

UC-NRLF



5B 14 136

LIBRARY  
OF THE  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

RECEIVED BY EXCHANGE

*Class*

JAN 16 1912  
EXCHANGE

768  
C 85

RETRACTATIO  
IN THE  
Ambrosian and Palatine Recensions  
of Plautus

A STUDY OF THE PERSA, POENULUS, PSEUDOLUS, STICHUS  
AND TRINUMMUS

A Dissertation

PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY OF BRYN MAWR COLLEGE IN PARTIAL  
FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE  
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

CORNELIA CATLIN COULTER



BALTIMORE  
J. H. FURST COMPANY  
1911



**RETRACTATIO**  
IN THE  
**Ambrosian and Palatine Recensions  
of Plautus**

A STUDY OF THE PERSA, POENULUS, PSEUDOLUS, STICHUS  
AND TRINUMMUS

**A Dissertation**

PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY OF BRYN MAWR COLLEGE IN PARTIAL  
FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE  
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

**CORNELIA CATLIN COULTER**



**BALTIMORE**  
**J. H. FURST COMPANY**  
1911

TO VINU  
ABSORBED

PA 6585

268

1911

MAN

## CONTENTS

---

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION.	
1) The Sources of the Inconsistencies and Contradictions in the Text of Plautus.	
a) Freedom in the Handling of the Greek Original . . . . .	1
b) "Plautine Carelessness" . . . . .	6
c) Retractatio . . . . .	8
d) Interpolatio . . . . .	20
2) The Manuscripts of Plautus . . . . .	23
I. PERSA . . . . .	27
II. POENULUS . . . . .	42
III. PSEUDOLUS . . . . .	67
IV. STICHUS . . . . .	83
V. TRINUMMUS . . . . .	97
CONCLUSION . . . . .	109
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	115

236763

Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2007 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation



## INTRODUCTION

---

The twenty-one plays of Plautus, in the form in which they have come down to us, present contradictions and inconsistencies which must impress even an uncritical reader, and which demand explanation at the hands of the Plautine scholar. For some defects we must hold Plautus himself directly responsible. We know that he wrote in an age of rude technique, and that he allowed himself great liberty in adapting Greek comedies for the Roman stage. Terence (*Adel. Prol.* 6-10) says that Plautus, in presenting his *Commorientes*, a version of the *Συναποθνήσκοντες* of Diphilus, left out a whole scene (*eum Plautus locum reliquit integrum*), and the prologue of the *Casina* (l. 65) warns the audience that Euthynicus will not appear upon the stage because *Plautus noluit*. One of the greatest living authorities on Plautus<sup>1</sup> has therefore assumed that at least two of the plays owe their faulty construction to Plautus himself; that it was he who changed the *Casina* from a finished comedy to a farce, and made the *Stichus* end in an uproarious song and dance.

Terence also tells us that Plautus combined the plots of two or more Greek comedies into one play. For this blending of originals (technically called *contaminatio*, from the Terentian verb *contaminare*), Terence frequently justifies himself. In one such defense (*Heaut. Prol.*

<sup>1</sup> F. Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen*, Berlin, 1895, pp. 150 ff. Cf. Leo, *Plautinische Cantica*, pp. 105 ff., in *Abhandl. Gött. Ges.* 1896-1897; Leo in *Nachr. Gött. Ges.* 1902, pp. 375 ff.

20-21) he says that he has good models for this practice (*bonorum exemplo*), and in another (*And. Prol. 18-19*) he mentions *Naevium Plautum Ennium . . . quos hic noster auctores habet*. Plautus himself does not hint at the existence of *contaminatio* in his plays; the extant prologues either omit the name of the Greek original altogether (*e. g.*, *Amphitruo*, *Captivi*), or they give only one (*e. g.*, the "Ἐμπορος of Philemon for the *Mercator*, the Καρχηδόνιος for the *Poenulus*).

But a study of the plays reveals more than Plautus himself disclosed. When we find in a comedy of Plautus two lines of action, the one completed before the other begins, and the second not a necessary outcome of the first; when, moreover, we find the two actions contradicting each other in detail, we can assume that the comedy is a combination of two Greek plays. As an example of such construction, we may take the *Miles Gloriosus*.

The Greek name of the play is given by Plautus (l. 86) as the 'Αλαζών, but its structure precludes the idea of a single original. The story, briefly told, runs as follows: The braggart soldier for whom the play is named has obtained possession of Philocomasium, the sweetheart of the young Athenian Pleusicles, and has carried her off to his house in Ephesus. But Pleusicles follows them to Ephesus, takes up his quarters in the house next door, and, with the help of friends, cuts a hole in the dividing wall. Through this hole Philocomasium can pass to join her lover without arousing suspicion in the soldier's household. It happens, however, that her custodian Sceledrus climbs to the roof one day and sees her in the embrace of Pleusicles. To hoodwink Sceledrus, a story is forthwith concocted by the conspirators, that the twin-

sister of Philocomasium, who is her exact counterpart, has come to Ephesus with her lover, and is staying in the adjoining house. Sceledrus hears the story, sees the supposed sister come out of the other house at the very moment when he is sure that Philocomasium is safe inside the house of the *miles*, and is so terrified at the possible consequences of his spying that he decides to run away. This ends the second act. The third act introduces a new plot by Pleusicles and his allies, which is carried out in the fourth and fifth. They know how vain the soldier is of his fascination for women. They therefore send him a message purporting to come from his neighbor's wife, who is dying for love of him. The soldier is flattered by the story and resolves to get rid of Philocomasium in order to be free for this new love. So he sends the apparently reluctant girl back to Athens, and attempts to visit his new mistress—with disastrous results.

The story clearly introduces two plots, both concerned with the freeing of Philocomasium—the trick of the secret passage and the fictitious twin-sister, and the trick that depends upon the vanity of the soldier. The first occupies Act II., the second Acts IV. and V. The connection between the two is so slight that they might easily come from two different Greek plays. Then too, the play shows confusion and contradiction just at the point where these two stories join. In ll. 582-583 Sceledrus announces his intention of running away; but in ll. 816-817, he is summoned out of the house, and his assistant Lucrio reports that he has drunk himself to sleep in the cellar. This scene (III., 2) repeats the situation at the end of Act II.; for Lucrio, like Sceledrus, cries out that his master will punish him and that he is going to get out of the way; and there is in the repetition no

increase of comic effect. We notice, too, a difficulty about the plan of the three conspirators. In ll. 592 ff., the session which has been going on inside the house is to be continued; in ll. 596 ff., the three meet outside the house, apparently to consider plans; ll. 612 ff. (with which ll. 738-739, 749 agree) would lead one to believe that all the arrangements had been completed inside; but at l. 765 active plotting begins again, and an entirely new scheme is evolved. Then at ll. 805 ff. comes the surprising command to Pleusicles not to call Philocomasium by name in the presence of the *miles*, but to address her as *Dicea*—a command which has no connection with any previous discussion, and no effect upon the later action of the play.

Therefore Leo<sup>2</sup> seems justified in his conclusion that the *Miles Gloriosus* combines material from two Greek plays. One was a play depending upon the secret passage and the story of the twin-sister. In this, the slave of the *miles* was duped and made off in terror (Act II.); then the plan of the three friends was rehearsed, as it had been agreed upon inside the house (ll. 805-809); and the *miles* himself was deceived, in much the same way as his slave had been (cf. ll. 805 ff.). In the other play, the *Ἀλαζών*, the weaknesses of the *miles* were exposed (Act I.); a plot was concocted on the stage, to strike him in a particularly vulnerable point (ll. 765-804); and this plot was carried out through the pretended wife of his neighbor and her slave (Acts IV.-V.).

Leo's analysis of the *Miles* marks the culmination of more than sixty years' work on Plautus. When Grauert,<sup>3</sup> in 1833, investigated the plays of Terence for traces of

<sup>2</sup> Leo, *Plaut. Forsch.*, pp. 161 ff.

<sup>3</sup> H. Grauert, *Historische u. philologische Analekten*, Münster, 1833, pp. 116-207.

*contaminatio*, he quoted Terence's statements about Plautus, and decided that, in all probability, Plautus had frequently combined plots; but he thought it impossible to push the question further without *scholia* on Plautus or a fuller knowledge of his Greek originals. Ladewig,<sup>4</sup> in 1841, quoted the passage from the *Adelphoe* again, and used it to prove that the *Epidicus* was "contaminated"; the next year<sup>5</sup> he added to his list the *Bacchides*, the *Captivi*, the *Miles*, the *Pseudolus*, the *Truculentus*, and (less positively) the *Stichus* and the *Trinummus*. Modern scholars would disagree with Ladewig on some of these points; they would probably deny *contaminatio* in the *Bacchides* and the *Captivi*, and would certainly affirm it in the *Poenulus*, which Ladewig expressly excludes; but they are indebted to him for first advocating the theory and for using it to account for contradictions and weaknesses in the plays. The danger of overemphasizing this phase of Plautus' work was recognized by Teuffel.<sup>6</sup> He denied Ladewig's assertions of *contaminatio* in certain plays, but pointed out that it would be easy to assume it in the *Poenulus*, which shows evidence of two independent plots.

During the next twenty-five years, a number of dissertations and articles on individual plays were published. Ribbeck,<sup>7</sup> Ladewig,<sup>8</sup> and Schmidt<sup>9</sup> did good work on the

<sup>4</sup> Th. Ladewig in *Zeitschrift für Altertumswissenschaft*, 1841, coll. 1079-1099.

<sup>5</sup> Ladewig, *Über den Kanon des Volcatius Sedigitus*, Neustrelitz, 1842, pp. 27 ff.

<sup>6</sup> W. Teuffel in *Rhein Mus.* 8 (1853), pp. 25-41 (= *Studien u. Charakteristiken*,<sup>2</sup> pp. 315-352).

<sup>7</sup> O. Ribbeck in *Rhein. Mus.* 12 (1857), pp. 594-611 (especially pp. 606, 607). <sup>8</sup> Ladewig in *Philol.* 17 (1861), pp. 255-261.

<sup>9</sup> F. Schmidt in Fleckeisen's *Jahrb.*, Suppl.-Bd. 9 (1877-1878), pp. 321-401.

*Miles*, and Reinhardt,<sup>10</sup> after arguing correctly that certain difficulties—*e. g.*, in the *Epidicus*—could not be ascribed to *contaminatio*, added a valuable discussion of the *Poenulus*. Goetz<sup>11</sup> devoted a section of his work on “dittographies” to a review of Ladewig’s principles and a statement of his own position. He thought that other reasons than *contaminatio* could be found for the smaller inconsistencies to which Ladewig objected, and he was on the whole inclined to find other reasons even where the difficulties were greater—for instance, in the *Poenulus*. Langen,<sup>12</sup> in his *Plautinische Studien*, also took up the question of *contaminatio*, arguing against its presence in the *Epidicus*, and supporting by detailed analyses the theory that it existed in the *Miles* and the *Poenulus*. The last two plays were taken as certain examples of *contaminatio* by Leo,<sup>13</sup> in the third chapter of his *Plautinische Forschungen*, and received such masterly treatment there that further discussion of them is almost superfluous. Leo himself suggested<sup>14</sup> that further investigation might add other plays to the list of the “certainly contaminated,” and this prophecy will probably be fulfilled—in fact, in the case of the *Pseudolus*, it has already been fulfilled.<sup>15</sup>

*Quorum aemulari exoptat neglegentiam*, says Terence (*And.* 20), speaking of *contaminatio* in Naevius, Plautus,

<sup>10</sup> L. Reinhardt in Studemund’s *Studien auf dem Gebiete des archaischen Lateins* I. (1873), pp. 79-111.

<sup>11</sup> G. Goetz, *Dittographien im Plautustexte*, in *Acta soc. phil. Lips.* 6 (1876), pp. 315-322.

<sup>12</sup> P. Langen, *Plautinische Studien*, Berlin, 1886.

<sup>13</sup> F. Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen*, Berlin, 1895.

<sup>14</sup> Leo, *Plaut. Forsch.*, p. 153, n. 2.

<sup>15</sup> J. Bierma, *Quaestiones de Plautina Pseudolo*, Groningen, 1897; Leo in *Nachr. Gött. Ges.* 1903, pp. 347-354.

and Ennius; and "Plautine carelessness," in a broader sense, has become proverbial. The most detailed investigation of the subject has been made by Langen,<sup>16</sup> and it is to his work that one first turns for examples. Such are the contradictions in the *Amphitruo*, where it is expressly stated that the scene of the play is in Thebes (Prol. 97; cf. ll. 376, 677, 1046), but at the same time frequent references are made to "the harbor" (ll. 149, 164, 195, etc.), and in the *Epidicus*, where the price of the girl is given as fifty *minae* in ll. 364-368 (cf. ll. 52, 141, 347), but as thirty *minae* in ll. 703-705. There are inconsistencies of character, too. Through the first four acts of the *Asinaria*, the figure of Philaenium appeals to us; in the closing scene it can arouse only disgust. An equally inconsistent scene occurs at the close of the *Bacchides*, where the two indignant fathers, instead of rescuing their sons from the clutches of the *meretrices*, themselves ogle these corrupters of youth, and end by going into the house to join the merry-making. Objection is sometimes made to the wordiness of certain scenes, the succession of quibbles and poor jokes, especially when one of the characters in the dialogue has announced that he is in a hurry. In the *Asinaria*, Act. II., Scene 2, Leonida comes on the stage, intent upon finding Libanus and imparting to him some important news. But when they meet, they thrust and parry for over thirty lines (ll. 297-331) before Leonida announces his business. And Thesprio, who is in such haste that he can not even look back to see who is pulling his cloak, nevertheless has time for a hundred lines of repartee and gossip. (*Epid.* I., 1.) Such flaws as these would not have es-

<sup>16</sup> P. Langen, *Plautinische Studien*, Berlin, 1886.

aped the notice of an accurate writer. But Plautus was not an accurate writer. His plays were composed hurriedly for immediate production, and his aim was not to write technically perfect drama, but to furnish amusement to the Roman populace.

The aim of an author who writes for the stage is necessarily different from the aim of one who writes for the reading public, and the history of a piece that lives only on the boards must differ from that of a printed book. Actors and stage-managers naturally make excisions, additions, and alterations to suit their own whims and the changing taste of the public;<sup>17</sup> and unless there be in addition a recognized standard text, these changes are likely to obscure the original form of the play. Such a fate is what we might expect for Plautus, if his comedies were performed after his death. And that his plays, like those of Naevius, Pacuvius, and Accius, were given at a later date, we can infer from Cicero's description of the lifelike way in which Roscius played the part of Ballio (*Pro Rosc. Com.* 7, 20).

In particular, we know of a definite period at which a special interest was taken in the production of Plautus. The beginning of this period is marked by the prologue to the *Casina*, ll. 5-20. The managers have heard, they say to the audience, *studiose expetere vos Plautinas fabulas*, and so they have brought out again an old comedy which, when it was first given, won the victory over all competitors. The date of this "Plautine Revival" is fixed by ll. 14-20. The second production of the *Casina* took place after the passing of the *flos poetarum* . . . *qui nunc abierunt hinc in communem locum* (ll. 18-19).

<sup>17</sup>The technical term applied to this process of addition and alteration is *retractatio*—a "working-over" of the plays. Cf. p. 13.



This must point to a date after 159 B. C., the year in which Terence died. Practically the same results are reached by calculation from ll. 14-15. There the speaker says that the *seniores* who were present would remember the first performance of the play, but the *iuniores* would not be familiar with it. There was a gap, then, of about thirty years, between the first production, which could not have been later than the death of Plautus, in 184 B. C., and the second, which was presumably not earlier than 154 B. C.

We do not know how long this revival lasted, nor how extensive it was. But we should naturally expect the managers who conducted the later performances to make some changes in the text to suit their own audiences. The most obvious addition would be some mention in the prologue of the Plautine authorship of the play. Thus we find in the scrap of prologue that is prefixed to our text of the *Pseudolus*, the same phrase that we noticed in the *Casina* (*Plautina . . . fabula*). Possibly, too, the prominence given to the name of Plautus in some of the other prologues may indicate a post-Plautine origin. The prologuist of the *Menaechmi* says (l. 3) *Apporto vobis Plautum—lingua, non manu*; and the Truculentus begins: *Perparvam partem postulat Plautus loci De vestris magnis atque amoenis moenibus*.

The name of the *Casina* seems to have been changed at this time, for we find it appearing in the prologue (ll. 31-32) as *Κληρούμενοι . . . Graece, Latine Sortientes*.<sup>18</sup> To the changes made in the same period may

<sup>18</sup>It is not clear from the text whether *Sortientes* was the original or the post-Plautine title of the play. The weight of recent scholarship favors the former view. See M. Schanz, *Römische Literaturgeschichte*<sup>3</sup> I., 1 (1907), p. 78, and the literature cited there.

be due the variant titles for other plays which occur in the grammarians. The *Mostellaria* is cited twice by Festus (p. 162M, quoting *Most.* 240, and p. 305, quoting *Most.* 727-728) as *Plautus in Phasmate* (*Fasmate*); and the *Syr* . . . (*i. e.*, *Syra*, the name of the *lena*?) which Festus cites (pp. 301, 352) may be only another name for the *Cistellaria*, since Priscian (I., 103) quotes the same phrase in a four-line passage (= *Cist.* 405-408) from *Plautus in Cistellaria*.<sup>19</sup>

Even in the body of the plays there are many suspicious points which can best be referred to changes made at the time of the Plautine Revival. It is hard to reconcile Cicero's exclamation (*De Senect.* 14, 50): *Quam gaudebat bello suo Punico Naevius! quam Truculento Plautus! quam Pseudolo!* with our present text of the *Truculentus*, in which the title is inappropriate and the action motiveless. Therefore Bergk's<sup>20</sup> theory that we have merely a shortened form of the Plautine play seems plausible. The *Curculio*, too, is slight in plot and (like the *Truculentus*) is considerably below the average of Plautus in length, so that here again we may suspect that the play has been abridged.<sup>21</sup>

At times the manuscripts show even clearer traces of revision. In many places we can recognize two parallel versions of the same speech or bit of dialogue. A glance at *Bacch.* 377-378, 380-381 will show that they contain exactly the same thought, expressed in almost identical words:

<sup>19</sup> F. Schoell, Ed. Mai. (1894), Praef., pp. XIII f.

<sup>20</sup> Th. Bergk, *Beiträge zur lateinischen Grammatik*, Halle, 1870, pp. 128 ff. O. Ribbeck in *Rhein. Mus.* 37 (1882), p. 422.

<sup>21</sup> Goetz in *Acta soc. phil. Lips.* 6 (1876), p. 282; Ed. Mai. (1879), Praef., p. xxii.

- ll. 377-378. *Quibus patrem et me teque amicosque omnes adfectas*  
*tuos*  
 Ad probrum, damnum, *flagitium* adpellere una et  
 perdere.
- ll. 380-381. *Quibus tuom patrem meque una, amicos, adfinis tuos*  
 Tua infamia fecisti gerulifigulos *flagiti*.

Similarly, *Most.* 816<sup>bc</sup>

- SI. Vin qui perductet? TH. Apage istum perductorem: non  
 placet.  
 Quicquid est, errabo potius, quam perductet quispiam,

presents in shorter form the sense of ll. 843-847:

- SI. Eho, istum, puere, circumduce hasce aedis et conclavia.  
 Nam egomet ductarem, nisi mi esset apud forum negotium.  
 TH. Apage istum a me perductorem: nil moror ductarier  
 Quicquid est, errabo potius, quam perductet quispiam.

In both these passages, only one of the two great families of manuscripts<sup>22</sup> is available, and all the manuscripts of the family agree in giving both versions. In some cases, however, one family presents a secondary version which is missing in the other. The most notable example is in the first scene of the *Stichus*, where a *canticum* is followed by a passage in *senarii* of exactly the same tenor—the latter omitted in A, but preserved in P. There are other less striking but still undoubted cases. *Bacch.* 519<sup>abc</sup> (omitted in A) repeat the sense and some of the phrasing of ll. 512-514:

- ll. 512-514. *Verum quam illa umquam de mea pecunia*  
*Ramenta fiat plumea propensior,*  
*Mendicium malim mendicando vincere.*

<sup>22</sup> A, the Ambrosian Palimpsest, probably written in the fourth century, and P, the Palatine family, a group of minuscule manuscripts ranging from the tenth to the twelfth century in date.

- ll. 519<sup>abc</sup>. *Sed autem quam illa umquam meis opulentiis  
Ramenta fiat gravior aut propensior,  
Mori me malim exeruciatum inopia.*

In *Cist.* 120-122, 126-129, the verbal parallels are not so close, but the thought is nevertheless the same, and the second passage is omitted in A. It is possible (though too much weight must not be laid upon this, in view of the proverbial weakness of grammarians' memories) that some of the disagreements between the *testimonia* and our received text may be explained on the theory of parallel versions, especially as Charisius, in quoting *Bacch.* 545 (*Bacch.* 540-551 are omitted in A) says *in quibusdam non ferunt<ur>*.

In addition to these secondary versions, the manuscripts sometimes present apparent attempts to shorten scenes by omission.<sup>23</sup> People who had to stretch their legs before a *Plautina longa fabula* came on the boards (*Pseud.* Prol.) would be likely to welcome some cutting. The method of indicating such omissions, according to Lindsay, was to adscribe in the margin, opposite the beginning of the passage in question, the line or lines which were immediately to follow.<sup>24</sup> This seems to be the purpose of the repetition in the first scene of the *Bacchides*.<sup>25</sup> Line 73 appears after l. 64, as well as in its proper place, and the verses that intervene (65-72) contain a series of puns and quibbles which might easily be spared. *Most.* 553, 557-559 are repeated after l. 549, as if to indicate the possibility of shortening this rather wordy passage.<sup>26</sup>

<sup>23</sup> Goetz in *Acta soc. phil. Lips.* 6 (1876), pp. 268 f. W. Lindsay, *Ancient Editions of Plautus*, Oxford, 1904, p. 1, note a (end).

<sup>24</sup> Lindsay in *Amer. Journ. Phil.* 21 (1900), p. 27.

<sup>25</sup> Goetz, Ed. Mai. (1886), *ad loc.*

<sup>26</sup> H. Kellermann in *Comm. phil. Jen.* 7 (1903), p. 134. Cf. Lindsay, Ed. (1905), *ad loc.*

In the *Trinummus*, some stage-manager seems to have cut out ll. 362-368—pious reflections which are somewhat tedious after the protracted moralizing of the first part of the scene—in order to come to the point in l. 369.<sup>27</sup> This line is inserted in A after l. 361; and in P, not only l. 369, but l. 368 as well, has slipped into this place.

To this stage revision of Plautus has been given, in recent years, the technical name *retractatio*. It corresponds to the Greek *διασκευή* (which was Ritschl's term for it), and though, like the word *contaminatio*, it has no support in classical Latin, it is so convenient that it may well be retained. The first work on *retractatio* was done by Osann,<sup>28</sup> in the last three chapters of his *Analecta Critica*. He summed up the evidence for performances of Plautus after his death, with especial emphasis on the *Casina*-prologue, and argued that many variations in our texts must go back to these later productions. The actors' versions were, in his opinion, responsible for the citation by grammarians of verses not in our text, or of different forms of verses which we have, as well as for parallels in the manuscripts of Plautus. His first two points are open to question, and so is his assumption of post-Plautine subject-matter in such passages, *e. g.*, as *Bacch.* 1072-1075, which speaks of a triumph as a common thing, or *Cas.* 699, which mentions a *vilicus*. But his principle that where parallel versions exist both should be preserved, is correct; and his opinion agrees in several cases (*e. g.*, *Bacch.* 511-520; *Pers.* 442-443, 433-436) with the results of more recent scholarship, while in others (*Capt.* 1022, *Most.* 548 ff.,

<sup>27</sup> Lindsay in *Amer. Journ. Phil.* 21 (1900), pp. 27 f.

<sup>28</sup> F. Osann, *Analecta Critica*, Berlin, 1816, pp. 141-204.

*Poen.* 1042 ff.), even though his solution may not be correct, he has recognized the difficulty.

The weak points in Osann's theories were patent enough, and it was these, rather than his real contributions to the study of Plautus, that scholars of his generation chose to consider. Ladewig<sup>29</sup> pointed out the danger of inferring from discrepancies in grammarians' citations that different versions of a play existed, when the same result might have been brought about by many other causes—lacunae in our text, carelessness in quoting, or error in the text tradition of the grammarians themselves.

Ritschl's *Parerga*<sup>30</sup> contain a number of valuable observations on the period of the Plautine Revival<sup>31</sup> and its effect on the manuscript tradition—especially changes of title,<sup>32</sup> new versions of the prologues,<sup>33</sup> and the second ending of the *Poenulus*.<sup>34</sup> But in reality Ritschl was rather conservative in applying his theories to single points in the text. He notes various kinds of addition and repetition in the *Trinummus*, but, even though he observes that l. 312 “perbene, si numeros spectas, factus est versiculus,” he takes this merely as proof of “vetustas interpolationis et exercitatio interpolatoris.”<sup>35</sup> The section *De Plauti Bacchidibus*<sup>36</sup> contains a spirited reply to Osann on this one play. Ritschl argues that the difficulties of the play are caused mainly by the loss of a large portion at the beginning, and that the confusion in the text which leads Osann to suspect parallel versions,

<sup>29</sup> Ladewig in *Zeitschr. f. Altertumswiss.* 1841, coll. 1079 ff.; *Rhein. Mus.* 3 (1845), pp. 179-205; 520-540.

<sup>30</sup> F. Ritschl, *Parerga Plautina et Terentiana*, Leipzig, 1845.

<sup>31</sup> Pp. 89 ff.

<sup>32</sup> Pp. 157 ff.; 233 ff.

<sup>33</sup> Pp. 180 ff.

<sup>34</sup> Pp. 601 ff.

<sup>35</sup> Pp. 509 ff.

<sup>36</sup> Pp. 389 ff. Cf. Ritschl in *Rhein. Mus.* 4 (1846), pp. 354 ff.; 567 ff. (= *Opusc.* II., pp. 293-374).

is due to the usual carelessness of scribes. It is possible, however, to trace a gradual shifting of position in Ritschl's editions of the plays. When he edited the *Trinummus*, he committed himself no further than to say: <sup>37</sup> "Ceterum diversarum recensionum tenues quasdam tanquam reliquias non infitior hodie quoque superesse, sed earum ex antiquioribus ut puto saeculis repetendarum, partim autem sua sponte natarum, partim critica opera grammaticorum paratarum"; and the note on *Bacch.* 377, 378 (Ed. 1849) is equally cautious: <sup>38</sup> "Non possunt ab eodem posita esse qui versus 380, 381 scriberet: quamquam iam a Nonio lecti, qui priorem affert." Ritschl recognized traces of *διασκευή* in the *Stichus*,<sup>39</sup> especially in the first scene, and in the names of the sisters, which appear in different forms in the two families of manuscripts; he thought that *Pers.* IV., 9 must have suffered shortening; <sup>40</sup> and finally, in his preface to the *Mercator*,<sup>41</sup> he not only distinguished between *διασκευή* and the dittography of the scribes, but assumed that the prologue, either as a whole or in part, and three certain cases of "parallels," dated from the Plautine Revival at the beginning of the seventh century A. U. C.

