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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.
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.

---

3M. 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.\(^5\)

\(^5\)Prete, 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 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 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). Again, evidence of ownership lies within the manuscript itself, where three notations in the hand of Bembo occur. On fol. 5r is the comment:

&EST MEI BERNARDI BEMBI QUI POST EIUS OBITU(M) MANEAT IN SUOS ANTIQUISS ANTIQUITATIS RELIQUAE

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

Ber(nardus)
codex mihi carior auro
Bem(bus)

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

---

7Prete, 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.
9Hauler, 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>

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. $\frac{\text{1477}}{15}$

Some attribute this last inscription to a third person who
might have owned the codex after Porcellio and before
Bembo.\textsuperscript{10} Others recognize it as in the hand of Porcellio.\textsuperscript{11}
At the end of this same inscription is a notation ($\frac{\text{1477}}{15}$)
followed by an erasure. This may be an indication of the
price\textsuperscript{12} 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 $\frac{\text{1477}}{15}$ are JPJ and
form the initials of the name of Porcellio (Johannes Pando-
ni) with the final letter of the cognomen in the genitive
case (Pandoni).\textsuperscript{13} In the space erased there may have been

\textsuperscript{10}Hauler, p. 274.
\textsuperscript{11}Prete, 1970, p. 10.
\textsuperscript{12}R. Sabbadini, Le scoperte dei Codici latini e
greci ne' secoli XIV et XV (Firenze: 1963): 146 n. 33.
\textsuperscript{13}Prete, 1970, p. 10. I presume Prete believes
Johannes Pandoni 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.
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 AEOQUE 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.

---

20 Sandys, p. 147.
21 Gabriel 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:

Terentio di lettere maiuscola con scholiij in lettera Longobarda, fu del Bembo, in pergamena in 4*.

Ful. Urs.

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

\textsuperscript{23}Sandys, p. 153.
\textsuperscript{24}Prete, 1970, p. 17.
\textsuperscript{25}Sandys, p. 153.
\textsuperscript{26}F. Ehrle, Fragmenta et picturae vergiliana codicis Vaticani Latini 3225 phototypice expressa consilio et opera curatorum Bibliothecae Vaticanae (In Vaticano, 1945), p. 17.
dangers arising from military operations against the Vatican. About 1798\(^27\) 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).\(^28\) Testimony to this fact is found in the inscription which Gaetano Marini (1742-1815),\(^29\) the "primus custos" of the Vatican Library at this time, wrote on fol. 4v:

\[
\text{Furto sublatus Mense Octob. A. CIC \(D\) CCXCIX\(^30\) sed multa a me diligentia perquisitus beneficio Egregii viri Dominici Sala Bibliothecae restitutus idibus Dec. eiusdem anni Cai. Marini a Bibl. Vatic.}
\]

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.\(^31\)

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

\(^{27}\)Ibid. p. 22, n. 2 and p. 23, n. 23.
\(^{28}\)Prete, 1970, p. 18, n. 43. Here he gives Sala's dates.
\(^{29}\)Enciclopedia Italiana di scienze, lettere ed arti, 1934-1942, s. v. "Gaetano Marini."
\(^{30}\)Ehrle, p. 22, n. 2 and p. 23, n. 23.
\(^{31}\)Prete, 1954, p. 17.
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.4

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 ·TER· and that of the hair-side indicates the abbreviated name of the particular play, e. g. ·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·= 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.5 These rubrics and titles are the same size as the letters of the text.

5Prete, 1954, p. 18.
Latin majuscule book-hand of early manuscripts consists of two styles of writing: a) square and rustic capitals and b) uncials. 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


\(^{11}\) Ibid., 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

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

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 mondo
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.17 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 manu-
script the two poems which Poliziano later transcribed
and commented upon in his own copy of the 1475 edition
of Terence.18

17Prete, 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.
18Prete, "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 elision 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

---

1This theory is well presented by Lowe, CLA, vol. 1, p. x.
2Ibid., 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.\textsuperscript{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-

\textsuperscript{3}Lowe, 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.4

We turn now to the orthographic variants found in the Phormio alone:5 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 A, three "marks" of punctuation were added later: the "paragraphos" (\textsuperscript{\textdegree}), the "simplex ductus" (\textsuperscript{\textdegree}) and the third sign resembling a Greek sigma (\textsuperscript{\textdegree}). It may well be that a corrector of the sixth century,\textsuperscript{6} who signs his name "Ioviales" in cursive on several pages, or a "manus recens" of the seventh/eighth century\textsuperscript{7} 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.\textsuperscript{8}

Possible errors, and not orthographic variants, occur: on fol. 53r, line 2 ANTHEONE 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 85l, 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.

\textsuperscript{6}Prete, 1970, pp. 31-32, n. 17.
\textsuperscript{7}Ibid., p. 32.
\textsuperscript{8}Prete, 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\(^9\) are reference signs placed above the word commented on to safeguard against confusion. The most common of these signs is \(\div\) cf. fol. 53v, lines: 4, 7, 8, 12, 13. Also found are symbols such as these: fol. 53v, line 4 \(\div\); fol. 53v, line 5 \(\uparrow\); fol. 53v, line 9 \(\omega\); fol. 53v, line 15 \(\downarrow\); fol. 54r, line 23 \(\phi\); fol. 54r, line 25 \(\omega\); fol. 54r, line 33 \(\nu\); fol. 54v, line 36 \(\nu\); fol. 54v, line 43 \(\gamma\).

[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]

\(^9\) 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" (m^4) which is possibly still Ioviales or someone shortly after him. This Ioviales^2 made only a few corrections particularly of the Hecyra. As Kauer himself states in the introduction to his Oxford text:

Iov. = 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 Ioviales^2 in his critical apparatus for the Hecyra. But in the Phormio, fol. 63v, line 476, Kauer proposes Iov. 2 ("...hie illic singula mutavisse videtur") as the supplier of the word SE above PRAEBUIT.

Sesto Prete\(^5\) 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

---

\(^4\)Prete, 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 articles\(^3\) 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. Mountford\(^4\) 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

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

Mountford maintains⁵ 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

⁵Mountford, p. 3.
⁶Ibid., p. 4.
⁷Ibid., 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 \textit{Phormio} 1-59. Paul Wessner\(^9\) 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 Löfstedt\(^{10}\) 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.

Mountford\(^{11}\) 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" \textit{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.  

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:  

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.  

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

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

A³ = "manus tertia"

Iov. = Ioviales

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

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

(1-6): see page 30.
Notes to Page 29

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


4Marouzeau does not date the last three hands.


6Marti, p. 126.
C. Sulpicii mollinaris periocnia
CREA INUMERALABERALBERERE CREPEDIAMNVE
RECIPIOERR ERIBERBEREBE
CREAS RABAILERUINCREAERELFILLAIA
ATNEMELE CONINCERMETANTEMANCYIA
CNAM McCINICINAMAM INTERELEVANOADVENDIT
ATRANAMORITURUTACOSOLABERALGAREMES
SUCREOCRATIEECCIAVANTIPRO
CUALINOORELACAREASITUXOREMAGACISP
INTEREICARESESREVERSIFREMEREDINAINAS
TRICINTADANTZARASITOUTILLAMCONYCEA
RABERTICERARIENPONOCERUMTRANICINA
XNOREMREINENANTEREDALAFREADCINTAAL
INCIPIT
LUDIS MEGALENSIBUS
SERUILLIO COS
PHORMIO MEGALENSIBUS
CASPIONE GRAECA
APOLLODORU FACTA EST

ANNONAM AMBULAMUS)
S3r

SULPICI APOLLINARIS PERIOCHA

CHREMES FRATER ABERAT PEREGRE DEMIPHO
RELIETO ATHENIS ANTHONI FILIO
CHREMES HABEBAT LEMNI UXOREM ET FILIAM
ATHENIS ALIAM CONIUGEM ET AMANTE UNICAM
GNATAM PHIDICINA MATER E LEMNO ADUENIT
ATHENAS MORITUR VIRGO SOLA ABERAT CHREMES
FUNUS PROCURAT IBI EAM UISAM ANTIPO
CUM AMERET OPERA PARASITI UXOREM ACCIPIT
PATER ET CHREMES REUERSI FREMERE DEIN MINAS
TRIGENTA DANT PARASITO UT ILLAM CONIUGEM
HABERET IPSE ARGENTO HOC EMITUR PHIDICINA
UXOREM RETINET ANTIPO A PATRUO ADGNITAM

PERIOCHA: For an extensive treatment of the periocha
and its author, see Schanz, Hosius, and
Krüger, Geschichte der römischen Literatur,
vol. III (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlags-
buchhandlung, 1959), pp. 159-161. See also
Sidney G. Ashmore, P. Terenti Afri Comoe-
diae (New York: Oxford University Press,
1908), notes to the Andria, p. 3.

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

POSTQUAM POETA UETUS POSTAM NON POTEST RETRABERE A STUDIO ET TRADERE HOMINEM IN OTIUM MALEDICTIS DETERRERE NE SCRIBAT PARAT QUI ITA DICTITAT QUAS ANTEHAC FECIT FABULAS TENUIT ESSE ORATIONE ET SCRIPTURA LEUI QUIA NUSQUAM INSANUM SCRIPSIT ADOLESCENTULUM CERUAM UIDESE FUGERE ET SECTARI CANES ET EAM PLORARE ORARE UT SUBUENIAT SIBI QUOD SI INTELLEGERET CON STETIT OLIM NOUA ACTORIS OPERA MAGIS STETISSE QUAM SUA MINUS MULTO AUDACTER QUAM NUNC LEDERET NUNC SI QUIS EST QUT HOE DICAT AUT SIC COGITET UETUS SI POETA NON LACESSISSET PRIOR NULLO INUINIRE PROLOGUM POTUISSET NOUUS QUOM DICERET NISI HABERET CUI MALE DICERET IS SIBI RESPONSUM HOC HABEAT IN MEDIO OMNIBUS PALVAM ESSE POSITAM QUI 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
10 ACTORIS: + reference sign to scholia to left of A
11 AUDACTER: in their app. crit. of the Oxford edition, Kauer and Lindsey cite Iov. as changing AUDACTER TO AUDACTER
12 DICAT: letter e added above A by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read DICET; + reference sign to scholia above the I
13 LACESSISSET: + reference sign to scholia above the first S
15 HABERET: - reference sign to scholia above the B
17 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 STUDUIT REICERE
HIC RESPONDERE VOLUIT NON LACESSERE
BENEDITIS SI CERTASSE AUDISSET BENE
QUOD AB ILLO ADLATUMST: ID SIBI ESSER RELATUM PUTET
DE ILLO TAM FIDEM FACIAM DICUENDI MIFI
PECCANDI CUM IPSE DE SE FECIT NON FACIT
NUNC QUID UELIN ANIMUM ATTENDITE ADPORTO NOUAM
EPIDICAZOMENON QUAM UOCANT COMOEDIAM
GRAECI LATINI PHORMIONEM NOMINANT
QUIA PRIMAS PARTIS QUI AGIT ERIT PHORMIO
PARASTUS PER QUEM RES GERETUR MAXIME
VOLUNTAS UOSTRA SI AD POETAM ACCESSERIT
DATE OPERAM ADESTE ABOQO ANIMO PER SILENTIUM
NI SIMILI UTAMUR PORTUNA ATQUE USTI SUMUS
CUM PER TUMULTUM NOSTER GRAEIX NOTUS LOCOST
QUEM ACTORIS UIRTUX NOBIS RESTITUIT LOCUM
BONITASQUE UESTRA ADIUTANS 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 EPIDICAZOMENON: reference sign to scholia above the D
26 GRAECI: reference sign to scholia above the A
28 RES: reference sign to scholia above the B
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 LOCOST: reference sign to scholia above the C
33 RESTITUIT: reference sign to scholia above the U
34 ADIUTANS: reference sign to scholia above the U
B AMICUS SUMMUS HEUS ET POPULARIS GETA
HERI AD ME URIT ERAT EI DE RATIONCULA
IAM PRIDEM APUC ME RELICUM PAUXILLIUM
NUMMORUM ID UT CONFICEREM CONFECI ADFFERO
NAM ERILEM FILIUM EISUS DUXISSE AUDIO
UXOREM EI CREDITO MINUS HOC CONRADITUR
QUAM INIQUE COMPARATIMST. II QUI MINUS HABENT
UT SEMPES ALTIQUIA ADDIANT DIUITORIUS
QUOD ILLE UNCATIAM VIX DE DESENSO SUO
SUUM DEFURDANS GENETUM CONPERIT MIZER
ID ILLA UNIVERSUM ABRIPEND HAD EXISTIMANS
QUANTO LABORE PARTEM PORRO AUTEM GETA
FERMIETUR ALIO MINERE UBI ERA PEPERERIT
PORRO AUTEM ALIO UBI ERIT PUEO NATALIS DIES
UBI INITIABUNT OMNE HOC MATER AUFERET
PUEO CAUSA ERIT MIGHTUNDI SED UIDEON GETAM

38

PHORM.

