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PREFACE

Unlike any preceding work, the present investigation is a specialized and intensive palaeographical study of the most important manuscript of a particular classical Latin work-- the Phormio Terenti of the Codex Bembinus.

The study consists of four chapters. Chapter One is an exhaustive consideration of the history as well as of the physical nature of the Codex Bembinus. For textual scholars and students of Terence, I present therein a detailed description of the Bembine text of the Phormio with special emphasis on palaeographic and orthographic analyses. I also examine the various theories of the most esteemed textual critics on the correctors of the Bembinus. In addition, I expose the problems connected with the studies of the "scholia Bembina", problems such as the number of writers of the scholia, and the date and sources of the scholia.

In Chapter Two, I present a reproduction of the Phormio of the Codex Bembinus together with a heretofore unattempted transcription of the same on the facing pages. An apparatus criticus below the transcription provides fresh palaeographical comment on the Bembine Phormio. The reproduction, it should be emphasized, is a new electrostatic copy, expertly done by University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan, of a newly made microfilm obtained
from the Vatican Library, where the Codex Bembinus is preserved. I have transcribed what I myself believe to be the reading of the codex. In my textual apparatus I have listed the variant readings of the Bembinus as recorded in the three best-known modern critical editions: the edition by Kauer and Lindsay in the Oxford Classical Text series;¹ the Budé edition by Jules Marouzeau;¹ and the edition by Sesto Prete,¹ perhaps the foremost expert on the Codex Bembinus today. Where no editor commits himself on a questionable reading, I propose my view. Where an editor clearly errs in a reading, I venture to correct him. In Chapter Three, a new transcription of the Bembine Scholia in the Phormio is presented to assist the reader in achieving a comprehensive knowledge of the manuscript.

The following comment by Leslie Webber Jones² is to be kept in mind as we come to Chapter Four:

There is hardly an important Latin author whose text is in worse condition today than that of Terence. His very popularity has worked against him; in the Middle Ages manuscripts of his plays were multiplied in such quantity and in such manner as to obscure completely their origin and relationships.

In Chapter Four, the fullest textual examination of the

¹For bibliographical details, see Notes, page 30.
²See page 170 of the present investigation.

iv
Codex Bembinus, and of its Phormio, is made through a review, for the period 1926-1976, of A.) the critical editions, and B.) the textual studies of Terence. In Part A I attempt to improve the condition of Terence's text by identifying and correcting mistaken readings of the six major critical editions containing the Bembine text of the Phormio. In Part B I present the various discussions of the textual history of the Bembinus, "the oldest direct evidence for the text of Terence," and its relationship with the Calliopian recension, the second of the two families of Terentian manuscripts. Also reviewed are theories on meter, scene division, character designation, all issues needed to illuminate a text that time has obscured.

---

3 M. M. Willcock, "Appendix to Chapter IX", Fifty Years (and Twelve) of Classical Scholarship, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1968), p. 331. He also mentions the Oxford Papyrus (IVth or Vth c.) which contains large parts of the Andria as the oldest direct evidence for the text of Terence.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

History of the Codex Bembinus

"One of the rarest and most valuable manuscripts of Western culture is without doubt the one of the comedies of Terence, Vat. Lat. 3226."¹ Also called "Bembine" after the name of the Venetian family (Bembo) which possessed it from the second half of the fifteenth century to the last decade of the sixteenth century,² the codex, the oldest and most trustworthy manuscript of Terence, was probably written in Italy at the end of the fourth or the beginning of the fifth century A.D.³ Scholars have not been able to determine its later history up to the fifteenth century.

A Neopolitan poet, Giannantonio de' Pandoni (Iohannes Pandonus, 1405-1485)⁴ known as Porcellio, discovered the codex toward the middle of the fifteenth century.⁵

⁵Prete, 1973, p. 79.
On the last page of the codex, fol. 116v, he wrote: "Mei porcelj laureatj a(n)tiq(ui)tatis pignus/ aegregium."

History attests to the fact that Federico III\(^6\) crowned Porcellio in Naples on April 9th, 1452, and for this reason, the poet could be called "laureatus." How he acquired the codex is not known. Some\(^7\) believe that he bought it or received it as a gift. In time the manuscript passed from Porcellio to a Venetian nobleman and humanist, Bernardo Bembo (†1519).\(^8\) Again, evidence of ownership lies within the manuscript itself, where three notations in the hand of Bembo occur. On fol. 5r is the comment:

\begin{verbatim}
&EST MEI BERNARDI BEMBI
QUI POST EIUS OBITU(M) MANEAT
IN SUOS
ANTIQUISS\(^9\) ANTIQUITATIS RELIQUAE
\end{verbatim}

On the bottom of fol. 6r is the following:

\begin{verbatim}
Ber(nardus)
codex mihi carior auro
Bem(bus)
\end{verbatim}

Scholars\(^9\) also attribute this inscription found on fol. 5r before the words "&EST," etc. (seen above) to Bembo:

---


\(^7\)Prete, 1970, p. 8. Edmund Hauler, "Paläographisches, Historisches und Kritisches zum Bembinus des Terenz," Wiener Studien 11 (1889): 273 n. 5, n. 6. Hauler thinks the poet could have found the codex in a monastery in southern Italy but does not deny that the manuscript could have been in a monastery in northern Italy.

\(^8\)Prete, 1970, p. 8. His birthdate is unknown.

\(^9\)Hauler, p. 277.
CONTINET LIBER ISTE/ CART CXIII
comedie omnes eunuchus & heauto(n)tumerumenos:/ phormio: hechyra & adelphis pene tota: dempte/
& n sunt due cart. finales et Deest item/
& prior andria. videl'(cet) huih libell<ul>o

On the same folio, just after the words "&EST MEI",
the following notation made, however, in another hand
reads:

Notum facio p(raese)ntj die libere deliberatum
mihi fuisse/ hunc librurn. 1457. die 15 Marci
 cuius rei/ sit laus omnipotenti deo. 

Some attribute this last inscription to a third person who
might have owned the codex after Porcellio and before
Bembo. Others recognize it as in the hand of Porcellio. At the end of this same inscription is a notation ( )
followed by an erasure. This may be an indication of the
price of the codex: "L 14 et...", i.e., "Libris 14" with
the figures of the monetary price erased. Sesto Prete
does not exclude the possibility that are JPJ and
form the initials of the name of Porcellio (Johannes Pandoni) with the final letter of the cognomen in the genitive
case (Pandoni). In the space erased there may have been

---

10 Hauler, p. 274.
13 Prete, 1970, p. 10. I presume Prete believes Johannes Pandonj is the parallel of the Italian name Gianntonio de' (dei) Pandoni since dei is the Italian
genitive. I am inclined to agree with Sabbadini that the notation indicates the price of the manuscript.
some expression such as "& amicorum".14

When Bernardo Bembo died, his son Pietro (1470-1547)15 inherited the codex. In 1491,16 the humanist Angelo Poliziano (1454-1494)17 asked the Bembo family for permission to study the manuscript. Poliziano transcribed into his personal copy of a 1475 edition of the Comedies of Terence all the textual variants from the Bembo Codex. He also noted, verse by verse, the division of verses as he found it in the Bembine manuscript which differed greatly from the verse division in the 1475 edition. He also copied into his text two poems (cf. pp. 12, 13) found in A on fol. 96r and fol. 97r where they were inserted by a corrector who in the seventh century had emended the

14Prete, p. 10, n. 17.
15V. Cian, Un decennio della vita di M. Pietro Bembo (1522-1531) (Torino: Loescher, 1885), pp. 103-104.
A passage on fol. 6r offers evidence that he saw the codex:

O FOELIX NIMIUM PRIOR AETAS
EGO ANGELUS POLITIANUS HOMO UETUSTATIS
MINIME INCURIOSUS NULLUM AEQUE ME
UIDISSE AD HANC AETATEM CODICEM ANTIQUUM
FATEOR

After the death of Pietro Bembo, the manuscript passed into the hands of his son Torquato (1525-1595). Since he did not share the same cultural and literary interest that Bernardo and Pietro possessed, Torquato sold the manuscript and other inherited treasures.

Gabriello Faërno of Cremona (d. 1561) made a careful examination of the codex while it was still in the possession of the Bembo family. Faërno discovered its superior importance in determining the text of Terence. His recension, published posthumously at Florence in 1565, contains a great number of readings from the Bembine codex. Some emendations proposed by him are still accepted.

---

20Sandys, p. 147.
21Gabriel Faernus, Emendationes in sex fabulas Terentij (Firenze: 1565).
Fulvio Orsini (1529-1600)\textsuperscript{23} bought the codex from the Bembo family in 1579.\textsuperscript{24} Twenty years earlier, he had become librarian to three of the Farnese cardinals in succession and had devoted himself to collecting manuscripts and printed books. There was hardly any edition of a Latin author published in his time to which he did not contribute readings from his collection of manuscripts.\textsuperscript{25} On fol. 4v of the Terentian codex is the following notation:

\begin{quote}
Terentio di lettere maiuscola con scholiij in lettera Longobarda, fu del Bembo, in pergamera in 4*. 
Ful. Urs.
\end{quote}

Orsini bequeathed in a will, dated January 21, 1600 to the Vatican Library the Bembine Codex and three additional manuscripts, the Vat. Lat. 3225 (Vergil), the Vat. Gr. 1312 (Pindar), and the Vat. Gr. 1300 (Dionysius of Halicarnassus). Although Orsini died on the 18th of May in 1600, the Vatican did not receive the manuscripts before January 1602.\textsuperscript{26}

From the early seventeenth century to the end of the eighteenth, the Codex Bembinus was exposed to various

dangers arising from military operations against the Vatican. About 1798 French soldiers, in an attack on the Vatican Library, took the famous Bembine manuscript in order to remove the decorative gilding from the codex. Subsequently, the treasure was restored to the library through the efforts of the Abbot Domenico Sala (1747-1832). Testimony to this fact is found in the inscription which Gaetano Marini (1742-1815), the "primus custos" of the Vatican Library at this time, wrote on fol. 4v:

```
Furto sublatus Mense Octob. A. C. D CCXCIX
sed multa a me diligentia perquisitus beneficio
Egregii viri Dominici Salaee Bibliothecae resti-
tutus idibus Dec. eiusdem anni
```

Marini himself examined the manuscript and left notes on paper where he mentioned the drawing of the letters in the Bembine text and the readings of other codices.

From the end of the eighteenth century, the Vatican Library has been the permanent home of the Codex Bembinus, designated Vat. Lat. 3226.

---

27Ibid. p. 22, n. 2 and p. 23, n. 23.
28Prete, 1970, p. 18, n. 43. Here he gives Sala's dates.
29Enciclopedia Italiana di scienze, lettere ed arti, 1934-1942, s. v. "Gaetano Marini."
30Ehrle, p. 22, n. 2 and p. 23, n. 23.
Description of the Codex Bembinus

Originally the Codex Bembinus (A) consisted of fourteen ten-leaved quires or 140 folios.¹ Now the first two quires along with the first two folios of the third (lines 1-786 of the Andria) are missing. Lines 787-888 of the Andria are damaged. Of the last quire there exist only the first six folios, and three tiny fragments of lines 915-997 of the Adelphoe. Fol. 77 and the upper part of the third folio of the third quire (Hecyra 1-37) are also missing. In all, 113 complete folios have survived.²

The folios measure 185 x 160 mm. The area of the written text, however, measures 123 x 123 mm. with each page containing rulings for twenty-five lines. These rulings are drawn on the flesh-side, several leaves at a time after folding, by means of a hard-pointed instrument. In order to guide the ruling, prick holes, visible throughout the text, have been made by a "punctorium". The scribe numbered or "signed", to use the technical word,³ each quire by tracing small Roman numerals on the last page of the

³Thompson, p. 54.
quire in the extreme lower right hand corner.\footnote{Prete, 1970, p. 19; Lowe, p. 5.}

The text of the six comedies is written continuously, without separation of words, across the face of the page. The middle top margin of each flesh-side reads \textit{TER} and that of the hair-side indicates the abbreviated name of the particular play, e. g. \textit{PHORM}.

In the Codex Bembinus, the first letter of the page, without regard to its position in relation to the text, is usually larger than the rest.

Never does there occur a word divided at the end of a line with the terminating portion carried over to the following line.

In general, no abbreviations appear in the body of the text except $Q_e = que; N$, resembling a ligature rather than an abbreviation, occurs infrequently and then only at the end of a line.

The scribe marked scene-division by listing the names of the "personae" taking part in the ensuing section. To this list, the rubricator added the type character of each "persona" and the Greek letters which, in the scene, indicate the new speaker. The names of the "personae" are then in black.\footnote{Prete, 1954, p. 18.} These rubrics and titles are the same size as the letters of the text.
Latin majuscule book-hand of early manuscripts consists of two styles of writing: a) square and rustic capitals and b) uncial. The Codex Bembinus survives as one of the oldest manuscripts of the rustic class. As the name suggests, rustic capitals are of a more negligent design, although, as a style of writing for select books, they are no less carefully formed than the square hand. Strokes more slender than square capitals, short cross-strokes oblique and waved, and strokes without finials characterize the rustic hand. Less finished as perfect letters, although accurately shaped, they have received the somewhat misleading title which distinguishes them. The letters F, L and T show a tendency to rise above the line.

If we judge by the manuscripts which have survived, capital writing ceased to exist as a literary hand for entire texts about the close of the fifth century.

Dating of the Bembine Codex has been the subject of many studies which, up to this time, have offered opposing conclusions. E. A. Lowe believes the manuscript probably was written at the end of the fourth or at the beginning of the fifth century. In establishing the date of the

---

6 Thompson, p. 272.
7 Ibid. p. 273.
8 Ibid. p. 284.
9 Lowe, p. 5.
Bembo codex, he pointed to similarities of particular letters in the Terentian manuscript and the fourth century palimpsest of Lucan's *Pharsalia*, Vat. Pal. Lat. 24. Letters F, G, and H provide the bases for comparison (discussed in detail in my description of the Bembine text of the *Phormio*, cf. p. 16). As to the place of origin of A, Lowe believes it probably to be Italy. He is uncertain about the origin of the Lucan codex.

More recently, A. Pratesi\(^{10}\) studied Vat. Pal. Lat. 24. Like Lowe, he found this manuscript to have the characteristics of A. Further, he saw that in A the "writing ... is laterally compressed, so as to give the impression of a nervous and broken drawing".\(^{11}\) Between the two codices he noticed an "evoluzione di gusto"\(^{12}\) and stated that they came from the same ambiance. He concluded, however, that A dates from the end of the fifth century if not from the beginning of the sixth.\(^{13}\)

S. Prete\(^{14}\) claims that the Bembine Codex is not much later than the fragments of Lucan. To him the hand of A appears more rough, inexpert, almost "primitive", and he


\(^{11}\)Pratesi, p. 249.

\(^{12}\)Ibid., p. 250.

\(^{13}\)Ibid.

believes, along with Lowe, that A dates at the end of the fourth or beginning of the fifth century.

In a letter to Prete by way of response, Lowe merely stated: \(^{15}\) "There is no doubt as to the date of A; it is fixed in the C(odices) L(atini) A(ntiquiores)...."

The order of the plays in the Codex Bembinus is as follows: Andria, Eunuchus, Heautontimorumenos, Phormio, Hecyra, Adelphoe. The text of each play is preceded by the "didascalia" followed by the "periocha".

The presence of two poems (previously mentioned above, p. 4) should also be noted in the description of the codex. The first one is found on fol. 96r at the end of the Hecyra and the second one is on fol. 97r after the first twelve lines of the prologue of the Adelphoe.

The verses of the poems are the following: \(^{16}\)

\[\text{Quis deus hoc medium flammabit crinibus aurum}
\text{Iussit et in dumis sentibus esse rosam}
\text{Aspice ut magni coeant in foedus amantis}
\text{Martem spina refert flos Veneris pretium est}
\text{Quit tibi cum magnis puer est lascivae sagittis}
\text{Hoc melius telo pongere corda potis}
\text{Nec flammras queras neque alti pectoris ignis}
\text{Set tibi vernantum preveat ista facis}\]

\(^{15}\text{Prete, 1970, p. 24, n. 14.}\)
\(^{16}\text{Sesto Prete, "Due poesie in antico latino medi­oevale," Romance Philology, 8 (1955): 263-271.}\)
Pallens erba viret color hic est semper amantium
Tam fugitiva rosa est quam fugitivus amor
Nam quod floricomis gaudet lasciva metallis
Aurum significat vilius esse rosa.

Fabula constituit toto notissima mundo
Gorgoneos vultus saxificumque nefas
Hoc monstrum natura potens novitate veneni
Ex oculis nostris iusserat esse malum
Hanc auro genitus Iovis ales presole diva
Mactans erato conspicit ingenio
Diriguit mirata necem fatumque veneni
Vertit et in morem decidit ipsa lapis
Sic presens absensque simul cecumque videndo
Ludit et ignorosapetor ab oste redit.

The author of the two epigrams is unknown. The text is in rustic capitals in imitation of the codex and also in uncial to which the scribe is plainly accustomed. The seventh century corrector of A copied into the manuscript the two poems which Poliziano later transcribed and commented upon in his own copy of the 1475 edition of Terence.

---

17 Prete, 1970, p. 22. He reports that Baehrens attributes the poems to Draco and that Sabbadini thinks that Poliziano had written these lines as a remembrance of his visit to the Bembo family in 1491.
18 Prete, "History of Textual Criticism," p. 27.
Description of the Bembine Text of the Phormio

The Phormio is the fourth play in the Codex Bembinus. The play engages folio numbers 53r through 76r inclusively. The average number of written lines on each page is twenty-two, the total number being 1051, four short of the number common to the manuscript tradition, since lines 172, 240-242 are not found in the Codex Bembinus (A).

On fol. 53r, the first and fourth lines of the "didascalia" and the line noting the authorship of the "periocha" are treated by the scribe in a decorative fashion. The first and last letters of the words involved are over- or underlined. In a similar but more flourishing manner, the words "TERENTI PHORMIO FINITUS" on fol. 76r are confined by three-stroked lines consisting of two unlevel but parallel lines which are thin and slanted, connected by a slightly thicker horizontal line. The only real embellishment of the manuscript is found on fol. 76r in which there are two consecutive series of short, vertical strokes interrupted in the center by an ornate, reversed S.

The medial point is the only form of punctuation employed by the scribe of A. The point is placed high in the line of writing between two words and frequently after elipsis or elision, e.g., fol. 54r, line 21 ADLATUMST·, fol. 56v, line 139 UIRIST·. More often, however, the medial point corresponds to the end of a thought.

The only abbreviations existing in the Phormio can
be seen on 53r in the "didascalia" (MEGALENSIB· Q·.. GN...COS), in the fifth line of the same folio (·G·) and very frequently throughout the play, Q·, the abbreviation for "que". The letters UE represented by the medial mark in the abbreviation Q· will be underlined throughout the transcription, e.g., fol. 74v, line 983 NEQ·O = NEQUEO.

Correctors of the Codex Bembinus signaled the omissions of the scribe of A with omission marks hd and hs. These letters do not stand for, at least did not originally, "hic deest" and "hic scribe" or "supple", as some palaeographers surmise, but rather "hic deorsum" and "hic sursum." ¹ Correctors note omissions with the letters hd in the text and hs after the insertion in the lower margin. An example can be found on fol. 67r where the insertion of the corrector, whose meaning it is difficult to establish, is followed by hs. On the other hand, hs may be added in the text as is true on fol. 53v at the end of line 11. Unfortunately, the omission which a corrector had once supplied in the lower margin of 53v is now erased.²

The first letter on most pages of the Phormio is usually larger than the rest. On eight pages foll. 53v, 54r, 54v, 57v, 58v, 61r, 66v, 69v, such is not the case. But three of these, foll. 54v, 57v, 66v, commence with a

¹ This theory is well presented by Lowe, CLA, vol. 1, p. x.
² Ibid., p. 5.
list of characters for a new scene.

Certain letters, other than the initial letter of each page, appear to be real capitals. They are U and Q. When U is the first letter in the line, the left arm branches far into the margin. This is immediately seen on the last line of fol. 53r: UXOREM. The letter Q is often larger than the other letters whether inscribed at the beginning of the line or in the middle, e.g., fol. 56v, line 144.

While the Codex Bembinus is written in small rustic capitals, some letters should be noted as departing from the expected form. The letter F descends below the line and this helps to distinguish F from D. The letter G has the uncial form and is easily confused with C. The letter H resembles the minuscule n with a small stroke to the right.³

What seems often to the unwary eye to be a dot over the letter next to the H is only the end of the horn. The very first instance of this occurs on fol. 53r, line 1 of the "didascalia": the first O of Phormio seems, at first glance, to be dotted.

The rustic capitals are a less rigid form of majuscule writing than square capitals. The letters O and Q are not circular but elliptical in form. Straight lines tend to curve as is evident in A, X and V, the latter now be-

³Lowe, p. 5.
coming a U. Often the ends of lines do not meet as in A and M. Serifs are sometimes more prominent, especially in A, P and T. Because of the short cross stroke at the top and a finishing stroke at the bottom, the T is likely to be confused with an I. Finally, letters F, L and T rise above the others.\footnote{4B. L. Ullman, Ancient Writing and its Influence (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1932; reprint ed., Cambridge, Mass.: The M.I.T. Press, 1969), pp. 60-62.}

We turn now to the orthographic variants found in the Phormio alone:\footnote{5Franz Umpfenbach, P. Terenti Afri Comoediae. Edidit et apparatu critico instruxit Franciscus Umpfenbach (Beri- ni: apud Weidmannos, 1870), praefatio xiii-xvii. Umpfen- bach has made a study of the orthography of the whole of the Codex Bemminus.} line 887 QUOIQUAM for cuiquam; line 848 QUOM for cum; line 620 PRENDO for prehendo; line 465 UITIPERANDUS for uituperandus; line 1033 MINUME for minime; line 976 OMNIS as the nominative plural form; line 17 NE for ni; prol. 31 NI for ne; line 573 AUDIERAS for audieras; line 658 MALIM for mallim; line 346 COTIO contracted form of coitio; line 78 IS for eis; line 126 IIS for eis; line 41 II for ei; line 582 contracted form in the imperfect SCI- BAM for sciebam; line 856 prefix DI for de; DILIBUTUM; line 179 consonant doubled: REPPERIS; line 461 an aspirated HIS for is; letter T for d: line 151 ALIUT and line 920 APUT; letter O for U: line 656 UOLT and line 696 NERUOM; prol. 11 LEDIT LAEDERET for laedit...which might be harsh sounding.
While the medial point is the only form of punctuation used by the scribe of Α, three "marks" of punctuation were added later: the "paragraphos" (↗), the "simplex ductus" (↗) and the third sign resembling a Greek sigma (ϛ). It may well be that a corrector of the sixth century,6 who signs his name "Ioviales" in cursive on several pages, or a "manus recens" of the seventh/eighth century7 inserted into the manuscript some signs of punctuation such as the "simplex ductus" and the "paragraphos" and further that such signs existed before these correctors. These forms of punctuation were written in the codex according to the norms established by grammarians, and the correctors were forced not only to imitate the writing of the codex but also to imitate the signs of punctuation already existing in the codex.8

Possible errors, and not orthographic variants, occur: on fol. 53r, line 2 ANTHONE is written no doubt instead of Antiphone; on fol. 65v, line 577 what was intended by the scribe when he wrote CHRE is not clear. The doubling of the consonant R in FAMILIORRIOREM, fol. 71v, line 851, is very likely a dittographical mistake on the part of the Bembine scribe. On fol. 76r, line 1055, the scribe wrote PLAUDIT instead of the imperative form plaudite.

7Ibid., p. 32.
8Prete, 1950, p. 39.
which occurs in the manuscript tradition.