Bergk, in his reviews of Ritschl's edition of Plautus,<sup>42</sup> had noted that certain cases of dittography were due, not to the changes of a grammarian or copyist, but to alteration for the stage; and he observed with some pleasure Ritschl's gradual conversion to his own point of view.

<sup>37</sup> Ed. (1848), Praef., p. lxxvii. (= *Opusc.* v., 325).

<sup>38</sup> Ed. (1849), *ad loc.*

<sup>39</sup> Ed. (1850), Praef., pp. x ff.

<sup>40</sup> Ed. (1853), Praef., p. ix.

<sup>41</sup> Ed. (1854), Praef., pp. vii f.

<sup>42</sup> Th. Bergk in *Zeitschr. f. Altertumswiss.* 6 (1848), coll. 1124-1149 (= *Opusc.* I., pp. 3-29) on *Trinummus*; 8 (1850), coll. 325-348 (= *Opusc.* I., pp. 29-53), on *Miles*, *Bacchides*, *Stichus*.

Even Ladewig so far changed his opinion about this "grundverkehrt" theory of Osann's,<sup>43</sup> that he published in 1861<sup>44</sup> a series of conjectures of his own, made on the basis of Ritschl's text, in which he recognized a number of parallel passages and later additions.

Thus at the end of half a century, *retractatio* had won a place as a recognized phenomenon in Plautus. The work since 1870 has consisted chiefly of a more detailed study of single plays, and of theorizing as to when and how the later versions entered our text tradition.

Oskar Seyffert<sup>45</sup> in 1874 suggested a theory which he has since elaborated: namely, that the variant lines of our text of Plautus were, at one period in the history of the manuscripts, written in the margin; and that their present position, sometimes before, sometimes after, the place where they belong, is due to careless copying from the margin into the text. Seyffert's statements were made on the basis of a few suspicious passages. Two years later Goetz<sup>46</sup> made a study of a large number of dittographies, dividing them into four general classes: (1) where one version immediately follows the other; (2) where one is inserted in the middle of the other; (3) where the two are separated by an interval; (4) where only the later version is preserved. As characteristics of the rewritten passages he notes an effort for rhythmical correspondence, humor of a very poor quality, and especially the attempt to shorten excessively long scenes. He observes that the dittographies generally appear in both families of manuscripts, and he therefore concludes that

<sup>43</sup> Ladewig in *Rhein. Mus.* 3 (1845), p. 523.

<sup>44</sup> Ladewig in *Philol.* 17 (1861), pp. 248-269; 452-480.

<sup>45</sup> O. Seyffert, *Studia Plautina*, Berlin, 1874, pp. 10 ff.

<sup>46</sup> G. Goetz in *Acta soc. phil. Lips.* 6 (1876), pp. 235-326.



they probably stood in the common archetype, into which the smaller ones at least were introduced as marginal adscripts. Another general treatment of the plays was undertaken by Langen,<sup>47</sup> who, in 1886, discussed the troublesome points of each play under three headings: (1) repetition of thought; (2) discrepancies in subject-matter; (3) spurious and suspected passages. The great value of his work lies in its completeness. Where two versions unquestionably exist, Langen's comprehensive study enables him to decide which is Plautine; and on the other hand he can argue that certain faults which are characteristic of Plautus everywhere are not to be charged to *retractatio*.

In the ten years between Goetz's article and Langen's book students of Plautus produced numerous articles and studies on the individual plays. Many of them made some valuable contributions to our knowledge of *retractatio*, but nearly all went too far in their search for traces of dittography.<sup>48</sup> Within the last ten years there has been a revival of interest in the subject, and a second (and perhaps a more moderate) set of dissertations has appeared.

Recent study of *retractatio* has been more or less closely connected with critical estimates of the manuscripts. Since the time of Ritschl,<sup>49</sup> it had been a generally accepted idea that the two families of manuscripts which we have to-day—A, the Ambrosian Palimpsest, written in rustic capitals and dating probably from the fourth cen-

<sup>47</sup> P. Langen, *Plautinische Studien*, Berlin, 1886.

<sup>48</sup> See, for example: W. Brachmann, *De Bacchidum Plautinae retractatione scaenica*, in *Leipz. Stud.* 3 (1880), pp. 59-187; A. Anspach, *De Bacchidum Plautinae retractatione scaenica*, Bonn, 1882.

<sup>49</sup> Ritschl, Ed. *Trin.* (1848), pp. xxxviii ff.

tury, and P, the Palatine family, consisting of a half dozen minuscule manuscripts—went back to a common archetype; and numerous studies were made to determine which of these families was the more trustworthy.<sup>50</sup> In 1885, in the preface to his edition of Plautus,<sup>51</sup> Leo stated a theory (more fully developed later<sup>52</sup>) which has given the impetus to much of the recent work on the manuscript question. The theory is: that our two families of manuscripts, A and P, represent reading copies of an edition of the twenty-one plays made by Probus (a grammarian of the Flavian period) or his school. Both this edition and the first published edition of Plautus, in the age of Lucilius and Accius, were made on Alexandrian principles—*i. e.*, everything in the sources was preserved in the text, and critical symbols indicated spuriousness or referred to notes in the commentary. The variant readings and parallel versions in our manuscripts accordingly owe their preservation to the grammatical work of these two periods. The last point was disputed by Seyffert. He had evidently been collecting material to support his theory of marginal variants during the twenty years that had elapsed since the publication of his *Studia Plautina*.<sup>53</sup> He now took as a starting point Leo's remark<sup>54</sup> that the repetition of *Men.* 1037-1043, in slightly different form, between l. 1028 and l. 1029, was due to a grammarian of the second or third

<sup>50</sup> Such as M. Niemeyer, *De Plauti fabularum recensione duplici*, Berlin, 1877; B. Baier, *De Plauti fabularum recensioneibus Ambrosiana et Palatina commentatio critica*, Breslau, 1885.

<sup>51</sup> Leo, Ed. (1885), Praef.

<sup>52</sup> Leo, *Plaut. Forsch.*, pp. 1-53; *Plaut. Cant.*, pp. 5 ff.

<sup>53</sup> E. A. Sonnenschein in *Trans. Amer. Phil. Ass.* 24 (1893), p. 7, quotes Seyffert "in a private communication" on this question.

<sup>54</sup> Leo, *Plaut. Forsch.*, pp. 15, 16.

century, who copied this version into the margin of his manuscript. Seyffert<sup>55</sup> questioned Leo's statement, and, with a wealth of suggestion and illustration, advanced the contrary theory: that the variant in question appeared in the common ancestor of A and P, and that at least a considerable number of the differences between our two recensions can be traced back, not to the activity of grammarians, but to marginal or interlinear variants in the archetype.

Leo's theory was again attacked by Lindsay, who devoted his "Ancient Editions of Plautus"<sup>56</sup> to a statement of his own views. According to Lindsay, the text-tradition of Plautus followed after his death "two main divergent channels," "the one adhering to the genuine 'ipsa verba' of the poet, the other exhibiting all the alterations, curtailments, or amplifications introduced by the stage-managers of the Revival time in order to make the performance pleasing to the audience of the day." There was a certain amount of "mixture" of these two versions, and of addition from grammarians and commentators, but in general the Ambrosian Palimpsest represents the first of these traditions, the genuine "ipsa verba" of the plays, and the Palatine text shows the "Revival" adaptations.

This view, "conservative" and "optimistic" as Lindsay thought it, has aroused much opposition. The Italian reviewer<sup>57</sup> who criticized the book found himself "pienamente d'accordo" with the views expressed there, but English and German critics have treated it less kindly.

<sup>55</sup> Seyffert in *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 16 (1896), coll. 252-255; 283-288.

<sup>56</sup> Lindsay, *The Ancient Editions of Plautus*, Oxford, 1904, especially pp. 35-37; 142-150.

<sup>57</sup> Aurelio-Giuseppe Amatucci in *Riv. di Fil.* 34 (1906), pp. 605-608.

Leo<sup>58</sup> thinks that Lindsay has too little regard for the views of other scholars on the passages which he discusses, and is too anxious to find "stage alterations" wherever P differs from A, even in single words. "Und wenn man Lindsay recht geben will," he concludes, "dass meistens A die ursprüngliche Lesart bietet, so folgt damit doch nichts für seine Hypothese, dass A in ungebrochener Linie auf Plautus, P in eben so ungebrochener Linie auf die gleich nach Plautus eingetretene Überarbeitung zurückgehe." And Sonnenschein<sup>59</sup> puts his opinion concisely: "Mr. Lindsay's conception of the independence of the two recensions from so early a date will not, I think, be found to hold water."<sup>60</sup>

One class of difficulties still remains, a class which is found to a greater or less extent in all classical authors, and which may therefore be briefly dismissed. This kind of alteration, which goes by the name of *interpolaratio*, originates later than any of the others, and is due chiefly to the work of grammarians and commentators. It often arises through the addition in the margin of a parallel passage from some other play, which in the course of time is taken into the text. The earlier stage of this process appears in the manuscript B. *Curc.* II, 1 is concerned with the physical condition of the *leno* Cappadox. In the margin opposite ll. 222, 223 (though apparently intended as an adscript to the phrase *oculis herbeis* in l. 231) are the words:

<sup>58</sup> Leo in *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 166 (1904), pp. 358-374.

<sup>59</sup> Sonnenschein in *Class. Rev.* 19 (1905), pp. 311-316.

<sup>60</sup> One great objection to Lindsay's theory, the existence of a large number of common errors in A and P, was emphasized by Leo (*Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1904, pp. 364 ff.), and has since been investigated in detail by Eugen Sicker (*Philol. Suppl.*-Band. XI. (1908), pp. 179-252).

solent tibi oculi duri fieri  
censesne locustam esse,

and opposite ll. 242, 243:

album atrum vinum potas  
quid tibi quaesito opus est.

Both couplets are confused versions of lines from *Men.* v., 5 (923-924; 915 ff.), the scene in which the physician is examining Menaechmus I. for symptoms of insanity; and Ritschl<sup>61</sup> thinks it probable that they were set down as parallels for the similar scene in the *Curculio*. So *Stich.* 722

Quid igitur? quamquam gravatus fuisti, non nocuit tamen

seems to have been added as a parallel to l. 763 *gravate*, and then to have been copied into the text after l. 766.<sup>62</sup>

In the same way, a gloss on a single word or the explanation of a difficult phrase may be added between the lines or in the margin, and so creep into the text. This accounts for some extra lines and some divergence of tradition in our manuscripts. *Poen.* 1020

Ut hortum fodiat atque ut frumentum metat

is apparently an explanation of *palas* and *mergas* two lines above; and *Pers.* 321 *rogasti* P (for *orasti* A);<sup>63</sup> 408 *periure* A (for *iniure* P and Nonius); *Poen.* 342 *oculto* A (for *abstruso* P) all seem to be glosses.

We are indebted to Ritschl for clearing away many of these intrusions into our text, and in particular for point-

<sup>61</sup> Ritschl in *Philol.* 1 (1846), pp. 300 ff. (= *Opusc.* II., pp. 274 ff.)

<sup>62</sup> Ritschl in *Philol.* 1 (1846), p. 305 (= *Opusc.* II., p. 281).

<sup>63</sup> Cf. Lindsay, *Anc. Edd.*, p. 73.

ing out how often the citation of a parallel passage might cause confusion.<sup>64</sup> Goetz, in his discussion of *Ditto-graphien im Plautustexte*,<sup>65</sup> and Kellermann in the article entitled *De Plauto Sui Imitatore*,<sup>66</sup> made similar studies, but in each of these the work on *interpolatio* was simply a preliminary to the main investigation.

The century of philological work on Plautus, the course of which has just been outlined, makes it possible to summarize the causes of difficulty and inconsistency in the plays as follows: (1) free treatment by Plautus of his Greek originals, resulting in omissions or in the combination of two originals into one Latin play; (2) Plautine carelessness in detail;<sup>67</sup> (3) changes in the text made during the Revival, a generation after the death of Plautus; and (4) parallel adscripts, explanations, and glosses, added by later scribes.

The mass of difficulties grouped under the third head of this summary (*retractatio*) forms the subject of the present investigation. An effort has been made first of all to determine whether the two great families of manu-

<sup>64</sup> Ritschl in *Philol.* 1 (1846), pp. 300-314 (= *Opusc.* II., pp. 274-291).

<sup>65</sup> Goetz in *Acta soc. phil. Lips.* 6 (1876), pp. 236 ff.

<sup>66</sup> Kellerman in *Comm. phil. Jen.* 7 (1903), pp. 131 ff.

<sup>67</sup> Inconsistencies due to the first two causes are traceable to Plautus himself. Further back than Plautus it is almost impossible to go. But as the charm of Menander shows through even the mutilated *Cistellaria*, so it is possible that a few of the defects in Plautus may be referred to his Greek models. Wilamowitz (*Index schol. Gött.* 1893-1894, pp. 13 ff.) has made it probable that the poor technique and crude character-drawing of the *Persa* go back to an original in Middle Comedy, and it may be that Acts I.-III. of the *Poenulus*, which are distinctly poorer than the other half of the play, merely reflect the weakness and verbosity of the Greek original. (See the analysis below).

scripts differ in the amount of *retractatio* that they indicate, and secondarily to throw new light on the general problem of *retractatio*. Since the two groups of manuscripts can be compared only where it is possible to know the contents of the Ambrosian Palimpsest, the work is limited to the five plays best preserved in that manuscript (*Persa*, *Poenulus*, *Pseudolus*, *Stichus*, *Trinummus*), and primarily to those portions of the plays the text of which is contained in both A and P. Except in cases where the source of the confusion is doubtful, difficulties due to other causes than *retractatio* are excluded. Of the passages suspected of *retractatio*, only those in which its presence seems fairly probable are discussed; others, which can lead only to questionable conclusions, are listed in footnotes.<sup>68</sup> Citations are made from the Goetz-Schoell text of Plautus (*Editio Minor*),<sup>69</sup> and Studemund's *Apographon*<sup>70</sup> is taken as the basis of the work on A.

Mention has already been made of the two families of manuscripts on which our text of Plautus is based. A fuller description is a necessary preliminary to an investigation which must constantly refer to the manuscripts. Until the early part of the nineteenth century, only one of these families, the Palatine, was known. This group, which received its name from the fact that

<sup>68</sup> Variations of a word or phrase are not considered. Of course some of these may be due to *retractatio* (e. g., *Pers.* 597 *me impulsore atque inlice* A, *suasu atque impulsu meo* P; *Poen.* 343 *palpas et lallas* A, *caput et corpus copulas* P); but the majority of cases are probably to be assigned to scribal error or interpolation.

<sup>69</sup> G. Goetz and F. Schoell, *Plauti Comoediae*, Leipzig, 1892-1896 (revised 1904-1909).

<sup>70</sup> W. Studemund, *T. Macci Plauti Fabularum Reliquiae Ambrosianae*, Berlin, 1889.

its most important representatives, B and C, were at one time in the library of the Elector Palatine, comprises six or seven manuscripts, ranging in date from the early tenth to the late twelfth century. Though the manuscripts vary greatly in authority, their common origin is a recognized fact.<sup>71</sup> Therefore, for the purposes of this paper, variations between the individual manuscripts are disregarded, and the whole family is designated by the symbol P.

Of the other family of manuscripts there is only one representative, a palimpsest in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, written about the fourth century, and covered in the seventh or eighth century with parts of the Book of Kings. It was discovered by Cardinal Mai, under whose direction an imperfect collation was published in 1815 with the title *M. Accii Plauti Fragmenta Inedita*. Even at that time the manuscript was in a bad condition. Some leaves were lost altogether, and those that remained had been injured by the cleaning process, by the ink of the second writing, and by the chemicals that Mai used to restore the original text. With careless handling and with the passage of time, some of the pages were torn, and others decayed so as to leave only a border around the edge, while the ink gradually faded. Ritschl, writing in 1837,<sup>72</sup> lamented the loss of some passages (*e. g.*, in the *Cistellaria*), which could have been read when the palimpsest was first discovered, and censured Mai for not having published a complete collation at

<sup>71</sup> See the *stemma codicum* in Ritschl's edition of the *Trinummus* (1848), and the discussions in more recent critical editions—*e. g.*, Lindsay's edition of the *Captivi*, London, 1900.

<sup>72</sup> Ritschl in *Zeitschrift f. Altertumswiss.* 1837, coll. 737-758 (= *Opusc.* II., pp. 166-197).



that time; and Geppert found in 1846<sup>73</sup> that much that had been visible even the year before had faded away. Studemund, "that scholar-hero," as Sonnenschein calls him,<sup>74</sup> spent the greater part of twenty-five years in deciphering the palimpsest,<sup>75</sup> only to die before his results were given to the world. They were brought out by his friend Oskar Seyffert, and are now accessible to the student of Plautus, in a form which is of infinitely more value to him than the manuscript itself would be.

Fortunately, even the smallest fragments are of value for the study of *retractatio*. A few letters at the beginning or end of the lines, even where all the rest of the passage is gone, show whether or not a certain passage appeared in A, and what was the order of the lines. Even the contents of a missing sheet may sometimes be estimated accurately. Difficulty arises when the missing section contained a *canticum*, in which case there can be no certainty as to how the lines were divided, or unusually long verses, like trochaic *septenarii* or iambic *octonarii*, which are run over in varying proportions, sometimes only one line out of thirty-five, sometimes three lines out of four. Passages containing scene-headings also cause difficulty. In general, the scene-division<sup>76</sup> of A corresponds to that of our printed texts; but sometimes, (*e. g.*, *Pseud.* IV., 5, 6) two scenes are run together under the same rubric, and sometimes (*e. g.*, *Pers.* IV., 7), where a single character leaves the stage, there is no

<sup>73</sup> K. Geppert, *Über den Codex Ambrosianus u. seinen Einfluss auf die plautinische Kritik*, Leipzig, 1847, p. 28.

<sup>74</sup> Sonnenschein in *Trans. Amer. Phil. Ass.* 24 (1893), p. 10.

<sup>75</sup> W. Studemund, *T. Macci Plauti Fabularum Reliquiae Ambrosianae*, Berlin, 1889 (Edited by O. Seyffert). Prooem., p. xxii., Seyffert's note.

<sup>76</sup> There is no division into *acts* in any of the manuscripts.

new scene-heading. On the other hand, A leaves a space of one line before the speech of the *Caterva* (*Capt.* 1029), and makes a similar break at the entrance of Saturio (*Pers.* 726). The amount of space left for the scene-headings is not always the same. In about 75 per cent of the cases extant the scene-headings occupy two lines, but the exceptions occur so irregularly that one can never be sure how much space was occupied by the missing headings. In the present paper, calculation of the amount of text in lost sheets of A is for the most part confined to continuous passages of trimeter without scene-divisions. Even here, of course, the results are not absolutely certain; in other places, though the calculation has occasionally been made, it has even slighter claims to accuracy.

---

## CHAPTER I.

### *PERSA*

The hero of the *Persa* is a slave, Toxilus, who holds a position of trust in his master's household, and has been left in charge during the master's absence. Toxilus is in love with Lemniselenis, a girl in the service of the *leno* Dordalus, and is anxious to obtain her freedom. But as he himself, being a slave, can neither purchase another slave nor be *patronus* of a freedwoman, he arranges with Dordalus that on a certain day he shall pay the required sum of money, and that Dordalus shall then go through the form necessary to set her free.<sup>1</sup> The day approaches, and Toxilus has not succeeded in getting the money. He therefore persuades his friend Sagaristio, who is likewise a slave, to lend him six hundred *nummi*, promising to repay him in a few days. Sagaristio provides the sum in question by appropriating funds given him by his master for the purchase of cattle; the money is paid, and Lemniselenis is set free. In the meantime, Toxilus has arranged another scheme to make the *leno* himself pay back the sum that has been borrowed from Sagaristio. The daughter of the parasite Saturio is dressed up as if she came from the Far East; Sagaristio puts on Persian garb, and is introduced to Dordalus as a messenger from Toxilus' master, who has an Arabian girl for sale. Dordalus sees the girl, is so charmed with her that he is willing to make the purchase *suo periculo*,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff in *Index schol. Gött.* 1893-1894, p. 18.

and pays the exorbitant sum of sixty *minae*<sup>2</sup> on the spot. Of course the natural sequel follows. As soon as the pseudo-Persian is out of the way, the father of the girl appears and threatens a law-suit; and the play ends with an uproarious banquet of Toxilus, Sagaristio, and Lemniselenis.

The *Persa* stands alone among the plays of Plautus in showing indications of an original in Middle Comedy. Wilamowitz<sup>3</sup> was the first scholar to suggest this date for the original of the play, and his theory, which has been accepted by Seyffert,<sup>4</sup> Hueffner,<sup>5</sup> and Leo,<sup>6</sup> seems to be well established, in spite of a recent attempt to combat it.<sup>7</sup> Wilamowitz's strongest argument is that the play represents the Persian Empire as still intact. The story of a messenger who comes *ex Persia* (l. 498), with news of the capture of Chrysopolis in Arabia by the Persians, points to a date before the conquests of Alexander. For, while it is true that the account of the Persian campaign makes no pretensions to truthfulness,<sup>8</sup> still the Athenian public must have demanded a certain amount of verisimilitude, and a story in which Persians figured as the chief actors would have had no point after the downfall of the Persian Empire. Therefore we may

<sup>2</sup> The regular price was twenty or thirty *minae*. Cf. Ritschl, *Opusc.* II., p. 308, note.

<sup>3</sup> Wilamowitz in *Index schol. Gött.* 1893-1894, pp. 13-26.

<sup>4</sup> Seyffert in Bursian's *Jahresber.* 1895, pp. 39 ff.

<sup>5</sup> F. Hueffner, *De Plauti Comoediarum Exemplis Atticis*, Göttingen, 1894, pp. 70 f.; 74-76.

<sup>6</sup> Leo, *Plaut. Forsch.*, p. 110; cf. Leo in *Hermes* 41 (1906), pp. 441 ff.

<sup>7</sup> M. Meyer, *De Plauti Persa*, in *Comm. phil. Jen.* 8 (1907), pp. 145-191.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Meyer, *De Plauti Persa*, pp. 181 ff.

assume that the original of the *Persa* was a Greek play of the age of Demosthenes.

To the unfinished technique of the Greek original may be due certain defects in the plot and the character-drawing of the *Persa*. The exceptional subject-matter of the play attracted the attention of Camerarius, who commented on it: "Argumentum fabulae est exile, amationis servilis." Although *servilis amatio* is touched upon in some of the other plays (*Amph.* 658; *Mil.* 1007-1008; *Stich.* 431-434), there is no other play in which the love of a slave forms the main theme.<sup>9</sup> But this *argumentum exile* may be merely another indication that the play originated in Middle Comedy. Slaves are prominent in several of the earlier plays of Aristophanes (we remember Dionysus and Xanthias in the *Frogs*, the Paphlagonian and his rival in the *Knights*); and in the *Plutus*, which stands on the border-line between Old and Middle Comedy, the slave Carion is one of the most important figures. It would have been only natural, therefore, if this tradition had continued and slaves had played an active part in the plots of Middle Comedy.<sup>10</sup>

The composition of the *Persa* is poor, although the theory of *contaminatio*, suggested by Ladewig<sup>11</sup> and discussed at length by van Ijsendijk,<sup>12</sup> has not been proved. Van Ijsendijk thought that the *Persa* was made up of two plays: (A) the *Persa* (our present Acts IV.-V.), in which a free-born girl is put through a form of sale,

<sup>9</sup> Meyer, *De Plauti Persa*, p. 152.

<sup>10</sup> W. Süß in *Rhein. Mus.* 65 (1910), p. 456; cf. Wilamowitz in *Index schol. Gött.* 1893-1894, pp. 18 ff.

<sup>11</sup> Ladewig, *Über den Kanon des Volcatius Sedigitus*, Neustrelitz, 1842, pp. 38 ff.

<sup>12</sup> A. van Ijsendijk, *De T. Macci Plauti Persa*, Utrecht, 1884.

and with the proceeds of this sale a lover gets his *amica*; (B) the *Boaria* or *Sagaristio*, in which a slave steals the money given him by his master to buy cattle, and so helps the *erilis filius* to get his *amica* free. But, as van Ijsendijk's critics have observed,<sup>13</sup> the two lines of action start together, and are connected throughout the play; and the whole object of the pretended sale is to get the *leno* to pay for Lemniselenis with *his own* money, and so repay the loan of *Sagaristio*. Anyone who is not convinced of the unity of the *Persa* need only compare it with one of the certainly contaminated plays (*Miles* or *Poenulus*). The length of the *Persa* is only 857 lines, while each of the others has 1400 lines or more; and the two threads of the story are closely interwoven here, while in the others the two plots are quite distinct, and the line of division clearly marked.

The banquet scene at the close is only loosely connected with the rest of the play, but there is no reason for suspecting a separate origin. The persons involved are the same as in the earlier scenes, and their conduct is quite consistent; Paegnium, for instance, shows himself just the same merry wag in Act V. as he was in Act II. To one who remembers the festivities with which Aristophanes ends his plays—the banquet spread for Dicaeopolis, the weddings of Peisthetairus and Trygaeus—the last act of the *Persa* will sound a familiar note; and the discomfiture of the *leno* in the final scene will seem closely akin to the horseplay of the Old Comedy.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>13</sup> Seyffert in Bursian's *Jahresber.* 1886, pp. 111 f.; Meyer, *De Plauti Persa*, pp. 159 ff.

<sup>14</sup> Wilamowitz in *Index schol. Gött.* 1893-1894, pp. 22 f.; Süss in *Rhein. Mus.* 65 (1910), p. 456.

The character-drawing shows the broad lines of the Old Comedy rather than the finer touches of the New. The *leno* Dordalus, stupid and gullible to the last degree, is not far removed from some of the exaggerated figures of Aristophanes. The daughter of Saturio, too, with her elevated diction and her rhetorical sentences, may reflect the technique of the transitional period, when a free-born woman was as yet an unfamiliar figure on the comic stage, and the playwright had to borrow some touches from the heroines of tragedy.<sup>15</sup>

TO. Cape hęc sis. DO. Quin das? TO. Númmi sexcenti hęc  
erunt 437

Probi, numerati: fác sit mulier líbera,  
Atque hęc continuo addíce. DO. Iam faxo hęc erit.  
Non hércle quoi nunc hęc dem spectandúm scio. 440  
TO. Fortásse metuis ín manum conerédere?  
†Mirúm quin citius iam á foro argentárii  
Abeúnt quam ín cursu rótula circumuórtitur.  
Abi istác trauorsis ángiportis ád forum:  
Eadem ista[ha]ec facito múlier ad me tránseat 445  
Per hórtum. DO. Iam hic faxo áderit. TO. At ne própalam.  
DO. Sapiénter sane. TO. Súpplicatum crás eat  
DO. Ita hércle uero. TO. Dúm stas, reditum opórtuit.

