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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.

---

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

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

10 Hauler, p. 274.
12 R. Sabbadini, Le scoperte dei Codici latini e
greci ne' secoli XIV et XV (Firenze: 1963); 146 n. 33.
13 Prete, 1970, p. 10. I presume Prete believes
Johannes Pandonj is the parallel of the Italian name
Gianntonio de' (dei) Pandoni since dei is the Italian
genitive. I am inclined to agree with Sabbadini that the
notation indicates the price of the manuscript.
some expression such as "& amicorum".  

When Bernardo Bembo died, his son Pietro (1470-1547) inherited the codex. In 1491, the humanist Angelo Poliziano (1454-1494) 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

---

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

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

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

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

---

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

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\textsuperscript{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).\textsuperscript{28} Testimony to this fact is found in the inscription which Gaetano Marini (1742-1815),\textsuperscript{29} the "primus custos" of the Vatican Library at this time, wrote on fol. 4v:

\begin{verbatim}
Furto sublatus Mense Octob. A. CIV D CCXCIX\textsuperscript{30}

sed multa a me diligentia perquisitus beneficio
Egregii viri Dominici Salae Bibliothecae restitutus idibus Dec. eiusdem anni
\end{verbatim}

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.\textsuperscript{31}

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

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{27}Ibid. p. 22, n. 2 and p. 23, n. 23.
  \item \textsuperscript{28}Prete, 1970, p. 18, n. 43. Here he gives Sala's dates.
  \item \textsuperscript{29}Enciclopedia Italiana di scienze, lettere ed arti, 1934-1942, s. v. "Gaetano Marini."
  \item \textsuperscript{30}Ehrle, p. 22, n. 2 and p. 23, n. 23.
  \item \textsuperscript{31}Prete, 1954, p. 17.
\end{itemize}
Description of the Codex Bembinus

Originally the Codex Bembinus (A) consisted of fourteen ten-leaved quires or 140 folios.\footnote{Prete, 1970, p. 19. Sir Edward Maunde Thompson, An Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1912), p. 54.} 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.\footnote{Sesto Prete, Il Codice Bembino di Terenzio, Studi e Testi (Città del Vaticano, 1950), pp. 22-23; Prete, 1970, p. 19; Lowe, p. 5.}

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,\footnote{Thompson, p. 54.} each quire by tracing small Roman numerals on the last page of the
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


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

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

\(^{13}\)Ibid.

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

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

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

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

The verses of the poems are the following:16

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 flammae queras neque alti pectoris ignis
Set tibi vernantium preveat ista facis

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

---

17 Prete, 1970, p. 22. He reports that Baehrens attributes the poems to Draco and that Sabbadini thinks that Poliziano had written these lines as a remembrance of his visit to the Bembo family in 1491.

18 Prete, "History of Textual Criticism," p. 27.
Description of the Bembine Text of the Phormio

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

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

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

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

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

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

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.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 0 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 0 and Q are not circular but elliptical in form. Straight lines tend to curve as is evident in A, X and V, the latter now be-

³Lowe, p. 5.
coming a U. Often the ends of lines do not meet as in A and M. Serifs are sometimes more prominent, especially in A, P and T. Because of the short cross stroke at the top and a finishing stroke at the bottom, the T is likely to be confused with an I. Finally, letters F, L and T rise above the others.  

We turn now to the orthographic variants found in the Phormio alone: 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 SCIBAM 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.

---


5Franz Umpfenbach, P. Terenti Afri Comoediae. Edidit et apparatu critico instruxit Franciscus Umpfenbach (Berolini: apud Weidmannos, 1870), praefatio xiii-xvii. Umpfenbach has made a study of the orthography of the whole of the Codex Bembinus.
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" (♂), the "simplex ductus" (♂) and the third sign resembling a Greek sigma (♂). It may well be that a corrector of the sixth century, who signs his name "Ioviales" in cursive on several pages, or a "manus recens" of the seventh/eighth century 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.

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

---

7 Ibid., p. 32.
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 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 \( \div \); fol. 53v, line 9 \( \div \); fol. 53v, line 15 \( \div \); fol. 54r, line 23 \( \div \); fol. 54r, line 25 \( \div \); fol. 54r, line 33 \( \div \); fol. 54v, line 36 \( \div \); fol. 54v, line 43 \( \div \).

[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" (m⁴) which is possibly still Ioviales or someone shortly after him. This Ioviales² made only a few corrections particularly of the Hecyra. As Kauer himself states in the introduction to his Oxford text:

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

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

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

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

---

⁴Prete, 1950, p. 34.
found in the codex. Manus\(^2\), "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.\(^6\)

\(^6\)Prete, 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 Heautontimoromenos, 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. Two different opinions exist in regard to the relationship of Donatus and the scholia of Phormio 1-59. Paul Wessner 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 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 observes that of the seventy-four scholia concerned, twenty-one are identical with the extant version of Donatus and twenty-eight, although they say the same things, differ in phraseology from Donatus. Mountford favors Löfstedt's theory and attributes this group of scholia to the original Donatus. If this view is correct, these scholia indicate that the present

---

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

If we exclude Phormio 1-59 and the approximately sixteen items which coincide with Eugraphius' commentary on Terence, about 1400 scholia\textsuperscript{12} 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.\textsuperscript{13}

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

\textsuperscript{12}Mountford, p. 122.
\textsuperscript{13}Ibid., p. 125.
\textsuperscript{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
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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.²