In the text of the Phormio, numerous examples exist in which the ink of some letters has dried on or somehow has become part of the opposite page. Most prominent of all are lines 180-185, 187, 189 of fol. 57v whose initial letters are seen on fol. 58r.

Regularly employed by scholiasts are reference signs placed above the word commented on to safeguard against confusion. The most common of these signs is \(-\) cf. fol. 53v, lines: 4, 7, 8, 12, 13. Also found are symbols such as these: fol. 53v, line 4 \(\cdot\); fol. 53v, line 5 \(\cdot\); fol. 53v, line 9 \(\cdot\); fol. 53v, line 15 \(-\); fol. 54r, line 23 \(-\); fol. 54r, line 25 \(\cdot\); fol. 54r, line 33 \(\cdot\); fol. 54v, line 36 \(\cdot\); fol. 54v, line 43 \(\cdot\).

For the convenience of the reader of this study, I append below a list of "personae":

DAUUS: SERUUS
GETA: SERUUS
ANTIPHO: ADULESCENS
PHAEDRIA: ADULESCENS
DEMIPHO: SENEX
PHORMIO: PARASITUS
DORIO: LENO
HEGIO: ADUOCATUS
CRATINUS: ADUOCATUS
CRITO: ADUOCATUS
CHREMES: SENEX
SOPHRONA: NUTRIX
NAUSISTRATA: MATRONA
CANTOR

The scholia, marginal or interlinear notes, will be discussed on pages 23-27; they will be transcribed in chapter three.
On the Correctors of the Bembine

It is immediately obvious that hands other than that of the original scribe of the Codex Bembinus have made corrections, supplied omissions, and added punctuation. The problem of determining those responsible for these corrections is a long-standing one. Much research has been done and various conclusions reached. Franz Umpfenbach\(^1\) maintains that three people corrected the text of the Codex Bembinus: the first is the original scribe (A) who, in reviewing his own work, removed errors in his manuscript (A'). Another is the "manus antiqua" (m\(^2\)) of the ten-eleventh centuries and finally the "corrector recens" (m\(^3\)) or Ioviales of the fifteenth century.

Edmund Hauler\(^2\) distinguishes two hands: "manus secunda" (m\(^2\)) which made his corrections at the end of the sixth century or the beginning of the seventh century and "manus tertia" (m\(^3\)) which revised the Bembine Codex at the end of the eighth century or the beginning of the ninth.

Robert Kauer,\(^3\) like Umpfenbach, believes that the original scribe, the first corrector, revised his own

---

\(^1\)Umpfenbach, praefatio x-xvii.


\(^3\)Robert Kauer, "Zum Bembinus des Terenz", Wiener Studien 20 (1898): 253-255.
text (A'). Kauer calls the second hand "corrector antiquissimus" or A''. Ioviales, a grammarian, or the third hand, completed his work not in the fifteenth century, as Umpfenbach states, but before the scholiast who wrote in the sixth century. Kauer also admits the existence of a "manus quarta" (m⁴) which is possibly still Ioviales or someone shortly after him. This Ioviales² made only a few corrections particularly of the Hecyra. As Kauer himself states in the introduction to his Oxford text:

Iov.¹ = Ioviales, qui v vel vi saec. ante scholiastas (saec. vi) textum recensuit et dixtinxit... et passim nomen subscripsit. Iov.² = Ioviales qui partem quandam libri (Hec.) retractavisse et hic illic singula mutavisse videtur.

To Ioviales, then, Kauer attributes the majority of the corrections and, incorrectly according to Prete, all of the punctuation.⁴

For reasons unknown, Kauer never records Ioviales² in his critical apparatus for the Hecyra. But in the Phormio, fol. 63v, line 476, Kauer proposes Iov.² ("...hic illic singula mutavisse videtur") as the supplier of the word SE above PRAEBUIT.

Sesto Prete⁵ asserts that the scribe of A himself revised his text adding words inadvertently omitted by him (A'). In addition, corrections made by other hands are

---

⁴Prete, 1950, p. 34.
found in the codex. Manus², "corrector antiquus", whose entries Prete believes not much more recent than the codex itself, and whose writing he considers rather slender, wrote in capital letters with yellowish ink. In Roman cursive, Ioviales, (see above p. 18) who lived approximately the same time as the scholiast, that is, the sixth century, emended a few lines. Ioviales oftentimes attached his name or the phrase "Hucusque Ioviales" to his contributions. His corrections, Prete maintains, extend also to the Hecyra. Some additions and corrections suggest also the hand of the scholiast. Finally, the greater part of the emendations Prete ascribes to "corrector recens" who lived in the seventh or eighth century. He made his corrections in uncial and rough capital letters which are in poor imitation of the codex. Prete does not exclude the presence of other occasional correctors who might possibly have participated in the revising of A at a later time nor does he exclude the possibility that some corrections, attributed to "corrector recens" (seventh century), might have been inserted shortly before his proposed date.⁶

⁶Prete, 1970, p. 31, n. 16.
On The Scholia Bembina

In the studies made of the "scholia Bembina" there is much dispute about such problems as the number of writers of the scholia, and the date and sources of the scholia.

Franz Umpfenbach is the author of the first publication of an almost complete collection of the scholia.¹ His article, however, has some defects, namely, the omission of a number of items, misprints, and doubt left in the reader's mind as to what is read in the manuscript and what is the editor's conjecture.² Wilhelm Studemund offers valuable supplements to Umpfenbach's work in two articles³ in which he corrects a portion of Umpfenbach's errors. To James F. Mountford we owe a careful edition of the whole body of the "scholia Bembina" accompanying it with an attempt to answer various questions about the scholia. Mountford⁴ is convinced there were two Bembine scholiasts. The Andria and the Eunuchus contain almost as many scholia by the first hand as by the second. In the Heautontimorumenos, the first hand offers very few notes. The scholia of the

⁴Mountford, pp. 2-3.
Phormio and Adelphoe are all in hand two. The Hecyra lacks scholia.

Mountford maintains\(^5\) that hand one is earlier than hand two and that hand two is later than Ioviales who inserted signs of punctuation as did the scholiasts. Mountford believes that the earlier scholia might have been written in the first half of the sixth century.\(^6\) If, however, the writer were an elderly man, they may belong to the second half of the century. The later scholia, he observes, cannot be earlier than the second half of the sixth century.

A brief look at the script of each hand shows that the earlier one exhibits a mixture of uncial, half-uncial and cursive forms. Generally, the writing appears square and labored with a slight slope to the right. The second hand usually has a cursive nature with occasional appearances of rustic capitals and uncials. Ease and fluency characterize the general appearance of the hand.\(^7\)

Of the problems surrounding the scholia, their source is the most troublesome. A convenient starting-point in discussing the matter centers on the group of notes in the Phormio, lines 1-59. At first glance, there seems to

\(^5\)Mountford, p. 3.
\(^6\)Ibid., p. 4.
\(^7\)Ibid., pp. 4-6.
be a close connection between Donatus' commentary on Terence and the scholia here. But Donatus' commentary as we have it today is not the same as the original commentary.8 Two different opinions exist in regard to the relationship of Donatus and the scholia of Phormio 1-59. Paul Wessner9 believes that the dependence of the scholia on Donatus appears so close that we must admit that our version of Donatus dates no later than the sixth century and that from it are derived the scholia.

Einar Löfstedt10 does not see enough evidence to prove that our scholia depend on the present version of Donatus and consequently, he holds that the existence of such a version in the sixth century is not proven.

Mountford11 observes that of the seventy-four scholia concerned, twenty-one are identical with the extant version of Donatus and twenty-eight, although they say the same things, differ in phraseology from Donatus. Mountford favors Löfstedt's theory and attributes this group of scholia to the original Donatus. If this view is correct, these scholia indicate that the present

---

9 Ibid., p. xxxvii.
10 Einar Löfstedt, "Die Bembinusscholien und Donat" Eranos XII (1912), p. 43 ss.
11 Mountford, pp. 119, 122.
version of Donatus is not greatly different from the original.

If we exclude Phormio 1-59 and the approximately sixteen items which coincide with Eugraphius' commentary on Terence, about 1400 scholia remain. Of these, less than 240 bear any relationship to the notes in our version of Donatus. Twenty-six scholia have a parallel in the commentary of Servius Danielis. There still remain more than 1000 items which show no affiliations with Donatus or any other commentary.

Wessner and Mountford attribute the great bulk of the Bembine scholia to a pre-Donatian commentator, Aemilius Asper, who wrote commentaries, now lost, on Terence, Sallust and Vergil.13

An indisputable account of the origin and transmission of the scholia cannot be gained from available evidence. But the sequence of events which appears to Mountford to be the most probable is as follows:14 Between the fourth and sixth centuries, a pre-Bembine scholiast copied into the margins of a manuscript, now lost, some excerpts from a commentary of Aemilius Asper or of one based on him. This pre-Bembine scholiast made only a few notes in the Phormio. Soon the same scholiast or another added the first part of

---

12 Mountford, p. 122.
13 Ibid., p. 125.
14 Ibid., p. 126.
the original commentary of Donatus to this play. In the course of time, many folios of the Terentian manuscript, containing the last part of the *Heautontimorumenos* and the whole of the *Hecyra*, were lost. Ioviales, in contact with the manuscript in its deteriorated state, corrected and punctuated the Codex Bembinus. Shortly afterwards, the first Bembine scholiast copied some of the marginal notes to the *Andria*, *Eunuchus*, and part of the *Heautontimorumenos*. Finally the second scholiast transcribed those notes on the *Andria*, *Eunuchus*, and *Heautontimorumenos* omitted by his predecessor, along with the notes on the *Phormio* and *Adelphoe*, plays which the first scholiast completely neglected.
CHAPTER II.

THE PHORMIO OF THE CODEX BEMBINUS

Conspectus Siglorum.

Notes to Conspectus Siglorum.

Transcription of the Phormio with Electrostatic Facsimile of the Text and Critical Annotations.
CONSPECTUS SIGLORUM

K. = Kauer

A₁ = the scribe of the codex making his own corrections

A₂ = "corrector antiquissimus"

m³ = Ioviales¹ who made the majority of the corrections and additions; before the scholiast (6th century)

m⁴ = Ioviales² who is possibly still Ioviales himself and made only a few corrections.

Mar. = Marouzeau

A₁ = the first hand, i.e., the original scribe

A₂ = "manus secunda" which made the majority of the corrections

A₃ = "manus tertia"

A⁴ = Ioviales

corr. rec. = "corrector recens" who made the majority of the corrections, 7-8th centuries

Pr. = Prete

A₁ = the original scribe of the codex
corr. ant. = "corrector antiquus", 5-6th centuries

Iov. = Ioviales who made only a few corrections and wrote at the same time as the scholiast, 6th century

@ : see page 30.
Notes to Page 29

1 Robert Kauer and Wallace M. Lindsay, *P. Terenti Afri Comoediae* (Oxonii: Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1926) (1902), praefatio.


4 Marouzeau does not date the last three hands.


6 Marti, p. 126.

2 ANTHONE: Ms. tradition = Antiphone
3 HABEBAT: ·is the medial point often used between words
4 ALIAM: -IAM is blurred in the electrostatic reproduction but is discernible in microfilm of Codex Bembinus
11 PHIDICINA: in his app. crit., Mar. incorrectly cites A as reading PHIDICINA
PROLOGUS

POSTQUAM POETA UETUS POSTIAM NON POSTIAM
RETRABERE A STUDIO ET TRADERE NOMINEM IN OTIAM
MALEDICTUS DETERRERE SE SIBI ET PARAT
QUI TAT DICTITAT QUAS ANTEHAC FECIT FABULAS
TENUI ESSE ORATIONE ET SCRIPTURA LEUI
QUIA NUSQUAM INSANUM SCRIPTIT ADULESCENTULUM
CERUAM UIDERE FUGERE ET SECTARI CANES
ET EAM PLOARARE ORARE UT SUBUENIAT SIIBI
QUOD SI INTELLEGERET COM STETIT OLIM NOVA
ACTORIS OPERA MAGIS STETISSIS QUAM SUA
MINUS MULGO AUDACITER QUAM NUNC LEDERET
NUNC SI QUIES EST QUT HOCH DICAT AUT SIC COGITET
UETUS SI POETA NON LACESSESET PRIOR
NULLUM INUENIRE PROLOGUM POTUISSET NOUUS
QUEM DICERET CUI MALE DICERET
IS SIBI RESPONSUM HOC HABEBAT IN MEDIO OMNIBUS
PALWAM ESSE POSTIAM QUAI ARTEM TRACTENT MUSICAM

4 ANTEHAC: + reference sign to scholia above the H
5 TENUI: + reference sign to scholia above the I
6 EAM: + reference sign to scholia above the EA
7 OLIM: + reference sign to scholia above the I
8 ACTORIS: + reference sign to scholia to left of A
9 AUDACITER: in their app. crit. of the Oxford edition, Kauer and Lindsay cite Iov. as changing AUDACITER TO AUDACTER
10 DICAT: letter e added above A by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read DICET; + reference sign to scholia above the I
11 LACESSESET: + reference sign to scholia above the first S
12 HABERET: - reference sign to scholia above the P
13 TRACTENT: letter A added above E by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A² (Mar.) to read TRACTANT
ILLE AD FAMEM HUNC A STUDIO SYUDUIT REICERE
HIC RESPONDERE UQLUIT NON LACESSERE
BENEDICTIS SI CERTASSE AUDISSET BENE
QUOD AB ITTO ADLATUMST: ID SIBI ESSER RELATUM PUTET
DE ITTO TAM IDEA DICEMT MIHI
PECCANDI CUM IPSE DE SE FINEM NON FACIT
NUNC QUID UELIN ANIMUM ATTENDITE ADPORTO NOUAM
EPIZCAZOMENON QUAM UOCAY COMOEDIAM
GRACCI LATINI PHORMIONEM NOMINANT
QUI PRIMAS PARTIS QUI AGST IS ERIT PHORMIO
PARASTUS PER QUEM RES GERETUR MAXIME
UOLINTAS UOSTRA SI AD POETAM ACCESSERIT
DATE OPERAM ADESTE ABDU ANIMO PER SILENTIUM
NI SIMILI UTAMUR PORTUNA ATQUE UST SUMUS
CUM PER TUMULTUM NOSTER GRAEM VOTUS LOGOST
QUEM ACTORIS UIRUTUS NOBIS RESTITUIT LOCUM
BONITASQUE UESTRA ADUITANS ATQUE AEQUANIMITAS

20 CERTASSE: letter T written above final E by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read CERTASSET; reference sign to scholia above RT
21 ADLATUMST: medial point placed between words by A
23 FINEM: reference sign to scholia above the N
25 EPIZCAZOMENON: reference sign to scholia above the D
26 GRAECI: reference sign to scholia above the A
28 RES: reference sign to scholia above the R
29 UOSTRA: letter O crossed out by corr. rec. (Pr.) and E added above the O to read UESTRA
31 NI: I changed to E by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read NE
32 LOGOST: reference sign to scholia above the C
33 RESTITUIT: reference sign to scholia above the U
34 ADUITANS: reference sign to scholia above the U
B AMICUS SUMMUS HEUS ET POPULARIS GETA
HARI AD ME UERIT ERAT EI DE RATIOUNCULA
IAM PRIDEM APUC ME RELICUIUM PAUIXILIIUM
NUMMORUM ID UT CONFINEREM CONFCI ADPERO
NAM ERILEM FILIUM EUS DUXISSE AUDIO
UXORH M ECI DEMUS HOC CONRADIOTUR
QUAM INIQUE COMPARATUMST IX QUI MINUS HABENT
UT SEMPES ALIQUID ADIANT DIUITORIBUS
QUOD ILLE UNCIATIM UIX DE DEMESO SUO
SUUM DEFRUDANS GENIUM CONPERISIT MISER
ID ILLA UNEUSERM ABRIPIT HAUD EXISTIMANS
QUANTO LABORE PARTUM PORRO AUTEM GETA
FERIETUR ALIO MUNERE UBI ERA PEPEPERIT
PORRO AUTEM ALIO UBI ERIT FOERO NATALIS DIES
UBI INITIABUNT OMNE HOC MATER AUERET
PUERO CAUSA ERIT MITTUNDI SED UIUEOS GETAM
50

r GETA B DAUS 50a
SERUI II 50b

SI QUIS ME ULERET RUFUS B PRAESTOST DESINE r OH
AT EGO OBUIAM CONABAR TIBI DAUE B ACCIPE EM
LECTUMST CONUEIET NUMERUS QUANTUM DEBUI
AND TE ET NON RECLEISSE HABEO GRATIAM
PRAEERTHIT UT NUNC SUNT MORES ADDO RES REDIT 55

36 RATIOUNCULA: * reference sign to scholia above
43 DEMEON: * reference sign to scholia above the
50 PUERO: letter O crossed out by Iov. (K.), by corr.
rec. (Pr.) to read PUER
50a r = Greek gamma
50b II: the numeral
53 LECTUMST: * reference sign to scholia above
the U
55 B added by Iov. (K.) at the beginning of the
line. A has Geta speaking lines 54, 55, 56
(Mar.). B added by corr. rec. according to Pr.
Si quis quid reddet magna haseandast gratia
sed quid tu es tristis? Egoque nescis quo in melo et
quantum in periculo sumus quid istuc est? scies
modo ut tacere possis? Abi sibi insciens
cuius tu fidem in pecunia perspexeris
uerere uerna ei credere ubi quid mihi luceri est
Te fallere? Ergo ausculata. Hanc operam tibi dico
senis nostri dae fratre matorem creemem
nostin B quid nt? quid eius gnatus phaedriam
Tanquam te? evenit senibus ambus stimul
iter illi in lenno ut esset nostro in ciliicium
ad hospitem antiquum est semen per epistulas
pellestit modo non montis auri polliciens
B cui tanta erat res et erat super? desinas
sic est ingenum b o regem me esse oportuit
assestes ambo hic tum senes me filis
relinquant; quas magistrium b o getta provinccia
cepistis duram mihi usus evenit; hoc scio
memini relinqui me dein irato meo
coepi adversari primo quid uersis opust
seni fidelifis dum sum sculpulas peridi
cuene in mentem mihi istaec b namque insciasti
adversum stimulus calces f coepi is omnia
facere obsequ quae uellet b scisti uti foro
f nostier malii nihil quicquam primo hic phaedria

57 B: crossed out by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.). A
advanced B from line 55 to line 57 (Mar.)
69 ERAT SUPER? marks made by Iov. (K.) above B of ERAT
and UP of SUPER indicate a change to
SUPERERAT
71 HIC: letter n added above the C by corr. rec. (Pr.),
by Iov. (K.) to read HINC
73 DURAM: after this word corr. rec. (Pr.), Iov. (K.)
added r. In fact, the Ms. tradition attribu-
utes MIHI...PERIDID to Geta
75 ADVERSARI: the word HIS added above AD by corr. rec.
(Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read HINC
77 r changed to B by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
beginning of line; ISTAEC: B: letter after ISTAEC
crossed out by Iov. (K.)
78 OMNIA: ea added above O by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov.
(K.)
PHORM.

Continuo quandam nactus est puellulam
Citharistriam hanc amare coepit Perdite
Neque quid daretur quicquam id curarant patres
Restabat aliqui nihil nisi oculos pascere
Sectari in ludum ducere et reducere
Noscioris operam dabanis phaedriat
In quo haec discerat ludio exaduero ilico
tonstrinam erat quadan hic solemamus fere
plebumque eas opperiri dum inde iret domum
Interria dum sedemus illi interuenit
adulescenst quidam lacrumans nos mirari
rogamus quid sit nuncnum aequo inquit ac modo
paupertas mini onus uisumst et miserum et graue
modo quandam uidi virginem hic uiciinae
Miseram suam matrem lamentari mortuam
eas sita erat exaduorsum neque illi beniuolus
Neque notus neque cognatus extra uiram ancillulam
quisquam aderat qui adiutaret funus miserumst
Uirgo ipsa facie egregia quid uerbis opus
Commorat omnes nos ibi continuo antiphon
uolitine eamus uisere alius censeo
Eamus duc nos sodem unus umbus
Uimdemus uirgo pulchra et --- magis diceres
nihil aderat adiumenti ad pulchritudinem

88 ILICO: the first I changed to E, the second I changed to L, letter O added above C by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.) to read EI loco
91 ILLI: letter C added above second I by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read ILLIC
97 EXADUORSUM: second U crossed out by corr. rec. (Pr.) and cursive a added above it to read EXADUORSUM. Mar. incorrectly cites A as reading EXADUORSUM
BENIUOLUS: second U crossed out by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.) and EN added above it by same to read BENIUOLENS
98 ANCILLULAM: letter I added above line between N and C, then ILL crossed out by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read ANICULAM
104 ---: three letters totally erased and quo written in their place by corr. rec. (Pr.)
CONFINGAM QUOD ERIT MIHI BONUM ATQUE COMMODO
CUM TU SORUM NIHIL REFLERES UINCAT SCILICET
PATER ADERIT MIHI PARATAE LITES QUID MEA
ILLA QUIDEM NOSTRA EZIT B IOCUKAREM AUDACIAM
PERSUASUMSTE: HOMINI FACTUMST UENTUMST: UINCUMIR 135
DUXIT B QUID NARRAS R HOC QUID AUDIT B Q GETA
QUID TE FUTURUMST: R NESCIIO HERCLE UNUM HOC SCIO
QUOD FORS FERET: PEREMUS AEQUO ANIMO B PLACET
EM ISTUC UIRIST: OFFICION R IN ME OMNIS SPES MIHI EST
B LAUDO R AD PRECATOREM ADEAM CREDO QUI MIHI 140
SIC ORIT NUNC AMITTE QUAESE HUNC CETERAM
POSTHAC SI QUICQUAM NIHIL PRECOR TANTUM MODO
NON ADDIT UBI EGO HINC ABIERO UEL OCCIDITO
B QUID PEDAGOGUS ILLRE QUI CITHARISTRIAM
QUID RIT GEREFT B STC TENTUER. B NON MULTUM HABET 145
QUOD DET FORTASS: R IIMO NIHIL NISI SPEM MERM
B PATER EIUS REDIT: AN NON R IONDUM B QUID SENEM
QUOD SPECTATIS UESTRUM R NON CERTUM SCIO
SED EPISTULAM AB EO ADLAIAM ESSE AUDIUI MODO
ET AD PORTIORES ESSE DELAIA PETAM 150
B NUM QUID GETA ALUIT ME UIS R UT BENE ST TIBI
PUEX NEMON HOC PRODIT CAPIT DA HOC DORCHIO
A ANTIPHO B PHAEDRIA
ADELSCENTES II
ADEON REM REDISSE UT QUI MIHI CONSULTUM OPTIME UELLET
ESSE

145 B: letter B inserted between TENTUER and NON by A (Pr.)

146 R: letter R inserted between FORTASS and IMMO by A (Pr.)

150 DELAIAM: letter T traced by corr. rec. (Pr.); PETAM: the word HANC added above PETAM by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)

153: page damage makes it impossible to read the character designation at the beginning of the line. UELLET: the first L crossed out by Iov. (K.) but he does not change the second L to I
Phaedria patrem ut existimescam ubi in mentem eius aduenti ueniat quod ni fuissem incogitans ita expecta--m ut par futt 155 b quid istuc est a rogitas qui tam audacis facinoris ni conscius sis quod uztinam in Phormioni id suadere in mentem incidunt seu nee cupidum eo impulsion quod mihi principiumst mali non potius esset fuisset tum illus mihi aegre aliquo quod dies at noncottidiana cura habc angeret animum b audio 160 a dum exspecto quam mox ueniat qui adinat hanc mihi consuetudinem b alius quia defit quod amant aegrest tibi quia superest dolet amore abundas antipho nam tua quidem hercle certo uita haec expetenda opzandaque est ita me di bene ament ut mihi licet tam diu quod amo frui 165 iam depicisci morte cupio tu concito cetera quod ego ex hac inopia nunc capiam et quid tu ex ista copia ut ne addam quod sine sumptu ingenium liberaele nactus es quod habes ita fului quiuxom sine mala fama palam beatus ne unum desit qui modestus istaec ferat 170 quod si tibi res sit cum eo lenone quo mihi est tum sentias a at tu mihi contra nunc uidere fortunatus phaedria cui de integro est potestas etiam consulendi quid uelis retinere amare amittere ego in eum incidi infelix locum 175 ut neque mihi sit amittendi nec reiningi contri sed quid hoc est uidon ego getam currentem hic aduentre is est ipsus ei timeo miserum quam hic mihi nunnuet rem a geta r antipho b phaedria