440 ff. The difficulties of this passage have puzzled scholars for the last hundred years, and the number of explanations is almost equal to the number of writers on the subject. The dialogue runs quite smoothly down to l. 439; then Dordalus says (l. 440), evidently referring to the money that Toxilus has just paid: *Non hercle quoi nunc hoc dem spectandum scio*—i. e., *spectandum, utrum probum sit necne*.<sup>16</sup> Toxilus' reply (l. 441): *Fortasse*

<sup>15</sup> Wilamowitz in *Index schol. Gött.* 1893-1894, pp. 25 f.

<sup>16</sup> Langen, *Plaut. Stud.*, p. 334.

*metuis in manum concedere*, is disjointed and hardly intelligible, since it lacks both direct object and dative of the person with *in manum concedere*. The couplet which follows (ll. 442-443) bears a striking resemblance to ll. 433-436:

DO. Mirúm quin tibi ego créderem | ut idém mihi                    433  
 Facerés quod pártim fáciunt argentáarii:  
 Ubi quíd credideris, cítius extempló foro  
 Fugiúnt quam ex porta lúdis quom emissíst lepús,

but it has no grammatical construction and no logical connection with the rest of the dialogue. Then (ll. 444-448) come certain directions about the freeing of Lemniselenis.

Out of the tangle we can separate ll. 442-443, which are clearly a fragmentary parallel version (probably with a line lost between *quin* and *cítius*) of ll. 433-436. The first version, a comparison of the money-changers to a hare at the games, may be Plautine, since we know of the use of animals in the games before the death of Plautus. (*Liv.* 39, 22 tells of a *venatio data leonum et pantherum* in the year 186 B. C.) This reference is paralleled by one to the ostrich in an earlier scene (l. 199 *marinus passer per circum*), and the two together make it probable that there was a keen interest in *venationes* at the time that the play was produced. The second simile (ll. 442-443), which is much more general, may have been added after this interest had declined.

With this intrusive couplet removed, it is possible to trace a certain connection in the dialogue. Toxilus pays the money, saying, "Set the woman free, and then bring her to me immediately." Dordalus murmurs, half to himself, as he examines the money, "How am I to know



whether this is good or not?" and Toxilus adds, seeing his hesitation, "Are you afraid to hand her over to me?"<sup>17</sup> Then he goes on rapidly: "Take this side street to the forum; [have your money tested and set her free]; then bring her back secretly by the same path. [I want her company to-day myself]; to-morrow she may go to sacrifice for her liberation." But even so there is much that is not clear. We do not quite get the force of *metuis . . . concredere*; no explanation is given for the injunction to secrecy (ll. 444-446); and the reason why the sacrifice is to be postponed until the morrow must be inferred.

It seems probable that the end of this scene, like a later section (ll. 738 ff.), has suffered considerable cutting, which has left only the bare essentials of the dialogue, without the necessary connection. If this is so, we may put down ll. 442-443 as a parallel version of ll. 433-436, and say that ll. 440-441, 444-448 are a shortened version of a scene now lost.

P has the verses in the order of the Goetz-Schoell text.

A agrees with P through l. 443, then *deest* 444-478 (35 lines of *senarius*). The passage contains three scene-headings, which, if given in the regular form, would have occupied 6 lines more, making a total of 41 lines. The one sheet missing in A would have given space for only 38 lines in all. But it is possible that some of the headings were missing in A (Cf. iv., 9, where A makes no division), or that the scene-headings occupied only one line each (Cf. III., 2;

<sup>17</sup>The object of the verb has commonly been taken as *argentum*, but there is no reason why *mulierem* should not be supplied from l. 438. It is the woman who is Toxilus' great concern at this point (Cf. ll. 438, 445, 447.) The use of *concredere* with a person as the direct object is supported by *Capt.* 348 (*filium*); *Cist.* 245 (*amicam*); and *manus* in the technical sense of the power of a man over the women of his household is too well known to need comment.

III., 3 in A.<sup>18</sup> In any case, A has ll. 442-443, which are the most suspicious verses.

---

TO. Sagarístio, heus, exi átque educe uírginem  
 Et istás tabellas quás consignauit tibi, 460  
 Quas tu áttulisti mi áb ero meo usque e Pérsia.

460-461. This couplet seems to be a later insertion, introduced to prepare the audience for the sudden appearance of the letter in l. 497. No mention has been made of this letter in the previous plans of Toxilus,<sup>19</sup> and when the trick is finally played on Dordalus, it is not Sagaristio, but Toxilus himself, who hands over the tablet (l. 497). The two lines are an awkward addition after l. 459, and the dependence of *tabellas* upon *educere* is unparalleled.<sup>20</sup>

A *deest*.

---

TO. Age illúc apscede prócul e conspectú: [SA.] tace. 467  
 Vbi cúm lenone mé uidebis cónloqui,  
 Id erít adeundi témpus. nunc agérite uos.

467-468. These verses are identical with 727-728, and must therefore be regarded with suspicion in one of the two places. Some connecting link is necessary between IV., 2 and IV., 3, and we must either retain 467-

<sup>18</sup> The latter explanation is suggested by Studemund. See his note on fol. 575v.

<sup>19</sup> A discussion of all the details of the plan was of course not necessary. The trick is perfectly clear without a previous mention of the letter, as is the similar trick in *Bacch.* IV., 9, where l. 941 is the only preparation for the presentation of the letter in ll. 997 ff.

<sup>20</sup> Langen, *Plaut. Stud.*, p. 178.

468 or assume that these verses have crowded out other directions to Sagaristio.

A *deest*.

---

DO. Iúbedum ea hóc accédât ad me. SA. I sáne ac morem illi  
gere. 605

Pérontare, exquire quiduis. TO. Age, age nunc tu: in proélium  
Vide ut ingrediare aúspicato. VI. Líquidumst auspicium: tace.  
Cúрабо, ut praedáti pulere ad cástra conuortámini.

TO. Cóncede istuc: égo illam adducam. DO. Age, út rem esse  
in nostrám putas.

TO. Éhodum huc, uirgo. ufde sis quid agas. VI. Táceas: curabo  
út uoles. 610

605-610. The reader who tries to imagine the stage "business" of this part of the play finds himself in difficulty. Dordalus has expressed a wish to question the girl, and the pseudo-Persian Sagaristio has given his permission (ll. 605-606). Then Toxilus speaks ll. 606 f. (*Age, age nunc tu: in proelium vide ut ingrediare auspicato*) to the girl, and she replies in a low tone. But in the very next line Toxilus is saying to Dordalus, *Concede istuc; ego illam adducam*. His next speech, an aside to the girl, and her reply (609-610) repeat the sense of ll. 606-608, and have in several places identical phrasing (607 *vide*, cf. 610 *vide*; 607 *tace*, cf. 610 *taceas*; 608 *curabo*, cf. 610 *curabo*). Clearly we have here two alternative versions (605-608; 609-610), of which the first is the cleverer and therefore probably the genuine.<sup>21</sup>

A has 605-610 in the order in which they appear in the Goetz-Schoell text.

P. omits 608, 610 (*i. e.*, one line of each version).

---

<sup>21</sup> Cf. J. H. Gray in *Class. Rev.* 14 (1900), p. 24.

DO. Tóxile, quid agó? TO. Di deaeque te ágitant iratí, [et]  
 scelus, 666  
 Qui há<n>c non properes déstinare. DO. †Habeto. TO. Eu, praedatu's probe: abi, argentum efer huc.  
 Nón edepol minís trecentis cárast: fecistí lucri.  
 SA. Heís tu, etiam pro uéstimentis híc decem accedént minae.  
 DO. Ábscedent enim, nón accedent. TO. Táce sis: non tu illúm  
 uides 670  
 Quaérere ansam, inféctum ut faciat? ábisne atque argentúm petis?  
 \* \* \* \* \* atque ut dignúst perit. 671<sup>b</sup>  
 DO. Heís tu, serua istúm. TO. Quin tu intro is? DO. Ábeo  
 atque argentum ádfero.

666 ff. A shortening of the scene seems to be indicated by the half-line *abi, argentum efer huc*, which is appended to l. 667 in P. Apparently this phrase was substituted for *eu, praedatu's probe* (l. 667),<sup>22</sup> with the result that the Palatine manuscripts have retained both endings, while in A the line ending <*eu praedatu's*> *probe* appears just before l. 669. There are further signs of change at the very end of the scene. The fragment of a line *atque ut dignust perit* (671<sup>b</sup>), which is preserved only in A, seems to belong to a bit of comment after the *leno's* departure, and is hardly suitable before l. 672.<sup>23</sup> To the first half of this fragmentary line may belong the adverb *interibi*, cited by the *Glossarium Plautinum* from some point in the *Persa* between l. 588 and l. 677, but not to be found in our present text.<sup>24</sup> It is quite possible, therefore, that we have here traces of some such shortening as this:

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Leo, Ed. (1896), *ad loc.*

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Leo, Ed. (1896), *ad loc.*

<sup>24</sup> The strictness with which the author of the glossary follows the order of lines in the text of Plautus makes it improbable that *interibi* in this position refers to l. 165 of the play. Cf. Ritschl, *Opusc.* II., pp. 266 ff.; Schoell, Ed. (1892), Praef., p. xx.

667. DO. Habeto. TO. Abi, argentum ecfer huc.  
 671<sup>b</sup> (Schoell's supplement) DO. Interibi opperire. SA. Aegre  
 avidus abit atque ut dignust perit.

A is very illegible at this point. The end of 665 is preserved, and then follows a space of three lines, which may have contained 666 and 667, the latter divided so as to take up two lines. After this it has a line ending *probe*, and then the ends of 669-671, 671<sup>b</sup>, 672. So A apparently omitted 668, and added 671<sup>b</sup>, which does not occur in P.

P has 667 in the form - - - *habeto, eu praedatus probe. abi argentum ecfer huc*, and omits 671<sup>b</sup>.

---

Vanfloquidorus Vîrginisuendónides	702
† Nugiepiloquides Argentumextenebrónides	
Tedígniloquides Númmosexalpónides	
Quodsémelarrripides Númquameripides: ém tibi.	705

704. The absurd patronymics of l. 704, which mean either: "Talk-to-you-as-you-deserve-son, Nonsense-son, Flatter-son," or "Talk-to-you-as-you-deserve-son, Flatter-money-out-of-you-son," according as we follow the reading of A or P, repeat the sense of the preceding line: "Talk-nonsense-to-you-son, Bore-your-money-out-of-you-son."<sup>25</sup> The line may have been substituted to expand the joke.

The line appears in both A and P, though A reads *nugidespalponides*, and P *nundesexpalponides*.

---

DO. Immo equidem grátiam	719
Tibi, Tóxile, habeo: nám te sensi sédulo	
Mihi dáre bonam operam. TO. Tibine ego? immo † sedulo.	
DO. Attát, oblitus sum íntus dudum edfcere	
Quae uólui edicta. adsérua hanc. TO. Saluast haéc quidem.	
VI. Patér nunc cessat. TO. Quid si admoneam? VI. Témpus est.	

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Leo, Ed. (1896), *ad loc.*

TO. Heus, Sátorio, exi. núnce est illa occásio 725  
 Inimícum uleisci. SA. Ecce me: numquíd moror?  
 TO. Age illúc abscede prócul e conspectú: tace.  
 Vbi cúm lenone mé uidebis cónloqui,  
 Tum túrbam facito. SA. Díctum sapientí sat est.  
 TO. Tunc, quándo abiero — <SA.> Quím taces? scio quíd uelis. 730

DORDALVS.

TOXILVS.

VIRGO.

LENO

SERVOS

DO. Transcídí loris ómnis adueniéns domi:

Ita míhi supellex squálet atque aedés meae.

TO. Redís tu tandem? DO. Rédeo. TO. Ne ego hodié tibi

Bona múlta feci. DO. Fáteor: habeo grátiam.

722 ff. Much has been written about the defects of the play at this point.<sup>26</sup> It is strange that Dordalus should go off the stage immediately after he has purchased the supposed Persian girl, and should leave her in the care of Toxilus, instead of taking her inside the house with him; even more strange that he should reappear six lines later, announcing (l. 731), *Transcidi loris omnis adueniens domi*. In the meantime, Saturio has emerged from his hiding-place and has been given some brief and quite inapposite directions about the line of action to follow when the *leno* returns. Two verses of this dialogue (727-728) repeat a couplet earlier in the play (467-468). Of the remaining lines, several show the stock phrases of comedy (726 *numquid moror*, cf. l. 462; 729 *dictum sapienti sat est*, cf. Ter. *Phorm.* 541; 734 *bona multa feci*, cf. l. 263). Immediately after the return of Dordalus (l. 734) the conversation goes back to the subject under discussion before he left (l. 721); and the dozen lines intervening seem to have no purpose

<sup>26</sup> Cf. especially Goetz in *Acta soc. phil. Lips.* 6 (1876), pp. 300 f.; Wilamowitz in *Index schol. Gött.* 1893-1894, p. 21; Meyer, *De Plauti Persa*, pp. 172 ff.

but to prepare for the entrance of Saturio at l. 738.<sup>27</sup> But the plan had been that Saturio should appear suddenly (cf. ll. 162-164), and his opening lines suit a first appearance. Therefore ll. 722-734 are probably a later addition.

A has the whole passage.

P. omits l. 730.

---

SA. Nisi égo illun<c> hominem pérdo, perii. atque óptume 738  
Eccum ípsum ante aedes. VI. Sálué multum, mí pater.

SA. Salué, mea gnata. DO. Ei, Pérsa me pessúm dedit. 740

VI. Pater híc meus est. DO. Hem, quíd? pater? perii óppido.  
Quid ego ígitur cesso infélix lamentárier

Minás sexaginta? SA. Égo pol te faciám, scelus,

Te quóque etiam ipsum ut lámenteris. DO. Óccidi.

SA. Age ámbula in ius, léno. DO. Quid me in iús uocas? 745

SA. Illi[c] ápuđ praetorem dícam: sed ego in iús uoco.

DO. Nonne ántestaris? SA. Tuán ego causa, cárnufex,  
Quoiquám mortali líbero auris átteram,

Qui híc cómmercaris cfuis homines líberos?

DO. Sine dícam. SA. Nolo. DO. Aúdi. SA. Surdus sum:  
ámbula. 750

Sequere hác, sceleste, féles uirginária.

Sequere hác, mea gnata, me úsque ad praetorém. VI. Sequor.

738 ff. Ritschl<sup>28</sup> observed that the movement of the play after the close of IV., 8 was very hurried, and other editors have agreed with him. In particular, IV., 9 seems to have suffered from shortening. The discovery of the pseudo-Persian girl's identity is made far too quickly (ll. 739-740), and the question of Dordalus: *Hem, quíd? pater?* (l. 741) is absurd after ll. 739-740. Saturio, his daughter, and Dordalus, are suddenly dismissed from the stage, and we hear nothing of what takes place between them in the forum. Then, too, we are puzzled

<sup>27</sup> Meyer, *De Plauti Persa*, p. 174.

<sup>28</sup> Ritschl, Ed. (1853), Praef., p. ix.

by the fact that the parasite, whose sole object in undertaking the deceit of the *leno* has been to provide himself with a dinner (ll. 140-147; 329 ff.), does not appear at the banquet in Act V., while Dordalus, who left to defend himself before the praetor (l. 752), re-enters at l. 778. The difficulties are explained if we suppose that IV., 9 is the shortened form of a scene in which the *leno* plead for mercy and finally, by the offer of a sum of money, induced Saturio to drop his legal proceedings, take the money and his daughter, and go home.<sup>29</sup>

A and P have 738-741 in the same form. Then A *deest* to the end of the play.

The *Persa* offers comparatively slight evidence for the changes of the Plautine Revival. There are a few instances of parallel versions—ll. 433-436, 442-443; 605-608, 609-610; 703, 704. An attempt to bring the scene to a close seems to be indicated by the confusion in the manuscripts after l. 666. The play as a whole is noticeably short, and the dialogue in two of the scenes (ll. 440-448; 738-752) is so hurried and disconnected that we are justified in assuming a shortening in which the original version was lost. On the other hand, there are a few places (ll. 722-734, and possibly 460-461), where an insertion seems to have been made in order to prepare for a later scene.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>29</sup> Meyer, *De Plauti Persa*, pp. 177 ff.

<sup>30</sup> In addition to the passages discussed in detail, the following lines have been suspected: 60, 240, 280-295, 453-454, 562, 673-682, 694-699, 833-851.

Of these lines, A is missing for 60, 240, 453-454, 833-851. Both A and P have 280-295 (except that P transposes 293, 294), 562, 673-682, 694-699.

The following lines show minor variations: 399, 485, 498, 500, 515-516, 574, 597.



The indications of change are not confined to the Palatine manuscripts. A has the beginnings of the two shortened scenes (ll. 440 ff.; 738 ff.) in the same form as P, and probably contained the whole. On the other hand, there are three passages in which A and P alike show traces of *retractatio*, but A has preserved a larger number of the suspicious lines. Far from showing the purer text, therefore, A gives all the later versions that P gives, and has some of them in fuller form.

---

## CHAPTER II.

### *POENULUS*

The *Poenulus* tells the story of two sisters in the service of the *leno* Lycus, who gain their freedom through Agorastocles, the lover of the elder girl, and his slave Milphio. In the first scene, Milphio evolves a scheme which he promises will give Agorastocles not only his sweetheart, but the whole household of the *leno* as well. The *vilicus* of Agorastocles, who happens to be in the city, and who is a stranger to Lycus, is to be dressed up as a foreign soldier and sent to the *leno* with a request for an evening's pleasure. Then Agorastocles is to appear and demand his slave, and, upon the *leno's* denial of all knowledge of the slave, Agorastocles is to drag him off to court. This plan is carried out with the help of *advocati* from the forum, who introduce the newcomer to Lycus and witness the whole proceeding. But Milphio, the author of the scheme, disappears from the action, and the proposed law-suit never takes place. Instead, Milphio enters at the beginning of Act IV., raging against the *leno* and threatening his destruction, as if Acts I.-III. had no existence. He learns from the slave of Lycus that the sweetheart of Agorastocles and her sister are really free-born Carthaginians, and, knowing that his young master is also Carthaginian by birth, he confidently plans their release. Just at this moment the Carthaginian Hanno appears, on a search for his two daughters and his nephew, all of whom were stolen away as children. The nephew is discovered to be Agorastocles, the adopted son of Han-

no's old guest-friend. Milphio then proposes that Hanno aid in outwitting the *leno* and obtaining the freedom of the two girls by pretending that they are his daughters. The fiction proves to be only too true, and the happy father promises the hand of his elder daughter to her lover. When the *leno* returns, desperate over the ruin that has already come upon him, he finds three-fold vengeance waiting at the hands of Hanno, Agorastocles, and the soldier to whom he had promised the younger girl.

Even this hasty sketch is sufficient to show the break between Act III. and Act IV., and the repetition in the two plots against the *leno*. A more detailed study of the play brings out other difficulties. The first act presents the two girls as *meretrices* of the ordinary sort, who are already familiar with their calling (cf. especially ll. 233-236; 265-270); in the last act, they are represented as entering upon their profession on the very day that the play opens (ll. 1139-1140), and their conversation is full of sentiments befitting their noble birth (cf. ll. 1185-1186; 1201-1204). In the first half of the play, too, they have no prospect of freedom aside from the lover of the elder sister (ll. 360-363); in the second, the prophecy of good fortune immediately makes them hope for assistance from their parents (l. 1208). We note, too, that, though the prologue gives the scene of the play as Calydon (ll. 72, 94; cf. 1057, 1181), Milphio promises Adelpasium that she shall become *civis Attica*. (l. 372).

It is almost certain that the *Poenulus* combines two different plots, one covering roughly the first three acts of the play, and the other the last two. The scene of the first was laid in Athens; that of the second (the

*Καρχηδόσιος*, of which the plot is given in the prologue) in Calydon. The two originals seems to have had as common elements two sisters in the service of a *leno*, and a festival of Venus, at which the sisters offered acceptable sacrifices, but the offerings of the *leno* were rejected. The two plots are necessarily bound together to some extent, especially at the beginning and the end of the play, but their general outlines can still be recognized. The first presents two Athenian *meretrices*, with the elder of whom a youth is in love. To obtain her freedom, he and his slave play a trick which results in a law-suit and the *leno*'s ruin. In the *Καρχηδόσιος*, on the other hand, the girls are Carthaginians of noble birth, who are to enter upon their calling on the day that the play begins. Their release comes about through their father, who arrives in Calydon at the proper moment, finds his daughters, and discovers his nephew in the lover of the older girl.

The line of division between the two plots in the *Poenulus* is so clear that it attracted attention comparatively early.<sup>1</sup> Teuffel,<sup>2</sup> noticing the distinctness of the two plots against the *leno*, and the contradiction about the scene of the play, decided: "Beim *Poenulus* läge die Annahme einer Contamination ziemlich nahe, wenn dadurch etwas gewonnen wäre." But Teuffel's hint was not followed up for fully twenty years. Then Reinhardt<sup>3</sup> and Francken<sup>4</sup> studied the composition of the play with

<sup>1</sup> G. Langrehr, *De Plauti Poenulo*, Friedland, 1883, p. 14, says that Rapp was the first to suspect *contaminatio* in the *Poenulus*.

<sup>2</sup> W. Teuffel in *Rhein. Mus.* 8 (1853), pp. 35 ff. (= *Stud. u. Char.*, pp. 337 ff.)

<sup>3</sup> L. Reinhardt in Studemund's *Studien auf d. Gebiete d. archaischen Lateins*, Vol. I. (Berlin, 1873), pp. 109 ff.

<sup>4</sup> C. M. Francken in *Mnem.* 4 (1876), pp. 146-175.

great care. The analyses which they made have been modified and corrected in detail by Langen,<sup>5</sup> Leo,<sup>6</sup> and Karsten,<sup>7</sup> but the main lines of their division still remain unchanged.

---

Earum hīc adulescens ālteram efflictīm perit	96
Suam sibi cognatam inprūdens, neque s<e>it quae si<e>t,	
Neque eam ūmquam tetigit: ita eum leno mācerat:	
(Neque quaequam cum ea fēcit etiamnūm stupri,	
Neque dūxit umquam: neque ille uoluit mittere:)	100
Quia amāre cernit, tāngere hominem uōlt bolo.	

99-100. This couplet, which gives the substance of l. 98 in a little fuller form, is probably to be set down to *retractatio*.

A *deest* 1-281.

---

(Ehem, paēne oblitus sūm relicuom dīcere.	118
Ille qui adoptauit hūnc pro filiō sibi	
Is illi Poeno, huiūs patri  , hospēs fuit.)	120

118-120. These lines may have been added to explain a little more fully the situation indicated in l. 75 *emit hospitem is filium inprudens senex*. The passage is especially disturbing because it breaks the connection between the subject of the next sentence (l. 121 *is*, or l. 124 *hic*—cf. below) and its antecedent, unquestionably the Carthaginian who has been under discussion in ll. 104-115.

A *deest*.

---

<sup>5</sup> Langen, *Plaut. Stud.*, pp. 181 ff.

<sup>6</sup> Leo, *Plaut. Forsch.*, pp. 153 ff.

<sup>7</sup> H. J. Karsten in *Mnem.* 29 (1901), pp. 363-387.

Is hódie huc ueniet ré[p]erietque hic ffilias 121  
 Et húnce sui fratris ffilium, utquidem dídici ego.  
 Ego íbo, ornabor: uós aequo animo nóscite.  
 (Hic qui hódie ueniet, ré[p]eriet suas ffilias  
 Et húnce sui fratris ffilium. dehinc céterum 125  
 Quod réstat, restant áli<i> qui faciánt palam.  
 Valéte: adeste. íbo: álius nunc fieri uolo.)  
 Valéte atque adiuuáte ut uos seruét Salus.

121-128. The close of the prologue undoubtedly contains two versions. There is almost exact verbal repetition in ll. 121-122 and 124-125; two announcements are made of the speaker's proposed change of dress (123; 127); and the farewell to the audience is given in two different forms (127; 128). Seyffert<sup>8</sup> is probably right in arranging the two versions: (1) ll. 121-123, 128; (2) ll. 124-127. Of the two, the second is probably the genuine. *Alius nunc fieri volo* (l. 127) is more vivid than *ornabor* (l. 123), and the collocation *restat, restant* (l. 126) is quite in the style of Plautus.

P has the verses in the order of the Goetz-Schoell text, except that l. 126 appears after l. 127.

A *deest*.

---

AD. Negóti sibi qui uolét uim paráre, 210  
 Nauem et mulierem haec duo comparato.  
 Nam nállae magís res duaé plus negóti  
 Habént, forte si ócceperís exornáre,  
 Neque umquam satis hae duae res ornantur,  
 Neque eís ulla ornándi satís satietás est. 215

214. The thought of ll. 214, 215 is exactly the same. The phrase *duae res* in l. 214 is an awkward repetition from l. 212, and the line is unmetrical. In line 215, on the contrary, the quibble *satis satietas* sounds Plautine. The first line is therefore probably due to a later hand.

<sup>8</sup> O. Seyffert, *Studia Plautina*, Berlin, 1874, p. 11.

A *deest.*

---

Atque hæc ut loquor, nunc domo docta dico. 216  
 Nam nos usque ab aurora ad hoc quod dieist  
 (Postquam aurora inluxit numquam concessauimus)  
 Ex industria ambae numquam concessamus  
 Lauari aut fricari aut tergeri aut ornari. 220

218. Another variant, also unskillful metrically, seems to be presented by l. 218. This line repeats ll. 217, 219, and was probably intended to take their place.

A *deest.*

---

AD. Invidia in me numquam innatata neque malitia, mea  
 soror: 300  
 Bono me<d> esse ingenio ornatam quam auro multo maiore.  
 (Aurum id fortuna inuenitur, natura ingenium bonum:  
 Bonam ego quam beatam me esse nimio dici maiore.)  
 Meretricem pudorem gerere magis decet quam purpuram.  
 (Magisque meretricem pudorem quam auro gerere condecet.) 305  
 Pulerum ornatum turpes mores peius caeno conlinunt:  
 Lepidi mores turpem ornatum facile factis comprobant.

300 ff. Fond as Plautus was of *sententiae*, he would hardly have made Adelphasium utter the whole of this speech as it stands in our text. Nearly every line in it has been suspected by some one of the editors. We can, however, be sure of *retractatio* only in l. 304, which repeats l. 305 almost word for word, omitting the necessary conjunction *-que*, and substituting *decet* for the Plautine verb *condecet*. The second version seems to have been composed to introduce a new detail (*purpura*) into the list of the courtesan's ornaments.<sup>9</sup>

The whole passage occurs in both A and P, but A has the order: 303, 305, 304.

---

<sup>9</sup> Langen, *Plaut. Stud.*, pp. 338 f.