B DAUS

SERUUS

35

AMICUS SUMMUS HEUS ET POPULARIS GETA
HERI AD ME URIT ERAT EI DE RATIONCULA
IAM PRIDEM APUC ME RELICUM PAUXILLIUM
NUMMORUM ID UT CONFICEREM CONFECI ADFFERO
NAM ERILEM FILIUM EISUS DUXISSE AUDIO
UXOREM EI CREDITO MINUS HOC CONRADITUR
QUAM INIQUE COMPARATIMST. II QUI MINUS HABENT
UT SEMPES ALTIQUIA ADDIANT DIUITORIUS
QUOD ILLE UNCATIAM VIX DE DESENSO SUO
SUUM DEFURDANS GENETUM CONPERIT MIZER
ID ILLA UNIVERSUM ABRIPEND HAD EXISTIMANS
QUANTO LABORE PARTEM PORRO AUTEM GETA
FERMIETUR ALIO MINERE UBI ERA PEPERERIT
PORRO AUTEM ALIO UBI ERIT PUEO NATALIS DIES
UBI INITIABUNT OMNE HOC MATER AUFERET
PUEO CAUSA ERIT MIGHTUNDI SED UIDEON GETAM

50

GETA B DAUS

SERUI II

36 RATIONCULA: r reference sign to scholia above

43 DEMENSO: r reference sign to scholia above the

50 PUER: letter O crossed out by Iov. (K.), by corr.

rec. (Pr.) to read PUEER

50a r: r = Greek gamma

50b II: the numeral

53 LECTIMST: r 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 REDEDD MAGNA HASENDAST GRATIA
B SEI QUID TU ES TRISTIS F EGONE NESCIS QUO IN METU ET
QUANTO IN PERICULO LAMMODI SILENTI EST T SILES F
SILES MOO UT TACERE POSSIS B ABI SIG INSCIENS
CUIS TU FIDEM IN PECUNIA PERSEPHERIS
UERERE UERBA EI CREDERE UBI QUID MIHI LUCR EST
TE FOLLER E ERGO AUSCULTA B HANC OPERAM TIBI DICO
SINES NOSTRI DAUE FRAETEM MATOREM CHEREMEN
NOSTIN B QUID NT F QUID EIOUS GNAETM PHAEIDRIAM
B TANQUAM TE F EUNET SENIBUS AMOBUS STIMUL
ITER ILLI IN LEMNO UT ESSET NOSTRO IN CILICIAM
AD HOSPITIEM ANTICUM IS SESEM PER EPISTULAS
PELLEXIT MODO NON MONTIS AURI POLICENS
B CUI TANTA ERAT RES ET ERAT SUPER F DESINAS
SIC EST INGENIUM B O REGER ME ESSE OPORTUIT
F ABSUNDES AMBO HIC TUM SENES ME FILIS
RELINQUON F QUASI MAGISTRUM B O GETA PROVINCIA
CEPSITI DURAM MIHI USUS USUNT HOC SCI
MEMINI RELINQUI ME DEO IRAE ME
COEI ADUERSARI PRIMO QUID UERGIS OPUS
SENIFIDELIS DUM SUM SCAULAS PERDIDI
F UERE E IN MEMENT MIHI ISTAEAC B NAMQUE INCITIAT
ADUORSUM STIMULUM CALCES F COEI IS OMNIA
PACE OBSEQU QUAE UELLENT B SCISTI UTI FORO
F NOSTER MALI NIHIL QUICQUAM PRIMO HIC PHAEIDRIA

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 HIN
73 DURAM: after this word corr. rec. (Pr.), Iov. (K.)
added r. In fact, the MS tradition attribu­
utes MIHI...PERIODI to Geta
75 ADUERSARI: the word HIS added above AD by corr. rec.
(Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read HIN
77 r changed to B by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) at
beginning of line; ISTAEAC: letter after ISTAEAC
crossed out by Iov. (K.)
78 OMNIA: ea added above O by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov.
(K.)
CONTINUO QUANDAM NACTUS EST PUELLULAM
CITHARISTRIAM HANC AMARE COEPIT PERDITAE
EA SERUIEBAT LENONI INPURISSIMO
NEQUE QUID DARITUR QUICQUAM ID CURARANT PATRES
RESTABAT ALIUT NIHIL NISI OCULOS PACERE
SECTARI IN LUDUM DUCE ET REDUCERE
NOS OTIOS OPERAM DABAMUS PHAEDRIAE
IN QUO HAC DISCEBAT LUDO EXADUEROS ILICO
TONSTRAINA ERAT QUANDAM HIC SOLEBAMUS FERE
PLEBUNQUE EAM OPERRIBI DUM INDE IRET DOMUM
INTEREA DUM SEDEmus ILLI INTEREUNIT
ADULESCENS QUIDAM LACRUMANS NOS MIRARIER
ROGAMUS QUID SIT NUMquam AQUE INQVIET AC MODO
PAUPERTAS MINI ONUS UISUMST ET MISERUM ET GRAUE
MODO QUANDAM UIDI VIRGINEM HIC VICINiae
MISERAM SUAM MATREM LAMENTARI MORTUAM
EA SITa ERAT EXADUORsurM NEQUE ILLI BENIUOLUS
NEQUE NOTUS NEQUE COGNATUS EXTRA URAM ANCIIULAM
QUISQUAM ADERAT QUI ADJUARAT FUNUS MISERITABUM
UIGRO IPSA FACIE REGREGIA. QUID UERBIS OPUST
COMMORAT OMNES NOS IBI CONTINUO ANTIPO
UGLITISNE EAMUS UISERE ALIUS CENSEO
EAMUS OCTUS NOS SODES INVIENIUS
UIDEMUS UIGRO PULCHRUS 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 LICO
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. in-
correctly 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 BENIUOLES
98 ANCIIULAM: letter I added above line between
N and C, then IIII crossed out by corr.
rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read ANICIIULAM
104 ---: three letters totally erased and QUO
written in their place by corr. rec. (Pr.)
CAPILLUS PASSUS NUDUS PES. IPSA HORMIDA LACRIMAE UESTITUS TURPIS: UT NI UI BONI IN IPSA INESSET FORMA HAEC FORMAM EXTINGUERENT ILLE QUI ILLAM AMABAT FIDICINAM TANTUM MODO SATIS INQUIT SCITAST HOSTER UERO B IAM SCIO AMARE COEPI T SCI QUAM QUO EUADIT VIDE POSTRIDIE AD ANUM RECTA PERCIT OBSECRAT UT SIBI EIU S FACIAT COPIAM ILLA ENIM SE NEGAT NEQUE EUM AEGUOM AIT, FACERE ILLAM CIUEM ESSE ATTICAM BONAM BONIS PROGNATAM SI UXOREM UELIT LEGE ID LICERE FACERE SIN ALIUM NEGAT NOSTER QUID FACERET NESCRE ET ILLAM DUCERE CUPIERAT ET METEBAT. ABSENTEM PATERM

B NON SI REDISSSET E PATER UENDAM DARET

ILLE INDO TAM IAE RIGINEM ATQUE IGNOBILEM DARET ILLI NUMQUAM FACERET B QUID FIT DENIQUE

R QUID FACIAT EST PARASITUS QUIDAM PHORMIO HOMO CONFIDENS QUI ILLUM DI ONNES PERDUINT

B QUID IS PECIT R HOC CONSILIUM QUOD DICAM DEDIT

LEX EST UT ORBAE QU SINT GENERE PROXIMI

IIIS NUBANT. ET ILLOS DUCERE EADEM HAECE = X UBIET EGO TE COGNATUN DICAM ET TIBI SCRIBAM DICAM PATERNUM AMICU NUM AEQUITAM AD IUDICES UENIEMUS QUI FUGIT PATER

QUAE MATER QUI COGNATI TIBI SIT-OMNIA HAECE

119 E: letter I added above and to the right of E by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read EI

120 ILLE: letters NE added above by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.) to read ILLNE

122 FACIAT: letters AC crossed out by Iov. (K.), corr. rec. (Pr.) to read FAMAT

125 QU: letter I added above by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read QUI
CONFINGAM QUOD ERIT MIHI BONUM ATQUE COMMODUM
CUM TU SORUM NIHIL REFELLES UINCAT SCILICET
PATER ADERIT MIHI PARATAE LITES QUID MEA
ILLA QUIDEM NOSTRA ERIT B IOCU LAREM AUDACIAM
PERGUESTEKT HOMINI FACTUMST VENTUMST UINCIMUR 135
DUXIT B QUID NARRAS F HOC QUOD AUDIS B O GETA
QUID TE FUTURUMST F NESCIO HERCILE UNUM HOC SCIO
QUOD FORS FERET F PEREMUS AEGO ANIMO B PLACET
EM ISTUC UIRIST OFFICION IN ME OMNIS SPES MIHI EST
B LAUDO F AD PRECATOREM ADEAM CREDO QUI MIHI 140
SIC ORET NUNC AMITTE QUEASO HUNC CETERUM
POSTHAC SI QUIquam NIHIL PRECOR TANTUM MODO
NON ADDIT UBI EGO HINC ABIERO UEL OCCIDITO
B QUID PEDAGOGUS ILLUS CITHARIARIAE
QUAD ERIT GERET F STC TERNITUR B NON MULTUM HABET 145
QUOD DET FORTASSE F IMMO NIHIL NISI SPEM MERAM
B PATER EIS REDIT AN NON TONDUM B QUAD SENEM
QUOD SPECTATIS UESTRUM F NON CERTUM SCIO
SED EPITULAM AB EO ADEARAM ESSE AUDIUI MODO
ET AD PORTITORES ESSE DELATAM PETAM 150
B NUM QUID GETA ALUIT ME UIS F UT BENE ST TIBI
PUER HEUS NEMON HOC PRODIT CAPE DA HOC DORCIIIO
A ANTIFO B PHAEDRIA
ADULESCENTES

ADEON REM REDISSE UT QUI MIHI CONSULTUM OPTIME UELLET ESSE

145 B: letter B inserted between TENITUR and NON
by A (Pr.)
146 F: letter F inserted between FORTASIUS and IMMU
by A (Pr.)
150 DELATAM: 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 FUSSIM INCOGITANS ITA EXPECTA—M UT PAR FUIT 155
B QUID ISTUC EST A BOGITAS QUI TAM AUDACIS FACINORIS NI
CONSCIUS SIS
QUOD UZINAM IN PHORMIONI ID SUADERE IN MENTEM INCIDISSET
NEO NE CUPIDUM EO INPULSISSET QUOD MIHI PRINCIPUIUMST—MALI
NON POTTVIS ESSEME FUSSISSET TUM ILLUS MIHI AEGRE ALIQUOD DIEB
AT NON COTTIDIANA CURA HABE ANGERET ANIMUM B AUDIO 160
A DUM EXSPECTO QUAM MOX UENIAT QUI ADINAT HANC MIHI
CONSUETUDINEM
B ALIIS QUIA DEFIT QUOD AMANT AEGREST TIBI QUITA SUPEREST

DOLET
AMORE ABUNDAS ANTIPHO

NAM TUA QUIDEM HERCLE CERTO UITA HAEC EXPETNDA OPPANDAQUE
EST
ITA ME DI BENE AMENT UT MIHI LICEAT TAM DIU QUOD ANO
FRUI 165
IAM DEPICISCI MORTE CUPIO TU CONICITO CETERA
QUOD EGO EX HAC INOPIA NUNC CAPIAM ET QUID TU EX ISTA
COPIA
UT NE ADDAM QUOD SINE SUMPTU INGENIUM LIBERALEM NACTUS ES
QUOD HABES ITA OOLUSTI UXOREM SINE MALA FAMA PALAM
BEATUS NE UNUM DESIT QUI MODESTE ISTAEC FERAT 170
QUOD SI TIBI RES SIT CUM EO LERONE QUIT MIHI EST TUM SEXTAS

A AT TU MIHI CONTRA NUNC UIDERE FORTUNATUS PHAEDRIA
CUI DE INTEGRUM EST POTESTAS ETIAM CONSULENDI QUID UELIS
RETNERE AMARE AMITERE EGO IN EUM INCIDI INFLEXILOCUM 175
UT NEQUE MIHI SIT MINITENDI NEC RETINENDI COPIA
SIT QUID IAC EST UIDRON EGO GETAM CURRENTM HIC ADUENTRE
IS EST IPSUS EI TEMEO MISERO QUAM HIC MIHI HUNTET REM

A GETA 7 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 Rubri-
cator
164 CERTO: letter O erased and E added above erasure by
Iov. (Pr.), (K.), by A2 (Har.) to read CERTE;
EXPETNDA: letter E added above TN by Iov. (Pr.) to read
EXPETNDA. On microfilm, letters EXPETN
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, EIUS added by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.)
178 MISERO: letter O erased by unknown cor. to read MISER
A NULLUS ES GETA NISI IAM ALIQUOD TIBI CONSILIUM CELEBRE

ITA NUNC INPARATUM SUBITO TANTA TE INPENDENT MALA 180
QUE NEQUE UTI DEUTEM SCI O NEQUE QUO MODO ME INDE

QUAE SI NON ASTU PROUIDENTUR ME AUT ERUM PESSUM DABUNT
NAM NON POTEST CELARI NOSTRA DIURIUS AUDACIA G QUID ILLIC
COMOTUS UENIT

A TAM TEMPORIS MIHI PUNCTUM AD HANC REM EST ERUS ADEST
G QUID ILLIC MALAST

A QUOD CUM AUDIERIT QUOD EIUS REMEDIAM INUENIAM

IRACUNDIAE 185
LOQUARNE INCENDAM TACEAM INSTIGEM PURGEM ME LATEREM
EHEU ME MISERUM CUM MIHI PAUEO TUM ANTIFHO ME EXCRUCIAT

EIUS ME MISERET EI NUNC TEMPO IS NUNC ME RETINET NAM
ABSQUE EO ESSET

RECTE EGO MIHI UIDISSEM ET SENIS ESSEM ULTUS IRACUNDIAM
ALIQUID CONVASISSEM ATQUE HINC ME CONOSCEREM PROTNUS IN

FEDES 190
G QUAM HINC FUGAM AUT FURTUM PARAT
A SED UBI ANTEPHONEM REPETERAM AUT QUA QUADERE INSISTITIAM IRAU
B TE NOMINAT G NESCIO QUOD MAGNUM HOC NUNTIO EXPECTO ILLUM

SANUSNE ES A DONUM IRE PERICM IBI PLURIMUST B REOCOMUS

HOMINEM STA ILLIC A HEM 195
SATIS PRO IMPERIO QUISQUIS ES G GETA A IPSE EST QUEM

HOC OBLIVEANT

C EDO QUID PORTAS OBSECRO ATQUE ID SI POTES UENBO EXPEDII
A FACIAM

FEOLOQUERE A MODO APOT PORTUM G MEUMRE A INTELLEXTI
G OCCIBI B HEM

G QUID AGAM B QUID AIS A HUIUS PATREM UIDISSEM ME ET PATRUM
TUUM

NAM QUOD EGO HUIC SUBITO EXITIO REMEDIAM INUENIAM MISER
200
QUOD SI EQ MARE FORTUNAE REREUNT PHANTUM ABS TE UT

DISTRAHAR
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, \( \Gamma \) 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 APORTEM

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
Nulla est mihi utia expetenda a ergo istaec cum ipa sunt.