154 EXPECTA--M: two letters between A and M totally erased and NE inserted by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read EXPECTAREM
157 IN: letter I crossed out and E added above N by Iov. (Pr.), (K.) to read NE
160 B: letter B inserted between ANIMUM and AUDIO by A as it seems to me but Pr. attributes it to the Rubricator
164 CERTO: letter O erased and E added above erasure by Iov. (Pr.), (K.), by A2 (Mar.) to read CERTE; EXPETENDA: letter E added above TN by Iov. (Pr.) to read EXPETENDA. On microfilm, letters EXPET appear darker, thicker and may be by a hand other than A
169 ITA: letter C added above A by corr. rec. (Pr.)
170 DESIT: after this work, ANIMOS added above by Iov. (Pr.), ANIMUS added by Iov. (K.)
172: one line, present in the Ms. tradition, is not found in A but added by corr. rec. (Pr.), (Mar.), by Iov. (K.). The addition reads: ITA PLERIQUE INGENIO SUMUS OMNIS NOSTRI NOSMET PENITET
176 MIHI SIT: above these words, Elius added by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.)
178 MISERO: letter O erased by unknown cor. to read MISER
SERVUS ADULESCENTES II

A NULLUS ES GETA NISI IAM ALIQUOD TIBI CONSILIUM CELERERE
REPERIS
ITA NUNC INPARATUM SUBITO TANTA TE INPENDENT MALA
QUAE NEQUE UTI DEUITEM SCIO NEQUE QUO MODO ME INDE
EXTRAHAM
QUAE SI NON ASTU PROUIDENTUR ME AUT ERUM PESSUM DABUNT
NAM NON POTEST CELARI NOSTRA DIUPIUS AUDACIA Γ QUID ILLIC
COMMOTUS UENIT
A TUM TEMPORIS MIHI PUNCTUM AD HANC REM EST ERUS ADEST
Γ QUID ILLIC MALIST
A QUOD CUM AUDIERIT QUOD EIUS REMEDIUM INUENIAM
IRACUNDIAE
LOQUIARNE INCENDAM TACEAM INSTIGEM ME PERGAM IBI
INCENDAM TACEAM INSTIGEM ME PERGAM IBI
RECTE EGO MIHI UIDISSEM ET SENIS ESSEM ULTIUS IRACUNDIAM
ALIQUID CONVASISSEM ATQUE HINC ME CONICEREM PROTINUS IN
FEDES
Γ QUAM HINC FUGAM AUT FURTUM PARAT
A SED UBI ANTIPOHNUM REPERIAM AUT QUA QUADERE INSISTAM UIAM
B TE NOMINAT Γ NESCIO QUOD MAGNUM HOC NUNTIO EXPECTO _M_ ALUM
B AH
SANUSNE ES A DONUM IRE PERSAM IBI PLURIMUMST B REOCHEMUS
HOMINEM STA ILLICO A HEM
SATIS PRO IMPERIO QUISquis ES Γ GETA A IPSE EST QUEM
VOLIT OBSIAT
Γ CEDO QUID PORTAS OBSECRO ATQUE ID SI POTES UENSO EXPEDI
A FACIAM
Γ ELOQUERE A MODO APUT PORTUM Γ NEUMRE A INTELLEXTI
Γ OCCIDI B HEM
Γ QUID AGAM B QUID AIS A HUIUS PATREM UIDISSE ME ET PATRUUM
TUUM
NAM QUOD EGO NUIC SUBITO EXITIO REMEDIUM INUENIUM MISER
QUOD SI ERU MEAE FORTUNAE REDUND PHANTUM ABS TE UT
DISTRAHAR

---

181 NEQUE: O- crossed out and C added above it by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.) to read NEC
183 ILLIC: the second I changed to E and C crossed out by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read ILLIS, and above ILLIC, NAM written by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
188 EIUS: letter U crossed out and I added above it by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read EI(IS)?
ESSET: letter T crossed out and M added above by corr.
rec. (Pr.), by A2 (Mar.), by Iov. (K.) to read ESSEM

189 MIHI: letter I written between M and H by A (Pr.);
UIDISSEM: letters PRO written above UI by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.) to read PROUIDISSEM but PRO was canceled by same corrector or later one

190 CONUASISSEM: letter I crossed out and A written above by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.) to read CONUASASSEM

191 HINC: letter N crossed out by Iov. (K.), by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read HIC

194 DONUM: letter M written above U by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read DOMUM

195 HOMINEM: after this word, ɹ added by corr. rec. (Pr.) by Iov. (K.) as a sign for Antiphon to say STA ILICO

198 APUT: letters PUT added above the first letter A by A (Pr.). Mar. cites A as reading APORTUM

199 ET: word crossed out by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.);
PATRUUM: Mar. incorrectly cites A as reading PATRUOM

200: page damage makes it impossible to read the character designation at the beginning of the line;
SUBITO: above the letter S is symbol possibly denoting omission of word NUNC which is present in other Mss. or Ms. tradition. Corrector unknown
 NULLAST MIHI UITA EXPETENDA A EGO ISTAEC CUM IPA SUNT-

ANTIPHO

--- NTO MAGIS TE ADVIGILARE AEQUOMST FORTIS FORTUNA ADIUIAT

R NON SUM APUT ME A AQUI OPUS EST NUNC CUM MAXUNE UT SIS

ANTIPHO

NAM SI SENSERIT TE TIMIDUM PATER ESSE ARBITRABITUR 205

COMMULCISCE CULPAM B CUC VURUSM R NON POSSUM INMUTABILIR

A QUID FACERES SI ALIUD GRAUIS TIBI NUNC FACTUNDUM FORET

R CUM CUC NON POSSUM ILLUD MINUS POSSE A HOC NIHI EST

QUID HIC CONTERIMUS OPERAM FRUSTRA QUIN ABRO B ET QUIDEM

EGO R OBS---

QUID SI ADVISIMO SATINEST A GARRIS R UOLTIM CONTREMPLAMIN-

EM 210

SATINE SIC EST A NON R QUID SI SIC A PROPESMODUM R QUID SIC

A SAP EST

EM ISTUC SERUA ET UERBUM UERBO PAR EARI ET RESPONDEAS

NE TE IRATUS SUIS SAEUIDICIS DICTIS PROTELET R SCIO

A UI COACTUM TE ESSE INUITUM B LEGE IUDICIO A TENES

SET HIC QUIS EST SENSEM UIO UDE IN ULTIMA PLATEA IPSUS

EST 215

R NON POSSUM ADDES A AH QUID AGIS QUO ABIS ANTIPHO

MANE INquam r EGOMET ME NOUI ET PECCATUM MEUM

UBIS COMMENDO PHANIAM ET UIIAM MEAN

B GETA QUID NUNC PIET A TU IAM LITES AUDIES

EGO PLECTAR PENDENS NISI QUID ME FEFELLIRIT

SED QUOD MODO HIC NOST SAEUIDICEM NONUMUS

ID HOMIET IPSOS FACERE OPORTE- PHAEDRIA

B AEPER MIHI OPORTE QUIN TUD QUID FACIAM IMPERA

203 ---NTO: first two letters blurred but Ms. tradition

reads TANTO

208 -----: letters blurred but Ms. tradition reads ILICET

209 OBSE---: three letters blurred but Ms. tradition reads

OBSECR

210 A: above A, unknown corrector added PH indicating

Phaedria should say GARRIS

213 PROTELET: above and to the right of this word is PATER

written by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)

218 PHANIAM: the second A is crossed out and U added above

it by corr. rec. (Pr.)

222 OPORTE-: final letter (A?) crossed out and T added

above by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read OPORTEIT
A MEMINISTIN OLIM UT FUERIT UESTRA ORATIO
IN RE INCEPTUNDA AD DEFENDENDAM NOXIAM
IUSTAM ILLAM CAUSAEM FACILEM UNICIBILEM OPTMAM
B MEMINI A EM NUNC IPSAST- OPUS EA AUT SI QUID POTEST
MELIOR ET CALIDIOR B FIEL SEDULIO
A NUNC PRIOR ADITO TU EGO IN INSIDIES HIC ERO
CENTURIATUS SI QUID DEFICIAS B AGE

Z DEMIPIO B PHAEDRIA A GETA

SENX ADULESCENS SERVUS

Z ITANE TANDEM UXORVM DUXIT ANTIPHO INIUSSO MEO
NEC MEUM IMPERIUM AC MITTO IMPERIUM NON SIMILATTEM MEAM
REVERERI SALTEM NON PUDERE O FACINUS AUDAX O GETA
MONTOR A UX TANDEM QUID MIHI DICENT QUAM
CAUSAM REPERIEN'T

DEMIOR A ATQUI REPERIAM ALIUT AGE B AN HOC DIC'T MINI 235
INITUS FOCI LEX COEGIT AUDIO FATOR A PLACES
Z UERUM SCIENTEM TACTITUM CAUSAM TRARE ADVERSARIIS
ETIAMNE ID LEX COEGIT B ILLUD DURUM A EGO EXPEDIAM SINE
Z INCERTSM LTD AGAM QUA PRAETER SPEM ATQUE IN
CREDIBLE HOC MINI OPTIGIT 239

PERICLA DANDA EX ILLA PERORE REDIENS SEMPER COGITET 243
AUT FILI PECCATUM AUT UXORIS MORTEM AUT HORBUM FILIAE
COMMUNIA ESSE HAEC POSSE UT NE QUIT ANO SIT NOUM 245
QUIDQUID PRAETER SPEM EUENIET OMNE ID DEPUTARE ESSE
IN LUCRO
O PHAEDRIA INCREDIBILEST QUANTUM ERUM ANTE EO SAPIENTIA

228 MELIOR: letter E added by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read MELIORE; CALIDIOR: letter E added by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read CALIDIORE
230 CENTURIATUS: letters SU added to front of the word by corr. rec. (Pr.), Iov. (K.) to read SUCCENTURIATUS
234 QUAM: word AUT written above by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
240-242: three lines, present in Ms. tradition, are not found in A
245 HAEC POSSE: above these words, Fieri added by Iov. (Pr.), (K.); ANO: letter O crossed out and IMO added above by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read ANIMO
247: page damage makes it impossible to read the character designation at the beginning of the line
MEDITATA MIHI SUNT OMNIA MEA INCOMMODA —S SI REDIERIT
MOLENDUM ESSE IN PISTRINO UAPULANDUM HABENDAE COMPEDES
OPUS RURI FACTIUNDEM HORUM NIHIIL QUIQVAM ACCIDENT ANIMO
NOUM

QUIDQUID PRAETER SPEM EVENIET OMNE ID DEPUTABO ESSE
SED QUID CESSAS HOMINEM ADIRE ET BLANDE IN PRINCIPIO
ADLOQUI

Z PHAEDRIAM MEI FRATRIS VIDEO FILIUM MIHI RE OBUTIAM
B MI PATRUE SALUE Z SALUE SED UBI EST ANTIPHO
B SALUM UENIRE Z CREDO HOC RESPONDE MIHI

255

B UALET HIC EST SET— SATIDE OMNIA EX SENTENTIA
Z UELLEM QUIDEM B QUID ISTUC EST Z ROGITAS PHAEDRIA
BONAS ME ABSENTE HIC CONFECTIONIS NUPTIAS

B ERO AN ID SUCSESES NUNC ILLI Z ARTIFICEM PROBUM
B EGON ILLI NON SUCSESEM IPSUM GESTIO

260

B DARI MIHI IN CONSEPCTUM NU— CULPA AUT SCIAT
LENEM PATREM ILLUM FACTUM ME ESSE ACERRIMUM
B ATQUIN NIHIIL FECIT PATRUE QUOD SUCSESEAS
Z ECCE AUTEM SIMILIA OMNIA OMNES CONGRUUNT
UNUM CUM NORIS OMNES NOSTRIS B HAUD ITAST

265

Z HIC IN NOXIAST ILLI AD DEFDENDUM CAUSAM ADEST
Z CUM ILLE ABEST PRAEOST— TRADUNT OPERAS MUTUAS
A PROBE HORUM FACTA INPRUDENS DEFINIXIT SENEX
Z IAM NI HARC ITA ESSENT CUM ILLO HAST STARES PHAEORIA
B SI EST PATRUE CULPAM UT ANTIPHO IN SE ADMISERIT
EX QUA RE MINUS REI FORET AUT FAMAE TEMPERANS
NON CAUSAM DICO QUIN QUOD MERITUS SIT FERAT
Sed si quis forte malitia pretus sua insidias nostrae fecit adulescentiae ac uiguit nostra culpa est an iudicum qui saepe propter inuidiam adiunxit diutii aut propter misericordiam adiunxit pauperi a nisi nossem causam crederem uera hunc locui 2 an quisquam iudex est qui possis noscere tua insta ubi tupe uerubim non respondas ita ut ille fecit bu functus adulescentuli est officium liberalis postquam ad iudices uenimus non potuit cogitata proloqui ita eum tum timidum ibi stupefactum pudor a laudo hunc sed cesso adire quam primum semem ere salutem saluem te audientes gaude bone custos salue columna ubro familiae cui commendaui pilium hunc aientes heum a iam dudum te omnes nos accussare audio inerimento et me horum omnium ineritiissimo namquid me in hac re facere uoluisse tibi seruom hominem causam orare leges non sinunt necque testimonio dictto est 3 mitto omnia addo istuc inprudens timuit adulescens sino tu seruus uerum si coghiata est maxime non fuit necessis habere sed id quod lex iubet dotem darest quisqueret aliquum uirum

275 EST: in his app. crit., Rauer noted "EST A (corr. man. 2)" but neither Prete nor I see correction here
281 FUNCTUS: letter C added above between N and T by A (Pr.)
284 IBI: second I crossed out and OB added above by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read OUSTEFECIT
286 AUDIENSISS: the two S's were erased and R added by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read AUDIENS
290 INERITIO: letter T inserted between I and O by A (Pr.) to read INERITO
293 TESTIMONIO: second O crossed out by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read TESTIMONI
295 EST: letters RAT written above by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read ERAT
A non ratio erum argumentum essebat cum summum Alicunde a nihil est dicto facilius.

Z postremo si nullo alioc facto fero sore a hui dixit pulchre siquidem quisquam crederet te uiso z non non sic futurum et non potest egeo illam cum illo ut paritiam unum diem nihil suaue meritum habet. Nomine comnonstrator 305

Mih istum uolo aut ubi habitat demonstrator a nempo phormionez z istum patronum mulieris.

A iam fako hic aber est a antipho ubi nunc est a foris.

Z abri phaedria hum requiere atque hic adduc b ego recta uia quotem illuc a nempo ad paphialm 310

Z at ego deos penates hic salutatem domum desertar inde ibo ad forum atque aliuses mihi amicos aduecabo ad uincum qui adiempt ut ne inparatus sim si uniat phormio.

A Phormio E Geta.

Paratus Seruus.

A itane patris aduentum ubritum hinc arisse e admodum 315

A phanium relicam solam e sic a et iratum senem e oppido a ad te summa solum phornio rebus est tute hoc instructi tibi omne est exedendo accingere e obsecro te a si rogabit e in te spes est a eccere quid si reddet e tu impulisti a sic opinor e subueni 320

300 Nihil: the word ALICUNDE is repeated between the lines above Nihil by Iov. (Pr.); DICTO: letter U written above letter O by Iov. (Pr.), (K.) to read DICTU.

304 Egon: letter E added above and to the right of N by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read EGONE.

306 Istum: letter T crossed out and letters PS written above ST by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read I(S)PSUM.

310 Paphialm: letters PA appear to be written by another hand but neither Pr. nor K. nor Mar. mention this correction.

314 Ueniat: letters AT written above by corr. rec. (Pr.), letters AD written by Iov. (K.) to read ATUENIAT, ADUENIAT respectively.

315 Patris aduentum: word AIS written above by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
A cedo senem iam instructa sunt mihi in corde consilia omnia
et quid aeges quid uti nisi uti maneat phanium atque
ex crimine hoc
antiphonem eripiam atque in me omnum iram deruem sens
et o vir fortis atque amicus urum hoc sarepe phorhmo
ueuem ne istaeec fortitudo in herum embapat denimque
325
ah non ita est factum est periculum iam pedum uisast uia
quod me censes homines iam deuerberasse usque ad necem
hospites tum ciues quo magis noui tanto saefius
cedo dni enunquam iniuriam audisti mihi scriptum dicam
et qui istuc a quia non rette accipisti tenditur neque
miluo 330
qui male factunt nobis illis qui nihil faciunt tenditur
quia enim in illis fructus est. in illis opera lubitum
aillis alintum est periculum unde aliquid potest
mihi sciant nihil esse dices ducent damnatum domum
alere nolunt hominem edacem et sapient mba sententia 335
pro maleficio si beneficium suum nolunt reddere
e non potest satis pro merito ab illo tibi referri gratia
a immo enim nemo satis pro merito gratiam regi repert
in symboolum uenire uinctum atque lautum e balineis
ottosum ab amino cum ille et cura et sumptu assimurium 340
dum tibi fit quod placeat ille ringitur tu rideas
prior nolier decumbas cena dubia appetitum
et quid istuc ubri est a ubi tu dubites quid sumas potissimum
haec cum rationem ineras quam sint suauia et quam cara sint

321 CEDO: letter A written above E by corr. rec. (Pr.) to
read CAEDO
322 AGES QUID: space left between these words probably for
character designation
326 EST: word crossed out by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.), corr.
rec. (Pr.)
329 ENUNQUAM: letter M written above E by corr. rec. (Pr.),
by Iov. (K.) to read ME NUNQUAM
330 RETE: letter C written above ET by corr. rec. (Pr.),
by Iov. (K.) to read RECTE
332 FRUCTUS: letters UCT appear to be written by another
hand but Pr., K., Mar. do not mention correc-
tion; ILLIS: letters IL converted to H, the
second L crossed out by corr. rec. (Pr.),
by Iov. (K.) to read HIS
336 SUUM: letters MM written above UM by Iov. (Pr.) to
read SUMMUM
339 TEN: letter E written above by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read
TEBE: Balineis: the first I erased by corr. rec.
(Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.) to read BALNEIS
341 QUOD: letter D blurred by Iov. (?) (K.) to read QUO
HA QUI PRAEBET NON TU IUNHC HABEAS PLANE PRAESENTEK DEUM 345
E SENEX ADEST UIDE QUID AGAS PRIMA COTIOST: ACERRIMA
SI IAM SUSTINEUNDI POST ILLAM UT LUSEB LUDAS LICET

Z DEMIPHO * HEGIO Y CRATINUS + Crito A PHORMIO ET GETA

SENEX ADUCATI III PARASITUS SERUUS

Z ENUNQUAM CUIQUAM CONTUNELIOSIUS
AUDISTIS FACTAM INIURIAM QUAM HAEC EST MINI
ADESTE QUAESO E IRATUS EST A QUIN TU HOC AGE
IAM EGO HINC AGITABO PRO DEUM IMMORTALITUM
NEGAT PHANTUM ESSE HANC SIBI COGNATAM DEMIPHO
HANC DEMIPHO NEGAT ESSE COGNATAM E NEGAT
A NEQUE EIUS PATREM SE SCIRE QUI FURIT E NEGAT
E IPSUM ESSE OPINOR DE QUO AGEBAM SEQUIMIN.
A REC STILPHONEM IPSUM SCIRE QUI FURIT E NEGAT
A QUIA EGENS RELICITAS MISIONE IGNORATUR PARENTS
NECLEGITUR IPSA UIDE AUERITAT HIC FECIT
E SI ERUM INSULALASIS HALITAE MALE AUDIES
Z O AUDACIAM ETIAM ME ULTER ACCUSATUM ADIINIT
A NAM IAM ADOLESCENTI NIHIL EST QUOD SENSES
SI ILLUM MINUS NORAT QUIPPE HOMO GRANDIOR
PAUPER CUI OPERA SI ILLUM MINUS NORAT QUIPPE HOMO GRANDIOR
ATQUE UIRUM QUO FIDEM ADIINIT

346 COTIOST: letter I written above OT by corr. rec.
(Pr.) to read COTIOST; ACERRIMA: second A
written by corr. rec. (Pr.)

347 POST ILLAM: letter IA written above M by corr. rec.
(Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Ash.) to read
POSTILLA IAM

350 AGE: letter S added by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.),
by A2 (Ash.) to read
AGE

351 IMMORTELUM: word FIDEM added at end of line by Iov.
(Pr.), (K.). Traces of the name "Ioviales"
can be seen just below correction.

357 EGENS: letter A written above A by A (Pr.) to read AEGENS

358 FECIT: second letter erased and A written in by another
hand. Letter A written in place of E by corr.
rec. (Pr.), by A2 (Mar.) to read PACIT.
"faciat Iov." (K.)