Stc enim dicerés, sceleste: hufus uoluptas, te ópsecro,	387
Hufus mel, huius cor, hufus labellum, hufus lingua, huius sáuium,	
Hufus delicia, huiús salus amoéna, huius festfuitas,	
Hufus colustra, huiús dulciculus cáseus, mastígia:	390 <sup>a</sup>
(Húius cor, huiús studium, huius sáuium, mastígia.)	390 <sup>b</sup>

390<sup>b</sup>. The terms of endearment in l. 390,<sup>b</sup> except for *studium*, merely repeat those of l. 388, and the epithet *mastigia* addressed to Milphio is taken from l. 390. It is possible that the word *studium* was a new bit of slang in the Revival Age, and that the alternative line was composed for the purpose of introducing this novelty.

P has the order: 389, 390<sup>a</sup>, 390<sup>b</sup>.

A omits 390<sup>a</sup> (a genuine verse), but writes *dulciculus caseus* above *savium mastigia* of 390<sup>b</sup>, showing that some form of the line must have stood in the archetype of A.

---

AG. ita me di ament, tárdo amico níl[i] est quicquam inaé-	
quius,	504
Praésertim homini amánti qui quicquíd agit properat ómnia.	505
Scut ego hos duco áduocatos, hómínes spissigradísumos,	
Tárdiores quám corbitae súnť in tranquilló mari.	
Átque equidem herele dédita opera amícos fugitauť senes:	
Sef[e]bam aetati tárdiore, métui meo amorí moram.	
Néquiquam hos procós mihi elegi lóripedis, tardísumos.	510
Quín si ituri hodie éstis, ite aut íte hinc in malám crucem.	
Scíne oportet íre amícos hómíni amanti operám datum?	
Nam ístequidem gradús succretust críbro pollinário:	
Nísi cum pedicis cóndidicístis ís<t>oc grassarí gradu.	
ADV. Heús tu, quamquam nós uidemur tibi plebei et paú-	
peres,	515
Sí nec recte dícis nobis díues de summó loco,	
Díuitem audactér solemus máctare infortúnio.	
Néc tibi nos obníxi[i] sumus istúe, quid tu ames aut óderis.	
Quom árgentum pro cápíte dedimus, nóstrum dedimus, nón tuom.	
Líberos nos ésse oportet: nós te nili péndimus:	520
Né tuo nos amorí seruos [tuos] ésse addictos cénseas.	
Líberos homínés per urbem módico magis par ést gradu	
íre: seruile ésse duco féstinantem cúrrere.	



Præsertim in re pópuli placida atque interfectis hóstibus  
 Nón decet tumúltuari. séd si properabás magis, 525  
 Prídie nos te áduocatos húc duxisse opórtuit.

Né tu opinere, haúd quisquam hodie nóstrum curret pér uias  
 Néque nos populus pró cerritis ínsectabit lápidibus.  
 AG. Át si ad prandiúm me in aedem uós dixissem dúcere,  
 Vínceretis céruom cursu uél grallatorém gradu. 530  
 Núnce uos quia mihi áduocatos díxi et testis dúcere,  
 Pódagrosi estis ác uicistis cócleam tarditúdine.

<ADV.> Án uero non iústa causast quó<r> curratur cériter,  
 [ADV.] V́bi bibas, edás de alieno quántum uelis usque ádfatim,  
 Quód tu inuitus númquam reddas dómino, de qu<o>io éderis? 535  
 Séd tamen cum eó cum quiqui quámquam sumus paupérculi,  
 ést domi quod edímus: ne nos tám contemptim cónteras.  
 Quícquid est pauxíllulum illuc nóstrum † id omne íntus est:  
 Néque nos quemquam flágitamus néque nos quisquam flágitat.  
 Tuá causa nemó nostrorumst suós rupturus rámites. 540

AG. Nímis iracundi éstis: equidem haec uóbis dixi pér iocum.  
 ADV. Pér iocum itidem dícta[m] habeto, quae nos tibi respón-  
 dimus.

AG. Óbsecro hercle operám celocem hanc mñhi, ne corbitám date.  
 Áttrepidate sáltem: nam uos ádproperare haud póstulo.

ADV. Síquid tu placide ótioseque ágere uis, operám damus: 545  
 Sí properas, cursóres meliust te áduocatos dúcere.

AG. Seftís, rem narráui uobis, quód uostra opera mi ópus siet,  
 Dé lenone hoc quí me amantem lúdificatur tám diu:  
 Ef paratae ut sñt insidiae de aúro et de seruó meo.

ADV. Ómnia istaec scímus iam nos, si hí spectatores sciant. 550  
 Hórunce hi[n]c nunc caúsa haec agitur spéctatorum fábula:  
 Hós te satius ést docere ut, quándo agas, quid agá[n]s sciant.  
 Nós tu ne curássis: scimus rem ómnem, quippe omnés simul  
 Dídicimus tecum úna, ut respondére possimús tibi.

AG. Ita profectost. séd agite igitur, út sciam uos scíre,  
 rem 555

éxpedite et mñhi quae uobis dúdum dixi dícite.

ADV. ftane temptas án sciamus? nón meminisse nós [t]ratu's,  
 Quó modo trecéntos Philippos Cóllabisco ulíco  
 Déderis, quos deférret huc ad lénonem inimicúm tuom,  
 fsque se ut adsimuláret peregrinum [esse] áliunde ex alio  
 óppido, 560

V́bi is detulerit, tu eó quaesitum séruom aduent<ar>és tuom  
 Qúm pecuniá. AG. Meministis mémoriter: seruástis me.

ADV. ille negabit: Milphionem quaeri censebit tuom  
 id duplicabit omne furtum: leno addicetur tibi.

Ad eam rem nos esse <t>estis uis tibi. <AG.> Tenetis rem. 565

ADV. Vix quidem hercle | — ita pauxillast — digitulis primoribus.

AG. (Hoc cito et cursimst agendum. propera iam quantum  
 potest.

ADV. Bene uale igitur. te aduocatos melius<t> celeris ducere:  
 Tardi sumus nos. AG. Optume itis, pessume hercle dicitis.

Quin etiam deciderint uobis femina | in talos uelim. 570

ADV. At edepol nos tibi | in lumbos linguam atque oculos in  
 solum.

AG. Heia, hau uostrumst iracundos esse quod dixi ioco.

ADV. Nec tuom quidemst amicis per iocum iniuste loqui.

AG. Mittite istaec. quid uelim uos, scitis. ADV. Callemus  
 probe:

Lenonem ut perierum perdas, id studes. AG. Tenetis rem.) 575

540 ff. The long tedious scene between Agorastocles and the *advocati* was apparently shortened for later productions. The beginning of the scene (ll. 504-542) and ll. 567-573 show exactly the same development of thought. In both, Agorastocles rebukes the old gentlemen for their slowness, and they resent the reproof; then he apologizes, saying that his words were meant only in fun. The plan against the *leno* which is reviewed at length in ll. 547-566 is summarized in ll. 574-575, though, as Goetz<sup>10</sup> observed, the second version would be incomprehensible if we had not the first as well. Moreover, a third version of the beginning of the scene is probably preserved in ll. 543-546.<sup>11</sup> Here again we have the remonstrance of Agor-

<sup>10</sup> Goetz in *Acta soc. phil. Lips.* 6 (1876), p. 269.

<sup>11</sup> Goetz (*Acta soc. phil. Lips.* 6, p. 254), noting the inappropriateness of these verses in their present position, made them precede ll. 541-542. Leo (*Plaut. Forsch.*, p. 161, note) thought them a part of the same shortened version that we find in ll. 567-575. Kellermann (*Comm. phil. Jen.* 7, p. 134) agreed with Goetz that ll. 543-546 and 567-575 could not belong to the same recension.



astocles and the reply of the *advocati* (cf. ll. 504-540; 567-571). The parallelism is particularly close between 507 (*corbitae*) and 543 (*corbitam*); between 521-523, 546, and 568; between 541-542 and 572-573; between 565 (*tenetis rem*) and 575 (*tenetis rem*). There seem therefore to have been three versions of the scene: (1) the Plautine version, ll. 504-542; 547-566; (2) ll. 567-575; and (3) ll. 543-546, probably followed by ll. 547-566.<sup>21</sup>

P has the passage in the order of the Goetz-Schoell text.

A *deest* 501-571 (=71 ll.) Two sheets of A are missing (=76 ll.). If we allow two lines for the scene-heading of III, 1, and assume that a few of the long verses were run over, we find that the whole passage could very well have been contained in A. But in any case, the fact that A preserves 572 ff. in the same form as P, would argue that it had the rest of the passage as well.

---

ADV. Aetóli ciues té salutamús, Lyce:	621
Quamquam hánc salutem férimus inuití tibi.	
[Et quamquam bene uolumus leniter lenonibus.]	622 <sup>b</sup>
LY. Fortúnati omnes sftis: quod certó scio	
Nec fóre nec Fortunam íd situram fferi.	
ADV. Istic ést thensaurus stáltis in linguá situs,	625
Vt quaéstui habeant mále loqui melióriibus.	
<LY.> Viám qui nescit quá deueniat ad mare,	
Eum opórtet amnem quaérere comitém sibi.	
Ego mále loquendi uóbis nesciuf uiam:	
Nunc uós mihi amnes éstis: uos certúmst sequi.	630
Si béne dicetis, uóstra ripa uós sequar:	
Si mále dicetis, uóstro gradiar lífmite.	

<sup>21</sup> Langrehr, *De Plauti Poenulo*, p. 19, suspected ll. 523, 567, 728, 733 (to which he should probably have added l. 730) because the *advocati*, for whom Plautus regularly uses the plural, speak or are addressed in the singular in these lines. Of the suspected verses, l. 567 is probably not by Plautus; the rest occur in passages which are otherwise free from suspicion.

ADV. Maló bene facere tántumdemst periculum  
 Quantúm bono male fácere. LY. Qui[d] ueró? ADV. Scies.  
 Malo síquid bene faciás, id beneficium íterit: 635  
 Bonó síquid male faciás, aetatem éxpetit.  
 <LY.> Facéte dictum. séd quid istuc ad me áttinet?  
 <ADV.> Quia nós honoris tuí causa ad te uénimus,  
 Quamquám bene uolumus leníter lenónibus.

622<sup>b</sup>. This verse is the same as l. 639, except that l. 622<sup>b</sup> begins *et quamquam*, and l. 639 *quamquam* alone. Lindsay<sup>13</sup> is probably right in thinking that the repetition indicates shortening. The actors of the Revival could easily pass from l. 622 to l. 639, and thence to the end of the scene.

A *deest* 604-634.

---

LY. Sed háec latrocinántur quae ego dixi ómnia. 704  
 CO. Quid itá? LY. Quia aurum póscunt praesentárium. 705  
 CO. Quin hércle accipere tú non maúis quam égo dare.  
 <ADV.> Quid, si éuocemus húc foras Agorástoclem,  
 Vt ípsus testis sít sibi certíssimus?  
 Heus tú, qui furem cáptas, egredere ócius,  
 Vt túte inspectes aúrum lenóní dare. 710

AGORASTOCLES.  
 ADVLESCENS

ADVOCATI.  
 LYCVS  
 LENO

COLLABISCVS.  
 VILICVS

AG. Quid ést? quid uoltis, téstes? ADV. Specta ad déxteram:  
 Tuos séruos aurum | ípsi lenóní dabit.  
 CO. Age áccipe hoc sis: hefc sunt numerati aúrei  
 Trecénti nummi quí uocantur Phillipp<e>i.  
 Hinc mé procura: própere hosce apsumí uolo. 715  
 LY. Edepól fecisti pródigum promúm tibi.  
 Age eámus intro. CO. Té sequor. LY. Age age ámbula:  
 Ibí quae relicua ália fabulábimur.

<sup>13</sup>Lindsay, Ed. (1905), *ad loc.*

CO. Eadém narrabo tibi res Spartiáticas.

LY. Quin séquere me intro. CO. Dúc me intro: addictúm  
tenes. 720

AG. Quid núnc mihi auctores éstis? ADV. Vt frugí sies.

AG. Quid, si ánimus esse nón sinit? ADV. Esto út sinit.

AG. Vidístis, leno quom aúrum accepit? ADV. Vídimus.

AG. Eum uós meum esse séruom scitis? ADV. Set{ui}mus.

AG. Rem aduórsus populi †saepe leges? ADV. Scfuimus. 725

AG. Em istaéc uolo ergo uós commemorisse ómnia.

Mox quom ad praetorem | úsus ueniet. ADV. Méminimus.

AG. Quid, sí recenti re aédis pultem? ADV. Cénseo.

AG. Si púltem, non reclúdet? ADV. Panem frángito.

AG. Si exérit leno, cénsen[t] hominem intérogem, 730

Meus séruos [si] ad eum uéneritne? ADV. Quíppini?

706 ff. The repetitions in the manuscripts at the close of III., 3 seem to indicate a shortening of the prolix scene that follows. After Collabiscus had agreed to pay Lycus the sum demanded for an evening's entertainment, there was no reason for delay; the money could be handed over at once, and then Agorastocles could appear and demand his slave, in accordance with the prearranged plan. It was apparently with the intention of cutting out the intervening dialogue that some manager adscribed ll. 720, 730 at the close of III., 3. But if, as Leo<sup>14</sup> and Lindsay<sup>15</sup> think, l. 720 followed directly upon l. 706, and l. 730 in turn upon l. 720, Agorastocles must have appeared upon the stage without any summons or any notice of his coming. Some announcement seems necessary, and the fact that l. 720 appears in A one line later than in P perhaps indicates that it was intended to be spoken after the summons of Agorastocles. (ll. 707-710).

<sup>14</sup> Leo, *Plaut. Forsch.*, pp. 7 f.

<sup>15</sup> Lindsay, *Anc. Edd.*, pp. 43 f.

P has the order: 706, 720 (in the unmetrical form *Quin sequere me intro? Duc me ergo intro. Addictum tenes.*), 707 ff., repeating 720 in metrical form in the proper place.

A has the order: 706, 707, 720 (in the same form as P, except that it omits *addictum tenes*), 730, . (with the reading *quid tum? hominem interrogem?*), 708. Then the sheet which must have contained 709-745 is missing in A. The 38 lines on the sheet would not give room for these 37 verses and a two-line scene-heading; but it is possible that the scene-heading for III., 4 took up only one line in A,<sup>16</sup> as the heading for III., 5 actually does. At any rate A, in inserting 730 before 708, shows more evidence of change than P.

---

CO. Abscedam hinc intro. AG. Factum a uobis comiter. 805  
 Bonam dedistis, aduocati, operam mihi.  
 Cras mane, quaeso, in comitio estote obuiam.  
 Tu sequere me intro. uos ualete. ADV. Et tu uale.

805-808. The command of Agorastocles to Collabiscus in l. 808 (*tu sequere me intro*) is impossible after Collabiscus has announced in l. 805 *abscedam hinc intro*. Langen<sup>17</sup> is probably right in thinking that a later version substituted l. 805 for ll. 806-808, in order to shorten the scene. He observes that the vocative *advocati* comes in much more naturally if l. 805 is omitted, and that the salutation *ualete . . . uale* (l. 808) forms a suitable close for the dialogue.

A *deest* 783-849.

---

MI. illic hinc abiit. dei immortales meum erum seruatum  
 uolunt 917  
 Est hunc disperditum lenonem: tantum eum instat exiti.  
 Satine, prius quam unumst iniectum telum, iam instat alterum?  
 Ibo intro: haec ut meo ero memorem: nam hic si ante aedes  
 euocem, 920

<sup>16</sup> This is evidently the assumption of Seyffert. Cf. *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 16 (1896), col. 253, note 3.

<sup>17</sup> Langen, *Plaut. Stud.*, p. 342.

Quae aúdiuistis módo, nunc si eadem híc iterum iterem, insectiast.  
 Éro uni potius íntus ero odio quam híc sim uobis ómnibus.  
 Dei immortales, quánta turba, quánta aduenit cálamitas  
 Hódie ad hunc lenónem. sed ego núnc est quom me cómmoror.  
 Íta negotium ínstitutumst: nón datur cessátio: 925  
 Nám et hoc docte cónsulendum, quód modo coneréditumst,  
 Ét illud autem inséruiendumst cónsilium uernáculum.  
 Rémor(a) si sit, quí malam rem míhi det, merito fécerit.  
 Núnc intro ibo: dum érus adueniat á foro, opperiár domi.

917-929. The close of the scene undoubtedly shows two parallel versions. There is very close correspondence between 917-918 and 923-924 (note especially the repetition of *dei immortales*); between 920 *ibo intro* and 929 *nunc intro ibo*. But l. 920 implies that Agorastocles is in the house, while l. 929 states that he is to return *a foro*. We must therefore recognize two versions: (1) ll. 917-922; and (2) ll. 923-929. Evidence for the genuineness of the former version is found in the jingle *ero . . . ero* in the last line;<sup>18</sup> and this version agrees with l. 808 (which, as we have just seen, is probably genuine) in representing Agorastocles as inside the house.

Both A and P give the entire passage.

---

Ythalonim ualon uth sicorathisyra comsyth	930
Chym lachunythmumys thral mycthi baruimy sehi	
Liphocanethythby nuthi ad edynbynui	
Bymarob syllohomaloni murbymy syrthoho	
Byth lym mothyn noctothu ulechanti clamas chon	
Yssid dobrim thyfel yth chil ys chon chem liful	935
Yth binim ysydybur thinnochot nu agorastocles	
Ythemaneth ihychir saelichot sith naso	
Bynny idehil liichilygubulim lasibit thim	
Bodiallytherayn nynnurs lymmon choth lusim	

---

<sup>18</sup> Lindsay, *Anc. Edd.*, p. 55.

Ythalonimualoniuthsicorathiisthymhimihiymacomsyth  
 Combaepumamitalmetlotiambeat  
 Iulecantheconaaalonimbalumbar # dechor  
 Bats\*\*\*\*hunesobinesubicsillimbalim  
 Esseantidamossonalemuedubertefet  
 Donobun\*hunecilthumucommucroluful 945  
 Altanimauosduberithemhuarcharistolem  
 Sittesedanecnasotersahelicot  
 Alemusdubertimurmucopsuistiti  
 Aoceaaneclictorbodesiussilimlimmimcolus.

930-949. A has only one version of the Carthaginian passage; P gives two. Lindsay<sup>19</sup> regards ll. 930-939 as *retractatio*; but it is hard to imagine any stage-manager, no matter how industrious, remodeling a speech in a foreign tongue, or calling in a professor of Semitics to correct the grammar. It is much more likely, therefore, that the second version is the work of a later grammarian.

A omits 930-939.

---

HA. O mí popularis, sálue. AG. Et tu edepol, quísquis es: 1039  
 Et síquid opus est, quaéso, dic atque ímpera 1040  
 Populáritatis caúsa. HA. Habeo grátiam:  
 Verum égo híc hospítium | hábeo: Antidamae fílium  
 Quaeró — commostra, sí nouísti — Agorástoclem.  
 (Sed ecquem ádulescentem tu híc nouísti Agorástoclem?  
 AG. Siquidem Antídama[t]i quaéris adoptatíciium, 1045  
 Ego sum ípsus, quem tu quaéris. HA. Hem, quid ego aúdio?  
 AG. Antídamae gnatum me ésse. HA. Si itast, tésseram  
 Conférré si uis hóspítalem, eccam áttuli.  
 AG. Agedum, húc ostende. est pár probe, <q>uam habeo domi.)  
 HA. O mi hóspes, salue múltum. nam mihi tíos pater 1050  
 Patrítus ergo | hóspes Antídamáas fuit.  
 Haec míhi hospitalis téssera cum illó fuit.  
 <AG.> Ergo híc apud me hospítium tibi praebébitur.

<sup>19</sup> Lindsay, *Anc. Edd.*, p. 44.



1042 ff. This passage has long been considered one of the most certain examples of *retractatio* in Plautus, but scholars are by no means agreed as to the extent of the dittography. There are two inquiries about Agorastocles (1042-1043; 1044), each introduced by an adverbative particle (*verum, sed*), and two presentations of the *hospitalis tessera* (1047-1049; 1052). The salutation in ll. 1050-1051 is concerned with the identity of Agorastocles as adopted son of Antidama, Hanno's ancestral guest-friend (cf. ll. 1042-1043), and the *tessera* (l. 1052) is brought in almost as an afterthought. Seyffert's<sup>20</sup> solution of the difficulty is on the whole the most satisfactory. He finds two parallel versions: (1) ll. 1042-1043, followed by a reply of Agorastocles, similar to that in l. 1046, and then by ll. 1050-1053; (2) ll. 1044-1049, followed by l. 1053. Each version begins with an inquiry about Agorastocles and a disclosure of the young man's identity; but in the first the recognition rests upon a simple statement, in the second there is a careful examination of the *tessera*. If Seyffert<sup>21</sup> and Langrehr<sup>22</sup> are right in thinking *Antidamas* (l. 1051) an un-Plautine form,<sup>3</sup> the second version is the genuine.

P has the verses in the order of the Goetz-Schoell text.

A has 1041, 1044-1048, 1042-1043, 1053, 1049-1053 (*i. e.*, A transposes the couplet 1042-1043, and repeats 1053).

---

<sup>20</sup> Seyffert, *Stud. Plaut.*, pp. 11 f.

<sup>21</sup> Seyffert, *Stud. Plaut.*, p. 12.

<sup>22</sup> Langrehr, *De Plauti Poen.*, p. 21.

<sup>3</sup> The same form occurs in l. 955. The final *-s* is in both cases necessitated by the meter.

- HA. Tu abdúce hose<e> intro et úna nutricém simul 1147  
 Iube hánc abire hinc ád te. AG. Fac quod ímperat.  
 MI. Sed quís illas tibi monstrábit? AG. Ego doctíssume.  
 MI. Abeo ígitur. AG. Facias módo quam memores máuelim. 1150  
 Patruo áduenienti céna curetúr uolo.  
 MI. Lachánam uos, quos égo iam detrudam ád molas,  
 Inde pórro ad puteum atque ád robustum códicem.  
 Ego fáxo hospitium hoc léniter laudábitis.  
 AG. Audín tu, patrué? díco, ne dictúm neges. 1155  
 Tuam míhi maiorem fíliam despóndéas.  
 HA. Pactám rem habeto. AG. Spóndesne ígitur? HA. Spóndeo.  
 <AG.> Mi pátrúe, salue: nám nunc es plané meus.  
 Nunc démum ego cum illa fábulabor líbere.  
 Nunc, pátrúe, si uis tuás uidere fíliás, 1160  
 Me séquere. HA. Iam dudum équidem cupio et té sequor.  
 (Quid, si eámus illis óbuiam? AG. At ne intéu uias  
 Praetérbitamus métno. HA. Magne Iúppiter,  
 Restítue certas míhi ex incertis núnc opes.  
 AG. †Ego quidem meos amores mécum confídó fore.)  
 Sed eocás uideo ipsas. HA. Haécine meae sunt fíliae? 1166  
 Quantae é quantillis íám sunt factae. MI. Sefn, quid est?  
 Thraecae sunt \* \* \* \* onem sustollí solent.  
 (Opíno[r] herele hodie quód ego dixi pér iocum,  
 Id éuenturum esse ét seuerum et sérium, 1170  
 Vt haec ínueniantur hódie esse huius fíliae.  
 <AG.> Pol istúe quidem iam certumst. tu istos, Mílfhio,  
 Abdúce intro: nos hásce hic praestolábimur.)

1162 ff. There are traces of alteration at the close of this scene. In ll. 1160-1161 Agorastocles bids Hanno follow him if he wishes to see his daughters. In ll. 1162-1163 Hanno proposes, as if the plan were quite new, that they go to meet the girls, and Agorastocles objects that they may miss them on the way. At l. 1166 the two girls are seen approaching, and at l. 1173 Agorastocles and Hanno announce that they will wait for them. Milphio has been commanded to enter the house at ll. 1147-1148, and has apparently done so (cf. l. 1150 *abeo*; l. 1154); to our surprise we find him on the stage at

ll. 1167 ff., making a belated comment on the identity of the two girls, and receiving the same directions that had been given to him before. There are certainly two versions of the command to Milphio and of the proposal to look for the girls; and it is possible that the whole passage (1162-1173) represents an alternative ending for the scene, intended to follow l. 1146.

A and P give the scene in the same form.

---

<AG.> Quaeso, quí lubet tam diú tenere còllum? 1266  
Omitte saltem tu áltera: nolo égo istuc — <AD.> Enicás me.

<AG.> Prius quám te mihi despónderit. AD. [O] Mittó? sperate,  
sálue.

<HA.> Condámus alter álterum ergo in néruom bracchiálem.

1267-1268. There is much confusion in the latter part of the play about the betrothal of Agorastocles and Adelphasium. It takes place in full form at ll. 1155-1157 (cf. *Aul.* 255-256; *Trin.* 571-573), and the promise made at that time is recalled to Hanno's mind at ll. 1278-1279. But at l. 1268 and again at l. 1357 Agorastocles speaks as if the betrothal were still to take place. This last line, as we shall see, probably belongs to the latest version of the play, and it is possible that ll. 1267-1268, which are awkwardly introduced at best, also represent a later addition. If the close of V., 3 was changed by the substitution of ll. 1162-1173 for 1147-1161 (cf. above), the betrothal was omitted in the later performance of the play, and the changes in the other scenes may have been made to agree with this.

A has the passage in the order of the Goetz-Schoell text.

P has the order 1266, 1268, 1267.

---

- AG. Num tibi, adulescens, málae aut dentes prúriunt, 1315  
 Qui huic és molestus, án malam rem quaéritis?
- ANTA. † Qur non adhibuisti, dúm istaec loquere, týmpanum?  
 Nam té cinaedum esse árbitor magis quám uirum.
- AG. Scin quám cinaedus sum? Íte istine, seruf, foras,  
 Ecférte fustis. ANTA. Heús tu, siquid pér iocum 1320  
 Dixi, nolito in sérium conuórtere.
- ANTE. Qui[d] tibi lubidos<t>, ópsecro, Antamoénides,  
 Loqui inclementer nóstro cognato ét patri?  
 Nam hic nóster pater est: híc nos cognouít modo  
 Et hunc sui fratris filium. ANTA. Ita me Iúppiter 1325  
 Bene amét, bene factum. gaúdeo et uolup ést mihi,  
 Siquíd lenoni | óptigit magni mali,  
 Quomque é uirtute uóbis fortuna óptigit.
- ANTE. Credibile ecastor dicit: crede huic, mí pater.  
 HA. Credo. AG. Ét ego credo. séd eccum lenonem óptume:  
 (Credo. AG. Át ego credo | édepol hic uenit cómodus.) 1331  
 Bonúm uirum eccum uídeo: se recipít domum.
- HA. (Quis hic ést? AG. Vtrumuis ést, <u>el leno <uél> λύκος.  
 In séruitute hic ffilias habuít tuas, 1334  
 Et mi [hic] aúri fur est. HA. Béllum hominem, quem nóueris.)  
 AG. Rapiámus in ius. HA. Mínume. AG. Quaproptér? HA.  
 Quia
- Iniúriarum múlto induci sátius est.