---nto magis te aduigilare aequomst fortis fortuna adiuuat
r non sum aput me a atqui opus est nunc cum maxume ut sis

Antipho

Nam si senserit te timidum pater esse arbitrabitur. 225
Commeruisse culpam & hoc uerumst & non possum inmutarier
a quid faceres si aitid grauis tibi nunc faciendum foret
r cum hoc non possum illud minus posse a hoc nihil est

Quid hic conterimus operam frustra quin abeo B et quidem
ego r obse---

Quid si adsimulo satinesst a garris r uolitum contemplaminem

210 Satine sic est a non r quid si sic a propemodum r quid sic
a sat est

Em istuc serva et urchum urcho par pari et respondenas
ne te iratus suis saeuidicis dicitis protelet r scio

A ui coactum te esse inuitum & legit judicio a tenes
set hic qui est senex quem uideo in ultima platea ipsus

215 r non possum adesse a ah quid agis quo abis antipho

Mane inquam r egomet me noui et precatum meum
Uobis commendo phaniem et uitam mean

B greta quid nunc piest a tu iam lites audies
ego plectar pendens nisi quid me fefellerit

220 sed quod modo hic nos antiphonen nonimus
Id homnet ipsos facere oporsted Pheadria

B aufer mihi oporsted quin tu quid faciam impera

---nto: first two letters blurred but Ms. tradition reads TANTO
---: letters blurred but Ms. tradition reads ILICET
Obse---: three letters blurred but Ms. tradition reads OBSECR
210 A: above A, unknown corrector added PH indicating Phaeodria should say GARRIS
213 Protelet: above and to the right of this word is PATER

written by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
218 Phaniem: the second A is crossed out and U added above
it by corr. rec. (Pr.)
222 Oporste-: final letter (A?) crossed out and T added
above by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read OPORTET
A MEMINISTIN OLIN UT FUEIT UESTRA ORATIO
IN RE INCEPTUNDA AD DEFENDENDAM NOXIAM
IUSTAM ILLAM CAUSAM FACILEM UINCIBILEM OPTUMAM
B MEMINI A EM NUNC IPSAST OPUS EA AUT SI QUID POVEST
MELIOR ET CALIDIOR B FIEG SEDULO
A NUNC PRIOR ADITO TU EGO IN INSIDIES HIC ERO
CENTURIATUS SI QUID DEFICIAS B AGE

225
230

Z DEMIPIO B PHAEODIA A GETA

SENEX ADULESCENS SERVUS
Z ITANE TANDEM UXORUM DUXIT ANTIPHO INIUSSO MEO
NEC MEUM IMPERIUM AC MITTO IMPERIUM NON SIMILATUM MEAM
RERERERI SALTEM NON PUDERI O PACINUS AUDAX O GETA
MONITOR A UX TANDEM QUO QUID MINI DICEST QUAM
CAUSAM REPERIERT

DEMOROR A APQUI REPERIAM ALIUT AGE Z AN BOC DICTEN MIHI
235
INUITUS FRCI LEX COEGIT AUDIO FATORE A PLACES
Z UERUM SCIENTEM TACITUM CAUSAM TRADERE ADUERSARIIS
ETIAMNE ID LEX COEGIT B ILLUD DURUM A EGO EXPEDIAM SINE
Z INCERTUS TQUID AGAM QUA PRATER SPEM ATQUE IN
CREDIBILE HO CMI OPTIGIT

239

PERICLA DAMNA EX ILLA PEREGRE REDIENS SEMPER
COGITET 243
AUT FILI PECCATUM AUT UXORIS MORTEM AUT FILIAE
COMMUNIA ESSE HAE PESE UT NE QUIT ANO SIT NOUM
245
QUI D UD PRATER SPEN B ENIET OMNE ID DEPUTARE ESSE
IN LUCRO
O PHAEODIA INCREDIBLEST QUANTUM ERUM ANTE ES 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 AU added written above by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
240-242: three lines, present in Ms. tradition, are not found in A
245 HAE PESE: 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 MOLIENDUM ESSE IN FISTRINO UAPULANDUM HABENDAE COMPEDES OPUS HURI FACTUNDUM HORUM NIHIL QUICQUAM ACCIDENT ANIM NOUM QUIDQUID PRAETER SPEM EUENIET OMNE ID DEPUTABO ESSE IN LUCRO 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 ANTIPO B SALDUM UENIRE Z CREDO HOC RESPONDE MIHI B UALET HIC EST SET• SATIDE OMNIA EX SENTENTIA V UELLEM QUIDEM B QUID ISTUC EST Z ROGITAS PHAEDRIA BONAS ME ABSENTE HIC CONCIFECISTIS NUPTIAS E ERO AN ID SUSCENSES NUNC ILLI Z ARTIFICEM PROBUN EGON ILLI NON SUSCENSEAM IPSUM GESTIO DARI MIHI IN CONSPECTUM NU- CULPA AUT SCIA~ LENEM PATREM ILLUM FACTUM ME ESSE ACERRIMUM B AQUIN NIHIL FECIT PATRUE QUOD SUSCENSES E ECCE AUTEM SIMILLIA OMNIA OMNES CONGRUUNT UNUM CUM NORIS OMNIS NORIS B HAUH ITAST HIC IN NOXIASC ILLI AD DEFENDUNDAM CAUSAM ADEST CUM ILLE ABEST HIC IN NOXIASC ILLI AD DEFENDUNDAM CAUSAM ADEST CUM ILLE ABEST PRAEST• TRADUNT OPERAS MUTUAS A PROBE HORUM FACTA INPRUDENS DEFINXIT SENEX Z HIC IN NOXIASC ILLI AD DEFENDUNDAM CAUSAM ADEST CUM ILLE ABEST PRAEST• TRADUNT OPERAS MUTUAS 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 248 ---S: letters ERU appear to me to be written by another hand (corr. rec.) 253 RE: letter I added before RE by corr. ant. (Pr.) to read IRE 260 EGON: letter E added above N by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read EGONE 261 NU--: letter N written after NU and letters C and SUA written above by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read NUNC SUA 265 UNUM CUM NORIS: Ashmore incorrectly cites A as reading NUM NORIS 266 HIC IN: Kauer wrote in his apparatus: HIC IAM IN A2 but I do not see IAM in the codex 267 ABEST: after this word, HIC added above by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
Sed si quis forte malitia pretus sua insidias nostrae fecit adulescentiae ac uicit nostra culpa est an iudicum qui saepe propter inuidiam adimunt diuiti aut propter misericordiam addunt pauperi a ni nosseem causam crederem uera hunc loqui z an quisquam iudex est qui possit noscere tua iusta ubi tupe uerbum non respondeas ita ut ille fecit in functus adulescentuli est officium liberalis postquam ad iudices uentum est non potuit cogitata proloqui ita eum tum timidum ibi stupefecit pudor a laudo hunc sed cesso adire quam primum senem ere salue salum te auenisse gaude bone custos salue columna ubro familiae cui commendavi pilium hinc abiens heum a iam dudum te omnes nos accusare audio inerito et me horum omniu ineritiisimo narnuid me in hac re facere ugliusti tibi seruom hominem causam orare leges non sinunt neque testimonio dictio est in mitto omnia addo istuc inprudens timuit adulescentis sino tu seruus uerum si coghata est maxume non futi necesse habere sed id quod lex iubet dotem daretis quarenet alium uirum

275 EST: in his app. crit., Kauer 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 O added above by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read OBSTUPE-FECIT

286 ADUENISSE: the two S's were erased and R added by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read ADUENIRE

290 INERITO: 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
QUA RATIONE INOPEM POTIUS DUCERAT DOMUM
A NON RATTO UBERUM ADVBRAT Z SUMMERT
ALICUNDE A NIHIL EST DICTO FACILIUS
Z POSTREMO SI NULLO ALIO FACTO PAENORE A HUI
DIXIT PULCHRIR SISIQUAM QUISQUAM CREEDERET
TE UTO Z NON NON SIC FUTURUMST. NON POOTEST
ECOQ ILLAM CUM ILLO UT PARTIAU HIPHAM UINUM DIEM
NIHIL SUAUE MERITUMST. HOMINEM COMONSTRARIER
300
MIHI ISTUM UOLO AUT UBI HABITET DEMONSTRARIER
A NEMPE PHORMIONEM Z ISTUM PATRONUM MULIERIS
A IAM FAKO HIC ADERIT Z ANTIFPO UBI NUNC EST A FORIS
Z ABI PHAEDRIA EUM REQUIRE ATQUE HIC ADDUC B EO
RECTA UIA QUIDEM ILLUC A NEMPE AD PAMPHILAM
310
Z AT EGO DEOS PENATES HINC SALUTATUM DOMUM
DEVERTAR INDE IBO AD FORUM ATQUE ALIQUOS MIHI
AMICOS ADOUCABO AD HANC REM QUI ADIENI
UT NE INPARATUS SIM SI UENIAT PHORMIO
A PHORMIO E GETA
PARASITUS SERUIS
A ITANE PATRIS ADVENTUM UERITUM HINC ABISSE E ADMODUM 315
A PHANUM RELICAM SOLAM E SIC A ET IRATUM SEREM
E OPPIDO A AD TS SUMMA SOLAM PHORMIO RERUM REDIT
TUTE HOC INTRISTI TIBI OMNE EST EXEDENDUM ACCINGERE
E OBSECOR TE A SI ROGABIT IN TE SPES EST A ECCERE
QUID SI REDDET E TU IMPULISTI A SIC OPINOR E SUBUENTI 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.), to read DICTO
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 IPSUM
310 PAMPHILAM: letters PA appear to be written by another hand but neither Pr. nor K. nor
(K.) mention this correction
314 UENIAT: letters AT written above by corr. rec. (Pr.),
letters AD written by Iov. (K.) to read ATUENIAT, ADENIAT respectively
315 PATRIS ADVENTUM: word AIS written above by corr.
rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
A CEDO SEMEM IAM INSTRUCTA SUNT MINI IN CORDE CONSILIA OMNIA
E QUID AGES QUID UTS NISI UTI MANEAT PHANUM ATQUE
EX CRIMINE HOC
ANTIPHONEM ERIPIAM ATQUE IN ME OMNEM IRAM DERTIEM SENIS
E O UR FORTIS ATQUE AMICUS URBUM HOC SARPE PHORMIO
UEMOR NE ISTAEC PORTITUDO IN NEUM EMUPAT DENTIQUE
325
A HON ITA EST FACTUMST PERICULUM IAM FEDUM UISAST UIA
QUO ME CENSESES HOMINES IAM DEUERBERASSE USQUE AD NCEM
HOSPITES TUM CIUES QUO MAGIS NOUI TANTO SAEPTUS
CEDO DUN ENUMQUAM INIURARUM AUDISTI MINI SCRIPTUM DICAM
E QUI ISTUC A QUA NON RETE ACCIPITRI TENDITUR NEXUE
MILIO 330
QUI MALE FACIUNT NOBIS ILLIS QUI NIHL FACIUNT TENDITUR
QUIA ENIM IN ILLIS FRUCTUS EST IN ILLIS OPERA LUDITUR
AILIS ALIUNT ET PERICULUM INDE ALIQUITINI INEAL RURI
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 ENUMQUAM: letter M written above E by corr. rec. (Pr.),
by Iov. (K.) to read ME NUMQUAM
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 corre-
tion; ILLIS: letters IL converted to H, the
second L crossed out by corr. rec. (Pr.),
by Iov. (K.) to read HES
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
TBNE: 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
339
HAE NEC RATIONEM INEAS QUAM SINT SURAIA 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 ENUMQUAM: letter M written above E by corr. rec. (Pr.),
by Iov. (K.) to read ME NUMQUAM
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 corre-
tion; ILLIS: letters IL converted to H, the
second L crossed out by corr. rec. (Pr.),
by Iov. (K.) to read HES
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
TBNE: 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 HUNC HABEBAS PLANE PRAESEuntek DEUM 345
E SENEX ADEST UIDE QUID AGAS PRIMA COSTIOST; ACERRIMA
SI IAM SUSTINUERIS POST ILLAM UT LUBET LUDAS LICET