364 PATRE: E added by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read PATRE

367 ATQUE: letters UEM added above ATQ. by Iov. (Pr.) to
read AT QUEM
E UIDEAS TE ATQUE ILLUM UT NARRAS A I IN MALAM CRUCEM
NAM EI EUM ESSE EXISTIMASSEN NUNquam TAM GRAUIS
OR HANC INJMCTIAS CAPEREM IN UESTRAM FAMILIAN 370
QUAM IS ASPERNATUR NUNC TAM INLIBERALITER
E PERGIN ERO ABSENTI MALE LOQUI INPURISSIME
A DIGNUM AUTEM HOC ILLOST E AIN TANDEM CARCER Z GETA
E BONO RUM EXTOR TORE LECUM CONTOR FOR Z GETA
A RESPONDE ET QUIS HOMOST EHEM Z TACE ET ABSENTI
A RESPONDE ET QUIS HOMOST EHEM Z TACE ET ABSENTI

TE INDIGNAS SERE DIGNAS CONTUMELIAS
NUMquam CESSAVIT DICERE HODIE Z DESINE
ADULESCENS PRIMUM ABS TE HOC BONA UENIA PETO
SI TIBI PLACERE POTIS ES MIHI UT RESPONDEAS
QUEM AMICUM TUUM AIS ET IUS ISTUM EXPLANA MIHI 380
ET QUI COGRATUM ME SIBI ESSE DICERET
A PROINDE EXPISCARE QUASI NON NOSSES Z NOSSEM A ITA
EGO ME NEGO TU QUI AIS REDIGE IN MEMORIAM
A ERO TU SOBRINUM TUUM NON ORAS Z ENICAS
DIE NOMEN A NOMEN MAXINE Z QUID NUNC TACIS 385
A PERI HERCLE NOMEN PEROIDI Z QUID AIS A GETA
SI MEMPSTI ID QUOD OLM DICTUM SUBICE EM
NON DICO QUASI NON NOSSES TEMPATUM ADUENIS
E Z EGO AUTEM TEMPTO ET STILPHO A ATQUE ADEO QUID MEA
STILPHOST Z QUEM DIXIT A STILPHONEM INQUAM EST
NONuemA 390
Z NEQUE EOS ILLUM NORME EC MIHI COGNATUS FUIT
QUISQUAM ISTOC NOMINE A ITANE NON TE HORUM PUDET

369 NI EUM: letters SITA written above by corr.
rec. (Pr.), letters ITA written above by A2 (Ash.)
380 AIS : second S crossed out by A
382 NOSSES: line between OS appears to be unintentional; ITA: after ITA is Z by an unknown hand. According to Ms. tradition EGO...MEMORIAM belongs to Z
At si talentum rem reliquisset decem
Z ita ut tu dices ego tum cum aduenisset qui mihi
Cognata ea esset dicerem itidem tu face
Cedo qui est cognata eu no stere recte heus tu caue
A dilucide expediui quibus me oportuit
Iudicibus tum id si falsum fuerat filius
Cur non repellit z filium habbas mihi
Cuius de stultitia dici ut dignumst. Non potest
A at tu qui sapiens es magistratus adi
Iudicium de eadem causa item ut reddant tibi
Quandoquidem solus regnas et soli licet
Hic de eadem causa bis iudicium adipiscier
Z etsi mihi facta injuriast uerum tamen
Potius quam lites secter aut quam te audiam
Itidem ut cognata si sit id quod lex iubet
dotis dare abduc hanc minas quinque accipe
A harahae homo suauis z quid est nunc iniquom postulo
An ne hoc quidem ego adipiscar quod ius publicumst
A itame tandem quaeso item ut meretricium ubi abusus
Mercedem dare lex iubet ei atque amittere
An ut ne quid turpe ciuis in seue amitteret
405
Propter egestatem proximo iussast dari
Ut cum uno aetatem degeter quod tu uetas

395 atauo: letter T changed to D by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read ADAUO
398 CAUE: at end of line, PHORMIO written by corr. rec. (Pr.)
413 ABUSUS: word SIS written at end of line by corr. rec. (Pr.) after erasure of two or three letters of A (ES?)
Zeta 

72

·PHORM· 62v

Z Eita proximo quidem ad nos unde aut quam ob rem a one actum aiunt ne agas z non am agi immo haud desinam donec perfeceris hoc a ineptis z sine modo 420 a postremo tecum jihil rei nobis demiprost tuus est damnatus gratus non tu nam tua praefererat iam ducenda aetas z omnia haec illum putato quae ego hunc dico dicere aut quidem cum uxore hac ipsum prohibebis domo 425 a iratus est tu te idem melius feceris z ita ine paratus facere me aduorum omnia ineflex a metuit hic nos tamet sedulo dissimulat et bene habent tibi principia a quin quod est perundum peres tuis dignum factis feceris ut amici inter nos simus z egn tuam expectam amicitiam aut te igitur aut auditum uelim a si concordabimus cum illa habeabis quae tuam seentutem oblectet repice aetatem tuam z ut oblectet tibi hase a minus igitur a tecum z hoc age 435 satis iam uerbosumst nisi tu properas mulierem abducere ego illam liciam dixi phormo a si tu illam attigine us quam dignumst liberam dicam tibi adpingle grant dem dixi semipro si quid opus fuerit heus dome et intellege 440 z quamta me cura et sollicitudine adpicts gratius qui me et se hisce inpediuat nuptiis

426 A: A appears to me to be by another hand but no editor has noted it
433 CONCORDABIS: sixth letter erased and replaced by R in the hand of corr. rec. (Pr.)
439 ADPINGAM: letters AD crossed out and IN written above by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read ADPINGAM
440 DOME: letters MO written above ME by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read DOME ME
Neque mihi in conspectu prodit ut saltem sciam quid de ea re dicat quidue sit sententiae abi uti redierit ne iam an nondum domum.

E ego Z uidetis quo in loco res hanc sit quid acq dic nam censeo si tibi uidetur 2 dic cratine y meae uis.

Z te y quae in rem tuam sint uelini factias mihi. Sic hoc uidetur quod te absente hic filius egit restitui in integrum aequum est et bonum et id impletabas dixi 2 dic nucleo.

Ego sedulo dixisse hunc credo uterum itast quod homines tot sententiae suus cuique nos est mihi non uidetur quod sit factum legibus.

Sic rescrindii posse et turpe inceptum est 2 dic crite.

Ego amplius deliberandum censeo res magna est et nuncquid nos uis 2 fecistis probe incertior sum multo quam dedum et negant redisse 2 frater est expectandus mihi.

Hic quod mihi dederit de hac re consilium id sequar percutatutn ibo ad porcum quoad se recipiat.

E at ego antiphonem quaeram ut quae acta hic sint sciat at eccum video in tempore huc se recipere.

A antiphon B geta.

Adulescens servus.

A enim uero antiphon multis modis cum istoc animo es uiteperandus.
Itane te hinc abisse et ---m tuam tutandam allis dedisse alios tuam rem credidisti magis quam tette animaudersuros nam utut erat alia illi certe quae nunc tibi donisti consules

ne quid propter tuam fides decepta potestur nali cui nunc miserae specie obesque sunt in te omnes sitae 470

b et quidem ere nos iam dudum hic te absentee accusamus qui adieris

A --- ipsum quarebamus b sed ea causa nihilo magis depectimus a loquere obsevero quonam in L--o sunt res et fortunae maeae

-um quid patri subolet b nihil etiam a quid spei forrost b nescio a ah

B nisi phaedria haud cessauit pro te entii a nihii peciti

nou 475

B tum phormio itidem in hac re ut allis strenuum hominem phaebuat

A quid is peciti b confutavit ubris admodum iratum semem

a eu phormio b ego quod potui porro a mi geta omnis uos amo b sic habent principia sese ut dixi adhuc tranquilla res es

mansurques patrum pater est dum huc aduinent

480

a quid eum b ut aiebat

de eius consilio sese uselle facere quod hanc rem attinet

a quantum metus est mihi uidere huc saijom nunc patruum geta nam per etius unam ut audio aut iuiam aut moriar sententiam

b phaedria tibi adest a ubinam b eccum ab sua palaestra exit

485

f phaedria e dorio a antipho b geta

adulescens leno adulescens senus

dorio audio obsevero e non audio f parumper e quin omitte me

f audi quod dicam e at enim tabdet etiam audire eadem miliens f at nunc dicam quod lubenter e loquere audio

---M: the first four letters are blurred but the Ms. tradition reads UITAM

469 POTERETUR: letter O erased and A superimposed by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Io. (K.), by A2 (Mar.) to read PATERETUR

471 ACCUSAMUS: letters AC erased and IN superimposed by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Io. (K.) to read INCUSAMUS

472 ---: two letters at beginning of line blurred but Ms. tradition reads TE

473 LOQUERE: letters LO can be seen on 64r; L--O: two middle letters blurred but Ms. tradition reads LOCO
474 -UM: first letter blurred but Ms. tradition reads NUM
476 PRAEBUIT: word SE written above by corr. rec. (Pr.),
    by Iov. 2 (K.)
479 DIXI: word erased and DICO written by corr. rec. (Pr.),
    by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.)
481 AIEBAT: Mar. incorrectly states that A reads AIBAT
Non quoque te exorare ut maleas triduum hoc quo nunc abis e nirabar si tu mihi quiquum adferres nomi. A et metuo lenonen nequid suo duat capiti; b idem ego usabore norbium mihi credis e bario eae sin fidem do e fabula. Ferbaratum istuc beneficium pulcree tibi dices e loci crede mihi gaudebis facto uerum hercle hoc est e sornia experis non est longum e canti lenam canti 495 ut mihi cognatus tu parere de tu amicus tu e garde modo adeon ingenio esse duro te atque inexorabili ut neque misericordia neque precibus koliri queas adeon te esse incogitaten atque impudentem phaedria sine modo ut ne phaleratis duca dictis et mean ductis gratias 500 a miseritum si ei ueris uincor b quam uterque est similis sui neque antipho alia cum occupatus esset sollicitudine tum hoc esse mihi objectum malum a quid istuc est autem phaedria o fortunatis sine antipho a egone g qui quod amas domist neque cum hi tus modi umquam tibi usus uerit ut conflictarist malo 505 a mihin domist immo id quod aizent auribus teneo lupum nam neque quo facto me amittam neque uti remelam socio et ipsum istuc mihi in hoc est a heia ne parum leno siex nunc quid hic conficit g hicine quod homo inhumanissimus paphiliam mean uendi didit a quid uendi didit a amin evido uendi didit 510 uendi didit g quam indum facinus ancillam ere empto meo neque exorare ut ne maneat et cum illo ut mutet fidem triduum hoc dum id quod est promissum ab amicus argentum auffero

493: Prete states that the correction I occurs in this line but it is not visible in either the xerox or the microfilm. Prete suggests original text had IOCI
494 UERUM: above the first U, E written by Iov. (Pr.), (K.) to indicate that Dorio says the words UERUM... SORNA; SORNA; letter a crossed out and UN written above by Iov. (Pr.), (K.), by A2 (Mar.) to read SOMNITUM
503 A QUID: letter h written above Q by Iov. (Pr.), (K.) thereby making A represent speaker and first letter of Al
507 NE AMITAM: first N crossed out, letter M written above first A to read EAM, letter A written above first N of second word to read ANITAM. Corrections made by Iov. (Pr.), (K.)
511 G: G crossed out and E written above by Iov. (Pr.), (K.); INDUM: letters IGN written above DU by Iov. (Pr.) to read INDIGNUM
Si non sum dedero unam praeterea horam ne opperfus sties e optundis a haud longumst. id quod orat dorio exoret sines15 idem hic tibi quod boni promeritus fueris conplectuerit e urnalba istae sunt a pampillamine hic urbe priarii singes tunc praeterea eorum amorem distrahit poterin pati e neque ego neque tu t di tibi omnes id quod es dignus duint e ego te compluris aduersum ingeniun neum nunes tulli 520 pollicitantem et nihil ferentem flentem nunc contra omnia haec repperi qui det neque lacrum-etu da locum melioribus a certe hercle ego si satis commenmi tibi quidem est olum dies quam ad dares huic praestitutam t factum e num ego istud nego a iam ha praeteritit e non uerum haec ei antecessit e non pudent 525 te unaniatis e minime dub ob rem b stercinium r dorio itane tandem faceor operzet e sic sum si placeo utere a sic nunc decipis e immo enim uero antipho hic me decipit nam hic me huius modo sciabet esse ego nunc esse alter credidi iste me fepellit ego isti nihilo sum aliter ac ful 530 sed ut haec sunt tamen hoc faciam cras mane argentum mihi miles dare se dixit si mihi prior tu appetulum phaedria mea lege utar ut postor sit qui prior ad dandum. uale a phaedria a antipho b geta 533a adulescentes ii servu 533b a quid faciam unde ego nunc subito huic argentum inferiatur miser

515 OPTUNDIS: Ash. incorrectly cites A as reading OPTUNDIS
518 EORUM: letter E changed to H by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read HORUM
519 f: f changed to A by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov.2 (K.). Pr. says A had NEQUE TUM DI TIBE and that corr. ant. (?) Changed M of TUM to F
522 LACRUM-ET: letter A between M and E crossed out by A
526 f: f crossed out and A written above by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
533a A: first A crossed out and f written to left of it by corr. rec. (Pr.); 533b SERUU: obvious omission of second S at end of word on part of A
534 A: A crossed out and f written over it by corr. rec. (Pr.)
QUI MINUS NIHILOST QUOD HIC SI POTE FUisset- EXORARIER 535
TRIDUUM HOC PROMISSUM FUERAT A ITAN HIC PATIEMUR GETA
PIERI MISERUM QUI NE VDUM UT DIXIT ADPUBERIT CONTINER
QUIN QUOD OPUST BENEFICIUM RURSUM EI EXPERIEMUR REDDERE
B SCIO EQUIDEM ESSE AETOUM A AGE BDoG SOlus SEluare
HUNC POTOS
B QUID PACIAM A INENIAS ARGENTUM B CUPIO SED UNDE EDOCE 540
A PATER ADEST HIC B SCIO SED QUD TUM A AB DICTUM SAPIENTI
SAT EST
B ITANE A ITA B SANE HERCLE PULCHRE SUADES ETIAM TU HINC ABIS
NON TRIUMPHO EX Nuptiis Tuis Si NIHiL Nancisor MAl
NI ETIAM NUNC NE Huius CAUSA QUaERERE IN MALO IUEAS CRUCEM
A UERUM HIC DICT IT QUID EGO UOBIS ALIENUS SUM B Haud
545
Sed Parumus Est QUod OMNius NunC NODIS SUSCENSET SENex
NE INSTIGEMUS ETIAM UT NULLus LOCus RELINGUATUR PRECI
ALius AB OCULIS MEIS ILLAM IN IGNOTUM Aeduct Et LOCUM HEM
TUM IGITUR DUM LICET DUM ADSUM LOquIMINI NExum ANTIPO
CONTEMPLAMINI NE A QUAN OQ REM AUT QUODNAM FACTURUS
Cedo 550
Q ROQUO HIC ASFORTABITUR TERRARUM CERTUMST PERSEQUI
A UT PERIRE B DI BENE IObartANT QUOD AGAS PEDETEMPTIN TAMES
A UIDE SI QUD OPIS POTES ADFERRE HUIC B SI QUD QUID
A QUARE OBSECO
NE QUID PIUs MINUSUE FAXIS QUOD NOS POST PIGEAT GETA
B QUAREO SALIUS EST UT OPINOR UERUM EINIM METUO MALUM
555
A NOLI METUERE UNA TECUM BOMA MALA TOLERABIMUS
B QUANTUM OPUS EST TIBI ARGENTI LOQUERE (SOLAE TRIGINTA
HUI PERCARAST PHAEDRIA I GSTAE UERO UILLIS EST
B AGE AGE INUENTAS REDDAM I O LEPIDUM B APER TE HINC
I AM OPUS EST

539 EQUIDEM ESSE: between EQUIDEM and ESSE, six letters of HERCLE erased by A
540 SED UNDE: word ID written above by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
545 UOBIS ALIENUS: word GETA written above by Iov. (K.)
554 FAXIS: letter S crossed out and T written above by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
559 INUENTAS REDDAM: word EST written above by Iov. (Pr.)
B IAM PERIS SET OPUS EST MIHI PHORIONEM AD HANC REM
A PRÆSTOST AUDACISSIME ONERIS QUIDUIS IMPONE FERET
SOLUS EST HOMO AMICO AMICUS B EAMUS EGO AD EUM OCIOYS
A NUNC QUIST EST QUOD OPERA MEA UOBIS OPUS SIT B NIIHIL UERUM
ET ILLAM MISERAM QUAM EGO NUNC INTUS SCIO ESSE EXANATUM
METU
CONSOLARE CESSAS A NIHIL EST AUSE QUOD FACIAM LUBENS 565
Γ ΚΘΩ ΊΤΩ ΠΑΣΙΕΙ B DICAM IN TERRÆ SOD TE HINC AMOR

2 DEMIPHIO E CHREMÈS

2 QUID QUA PROFECTUS CAUSA HINC ES LEMNUM CHRÈME
ADDUXIT TECUM FILIAM E NON 2 QUID ITA NON
E POSTQUAM UIDET ME RIVUS MATER ESSE HIC DIUTIUS SIMUL AUTEM NON MANEAT AETAS VIRGINIS 570
HEAM NECLEGANTIAM IPSA CUM OMNI FAMILIA AD ME PROFECTAM ESSE AEBANZ 2 QUID ILLI IAM DIU QUIDERO IGITUR COMMORABERE USI ID AUDIERAS
E POL ME DETINUIT MORBUS 2 UNDE AUT QUI E ROCAS SENECTUS IPSAINT MORBUS SED UNISSÈ EAS SALVAES AUDIUS EX NATAE QUI ILLAS UFERAT 575
2 QUID CHATO OPTIGERIT ME ABSENTE AUDISTI CHRE E QUID QUIDEM ME FACIAM UI TULERO EXTRIO NAM HANC CONDICIONEM SI CUI TULERO EXTRIO QUID FACTO AUT UNDE MIHI SIT DICENDUM ORDINABE 580
TE MIHI PIDELEM ESSE AQUE AQUE ECONST SUM MIHI SCIABAM ILLI SI ME ALIENUS ADFINEM UOCET

561: Mar. and K. suggest line 561 was attributed to A by A but was given to Γ by A2 (Mar.); IMPONE FERET: word hic written above By Iov. (Pr.). In his app. crit., K. writes "IMPONI EFF. Iov. (?)."
572 ILLI: over second I and to the right, letter C written by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read ILLIC
577 CHRE: in his app. crit., Mar. states "A incertum"
579 CONDICIONEM: reference sign to scholia above first N
580 DICENDUM: first C crossed out and E written above by Iov. (Pr.) to read DICENDUM
582 UOCET: letter C crossed out and L added above by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read UOCET
TACEBIT DUM INTERCEDET FAMILIARITAS...

588 ESSE: word IPA written above by Iov. (Pr.), (K.)
593 OPUS: word OPUS crossed out at the end of the line and written above ESSE by corr. rec. (Pr.). In his app. crit., K. writes "OPUS post FIERET Al"
597 --------------: what A had is not clear. Letters DRIAE SE OSTENDERET written on and above the line by corr. rec. (Pr.), by A3 (Mar.)
604 INSTISI SI: Ash. states A as reading INSTISSI
BANIEHO AGIEA CHERAMES ZDAMIEO
ADULCESCENS SERVUS SENES
II
B EXSPECTO QUAM MAX RECIPIAT SERE GETA
SED PATRUM UIDEO CUM PATRRE ADSTANTEM EI MIHI
QUAM TINEO ADVENTUS HUIUS QUO INPELLAT PATREM
A ADISO VOSCE O SALUE HOSTER CHREME E SALUE GETA
A UERIRE SALUO QUGUP EST E CREDO A QUID AGITUR
E NULTA ADUERIENTI UT FIT NOVA HIC COMPLURIA
A ITA DE ANTIPHONE AUDISTIN QUAE FACTA E OONIA
A TUN DIXERAS HUIUC FACIUS INDIITUM CHRAME
SIC CIRCUMIRE I I D CUM HOC AGERAM COMMODUM
A HAM HERCLE EGO QUGOQUE TD AGITANS NECNUN SEDULO
615 INUEI OPINOR REMEDA HUIUC REI E QUID GETA
2 QUOD REMEDA A UT ABI ABS TS FIT FORTE OBIAUM
MIHI FAHRMO E QUI VHRMO Z SI QUI ISTAN E SCIO
A UISUM EST MIHI UT EUS TEMPITU SINTENTIAM
PINO RONINEM SOLUM CUR NON INQUAM PHORMIO
UIDES INER UOS SIC HARE POTIUS CUM BONA
UT COMPOHAN GRATIA QUAM CUM HALA
ERUS LIBERALIS EST ET FUGITANS LITIUM
NAM CETERI QUIDE HERCLE AMICI OMNES
UNO ORE AUTORES FUERE UT PRAEPIIPTEM HANC DARET 625
B QUID HIC COEPTAP AUT QUI QUADDET HODIE A N LEGIBUS
DATURUM FONIAS DICES SI ILLAM EIECERIT
IAM ID EXPLORATUMST. EIA SUDABIS SATIES
Si cum illo inceptas homine ea eloquentia est
uimum pono esse uictum eum at tandem tamen
non capis eius res agitur sed paciunia
postquam hominem his uerbis sentio mullirier
soli sumus nunc hic inquam ego quid uis dari
tibi in manum ut erus his desistat litibus
b sat iu lll i diu sunt propiti i a nam satis scio
si tu aliquam partem aequi bonique dixeris
ut est ille bonus uir tria non commutabilis
uerae hodie inter uos 2 quis te iustae iussit loqui

e immo non potuit melius peruenier

bo quos nos volumus b occidi 2 perge eloqui
a a prino homo insaniat et cedo quid postulat
a quid nimium quantum licuit e dic a si quis ei daret
talentum magnum 2 immo malum hercle nihil pudet
a quod dixi ad e ei queso quid si filiam
suam uniam locaret parui retulit
non suscepsisse inuentast quae dote petat
ut ad paucu redeam ac mittam illius inceptas
habe c denique eius fuit postrema oratio
ego iniqui principio amici filiam

ita ut aequou fuerat uolui uiorem ducere
nam mihi ueniebat in mentem eius incommoqui
in seruuitum pauperem additum dari
sed mihi ofus erat ut aperte tibi nunc fabuler

line 635 not written by a but supplied by corr.
rec. (pr.), by iov. (k.) in uncial letters. the
line reads: nec hic facessat tu molestus ne sies.
pr. incorrectly states... tum..
642 a: a crossed out by iov.? (k.), corr. rec.? (pr.)
644 nihil: word ut added above the line before
nihil by corr. rec. (pr.), by iov. (k.)
646 locaret: reference sign to scholia above the

bottom line: pr. says this line is written in
semi-cursive italic uncharacteristic of the seventh century. he notes
that the last word contains an error
and it is not easy to establish what
the corrector intended to write; after
the letters si (of sies) an l
seems to be cancelled out. then an
es follows. the meaning of the final
letters ha is found on the introd-
cutory page of lowe, cla 1 (x).
ALIQUANTUM QUAE ADFERRET UT DISSOLUEREM DARE QUANTUM AB HAC ACCIPIO QUAES IPSA SAINT MHI NULLAM MIHI NULLAM IANUS IATXIUX VORUM DARI

B UTREM STULTITIA FACERE HAC AN MALITIA DIFICAM SCIENTEM AN INPRUDENTEM INCERTUM SUM

Z QUID SI ANIMAM DEBET A AGER OPPOSITUS PIGNORI OB DECEN MINAS EST Z AGE AGE IAM DUCAT DABO

A AEDICULAE ITEM SUNT OB DECEN ALIAS Z OTIE NIMIUNST E NE CLAMA PETITO NASCE A ME DECEN

UXORI EMUNDA ANCTILLILAST FUM PLUSCOLA

SUPERFELICTILE OPUS EST SUMPTUM AD NUPTIAS HIS REBUS SANE PONE INQUIT DECEN MINAS

Z SESCENTAS PRONDE SCRIBITO MIHI DICAS NIIHEL DO ILLLE UT ETIAM INRIDEAT

E QUESO EGO DABO QUESCE TU MODO FILIUM FAC UT ILLAM DUCAT NOS QUAM UOULUMUS B EI MIHI GETA OCCIDISTI ME TUIS FALLACIS

E MEA CAUSA EICITUR ME HOC EST ABQUM AMITERE A QUANTUM POTESSE ME CERTOREM INQUIE FACE SI ILLAM DANT HUC UT TAM NE INCERTUS SIEM

NAM ILLI MIHI DOTH1 IAM CONSTITUERUNT DARE Z IAM ACCIPIT ILLIS REPUDIUM RENUNTIET DUCAT A QUAE QUIEM ILLI RES UORTAT MALE

E OPPORTUNE ADEO ARGENTUM NUNC MECUM ATTULI

661 PIGNORI: after this word, EST added by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)

662 EST: word crossed out and added at the end of line 661 by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)

666 SUMPTUM: words OPUS EST repeated above the line before SUMPTUM by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)

668 PRONDE: letter E added above PR and 0 crossed out by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.) to read PERINDE; MIHI: word IAM added above the line before MIHI by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)

670 FILIUM: letter M crossed out and S added by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Ash.) to read FILLIUS

675 TAM: letter T added above the line before TAM, letter 1 added before TAM and T added above 72 by Iov. (K.), (Mar.) to read MITTAM. Pr. notes only MT corrections by corr. rec. to read MITTAM
FRUCTUM QUEM LEMNI UXORIS REDDUN V PRAEDIA
INDE SUMUM UXORI TIDI OPUS ESSE DIXERO
B ANTIPO A GETA
ADULESCENS SERUUS

