1968) p. 180 sees in 'the Terentian conception of *humanum*' nothing more than 'a reproduction of an analogous Greek idea'. In fact, the Greek words relative to ἄνθρωπος hardly had the cultural meaning of the Ciceronian *humanitas* (the hapax is Aristippus' saying in Diog. Laert. 2.70), Høgel (2015) pp. 29–31. On the historical grounds of Scipio Aemilianus' youth and of the reappraisal of the cultural context in 2nd-century Rome, Goldberg (1986) pp. 9–13 and Forehand (1985) pp. 6–7 argue against the 'now widely accepted' view that Terence was a literary spokesman for the 'Scipionic Circle'. However, Brothers (1998) p. 11 states: 'the involvement of the Scipionic Circle is rendered highly likely by the fact two of Terence's plays were put on at the funeral games for Scipio's father, L. Aemilius Paulus'. On the other hand, Jocelyn (1973) p. 25, who sees vv. 77–9 as 'redolent of philosophical lecturing', considers that Roman audiences 'would not have missed the general associations of Chremes' with a personage of *philosophus*, i.e. 'the verbal trickster, the maker of paradoxical statements about reality, the giver of advice quite useless from the practical point of view' (p. 27). He concludes: 'It is therefore reasonable to suppose that Terence composed the trio of verses beginning with *homo sum*... in order to appeal to the ignorant and the prejudiced rather than to comfort the cultivated' (p. 28).

35) Sargeaunt (1918) p. 125.

36) Graves (1962) p. 106.

none of my business'.[37)]

During the Second World War, German scholars deepened their cultural understanding of this line from a *fabula palliata* through their dispute over a Menandrian verse proposed by Ernst Bickel[38)] as its source: Ἄνθρωπον ὄντα δεῖ

37) Copley (1963) p. 6. J. Marouzeau, P. Bovie, A.J. Brothers, P. Brown and J. Barsby translate literally. On the contrary, B. Radice's rendering is unique in its universal humanistic form: 'I'm human, so any human interest *is* my concern' Radice (1976) p. 104 [her italics]. See also her comment: 'It is easy to see why his words *homo sum: humani nil a me alienum puto* (*The Self-Tormentor* 77) have been so often quoted out of context with application to Terence himself' (p. 17).

38) Bickel (1941) and Bickel (1942) pp. 186–91. Another Menadrian and other fragments have been compared with our verse: οὐδείς ἐστί μοι | ἀλλότριος, ἀν ᾖ χρηστός · ἡ φύσις μία | πάντων, τὸ δ᾽οἰκεῖον συνίστησιν τρόπος. (No one is stranger to me if he is good; nature is one for all, but habit [or character] makes everyone's own) (fr. 602K = Stob. *Ecl.* 2.38.7). Headlam (1899) p. 7 conjecturally reconstructs the missing beginning of the first line: <ἄνθρωπός εἰμ᾽· ἄνθρωπος> (I am a man; not a man...). On this fragment see also Herwerden (1903) pp. 171–2, Menander (1921) pp. 504–5, Körte (1942) p. 102, Bickel (1942) p. 191 n. 4, Mewaldt (1942) p. 174, for whom it signifies a universal humanism: 'basically the human nature is everywhere the same' [original in German], Dornseiff (1943) p. 110, Pohlenz (1943) pp. 274–5, who finds in the terms ἀλλότριος-οἰκεῖον an influence of Zenon, Menander (1959) p. 164 (fr. 475K-T), Delcourt (1960) p. 258 n. 1. Mewaldt (1942) p. 168 n. 2 denies that it is the original verse. The third line seems to sound irrelevant, although Webster (1974) pp. 52–3 finds in it a reference to Aristotelian friendship (*Eth. Nic.*1155a21). Dornseiff (1943) p. 110 is aware of its inappropriate gravity. But if here is a *sophistic* meaning to the unity of φύσις and the instability of νόμος, as Jocelyn (1973) pp. 32–3 argues, it may be ironically relevant to Chremes' inappropriate habit of philosophizing as well as to his absurd claim of the socially inadmissible (see below n. 45) but human-naturally permissible πολυπραγμοσύνη, whose extremely philosophical and intellectual pun was omitted by Terence out of respect for the generality intended for the Roman audience. On τρόπος as inner conscience, see Mewaldt (1942) pp. 172 and 175.

Gleye (1896) suggested as a source a passage from the *Chronographia* of John Malalas, *CSHB* 32, p. 370: ὁρῶ καὶ οὐ ξενίζομαι· ἄνθρωπος γὰρ ὢν ἀνθρωπίναις περιέπεσα συμφοραῖς (I see and I am not surprised; for I am a man and I have encountered a human predicament); Delcourt (1960) 258 quotes much the same words θνητός ἐστι καὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων συμφορῶν οὐκ ἀλλότριος (se mortalem esse et ab humanis casibus non alienum) 'he is mortal and not alien to human events'

φρονεῖν τἀνθρώπινα (Being human, one must think humanly).[39] Indeed, it is likely that the Terentian line was a fairly literal translation of Menander's, for one can render it back (*rückübersetzen*) into Greek in one way or another,[40] and the Latin phrase 'humani nihil a me alienum puto' is a rather complicated and rare structure, but quite normal in Greek, as I shall see in the case of Cicero. Bickel was soon contradicted by several scholars,[41] but during the

---

quoted as Diocletian's utterance by an anonymous continuator of Cassius Dio in *FHG* 4.198. Büchmann (1905) p. 441 accepted Gleye's suggestion, but it was deleted in the later editions. Bickel (1941) criticizes it as completely irrelevant. See also Jocelyn (1973) p. 20 n. 44. In conclusion, the judgement of Dumont (1992) p. 40 is quite correct: 'the attempts of restitution to make the original of the verse out of some fragments are not at all convincing' [original in French]. Delcourt (1960) p. 259 rightly wonders why we have no trace of the Latin commentators who must have known the Menandrian text and would probably have compared this impressive verse with its Greek model. One major reason is surely the early loss or non-existence of Donatus' commentary on this play. On Donatus' commentary, see Zetzel (2018) p. 254.

39) *Menandri ΓΝΩΜΑΙ ΜΟΝΟΣΤΙΧΟΙ*, v. 1, *FCG* 4 340M; Menander (1964) p. 33. On the basis of two transitive uses of φρονεῖν (Hom. *Od.*14.82 and Plut. *Ant.*10.3), Bickel (1942) pp. 186–8 considers the verb to be transitive and the accusative τἀνθρώπινα to be a direct object, and the phrase to mean 'to think about human affairs' or 'to be interested in human affairs'. Agreeing with this, Mewaldt (1942) p. 169 n. 1 says: 'τἀνθρώπινα here means the same as τὰ ἀνθρώπῳ προσήκοντα (things concerning man)' [original in German]. Other scholars do not distinguish φρονεῖν τἀνθρώπινα from φρονεῖν ἀνθρώπινα, but see the verb as intransitive and the accusative as adverbial, and take the phrase to mean 'to think humanly', as Körte (1942) p. 101 says 'Where does φρονεῖν τι mean to worry about something or to take care of something?' [original in German]; Pohlenz (1943) pp. 270–71 treats θνητὰ φρονεῖν, φρονεῖν θνητὸν, ἀνθρώπινα φρονεῖν as synonyms for φρονεῖν τἀνθρώπινα. I agree with the judgement of Körte and Pohlenz, considering the abundance of articleless but very similar examples given by the latter.

40) Bickel (1942) p. 189 gives his own example using the monostich. Mewaldt (1942) p. 168 states that the Terentian *alienum* must correspond to the Greek ἀλλότριον frequently found in Menander.

41) Körte (1942), Mewaldt (1942) and Dornseiff (1943). Mewaldt (1942) p. 170 notes the difference between the negative feature of monostich (limiting the human sphere) and the positive action (extending one's sphere of interest to the affairs of

controversy Max Pohlenz[42] has clarified an affinity of sociocultural attitudes between the approach of Chremes, a typical Athenian, and the expansionism of Athenian diplomacy under Pericles, which intervened in the internal affairs of other countries, since both attitudes, individual or collective, can be characterized by the word πολυπραγμοσύνη.[43] Accordingly, the *humana* of Chremes means only the daily affairs of Athenian citizens, to the exclusion of women, barbarians, foreigners and slaves, which, however private they may be, belong more or less to the community of the *polis*. In this sense, man is an Athenian and humanity is a brotherhood of Athenian men; on the other hand, Menedemus is an apolitical egoist, unworthy of Athens,[44] who risks ceasing to be human by shutting himself up in absolute privacy; indeed, Pericles said: 'We [the Athenians] alone consider him who takes no part in the affairs of the polis (τὰ πολιτικὰ) not to be an idler (ἀπράγμονα), but a good-for-nothing' (Thuc. 2.40.2). However, as Jocelyn points out, the following facts must also be taken into account: the Athenian leaders 'had accepted with some complacence the charge of πολυπραγμοσύνη' because the character of πολυπράγμων was generally denounced by ordinary people in 'ancient Mediterranean communities'; moreover, in order to protect the privacy of landowners, neither

others) created by a double negation '*nihil alienum*' in the Terentian verse. On the controversy, see Gaiser (1967) p. 31 n. 101.

42) Pohlenz (1943).

43) Walzer (1935) p. 200 also mentions πολυπραγμοσύνη. On πολυπράγμων see Jocelyn (1973) p. 23 n. 71. According to him (p. 23), in the Menandrian play 'Chremes wore a mask indicative of his character (perhaps ... the so-called "Lycomedean" with its one raised eyebrow indicating ἡ πολυπραγμοσύνη)'. On the Lycomedes (etymologically 'wolfish cunning') mask, see Wiles (2004) p. 164. Jocelyn also claims that Terence's actors did not wear masks (p. 23 n. 70). However, Brothers (1998) p. 28 n. 21 considers this question unresolved, and according to Wiles (2004) pp. 146-9, it is apparently affirmative, but the elaborate Menandrian masking system was simplified and loosened. The Romans approximated πολυπράγμων to *curiosus*, Jocelyn (1973) p. 24 n. 73. On *curiosus*, see Plaut. *Stich.* 198-208, and Primmer (1966) p. 295. Chremes' first speech ends emblematically with 'plus agas' (74).

44) Pohlenz (2010) p. 136 is sure that our verse 'rings like a protest against Epicure's egoism' [original in German].

in Athens nor in Rome did law and custom '[give] a man the right to offer a fellow citizen advice on what to do with his land or on how to behave while on it'.[45)]

In the Greek context, this line has a long and rather complex antecedent.[46)] First of all, θνητὰ φρονεῖν or ἀνθρώπινα φρονεῖν, expressed in Menander's monostich,[47)] is a traditional warning against the hubris[48)] of man who tends to see himself as a rival to a god, and as such the lesson of modesty is of great truth, both in the heroic world[49)] described by tragedians (Sophocles, Aeschylus, Euripides) and in the games sung by Pindar. Within this archaic tradition, only idealists and a few other philosophers insisted on the immortality of the human intellect and their own godlike existence.[50)] On the other hand, as we have seen, in the Periclesian mentality, humanity is an intervention in the mutual life of fellow citizens and in the affairs of a foreign

45) Jocelyn (1973) p. 24 n. 74 and p. 30 (an impertinent 'surveillance of a wealthier man's behaviour could incur the charge of *inuidia* or *maliuolentia*').

46) This paragraph is based on Pohlenz (1943).

47) Mewaldt (1942) p. 170 n. 1 gives another monostich of the same tenet: Θνητὸς γεγονώς, ἄνθρωπε, μὴ φρόνει μέγα (Since you are mortal, man, do not think greatly) *ΓΝΩΜΑΙ ΜΟΝΟΣΤΙΧΟΙ* Supplementum II v. 603 (*FCG* 4 357M) = *ΓΝΩΜΑΙ ΜΟΝΟΣΤΙΧΟΙ* v. 350 Menander (1964) p. 52. Another is found: Θνητοὶ γεγῶτες μὴ φρονεῖθ᾽ὑπερ θεούς *ΓΝΩΜΑΙ ΜΟΝΟΣΤΙΧΟΙ* v. 243 (*FCG* 4 347M) = Θνητὸς πεφυκὼς μὴ φρόνει <γ᾽> ὑπέρθεα (Since you are mortal, do not think more than God) v. 336 Menander (1964) p. 52; and a doubtful or pseudepigraphic fragment: εἰ θνητὸς εἶ, βέλτιστε, θνητὰ φρόνει (If you are mortal, the best man, do think as a mortal) fr. 945K-T Menander (1959) p. 270.

48) Mewaldt (1942) p. 170 and Pohlenz (1943) p. 270.

49) 'Homeric heroes were honoured by their peoples "as gods" (Hom. *Il.* 5.78, 10.33, 12.312, etc.)', Kenney (1971) p. 1.

50) Pl. *Ti.* 90b-c, *Tht.* 176b, see Bickel (1942) p. 190; Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 1177b30 ff., *Rh.* 1394b25 = Epicharm. DK 23B20, see Mewaldt (1942) p. 169, Pohlenz (1943) pp. 270–71; Isoc. *Demon.* 32. Chilon of Sparta's saying in Plut. *Septem sapientium Convivium* (152b) is treated by Heinemann (2019) p. 24 n. 95 as a Platonized instance. Dornseiff (1943) pp. 110–11 mentions Aristotle's use (or abuse) of Chilon's saying for his theory of the contemplative life in Book 10 of *Eth. Nic.* 1177b30 ff. On the philosophical life as divine, see Empedocles, DK 31B112.4–5 and Epicurus, *Ep. Men.* 135, cf. Lucr. 5.8, see Costa (1984) p. 50.

country; it is not the monopoly of Pericles, Theseus is said to have practiced the 'meddling' (Eur. *Supp.* 576), and as such, it was the symbol and the key to the prosperity of the country.[51] After the fall of the Athenian hegemony, a negation of the πολυπραγμοσύνη by Democritus—χρὴ μὴ πολλὰ πρήσσειν (man should not do much, DK 68B3 = Stob. *Ecl.* 4.39.25)—has an inverse effect on the mindset of the Greeks, and especially on Epicurus, who appropriates it to create his selfish motto 'λάθε βιώσας' (live unnoticed)[52] or 'μὴ πολιτεύεσθαι' (take no part in politics),[53] which is probably reflected in Menedemus' curt reply.[54] Athenians of a new generation, the characters of Menander who was συνεφήβος to Epicurus (Strabo 14.1.18),[55] are no longer political animals like Pericles' contemporaries, bound by the bonds of the same city, but individuals sensitive to each other, simply bound together by human solidarity.[56] Accordingly, Chremes' meddling can be associated with Stoic cosmopolitanism,

51) Pohlenz (1943) p. 272. Theophrastus' theory of *philanthropia* was along the similar lines, see Grimal (1979) p. 176.

52) Plut. *Mor.* Εἰ καλῶς εἴρηται τὸ λάθε βιώσας.

53) Cic. *Att.* 14.20.5; Diog. Laert. 10.119.

54) Pohlenz (1943) pp. 273–4, Pohlenz (2010) p. 136. See above n. 44. Mewaldt (1942) p. 178 also notes the change in the Athenians' view of man after the end of the Peloponnesian War. Probably this new attitude is also reflected in the Menandrian monostiches 'Tὸ πολλὰ πράττειν ἐστὶ πανταχοῦ σαπρόν.' 'Tὸ πολλὰ πράττειν πολλὰς καὶ λύπας ἔχει.' (Much action is everywhere useless. Much action brings much pain) *Menandri sententiae e codicibus byzantinis ductae*, vv. 737 and 750, Menander (1964) pp. 75–6 = *Menandri ΓΝΩΜΑΙ ΜΟΝΟΣΤΙΧΟΙ*, Supplementum III ex Aldo. vv. 722–3, *FCG* 4, 361M (for v. 723 var. πολλὰς καὶ λύπας] κὠδύνας πολλὰς). On the other hand, Menander says the opposite 'τοῦτ᾽ἐστὶ τὸ ζῆν οὐχ ἑαυτῷ ζῆν μόνον' (To live is not only to live for oneself) (fr. 507K = Stob. *Ecl.* 4.53.4 'Μενάνδρου Φιλαδέλφοις'), Menander (1959) p. 205 (fr. 646K-T). Such a contradiction is quite normal in dramaturgy, when assigned to a pair of opposing protagonists, such as Menedemus and Chremes at vv. 76–7.

55) Strabo (1960) p. 219 n. 1. See also Dumont (1992) p. 49 n. 43. Mewaldt (1942) p. 175 insists on the similarity of their views. However, Menander was never an Epicurean philosopher.

56) Grimal (1979) p. 178, on the other hand, sees both Chremes and Menedemus as experiencing the same money problems as traditional Athenians throughout the play.

or rather with peripatetic philanthropy.[57)]

In the play itself, however, the line serves only as a prelude to a long speech by Menedemus (96 ff.) in which he confesses the cause of his self-punishment—he blames himself for having persecuted his own son for an unbalanced love affair,[58)] only to let him leave home and become a mercenary in Asia. The verse does not affect the development of the plot: twists and turns in the love story of the two sons, with comic deceptions and complicated machinations by the slave, except that in relation to *aliena-sua* (*tua*), *aliis-tibi* the vv. 76–7 find a distant echo in Menedemus' lines 503–5 in III, 1, praising Chremes' keen insight, though soon to be known as illusion,[59)] and further in the lines 922–3 in V, 1, also in the same mouth, showing a reversal of position

57) Pohlenz (1943) p. 275 cautiously, Pohlenz (2010) pp. 136–7, p. 273 openly approves of Stoicism. Wiles (2004) p. 146 speaks of '*Terence*'s Stoic concern with "humanity"' or '*his* Stoic concept of man's common humanity' [my italics]. Walzer (1935) pp. 199–200, Gaiser (1967) p. 31, Grimal (1979) pp. 175–6 and A. Barigazzi (see *ibid.*) find here peripatetic philanthropy (Arist. *Eth. Nic.*, 1161b7 ff. etc.), and Lefèvre (1994) p. 162 shares their view and cites Chremes' typically peripatetic words *excess-deficiency*: 'vehemens in utramque partem, Menedeme, es nimis | aut largitate nimia aut parsimonia' (440–41, 'Oh, Menedemus, you're too extreme in each direction with your excessive generosity or your excessive tight-fistedness', transl. Brothers (1998) p. 83); on these lines, see Grimal (1979) p. 180. But Jocelyn (1973) p. 33 prefers to see in Chremes' apparently Stoic-peripatetic words not 'any particular positive doctrine about society, like, for example, Zeno's, but ... the [inappropriately] unconventional tendency of philosophical doctrines generally', hence his character of philosophical trickster, see above n. 34.

58) Brothers (1998) p. 170 n. 96 makes it clear that it is not Antiphila's poverty but her Corinthian nationality, which would deprive her offspring of Athenian citizenship, that was the main obstacle in Menedemus' eyes. Glycerium of *Andria* is in the same situation.

59) 'ita conparatam esse hominum naturam omnium | *aliena* ut meliu' videant et diiudicent | quam *sua*!' (human nature's so arranged that everyone can see and decide about *other people's* problems better than *their own*!) [my italics], transl. Brothers (1998) p. 89. See also *ibid.* p. 196 n. 503 ff. Moreover, Delcourt (1960) p. 260 notes the close relationship between v. 75 'tantum ... oti tibi' and v. 508 'otiosus' in order to refute Marouzeau's assumption that vv. 498–508 are an unnecessary insertion, Terence (1979–90) vol. 2 p. 14 and p. 50 n. 1. On the authenticity of these lines, see Brothers (1998) p. 195 n. 498 ff.

from I, 1 between the good counsellor and the blinkered:[60] nonne id flagitiumst te *aliis* consilium dare, | foris sapere, *tibi* non posse te auxiliarier? (Don't you think it's a disgrace that you advise *other people* and show good sense to outsiders, but can't be any help to *yourself?*) [my italics].[61] As for the character, 'Chremes, humane and sympathetic to the suffering of others, becomes violent and unjust in his own interest',[62] so much so that Eckart Lefèvre does not consider the verse in his mouth to be an expression of true *humanitas*.[63] He even goes so far as to describe him as an *eitler Phrasendrescher* or empty personality of *Besserwisserei*[64] and to attribute to Terence's invention[65] the emptiness that is a regression to περίεργος in relation

60) On the reversal see also V, 1, 897, and 915–31 with comment by Goldberg (1986) pp. 141–3. The reversal is a main point of the play, whose title role 'the Self-Tormentor' is Menedemus in the first act—the title was named after the first scene only, as in many other comedies, Fraenkel (1932) p. 119, Walzer (1935) p. 199 n. 2 and Jocelyn (1973) p. 23 n. 63—, but in the later acts Chremes is the 'key figure', Forehand (1985) p. 64. On the centrality of the reversal, see Jocelyn (1973) pp. 22–3, Forehand (1985) p. 126 and Goldberg (1986) pp. 141 and 148.

61) Transl. Brothers (1998) p. 139.

62) Terence (1979–90) vol. 2 p. 12 [original in French]. Far from violence, Walzer (1935) pp. 200–201 notes Chremes' excessive ἐπιείκεια towards his own slave, i.e. his peculiarly mild behaviour towards Syrus in IV, 5, 761–2: non possum pati | quin tibi caput demulceam ('I can't stop myself giving you a pat on the head', Brothers (1998) p. 119).

63) Lefèvre (1986) p. 40. Primmer (1966) p. 297 speaks of 'this somewhat exaggerated confession of humanitas' [original in German]. On the character of Chremes, see also Forehand (1985) pp. 64–6 and Richardson (2006) pp. 26–9, who quotes Menedemus' reproachful words as a contrast to our verse: 'Enimvero Chremes nimi' graviter cruciat adulescentulum | nimi'que inhumane' (1045–6, 'Chremes is definitely tormenting the young lad too harshly and too cruelly', Brothers (1998) p. 153).

64) Primmer (1966) p. 295 also says: 'He also tends to be a know-all (*Besserwisser*)' [original in German].

65) Lefèvre (1986) p. 40. Radice (1976) p. 96 suggests that Chremes is an additional persona of Terence's invention, but this suggestion inevitably leads to the removal of most of the major characters associated with him, his son Clitipho, his son's mistress Bacchis, and his trickster slave Syrus, and thus to the destruction of the story itself. For a discussion of this issue, see Brothers (1998) pp. 15–16, esp. p. 32

to the philanthropy of the Menandrian Chremes.[66] This is not only highly conjectural in the absence of the original Greek play, but untenable in view of its rare fragment,[67] and his rigid *Menander-Terence* schematism is criticized by several scholars as exaggerated.[68] On the other hand, Pierre Grimal does not consider Chremes to be particularly violent or greedy compared with Menedemus,[69] claiming that they both behave normally as family heads trying to protect their property from the extravagance of their sons.[70] But most of critics recognize the incongruity between Chremes' interference and his true character, as Goldberg observes: 'His meddling has revealed a coarse egotism behind the polished facade'.[71] In any case, it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish Terence's Chremes from Menander's. Both Grimal[72]

---

nn. 10 and 12, who considers it unlikely on the basis of some Menandrian fragments which record Chremes' lines (fr. 127K-T, see below n. 67; 131K-T = Schol. Bem. ad *Heaut.* vv. 440 ff. 'πᾶς πατὴρ μῶρος (all fathers are stupid)' [Körte in Menander (1959) p. 57 mentions Saekel (1914) pp. 73–4's doubt about the scholiast's attribution of the words to Chremes and his suggestion of Clitipho's lines vv. 213–14], and 133K-T on Chremes' description of the *cena* he gave to Bacchis, vv. 455 ff.). For Venediger's view similar to Radice's, see Brothers (1980) p. 103.

66) Lefèvre (1994) p. 71. On περίεργος see Theophr. *Char.* 13, Webster (1960) p. 65 n. 1 and Jocelyn (1973) p. 23 n. 72.

67) Comparing vv. 61–4 with Menandrian fr. 127K-T [Menander (1959) p. 56], Goldberg (1986) pp. 11–12 remarks that Terence took 'the edge off Chremes' inquisitiveness' and that 'Menander's fragment suggests far more aggressive a busybody'.

68) Steidle (1974) and Mc C. Brown (1999) p. 660. I fully agree with Néraudau (1996) p. 118 n. 6: 'I exclude here the question about Terence's originality in relation to Menander. It would be extremely interesting if one could read the play of Menander. But this is not the case, and even if it is regrettable, it is better to get used to the conclusions that can be drawn from a comparison between the surviving rare fragments and Terence's play than to lose oneself in conjectures' [original in French]. On Terence's originality, see also Webster (1960) pp. 83–6.

69) Grimal (1979) pp. 178–9.

70) Grimal (1979) p. 181 ascribes Chremes's internal contradiction to 'a subterfuge to bring his son back to better feelings' [original in French].

71) Goldberg (1986) p. 143.

72) Grimal (1979) p. 175. Walzer (1935) p. 197 too.

and Pohlenz,[73] although they disagree as to which philosophy—Peripatos or Stoicism—the verse belongs to, consider the verse and the character of Chremes to be essentially Menandrian. I almost agree with them in this respect, but ignorance of Menandrian Chremes must restrain one from unqualified identification,[74] for the *prologus* seems to indicate that Terence brought his own originality to the play to an extent unknown to us: duplex quae ex argumento facta est simplici ([comedy] which from being a single plot has been turned into a double play) v. 6.[75] To condemn the baroque contamination of genres, Horace, in the *Art of Poetry*, written about 10 BCE, attacks Chremes, the *comic* figure *tragically* declaiming in anger: 'irastusque Chremes tumido delitigat ore' (angry Chremes declaims foam at the mouth, 94).[76] On the whole, this old man, who seizes the opportunity to speak to the

73) Pohlenz (2010) p. 136.

74) A bad example is found in Reitzenstein (1907) p. 13: *Menander's* word 'I am human, therefore everything that concerns another man concerns me' [my italics] [original in German].

75) Transl. Brothers (1998) p. 45. Because of the textual variance between the Codex Bembinus and other MSS, and the cryptic technicality of the words, its interpretation is difficult, see Terence (1979–90) vol. 2 p. 19 n. 2. Norwood (1923) p. 42 finds here 'a strong proof of his essential originality', and Forehand (1985) p. 57 sees it as a statement that Terence 'has modified [the] plot' of his 'single Greek original'. But Goldberg (1986) p. 135 says of the line: 'Terence is not making a statement about what he has or has not done to his Greek original, which was a play by Menander'. On the controversy over the line, see Jocelyn (1973) p. 22 n. 54 and Brothers (1980). Goldberg (1986) pp. 135–48 takes *duplex comoedia* to be a dual plot, i.e. 'the method of employing two problems or complications to solve each other' (Norwood), and *simplex argumentum* to be a story of the unmasking of Chremes' true self. For a full discussion of the line and the argument against me, however, see Dunsch (1999), who interprets it as meaning a single-plot play with a double set of roles: two pairs of lovers '*binos adulescentes*' (Evanth. *De fab.* 3.9) and two fathers, and thus as referring to the 'unadulterated' Menandrian plot.

76) On the date of the *Epistula ad Pisones* (*Ars poetica*), see Horace (1989) pp. 19–21; on the verb *delitigo* (to declaim as in court), see *ibid.* p. 166. F. Villeneuve in Horace (2002) p. 207 n. 3 thinks it refers to a scene in which Chremes is very authoritarian in front of his wife and son (1032 ff.); of this scene Terence (1979–90) vol. 2 p. 92 n. 1 says: 'the tone ... is clearly tragic'. But Terence's language in

new neighbour arousing his curiosity and pity, displays a gratuitous kindness, and his *humanitas*, though genuine, is superficial and momentary, 'easily slid-[ing] into self-satisfaction';[77] in the next scene, he loses his sincerity towards his new friend and, in the name of his precious paternal authority, hides from him the long-awaited return of Clinia: 'I'll bite my tongue, because it's useful to his father for this boy of his to stand in awe of him' (199).[78] The point is neatly summed up by A. J. Brothers: 'There are several ways of looking at Chremes' character. One, now largely discredited, regards him as someone whose genuine interest in and regard for others, typified by the sentiments of 77, is a model of human sympathy. Another sees him as a busybody, too anxious to take a hand in other people's affairs and to preach to them, when he cannot even keep his own house in order. A third sees him as something of both: "inquisitive, opiniated, self-satisfied, and insensitive, yet genuinely moved by the other man's situation and ready to extend his unwanted help".'[79] Richard Walzer observes that in relation to the peripatetic golden mean, Chremes' kindness is as much an excess as Menedemus' self-punishment is a deficiency, and that his excessiveness prevents Chremes, who preaches to another about the need to *vere vivere* (154), from experiencing the unity of λόγος and βίος.[80] But his observation goes a little too far, because at the end of the play,

---

general does not swell '*ad tragicam celsitudinem*' (to the tragic height), according to Evanthius (4th century) *De fab.* 3.5. The scene is a rare exception.

77) Forehand (1985) 65: 'is Chremes a concerned humanitarian or a self-satisfied busybody? In fact, it seems important to realize that he is a little of both. His concern for Menedemus is genuine, and his interest in people seems motivated by honest caring. He is, however, very sure of himself, and easily slides into self-satisfaction'.

78) Brothers (1998) p. 59.

79) Brothers (1998) p. 19; the last quotation is from Sandbach, *Ancient Writers: Greece and Rome I*, New York, 1982, p. 545.

80) Walzer (1935) p. 200. Menander was a student of Theophrastus (Diog. Laert. 5.36), see RE15-1 col. 709, Körte (1928) p. 78 n. 1, Walzer (1935) p. 197, Grimal (1979) p. 175 (on A. Barigazzi) and Dumont (1992) p. 49 n. 42. But unlike Walzer, Grimal (1979) pp. 186-7, for whom the play is a 'philosophical comedy designed to demonstrate the truth of Aristotelianism' [original in French], idealizes Chremes as a peripatetically philosophic figure who always strives for the golden mean. This

Chremes sincerely admonishes Clitipho for his bad morals and listens to his wife and friend's plea to reconcile with his son. The comedy's 'conventional happy ending' should not be overlooked.[81)]

Cicero

From now on the verse goes its own way out of its origin, ending up as a maxim and losing its own theatricality forever,[82)] except in Augustine, who will catch a glimpse of it (see below). First of all, Cicero quotes it twice, in the *De legibus*, possibly written from 52 BCE, one year after the death of Crassus and the end of the first triumvirate, to 51 BCE,[83)] and in the *De officiis*, certainly written in 44 BCE,[84)] the year of Caesar's assassination and one year before that of the author himself. Of the two quotations, the first is more philosophically significant,[85)] since it appears as a non-essential but important argument in the introduction to this dialogue on philosophy of law, which is based on Plato's dialogue of the same name (Νόμοι).[86)] Cicero imitates Plato in his own style, for he begins his dialogue without following its model;[87)] in his *Laws* Plato does

idealization is criticized by Néraudau (1996) p. 118, and the view that the play contains a 'special philosophical program' is contradicted by Forehand (1985) p. 67. It is correct to see in Chremes a comic figure of the *philosophus*, as Jocelyn (1973) does, see above n. 34.

81) Brothers (1998) p. 226. Chremes is not Harpagon in Molière's *L'Avare*, who clings to his folly even at the end of the play. The play is not about the ridiculous personality of an eccentric, but about a narrow and too patronizing self-image as *paterfamilias* (country squire).

82) With the proviso that, in the late 18th century, a secret of successful *tragedy* as human interest was to be found in this verse of *comedy* by some French writers. See Delon (1984) pp. 289–91.