Z DEMPHE R HEGIO Y CRATINUS CRITO A PHORMO G ETAS

SENEX ADUOCATI III PARASITUS SERUS

Z ENIQUAM CUIQUAM CONTUMELIOSUS
AUDITIS FACTAM INIURIAM QUAM HAECE EST MINI
ADESTE QUESO ERATUS EST A QUINT HOC AGE
IAM EGO HUNC AGITABO PRO DEUM IMMORTALITUM
NEGAT PHANTUM ESSE HANC SIBI COGNATAM DEMPHE
HANC DEMPHE NEGAT ESSE COGNATAM E NEGAT
A NEQUE EIES PATREM SE SCIRE QUI FERIT E NEGAT
ET IPSUM ESSE OPINOR DE QUA AGEBAM SEQUEMIN
A REE STILPHONEM IPSUM SCIRE QUI FERIT E NEGAT
A QUIA EGENT RELICITAS MIESA IGNORATUR PARENTES
NECLEGITUR IPSA UAEURIT QUID FECIT
E SI ERUM INSULINABIS MALITITAE MAE AUDES
Z O AUDACIAM ETIAM ME ULTRA ACCUSATUM ADUENIT
A NAM IAM ADOLECENTI NIHIL EST QUOD SUSCENSEM
SI ILLUM MINUS NORAT QUITFFE HOMO IAM GRANDIOR
PAUPER CUI OPERA RURI FERE
SE CONTINEBAT IBI AGRUM DE NOSTRO PATR
COLENDEM HABERAT SARKE INTEREBA MIHI SENEX
NARRABAT SE HUNC NECGERGEBE COGNATUM SUUM
ATQUE UIRUM QUEM EGO UIDERIN IN UITA OPTIMUM

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: letters 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 AGES

351 IMMORTALITUM: word PIDEM 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 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 Iovs." (K.)

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

367 ATQUE: letters UEM added above ATQ. by Iov. (Pr.) to read AT QUEM
E ÚDEAS TE ATQUE ILLUM UT NARRAS A I IN MALAM CRUCEM NAM NI EUM ESSE EXISTIMASSEM NUNQUAM TAM GRAUIS OS HANC INMIXTIAS CAPEREM IN UESTRAN FAMILIAN 370 QUAM IS ASPERNATUR NUNC TAM INLIBERALITER E PERGIN EROI ABSENTI MALE LOQUI INPURSSISME A DIGNUM AUTUM HOC ILLOST E AIN TANDEM CARER Z GETA E BONORUM EXTORTOR LECUM CONTORFOR Z GETA A RESPONDE E QUIS HOMOST EHEM Z TACE E ABSENTI

TE INDIGNAS SEQUE DIGNAS CONTUMELIAS NUNQUAM CESSAUIT DICERE HODIE Z DESINE ADULESCENS PRIMUM ABS TE HOC BONA UENIA PETO SI TIBI PLACERE POTIS ES MIHI UT RESPONDEAS QUEM AMICUM TUUM AIS - FUISSE IUSTUM EXPLANA MIHI 380 ET QUI COGNATUM ME SIBI ESSE DICERET A PROINDE EXPISCARE QUASI NON NOSSES Z NOSSAEM A ITA EGO ME NEGRO TU QUI AIS REDIGE IN MEMORIAM A ERO TU SOBRINUM TUUM NON NORAS Z ENICAS DIC NOMEN A NOMEN MAXINE Z QUID NUNC TACIS 385 A PERI HERCLE NOMEN PERIODI Z QUID AIS A GETA SI MEMISTI ID QUOD QUID OLM DICTUMT SUBICE EM NON DICO QUASI NON NOSSES TEMPTATUM ADUNENIS Z EGO AUTUM TEMPTO ET STILPHO A ATQUE ADEO QUID MEA STILPHOST Z QUEM DIXIT A STILPHONEM INQUAM EST NOUERAS 390 Z NEQUE EGO ILLUM NORAM NEC MIHI COGNATUS FUIT QUISQUAM ISTOC NOMINE A ITANE NON TE HOREM PUDET

369 NI EUM: letters SITA written above by cor. 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 DI TIBI MALE FACIANT A PRIMUS ESSES NEMORITER
PROGENIEM UESTRAM USQUE AB AUO ATQUE ATAUO
PROFERENS 395
Z ISTA UT TU DICES EGO TUM CUM ADVENISSEM QUI MIHI
COGNATA EA ESSE TICEREM TUIDEM TU FACE
CEDO QUE EST COGNATA ET EU NOSTER RECTE HEUS TU CAUE
A DILUCIDE EXPEDIBUS ME OPORTUIT
IUDICIBUS TUM ID SI FALSUM FERAT PILIUS
CUR NON REPELLIT Z PILIUM NABRAS MIHI
CUIUS DE STULTITIA DICI UT DIGNUMST- NON POTEST
A AT TU QUI SAPIENS ES MAGISTRATUS ADI
IUDICUM DE EADEM CAUSA ITERUM UT REDDANT TIBI
QUANDOQUOD SOLUS REGNAT ET SOLI LICET
400
HIC DE EADEM CAUSA BIS IUDICIUM ADIPISCER
Z ETSI MIHI FACTA INJURIAS UERUM TAHEN
POTIUS QUAM LITES SECTER AUT QUAM TE AUDIAM
ITIDEM UT COGNATA SI SIT ID QUOD LEX IUBET
DOLIS DARE ABUDUC HANC MINAS QUINTO ACCIPERE
405
A HAHAE HOMO SUAUIS Z QUID EST NUN INIQUUM POSTULO
AN NE HOC QUIDEM EGO ADIPISCAR QUOD IUS PUBLICUMST
A ITANE TANDEM QUAESO ITEM UT MERETRICEM UBI
ABUSUS MERCEDEM DARE LEX IUBET ET ATQUE AMITTERE
AN UT NE QUIT TURPE CIUIS IN SESE AMITTERET
410
PROPER EGESTATM PROXIMO IUSSAST DARI
UT CUM UNO AETATEM DEGERET QUOD TU UETAS

395 ATAUO: letter T changed to D by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read ADUAO
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?)
Z ITA PROXIMO QUIDEM AD NOS UNDE AUT QUAM OB REM A OHE ACTUM AIUNT NE AGAS Z NON AGAM IMMO HAUD DESINAM DONEC PERFECERO HOC A INEPTIS Z SINE MODO 420 A POSTREMO TECUM JIHIIL REI NOBIS DEMIPHOST TUUS EST DAMNATUS GNATUS NON TU TUA PRAETERIERAT IAM DUCENDA AETAS Z OMNIA HAEC ILLUM PUTATO QUAE EGO HUNC DICO DICERE AUT QUIDEM CUM UXORE HAC IPSUM PROHIBEBO DOMO 425 A IRATUS EST TU TE IDEM MELIUS FECERIS Z ITAUE ES PARATUS FACERE ME ADUORUM OMNIA INPELIX A METUIT NIC NOS TAMESTI SEDULO DISSIMULAT E BENE HABENT TIBI PRINCIPIA A QUIN QUOD EST PERUNDUM PERES TUIS DIGNUM FACTIS FECERIS UT AMICI INTER NOS SIMUS Z ECON TUAM EXEPTEM AMICTITAM AUT TE UIEJN AUT AUDITUM UELIM A SI CONCORDABIS CUM ILLA HABEBIS QUAE TUAM SENECTUTEM OBLECTET RESPECE AETATEM TUAM Z TE OBLECTET TIBI HASE A MINUE UERO IRAM Z HOC AGE 435 SARTIS IAM UERBORUMST NISI TU PROHERAS MULIEREM ABDUEREC EGO ILLAM LICIAM DIXI PHORMO A SI TU ILLAM ATTIGERES SECUS QUAM DIGNUMST LIBERAM DICAR TIBI ADPINGAM GRANDEM DIXI DEMENT SI QUID OPUS FERIT HEUS DOME E INTELLEGRO Z QuANPA ME CURA ET SOLICITUDINE ADPICS GNATUS QUI ME ET SE HISCE INPEDIUIT 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 INPINGAM
440 DOME: letters MO written above ME by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read DOMO ME
Neque mihi in conspectu prodit ut saltem sciam quid de ea re dicat quidue sit sententiae abi ute redierit ne iam an nondum domum

445

Et ego uidetis quo in loco res haec sit? Quid acq dicis in cratinius censeo si Tibi uidetur di dicat quid sit factum. Insum est mihi non uidetur hoc quod sit factum. Legibus rescindi posse et turpe inceptum sit dic crito.

450

Ego sedulo dixisse hunc credo uerum ita 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 impetrabis dixi z dic nunc Hegio.

455

Ego amplius deliverandum censeo res magna est y nonquid nos uis z fecistis probe incertior sum multo quam dudum esse negant redisse z frater est expectandum mihi. his quod mihi dederit de hac re consulium id sequar percunctatum ibo ad porum quod se recipiat.

460

Et ego Antiphonem quae am ut quae acta hic sint sciat at eccum uideo in tempore huc se recipere.

A Antipo B Geta

Adulescens Seruus

A enim uero Antipo multus modis cum istoc animo es utiperandus 465
Ioane te hinc abisse et ---m tuam tutandum allis dedisse allis tuam rem credidisti magis quam tete animaduersuros nam utut erat alla illi certe quae nunc tibi donist consules

ne quid propter tuam fidem decepta potestur nali cui nunc miserae spees opesque sunt in te omnes sitae 470 b et quidem ere nos iam didum hic te absenzech accusamus qui

A -- ipsum quarebam b sed ea causa nihilo magis depechmus a locuere obsequro quonam in l-0 sunt et fortunae hae

-um quid patri subolet b nihil etiam a quid spei porroest b nescio a an

b nisi phaedria haud cessauit pro te enti a nihil fecit

nou 475 b tum phormio itidem in lac re ut allis strenuum hominem phaebuit

A quid is fecit b confutauit verbis admodum iratum semen

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

Mansurques patruum patrum est dux adueniat 480 a quid eum b ut aiebat de eius consilio sese uelle facere quod hanc rem attiniet a quantum metus est mihi uidere huc saljuom nunc patruum geta

nam per etius unam ut audio aut uium aut moriar sententiam b phaedria tibi adest a uginam b eccum ab sua palaestra exit foras 485

\( \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree} PHAEDRIA E DORIO A ANTIPHO B GETA ADULESCENS LENO ADULESCENS SENUUS} \)

\( \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree} DORIO AUDIO OBSECRO E NON AUDIO} \) \( \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree} PARUMPER E QUIN OMITTE ME} \)

\( \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree} AUDI QUOD DICAM E AT ENIM TADDET ETIAM AUDIRE EADEM MILIENS} \)

\( \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree} AT NUNC DICAM QUOD LUBENTER E LOQUERE AUDIO} \)

---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 Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.) to read PATERETUR

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

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

473 LOQUERE: letters LO can be seen on 64r; L--0: 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 quod te exorare ut naves triduum hoc quo nunc abis
et nirabar si tu mihi quocum adferras now.

A ei metuo lomenem nequid suoo suat capiti b idem ego ubor
nonnum mihi credis e bariolae f sin fidum do e fabulae

Farneratum istuc beneficium pulchrre tibi dicers e logi
crbe mihi gaudebis facto uerum Hercle hoc est e somnia

Experire non est longum e cantilenam banderi cantis
495

Tu mihi cognatus tu parum de tuo tu amis tus tu e garbo modo

Adon ingenio esse duros te atque inexorabil

Ut neque misericordia neque precibus koliri queas
Adon te esse incogitaten atque infudentem phaedria sine

Ut ne phaleratis duas dictis et meas ductis gratiis 500

a misericustem e ueris uincor b quam uerque est similis

Sui

Neque antipho alia cum occupatus esset sollicitudine

Tum hoc esse mihi objectum malum a quid istuc est autem

Phaedria

O fortunatissime antipho a egone f qui quod amas domist

Neque cum hisus modi uquam tibi ussus ut conflictarist

Malo 505

A mihi domist immo id quod aius ueribus teneo lupum

Nam neque quo pacto me amittam neque uti repennem scio

E ipsum istuc mihi in hoc est a heia ne parum leno siex

Nunc quiid hic conficit f hicine quod homo inhumanissimus

Pamphilam mean uenidit a quid uenidit a ain uenidit 510

VENIDIT f quam indum factum ancillian ere empto seq

Neque exorare ut me maneat et cum illo ut mutet fidem

Triduum hoc dum id quod est promissum ab amicis arguentum

Auffero

493: Prote states that the correction I occurs in this line
but it is not visible in either the xerox or the
microfilm. Prate 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...

SOMNIA; SOMNIA: letter a crossed out and U,
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 AH

507 NE AMITTAM: first N crossed out, letter M written above
first A to read EAM, letter A written above
first N of second word to read AMITAM.

Corrections made by Iov. (Pr.), (K.)