Mar. = Marouzeau

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

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

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


4 Marouzeau does not date the last three hands.


6 Marti, p. 126.
Scribitur ad illius locum.

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

POSTQUAM POëTA UETUS POSTAM NON POTEST RETRABERE A STUDIO ET TRADERE HOMINEM IN OTIUM MALEDICTIS DETERRERÉ NE SCRIBAT PARAT QUI ITA DICTITAT QUAS ANTHEA FECIT FABULAS TENET ESSE ORATIONE ET SCRIPTURA LEUI QUIA NUSQUAM INSANUM SCRIPIT ADOLESCENTULUM CERUAM UIDERE FUGERET ET SECTARI CANES ET EAM PLORARE ORARE UT SUBVENIAT SIBI QUOD SI INTELLEGERET CON STETIT OLIM NOUA ACTORIS OPERA MAGIS STETTISSE QUAM SUA MINUS MULTO AUDACITÉR QUAM NUNC LÆDERET NUNC SI QUIS EST QUO HOC DICAT AUT SIC COGITET UETUS SI POETA NON LACESSISSET PRIOR NULLUM INVENIRE PROLOGUM POTUisset NOUS QUAM DICIERT NISI HABERET CUI MALE DICIERT IS SIBI RESPONSUM HOC HABEAT IN MEDIO OMNIBUS PALVAM ESSE POSTAM 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
8 ACTORIS: +reference sign to scholia to left of A
9 NULLUM: +reference sign to scholia above the A
10 TRACTENT: letter A added above E by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read TRACTANT
ILLE AD FAMEM HUNC A STUDIO SYUDUIT REICERE
HIC RESPONDERE UQLUIT NON LACESSERE
BENEDICIT IS CERTASSE AUDISSET BENE
20 QUOD AB ILLO ADLATUMST: ID SIBI ESSER RELATUM PUTET
DE ILLO TAM IDEM PACIAM DICUNI MIHI
PECCANDI CUM IPSE DE SE FIRM NON FACIT
NUNC QUID UELIN ANIMUM ATTENDITE ADPORTO NOUAM
EPIDICAZOMENON QUAM UOCANT COMOEDIAM
GRAECLI LATINI PHORMIONEM NOMINANT
QUIA PRIMAS PARTIS Qm AGER EST ERIT PHORMIO
PARATISUS PER QUEM RES GERETUR MAXIME
ULUNTAS UOESTRA SI AD POETAM ACCESSERIT
DATE OPERAM ADESTE AEUO ANIMO PER SILENTIUM
30 NI SIMILI UAMUR PORTUNA ATQUE UUI SUMUS
CUM PER TUMULTUM NOSTER GRAEX NUS LOCOST
QUEM ACTORIS VIRTUS 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 GRAECLI: reference sign to scholia above the A
28 RES: reference sign to scholia above the E
29 UOESTRA: 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 lov. (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
AMICUS SUMMUS NEUS ET POPULARIS GETA

HERI AD ME UERIT ERAT EI DE RATIOUNCULA
IAM PRIDEM APUC ME RELICUIUM PAUXILIUM
NUMMORUM ID UT CONICEREM CONFCN ADIEFO
NAM ERILEM FILIUM EIUSSISSE AUDIO
UXOREM EI CREDO MINUS HOC CONRADITUR
QUAM INIQUE COMPARATUMST· II QUI MINUS HABENT
UT SEPES ALIQUID ADDANT DIUITIORIBUS
QUOD ILLE UNCIATIM UIX DE DEEMBO SUO
SUUM DEFRUDANS GENIUM CONPERSIT MISER
ID ILLA UNIUSUM ABRIPIT HAUD EXISTIMANS
QUANTO LABORE PARTUM PORRO AUTEM GETA
FERETUR ALIO MINERE UBI ERA PEPERERIT
FORRO AUTEM ALIO UBI ERIT PUERO NATALIS DIE
UBI INITIABUNT OMNE HOC MATER AUFERET
PUERO CAUSA ERIT MITTUNDI SED UIDEON GETAM

.bits

Si quis me quaeret Rufus B PRAEOSTST· DESINE r OH
AT EGQ OBIUM CONABAR TIBI DAUE B ACCipe EM
LECTUMST· CONUENIET NUMERUS QUANTUM DEBUI
R AND TE UT NON RECLEXISSE HABEO GRATIAM
PRAEERTIM UT NUNC SUNT MORES ADEO RES REDIT
Si quid quid reddat magnac hagendast gratia
B sed quid tu es tristis  f egone nescis quo in metu et
quanto in periculum luis quid bui est  scies
modo ut tacere possis  a bi s iis insciens
cuius tu fideum in pecunia perspexeris
uerere uerbâ ei credere ubi quid mihi luceri est
2 TE pallere f ergo auscultâ  b hanc operam tibi dico
3 senis nostri daue fratre matorem curenem
nostin b quid 1 r quid eius gnatus phaedriam
B tanquam te  f evenit senibus ambus stimul
iter illi in lenno ut esset nostro in ciliaci
ad hospitem antiquom  is semen per epistulas
fellexit modi non montis auri pollices
B cui tandem erat res et erat super 1 desinas
sic est ingenuum  b o regem me esse oportuit
f absentem ambo hic tum sensis me filius
relinquunt  quasi magistrum  b o geta proximici
cepisti duram mihi usus evenit  hoc scio
memini reliqui me deo irato meo
coepi adversari primo quid uersis opust
seni fidelis dum sum scapulas peridi
4 uenere in mentem mihi istaec b namque insciasti
adversum stimulum calces  f coepi is omnia
pacere obsequit quae uellent b scisti uti foro
5 r noster mal i niil quicquam primo hic phaedria

57 B: crossed out by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.). A
advanced B from line 55 to line 57 (Mar.)
69 ERAT SUPER: marks made by Iov. (K.) above B of ERAT
and UP of SUPER indicate a change to SUPERERAT
71 HIC: letter n added above the C by corr. rec. (Pr.),
by Iov. (K.) to read HNC
73 DURAM: after this word corr. rec. (Pr.), Iov. (K.)
added r. In fact, the Ms. tradition attributes MIHI...PERODI to Geta
75 ADUERSARI: the word HIS added above AD by corr. rec.
(Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read HNC
77 r changed to B by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
in beginning of line; ISTAEC B: letter after ISTAEC
crossed out by Iov. (K.)
78 OMNIA: ea added above O by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov.
(K.)
CONTINUO QUANDAM NACTUS EST PUELULAM
CITARISTRIAM HANC AMARE COEPTAT PERDITAE
EA SERUIEBAT LENONI INPURISSIMO
NEQUE QUID DARARUM ID CURARANT PATRES
RESTABAT ALIUT NISI Oculos PASCERE
SECETAI IN LUDUM DUCERE ET REDUCERE
NOS OTIOS OPERAM DABAMUS PHAEODIAE
IN QUO HAECE DISCEBAT LUDO EXAUDERUOS ILICO
TOMOSTRAE ERAT QUANDAM HIC SOLEAMUS FERE
PIERUMQUE EAM OPERIBI DUM INDE IRET DOMUM
INTEREA DUM SEDEMUS ILLI INTEREUNIT
ADULESCENS QUIDAM LACRUMANS NOS MIRARIER
ROGAMUS QUID SIT NUMQAM AQUE INQUIT AC MODO
PAUPERTAS MINI ONUS UISUMST ET MISTERIUM ET GRAUE
MODO QUANDAM UIDI UIRGINEM HIC UICINIAE
MISERAM SUAM MATREM LAMENTARI MORTUAM
EA SITA ERAT EXAUDERUOS NEQUE ILLI BENIUOLOS
NEQUE NOTUS NEQUE COGNATIUS EXTRA URAM ANCILLULAM
QUISQAM ADERAT QUI ADIUTARET FUNUS MISERITUM
UIRGO IPSA FACIE EGREGIA QUID UERBIS OPUS
COMMORAT OMNES NOS IBI CONTINUO ANTIPHONI
UGLITNE EAMUS UISERE ALIUS CENSEO
EAMUS DUC NOS SODES INUIMUS
UIDEMUS UIRGO PULCHRA ET MAGIS DICERES
NIHIL ADERAT ADIUMENTI AD PULCHRITUDINEM