83) Schofield (2021) p. 90. J.E.G. Zetzel in Cicero (2017) pp. xxii-xxiii is more discreet, stating that the work 'was never completed'.

84) Cicero (1991) pp. xvii-xix.

85) Jocelyn (1973) p. 39 erroneously fails to distinguish between the meanings of the two quotations.

86) *Leg.* 1.15. Two years earlier, Cicero had written another great political dialogue, *De republica*, based on Plato's Πολιτεία. On Cicero's Plato, see Hösle (2008).

87) The proem, consisting of the episode of Marius' oak (1.1–2), the contrast between poetic and historical truths (1.3–5), an overview of Roman historiography as well as

not develop the theory of natural law as systematically as Cicero does.[88] Cicero, as a Stoic,[89] lays the foundations of natural law on some universal principles ('nunc iuris principia videamus', let us now consider the principles[90] of Justice, 1.18): if his complex and nuanced argument can be simplified,[91] the unity of the Law (law of nature and human law, 1.18–20), the unity of Reason (divine reason and human reason, 1.21–7), the unity of Man (1.29–34),[92] and

---

Cicero's wish to write a contemporary history (1.5–8) and his wish to be a counsellor at law (1.9–13) does not concern the theory of natural law, *pace* Benardete (1987) pp. 295–302, who gives an extremely complicated account. The discussion on poetic truth (myth of Boreas and Orithyia) is found to be a Platonic reminiscence of the *Phaedr.* 229b-d, see Atkins (2013) p. 158.

88) In terms of legal criteria, Plato refers to divine justice (*Laws* 716c-d) rather than natural law, because he is suspicious of human nature (713c 'no human nature is sufficient, by conducting all human affairs at its pleasure, to avoid becoming filled of pride and of injustice').

89) Cicero's concept of Law is derived from Chrysippus, see Asmis (2008) pp. 7–8 and Atkins (2013) pp. 165–6. 'The exposition of the idea and implications of natural law in Book 1 is the fullest exposition of Stoic doctrine on the subject that survives', Cicero (2017) p. xxv. On the Stoicism of *De Legibus*, see also Pohlenz (2010) pp. 243–4, Colish (1985a) pp. 98–104 and Asmis (2008) *passim*, but Atkins (2013) pp. 161 ff. is more nuanced, saying that Cicero 'is portraying the Stoic account of law as the development of Platonic doctrine' (p. 166) from the standpoint of Antiochus' syncretism (pp. 167–8). On natural law in Cicero, see *OCD*[3] p. 835 and *OCD*[4] p. 812, s.v. 'law of nature', Asmis (2008), Brown (2009) pp. 331–3 and 356, Atkins (2013) pp. 155–87; Schiavone (2012) p. 297 sees Cicero's idea as a legal requirement of the imperial experience, calling for a universal law in place of the traditional *ius civile*, which was no longer adapted to the greatly expanded Roman rule.

90) Translators often render *principia* as 'the origins', Cicero (1928) p. 317, Cicero (2017) p. 113. However, the *OLD* p. 1459 classifies this phrase as meaning 'A guiding principle, basis', and Rudd (2008) p. 103 translates it accurately as 'the first principles'.

91) Another summary is given by Atticus, a character in the dialogue (1.35).

92) According to Atkins (2013) p. 169, the whole (1.18–34) forms the first natural law argument of Book 1, while the second runs from 1.40 to 1.52. Benardete (1987) p. 303's division is almost the same. Asmis (2008) p. 5 suggests another: 1.18–20 and 21–63, but Atkins' is more substantive.

at the level of the third principle, our verse comes to testify the truth that all men share the same human concern, that of Justice: Quodsi, quomodo est natura, sic iudicio homines 'humani' (ut ait poeta) 'nihil a se alienum putarent', coleretur ius aeque ab omnibus. (But if the judgments of men were in agreement with Nature, so that, as the poet says, they considered 'nothing alien to them which concerns mankind,' then Justice would be equally observed by all. 1.33).[93] The name *poeta* without saying Terence seems all the more meaningful in this Platonic dialogue, since for Plato the ποιητής is a mediator of truth: 'according to the poets, for they are, as it were, our fathers and guides of wisdom', *Lysis* 214a.[94] The imperfect subjunctives *putarent* and *coleretur* are not an unreal present, but a potential of the past: 'if men *had come to consider*, as the poet says, ... Justice *would have been observed*'.[95] Thus, for Cicero, Terence's verse contains an ideal and timeless truth about the equality of men who share a natural sense of justice, the basis of the theory of natural law.[96] The men in question are not just Athenians or Romans, or

---

93) Transl. Cicero (1928) p. 333. Dyck (2004) p. 157 gives no further information on the quotation other than a reference to Jocelyn (1973).

94) See also Pl. *Leg.* 682a. Of course, his view of poetry in relation to philosophy is complex. See Jaeger (1986) vol. 2 pp. 212 ff.; for a recent study, Halliwell (2000).

95) On the imperfect subjunctive as a potential of the past, esp. in Cicero, see Ernout and Thomas (1972) p. 378. The same structure is found at 1.29 'quodsi ... non ... *torqueret* et *flecteret* ... nemo ipse tam similis *esset*...' (if ... did not twist ... and turn ..., no one would be so like his own self...). Of this passage, Benardete (1987) p. 306 says: 'Cicero's proof has its centerpiece a contrafactual: if the original nature of men could be restored, the identity of every man with the highest in man would be self-evident (29, 32 [it must be misprint for 33, i.e. our passage])'. The Ciceronian *contrafactual* is not a mere unreality (in the corrupted present), but an *ideal* as *consensio omnium gentium* (*Tusc.* 1.30), projected far into the past by a kind of primitivism. On Cicero's primitivism, see Lovejoy and Boas (1997) pp. 252–9.

96) Delcourt (1960) p. 257. Immediately after the quoted sentence, Cicero most readily draws an equivalence between Justice, Law and right reason in a passage (1.33) that is 'a formal restatement of the argument' of 1.23 (Atkins (2013) p. 171), so that the first argument of Book 1 as a whole constitutes 'a type of ring composition' (*ibid.*). The verse thus occupies an important position before the general conclusion.

even free men, but slaves—Cicero knew of cultivated slaves who served as teachers, secretaries or scribes, and Terence himself was a freedman according to Suetonius (*Vita Terenti* 1)[97)]—, the various peoples under Roman rule and theoretically far beyond, their enemies, even savage races ('*gens* ... *fera*' 1.24).[98)] Here his view of humanity is closest to Stoic cosmopolitanism ('those who have these things [Law and Justice] in common must be considered members of the same state' 1.23; 'a citizen of the whole world as if it were of a single city' 1.61),[99)] to the extent that Pohlenz includes Cicero among Stoics and says: 'The Stoics always acknowledge in Terence's verse their own spirit and are ready to use it'[100)]—besides, Rome is the most cosmopolitan city in the world under imperial expansion.[101)] The combination of a virtual Platonic idealism and a textual Stoic cosmopolitanism constitutes a Ciceronian humanism[102)] in quotation form, and our Terentian verse is their true point of

97) Donatus (1902–03) vol.1 p. 3.

98) This egalitarian tendency in Cicero has been seen by some scholars as a deviation from Stoic orthodoxy showing its extreme elitism for the perfect Sage, see Asmis (2008) p. 9 n. 26 (but *ibid.* pp. 10–11 for her own view of Stoic natural law as an 'impulse' given to all humans) and Atkins (2013) pp. 174–5.

99) Cicero (2017) pp. 115 and 130.

100) Pohlenz (1943) p. 275 n. 2 [original in German]. Stoicism is conspicuous in this work (see above n. 89), although Cicero's eclecticism is generally acknowledged, and some scholars [Görler (1995) and Atkins (2013) pp. 176–9] have found at 1.39 not a denial but a roundabout recognition of the New Academy's scepticism. On Ciceronian philosophy in general, see Powell (1995). In the post-Cold War, the question of Stoic and Ciceronian cosmopolitanism has become topical and popular in political science, see for example Nussbaum (1997) and Pangle (1998). For recent classicistic studies, see Brown (2009) p. 359, Atkins (2018) pp. 184–9, Schofield (2021) pp. 105–12.

101) Although Cicero does not explicitly suggest 'that Rome is the cosmopolis', Brown (2009) p. 359. Cicero's treatment of imperialism is richly nuanced, Schofield (2021) pp. 125–35.

102) The word was to be invented with a particular ideology in the 19th-century Germany. See above n. 4 and below n. 280, also Davies (1997). Irrespective of ideology, it will be used in this paper to refer to vision(s) of man. On Ciceronian humanism in general, see Hunt (1955) chap. VII 'The humanism of Cicero', Boyancé (1970) esp. the preface, and Høgel (2015) pp. 41–67.

confluence. This universal legal humanism will be reflected in the Roman jurists' theory on *ius gentium* or *ius naturale*, and far beyond, in the eighteenth-century discussion of human rights by advocates of the Enlightenment.[103] A reminder of this idea is found in a treatise written and dedicated to Brutus in 45 BCE, seven months before his assassination of Caesar,[104] *De finibus bonorum et malorum*, 3.63: Ex hoc nascitur ut etiam communis hominum inter homines naturalis sit commendatio, ut oporteat *hominem ab homine* ob id ipsum quod *homo sit non alienum videri* (From this arises the mutual attraction men have naturally for one another, so that, because of their common humanity, *no man* should *be seen as a stranger to another*) [my italics],[105] paragraph describing Stoic philanthropy. M.R. Wright's note on this quotation is worth citing: 'The Stoic theory of social relations, which Cicero approves in his own right as well as in the *persona* of Cato, was that men are equal by nature, there are no class distinctions or

103) On *ius gentium* and *ius naturale* see Cicero (1991) pp. xxvii-xxviii, p. 108 n. 3, Stein (1999) pp. 12-13, Falcón y Tella (2008) pp. 25-8, Schiavone (2012) pp. 288-306 and Atkins (2013) pp. 224-5, who notes the divergence of Roman jurists from Ciceronian natural law. On the other hand, recent classicists are aware of a certain divergence of Cicero's political pragmatism from the Stoic orthodox idea of natural law, see Brown (2009) p. 356, Atkins (2013) pp. 204-6 (seeing a similarity to Plato) and Schofield (2021) pp. 116-25. On Cicero's influence on the Enlightenment, see Sellers (2009).

104) Cicero (1914) p. x and Cicero (1915) pp. XI-XIII.

105) Transl. Wright (1991) p. 65. The fictional speaker is Cato the Younger, see *Fin.* 3.7. On the Stoicism of the quote, see Cicero (1914) p. 282 note a and Pohlenz (1943) p. 275 n. 2. See also Hunt (1955) pp. 77-9 and George (1988) p. 333. Jocelyn (1973) p. 41, on the other hand, denies any direct connection between the Terentian verse and *Fin.* 3.63, but his argument is unconvincing. His conclusion 'that *homo sum: humani nil a me alienum puto* is never quoted as an expression of this kind of *humanitas*' (p. 42) is reached by completely ignoring the Ciceronian universal humanism expressed in *Leg.* 1.33 as well as in *Fin.* 3.63. On philanthropy, see Wright (1995) p. 186 (brief history of the Greek φιλάντρωπος), pp. 188-93 (on *Fin.* 3.63 ff.). From the outset of the work (*Fin.* 1.3), Chremes who felt pity for his neighbour's toil (Ter. *Haut.* 69) is introduced as the epitome of humaneness (*non inhumanus*), but with irony towards busybodies (*curiosi*) who are kind enough to deter Cicero from his literary toil.

slaves by nature, but all aim at the same end, are subject to the same law, and are endowed with reason, therefore we are all parts of one connected whole. Consequently (i) in benefiting others we benefit ourselves, and (ii) the love and care we show to our neighbour (even our enemy) is of the same kind, and has the same source, as the love and care that parents show towards their children'.[106] Nevertheless, his sympathy for human beings, based on their fundamental equality, is purely philosophical and never social or political, and his respect for the *mos maiorum* prohibited him from wanting and being able to recognize the right to citizenship for slaves.[107]

Less interesting is a quotation in the *De officiis*. In this very Stoic treatise, based on that of Panaetius[108] ('I shall, therefore, for the present and on this question, follow the Stoics above all' 1.6),[109] and intended for his own son who was studying in Athens, he discusses rhetorically (i.e. in good style, 'aequabile et temperatum orationis genus' 1.3) the nature of duty. He defines 'duty' or virtue (1.11–14), classifies the four cardinal virtues (1.15–17), briefly explains the first virtue, which is wisdom or the knowledge of truth (1.18–19), determines the meaning of the second virtue, which is justice (1.20–23; 'Of justice, the first office is that no man should harm another..., the next that one should treat common goods as common and private ones as one's own' 1.20),[110] and clarifies two kinds of injustice: active and passive, which are respectively to do wrong and not to protect others from wrong if one can (1.23–9), he finally says to his son: 'we shall now be able to judge with ease what is our duty on

106) Wright (1991) p. 173 n. 263. (ii) is a Stoic principle of οἰκείωσις or 'cradle argument'. See below nn. 121 and 143.

107) Nowak (2020) considers the ambivalence of Ciceronian humanism on the question of slaves. This is a crucial point of difference with Enlightenment human rights. On the Stoic restrictions on women and slaves, see also Wright (1995) p. 191. On the exclusion of slaves from Ciceronian *humanitas*, see Høgel (2015) pp. 57–8, 65–6.

108) On the *De officiis*, see Hunt (1955) pp. 159–87, Colish (1985a) pp. 143–52. Nonetheless Atkins (2013) p. 179 says: 'In that work he stressed that as an *Academic skeptic* he was free to exercise his own judgment in following the Stoics for the moment on the matter of practical ethics' [my italics].

109) Cicero (1991) p. 4.

110) *Ibid.* p. 9.

each occasion—that is, if we do not love ourselves too much' (1.29).[111] Despite or because of this restrictive condition (*nisi* = if ... not), a self-respect practically prevents the easy recognition of duty: Est enim difficilis cura rerum alienarum. Quamquam Terentianus ille Chremes 'humani nihil a se alienum putat' (For it is difficult to be concerned about another's affairs. Terentian Chremes, however, thinks 'nothing that is human is another's affair', 1.30).[112] Cicero flatly rejects Chremes' altruistic psychology in favour of the egocentric reality of men.[113] The quotation, which serves only as a foil, does not deepen the discussion. Pohlenz takes the whole passage of 1.29–30, including the Terentian verse, to be a quotation from Panaetius' treatise.[114] Perhaps this 'too oblique' reference[115] is only evidence of the popularity of the play and the verse.

Cicero was influenced by the verse in another way: his very frequent use of the phrase 'nihil alienum puto' and the like, which is striking in his works—besides *Off.* 1.30 and *Leg.* 1.33, 'non alienum puto' (*Ad Brut.* 1.15.4), 'non alienum putavi' (*Att.* 4.2.6), 'non puto esse alienum' (10.8.1), 'nisi alienum putabis' (12.36.2), 'non alienum a te putabam' (*Brut.* 87.299), 'nullum genus ... a se alienum putasse' (*De or.* 3.126), 'non putavi esse alienum' (*Fam.* 5.17.1), 'si non alienum ... putabis esse' (13.26.3), 'non alienum putavi' (15.2.8), 'quis alienum putet' (*Fin.* 1.11), 'nisi alienum putas' (3.14), 'non alienum videri' (3.63), 'non alienum puto' (*Orat.* 7.24), 'non alienum esse arbitror' (*Prov. cons.* 17.40), 'non quo alienum mea dignitate arbirarer' (17.42). This Latin

111) *Ibid.* p. 12.

112) *Ibid.* pp. 12–13.

113) Delcourt (1960) p. 257. Körte (1942) p. 101 says that Cicero does not seem to have overlooked the awkwardness of this sentence, which gives carte blanche to all *unauthorized, inquisitive interference* in the affairs of others, 'wenn er off. I, 30 sagt...' But here the *unbefugte neugierige Einmischung* is irrelevant. Moreover, Lefèvre (1994) p. 69 n. 102 tells us that Johannes Christes insisted on Cicero's praise for *hohem Ethos* of the Chremes in this quotation, but the context does not allow of such an interpretation.

114) Pohlenz (1934) p. 29 n. 4. Some others also argue for Panaetius' quotation, see Dyck (1996) p. 126 n. 36.

115) Jocelyn (1973) p. 39.

phrase is found relatively rarely elsewhere,[116] and almost exclusively after Cicero: Nep. *Milt.* 6.1; Q. Cic. *Comment. pet.* 1.1; *Ep. ad Cic. servatae* 9.15A.9; Caes. *BGall.* 6.11.1; Liv. 1.20.3, 35.49.13; Sen. the Elder, *Suas.* 6.14; Sen. *Ep.* 88.30 (reminiscent of Terence, see below); 95.53 (quoting Terence, see below); Curt. 8.8.15; Columella, *Rust.* 2.18.3, 3.3.1, 8.17.6, 11.3.39, 12.18.1, 12.59.5; Plin. *HN* 2.27, 3.65, 3.136, 14.58, 32.142; Tac. *Hist.* 4.68; Plin. *Ep.* 2.5.2, 7.12.4; Hyg. Gromaticus, *Consititutio limitum* 8; Suet. *Gram. et rhet.* 25.9; Id. *Jul.* 44.4; Apul. *De deo Soc.* 24, if the list stops at the mid-second century CE.[117] The rather complex structure as a kind of double negation[118] seems to be originally Greek, like Menandrian οὐδείς ἐστί μοι ἀλλότριος.[119]

116) The exceptions are Vitruvius and Celsus. The former alone used it ten times: *De arch.* 4.2.1, 4.4.3, 5.6.7, 7. pref. 3, 7.5.7, 7.12.1, 10. pref. 4 (twice), 10.2.11, 10.15.2. The latter more frequently: *Med.* 2. prooem., 3.9, 3.10, 3.18, 3.19, 3.21, 3.27, 4.13 (twice), 4.14, 4.15, 4.28, 5.0, 5.26 (four times), 5.27 (twice), 5.28, 6.6 (six times), 6.10, 7.26 (twice), 8.3. These abnormal frequencies must have come from the Greek origins of architecture and medicine. Another architect Frontin. *Aq.* 17.1, 102.1; another physician Scribonius Largus, *Composiones* 10, 47, 52, 135. Since rhetoric and grammar are also Greek subjects (Suet. *Rhet.* 1 and *Gram.* 4), rhetoricians and grammarians can be assigned to the Greek-oriented anomaly: *Rhet. Her.* 2.11.16, 4.11.16, 4.19.27; Quint. *Inst.* 1 pr., 1.1, 8.1, 12.9; ps-Quint. *Declam. minor.* 252.8, 313.1, 388.17; Rutilius Lupus, *Schemata lexeos* 1.17; Velius Longus, *De orthographia* 65.20.

117) This count is made using the search engine of Tufts University's Perseus Digital Library (Greek and Roman Materials, although their chapter numbering is sometimes puzzlingly incorrect) and supplemented by BTL-2 (2002). Unlike me, Jocelyn (1973) p. 37 n. 190 says: 'It would be accident that the phrase common in classical writings, *non alienum est* (*uidetur, esse puto*), is not recorded before Anon. rhet. *Herenn.* ii 16'.

118) Mewaldt (1942) p. 170 speaks of *nil alienum* as a 'doppelte Negation'.

119) See above n. 38. In Greek this formulation is common: Thuc. 4.72.1; Lys. 33.8 (*Olym. Or.*); Isoc. *Loch.*20.21; Xen. *Cyr.* 7.5.73; Dem. *De cor.* 18.182; Lycurg. *Leoc.* 1.46; Polyb. 3.57.4, 8.1.1, 28.8.6; Joseph. *AJ* 17.354; Dio Chrys. *Or.* 1.41, 1.62, 12.76, 31.157, 41.9, 59.6; Plut. *Caes.* 66.2; Id. *De gen.* 2; Epict. *Diatr.* 4.5.7; Lucian, Bacch. 6, 7; Id. *Salt.* 46; Id. *Abdic.* 26; Arr. *Anab.* 7.29.4; Ath. 10.86, 15.17, 15.46. Historians and orators stand out. This is not the case with the Romans, apart from Cicero.

Seneca

Seneca, for his part, uses this verse to support his opinion on *humanitas* or *officium humanum*,[120] especially the duty of κοινωνία,[121] in his *Letters to Lucilius*. In *Ep.* 95, written in 64 CE,[122] he advocates mutual help among men, since this world is only one and we are its members: 'Nature has created us parents ... has implanted in us mutual love and has made us sociable' (95.51–2).[123] He thus quotes the verse as a saw to be kept in mind at all times: Ille versus et in pectore et in ore sit: | homo sum, humani nihil a me alienum puto. | Habeamus in commune: ‹in commune› nati sumus. Societas nostra lapidum fornicationi simillima est, quae, casura nisi in vicem obstarent, hoc ipso sustinetur (Let this verse be in your heart and in your mouth: 'I am a human being, I regard nothing human as foreign to me'. Let us hold things in common, as we are born for the common good. Human society is just like an arch, which would collapse without the stones' mutual support to hold it up, 95.53).[124]

---

120) Grimal (1991) p. 323 finds here an example of the Stoic καθήκοντα (*officia*). However, the term covering the gamut of duties or natural actions for ordinary people (and even for plants and animals, Diog. Laert. 7.107) is too general; on τὰ καθήκοντα, see Arnold (1911) pp. 301–2, Long (1986) pp. 188–9 and Pohlenz (2010) pp. 129–31. It is better to see Stoic philanthropy as mentioned in the next note.

121) Seneca (1971) p. 104 n. 2, *SVF* 3.83–5 ('§5. De conjunctione hominum' fr. 340–48, although *SVF* is short on information about philanthropy and cosmopolitanism). To understand them from the Stoic principle of οἰκείωσις (self-preservation), see Copleston (1993) pp. 399–400 and Fiasse (2002) pp. 528–30. For the classical sources and studies of οἰκείωσις (or 'cradle argument'), see Wright (1995) p. 172 n. 2. The Stoics saw in *'alienum'* (alienation) of the verse the opposite of οἰκείωσις 'approriation', Atkins (2018) p. 187 and Pohlenz (1943) p. 275 (see above n. 38). On Stoic κοινωνία, see also Long (1986) p. 163.

122) Grimal (1991) p. 451. On *Ep.* 95, see Schafer (2009).

123) The *kinship* συγγένεια and the *family* οἰκειότης among men were mentioned by Hippias in Pl. *Prt.* 337c-d and by Theophrastus in Porph. *Abst.* 3.25. See Dumont (1992) p. 44, n. 25, and on Theophrastus in Porph. *Abst.* 3.25, see Brink (1956) pp. 126–35, who insists on the links between humans and animals (pp. 128–31).

124) Transl. Seneca (2015) p. 377 modified. Instead of the MSS reading 'habeamus', Seneca (1971) p. 105 adopts Bartsch (1869) p. 279's elaborate emendation 'cohaereamus' (let us show our close solidarity). Fiasse (2002) pp. 533–4 insists

'Homo sum' picks up the previous 'homo sacra res homini' (95.33) and 'homo mansuetus homini est' (95.51), apparently intended to contradict Plautus' 'lupus est homo homini, non homo' (*Asin.* 495).[125] In Terence's verse, Seneca found the most complete and memorable expression of Stoic philanthropy and cosmopolitanism,[126] and thus the Terentian verse became a universal motto that could replace all the innumerable moral precepts given by the Stoic παραινετική with regard to human relations.[127] Incidentally, according to François Préchac, this verse is 'one of those beautiful words that 'provoke applause' in the theatre 108.8, [and] that cannot be doubted'.[128] In this passage, Seneca points out that beautiful verses, when they reflect collective

---

on the weight of the social insight in the whole passage. Accordingly, I choose 'human society' rather than 'our companionship' in Graver and Long's translation. The phrase 'Ille versus et in pectore et in ore sit' is an echo of Cic. *Fam.* 5.16.2 'consolatio ... illa ... quam semper in ore atque in animo habere debemus' despite the difference in context—Cicero speaking of the inevitability of the human condition.

125) The departure from the original meaning should be noted: it was a merchant's distrustful reply to a cheating slave who pretends to be a good receiver of money by assuring 'tam ego homo sum quam tu'. The Senecan meaning is already Hobbesian. It is uncertain, however, whether Seneca has in mind the Plautian original or its reformulation by Caecilius Statius 'homo homini deus est, si suum officium sciat' (Man to man is a god if he knows his duty), Ribbeck (1897) p. 89 fr. XVI, found in a letter of Symmachus (late 4th century).

126) Pohlenz (1943) p. 275 n. 2, Lefèvre (1986) p. 41. On Roman Stoic cosmopolitanism, see Arnold (1911) pp. 274–5. Despite Seneca's cosmopolitanism, Lavery (1997) shows him to be convinced of both female inferiority and male elitism (p. 13 n. 15). Although Miller (2009) pp. 321–2 argues that human rights are anticipated by Senecan Stoicism around this quote, Seneca's backwardness is as great as Cicero's in relation to Enlightenment human rights. See above n. 107.

127) 95.51–2. Jocelyn (1973) p. 43. In this way Seneca seems to have attempted to go beyond ἡ παραινετική (mechanical teaching through individual precepts) and reach the sphere of autonomous philosophical reasoning necessary for *consummandam sapientiam* (95.1), which Grimal (1991) p. 356 calls the 'centrifugal' method. See also *ibid.* pp. 361–2. On Seneca's discussion (*Ep.* 94–5) of Ariston and Cleanthes' theory of *praecepta* (παραίνεσις) and *decreta* (δόγμα, doctrine), see also Asmis (2008) pp. 28–9 and Schafer (2009) pp. 25–32.

128) Seneca (1971) p. 105 n. 2 [original in French].

conviction, bring down the house.[129] But the inclusion of Terence's line is obviously an afterthought from Augustine's letter (*Ep.* 155), in which these two passages will be joined together (see below). It is actually impossible for Seneca to have heard this line in the theatre, for it seems that Terence's plays were no longer performed.[130]

There is a clear reminiscence in *Ep.* 88. To demonstrate the supremacy of philosophy over all the liberal arts, Seneca explains the self-sufficiency of this discipline as 'scientia bonorum ac malorum inmutabili' (unshakeable knowledge of good and evil, 88.28), and enumerates the virtues in order to prove that they cannot be learned in the liberal arts: courage, fidelity, continence and humanity: Humanitas vetat superbum esse adversus socios, vetat amarum; verbis, rebus, adfectibus comem se facilemque omnibus praestat; *nullum alienum malum putat*... (Humanity forbids one to be arrogant and unpleasant toward one's fellow men: One should be kind in word, deed and affection, and friendly to all; one should *not think that the misfortune of others is foreign to oneself*, 88.30) [my italics].[131] The *nullum alienum malum* [*sibi*] *putat* is very close to Chremes' compassion for his

129) Cicero often spoke of such a reaction from Roman audience, see Jocelyn (1973) p. 40 n. 205.

130) Terence (1979–90) vol. 1 p. 17 (they were scarcely performed already in Cicero's time); but *ibid.* vol. 2 p. 12 (Varro seems to have seen the *Heauton timorumenos*); Reeve (1983) p. 412. Forehand (1985) p. 49 and p. 135 n. 2 finds in the second ending of *Andria* a reference to a production in 'ca. A.D. 100?', though Duckworth (1975) p. 66 thinks it was around the Plautine revival in the mid-2nd century BCE and, according to Skutsch (1957) p. 68, the dating is still open. On the situation of Roman comedy in the imperial period, see also below n. 136 and Jocelyn (1973) pp. 42–3: the republican comedies and tragedies 'were neither performed in the public theatres nor read in the schools' (however, his source, Suet. *Gram.* 16 (Epirota) and 23 (Remmius Palaemon) says nothing about the teaching of Terence in schools).

131) *amarum* (unpleasant) is an emendation by F. Haase. The MSS read *auarum* (greedy). Jocelyn (1973) p. 43 notes that the range of meaning of *humanitas* in Seneca and other contemporaries is narrower (almost homonymous with *clementia*) than in Cicero and Varro. According to Høgel (2015) pp. 76–83, *humanitas* was used in Seneca as a substitute for philosophically genuine concepts like *beneficium*, and not often.

wretched neighbour. But if one rightly excludes the possibility of including the Terentian line among the beautiful verses mentioned at 108.8, strangely enough Seneca, himself a playwright, could not grasp the original theatricality of his two quotations, and as Jocelyn observes, 'it would be reasonable to hold that for Seneca *homo sum: humani nil a me alienum puto* was as much an ἔπος πτερόεν as the Naevian tag'.[132)]

Pliny the Younger

Some scholars[133)] point to a reminiscence of this verse in a letter written by Pliny the Younger (*Ep.* 5.3) at the turn of the second century.[134)] In order to justify his light verses (*uersiculos seueros parum* 5.3.2) to his moralistic accusers, he provocatively admits to appreciating all comic and even licentious genres, laughing, joking and frolicking, 'utque omnia innoxiae remissionis genera breuiter amplectar, *homo sum*' (and—let me summarize all the forms of harmless relaxation—*am human*, *ibid.*) [my italics].[135)] It could be an allusion to our verse, since Pliny evokes comedies ('*comoedias audio*', *ibid.*),[136)] but the sentence is fully intelligible without reference to the verse—from the enthymeme *I am human, therefore I am amused*. If it were indeed

132) Jocelyn (1973) p. 43, the *Naevian tag* is meant to be a quote 'Laudari a laudato viro' in *Ep.* 102.16. On Naevius, see Duckworth (1971) pp. 40–42. On the expression ἔπος πτερόεν, see below n. 351. This is a misuse for a maxim or famous saying.

133) Pliny (1915) p. 367 n. c [W.M.L. Hutchinson], Pliny (1969) p. 328 n. 2 [B. Radice], Lefèvre (1986) pp. 41–2, Lefèvre (1994) pp. 28–9. R.C. Kukula, in Pliny (1908) p. 120 n. 1, cites our verse among others and, in the 2nd ed. Pliny (1912) p. 121, refers to Otto (1890) pp. 165 ff. (entry 'homo, humanus' consisting of ten citations including our verse). On *Ep.* 5.3, see Roller (1998) p. 274 n. 20, pp. 278–9, 281–2, 289–90.

134) The dates of the events described in his letters range from 97 to 108–109. See Pliny (1969) p. XX.

135) Transl. Pliny (2006) p. 110.

136) A.-M. Guillemin says: 'He *listens* to the comedies and does not *see* them performed. This type of play was no longer performed during the Empire. The ancient and classical comedies provided the material for the *acramata*', Pliny (1964) p. 57 n. 1 [original in French]. On the decline of Roman comedy, see Duckworth (1971) pp. 68–72.

a quotation, it would mean that for people who did not like comedy, the play or even the verse was so familiar that the rest was evoked by the single truncated form *homo sum*. Finally, this distinctly hedonistic and individualistic feature stands in singular contrast to all the other occurrences in antiquity that more or less testify to the sociality of man and his altruism. A strong doubt remains about the quotation.