B GETA A HEM B QUID EGIsti A EMUNXI ARGENTO SENES
B SATINE EST A NESCIO HERCLE TANTUM TUSSS SUM
B ERO UEBRERO ALIUD MIHI RESPONDAS AC ROGO
A QUID ERGO NARRAS B QUID EGO NARREM OPERA TUA
AD RESTIM MIHI QUIDEM RES REDIT PLANISSIME
UT TE QUIDEM OMNES DI DAEQUE SUPERI INFERI
MALI EXEMPLIS PENDAM EM SI QUID UELIS
HUC MANDES QUOD QUIDEM RECTUM UELIS
QUID MINUS UTILE FUIT QUAM HOC UOLNUS TANGERE
AUT NOMINARE UXOREM INICTA EST SPES PATRI
POSSIS ILLAM EXTENDI CEDO NUNC FORO PHOBIO
DOTEI SI ACCIPIET UXOR DUCENDA EST DOMUM
QUID FIET A NON ENIM Ducet B NOUI CETERUM
CUM ARGENTUM REPETET NOSTRA CAUSA SCLICIT
IN NERIUM POTIUS IBIT A NIhil EST ANTIPO
QUIN MALE NARRANDO POSSIT DEPRAVARIER
TU ID QUOD BONI EST EXCERPTUS QUOD MALI EST
AUDI NUNC CONTRA IAM SI ARGENTUM ACCEPERIT
DUCENDA EST UXOR UT AIS CONCEDO TIBI
SPATIUM QUIDEM TANDEM APPARANDAS NUPTIAS
UCANDI SACRIFICANDI DABITUR PAULULUM

681 INDE: cancel marks over N and E by Iov. (K.)
to read ID
683 EST: word id written above by Iov. (Pr.), (K.)
690 UOLNUS: letters 0 and N crossed out and C
written above N by corr. rec. (Pr.),
by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Ash.) to read UOLCUS
701 APPARANDAS: letter I written above last A by
corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read APPARANDIS; NUPTIAS: letter I
written above last A by corr. rec. (Pr.),
by Iov. (K.) to read NUPTIIS
702 SACRIFICANDI: first I converted to E by corr.
rec. (Pr.) to read SACRIFICANDI
nique est quoam ego curabo ne quid usurborum duit
cum temere nunquam amittam ego a me quin nihilo testis

z quiet est inquam ego curabo ne quid usurborum duit
hoc temere nunquam amittam ego a me quin nihilo testis

z cum dem et quam ob rem dem connemorabo a ut cautust ubi
nihilo opus 715
e atqui ipsa opus factost. et matura dum libido eadem haec

z nam si altera illae magis instatit forsitan nos recitai
z rem ipsam putasti duc me ad eum ergo a non moror e ubi hoc
egris

transito ad uxorem meam ut conveniat haec prius quam hinc

z dicat eam dare nos phormion'i nuptum ne suscenseat
z et magis esse illum idoneum qui ipsi sit: familiarior
z nos nostro officio non digressos esse quod eventus in talibus
z magis instatit forsitan nos recitai
z rem ipsam putasti duc me ad eum ergo a non moror e ubi hoc

z demi phys non satiss est tuum te officium fecisse si non id pama

z uolo ipsius quoque volunlata haec fieri ne se electam

praecidet 725
Z IDEM EGO ISTUC FACERE POSSUM E MULIER MULIERI MAGIS CONSEMIT
Z ROGABO E UDI ILLAS NUNC EGO REPERIRE POSSIM COGITO
Θ SOPHRONA E CURINES
NUTRIX SENEX

Θ QUID AGAM QUEM NIHI AMICUM INUENTIAN MISERA AUT QUO CONSILIA HAECE

REFERAM AUT UNDE AUXILIIUM PETAM

NAM UEREOR ERA NE OB MEUM SUASUM INDICNA INUIRIA

ADIFICIATUR 730

ITA PATREM ADULESCENTIS FACTA HAECE TOLERARE AUDIO UIOLENTER

E NAM QUAE HAECE ANUS EST EXAMINATA A FRATRE QUAE EGRESSAS

Θ QUOD UT FACEREM EGESTAS NE INPULIT CUM SCIEM INFRANAS

NUTPIAS

HASCE ESSE UT ID CONSULEREM INTEREA UITA UT IN TUTO FORET

CERTE EDEPOL MISI NE ANIMUS FALLIT AUT PARUM PROSPLICENT

OCULI 735

MEA NUTRICEM GNATAE VIDE Θ NEQUE ILLE INVESTITUR

E QUID AGO

Θ QUI EST EUS PATER Θ ADEO MANEO DUM HAECE QUAE LOQUITUR

Θ QUOD SI EUM NUNC REPERIRE POSSIM NIHI EST QUOD UEREBAM

E EAST IPSA

CONQUAM Θ QUIS HIC LOQUITUR Θ SOPHRONA

Θ ET MEUM NOMEN NOMINAT

Ε RESPICE AD ME Θ DI OBSECRUE UOS ESTME HIC STILPHIO Θ NON

Θ NEGAS 740

Ε CONCEDE HINC A FORIBUS PAULLUM ISTORSUM SODES SOPHRONA

Ε ME ISTOC POSTHAC NOMINE APPELLASSIS Θ QUID NON OBSECRUE UOS

ΕSEMPER TE ESSE DICITASTI Θ ET QUID HAS METUIS FORES

Ε CONCLAMAM HIC UABEO UXOREM SAEVUM UERUM ISTUC DE NOMINE

Ε OERPERAM OXIO IUXII NE UOS FORTE INFRANITARES FORIS 745
EFFUTTIBETIS ATQUE ID PORRO ALIQUA UXOR MEA RESCISCERET
E ISTOC POL NOS TE TIC INVENIRE MISERAEC NUNQUAM POTUIMUS
E BEO DIC NIHI QUID SEI TIBI EST CUM FAMILIA FAC EXIS
UBI ILLAE SUIT Q MISERAM ME E HEM QUID EST UISQUTE
Q UIUIC GNATA
MATREM IPSAM EX AEGRITUDINE HAC MISERAM MORS CONSEICUTA
EST 750
E MALE FACTUM Q EGO AUTEM QUAE ESSEN ANUS DESERTA ARGENS
IGNOTA
UT POTUI UIRGINEM NUPTEM LOCAUI HUC ADULESCENTI
HARUM QUI EST DOMINUS AEDlUM E ANTIPHONIN Q EM ISTI IPSI
Q QUI DUAS UXORES HABET Q AU OBSECRO UNAM ILLE QUIDEM
HANC SOLAM
Q QUID ILLAM ALTERAM QUAEB DICTUR Cognata q HAEc PROGET
Q QUID AIS 755
Q COMPOSITO FACTUMST QUO MODO HANC AMANS HABERE POSSET
SINE DOTE E DI UESTRAN FIDEM QUAM SABEP FORTE TEMERE
BUENTUNT QUAEB NON AUDDEA OPTARE OFFENDI ADUENTIENS
QUOCUM YOLEBAM ET UT YOLEBAM CONLOCATAM AMARI
QUOD NAMO OPERE MAXIMO DABAMUS OPERAM UT YIERET 760
SINE NOSTRA CURA MAXIMA SUA CURA SOLUS FECIT
Q HANC QUID OPUS FACTO SIT UIDE PATER ADULESCENTIS UENIT
E HANC CAUE RESCISCAT
Q QUIDAM
Q NEMO E ME SCRIBIT E SEQUERE ME TINTS CETERA AUDIES 765
Z DEMIPHO A GETA
Z NOSTRAPTE CULPA FACIMUS UT MALIS EXPEDIAT ESSE
Z DOMINUM DICI NOS BONOS STUDERUS ET BENIGNOS

761 SOLUS: letters US erased and A superimposed by corr.
rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read SOLA. K. attributes LA to Iov.
766 MALIS: letter I changed to 0 by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.) to read MALOS
ita fugias ne praeter casam quod dicunt nonne id satis erat accipere ab illo iniuriam etiam arguentum. ultro objectum ut sit qui utuat dum alium aliquid flagitii conficiat 770
a — anissime 1is nunc praecum qui quin praecum faciunt a — -- anissime 5 ut stultissime quidem ille rem gesserimus
a nodo ut hoc consilio possint discidi ut istam ducat z etiamne id dubium? a haud scio hercle ut homost an mutet animum z item mutet autem a nescio umerum si porter dico 775
z sic faciam ut praeter censur1 ut uxorem eius hoc adducan cuh iste ut loquantur tu geta abi prae nuntia hanc uenturam a arguentum inuentum: phaedri de uergio siletur praecium est ne in praesenti haec hinc asebat quid nunc porbo
quid fiet in eodem luto haesitas uorsuram solues 780
geta praeseens quod fuerat malum in diem abit plagae crescunt nisi prospicis nunc hinc donum 1do ac phanum edocebo ne quid uereatur phormionem aut eius orationem
demipho b nausistrata
senex mulier
age dum ut soles nausistrata fac illa ut placetur nobis ut sua uoluntate id quod est faciundum faciat b factum 785
z pariter nunc opera me adiures ac re dudum opitulata es b factum uolo ac pol minus quod uiri uiri quam me dignum z quid autem b quia pol mei patris bene parata indigentem tutatur nam ex iis praediiis talenta arguentittina bina
statim capiebat uir uto quid praestat z binan quaebo

768 praeter: letters mittas written above the line after praeter by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read praetermittas; dicunt: letters dic erased and ia superimposed by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read alint
770 conficiat: second i crossed out, letter n written above the line and the c changed to an uncial g (according to ms. tradition) have disappeared. Iov. does not touch the codex here (Pr.)
771a — anissime: traces of the character designation a remain but the first two letters of the first word fl (according to ms. tradition) have disappeared. Iov. does not touch the codex here (Pr.)
772 — anissime: first two letters of the first word utr (according to ms. tradition) not visible due to page damage
776 SIC: word SIC (?) erased and ITA superimposed by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.)
780 UORSURAM: letter O erased and E superimposed by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read UERSURAM
790 UIR: word EM written above UIR by Iov. (Pr.), (K.), by A2 (Mar.)
BACRESBUS UILLORIBUS MUTO TAMES TALENTA BINA Z HUN.

B QUID HANC UDENTUR Z SCILICET B UTRUM ME NAT UELLEM
EGO OSTENDERE N CERTO SCIO B QUO FACTO Z PARCE SODES
UT POSSIS CUM ILLA ME TE ADULESCENS MULIER DEFIGEAT.

B NAUSISTRA E CREMES Z DEMPHO
MULIER SENECA.

B FABIAM UT IUBES SED NEUM UTRUM ABS TE EXIRE VIDE
E HOM DEMPHO.

IAM ILLI DATUM EST ARGENTUM Z CURAUI ILICO E HOM NOLLE
DATUM.
EI VIDE OUXOREM PAENG PLUS QUAM SAT ERAT Z CUR NOLLES
CHERMES.
B IAM RECTE Z QUID TU EQUID LOCUTUS CUM ISTAC QUOD REM
HANC DUCIM--
E TRANSEGI Z QUID AIT TANDEM Z ABDUCI NON POTEST Z QUI NON
POTEST.
E QUIA UTERQUE UTRIOE EST CORDI Z QUID ISTUC NOSTRA
E MAGN PRIAPERTHAC.

COGNATAM COMPERI ESSE NOBIS Z QUID DELIRAS Z EIC ERIT
NON TEMERE DICO REDI MECUM IN MEMORIAM SATINE SANS ES
B AU OBSERO UIDE NE INCOGNATAM PECCES Z NON EST E NI NEGA
PATRIS Nomen ALIUT DUCTUM EST HOC T ERRASTI Z NON NORAT
PATREM.

E NORAT Z CUR ALIVT DIXIT E NUMQUAM HODIE CONEDES.
NEQUE INTELLEGES Z SI TU NIHIL NARRAS E PERDIS B MIROR
QUID HOC SIET.

B UT PROFELOR ILLI QUAM EGO SUM AC TU NEMOST Z DI UESRAM
EAMUS AD IPSAM UNA OMNIS NOS AUT SCIRE AUT NESCIRE HOC
UOLO E AH.

Z QUID EST E ITAN PARAUS MINI FIDEM ESSE APTE Z TE Z UIN ME
UIN SATIS QUESITUM MINI ISTUC ESSE AGE FIAT QUID ILLA
FILLA.

AMICI NOSTRI QUID FUTURUMST E RECTE Z HANC IGITUR MITTIMUS
E QUID HI Z ILLA MANET E SIC E IRE IGITUR TIBI LICET
NAUSISTRA.

Z EQUIDEM HERCLE NESIOI UIN SCIRE AT ITA ME SERUET
IOPPITER.

106

792 NAT UELLEM: letters UM written above the line after
NAT by Iov. (Pr.) to read NATUEN. Har.
correctly states A as reading
NATUELEMM.
793 CERTO: K incorrectly states “CERTE A2…”
798 DUCIM--: last two letters US (according to Ms. tradition) not visible due to page damage

802 MEMORIAM SATINE: space left in A for rubricator to write character designation unfilled until added corr. rec. (Pr.)

803: Pr. suggests Z as an object of correction by corr. rec. but no other editor mentions it. Further, no such correction is visible on microfilm or xerox

804 DUCTUM: letter I written above the first U by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read DICTUM

806 SIET: K. and MAR. incorrectly state "EST A2..."

807: line omitted from rightful place but written after last line of the folium, line 813. Notice of omission given by a mark in the margin between lines 806 and 808 by . Before UIN SCIRE, E erased (Pr.)
AB ANTIPO
ADULESCENS

B LAETUS SUM UT MEAE RES SESE HABENT PRATRI OPTIGISSE QUOD
VOLT 820

QUAM SCITUNST: IBIUS MODI IN ANIMO PARE CUPIDITATES
QUAS CUM RES ADURGAE SIET AN PAULU MEDUM POSSE
HIC SIMUL ARGENTUM REPERIT C URA SESE EXPEDIVIT
EGO NULLO POSSEME REMEDIO ME EVOLUERE HX HIS TURBIS
QUIN SI HOC CELEUTUR IN METUS SIN PATEST IN PROBO SIEM
NEQUE ME DOMUM NUNC RECIPERE MIHI ESSE OSTE NTA
HUIUSCE HABENDAE SED UBINAM GETAM INVENIRE POSSUM
UT ROGEN QUOD TEMPUS CONVENIUNT FARIIS ME CAPERE SIRADEAT

Y PHORMIO B ANTIPO
PARASITUS ADULESCENS

Y ARGENTUM ACCEPI TRADIDI LENONI ADUXI MULIERE:
CUPRINTI PIPOUTA PHAEDRIA POTERUT NAM EMPISSAT
MANU 830

NUNC UDA MIHI RES ETIAM RESTAT QUAE EST CONFINCIENDA OPTUM
AB SENIBUS AD HABEAM NAM ALIQUOD HOC SUMAS DIES

B SED PHORMIOST: QUID AIS Y QUID B QUIDNAM NUNC FACTURUS
PHAEDRIA

817: Pr. suggests M as a correction in a word on this
line. Presumably, he is referring to a "touch up"
of the M of the last word, HEM
821 PARE: letters RE written above the line after PARE
by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read PARE. First E
was supposed to be changed to A to read
PARE
Quo facto satietatem amoris ait se uelle absumere
y uicissim partis tuas acturus est b quas y ut fugiport
a patrem 835
t e suas rocavuit rursum ut ageres causam ut pro se diceres
n am potaturus est. Art pe me ego me ire senibus unum
dicam ad mercatum ancillullam emptum quan dudum dixit
aget ne cum hic non uideant me conficerere credant arguentum suum
set ostium concruequit. Abst e te b uide qui egreditur y getast
a geta b antipho y phormio
seruus adulescens parasitus
a o fortuna o fons fortuna quantis commoditatis
841 quam subito me ero antiphoni ope uestra hunc onerastis
diem
b quid nam hic sibi uolt a nosque amicos eius exonerabis
metu
sed ego nunc mihi cesso qui non uemurum hunc onerum pallio
adque hominem proprio inuenire ut haec quae configerit
sciat 845
b nunc tu intelliges hic quid hic narety num tu b nilil
y tautundem ego
a ad lenonem hinc ire pergam ibi nunc sunt b heus geta
num mirum aut nouo est reuocare cursum quod institueris
b geta
a pergit hercle numquam tu odio tuo me uinces b non manes
a uapula b id quidem tibi iam fiet nisi restitatis uberboru
850 a familiarirorem oportet esse hunc mitatur malum set isne
est quem quaero an non ipsus est congeriari actum b quid
est
a o omnium quantum est qui uuiont homo hominum ornatisine
nam sine controversia ab dis solus diligere antipho
b ita uelimit sed quid istuc credam ita esse mihi rect
uelim 855
a satine est si te dilibutum caudio reddo b enicas

834 absumere: letters AB crossed out by Iov. (K.), by
corr. rec. (Pr.) to read suumere
836 suas: letter M written over second S by corr. rec.
(Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Ash.) to read suam
837 senibus unum: the initial S of the second word left
out by a
838 quan dudum: Mar. incorrectly states “dudum quan”
846 Nunc: second N crossed out and M added by corr. rec.
(Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read num(C)
849 PERGIT: letter T crossed out and S written above by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read PERGIS
850 UAPULA: letters BIS written above by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.), (Ash.) to read UAPULADIS
851 MITATUR: letters NI written above by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read MINITATUR
852 CONGREDIARE: letter A crossed out and I changed to E by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read CONGREDERE
853 ORNATISSIME: letter N crossed out and NO written above OR by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.) to read ONORATISSIME
854 DILIGERE: after the second E, above the line is an I by A (Pr.) and above this I is an S by corr. rec. (Pr.). These observances are made by no other editor.
Ut modo arguentum Tibi dedimus. Aput forum recta donum sumus profecti interea mittit erus me ad uxorem tuam 860. Quam ob rem a onitio prolocui nam nihil ad hanc rem est antipho.

Ubi in gymnacium ire occultio pius ad me accurrit nida fone reprehendit pallio resupinat respicio rogo quam ob rem retineat me att esse utitum intro ad eram accedit.

Sophronia modo pratern huc inquit senis introduxit.

Cremem 865 emoque nunc esse intus cum illis hoc ubi ego audiei ad porsus.

Suspenso gradu placide ire perexi accessi assitit animam compressi aurem admoi ita animum coepi attendere hoc modo sermonem captans et egeta a hic pulcherrimum facinus audii itaque paene hercle exclamauit gaudio 870. Quod a quod nam arbitare b nescio a atqui mirificissimum patruus tuus est pater indeus phario uxorii tuae

Quid ais a cum eius conuehit olim matre in lenem clanculum.

Y somnium utin haec ignoraret suum patrem a aliquid credito phormio esse causae sed men censo potiusse omen. 875 inteligere extra ostium intus quae inter esse ipsi egrinit.

B atque ego quoque inaudui illam fabulam a immo etiam daboe quo hagis credas patruus interea inde huc egreditur foras haud multo post cum pater inde recipit se intro dixit ait uterque tibi potestatatem eius adhibendae dare 880. Denique ego missus sum te ut requirerem atque adducerem.
PHORM.

B QUIN ERGO RAPE ME QUID CFSSAS A FECERO B HEUS PHORMIO
VALE Y VALE ANTI PHI BENE ITA ME DI AMEN FACTUM GAUDEO
Y PHORMIO

PARASITUS

Y TANTAM FORTUMAN DE INPROQUIO ESSE HIS DATAM
SUMMA ELUENDI OCCASIOST MIHI NUNC SENES
ET PHAEDRIAE CURAM ADIMERE ARGENTARIAM
NE QUOTQUAM SUORUM AEQUALIUM SUPPLEX SIET
NAM IDEM HOC ARGENTUM ITA UT DATUMST- INGRATII
EX DATUM ERIT HOC QUI COGAM RE IPSA REPPERI
NUNC GESTUS MIHI VOLUTOQUE EST CAPIENDUS NODOS
SED HINC CONCEDAM IN ANTI FORTUM HOC PROXIMUM
INDE HISCE OSTENDAM ME UBI ERUNT EGRESSI FORAS
QUO ME AD SIMULARAM IRE AD MERCATUM NON EO

Z DEMI PHI E CHREMES Y PHORMIO

SENES II

PARASITUS

Z DIS MAGNAGNAS MERITO GRATIAS HABEO ATO ANQUO
QUANDO EUE NARE HAC EST PROSPERAE
QUANTUM POTEST NUNC CONVENIENDUS EST PHORMIO
PRIUS QUAM DI LAPIDAT NOSTRAS TRIGINTA MINAS
UT ABFERAMUS Y DEMIPHONEM SI DOMINUS
UT QUOD AD NOOS AD TE EBAMUS PHORMIO
Y DE EADEM HAC FORTASSE CAUSA Z ITA HERCLE Y CREDIDI
QUID AD ME IBATIS Z RIDICULUM Y UEREBAMINI
NE NON ID FACEREM QUOD RECEPISSE SEMEL

882 HEUS: HEUS crossed out and words O MI written above by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
Heus quanta quanta iaec ne paupertas est tamen
adhib curaudi unum hoc quidem ut mihi esset fides
Z estne ita ut dixi liberalis e oppido
Y idque adeo unio ad uos nuntiatum demipho
paratum ne esse ubi volitis uxorut date
Nam omnis posthuius mihi res ita ut par fuit
Postquam id tantisper e uol uelle animaduerteram
Z ad hic dehortatus est me ne illam tibi darem
Nam qui erit rumor populi inquit si id feceris
Olim cum honeste potuit tum non est data
Eam nullum extrudit turpem ferme eadem omnia
Quae tute dudum coram me incusaueras
Y satius superbe induititis me 2 qui y rogas
Quia ne alteram quidem illam potero ducere
Nam quo re redibo ad eam quam contemptor
E tum autem antiphenem video ad se ne amittere
Initium eam inique 2 tum autem video filium
Initium sane mulierem ab se amittere
Sed translodes ad forum atque illus mihi
Argentum Cursorium iube rescribit Phormio
Y quodne ego disciplsi porbo illis quius debui
Z quid igitur fiat y si uis mihi uxorere dare
Quam despondisti ducam sin est ut uelis
Manere illam aput te hos hic maneant demipho
Nam non est aequum ne propter uos decipi

915 SATIS: letter N written above second S by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.) to read SATIN
917 RE: letter O written above the line before RE by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
921 ILLUS: letter T added above the line after ILLUS by A (Pr.)
925 SIN: letter N written above I by A (Pr.)
Cum ego uestri honoris causa repudiant alterae
remiserim quae dotis tactualum daban
z i in malam rem hiunc cum istanc magnificentiam
fugisse etiam hunc credidisse te ignorantem
aut tua facta adeo y inritor t zur hanc duceress
si tibi daretur y fac pericum z ut filius
cum illa habit aput te huc uestrum consilium fuit
ye quaeso quid narras z quin tu mihi argentum cedo 935
y inno uero uxorom tu cedo z in ius ambula
y in ius enim uero si porro esse odiose pergitis
z quid facies y spondeos me indotatis modo
patrocinari fortasse arbitramini
etiam dotatis soleo y quid id nostra y nihil
hic quandam noram cuius uir uxorem e hem z quid est
y lemn habit aliain e nullus sum y ex qua fi lam
suscepit et eam clamat educat e sepultus sum
y haec adeo illi tam demanis y obsecro
ne facias y oh tune is eras z ut ludos factit
et missum te factimus y fabulae et quid uts tibi
argentum quod habes condonamus te y audito
quid uos malum ergo me st lucificabamini
inempta uestra puerili sententia
nolo uolo uolo nole rursum cape cedo 945
quod dictum indictumst. quod modo erat ratum inritumst
z quo facto aut unde haec hic rescuet z nescio

930 istanc: letter N crossed out by corr. rec. (Pr.)
to read ISTANC
934 HABIT: letters ET written above the line after
habitat by corr. rec. (Pr.), by iov. (R.) to
read HABITAT
945 ERAS Z UT: Z written above the two words by
rubricator (Pr.)
951 DICTUM: letter D added above the line before the
I by A (Pr.)
Non hoc publicitus scelus hunc asportarius
in solas terras e in id redactus sum loci
ut quid agam illo nesciam prorsum e ego scio
in ius eamus y in ius huc si quid iubeb
e adsequere retine dum ego huc seruos euoco
z enim nequeo solus accurrere e una injuriaest
tecum z lege agito ergo y alterast tecum chrem
e rape hunc y sic acitis enim ueo uocest opus
nausistrata exit e os opprimem uide
quantum uale y nauisstrata inquam z non taces
y tacean e nisi sequitur pugnos inueniarem ingere
y uel oculum excule est ubi uos ulciscar probe

B NAUSISTRATE E CHREMES Z SEMIPHO Y PHORMIO
MULIER SENES II PARASITUS

B QUI NOMINAT ME HEM QUID ISTUC TURBAEST OBSERECO
990
M I UR Y HEM QUID NUNC OBLISTUPISTI B QUIS HIC HOMOST
NON NIHI RESPONDES Y HICINE UT TIBI RESPONDENT
QUI HERCLE UBI SIT- NESCIT E CAUE ISTI QUIQUAM CREPAD
Y ABI TANGE SI NON TOTUS FRIGET ME ENICA
E NIHIIL EST B QUID ERO QUID ISTIC NARRAT Y IAM
SCIEN
AUSCULETA E PERGIN CREDERE B QUID EGO OBSECCO HUC
CREDAM QUI NIHIIL DIXIT Y DELIRAT Miser
TIMORE B NON POL TEMEREST QUOD TU TAM TIMES
E ECON TIMEO Y RECTE SANE QUANDO NIHIIL TIMES
ET HOC NIHIIL EST QUOD EGO DICO TU NARRA Z SCLELS 1000

988 INUENIREM: second I changed to T by corr. rec.
990 HEM...UIR: written above the line before
(Pr.) to read IN UENTREM
Hem by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.),
by AZ (Mar.) pointing to the name of
Chremes and indicating that he speak
these words
TIBI narræt y quale tu factumst. abs te sedulo pro fratre B mi non mihi dices et B quid at E non opus est dicto y tibi quidem at. scito hic opust in lemma 2 iem quid ats. 2 non taces y clam te B et mihi.