88 ILICO: the first I changed to E, the second I changed to L, letter O added above C by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.) to read EI LICO
91 ILLI: letter C added above second I by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read ILLIC
97 EXAUDERUOS: second U crossed out by corr. rec. (Pr.) and cursive a added above it to read EXAUDERUOS. Mar. incorrectly cites A as reading EXAUDERUS
BENIUOLOS: second U crossed out by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.) and EN added above it by same to read BENIUOLO
98 ANCILLULAM: letter I added above line between N and C, then ILL crossed out by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read ANICULAM
104 ---: three letters totally erased and QUO written in their place by corr. rec. (Pr.)
CAPILLUS PASSUS NUDUS PES. IPSA HORBIDA
LACRIMABE UESTITUS TURPFIS: UT NI UI BONI
IN IPSA INESSET FORMA HAECE FORMAM EXTINGUERENT
ILLE QUI ILLAM AMABAT FIDICINAM TANTUM MODO
SATIS INQUIT SCIPIAT NOSTER UERO B IAM SCIO
AMARE COEPTA SCIN QUAM QUO EUADAT UIDE
POSTRIDE AD ANUM RECTA PERGIT OBSECRAET
UT SIBI EUI FACIAT COPIAM ILLA ENIM SE NEGAT
NEQUE EUM AEGUM ALT. FACERE ILLAM CIVEM ESSE ATTICAM
BONAM BONIS PROGNATAM SI UXOREM UELIT
LEGE ID LICERE FACERE SIN ALIUS ACEREM
NOSTER QUID FACERET NESCIRE ET ILLAM DUCERE
CUPERBAT ET METUERAT. ABSENTEM PATREM
B NON SI REDISSSET E PATER UERIAM DARET
R ILLI INDOTATAM UIRGINEM ATQUE IGNOBILEM
DARET ILLI NUMQUAM FACERET B QUID FIT DENIQUE
R QUID FACIAT EST PARASITUS QUI DAM PHORMIO
HOMO CONFIDENS QUI ILLUM DI ONEN PERDUIENT
B QUID IS FECIT R HOC CONSILIUM QUOD DICAM DEDIT
LEX EST UT ORBAS QUO SINT GENERE PROXIMI
IIS NUBANT. ET ILLOS DUCERE EADEM HAECE LEX IUBET
EGO TE COGNATUM DICAM ET TIBI SCRIBAM DICAM
PATERNUM AMICUM NE ADISIMULABO UIRGINIS
AD IUDICES UENIEMUS QUI FUERIT PATER
QUAE MATER QUI COGNATI TIBI SIT-OHNA 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 AZ (Mar.) to read ILLENE
122 FACIAT: letters AC crossed out by Iov. (K.), corr. rec. (Pr.) to read FIAE
125 QU : letter I added above by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read QUI
CONFINGAM QUOD ERIT MIHI BONUM ATQUE COMMOUN CUM TU HOC Nihil REFLUES UINCAT SCILICET PATER ADERIT MIHI PARATAE LITES QUID MEA ILLA QUIDEM NOSTRA ERIT B IOCUlAREM AUDACIAM PERSUASUM: HOMINI FACTUStM USM= UINCIMUM 135 DUXIT B QUID NARRAS R HOC QUID AUDIS B O GETA QUID TE FUTURAM: * R NESCEO HERCLE UNUM HOC SCIO QUID FORS FERET: PEREMUS AEO ANIMO B PLACET EM ISTUC UIRIST: OFFICIUM IN NE OMNIS SPES MIHI EST B LAUO R AD PRECATOREM ADEAM CREDO QUI MIHI 140 BIC OR ET NUNC AMITTE QUAESO HUNC CETERUM POSTHAC SI QUIquam Nihil PRECOR TANTUM MODO NON ADDIT UBI EGO HINC ABIERO UEL OCCIDITO B QUID PEDAGOGUS ILLE QUI CITHARISTRIAM QUIT ET GERET R STC TENUITER. B NON MULTUM HABET 145 QUID QUOD DET FORTASSE R IMMO Nihil NISI SPEM MERMAR B PATER Eius REDIT: AN NON R NONDUM B QUID SENEM QUOD SPECTATIS UESTRUM R NON CERTUM SCIO SED EPISTULAM AB RO AdLAIAM ESSE ADIUII MODA ET AD PORTITORES ESSE DELIATAM PETAM 150 B NUM QUID GETA ALUIT ME UIS R UT BENE SIT TIBI PUEIR HEUS NEMON HOC PRODIT CAPE DA HOC DORCIO

A ANTIPHO B PHAEDRIA

ADELCENTES II

ADEON REM REDISSE UT QUI MIHI CONSULTUM OPTIME UELLET ESSE

145 B: letter B inserted between TENUITER and NON by A (Pr.)
146 R: letter R inserted between FORTASSE and IMMO by A (Pr.)
150 DELIATAM: letter T traced by corr. rec. (Pr.); P ETAM: the word HANC added above P ETAM 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 EIUSS ADUENTI
VENIAT QUOD NI FUSSEM INCOGITANS ITA EXPECTA--M UT PAR PUTT 155
B QUID ISTUC EST A ROGITAS QUI TAM AUDACIS FACINORIS MI
CONSCIUS SIS QUOD USTINAM IN PHORMIONI ID SUADERE IN MENTEM INCIDISSET
NEU ME CUPIDUM EGO IMPULSSET QUOD MIHI PRINCIPiUMST. MAl
NON POTTVS ESSUM FUSSSET TUM ILOSI MIHI AGRE ALIQUOD DIEB
AT NON COTTITIANA CURA HABEC ANGERET ANIMIUM B AUDIO 160
A DUM EXSPECTO QUAM MOX UENIAT QUI ADINAT HANC MIHI
CONSUMTUDINEM B ALIIS QUA DEFIT QUOD AMANT AEGREST TIBI QUa SUPEREST

DOLET AMORE ABUNDAS ANTIphO

NAM TUA QUIDEM HERCILE CERTO UTA HAC EXPETENDA O'PANDAQE
EST ITA ME DI BENE AMEN'T UH MIHI LICEAT TAM DIU QUOD AMO
FRUI 165
IAM DEPISISCI MORTE CUPIO TU CONICTO 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 OULUSTI UXOREM SINE MALA FAMA PALAM
BEATUS NE UNUM DESIT QUI NODESTE ISTAEC FERAT 170
QUOD SI TIBI RES CIT IC EO LENONE QUO MIHI EST TUM SENTIAS

A AT TU MIHI CONTRA NUNC UIDERE FORTUNATUS PHAEDRIA
CUI DE INTEGRO EST POTESTAS E TIAM CONSULENDI QUID UELIS
R E T INERE AMARE AMITTERE EGO IN EUM INCIDI INFELIX LOCUM 175
UT NEQUE MIHI SIT AMITENDI NEC RETINENDI COPIA
SED QUOD HOC EGT UIDRON EGO GETA CURRENTEM HIC ADUENTRE
IS EST IPSUS EI TIMEO MISER QUA HIC MIHI HUNTET REM