Juvenal

Around 127–130 or later, Juvenal alluded to the verse (*Saturae* 5.15.140–42):[137) quis enim bonus et face dignus | arcana, qualem Cereris uolt esse sacerdos, | *ulla aliena sibi credit mala*? (What good man, worthy to bear the mystic's torch, and such as Ceres' priest would wish him, *thinks any human ills outside his concern?*) [my italics].[138) Here the poet must have had in mind the Senecan *nullum alienum malum* [*sibi*] *putat* (*Ep*. 88.30, see above) rather than the Terentian verse itself. The satirist, condemning the cannibalistic cruelty of some Egyptians, praises the gentleness of human nature ('When Nature equipped mankind with tears, she proclaimed that she gave him a most tender heart, the best part of our feelings', 5.15.131–3);[139) for example, the good character required in Eleusinian mysteries (*bonus et face dignus arcana*) is described as human concern for the suffering.[140) It is this humanity which, by separating man from the animal, has given man a natural superiority over the animal (5.15.142–7). By the [*n*]*ulla aliena sibi credit mala* Juvenal thus means much the same thing as Seneca, the primordial nature of *humanitas*, but from a different point of view: whereas for the Stoics mutual help is a cosmic phenomenon that includes animals, for Juvenal it is a

137) Lefèvre (1994) p. 29. On the date of the 15th Satire, see Juvenal (2001) p. 316; Courtney (2013) p. 528 is more cautious about the meaning of *nuper* 5.15.27. On this Satire, see Juvenal (1967) pp. 186–8. In Juvenal's boyhood, Terence does not seem to have been taught in the schools, according to Jocelyn (1973) p. 44.

138) Transl. Juvenal (1998) p. 119.

139) *Ibid.* p. 118 modified. 'molissima corda | humano generi dare se natura fatetur, | quae lacrimas dedit. haec nostri pars optima sensus.' A.E. Housman places a full stop after *optima* [Juvenal (1956) p. 140], but most editors after *sensus*.

140) See Juvenal (1920) p. 298 n. 2, Courtney (2013) p. 539, Juvenal (2001) p. 321.

characteristic of the human species in the midst of the animal genre. In verses 5.15.143–9, Gilbert Highet certainly finds 'the most impressive of his Stoical utterances',[141] and Edward Courtney says of the same lines: 'All this is of Stoic character'.[142] But the parallels with Stoicism refer only to Man's close relationship with God in terms of Reason. The κοινωνία based upon οἰκείωσις was considered by the Stoics to be common to humans and to animals, as a passage from Cic. *Fin.* 3.62: 'Again, it is held by the Stoics to be important to understand that nature creates in parents an affection for their children; and parental affection is the source to which we trace the origin of the association of the human race in communities... Even in the lower animals nature's operation can be clearly discerned'.[143] Juvenal's uniqueness must be acknowledged.

Ambrose

In the late fourth century, Ambrose quotes the verse in his *De officiis ministrorum*,[144] a Christian reworking of Cicero's *De officiis*. In the seventh

141) Highet (1949) p. 260. However, he recognizes (pp. 261–4) the shallowness of Juvenal's knowledge of Stoicism. According to Jocelyn (1973) p. 44, '*homo sum: humani nil a me alienum puto* [was] lurking behind a vaguely philosophical sermon advocating pity for men in distress'.

142) Courtney (2013) p. 539 note on vv. 143–7: '(cf. Zeller 34.1.203); all the themes have close parallels in Cic. *De Leg.* 1.22–6'. Both Zeller (1922) pp. 203–4 and Cicero *loc. cit.* speak of the kinship of human reason with God.

143) Cicero (1914) pp. 281–3. On this passage, see Wright (1995) p. 180, who notes a similarity with Theophrastus' idea (see above n. 123). This is the theory of Panaetius, according to Sandbach (1989) pp. 123–4. Zeller (1997) p. 248 states: '[Panaetius] abandoned the insistence on apathy and the harsh ideal of the Stoic wise man, in favour of co-operation among men. It is to his influence that the development of the ideal of humanity in the circle of Scipio is due'. See also Grimal (1991) pp. 369–70 and Pohlenz (2010) p. 84 (on '*conciliatio sui*' i.e. οἰκείωσις).

144) Jocelyn (1973) p. 45, Delon (1984) p. 287 and Lefèvre (1994) p. 29, all without full commentary. On the *De officiis ministrorum*, see Gilson (1986) p. 113, Labriolle (1947) pp. 42–3, 400–402, Coyle (1955), Colish (1985b) pp. 58–68. On the date, see Colye (1955) p. 225 n. 8, Ambrose (1984–92) vol. 1 pp. 44–9, Davidson (1995) p. 326 n. 1, Ambrose (2001) vol. 1 pp. 3–5. On the rather loose composition of Book III, see Testard (1974) pp. 181–91. On Terence's influence on Ambrose, see

chapter of Book III (3.45 ff.), dealing with an example found in Cicero's political discussion of the useful and the honest,[145] the Bishop of Milan briefly presents his argument forbidding the expulsion of foreigners in times of famine: Sed et illi qui peregrinos urbe prohibent, nequaquam probandi[146] (But also those who banish foreigners from a city are not to be approved at all, 3.45). Ambrose paraphrases the point as follows: to expel them when it is necessary to help them, to cut off *common relatives*[147] [i.e. foreigners] from our relations, to deny them the products of the land which are distributed for all, to abolish the communities of life that have already begun; with those who have the same rights as ours, not to want to share our food in time of need; not even wild animals do this, but 'homo excludit hominem' (*ibid.*). This reversal of position between man and beast reminds the holy bishop of the humane verse of Chremes read in Cicero's own treatise (*Off.* 1.30), but he uses it differently, but similarly to *De legibus* (1.33) and *De finibus* (3.63), or rather to Seneca's moral letter (95.53): illae etiam conformem generis sui adjuvant: homo impugnat qui *nihil a se alienum* debet *credere* quidquid *humani* est (Animals help one of their own kind, while men fight one another, men who must *believe that nothing human is alien to them*, 3.45) [my italics]. What Ambrose is teaching here is the Stoic ideal of a universal community bound by

---

Courcelle (1972) pp. 225–31, who curiously does not mention our verse.

145) *Off.* 3.47 'Male etiam qui peregrinos urbibus uti prohibent eosque exterminant ... usu vero urbis prohibere peregrinos sane inhumanum est' (They also act badly who prevent foreigners from enjoying their cities and banish them ... to prevent foreigners from enjoying the city is surely inhuman) transl. Cicero (1991) p. 117. Note that Cicero always sided with the honest in the name of the *hominum natura* (3.46), avoiding *crudelitas* (*ibid.*) or *inhumanum* (3.47).

146) Ambroise (2008) vol. 1 p. 380, *CCSL*15 p. 170, Ambrose (1984–92) vol. 2 p. 102, *PL*14 col.158.

147) Instead of Migne, Testard and Davidson's reading 'separare a commerciis *communis parentis*' (Migne takes the common parent to be Rome, Davidson the earth), I choose the reading of several better MSS (P, V, E1 and W) '*communes parentes*' (*CCSL*15 p. 170 critical apparatus; Ambroise (2008) vol. 2 p. 841 note on *communis parentis*). Seneca already spoke of parents (*cognatos*) in relation to the human community (*Ep.* 95.51). See above n. 123.

a general and cosmic sympathy for one's fellow beings.[148] In this passage, the Bishop of Milan is not speaking exclusively as a Christian minister of charity: in his eyes, Christianity and Stoicism are in complete agreement on the duty of humanity towards strangers. Compared with Juvenal, for whom the verse was a sign of humanity, a characteristic of human specie,[149] the Stoicism of Ambrose, who preaches the universal community, including animals, is most striking.

Paulinus of Nola

At the end of the year 397,[150] Paulinus of Nola wrote a long letter (*ep.* XIII)[151] to Pammacus, who had just become a monk after losing his young wife. A poet, a former pupil of Ausonius of Bordeaux[152] and a good letter-writer whom Jerome compares to Cicero,[153] Paulinus preaches to his addressee, a wealthy patrician, about Christian charity and renunciation: '*Blessed is he that considereth* particularly *the poor*,[154] he who piously worships the body of Christ and is not afraid to appeal to the judge because of the injustice done to the body of the Lord, and the rich man who piously spends much on a costly shroud and a new tomb for the Lord's burial.[155] Holy Scripture will add you to these names, and you will be counted among the rich, whose riches are compared with their souls. For those who possessed for themselves did not possess, *neither said any* [*of them*] *anything was his*

148) On the Stoic κοινωνία, see above nn. 121 and 143. Curiously, at the end of 17th century, a French religious translator, abbé de Bellegarde, found the verse profane and got rid of it by rendering the passage as follows: 'les chrétiens sont obligés de se rendre tous les devoirs de l'humanité', quoted by Delon (1984) p. 287.

149) See above.

150) *PL*61 col. 207, n. *.

151) *CSEL*29, pp. 84 ff., *PL*61 col. 207 ff. Lefèvre (1986) does not, but Jocelyn (1973) p. 45 and Lefèvre (1994) p. 29 mention Paulinus' quotation.

152) On Paulinus of Nola, see Labriolle (1947) pp. 481–94, Marrou (1958) pp. 99–100. Jocelyn (1973) p. 45 states: 'Paulinus had probably studied Terence at school in Bordeaux'.

153) Labriolle (1947) p. 488.

154) Psalm 41:1 (40:2).

155) Matt. 27:57–60: 'a rich man of Arimathaea, named Joseph'.

own, and they believed that nothing human was alien to them [et humani nihil a se alienum putabant], like that first *multitude* of the faithful of the past, who *were of one heart and of one soul* and *had all things common*'[156] (*Ep.* 13.20).[157] In this text, as E.-C. Babut has rightly pointed out, the author 'multiplies ... the quotations or reminiscences of Scripture [here, at least three biblical quotations are underlined and noted in the *PL* edition] ... Paulinus interweaves his own words and borrowed words. He constantly expresses his own thoughts in expressions taken from Scripture, or rather, his thinking seems to consist of a continuous flow of biblical memories'.[158] Among the biblical memories is a quotation from Terence, which is our verse. The meaning of the passage is clear: Pammacus, like Joseph of Arimathea, who spent a large sum of money on the burial of Christ, is advised to practise the Christian virtues intended for the rich, those of charity, good works and almsgiving, and even more, like Paulinus himself, who alienated all 'his splendid estates, *regna Paulini*',[159] that of renunciation. It is remarkable that, in order to prove primitive Christian communism, Terence's verse is Christianized by being quoted on an equal footing with biblical verses.

Augustine

An obvious quote is also found in a letter written by Ambrose's disciple Augustine in 413 or 414 to Macedonius, imperial vicar of Africa. In his 155th letter,[160] the Bishop of Hippo explains the happy life and Christian duties: 'Christ, the Truth, teaches us that the whole Law and Prophets are contained in these two commandments: to love God with all our soul, with all our heart, with all our mind, and to love our neighbour as ourselves.[161] The neighbour

156) Acts 4:32.

157) *CSEL*29 p. 101, *PL*61 col. 219.

158) Babut (1910) p. 129 [original in French], quoted also by Labriolle (1947) p. 488.

159) Labriolle (1947) p. 482.

160) For Macedonius' term of office during which the letter was written, see Dodaro (2004) p. 432. On *Ep.* 155, see *ibid.* pp. 436 ff.; on the passage in question (155.14), see p. 443. On Augustine's reception of Terence, see Hagendahl (1967) pp. 254–64, esp. on our verse pp. 262–3.

161) Matt. 22:37–40. Quoting Matt. 22:39, Augustine repeatedly speaks of Love of

here is not the one who is close to us by blood ties, but by the community of reason that unites all men among us' (*Ep.*155.14).[162] In fact, greater than the reason of money (*pecuniae ratio*), which creates a mere bond of commercial partners (*socios*), the reason of nature (*ratio naturae*) creates a bond of friends (*communis*) among men. He continues: hinc et ille comicus, sicut luculentis ingeniis non defit resplendentia veritatis, cum ab uno sene alteri seni dictum componeret: 'Tamtumne ab re tua est oti tibi, | Aliena ut cures ea, quae nihil ad te adtinent?' responsum ab altero reddidit: 'Homo sum humani nihil a me alienum puto.' cui sententiae ferunt etiam theatra tota plena stultis indoctisque plausisse. Ita quippe affectum omnium naturaliter attigit humanorum societas animorum, ut nullus ibi hominum nisi cujuslibet hominis proximum se esse sentiret[163] (Thus also the comic poet, as the brilliance of truth is not lacking in the beautiful geniuses, when he wrote the lines of an old man to another old man: 'Your own business leaves you so much leisure | that you can occupy yourself with those of others who do not regard you?', he put the latter's answer: 'I am a man, and nothing human is alien to me.' It is said that the whole theatre, despite the presence of the fools and the ignorant people, applauded the poet's maxim. For the solidarity of human souls naturally touches the emotion of all men, so that there was not a single man in that assembly who felt himself to be human, if not the neighbour of whomever it was). The Stoic κοινωνία is skilfully transposed into the Christian context, but this transposition—from the opposition between *alienum* (ἀλλότριον) and *proprium* (οἰκεῖον) to that between *alienum* (ἀλλότριον) and *proximum* (κοινωνικόν)—is not Augustine's monopoly, for Origen had already achieved it.[164] In order to further Christianize Origen's Stoic κοινωνία and thus to

neighbour: *In Evang. Iohan.* 17.8; *doctr. chr.* 1.22.21, 1.26.27, 2.6.7, 2.7.10, 2.16.25; *De civ. D.* 10.3.406, etc.

162) *CSEL*44 p. 444.

163) *CSEL*44 pp. 444–5.

164) On the idea of Christian κοινωνία, see 1 Cor. 1:9, Phil. 2:1, Philem. 6, 1 John 1:3, *SVF* 3.85 fr. 346 (Origen, *C. Cels.* 8.50): οὐδὲ γὰρ τὸ κοινωνικὸν περιγέγραπται ὥσπερ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀλόγων ζῴων οὕτω καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀγροικοτέρων· ἀλλ᾽ ἐπίσης ὁ ποιήσας ἡμᾶς πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους πεποίηκε κοινωνικούς. (For the boundaries that separate us from the dumb animals do not also separate us from the grossest of men so as to

support Love of neighbour—the second transposition, from natural sociality (κοινωνία) to Christian charity (ἀγάπη)[165]—, the Bishop of Hippo makes use of our verse, which in his eyes represents the universal *humanitas* which underlies and is the foundation of Christianity.[166] His pessimistic doctrine of original sin and the grace of God seems somewhat tempered by the strength of Christian Stoicism. It is also worth noting the image of theatre ('cui sententiae ferunt etiam theatra tota plena stultis indoctisque plausisse'), since the turn of phrase ('*theatra tota... plausisse*') is closely related to that in Seneca's *Ep.* 108.8: Non vides quemadmodum *theatra consonent* quotiens aliqua dicta sunt quae publice adgnoscimus et consensu vera esse testamur? (Do you not see how *our theatres echoe with applause* every time the maxims which our society recognizes and which we unanimously accept as true are pronounced?) [my italics].[167] The '*ferunt*' (they say) in Augustine openly testifies that it is a Senecan reminiscence and not his personal experience,[168] while the holy

---

prevent us from communicating with them. On the contrary, He who created us has made us equally capable of communicating with all people). The New Testament examples refer to a communion among Christians, while Origen's refers to human solidarity in the state of nature. The emphasis on natural κοινωνία is common to Origen, Ambrose, Augustine and John of Salisbury.

165) 1 Cor. 13:4. Incidentally, French *philosophers* of the Enlightenment disliked the pious word 'charité' and preferred the profane neologism 'bienfaisance', see Delon (1984) p. 287.

166) Delcourt (1960) p. 258 says: 'St Augustine ... [shows] that the Christian doctrine of charity has natural roots' [original in French].

167) Transl. Seneca (2015) p. 427. There is also a reminder of Cic. *Tusc.* 1.37 'Frequens enim consessus theatri, in quo sunt mulierculae et pueri, movetur audiens tam grande carmen [and Cicero quotes verses from an unknown tragedy]' (For the theatre audience, which includes many girls and children, is often moved when hearing such great verses). See also above n. 129. Curiously, Jocelyn (1973) pp. 40–41 does not link this Augustinian passage to the Senecan reminiscence, although many have done so, such as F. Préchac in Seneca (1971) p. 105 n. 2 (see above n. 128), together with several scholars mentioned in the next note.

168) West (1888) p. 213 remarks: 'Augustine *preserves the tradition* as to its reception by audience' [my italics]. On the contrary, Büchmann (1920) p. 365 (the mention appears since the 24th ed.) and after him Bickel (1941) take the statement as a report of his own experience. It should be remembered that the classical comedies

bishop also finds the Roman theatrical habit of applauding maxims quite normal. What is certain is his great sympathy for the playwright, who, like himself, was a Carthaginian.[169]

In about 421, Augustine quoted the verse again in the *Contra Julianum*, a controversial writing against Julian of Eclanum, a Pelagian bishop who denied original sin, especially in the matter of marriage and concupiscence.[170] Chapter 16 of the book IV deals with Julian's interpretation on the parable of the body and its members in *1 Corinthians* 12—by which St Paul speaks of the unity of the Christian Church, but Julian uses it to prove the invalidity of original sin by breaking down the distinction between *seemly* and *unseemly* members of body—and the Bishop of Hippo sees in the very distinction an obvious sign of 'concupiscence' resulting from original sin. In the last paragraph (4.16.83), mocking Julian, who said: 'We must not think that the Devil has created anything in man's members or in his senses',[171] Augustine, convinced of the divine Creation and the free Fall of man, exclaims: 'Why do you raise such vainly extravagant objections?',[172] and urges him to see the miserable reality of man: Ecce circumstat sensus tuos miseria generis humani.

---

were no longer performed under the Empire. See above n. 136. However, according to Jocelyn (1973) p. 44, in the 4th century it is 'possible that some [Terentian plays] were occasionally performed in the public theatres' on the authority of Donatus, who spoke of female actors *ut nunc videmus* (on *Andr.* 716), *ibid.* n. 238.

169) Although the late Romans took Suetonius' *Live of Terence* to be true when claiming that Terence was 'Karthagine natus', modern scholars such as Beare (1942) p. 26, Sandbach (1977) p. 135 and Forehand (1985) p. 5 doubt his African origin, while Duckworth (1971) p. 56 believes it; Forehand *ibid.* mentions also the possibility of a Libyan origin. See also Brothers (1998) pp. 8–9. On the other hand, Jocelyn (1973) p. 45 asserts that 'Augustine quite certainly [studied Terence] in Carthage'. On Augustine's reaction to Terence's immoral passages taught in class, see Courcelle (1972) p. 223 n. 2.

170) Lefèvre (1994) p. 30. On this work, see Augustine (1957) pp. xi-xix, Augustine (1968) pp. 259–62, Keech (2012) pp. 98–104; on the date of writing, see Augustine (1968) p. 260.

171) 'Fugienda opinio est, quae putat vel in membris hominum, vel in sensibus membrorum aliquid diabolum condidisse', *PL*44 col. 781, transl. Augustine (1957) p. 239 modified.

172) *Ibid.*

Homo es, humani nihil abs te alienum puta; et in iis quae non pateris, compatere patientibus (Behold, the wretchedness of the human race permeates your theories. *You are a man; consider nothing human foreign to you.* Be compassionate with those who suffer from that which does not make you suffer) [my italics].[173)] Thus, against the complacent haughtiness of Julian, who considers himself sinless, the Terentian verse, more eloquently than the biblical verses, counsels him to have humane compassion for others who do indeed suffer from original sin, and to consider himself guilty of it. Here man is seen from Augustine's characteristically pessimistic perspective.[174)] And *compatere patientibus* is not Stoic *apatheia* but purely Christian *pathos* (*misericordia*).[175)] But, as we shall see, it is not this pessimism but his stoically optimistic *humanitas*, described in *Ep.* 155, that will influence Julianus Pomerius and John of Salisbury.

Latin Fathers

The three saints who quoted Terence's verse—Ambrose, Paulinus and Augustine—at the end of the fourth and beginning of the fifth centuries, at the end of antiquity, had a common interest: charity towards the poor and the suffering. The three of them knew each other personally[176)] and shared the ancient culture that was soon to be lost and destroyed by barbarism in the West. Remarkable is the concentration of their quotations in the short span of a few decades, like a lonely beautiful oasis in the vast desert of millennial silence that spreads over our verse from the second to twelfth century. For all of them, the verse was a torch that illuminated Christian κοινωνία in the light of the natural *humanitas* of Roman pagan authors.

---

173) *PL*44 col. 781–2. Transl. Augustine (1957) pp. 239–40 much modified. Jocelyn (1973) p. 45 n. 242 suggests that 'Augustine simply throws the quotation back' at Julianus who 'had quotes' the verse, but this is pure speculation without evidence.

174) On this matter, see Hunter (1994).

175) Høgel (2015) p. 88 shows how Lactantius drew an opposition between Stoic *apatheia* (inhumane) and Christian *pathos* (humane). Greenblatt (2011) p. 103–9 depicts a fundamental shift at the end of antiquity towards Christian pursuit of pains.

176) On Paulinus' knowledge of Ambrose, see Labriolle (1947) p. 486.

Julianus Pomerius

At the very end of antiquity, towards the end of the fifth century, Julianus Pomerius, a follower of Augustine, quotes our verse in his *Contemplative Life*.[177)] He explains the virtues in the book III, and thus equity[178)] as a form of justice, in chapter 22, entitled 'De aequitate; quod ad eamdem pertineat

177) Jocelyn (1973) p. 45 and Lefèvre (1994) p. 30. On the date of writing and on the work, see Julianus Pomerius (1947) pp. 3–12, Schmidt (1949), *Masterpieces of Catholic literature* (1964) pp. 220–23.

178) *Rhet. Her.* 3.3 iustitia est aequitas ius unicuique retribuens pro dignitate cuiusque (justice is the equity that gives to each his own right for the dignity of each); Cic. *Off.* 1.64 aequitatem quae est iustitiae maxime propria (equity that is a special mark of justice, transl. Cicero (1991) p. 26 modified). Dorado (2004) p. 444 says: 'Justice in its classical sense is defined as 'rendering to each his due', an understanding which is close in Roman jurisprudence to establishing and maintaining an equity between parties'; see also *ibid.* n. 41. On *aequitas* in Roman law, see Schiavone (2012) pp. 299–301, and Falcón y Tella (2008) pp. 22–34 (despite somewhat crude translation, e.g. 'Gayo' instead of 'Gaius', and an awkward treatment of Cicero pp. 32–4), esp. pp. 31–2: '*"Humanitas"* then came to be the name assumed by *"aequitas"*—as an expression of *"benignitas"*, *"pietas"* and *"charitas"*—through the influence of Christianity'. Accordingly, as for *aequitas* in the Christian era, the importance of Christian charity should be taken into account in its intervention in imperial politics and law, such as Ambrose's excommunication of emperor Theodosius for the massacre of Thessalonica in 390, or Augustine's plea for the commutation of the death penalty before Macedonius [Dorado (2004) p. 434]. After the fall of the Western Empire, Pomerius, like his Christian predecessors, meant by *aequitas* the equal and humane treatment of others on the basis of natural humanity. Through this Christianizing process, it is noteworthy that the position of subject and predicate—*iustitia* and *aequitas*—was reversed (now charitable equity is deemed to be a variant of divine justice and a synonym for social duty in Christendom) compared with the classical definition by *Rhet. Her.* and Cicero that saw *aequitas* as underlying and justifying *iustitia* of various *iura* or their common lawful feature. Whereas for the Romans *Aequitas* was among other deities a goddess carrying her symbolic balance, for the Christians God is Justice ('Deus ... justus et rectus' *Deut.* 32:4) and asking what is Justice (i.e. what is God) is nonsensical, since He is One, Summum Bonum and the genus summum, thus only predicable.

humanae societatis utilitas' (Of equity; That the advantage of human society belongs to it): 'From justice equity also flows, which makes us call the necessities of all men our own and makes us believe we were born not for ourselves alone but also for mankind in general'.[179] The last phrase (*nec nobis tantum, sed etiam generi humano nos natos esse credamus*) recalls the classical passages referring to the Greco-Roman κοινωνία, 'ἕκαστος ἡμῶν οὐχ αὑτῷ μόνον γέγονεν' (none of us is born for himself alone, Pl. *Ep.* 9.358a),[180] its translation 'non nobis solum nati sumus' (Cic. *Off.* 1.22) and its Stoic variant 'in commune nati sumus' (Sen. *Ep.* 95.53), such passages as would be collected by Calphurnius in his note on the verse some thousand years later (see below). Pomerius continues: et quidquid cuilibet homini nocere potest, tanquam si nobis noceat, evitemus: quia qui *homines sumus, nihil humani a nobis alienum putare* debemus (It makes us avoid whatever can harm any man as though it were to harm ourselves; for *we who are men* should *think nothing human alien to us*) [my italics].[181] Here, *humanitas* is referred to as the basis of human society, as in Seneca, and even more so in Augustine, who preaches Love of neighbour, since 'quidquid cuilibet homini nocere potest, tanquam si nobis noceat, evitemus' means 'Love your Neighbour as Yourself'.[182] Moreover, Pomerius considers this love to be characteristic of the human species: 'Of beasts it is of course characteristic to live for themselves and not to share their advantages'.[183] This is the point of view of Juvenal, who saw in it the differentiation of man (see above).

179) *PL*59 col. 505. Transl. Julius Pomerius (1947) p. 149 modified.

180) Transl. Plato (1962) p. 258. The Ninth Letter including this altruistic passage which Cicero liked to translate as Plato's (*Off.* 1.22, *Fin.* 2.45) was not written by Plato, see Edelstein (1966) p. 128.

181) *PL*59 col. 505. Transl. Julius Pomerius (1947) p. 149. Jocelyn (1973) p. 45 n. 241, after Hagendahl (1958) p. 373, claims that in the passage Cic. *Off*. 1.22 'is conflated with' 1.30, where the verse is found, although he admits that the reference to the verse 'cannot so easily be shown to be made at second hand'.

182) See above n. 161 and below n. 211. At the same time, Cic. *Off.* 1.20 'iustitiae primum munus est, ut ne cui quis noceat' (the first office of justice is that no man should harm another, transl. Cicero (1991) p. 9) is transparent.

183) Julius Pomerius (1947) p. 149.

Middle Ages

Throughout the Middle Ages, only one author is known to have quoted Terence's verse: John of Salisbury. The unpopularity of the verse in the Middle Ages is surprising, given the very active production of Terentian manuscripts after the ninth century[184)] and the well-known medieval fondness for Terence: the works of Aldhelm of Malmesbury (seventh century) 'are full of quotations from Virgil, Terence, Horace, Juvenal, others',[185)] in the same century a *Dialogus inter Terentium et Delusorem* was written;[186)] in the mid-ninth century the Abbey of Bobbio had 'libros Terentii II',[187)] Lupus Servatus was looking for Donatus' commentary on Terence, Radbert of Corbie was able to quote Terence,[188)] and Hildemar of Corbie took material for scholia to Brescia to be copied there a century later,[189)] in the same century 'Freising lamented the lack of a copy';[190)] in the tenth century 'Sister Hrotsvita, of the convent of Gandersheim, succumbed to the charm of this author';[191)] E.R. Curtius mentions Walter of Speyer (963–1027) who, around 975, read at school, among other classics, 'den im ganzen Mittelalter gelesenen Terenz'[192)] and informs us of 'the overwhelming fact that Terence was one of the most beloved authors in

184) Terence (1979–90) vol. 1 pp. 70 ff., Terence (1958) Praefatio [tabula codicum] and esp. Reeve (1983) pp. 415–17, who speaks of 'the Dark Ages' from the 6th to the 8th centuries for which no manuscript has survived (p. 415). More than 100 manuscripts date from the 9th to 13th centuries, Brothers (1998) p. 22. Lawton (1970–72) vol. 1 p. 26 insists on the moral interest of medieval monastic scribes in Terence.

185) Gilson (1986) p. 182 [original in French].

186) Lawton (1970–72) vol. 1 p. 26. Magnin (1839–40) p. 523 dates this work to the end of the 7th century.

187) Reeve (1983) p. 418.

188) Terence (1979–90) vol. 1 p. 20, Bolgar (1973) p. 125.

189) Reeve (1983) p. 420. 'Corbie may have been an important centre', *ibid.* p. 418.

190) *Ibid.*

191) Gilson (1986) p. 229 [original in French], Lawton (1970–72) vol. 1 pp. 28–30, Duckworth (1971) pp. 396–7, Reeve (1983) p. 418 (Hrotsvitha).

192) Curtius (1993) pp. 58–9.

the schools of the whole Middle Ages',[193] in the late tenth century, Gerbert of Aurillac, Abbot of Bobbio (later Pope Sylvester II), ordered that 'Eugraphius recipiatur' (Eugraphius' commentary on Terence should be recovered),[194] catalogued two copies of Terence in the library of Bobbio, and often quoted him as 'un trésor de morale';[195] in the eleventh century, the Abbey of Montecassino had a manuscript[196] and Benzo, Bishop of Alba, named Terence among others to collect classics in his 'Topos of the Unsayable',[197] in the same century, Otloh of St. Emmeram in Regensburg, in his *De doctrina spirituali*, mentions Terence as one of the three great classical authors 'quos sectatur schola mundi (of whom the secular school follows the guidance)';[198] Wenrich of Trier's catalogue (*c.*1075) includes his name;[199] Aimeric's *Ars lectoria* (in 1086) mentions him among the golden *autentici*;[200] there are 'at least four distinct commentaries on Terence in the twelfth century and more later';[201] in 1280 a schoolmaster in Bamberg, Hugo von Trimberg, said that his plays 'non in numero ponuntur metricorum (are not in metrical verse)', and thirteenth-century verse stories derived their content from Terence;[202] and Dante (fourteenth century), knowing only his name, drew a Terentian story of Thais from John of Salisbury[203] and asked his guide 'dov'è Terrenzio nostro antico' in his *Purgatory* (XXII, 97),[204] at the end of the same century, Jean de Montreuil, ambassador of France, showed favour to Terence on several occasions;[205] from the end of the fourteenth to the fifteenth centuries, some Parisian theologians, such as Nicholas of Clamanges or Jean Gerson, quoted

---

193) *Ibid.* pp. 435-6 [original in German].
194) Lawton (1970-72) vol. 1 p. 28.
195) *Ibid.* p. 30.
196) Reeve (1983) p. 418.
197) Curtius (1993) p. 168 n. 7.
198) *PL*146 col. 270, Lawton (1970-72) vol. 1 p. 30, Ziolkowski (2007) p. 35.
199) Curtius (1993) p. 266.
200) *Ibid.* p. 459, Bolgar (1973) p. 197; Reeve (1983) p. 419.
201) Zetzel (2018) p. 257.
202) Sandys (1903) p. 608 n. 2, Bolgar (1973) p. 189.
203) Curtius (1993) p. 369.
204) *Ibid.* p. 267, Dante (2011) p. 654.
205) Lawton (1970-72) vol. 1 pp. 33-4.

him.[206)]

John of Salisbury

John of Salisbury is a unique exception in his extensive use of the verse. In the *Policraticus* (written between 1156–7 and 1159), he quoted the verse in the rather loose *Prologus* to Book 3, which deals with the enemies of the commonwealth.[207)] After complaining about the large number of opponents whose stupidity he had previously condemned, he admits that his hope of distancing himself from them in a quiet retreat had been frustrated by his busy schedule and his own impulse to act. He then goes on to meditate on man's emotional susceptibility to the vicissitudes of fortune, especially in his misery, and on *humanitas* towards the misfortunes of others: Licet parum humanus sit quem extraneorum jactura non concutit, non satis homo est quem aliena non movent[208)] (Although he who is impassive in the face of the harm of others[209)] is not very human, he who is in no way affected by the affairs of others is not sufficiently human). But the wiser men[210)] asked themselves whether something human is legitimately alien to a man (Sed sapientioribus jam venit in dubium an quicquam hominis recte sit homini alienum). The progress of the virtues has resolved the crux of the matter, 'cum et comicus *nichil humani alienum a se reputet* et magister caelestis hominem homini

---

206) *Ibid.* pp. 34–5.