511 Farto crossed out and E written above by Iov. (Pr.), (K.);

INDUM: letters IGN written above DU by Iov. (Pr.) to
read INDIENNIM
Si non sum pedero unam praeteram horam ne opperfus sitis
et optundis a haud longumst. Id quod orat dorio exortet sines
S inferno hic tibi quod boni promeritus fueris coniunciperit.
Et uerba istae sunt a pamphilanne hac urbe priuari singes
Tunc praetera eorum arem diastri poterim pati
Et neque ego neque tu r di tibi omnes id quod es digeris duint
Et ego te complruit aduersum ingenium heim menses tulli 520
POLLICITANTE ET Nihil ferentem flendem nunc contra omnia
Haeec
Reperi qui det neque lacrum-etu da locum meliorebus
A certe hercle ego si satis commenmini tibi quidem est olim
dies
Quam ad dares huic praestitutam factum et num ego istud
nego
A iam ha praeteriti et non uerum haecl ei antecessit n non
Pudet 525
Te unaniatis et minime dum ob rem b stercilinnium r dorio
Itane tandem facere operzet et sic sum si placeo utere
A sic hunc decipis et immo enim uero antipho hic me decipit
Nam hic me huius modi sciebat esse haecl hunc esse aliter
Credidi
Iste me pellest haecl istic nihil sum aliter ac ful
530
Sed ut haec sunt tamen hoc faciam cras mane argementum nihi
Miles dare se dictix si nihi prior tu appuleris phaedria
Mia legce utar ut potior sit qui prior ad dandum: 533
Uale
A phaedria a antipho b geta 533a
Adulescentes ii servuu
A quid faciam unde ego nunc subito huic argementum inueniam
Miser
QUI MINUS NIHILOST QUOD HIC SI POTE FUSET EXORIERT 535
TRIDUUM HOC PROMISSUM FUERAT A ITANE HINC PATIEMUR GETA
PIERI MISERUM QUI NE DUDUM UT DIXIT ADDUERIT CONTIVIT
QUIN QUOD OPUST BENEFICUM RURSUS EI EXPEREMUR REDDRE
B SCI0 EQUIDEM __ ESSE AEQVOM A AGE BR0 SOELUS SERUARE
HUNC POTES
B QUID FACIAM A INENNIA ARGENTUM B CUPIO SED UNDE EDOCE 540
A PATER ADEST HIC B SCI0. SED QUID TUM A AN DICTUM SAPIINTI
SAT EST
B ITANE A IPA B SANE HERCLE PULCHRE SUADES ETIAM TU HINC ABIS
NON TRIUMPHO EX Nuptis TUIS SI NIRI3 NANCISOR MALLI
NT ETIAM NUNC ME HUIUS CAUSA QUAREERE IN MALO IUEBDAS CRUCEM
A UERUM HIC DICIT B QUID EQO UOBIS ALIENUS SUM B HAU3
PUTO 545
SED PARVUM EST QUOD OMNIBUS NUNC NOBIS SUSCENSESET SENEX
NE INSTIGEMUS ETIAM UT NULLUS LOCUS RELINQVATUR PRECI
ALIUS AB OCULIS MEI ELLAM IN IGNOTUM AEDUCET LOCUM HEM
TUM IGITUR DUM LICEET DUM ADSUM LOQUIMINI NECUM ANTIPO
CONTEMPLANMINI NE A QUAO AN REM AUT QUIDNAM FACTURUS
CEDO 550
Γ QUOQV HINC ASPORTABITUR TERRARUM CERTUMST PERSEQUI
AUT PERIRE B DI BENE UORTANT QUOD AGAS PEDETEPTMTM TAMEN
A UIDE SI QUID OPIS POTES ADFERRE HUIC B SI QUID QUID
NE QUID PLUS MINUSUE FAXIS QUOD NOS POST PIGEAM GETA
B QUAERO SALIUS EEST UT OPINOR UERUM ENIM METUO MALUM 555
A NOLI METUERE UNA TECUM BOVA MALA TOLERABIMUS
B QUANTUM OPUS EST TIBI ARGENTI ASIO ASIO TRIGINTA
A QUOMED HIC ANTIPHO
B QUORE OBSCERO
NE QUID PLUS MINUSUE INNOMO QVID NOS POST PIGEAM GETA
B QUAERO SALIUS EEST UT OPINOR UERUM ENIM METUO MALUM 555
A NOLI METUERE UNA TECUM BOVA MALA TOLERABIMUS
B QUANTUM OPUS EST TIBI ARGENTI ASIO ASIO TRIGINTA
A QUOMED HIC ANTIPHO
B QUORE OBSCERO
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. (Pr.),
(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 FERIS SET OPUS EST MIIII PHORMIONEM AD HANC REM ADJUTOREM DARI 560
A PRAESTOST AUDACISSIME ONERIS QUIDUIS IMPONE FERET
SOLUS EST HOMO AMICO AMICUS B EAMUS ERGO AD EUM OCIUS
A NUNC QUID EST QUOD OPERA MEA OUBIS OPUS SIT B NIHIL U ERUM
ABI DONUN
ET ILLAM MISERAM QUAM EGO NUNC INTUS SCIO ESSE EXAMINATION
METU
CONSOLARE CESSAS A NIHIL EST ABQUE QUOD FACIAM LUBENS 565
Γ QU A UIA ISTUC PACIES Β DICAM IN TEINERE NODO TE HINC AMOR
Z DEMIPHO E CHREMES

561: Mar. and K. suggest line 561 was attributed to
A by A but was given to Ρ by A2 (Mar.): IMPONE
FERET: word hic written above By IoV. (Pr.)
In his app. crit., K. writes "IMPONE EFF. Λ0V. (?)"
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 CONDI ONEM: reference sign to scholia above
first N
580 D I C UM: 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 UOLET
BANTHICO ACETA... SERVO SENIS

ADULCENS SERVO SENES II

B EXSEPCTO QUAM NOSX... SED GETA

SED PATRUM UIDE... A MIHI

QUAM TEMPO ADVENTUS HUUS... 610

A DIBO HOSE... QUAE FACTA... 615

A TUN DIXERAS... QUAM... 620

EXOCTO QUAM MOX... 66v

B ANTIPO A GETA E CHREMES Z DEIMPO

ADULCESCENS SERVOS SENES II

B EXSEPCTO QUAM NASX... SED GETA

SED PATRUM UIDE... A MIHI

QUAM TEMPO ADVENTUS HUUS... 610

A DIBO HOSE... QUAE FACTA... 615

A TUN DIXERAS... QUAM... 620

EXOCTO QUAM MOX... 66v
SICUM ILLO INCEPTAS HOMINE EA ELOQUENTIA EST
UERUM PONIS ESSE UICTUM EAM AT TANDEM TAHEN
NON CAPIS EIUS RES AGITUR SED FICUNDIAE
POSTQUAM HOMINEM HIC UERIS SEXTIO MOLLIRIER
SOLI SUMUS NUNC HIC INQUAM EIO QUID UIS DARI
TIBI IN MANUM UT EROS HIS DESISTAT LITIBUS
B SATIN ILLI DI SUNT PROPITI A HAM SATIS SCIO
SI TU ALIQUAM PANTEM AEQUI BONIQ DIXERIS
UT E ILLE BONUS UIR TRIA NON COMMUTABITIS
UERBA HODIE INTER UOS Z QUIS TE IUSTAB EIUSSIT LOQUI
E IMMO NON POTUIT MELIUS PERGUENIER
EO QUO NOS VOLUMUS B OCCIDI Z PERE ELOQUI
A PRIMO HOMO INSANITAT E CEDO QUID POSTULAT
A QUID NIMIUM QUANTUM LICUIT E DIC A SI QUIS EI DARE
TALENTEM MAGNUM Z IMMO MALUM HERCLE NIIHIL PUDET
A QUOD DI EX AEIO EI QUESO QUID SI PIIAM
SUAM UNICAM LOCARET PARUI RETUTLIT
NON SUSCIPISS PEINITAST QUAE DOMET PETAT
UT AD PAUCA REDEAM AC MITTAM ILLIUS INEPTIAS
HAEC DENIQUE EIUS FUIT POSTREMA ORATIO
EGO INQUIT A PRINCIPIO AMICI PIIAM
ITA UT AEOQU MUERAT UOLUI UXOREM DUCERE
NAM MIHI UENIEBAT IN MENTEN EIUS INCOMMODUM
IN SERUITUTEM PAUPEREM ADDITEM DARI
SED MIHI OPUS ERAT UT APETERE TIBI NUNC FABULER

Line 635 not written by A but supplied by corr.
rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) in uncial letters. The
line reads: BEC HIC FDECASSAT TU MOLLSTUS NE SIEII.
Pr. incorrectly states...TUM...
642: A crossed out by Iov.? (K.), corr. rec.? (Pr.)
644 NIILL: word UT added above the line before
NIHIL by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
646 LOCARET: "Reference sign to scholia above the
C
Bottom line: Pr. says this line is written in
semicursive Italian uncharacteristic-
not easy to establish what
the corrector intended to write; af-
the letters SI (of SIES) an L
is not easy to establish what
the corrector intended to write; af-
the letters SI (of SIES) an L
 seems to be cancelled out. Then an
ES follows. The meaning of the final
letters he is found on the introd-
page of LOWE, CLA 1 (X).
ALIQUANTULUM QUAE ADFERRET UT DISSOLUEREM QUAE DEBEO ETIAM NUNC SI VULT DEMIPHO DARE QUANTUM AB HAC ACCIPIO QUAE SPONSAE MIIHI NULAM MIHI NALM QM ISTMAR UXXRUM DARI B UTTRUM STULTITIA FACERE NHNC AN MALTIA DICAM SCIENTEM AN INCERTUM INCERTUM SUM Z QUID SI ANIMAM DEBET A AGER OPPOSITUS PIIGNOR OB DECEM MINAS EST Z AGE AGEIAM DUCAT DABO A AEDICULAE ITEM SUNT OB DECEM ALIAS Z OUEI NIMIUNP E NE CLAMA PETITO NASCE A NE DECEM A UXORI EMUNDA ANCTILLULAST TUM PLUSCOLA SUPERFLICTILE OPUS EST SUMPTUM AD NUPTIAS HIS REBUS SANET POINE INQUIT DECEM MINAS Z SESCENTAS PROINDE SCRIBITO MIIHI DICAS NIHIL DO ILLE UT ETIAM INRIDEAT E QUESO EGO DABO QuiESECU TUM MODO PIIUM FAC UT ILLAM DUCAT NOS QUAU VOLUMUS B E MIHI GETA OCCIDISTI ME TUIS FALLACLIS E MIA CAUSA EICITUR NE HOC EST AQVOM AMITTE A QUANTUM POTEST ME CERTOREM INQUIT FACE SI ILLAM DANT HANC UT TAM NE INCERTUS SIEM ZAM ILLI MIIHI DOTIN IAM CONSTITUEHUNT DARE Z IAM ACCIDIT MIIHIS REDIDUUM RENUNTIET HAN DUCAT A QUAE QUIEM ILLI RES UORTAT MALE E OPPORTUNE ADEO ARGENTUM NUNC NECUM 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 PROINDE: letter P added above PR and O 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 MITTAM
675 TAM: letter T added above the line before TAM, letter I added above TAM and T added above T by Iov. (K.), (Mar.) to read MITTAM. Pr. notes only MT corrections by corr. rec. to read MITTAM
FRUCTUM QUEM LEMNI UXORIS REDDUNT PRAEDEA
INDE SUMA UXORI TIBI OPUS ESSE DIXERO
B ANTIPHO A GETA
ADULESCENS SERUUS

B GETA A HEM B QUID ECISTI A EMUNXI ARGENTO SENES
B SATINE EST A NESCIO HERCLE TANTUM TUSSUS SUM
B ERO UBERBO ALIUD MIHI RESPONDES AC ROGO
A QUID ERO NARRAS B QUID EGO NARREMI OPERA TUA
AD RESTIM MIHI QUIDEM RES REDIT PLANISSIME
UT TE QUIDEM OMNES DI DAEQUE SUPERI INFERI
MALIS EXEMPLIS PERDANT EM SI QUID UERIS
HIC MANDES QUOD QUIDEM RECTUM UERIS
QUID MINUS UTILE FUIT QUAM HOC UOLNUS TANGERE
AUT NOMINARE UXOREM INIECTA EST SPES PATRI
POSSE ILLAM EXTUBIT CEDO HINC FORBO PHOBIO
DOTE SI ACCIPIER UXOR DUCENDA EST DOMUM
QUID PIET A NON EMIN DUCET B NOUI CETURUM
CUM ARGENTUM REPETANT NOSTRA CAUSA SCILICET
IN NERUUM POTIUS IN VELIL EST QUID EGO
QUIN NAMCI NARRANDO POSSIT DEPRANDER
TU ID QUOD BONI EST EXCERPIS DICIS QUOD
MALI EST
AUDI NUNC CONTRA IAM SI ARGENTIO ACCEPERIT
DUCENDA EST UXOR UT AIS CONCEDO TIBI
SPATIIUM QUIDEM TANDEM APPARENDAR NUPTIAS
UOCANDI 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 O and N crossed out and C
written above N by corr. rec. (Pr.),
by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Ash.) to read
ULCUS
701 APPARENDARAS: letter I written above last A by
corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
to read APPARENDARIS; NUPTIAS: letter I
written above last A by corr. rec.
(Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read NUPTIAS
702 SACRIFICANDI: first I converted to E by corr.
rec. (Pr.) to read SACRIFICANDI
Z IDEM EGO ISTUC FACERE POSSUM E MULIER MULIERI MAGIS CONSENIT
Z ROGABO E UBI ILLAS NUNC EGO REPERIRE POSSIM COGIT
OE SOPHRONA E CURINES
NUTRIX SENEX