A GETA  r ANTIphO  B PHAEDRIA

154 EXPECTA--M: two letters between A and M totally erased
and NE inserted by corr. rec. (Pr.) to
read EXPECTAREN

157 IN: letter I crossed out and E added above N by Iov.
(Pr.), (K.) to read NE

160 B: letter B inserted between ANIMIUM 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 (Mar.) to read CERTE;
EXPETENDA: letter E added above TN by Iov. (Pr.) to
read EXPETENDA. On microfilm, letters EXPETEN
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
NULLUS ES GETA NISI IAM ALIQUOD TIBI CONSILIUM CELERE REPERIS
ITA NUNC INPARATUM SUBITO TANTA TE INPENDENT MALA 180
QUAE NEQUE UTI DEUITEM SCIO NEQUE QUO MODO ME INDE
ESSET
QUAE SI NON ASTU PRUDENTUR ME AUT ERM US PESSUM DABUNT
NAM NON POTEST CELARI NOSTRA DIUPLUS AUDACIA Γ QUID ILLIC
COMMTUS UENIT
A TUM TEMPORIS MIHI PUNCTUM AD HANC REM EST ERUS ADEST
Γ QUID ILLIC MALIST
A QUID CUM AUDIERIT QUID EIUS REMEDIV INUENIAM
IRACUNDIAE 185
LOQUARNE INCENDAM TACEAM INSTIGEM PURGEM ME LATEREM
EHEU ME MISERUM CUM MIHI PAUEO TUM TANTUM ME EXCRUCIAT
ANIMI
EIUS ME MISERET EI NUNC TIMEO IS NUNC ME RETINET NAM
ABSQVE EO ESSET
RECTE EGO MIHI UIDISSEM ET SENIS ESSEM ULTUS IRACUNDIAM
ALIQUID CONVASISSEM ATQUE EIIC ME CONICEREM PROTVNUS
IN PEDES 190
Γ QUAM HINC FUGAM AUT FURTUM PARAT
A SED UBI ANTIPOHREM QEPERIAM AUT QUA QUAGRE INSITIAM 
B TE NOMINAT Γ NESCO QUID MAGNUM HOC NUNTIO EXPECTO MALUM旅游度假
SANUSNE ES A DONUM IRE PERGAM IBI PLURIMURUM B REOCCEUS
HOMINEM STA ILICO A HEM 195
SATIS PRO IMPERIO QUISQUIS ES Γ GETA A IPSE EST QUEM
ULUI OBUIAM
Γ CEDO QUID PORTAS OBECCRO ATQUE ID SI POTES UENSO EXPEDI
A FACIAM
Γ ELOQUERE A MODO APUT PORTUM Γ MEUNRE A INTELLEXTI
Γ OCCIDI B HEM
Γ QUID AGAM B QUID AIS A HUIUS PATREM UIDISS E ME ET PATRUM
TUUM
NAM QUID EGO HUIC SUBITO EXITIO REMEDIV INUENIAM MISER 200
QUO D SI EO MARE FORTUNAE REDENT PHANTUM ABS TE UT
DISTRAR

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

200: page damage makes it impossible to read the character designation at the beginning of the line;
SUBITO: above the letter S is symbol possibly denoting omission of word NUNC which is present in other Mss. or Ms. tradition. Corrector unknown
Nullast mihi uita expetenda a ergo istae cum ipa sunt. Antipho
—n. n. m. gis te audigilare aequomst fortis fortuna adiuuat
r non sum aput me a aquis opus est nunc cum maxume ut sis
Antipho

Nam si senserit te timidum pater esse arbitrabitur 205
commeruisse culpam b hoc uerumst r non possum inmutari
er a quid faceres si aliud gratus tibi nunc faciundum foret
g cum hoc non possum illud minus posse a hoc nihil est

Quid hic conterimus operam frustra quin abeo b et quidem
tenem eas. PHAEDRIA ———-

Quid si adsimulo satines te garris r uolatum contemplamin-

Em istuc serua et uerbum uerbo par pari et respondendas
ne te iratus suis saecudicis dictis protelet r scio
A ui coactum te esse inuitum b legi iudicio a tenes
set hic quis est senex quem uideo in ultima platea ipsus
est 215
t non possum adesse a ah quid agis quo abis antipho
mane inquam r egomet me noui et peccatum meenum
uobis commendo phaniam et uitam mean
b geta quid nunc piest a tu iam uites audies
tenem eas. PHAEDRIA

Ego plectar pendens nisi quid me fefellerit
sed quod modo hic nos antiphonem nonuimus
id nosmet ipsos facere oporite — PHAEDRIA
b aufer mihi oporite quin tu quid faciam impera

203 ——TANTO: first two letters blurred but Ms. tradition reads TANTO
208 ———: letters blurred but Ms. tradition reads ILICET
209 OBSE—: three letters blurred but Ms. tradition reads OBSECR
210 A: above A, unknown corrector added PH indicating Phaedria should say GARRIS
213 PROTELET: above and to the right of this word is PATER written by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
218 PHANIAM: the second A is crossed out and U added above it by corr. rec. (Pr.)
222 OPORTE—: final letter (A?) crossed but and T added above by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read OPORTE
A MEMINISTIN OLIN UT FUEUIT UESTRA ORATIO
IN RE INCIPITUNDA AD DEFENDENDAM NOXIAM
IUSTAM ILLAM CAUSAEM FACILEM LICIBILEM OPTUMAM
B MEMINI A EM NUNC IPSAST OPUS EA AUT SI QUID POTEST
MELIOR ET CALIDIOR B FIERI SEDULIO
A NUNC PRIOR ADITO TU EGO IN INSIDIES HIC ERO
CENTURIATUS SI QUID DEPIECIAS B AGE

Z DEMIPHO B PHAEDRIA A GETA

SENEX ADULESCENS SERIVS
Z ITANE TANDEM UXORUM DUXIT ANTIPH O INIUSSO MEO
NEC MEUM IMPERIUM AC MITTO IMPERIUM NON SIMILATIEM MEAM
REVERERI SALTEM NON PUDERI O FACINUS AUDAX O GETA
MONITOR A UIX TANDEM QUID MII DICE NT QUAM
CAUSAEM REPERIERT
DEMIPOR A ATQUI REPERIAM ALIUT AGE Z AN HOC DICET MIHI
INUITUS ERCI LEX COEGIT AUDIO FATEOR A PLACES
Z UERUM SCIENTEM TACITUM CAUSAM TRADERE ADVERSARIIS
ETIAMNE ID LEX COEGIT B ILLUD DURUM A EGO EXPEDIAM SINE
Z INCERTUSMT QUID AGAM QUA PRAETER SEMPATRE IN
CREDIBILEM HOC MIHI OPTIGIT