207) John of Salisbury (1990) pp. xviii-xix. On Book 3, see Webb (1932) p. 36, Brown (1959) p. 285. John of Salisbury (1909) vol. 1 p. xxix says that throughout the work John 'often refers to Terence as *the comic poet* by antonomasia' [my italic] [original in Latin].

208) *CCCM*118 p. 172, John of Salisbury (1909) vol. 1 p. 170 (477b), *PL*199 col. 477. The punctuation is Webb's.

209) Both John of Salisbury (1938) p. 152 and John of Salisbury (1990) p. 13 incorrectly translate 'extraneorum jactura' as 'his own material losses' or 'the loss of his own material goods'.

210) It is unclear who and what kind of people the author means by the *sapientiores*. Are they pagan philosophers or patriarchs?

diligendum docuerit ut se ipsum[211),212)] (for the comic poet *considers nothing that is human alien to him*, and the Master of Heaven taught that a man should love another man as himself) [my italics]. Eckhart Lefèvre sees irony in the equal footing of Christ and Terence,[213)] but Augustine had already established the precedent: '*Christus* ... id est veritas dicit ... hinc et ille *comicus*...' [my italics],[214)] and we must recognize that this parallel is no more ironic in the future Bishop of Chartres than in the holy Bishop of Hippo. On the contrary, the very association of Terence with Christ demonstrates John's direct and pious borrowing from the letter of Augustine, who preached Love of neighbour. As for the verse,[215)] Love of neighbour (*Caritas*) is more clearly referred to, or rather is put in the position of its invented speaker, in Chapter 24 'De invidis et detractoribus' (On the Jealous and the Detractors) of Book 7: Si ergo livor bonis affligitur alienis, planum est quod a caritate plurimum distat quae sua non quaerit sed quae proximorum. Caritas in bonis nichil suum, *in malis reputat nichil alienum*; malis compatitur alienis, bona sua diffundit in proximos[216)] (Therefore, if anyone suffers from envy at the happiness of others, it is clear that he is very much at variance with Charity, which preaches the pursuit not of one's own happiness but of that of neighbour. Charity

211) Lev. 19:18, Matt. 19:19 22:39, Mark 12:31, Luke 10:27, Rom. 13:9, Gal. 5:14, James 2:8.

212) *CCCM*118 p. 172.

213) Lefèvre (1986) p. 42.

214) *CSEL*44 p. 444. See above.

215) A very slight reminiscence, purely linguistic, is found in a passage on ancient philosophy in *Policrat.* 7.13, John of Salisbury (1909) vol. 2 p. 151 (669d), *PL*199 col. 669: Terram alienam philosophia exigit et suam interdum alienam facit, immo alienam facit suam, et nullo unquam gravatur exilio. Hoc est quod domesticas et quae carnis sunt abigit sollicitudines ut homo, totus quodammodo versus in spiritum, omne quod sapientiae profectum impedit, *reputet alienum* (Philosophy claims another country and sometimes makes another its own country, or rather makes the country of others its own, and is not at all troubled by its own exile. In this way it averts the anxiety inherent in our flesh, so that the whole man, somehow transformed into a soul, may *consider* everything that hinders the progress of wisdom *to be alien*) [my italics].

216) John of Salisbury (1909) vol. 2 p. 211 (702b), *PL*199 col. 702.

considers nothing happy as her own and *nothing unhappy as foreign*. She has compassion on the misfortune of others and spreads her own happiness to her neighbours) [my italics]. The quotation *in malis reputat nichil alienum* is more like the Senecan *nullum alienum malum* [*sibi*] *putat* (*Ep*. 88.30 see above), so it is an indirect quotation, as was Juvenal's [*n*]*ulla aliena sibi credit mala* (5.15.142 see above).

John of Salisbury quotes this verse six times in his letters (188, 195, 214, 241, 250, 276).[217] As far as I can tell from the *PL*199 edition, John rarely quotes verses in his letters, and among the classical poets he quotes Horace, Ovid, Virgil and Juvenal several times, sometimes Lucan, twice Terence[218] (*Andr.* 309 in *Ep.* CLXXIX to his brother Richard in 1166, col. 175; *Andr.* 68 in *Ep.* CXCIII to Baldwin, Archdeacon of Exeter[219] in 1166, col. 211), and once Persius. The fact that he quoted six times the same line shows his strong attachment to the Love of neighbour argument, which he took directly from Augustine. Indeed, in *Ep.* 188 (probably written towards the end of 1166),[220] he wrote to Nicholas of Mont-Saint-Jacques in Rouen to ask for help for his friend Thomas Becket and for himself, who had also been in exile since 1164:[221] Exulo, proscriptus sum, expositus paupertati, coexulantium michi magis quam propriis incommodis urgeor, et eorum quae in pressuris ecclesia Dei patitur *a me nichil reputo alienum*[222] (I am in exile, proscribed, exposed to poverty, overcome more by the hardships of my fellow refugees than by my own, and *I consider that nothing* of the things from which the Church of God

217) Lefèvre (1986) p. 43, Lefèvre (1994) pp. 31–2.

218) The six quotations of our verse are not treated as such in the *PL*199.

219) Incorrect title. Baldwin of Forde, Archdeacon of Totnes, later Archbishop of Canterbury.

220) For the significance of this letter on behalf of the Canterbury exiles, see Duggan (1994) p. 432. Nicholas, Prior of Mont-aux-Malades, was close to Empress Matilda, mother of King Henry II, who had banished John and Thomas Becket, the Chancellor and Archbishop of Canterbury. O'Daly (2018) p. 169 says: 'In Letter 188, addressed to Nicholas of Mont-Saint-Jacques at Rouen and composed around the end of 1166, ... John compares the poverty of the exiles to that of Christ himself. He commends Nicholas's generosity'.

221) See Webb (1932) pp. 105 ff.

222) John of Salisbury (1979) p. 250, *PL*199 col. 213 (*Ep.* CXCIV).

suffers *is foreign to me*) [my italics, the same applies below]. By way of quotation, John expresses his deep Christian concerns for the political exile of the Archbishop Becket and his followers, including himself, and for the cause of the Church which they have championed in this sacrifice to the King. Then, in *Ep.* 195 (of uncertain date), John recommends to his friend Osbert of Faversham[223] that he help his nephew in school difficulties, justifying his own intervention by quoting our verse: *Humanum*, teste comico, *nichil caritas a se reputat alienum*, sed per congratulationem recte gaudentibus adest et per compassionem dolentibus congemiscit[224] (Witness the comic poet, *Charity believes that nothing human is alien to her*, and we are right to share joy with the merry and to lament with the sorrowful). Giving advice to an uncle about a nephew is not sticking one's nose in someone else's problem, but an act of charity (ἀγάπη = *caritas*), calling people to have compassion and sympathy for their fellow human beings. Thus John, who places *caritas* in the same position of personified subject as in chapter 24 of the *Policraticus*, and identifies it with *humanitas*, is precisely in line with Augustine. In *Ep.* 214 (early 1167), he wrote to Milo II, Bishop of Thérouanne, whose *sinceritas in caritate* is compared to that of St Paul: Sic enim et apostolus scandalizatis couritur et fratribus coinfirmatur infirmis[225] et per copassionem fit in Christo omnibus omnia, dum ad formam ethicae purioris et consummatioris philosophiae *humanum a se nichil reputat alienum*[226] (Thus the Apostle burns with those who are offended, is weak with the weak brethren, does everything for all with compassion in Christ, to the extent that, according to the most pure and perfect moral philosophy *he considers nothing human to be alien to him*). Here, to express the Christian ἀγάπη, John puts the Terentian verse in the mouth of St Paul (!), and St Paul's foundation is not theology but moral philosophy (*ethica philosophia*). The reference to 'compassion in Christ', which is *humane*, as in the case of Lactantius, as opposed to Stoic *apatheia* is noteworthy.[227] *Ep.* 241 (January 1168),

223) John's unidentified friend, John of Salisbury (1979) p. 540 n. 1.

224) *Ibid.* p. 274, *PL*199 col. 229 (*Ep.* CCVI).

225) 2 Cor.11:29 and 1 Cor.9:22, John of Salisbury (1979) p. 353 n. 2.

226) *Ibid.* p. 352, *PL*199 col. 227 (*Ep.* CCIV)

227) See above n. 175. John will say in *Ep.* 276: 'The Stoics preach *apatheia*, which the

addressed to Baldwin, Archdeacon of Totnes, says: Si *nichil humanum comicus a se reputat alienum*, non ambigo te curare quem sorciatur exitum causa Dei et amicorum labor, qui pro libertate ecclesiae patiuntur aut imminentia sibi pericula reformidant[228] (If *the comic poet considers nothing human to be alien to him*, I have no doubt that you care what the outcome will be for the cause of God and the struggle of my friends who suffer for the freedom of the Church or fear their own imminent danger). This is for the same purpose as *Ep.* 188 considered above: to urge the addressee to have compassion on religious refugees. In *Ep.* 250 (1167–8) John said to his friend Peter Scriptor:[229] Zelus quem habes in Domino michi notus est a multis annis, ut te sciam super ecclesiae statu non posse non moveri. Quippe | sidera quis mundumque velit spectare cadentem | expers ipse[230] | sollicitudinis? praesertim si caritas urgeat[231] ut *nichil humanum a se reputet alienum*[232] (Your zeal for the Lord has been known to me for many years; I know that you cannot help being moved by the situation of the Church. For who would like to gaze at the stars and the falling universe and be free from care? Especially when charity constraineth us to *consider nothing human to be alien to us*).[233] For John, it is *caritas Christi* (2 Cor. 5:14) rather than Terence himself who is the promoter of this phrase. In *Ep.* 276 (June 1168) he wrote to John of Canterbury, Bishop of Poitiers, and Master Raymond, Chancellor of

Latin tongue translates insensibility; but their view has been destroyed by the most faithful reasoning and virtue of truer philosophers and, what is most to the point, by the precepts and examples of Holy Scripture', John of Salisbury (1979) p. 585.

228) *Ibid.* p. 460, *PL*199 col. 277 (*Ep.* CCXLIII).

229) On Peter Scriptor or Peter the Scribe, see John of Salisbury (1979) p. 389 n. 225.1.

230) Luc. *Phars.* 2.289–90: velit] valet. In conversation with Brutus, who urges him to join Pompey's camp against Caesar, Cato the Younger speaks of the fall of the Republic. John speaks of the fall of Christendom in a schismatic crisis between the Pope Alexander III and the Emperor Frederick Barbarossa. On this crisis, see Webb (1932) pp. 112 ff. and John of Salisbury (1979) p. 504 n. 3: 'John is describing Barbarossa's invasion of Italy and the attempt to establish the anti-pope in Rome'.

231) 2 Cor. 5:14.

232) John of Salisbury (1979) pp. 502–4, *PL*199 col.317 (*Ep.* CCLXXXI).

233) Peters (1943) p. 114 modified.

Poitiers Cathedral:[234] Et quidem necessaria fuerat consolatio, si tamen verum est quod audistis, sed potius ob causam publicam quam privatam; nam | sidera quis mundumque velit spectare cadentem | expers ipse metus,[235] | expers doloris, expers sollicitudinis? Non quod justum, qui ut leo confidit[236], pro se contristare valeat quicquid acciderit, sed quia instinctu naturae et virtutis urgente stimulo proximis sic compatitur et congaudet, ut *nichil humani a se reputet alienum*[237] (That comfort was truly necessary for a public rather than a private reason, if what you heard is true; for 'who would wish to gaze at the stars and at the falling world, without fear', without grief, without solicitude? Not that the righteous who are bold as a lion can feel sorrow for themselves at whatever happens, but because by natural instinct and by urgent stimulus of virtue they so compassionate and rejoice with their neighbours that *they consider nothing human to be alien to them*).[238] Here is a set, or rather recycled, argument for Christian charity in a crisis, made up of the same quotes from Lucan and Terence in the same order, which, repeated on close days, shows somewhat sloppy work on the part of the author. John's eight quotations clearly testify to his strongest attachment to the symbol of Christian ἀγάπη (*caritas*)—none of which means anything else, and even the utterance of the verse is sometimes put to the mouth of St Paul or *caritas Christi* rather than Terence or Chremes—and thus testify to his most loyal allegiance to Augustine's argument for Love of neighbour, and such a persistence of quotation is seldom found elsewhere in all of history.[239]

Italian Renaissance

The unpopularity of the verse continued into the early Renaissance. Even in Italy, where new editions of Terence kept appearing;[240] Petrarch, in his

234) John of Salisbury (1979) p. 91 n. 1.

235) See above n. 230.

236) Prov. 28:1.

237) John of Salisbury (1979) p. 582, *PL*199 col. 262 (*Ep.* CCXXXV)

238) Peters (1943) p. 32 modified.

239) Voltaire will quote it six times, Lefèvre (1994) pp. 33–40.

240) The catalogue of the Bibliothèque Nationale de France lists 26 editions of Terence for the decade of 1470 alone. Two come from the Mentelin press in Strasbourg (not

youth, wrote a play imitating Terence, wrote *Vita Terentii*, and did critical work on him;[241] Terence was taught, among other classics, at the University of Florence;[242] Gasparino Barzizza (1360–1430), famous humanist schoolmaster, praised Terence for his moral judgements, and Guarino da Verona (1374–1460) extolled him for the purity of his style;[243] Leon Battista Alberti wrote a Latin comedy, *Philodoxius* (*c.* 1424), which somewhat resembles Terence;[244] *Poliscena*, a Latin comedy attributed to Leonardo Bruni, is said to have been modelled on Aristophanes, Plautus and Terence;[245] Terentian plays were frequently performed under the auspices of newly founded *academies* in all the important cities of the peninsula;[246] and Ariosto, in his *Cassaria* (written in 1498 and performed in Ferrara in 1508), 'the earliest original comedy in the modern manner', partly adapted *The Self-Tormentor*.[247] However, no author quotes the verse before Niccolò Perotti.

---

after 1470), three from Paris (in 1472 and 1475; another in 1476, without place or printer, is attributed by Brunet to U. Gering, publisher in Paris), and all the rest from Italy (Venice, Milan, Rome, etc.). Lawton (1970–72) vol. 1 pp. 63–78 lists 34 editions published in the 1470's, of which 27 are Italian or thought to be. Another statistic given by Lawton, *ibid.* p. 281: of 461 editions published between 1470 and 1600, 147 are Italian, 176 French, 70 German, 25 Dutch, 20 Swiss, 8 English, 5 Spanish, 10 of unknown origin; this indicates the transfer of editorial supremacy from Italy to France in the sixteenth century. The Incunabula Short Title Catalogue (British Library) lists 132 editions of Terence (Terentius Afer, Publius), of which 67 were published in Italy, 34 in France, 10 in Britain, 7 in Germany, 6 in Belgium, 6 in the Netherlands and 1 in Spain.

241) Nolhac (1892) pp. 156–7. The *Vita Terentii* was edited by I. Ruiz Arzálluz in 2010.

242) Le Goff (1965) p. 175.

243) Grund (2005) pp. ix-x.

244) Lawton (1970–72) vol. 1 p. 41, Jones-Guzzi (1993), Grund (2005) pp. 70–169.

245) Lawton (1970–72) vol. 1 p. 41. The true authorship is attributed to Leonardo della Serrata, see the entry 'DELLA SERRATA, Leonardo' by G. Nonni in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 37 (1989).

246) Burckhardt (2014) pp. 310 and 346. The first production since antiquity was *Andria*, performed in Florence in 1476, Reeve (1983) p. 419. Performances of Terence's plays were occasions for practising Latin conversation, Burckhardt, *ibid.* pp. 267 and 281.

247) Highet (1976) p. 136. See also Duckworth (1971) p. 399.

Calphurnius

Nevertheless, in order to fill a commentary gap left by the fourth-century grammarian Donatus on the *Heauton timorumenos*,[248] Johannes Calphurnius Brixiensis (Giovanni Perlanza dei Ruffinoni, 1443–1503) wrote a note to the verse in the Venetian edition of 1476 (Jacobus Rubeus):[249] Hoc ex Platonis sententia, qui inquit, Ortus nostri partem patriam vendicare, patem amicos et ut Stoicis placet, quae in terris gignuntur, ad usum hominum omnia creantur. Homines autem, hominun causa generantur, ut ipsi inter se alii aliis prodesse possint.[250] (This comes from the thought of Plato, who said that our birth is claimed partly by our homeland, partly by our friends, and according to the Stoics, everything born on earth is created for the use of men; and men are

248) On Donatus' commentary, see Grant (1986) pp. 60–96 and Zetzel (2018) p. 254. It is not known why Donnatus' commentary does not exist only for the *Heauton timorumenos*. On the biography of Calphurnius, see the entry 'RUFFINONI, Giovanni Perlanza, detto Calfurnio' by B. Valtorta in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 89 (2017). For his commentary, see Donatus (1902–03) vol. 1 p. XXXIV, Gehl (2016) p. 257, Torello-Hill and Turner (2020) pp. 59–60.

249) *Aelii Donati grammatici clarissimi in sex P. Terentii Afri Comoedias examinata interpretatio*, [Venice]: Impressum quidem est opus hoc per Iacobum Gallicu[m] mira arte ac diligentia, Anno Domini. MCCCC. Lxxvi. viii. Calendas Septe[m]bris... [25 Aug. 1476] (ISTC it00073000). Lefèvre (1994) p. 68 n. 98 erroneously gives 1474 as the year of editing, presumably based on Jocelyn (1973) p. 17 n. 15, who misleadingly says: 'this work was first published at Treviso in 1474', on the doubtful authority of Hain (1831) vol. 2 p. 400 and Copinger (1898) pt. 2 v. 2 p. 115. Lawton (1970–72) vol. 1 p. 70 no 15 believes in the existence of this edition. But Copinger's source, Van der Meersch (1856) p. 315 clearly states his doubt: 'Cette édition, citée par Maittaire, d'après Beughem et Fabricius, paraît douteuse. Il est probable qu'ils auront voulu désigner celle de 1477, imprimée à Trévise par *Herman de Levilapis* (*Lichtenstein*).' Incidentally, the 1476 Venice edition is the first edition of Terence to include Donatus' commentary, Dane (1999) p. 109. On the 1476 edition, see also Lawton (1970–72) vol. 1 pp. 74–5 no. 25.

250) Terence (1830) p. 19. This edition warns readers of a common error (*error pervulgatus*), which consists of mistaking Calphurnius for an ancient scholiast (*ibid*. p. 7 n.*). See also Terence (1477) fol. K2^r, which reproduced the 1476 edition.

born for men, so that men may be useful to each other). The allusion to Plato comes from his ninth letter (358a): 'But this also you must bear in mind, that none of us is born for himself alone; part of our existence belongs to our country, part to our parents, part to our other friends',[251] a passage which expresses the academic κοινωνία. But, as we have seen, no one before Calphurnius had so boldly traced the line back to Platonism. While this claim seems misplaced, the reference to the Stoics through Cicero[252], Seneca and Church Fathers is perfectly understandable. In fact, the whole note is nothing less than a paraphrase of a single passage from Cicero's *De officiis* 1.22:[253]

ut praeclare scriptum est a Platone, non nobis solum nati sumus ortusque nostri partem patria vindicat, partem amici, atque, ut placet stoicis, quae in terris gignantur, ad usum hominum omnia creari, homines autem hominum causa esse generatos, ut ipsi inter se aliis alii prodesse possent (We are not born for ourselves alone, to use Plato's splendid words, but our country claims for itself one part of our birth, and our friends another. Moreover, as the Stoics believe, everything produced on the earth is created for the use of mankind, and men are born for the sake of men, so that they may be able to assist one another)[254]

In short, it is a summary of the classical Greco-Roman κοινωνία arguments.[255] Without mentioning its Ciceronian origin and often even its authorship of Calphurnius, this note, together with the comments of Donatus and Eugraphius, is repeated in editions up to the nineteenth century.[256]

---

251) Plato (1962) p. 258. See Jocelyn (1973) p. 17 n. 18, who also refers to Cic. *Fin.* 2.45. On inauthenticity of the Ninth Letter, see above n. 180.

252) Joselyn (1973) p. 17 n. 19 refers to Cic. *Fin.* 3.67 and Porph. *Abst.* 3.20 (Chrysippus' theory on Stoic anthropocentrism).

253) Joselyn (1973) p. 17, Lefèvre (1994) p. 68.

254) Transl. Cicero (1991) pp. 9–10.

255) Cicero speaks of 'vitae quasi communitas' (*Off.* 1.20).

256) The note of Eugraphius (6th century) for the verse [Donatus (1902–03) vol. 3 p. 161], which is a mere paraphrase, is of no interest to us. According to Goff (1973) pp. 583–5 (T-number is the entry number in this catalogue), Calphurnius' commentary appears in editions of Venice 1476 (T-73), Treviso 1477 (T-75), Venice 1479 (T-77), Venice 1483 (T-81), Brescia 1485 (T-82), Lyon 1488 (T-85), Venice 1490 (T-87), Venice 1491 (T-88), Venice 1492 (T-89), Venice 1494 (T-92),

Perotti, Calepino

No one in the Italian Renaissance seems to have quoted this verse before Niccolò Perotti. In his famous *Cornu Copiae*, an encyclopaedic and lexicographic commentary on Martial completed in 1478 and published posthumously in 1489, he gives an etymological explanation of the words *homo*, *humanus* and *humanitas*, in which he quotes our verse:[257)]

HOMINUM. Ratione scilicet viventium, per quod a feris homines distant. Homo diffinitur animal rationis capax morti obnoxium... Homo ab humo deducitur, ut Varro inquit, quod sit humo natus, quamvis hoc Quintilianus deridet, quod omnibus animalibus eadem origo sit, et quod non sit verisimile primos illos mortales ante terrae nomen imposuisse quam sibi... Nos tamen hominem non ab humo, sed a consortio atque concordia vitae appellatum existimamus... Est enim homo omnium animalium maxime sociabilis... Veteres non hominem, sed homonem dicebant, a quo homonium, hoc est humanum. Quippe ab homo humanus fit, sicut a fera ferinus, a belua beluinus. Humanum enim proprie dicitur quod hominis est, et ad hominem spectat. *Terentius. Homo sum: humani nihil a me alienum puto.* Hinc humanitas ‹est› dicta eruditio, atque institutio in bonas artes, quas qui sinceriter cupiunt, atque assequuntur, hi sunt maxime humani. [my italics][258)]

(Hominum. That is, as a matter of course, of living beings with reason, in which man differs from animals. Man is defined as a mortal animal endowed

---

Venice 1495 (T-93), Venice 1497 (T-95), Venice 1497 (T-97), Venice 1497/98 (T-98), Barcelona 1498 (T-100), Venice 1499 (T-103), and Milan 1499 (T-104). These are almost a half of the 35 editions published between 1476 and 1500 (T-73–105 including two extra numbers 75a and 89a).

257) Neither Lefèvre (1986) nor Lefèvre (1994) mentions this quotation. See Høgel (2015) p. 106 n. 260 for an excerpt of the Latin text. On the *Cornu Copiae*, see Furno (1995), esp. on its publishing success, *ibid.* p. 14.

258) Perotti (1489) p. 227. Abbreviations are unfolded from the Aldine edition, Perotti (1527) col. 653–4. On the word order '*humani nihil a me*', see below n. 270. Perotti, with Calepino (see below), is quite unique. Certainly, he was influenced by the 1472 Roman edition (it00065500) published by Sweynheim and Pannartz, the printers of Perotti's 1473 editions of Martial and of Pliny. Furno (1995) pp. 13, 222–3.

with reason... *Homo* is derived, according to Varro, from *humus* (the earth), because he is born on the ground, although Quintilian laughs at this, since the same way of birth is common to all animals and it is unlikely that primitive men named the earth before themselves... I believe that *homo* does not derive its name from *humus*, but from the community and cooperation of life... For man is the most sociable of all animals... The early ancients did not say *hominem*, but *homonem*, from which came *homonium*, which is *humanum*. In fact, *humanus* comes from *homo*, just as *ferinus* comes from *fera* (the beast) or *beluinus* from *belua* (the brute). *Humanum* is used primarily for that which is of man, that which belongs to man. *Terence. Homo sum: humani nihil a me alienum puto.* Hence *humanitas* is said for learning and education in the liberal arts, and people who pursue these arts are most *human.*)

In this ambiguous passage (the ambiguity is due to the accumulation of arguments characteristic of Renaissance humanism), as Christian Høgel put it, 'the word *humanus* may be used in the sense of "meek" and "sociable" and *humanitas* sometimes as denoting "friendliness" and "sociability"'.[259] Perhaps because of a conjunctive adverb *hinc* (hence), Høgel sees the Terentian verse as a trigger for the next sentence, introducing another meaning of *humanitas* as classical learning (*eruditio*, *institutio in bonas artes*).[260] But Perotti seems to have quoted the verse only to illustrate his previous explanation of *humanus* in the sense of belonging to human beings. Here *hinc* very loosely connects beyond the verse to the previous sentences,[261] since it is not at all possible to see an educational or scholarly connotation in the Terentian verse, where *humanus* is nothing more than 'sociable' or 'friendly'. Thus, the verse has the independence of a Latin label, but it has neither the power to argue nor to influence posterity.

A few decades later, Ambrogio Calepino quotes the verse in his very popular Latin dictionary (first published in 1502) under the entry of 'Humanus': 'Ter. Homo sum humani nihil a me alienum puto', without any

259) Høgel (2015) pp. 106–7.

260) *Ibid.* p. 106. On Perotti's way of quoting Terence, see Furno (1995) pp. 35–6.

261) It is possible that the Terentian verse was inserted afterwards, so that the connection by *hinc* became improper, as Furno (1995) p. 54 mentions such an instance of carelessness with *Idem*.

explanation.[262)]

Ariosto

Ludovico Ariosto parodies the verse in *Carmina* (*Lirica latina*), first published posthumously in 1553,[263)] (Lirica latina XLVI):[264)]

[EPITAPHIUM EIUSDEM]

Quaeris quae fuerim? Me scito fuisse Philippam:

plus rogas? Nolo plura loqui, nisi quod

nil alienum a me mulier muliebre putavi:

hoc, heus! in partem accipe, quaeso, bonam.

Quid tibi vis? An me interius vis nosse? Quid ipsum

ten noscis? Prior haec sit tibi cura, et abi.[265)] [my italics]

[Epitaph of the same (Filippa)] Do you ask who I was? Know I was Filippa: | Do you want more? I won't say more, but that | *I considered nothing feminine to be alien to me who was woman*: | Look! Take it, I beg you, in good part. | What do you want? Do you want to know me more intimately? What | do you know of yourself? That should be your primary concern, and go away!

This is a feminist version of the verse, in which Ariosto's burlesque

---

262) Calepino (1502) not paged. His dictionary was regularly republished until the late 17th century (see BNF's catalogue). The next great lexicographer, Robert Estienne, quotes the verse under the entry of 'Homo sum. Je suis fragille, Je puis faillir': 'Idem in Heaut. I.1.25, Homo sum, humani à me nihil alienum puto', Estienne (1531) fol. 367[r], but this semantic classification, which puts it together with 'censen hominem me esse?' (Do you take me to be in my senses? Ter. *Ad.* 579 [Estienne mistook *hominem* for 'man at fault' because of the next word *Erravi* 'I made a mistake']) and 'homo sum' (I am normal man, Plin. *Ep.* 5.3.2) etc. is wrong.

263) By G.B. Pigna: *Io. Baptistae Pignae Carminum Lib. quatuor*...Venetiis, Ex officina Erasmiana, Vincentii Valgrisi. M.D.LIII., see Ariosto (1954) p. 1168.

264) Neither Lefèvre (1986) nor Lefèvre (1994) mention this quotation. I learned it from the Perseus Digital Library (Humanist and Renaissance Italian Poetry in Latin) of Tufts University. Ariosto translated *Andria* and *Eunuchus* in his youth around 1478, see Lawton (1970–72) vol. 1 p. 42.

265) Ariosto (1954) p. 74.

humour is very much in evidence. This is especially true when we remember that the original play was set in sexist Athens. At the same time, the Christian charity of the Middle Ages has disappeared without a trace.

Bandello

Next is Matteo Bandello, whose *Novelle* were first published in 1554. In the dedication to his seventeenth novella 'Lucrezia vicentina, innamorata dí Bernardino Losco con lui si giace e con dui altri di Bernardino fratelli' (Lucrezia of Vicenza, in love with Bernardino Losco, slept with him and with his two brothers), he asks the dedicatee, Paris Ceresaro, for protection against any attacks from false devotees that might be provoked by this indecent tale: Ma perché oggidí ci sono assai, i quali vorrebbero esser tenuti santi, ed in effetto sono sentine d'ogni vizio, e se vedessero questa mia novella mi bandirebbero la cruciata a dosso, poco del lor falso giudicio curando, l'ho voluta dar a voi, che sète uomo terenziano, e *nessuna cosa umana aliena da voi stimate* (Since there are a lot of people today who want to pass themselves off as saints, and who are really on guard against all vices, and since, if they saw this novella I have written, they would declare a veritable crusade against me, without caring much for their false judgement, I wanted to give it to you, who are the man of Terence, and who *believe that nothing human is alien to you*) [my italics].[266] The quote can be interpreted in two ways: firstly, as an appeal to the recipient's compassion for Bandello's possible predicament as a result of this novella, and it is, as we have seen, a good ancient and medieval tradition to emphasize human solidarity. Secondly, as a reference to the curiosity that takes an interest in any human event, however immoral it may be, which can be hinted by the following sentence: Conoscete poi chiaramente che scriver cose che a la giornata avvengono, se son cattive non per ciò macchiano il nome di chi le scrive (You know very well that writing about things that happen every day, even if they are bad, does not tarnish the name of the person who writes them).[267] The curiosity of the writer, on the one

266) Bandello (1928) pp. 210–11. Bandello (1554) fol. 112^{v}: oggidí] hoggi di; vizio] vitio; uomo terenziano] huomo Terentiano; umana] humana. The punctuation is from this edition (the same applies below). See Lefèvre (1986) p. 44.

267) Bandello (1928) p. 211, Bandello (1554) fol. 112^{v}.

hand—a Bandello—who wants to deal with all human problems and reveal the flip side, and the curiosity of the reader, on the other—a Ceresaro—who wants to know a whole story and creates the demand for author's activity, are both a completely new and modern form of *unbefugte neugierige Einmischung in fremde Verhältnisse* (*unauthorized, inquisitive interference in the affairs of others*).[268] Here, beyond the realm of classical and Christian ethics, is the phenomenon of voyeurism, which still persists today, or rather is magnified in the journalistic love of sex scandals. In fact, the first part of the dedication describes a scene at the court of Mantua, where all the gentlemen want to know everything about a lady's forbidden love. Essentially, the novella is more or less erotic gossip, since the genre was created by Boccaccio. If so, this is the real beginning of the modern literary economy of supply and demand.