Y UXOREM DUXIT B MI HOMO DI HELIUS DUINT

Y SIC FACTUMST B PERI MISERA Y ET INDE FILIAM

SUSCEBIPIT IAM UART DUM TU DORMIS E QUID AGINUS

B PRO DI IMMORTALIS FACTUS MISERANDUM ET MALUM

Y HOC ACTUMST B AN QUICQUAM HODIEST FACTUM INDIGNIUS

QUI MIHI AD UXORES UENTUST. TUM FIUNT SENES

1010 DEMIPHO TE APPELLO NAM CUM HOC IPSO DISTAEBAT LOQUI

HABEAT ERANT IPONES CEREBRA ET MANSIONES DIUTINAE

LENNI HABCINE ERAT EA QUAE NOSTROS MINUIT FRUCTUS ULLITAS

Z EGO NAUSISTRAEA ESSE IN HAC RE CULPAM MERMIT NON NEG

SED EA QUIN SIT IGNOSCENDA Y UERBA FIUNT MORTUO

1015 Z NAM NEQUE NECLENTIA TUA NEQUE ODO ID FECIT TUA

UNDOLENTUS FERE ABHINC AHIUS QUIDECIM MULTICULAM

EAM COMPRSIT UNDE HARC NATAST NEQUE POSTILLA UQUAM

ATTIGIT

EA MORTE OBIIT DE MEDIO ABIIT QUI FUIT IN RE FACIPULUS

QUAM OB REM TE ORO UT ALIA FACTA TUA SUNT AHIUE ANIMO HOC

FERAS 1020 B QUID EGO AEUQO ANIMO CUPIO MISERA IN HAC RE IAM DEFUNGER

SED QUID SPEREM PORRO MINUS PECCTRUM PUDUM

IAM TUM ERAT ENEXENCTUS SI VEERCUDOS FACIT.

AN MEA FORMA ATQUE AETAS HINC MAGIS QUINT TUNC EXPETENDAST

DEMIPHO

1003 EST DICTO: between these two words, letter O crossed out by A

1009 B:B written above the line before AN by rubricator (Pr.)

1011 CUM: letters NE written above by corr. rec. (Pr.), by

Iov. letter L to read NECUM: IPSO

word crossed out by Iov. (K.)

1014 MERITUM: letter U crossed out and A written above by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.)

to read MERITAM

1015 QUIN: letter N crossed out by Iov. (K.), (Mar.)

by corr.

rec. (Pr.) to read QUI

1019 DE: letter D crossed out by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov.

(K.) to read E

1022 PUDIC: letter D crossed out and T added above by corr.

rec. (Pr.) to read PUDIC

1024 QUAM TUNC: words crossed out by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
Quid mihi hic adhers quam ob rem exspectem aut sperem porro non fore 1025
exsequias chremetii quibus est commodum ire in tempus est sic dabo aeg nunc phormignon qui uiget laccisitio faxo tali sit pactatus atque hic est infortunio redeat sane in gratiam supplianti satis est mihi habebi haec ei quod sum vitatu usque ad aremen ogonianit 1030
b at neo merito credo quid ego nunc ea commoratem demipho singularis qualis ego in hunc fuenim s noui aequo omnia tecum b meriton hoc meo uidentur factum z minime gentium uerum iam quando accusando fieri infectum non potest ignoce orat conpitetum purgat quid uis amplius 1035
y enim uero prius quam haec dat ueniam mihi prospiciam et phaedriae

heus nausistrata prius quam huic responds temere audi b quid est y ego minas tringinta per fallaciam ab illoc abstuli eas dedit tuo gnatio ist pro sua amica lenone dedit e hem quid ails b adeon hoc inignum tibi uidetur filius 1040
homo adolescentem si habet unam amicum tu uoxres duas nihil pudere quo ore illum obturgabiis respondet mthi z faciet ut uola b immo ut iemn iam scias sententiam neque ego ignoce neque promittit quicquam neque respondes prius quam gnatum uidero siue iudicio permittit omnia 1045
quod ist iubebit faciab y mulier sapiens es nausistrata b satint tibi est y immo uero pulchre disceto et probe

1026: character designation Y added at the beginning of the line by corr. rec. (Pr.)
1031 EA: EA crossed out by Iov. (K.)
1033 MERITON: letter N written above the line after MERITO by A (Pr.), by A2 (Mar.)
Et praeter spem B tuum nomen dic quid est y mihi
vestrae familiae hercle amicus et tuo summis phaedriae
phormio at ego ecastor posthac quod potero quod uoles
factamque et dicam y benigne dicis B pol meritumst tuum
y uin primum hodie facere quod ego gaudeam nausistrata
et quod tuo uiro oculi doleant B cupio y ne ad cenam uoca
B pol uiro uoco y eamus intro hic B fiat set ubi est
phaedria
iudex nostre y iam hic faxo aderit uos ualete et
plaudit

1050 B: traces of the letter are barely visible in the
left margin
1055 Q: the sign used by the scribe for "cantor";
plaudit: there is no indication of a final E in
plaudit in the Bembine codex
CHAPTER III.

BEMBINE SCHOLIA IN THE PHORMIO

Guide to Reading the Scholia

In presenting this transcription of the scholia of the Bembinus, I have employed the following procedure: words explained or referred to in the scholia (lemmata), I have supplied in capital letters. When the scholiast himself has written out a lemma, I have separated it from the scholium by a colon (e.g. fol. 53v line 9 olim is taken from the text, rewritten by the scholiast, and commented upon). To afford ready comprehension, a solidus indicates the end of each line of scholium (/). The numbers in the left margin correspond to the line numbers in the Codex Bembinus. I have placed a dot under all letters unable to be read with certainty. In pointed brackets, < >, I have added letters and words for which there is no evidence in the manuscript. Included also in such brackets are the expansions of abbreviations. In parentheses, ( ), I have included explanations of orthography. In square brackets, [ ], I have provided words no longer legible.

1The last work on the scholia was done by J. F. Mountford (cf. page 23) more than forty years ago. It was accompanied by no facsimiles.
either because the ink has faded or because the margin
has been torn.²

I have found no indication that a translation of
the Scholia Bembina has been made in any language. My
investigation is supported by Dr. Sesto Prete who, in a
letter to me dated March 9, 1976 from the University of
Kansas, wrote, "I do not think that the Bembine Scholia
of (the) Phormio have ever been translated."

²I have adopted supplements from Mountford who has
adduced parallels from the Terence Commentaries of Dona-
tus and Eugraphius and the Vergil Commentaries of Servius
and Servius Danielis.
The Scholia of the Phormio are in "hand 2".

Top Margin:
1 [haec acta e]st ludis Megalensibus Chorinto (Cornelio)*
Merula aedile curuli et L. Postumio alṣro (Albino)*/
[3?] agentibus in rebus Cassio Atilio et Bambio
(Ambiuio),* modificante Flacco Claudi filio tibiis
Serranis/[2?]; tota deuerb<i>is quoque facetissimis
et gestum disiderantibus scaenicum et suauissimis
ornata/ [cant]icis fuisse dictaque (fuit. edita-) est
quarto loco com<oedia>, Valerio et G. Fannio consulibus.

Left Margin: POSTQUAM
[nota postquam] apud uete/[res non modo pr]aeterito
tem/[pori sed etiam pra]esenti iungi/ [ut postquam
no]s Amaryllis/ [habet G<alatea> r<eliquit>. quamqua]m
sunt qui/ [postquam pro q]uoniam ac/[cpi uelint].

Suprascript: POETA UE?US
Luscius Lanuuinus

*The didascalia of the mss. of the Calliopian family and
the Commentum Donati support these names.
Right margin:

2 tra<n>sde<re>: ueteres so/niantius, nam nos le/uius tradere ut e contrario/ elli tralatum, nos translatu<m>. ("te" of ueteres is a suprascript of the scholiast himself)

Right, with reference sign to DICTITAT

4 inpudentiam ostendit/ frequentatiuo uerbo.

Left, with reference sign to ANTEHAC

hic eti/am lentum/ [accusatorem] facit qui pr<a>e/ [terita ingerat et] de quibus iam/ [iudicatum] est.

Top margin, with reference sign to TENUI

5 tenui esse oratione: imperitus accusa/tor hoc obicit quod in comoedia maxime/ pollet; nam cot<h>urnus tragoediae aptus est.

Left, with reference sign to CERUAM

7 [ambiguitas] per accusatiiuu<m>/ [casum perseu]erans usq<ue> ad / [ultimum de in]dustria ut / [etiam ipsa perp]lexitas odio/[sa sit].

Right, with reference sign to EAM

8 haec omnis per<s>tasys tragi/ca est et ideo in com<o>edia ui/tiosa dicitur (du-?).
Top margin, with reference sign to OLIM

9 olim: quasi dicat, cum nondum Te/rentius scriberet,
   id est bonorum penuria./ noua autem ostendit commendari
om/nia nouitate. potuit enim dicitur (dici cur) stetit/
et non exacta est. ob hoc et olim et noua.

Left, with reference sign to ACTORIS

10 [suffragium sca]enicorum/ [comparat et laed]et (-it)
aduer/[sarium].

Left margin DICAT-COGITET

12 [omne quod in m]entem ue/[nit aut cogit]amus aut/
   [dicimus ut U<e>rg<ilius>] et mihi iam/ [multi crudele
   can]ebant a<rtificis> s<celus>.

Bottom margin, with reference wrongly to line 16
   est sensus: nunc si quis hoc dicat aut cogitet:
inprobus est/ [T]erentius qui prologos de maledictis
<h>abet, hoc responsum si/[bi h]abeat: aduersarium
coegisse. nam quid faceret Teren/[tius] cum de palma
artis musicae certandum uideat sibi esse.

Right, with reference sign to LACESSISSET PRIOR

13 suffecerat lacesisse[t]/ an etiam prior potuisset?

Right margin: NOUUS

14 quod supra pr<a>etermisit/ hic reddidit nouus.
15 [mire haberet qua]si dubium/ [non sit maledicen] dum esse/ [Luscio].

Right margin: OMNIBUS
16 omnibus: peie/rasticos/ anti qui qui/ comoadias s/cribunt pla/ticae, et nous/ et ueteribus.
(solidus after "-rasticos" and "nouis" omitted in Mountford's edition)

Left margin: PALMAM
17 [palmam: dixit] causa/[m certaminis].

54r

Left margin: AD FAMEM
18 nam uendere/ solebant poe/tae quidquid s/cribsissent.

Left, with reference sign to CERTASSE
20 certasset: pro/uocasset; ab eo/ quod praededit/ id quod sequitur. / U<e>rg<iarius> nec te cer/tasse priorem/ paeniteat.

Right margin:
   bene certasset quia supra d[ixit in medio o<mnibus> pal]/mam esse quasi dicat quid[quid in certa]/men uener[it in eo uincen]/dus aemulu[s est].
Right margin:
certamen studium ipsum/ est sed etiam [contentio]/ne
definitur. U[<e>rg<ilius> et certa]/men erat, Cor[ydon
cum Thyr]/side, [magnum].

Suprascript: ADLATUM
21 prouerbialiter: quod dedit accipit.

Suprascript: ILLO
22 hoc
(pro non faciat written in error over IAM FINEM)

Right, between text and line 20 scholia certamen, etc: FINEM
23 maledicen/di aut pec/candi.

Suprascript: NON FACIT
pro non faciat.
(written in error over IAM FINEM line 22)

Top margin, with reference to FINEM NON FACIT
prius, inquid (-it), ego de illo dicendi fi/nem faciam
quam ille peccandi.

Suprascript: QUID UELIM
24 deest qu<a>er<it>is.

Left margin: ADPORTO NOUAM
adporto nouam: / sed Latinam.
Left, with reference sign to EPIDICAZOMENON
(Mountford's edition reads "right")

25 manifeste/ hic errat Terentius; nam haec/ fabula
Epidicazomini (-mene) dicta est/ a puella, de qua/
iudicium est, cum/ sit alia fabula/ eiusdem Apollo/dori
quae Epidica/azominos s/cribitur. debuit/ ergo dicere
Epidicazomenem (-en).

Suprascript: LATINI
26 id est Terentius, Latinus poeta; et est enfasis.

Bottom margin, with reference to GRAECI
formon dicitur gr<ae>ece saccum (-us) sparteum (-us);
ab hoc parasito nomen est, uel ex [uentris]/ capacitate;
unde Formio correpta prima syllaba Apollodorum e[est.
non a for]/mula ut quidam putant. ergo inde parasitus
uilissimae condicionis hom[o dictus est.]/ si enim a
formula esset nomen comoediae protra<e>reus primam
syll[abam, si a formi]/one corripere debemus. uidis (-es)
ergo φopΜiοΝεM dici non ϕαρΜiοΝεM a [formione]/
compositum. ϕαρΜiοM enim non φαρΜor Gr<a>eic scribunt.
et forma cum [dicimus sylla]/bam producimus non
corripimus.
("enim non" are in majuscules except e which is uncial;
M, N, R are often used in the Greek words)
Right margin: PRIMAS

27 primas: maxim[as, ad actorem]/ enim rettulit. C[icero
saepe illum]/ qui est secundaru[m aut tertiarum]/
partium.

Top margin, with reference sign to RES

28 necessarie additum per quem res quia primae partes/
etiam alios (-ud?) significant; non ergo primas sed
maximas./ unde ex (et) maxime quia et per alios agitur
sed minus.
(The scribe mistakenly added an "a" over the "me" of
"maxime")

Right margin: PER SILENTIUM

30 fabor (-uor) in com[edia silen]/tium expec[tatoris
(spec-) est;]/ recte ergo [addidit per silentium].

Right margin: MOTUS LOCOST

32 apparet <H>ec[yram ante Phormionem]/ actam ess[e
cui contigit id quod]/ quaeritur (quer-) [populum
subaccu]/sans.

Bottom margin, with reference sign to LOCOST

locus est distributio temporum quae cuique in expecta-
culum (spec-) uenturo attribuuntur]/ ab aedilibus;
unde loco motus dicitur qui suas <h>oras non o[btinuerit
inter prae]/cedentes et consecuturos. ergo proprie
dixit.
33 [laudat actor]em; est enim [po]le\textae utile; qui exclusus
[totiens animum non abiecerit].

bene uitabit (-uit) ne per amfiboliam et tumultum
intell[egeremus].

antiqui sic ma/luerunt quam / adiuuans.

54v

35 [quod in omnibus fere comoediis in quibus] perplexa
argumenta sunt te/neri solet, id in hac quoque
Terentius seruat ut personam extra argumentum/
indu\textit{cat}; cui dum ob ipsum quod ueluti aliena a tota
fabula est, res gesta/ narratur, d[i]scat populus
continentiam rerum sitq<ue> institutus ad cetera./
persona inducitur ad narrandum argumentum, quae cum
seruiles (-is) intellegatur,/ adhuc nesciatur cuius
sit domini.

in hac scaena quae docendi spectatoris causa inducitur,
miri ex/trinsecus lepo\textaeq<ue> cernuntur et
talis (sales) comoeci. id enim est artis poe/ticae
ut dum narrationi argumenti detur opera idem tamen res
agi/ et comoedia spectari uideatur.

Left margin:
[amicus a uolun]tate, po/[pularis a fortu]na. popula/
[ris eiusdem co]ndicionis/ [generisq<ue>; Sallu]stius
popu/[laris sceleris] sui.

Right margin:
popularis: ciuilis est, popu/lo amatus est, ciuis est
hu/milis populoque factus ut/ sordidum popularemq<ue>
ciuitati.

Suprascript: POPULARIS
socius.

Suprascript: ERAT EI
36 deest nam.

Top margin, extreme left. Reference sign over RATIO UNCULA
36-7 [opportuna]/ dimi[nutio] in ser/[uorum] ma[xima
paup]/[ertate]. pausillulum,/ [quartus] gradus
di/[minutionis]: paulum/ [paululum pauxillum
pau]xillulu<m>.
Left margin: CONFICEREM

38 [conficerem: prop]riae; nam/ [fieri pecuni]am dicaba/
    [nt. Sallustus quae pecunia ad/ [Hispaniense bellum]
    facta erat/ [Metello].

Right margin: CONFECI

    quasi reddendi mora/ <non> <h>abere fuit.

(Solidus in Mountford's edition is omitted)

Suprascript: NAM...EIUS

39 mire se adplicat ad argumentum.

Suprascript: EI

40 uxori.

Right margin: CONRADITUR

    apta in uerbo difficultas, ut/ minas decem conradet
    ali/cunde et conra/si omnia.

(Scribe wrote "difficoltas" and then wrote "u" over "o")

Left margin:

41 [dicit potius generaliter/ [ii qui mi]nus <h>abent
    diui/[tioribus; non] dicit serui domi/[nis].

Right margin:

42 mire addant non dent et/ non aliquando sed semper.
Left margin: UNCIATIM


Right, with reference sign to DEMENSO

uel a mense uel a mensura.

Right margin: GENIUM

44 mutuaq<ue> inter se laeti con/uuia curant; inuitat/ genialis hiemps c<urasque> r<esoluit>.

Suprascript: CONPERSIT

seruauit.

Right margin: PARTUM

46 partum: quaesitum dixit pro/priae; nam nullus partus est sine/ labore.

Left margin: FERIETUR


Right margin: NATALIS

48 natalis non pure ponen/dum est. nam et <h>ora nata/lis dicitur et dies ut hic./ aput <H>oratium pars uiolen/tior natalis <h>orae./ U<e>rg<ilius> rusticitati serui/ens meus est natalis/ Iolla.
Suprascript: MITTUNDI

50 facete de mulieribus.

Right margin: ACCIPE

52 hoc cum gestu offerentis/ dicitur.

Left, with reference sign to: LECTUMST

53 [tribus modis d]ebitum/ [pecuniarium soluitur: pensio]ne
   ex/[spectatione nume]ro: ex/ [pensione accipe]
   spec/[tatione lectum est numero conuenie]t.

Bottom margin: AMO TE

54 [a]mat quod reddidit pecuniam. red<h>ibitio debiti hoc
   agit ne oderimus/ [debito]rem. non neglixisse hoc agit
   utrum quia condictum non fefellerit/ [an quia lec]tum
   optulerit et numero congruenti.

Right margin: HABEO GRATIAM

   et in Andria et id gratum/ fuisse apud te <h>abeo
   gra/tiam.

55r

Suprascript: HABENDAST GRATIA

56 deest ei.

Right margin:

   ostenditur gratiarum [actione ue]/re necessariam
   fui[sse pecuniam].
SED
57 sed: particula/ transitum significat ad mentionem alterius/ rei.

SED
discensus ad argumentum.

METU ET ...
PERICULO
et futuri tempor[is periculum]/ di<ci>t et futuri me[tum].

QUID ISTUC EST
58 necessario igna/uus inducitur Da/uus ut narrandi/
sit locus.

MODO
59 modo:/ tantummodo, ut U<e>rg<ilius> modo Iup/piter adsit.

INSCIENS
inscientem pro insci[to, stulto,]/ alias pro ignauo

PLECTAR
220 puniar
Left margin: CENTURIATUS

230 [parat] tus subor/[natu] s.

239 Only traces of a two-line scholium remain.

Right margin: ECCERE

319 eccere: hoc se[cum]/ cogitat, id est [si]/ reddit;
et de[est]/ aliquit ut P[hanium].

Right margin: BONA UENIA

378 sine lite.

Suprascript: UENIA gratia.

Left margin: EXPISCARE

382 fraudulenter temp/tare.

Suprascript: PORROST

474 dehinc in futuru<m>.

Left margin: CONFUTAUIT

477 redarguit.
Suprascript: SUAT
491 excogitet.

Right of line 493 (misplaced): CANTILENAM
495 modul[atio] cantionis.

Right margin: GARRI
496 res ineptas loquere.

Suprascript: TRIUMPHO
543 gaudeo.

Left, with reference sign to CONDICIONEM
579 nuptiarum.

Suprascript: ALIQUA
585 aliquo modo.

Right margin: BELUA
601 stultus.

Right, with reference sign to COMMODUM
614 tantum quod.
Left, with reference sign to LOCARET

646 nuptum daret, / id est conlocaret.

Suprascript: SUSCEPISSE

647 abuisse.

Right margin: EMUNXI ARGENTO SENES

682 argentum [ei]s abstuli.

Right margin: MINUS UTIBILE

690 uitiosum et peri/culosum.

(peri- and -osum seen on 67v)

Left margin: QUOT RES

705 quantae causae.

Right margin: HARIOLUS

708 diuinandi peritus.

Right margin: NAM QUAE

732 pro quaenam./ Urgilius quarto lib<ro> / Georgicoru<m> nam quis te iu/uenum conf<identissime>.

(Mountford's edition lacks a solidus after "Georgicoru<m>")
EGESTAS

733 excusatio peccati e<st> aegestate deliquere, unde Uerg<ilius> e[t duris urgens in rebus egestas].

70r

Above QUOD DICUNT: NE PRAETER CASAM

768 ne ante casam transeas.

Right margin: UORSURAM SOLUES

780 a.es alienum acceptum mutuo sol[ues].

Suprascript: IN DIEM ABIIT

781 dilatum est.

Suprascript: RE

786 pecunia a<ut> argento.

Right margin: OPITULATA ES

iuuasti.

74r

(Mountford's edition reads 73v)

Left margin: GLADIATORIO

964 gladiatorio:/ disperato.

(Mountford's edition lacks a solidus after "gladiatorio")
150

Right margin: ADFECTANT UIAM

alibi ad dominas qui/ affectant uiam.

75v

Left margin: MACTATUS

1028 affectus.