O QUID AGAM QUES NIELI AMICUM INUENIAM MISERA AUT QO CONSILIA HAECE
REFERAM AUT UNDE AUXILIIUM PETAM
NAM UREOR ERA NS OB MEUM SUASUM INDICIA INIURIA
ADFIICIATUR 730
ITA PATREM ADULESCENTIS FACTA HAECE TOLERARE AUDIO UIO IENTER
E NAM QUAE HAECE ANUS EST EXAMINATA A FRATRE QUAE EGRESSAST
MEO
O QUOD UT FACEREM EGESTAS NE INPULIT CUM SCIREM INFRANAS
NUPTIAS
HASCE ESSE UT ID CONSULAREM INTEREA UT IN TUTO FORET
E CERTE EDEPOL MHS NE ANIMUS FALLIT AUT PARUM PROSPICIENT
OCULI 735
MENAE NUTRICEI GNATAE IDEO O NEQUE ILLE INVESTIGATUR
E QUID AGO
O QUI EST EIUS PATER ADEO MANEO DUM HAECE QUAE LOQUIR
O QUOD SI EUM NUNC REPERIRE POSSIM NIELI EST QUOD UERBAR
E EAST IPSA
CONQUAE QUID HIC LOQUITUR E SOPHRONA
O ET MEUM NOMEN NOMINAT
E RESPIE AD ME O DI OBSEZCO UOS ESTNE HIC STILPHI E NON
O NEGAS 740
E CONCEDE HINC A FORIBUS PAULULUM ISTORSUM SODES SOPHRONA
NE ME ISTOC POSTHAC NOMINE APPELLASIS O QUOD NON OBSE
O QUES SEMPER TE ESSE DICITASI E ST O QUID HAS METUISI
E CONCLAMAS HIC HABEO UXOREM SAEMUE UERUM ISTUC DE NONE
EO PERPERAM OLIM DIXI NE UOS FORTE INPUDENTES FORIS 745

736 AGO: above letter O, only M written very lightly by Iov. (Pr.), (K.)
737 ADEO: letters NE written above the line after ADEO
by Iov. (Pr.), (K.) to read ADONE; HAECE: in his app. crit., K. states "HAEC A: EA Iov. (?)."
Letters H and C appear to me to Ee crossed out leaving AE as the reading. These are the only visible corrections.
EFFUTTIBETIS ATQUE ID PORRO ALIQUA UXOR HABET RESCISCERET
Θ ISTOC POL NOS TE TIC INUENIRE MISERAE NUNQUAM POTUIT
E EHO DIC NIHI QUID REI TIBI EST CUM FAMILIA FAC UNDE EXIS
UBI ILLAE SUNT Θ MISERAM ME E HEM QUID EST UHONTE
Θ UIUIT QVATA
MATREM IPSAM EX AEGRITUDINE HAC MISERAM MORIS CONSECUTA
EST 750
Ε MALE FACTUM Θ EGO AUTEM QUAE ESSEN ANUS DESERTA ARGUS
IGNOTA
UT POTUE VIRGINEM NUPTEM LOCAUI HUIC ADULESCENTI
HARUM QUI EST DOMINUS AEDIC ET ANTIPOHIN Θ EN ISTI IPSI
E QUID DUASNE UXORES HABER Θ AU OBSECRU UNAM ILLE QUIDEM
HANC SOLAM
Ε QUID ILLAM ALTERAM QUAE DICTUR COGNATA Θ HABEB PROQNT
Ε QUID AIS 755
Θ COMPOSITO FACTUMST. QUD MODO HANC AMANS HABERE POSSER
SINE DOTE ET DI OESTRA FIDEM QUAM SABIE FORTE TEMER
UEUNTQ QUAE NO NON ADEA SPARE OFFENDI ADUENTIENS
QUOCUM UOLEBAM ET UT UOLEBAM CONLOCATAM AMARI
QUOD NOS AMBO OPERE MAXIMO DABAMUS OPERAM UT FIERET 760
SINE NOSTRA CURA MAXIMA SUA CURA SOLUS FECIT
Θ NUNC QUID OPUS FACTU SIT UIDE PATER ADULESCENTIS UENIT
Ε QUID IAM QUID AIUNT E NIHIL PERCUMIST
Ε QUID AIS 765
Ε NEMO E ME SCIBIT ET SEQUERE ME IN TUNS CETERA AUDIES
2 DEMIFHO A GETA
SENEX SERUUS
2 NOSTRANTE CULPA FACIMUS UT MALIS EXPEDIAM ESSE
DUM NIMIUM DICI NOS BONOS STUDIENS ET BENIGNOS

761 SOLUS: letters US erased and A superimposed by corr.
rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (C.) to read SOLA. K. att-
tributes LA to Iov.
766 MALIS: letter I changed to 0 by corr. rec. (Pr.), by
Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.) to read MALIS
ITA FUGIAS NE PRABER CASAH QUOD DICUNT NONNE ID SATIS ERAT ACCIPERE AB ILLO INIURIAM ETIAM ARGENTUM. ULTRIO OBJECTUM UT SIT QUI UIUAT DUM ALIUT ALIQUID FLAGITII CONIFICAT 770

A --AISSIEME ICIS NUNC PRABECUM QUIT QUIE PRERA FACIUNT

A --AISSIEME ICUS UT STULTISSIME QUIDEM ILLE REM GESSERIMUS

A MOD US UT HOC CONSILIO POSSIET DISCHI UT ISTAM DUCAT

Z ETIAMTE ID DUBIUM? A HAUD SCIO HERCLE UT HOMOST AN MUTET ANIMUM Z IHE MUTET MUTEM Z HESCIUS UERUM SI PORTET DICO 775

Z SCIAIC DURFRER CENSURUS UT UXOREM EICUS HUC ADDUCAM

CUH ISTA UT LOCUTUR TU GETA ABI PRAE NUNITA HANC UENTURAM

A ARGENTUM INVENTUM? PHAEDRUS DE TURGIO SILETUR

PROUIUM EST NE IN PRABENTI HAECE HINC ABET QUID NUNC PORRO

QUID FIT IET IN EODEM LUTO HAESITAS UORDURAM SOLUS

GETA PRAESENS QUOD FUERAT MALUM IN DIEM ABIIT PLAGAE

NISI PROSPICIS NUNC HINC DONUM IDO AC PHALEM EOCHE

NE QUID UEREATUR PHORMIONEM AUT EICUS ORATIONEM

Z DEMPHO B NAUSISTRATA

SENEX MULIER

Z AGE DUM UT SOLES N Ausistrata FAC ILLA UT PLACEUR NOBIS

UT SUA VOLUNTATE ID QUOD EST FACIUNDUM FACIAT B FACIAM 780

Z PARITER NUNC OPERA ME ADIURES AC RE DUDUM OPITULATA ES

B FACTUM UOLO AC POL MINUS QUO UIRI UIRP VAM ME DIGNUNT

Z QUID AUTEM B QUIT POL MEI PATRIS BENE PARTE INDIGENTEM

TUATUR NAM EX IIS PRAEIUS TALENTA ARGENTITI BINA

STATIM CAPIEBAT UIRUI UORD QUOD PRAESTAT Z BINAN QUASEO 790

768 PRABER: letters MITTAS written above the line after PRABER by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read PRABERMITTAS; DICUNT: letters DIC erased and IA superimposed by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read AIUNT

770 CONFICAT: second I crossed out, letter N written above the line and the C changed to an uncial G by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.) to read CONFINGAT

771A --AISSIEME: traces of the character designation A remain but the first two letters of the first word PL (according to Ms. tradition) have disappeared. Iov. does not touch the codex here (Pr.)

772 --AISSIEME: first two letters of the first word UR (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.)
B AC RESUS ULLORIBUS MUTO TAMEM TALENTA BINA Z HUI
B QUID HAEQ UIDENTUR Z SCILICET B UT RUM ME NAT UELLEM
EGO OSTENDEREN Z CERTO SCIO B QUIT FACTO B PARCE SODER
UT POSSIT SIC ULLA ME TE ADULCESCUM MULIER DEFERTGET

B NAAUSISTRATA E CHREMES Z DEMIPHO
MULIER
SINES II

B FACTAM UT IUBES SED MEUM UIRUM ABS TE EXIRE VIDEQ
E EHEM DEMIPHO

IAM ILLI DATUM EST ARGENTUM Z CURAUI LILICU E HOMLEM
DATUM
EI VIDEQ UXOREM PAESE PLUS QUAM SAT ERAT Z CUR NOLLES
CHREMES
E IAM RECIT Z QUID TU EQUID LOCUTUS CUM ISTAC QUOD REM
HANC DUCIM--
E TRANSEGI Z QUID AIT TANDEM E ABDUCI NON POTESTZ QUI NON
POTEST
E QUIA UTERQUE UTRIQUE EST CORDI Z QUID ISTUC NOSTRA
E MAGNI PRATERHAC
800
COGNATAM COMPERI ESSE NOBIS Z QUID DELIRAS E SIC ERIT
NON TEMERE DICO REDI MECUM IN MEMORIAM SATINE SANUS ES
B AU OBSECO UIDE NE INCOGNATAM PECCES Z NON EST E NI NEGA
PARRIS NOMEN ALIUT DUCTUM EST HOC TU ERRASTI Z NON NORAT
PATREM
E NORAT Z CUR ALIUT DIXIT E NUMQUAMME HODIE CONCEDES
NIII
805
NEQUE INTELLEGES Z SI TU NIHIL NARRAS E PERDIS B MIRROR
QUID HOC SIET
806
B UT PROPELOR ILLI QUAM EGO SUM AC TU NEMOEST Z DI UESTRAM
EAMUS AD IPSAM UNA OMNIS NOS AUT SCIRE AUT NESCIRE HOC
UNO E AH
Z QUID EST E ITAN PARUM MINI FIDEM ESSE APUT TE Z UIN ME
UN SATIS QUESITUM MINI ISTUC ESSE AGE FIAT QUID ILLA
FILIA
AMICI NOSTRI QUID FUTURUMST E RECTE Z HANC IGIURUM MITTIMUS
E QUID HI Z ILLA MANEAT E SIC Z IRI IGIURUM TIBI LICIT
NAUSISTRATA
810
Z EQUIDEM HERCLE NESIO UIN SCIRE AT ITA ME SERUET
IUPPETER
809

792 NAT UELLEM: letters WR written above the line after
NAT by Iov. (Pr.) to read NATU. Har.
incorrectly states Α as reading
NATUVELLEM

793 CERTO: K incorrectly states "CERTA Α..."
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 A. Before UIN SCIREE, E erased (Pr.)
SIQUO COMMODIUS ESSE IN OMNIS ARBITROR QUAM UT COEPERAS
MANERE HANC HABET PARLERIS USATUM CUM UDI MTHI 8815
Z QUID ISTD NECI EST E TANHE OPUBUIT OUSTIN Z IAN E O
IUPPER
DI NOS RESPICIUNT Gnath MINE NUPNAM CUM Tuo FILIO
Z HEM
QUO FACTO POTUIT E NON SATIS TUTUS EST AD HARRIOH NIN
LOCUS
Z AT TU INTRO ABI E HEUS NE FILI QUIDEM HOC NOSTRI
RESPICIAVT UOLO

B ANTIPHO
ADULESCENS

B LAETUS SUM UT MEAE RES SESE HABENT PRATRI OPTIGISSE QUOD
VOLT 8820
QUAM SCITUMST: EIIUS MODI IN ANIMO PARE CUPIDITATES
QUAS Cum RES ADVESAE SIENT PAULO MEDERI POSSIS
HIC SIMUL ARGENTUM REPERIT CURA SESE EXPEDIUIT
EGO Nullo POSSUM REMEDIO ME EVOLUERE EX HOC TURBIS
QUIN SI HOC CELETUR IN METU SIN PATEFUT IN PROBO STEM 8825
NEQUE ME DOKUN NUNC RECIPEREM NI MIHI ESSET SPES OSTEENTA
HUIUSCE HABENDAE SED UBINAM GETAM INUINIRE POSSIM
UT ROGEN QUOD TEMPUS CONVENTUNI PATRIS ME CAPERE SUADEAT

Y PHORMIO B ANTIPHO
PARASITUS ADULESCENS

Y ARGENTUM ACCEPI TRADIDI LIENONI ABDUXI MULIERE:
CURAUI PROPRIA UT PHAEDRIA POTERUTUR NUM EMISSAT
MANU 8830
NUNC UHA MIHI RES ETIAM RESTAT QUAE EST CONCIFENCIES OPTUM
AB SENIBUS AD POTIUM UT HABEAM NUM ALIQUOD HOC SUMAS
DIES
B SED PHORMIOTH: QUID AIS Y QUID B QUIDNUM NUNC FACTURUS
PHAEOMIA

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 PARAE
Quo pacto satisatem amoris ait se uelle absumere
y uicissim partis tuas acturus est b quas y ut fugit et

Patrem 835

Te suas rocauit Rursum ut agerem causam ut pro se diceres
nam potatura est. Apud me ego me ire senibus unum
dicam ad mercatum ancillum emptum quam dum dum dixit geta
nem cum hic non uideant me conficeri credunt argentinum suum
set ostium concrepit. Abs te b uide qui egreditur y gestat