Charles V

Early eighteenth-century German writers tell an anecdote about this verse:[269] Francis I, imprisoned in Madrid after the defeat at Pavia, noticed Charles V's motto '*Plus ultra*' on the palace wall and wrote below it '*Hodie mihi, cras tibi*'. On his release, the emperor noticed this and added at the

---

268) Körte (1942) p. 101's expression for a quotation of the verse by Cicero. The expression does not fit Cicero, as seen above at n. 113, but it does fit Bandello. The verse will reappear in a more compromising form in the late 18th-century French romance, Lacros's *Les Liaisons dangereuses* (1782), 74th letter, under the pen of a femme fatale (Mme de Merteuil) who wants to know everything about her target to seduce him, see Delon (1984) p. 292.

269) *Singularia historiae imperatoriae* (1705) pp. 1306–7: '*Franciscus* liess doch einiges Nachdencken in Spanien hinter sich: Denn als er im Gefängniss des Keysers Wahl-Spruch: *Plus ultra!* angeschrieben sahe | scrieb er diese Worte darunter: *Hodie mihi, cras tibi!* Welchem *Carolus* nachmals dieses beyfügte: *Homo sum, humani à me nihil alienum puto!* Sonst wissen sich die Spanier mit dieser Geschicht sehr viel...'. König (1712) Vor-Gericht, fol.)*(3v: 'Als er [= Franz] zu Madrid in demjenigen Zimmer | welches ihm zum Gefängniß dienete | Carl V. Wahl-Spruch: Plus Ultra! gefunden | schrieb er dazu: Hodie mihi, cras Tibi. Als solches der Kayser observirte | setzte er darunter: Homo sum, humani à me nihil alienum puto'; see also Seebald (2009) p. 320 n. 766 and p. 352; Lehmann (1740) n. pag. [p. 2]; *Wöchentliche* (1740) p. 187.

bottom: 'Homo sum, humani a me nihil alienum puto'.[270] If this is a true story, the event must have taken place between August 1525, when the King of France arrived in Madrid,[271] and a date close to his deliverance in March 1526.[272] But I suspect that it was the invention of a late seventeenth- or early eighteenth-century German—probably the author of the *Singularia historiae imperatoriae*?—or a Spaniard who told him the story as a gossip ('wissen sich die Spanier mit dieser Geschicht sehr viel', the Spaniards are very proud of this story).[273] First, Brantôme, almost a contemporary of the two princes and a

---

270) I would like to correct my error in Tsutsui (2021) p. 13, which presents a false discussion of the word order of the verse. As far as I know of the 16 pre-1530 editions available in the BNF's Gallica (see Appendix 1), this '*humani a me nihil*' is a widespread standard order in the Renaissance since the Mentelin edition of not after 1470 (often considered the *editio princeps*)—derived from the γ group of MSS, Terence (1958) critical apparatus for v. 77. On the γ group, see Reeve (1983) pp. 416–7, Grant (1986) pp. 136–54 and Victor (1996) p. 270. However, these early editions did not follow the pure γ tradition, but the heavily 'contaminated' medieval manuscripts, see Dane (1999) p. 106.
On the contrary, the actual '*humani nihil a me*' which was common in antiquity [see Terence (1979–90) vol. 2 p. 23, critical apparatus] was only adopted by the Venetian editions of 1497, 1515 and 1518, the Tarvisian of 1477 (Tarvisio was under the Venetian Republic) and the Roman of 1472. Probably this was the case with the Venetian and Tarvisian editions because of the presence of the *Codex Bembinus* of this order (4th or 5th century, now in the Vatican Library, Vat. lat.3226, see Reeve (1983) pp. 414–5), which had been in the possession of Bernardo Bembo in Venice since 1457, and on which Angelo Poliziano, together with Pietro Bembo, made the collation of the Terence texts there in 1491. See Grant (1988) p. 214. In 1565 Gabriele Faerno, in *Emendatinones in sex fabulas Terentii* (Florence, Juntas) p. 78, wrote for the emendation: 'A me nihil alienum puto. *O.l.s.* [= *Omnes libri scripti* (*habent*)] *nihil a me.*' (All MSS have *nihil a me*). Faerno is said to be 'the first editor to use the Bembinus', Reeve (1983) p. 420. This word order was also adopted by Lindenbrog in his 1602 Paris and 1623 Frankfurt editions, and from the second half of the 17th century it became the standard. Lehmann (1740) pp. 4–5 supported Faerno's choice.

271) Rey (1837) pp. 120–22 and Mignet (1875) p. 113. July 1525 according to Brandi (1964) p. 190.

272) Rey (1837) pp. 162, 174, Mignet (1875) p. 198, and Brandi (1964) p. 195.

273) *Singularia historiae imperatoriae* (1705) pp. 1306–7.

great lover of anecdotes, says nothing.[274] Then the modern historians also remain silent.[275] Finally, it is very difficult, if not impossible, to quote the verse in this way for Charles V, a former pupil of Adrian VI,[276] who must have read with him, as part of the curriculum of *institutio principis*, the political dialogues of Cicero and the *Moral Letters* of Seneca, which explicitly associate it with the feeling of solidarity (see above). In this exchange, the verse refers to the idea of exposure to misfortune, such as imprisonment: in response to the king's satirical and vindictive remark 'Today mine, tomorrow yours', the emperor is said to have mentioned this verse to say that he was aware of everyone's subordination to fate. But, as we shall see, the pessimistic interpretation of the human condition is unique to Montaigne. The emperor, for his part, was not inclined to scepticism, as his expansionist motto *Plus ultra* attests.[277] All the circumstances rule out the possibility that Charles V quoted the verse. The author of the story must have read Montaigne's *Essays*, or rather Tanneguy Le Fèvre's (Tanaquillus Faber) or his daughter Anne Dacier's note in their editions (1671 and 1688 respectively), for the Le Fèvres said that people interpret the *humanum* in the verse, on the alleged authority of Cic. *Off.* 1.30 and Juv. 5.15.142, to mean human predicament, either accidental or fated.[278] They seem to be alluding to the seventeenth-century French *honnêtes hommes'* breviary Montaigne, who was pessimistic in his view of man;[279] on the other hand, as we have seen, neither Cicero nor Juvenal were so in their quotations of the verse.

---

274) *Les vies des grands capitaines du siècle dernier*, chap. I, L'empereur Charles le Quint, in Brantôme (1858–95) vol. 1 pp. 84–134; *Les vies des grands capitaines françois*, chap. XIV, Le grand roy François, *ibid.* vol. 3 pp. 233–328.

275) See Rey (1837) and Mignet (1875), which are detailed and comprehensive.

276) Burckhardt (2014) p. 260 n. 15, citing Paul Jove's *Vita Hadriani VI*. Brandi (1980) p. 47.

277) After his abdication in 1556 and his retreat in a monastery in 1557, he led a reclusive life until his death in the following year, and may have come closer to scepticism, but only then. As emperor, he seems to have had an enormous ambition to be another Caesar by creating a kingdom of Gaul in northern Europe, Brantôme (1858–95) vol. 1 pp. 104–5.

278) Lefèvre (1994) p. 68. He describes this pessimism as 'metaphysische', *ibid.* p. 69.

279) Villey (1935) pp. 308 ff.

Erasmus

Humanism is a nineteenth-century German neologism, probably coined by Friedrich Immanuel Niethammer.[280] The word is derived from the academic

---

280) Kristeller (1961) p. 160 n. 61a and Davies (1997) p. 9. In 1808 Niethammer published *Der Streit des Philanthropinismus und des Humanismus in der Theorie des Erziehungs-Unterrichts unsrer Zeit* (*The Struggle of Philanthropism and Humanism in the Educational Theory of Our Time*), which sought to reconcile the practical and philosophy-centred educational 'philanthropinism' of the Enlightenment with a classical humanist civic-minded education based on Cicero's *humanitas*.
With reference to the word history in Great Britain, the *OED* shows, after the first appearance in 1618 in the sense of 'the pursuit of human or earthly interests to exclusion of moral or religious considerations' and the theological usages meaning the 'doctrine that Christ's nature was human only and not divine' appearing in 1790 and 1795, the emergence of the actual meaning 'Literary learning or culture; devotion to or expertise in the humanities, esp. classical scholarship' in 1836 (as a transliteration of the German *Humanismus*), and esp. of that relating to the Renaissance in 1849, parallel to the emergence of human-centred ideological meanings (classified in n° 5a and b) in 1848 or 1853, most likely under the influence of Feuerbach and Marx's idea of *Entfremdung*, Auguste Comte's atheistic positivism, and his friend John Stuart Mill's religion of humanity. See Davies (1997). In terms of the sustainability of the word, Niethammer's merit as an inventor seems unassailable.
For France, see *TLFi*: '**1.** 1765 'amour de l'humanité' (*Éphémérides du Citoyen*, n° 16, I, p. 247 ds BRUNOT t. 6, p. 119), attest. isolée; 1846 philos. 'doctrine qui prend pour fin la personne humaine' (PROUDHON, *loc. cit.* [*Syst. contrad. écon.* ds *Œuvres choisies*, Paris, Gallimard, 1967 [1846], pp. 243–244.]); **2.** 1877 'mouvement intellectuel européen des XVe et XVIe s. qui préconisait un retour aux sources antiques par opposition à la scolastique' (*R. des 2 Mondes*, 15 mars, p. 273 ds LITTRÉ *Suppl.*)'. The first mention relating to the Italian Renaissance is in an article 'Les Borgia' in 1877 by H. Blaze de Bury, who knew German as a translator of *Faust*, and one must expect the influence of Burckhardt's *Die Cultur der Renaissance in Italien*, published in 1860, a best-seller at the time [see Buck (1991) p. 53; first French transl. in 1885], the third part of which, 'Die Wiedererwechung des Altertums', deals with Italian humanism. From the 1880s, humanism was much discussed in the Parisian academic world: 1887, E. Müntz and P. Fabre, *La Bibliothèque du Vatican au XVe siècle: d'après les documents*

jargon '*umanista*', which in late fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century Italy referred to the teacher of grammar and rhetoric.[281] But the world of the humanists as we understand it today—that of philologists, literary scholars and writers interested in classical literature—extended beyond the borders in Renaissance Europe, as J.-C. Margolin clearly shows in a little book of the same name,[282] and its 'prince' at the beginning of the sixteenth century was undoubtedly Erasmus. Critical editor of Terence, Seneca, Ambrose and Augustine,[283] he was better able than anyone to quote the verse of Terence, and he did so in the most read and rhetorical of his books, *Praise of Folly* (written in 1509 and published in 1511),[284] but his way of quoting differs from that of Seneca and the Church Fathers, whom he knew very well. In chapter 30,[285] the goddess of Madness challenges the Stoic sage, whom 'twice the Stoic Seneca ... deprives ... absolutely of all passions' like 'a marble statue in the image of man, but unconscious and completely alien to the slightest human

---

inédits, contributions pour servir à l'histoire de l'humanisme (BNF catalogue); 1891, inaugural lecture by E. Faguet at the Sorbonne [Chamard (1920) p. 241]; 1892, P. de Nolhac, *Pétrarque et l'humanisme*; 1894, preface to *Seizième siècle* by Faguet (*ibid.* p. 242); 1897, H. Hauser's essay 'L'Humanisme et la Réforme en France' (*ibid.* p. 243).

281) Campagna (1946) p. 61 considered the first occurrence of the word *umanista* to be in a document from Bologna in 1512. Kristeller (1961) p. 160 n. 61 has found an earlier occurrence of the form *humanista* in a letter of 1490 from the Rector of the University of Pisa. Kristeller *ibid.* p. 111 warns against confusion between the Renaissance title *umanista* and the 19th-century philosophical coinage *humanism*. See also Grendler (1967) p. 317. Margolin (1981) p. 9 says that 'les premiers exemples connus remontent au début du XVe siècle en Italie', but this seems to be a misprint for 'XVIe'. On Renaissance *humanism* and its *humanitas*, see also Høgel (2015) pp. 99–113.

282) Margolin (1981). See also Margolin (2007).

283) Reynolds and Wilson (1991) p. 162. On Erasmus' high opinion of Terence, see McPherson (1981) pp. 20–21. On Erasmus as editor of Terence, see Dane (1999) pp. 120–26.

284) 1st unauthorised edition (Paris, 1511), 1st authorised edition (Paris, 1512), see Erasmus (1979b) p. ix-x and xxxiv.

285) The chapter divisions used in modern editions of *Praise of Folly* were introduced by Meusnier de Querlon in 1751, Erasmus (1953) p. 8 n. *.

feeling'.[286] On the other hand, she values an ordinary man—her *stultus*: Quis autem non malit vel unumquemvis de media stultissimorum hominum plebe, qui stultus stultis vel imperare possit vel parere, qui sui similibus placeat, sed quamplurimis, qui comis sit in uxorem, jucundus amicis, bellum conviva, convictor facilis, postremo qui *nihil humani a se alienum putet*? (Who would not prefer someone chosen at random from the mob of out-and-out fools? Being a fool himself, he could either command fools or obey them, please his peers (who are clearly in the majority), be companionable with his wife, cheerful with his friends, a fine table companion, an easy-going messmate. In short, *he considers nothing human foreign to him.*) [my italics].[287] It is clear that Erasmus, or his Folly, is not speaking here of Stoic solidarity in the Senecan or Ambrosian style—Seneca is the main antagonist[288]—nor of Christian Love of neighbour in the Augustinian and Salisburian manner, but of human sensitivity and hedonistic sociability. Hedonism comes remarkably close to Pliny the Younger's '*homo sum*', though the latter is more individualistic. In the whole history of verse, the case of Erasmus is unique, unless one includes Pliny the Younger, which remains highly questionable (see above), and at the same time it is rhetorically subtle enough to aim the Terentian verse which was Seneca's own weapon at him.

286) Erasmus (1979a) p. 106, Erasmus (2016) vol. 2 p. 64, transl. from Chomarat's Erasmus (1991) pp. 144–5. Despite his belief in Stoic *apatheia* (*Ep.* 9.1–2, 85.2–12, 116.1), Seneca would not have recognized this as his own opinion, for he said (*Ep.* 71.27): Non educo sapientem ex hominum numero nec dolores ab illo sicut ab aliqua rupe nullum sensum admittente summoveo (I do not put the sage in a separate class from the rest of humankind, and neither do I eliminate pain and grief from him as if he were some sort of rock, not susceptible to any feeling), transl. Seneca (2015) p. 220. In order to attack Stoicism, Erasmus deliberately inverts Seneca's argument. The critique of Stoic *apatheia* has its Christian precedents, which insist on human sufferings of Christ (see above n. 175). But the rhetoric leaves no trace of Christian charity here.

287) Erasmus (1979a) p. 106, Erasmus (2016) vol. 2 p. 64, transl. Erasmus (1979b) p. 46.

288) Erasmus does not deny the value of Stoicism and Seneca, far from it. We should take into account the rhetorical and declamatory nature of the book. On his Stoicism, see the recent update by Pitkin (2016) pp. 148–50.

On the other hand, the *Adagia* does not mention the verse. This shows Erasmus' lack of interest in the line as a Latin tag: he did not find in it a cultural and linguistic complexity that his philological skills could elucidate. This echoes the indifference of Renaissance humanism towards the verse. In the eyes of the humanists, the line is so simple and straightforward that it requires only references to Cicero and Seneca[289)] (as well as Ambrose and Augustine), their basic knowledge. The path to the modern popularity of the verse,[290)] which did not follow the main road of Renaissance philological humanism but was prepared by the rhetoric of the *Praise of Folly*, seems to have been opened by Montaigne's *Essays*.

Montaigne

Half a century later it was Montaigne who followed Erasmus. As early as 1549 he bought an edition of Terence, *P. Terentii Comoedias* (Basel, Froben, 1538), endorsed by Erasmus, and on his copy he inscribed his name, the date of purchase and his age: 'Michael Montanus Burdigalensis hujus possessor 1549 aetatis anno prope 16. Ca. Ja [n.]' (Michel de Montaigne, of Bordeaux, owner of this book, 1549, almost 16 years old on the first of Jan.), then added his commoner surname 'Eyquemius', and in the margins he added more than 200

289) With regard to the line, in addition to Calphurnius' commentary, Giovanni Maria Bonelli's 1561 Venetian edition (fols 102^{r}-103^{r}) includes Guy Jouenneaux's (1450?-1507) short note on natural sociability, Barthélemy Latomus' (1485–1566) rhetorical note 'Replicatio ex coniugatis' (Reply from etymological relation [probably Latomus is talking about 'etymological relation' between *homo* and *humanum*]), Pietro Marso's (1441–1511) full reference to Seneca's *Ep.* 95 immediately after his quote from Cic. *Fin.* 3.63, and Heinrich Glarean's (1488–1563) metrical note 'Homo iambui est, vel m, in Sum non eliditur' (*Homo* is iambic [i.e. short syllable-long syllable], or *m* in *sum* does not elide).

290) Guillaume Antoine Le Monnier (1723–97) will say: 'Ce vers est un des plus beaux de Térence' in his *Les Comédies de Térence* (Paris, 1771) vol. 2 p. 236. For the change in popularity, Lefèvre (1994) pp. 32–53, albeit with some omissions, counts 3 quotations in the 16th century, none in the 17th, 38 in the 18th, 19 in the 19th. On the 18th-century boom associated with the Enlightenment human rights, see Delon (1984).

annotations—unfortunately none relating to our verse.[291)] Erasmus is said to have produced Froben's edition of 1532, of which this 1538 edition is a reprint, but J.A. Dane believes that his contribution was very limited, on his own testimony[292)] that 'quatriduanam opellam' (four days of little work) was spent only on the metrical difficulties of *Andria* and part of other plays, leaving the rest of the work to the apprentices (*adolescentulis*).[293)] Montaigne had another edition of Terence, that of Paris, R. Estienne, 1541,[294)] which is

---

291) Legros (https). For the image of the title page signed by Montaigne, see http://www.bvh.univ-tours.fr/MONLOE/Terence_img/1_TitreExlib.jpg
'Although still only sixteen, Montaigne splurged on ... magnificent folio edition', Hoffmann (2012) p. 121. Montaigne says: 'I left College at thirteen', Montaigne (1991) p. 197; I 26, 175A. As for the reference to the *Essais*, after the numbers of book (Roman numeral), chapter and Montaigne (1992)'s page, the capital alphabet represents the level of the text: A is the text of the 1580 edition, B that of 1588, and C the handwritten additions on the Bordeaux copy (now in the Bordeaux Municipal Library).
On the Froben copy, see also Legros (2010) pp. 22–3, 63–4, 161–205, 750 no 88. He believes that the annotations were made in two stages, immediately after the acquisition and around 1553, *ibid.* p. 22. According to *ibid.* pp. 161–205, *Andria* receives 176 annotations, *Eunuchus* 43, *Heautontimorumenos* only one, *Adelphoe* 4, *Hecyra* and *Phormio* one each (the plays are in this order in the edition). Clearly Montaigne's enthusiasm vanished in the middle of *Eunuchus.* The only comment on *Haut.* concerns lines 364–5 of Syrus 'in tempore ad eam veni, quod rerum omnium est | primum.' (I went to her at the right time, the most important point of all. Transl. Brothers (1998) p. 77). It says: 'γνῶθι ~~σεαυτὸν~~ καιρ[όν] | Auzon. in Pittaco.' (Know ~~yourself~~ the opportune moment. Ausonius on Pittacos) Legros (2010) p. 202. At first Montaigne mistakenly wrote σεαυτὸν (yourself) in confusion with the Delphic maxim, then crossed it out. This comment, taken from Auson. *Ludus septem sapientum* 9 (see Legros *ibid.* p. 208), shows his sole gnomic but not philological or literary concern. The most Terentian quotes (8) in the *Essays* come from *Adelphoe*, followed by *Haut.* with 6 (vv. 77, 80, 94, 149/147, 195–6, 621), Lawton (1970–72) vol. 2 pp. 62, 195–204.

292) Terence (1532) fol. α 3^{r}.

293) Dane (1999) p. 123.

294) Now in the Cambridge Univ. Library (Montaigne's Library). The copy was signed with his name, but not annotated. Cf. Legros (2010) p. 750 no 89. Hoffmann (2004) p. 961 says of this copy: 'bequeathed by La Boétie?'.

textually very close to Froben's, and both editions bear the note of Calphurnius.[295] The note, as we have seen, is in the spirit not of Terence imitating Menander, nor of Augustine preaching Love of neighbour, but of Cicero advocating Stoic cosmopolitanism and universal κοινωνία. Montaigne must have studied Terence at the Collège de Guyenne[296]—he was there from 1539 to 1546 or 1548—and then read Terence privately in addition to these school studies.[297] On the basis of a rumour (‘Non obscura fama est adjutum Terentium in scriptis a Laelio et Scipione’, Rumour has it clearly that Terence was assisted in writing his works by Laelius and Scipio) reported by *Terentii vitae ... ex Aelio Donato* (mainly a copy of Suetonius' *De vita Terentii*),[298] he was fully convinced of the true authorship of Scipio and Laelius under the name of their slave.[299]

Since 1571, Montaigne has had the famous phrases painted on the beams of his tower library,[300] and Terence's verse is one of them: sentence n° 19, ‘HOMO SVM HVMANI A ME NIHIL ALIENUM PVTO’.[301] Since the adjoining

---

295) For the similarity between the Estienne and the Froben editions (rather the ‘piracies’ of one on the other), see Dane (1999) pp. 123–5. For Calphurnius' note, see Terence (1538) pp. 157–8 (BNF's Gallica) and R. Estienne's Terence (1541) pp. 161–2 (Cambridge Univ., Montaigne's Library). Only variant in Terence (1541): ...partem ... partem] ...parte ... parte (see above n. 250). Hoffmann (2004) p. 960 erroneously attributes this note to Donatus (see below n. 303).

296) Trinquet (1972) p. 443 n. 68, Bolgar (1973) p. 362, Hoffmann (2004) p. 961.

297) I 26, 175A. For his appreciation of Terence, see II 10, 411A. As a student he read in another, now lost, copy in one of the many ‘quarto school texts or inexpensive octavo volumes’ [Hoffmann (2012) p. 121] published in the late 1530's or early 1540's. It may have been Gouveia's 1541 quarto edition.

298) Terence (1538) fol. α 5^r = Terence (1541) p. 12 = *Vita Terenti* 4, Donatus (1902–03) vol. 1 p. 5.

299) I 40, 250A ‘certainement Scipion et Lælius ... à un serf Afriquain... Terence l'advoüe luy mesme’; II 10, 411A ‘Terence ... sent bien mieux son Gentilhomme’; III 13, 1109B ‘Scipion ... s'amusant ... à representer par escript en comedies...’; Montaigne (1992) p. 1254 note on p. 250 l. 4.

300) III 3, 828BC ‘[B] At home I slip off to my library a little more often... [C] It is on the third storey of a tower’, Montaigne (1991) p. 933.

301) Legros (2000) pp. 251–7 (on the date), 339–40 (on the verse of Terence). The word order *‘humani a me nihil’* is identical to Froben's Terence (1538) p. 154

beams bear phrases of agnosticism, human fickleness and sapiential moderation,[302)] the line appeared to be tinted with scepticism. Accordingly, regardless of the original meaning or the Christian-Stoic one, Alain Legros suggests two possible meanings: 'Étant donné que je suis homme, je n'échappe à rien de ce qui constitue la condition humaine (Being human, I do not escape anything that constitutes human condition)' and '...tout ce que font les hommes m'importe (...Everything that men do matters to me)'.[303)] But both of

---

and R. Estienne's Terence (1541) p. 257, and is a standard reading of Renaissance editions. See above n. 270. António de Gouveia, headmaster of the Collège de Guyenne (I, 26, 176 B 'Andreas Goveanus, nostre principal') gave an edition of Terence (1541a), of which p. 104 has the same word order *'à me nil'*. Another teacher at the Collège (I, 26, 174B, 176B), Marc-Antoine Muret, also adopted this order when, after leaving Bordeaux, he made a new Aldine edition of Terence (1555) fol. 55^{v}. Lawton (1970–72) vol. 1 pp. 311–12 evaluates Muret's work as more educational than academic. Muret said of Gouveia: 'ei [Ant. Goveani] Terentii amatores multum se debere fateantur' (The lovers of Terence recognize themselves to be greatly indebted to António de Gouveia), Lawton *ibid.* p. 308 n. 3.

302) Legros (2000) pp. 335–8, 341–2. n° 18/s 'Nescis homo hoc an illud magis expediat an aeque utrumque. Eccl. 11' (Thou, man, knowest not whether shall prosper, either this or that, or whether they both shall be alike good.) (*Eccles.* 11:6 modified); n° 18/i 'Quo me cunque rapit tempestas deferor hospes' (Where every wind drives me, I let myself be carried as a guest.) (Hor. *Epist.* 1.1.15); n° 20 'Ne plus sapias quam necesse est ne obstupescas. Eccl. 7' (Be not over much [wise], neither be thou foolish) (*Eccles.* 7:17). The two Bible verses are translated from the KJV (modified), which is quite appropriate here. On 'expediat' (it is suitable, profitable) instead of the Vulgate's ambiguous 'oriatur' (arise, occur), see Céard (1971) p. 371; it is an equivalent for the Septuagint στοιχήσει (στοιχέω 'to fit', or according to Thayer (1889) p. 589 'to go on prosperously, to turn out well', which is a conjectured meaning from the Hebrew text, see Gesenius (1953) p. 506: כשר be advantageous, proper, suitable, succeed ... *Impf.* יִכְשָׁר Ec 11[6] thou knowest not whether this *shall succeed*, or this).

303) Legros (2000) p. 339 n. 107. Hoffmann (2004) p. 960 gives three meanings: 'as an injunction for human solidarity (moral meaning, which the verse has in Terence), or as a praise of human potential (Platonic meaning, which Donatus' commentary [for which Hoffmann mistakes Calphurnius'] provides...), or conversely, as an admonition to human humility (ethical meaning, which Montaigne chooses when he quotes it in the *Essays*, II 2. 346) [original in French]. However, his 'Platonic

these proposed meanings are merely an afterthought, for they are taken from the *Essays*, which are to be written later: the first comes from the way in which the verse is used there, in the very sense that we shall see, and the second expresses Montaigne's intention to picture the man that will be proclaimed throughout the *Essays*.[304)] Rather than impose an afterthought on this painted maxim, I shall confine myself to pointing out that the verse itself, surrounded as it is by a cloud of sceptics on the ceiling of the library, does not carry these meanings, nor does it even allude to them, in the text and notes of the editions he owed, as well as in his favourite classical authors. Of the meanings that do exist, only Erasmus' anti-Stoic view of human sensibility fits the bill, or 'I am fragile, I can make mistakes', which Robert Estienne in his dictionary mistakenly ascribes to Terence's 'homo sum'.[304 *bis*)]

He quotes the verse only once, in chapter II 2 'De l'yvrognerie' (On drunkenness), an essay more Plutarchian than philosophical, which gathers all sorts of historical, ethical, anecdotal, autobiographical information on this vice. At the end of the chapter, he tackles a philosophical problem on impenetrability of the wise to wine, which Seneca had treated at length,[305)] and Montaigne dismisses the discussion as silly vanity: 'Whether the soul of a wise man should be such as to surrender to the power of wine is an old and entertaining question... To what inanities are we driven by that good opinion we men have of ourselves! ... A man can be as wise as he likes: he is still a man ... Wisdom cannot force our natural properties... When he is threatened with a

meaning' is completely misleading, since Calphurnius' rewriting of the Ciceronian passage speaks of academic or rather Stoic κοινωνία, as seen above at n. 255, but not of 'human potential' at all. And his 'moral meaning, which the verse has in Terence' is inappropriate (see above the section 'Terence').

304) For example, I 22, 105C 'In the study I am making of manners and motives... Whether it happened or not, to Peter or John, in Rome or in Paris, it still remains within the compass of what human beings are capable of', Montaigne (1991) p. 119; III 2, 804B 'Others form Man; I give an account of Man and sketch a picture of a particular one of them...', *ibid.* p. 907.

304 *bis*) See above n. 262.

305) *Ep.* 83.8 ff. On the question of drinking in Stoicism, see Arnold (1911) pp. 346–7. Intoxication was much discussed by the Greek philosophers, see Bailey (1972) p. 1077.

blow nothing can stop a man closing his eyes, or trembling if you set him on the edge of a precipice... He becomes livid with fear; he reddens with shame; he bewails an attack of colic paroxysms if not with a loud cry of despair at least with a cry which is broken and wheezing. | *Humani a se nihil alienum putet*'.[306] He attacks the inhuman impassibility of the Stoic sage as much as Erasmus' Goddess of Madness does, and quotes Chremes' verse as much as she does. Accordingly, Hugo Friedrich is quite right in his judgement on this matter: 'To the Stoic he objects: you cannot escape the human condition... Terence's verse, which echoes throughout the literature of humanism with its so many interpretations, has here found the particular meaning that suits Montaigne: bow to your weak human condition, impossible to escape from it', and in a footnote: 'as Montaigne, so Erasmus, *Praise of Folly* (... cap. 30) uses it'.[307] Against the Stoic impassibility (ἀπάθεια), Montaigne appropriated the Erasmian weapon that is the verse of Terence,[308] and he could only do so through the *Praise of Folly*, for, as we have seen, nowhere else is the Terentian quote expressing anti-Stoicism to be found. But compared to the Dutch humanist, who saw in it a pleasant conviviality of ordinary men, the French thinker undoubtedly takes a step forward by adding a new philosophical dimension: his scepticism or awareness of the limits of man, which would be, from a certain point of view, a return to the origin of θνητὰ φρονεῖν (think humanly), an archaic Greek desire for human modesty that could be reflected in the Bordeaux copy in an optative *putet*.[309] This is a rare

306) Montaigne (1991) p. 388; II 2, 345-6A.

307) Friedrich (1993) p. 165 and p. 360 n. 124, French transl. Friedrich (1969) p. 187 and p. 402 n. 124. For the division of chapters in the *Praise of Folly*, see above n. 285.

308) Montaigne's attitude to Stoicism and Seneca is no less ambivalent than that of Erasmus (see above n. 288). See the entries 'Sénèque' and 'stoïcisme' by A. Tarrête in *Dictionnaire de Montaigne* (2004) pp. 904-8, 933-8. Delon (1984) pp. 281-2 sees the inversion of Montaigne's meaning as a preparation for the optimism of Enlightenment (praise of wine by Voltaire and Roucher).

309) The 1580 edition had the indicative 'putat', and in the Bordeaux copy (after 1588) Montaigne chose the optative. See Legros (2000) p. 339, Montaigne (2007) p. 1507 note *i* on p. 365.

According to Jocelyn (1973) p. 20, Georgius Erhardus—pseudonym of Michael

stroke of luck, and it must be admitted that Montaigne had no scholarly intention of going back to the Greek origin. Having read Plutarch, Sextus Empiricus, Diogenes Laertius, Stobaeus, Lucretius, Cicero and Seneca,[310] he was more imbued with Hellenistic thought than any of his contemporaries, which allowed him to catch a glimpse of θνητὰ φρονεῖν.

English Renaissance. Robert Burton

In the early seventeenth century, the English Renaissance was represented by two authors who quoted the verse: Robert Burton and Francis Bacon.

Robert Burton quotes it in his masterpiece *The Anatomy of Melancholy* (first published in 1621).[311] His style is characteristic of late Renaissance humanism, with its over-emphasis of the *copia*, where a plan of composition is unclear (his *synopsis* of each section is not modern but scholastic), digressions

---

Caspar Lundorpius, see Sochatoff (1976) pp. 337–8—in the edition of Petronius (Frankfurt 1610, p. 639), for the comparison with 75.1 ‘nemo... nostrum non peccat. Homines sumus, non dei’, quotes the verse ‘in the same way as did Montaigne’, although Erhardus’ quotation is criticized as irrelevant by P. Burman (edition of Petronius, Utrecht 1709) and A.H. Westerhoff (edition of Terence, The Hague 1726). See above n. 5.