PERICLA DAMNA EX ILLA PEREGRE REDIENS SEMPER
COGITAT 243
AUT FILI PECCATUM AUT UXORIS MORTEM AUT MORBAM
FILIAE COMMUNIA ESSE
HAEC POSSE UT NE QUIT ANO SIT NOUOM
QUIDQUID PRAETER SPEM EUNIEIT OMNE ID DEPUTARE ESSE
IN LUCRO
O PHAEDRIA INCREDIBLEST QUANTUM ERUM ANTE EO SAPIENTIA

228 MELIOR: letter E added by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read MELIORE
CALIDIOR: letter E added by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read CALIDIORE

230 CENTURIATUS: letters SUC added to front of the word by corr. rec. (Pr.), Iov. (K.) to read SUCCENTURIATUS

234 QUAM: word AUT written above by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)

235 ALIUT: letter T written by corr. rec. (Pr.); AGE: word AGE erased and CURA added by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)

240-242: three lines, present in Ms. tradition, are not found in A

245 HAEC POSSE: above these words, FIERI added by Iov. (Pr.), (K.); ANO: letter O crossed out and IMO added above by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read ANIMO

247: page damage makes it impossible to read the character designation at the beginning of the line
MEDITATA MIHI SUNT OMNIA MEA INCOMMODA ---S SI REDIERIT MOLENDUM ESSE IN PISTRINO UAPULANDUM HABENDAE COMPEDES OPUS HURI FACTUMDEM HORUM NIHIIL QUIQUAM ACCIDET ANINO NOUOM

QUIQQUID PRAETER SPEM EUEIYET OMNE ID DEPUTABO ESSE IN LUCRO SED QUID CESSE HOMINEM ADIRE ET BLANDE IN PRINCIPIO ADLOQUI

Z PHAEDRIAM MEI FRATRIS UIDEO FILIUM MIHI RE OBUTIAM B MI PATRUE SALUE Z SALUE SED UBI EST ANTIPOH B SALDO UENIRE Z CREDO HOC RESPONDE MIHI 255 B UALET HIC EST SET SATIDE OMNIA EX SENTENTIA Z UELLEM QUDEM B QUD ISTUCE EST Z ROGITAS PHAEDRIA BONAS ME ABSENTE HIC CONFECTIONIS NUPTIAS B EHO AN ID SUSCENSES NUNC ILLI Z ARTIFICEM PROPUN EGON ILLI NON SUSCENSEAM IPSUM GESTIO 260 DARI MIHI IN CONSPECTUM NU CULPA AUT SCIAT LENEM PATEM ILLUM FACTUM ME ESSE ACERRIMUM B ATQUIN NIHIIL FECIT PATRUE QUOD SUSCENSEAS Z ECCE AUTEM SIMILIA OMNIA OMMNES CONGRUUNT UNUM CUM NORIS OMNIS NORKIS B HAUD ITAST 265 Z HIC IN NOXIAST ILLI AD DEFENDUNDAM CAUSAM ADEST CUM ILLE ABEST PRAESTABIT TRADUNT OPERAS MUTUAS A PROBE HORUM FACTA INPRUDENS DEFINIXIT SENEX Z HAM NI HARC ITA ESSENT CUM ILLO HAULT STARES PHAEDRIA B SI EST PATRUE CULPAM UT ANTIPOH IN SE ADMISERIT 270 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 ADJURAT DIUITI AUT PROPTER MISERICORDIAM ADDUXT PAUPERI A NI NOSSEM CAUSAM CREDEREM UERA HUNC LOQUI Z AN QUISQUAM IUDEX EST QUI POSSIS NOSCERE TUA IUSTA UBI TUPE UERBUM NON RESPONDEAS ITA UT ILLA FECTUM B FUNCTUS ADulescENtULi EST OFFICIUM LIBERALIS POSTQUAM AD IUDICES VENiMUT NON POTUIT COGITATA PROLOQUI ITA EUM TUM TIMIDUM IBI STUPEFECIT PUDOR A LAUDE HUNC SED CESSO ADIRE QUAM PRIMUM SENE MERE SALUE SALUAM TE ADuENisses GAUDE BONE CUSTOS SALUE COLUMEN UERO FAMILlAE CUI COMMENdAUI PILLUM HINC ALENS HEUM A IAM DUDUM TE OMBRES NOS ACCUSARE AUDIO INERMITO ET ME HOMini OMNIOUM INERMITISSIMO NAMQUID ME IN HAC RE FACERE UOLIUISTI TIBI SERUUM HOMINEM CAUSAM ORARE LEGES NON SINGUE TESTIMONIO DICTO EST Z MITTO OMNIA ADDO IUSTIC INPRUDENS TlMITUT ADulescENSISO TU SERUUS UERUM SI COGNATA EST MAXUNE NON FUIT NECESSE HABERE SED ID QUOD LEX IUBET DOTEI DARETIS QUAERET ALIUM UERUM

275 EST: in his app. crit., Rauer noted "EST A (corr. man. 2)" but neither Prete nor I see correction here
281 FUNCTUS: letter C added above between N and T by A (Pr.)
284 IBI: second I crossed out and OB added above by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read OBSTUPE-FECIT
286 ADuENisse: the two S's were erased and R added by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read ADuENIRE
290 INERMITO: letter T inserted between I and O by A (Pr.) to read INERMITO
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 inopeh potius ducerat domum
A non ratto ubrum arguerat, ub que
Alicunde a nihil est dicto facilius
Z postremo si nullo alio facto faenore a hui
Dixit pulchre siquidem quisquam crederet
Te uiuo z non non sic futurum est, non potest
Ego illam cum illo ut partiar huptam ubrum dieum
Nihil suaue meritum; hominem commonestriarius
Mih iustum uolo aut ubi habitet demonstrariur
A nempe Phormione z iustum patronum mulieris
A iam fako hic aderit z antipho ubi nunc est a foris
Z abi phaeodria eum requiere atque huc adduc e eq
Recta uia quidem illuc A nempe ad pamphilam
Z at ego deos penates hinc salutatem domum
deuer tar inde iuo ad forum atque alios mihi
Amicos aduocabo ad hunc rem qui adiendur
Ut ne inparatus sim si ueniat Phormio

A Phormio e Geta

Parasitus
Sericus

A itane patriis aduentum ubritum hinc arisse e admodum 315
A phanium relicram solam e sic a et iratum senem
E oppido a ad te summa solam phormio rebus redit
Tute hoc intrist iibi omn est exedendum accingere
E obseco te a si rogabit e in te spes est a eccere
Quid si reddet e tu impulisti a sic opinor e subuenit 320