A GETA B ANTIPO Y PHORMIO

SERUUS ADULESCENS PARASITUS

A O FORTUNA O FORS FORTUNA QUANTIS COMMODITATIBUS
QUAM SUBITO MEO ERO ANTIPHON OPE UESTRA HUNC ONERASTIS

DIEM

B QUID NAM HIC SIBI UOLT A NOSQUE AMICOS EIUS EXONERASTIS
METU

SED EGO NUNC MIHI CESSO QUI NON UMERUM HUNC ONERO PALLIO
ADQUE HOMINEM PROPERO INUNUERIT UT HACF Quae conquiret

SCIAT 845

B NUNC TU INTELLIGES HIC QUID HIC NARET Y NUNTU TUB NIHL
Y TAN TUNDEMO EGO

A AD LENONEM HINC IRE PEGAM IBI NUNC SUNT B HEUS GETA
NUM MIRUM AUT NOOUM EST REOCARE CURSUM QUID INSTITIERS

B GETA

A PERGIT HERCLE NUNQUAM TU ODIO TUEO ME UINCES B NON MANES
A UAPULA B ID QUIDEM TIBI IAM FETTIS RESTITIS UBERBO 850
A FAMILIARRIOREM OPORTET ESSE HINC HITATUM MALUM SET ISNE

EST

QUEM QUERO AN NON IPSUS EST CONGRECIARE ACTUTUM B QUID

EST

A O OMNII QUANTUM EST QUI IUONT HOMO HOMINUM ORNATISSINE
NAM SINE CONTROVERSIDA AB DIS SOLUS DILEGARE ANTIPO
B ITA UELIM SED QUID QUID ISTUC CREDAN ITA ESSE MIESEQ

A UELIM 855

A SATINE EST SI TE DILIBUTUM GAUDIO REDDO B ENICAS

834 ABSUMERE: letters AB crossed out by Iov. (K.), by
corr. rec. (Pr.) to read SUMERE
836 SUAS: letter N written over second S by corr. rec.
(Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by ad (Ash.) to read SUAM
837 SENEBUS UNUM: the initial S of the second word left
out by a
838 QUAM DUDUM: Mar. incorrectly states "DUDUM QUAM A"
846 NUNC: second N crossed out and N 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 CONGRESIARE: letter A crossed out and I changed to E by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read CONGREDEERE
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.
y Quint tu hinc polllicitaciones auper et quod fers cedo a oh
tu quoque aderes phormio y aderam sed tu cessas a accipe
em ut modo argentum tibi dedimus apud forum recta dominum
sumus profecti interea mittit erus me ad uxorem tuam 860
b quan ob rem a onitio proloqui nam nihil ad hanc rem est
antipho
ubi in gymacsum ire occipio pier ad me accurrit militia
fome reprehendit palla resupinat respectio rogo
quan ob rem retineat me ait se se et utum intro ad eram
acced---
sophrona modo pratum huc inquit senis introduxit
chremum 865
euque nunc esse intus cum illis hoc ubi ego audii ad
fores
suspensu gradu placide ire perexi accessi assimilati
anima compresi auro adnou ita animum coespi attendere
hoc modo sermonem captans y eu geta a hic pulcherrimum
facinus audui itaque paene hercule exlamau gaudio 870
b quod a quod nam arbitrae b nescio a atqui mirificissimum
patruus tuus est pater inuentus phario uxor tuae
b quid ais a cum eius consueuit oliv matre in lenimo
clanulum
y somnum utin haec ignoraret suum patrem a aliquod credito
phormio esse causae sed men censens potuiisse quinta
875
intellegere extra ostium intus quae inter esse ipsi
egriti
b atque ego quoque inaudii illam fabulam a imo etiam dabo
quo hagis credas patruus interea inde huc egreditur foras
haud multo post cum patre idem inde recipi se intro dux
aet uterne tibi potestatem eius adhibendae dare 880
denique ego missus sum te ut requirerem atque adducerem

857 aufer: letter S written above R by corr. rec. (Pr.)
to read AUFEs
863 reprehendit: letters RE crossed out and AD added above
by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read ADPREHENedit
864 sese: first S crossed out and S written above ES
by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read SESE;
acced---: last three letters REP (943) on 71v
874 utin: letter N appears to me to be crossed out by
Iov. (?7) to read UTI. No editor mentions it
877 inaudui: letters IN crossed out by Iov. (K.), by corr.
rec. (Pr.) to read AUDUI
878 patruus: word TUS written above the line after PATRUUS
by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
880 adhibendae: letters DH crossed out by Iov. (K.), corr.
rec. (Pr.) to read ADEBENDAE
B Quin ergo rape me quid cefssas a fecero b heus phormio
uale y uale antipho bene ita me di amant factum gaudeo
y phormio

Parasitus

Y tantam fortuman de inproviso esse his datam
summa eludendi occasiost mihi nunc senes
et phaedriae curam adimere argentaria
ne quoquam suorum aequalium supplex siet
nam idem hoc argentum ita ut datumst. ingratiss
ex datum erit hoc qui cogan re tpsa repperi
nunc gestus mihi voltusque est capiendus nodos
sed hinc concedam in angifortum hoc proximum
inde hisce ostendam me ubi erunt egressi foras
quo me adsimularam ire ad mercatum non eo

Z demipho e chremes y phormio

Senes II Parasitus

Z dis magnagnas merito gratias habeo atque ago
quando euenero haec nobis frater prospera
quantum potest nunc conueniundus est phormio
prius quam dilipidat nostras triginta minas
ut auferamus y demiphonem si donist
uisam ut quod z ad nos ad te ibamus phormio
y de eadem hac fortasse causa z ita hercle y credidi
quid ad me ibatis z ridiculum y urebhamini
ne non id facerem quod recepissem semel

882 heus: heus crossed out and words o mi written above by corr. rec. (pr.), by iov. (k.)
HEUS QUAM QUANTA IAEC ME PAUPERAS EST TAMEN ADHUC CURAUI UNUM HOC QUIDEM UT MIHI ESENT FIDES
Z ESTNE ITA UT DIXI LIBERALIS E OPPIDO Y IDQUE ADEO VENIO AD UOS NUNTIATUM DEMPHO
PARATUM NE ESSE UBI VOLTIS UXOREM DATE
NAM QMIS POSTHABUI MIHI RES ITA UTT PAR FUIT
POSTQUAM ID TANTOPERE UOL UELLE ANIMADUERTERAM
Z AD HIC DEHORTATUS EST ME NE HEILL IIBI DAREM
NAM QUI ERIT RUMOR POPULI INQUIT SI ID FECERIS
OLIM CUM HONESTE POTUIT TUM NON EST DATA
EAM NUNC EXTRUDI TURPEST FERME EADEM OMNIA
QUAE TUTE DUDUM CORAM ME INCUSAERAS
Y SATIS SUPERBE INCLUDITIS ME Z QUI Y ROGAS
QUIA NE ALTERAM QUIDEM ILLAM POTERO DUCERE
NAM QUA RE REDIBO AD EAM QAM CONTEMPTERIM
E TUM AUTEM ANTIPHONEM VIDEO AD SESE AMITTEM
INUITUM EAM INIQUE Z TUM AUTEM VIDEO FILIUM
INUITUM SANE MULIEREM AB SE AMITTEM
SED TRANSI SODES AD FORUM ATQUE ILLU MIHI
ARGENTUM KURSUM IUBE RE Scribi PHORHIO
Y QUIDNE EGO DISCRIPSI PORRO ILLIS QUIBUS DEBUI
Z QUID IGITUR FIET Y SI UIS MIHI UXOREM DARE
QUAM DESPONDISTI DUCAM SIN EST. UT UELIS
MANERE ILLAM APOT TE DOS HIC MANEAT DEMPHO
NAM NON EST AEQUUM ME FRoPTER UOG 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.) to read ORE: REDIBO AD; letters REDIBO A seem to be retouched by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
921 ILLU: letter T added above the line after ILLU by A (Pr.)
925 SIN: letter N written above I by A (Pr.)
Cum ego uestri honoris causa repudiwm alterae
remiserim quae dotis tantundem dabat
z 1 in malum rem iunc cum istanc magnificentia
fuscitue etiam hunc credis te ignorari
dux tua facta adeo y inritor z turb hanc duceres
si tibi daretur y fac periculum z ut filius
cum illa habit aput te hoc uestrum consilium fuit
y quaeso quid narras z quin tu mihi argentum cedo 935
y immo uero uxor em tu cedo z in ius ambula
y in ius enim uero si porro esse odioi persigit
z quid facies y egone uos me indotatis modo
patrocinar a fortasse arbitramini
etiam dotatis soleo e quid id nostra y nihil
hic quandum noram cuius uir uxorem e hem z quid est
y lemn habuit aliam e nullus sum y ex qua filiam
suscepit et eam clam educat e seipus sum
y haec adeo illi tam denarrao e obsebro
ne facias y oh tune is eras z ut ludus facit
495
e missum te facimus y fabulae e quid uts tibi
argentum quod hares condoramus te y audio
quid uos malum ergo me sic ludificabamini
inepti uestram puerilli sententia
noluo uolo uolo noolo rursum cape cedo
quod dictum indictumst. quod modo erat ratum inritumst
e quod facto aut unde haec hic resciuiz z nescio

930 ISTANC: letter N crossed out by corr. rec. (Pr.)
to read ISTAC
934 HABIT: letters ET written above the line after
HABIT by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read HABITET
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.)
NISI ME DIXISSE NEMINI CERTO SCO
E MONSTRI ITA ME DI AMENT SIMILE Y INICI SCRUPULUM
HICINE UT A NOBIS HOC TANTUM ARGENTI AUFERAT
TAM APERTI INRIDENS EHORI HERCLE SATIUS EST
ANIMO UIRILLI FRAESENTIQUE UT SIS PARA
UIDES PECCATUM TUIUM ESSE ELATUN FORAS
NEQUE IAM ID CELARE POSSE TE UXOREM TUAM
NUNC QUOD IPSA EX ALIIIS AUDITURAST CHREME
ID NOSMET INDICARE PLACABILIIUS EST
TUN HUNC INPURATUM POTERIMUS NOSTRO MODO
ULCISC1 Y ATTAT NISI NIHI PROSPICIO HAEREO
HI GLADIATORIO ANIMO AD ME ADPECTANT ULAN
E AT UEREOR UT PLACARI POSSIT Z BONO ANIMO ES
EGO REDIGAM UOS IN GRATIAM HOC FRETUS CHREME
CUM E MEDIO EXCESSIT UNDE HAEC SUSCEPTAT TIBI
Y ITANEE AGITIS MECUM SATIS ADPOSTE ADGREHIMINI
NONNE HERCLE EX RE ISTIUS ME INSTIGASTI SEMPHO
AIN TU UBI QUE LIBITUM FUERIT PEGRE FECERIS
NEQUE HUIUS SIS UERITUS INRIDEAE PRIMARIAE
QUIN NOUO MODO EI Faceres CONTUMELIAM
PENDAS NUNC PRECIBUS LAIUTUM PECCATUM TUUM
HISCE EGO ILLAM DICTIS ITA TIBI INCENSAM DABO
UT NE RESTINGUAS LACRIMIS SI EXTILLAERIS
Z MALUM QUOD ISTI DI DEAEQUE OMIIS DUNIT
TANTAN EXPECTUM QUEMQUAN ESSE HOMINEM AUDACIA

There are no corrections on this page. However much ink has been rubbed off which makes the reading of it slow.
NON HOC PUBLICITUS SCELUS HINC ASPORTARIE
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 IUBET
E ADSEQUERE RETINE DUM EGO HUC SERUOS EUOCO
Z ENIM NEQUEO SOLUS ACCURREY E UNA INJURIAS
TECU M Z LUGE AGITO ERGO Y ALTERAS TECUM CHEREM
E RAPE HUNC Y SIC ACISIS ENIM UEO UOCES OPUS
NAUSISTRATA EXIT E OS OPPRIME INPURUM UIDE
QUANTUM UALET Y NAUSISTRATA INQUAM Z NON TACES
Y TACEAM Z NISI SEQUITUR PUGNO INUENIREM INGyre
Y UEL OCLUM EXCULPE EST UBI UOS ULCISCAR PROBE

B NAUSISTRATA E CHREMES Z DEMPYO Y PHORMIO

MULIER SENES II PARASITUS

B QUI NOMINAT ME HEM QUID ISTUC TURBAEAST OBSCERO
990 MI UIR Y HEM QUID NUNC OBTUSIUSI B QUID HIC HOMOST
NON NIHI RESPONDIES Y HICINE UT TIBI RESPONDENS
QUI HERCLE UBI SIT\- NESCIIT E CAUE ISTI QUIQUEM CREDAS
Y ABE TANGI SI NON TOTUS FRIGET ME ENICA
E NIHIIL EST B QUID ERGO QUID ISTIC NARRAT Y IAM
SCIES 995

AUSCULTA E PÆRGIN CREDEREE B QUID EGO OBSCERO HUC
CREDEM QUI NIHIIL DIXIT Y DELIRAT MISER
TIMORE B NON POL TEMEREST QUOD TU TAM TIMES
ET EGO TEMEO Y RECTE SANE QUANDO NIHIIL TIMES
ET HOC NIHIIL EST QUOD EGO DICO TU NARRA Z SCELUS 1000