310) Villey (1933) s.v. each author. On Plutarch, Konstantinovic (1989); on Lucretius, Screech (1998); on Seneca, Hill Hay (1938), Pire (1954a) (1954b). On Diog. Laert., Coleman (1995) pp. 31–2 overestimates Montaigne’s knowledge of Greek. Evidence (e.g. ‘La vertu, dict Antisthenes, se contente de soy : sans *disciplines*, sans paroles, sans effects’ I 39, 241C = Diog. Laert. 6.11 ἀπεδείκνυε ... αὐτάρκη δὲ τὴν ἀρετὴν πρὸς εὐδαιμονίαν ... τήν τ᾽ἀρετὴν τῶν ἔργων εἶναι, μήτε λόγων πλείστων δεομένην μήτε μαθημάτων. ([Antisthenes] proved ... that virtue is self-sufficient for happiness ... and that virtue is actions and does not need a lot of words or learning) = Sufficere virtutem ad beatam vitam...Virtutem quoque operum esse, neque verbis multis, neque *disciplinis* indigentem [transl. Ambrosius Camaldulensis] (Virtue suffices for happy life... Virtue is also actions, and does not need a lot of word or discipline), Montaigne (1920) vol. 4 p. 117 [my italics]) attests to his reading in Latin, even if he sometimes could see some word or another in Greek edition. He used also a Latin transl. of Stob. (by Conrad Gesner) printed alongside the original.

311) Neither Lefèvre (1986) nor Lefèvre (1994) mention his quotations.

or even volte-faces are frequent, countless classical Latin quotations[312] and modern references are piled up indiscriminately, often without mentioning their origin, regardless of their validity, and in a highly allusive manner; there is rarely any unexpected personal information, no deep scientific concern[313] guides its scholastic-humanist argumentation, and encyclopaedic pedantry without criticism prevails.[314] Had he written his work in Latin, it would have been considered as a mere example of the unoriginal Renaissance compilations written by mean imitators of Aulus Gellius, this time on the medical subject of 'melancholy'. The third *partition* of his book deals with 'love-melancholy'. In the Preface to this *partition* 3.1.1.1, Burton apologizes at astonishing length for talking about love, which can be a frivolous and immoral matter. He insists on

---

312) He sometimes includes Latin phrases of his own invention.

313) J.B. Bamborough points out his *mathematical* concern (surveying, astrology and astronomy), Burton (1989–2000) vol. 1 pp. xix-xx. But compared to his contemporaries John Napier (1550–1617), Galileo Galilei (1564–1642) and Johannes Kepler (1571–1630), Burton (1577–1640) was obviously very far behind in the field. His interest in medicine was not as professional as that of Andreas Vesalius (1514–1564) or William Harvey (1578–1657), *ibid.* p. xxi. Douglas Bush seems to be right in his assessment of Burton's science: 'sitting between Bacon and Hobbes, he appears as a kind of gargoyle between the two spires of the cathedral of English scientific thought' (quoted by O'Connell (1986) p. 37; although Bamborough somewhat disagrees, Burton (1989–2000) vol. 1 p. xviii). Amateurism pervades all his work. He was not even a philologist. He was essentially an antiquarian humanist, as his status as a librarian suggests. Or rather, his work was a *Library of a Book*, as O'Connell (1986) p. 48 put it, a book that somehow contained all the bookish knowledge available to him.

314) Burton's English has its stigmata: dense pronouns that are often unclear as to what they refer to, and sentences that are too long to know where they are going. O'Connell (1986) pp. 34–6 shows the various ways in which *The Anatomy of Melancholy* has been interpreted: its original therapeutic purpose, its later use as a source of Latin tags (for a Laurence Stern) or antique tales (for a Charles Lamb), and the paradoxical reading of 20th-century criticism. O'Connell *ibid.* pp. 38–9 insists on the impersonal nature of the work: 'unlike Montaigne, Burton never portrays his own interior experience', and on the universality of its aim, quoting our verse (!): 'nothing human can be alien to his subject or to his book' (*ibid.* p. 40).

soundness of his conduct by saying that other serious people have done what he does, and his way of arguing is, as usual, to collect an enormous number of authorities of every kind, known and unknown, ancient, medieval or modern (see below appendix 2). In this great ocean of quotations, which extends over six pages, Burton will finally quote our verse:

'Hoc etiam quod scribo, pendet plerumque ex aliorum sententia et authoritate, nec ipse forsan insanio sed insanientes sequor. Atqui detur hoc insanire me, *Semel insanivimus omnes*,[315] et tute ipse opinor insanis aliqundo, et is, et ille, et ego, scilicet,

Homo sum, humani a me nihil alienum puto:[316] [italics in original].

(Even this that I write depends mainly on the opinion and authority of others; perhaps I am not mad myself, but only follow madmen. And supposing I am mad, *'we have all been mad once'*; I imagine you yourself are mad at times, and that man, and the other fellow, and I am too, that is to say *'I am a man, and I find nothing human alien to me'*).[317]

Three lines in Latin '*Hoc ... scilicet*' immediately preceding Terence's verse are Burton's invention. Why did he write them in Latin rather than English? Any answer other than his pedantry is difficult to give, or perhaps, in the Jacobean mentality, speaking of madness ('*insanio*, *insanientes*, *insanire*, *insanivimus*, *insanis*') might have seemed indecent.[318] In logical connection ('*scilicet*'), Terence's *Homo sum* here means *homo insanus sum*, and Burton wants to share in the common madness of talking about love. This is proved by the following sentence, written in an archaic style: 'And which hee urgeth for himselfe, accused of the like fault, I as justly plead'.[319] Just as '*hee*', Chremes, justifies himself ('*which hee urgeth for himselfe*') for his criticized interference, so and with the same justice ('*as justly*') Burton makes his plea.

---

315) Baptista Mantuanus (late 15th-century Italian humanist poet), *Adulescentia*, 1.118.

316) Burton (1989–2000) vol. 3 p. 6, see also Burton (2023) p. 673.

317) Transl. *ibid.* vol. 6 p. 6 note on l. 12–16.

318) Although Jacobean tragedy often overtly referred to madness on stage, for example *Hamlet* and *King Lear.* See Higgins (1945) p. 187; for recent and thorough study, see Salkeld (1993).

319) Burton (1989–2000) vol. 3 p. 6. Burton (2023) p. 674 slightly modernised.

Why did Burton not mention Terence by name, although he did so in two subsequent verses, with Martial and Ovid, by adding notes of his own?[320] It was to obscure the referent of 'hee', Terence or Chremes, for it was Chremes and not Terence who was the justifier, but Terence was the poet. In Burton's mind, all great poets indispensably vindicate themselves for their frivolous literary creation in order to set precedents for his own practice. This quotation can be compared to Pliny the Younger's suspect quotation and Bandello's in terms of literary creation and the sense of shame involved, although with them there is no direct connection. On the other hand, Burton's quotation is so completely embedded in the great web of citations (see appendix 2), and so immediately connected ('*scilicet*') to his own preceding Latin sentences, that all the enormous evocative power of Latin tag is lost. Almost no reader of *The Anatomy of Melancholy* will have stopped to admire this quotation.

Once again he quotes half of the verse at the end of 3.2.3.1, entitled 'Symptomes or Signes of Love Melancholy, in Body, Minde, good, bad, etc.': 'But I conclude there is no end of Loves Symptoms, 'tis a bottomless pit, Love is subject to no dimensions; not to be survayed by any art or engine: and besides I am of Haedus[321] minde, *no man can discourse of love matters, or judge of them aright, that hath not made triall in his owne person*, or as *Æneas Sylvius*[322] addes, *hath not a little doted, beene mad or love sicke himselfe*. I confess I am but a novice, a Contemplator only,

Nescio quid sit amor nec amo—[323]

320) '[b]*Lasciva est nobis pagina, vita proba est,*
Howsoever my lines erre, my life is honnest,
[c]*Vita verecunda est, musa jocosa mihi.*
[b]*Mart.*
[c]*Ovid.*' [italics in original], Burton (1989–2000) vol. 3 p. 6 and Burton (2023) p. 674 slightly modernised.

321) See below n. 369.

322) The source is unknown. Enea Silvio Piccolomini, Italian humanist, diplomat, later Pope Pius II (1405–1464).

323) 'Nescio quid sit amor; noli me sollicitare' (I do not know what love is. I do not want to be afflicted with it) [Kloocke (1973) p. 528] is medieval distichal parody of Verg. *Ecl.* 43 'Nunc scio, quid sit Amor' (Now I know what love is). There was a variation of this: 'Nescio quid sit amor nec amo nec amo nec amavi | sed scio: si

I have a tincture, for why should I lye, dissemble or excuse it, yet *homo sum*, etc., not altogether inexpert in this subject, *non sum praeceptor amandi*,[324] and what I say, is meerely reading, *ex aliorum forsan ineptiis*,[325] by mine owne observation, and others relation.'[326] [italics in original].

In concluding this *member* on 'love's symptoms', Burton confesses his inability to carry out the task, for love deprives one of the judgement needed for it, and Burton himself is a 'novice' lover ('*I have a tincture*'). 'Yet *homo sum*, etc.' is his confession of human feelings, which is in line with Erasmus and Montaigne, and its truncated form is exactly the same as Pliny the Younger's hedonistic *homo sum* (*Ep.* 5.3.2),[327] so Burton may have had it in mind as well.

Francis Bacon

Another case of the English Renaissance is that of Francis Bacon.[328] After greatly expanding *The Twoo Bookes of the proficience and advancement of Learning, divine and humane* (1605), he published in Latin in 1623 the nine books of *De dignitate et augmentis scientiarum*.[329] This work, placed in the

quis amat, uritur igne gravi' (I do not know what love is, I do not love, I do not love, I have not loved, but I know that if you love, you burn in terrible flames). See Rubio (1989–90) p. 407 n. 43. The late 16th-century Slovenian composer Jacobus Gallus (Jacob Händel) wrote a song based on this variation (first published in 1589), Handl (1970) pp. 103–109.

324) 'I am not an instructor in love', Ov. *Tr.* 1.1.67: non sum praeceptor amoris, Burton (1989–2000) vol. 6 p. 126 note on l. 2.

325) 'Perhaps from the follies of others', *ibid.* note on l. 3. Probably Burton's invention.

326) *Ibid.* vol. 3 pp. 195–6. Burton (2023) p. 851 slightly modernised.

327) See above.

328) Neither Lefèvre (1986) nor Lefèvre (1994) mention his quotation. See Garrett (2014) p. 10.

329) Bacon (1623). Elliott (1966) p. 91 evaluates the first edition as follows: 'Although Bacon intended the *Advancement of Learning* as little more than a sketch of what was to follow in the *Magna Instauratio*, as a "kind of call-bell to awaken and attract the interest of others in the thoughts and hopes which so interested himself," although it appears that Bacon wrote it in something of a rush, although it is marred by pedantries, and by inadequacy of information about the stage of scientific discovery that had been reached in Bacon's time, still the work is one of

first part of his summa-like programme of philosophical system 'Instauratio Magna (Great Instauration)' and thus before the *Novum Organum*, constitutes a general survey of the existent sciences and of their progress.[330)] The second chapter of the Book IV deals with divisions of 'the knowledge of the Human Body' and in particular with medicine.[331)] In describing the art of medicine, he emphasizes the complexity of the human body, and therefore the fundamentally conjectural nature of medicine: 'This variable and subtile [*sic*] composition, and fabric of the human body, makes it like a kind of curious musical instrument, easily disordered... The subject being so variable has rendered the art more conjectural, and left the more room for imposture'.[332)] The 'weakness and credulity of men is such, that they often prefer a mountebank, or a cunning woman, to a learned physician'.[333)] From the instability of their art, it follows that physicians 'commonly study some other art, or science, more than their profession. Hence, we find among them poets, antiquaries, critics, orators, politicians, theologians, and in each more knowing than in medicine'.[334)] Here he cites *De incertitudine et vanitate scientiarum*

---

the two things that Bacon will be most remembered for (the *Essays* being the other), and it represents some of Bacon's best prose style.' For the second edition, see Coquillette (1992) p. 236.

330) See *Instauratio Magna*, Distributio operis (1:134); transl. (4:22). All parenthetical references are to the volume and page number of Bacon (1858-74). See also Quinton (1980) p. 19, Urbach (1987) p. 7, Coquillette (1992) pp. 334-5 and Zagorin (1998) pp. 74-5.

331) Bacon (1901) p. 182. On Bacon's view of medicine, see Urbach (1987) pp. 144-7 and Box (1989) pp. 358-63.

332) Transl. Bacon (1901) p. 183. (4:380) slightly different transl. First edition's corresponding passage: 'So then the *Subject* being so *Variable*, hath made the *Art* by consequent more *conjecturall*, and the Art being Conjecturall, hath made so much the more place to bee left for imposture', Bacon (1605) fol. 39[v] [italics in original] = (3:371) = Bacon (2008) p. 209.

333) Transl. Bacon (1901) 184. (4:381) slightly different transl. First edition's corresponding passage: 'Nay, we see weakenesse and credulitie of men, is such, as they will often preferre a Montabanke or Witch, before a learned Phisitian', Bacon (1605) fol. 39[v] = (3:371) = Bacon (2008) p. 209.

334) Transl. Bacon (1901) p. 184 modified. (4:381) slightly different transl. First edition's corresponding passage: 'they use commonly to intend some other Art or

(first published in Cologne, 1527) of Heinrich Cornelius Agrippa von Nettesheim, the notorious sixteenth-century German slanderer of his own profession,[335] and quotes our verse: Neque hoc fit, ut arbitror, quia (ut quidam declamator contra scientias medicis objicit) habeant quae sibi obversentur objecta tam foeda et tristia, ut animum ad alia abducere iis omnino sit opus; (nam qui homines sint, *Nihil humani a se alienum putent*;[336]).[337] (And this does not happen, in my opinion, because (as a certain slanderer of the sciences says of physicians) they are so often in contact with loathsome and sad spectacles that it is necessary for them to divert their minds from them to other things. For, being men, 'they consider nothing human to be alien to them').[338] Thus, the Terentian *humanum* means the natural reaction of physicians to their ordinary acquaintance with dirty, sad and disgusting things, such as disease, wound, ulcer, bleeding, decay, gangrene, cough, stench, phlegm, urine, excrement, diarrhoea, vomiting, agony or death; that is to say, it

---

practise, which they fancie, more than their profession. For you shall have of them: Antiquaries, Poets, Humanists, States-men, Marchants, Divines, and in everie of these better seene, than in their profession', Bacon (1605) fol. 40r = (3:372) = Bacon (2008) p. 210.

335) *De incertitudine et vanitate scientiarum*, cap. 83 'De medicina operatrice' (Of clinical medicine): 'Sunt praeterea medici plerunque contagiosi, et ab objectis urinis et stercoribus foetulenti, lotiolenti, sterculenti, et ipsis obstetricibus sordidiores ac sensibus omnibus infecti...' (Moreover, physicians are often infected, stinking of urine and stools presented to them, wet with urine, dungy, dirtier than midwives, soiled in all senses...), Agrippa von Nettesheim (1970) vol. 2 p. 243.

336) Bacon recorded the verse in his handwritten commonplace book *Promus of Formularies and Elegancies* [British Library, Harley MS.7017 fols 83r-129v = *BcF269, written *c.*1594–6 according to Durning-Lawrence (1910) p. 187], first published in its entirety in 1883 with Shakespearean passages to support the Baconian theory of Shakespeare authorship. At fol. 83v Bacon (1883) p. 99 runs '36. Homo sum. A me nil alienum puto (*sic*)', but Durning-Lawrence (1910) p. 195 reads: 'Homo sum humanj a me nil alienum puto'. The *De Augmentis* puts the verse in a unique order 'nihil humani a se' for emphasis. Both Burton and Bacon in the *Promus*—at least according to Durning-Lawrence (1910) p. 195—adopt the Renaissance vulgate reading 'humani a me nihil'. See above nn. 270 and 316.

337) Bacon (1623) vol. 2 p. 194 = (1:589). No corresponding passage in the first edition.

338) Transl. Bacon (1901) p. 184 much modified. (4:381) slightly different transl.

is very *human* for them to divert their attention from medicine. He goes on to give real and genuine reasons for their distraction: Sed ob hoc ipsum, de quo nunc agimus; nempe quod arbitrentur parum ipsis interesse, vel ad existimationem, vel ad lucrum, utrum artis suae mediocritatem, an perfectionem in ea majorem assequantur[339] (but the reason is what we are now talking about, that is, no doubt, because they find that mediocrity and excellency in their own art make no difference in terms of profit or reputation).[340] For doctors, the *humanum* is the need for recreation in their hard working conditions, as well as the incentive to improve their art, be it pecuniary or honorary. Doctors, 'they are men' like others, to follow an incentive, their own interest. But the incentive is very poor for them in the actual situation where there is no distinction between doctors and quacks. Before Francis Bacon, money and fame were negatively associated with medicine, as if they were its dark side,[341] as Cato the Elder criticized.[342] Bacon seems to have been the first theorist to recognize the need for incentives for the progress of medical knowledge; his pragmatism is noteworthy as a forerunner of English modern thought.

---

339) Bacon (1623) vol. 2 p. 194 = (1:589). First edition's corresponding passage: 'and no doubt, upon this ground that they find, that mediocrity and excellency in their Art, maketh no difference in profite or reputation towards their fortune', Bacon (1605) fol. 40^r = (3:372) = Bacon (2008) p. 210. Our verse is not quoted.

340) Transl. Bacon (1901) p. 184 much modified. (4:382) slightly different transl.

341) After Bacon, it will be the same with Molière's *Le Malade imaginaire* in 1673.

342) Plin. *HN* 29.12–16, esp. 29.14: 'They have conspired together to murder all foreigners with their physic, but this very thing they do for a fee, to gain credit and to destroy us easily' and 29.16: 'It was not medicine that our forefathers condemned, but the medical profession, chiefly because they refused to pay fees to profiteers in order to save their lives', transl. Pliny the Elder (1963) p. 193. It is a real scandal in the eyes of Agrippa von Nettesheim: 'Si vero dives sit aeger, aut magnae authoritatis, tunc quo plus sibi compendii atque famae accessurum sit, morbum quantum potest protrahit ... ne superveniens alius, qui aegrum solus restituat famam sibi atque laudem cum lucro praeripiat' (But if a rich and very influential man is ill, then more profit and greater fame will come as long as the patient lasts ... so that the doctor alone, without the intervention of another colleague, can cure the patient and gain all the reputation and fees), Agrippa von Nettesheim (1970) vol. 2 p. 240.

Conclusion

Homo changes from one epoch to another, as Nietzsche observes: 'Everything that the philosopher says about man is really nothing more than testimony about the man of *a very limited* space of time' [italics in original].[343] Worse still, it varies almost from author to author. The friendly but superficial *homo* of Chremes in Terence, the legal and metaphysical egalitarian *homo* of Cicero, the Stoic solidarity-minded *homo* of Seneca and Ambrose, the individually hedonistic *homo* of Pliny the Younger, the humane and sympathetic *homo* of Juvenal, the Christian communist *homo* of Paulinus of Nola, the Christian charitable *homo* of Augustine, Julianus Pomerius and John of Salisbury, who loves his neighbour as himself, the burlesque feminist *homo* of Ariosto, the indiscreetly curious *homo* of Bandello, who is like a gossip writer, the joyful and cheerful tender *homo* of Erasmus,[344] the sceptical *homo* of Montaigne, who is aware of his own human limitations, the love-oriented *homo* of Robert Burton, the pragmatic *homo* of Francis Bacon: so many *homines*. The richness and variety of this false *aeterna veritas*—a metaphorical reflection of the absence of a referent or, in scholastic terms, of a quiddity—make the history of Terence's verse a history of *humanisms*.

On the other hand, Henri Brémond, the French priest and historian of modern religious literature, also speaks of several *humanisms*. But, unlike us, he seeks a quiddity of Man, his humanisms are mere nuances of a single 'eternal humanism', and for him Terence's verse is a motto of that Humanism.[345] Indeed, Brémond goes so far as to say: 'For the Renaissance ...

343) 'Alles, was der Philosoph über den Menschen aussagt, ist aber im Grunde nicht mehr, als ein Zeugnis über den Menschen eines *sehr beschränkten* Zeitraumes', Nietzsche (1973) vol. 1 p. 234. For the transl. *Human All Too Human*, aph. 2, Nietzsche (1910) p. 15. See above n. 2.

344) A degenerate form of the Erasmian meaning would be the modern cold-hearted view of man, which Dornseiff (1943) p. 111 defines as the elastic capacity to experience the feelings of others, a capacity that is the opposite of intellectual snobbery: 'auch für das Überraschendste und Tollste habe ich Verständnis, bin bestimmt nicht zimperlich' (I can also understand the most surprising and silly things, and I'm certainly not snobbish).

345) Brémond (1916) p. 8 (among others). Delon (1984) p. 287, despite his general

Humani nil alienum is the command to attack, the words of hope, of promise, the cry of victory. Nothing that human powers can achieve is too much for us'.[346] But, as we have seen, every Renaissance author who quoted this verse was not so boastful in his vision of man. Brémond's statement sounds exaggerated and hollow. Strangely enough, a Catholic monk like him, in the boldness and aggressiveness of his language, is on a par with an atheist like Feuerbach, who uses this verse to strengthen his convictions.[347] For the epochs of our scope, there was no sign of the philosophy of Man as militantly invented by Feuerbach with his counter-concept of *Entfremdung* (alienation), applied to Renaissance humanism by Burckhardt and influencing Brémond's religious vision. The latter continues: 'with Terence, and better and more than Terence, [Christian humanism] understands well that nothing human is not alien to it, and so, because it recognizes in all that is human the image of God and a brother in every man (*un frère dans chaque homme*)',[348] but the three saints we have analysed—Ambrose, Paulinus and Augustine—did not see a transcendent image of God in the *homo* of the verse, but, speaking as Christians, simply saw 'un frère dans chaque homme' as did the pagan classical authors, since for them the natural κοινωνία of man is a basis for Christian society.[349]

At the end of our history of verse, in the Renaissance, all the sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century authors—Ariosto, Bandello, Erasmus, Montaigne, Robert Burton and Francis Bacon—prove to be eminently Renaissance men, in that each of them paved his way into the modern age by cutting himself off from a long-standing Christian-Stoic tradition that had handed down verse as a motto of the natural and charitable community of mankind. Several factors were involved: parody (in Ariosto), irony (in Erasmus and Montaigne), psychology (in Montaigne and Burton) and realism (in Bandello and Bacon). It should also be noted that from Cicero, the first user or misuser of the verse, down, no one (except perhaps the philologists)

perceptiveness, agrees with this misjudgement.

346) Brémond (1916) p. 8 [original in French].

347) On Feuerbach's philosophy of Man, see above n. 4.

348) Brémond (1916) p. 11 [original in French].

349) On natural κοινωνία for Christian authors, see above n. 164.

has been interested in the original meaning as it was in the Terentian play. Jocelyn wonders 'why they [Paulinus and Augustine] misinterpreted *homo sum: humani nil a me alienum puto* in much the same way as the first-century pagans has done',[350] but his wonder itself is a lack of understanding of *geflügeltes Wort*[351] which, once having flown from the nest, never returns as its meaning expands endlessly. Of our verse, Adolf Primmer rightly remarks that it has 'Zauber[s], den er später als geflügeltes Wort gewann' (magic, which it later won as a dictum).[352] No amount of study in schools or critical commentary in editions can force one to return to the purest original meaning and get rid of all the false ones that prevail in the world. Studying the script or watching the stage is no guarantee of understanding the *authentic* meaning, since one tends to interpret according to one's own prejudices. The gnomic study is rather a search for the routes (however erroneous or false) through which the word has flown in all directions, as already clearly defined by A.O. Lovejoy as one of the elements of the history of ideas: 'a study of the sacred words and phrases of a period or a movement, with a view to a clearing up of their ambiguities, a listing of their various shades of meaning, and an examination of the way in which confused associations of ideas arising from these ambiguities have influenced the development of doctrines, or accelerated the insensible transformation of one fashion of thought into another, perhaps its very opposite. It is largely because of their ambiguities that mere words are capable of this independent action as forces in history'.[353]

---

350) Jocelyn (1973) p. 45.

351) Büchmann (1905). Grimm's *Deutsches Wörterbuch* (s.v. *geflügelt*) says: 'Nowadays every new and successful expletive or witticism, favourite phrase of the day, happy quotation, etc., is called *geflügeltes Wort* (*winged word*), without any longer thinking of wings or of Homer' [original in German]. The German phrase itself is another example of semantic deviation from the original meaning of Greek ἔπεα πτερόεντα, while in English *winged word* does not have the derived meaning (*OED* s.v. *winged*) and in French *mot ailé* means light or ethereal word (*mot aérien*) (*TLFi* s.v. *ailé*). Jocelyn (1973) p. 43's use of 'ἔπος πτερόεν' in the sense of *geflügeltes Wort* is misleading (see above n. 132), for the Greek phrase does not have this meaning.

352) Primmer (1966) p. 295. Delcourt (1960) p. 259 also admits a free flow of maxims.

353) Lovejoy (1964) p. 14.

In late antiquity and the Middle Ages, the strong Christian-Stoic magnetism (in other words, *Faith* or *Tradition*) had prevented an unrestricted proliferation of meanings for the Terentian verse. It can be said that Christianity, from the standpoint of ἀγάπη, for a long time kept the *homo* on the same footing. This brake will be completely released in the following centuries. Conversely, the uniformity of reception from Ambrose to John of Salisbury (some eight hundred years apart) is most striking when compared with the diversity of two contemporary Italian Renaissance authors: Ariosto and Bandello. During the Renaissance, the magnetic force weakened to such an extent that different meanings were released. Whether it should be called 'the emancipation of Man' or 'the discovery of Man', as Burckhardt did,[354] is another matter. What is certain is that the Renaissance underwent a fundamental change in the way literary messages were transmitted and produced. It is not a 'return to the antiquity', for a common magnetic field among the Romans (apart from Terence himself and the dubious case of Pliny the Younger), the κοινωνία, disappeared in the Renaissance (apart from Calphurnius). In its place we have the liberalization of semantic production.

Appendix 1

Editions of Terence before 1530 on the BNF Galica's catalogue (ISTC number)
[The years (New Style) are the correct ones, not those of the catalogue.]

A) Editions with 'humani a me nihil':
word-order of the MSS of P[Parisius<γ] C[Vaticanus3868<γ] F [Ambrosianus<γ][355]

1) *c.*1470: [*Publii Terentii Comoediae sex: Andria, Enuchus* (*sic*) *Heutontumerumenon* (*sic*), *Adelphos, Echira* (*sic*), *Phormio.*], (Argentorati: Mentelin, *c.*1470) [BN: RES G-YC-182] (it00064000)
2) 1472: [*Publii Terentii Comoediae sex: Andria, Eunuchus, Heautontymorumenon, Adelphoe* (*and: Adelphos*), *Hecyra,*

354) Burckhardt (2014) p. 335. See above n. 4.
355) See Terence (1979–90) vol. 2 p. 23 critical apparatus.

Phormio.], [Paris: Ulrich Gering, Martin Crantz and Michæl Friburger, about 1472] [BN RESG-YC-994] (it00065800)

3) after 1476 [ISTC between 1478 and 1483]: [*Terentii Comoediae sex: Andria, Eunuchus, Heautontymorumenon* (*and Heautontimorumenon*), *Adelphoe, Ecyra* (*and Hecyra*), *Phormio*], [s.n.], after 1476, fol. e.iiii.r [BN Rés. g-Yc-188] (it00076500)

4) 1493: [*Terentii Comoediae sex, a Guidone Juvenale explanatae, et a Jodoco Badio, cum annotationibus suis, recognitae*], (Lyon), 1493, fol. Piir [BN Rés. m-Yc-384; microfilm (from Upsala Univ. Libr.); Bibliot. Municip. de Lyon, Rés Inc 889] (it00091000)

5) 1495: *Comoediae. Comm. Aelius Donatus, Guido Juvenalis*, Lyon: Perrinus Lathomi, Bonifacius Johannis et Johannes de Villa Veteri, 27 XI 1495, fol. k iiiir [Bibliot. Sainte-Geneviève, OEXV 815 (2) RES (P.1)] (it00093200)

6) 1496: *Comœdiæ*, Strasbourg: Johannes Grüninger, Kalendarum Nouembrium [1 XI] 1496, fol. LXIIv [BN Arts du spectacle, RESERVE 4-EGC-980] (it00094000)

7) 1498: [*Comediae.*] *Guidonis Juvenalis natione Cenomani in Terentium familiarissima interpretatio. Cum aditionibus.* Edition of Guy Jouveneaux; additions of Josse Bade, Lyon: Claude Gibolet, 21 II 1497/98 [Bibliot. Mazarine, Inc 967] (it00098200)

8) between 1499 and 1503: *Thérence en françois, prose et rime, avecques le latin,* (Paris, Anthoine Vérard), fol. CLVIIIv [BN Rés. g-Yc-214; Arsenal, RESERVE FOL-BL-1388; Bibliot. Sainte-Geneviève, OEXV 710 RES; Bibliot. de l'INHA 4 RES 830] (it00106000)

9) 1505: *Terentius in sua metra restitutus*, Florentiae, 1505, fol. giiir [BN Arsenal, RESERVE 8-BL-4138]

10) 1511: *P. Terentii Aphrii comicorum elegantissimi comedie*, Lugduni, ab Jacobo Huguetan, 1511 [microfilm (from where?)]

11) 1529: *Terentius cum comentariis, publii terentii...comicorum latinorum principis comedie... Donati et guidonis juvenalis... expositio familiarissima Jodoci Badii ascensii...* [Bibliot. Municip. de Lyon, SJ X 329/7]

B) Editions with 'humani nihil a me':

word-order of the MSS of A[Bembinus] D[Victorianus<δ] E[mixed], Eugr. [Eugraphius], Cic. *De off.* 1.30, *De leg.* 1. 33, Sen. *Ep.* 95.53, Aug. *Ep.* 51[356)]

12) 1472: [*Comoediae*], Rome, Sweynheim and Pannartz, M.CCC.LXXII. die.VI. Octobris [Bibliot. Sainte-Geneviève, OEXV 98 RES] (it00065500)
13) 1477: [*Terentii Comoediae (sex), cum Donati interpretis commentario, juxta fidele Calphurnianae castigationis exemplar, doctrinam studiumque Calphurnii Hieronymo Bononio enixe commendante*], Tarvisii: Hermanus Levilapis Coloniensis, MCCCCLXXVII, XIV. KL. Octibres (1477), fol. K2r [BN Rés. g-Yc-190; microfilm (from Upsala Univ. Libr.)] (it00075000)
14) 1497: *Terentius cum tribus commentis: videlicet Donati Guidonis & Calphurnii*, Venetiis, per Simonem de Lucre, impensis Lazari Soardi, MCCCCXCVII, fol. 95v [BN Arts du spectacle, RESERVE 8-RE-1525] (it00095000)
15) 1515: *Terentius cum duobus commentariis videlicet Aelii Donati et Joanni Calfurini*, Venetiis, per Georgium de Rusconibus, 1515, fol. 54v [BN Arts du spectacle, RESERVE 4-RE-1530]
16) 1518: *Terentius cum quinque commentis: vz Donati, Guidonis, Calphurunii, Ascensii & Servii*, Venetiis, Georgii de Rusconibus,1518, fol. XCIXr [BN Res g Yc 198]

Appendix 2

List of the authorities cited and mentioned by Robert Burton in *The Anatomy of Melancholy* 3.1.1.1[357)] up to Terence's '*Homo sum...*' (p. 6, l. 16)

---

356) *Ibid*.