300 Nihil: the word ALICUNDE is repeated between the lines above Nihil by Iov. (Pr.); DICTO: letter U written above letter O by Iov. (Pr.), (K.) to read DICTU
304 Egon: letter E added above and to the right of N by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read EGONE
306 Iustum: letter T crossed out and letters PS written above ST by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read I(S)PSUM
310 PAMPHILAM: letters PA appear to be written by another hand but neither Pr. nor K. nor Mar. mention this correction
314 UENIAT: letters AT written above by corr. rec. (Pr.), letters AD written by Iov. (K.) to read ATUENIAT, ADUENIAT respectively
315 PATRIS ADUENTUM: word AIS written above by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
CEDO SENEM IAM INSTRUCTA SUNT MIHI IN CORDE CONSILIA OMNIA
E QUID AGES QUID UTS NISI UTI MANEAT PHAINIUM ATQUE
EX CRIMINE HOC
ANTIPHONEM ERIPIAM ATQUE IN ME OMNEM IRAM DEMENTEM SENIS
E O UIR FORTIS ATQUE AMICUS URRUM HOC SAEPE PHORMIO
MEREO NE ISTAECE PORTITUDO IN HENNUM ERUMPAT DEMENTE 325
A H NON ITA EST FACTUMST PERICULUM IAM PEDUM UISSAT UIA
QUOD ME CENSES HOMINES IAM DEUERBERASSE USQUE AD NECTEM
HOSPITUM TUM CIUES QUO MAGIS NOU TANTO SAEPITUS
CEDO DUM ENUMQUAM INIURIAM AUDISTI MIHI SCRIPTAM DICAM
E QUIT ISTUC A QUA NON RETE ACCIPISTI TENDITUR NEXE
MILIO 330
QUIT MALE FACIUNT NOBIS ILLIS QUI NIHIIL FACIUNT TENDITUR
QUIA ENIM IN ILLIS FRUCTUS EST IN ILLIS OPERA LUDITUR
ALIIS ALIUNTUR EST PERICULUM UDE ALIQUAM DECURIO POTEST
MIHI SCIUNT NIHIIL ESSE DICES DUCENT DAMNATUM DOMUM
ALERe NOLUNT HOMINEM EDACEM ET SAPIUNT MEA SENTENTIA 335
PRO MALEFICIO SI BENEFICIO SUUM NOLUNT REDDERE
E NON POTEST SATIS PRO MERITO AB ILLI TIBI REFERRERI GRATIA
A IMMO ENIM NEMO SATIS PRO MERITO GRATIAM REGI REPERT
TEN ASYMBOLOM UENTRE UINCTUM ATQUE LAUTUM E BALINEIS
OTTOSUM AB AMINO CUM ILLE ET CURA ET SUMPTU ABSUMIT 340
DUN TIBI FIT QUOD PLACEAT ILLI RINGITUR TU RIDEAS
PRIOR BIHAS DECURMIS CENA DUBIA APPARET
E QUID ISTUC UERBI EST A UBI TU DUBITES QUID SUMAS POTISSIMUM
AEAC CUM RATIONEM INEAS QUAM SINT SUAUIA ET QUAM CARA SINT

321 CEDO: letter A written above E by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read CAEDO
322 AGES QUID: space left between these words probably for
correction 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 correction;
ILLIS: letters IL converted to H, the second L crossed out by corr. rec. (Pr.),
by Iov. (K.) to read HIS
336 SUUM: letters MM written above UM by Iov. (Pr.) to read SUMMUM
339 TEN: letter E written above by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read
TANE: 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 IUNC HABEAS PLANE PRAESENTEK DEUM
E SENEX ADEST UIDE QUID AGAS PRIMA COTIOST: ACERRIMA
SI IAM SUSTINUIERIS POST ILLAM UT LUBET LUDAS LICET

Z DEIMPHO T HEGIO Y CRATINUS接入AND A PHORHOGCHIA
SENEX ADOVACATI III PARASITUS SERUS

Z ENUQUAM CUIQUAM CONTUMELIOSIUS
AUDISTIS FACTAM INIURIAM QUAM HAECE EST MISTI
ADESTE QUESO E IRATUS EST A QUINT HOC AGE
IAM EGO HUNC AGITABO PRO DEUM IMMORTALIUM
NEGAT PHANTUM ESSE HANC SIBI COGNATAM DEMIPO
HANC DEMPHO NEGAT ESSE COGNATAM E NEGAT
A NEQUE EIUS PATREM SE SCIRE QUI FURIT E NEGAT
E IPSUM ESSE OPINOR DE QUO AGEBAM SEQUIMIN
A RECP STILPHONEM IPSUM SCIRE QUI FURIT E NEGAT
A QUIA EGENTI RELICITAST MISERA IGNORATUR PARENTS
NECLEGITUR IPSA UIDE AUARITIA QUID FECIT
E SI ERUM INSIMULABIS HALITIAE MALE AUDIES
Z O AUDACIAM ETIAM ME ULTRA ACCUSATUM ADEUNT
A NAM IAM ADOLESCENTI NIHIL EST QUOD SUSCEMS
SI ILLUM MINUS NORAT QUITFPE HOMOIAM GRANDIOR
PAUPER CUI OPERA UT Pros RURI FERE
SE CONTINEBAT IBI AGRUM DE NOSTRO PATR
COLENDUM HABERAT SARPE INTEREBA MIFI SENEK
NARRABAT SE HUNC NEECLEGERE 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 (Mar.) to read AGES
351 IMMORTALIUM: word PIDEN 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 FACIT.
364 PATRE: E added by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read PATRE
367 ATQUE: letters UEM added above ATQ. by Iov. (Pr.) to read AT QEM
E UDEAS TE ATQUE ILLUM UT NARRAS A I IN MALAM CRUCEM
NAM NI EUM ESSE EXISTIMASSE NUNQUAM TAM GRAUIS
OB HANC INNOCITIAS CAPEREM IN USTRAM FAMILIAN 370
QUAM IS ASPERNATUR NUNC TAM INLIBERALITER
E PERGIN ERO ABSENTI MALE LOQUI INPURISSIME
A DIGNUM AUTUM HOC ILLOST E AIN TANDEM CARCER Z GETA
E BONORUM EXUTOR LECUM CONTORTOR Z GETA
A RESPONDE E QUIS HOMOST EHEM Z TACE E ABSENTI