988 INUENIREM: second I changed to T by corr. rec.
990 HEM...URN: A written above the line before
[Pr.] to read IN UNTREM
Hem by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.),
by A2 (Mar.) pointing to the name of
Chremes and indicating that he speak
these words
Voci...
Quid mihi hic adferis quam ob rem exspectem aut sperem. Foro non fore 1025
Exsequias chremeti quibus est commodum ire em tempus est.
Sic dabo age nunc Phornicum qui uolget laccessit.
Fadox tali sit pactatus atque hic est infortunio.
Redeat same in gratiam supplici satis est mihi.
Habet haec ei quod dum uulat usque ad aurem ogniant 1030
B at meo meritio credo quid ego nunc ea commororem demipho.
Singulatiem qualis ego in hunc puruem s noui aequo omnia.
Tecum b meriton hoc meo uidetur factum z minime gentium
Uerum iam quando accusando fieri infectum non potest.
Ignoscere orat confitetur purgat quid uis amplius.
1035
Y enim uero prius quam haec dat ueniam mihi prospiciam et
Pherdrie
Heus nausistrata prius quam uic uit respondes temere audi.
B quid est.
Y ego minas trignita per fallaciam ab illoc absulti
Eas dedi tuo gnato s is pro sua amica lenone dedit.
E hem quid ais b adeon hoc indicium tibi uidetur fillius 1040
Homo adulescens si habit unam amicam tu uxores duas
Nihil pudere quo ore illum obiurgabis responde mihi.
Z faciet ut uolles b inmo ut xeam iam sciias sentimentum,
Neque ego ignesco neque primo quiuquam neque respondes prius
Quam gnatum uidero siue iudicio permitto omnia 1045
Quod is tuebit facian y mulier sapiens es nausistrata.
B satin tibi est y inmo uero pulchre disced et probe.
Et praeter speram tuam nomen dic quid est mihi

Phormio

vestrae familiae hercle amisus et tuo summus Phaedriae

Phormio at ego ecastor posthac quod potero quod Uoles

factamque et dicam y benigne dicis B pol meritumst tuum

y uin prihum hodie facere quod ego gaudeam nausistrata

et quod tuo uiro oculi doleant B cupio y ne ad cenam uoca

B pol usuro uoco y eamus intro hic B fiat set ubi est

Phaedria

Iuex 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,¹ 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 Donatus and Eugraphius and the Vergil Commentaries of Servius and Servius Danielis.
The Scholia of the Phormio are in "hand 2".

53v

Top Margin:

1 [haec acta e]st ludis Megalensibus Chorinto (Cornelio)*
   Merula aedile curuli et L. Postumio alšro (Albino)*/
   [3?] agentibus in rebus Cassio Atilio et Bambio
   (Ambiuio),* modificante Flacco Claudi filio tibiis
   Serranis/[2?]; tota deuerb<i>s 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]æeterito
   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/[cipi uelint].

Suprascript: POETA VETUS

Luscius Lanuuinus

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

2 transde: uenteres so/nantius, nam nos le/uius tradere ut e contrario/ illi tralatum, nos translatu<m>. ("te" of uenteres 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 accusatiuu<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
omnia 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
cogisse. nam quid faceret Teren/[tius] cum de palma
artis musicae certandum uideat sibi esse.

Right, with reference sign to LACESSISSET PRIOR
13 suffecerat lacessisse[t];/ an etiam prior potuisset?

Right margin: NOUUS
14 quod supra pr<a>etermisit/ hic reddidit nouus.
Left, with reference sign to HABERET

15 [mire haberet qua]si dubium/ [non sit maledicen]dum esse/ [Luscio].

Right margin: OMNIBUS

16 omnibus: peie/rasticos/ anti qui qui/ comoedias s/cribunt pla/ticae, et nouis/ 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 praecedit/ id quod sequitur. / U<e>rg<ilius> 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].
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 proverbia(ter: 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 maledicendi 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<e>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
Epidica/zomini (-mene) dicta est/ a puella, de qua/
iudicium est, cum/ sit alia fabula/ eiusdem Apollo/dori
quae Epidica/azoninos s/cribitur. debuit/ ergo dicere
Epidica/zomenem (-en).

Suprascript: LATINI

26 id est Terentius, Latinus poeta; et est enfasis.

Bottom margin, with reference to GRAECI

formon dicitur gr<a>ece saccum (-us) sparteum (-us);
ab hoc parasito nomen est, uel ex [uentris]/ capacitate;
unde Formico correpta prima syllaba Apollodorum e[st.
non a for]/mula ut quidam putant. ergo inde parasitus
ulissimae condicionis hom[o dictus est.]/ si enim a
formula esset nomen comoediae protra<h>eremus primam
yll[abam, si a formi]/one corripere debemus. uidis (-es)
ergo φοPΜίωΝεΜ dici non φαΡΜίωΝεΜ a [formione]/
conpositum. φοΡΜίωΝ enim non φαΡΜίων Gr<a>/eci 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[oedia 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]/ quaeeritur (quer-) [populum subaccu]/sans.

Bottom margin, with reference sign to LOCOST

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

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

antiqui sic ma\luerunt quam / adiuuans.

54v

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

Left margin:
[amicus a uoluntate, po/[pularis a fortuna. popula/
[ris eiusdem condicionis/ [generisq<ue>; Sallusti popu/[laris sceleris] sui.

Right margin:
popularis: ciuillis est, populo amoratus est, ciuis est
humi milis populoque factus ut/ sordidum popularemq<ue>
ciuitati.

Suprascript: POPULARIS
socius.

Suprascript: ERAT EI
36 deest nam.

Top margin, extreme left. Reference sign over RATIOUNCULA
36-7 [opportuna]/ dimi[nutio] in ser/[uorum] ma[xima
paup]/[ertate]. pausillulum,/ [quartus] gradus
di/[minationis]: 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 potiu)s generaliter/ [ii qui mi]nus <h>abent
diu/[tioribus; non] dicit serui domi/[nis].

Right margin:

42 mire addant non dent et/ non aliquando sed semper.

Right, with reference sign to DEMENSO
uel a mense uel a mensura.

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

Suprascript: CONPERSIT
seruauit.

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


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> rusticitiati 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


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 sig/nificat ad men/tionem
alterius/ rei.

Right margin: SED
discensus ad argum[entum].

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

SED
58 necessario igna/uus inducitur Da/uus ut narrandi/
sit locus.

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

INSCIENS
58r

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

PLECTAR
220 puniar
Left margin: CENTURIATUS

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

239 Only traces of a two-line scholium remain.

60r

Right margin: ECCERE

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

61v

Right margin: BONA UENIA

378 sine lite.

Suprascript: UENIA

gratia.

Left margin: EXPISCARE

382 fraudulenter temp/tare.

63v

Suprascript: PORROST

474 dehinc in futuru<m>.

Left margin: CONFUTAUIT

477 redarguit.
491 excogitet.

Right of line 493 (misplaced): CANTILENAM

495 modulat[atio] cantionis.

Right margin: GARRI

496 res ineptas loquere.

543 gaudeo.

Left, with reference sign to CONDICIONEM

579 nuptiarum.

585 aliquo modo.

Right margin: BELUA

601 stultus.

614 tantum quod.
Left, with reference sign to LOCARET

646 nuptum daret, / id e<st> conlocaret.

Suprascript: SUSCEPISSE

647 <h>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./ U<e>rg<ilius> 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 est aegestate deliquere, unde 
Uergilius et duris urgens in rebus egestas].

QUOD DICUNT: NE PRAETER CASAM
768 ne ante casam transeas.

UORSURAM SOLUES
780 es alienum acceptum mutuo sol[ues].

IN DIEM ABIIT
781 dilatum est.

PECUNIA A<UT> ARGENTO.

OPITULATA ES
74r
iuuasti.

(Mountford's edition reads 73v)

GLADIATORIO
964 gladiatorio:/ disperato.

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

alibi ad dominas qui/ affectant uiam.

MACTATUS

affectus.

OGGANIAT

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;¹ b) the Classical World bibliographical survey;² c) the Lustrum bibliographical survey.³

I have not been able to secure certain works:

Émile Chambry, ed. et trad., Terence, Comédies, Paris, Garnier, 1932 ordered January 29, 1976 through the Loyola University Inter-library Loan system (a review⁴ 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 of Soave's edition gives no indication that this work is anything but a translation); G. Coppola, Terenzio, Commedie, Torino, Chiantore, 1927.6


6After 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.

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 fuisset; 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 SEQUAR 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. Σ: 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 Σ (the Calliopian family which covers all the remaining manuscripts) have branched out from a Terentian archetype and further, that J and Y are branches of Σ. He believes that A and Σ 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: "-DRIAE 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 PATRUOM instead of PATRUUM; 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, deputo 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 Bembinus exhibits the hand of various correctors - that of a "corrector antiquus", that of Ioviales and that of a "corrector 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) Donatus, in his commentary, mentions codices containing readings 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 correctors, 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 ω. 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.


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. AR); A reads ADUENIRE and AR changed it to ADUENIRE. Line 351 pro deum inmortalium A; A reads PRO DEUM IMMORTALIUM. Line 417 ut 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. AR; A reads QU with the letter I added above by the corrector rec. (Prete). Line 169 ut J om. A (add. AR); 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. AR; 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 AR; 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 \( \Sigma \) 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" \( \Sigma \); (b) Eun. 632 "puto" A for "reputo" \( \Sigma \); (c) Phorm. 877 "inaudiui" A for "audiui \( \Sigma \); (d) Eun. 998 "necessus" A for necesse \( \Sigma \).

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 A). 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 superscript "-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 $\Gamma$ and $\Delta$ come) dates later than the grammarians of the fifth century (Arusianus, Nonius, Eugraphius); Arusianus and Nonius use $\Lambda$ 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 $\Gamma$ and $\Delta$ occurs in the following century. c) The traces of the $\Delta$ 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 $\Lambda$ 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\textsuperscript{1} 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\textsuperscript{2} 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\textsuperscript{3} 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.

\textsuperscript{1}This 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.

\textsuperscript{2}This 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.

\textsuperscript{3}Eugraphius 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 ξ and _sector manuscripts against A in three possible cases and with ξ manuscripts against A and _sector in one possible case, Jones concludes Arusian had access to _sector and to _sector-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 η manuscripts alone against others, three times; with _sector manuscripts alone against others, five times; with Υ (i.e., _sector and η 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 "exclude" Σ, "exculpe" A; Eunuchus 779 "non posse fieri" Σ, "fieri non posse" A; Phormio 88

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 (\( \mathcal{S} \)) of minuscule manuscripts. Common sense suggests that Servius, a grammarian about 400 A.D., knew the contemporary edition of Terence, the Codex Be- minus. 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" Σ; 74 (Aen. VIII 412): "primo" for "primum" Σ; 708 (Aen. IX 693): "quo te agis" for "quo hinc te agis" Σ - 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 *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 mono-syllable "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 hoc die hie 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 manuscripts 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. Fehl maintains that the interpolations 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 A 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 A 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 CJ 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 \( A \) and \( E \) had already been realized before the signs were introduced systematically into the text. The absence of true common errors in \( A \) and \( E \) 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 \( A \) and \( E \) before the third century, or even to renounce the hypothesis of a tradition common to \( A \) and \( E \). 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 Marouzeau¹ 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:

In mentem venit; nam quam maxume huic visa haec suspicio
Erit uera, quamque adulescens maxume quam in
minima spe situs
Erit, tam facillume patri' pacem in leges conficet suas.

The manuscript tradition presents the following versions:

Σ

In mentem uenit; namque adulescens quam in
minima spe situs
Erit...

A

In mentem uenit; namque adulescens maxime huic
visa haec suspicio.

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 versus 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/tēm uē/nīt; nām/guē adūlēs/cēns// quam īn/ minīmā/ spē sitūs/ ērit

Tām fā/cīlū/mē pātrī'/ pācem īn// lēgēs/ cōnīcī/
ēt sū/as/

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 Ψ Ω. The cantor is always designated by Ψ. The scribe reserves Θ, Ρ, Φ, 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., Ρ Ψ 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., Ν Pamphilus, Α 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, Χ Syrus, S Sostrata, Ε Sophrona Nutrix. For characters whose initial letter is "C", the scribe devises
this system: H Chremes, X Ctesipho, Y Clitipho, 1 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 Heceyra 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 (uāh) 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 Porcelius. 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. l11r; Eunuchus, foll. 9r, 9v, l11r; Heauton- timorumenos 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, uerberauit, me inuito abduxit meam:
Ob male facta haec tantidem emptam postulat sibi tradier!
Hominis 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, uerberauit, [colaphos infregit mihi
Hominis 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-

---

1G. Jachmann, Die Geschichte des Terenztextes im Altertum (Basel: Reinhardt, 1924).
2cf. my review of Prete, 1950.
4cf. my review of Andrieu, 1939, 1940.
5For 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 Calliopian recension (Ξ), 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 Calliopian 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 Ξ 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):

\[ \text{A PHORMIO} \quad \text{GETA} \]
\[ \text{PARASITUS} \quad \text{SERUUS} \]

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):

\[ \text{Z DEMIPHO} \quad \text{CHREMES} \]
\[ \text{SENES} \quad \text{II} \]

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 *APh* 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 *APh* (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.

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 ABHUC and himself corrects to ADDVC". ABDVC 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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