LYCVS.

AGORASTOCLES.

HANNO.

LENO

ADVLESCENS

POENVVS

ANTAMOENIDES

MILES

- LY. Decspitur nemo méa quidem senténtia,  
 Qui súis amicis nárrat recte rés suas:  
 Nam omnibus amicis meis idem unum cónuenit, 1340  
 Vt mé suspendam, ne áddicar Agorástocli.
- AG. Leno, eámus in ius. LY. Ópsecro te, Agorástocles,  
 Suspéndere ut me liceat. HA. In ius té uoco.
- LY. Quid tibi mecum autem? HA. Quía | hasce aio líberas  
 Ingénuasque esse ffilias ambás meas. 1345  
 Eae súnť surruptae cúm nutrice páruolae.
- LY. Iam prídem equidem istuc sefui et miratús fui  
 Nemínum venire qui istas adsererét manu.

- Meaequidém profecto nón sunt. ANTA. Leno, in iús eas.  
 LY. De prándio tu dícis: debetúr, dabo. 1350  
 AG. Duplúm pro furto mi ópus est. LY. Sume hinc quídlubet.  
 HA. Et míhi supplicíis múltis. LY. Súme hinc quídlubet.  
 (ANTA. Et míhi quidem min[im]a[m] argénti. LY. Sume hinc  
 quídlubet.)
- Colló rem soluam iam ómnibus quasi báiolus.  
 AG. Numquíd recusas cóntra me? LY. Haud uerbúm quidem.  
 AG. Ite igitur intro, múlieres. sed, pátrúe mi, 1356  
 Tuam, út dixisti, míhi desponde fíliam.  
 HA. Haud áliter ausim. ANTA. Béne uale. AG. Et tu béne  
 uale.)
- ANTA. Leno, árrabonem hoc pró mina mecúm fero.  
 LY. Perii hércle. AG. Immo haud multó post, si in ius  
 uéneris. 1360
- LY. Quin égomet tibi me addíco: quid praetóre opust?  
 Verum óbsecro te ut liceat simplum sóluere,  
 Trecéntos Philippos: crédo, conradí potest.  
 Cras aúctionem fáciam. AG. Tantispér quidem  
 Vt sis apud me lígnea in custódia. 1365
- LY. Fiát. AG. Sequere intro, pátrúe mi, ut hunc festúm diem  
 Habeámus hilare[m] huiús malo et nostró bono.  
 Multúm ualete. multa uerba fécimur:  
 Malúm postremo omne ád lenonem réccidit.  
 Nunc, quód postremumst cóndimentum fábulae,  
 Si plácuít, plausum póstulat comoédia. 1371

AGORASTOCLES.  
 ADVLESCENS

LYCVS.  
 LENO

HANNO.  
 POENVS

ANTAMOEENIDES  
 MILES

ANTERASTYLIS. ADELPHASIVM.  
 MERETRICES II

- AG. Quam rém agis, miles? quí lubet patruó meo  
 Loqui inclementer? né mirere múlieres  
 Quod eúm sequuntur: módo cognouit fílias  
 Suas ésse hasce ambas. LY. Hém, quod uerbum aurís meas 1375  
 Tetígit? nunc perii. ANTA. Vnde haec perierúnt domo?  
 AG. Carthágiensenses súnt. LY. At ego sum pérditus.

- Illúc ego metuei sémper, ne cognósceret  
 Eas áliquis: quod nunc fáctumst. uae miseró mihi.  
 Periére, opinor, duódeuigintí minae 1380  
 Qui hasce émi. AG. Et tute ipse peri<i>stí, Lyce.  
 HA. Quis hic ést? AG. Vtrumuis ést. [no]uel leno uél λύκος.  
 In séruitute hic ffilias habuit tuas  
 Et mi aúri fur est. HA. Béllum hominem, quem nóueris.  
 AG. Lenó, rapacem te ésse semper crédidi: 1385  
 Verum étiam furacem <áiunt> qui norúnt magis.  
 LY. Accédam. per ego † te tua te genua óbsecro  
 Et hunc, cognatum quém tuom esse intéllego:  
 Quandó boni estis, út bonos facere áddecet,  
 Facite út <uos> uostro súbueniatis súpplíci. 1390  
 Iam prídem equidem istas scui | esse líberas  
 Et éxpectabam, síqui eas assererét manu[m]:  
 † Nam meae prosum nóñ sunt. tum autem aurúm tuom  
 Reddám quod apud mest ét ius iurandum dabo  
 Me málitiose níl fecisse, Agorástocles. 1395  
 AG. Quid míhi par facere sft, † cum egomet cónsulam.  
 Omítte genua. LY. Mítto, si ita senténtiast.  
 ANTA. Heús tu, leno. LY. Quid lenonem uís inter negótium?  
 ANTA. Vt <m>inam mihi argénti[m] reddas, prfus quam in  
 neruom abdúcere.  
 LY. Dí meliora fáxint. ANTA. Sic est: hódie cenabís foris: 1400  
 Aúrum, argentum, cólum, leno, [s]trís re<s> nunc debés semul.  
 HA. Quid me<d> hac re fácere deceat, égomét mecum cógíto.  
 Sí uolo hunc ulcíscei, litis séquar in alieno óppido,  
 Quántum audiui ingénium et mores éius quo[d] pactó sient.  
 AD. Mí pater, nequíd tibi cum istoc rei † siet ac massum  
 óbsecro. 1405  
 ANTE. Aúsculta soróri. abi, diiunge inimicitias cum ínprobo.  
 HA. Hóc age sis, lenó: quamquam ego te méruisse ut pereás  
 scio,  
 Nóñ experiar técum. AG. Neque ego, si aúrum mihi reddés  
 meum.  
 Leno, quando ex néruo emissu's, cónpingare in cárcerem.  
 LY. Iám<ne> autem, ut solés? <ANTA.> Ego, Poene, tibi me  
 purgatúm uolo. 1410  
 Siquid dixi irátus aduorsum ánimi tui senténtiam:  
 fd uti ignoscas, quaéso, et quom istas inuenisti ffilias,  
 fta me di ament, <út> mihi uolup[tatis] est. HA. fgnosco et  
 credó tibi.

ANTA. †Leno, tu autem amicam mihi des facito aut auri mihi  
reddás minam.

LY. Vñ tibicinám meam habere? ANTA. Nñl moror tibicinam:  
Néscias utrum ef maiores búccaene a<n> mammaé sient. 1416

LY. Dábo quae placeat. ANTA. Cúra. LY. Aurum crás[s] a<d> te  
referám tuom.

AG. Fác<i>to in memoria hábeas. LY. Miles, séquere me. ANTA.  
Ego ueró sequor.

AG. Quid ais, patrué? cuándo hinc ire cógitas Cartháginem?  
Nám tecum mihi una ire certumst. HA. Vbi primum potero,  
flico. 1420

AG. Dum aúctionem fácio, hic opus est áliquot ut manéas dies.  
HA. Fáciam ita ut uis. AG. Áge sis, eamus: nós curemus.  
plaúдите.)

*Double Ending (1315-1422).* The manuscripts of Plautus give two versions of the close of the *Poenulus*, each ending with a request for applause (ll. 1315-1371; 1372-1422). Early editors tried to fix upon one of these endings as genuine, and to discard the other;<sup>24</sup> but the prevalent view to-day is that both contain a mixture of the genuine text and the text of the Plautine Revival, with some still later additions and interpolations. The older of the two versions is represented by ll. 1322-1355; 1398-1422; but even this is probably not preserved in the form in which Plautus wrote it. Substitutions were made for both parts of this ending, though not necessarily by the same author or at the same date. The first half was displaced by the confused dialogue of ll. 1372-1397, and the last by ll. 1356-1371, the only final scene in Plautus which is written in iambic *senarii*, and the only one in which the abstract *comoedia* asks for applause.<sup>25</sup>

Both A and P give both endings. A makes no division between the two; P leaves a space as if for a new scene before l. 1372.

<sup>24</sup> See Goetz-Loewe, Ed. (1884), on V., 7.

<sup>25</sup> On the whole question, see Langen, *Plaut. Stud.*, pp. 343 ff.; Leo, *Plaut. Forsch.*, p. 158, note 3.

Except for some slight differences which will be discussed below, the form of the two endings is the same in both families of manuscripts.

1315 ff. The general discussion of the Double Ending has left untouched ll. 1315-1321. The starting-point of both endings is the insolent speech of Antamoenides to Hanno (ll. 1309-1314). As a matter of fact, this speech is rebuked three times: (1) by Agorastocles (ll. 1315 ff.); (2) by Adelphasium (ll. 1322 ff.); (3) by Agorastocles (ll. 1372 ff.). The second reproof follows the apology of the *miles* (ll. 1320-1321), and is clearly out of place; the third, as we have already seen, belongs to the later version of the ending. Moreover, there are three announcements of the approach of the *leno* in three successive lines (1330-1332). The second of these so closely resembles the first that it must be regarded as an alternative version, and the repetition of *eccum* in the third throws suspicion on that line also. The passage which follows l. 1331 in P (ll. 1333-1335) is identical with ll. 1382-1384. It seems more appropriate in the first position, for we should expect Hanno to inquire about the approaching stranger;<sup>26</sup> in the second, since Lycus is already taking part in the dialogue, there is much less reason for the question. It is probable that in the first two versions Antamoenides was rebuked for his rudeness, apologized, and received forgiveness; then as the *leno* was seen approaching, Hanno inquired about him. In the third version, Lycus entered abruptly after l. 1314, just in time to hear the reproof of Antamoenides and to learn that Hanno was the father of his two slaves. The three versions therefore ran as follows: (1) ll. 1315-1321,

<sup>26</sup> Langen, *Plaut. Stud.*, p. 351.



followed by ll. 1329-1330, 1333-1335; (2) the genuine version, ll. 1322-1328, 1329-1330, 1333-1335; (3) ll. 1372-1381.

P omits 1331 (which is certainly due to *retractatio*), but aside from that omission gives 1315-1337, 1372-1384 in full form (1333-1335 = 1382-1384). A omits 1333-1335, but writes *quis hicst* at the close of 1332, showing that the lines must have appeared in full form somewhere in the A-family. If we assume that 1322-1328 and 1372-1381 were alternative versions, the repetition of 1333-1335 after 1381 is not surprising.

1378 ff. The repetition of l. 1377 after l. 1381 in P may perhaps indicate a shortening of the scene by the omission of ll. 1378-1381.<sup>27</sup>

P repeats 1377 after 1381.

A *deest* after 1381, but apparently did not repeat 1377, for the 38 lines of the missing sheet would have given just enough space for 1382-1419.

The *Poenulus* shows more extensive alteration than any other play of Plautus. It contains the longest single case of dittography—the Double Ending—and both this ending and the body of the play have received an unusual amount of revision. In two places (ll. 504 ff.; 1315 ff.) there are clear traces of three parallel versions. Scattered through the play, too, in passages which would otherwise arouse no comment, are a number of suspicious forms (the singular verbs in ll. 523, 728, 730, 733; the nominative in -s in l. 955). Then there are, of course, examples of the more common kinds of *retractatio*: variant lines (214, 218, 304, 390<sup>b</sup>) and longer alternative versions (ll. 121-128; 917-929; 1042-1052), and possible

<sup>27</sup> Leo, Ed. (1896), *ad loc.* Lindsay, *Anc. Edd.*, p. 45, note c.

attempts to shorten scenes (ll. 622<sup>b</sup>, 706 ff., 805, 1377 ff.).<sup>28</sup>

For a number of these passages, the evidence of the Ambrosian Palimpsest is lacking. In the long Double Ending, the text of A and P is practically the same, and it is the same also in ll. 917-929, 1147-1173. A and P give the same text, though their order differs, in ll. 300-305, 1267-1269; and in two places, though A does not preserve the whole of the passage, it gives enough to show that the passage was present in some form in its archetype (ll. 389 ff.; 1333 ff.). In two instances where *retractatio* undoubtedly exists, A shows slightly more evidence of it than P (ll. 706 ff., 1042 ff.); and the alternative line 1331 is preserved only in A. The one change which A apparently fails to indicate is the shortening at ll. 1378 ff. On the whole, then, A shows slightly more evidence of *retractatio* than P.

<sup>28</sup> The following lines have also been suspected: 5-10, 14, 27, 37-40, 46-58, 79-82, 159-163, 176, 225-232, 242, 244 ff., 263-274, 275-282, 289-296, 313-316, 327-328, 330-408, 352-354, 360-364, 370-380, 385, 408, 419, 456<sup>bc</sup>, 518, 521, 550, 551, 576, 631-632, 669-678, 717-718, 721-745, 831, 865, 877-878, 950-960, 967-970, 982-984, 988-989, 990-991, 1020, 1036, 1075, 1079-1085, 1108, 1116, 1125-1126, 1159, 1192-1204, 1212-1236, 1277-1279, 1328-1330, 1336-1337, 1349, 1350, 1353-1358, 1393 f., 1401, 1403-1404, 1408, 1417.

The evidence of A is lacking for 5-10, 14, 27, 37-40, 46-58, 79-82, 159-163, 176, 225-232, 242, 244 ff., 263-274, 275-282, 518, 521, 550, 551, 631-632, 717-718, 721-745, 831, 1075, 1079-1085, 1393, 1401, 1403-1404, 1408, 1417. Both A and P have 289-296, 313-316, 327-328, 330-408, 352-354, 360-364, 370-380, (P has the order 376, 375), 385, 408, 419, 576, 669-678, 865, 887-888, 950-960, 967-970, (P has the order 969, 968), 982-984, 988-989, 990-991, 1020 (in different order), 1036, 1108, 1116, 1125-1126, 1159, 1192-1204, 1212-1236, 1277-1279, 1328-1330, 1336-1337, 1349, 1350, 1353-1358 (A omits 1353). A omits 456<sup>bc</sup>.

The following lines show minor variations: 331, 342, 343, 587, 690, 875, 975, 1332.

## CHAPTER III.

### *PSEUDOLUS*

The *Pseudolus* was a favorite with Plautus himself, if we may believe Cicero (*De Senect.* 14, 50), and its lively action and exuberant humor have made the play popular ever since. The situation is the old one of the youth in love. This time his name is Calidorus, the girl is called Phoenicium, her master Ballio, and the title-rôle is taken by Pseudolus, the slave of the young lover. In the first scene, Calidorus shows Pseudolus a letter from Phoenicium, announcing that she has been sold to a Macedonian soldier for twenty *minae*; three-quarters of the sum have already been paid, and she is to be handed over, on the payment of the last quarter, to the soldier's messenger, who is to bring an impression of his master's sealing as identification; the limit set for the payment of the balance is the next feast of Dionysus, which falls on the morrow. Ballio is next introduced—a brutal character at best, and especially brutal to-day, because it is his birthday, and he is planning to give a grand dinner. Calidorus appeals to him for six days of grace on the payment of twenty *minae* for Phoenicium, is told, to his surprise and delight, that she is not for sale, and then hears that she has already been sold to a Macedonian soldier—with all the details just as they were given in the first scene, except that the time set for the payment of the other five *minae* is “to-day.” Pseudolus undertakes to help his young master, frankly confesses his purpose to the father, Simo, and warns the old gentleman

that he intends to cheat him. He adds that he is planning a second campaign, against the *leno* Ballio. If he succeeds in both plots, Simo is to pay for the girl. Simo's friend Callipho promises to remain at home that day and lend his aid to the schemer. Luck throws into the hands of Pseudolus a sealed letter from the *miles*; so a rogue who rivals Pseudolus himself in cleverness is dressed up like the soldier's messenger, and sent to Ballio, with the letter and five *minae*. Ballio recognizes the soldier's seal, delivers the girl to the messenger, and is then so sure of safety from attack that he offers to give Simo twenty *minae* if Pseudolus succeeds. But when the real messenger of the *miles* appears, it becomes evident that the trick is already played, and that Ballio is the victim. Simo acknowledges that Pseudolus has won his twenty *minae*, and the money is handed over,—to a very drunk and very impudent slave.

The plot of the *Pseudolus* shows obvious inconsistencies. The explanation given in the letter (ll. 51-59) makes the later account of the sale of Phoenicium superfluous, and the attitude of Calidorus—his tender solicitude for the girl (l. 231), his unbounded joy when he hears that she is not for sale (ll. 323 ff.), his despair when the truth is finally told (ll. 342 ff.)—is quite incomprehensible in one already familiar with the contents of the letter. There is a discrepancy, too, about the time when the final payment of the *miles* is due—*hodie* in the one case (ll. 373 f., 623 f.), *cras* in the other (ll. 60, 82). Callipho, whom we expect to take a prominent part in the action after his promise of aid to Pseudolus (ll. 547-560), disappears from the stage at the end of the scene and is never mentioned again.

Ladewig<sup>1</sup> noticed some of the discrepancies, and suggested that the *Pseudolus* really contained two plots : (1) the duping of the old man to get the money ; and (2) the duping of the *leno* to get the girl. But other scholars paid little attention to this suggestion. Langen<sup>2</sup> noted a number of difficulties in the plot, without attempting to explain them by *contaminatio*, and Leo<sup>3</sup> confined his hint of two originals in the *Pseudolus* to a foot-note. In 1897, Bierma<sup>4</sup> made a detailed analysis of the play, and this analysis, modified by Seyffert,<sup>5</sup> Leo,<sup>6</sup> and lately by Schmitt,<sup>7</sup> is the basis of work today.

It is evident that the *Pseudolus* does not, like the *Miles* and the *Poenulus*, combine two full plots, but that certain scenes from one plot have been worked into the other. The two plots agree in general features : in both, the difficulties of the young man in love are removed by the clever slave ; in both, the father has received some warning of the slave's plans, and has to pay over a sum of money at the end. The two plots may be sketched as follows : (A) The girl with whom the young man is in love has been sold to a Macedonian soldier ; part payment has been made, and the balance is due on the day that the play opens. The slave outwits the *leno* by getting possession of the soldier's letter, and sending a messenger

<sup>1</sup> Th. Ladewig, *Über d. Kanon des Volcatius Sedigitus*, Neustrelitz, 1842, pp. 32 f.

<sup>2</sup> Langen, *Plaut. Stud.*, pp. 198 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Leo, *Plaut. Forsch.*, p. 153, n. 2.

<sup>4</sup> J. W. Bierma, *Quaestiones de Plautina Pseudolo*, Groningen, 1897.

<sup>5</sup> Seyffert in *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 18 (1898), coll. 1511-1515.

<sup>6</sup> Leo in *Nachr. Gött. Ges.* 1903, pp. 347-354.

<sup>7</sup> A. Schmitt, *De Pseudoli Plautinae exemplo Attico*, Strassburg, 1909. (Accessible to me only in a review by M. Niemeyer in *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 30 (1910), coll. 870-873).

with it to fetch the girl. The actual cost of the girl is defrayed by the young man's father, who has previously agreed to pay this sum if the slave's ruse succeeds; but he is reimbursed by the *leno*, who has in the meantime promised him twenty *minae* on the same conditions. So the *leno* is ruined, and his fall is all the greater because the scene is laid on his birthday.<sup>8</sup> (B) The young man needs twenty *minae* to pay for the girl, the morrow being the last opportunity. The slave gets this sum by cheating the father, after he has announced his intentions and warned the old man to be on his guard. In the trick (the details of which we can not fill out) he has the help of the father's friend Callipho. To the first plot (A) belong I., 2, 3; II., 2-IV., 8; to the second (B): I., 1 (except ll. 51-59), 4, 5 (except ll. 522-546); V., 2. Plautus himself made some changes; he added ll. 51-59, and 522-546<sup>9</sup> (elements from plot B) to plot A; he combined the two plots in II., 1; and he added V., 1<sup>10</sup> and certain details (*e. g.* l. 1308) in V., 2.

---

<sup>8</sup>It is possible that this *motif* had even more prominence in the original. It is emphasized in ll. 165, 167, 179, 234, 243, 1237, and forms the sole connecting link between Act III. and the rest of the play. Cf. Bierma, *De Plaut. Pseud.*, pp. 40 ff., 87 f.; Leo in *Nachr. Gött. Ges.* 1903, p. 352.

<sup>9</sup>The insertion is unskillfully made, and has resulted in some confusion. As the dialogue stands, Simo agrees that if Pseudolus succeeds in *both* plots (*i. e.*, the duping of Simo himself and the duping of Ballio) Simo will pay him twenty *minae*. The original bargain in plot B must have been that Simo would pay the money if Pseudolus succeeded in cheating Ballio. Cf. Leo in *Nachr. Gött. Ges.* 1903, pp. 349 ff.

<sup>10</sup>Hence the double motivation of the entrance of Pseudolus (ll. 1282, 1283), and of Simo's return to the stage (ll. 1239 ff., 1285). Cf. Leo, *Plaut. Cant.*, p. 41, note, in *Abhandl. Gött. Ges.*, 1896-1897.

Expórgi meliust lúmbos atque exsúrgier:  
Plautína longa fábulā in scaená m uenit.

*Prologue (ll. 1-2).* Both the Ambrosian Palimpsest and the Palatine manuscripts give these two lines, which bear the mark of the Plautine Revival in the phrase *Plautina longa fabula*. (Cf. *Cas. Prol. 12*). A prologue is really unnecessary for the exposition of the *Pseudolus*,<sup>11</sup> and Lindsay<sup>12</sup> therefore concludes that the extant couplet formed the whole of the later stage-manager's introduction. But though the play may be perfectly clear without the prologue, the prologue in its present form is far from clear. The comparative *melius* (l. 1) demands as least an implied positive, and there is no expressed subject for the infinitives *exporgi* and *exsurgier*. The extant prologue must therefore have been preceded by several lines, and it was probably followed by others giving the name of the *Plautina fabula* and making the usual request for quiet.<sup>13</sup>

P prefixes the prologue to Argument I. (omitting Argument II.).

A places the prologue immediately before Scene I. (omitting Argument I. and giving Argument II. in a later hand).

---

PS. 'Nunc nōstri amores, mōres, consuetūdines,	64
Iocus lūdus, sermo, suāui[s]saiiatio,	65
Comprēssiones ártae amantum cómparum,	
Teneris labellis mōlles morsiúnculae,	
Nostrorum orgiorum * s * * * iúnculae,	67 <sup>b</sup>
Papíllarum horridulárum oppressiúnculae:	
Harúne uoluptatum míhi omnium atque itidém tibi	
Distráctio, discídium, uastitiés uenit.	70

<sup>11</sup> Leo, *Plaut. Forsch.*, p. 196.

<sup>12</sup> Lindsay, *Anc. Edd.*, p. 1, note a.

<sup>13</sup> Leo, *Plaut. Forsch.*, p. 197.

67<sup>b</sup>. The verse, as Löwe<sup>14</sup> noted when he tried to reconstruct its reading from the Palimpsest, is not appropriate here, for it inserts a phrase of general nature in a list of specific details. He likewise objected to the word *orgia*, which does not appear elsewhere in Roman literature before Catullus. Leo<sup>15</sup> surmised that the line might be a later addition to l. 64, and this hypothesis is possible, although in the broken state of the text it is hard to reach definite conclusions.

P omits 67<sup>b</sup>.

---

Nempe ita animati | estis uos: uincitis duritia hoc atque me 151  
Hoc sis uide ut alias res agunt. hoc agite, hoc animum aduertite.

Huc adhibete auris quae ego loquar, plagifera genera | hominum.

Numquam edepol uostrum durius tergum erit quam terginum hoc meum.

Quid nunc? doletne? em sic datur, siquis erum seruos spernit. 155

Adsistite omnes contra me et quae loquar aduertite animum.

151-156. Even the general wordiness of Ballio's speech does not excuse the three commands to pay attention (ll. 152, 153, 156) in so brief a space. *Vincitis duritia hoc [terginum] atque me* (ll. 151), and *numquam edepol uostrum durius tergum erit quam terginum hoc meum* (l. 154), have the same idea at base, though the turn given to it is different; and the two lines are intolerable together. *Hoc* (l. 151) must mean *terginum* (cf. l. 154), and though the action on the stage probably helped to make the sentence clear, still the postponement of the noun is at least noticeable. There are two cases of verbal

<sup>14</sup>G. Löwe, *Analecta Plautina*, Leipzig, 1877, pp. 153 ff.

<sup>15</sup>Leo, Ed. (1896), *ad loc.*



repetition: 152 *animum advortite*, cf. 156 *advortite animum*; 153 *quae ego loquar*, cf. 156 *quae loquar*. Therefore it seems possible that we have two versions: (1) 151-153; (2) 154-156. Of these, the second is probably Plautine, for the phrase *contra me* (l. 156) to which Lorenz<sup>16</sup> objected, is paralleled in *Pers.* 13, and the clearness of l. 156, as opposed to l. 151, together with the play on *tergum . . . terginum*, counts in its favor.

P has the verses in the order of the Goetz-Schoell text.

A has the whole passage, but puts 153 after 154.

---

Tibi hoc praecipio ut nteant aedes: habes quod facias: propera,  
abi intro. 161

Tu esto lectisterniator. tu argentum eluito, idem extruito.  
Haec, quom ego a foro reuortor, facite ut offendam parata,  
Vorsa sparsa, tersa strata, lautaque unctaue omnia uti sint.  
Nam mi hodie natalis dies est: decet eum omnis uos concel-  
brare. 165

Pernam callum glandium sumen facito in aqua iaceant. satin  
audis?

Magnifice uolo me uros summos accipere, ut mihi rem esse  
reantur.

Intro abite atque haec cito celebrate, ne mora quae sit, cocus quom  
veniat [mihi].

166. This verse breaks the close connection between l. 165 and l. 167, and is quite out of place here under any circumstances. Ballio has finished his individual commissions in l. 162, and ll. 163-168, with the sole exception of l. 166, are general directions in the plural.<sup>17</sup>

The line is given in both A and P.

---

<sup>16</sup> A. Lorenz in *Philol.* 35 (1876), p. 159.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. H. Usener in *Index schol. Gryphiswald.*, 1866, pp. 13 ff.

† Xýtilis, face ut ánimum aduortas, quofus amatorés oliui 210  
 Dýnamín domi habent máxumam:  
 Sí mihi non iam huc cúlleis  
 Óleum deportátum erit,  
 Te ípsam culleo égo cras faciam ut déportere in pérgulam.  
 íbi tibi adeo léctus dabitur, úbi tu hau somnum cápias, sed  
 ubi 215  
 V́sque ad languorém —: tenes  
 Quó se haec tendant quae loquor.  
 Áín, excetra tu, quae tibi amicos tót habes tam probe óleo  
 onustos?  
 Num quóspiamst hodié tua tuorum ópera conseruórum  
 Nítidiusculúm caput? aut num ipse égo pulmento utór  
 magis 220  
 V́nctiusculó? sed scio, tu | óleum hau magni péndis: uino  
 Té deu[i]ngis. sine modo:  
 Réprehendam ego cuncta hércle una opera, nísi quidem tu hodie  
 ómnia  
 Fácis effecta haec út loquor.