357) I follow the Clarendon critical edition, Burton (1989–2000) vol. 3 pp. 1–6, which reproduces the 1632 edition (see *ibid.* vol. 1 p. liv). For the commentary on the preface, see *ibid.* vol. 6 pp. 1–7. The following page numbers are from vol. 3 of this edition. Referencing Burton (2023), the pages correspond to pp. 669–73 in the following manner: vol. 3 p. 1-p. 2, l. 11 (Stefano Guazzo) = p.669; p. 2, l. 12-p. 3, l. 16 (Homer) = p. 670; p. 3, l. 17-p. 4, l. 18 (Aeneas Sylvius) = p. 671; p. 4, l. 18-p. 5, l. 16 ('Poet' (Horace)'s 'Omne...dulci') = p. 672; p. 5, l. 17-p. 6, l. 16 = p. 673.

p. 1 Erasmus,[358] 'Caussinus' (Nicolas Caussin),[359] Petronius;[360] **p. 2** Martial ('*Erubuit...legit*'11.16.9–10),[361] Stefano Guazzo,[362] 'Jacobus Mysillius' (Jacob Micyllus),[363] 'Mercerus' (Jean Mercier),[364] Plato, Plutarch, Plotinus, 'Maximus Tyrius' (Maximus of Tyre), Alcinous, Avicenna, 'Leon Hebreus' (Leo the Hebrew),[365] Xenophon, Theophrastus, Athenaeus, 'Picus Mirandula' (Pico della Mirandola), 'Marius Æquicola' (Mario Equicola),[366] Kormannus (Heinrich Kornmann),[367] Petrus Godefridus (Pierre Godefry).[368] Petrus Haedus,[369]

358) Burton (*ibid.* vol. 3 p. 1 n. a) gives a Latin quotation from *Encom. Mor.* praef.

359) 17th-century French Jesuit. Burton (*ibid.* vol. 3 p. 1 n. b) gives a Latin quotation from his '*Eloquentiae sacrae et humanae paralelela* (1619)', *ibid.* vol. 6 p. 1 note on note b.

360) Burton (*ibid.* vol. 3 p. 1 n. c) gives a Latin quote from *Satyr.* 85, *ibid.* vol. 6 p. 1 note on note c.

361) *Ibid.* vol. 6 p. 1 note on l. 4–5, d.

362) Late 16th-century Italian writer and author of *La civil conversazione*, 'probably quoted from the translation by Bartholomew Young (1586)', *ibid.* vol. 6 p. 1, note on l. 6–11.

363) 16th-century German Humanist and translator of Lucian's *Dialogi meretricii*, the preface to which 'Argumentum' is concerned, *ibid.* vol. 6 p. 1 note on l. 14.

364) 16th-century French Hebraist and editor of Aristaenetus, *Love Epistles* (Paris, 1594), see Jordan-Smith (1931) p. 30. Burton (Burton (1989–2000) vol. 3 p. 2 n. f) gives a Latin quotation from '*Aristaeneti epistolae Graecae* (1586)', *ibid.* vol. 6 p. 1 note on note f.

365) Jewish philosopher of the late 15th and early 16th centuries and author of '*De Amore* (Venice, 1564)', Jordan-Smith (1931) p. 29. The *Dialogi d'amore* was first published posthumously in Rome in 1535.

366) Early 15th-century Italian humanist.

367) Early 17th-century German jurist and author of '*Outline of Love* (Frankfurt, 1610)' (*ibid.* p. 30). Exactly *Linea amoris* (Frankfurt, Becker, 1610).

368) *Dialogues of Love* (Antwerp, 1554), (*ibid.*). *Netherlandish Books* (2011) vol. 1 p. 587 (13448–13452) lists five Dutch and Belgian editions of *Dialogus de amoribus* (Leiden, 1552; Antwerp, 1552, 1553, 1554 twice). Pierre Godefroy was a 16th-century French lawyer and magistrate in Carcassonne. His *Dialogus* first appeared in Lyon in 1552, but from then on it was not published in France until 1648.

369) 15th-century Italian priest and author of *Anterotica: De Amoribus Generibus* (Treviso, 1492), Jordan-Smith (1931) p. 30.

'Arnoldus Villanovanus' (Arnaldus de Villa Nova),[370] Valleriola (Francisco Vallerioli),[371] 'Aelian Montaltus' (Elijah Montalto),[372] Laurentius (André du Laurens),[373] Valescus de Taranta,[374] Gordonius (Bernard de Gordon),[375] Hercules de Saxonia (Ercole Sassonia),[376] Michele Savonarola,[377] Langius (Johann Lange),[378] 'Ficinus' (Marsilio Ficino), Cadmus Milesius,[379] Virgil, Servius,[380] Castalio (Sébastien Castellion or Châteillon);[381] **p. 3** *Song of Songs*, *Genesis*, *Book of Numbers*, *Book of Judges*, *Books of Kings*, *Book of Esther*, *Book of Judith*, *Book of Daniel*, Dicaearchus,[382] Aulus-Gellius (*Suavia...fuit*, 19.11.2),[383] Homer (in a long citation from Maximus of Tyr),[384]

---

370) 13th-century royal physician and author of a 'treatise on "Heroical Love" (Lyon, *ca.*1504)', *ibid*. Exactly *Tractatus de amore heroico*.

371) 16th-century Montpellier physician (from Turin).

372) Late 16th- and early 17th-century physician (court doctor to Marie de Médicis) and author of *Archipathologia* (Paris, 1614), 'a valuable source-book on the symptoms of melancholy', *ibid.* pp. 47–8.

373) 16th-century French royal doctor, *ibid.* p. 47.

374) Early 15th-century 'Portuguese physician, who taught at Montpellier', *ibid.* p. 49. He was royal doctor to Charles VI (A. Rittmann, *Culturgeschichtliche Abhandlungen über die Reformation des Heilkunst*, 1.Heft, Brünn, Karafiat, 1869, p. 5).

375) 13th-century French doctor, Jordan-Smith (1931) p. 40.

376) 16th-century Italian physician, *ibid.* p. 44.

377) 15th-century Italian humanist physician, *ibid.*

378) 16th-century German court physician. Burton (Burton (1989–2000) vol. 3 p. 2 n. g) gives a Latin quotation from his '*Epistolae medicinales* 1.24', *ibid.* vol. 6 p. 2 note on note g.

379) 'According to Suidas, Cadmus of Miletus (who may not have existed) wrote fourteen books of a history of Attica, and also some erotic poems', *ibid.* vol. 6 p. 2 note g.

380) Late 4th-century grammarian, commentator of Virgil.

381) 16th-century French humanist, Protestant theologian. On his quarrel with Calvin 'over [his] proposal to remove the Song of Solomon from the Bible', see *ibid.* vol. 6 p. 2 note on l. 35–3:2,i.

382) 'From Cicero, *Tusc.*4.34.71', *ibid.* vol. 6 p. 2 note on l. 8–10.

383) *Ibid.* vol. 6 p. 2 note on l. 11–12. Original in Greek.

384) *Ibid.* vol. 6 p. 2 note on l. 13–35, j,k,l. Burton (*ibid.* vol. 3 p. 3 n. k and n. l) gives a Latin translation of his passage, *ibid.* vol. 6 p. 2 note on note k, and another

Callias (*ibid.*), Thrasimachus (*ibid.*), Polus (*ibid.*), Aristophanes (*ibid.*), Anytus (*ibid.*), Melitus (*ibid.*); **p. 4** Cato Minor,[385] Ficino,[386] Valleriola,[387] 'Godefridus the lawyer',[388] Laurentius, Heliodorus of Emesa (in a citation from Nicephorus),[389] Nicephorus,[390] Aeneas Sylvius (Enea Silvio Piccolomini, later Pope Pius II),[391] Beroaldus (Filippo Beroaldo),[392] Erasmus, 'Alpheratius' (Alfarache),[393] Cristóbal de Fonseca,[394] Lucius Accius,[395] Gnaeus Matius' '*Edulcare...nugis*' (quoted by Aulus Gellius),[396] Pliny the Elder's '*magna...*

---

quotation from him translated by Paccius, *ibid.* vol. 6 p. 3 note on note l.

385) On his drunkenness, Sen. *Tranq.* 17.4; 17.9, Mart. 2.89, Plut. *Cat. Min.* 6.2–3, Plin. *Ep.* 3.12. See Duff (1999) p. 143 (with some errors in reference numbering). Burton appears to have quoted Petrarch's '*De remediis utriusque fortunae* 24' (Burton (1989–2000) vol. 6 p. 3 note on l. 3.4:1–2) based on Sen. *Tranq.* 17.9.

386) Burton (*ibid.* vol.3 p. 4 n. m) gives a Latin quotation from his *Commentary on Symposium*, *ibid.* vol. 6 p. 3 note on note m.

387) Burton (*ibid.* vol. 3 p. 4 n. n) gives a Latin quotation from his '*Observationes* (1588)', *ibid.* vol. 6 p. 3 note on note n.

388) Burton (*ibid.* vol. 3 p. 4 n. o) gives a Latin quotation from his '*Dialogus de amoribus* (1554)', *ibid.* vol. 6 p. 3 note on note o.

389) *Ibid.* vol. 6 p. 3 note on l. 15–16, p.

390) *Ecclesiastica historica,* see *ibid.*

391) Burton (*ibid.* vol. 3 p. 4 n. q) gives a Latin quotation from his 'lettre 113', *ibid.* vol. 6 p. 4 note on note q.

392) 15th-century Italian humanist.

393) A 'picaresque novel *La vida y hechos del Picaro Guzmán de Alfarache* (1599; 1602), translated into English by J. Mabbe as *The Spanish Rogue* (1622)', *ibid.* vol. 6 p. 4 note on l. 22.

394) *Ibid.* vol. 6 p. 4 l. 24–5. He was a Spanish theologian of the late 16th and early 17th centuries.

395) Roman tragic poet of the 1st century BCC. Burton (*ibid.* vol. 3 p. 4 n. r) gives a Latin quotation attributed to him (no information on its source).

396) 15.25.2, see *ibid.* vol. 6 p. 4 note on l. 26.

quarimus',[397] Cicero,[398] Macrobius;[399] **p. 5** Apuleius,[400] Solon (in a citation from Apuleius), Plato, Xenophon,[401] 'Adrian' (Emperor Hadrian),[402] Aretino's '*tam...delectetur*',[403] Aulus Gellius,[404] Beroaldus, Propertius,[405] Justus Lipsius' '*pluris...repetendum*',[406] Epictetus (in Lipsius' citation), Ben Jonson,[407] Pliny the Younger's '*severitatem...condire*',[408] Synesius of Cyrene,[409] 'Poet' (Horace)'s '*Omne...dulci*',[410] Lucian,[411] '*Aretines Antonia*',[412] 'Hierome'

---

397) *NH* 14, see *ibid.* vol. 6 p. 4 note on l. 27.

398) Burton (*ibid.* vol. 3 p. 4 n. s) gives the Latin quotation from *De orat.* 2.5.21, *ibid.* vol. 6 p. 4 note on note s.

399) Burton (*ibid.* vol. 3 p. 4 n. t) gives the Latin quotation from *In Somn.* 1.2.8, *ibid.* vol. 6 p. 4 note on note t.

400) *Apol.* 9, see *ibid.* vol. 6 p. 4 note on l. 3.5:2.

401) Burton (*ibid.* vol. 3 p. 5 n. u) paraphrases Suidas' entries on two other Xenophon (of Antioch and Ephesus) than the famous, both of whom wrote love stories. See *ibid.* vol. 6 p. 4 note on note u.

402) *Ibid.* vol. 6 p. 5 note on l. 3. Aelianus Spartianus, *Vita Hadriani* 14.9 from *Historia Augusta.*

403) Burton (*ibid.* vol. 3 p. 5 l. 5, giving the reference in n. v) quotes the words of the prostitute Antonia from his *Raginonamento* 'translated [in Latin] by Barth (*Pornodidascalus...*)', *ibid.* vol. 6 p. 5 note on l. 5–6, v.

404) '*Neque...meminisse*' is an adaptation of *NA* praef. 11, *ibid.* vol. 6 p. 5 note on l. 7–8.

405) According to *ibid.* vol. 6 p. 5 note on l. 8–9, it refers to Beroaldo's preface to his commentary on Propertius. But the connection is not clear.

406) '*Manuductio ad Stoicam philosophiam* 1.19', *ibid.* vol. 6 p. 5 note on l. 10–11.

407) 'if you like them you may' is an adaptation of the last line 'if you like't, you may' of the epilogue to his *Cynthia's Revels*, *ibid.* vol. 6 p. 5 note on l. 12.

408) *Ep.* 4.3.2, *ibid.* vol. 6 p. 5 note on l. 13–14.

409) According to *ibid.* vol. 6 p. 5 note on l. 14–15, it refers to his *Ep.* 1.

410) *Ars. P.* 343, *ibid.* vol. 6 p. 5 note on l. 16, w.

411) Burton (*ibid.* vol. 3 p. 5 n. x) gives a Latin phrase '*Legendi cupidiores, quam ego scribendi*' attributing it to Lucian ('saith *Lucian*'), but there is no relevant passage in him. Burton's fabricated quotation?

412) See above n. 403. Burton (*ibid.* vol. 3 p. 5 n. y) gives a Latin quotation '*Plus... ludis*' from Barth's translation, *ibid.* vol. 6 p. 5 note on note y.

(Jerome),[413] Apuleius (in Jerome's citation),[414] Plato (in Jerome's citation), 'Tully' (Tullius Cicero),[415] 'Plato's *Timœus*' (in Cicero' citation), Ottamar Luscinius' *Grunnius sophista*,[416] 'The Comicall Poet' (Terence)'s '*Id... fabulas*';[417] **p. 6** 'Maudarensis' (Apuleius, in Ausonius'citation), Ausonius,[418] Annianus (in Auson. *Cent. nupt.* 8.147),[419] 'Sulpicius',[420] 'Euemus' (Euenus of Paros, in Auson. *Cent. nupt.* 8.148),[421] Menander (in Auson. *Cent. nupt.* 8.149),[422] Catullus' '*Castum...leporem*' (16.5–7), Terence's '*homo...puto*'.

---

413) Burton (*ibid.* vol. 3 p. 5 n. z) gives a Latin quotation from his '*Comment. in Isaiam* 12.41', *ibid.* vol. 6 p. 5 note on note z.

414) His *Metamorphorses* or 'Golden Ass' is referred to, *ibid.*

415) *Fin.* 2.5.15 is referred to, *ibid.* vol. 6 p. 5 note on l. 21–2.

416) Luscinius was an Alsatian humanist of the early 16th century. It is a comic will of Grunnius the pig, *ibid.* vol. 6 p. 5 note on l. 23.

417) Ter. *An.* Prol. 2–3, *ibid.* vol. 6 p. 5 note on l. 25–6.

418) Burton (*ibid.* vol. 3 p. 6 n. a) gives a modified Latin quotation from '*Cento Nuptialis* 8', *ibid.* vol. 6 p. 6 note on l. 3.6:2–4, a. And Burton 'by misreading assigned [Cicero's lost letters to Caerellia] to Apuleius', *ibid.*

419) *Ibid.* Early 2nd-century Roman poet of the Fescennine verses. See Gell. *NA* 20.8.

420) Confusion with 'Sulpicia' (1st-century Roman love poetess) in Ausonius? or Servius, of whom Ovid speaks in *Tr.* 2.441, *ibid.* Servius in Ovid was probably a son of the jurist Servius Sulpicius Rufus, and possibly the father of Sulpicia, see P. Ovidius Naso, *Tristia*, ed. G. Luck, Band 2 *Kommentar*, Heidelbelg, Winter, 1977, p. 144. But I doubt whether Burton was aware of all this.

421) 5th-century BCC Greek philosopher and poet, mentioned several times by Plato and quoted by Aristotle. Burton (1989–2000) vol. 6. p. 6 note on l. 4.

422) *Ibid.*

Works Cited

Primary sources

(Terence and Menander)

Terence (1477), [*Terentii Comoediae (sex), cum Donati interpretis commentario, juxta fidele Calphurnianae castigationis exemplar, doctrinam studiumque Calphurnii Hieronymo Bononio enixe commendante*], Talvisii, H. Levilapis (BNF Rés.g-Yc-190, on the BNF's Gallica; ISTC it00075000).

Terence (1532), *Habes hic amice lector P. Terentii comoedias, una cum scholiis ex Donati*..., Basel, Froben.

Terence (1538), *P. Terntii Comoedias, una cum scholiis ex Donati*..., Basel, Froben (on BNF's Gallica).

Terence (1541), *P. Terentii Comoediae sex, tum ex Donati commentariis*..., Paris, R. Estienne (https://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/PR-MONTAIGNE-00001-00004-00003/1).

Terence (1541a), *Pub. Terentii Aphri Comoediae sex. Ab Antonio Goveano*..., Lyon, Gryphius.

Terence (1555), *Terentius, a M. Antonio Mureto locis prope innumerabilibus emendatus*, Venice, Paolo Manuzio.

Terence (1623), *Publii Terentii Carthaginiensis Afri Comoediae N.VI*, F. Lindenbrog (ed.), Frankfurt.

Terence (1726), *Publii Terentii Afri Comoediae*, R. Bentley (ed.), Cambridge.

Terence (1732), *P. Terentii Afri Comoediae sex*, H. Westerhovius (ed.), The Hague.

Terence (1830), *P. Terentii Afri Comoediae sex, cum interpretatione Donati et Calphurnii*, A.H. Westerhovius (ed.), vol. 3, Heautontimorumenos, Lipsiae.

Terence (1870), *P. Terenti Comoediae*, F. Umpfenbach (ed.), Berlin.

Terence (1884), *P. Terenti Afri Comoediae*, K. Dziatzko (ed.), Leipzig.

Terence (1916), *Comoediae*, A. Fleckeisen (ed.), Leipzig.

Terence (1926), *Comoediae*, R. Kauer and W.M. Lindsay (eds.), OCT, Oxford.

Terence (1958), *Comoediae*, R. Kauer, W.M. Lindsay and O. Skutsch (eds.), OCT, Oxford.

Terence (1979–90), *Comédies*, J. Marouzeau (ed.), J. Gérard (rev.), CUF, Paris, vol. 1, 1979; vol. 2, 1990 (1st edn. 1942–47).

Menander (1921), *Principal Fragments*, F.G. Allison (ed.), Loeb, London and New York.

Menander (1959), *Menandri quae supersunt*, Pars altera, A. Körte (ed.), Leipzig.

Menander (1964), *Menandri sententiae. Comparatio Menandri et Philistionis*, S. Jaekel (ed.), Leipzig.

*FCG*4: *Fragmenta comicorum Graecorum*, vol. 4, A. Meineke (ed.), Berlin, 1841.

*CSHB*32: *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae*, 32, *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia*, L. Dindorfius (ed.), Bonn, 1831.

Ribbeck, O. (ed.) (1897), *Scenicae Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta*, 3rd edn., vol. 2, *Comicorum Fragmenta*, Leipzig.

(compilations of Christian authors)

*CCCM*118: *Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis*, vol. 118, (Ioannes Saresberiensis) *Policraticus I-IV*, K.S.B. Keats-Rohan (ed.), Turnhout, 1993.

*CCSL*15: *Corpus Christianorum Series Latina,* vol. 15, (Ambrosius Mediolanensis) *De officiis*, M. Testard (ed.), Turnhout, 2000.

*CSEL*29: *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiaticorum Latinorum*, vol. 29, *S. Pontii Meropii Paulini Nolani Opera* Pars I *Epitulae*, G. de Hartel (ed.), Vienna, Prague and Leipzig, 1894.

*CSEL*44: *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiaticorum Latinorum*, vol. 44, *S. Aureli Augustini Hipponiensis Episcopi Epitulae*, A. Goldbacher (ed.), Pars III, Vienna and Leipzig, 1904.

*PL*14: *Patrologia Latina*, J.-P. Migne (ed.), vol. 14 (Ambrosius), Montrouge, 1845.

*PL*59: *Patrologia Latina*, J.-P. Migne (ed.), vol. 59 (...Julianus Pomerius...), Montrouge, 1847.

*PL*61: *Patrologia Latina*, J.-P. Migne (ed.), vol. 61 (Paulinus Nolanus), Montrouge, 1847.

*PL*146: *Patrologia Latina*, J.-P. Migne (ed.), vol. 146 (Otholoni Monachi S. Emmerammi), Montrouge, 1853.

*PL*199: *Patrologia Latina*, J.-P. Migne (ed.), vol. 199 (Joannes Saresberiensis), Montrouge, 1855.

(chronological order of authors)

Plato (1962), *Plato's Epistles*, G.R. Morrow (transl.), Indianapolis and NewYork.

SVF: *Stoicorum veterum fragmenta*, J. von Arnim (ed.), Stuttgart, 1964, 4 vol.

Cicero (1914), *De Finibus bonorum et malorum*, H. Rackham (ed.), Loeb, London and New York.

Cicero (1915), *De finibus bonorum et malorum*, T. Schiche (ed.), Leipzig.

Cicero (1928), *De Re Publica. De Legibus*, C.W. Keyes (ed.), Loeb, Cambridge Mass., n.d. (1st edn. 1928).

Cicero (1991), *On Duties*, M.T. Griffin and E.M. Atkins (transl.), Cambridge.

Cicero (1994), *De Officiis*, M. Winterbottom (ed.), OCT, Oxford.

Cicero (2006), *De Re Publica, De Legibus, Cato Maior de Senectute, Laelius de Amicitia*, J.G.F. Powell, OCT, Oxford.

Cicero (2017), *On the Commonwealth and On the Laws*, J.E.G. Zetzel (transl.),

2nd edn., Cambridge.
Horace (1989), *Epistles book II*..., N. Rudd (ed.), Cambridge.
Horace (2002), *Épîtres*, F. Villeneuve (ed.), CUF, Paris (1st edn. 1934).
Strabo (1960), *The Geography of Strabo*, H.L. Johns (ed.), vol. 6, Loeb, Cambridge Mass. and London.
Seneca (1965), *Ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales*, L.D. Reynolds (ed.), OCT, Oxford, 2 vol.
Seneca (1971), *Lettres à Lucilius*, vol. 4, F. Préchac (ed.), H. Noblot (transl.), CUF, Paris (1st edn. 1962).
Seneca (2015), *Letters on Ethics. To Lucilius*, M. Graver and A.A. Long (transl.), Chicago and London.
Pliny the Elder (1963), *Natural history*, vol. 8, W.H.S. Johns (ed.), Loeb, Cambridge Mass. and London.
Pliny (1908), *C. Plini Caecili Secundi Episturarum libri novem*..., R.C. Kukula (ed.), Leipzig.
Pliny (1912), *C. Plini Caecili Secundi Episturarum libri novem*..., editio altera aucta et emendatior, R.C. Kukula (ed.), Leipzig.
Pliny (1915), *Letters*, vol. 1, W. Melmoth (ed.), W.M.L. Hutchinson (rev.), Loeb, London and New York.
Pliny (1964), Pline le Jeune, *Lettres*, vol. 2, A.-M. Guillemin (ed.), CUF, Paris.
Pliny (1969), *Letters and Panegyricus*, B. Radice (ed.), Loeb, Cambridge Mass.
Pliny (2006), *Complete Letters*, P.G. Walsh (transl.), Oxford.
Juvenal (1920), *Juvenal and Persius*, G.G. Ramsay (ed.), Loeb, London and New York.
Juvenal (1956), *D. Iunii Iuvenalis Saturae*, A.E. Housman (ed.), Cambridge (1st edn. 1905 London).
Juvenal (1967), *Satires*, P. de Labriolle and F. Villeneuve (eds.), CUF, Paris.
Juvenal (1998), *The Sixteen Satires*, P. Green (transl.), Penguin Classics, London (1st edn. 1967).
Juvenal (2001), *The Satires*, J. Ferguson (ed.), London.
Donatus (1902–03), *Aeli Donati quod fertur commentum Terenti*, P. Wessner (ed.), Leipzig, vol. 1 1902; vol. 3 1903.
Ambrose (1984–92), saint Ambroise, *Les Devoirs*, M. Testard (ed.), CUF, Paris, vol. 1, 1984; vol. 2, 1992.
Ambrose (2008), *De officiis*, I.J. Davidson (ed.), Oxford, 2 vol.
Augustine (1957), *Against Julian*, M.A. Schumacher (transl.), The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation vol. 35, New York.
Augustine (1968), *The Retractations*, M.I. Bogan (transl.), The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation vol. 60, Washington, D.C.

Julianus Pomerius (1947), *The Contemplative Life*, M.J. Suelzer (transl.), Ancient Christian Writers, The Works of the Fathers in translation n° 4, Westminster, Maryland.

John of Salisbury (1909), *Ioannis Saresberiensis Episcopi Carnotensis Policratici sive De nugis curialium et vestigiis philosophorum libri VIII*, C.I.C. Webb (ed.), Oxford, 2 vol.

John of Salisbury (1938), *Frivolities of Courtiers and Footprints of Philosophers*, J.B. Pike (transl.), Minneapolis.

John of Salisbury (1979), *The Letters of John of Salisbury, II: The Later Letters (1163–1180)*, W.J. Millor and C.N.L. Brooke (eds.), Oxford.

John of Salisbury (1990), *Policraticus: Of the Frivolities of Courtiers and the Footprints of Philosophers*, C.J. Nederman (transl.), Cambridge.

Dante (2011), *La Divina Commedia. Purgatorio*, Oscar classici, Milan.

Perotti (1489), Niccolò, *Cornu Copiae: sive Commentarii Linguae Latinae*, Venice, Paganino de' Paganini.

Perotti (1527), Niccolò, *In hoc volumine habentur haec. Cornucopiae, sive linguae latinae commentarii*..., Venice, Aldo Manuzio and Andreas Torresanus de Asula.

Calepino (1502), Ambrosio, *Dictionarium*, Rhegii Lingobardiae, Dionysius Berthocus.

Erasmus (1953), *Éloge de la Folie*, P. de Nolhac (transl.), M. Rat (annot.), Paris (1st edn. 1936).

Erasmus (1979a), *Opera Omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami*, Ordinis quarti Tomus tertius, *Moriae Encomium, id est, Stultitiae Laus*, C.H. Miller (ed.), Amsterdam and Oxford.

Erasmus (1979b), *The Praise of Folly*, C.H. Miller (transl.), New Haven and London.

Erasmus (1991), *Œuvres choisies*, J. Chomarat (transl.), Paris.

Erasmus (2016), *Ausgewählte Schriften*, W. Welzig (ed.), Darmstadt, 8 vol. (1st edn. 1967–80).

Ariosto (1954), Ludovico, *Opere minori*, C. Segre (ed.), Milan and Naples.

Bandello (1554), *La Prima parte de le Novelle del Bandello*, Lucca.

Bandello (1928), Matteo, *Le Novelle*, G. Brognologo (ed.), vol. 1, Bari.

Agrippa von Nettesheim (1970), Henricus Cornelius, *Opera*, Hildesheim and New York, reprint of edn. of Lyon [presumably published in Germany], n.d. [1600?], 2 vol.

Estienne (1531), Robert, *Dictionarium, seu Latinae linguae Thesaurus*, Paris.

Montaigne (1920), *Les Essais de Michel de Montaigne*, vol. 4 *Les Sources des Essais*, P. Villey (ed.), Bordeaux.

Montaigne (1991), *The Essays of Michel de Montaigne*, M.A. Screech (transl.),

London.

Montaigne (1992), *Les Essais*, P. Villey and V.-L. Saulnier (eds.), Paris (1st edn. 1965).

Montaigne (2007), *Les Essais*, J. Balsamo, M. Magnien and C. Magnien-Simonin (eds.), Paris.

Brantôme (1858–95), *Œuvres complètes de Branthôme*, P. Mérimée and L. Lacour (eds.), Paris, 10 vol.

Burton, Robert (1989–2000), *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, T.C. Faulkner, N.K. Kiessking and R.L. Blair (eds.), J.B. Bamborough and M. Dodsworth (comment.), Oxford, 6 vol.

Burton, Robert (2023), *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, A. Gowland (ed.), Penguin Classics, London.

Bacon, Francis (1605), *The Twoo Bookes of Francis Bacon. Of the proficience and advancement of Learning, divine and humane*, London.

Bacon, Francis (1623), *Francisci Baronis de Verulamio... De dignitate et augmentis scientiarum livri IX*, London, 2 vol.

Bacon, Francis (1858–74), *The Works of Francis Bacon*, J. Spedding, R.L. Ellis and D.D. Heath (eds.), London, 14 vol. (reprint, Stuttgart and Bad Cannstatt, 1962).

Bacon, Francis (1883), *The Promus of Formularies and Elegancies (Being Private Notes, circ.1594, hitherto unpublished)*, H. Pott (ed.), London.

Bacon, Francis (1901), *Advancement of Learning*, J. Devey (ed.), New York.

Bacon, Francis (2008), *The Major Works*, B. Vickers (ed.), Oxford.

Singularia Historiae Imperatoriae (1705) : *Singularia Historiae Imperatoriae, oder merckwürdige Kayser-Historie...vom Julio Caesare an bis aufietzige Kayserl. Maj. Josephum I.*, Leipzig, / *I.N.J. Singularia Historico-Geographica, oder Historische und Geographische Merckwürdigkeiten...*, Leipzig, 1701 [supposedly 1705] , vol. 2. (BSB, Res/H.misc. 292 d-2).

König, Johann Ulrich von (1712), *Die Oesterreichische Grossmuth, oder, Carolus V*, [Hambourg] .

Lehmann, Johann Jakob (1740), *Terentianum illud Homo sum humani nihil a me alienum puto recte interpretatur...*, Iena, [1740] .

Wöchentliche (1740) : *Wöchentliche Nachrichten von gelehrten Sachen auf das Jahr 1740*, Regensburg, [1740] .

Feuerbach, Ludwig (1843), *Grundsätze der Philosophie der Zukunft*, Zürich and Winterthur.

Nietzsche, Friedrich (1910), *Human All-Too-Human: A Book for Free Spirits*, Part I, H. Zimmern (transl.), Edinburgh and London.

Nietzsche, Friedrich (1973), *Werke in zwei Bänden*, Munich.

Secondary sources and minor editions or translations (alphabetical order of authors or of editors)

Arnold, E.V. (1911), *Roman Stoicism*, Cambridge.

Ashmore, S.G. (ed.) (1908), *P. Terenti Afri Comoediae, The Comedies of Terence*, New York.

Asmis, E. (2008), 'Cicero on Natural Law and the Laws of the State', *ClAnt*, 27, pp. 1–33.

Atkins, J.W. (2013), *Cicero on Politics and the Limits of Reason: The Republic and Laws*, Cambridge.

Atkins, J.W. (2018), *Roman Political Thought*, Cambridge.

Babbitt, I. (1908), *Literature and the American College: Essays in defense of the Humanities*, Boston and New York.