Right margin: OGGANIAT

1030 cum querella m[ur]/muret; gannire/ enim ca/nes propri/e dicuntur.

(Scribe wrote "a" over "enim")
CHAPTER IV.

A SURVEY, CHRONOLOGICALLY ORDERED, OF

A. CRITICAL EDITIONS OF TERENCE;

B. TEXTUAL STUDIES OF TERENCE; FROM 1926 TO 1976.

PRELIMINARY

Three sources have been utilized to locate pertinent works for this chapter: a) Marouzeau's L'Année Philologique; b) the Classical World bibliographical survey; c) the Lustrum bibliographical survey.

I have not been able to secure certain works:

Emile Chambry, ed. et trad., Terence, Comédies, Paris, Garnier, 1932 ordered January 29, 1976 through the Loyola University Inter-library Loan system (a review of Chambry's edition mentions his translation and commentary, but it does not indicate whether the edition is a critical one);

Vittorio Soave, *Terenzio, Commedie*, Torino, U.T.E.T., 1953 ordered January 29, 1976 through the Inter-library Loan system (Tescari's review\(^5\) of Soave's edition gives no indication that this work is anything but a translation); G. Coppola, *Terenzio, Commedie*, Torino, Chiantore, 1927.\(^6\)

---


\(^6\)After the public defense of my dissertation, I received a critically annotated book by F. Ranzato called *Terenzio, Le Commedie*, ed. crit. a cura di F. Ranzato, trad. di R. Cantarella, vol. I: Andria e Heautontimorumenos, Milano, 1971. The *Phormio* is not included in this volume and my sources mention no succeeding volumes of the publication.
A. CRITICAL EDITIONS OF TERENCE.


In his "Conspectus Siglorum" Robert Kauer maintains that A (Codex Bembinus), written in the fourth or fifth century, is corrected by the original scribe, designated A¹, and by a second hand (before Ioviales), A², and by Ioviales, who made most of the text's emendations in the fourth or fifth century before the scholiasts (sixth century). Finally, he mentions Ioviales² who corrected the Hecyra and changed readings here and there.

Wallace Lindsay, who, utilizing Kauer's collations of the manuscripts of Terence, was responsible for the critical apparatus, believes that A and Σ have a common archetype, φ, of which A of the fourth-fifth century is a faithful copy. He suspects that an exemplar of this ancient text was given in the fifth century by the grammarian Calliopius to his pupil who emended the text introducing words and notes which the teacher had written in the margins in order to remember observations he would use in his class. To this "pupil-editor" we must attribute the Calliopian deviations (Σ). Briefly, the Calliopian recension is attributable to an inferior revision of a
text of the family A.

The Kauer-Lindsay critical apparatus contains twenty-one inaccurately cited readings of the Bembine Phormio: line 155 essem ex fuissem; A reads FUISSEM with no correction. In this same line, eum om. A (add. man. 2); EUM is lacking in A but no corrector adds it. Line 169 ut om. A (add. Iov.); corrector does not add UT but possibly a C after ITA. Line 199 agis Iov. (?); A reads AIS with no correction. Line 249 molendum est (?) us. in Iov.; no correction exists in A here. Line 266 hic iam in A² (?) ; there is no IAM here. Line 275 nostran ex nostra A; no such correction is seen is A. In the same line est A (corr. man. 2) but I do not find this correction in the Bembinus. Line 314 adv. Iov.; A reads UENIAT and the corrector adds AT not AD above the line. Line 358 faciat Iov.; A originally read FECIT but a corrector erased the E and wrote an A in its place to read FACIT not FACIAT. Line 417 ut] ita A implies that A reads ITA but it reads UT. Line 461 exsequar (exe.) A²; A reads ID SEQUEAR with no correction. Line 476 se praeb. Iov.²; the corrector adds SE only above the line. Line 501 verbis Iov. (?); A reads UERIS with no correction. Line 561 inp. feret A: inponi eff. Iov. (?); A reads INPONE FERET and the corrector adds HIC above the line to read INPONE HIC FERET. Line 618 isJ si A (corr. Iov.); A reads IS QUI ISTANC with no correction.
Line 728 cui Iov. Ξ: quo A; A reads QUO but cui is not visible. Line 730 indigna A (man. 2 superscr. erae) but this is likewise not visible. Line 737 haec A: ea Iov. (?); letters H and C appear to me to be crossed out leaving AE as the reading; these are the only visible corrections. Line 793 certe A²; A reads CERTO with no correction. Line 806 siet J est A²; A reads SIET and no correction is found here.


In his discussion of the history of the text, Marouzeau maintains that A (Codex Bembinus) and Ξ (the Calliopion family which covers all the remaining manuscripts) have branched out from a Terentian archetype Λ and further, that Σ and Υ are branches of Ξ. He believes that A and Ξ are approximately contemporary and of comparable worth.

For establishing the text, Marouzeau adheres to certain basic rules: a reading is not faulty simply because it goes against someone's view. Secondly, each time we accept as authentic an aberrant reading, or we propose a conjecture, we must furnish a plausible explanation for the supposed mistakes.
Marouzeau aims to correct and complete the apparatus of Franz Umpfenbach, while utilizing all the collations and revisions published three-fourths of a century before his first volume (including Kauer and Lindsay's edition).

Marouzeau distinguishes four hands in the Codex Bembinus: the hand of the scribe himself (A) who corrects his work (A1), a second hand (A2) which makes the greater portion of corrections and Ioviales who, together with A2, seems to do the work of Kauer's Ioviales. Marouzeau does not date A2 and Ioviales but they are most likely contemporaneous with the "manus tertia" or Ioviales of Kauer. Occasionally, Marouzeau attributes a correction to A3 such as exists in the Phormio on line 597: "-DRAE SE OSTENDERET in ras. A3".

As for the text of the Phormio in volume II, there are eight instances of incorrect readings in Marouzeau's apparatus criticus regarding the Bembine text: on line 11 Marouzeau incorrectly cites A as reading FHIDICINA instead of PHIDICINA; on line 97 EXADUERSUM instead of EXADUORSUM; on line 199 PATRUUM instead of PATRUM; on line 461 Marouzeau cites A2 as changing SEQUAR to EXSEQUAR where no correction seems to be visible; on line 481 he incorrectly states that A reads AIBAT instead of AIEBAT; on line 792 NATUELLEM instead of NATUELLEM; on line 806 he incorrectly states "EST A2..." but A reads SIET without any correction; on line 838 he cites A as reading DUDUM QUAM instead of

Pratesi bases his critical edition on the collation of the manuscripts by Umpfenbach and Kauer. The editor aims to establish the readings of the Bembine Codex and to distinguish the various hands of the correctors.

In his "Conspectus Notarum et Compendiorum" Pratesi states that A is a product of the fifth or sixth century; A' is the scribe of A who corrected his own work; A'' is another corrector who emended the text "here and there a little later"; Iov. is Ioviales who lived in the sixth (?) century; and finally A rec. is a recent corrector, eighth (?) century, who made most of the emendations.

Pratesi's critical apparatus is briefer than that of Prete or Marouzeau. Still, I have found neither printer's errors nor mistaken readings of the Bembine text of the

---

1Volume I has been published (year?) with the introduction by M. R. Posani. APh does not mention the publication.
Phormio. In fact, there are three instances of corrections by various hands not noted either by Kauer, Prete or Marouzeau: line 320 REDDET A; redet (i.e. redate?) A rec. Pratesi. The first D of REDDET has been crossed out. Line 372 PERGIN ERO A; pergi in ero A rec. Pratesi. An I has been added above the IN of PERGIN. Line 646 RETTULIT A; retulit Iov. Pratesi. The first T of RETTULIT has been crossed out. Prete's critical text (1954) of the Phormio reads RE TULIT but he does not mention the correction in his apparatus.

There are eight instances where readings and corrections are questionable: line 251 DEPUTABO A, depute A', ut videtur, cum -b- ex deputabo expunxerit, postea Iov. delever. Line 314 UENIAT A, adueniat A rec. (Pratesi), Iov. (Kauer), atueniat corr. rec. (Prete). I agree with Prete that AT is written above UENIAT. Line 454 mos est A' (est delevisse videtur A''); EST does not seem deleted to me. Line 456 POSSE A, posset Iov. (Pratesi). The mark resembling a T may be a punctuation mark (>). Line 501 UERIS A, uerbis Iov. (ut videtur) Pratesi. Line 715 OPUS EST A but there is no trace of EST at the end of the line. Line 737 ADEO A, adeon Iov. (Pratesi), adeone Iov. (Prete, Kauer). Line 759 AMARE A Pratesi, AMARI A Kauer.

Pratesi treats carefully and exactly the variants he has chosen to present, but fails to mention some obvious instances of emendations in the Bembine text of
the Phormio, such as TEN line 339, COTIOST line 346, INDUM line 511, SACRIFICANDI line 702, UORSURAM line 780, MITATUR line 851.


In the section of his introduction subtitled "De Terenti textus historia antiqua aetate", Prete expounds the theories of various scholars. We single out Gunther Jachmann because Prete inclines in part to his opinion. The central question in the history of the text of Terence lies in the establishment of the relationship between the two families of the codices of Terence, A and \( \omega \) or \( \varepsilon \). Errors common to A and \( \omega \) demonstrate that they must have had a common origin. Prete believes that the division into scenes, essentially identical in both families, substantiates this conclusion. Jachmann calls this common source \( \phi \). He believes that \( \phi \), in turn, stems from an edition of Probus. (But it is not certain that Probus wrote a critical edition of Terence.) Prete agrees with Jachmann that A and \( \omega \) have a common font. Further he proposes that another family of codices (X) existed at the time of the Bembine manuscript or before it. Certain facts deduced
from the study of the transmission of the comedies point to the existence of such a tradition: a) the Codex Bem-
binus exhibits the hand of various correctors— that of a "corrector antiquus", that of Ioviales and that of a "cor-
rector recens". These correctors offer material different from A and ω. It is possible to affirm that these new readings derive from other manuscripts now lost. b) Dona-
tus, in his commentary, mentions codices containing read-
ings which are not present in our manuscript tradition. Therefore Donatus must have known of codices no longer extant. c) Donatus gives testimony that the division of scenes in some manuscripts of Terence contained letters (M·M·C·, "mutatis modis canticum", and DV, "deverbium") referring to the musical nature of the scene itself. These signs are absent from the extant transmission but were evidently present in the manuscripts Donatus knew. Owing to these factors, Prete postulates the existence of a manuscript of Terence in the time of Donatus which follows a different tradition (X). From this tradition, depend, in part, the Codex Bembinus (A), its three cor-
rectors, Donatus and the Calliopian family (ω). Whether X depends on φ, Prete does not say. The following stemma illustrates Prete's theory:
Prete collates twenty-three individual manuscripts of Terence to establish his critical text. In his apparatus criticus he mentions the following editors: Muretus, Guyetus, Bothe, Wagner, Fleckeisen, Umpfenbach, Dziatzko, Lindsay and Kauer, and Marouzeau.

We call special attention to Prete's treatment of the Codex Bembinus in his apparatus criticus of the Phormio. There are six instances where Prete incorrectly cites readings of A: line 110: "SCITA EST" instead of SCITAST; line 147: "REDDIT" instead of REDIT; line 177: "EST HOC" instead of HOC EST; line 415: "AMITTENT" instead of AMITTERET; line 417: "ITA CUM UNO" instead of UT CUM UNO; line 821: "IN ANIMO PARARE" instead of IN ANIMO PARE.

I share Jachmann and Prete's belief that the two families, A and ω (or Σ), have a common source, ϕ.
Prete's theory of another family of codices \((X)\), which existed at the time of the Bembine manuscript or before it, is most convincing and appealing. The existence of a different tradition \((X)\) accounts for the variety of hands in the Codex Bembinus. Most attractive to me is the fact that Prete recognizes the slightest variation in style of handwriting and, not hesitating to depart from previous conjectures, distinguishes more hands than heretofore acknowledged (see "Conspectus siglorum", p. 29). Further he is willing to admit the possibility of additional correctors.

Prete believes that \(A\) gives almost everywhere a correct reading while numerous errors are found in \(\omega\). In my present investigation, I have found, with Prete, that modern editors of the comedies of Terence follow \(A\) very faithfully.


Skutsch supplements the apparatus criticus of Kauer and Lindsay's 1926 edition with readings from the
"fragmenta Sangallensia palimpsesta, Vindobonensia et Oxoniensia papyracea". He adds readings of the St. Gall fragments for *Heautontimorumenos* 857-863, 875-878; readings of the Viennese papyri for *Andria* 489-499, 540-546, 549-554, 514-521 and 575-582; readings of the Oxford papyri for *Andria* 602-668, 924-979a. He changes none of the annotations by Kauer and Lindsay. Above all, the readings of the *Phormio* remain exactly the same as those of the 1926 edition.


Rubio provides an apparatus criticus for each play of Terence. He follows Prete's interpretation of the correctors of A: "A= Codex Bembinus (Vat. lat. 3226), saec. iv.-v. A¹= ipse codicis Bembini librarius. A²= corrector antiquus. Iov. = corrector Ioviales, saec. v-vi. A²=corrector recens, saec. vii-viii." There are seventeen instances of error in the editor's citations of the Bembine text of the *Phormio*: line 66 in Lemmo A; A reads IN LEMNO. Line 110 inquit scita est A; A reads INQUIT SCITAST. Line 198 apud portum J aportum A (corr. A¹); A reads APUT not
apud. Line 211 quid si sic J quid sic A; A reads QUID SI SIC. Line 243 damna exsilia A; A reads DAMNA EX ILLA.

Line 286 aduenisse J aduenire A (corr. A²); A reads ADUE-NISSE and A² changed it to ADUENIRE. Line 351 pro deum inmortalium A; A reads PRO DEUM IMMORTALIUM. Line 417 ut J ita A; A reads UT. Line 451 aequomst et bonum A; A reads AEOQUOM EST ET BONUM. Line 515 obtundis A Prete; A and Prete (1954) read OPTUNDIS. Line 724 sat A; A reads SATIS.

Line 792 natuuellem A; A reads NAT UELLEM. Line 821 in animo parare A; A reads IN ANIMO PARE. Line 896 conueniundust Phormio A; A reads CONUENIUNDUS EST. Line 934 habitapud A; A reads HABIT APUT. Line 970 quae lubitum fuerit peregre A; A reads QUAE LIBITUM FUERIT PEREGRE. Line 1008 inmortalis A; A reads IMMORTALIS.

Furthermore, I have found five instances where the readings are questionable: Line 125 qui J i in ras. A²; A reads QU with the letter I added above by the corrector rec. (Prete). Line 169 ut J om. A (add. A²); the letter C is added above A by the corr. rec. (Prete). Line 222 oporter A; Prete sees traces of an A in the erased space and says that the T above the line is by the corr. rec. who may have intended to write OPORTEAT. Line 227 ea J om. A²; EA is not crossed out in A but perhaps the two dots above EA signifies deletion (though such practice by a corrector is uncommon). Line 358 facit A; faciat A²; A reads FECIT and is changed to FACIT by a corrector (Prete, Marouzeau).
B. TEXTUAL STUDIES OF TERENCE.


The purpose of Craig's article is to review the whole subject of archaism in Terence and to attempt to make out a case for "lost archaism as a fruitful source of corruption in Terence's lines". He considers briefly but with some completeness in the enumeration of examples (1) archaisms transmitted in the manuscripts of Terence; (2) archaisms not in the manuscripts, but attested by Donatus or another grammarian; (3) archaisms restored by modern scholarship.

The first category especially concerns us. Craig states that the existence of an old form in A, and of a modern variant in Σ as a whole, implies that the editor (whoever he was) of the "Calliopian" text was responsible for the modernizing. Thus (a) _Eun._ 582 "haec" A for "hae" Σ; (b) _Eun._ 632 "puto" A for "reputo" Σ; (c) _Phorm._ 877 "inaudiui" A for "audiui Σ"; (d) _Eun._ 998 "necessus" A for necesse Σ.

Craig lists a number of examples of archaisms mentioned by Donatus and preserved in (all) Terence manuscripts: _Andr._ 42 "aduorsum te" for "apud te"; 433 "licitum" for "licuit"; 608 "nulli" for "nullius"; _Phorm._
Craig further cites a few archaisms in Terence manuscripts which are confirmed by no external authority—at least no external authority referring definitely to the passages where they appear: Hec. 735 "quaesti" (gen.) A for "quaestus" Σ; Heaut. 693 "apti" A for "adepti" Σ, and 1065 "Archonidi" (gen.) A for "Archonidis" Σ.

The manuscripts have without exception transmitted the infinitive passive in "-ier" faithfully everywhere and Donatus does not comment on it. This form occurs in the Phormio on lines 92, 206, 305, 306, 406, 535, 589, 603, 632, 697, 931, 978, 1021.


In the article Craig defends the "new Oxford Terence" of Kauer and Lindsay against three criticisms made by Professor A. Ernout.¹

Hecyra 313 reads: "fortasse unum aliquod uerbum inter eas iram hanc conciuisse" (concluserit Α). The

Iambic septenarius here intrudes on a series of octonarii. Ernout objects to the final word and approves of Bentley's addition of "-ere" after "conciuisse" and indicates how the variant "conciuerit" of the manuscripts might have arisen. Craig offers a defense that apart from the senarius, we cannot give an account of the precise reason why Terence varies his lines. He states further that the suprascript "-ere" does not fully explain why "conciuisse" should be corrupted to "conciuerit". He concludes that a solitary iambic septenarius at Hecyra 313 is not indefensible.

Ernout also criticizes Adelphoe 55 "nam qui mentiri aut fallere institerit (insueuerit A) patrem aut". He says that "institerit" is feebly supported by the citation of Martianus Capella (v. 495), which is preserved in the form "instituerit". Ernout insists that "insuerit" (the reading of all manuscripts except ALpVD) is correct. Craig concedes there is some evidence for a variant of "insuerit".

Ernout directs criticism against the abnormal scansion of Adelphoe 60: "uenit ad me saepe clamitans (A) quid agi' (= agis A) Micio". Ernout agrees that the frequentative form "clamitans" must stand but he proposes to eliminate "agis". Craig insists, however, that the manuscripts of Cicero, of Victorinus and of Terence, all of which quote "agis", are too formidable to be lightly set aside.

Craig re-examines the Terentian quotations of the commentators or grammarians Arusianus Messius, Nonius Marcellus, and Eugraphius with the intention of discovering what text or texts they used. Craig offers these findings: a) The "standard text" of Terence in the fourth century was the Codex Bembinus. b) The Calliopian recension (from which and come) dates later than the grammarians of the fifth century (Arusianus, Nonius, Eugraphius); Arusianus and Nonius use A and not the Calliopian, and Eugraphius seems to use the Calliopian on occasion but actually does not; the Calliopian recension is to be dated toward the end of the fifth century and the division between and occurs in the following century. c) The traces of the tradition in the commentary of Donatus (fourth century) as it comes down to us are to be assigned to modifications of the original form of the commentary. d) The authority of A is superior to that of the Calliopian recension. The latter offers us a modernized Terence.

Craig concludes, "In reality, it appears, there was only one 'ancient' edition of Terence, the edition which Codex Bembinus, with all its inaccuracy, preserves" (p.130).

Craig makes conjectures about the dates of each grammarian. He asserts that Arusian, who dedicated his
Exempla Elocutionum to Olybrius and Probinus, consuls in 395 A.D., must have flourished toward the end of the fourth century. We know for certain that Nonius lived before Priscian (ca. 500 A.D.) and after Apuleius (ca. 150 A.D.) but Craig states: "We shall be content with putting him in the period fourth or fifth century" (p. 52). Craig suggests that Eugraphius may have lived at "the end of the fifth or the beginning of the sixth century" (p. 84). Again, Craig maintains that the Calliopian recension is to be dated after the grammarians who cited Terence from a copy of an edition of which A is the only surviving representative.

---

1This is an alphabetical list of nouns, adjectives, verbs, and prepositions which have more than one construction. The grammarian, Arusian, also made citations from Sallust's Historiae.
2This grammarian and lexicographer is the author of De compendiosa doctrina which consists of twenty books. The first twelve deal with points of grammar, and the last eight deal with miscellaneous information. Nonius is our chief authority for many fragments of early writers, and especially of Varro's poetry.
3Eugraphius is the author of a commentary on Terence. His chief interest lies in rhetorical qualities and characterization of the plays and often he simply paraphrases the text of Terence.

Jones subjects to careful scrutiny the conclusions of J. D. Craig in the latter's Ancient Editions of Terence (London 1929). Following the same order of presentation as Craig, Jones discusses each grammarian individually and offers his own findings. Since Arusian's quotations of Terence agree with ε against A in six good cases and with some γ and δ manuscripts against A in three possible cases and with γ manuscripts against A and δ in one possible case, Jones concludes Arusian had access to δ - and to δ - readings (cf. Craig, Ancient Editions, line 9).

Jones believes one cannot determine the dates of the manuscripts which Nonius used since the date of Nonius is not determined. For the sake of argument he grants Craig's assumption that Nonius belongs to the fourth or fifth century. Yet, considering that Nonius' citations agree with the minuscule manuscripts against A in at least twelve cases, Jones concludes that Nonius must have used the Calliopian codices.

Jones records that Eugraphius agrees with A alone against other manuscripts eight times (though one instance is not as firm as the others); with γ manuscripts alone against others, three times; with δ manuscripts alone against others, five times; with ε (i.e., δ and γ manuscripts together) alone against A, seven times. On the
basis of the evidence presented, he believes that it is impossible to state that Eugraphius knew the A text but did not know a minuscule manuscript (or manuscripts).

Finally, Jones maintains that the evidence of the Terentian quotations in all three grammarians is too small and weak and contradictory to establish definitely the text or texts the grammarians used. If they were familiar with A, they seem also to have been familiar with the minuscule manuscripts of the Calliopian family.


We have more than four hundred Terence citations in the manuscripts of Priscian, a grammarian at the beginning of the sixth century. Craig cites only twelve examples where Priscian agrees with the minuscule manuscripts (Σ) of Terence against A: Andria 922 "dixi" Σ, "dico" A, "audieris" Σ, "audierim" A; Eunuchus 32 "Eunuchum suam" Σ, "Eunuchum suum" A; 104 "fictum" Σ, "finctum" A; 300 "dices" Σ, "dicet" A; 666 "potesse" Σ, "posse" A; 744 "attinere" Σ, "pertinere" A; Phormio 768 "aiunt" Σ, "dicunt" A; 989 "excluden" Σ, "exculpe" A; Eunuchus 779 "non posse fieri" Σ, "fieri non posse" A; Phormio 88
"exaduorsum" Σ, "exaduerso" A, "ei loco" Σ, "ilico" A; 759 "conlocatam filiam" Σ, "conlocatam amari" A; Adelphoe 608 "ipsis coram" Σ, "ipsi coram" A. The evidence is overwhelming that Priscian used the A text and not the Calliopian text. Craig emphasizes his point by mentioning Umpfenbach's preface (LIX-LXII) to his critical edition of Terence (1870) where anyone can see from Umpfenbach's collection of passages how faithfully Priscian reproduces A's readings as opposed to those of Σ or some of the minuscule manuscripts (γ and δ whose common parent is the Calliopian text Σ) of Terence.