210-224. As the text stands, this whole passage is addressed to Xytilis. The length of the tirade is quite out of proportion to the speeches addressed to the other *meretrices* (ll. 188-193 ; 196-201 ; 225-229). The sense of ll. 210 f. is repeated in l. 218, and the threats of ll. 222-224 are an anticlimax after ll. 212-217. It is possible that ll. 218-224 are a second version, intended to avoid the brutality of ll. 210-217.<sup>18</sup>

The passage has the same form in A and P.

---

PS. Hóc ego oppidum ádmoenire ut hódie capiatúr uolo. 384  
 Ad eam rem usust hómínem astutum dóctum, cautum et cálli-  
 dum, 385  
 Qui ímperata efécta reddat, nón qui uigilans dórmiat.  
 CA. Cédo mihi, quid és facturus? PS. Témperi ego faxó scies.

<sup>18</sup> E. Norden in *Rhein. Mus.* 49 (1894), pp. 197 ff.

Nólo bis iterári: sat sic lóngae fiunt fábulae.

CA. Óptimum atque aequíssimum oras. PS. Própera, adduc  
hominém cito.

<CA.> Paúci ex multis súnť amici, hóm̄ini qui certí sient. 390

PS. Égo scio istuc: érgo utrumque t̄ibi nunc dilectúm para

Átque ex multis éxquire illis ún̄um qui certús siet.

<CA.> Iám hic faxo aderit. PS. Pótin ut [h]abeas? t̄ibi moram  
dictís creas.

385-386. The end of this scene is almost hopelessly confused. The request of ll. 385-386 is repeated in ll. 724-728, where it is much more in place ; for Pseudolus has by that time gained possession of the letter and has formed a plan in which he needs the help of a clever rogue. The reflection of Calidorus (l. 390) and the response of Pseudolus (ll. 391 f.) sound as if Pseudolus had really asked, not for a rogue, but for a trusty friend ; and ll. 697f., spoken when Calidorus brings in his friend Charinus, agree with this interpretation :

Pseudolus mihi ita imperavit, ut aliquem hominem strenuom  
Benevolentem adducerem ad se.

Ll. 385-386, then, are inappropriate in their present position. It seems possible that they were made up on the model of ll. 724 ff., and got into this position by mistake, crowding out a bit of the original dialogue, in which Pseudolus asked for the aid of a friend.

The passage has the same form in A and P.

---

PS. Atque égo me iam pridem huíc daturum dixeram 406  
Et uólui inicere trágulam in nostrúm senem:  
Verum ís nescioquo pácto praesensit prius.

406-408. The vague allusion of these verses is not

explained by anything in the earlier scenes of the *Pseudolus*, and the difficulty is not materially lessened by the assumption of *contaminatio*.<sup>19</sup> It seems probable that the passage is a later insertion, suggested by ll. 421-422 :

SI. Si dé damnoseis aút si de amatóribus	415
Dictátor fiat núnc Athenis Átticis,	
Nemo ánteueniat filio credó meo.	
Ita núnc per urbem sólus sermoni ómnibust,	
Eum uélle amicam líberare et quaérere	
Argéntum ad eam rem: hoc álíi mihi renúntiant	
Atque íd iam pridem sénsi et subolebát mihi,	421
Sed díssimulabam. PS. Iám illi fe * * fílius:	
Ocefsast haec res, haéret hoc negótium.	

One notices the repetitions : 406 *iam pridem*, cf. 421 *iam pridem* ; 408 *praesensit*, cf. 421 *sensi* ; and the fact that *huic* (l. 406) has no antecedent.

The passage occurs in both A and P.

---

PS. Vín étiam dicam quód uos magis mirémini?	522
CA. Studeo hércle audire: nám ted auscultó lubens.	
SI. Agedúm: nam satis lubénter te auscultó loqui.	523 <sup>b</sup>

523<sup>ab</sup>. These verses are clearly doublets. Abraham<sup>20</sup> has shown conclusively that the second is un-Plautine. *Auscultare* in Plautus never takes a complementary infinitive, and is never joined with an adverb, but always with an adjective; *agedum* is never used alone, but always with another imperative; and *satis lubenter* does not occur elsewhere in Plautus. The intention of the author

<sup>19</sup> Bierma's explanation. Cf. *De Plaut. Pseud.*, pp. 38 f., 56 f.

<sup>20</sup> W. Abraham, *Studia Plautina*, Leipzig, 1884, pp. 182 ff.

of the line may have been either to supply a variant for l. 523<sup>a</sup>, or to add another verse, and so give both the old men speaking parts.

P has the verses in the order of the Goetz-Schoell text.

A *deest* 2 sheets = 76 ll.

A *deest* 477-551 = 77 ll. (including 523<sup>b</sup> and 543<sup>b</sup>).

Therefore A probably omitted 523<sup>b</sup>.

---

Concédere aliquantsper hinc mihi intró lubet,	571
Dum cóncenturio in córde sycophántias.	
* * * * * nón ero uobís morae.	573 <sup>a</sup>
Tibícen uos intéribi hic delectáuerit.	573 <sup>b</sup>

573<sup>a</sup>. The beginning of l. 573<sup>a</sup> is lost in the Palimpsest, but enough is left to show that it contained much the same announcement as ll. 571-572. *Interibi* (l. 573<sup>b</sup>) must, as Baier<sup>21</sup> points out, refer not to the line immediately preceding, but to *dum concenturio* (l. 572). Therefore l. 573<sup>a</sup> is probably due to *retractatio*, its object being to announce clearly the return of Pseudolus in the next scene.

P omits 573<sup>a</sup>.

---

Séd iam satis est phîlosophatum: nîmis diu et longúm loquor	687
Di immortales, aúrichalco cóntra non carúm fuit	
Meúm mendacium, hîc modo quod súbito commentís fui,	
Quía lenonis mé esse dixi. núnce ego hac epístula	690
Trís deludam, erum ét lenonem et qui hánc dedit mihi epístulam.	
Eúge: par pari áliud autem quód cupiebam cóntigt:	
Vénit ecceum Calidórus: ducit néscioquem secúm simul.	

688 ff. The exultant *di immortales*, with which l. 688 begins, echoes l. 667, and the tone of the next few

<sup>21</sup> B. Baier, *De Plauti Fab. Recenss.*, p. 128.

lines is what we should expect at the beginning of a speech. This is particularly strange, because Pseudolus has just announced (l. 687): *sed iam satis est philosophatum*. Leo<sup>22</sup> therefore advances the plausible theory that the speech of Pseudolus originally consisted of ll. 667-687 *sed iam satis est philosophatum*, followed by 690 *nunc ego hac epistula* -693; then ll. 688-690 *quia lenonis me esse dixi* were substituted for the early part of this scene; and the editor who combined the two versions, finding a vacant half line at the end of l. 687, supplied *nimis diu et longum loquor*.

The passage has the same form in A and P.

---

CA. Dúlcia atque amára apud te sum élocutus ómnia: 694  
Scfs amorem, scfs laborem, scfs egestatém meam.

CH. Cómmemini omnia: íd tu modo me quíd uis facere fác  
sciam. 696<sup>a</sup>

[CA. Quom haec tibi alia sum elocutus uis scires si scis de  
symbolo.

CH. Omnia inquam tu modo quid me facere uis fac ut  
sciam.] 696<sup>c</sup>

696<sup>bc</sup>. These two lines, which are in part a verbal repetition of ll. 694-696<sup>a</sup>, seem to offer an alternative version: 694 *apud te*, cf. 696<sup>b</sup> *tibi*; 694 *sum elocutus*, cf. 696<sup>b</sup> *sum elocutus*; 696<sup>a</sup> *omnia*, cf. 696<sup>c</sup> *omnia*; 696<sup>a</sup> *tu modo me quid vis facere fac sciam*, cf. 696<sup>c</sup> *tu modo quid me facere vis fac ut sciam*. The *symbolum* which is introduced so abruptly here (l. 696<sup>b</sup>) could have had no special significance for the story of Calidorus, though it was of importance in the trick that Pseudolus planned

<sup>22</sup> Leo, Ed. (1896), *ad loc.*

to play. The purpose of the alteration may have been to emphasize this detail.

A omits 696<sup>b,c</sup>

---

SI. Vissó quid rerum méus Vlixes égerit,	1063
iamne hábeat signum ex árce Balliónia.	
BA. O fórtunate, cédo fortunatám manum.	1065
SI. Quid ést? BA. Iam—SI. Quid iam? BA. Níl est quod metuás. SI. Quid est?	
Venírne homo ad te? BA. Nón. SI. Quid est igitúr boni?	
BA. Minaé uiginti sánae et saluae súnnt tibi,	
Hodié quas aps te<d> ést stipulatus Pseudolus.	1069
* * * * *	
SI. Sed cónuenistin hóminem? BA. Immo ambó simul.	1079
SI. Quid aft? quid narrat? quaéso, quid dicit tibi?	1080
BA. Nugás theatri: uérba quae in comoédiis Solént lenoni díci, quae puerí sciunt: Malum ét scelestum et péiurum, aibat ésse me. SI. Pol haú mentitust. BA. Érgo haud iratús fui. Nam quánti refert éf nec recte dícere,	1085
Qui níl<i> faciat quíque infitias nón eat?	

1079-1086. These lines were suspected of being due to *retractatio* by Kiessling,<sup>23</sup> in 1868, and have been bracketed by most editors since then. The question of l. 1079 is a surprise after l. 1067, and the answer an absolute contradiction. The sense of the two questions is the same; for Simo is evidently referring, not to the meeting with Pseudolus in I., 3, which Ballio describes, but to a meeting in which Pseudolus might have tried to trick Ballio. So l. 1079 repeats l. 1067, and the whole passage is probably a later addition.

A and P give the passage in the same form through 1084—then A *deest*.

---

<sup>23</sup> A. Kiessling in *Rhein. Mus.* 23 (1868), pp. 425 f.

- Heús, ubi estis uós? <BA.> Hicquidem ad me récta habet  
 rectám uiam. 1136  
 <HA.> Heús, ubi estis uos? <BA.> Heús, adulescens, quíd istic  
 debetúr tibi?  
 Béne ego ab hoc praedátus ibo: nóui, bona scaeuást mihi.  
 <HA.> Écquis hoc aperit? <BA.> Heús, chlamydate, quíd istic  
 debetúr tibi?  
 <HA.> Aédium dominúm lenonem Bállionem quaérito. 1140

1137. L. 1137, which combines l. 1136 and l. 1139, was probably intended as a substitute for ll. 1136, 1138-1139. If l. 1137 were genuine, we should expect it to be followed, not by another aside by Ballio (l. 1138), but by the answer of Harpax (l. 1140).<sup>24</sup>

Both A and P give l. 1137.

---

BA. Édepol hominem uérberonem Pseúdolom, ut docté dolum 1205  
 Cómmentust: tantúndem argenti quántum miles débuit  
 Dédit huic atque hominem éxornauit, múlierem qui abdú-  
 ceret. 1207. 1208

1205-1207. An attempt to cut out ll. 1162-1204 may be indicated by the repetition of ll. 1205-1207 after l. 1161.

BA. Quíd agimus? manufésto teneo hunc hóminem qui argen-  
 tum áttulit. 1160  
 SI. Quídm? BA. An nescis quae sit haec res? SI. Íuxta cum  
 ignaríssumis.  
 BA. Pseúdolos tuos állegauit hunc, quasi a Macédonio  
 Milite esset.

A has the passage in the order of the Goetz-Schoell text.  
 P has 1205-1207 both after 1161 and after 1204

---

<sup>24</sup>The first scholar to suspect the line was Fleckeisen. Cf. Ritschl's Ed. of *Pseud.* (1850), Praef., pp. xiii f.



BA. Édepol ne istuc mágis magisque métuo, quom uerba aú-  
 dio. 1214  
 [BA.] Mfhi quoque edepol iám dudum ille Súrús cor perfrigé-  
 facit,  
 Súbololum qui ab hóc accepit. míra sunt, ni Pseúdolust.

1214-1216. The first of these verses is the same in sense as the last two, and the word *edepol* is repeated. It is worth noting, also, that the best manuscripts of the Palatine family prefix BA. to l. 1215. Perhaps l. 1214 was substituted by the same reviser who cut out ll. 1162-1204, who accordingly wished to avoid the name *Surus*. (Cf. l. 1203).<sup>25</sup>

The passage has the same form in A and P.

The results of work on the *Pseudolus* are somewhat unsatisfactory. After the undoubted evidences of *retractatio* in the prologue, we expect to find further traces of change in the text of the play. But only ll. 523,<sup>b</sup> 688 ff., 1137 can be put down with any degree of certainty as later versions. In many other places (*e. g.*, ll. 166, 385 ff.), though there is unquestionably something wrong with the text, it is hard to locate the trouble exactly. Certain lines preserved in A alone (ll. 67<sup>b</sup>, 573<sup>a</sup>) are probably due to *retractatio*, but are so fragmentary that any statement about them must be qualified. Two passages (ll. 151-156, 210-224) seem to present parallel versions; ll. 406-408 are apparently a later addition; and ll. 1205-1207 were perhaps inserted after l. 1161 to shorten the scene.<sup>26</sup>

<sup>25</sup> Ribbeck suspected the verse. Cf. Ritschl's Ed. of *Men.* (1851), Praef., p. xv.

<sup>26</sup> In addition to the passages discussed in detail, the following lines of the *Pseudolus* have also been suspected: 65, 82, 91 ff., 97,

In these cases of *retractatio*, possible or probable, the two families of manuscripts are almost evenly balanced. Most passages have the same form in both. A is the only one to preserve ll. 67<sup>b</sup>, 573<sup>a</sup>. P alone has ll. 696<sup>b</sup><sup>c</sup> and repeats ll. 1205-1207, and A probably omitted l. 523<sup>b</sup> also. But at least the *Pseudolus* shows that A is not a purer text than P.

---

116, 142, 176, 177, 205-208, 238, 259-263<sup>b</sup>, 269, 284, 292-295, 307, 336 f., 384, 398, 403, 422, 467, 485, 497-499, 502 f., 527, 530, 543<sup>b</sup>, 544, 550, 565 f., 576 f., 585<sup>b</sup>, 586, 599, 600, 737-750, 759-766, 767-904, 768, 781 f., 842 f., 866-889, 936-939<sup>b</sup>, 944, 1002-1008, 1025-1031, 1043, 1073, 1093, 1097, 1098, 1196, 1204, 1245, 1259-1261, 1277 f., 1314.

These suspected passages are preserved as follows: A *deest*: 238, 259-263<sup>b</sup>, 485, 497-499, 502 f., 527, 530, 543<sup>b</sup>, 544, 550, 737-750, 759-766, 767-904, 768, 781 f., 1025-1031, 1043, 1093, 1097, 1098, 1259-1261, 1277 f. Both A and P have 65, 82, 91 ff., 97, 116, 142, 176, 177, 205-208, 269, 284, 307, 336 f., 384, 398, 403, 467, 565 f., 576 f., 585<sup>b</sup>, 586, 599, 600, 842 f., 866-889, 936-939<sup>b</sup>, 944, 1002-1008 (A transposes 1002, 1003), 1073, 1196, 1204, 1245, 1314. A omits 293-295, and places 292 after 296. P omits 422.

The text of the *Pseudolus* shows an unusually large number of slight differences between the two families of manuscripts. Variations of a word or phrase occur in the following lines: 85, 152, 208, 223, 298, 308, 315, 321, 340, 372, 375, 385, 389, 391, 392, 397, 418, 432, 433, 451, 621, 627, 631, 659, 669, 700, 723, 841, 843, 856, 864, 873, 889, 901, 954, 955, 975, 978, 992, 997, 1175, 1204, 1220, 1294, 1295, 1299.

## CHAPTER IV.

### *STICHUS*

The opening scene of the *Stichus* introduces two sisters, whose husbands have left home three years before to repair their damaged fortunes, and have not been heard from since. Their father, Antipho, wishes them to marry again, but they firmly refuse. The elder sister, Panegyris, sends for the parasite Gelasimus, explaining that she wishes to dispatch him to the harbor for special tidings. But before he reaches her door, the slave who is regularly on the watch comes from the port with the news that Epignomus and Pamphilippus have arrived. Epignomus and his slave Stichus appear on the stage; Stichus asks for a holiday, and receives permission to go to a banquet with Sagarinus, the slave of Pamphilippus, and Stephanium, who is *amica ambobus*. Then follows a series of scenes in which the parasite makes desperate efforts to get an invitation to dinner, but is repulsed, and the two brothers, who have in the meantime become reconciled with their father-in-law and with their wives, plan a banquet together. After this Stichus comes on again, ready for the feast, and through the last six scenes of the play he and his two friends drink and dance and sing.

“Ein rätselhaftes Stück,” said Teuffel<sup>1</sup> of the *Stichus*, and the play has remained “a puzzle” to scholars ever

<sup>1</sup> W. Teuffel in *Rhein. Mus.* 8 (1853), p. 38 (= *Stud. u. Char.*,<sup>2</sup> p. 340).

since. All are agreed <sup>2</sup> that the play which we possess is very different from the "ADELPHOE MENANDRU" which the *didascalía* names as its source. Ritschl <sup>3</sup> characterized the *Stichus* as "äusserst flüchtig skizzirt," and Leo <sup>4</sup> has said of it in recent years, "Die Teile sind sehr hübsch, das Ganze unmöglich."

The play opens as if it were to hinge upon the faithfulness of two wives to their husbands. The second, third, and fourth acts, in which the husbands return and become reconciled with their father-in-law, are slightly connected with the theme of the first act, though they give much less prominence to the women than we should expect. But in the fifth act all these characters disappear from the stage, and the rest of the play is taken up with the banquet of their slaves.

The slight connection of Act V. with the rest of the play led Goetz <sup>5</sup> to suspect *retractatio*, and Winter <sup>6</sup> even assumed that a later author combined two plays of Plautus to make the *Stichus*. But such composition is not impossible for Plautus himself.<sup>7</sup> We remember that he was sometimes unsuccessful in combining two Greek comedies, and that he sometimes left out important scenes at the close of a play. (Cf. *Cas.* 64 f.; *Cist.* 782 ff.) So the lack of unity in the *Stichus* is not a sufficient reason for denying the play in its present form to him.

<sup>2</sup> W. Süss in *Rhein. Mus.* 65 (1910), pp. 452 ff., tries to prove that the *Stichus* accurately represents the Greek original.

<sup>3</sup> Ritschl, *Parerga*, p. 280.

<sup>4</sup> Leo in *Nachr. Gött. Ges.* 1902, p. 376.

<sup>5</sup> Goetz in *Acta soc. phil. Lips.* 6 (1876), pp. 302 ff.

<sup>6</sup> F. Winter, *Plauti Fabularum Deperditarum Fragmenta*, Bonn, 1885, pp. 82 ff.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Leo, *Plaut. Forsch.*, pp. 150 ff.; Leo in *Nachr. Gött. Ges.* 1902, p. 377.

Such a lack of unity would, however, have been impossible in the Greek original. Even Aristophanes makes his plays center around one or two principal characters, who take part in the riotous scenes at the end as well as in the earlier action; and the *Persa* of Plautus, which is probably based on an original of the Middle Comedy, preserves the unity of characters through the banquet-scene.<sup>8</sup> From all that we know of New Comedy, and especially of Menander, we can infer that unity of character was still more essential there. Before the discovery of the Cairo papyrus, Wilamowitz declared that Menander could never have joined *humano capiti cervicam equinam*;<sup>9</sup> and we to-day can make the statement even more positively. The fifth act of the *Stichus*, then, must contain some alteration by Plautus, and the passage (ll. 419-453) which prepares for Act V., was probably original with him.<sup>10</sup> We notice that, as the text stands, Stichus remains on the stage after he has been dismissed, and Epignomus waits awkwardly through the entire monologue of Stichus (ll. 436-453). If ll. 419-453 were cut out, the transition would be perfectly easy, and Epignomus would be on the stage for the beginning of the next scene. In other words, ll. 419-453 are a necessary preliminary to Act V. as it stands, but would be quite superfluous in a play which did not end with a merry-making among slaves.

But while we recognize the faulty construction of the play, we are not justified in assuming that Act V. was original with Plautus,<sup>11</sup> or even that its presence here

<sup>8</sup> Leo in *Nachr. Gött. Ges.* 1902, pp. 376 f.

<sup>9</sup> Wilamowitz in *Neue Jahrb.* 3 (1899), p. 516.

<sup>10</sup> Leo, *Plaut. Forsch.*, p. 152; *Nachr. Gött. Ges.* 1902, p. 383.

<sup>11</sup> Stüss in *Rhein. Mus.* 65 (1910), p. 453, notes the large number of Greek details in this act.

is due to *contaminatio*. Leo has dissected the *Stichus*<sup>12</sup> and found in it material from three Greek plays: (A) a play on the theme of the faithful wives; (B) a play with a parasite as its central figure; (C) a play furnishing material for the banquet-scene. It is improbable that Plautus used so many different sources as this. The more likely theory is that a single original, the *Adelphoe* of Menander, is the basis of the *Stichus*, but that the plot has been disturbed by omissions, alterations, and additions.<sup>13</sup> In particular, Plautus seems to have changed the last act, perhaps, as Teuffel suggested,<sup>14</sup> substituting a slaves' banquet<sup>15</sup> for the masters' banquet in the original play.

---

The *Stichus* is unique in showing evidences of *retractatio* in the names of the characters. The elder of the two sisters appears in the text of both A and P (ll. 247, 331) as *Panegyris*, and the same name occurs in the scene-heading of II., 2, in A and in P, and in the heading of I., 1 in P. A, on the contrary, gives her name as *Philumena* in the scene-heading of I., 1. The name of the other sister does not occur in the text, but is given in the scene-heading of I., 1 as *Pamphila* in A, and as *Pinacium* in P. A recent study of the scene-headings in the manuscripts of Plautus<sup>16</sup> has made it evident that

<sup>12</sup> Leo in *Nachr. Gött. Ges.* 1902, pp. 381 ff.

<sup>13</sup> Schanz, *Röm. Literaturgesch.* I., 1<sup>3</sup>, p. 91.

<sup>14</sup> Teuffel in *Rhein. Mus.* 8 (1853), pp. 39 f. (= *Stud. u. Char.*,<sup>2</sup> p. 342).

<sup>15</sup> The slaves' banquet followed Greek, not Roman custom. Cf. ll. 446-448.

<sup>16</sup> H. W. Prescott in *Harvard Studies* 9 (1898), pp. 102-108. Cf. Lindsay, *Anc. Edd.*, pp. 102 f.

the names of the characters as they appear in the scene-headings, do not belong to the direct tradition of the Palatine manuscripts, but were at some period filled in from the text. So the form *Pinacium* (which is apparently due to a misunderstanding of l. 284) has no authority, and the only evidence to be considered is that of P and A in the text, and of A in the scene-headings. From this evidence we may infer that *Panegyris* was the original name of the elder sister, and that the change to *Philumena* was made for a later production. As to *Pamphila*, there may be some doubt. Since this sister is nowhere named in the text, there is no direct evidence against the name, but it is open to suspicion, because it appears in company with *Philumena* in A.

- 
- PAN. Credo ego miseram fuisse Penelopam,  
 Soror, suo ex animo, quae tam diu uidua  
 Viro suo caruit: nam nos eius animum 2<sup>b</sup>  
 De nōstris factis nōscimus, quarūm uiri hinc apsumt,  
 †Quorūmque nos negōtiis apsentum, ita ut aequomst,  
 Sollīcitae noctes et dies, sorōr, sumus semper. 5  
 PA. Nostrum officium nos facere aequomst:  
 Neque id magis facimus quam nōs monet pietas.  
 Sed hic, mēa soror, adsīdedum: multā uolo teum 7<sup>b</sup>  
 Loquī de re tūiri <PAN.> Saluēne, amabo?  
 PA<N>. Sperō quidem et uolō. sed hoc, soror, crūciōr:  
 Patrēm tuom meūmque adeo, unice qui ūnus 10. 11  
 Ciufbus ex omnibūs probus perhibētur,  
 Eūm nunc improbf uiri officio ūti, 13. 14  
 Virīs qui tantas apsentibus nostris 15  
 Facit iniurias inmērito  
 Nosque āb eis abducere uolt.  
 Haec rēs uitae me, sōror, saturant,  
 Haec mīhi diuidiae et sēnio sunt.  
 PA<N.> Ne lācruma, soror, neu tūo id animo 20  
 Fac quōd tibi [tuos] pater facerē minatur.  
 Spes est eum melius facturum.

Noui égo illum: ioculo istaéc dicit:	
Neque illé sibi mereat Pérsarum	
Montís qui esse aurei pérhibentur,	25
Vt istúe faciat quod tú metuis.	
Tamen sí faciat minume frasci	
Decet: néque id immerito euéniet.	
Nam uiri nostri domo ut ábierunt,	
Hic tértius<t> annus—<PA.> Ita út memoras.	30
<PAN.> Quom ipsi ínterea uiuánt, ualeant,	
Vbi sînt, quid agant, ecquíd agant,	
Neque párticipant nos néque redeunt.	
<PA.> An id dóles, soror, quia illi suom ófficium	
Non cólunt, quom tu tuom fácis? PAN. Ita pol.	35. 36
PA. Tace sís: caue sis audíam ego istue	
Postháe ex te. PAN. Nam quíd iam?	
PA. Quia pól meo animo omnis sápiéntis	
Suom offeium aequomst colere ét facere.	40
Quam ob rem égo te hoc, soror, tam ets's maior,	
Moneo út tuom memineris ófficium:	
Et si illi improbi sint átque aliter	
†Nos fáciant quam aequomst, tám pol	
†Nequid magis sit omnibus obnixe opibus	45
Nostrum ófficium meminisse decet.	
PAN. Placet: táceo. PA. At memineris fácto.	
(<PAN.> Nolo égo, soror, me crédi esse ínmemorém uiri:	
Neque ille eós honores míhi quos habuit pérdidit.	
Nam pól mihi grata accéptaque huiust benignitas:	50
Et mé quidem haec condício nunc non paénitet	
Nequést quor [non] studeam has núptias mutarier.	
Verúm postremo in pátris potestatést situm:	
Faciéndum id nobis quód parentes imperant.	
<PA.> Scio átque in cogitádo maerore aúgeor:	55
Nam própe modum iam osténdit suam senténtiam.	
<PAN.> Igitúr quaeramus nóbis quid factó úsus sit.)	

48-57. This passage was one of the first in Plautus to be suspected of dittography. It gives, in briefer form and in dialogue-verse, the substance of the preceding *canticum*. It must therefore be considered a variant for the lyrical passage, probably introduced in order to dispense with the musical accompaniment. The author



seems to have contented himself with presenting the general situation of ll. 1-47, without attempting to explain it in detail (there is no direct statement, *e. g.*, of the father's plan to give his daughters in marriage again). On the other hand, he has borrowed the idea of ll. 53, 57 from the following scene (ll. 68 ff.).