Babut, E.-C. (1910), 'Pauline de Nole et Priscillien', *RHLR*, pp. 97–130.

Bailey, C. (1972), *Titi Lucreti Cari De rerum natura libri sex*, Oxford, 3 vol. (1st edn. 1947).

Barsby, J. (ed.) (2001), Terence: *The Woman of Andros, The Self-tormentor, The Eunuch*, Loeb, Cambridge Mass. and London.

Bartsch, J. (1869), 'Zur Kritik des Briefe Senecas', *RhM*, 24, pp. 271–288.

Beare, W. (1942), 'The Life of Terentius', *Hermathena*, 59, pp. 20–29.

Bellhouse, M.L. (2006), 'Candide Shoots the Monkey Lovers: Representing Black Men in Eighteenth-Century French Visual Culture', *Polit. Theory*, 34–6, pp. 741–784.

Benardete, S. (1987), 'Cicero's *De Legibus* I: Its Plan and Intention', *AJPhilol*, 108, pp. 295–309.

Bettini, M and Ricottilli, L. (1989), 'Homo sum: humani nil a me alienum puto: Elogio dell'indiscrezione', *Lares*, 55, pp. 361–373.

Bickel, E. (1941), ''Ἄωθρωπον ὄντα δεῖ φρονεῖν τἀνθρώπινα Menander, im Heautonim. Homo sum, humani nihil a me alienum puto Terent. haut. 77', *RhM*, 90, p. 352.

Bickel, E. (1942), 'Menanders Urwort des Humanität', *RhM*, 91, pp. 186–191.

Bolgar, R.R. (1973), *The Classical Heritage and its Beneficiaries*, Cambridge (1st edn. 1954).

Bovie, P. and others (transl.) (1992), *Terence: The Comedies*, Baltimore and London.

Boyancé, P. (1970), *Études sur l'humanisme cicéronien*, Brussels.

Box, I. (1989), 'Medicine and Medical Imagery in Bacon's "Great Instauration"', *Hist. Reflections*, 16, pp. 351–365.

Brandi, K. (1980), *Kaise Karl V.: Werden und Schicksal einer Persönlichkeit und eines Weltreiches*, Munich (1st edn. 1937).

Brémond, H. (1916), *Histoire littéraire du sentiment religieux en France*, vol. 1, L'humanisme dévot (1580–1660), Paris.

Brink, C.O. (1956), 'Οἰκείωσις and Οἰκειότης: Theophrastus and Zeno on Nature in Moral Theory', *Phronesis*, 1, pp. 123–145.

Brothers, A.J. (1980), 'The Construction of Terence's Heautontimorumenos', *CQ*, 30, pp. 94–119.

Brothers, A.J. (ed.) (1998), *Terence, The Self-tormentor*, Warminster.

Brown, M.A. (1959), 'John of Salisbury', *Franciscan Stud.*, 19–3/4, pp. 241–297.

Brown, P. (transl.) (2006), *Terence, The Comedies*, Oxford.

Brown, E. (2009), 'The Emergence of Natural Law and the Cosmopolis', in S. Salkever (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Greek Political Thought*, Cambridge, pp. 331–364.

Brunetière, F. (1905), *Histoire de la littérature française classique*, Paris.

BTL-2 (2002), *Bibliotheca Teubneriana Latina*, BTL-2, P. Tombeur (ed.), Turnhout and Munich.

Büchmann, G. (1905), *Geflügelte Worte: Der Zitatenschatz des deutschen Volkes*, 22th edn., Berlin.

Büchmann, G. (1920), *Geflügelte Worte: Der Zitatenschatz des deutschen Volkes*, 26th edn., Berlin.

Büchner, K. (1974), *Das Theater des Terenz*, Heidelberg.

Buck, A. (1991), 'Die Auseinandersetzung mit Jacob Burckhardts Renaissancebegriff', in his *Studien zu Humanismus und Renaissance*, Wiesbaden, pp. 31–59.

Burckhardt, J. (2014), *Die Kultur der Renaissance in Italien, Ein Versuch*, Stuttgart.

Butterfield, D.J. (2009), 'Housman on Meter and Prosody', in D.J. Butterfield, C.A. Stray (eds.) *A.E. Houseman Classical Scholar*, London, pp. 117–137.

Campagna, A. (1946), 'The Origine of the word "Humanist"', *JWI*, 9, pp. 60–73.

Céard, J. (1971), 'Montaigne et l'Écclésiaste: Recherches sur quelques sentences de la "librairie"', *BHR*, 33–2, pp. 367–374.

Chamard, H. (1920), *Les Origines de la poésie française de la Renaissance*, Paris.

C.K. [Knapp, C.] (1918), 'Cicero, *Cat.* 1. 2–3; Terence *Haut.* 75–79...', *Class. Weekly*, 11, pp. 145–146.

Coleman, D.G. (1995), 'Notes sur l'édition grecque de Diogène Laërce', in her *Montaigne, quelques anciens et l'écriture des Essais*, Paris, pp. 31–32.

Colish, M.L. (1985a), *The Stoic Tradition from Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages. I. Stoicism in Classical Latin Literature*, Leiden.

Colish, M.L. (1985b), *The Stoic Tradition from Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages. II. Stoicism in Christian Latin Thought*, Leiden.

Copinger, W.A. (1898), *Supplement to Hain's Repertorium Bibliographicum*, pt. 2 v. 2, London.

Copleston, F. (1993), *A History of Philosophy*, vol. 1, *Greece and Rome*, New York

(1st edn. 1946).
Copley, F.O. (transl.) (1963), *Terence, The Self-tormentor* (*Heauton-timorumenos*), Indianapolis and New York.
Coquillette, D.R. (1992), *Francis Bacon*, Stanford.
Costa, C.D.N. (1984), *Lucretius, De Rerum Natura V*, Oxford.
Courcelle, P. (1972), 'Ambroise de Milan face aux comiques latins', *REL*, 50, pp. 223–231.
Courtney, E. (2013), *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal*, Berkeley.
Coyle, A.F. (1955), 'Cicero's De Officiis and De Officiis Ministrorum of St. Ambrose', *Franciscan Stud.*, 15–3, pp. 224–256.
Curtius, E.R. (1993), *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter*, 11. Auslage, Tübingen and Basel (1st edn. 1948).
Dane, J.A. (1999), 'On Metrical Confusion and Consensus in Early Editions of Terence', *HumLov*, 48, pp. 103–131.
Davidson, I.J. (1995), 'Ambrose's *De Officiis* and the Intellectual Climate of the Late Fourth Century', *Vigiliae Christ.*, 49–4, pp. 313–333.
Davies, T. (1997), *Humanism*, London.
Delcourt, M. (1960), 'Terence, *Heautontimoroumenos*, 77, 168–172, 498–508', in *Hommages à Léon Herrmann*, Brussels, pp. 257–262.
Delon, M. (1984), '"Homo sum...". Un vers de Térence comme devise des Lumières', *Dix-Huit. Siècle*, 16, pp. 279–296.
Der Neue Georges (2019) : *Der Neue Georges: Ausführliches Handwörterbuch Lateinisch-Deutsch* Darmstadt.
Dictionnaire de Montaigne (2004) : *Dictionnaire de Michel de Montaigne*, P. Desan (ed.), Paris.
Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani (1960–2020), Rome, 100 vol.: on the internet (https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/elenco-opere/Dizionario_Biografico).
Dodaro, R. (2004), 'Political and Theological virtues in Augustine, Letter 155 to Macedonius', *Augustiniana*, 54, pp. 431–474.
Dornseiff, F. (1943), 'Nichts menschliches ist mir fremd', *Hermes*, 78, pp. 110–111.
Drexler, H. (1939), Review of 'W.A. Laidlaw: *The Prosody of Terence. A relational study*', *Gnomon*, 15, pp. 136–140.
Duckworth, G.E. (1971), *Nature of Roman Comedy: A Study in Popular Entertainment*, Princeton.
Duff, T. (1999), *Plutarch's Lives: Exploring Virtue and Vice*, Oxford.
Dumont, J.-C. (1992), 'Contenu et expression philosophique dans la comédie latine', in *La Langue latine, langue de la philosophie*, Rome, pp. 39–50.
Dunsch, B. (1999), 'Some notes on the understanding of Terence, *Heauton Timorumenos* 6', *C&M*, 50, pp. 97–131 (reprinted in M. Pade (ed.) *Renaissance*

Readings of the Corpus Aristotelicum: Proceedings of the Conference Held in Copenhagen 23–25 April 1998, Copenhagen, 2001, pp. 97–131).

Duggan, A. (1994), 'John of Salisbury and Thomas Becket', *SCH.S*, 3, pp. 427–438.

Durning-Lawrence, E. (1910), *Bacon is Shake-speare*, Together with *a Reprint of Bacon's Promus of Formularies and Elegancies*, F.B. Bickley and F.A. Herbert (ed.), New York.

Dyck, A.R. (1996), *A Commentary on Cicero, De Officiis*, Ann Arbor.

Dyck, A.R. (2004), *A Commentary on Cicero, De Legibus*, Ann Arbor.

Edelstein, L. (1966), *Plato's Seventh Letter*, Leiden.

Elliott, J.W. (1966), *The Writings of sir Francis Bacon*, New York.

Ernout, A. and Thomas, F. (1972), *Syntaxe latine*, Paris (1st edn. 1951, 2nd edn. 1953).

Falcón y Tella, M.J. (2008), *Equity and Law*, P. Muckley (transl.), Leiden and Boston.

Fiasse, G. (2002), 'Les fondements de la philanthropie dans le nouveau stoïcisme, deux cas concrets: l'esclavage et la gladiature', *Études Philos.*, 4, pp. 527–547.

Forehand, W.E. (1985), *Terence*, Boston.

Fraenkel, E. (1932), 'Das Original des Cistellaria des Plautus', *Philologus*, 87, pp. 117–120.

Friedrich, H. (1969), *Montaigne*, R. Rovini (French transl.), Paris.

Friedrich, H. (1993), *Montaigne*, Tübingen and Basel (1st edn. 1949).

Furno, M. (1995), *Le Cornu Copiae de Niccolò Perotti: Culture et méthode d'un humaniste qui aimait les mots*, Geneva.

Gaiser, K. (1967), 'Menander und der Peripatos', *Antike und Abendland*, 13, pp. 8–40.

Garrett, A. (ed.) (2014), *The Routledge Companion to Eighteenth Century Philosophy*, Milton Park and New York.

Gehl, P.F. (2016), 'Selling Terence in Renaissance Italy. The Marketing Power of Commentary' in C.S. Kraus and C. Stray (eds.) *Classical Commentaries: Explorations in a Scholarly Genre*, Oxford, pp. 253–274.

George, D.B. (1988), 'Lucan's Caesar and Stoic *ΟΙΚΕΙΩΣΙΣ* Theory: The Stoic Fool', *TAPhA*, 118, pp. 331–341.

Gesenius, W. (1953), *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*, E. Robinson (transl.), F. Brown, S.R. Driver and C.A. Briggs (eds.), Oxford, n.d. (1st edn. 1907).

Gilson, E. (1986), *La philosophie au Moyen Âge*, Paris (2nd revised edn. 1944).

Gleye, C.E. (1896), 'Ein Menandervers bei Malalas', *ByzZ*, 5, 336.

Goff, F.R. (1973), *Incunabula in American libraries: a third census of fifteenth-century books recorded in North American collections*, New York (reprint of

edn. of 1964).
Goldberg, S.M. (1986), *Understanding Terence*, Princeton.
Görler, W. (1995), 'Silencing the Troublemaker: *De Legibus* 1.39 and the Continuity of Cicero's Scepticism', in J.G.F. Powell (ed.) *Cicero the Philosopher*, Oxford, pp. 85–113.
Grant, J.N. (1986), *Studies in the Textual Tradition of Terence*, Toronto.
Grant, J.N. (1988), 'Pietro Bembo and Vat. Lat. 3226', *HumLo*, 37, pp. 211–243.
Graves, R. (transl.) (1962), *The Comedies of Terence*, Chicago.
Gray, J.H. (ed.) (1895), *P. Terenti Hauton Timorumenos*, Cambridge.
Greenblatt, S. (2011), *The Swerve: How the world became modern*, New York and London.
Grendler, P.F. (1967), 'Five Italian Occurrences of Umanista, 1540–1574', *RenQ*, 20, pp. 317–325.
Grimal, P. (1979), 'Térence et Aristote à propos de l' "Héautontimorouménos"', *Bull. Ass. Budé*, 2, pp. 175–187.
Grimal, P. (1991), *Sénèque ou la conscience de l'Empire*, Paris (1st edn. 1979).
Grund, G.R. (ed.) (2005), *Humanist Comedies*, Cambridge Mass.
Hain, L. (1831), *Repertorium bibliographicum*, v. 2, Stuttgart and Paris.
Hagendahl, H. (1958), *Latin Fathers and the Classic: A Study on the Apologists, Jerome and other Christian writers*, Gothenburg.
Hagendahl, H. (1967), *Augustine and the Latin Classics*, vol. 1, Gothenburg.
Handl, J. (1970), *The Moralia of 1596* Part 1, A.B. Skei (ed.), Madison.
Halliwell, S. (2000), 'The subjection of muthos to logos: Plato's citations of the poets', *CQ*, 50, pp. 94–112.
Headlam, W. (1899), 'Critical Notes', *CR*, 13, pp. 3–8.
Heinemann, G. (2019), 'Sterbliche und unsterbliche Natur, Kontexte eines vielzitierten Euripides-Fragments', in V. Bachmann and R. Heimann (eds.) *Grenzen des Menschseins*, Wiesbaden, pp. 13–37.
Herwerden, H. van (1903), *Collectanea critica, epicritica, exegetica*, Leiden.
Higgins, M.H. (1945), 'Chapman's "Senecal Man". A Study in Jacobean Psychology', *Rev. Engl. Stud.*, 21–83, pp. 183–191.
Highet, G. (1949), 'The Philosophy of Juvenal', *TAPhA*, 80, pp. 254–270.
Highet, G. (1976), *The Classical Tradition: Greek and Roman influences on Western Literature*, Oxford (1st edn. 1949).
Hill Hay, C. (1938), *Montaigne: lecteur et imitateur de Sénèque*, Poitiers.
Hoffmann, G. (2004), 'Térence (Publius Terentius Afer) ', in *Dictionnaire de Montaigne*..., pp. 960–963.
Hoffmann, G. (2012), 'Montaigne's lost years', *Bull. Soc. Int. Amis de Montaigne*, 55, pp. 121–141.

Høgel, C. (2015), *The Human and the Humane: Humanity as Argument from Cicero to Erasmus*, Göttingen and Taipei.

Hösle, V. (2008), 'Cicero's Plato', *Wien. Stud.*, 121, pp. 145–170.

Housman, A.E. (1919), 'Nihil in Ovid', *CR*, 33, pp. 56–59 (= *The Classical Papers of A.E. Housman*, J. Diggle and F.R.D. Goodyear (eds.), Cambridge, 1972, vol. 3, pp. 1000–1003).

Housman, A.E. (1920), 'De Nihilo', *CR*, 34, pp. 161–164 (= *The Classical Papers of A.E. Housman*, *op. cit.*, vol. 3, pp. 1012–1015).

Housman, A.E. (1922), 'The Application of Thought to Textual Criticism', *PCA*, 18, pp. 67–84 (= *The Classical Papers of A.E. Housman*, *op. cit.*, vol. 3, pp. 1058–1069).

Hunt, H.K. (1955), *The humanism of Cicero*, Melbourne.

Hunter, R.L. (1985), *The New Comedy of Greece and Rome*, Cambridge.

Hunter, D.G. (1994), 'Augustinian Pessimism? A New Look at Augustine's Teaching on Sex, Marriage and Celibacy', *Augustinian Stud.*, 25, pp. 153–177 (reprinted in E. Ferguson (ed.) *Christianity and Society: The Social World of Early Christianity*, New York-London, 1999, pp. 125–149).

Jaeger, W. (1986), *Paideia*, G. Highet (transl.), Oxford (1st Engl. edn. 1939–44).

Jocelyn, H.D. (1973), 'Homo sum: humani nil a me alienum puto (Terence, Heautontimorumenos 77) ', *Antichthon*, 7, pp. 14–46.

Jocelyn, H.D. (1999), 'The Arrangement and the Language of Catullus' so-called *polymetra* with Special Reference to the Sequence 10–11–12', *PBA*, 93, pp. 335–375.

Jones, J.R., Guzzi, L. (1993), 'Leon Battista Alberti's *Philodoxus* (*c.*1424) an English translation', *Celestinesca* 17–1, pp. 87–134.

Jordan-Smith, P. (1931), *Bibilographia Burtoniana: A Study of Robert Burton's The Anatomy of Melancholy*, California.

Keech, D. (2012), *The Anti-Pelagian Christology of Augustine of Hippo, 396–430*, Oxford.

Kenney E.J. (1971), *Lucretius, De Rerum Natura Book III*, Cambridge.

Kloocke, K. (1973), 'Einige vergessene Vers des Pamphilus', *Rom. Forsch.*, 85, pp. 527–531.

Konstantinovic, I. (1989), *Montaigne et Plutarque*, Geneva.

Körte, A. (1928), 'Xapakthp', *Hermes*, 64, pp. 69–86.

Körte, A. (1942), 'zu Terenz Haut.77', *Hermes*, 77, pp. 101–102.

Kristeller, P.O. (1961), *Renaissance Thought: The Classic, Scholastic, and Humanistic Strains*, New York.

Labriolle, P. de (1947), *Histoire de la littérature latine chrétienne*, Paris (1st edn. 1920).

Lachmann, K. (1855), *Caroli Lachmanni in T. Lucretii Cari De Rerum Natura libros*, Commentarius iterum editus, Berlin.
Lachmann, K. (1876), *Kleinere Schriften*, Zweiter Band, Berlin.
Laidlaw, W.A. (1938), *The Prosody of Terence: A Relational Study*, London.
Lavery, G.B. (1997), 'Seneca and the Limits of Cosmopolitanism', *Latomus*, 56, pp. 3–13.
Lawton, H.W. (1970–72), *Contribution à l'histoire de l'humanisme en France : Térence en France au XVIe siècle*, Geneva, 2 vol. (reprint of edn. of 1926).
Lefèvre, E. (1986), 'Ich bin ein Mensch, nichts Menschliches ist mir fremd', in O. Herding and E. Olshausen (eds.) *Wegweisende Antike: zur Aktualität humanistischer Bildung*, Stuttgart, pp. 39–49.
Lefèvre, E. (1994), *Terenz' und Menanders Heautontimorumenos*, Munich.
Le Goff, J. (1965), *Les Intellectuels au moyen âge*, Paris.
Legros, A. (2000), *Essais sur poutres*, Paris.
Legros, A. (2010), *Montaigne manuscrit*, Paris.
Legros, A. (https), 'Térence annoté par Montaigne', https://montaigne.univ-tours.fr/terence/
Lindsay, W.M. (1922), *Early Latin Verse*, Oxford.
Long, A.A. (1986), *Hellenistic Philosophy: Stoics, Epicureans, Sceptics*, London (1st edn. 1974).
Lovejoy, A.O. (1964), *The Great Chain of Being: A Study of the History of an Idea*, Cambridge Mass. (1st edn. 1936).
Lovejoy and Boas (1997), *Primitivism and Related Ideas in Antiquity*, Baltimore and London (1st. edn. 1935).
Ludwig, W. (1968), 'The Originality of Terence and his Greek Models', *GRBS*, 9, pp. 169–182.
Magnin, C. (1839–40), 'Fragment d'un comique du septième siècle', *BEC*, 1, pp. 517–534.
Margolin, J.-C. (1981), *L'humanisme en Europe au temps de la Renaissance*, Paris.
Margolin, J.-C. (ed.) (2007), *Anthologie des humanistes européens de la Renaissance*, Paris.
Marrou, H.-I. (1958), *Saint Augustin et la fin de la culture antique*, Paris (1st edn. 1938).
Masterpieces of Catholic literature (1964), *Masterpieces of Catholic literature in summary form*, vol. 1, c. 90 to 1613, F.N. Magill (ed.), New York.
McC. Brown, P.G. (1999), Review 'Eckard Lefèvre: *Terenz' und Menanders Heautontimorumenos*...', *Gnomon*, 71, pp. 659–663.
McPherson, D. (1981), 'Roman Comedy in Renaissance Education: The Moral

Question', *Sixt. Century J.*, 12, pp. 19–30.
Mewaldt, J. (1942), 'Homo sum', *AAWW*, Philos.-Hist. Klasse, 79, pp. 167–179.
Mignet, M. (1875), *Rivalité de François Ier et de Charles-Quint*, vol. II, Paris.
Miller, F.D. Jr (2009), 'Origins of Rights in Ancient Political Thought', in S. Salkever (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Greek Political Thought*, Cambridge, pp. 301–330.
Néraudau, J.-P. (1996), 'La personne sous le masque, réflexions sur la dramaturgie de Térence d'après l'*Heautontimoroumenos*', *LitC*, 27, pp. 117–124.
Netherlandish Books (2011), *Netherlandish Books: Books Published in the Low Countries and Dutch Books Printed Abroad before 1601*, A. Pettegree and M. Walsby (eds.), Leiden and Boston, 2 vol.
Nolhac, P. de (1892), *Pétrarque et l'humanisme d'après un essai de restitution de sa bibliothèque*, Paris.
Norwood, G. (1923), *The Art of Terence*, Oxford.
Nowak, O.S. (2020), '*Homo sum, humani nihil a me alienum puto*—the imperative of the principle of *humanitas* in views on slavery derived from natural law. M.T. Cicero's views on the subject of slavery and slaves', *Person and the Challenges*, 11–2, pp. 155–186.
Nussbaum, M.C. (1997), 'Kant and Stoic Cosmopolitanism', *J Polit Philos*, 5, pp. 1–25.
OCD[3]: *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 3rd edn., Oxford, 1996.
OCD[4]: *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 4th edn., Oxford, 2012.
O'Connell, M. (1986), *Robert Burton*, Boston.
O'Daly, I. (2018), *John of Salisbury and the medieval Roman renaissance*, Manchester.
OED: *Oxford English Dictionary*, Online version.
OLD: *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, Oxford, 1996 (1st edn 1968).
Otto, A. (ed.) (1890), *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer*, Leipzig.
Pangle, T.L. (1998), 'Socratic Cosmopolitanism: Cicero's Critique and Transformation of the Stoic Ideal', *Can. J. Political Sci.*, 31, pp. 235–262.
Peters, M.J. (1943), *Historical Background and Translation of Letters 245–291 of John of Salisbury*, Master's Thesis, Loyola University Chicago.
Pinkster, H. (2015), *The Oxford Latin Syntax*, vol. 1, *The Simple Clause*, Oxford.
Pire, G. (1954a), 'De l'influence de Sénèque sur les *Essais* de Montaigne', *LEC*, 22, pp. 270–286.
Pire, G. (1954b), 'De l'influence de Sénèque sur les théories pédagogiques de Montaigne', *LEC*, 22, pp. 379–387.
Pitkin, B. (2016), 'Erasmus, Calvin, and the faces of Stoicism in Renaissance and

Reformation thought', in J. Sellars (ed.) *Routledge Handbook of the Stoic Tradition*, London, pp. 145–159.

Pohlenz, M. (1934), *Antikes Führertum: Cicero De officiis und das Lebensideal des Panaitios*, Leipzig and Berlin.

Pohlenz, M. (1943), 'Menander und Epikur', *Hermes*, 78, pp. 270–275 (= his *Kleine Schriften*, Hildesheim, 1965, vol. 2, pp. 38–43).

Pohlenz, M. (2010), *Die Stoa: Geschichte einer geistigen Bewegung*, 8th edn., Göttingen (1st edn. 1948).

Postgate, J.P. (1920), 'On some quantities in Phaedrus', *Hermathena*, 19–42, pp. 52–63.

Postgate, J.P. (1921), 'De Nihilo Nil', *CR*, 35, pp. 23–25.

Powell, J.G.F. (1995), 'Introduction: Cicero's Philosophical Works and their Background', in J.G.F. Powell (ed.) *Cicero the Philosopher*, Oxford, pp. 1–35.

Prete, S. (1961), 'Terence', *CW*, 54, pp. 112–122.

Primmer, A. (1966), 'Die homo-sum-Szene im Heautontimorumenos', *Wien. Stud.*, 79, pp. 293–298.

Quinton, A. (1980), *Francis Bacon*, New York.

Radice, B. (transl.) (1976), *Terence, The Comedies*, Hamondsworth.

RE15–1, *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, G. Wissowa (ed.), vol. 15–1, 1931.

Reitzenstein, R. (1907), *Werden und Wesen des Humanität im Altertum*, Strasbourg.

Reeve, M.D. (1983), 'Terence', in L.D. Reynolds (ed.) *Texts and Transmission. A Survey of the Latin Classics*, Oxford, pp. 412–420.

Rey, J. (1837), *Histoire de la captivité de François Ier*, Paris.

Reynolds, L.D. and Wilson, N.G. (1991), *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature*, 3rd edn., Oxford.

Richardson, L. Jr (2006), 'The Terentian Adaptation of *Heauton Timorumenos* of Menander', *GRBS*, 46, pp. 13–36.

Rolfe, J.C. (ed.) (1891), *P. Terenti Afri Heauton Timorumenos*, Boston.

Roller, M. (1998), 'Pliny's Catullus: The Politics of Literary Appropriation', *TAPhA*, 128, pp. 265–304.

Rubio, F.P. (1989–90), 'Una aproximamación a la vida y a la obra de Gautier de Chatillon', *Archivum*, 39–40, pp. 395–420.

Rudd, N. (transl.) (2008), Cicero, *The Republic and The Laws*, Oxford.

Saekel, A. (1914), *Quaestiones comicae de Terenti exemplaribus Graecis*, Berlin.

Salkeld, D. (1993), *Madness and drama in the age of Shakespeare*, Manchester and New York.

Sandbach, F.H. (1977), *The Comic Theater of Greece and Rome*, London.

Sandbach, F.H. (1989), *The Stoics*, Bristol (1st edn. 1975).
Sandys, J.E. (1903), *A History of Classical Scholarship: From the sixth century B.C. to the end of the Middle Ages*, Cambridge.
Sargeaunt, J. (ed.) (1918), *Terence I, The Lady of Andros, The Self-tormentor, The Eunuch*, Loeb, London and New York.
Schafer, J. (2009), *Ars Didactica, Seneca's 94th and 95th Letters*, Göttingen.
Schiavone, A. (2012), *The invention of law in the West*, J. Carden and A. Shugaar (transl.), Cambridge Mass.
Schmidt, F.M. (1949), 'Review: *Julianus Pomerius. The Contemplative Life* (*De Vita Contemplativa*). Translated annotated by Sister Mary Josephine Suelzer...', *Franciscan Stud.*, 9, pp. 75–77.
Schofield, M. (2021), *Cicero: Political Philosophy*, Oxford.
Screech, M.A. (1998), *Montaigne's Annotated Copy of Lucretius: A transcription and study of the manuscript, notes and pen-marks*, Geneva.
Sellers, M.N.S. (2009), 'The influence of Marcus Tullius Cicero on modern legal and political ideas', in *Ciceroniana*, vol 13: Atti del XIII Colloquium Tullianum (Milano, 27–29 marzo 2008), pp. 245–280.
Shuckburgh, E.S. (ed.) (1877), *The Hauton Timorumenos of Terence*, London.
Skutsch, O. (1957), 'Der zweite Schluss der *Andria*', *RhM*, 100, pp. 53–68.
Sochatoff, F. (1976), 'Petronius Arbiter', in P.O. Kristeller, F.E. Cranz and V. Brown (eds.) *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum: Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin translations and commentaries*, v. 3, Washington D.C., pp. 313–339.
Steidle, W. (1974), 'Menander bei Terenz', *RhM*, 177, pp. 247–276.
Stein, P. (1999), *Roman law in European history*, Cambridge.
Testard, M. (1974), 'Étude sur la composition dans le *De officiis ministrorum* de saint Ambroise', in Y.-M. Duval (ed.) *Ambroise de Milan: XVIe Centenaire de son élection épiscopale*, Paris, pp. 155–197.
TLFi: *Trésor de la langue française informatisé.* http://atilf.atilf.fr
TLL: *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (TLL) Online.
Torello-Hill, G. and Turner, A.J. (2020), *The Lyon Terence: Its Tradition and Legacy*, Leiden.
Thayer, J.H. (1889), *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, New York.
Trinquet, R. (1972), *La Jeunesse de Montaigne*, Paris.
Tsutsui, N. (2021), '"Homo sum..." de Térence dans l'histoire de l'humanisme', *Études de langues et culture françaises*, Dokkyo University (Japan), 25, pp. 1–27.
Tyrrell, R.Y. (ed.) (1902), *P. Terenti Afri Comoediae*, Oxfords.
Urbach, P. (1987), *Francis Bacon's Philosophy of Science: An Account and A Reappraisal*, La Salle (Illiois).

Van der Meersch, P.G. (1856), *Recherches sur la vie et les travaux des imprimeurs belges et néerlandais, établis à l'étranger, et sur la part qu'ils ont prise à la régénération littéraire de l'Europe au XVe siècle*, vol. 1, Ghent and Paris.

Victor, B. (1996), 'A problem of method in the history of texts and its implications for the manuscript tradition of Terence', *Rev. Hist. Textes*, 26, pp. 269–287.

Villey, P. (1933), *Les Sources et l'Évolution des Essais de Montaigne*, vol. 1, *Les Sources et la chronologie des Essais*, Paris.

Villey, P. (1935), *Montaigne devant la Postérité*, Paris.

Wagner, W. (ed.) (1869), *P. Terenti Comoediae*, Cambridge.

Wagner, W. (ed.) (1872), *P. Terenti Hauton Timorumenos*, Berlin.

Walzer, R. (1935), 'Zum Hautontimorumenos des Terenz', *Hermes*, 70, pp. 197–202.

Webb, C.C.J. (1932), *John of Salisbury*, London.

Webster, T.B.L. (1960), *Studies in Menander*, Manchester.

Webster, T.B.L. (1974), *An introduction to Menander*, Manchester.

West, A.F. (ed.) (1888), *P. Terenti Afri Andria et Heauton Timorumenos*, New York, Cincinnaty and Chicago.

Whitaker, G. (2007), '... Brevisque Adnotatione Critica ...: a Preliminary History of the Oxford Classical Texts', *Bull. Inst. Class. Stud. Suppl.*, 101, pp. 113–134.

Wiles, D. (2004), *The masks of Menander: sign and meaning in Greek and Roman performance*, Cambridge (1st edn. 1991).

Wright, M.R. (ed.) (1991), Cicero, *On Stoic Good and Evil. De Finibus 3 and Paradoxa Stoicorum*, Warminster.

Wright, M.R. (1995), 'Self-love and Love of Humanity in *De Finibus* 3', in J.G.F. Powell (ed.) *Cicero the Philosopher*, Oxford, pp. 171–195.

Zagorin, P. (1998), *Francis Bacon*, Princeton.

Zeller, E. (1923), *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, dritter Teil, erste Abteilung, 5th edn., Leipzig.

Zeller, E. (1997), *Outlines of the history of Greek philosophy*, W. Nestle (rev.), L.R. Palmer (transl.), Bristol (reprint of 13th edn. of 1931).

Zetzel, J.E.G. (2018), *Critics, Compilers, and Commentators: An Introduction to Roman Philology, 200 BCE - 800 CE*, Oxford.