In the history of the text of Terence an interesting question is whether sufficient evidence exists to prove that the Terence known to Servius had been already tampered with by "Calliopius", or that Servian versions betray the existence in his time of the edition of Terence implied by the small group (δ) of minuscule manuscripts. Common sense suggests that Servius, a grammarian about 400 A.D., knew the contemporary edition of Terence, the Codex Bembinus. Yet, according to Craig, the history of the text
of Terence has been written on the assumption that the grammarians and commentators were familiar with every variety of edition. Craig here endeavors to show that Servius used the A text. As positive evidence of this, Craig points to Eun. 268 (Aen. I 436), Phorm. 175-6 (Aen. XI 699), Ad. 329 (Aen. I 208), Haut. 72 (Ecl. II 34; Aen. I 548). Craig adds that it would be possible to go on to prove that Servius did not employ the Calliopian text, if he should use such instances as Andr. 330-1 (Aen. VI 664): "mereat" and "poni" for "commereat" and "adponi" $\Sigma$; 74 (Aen. VIII 412): "primo" for "primum" $\Sigma$; 708 (Aen. IX 693): "quo te agis" for "quo hinc te agis" $\Sigma$ - though Servius may be quoting from memory. Craig concludes that the argument that Servius did not use the A text is without foundation.


As in earlier articles, "Priscian's Quotations from Terence" (1930) and "Terence Quotations in Servius" (1930) Craig endeavors to show precisely what Servius Auctus'¹ and

¹"Servius Auctus" refers to the writer of additional comments in the enlarged Commentary of Servius.
the aforementioned grammarians' evidence is and to convert the scholars who repeat the unproved statement that Servius Auctus' and the grammarians' quotations demonstrate the existence of a variety of texts of Terence as early as the Byzantine Age. Craig points out possible instances where the writer of the additional comments may have copied from the minuscule manuscripts of Terence, but he believes that they are too few and too weak to base an argument for the existence of such manuscripts in the fourth century. Craig points to four examples where Servius Auctus coincides with the Codex Bembinus instead of with z: Hecyra 605 (A. iv, 435); Hecyra 618 (G. iii, 305); Eunuchus 268 (G. iv. 104; A. i, 436); Adelphoe 790-791 (A. ii, 424). According to Craig, these four examples are more than sufficient to discredit the argument that the Terence quotations in Servius Auctus betray the early existence of other texts of Terence than the one we know, from the Codex Bembinus, to have been current in the fourth or fifth century.


Marouzeau believes that the inversion of words, a
frequent and easy error of scribes, appears conditioned by a common circumstance: the brevity of the inverted words. For example, in the critical editions of Umpfenbach and Lindsay-Kauer, we find the following inversion: Eunuchus line 187 "ibi hoc me macerbo": "ibi me macerbo hoc". A. Marouzeau points to a psychological explanation for this condition. A short word has less individuality than a long word and it occupies a place of less importance in the memory.

Further, the "rare order" of words causes errors of inversion, e.g., "factum est" for "est factum". Scribes are naturally inclined to substitute usual order for rare order as evidenced in Eunuchus 41: "Nullum est iam dictum (substantive) quod non sit dictum prius" (PCDG Diomedes). The Codex Bembinus and Eugraphius have the order "dictum sit" which several editors adopt and Marouzeau regards as wrong.


In a study entitled Die Geschichte des Terenztextes im Altertum (Basel, Reinhardt, 1924), Gunther Jachmann
deals with mistakes common to our sources for establishing the unity of the Terentian tradition during a certain period. He admits that the traces of this unity are few in number. Marouzeau believes he can reduce the list of alleged examples by, first of all, categorizing some errors as "fautes à faire", that is to say, inevitable. For example, Eunuchus 241 "amisti" PCED²; "amisisti" A; "amisit" Donati C. Secondly, readings which editors interpret as common mistakes are not always mistakes. Marouzeau points out that Eunuchus 79 "ecca", the unanimous reading of the manuscripts, is corrected uniformly by editors to "eccam", under the pretext that the word does not have a nominative form.

II

A peculiarity of Terence's versification is the unification of two lines by a monosyllable. Marouzeau notes that scribes have a tendency to correct this disposition by suppressing a monosyllable which ends a line. Since certain monosyllables (oh, ah, hui) can be elided with the preceding syllable, its disappearance does not harm the meter of the line. Further, since the word is a filler, its disappearance does not harm the sense of the line, e.g., at Heautontimorumenos 1010 A omits "oh".

On occasion, a corrector suppresses a monosyllable, e.g., at Eunuchus 236 Ioviales crosses out "oh" written by A.
In this article, Craig selects two types of errors in our manuscripts of Terence: the omission of the monosyllable "at" when it occurs at the end of a line and the addition of "etiam", especially to "nondum". Craig attempts to explain these errors, while at the same time indicating where there is no ground for tampering with the accepted text at all. He hopes that his method of grouping errors of the same type may possibly be found useful in other textual difficulties.


Craig in this note explains how the evidence of Donatus' Commentary may be of assistance in establishing the text of Terence, and at the same time how disappointingly vague and contradictory the existing version of Donatus is. He offers three examples to prove his points: 1) Andria 226 (Codex Bembinus, however, does not begin till line 889); 2) Eunuchus 230: "facie honesta. mirum ni ego me turpiter hodie hic dabo" in which A reads "egomet", not "ego me". The quotation of Donatus (Phormio
text in antiquity. Fehl, on page 13, states the aim of
the treatise: to make a comparison of the readings of the
Bembinus and of the hypothetical exemplar of all the manu-
scripts of Terence with what represents the consensus
of the manuscripts of the so-called interpolated class,
in order to determine more definitely the character and
 genesis of the latter.² Fehl maintains that the interpo-
lations in the Codex Bembinus are the result of a series
of conscious insertions which antedated the archetype of
all the existing manuscripts. He shows that a similar
situation has arisen in the case of the interpolated class
of codices (Σ or Ω here). Some corruptions in Α and Ω
result from attempts to fill in by means of the verb "to
be" or other "understood" verbs besides nouns, pronouns
and prepositions. Such meddling with the text can be
 traced back to the archetype of all our manuscripts.

Fehl concludes that the Bembinus belongs as much
to the interpolated class as the codices expressly so
called. He claims that errors resulted from interpolations
which were either explanatory or purely arbitrary and
wilful. He maintains that no distinction should be made
between the text tradition of Α and that of the other
codices. In effect, Fehl assails the opinion of Lindsay

²J. J. Savage, review in CW XXXIV, 1940-1941, pp. 221-2.
and Craig by emphasizing the common history of A and C and by establishing that certain scholars have set too high a value on some of the readings of A out of respect for its general excellence.


Andrieu slightly expanded his 1939 article on character designations into a monograph on the same subject matter. The two offer substantially the same conclusions. The author summarizes his conclusions about rubrics and character designations in a short chapter at the end of his book (pages 120-122). There are his findings regarding the two families of Terentian manuscripts, A and Σ: all the mistakes of character designations in the manuscripts of Terence are due either to material accidents or interpreters of the text. The errors demonstrate that the character signs are not authentic. They prove that it is not only a question
of emendations proposed here and there, but of a systematic introduction of signs into a text which was previously devoid of them.

The rubric, like the character signs, is not authentic. The division of the text which the rubric makes is very artificial and does not determine a fixed method. Its elements are taken from reading the text and reflect anomalies or lacunae.

Examination of the character signs permits us to discuss with precision the history of the Terentian manuscripts. Independence of Α and Σ had already been realized before the signs were introduced systematically into the text. The absence of true common errors in Α and Σ proves this. There are, however, common pseudo-errors caused by successive and independent mistakes in the two families or by inevitable mistakes which have no testimonial value.

Examination of the character signs permits us to place the separation of Α and Σ before the third century, or even to renounce the hypothesis of a tradition common to Α and Σ. It invites us to revise the delicate problems of distribution of replies and even the structure of the dialogue in general.

Finally, Andrieu offers one last conclusion: the modern editor can interpret freely the character designations without regarding the manuscript tradition. The
signs do not go back to Terence and are not the result of a textual operation.


Andrieu agrees with Jules Marouzeau\(^1\) that common errors in A and Σ are not evident for establishing the unity of the manuscript tradition of Terence. The examination of "double" lines in Terence confirms the independence of the two traditions. Here is one of the many examples Andrieu offers: Heautontimorumenos 997, 997a, 998:

the text of Kauer-Lindsay:

\[
\text{In mentem venit; nam quam maxume huic visa haec suspicio} \\
\text{Erit uera, quamque adulescens maxume quam in minima spe situs} \\
\text{Erit, tam facillume patri' pacem in leges conficiet suas.}
\]

The manuscript tradition presents the following versions:

\[\Sigma\]

\[
\text{In mentem uenit; namque adulescens quam in minima spe situs Er}it\ldots
\]

\[\Lambda\]

\[
\text{In mentem uenit; namque adulescens maxime huic uisa haec suspicio.}
\]

\(^1\)Jules Marouzeau, "Notes de critique térentienne," REL, XII (1934): 49. See above, p. 175.
The text of Eugraphius:

que (ms. F.G.)
In mentem uenit. Nam adulescens
cum (ms. L.V.)

quod (ms. F.)
in minima spe situs erit.
quam (ms. G.)

In their apparatus criticus Kauer-Lindsay comment: "duo uersus in unum a librariis fusos sic fere refingendos putamus".

Andrieu restores the text based on the lines of Σ and Eugraphius. Line 997 scans as an iambic octonarius and line 998 as a trochaic septenarius which gives the following reading:

In mēn/tem uē/nīt; nām/quē adūlēs/cēns// quam īn/
minimā/ spe situs/ ērit
Tām fā/cīlū/mē pātři'/ pācem īn// lēgēs/ cōnfīcī/
ēt su/ās/

Andrieu believes that A represents a text where a gloss substituted for the authentic reading was introduced.

As a summary, the author gives three types of explanation for a "double" line in Terence: metrical problems not yet clarified; isolated interpolations in some manuscripts; consequences of scribes using glosses or making comparisons of texts or the consequences of scribes misunderstanding the delicate style of Terence (e.g., final monosyllables).

Andrieu observes that the scribe of the Codex Bembinus employs a rigid system for noting the distribution of roles among actors. The Bembine scribe uses the following letters taken from the Greek alphabet: Α Β Γ Δ Ε Ζ Θ and ρ ṕ ψ ω. The cantor is always designated by ω. The scribe reserves Θ ρ ṕ ψ for female characters.

The scribes of the two manuscripts of the Carolingian age, the Laurentianus (D) and the Parisinus 10304 (p), fail to understand the system employed in ancient manuscripts, and invent systems which need interpretation.

While the scribe of D most often uses a system of Greek letters, he occasionally gives to a character the Roman initial of his name, e.g., P Phaedria; G Gnatho. At other times, the scribe utilizes Roman letters which are not the initial of the name.

The scribe of p employs a system of Greek letters according to the initials of the name of the character, e.g., Π Pamphilus, Δ Davus. Difficulties arise when a second character has the same initial. The scribe is obliged to find a solution by devising another system as he does for characters whose names begin with the letter "S": Σ Sannio, Ἰ Syrus, Σ Sostrata, Σ Sophrona Nutrix. For characters whose initial letter is "C", the scribe devises
this system: H Chremes, X Ctesipho, \( \Psi \) Clitipho, \( \Phi \) Clinia, R (a Roman letter) Canthara, C/ Chaerea, CRA Cratinus, CRI Crito.

Because the scribes of D and p fail to devise a single system, a variety of solutions is needed to meet the difficulties which present themselves.


The Commentary of Donatus on Terence gives us access to a manuscript source independent of the Codex Bembinus and of the Calliopian recension. Besides the text, which serves as a basis for his commentary, Donatus furnishes variants taken from other manuscripts of his library. Marouzeau states that the worth of these variants presented by Donatus is variable but rarely negligible. He notes twenty-eight variants in the Andria, thirteen in the Phormio, eight in the Hecyra, seven in the Adelphoe and in the Eunuchus. Even in the interior of each play there is irregularity: in the Andria, there are fourteen variants in 200 lines (from 459 to 656) and not one in the last 150 lines; in the Adelphoe we find no variant from line 215 to
line 631 and from line 666 to line 997; in the Phormio no variant exists from line 761 to 1055; in the Eunuchus, we find none from line 294 to 998. It seems to Marouzeau that from time to time Donatus desired, without a major reason, to appreciate the worth of the variants thus gleaned. As far as establishing the origin of these manuscripts, we can scarcely reach any conclusions.


Twenty examples of the Latin interjection "vah" or "uah" exist in the text of Terence: nine in the Heautontimorumenos, eight in the Adelphoe, two in the Andria, one in the Eunuchus, none in the Hecyra or Phormio. We find, however, that the scribes and editors do not write "uah" or "vah" unanimously; there are variants, e.g., "ah": Heaut. 397 in A; "ua": Heaut. 978 in A; "uaha", "uha", "auah" elsewhere in other manuscripts. Marouzeau states that the problem is metrical. Certain lines, e.g., Ad. 405, Ht. 857, Ad. 445, Ad. 439, Ht. 397, cannot be scanned unless we admit the vocalic quality of the initial "u" of the form "uah" be it a dissyllable (ūāh) or a monosyllable (ūāh) with syneresis. We thus keep the form
"uah" and dispense with the correction in the passages where it figures.


The author makes a detailed study of the important issues regarding the Codex Bembinus and a concise resume of preceding works on Vat. Lat. 3226. This book subsequently provided a basic outline for the preface of Prete's critical edition *P. Terenti Afri Comoediae* (1954).

In the first of four chapters, Prete discusses the history of the Codex Bembinus and offers a new interpretation of a signature on folio 9 which he theorizes to be the initials of one of the manuscript's owners, Johannes Porcellius. He examines the conjectures of Umpfenbach, of Hauer, and of Kauer concerning the manuscript's history and often states whose observations and conclusions seem to him more consistent with the truth.

In chapter two, Prete offers a very brief description of the codex and dedicates the major portion of the chapter to the correctors of A. Umpfenbach makes observations based solely on the naked eye, that is, he looks only at the color of the ink when he distinguishes the various
hands of the correctors. Hauler formulates an hypothesis without thorough research and documentation, which results in an unsatisfactory and inexact study. Kauer provides inconsistent arguments and fails to show, according to Prete, how Ioviales is responsible for all of the corrections attributed by Umpfenbach to the "manus recens". Prete expounds not only on his own theories about the various hands of the correctors but also on the signs of interpunction. His arguments are convincing.

In chapter three, Prete traces the history of the text of Terence according to the theories of Jachmann, Lindsay/Craig and Marouzeau/Andrieu. Prete also illustrates them graphically:
In chapter four, Prete discusses the scholia of the Codex Bembinus, particularly as presented in the 1934 edition by James F. Mountford.

Prete adds five reproductions of the Codex Bembinus: Adelphoe, fol. 111r; Eunuchus, foll. 9r, 9v, 11r; Heautontimorumenos fol. 37v. Because of the reduction of their original size, the plates are very difficult to read.


Andrieu here wishes to give a psychological explanation for certain copyist errors. He discusses two major types of mistakes: a) haplography and dittography. These errors "reposent sur un mécanisme psycho-physiologique qui n'est autre que la différence de vitesse de la pensée qui conçoit et de la main qui écrit." In other words, haplography (DIFFERES for DIFFERRES) and dittography (TUM MIHI for TU MIHI) are explained by the slowness of the hand to keep pace with the mind: b) omission and repetition of a group of words. Omission of a line is caused by "la fausse liaison syntaxique". The arrangement of words in the lines leads us, in the course of reading, a psychic act, to link line one with line three. The editions
by Kauer-Lindsay and Marouzeau present lines 198-200 of Terence's *Adelphoe* in this way:

Domo me eripuit, uerberaui, me inuito abduxit meam; Ob male facta haec tantidem emptam postulat sibi tradier! Homini misero plus quingentos colaphos infregit mihi!

Many editors reverse lines 199-200 but Andrieu endorses the correction proposed by Louis Havet. Andrieu suggests that the error is explained by the "fausse liaison syntaxique" in the interior of the lines. Havet rearranges the text in which brackets are added to signal the false liaison:

Domo me eripuit, uerberaui, [colaphos infregit mihi Homini misero plus quingentos]; me inuito abduxit meam; Ob male facta haec tantidem emptam postulat sibi tradier!

The error of repetition, less frequent than the preceding case, happens when the attention of the scribe is unusually relaxed (especially on the brink of sleep). The muscular tension which orients the eye to the bottom of the page is diminished and the scribe begins again a line he has already written.

Prete, after outlining the theories of Jachmann, Lindsay, Craig, and Andrieu regarding the tradition of Terence's text in antiquity, presents his own views and states exactly where he agrees and disagrees with these scholars. Prete believes that in the middle of the fourth century, there existed Terentian codices which do not belong to our manuscript tradition, i.e., to one or other of the two families, Bembinus or Calliopian. Prete considers whether these lost codices might possibly be connections between A and X or between Σ and X or even between X and Φ. Many corrections of the Bembine text which are attributed arbitrarily to a "corrector" could find their source in X or in the other codices of this family.

The importance of grammarians, Prete continues, is very great also for the history of the text of Terence (cf. the works of Lindsay, Craig, Marouzeau, Andrieu).

Prete does not accept the theory of Lindsay and Craig regarding the history of Terence's text in antiquity; he maintains that Andrieu does not offer definitive argu-

---

1 G. Jachmann, Die Geschichte des Terenztextes im Altertum (Basel: Reinhardt, 1924).
2 cf. my review of Prete, 1950.
4 cf. my review of Andrieu, 1939, 1940.
5 For a stemma, see 1954 review.
ments nor does Andrieu prove Jachmann's false. Prete believes that Jachmann's theory is the most probable: the Bembine and Calliopian recension are derived from a common source at a time when other Terentian editions existed. We can deduce from grammarians that at times they are not referring to one of the existing families. If this source common to A and $\Sigma$ depends on Probus and if these other editions depend on Probus, as Jachmann suggests, we do not know.


In a discussion of the medieval tradition, Pasquali states that the plays of Terence are transmitted to us by a large number of manuscripts, some of which are Carolingian that go back to one ancient edition. He reports that the medieval codices of Terence are more numerous than those of Plautus because Terence was a school-author in the Middle Ages as well as in antiquity. The Bembine Codex (A) is much more complete than the Ambrosian palimpsest (A) of the Palatine manuscripts of Plautus.

In a discussion of the two families (A and $\Sigma$) which transmitted the plays of Terence, he believes that
the Calliopían recension (Σ), compared with A, presents a series of changes evidently intentional. The editor of the recension, Pasquali continues, sought to facilitate the reading, simplifying the constructions, completing elliptical phrases, adding little words wherever he thought necessary, and substituting current vocabulary for archaic. These changes the editor made without regard for meter and sometimes without having understood the text which he arbitrarily changed.

Pasquali agrees with Jachmann that A dates from the fourth or fifth century, but he maintains that the Calliopían recension is not earlier than the fifth century, whereas Jachmann believes that it dates from the second half of the third century.


Prete states that the indication of a new scene in A and Σ follows a diverse method. The purpose of this study is to examine the principles involved.

The elements which constitute the title of a scene in its complete form were originally three, written in two distinct horizontal lines in this order: a) the "nota
personae" (a Greek letter); b) the name of the person; c) the role. In the Bembine text the first and the third are written in red and the second in black ink.

Prete's conclusions about scene titles are the following: it seems that the scene titles were at first analytic and vertical; corresponding to the name of each character in the first line there was, in the second, an indication of the role played. Example: A Phormio II, 2 (verse 315):

A PHORMIO \(\varepsilon\) GETA
PARASITUS SERUUS

When a title contained the names of two actors, both of whom played the same role, these two characters were originally indicated synthetically. Example: A Phormio IV, 1 (verse 567):

Z DEMIPHO \(\varepsilon\) CHREMES
SENES II

Prete adds that when two characters play the same role they are designated synthetically by the numeral II. In A the form II is the ordinary one, although "DUO" is also found (e.g. Htm. 53).

Wille presents a detailed examination of character designations in the plays of Terence in the Codex Bembinus. The "sigla" in A go back to the role-distribution in the ancient director's copy and not to the time of Terence. We are able to determine, with the help of the "sigla", the minimum number of actors necessary for any of the comedies but we cannot be certain about the number actually used in the time of Terence and throughout antiquity.


This volume of Studi e Testi, very strangely not listed in APhe until volume XLIV (1973) and apparently reviewed only once\(^1\), contains a reproduction of the entire Codex Bembinus. The quality of the reproduction is quite unsatisfactory and falls far short of the usefulness that Prete doubtless intended.

\(^1\)I am indebted to Theresa J. Kitchell who attempted to find a notice of Prete's book before the publication of APhe (1973). I learned about the book only after writing to the Vatican Librarian on a related matter.
The introduction, which deals with the origin, description, correctors and scholia of the Codex Bembinus, is an abbreviated and revised version of the author's 1950 study of the Terentian manuscript.²


³In my own apparatus criticus I have chosen his 1970 decisions over those of 1954.
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Prete's presentation of corrections and correctors in the form of a list has its disadvantages. By simply noting the letter of correction without reporting the lemma of the text, Prete often leaves the reader in doubt about the true object of correction, especially where, as is so often the case, his reproduction is very difficult to read. Also, Prete does not report in his list deletions made by the various correctors, deletions in fact mentioned in his critical edition. Examples of such deletions are these: line 834: ABSUMERE A, SUMERE corr. rec.; line 877: INAUDIUI A, AUDIUI corr. rec.; line 880: ADHIBENDAE A, ABENDAE corr. rec.; line 1015: QUIN A, QUI corr. rec.; line 1019: DE MEDIO A, E MEDIO corr. rec.; line 1024: NUNC MAGIS QUAM TUNC A, NUNC MAGIS corr. rec.

An exhaustive scrutiny of a newly made microfilm of the Bembine Phormio confirms that Prete's revisions concerning the correctors and their corrections are justified. Over the period of twenty years (from 1950 to
1970) Prete's judgment about the correctors has become more precise. He distinguishes the hand of the rubricator who adds character designations. Interesting to note is that, of the sixteen revisions, eight concern change of correctors: six from corr. rec. to Iov., two from Iov. to corr. rec. Prete gives no indication of the reasons for such changes.


Prete asserts that the only editions of Terence provided with a complete critical apparatus derived from a direct and complete inspection of A, are Umpfenbach's and the one by Lindsay and Kauer.

Prete, in this article, focuses on the critical apparatus of the Kauer-Lindsay edition where, he professes, many readings are attributed to A, although they are not found in the Bembinus, and others which are in A are not reported. He adds that corrections transcribed in the apparatus as belonging to A2 or Ioviales are not in the codex, and others which are found there are not indicated. The purpose of the article is to review the text of the
Phormio in A in order to determine with exactness the original readings\(^1\) and the emendations executed by the correctors.

Since this article bears directly on the present investigation, I have carefully examined the collection of emendations and I have incorporated them into my apparatus criticus. This work documents Prete's latest decisions regarding a portion of the corrections and correctors in the Phormio of A. I have found as a result of my scrutiny, a number of inaccuracies which should be mentioned here: line 104 in A reads ET QUO MAGIS. Prete notes that QUO is written over an erasure that seems to have space for four letters. Looking at the manuscript, one could make a defense for a space for three letters by lining up the letters on line 103 with line 104. Three letters UEN- stand above QUO. Line 150: "A writes DELEIAM" but DELAIAM is clearly the reading. The corrector emends this word to DELATAM not "DELETAM". Line 189: "A writes RECTEMKIVIDISSEM" whereas A actually has RECTEMHIVIDISSEM. In the same line "the corrector adds pro above vidisset (providisset)" but A reads VIDISSEM (corrected to PROVIDISSEM). One finds MELIORETCALDIOR on line 228 not

\(^1\)Prete does not reproduce his apparatus criticus (1954) nor Kauer's (1926) but cites about seventy-five instances where he believes Kauer has made an error of omission or of judgment.
line 222. Line 410: "the scribe of A writes АВHUC and himself corrects to ADDVC". АВDVC is obviously meant here as the correction. Line 821: "A writes PARE instead of parare. The corrector adds RA above the line, after PARE, without correcting the E". In fact, however, the corrector adds RE not RA above the line after PARE. A omits the sigla to indicate Demipho Z on line 945 not line 946.
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