TE INDIGNAS SEQUE DIGNAS CONTUMELIAS
NUMQUAM CESSAUIT DICERE HODIE Z DESINE
ADULESCENS PRIMUM ABS TE HOC BONA UENIA PETE
SI TIBI PLACERE POTIS ES MIHI UT RESPONDES
QUEM AMICUM TUUM AIS FUISSE ISTMU EXPLAINA MIHI 380
ET QUI Cognatum me SIBI ESSE DICERET
A PROINDE EXPICARE QUASI NON NOESSE Z NOSSEM A ITA
EGO ME NEGOSTI TU QUI AIS REDIGE IN MEMORIAM
A ERO TU SOBRINUM TUEM NON NORA Z ENICAS
DIC NOMEN A Nomen MAXINE Z QUID NUNC TACIS
A PERI HERCLE NOMEN PERODISI Z QUID AIS A GETA
SI MEMISTI ID QUOD OLM DICTUMT SUBICE EM
NON DICO QUASI NON NOSES TEMPTATUM ADUENIS
Z EGO AUTEM TEMPTO E STILPHO A ATQUE ADEO QUAID MEA
STILPHOST Z QUEM DIXTI A STILPHONEM INQUAM EST
NOEBAZ 385
Z NEQUE EGO ILLUM NARCIS MEI COGNATUS FUIT
QUIquam ISTOC NOMINE A ITANE NON TE HOREM PUDET

369 NI EUM: letters SITA written above by corr. rec. (Pr.), letters ITA written above by A2 (Ash.)
380 AIS -: second S crossed out by A
382 NOSES: 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 SITI TIBI MALE FACIANT A PRIMUS ESSES MEMORITER
PROGENIEM UESTRAN USQUE AB AUQUE ATAUO

PROPERENS 395

Z ICTA UT TU DICES EGO TUM CUM ADUENISSEM QUI MIHI
COGNATA EA ESSET DICEarem ITIDEM TU FACE
Cedo qui est cognata e e u NOSTER RECTE HEUS TU CAUE
A DILUCIDE EXPEDIT qui USUS ME OPORTUIT
IUDICIBUS TUM ID SI FALSUM FUERAT FILIUS
CUR NON REPELLIT qui FILIUM NABRAS MIHI
CUIUS DE SULTITIA DICI UT DIGNUMST NON POTEST
A AT TU QUI SAPIENS ES MAGISTRATUS ADI
IUDICIJM DE Eadem CAUSA ITERUM UT REDDANT TIBI
QUANDOQUIDEM SOLUS REGNAS ET SOLI LICET

HIC DE Eadem CAUSA BIS IUDICIUM ADIPISCIER
Z ETSI MIHI FACTA INIURIAS UERUM TAHEN
POTIUS QUAM LITES SECTER AUT QUAM TE AUDIAM
ITIDEM UT COGNATA SI SIT ID QUOD LEX IUBET
DOTIS DARE ABDUC HANC MINAS QUINQUE ACCIPER

405
A HAHAE HOMO SUAUIS Z QUID EST NUM INIQUUM POSTULO
AN NE HOC QUIDEM EGO ADIPISCAR QUOD IUS PUBLICUMST
A ITANE TANDEM QAESSO ITEM UT MERETRICUM UBI ABUSUS
MERCEDEM DARE LEX IUBET ET ATQUE AMITTERE
AN UT NE QUIT TURPE CIUIS IN SESE AMITTERET

410
PROPER EGESTATEM PROXIMO IUS SAST DARI
UT CUM UNO AETATEM Deger QUOD TU UETAS

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

72

Ita proximo quidem ad nos unde aut quam ob rem a ohe actum aijunt ne agas z non agam imo haul desinan donec perfecerero hoc a ineptis z sine modo 420

A Postremo tecum jihil rei nobis demiphost tuus est damniatus gnatus non tu nam tua praeterierat iam ducenda aetas z onnia haec illum putato quae ego hue dicodicer aut quidem cum uxor hac ipsum prohibebbo domo 425

A iratos est tu te idem melius peceris

Z itane es paratus facere me aduorum omnia inpelex a metuit hic nos tanpeti sedulo dissimulat et bene habent tibi principia a quin quod est

Perundum peres tuis dignum factis peceris ut amici inter nos simus z ecnon tuam expectam amicitiam aut te usum aut auditum uelim a si concordabis cum illa habebis quae tuam senectutem obletct respice aetatem tuam z te oblectet tibi habe a minue uero iram z hoc age 435 satis iam uerborumst nisi tu properas multarem abudcre ero illam liciam dixi phormo a si tu illam attigeris secus quam dignumst liberam dicam tibi adpingam grandem dixi demipho si quid opus fuerit heus dome e intelleco z quanfa me cura et sollicitudine adpictis gnatus qui me et se hisce inpeidiu 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 uisre redierit ne iam an nondum domum

E ego z uidetis quo in loco res haec sit
quid acq dic natum censeo si tibi uidetur z dic

2 te y qua in rem tuam sint uelini facias mihi.
Sic hoc uidetur quod te absente hic filius
Egit restitui in integrum aequum est et bonum
et id imperabis dixi z dic nunc Hegio.

Ego sedulo Dixisse hunc credo uerum Itast
Quod homines tot sententiae suus cuique nos est
Mihi non uidetur quod sit factum legibus
Bescind posse et turpe inpemptum 2 dic crito.

Ego amplius deliberalandum censeo
Res magna est y nuncquid nos uis 2 fecistis probe
Incertior sum multo quam dodum e negant
Redisse z frater est expectandus mihi
His quod mihi dediter de hac be consilium id sequar

PERCUNCTATUM IBO AD PORVUM QUOAD SE RECIPIAT
E at ego antiphonem quaeam ut qua acta hic sint sciat
AT ECCUM VIDEO IN TEMPERE HUC SE RECIPIERE

A ANTIPHO B GETA
ADULESCENS SERVUS

A ENIM UERO ANTIPHO MULTIS MODIS CUM ISTOC ANINO ES
UITEPRANDUS 465

445 DOMUM: word etiam written above DOMUM in cursive style by Iov. (Pr.), (K.) to read NONDUM etiam DOMUM
448 UIDETUR: letter R appears to be the correction of a half-erased letter (N?) in the hand of A
449 QUAE: word EGO written above by Iov. (Pr.), (K.)
461 SEQUAR: both K. and Mar., each in their own app. crit., cite A2 as changing SEQUAR to
EXSEQUAR but T see no such correction. Pr. attributes change to corr. ant. whose correction is very light and hardly able to be read
Phaed. 63v