A omits 48-57.

<AN.> Príncipium ego quo pácto cum illis áccipiam, id ratió-  
cinor: 75

Vtrum ego perplexím lacessam orátione ad húnce modum,  
Quási numquam quicquam ádeo adsimulem, an quási quid in-  
daudfuerim

Eás in se meruisse culpam: an pótius temptem léniter

An minacítér. scio litis fóre: ego meas noui óptume.

Sí manere hic sese malint pótius quam alio núbere, 80

Nón faciam: quid mi ópust decurso aetátis spatio cúm <m>eis

Gérene bellum, quóm nil quam ob rem id faciám me ruisse  
árbitor?

Mínime: nolo túrbas. sed hoc mihi óptimum factu árbitor,

Síc faciam: adsimulábo quasi quam cúlpan in sese admiserint:

Pérplexabilítér earum hodie pérpauefaciam péctora. 85

Póstid †agam igitur deínde ut animus méus erit faciám palam.

Múlta scio faciúnda uerba: ibo íntro. sed apertást foris.

75-83. The order of these verses is confused in P, and the whole passage is full of difficulties. Langen<sup>17</sup> notes the peculiar use of *perplexim* (l. 76), which must refer only to *quasi quid indauidiverim Eas in se meruisse culpam* (ll. 77 f.), and not to *quasi numquam quicquam adsimulem* (l. 77); the unusual construction *eas in se meruisse culpam* (l. 78); the position of *potius* in the first instead of the second alternative clause (ll. 78 ff.);

<sup>17</sup> Langen, *Beiträge zur Kritik u. Erklärung des Plautus*, Leipzig, 1880, pp. 147 ff.

and the adverb *minaciter* (l. 79), not found elsewhere in Plautus. Langen rejected altogether about one-third of ll. 75-79, and rearranged the rest; Leo<sup>18</sup> thought that l. 79 was an interpolation, and *leniter* (l. 78) a corruption for *saeviter*.

The large number of repetitions from the verses immediately preceding and following is noticeable also; 76 *perplexim* (a very rare form), cf. 85 *perplexabiliter*; 77 *adsimulem*, cf. 84 *adsimulabo*; 77 *quasi quid indaudiverim Eas in se meruisse culpam*, cf. 84 *quasi quam culpam in sese admiserint*; 79 *ego meas novi optume*, cf. 73 *novi ego nostros*; 81 *non faciam*, cf. 84 *sic faciam*.

The content of the verses does not in itself suggest *retractatio*, but the confusion in the manuscripts, combined with the many irregularities in construction, makes one suspect that ll. 75-83 (or at least 75-79) are by a later hand.

A has the verses in the order of the Goetz-Schoell text.

P has the order: 80-83; 75-79; 70-74.

---

GE. Famem ego fuisse suspicor matrem mihi:	155
Nam postquam natus sum, satur numquam fui.	
Neque quisquam melius referet matri gratiam,	
(Quam ego matri meae refero inuitissimus.)	
Neque rettulit quam ego refero meae matri Fami.	158 <sup>b</sup>

157 ff. There are here, as Seyffert recognized,<sup>19</sup> two versions:

- (1) 157 Neque quisquam melius referet matri gratiam  
158<sup>a</sup> Quam ego matri meae refero inuitissimus;

<sup>18</sup> Leo, *Nachr. Gött. Ges.* 1895, p. 420, n. 3; Ed. (1896), *ad loc.*; *Nachr. Gött. Ges.* 1902, p. 377.

<sup>19</sup> Seyffert, *Studia Plautina*, Berlin, 1874, p. 11, n. 10.

- (2) 157 Neque quisquam melius referet matri gratiam  
 158<sup>b</sup> Neque rettulit quam ego refero meae matri Fami.

Of the two forms of the second line, 158<sup>b</sup> has most often been taken as the genuine. It is less awkward than 158<sup>a</sup>, and the citation by Charisius of *fami* in the dative, from the *Stichus* of Plautus, proves that 158<sup>b</sup> occurred in his sources, and that Charisius himself, writing in the fourth century A. D., regarded it as genuine.

A has 157, 158<sup>a</sup>—*i. e.*, preserves the first line of the couplet, and the substitute verse for the second.

P omits 157, but has 158<sup>a</sup>, 158<sup>b</sup>—*i. e.*, omits the first line of the couplet, but preserves both versions of the second line.

---

Nam illa mé<d> in aluo ménses gestauit decem:	159
At égo illam in aluo gésto plus annós decem.	160
Atque illa puerum mé gestauit páruolum,	
Quo mínus laboris cépisse illam exístumo:	
Ego nón pausillulam ín utero gestó famem,	
Verum hércle multo máxumam et graufssumam.	
Vteri dolores ímíhi oboriuntur cotídie:	165
Sed mátrém parere néqueo nec quid agám scío.	

160 ff. The position of ll. 165-166, between ll. 160, 161 in A, may perhaps indicate a shortening by the omission of ll. 161-164.<sup>20</sup>

A places 165, 166 after 160.

P has the verses in proper order.

---

†Auditauí saépe hoc uolgo dícier,	167
Solére elephantum gráuidam perpetuós decem	
Esse ánnos: eius ex sémine haec certóst fames:	
Nam íám complures ánnos utero haerét meo.	170

167-170. The parasite's account of himself and his

<sup>20</sup> Lindsay, *Anc. Edd.*, p. 55.

mother comes to a suitable close in l. 166. Then ll. 167-170 add a new and hardly consistent thought, and l. 170 is particularly objectionable because *complures annos* repeats, in weaker form, the *plus annos decem* of l. 160. It is possible, therefore, that these verses are a later insertion,<sup>21</sup> made in order to expand the coarse wit of the passage.

The passage appears in both A and P.

---

Gelásimo nomen míhi indidit paruó pater,	174
Quia inde iam á pausillo púero ridiculús fui.	175
Proptér pauperiem hoc ádeo nomen répperi,	
Eo quía paupertas fécit ridiculús forem:	
Nam illa ártis omnis pérdocet, ubi quem áttigit.	

174 ff. Gelasimus gives two explanations for his name: (1) that his father gave it to him because he was a droll child; (2) that he received the name because poverty taught him to be witty. A connection between these two thoughts,<sup>22</sup> though possible, is rather strained, and it seems more likely that we have here two parallel versions: (1) ll. 174-175; (2) ll. 176-178.

A and P both contain the whole passage, in the order: 174, 176, 175, 177, 178.

---

Dicam aúctionis caúsam, ut damno gaúdeant —	207
Nam cúriosus némost quin sit máleuolus —:	
[Ipse égomet quam ob rem   aúctionem praédicem:]	208 <sup>b</sup>
Damna éuenerunt máxima miseró míhi.	

208<sup>b</sup>. The verse is impossible after *dicam auctionis*

<sup>21</sup> Langen, *Plaut. Stud.*, p. 372; Leo, *Nachr. Gött. Ges.* 1902, p. 379.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Langen, *Plaut. Stud.*, p. 76.

*causam* (l. 207), but is probably to be regarded as an interpolation, explaining l. 207, rather than as *retractatio*.

A omits 208<sup>b</sup>.

---

Haec uénisse iam opus est quantum potest,	232
Vt decumam partem   Hérculi polluceam.	233. 234

232, 233. These verses occur in A after 208<sup>a</sup> as well as in their proper place. The repetition may indicate that the scene was to be shortened by omitting ll. 209-231.<sup>23</sup>

A (which omits 208<sup>b</sup>) inserts 232, 233 between 208<sup>a</sup> and 209. P has 208<sup>a</sup>, 208<sup>b</sup>, 209 ff.

---

ST. Iam hercle ego per hortum ad amicam transibó meam,	437
Mi hanc occupatum noctem: eadem symbolam	
Dabo ét iubebo ad Sá[n]garinum cenám coqui.	
Aut egomet ibo atque opsonabo opsónium.	440
Sa[n]gárinus scio iam hic áderit cum dominó suo	
Seruós homo: qui <ni>s<i té>m<p>er<i a>d cenam meat,	
Aduórsitores pól cum uerberibús decet	
Dari, úti eum uerberábundum abducánt domum.	
Paráta res faciam út sit. egomet mé moror.	445
Atque íd ne uos mirémini, hominis séruolos	
Potáre, amare atque ád cenam condícere:	
Licet haéc Athenis nóbis. sed quom cógito,	
Potiús quam inuidiam inuéniam, est etiam hic óstium	
Aliúd posticum nóstrarum harunc aédium:	450 <sup>a</sup>
[Postícam partem mágis utuntur aédium.]	
Ea ibo óbsonatum atque eádem referam opsónium:	451
Per hórnum utroque cómmeatus cóntinet.	
Ite hác secundum uósmet: ego hunc laceró diem.	

441-445. The end of the scene is unduly protracted, and Stichus announces his departure three times (ll. 440,

<sup>23</sup> Lindsay, *Anc. Edd.*, p. 55; Ed. (1905), *ad loc.*

445, 453) before he finally leaves the stage. His impatience with the delay of Sagarinus, too, is quite out of place here. Baier<sup>24</sup> and Leo<sup>25</sup> are probably right in thinking that this *motif* was taken over from ll. 641-648, where it is much more appropriate, and that ll. 441-445 were inserted at the time of the later production.

P omits 441-445.

---

GE. Quando quidem tu ad me non uis promittere, 483

(Sed quoniam nil processi sat ego hac, fero

Apertiore magis uia: ita plane loquar.) 485

483-485. The first of these three lines (483), beginning *quando quidem*, and the last two (484-485), beginning *sed quoniam*, are undoubtedly parallel versions. Of the two versions, the second (ll. 484-485) is the more subtle, and therefore probably the genuine.

P omits 484-485.

---

ST. (Proin tu lauare prospera. SA. Lautus sum. ST. Optume: 668

Sequere ergo | hac me | intro. SA. Ego uero sequor.)

Volo eluamus hodie: peregrina omnia 670

Relinque: Athenas nunc colamus: sequere me.

<SA.> Sequor et domum redeundi principium placet:

Bona scaeva strenaque obuiam accessit mihi.

668 ff. The close of this scene seems to have been shortened by the substitution of ll. 668-669 for ll. 670-673.

P has the verses in the order of the Goetz-Schoell text.

A deest 1 sheet = 38 ll.

<sup>24</sup> Baier, *De Plauti Fab. Recens.*, pp. 123 f.

<sup>25</sup> Leo in *Nachr. Gött. Ges.* 1902, p. 379.

A *deest* 648-681 = 34 ll. + 2 scene-headings (= 4 ll.). Total, 38 ll.

Therefore A probably had 668, 669.

<SA.> Tibi propino. dēcumum a fonte tibi tute inde, si sapi-  
pis. 708

Bēne uos: bene nos: bēne te: bene me: bēne nostram etiam Stē-  
phanium.

Bibe[s], si bibis. ST. Non mōra erit apud me. SA. Édepol  
coniuif sat est: 710

Mōdo nostra huc amīca accedat: id abest, aliud nīl abest.

<ST.> Léptide hoc actumst. tibi propino cāntharum. <SA.> Vi-  
nūm tu habes:

Nīmis uellem aliquid pūlpamenti. ST. Si hōrum quae adsunt  
paénitet,

Nīl est. tene aquam. SA. Mélius dicis: nīl moror cuppédia.  
Bibe, tibicen: áge siquid agis: bībendum hercle hoc est: né  
nega. 715

710-711. These verses disturb the connection equally here and in the position to which Ritschl transposed them (after l. 735). Langen<sup>26</sup> noted also that the use of *mora* (l. 710) in the sense of "delay" was un-Plautine. The couplet seems to be introduced for the purpose of shortening the scene.<sup>27</sup>

P has the verses in the order of the Goetz-Schoell text.

A *deest* 709 to end of play.

The *Stichus* shows no extensive changes due to *retractatio*, but there are traces of slight alterations all through the play, from the name of the elder sister at the beginning to a proposed shortening of V., 4. The changes seem to have affected especially the third scene of the first act. There are a number of passages showing parallel versions, the second version in one case (ll. 48-57) evidently being intended to dispense with musical

<sup>26</sup> Langen, *Beiträge*, pp. 171 ff.

<sup>27</sup> Leo, Ed. (1896), *ad. loc.*; *Nachr. Gött. Ges.*, 1902, p. 378.

accompaniment. A shortened version of the close of V., 2 is given, and a couplet (ll. 710-711) is inserted to shorten V., 4. On the other hand, the revisers seem to have made some trivial additions to the original thought (ll. 167-170; 441-445).<sup>28</sup>

The evidence of the *Stichus* is particularly valuable because we can consult both families of manuscripts for nearly all the questionable passages. Only in the case of ll. 710, 711 is it absolutely impossible to tell what A contained; for calculation makes it probable that ll. 668, 669 appeared on a lost page of A. This passage, then, would belong in the same class with ll. 174-178, and with a less certain case of *retractatio* (ll. 167-170), where A and P have exactly the same amount of text. Both P and A have ll. 75-83, though the lines appear in different order; and the mixture in ll. 157 ff. indicates that both the Plautine and the substitute version were at one period represented in both families of manuscripts. There is one place (ll. 48-57) in which P gives a second version not preserved in A, and several cases (ll. 441-445; 483-485; 160 ff.; 232 f.) in which A shows more evidence of *retractatio* than P. The evidence of the *Stichus*, therefore, is decidedly against the theory that A is the purer text.

<sup>28</sup> In addition to the passages discussed in detail, the following lines have been suspected: 84, 118-120, 121-125, 135, 179-180, 225, 294, 321, 330, 387, 425-435, 427-429, 450<sup>b</sup>, 473-482, 535, 555, 590-591, 681, 684, 746-747.

Of these lines, the evidence of A is lacking for 555, 681, 746-747; A omits 450<sup>b</sup>; P omits 387, 427-429, 535, 590-591; A and P both have 84, 118-120, 121-125, 135, 179-180, 225, 294, 321, 330, 425-435 (except that P omits 427-429), 473-482, 684.

The following lines show variations of a word or phrase: 76 f., 90, 163, 166, 189, 202, 237, 253 f., 255, 262 f., 282, 342, 350, 373, 374-376, 390 f., 586, 594, 632 f., 640, 688.



## CHAPTER V.

### *TRINUMMUS*

The *Trinummus* of Plautus is translated, so the prologue tells us, from the *Θησαυρός* of Philemon. It is a comedy without female parts (except for the two abstractions who speak the prologue), and without the erotic element which is so prominent in other plays of Plautus. When the play opens, the old man Charmides has gone off on a business voyage, leaving his daughter and his dissolute son in the care of his friend Callicles, with special instructions that a treasure buried in his house be kept intact for the daughter's dowry. In the meantime, the son, Lesbonicus, goes from bad to worse, and finally advertises his father's house for sale. In order to preserve the treasure without betraying the secret, Callicles buys the house. Lysiteles, a young man of exemplary character and good family, and a devoted friend of Lesbonicus, now sues for the daughter's hand, and Callicles feels in duty bound to produce the treasure. So a rogue is hired to play the part of a messenger from Charmides, to bring forged letters for Lesbonicus and Callicles, and a sum of money to serve as the daughter's dowry. Unfortunately for the success of the scheme, Charmides arrives unexpectedly, and meets the supposed messenger in front of his own house. But matters are explained, Lysiteles receives both bride and dower, and Lesbonicus is pardoned, on condition that he take the daughter of Callicles as his wife.

CA. Quid uenis?	67
ME. Malis te ut uerbis mŭltis multum obiŭrigem.	
CA. Men? ME. Nŭmquis est hic Ńlius praeter me atque te?	
CA. Nemŏst. ME. Quid tu igitur rŏgitas tene obiŭrigem?	70
Nisi tŭ me mihimet cŕnses dicturŭm male.	
Nam si ũn te aegrotant Ńrtes antiquae tuae	72 <sup>a</sup>
[Sin immutare ũs ingenium mŏribus]	72 <sup>b</sup>
(Aut si demutant mŏres ingenium tuom	
Neque eŏs antiquos sŕuas, ast captas nouos.)	
Omnibus amicis mŏrbum tu incutiŕs grauem,	75
Vt tŕ uidere audireque aegroti sient.	

72 ff. Most editors have taken l. 72<sup>b</sup> as an explanation of l. 73, or an adscript parallel to it. But l. 73 is perfectly clear without explanation, and l. 72<sup>b</sup> is too closely related to it in thought and phrasing to be merely an accidental parallel. We are therefore led to suspect the hand of the *retractator*. The manuscript-reading *sin* can not stand, since the strongly adversative idea which *sin* demands is lacking; and Ritschl's<sup>1</sup> emendation *sive* is therefore probably to be accepted. But Ritschl himself observed that the Plautine conjunction was not *sive*, but *aut si* (the form which we actually find in l. 74), and this fact supports the other evidence against the genuineness of the line. The next two lines (73-74) have been regarded as due to dittography. But they can not be simply an alternative version of l. 72<sup>a</sup>, for the first words (*aut si*) are impossible at the beginning of a sentence. Ritschl noted the irregular use of the word *mores*—in the sense of "temperament" instead of "the (proverbially corrupt) morals of the day," as elsewhere in Plautus (cf. ll. 28 ff., 1037, 1045, etc.). But this criticism applies only to l. 74. Without this addition,

<sup>1</sup>Ritschl, *De Interpolatione Trinummi Plautinae*, Bonn, 1844 (= *Parerga*, pp. 513 ff.).

l. 73 is unobjectionable; the conjunction *aut si* is Plautine, and *mores* has its customary meaning. Therefore it seems probable that ll. 72,<sup>b</sup> 74 were inserted as a more emphatic substitute for l. 73.

P has the whole passage.

A omits 72<sup>b</sup>.

---

Nil ést profecto stúltius neque stólidius	
Neque méndaciloquiús neque argutúm magis	200
Neque cónfidentilóquiuis neque peiiúrius	
Quam urbáni adsidui efues quos scurrás uocant.	

200. One would not object so much to the repetition in this passage, were it not that *mendaci-loquiuis* anticipates the compound *confidenti-loquiuis* in the next verse, and that the circumlocution with *magis* interrupts the series of simple comparatives.<sup>2</sup> It seems possible that the verse was intended as a substitute for l. 201.

The line occurs in both A and P, but in A has the reading *adeo argutum*, in P *argutum magis*.

---

<PH.> Quí homo cum animo inde áb ineunte aetáte depugnát  
suo, 305

Vtrum itane esse máuelit ut eum ánimus aequom cénseat,  
An ita potius út parentis éum esse et cognatí uelint:  
Si ánimus hominem pépulit, actumst, ánimó seruit, nón sibi:  
Si ípse animum pepulit, dum uiuit, ufetor uictorúm cluet.  
Tú si animum uicísti potius quam ánimus te, est quod gaú-  
deas. 310

Nímio satiust út opust te ita ésse quam ut animó lubet.  
(Qui ánimum uincunt quám quos animus sémper probiorés cluent.)

305-312. Philto is delivering a sermon on the text,

<sup>2</sup> J. Brix, Ed. (1879), *ad loc.*

“Better is he that ruleth his spirit.” He generalizes broadly (ll. 305-309) and then makes a personal application to the case of Lysiteles (l. 310). After this he gives a weaker turn to the last statement (l. 311), and then returns to generalization (l. 312), repeating much of the phrasing of l. 310.<sup>3</sup> Bergk<sup>4</sup> was probably right in thinking that the last two lines were an alternative version for ll. 305-310.

The passage has the same form in A and P.

---

[PH.] is probust, quem paénitet quam próbus sit et frugí  
bonae: 320  
Qui ípsus sibi satís placet, nec próbus est nec frugí bonae:  
Qui ípsus se contémnit, in eost índoles índústriæ:  
Bénéfacta benefáctis aliis pértegito, ne pérpluant.

322. Without l. 322, the speech of Philto makes a very neat antithesis (ll. 320-321), followed by a line of practical application (l. 323). The line which intervenes (322) merely repeats l. 320, and is especially disturbing because it returns to the first half of the contrast after the second is finished.<sup>5</sup>

The line occurs in both A and P.

---

PH. Quói[us] egestatém tolerare ús? loquere audactér patri. 358  
<LY.> Lésbonico huic ádulescenti, Chármid<a>i filio,  
Qui illic habitat. PH. Quín comedit quód fuit, quod nón  
fuit? 360  
<LY.> Ne ópprobra, pater: múlta eueniunt hómni quae uolt,  
quae neuolt.  
<PH.> Méntire edepol, gnáte, atque id nunc fácis haud consue-  
túdine.

<sup>3</sup> Ritschl, *Parerg.*, pp. 522 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Bergk in *Zeitschr. f. Alt.* 1848, coll. 1137 f. (= *Opusc.* I., p. 17).

<sup>5</sup> Langen, *Plaut. Stud.*, pp. 374 f.

Nám sapiens quidém pol ipsus fñgit fortunám sibi:  
 Eó non multa quaé neuolt euéniunt, nisi fictór malust.  
 <LY.> Múlta illi opera opúst ficturae quí se fictorem probum 365  
 Vitae agundae esse éxpetit: sed hic ádmodum adulescéntulust.  
 <PH.> Nón aetate, uérum ingenio apíscitur sapiéntia.  
 Sápiénti aetas cóndimentum, tsápiens aetatí cibust.  
 Ágedum eloquere, quíd dare illi núnc uis? LY. Nil quicquám,  
 pater:  
 Tú modo ne me próhibeas accíperere, siquid dét mihi. 370

361 ff. The insertion of l. 369 after l. 361 probably indicates the omission of the moralizing in ll. 362-368.<sup>6</sup>

A inserts 369 after 361.

P inserts 369, 368 after 361.

---

PH. I hac, Lésbonice, mécum, ut coram núptiis 580  
 Dies cóstituatur: eádem haec confirmábimus.  
 <LE.> †Tu istuc cura quod iussi: ego iam hic ero.  
 Dic Cállichi me ut cónueniat. ST. Quin tu í modo.  
 LE. De dóte ut uideat quíd <o>pus sit factó. ST. Í modo.  
 <LE.> Nam cértumst sine dote ha<ú>d dare. ST. Quin tu í  
 modo. 585  
 LE. Neque enim illi damno umquam ésse patiar — ST. Abi modo.  
 <LE.> Meam néglegentiam. ST. í modo to pater  
 LE. Aequóm uidetur quín quod peccarim — ST. í modo.  
 LE. Potíssimum mihi id ópsit. ST. I modo. LE. Ó pater,  
 Enúmquam aspiciam te? ST. í modo, i modo, í modo.

582. After Lesbonicus has finally uttered the long-delayed *spondeo* which betroths his sister to Lysiteles, and Philto has left the stage, Lesbonicus remains and resumes the discussion of the dowry—to the great disgust of Stasimus. It is possible that the audience may have grown impatient too, and that consequently l. 582 was

<sup>6</sup> Lindsay in *Amer. Journ. Phil.* 21 (1900), p. 27; cf. *Anc. Edd.*, p. 47; Ed. (1905), *ad loc.*

substituted for the original ending of the scene (ll. 583-601).<sup>7</sup>

A *deest* 568-636.

---

Itast amor ballista ut iacitur: níl sic celerest néque uolat: 668  
 Atque is mores hóminum moros ét morosos éfficit.  
 Mínus placet magis quód suadetur: quód dissuadetúr placet. 670  
 Quom ínopiast, cupiás: quando eius cópiast, tum nón uelis.  
 (ille qui aspellit, ís compellit: ille qui consuadét, uetat.)

672. The suggestion of Bergk,<sup>8</sup> that l. 672 is a second version of l. 670, has been followed by most editors. Except for the fact that l. 672 has a personal subject, the thought of the two verses is the same, and *ille* (l. 672) must twice be scanned either *illē* or *ill'*.<sup>9</sup>

A *deest* 672-735.

---

ME. Homo cónducatur áliquis iam quantúm potest. 765  
 [Quasi sít peregrinus. CA. Quid is scit facere póstea?]  
 Is homo éxornetur gráphice in peregrinúm modum:  
 †Ignóta facies quae non uisitáta sit  
 (Mendácilocum aliquem. CA. Quid is [i]scit facere póstea?)  
 †Falsídicum, confidéntem. CA. Quid tum póstea? 770

765 ff. Brix<sup>10</sup> was probably right in bracketing l. 766 as an interpolation. *Quasi sit peregrinus* seems to be merely an explanation of l. 767 in *peregrinum modum*, and *quid is scit facere postea?* is apparently borrowed from l. 769 to fill out the line. But l. 769 presents a reasonably certain case of *retractatio*. The objections

<sup>7</sup> Leo, Ed. (1896), *ad loc.*

<sup>8</sup> Bergk in *Zeitschr. f. Alt.* 1848, col. 1141 (= *Opusc.* I., pp. 20 f.).

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Langen, *Plaut. Stud.*, p. 376; Niemeyer, Ed. (1907), *ad loc.*

<sup>10</sup> Brix, Ed. (1879), *ad loc.* (Brix numbers 770).

which Brix makes to *quid is scit facere postea?* in l. 766 hold equally for it here: the question could properly be asked only when the man had already been found and his ability to carry out the scheme was under discussion. (See *Pseud.* 745 for an instance of *scit* properly used in a similar situation.) Plautus uses *mendaci-locus* only here and in *Trin.* 200<sup>11</sup> (where, as we have seen, it is also suspicious). The meaning of the word is exactly the same as that of *falsi-dicus*, in the next line, and it is possible that the new compound was introduced in both places (ll. 200, 769) for the sake of novelty.

P omits 769.

---

[CA.] Sed epístulas quando ópsignatas ádferet,	788 <sup>a</sup>
[Sed quom óbsignatas áttulerit epístulas]	788 <sup>b</sup>
Nonne árbitraris tím adulescentem ánuli	
Patérni signum nósse?	

788<sup>ab</sup>. The two lines are unquestionably variants, the second giving the idea "sealed" a little more emphatically. The scansion *attulerit* may perhaps be explained as the lengthening of a short syllable before the final *metrum* of the line,<sup>12</sup> but it is at all events sufficiently rare to throw suspicion on the line.<sup>13</sup>

A *deest* 774-834.

---

ME. In hufus modi negótio	795
Diém sermone[m] tér[r]ere segnitiés merast:	
Quamuís sermones póssunt longi téxier.	
Abi á<d> then[a]saurum iám confestim clánculum.	

<sup>11</sup> The statement is based on a collection of the adjectives in Plautus made by the Latin Seminary of Bryn Mawr College, 1907-1908.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Lindsay, Ed. *Capt.* (London, 1900), *Introd.*, p. 42.

<sup>13</sup> Lindsay, *Anc. Edd.*, p. 47; Ed. (1905), *ad loc.*

796, 797. Here again we have two lines which are very similar in meaning. Megaronides might be allowed to repeat himself if he were not at that very moment doing his best to put a stop to the conversation; but as it is, it seems probable that l. 796 is a later version, which borrows much of its phrasing from ll. 806 f.

A *deest*.

CH. Fáciam ita ut uis: ágedum, nomen tuóm primum memorá mihi. 883

<SY.> Mágnum facinus íncipissis pétere. CH. Quid ita? SY. Quá, pat<e>r[em],

Si ánte lucem ñre occipias á meo primo nómine, 885  
Cóncubium sit nóctis prius quam ad póstrum peruéneris.

CH. Ópus ñfactost et uíatico ad tuom nómen, ut tu praédicas.

<SY.> Ést minusculum álterum quasi ñuxillum uinárium.

<CH.> Quid est tibi nomén, adulescens? SY. Páx, id est nomén mihi:

Hóc cotidiánu<m>st. CH. Edepol nómen nugatórium: 890  
Quási dicas, siquíd crediderim tibi, 'pax' periisse flico.

889-891. These three verses appear in P after l. 937. Meier<sup>14</sup> transposed them to their present position, and altered the reading of l. 889 to *quid illud est nomen?* The order of P is manifestly impossible; the inquiry about the name must follow directly after l. 882, before Charmides goes on to ask about the sycophant's *facta et itinera* (ll. 893 ff.). But if ll. 889-891 are preceded by ll. 883-888, the question in l. 889 should be, not *quid est tibi nomen?* but *quid est alterum nomen?* It is possible that the stage-manager of the Revival used only ll. 889-891, substituting *quid est tibi nomen?* for a question about the *minusculum alterum*.<sup>15</sup> If this was the case,

<sup>14</sup> M. H. E. Meier, *Commentatio de Plauti Trinummo*, Halle, 1845, pp. 7 f.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Leo, Ed. (1896), *ad loc.*



the later version must have crowded out the original form of the line.

P has 889-891 after 937.

A *deest* 864-1044.

---

SY. Hanc me iussit Lésbonico suó gnato dare epístulam 898  
Ét item hanc alterám suo amico Cállicli iussit dare.

CH. Míhi quoque edepol, quom híc nug[ur]atur, cóntra nugarí  
lubet. 900

Vbi ipse erat? SY. Bene rém gerebat. CH. Érgo ubi? SY. In  
Seleúcia.

CH. Ab ipson istas ácepisti? SY. E mánibus dedit mi ipse ín  
manus.

901. The question and answer of l. 901 anticipate the long dialogue (ll. 928-947) in which Charmides asks his own whereabouts. The shorter answer is really the correct one (cf. ll. 112, 771), but is for that very reason the less likely in the mouth of the sycophant. It is improbable that Charmides would ask the question at l. 901, and then devote so much time to it later, or that he would fail to comment on the inconsistency of the sycophant's two answers. It is much more likely that l. 901 represents another part of the same shortened version which we find in ll. 889-891.

A *deest*.

---

CA. Quid hoc híc clamoris aúdio ante aedís meas? 1093

CH. O Cállices, o Cállices, o Cállices,

Qualíne amico méa commendauf bona? 1095

CA. Probo ét fideli et fído et cum magná fide:

Et sálue et saluom te áduenisse gaúdeo.

CH. Credo ómnia istaec, sí | itast ut praédicas.

Sed quis istest tuos ornátus? CA. Ego dicám tibi:

Thensaúrum effodiebam íntus dotem filiae 1100

Tuae quae daretur. sed intus narrabo tibi  
 Et hoc et alia: sequere. CH. Stasime. ST. Hem. CH. Strénue  
 Curre in Piraeu[u]m atque unum curriculum face.  
 Videbis iam illic nauem qua aduecti sumus.  
 Iubeto Sa[n]gariónem quae imperauerim 1105  
 Curare ut efferantur, et tu ito simul.  
 Solutu[m]st portitori iam portorium.  
 Nil est mora[e]. cit[o] ambula: actutum redi.  
 ST. Ille sum atque hic sum. CA. Sequere tu hac me intró.  
 CH. Sequor.

1093 ff. The rapidity with which this scene draws to a close is equal to that of certain scenes in the *Persa*. For the audience, to be sure, no explanation of the motives of Callicles was necessary, but it seems incredible that Charmides should rest satisfied with the simple assurance of ll. 1096-1097. Leo<sup>16</sup> is probably right in thinking that P gives only a shortened version of the scene, although we cannot assume, as Ritschl<sup>17</sup> did, that the passage had any fuller form in A.<sup>18</sup>

A *deest* 1079 to end of play.

---

ST. Hic meo ero amicu[s] solus firmus restitit 1110  
 Neque demutauit animum de firma fide,  
 Quamquam labores multos \* \* \* \* \*  
 Sed hic unus ut ego suspicor, seruat fidem.  
 †Ob rem laborem eum ego cepisse censeo.

1110 ff. There seem to be traces of two versions here: (1) 1110-1112; (2) 1113-1114. As far as we can tell from the mutilated text, the sense of the two passages was about the same, and some of the phrasing is repeated.

<sup>16</sup> Leo, Ed. (1896), *ad loc.*

<sup>17</sup> Ritschl, Ed. (1848), Praef., pp. xxv f.

<sup>18</sup> Studemund's *Apog.*, note on fol. 464v.

A *deest*.

B marks a lacuna after *multos* (1112).

The abundance of *sententiae* and moral reflections in the *Trinummus* makes the play a difficult one for the student of *retractatio*. A sententious line would naturally invite every later poet to try to turn the phrases a little more neatly. On the other hand, even the original author might be open to the same temptation, and might add to a pithy sentence another in slightly different form. Indeed, wordiness and repetition are so characteristic of the moralizing style that it is frequently impossible to say whether a given line is an extension by Plautus himself or by a later author.

The suspicious passages are extremely limited in extent, in no case covering more than half a dozen lines, and generally not more than one or two. The majority are concentrated in certain scenes, especially II., 2 and III., 3. Of the possible variant lines, most are of the moralizing type: 200, 311-312, 322, 672. Dittography also seems to be present in ll. 796 f., 1110 ff.; and almost certainly exists in ll. 72 ff., 769 f., 788<sup>ab</sup>. The transposition of l. 369 seems to indicate the omission of a passage, and ll. 582, 889-891, 901 are probably intended to furnish substitutes for lengthy scenes. It is probable that at ll. 1093 ff. only the shortened version is preserved.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>19</sup> The following lines have also been suspected: 6-7, 18-21, 60, 64, 92, 93, 126, 206-209, 223 ff., 231-232, 248-249, 263, 321, 368, 414-415, 420-424, 427<sup>b</sup>, 470, 471, 527-528, 562-568, 587-589, 660 ff., 702, 707-708, 756-762, 764, 792, 808-814, 816, 831, 852, 857-860, 872, 929 ff., 980, 982, 1005, 1033, 1043-1045, 1053-1054, 1130-1131, 1164-1166.

The evidence of A is lacking for 126, 587-589, 702, 707-708, 792, 808-814, 816, 831, 872, 929 ff., 980, 982, 1005, 1033, 1043-1045, 1130-

Unfortunately the *Trinummus* affords slight opportunity for a comparison of the manuscript-tradition. In several of the most certain cases of *retractatio*, sheets are missing from the Palimpsest, and it is impossible to calculate their contents. In most of the others, the reading of the two families of manuscripts is the same. At ll. 361 ff., where both A and P indicate an omission, P has transposed one more line than A. A omits l. 72<sup>b</sup>, though it gives the remainder of the suspicious passage, and P omits l. 769, which is almost certainly a later addition. But on the whole, where we can compare A and P, the testimony of the *Trinummus* strongly supports the theory that the two families of manuscripts had a common origin.

---

1131, 1164-1166. The rest of the passages are preserved in both A and P: 6-7, 18-21, 60, 64, 92, 93, 206-209, 223 ff., 231-232, 248-249, 263, 321 (preserved in B, but omitted in the other Palatine manuscripts), 368 (in different order), 414-415, 420-424, 427<sup>b</sup> (in different order), 470, 471, 527-528, 562-568 (except that A *deest* 568 ff.), 660 ff., 756-762, 764 (in different order), 852, 857-860, 1053-1054.

The following lines show minor variations: 52, 61, 70, 186, 214, 238, 256, 328, 339, 351, 537, 660, 842, 1064, 1069, 1078.

## CONCLUSION

The five plays which have been discussed in detail show a marked difference both in the amount and in the kind of *retractatio* that they present. By far the most extensive changes, as well as the greatest number of certain examples of *retractatio*, occur in the *Poenulus*. In this play we find a secondary ending of about forty lines; two passages, each of which shows three parallel versions; and numerous others which present two parallels. The *Persa* seems to have suffered shortening, and to have preserved only the shortened version of certain scenes. The *Stichus* has several alternative versions, only one of which is of any length, and a few small additions. The changes in the *Pseudolus* and the *Trinummus* are for the most part confined to single lines. It is evident, therefore, that theories about the general problem of *retractatio* should be based, not on a few selected cases, or even on all the cases in a single play, but on the whole body of text.

However, even the study of five plays has led to some general conclusions. It appears that, on the whole, the *retractatores* made no very important contributions to our text. Even in the second ending of the *Poenulus* they used to a large extent material that Plautus had supplied, and in other cases their debt to him was even greater. *Pers.* 722-734 is a patchwork of Plautine phrases, and *Pseud.* 406-408 is borrowed directly from the next scene. The later poets often seem to have contented themselves with making slight changes in phrasing, either to improve upon the original form of a line

(*Pers.* 704; *Trin.* 788<sup>b</sup>; *Stich.* 158<sup>a</sup>) or to give a more modern turn to an old phrase (*Poen.* 390<sup>b</sup>; *Pers.* 442 f.). The alternative versions sometimes have the effect of shortening the scene, and once, at least (*Stich.* 48-57), there is a change in order to dispense with musical accompaniment. Occasionally a transposition indicates that a wordy passage was to be omitted (*Poen.* 622<sup>b</sup>; *Stich.* 160 ff.; *Trin.* 361 ff.). Such shortenings by means of simple omission generally occur in the body of the scene; alternative versions which are intended to shorten a scene most often occur near the end (*Pers.* 666 ff.; *Poen.* 805; *Stich.* 668 ff.; *Trin.* 582).

The chief object of this investigation, however, has been to determine as far as possible the relation of the Ambrosian and Palatine recensions to the phenomenon of *retractatio*. New light has been thrown upon this question by a study of the five plays in which the Ambrosian Palimpsest is best represented—for any solution must rest primarily upon the evidence of these plays. The discussion has taken up altogether 66 cases of *retractatio*.<sup>1</sup> In 17 of these 66 cases, the evidence of the Palimpsest is absolutely lacking: *Pers.* 460 f.; *Poen.* 98-100; 118-120; 121-128; 214-215; 217-219; 622<sup>b</sup>; 805-808; *Stich.* 710 f.; *Trin.* 582; 672; 788<sup>ab</sup>; 796-797; 889-891; 901; 1093 ff.; 1110 ff. We are therefore reduced to 49 passages on which to base our conclusions.

<sup>1</sup>This summary includes only certain or fairly probable cases of *retractatio*. *Pers.* 467-468; *Poen.* 930-939; *Stich.* 208<sup>b</sup> are excluded, since the difficulty in these passages is probably not to be charged to *retractatio*, and the passages listed in foot-notes under each play are omitted as well. In the summary, the Double Ending of the *Poenulus* (ll. 1315-1422) counts as a single case, but two additional cases are listed from the same portion of the play (ll. 1315 ff.; 1331).

Of these 49, we find 15 preserved (aside from slight verbal differences) in exactly the same form in A and P: *Pers.* 704; *Poen.* 917-929; 1162 ff.; *Pseud.* 166; 210-224; 385 f.; 406-408; 688 ff.; 1137; 1214-1216; *Stich.* 167-170; 174 ff.; *Trin.* 200; 305-312; 322. In 6 other cases it is probable that A, if preserved, would give the passage in the same form as P. These are cases in which the Palimpsest breaks off after giving part of a suspicious passage, or else, even though the text is entirely missing from A, calculation makes it probable that A had the same form as P: *Pers.* 440 ff.; 738 ff.; *Poen.* 504-575; 1315-1422; *Pseud.* 1079-1086; *Stich.* 668 ff. Also, at *Poen.* 389 and 1333 ff. (the latter passage discussed under 1315 ff.), though A has at first omitted one or more lines, part of the verse or the passage in question is added between the lines or in the margin, showing that somewhere in the A-family the passage was given in full form. Altogether, then, we find 23 cases in which the text-tradition of the A-family and the P-family is virtually the same.

Of the remaining 26 cases, some show differences in the amount of text preserved, others in order only, and a few differ both in amount and in order. There are, in all, 8 instances in which A shows evidences of *retractatio* not found in P: *Poen.* 706 ff. (the insertion of 730 after 706, 707, 720, indicating a further omission); 1331 (an alternative for 1330); *Stich.* 441-445 (an addition modeled on ll. 641-648); *Trin.* 769 (a variant for 770); and, less certain cases: *Pseud.* 67<sup>b</sup> (an addition to l. 64); 573<sup>a</sup> (likewise an addition); *Stich.* 160 ff. and 208 ff. (transpositions to indicate omission). On the other hand, P presents 5 cases of *retractatio* of which there is no

trace in A: *Pseud.* 523<sup>b</sup> <sup>2</sup> and *Stich.* 48-57, both undoubted examples of later versions; and also *Poen.* 1378-1381 (a proposed shortening); <sup>2</sup> *Pseud.* 696<sup>bc</sup> (an addition); and 1205-1207 (a shortening).

We also find a number of instances in which both families of manuscripts give a parallel version or a shortened scene-ending, but one or the other omits some of the lines. In such cases it must, of course, be assumed that the whole passage originally stood in that family, but that in some way (perhaps through errors due to *homoeoteleuton* or *homoeokatarkton*, or through other forms of carelessness in transcribing) part of it was lost. Thus in *Pers.* 605-610, P omits 608 (a genuine line) and 610 (part of the later version); 666 ff., P omits 671<sup>b</sup>; 722-734, P omits 730; *Poen.* 1042-1053, P gives 1053 only once, whereas A gives it twice; *Stich.* 483-485, P has only the spurious version, A has both. Against these 5 passages in which A gives the fuller form can be ranged 2 in which P is more complete: *Stich.* 157 ff., in which A gives only one (probably the substitute) version for the second line of the couplet, whereas P has both (but omits the first verse of the couplet); and *Trin.* 72 ff., in which A omits 72<sup>b</sup>.

In 3 of the cases just mentioned (*Pers.* 666 ff.; *Poen.* 706 ff.; 1042-1053) there is a difference in the order of the lines as well as in their number. There are also 6 passages which show the same text in A and P, arranged in different order: *Poen.* 300-305; the prologue of the *Pseudolus* (which appears in a different position in the two families); *Trin.* 361 ff. (in which P transposes 368 as well as 369); and, in addition to these fairly certain

<sup>2</sup>The contents of A are calculated.



cases, others which are less sure: *Poen.* 1267-1268; *Pseud.* 151-156; *Stich.* 75-83.

On the whole, the difference between the two families of manuscripts in the amount of *retractatio* preserved is slight. In 23 cases out of 49, A and P seem to show the same text-tradition. In 6 additional cases, the only difference is in the order of the lines. A has 8 cases of *retractatio* which P does not give, and P has 5 which A does not give. In 5 cases, though both families of manuscripts show traces of *retractatio*, A gives more text; in 2, P has the fuller form. The few differences that exist indicate, not that A presents the "ipsa verba" of Plautus, and P the "Revival text," but that A, as the older manuscript, has kept more of the "Revival" alterations than P. We are therefore forced to the conclusion that the source of A and P was the same; that the two families had originally about the same amount of *retractatio*, but that, in the course of centuries, some lines and passages have dropped out; the Palatine manuscripts, being the later, have naturally lost more than the Ambrosian Palimpsest.

When we try to account for the omission of a passage in one family of manuscripts and its transmission in another, for the confused order of half a dozen lines, or the mutilation of a substitute passage, we find the most satisfactory explanation in Oskar Seyffert's theory that at one time in the history of the common archetype the passages due to the Plautine Revival were adscribed in the margin. Not only is the complete loss of certain passages easier to understand on this hypothesis; but the disappearance of single lines like *Pers.* 610, *Trin.* 72<sup>b</sup>, is intelligible, if we assume that the whole passage once stood in the margin and was introduced from there into

the text. It sometimes happens, too, that the spurious passage is preserved in full, but that, in being taken into the text, it has crowded out a genuine line (*Stich.* 157 in P, and probably *Pers.* 668 in A).

Confusion in the order of lines may have arisen in the same way. Twice a substitute passage has been inserted in the wrong place in both A and P: *Pers.* 442 f.; *Pseud.* 385 f.; and twice (in portions of the text for which A is missing) P has put an alternative version in the wrong position: *Trin.* 889-891; 901. The differences of order in A and P (*Poen.* 300-305; *Pseud.* 151-156; *Stich.* 75-83) also point to variants which were written in the margin and were taken into the text at different points.

This investigation of *retractatio* in five plays of Plautus therefore supports the view that the Ambrosian Palimpsest and the Palatine manuscripts were descended from a common archetype; that substitute versions were written in the margin of this archetype; and that the introduction of these marginal adscripts into the text was responsible for the omission of whole passages and of single lines, for differences in order, and for confusion in the genuine text of Plautus.

---

## BIBLIOGRAPHY<sup>1</sup>

### EDITIONS OF PLAUTUS

- GOETZ, G., F. SCHOELL, and G. LOEWE—Ed. Mai., Leipzig, 1871-1894.  
GOETZ, G., and F. SCHOELL—Ed. Min., Leipzig, 1892-1896 (revised  
1904-1909).  
LEO, F.—Berlin, 1885 (incomplete).  
LEO, F.—Berlin, 1895-1896.  
LINDSAY, W. M.—Oxford, 1904-1905.  
RITSCHL, F.—Begun in 1848 (incomplete).  
USSING—Copenhagen, 1875-1892.

### GENERAL LITERATURE

- BAIER, B.—*De Plauti Fabularum Recensionibus Ambrosiana et Palatina Commentatio Critica*, Breslau, 1885.  
BERGK, TH.—Reviews of Ritschl's editions, in *Opusc.* I., pp. 3-53.  
BRACHMANN, W.—*De Bacchidum Plautinae Retractatione Scaenica*, in *Leipz. Stud.* 3 (1880), pp. 59-187.  
DZIATZKO, K.—*De Prologis Plautinis et Terentianis Quaestiones Selectae*, Bonn, 1863.  
— *Über die plautinischen Prologe*, Luzern, 1866-1867.  
GOETZ, G.—*Dittographien im Plautustexte*, in *Acta soc. phil. Lips.* 6 (1876), pp. 235-326.  
GRAUERT, W. H.—*Historische und philologische Analecten*, Münster, 1833.  
KELLERMAN, H.—*De Plauto Sui Imitatore*, in *Comm. phil. Jen.* 7 (1903), pp. 129-197.  
LADEWIG, TH.—*Zum Epidicus des Plautus*, in *Zeitschrift für Altertumswissenschaft*, 1841, coll. 1079-1099.  
— *Über den Kanon des Volcatius Sedigitus*, Neustrelitz, 1842.  
— *Einleitungen und Anmerkungen zu plautinischen Lustspielen*, in *Rhein. Mus.* 3 (1845), pp. 179-205; 520-540.

<sup>1</sup>A selected list of the books and articles which have been most helpful in the preparation of this dissertation. Authorities for minor points are given in the foot-notes.

- LADIEWIG, TH.—*Plautinische Studien*, in *Philol.* 17 (1861), pp. 248-269; 452-480.
- LANGEN, P.—*Plautinische Studien*, Berlin, 1886.
- LEO, F.—*Plautinische Forschungen*, Berlin, 1895.
- LINDSAY, W. M.—*The Two Recensions of Plautus*, A and P<sup>A</sup>, in *Amer. Journ. Phil.* 21 (1900), pp. 23-37.
- The Ancient Editions of Plautus*, Oxford, 1904.
- OSANN, F.—*Analecta Critica*, Berlin, 1816.
- REINHARDT, L.—*De Retractatis Fabulis Plautinis*, in Studemund's *Studien auf dem Gebiete des archaischen Lateins* I., Berlin, 1873, pp. 79-111.
- RITSCHL, F.—*Parerga Plautina et Terentiana*, Leipzig, 1845.
- Parallelstellen in Plautus als Ursache von Glossemen*, in *Opusc.* II., pp. 274-291.
- SEYFFERT, O.—*Studia Plautina*, Berlin, 1874.
- Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der Komödien des Plautus*, in *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 16 (1896), coll. 252-255; 283-288.
- SICKER, E.—*Novae Quaestiones Plautinae*, in *Philol. Suppl.-Bd.* 11 (1908), pp. 179-252.
- SONNENSCHN, E.—*The Scientific Emendation of Classical Texts*, in *Trans. Amer. Phil. Ass.* 24 (1893), pp. 5-16.
- SPENGL, A.—*T. Maccius Plautus*, Göttingen, 1865.
- STUEMUND, W.—*Zur Kritik des Plautus*, in *Festgruss der philologischen Gesellschaft zu Würzburg*, Würzburg, 1868, pp. 38-76.
- T. Macci Plauti Fabularum Reliquiae Ambrosianae*, Berlin, 1889.
- TEUFFEL, W.—*Studien zu den römischen Komikern*, in *Studien und Charakteristiken*,<sup>2</sup> Leipzig, 1889, pp. 315-352.

#### PERSA

- VAN IJSENDIJK, A.—*De T. Macci Plauti Persa*, Utrecht, 1884.
- MEYER, M.—*De Plauti Persa*, in *Comm. phil. Jen.* 8 (1907), pp. 145-191.
- V. WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORF, U.—*De Tribus Carminibus Latinis*, in *Index schol. Gött.* 1893-1894, pp. 13-26.

#### POENULUS

- BRACHMANN, W.—*De Bacchidum Plautinae Retractatione Scaenica*, in *Leipz. Stud.* 3 (1880), pp. 73-79.

- FRANCKEN, C. M.—*De Poenuli Plautinae Compositione*, in *Mnem.* 4 (1876), pp. 146-175.
- GOETZ, G.—*De Compositione Poenuli Plautinae Commentariolum*, Jena, 1883.
- HASPER, TH.—*De Poenuli Plautinae Duplici Exitu*, Leipzig, 1868.
- KARSTEN, H. T.—*De Compositione Poenuli*, in *Mnem.* 29 (1901), pp. 363-387.
- LANGREHE, G.—*De Plauti Poenulo*, Friedland, 1883.
- LEGRAND, PH.-E.—*Pour l'histoire de la Comédie Nouvelle, 4. L'original du Poenulus de Plaute*, in *Revue des Études Grecques* 16 (1903), pp. 358-374.
- REINHARDT, L.—*De Retractatis Fabulis Plautinis* in Studemund's *Studien auf dem Gebiete des archaischen Lateins I.*, Berlin, 1873, pp. 109-111.
- SCHUETH, K.—*De Poenulo Plautina Quaestiones Criticae*, Bonn, 1883.

## PSEUDOLUS

- BIERMA, J. W.—*Quaestiones De Plautina Pseudolo*, Groningen, 1897.
- KARSTEN, H. T.—*De Plauti Pseudolo*, in *Mnem.* 31 (1903), pp. 130-156.
- KIESSLING, A.—*Plautinische Miscellenen*, in *Symbola Philologorum Bonnensium*, pp. 835-839, Leipzig, 1863-1867.
- *Zur Kritik und Erklärung des plautinischen Pseudolus*, in *Rhein. Mus.* 23 (1868), pp. 411-426.
- LEO, F.—*Über den Pseudolus des Plautus*, in *Nachr. Gött. Ges.* 1903, pp. 347-354.
- LOBENZ, A. O. F.—*Zum Pseudolus des Plautus*, in *Philol.* 35 (1876), pp. 153-180.
- *Ed.*, Berlin, 1876.
- NORDEN, E.—*Sprachliche Beobachtungen zu Plautus*, in *Rhein. Mus.* 49 (1894), pp. 197-203.
- SAUPPE, H.—*Quaestiones Plautinae*, in *Index schol. Gött.* 1858-1859.
- SCHMIDT, F.—*Bemerkungen zum Pseudolus des Plautus*, in *Misc. phil. Gött.* 1876, pp. 20-31.
- SCHMITT, A.—*De Pseudoli Plautinae exemplo Attico*, Strassburg, 1909.
- USENER, H.—*Pseudoli Plautinae Scaena Secunda*, in *Index Schol. Gryphiswald.*, 1866.

## STICHUS

- LEO, F.—*Über den Stichus des Plautus*, in *Nachr. Gött. Ges.* 1902, pp. 375-391.

## TRINUMMUS

BRIX, J.—Ed., Leipzig, 1879.

— Edition revised by M. Niemeyer, Leipzig, 1907.

RIBBECK, O.—*Zu Plautus' Trinummus*, in *Rhein. Mus.* 27 (1872),  
pp. 177-180.

RITSCHL, F.—*De Interpolatione Trinummi Plautinae*, in *Parerga*,  
pp. 509-579.

TEUFFEL, W.—*Zu Plautus' Trinummus*, in *Rhein. Mus.* 30 (1875),  
pp. 472-475; 632-633.

VAHLEN, J.—*Varia*, in *Hermes* 15 (1880), pp. 257-259.

---

## VITA

I, Cornelia Catlin Coulter, was born in Ferguson, Missouri, December 27, 1885. My father was Horace P. Coulter, my mother Laura Chamberlain Coulter. I received my early education in the public schools of Ferguson, Missouri, and was prepared for college by the St. Louis Central High School. From 1903 to 1907 I was a student in Washington University, from which institution I was graduated with the degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1907. Since then I have spent four years in graduate work, the years 1907-1908, 1909-1911 at Bryn Mawr College, and the year 1908-1909 at the University of Munich.

In 1907-1908 I held a scholarship in Latin in Bryn Mawr College, and at the end of that year I was awarded the President's European Fellowship, which I used in travel and in study at the University of Munich. In 1909-1910 I held the Resident Fellowship in Latin, and in 1910-1911 the Resident Fellowship in Greek, in Bryn Mawr College.

My graduate work at Bryn Mawr College has been done under the direction of Dr. Wheeler and Dr. Frank in the Department of Latin, and Dr. Sanders and Dr. Wright in the Department of Greek. At Munich I attended the classical seminar of Professor Crusius, Professor Vollmer, and Professor Rehm, and heard lectures by Professor Pöhlmann, Professor Simonsfeld, and Dr. Otto. To Professor Vollmer, and to Professor Krumbacher, whom I was so fortunate as to know a few months before his death, I owe especial thanks for their kindly interest in my work.

The graduate work that I have done has been divided almost equally between Latin, which is my major subject, and my minor, Greek. My dissertation, which was presented to the faculty of Bryn Mawr College in May, 1911, has been written under the direction of Dr. A. L. Wheeler. I can have no better opportunity than this to express to him my gratitude, not only for his advice during the writing of this dissertation, but for his kindness and consideration throughout my entire graduate course.







U. C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C045897328

236763

*Coulter*