Itane te hinc abisse et ——tuam tutandam allis dedisse alios tuam rem credidisti magis quam tette ascinduerueros nam utut erat alia illi certe quae nunc tibi donist

consules

ne quid propter tuam fidem decepta potestur nali

cui nunc miserae speae obesse sunt in te omnes sitiæ 470

b et quidem ere nos iam dudum hic te absenti accusamus qui

adieris

a — ipsum quareban b sed ea causa nihil magis depeecimus

a loquere obsecro quomam in L—o sunt res et fortunae saeae

—um quid patri subolet b nihil etiam a quid spei porrost

b nescio a ah

b nisi phaedria haud cessavit pro te eniti a nihil pecit

nou 475

b tum phormio itidem in hac re ut allis strenuum hominem

phaebuit

a quid is pecit b confutavit uerris admodum iratam seneb

a eu phormio b ego quod potui porro a mi geta omnis uos amo

b sic habent principia seae ut dixi adue tranquilla res es

mansuerque patrium pater est dum huc adueiat

480

a quid eum b ut aiebat

de eius consilio sese uelle facere quod hanc rem attinet

a quantum metus est mihi uideret huc saiuom nunc patrium geta

nati per etius uanam ut audio aut uiuam aut moriar sententiam

b phaedria tibi apest a ubiam b eccum ab sua palaestra exit

485

foras

phaedria e dorio a antipho b geta

adulescens leno adulescens senus

f dorio audio obsecro e non audio f parumper e quin mitte

me

f audi quod dicam e at enim tamed etiam audire edem miliens

f at nunc dicam quod lubenter e loquere audio

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

469 PATERETUR: letter 0 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

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

473 LOQUERE: letters LO can be seen on 64r; L—O: two middle letters blurred but Ms. tradition reads LOCO
474 -UM: first letter blurred but Ms. tradition reads NUM
476 PRAEBUIT: word SE written above by corr. rec. (Pr.),
    by Iov. 2 (K.)
479 DIXI: word erased and DICO written by corr. rec. (Pr.),
    by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.)
481 AIEBAT: Mar. incorrectly states that A reads AIBAT
Non quod te exorare ut naiheas triduum hoc quo nunc abis e mirabar si tu mihi quocum adferres novi. A et metuo lexemem nequid suo suat capit. B idem ego unus hor nonnum mihi credis e rect ordine sine fidem dixi e fabulae. Barnabatrum istuc beneficium pulchre tibi dices e loci. Crede mihi gaudebis facto uerum hercle hoc est e somnia. Experire non est longum e cantilenam iandem cantis. Tu mihi cognatus tu parce de tu amicus tu e gamba modo adeo ingenio esse duro te atque inexorabili ut neque misericordia neque precibus koliri quae adeo te esse incognitainyen atque impudentem phaedria sine modo ut ne phaleratis duces dictis et mean dictis gratiss 500 a misericorntum e ui eris unicor b quam uteque 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 g qui quod amas domist neque cum huius modo umquam tibi usus ut conflictaris malo 505 a mihi domist immo id quod aint auribus teneor lupum nam neque quo pacto me amittam neque uti retenam scio e ipsum istuc mihi in hoc est a heia ne parum lento siis nunc quid hic conficit g hicine quod homo inhumanissimus paphilam mean uendidit a quid uendidit a enim uendidit 510 a uendidit g quam indum facinus ancilam ere empto meq nequeo exorare ut me maneat et cum illo ut mutet fidem triduum hoc dum id quod est promissum ab amicus argentum aufero
Si non sum dedero unam praeferam horam ne opperfus sita
et optundis a haud longumst. id quo quod dorio exortet sinesi
ideo hic tibi quod boni promeritus fueris conpleuseris pat
et eurba istae sanctum a pampillanne hac urbe priusari singe
tunc praeferet eorum amore distrahi poterii pati
et neque ego neque tu f di tibi omnes id quo es dignus duint
et ego te compluris aduersum ingenti hum nesses tuli
520 pollicitantes et nihil ferentem flentem nunc contra omnia
haec
reperior qui det neque lacrumet da locum meliouribus
a certe hercle ego si satis commenimini tibi quidem est olime
dies
quam ad dures huc praestitutam f factum et nun ego istud
nego
a iam ha praeferiit et non uerum haec ei antecessit et non
printet 525 te unatissimae minime dub rem b sterculinium
f dorio
itaque tandem facere oportet et sic sum si placeo utere
a sic hunc decipis et immo enim uero antipho hic me decipit
nam hic me huies modi sciebat esse ego hunc esse aliter
credidi
iste me fepellit ego isti nihilo sum aliter ac ful
530 sed ut haec sunt tanen hoc faciam cras mane argentum mihi
miles dare se dixit si mihi prior tu appuleris phaedria
mea legem utar ut potior sit qui prior ad dandumst. ulle
a phaedria a antipho b geta 533a
adulescentes ii seruu
a quid faciam unde ego nunc subito huc argentum inueniam
miser
CUI MINUS NIHILOST QUOD HIC SI POTE FUSET- EXORARIER 535
TRIDUUM ROC PROMISSUM FUERAT A ITALI HINC PATIEMUR GETA
FIERI MISERUM QUI NE DUDUM UT DIXIT ADVISERIT CONITUR
QUIN QUOD OPUS BENEFICIO NUM SUSEM REDDIRE
B SIO EQUITEM ______ ESSIC AEQUOM Amage SERUARE
HINC POTES
B QUID FACIAM A INENIAS ARGENTUM B CUPIO SED UNDE EDUCE
A PATER ADEST HIC B SIO- SED QUID TUM A AM DICITUM SAPIENTI
SAY EST
B ITANE A IPA B SANNE HIC PULCHRE SUADES ETIAM TU HINC ABIS
NON TRIUMPHO EX UPTIS TUIS SI NIIL NANCISOR MALI
NT ETIAM NUNC ME HISTUS CAUSA QUARE R IN MALO IUBES CRUCEM
A UERUM HIC DICTIT QUID EGO UOBIS ALIENUS SUM B HAUD
PUTO 545
SED PARUMNE EST QUOD OMNIBUS NUNC NOBIS SUCENSSET SENEX
NE INSTITEMUS ETIAM UT NULLUS LOCUS RELINQUATUR PRECI
R ALIUS AB OCULIS MEIS ILLAM IN IGNOTUM ADEDM LOCUM HEM
TUM IGITUR DUM LICET DUM ADSUM LOQUIMINI MECUM ANTIPO
CONTEMPLAMINI NE A QUAN OB REM AUT QUIDAM FACTURUS
CEDO 550
R QUOQUO HINC ASPORTABitur TERRARUM CERTUMST PSEQQUI
AUT PERIRE B DI BENE UORTANT QUOD AGAS PEDETEMPTEM TAMEN
A UIDE SI QUID OPIS POTES ADHERE HUIC B SI QUID QUID
NE QUID PLUS MINUSUE FAXIS QUOD NOS POST PIGEAM GETA
B QUAPER SALUS EST UT OPINOR UERUM ENIM METUO MALUM 555
A NOLI METUERE UNA TECUM BONA MALA TOLERABIMUS
B QUANTUM OPUS EST TIBI ARGENTI LOQUEMET R SOLAE TRIGINTA
MIDAE
B TRIGINTA HUII PERCARAT PHAEDRIA B ISTAEC UERO VILLISU EST
B AGE AGE INUENTAS REDDAM R O LEPIDUM B AUPER TE HINC
R IAM OPUS EST

539 EQUIDEM ______ ESSE: between EQUIDEM and ESSE, six
letters of HERCLE erased by A
540 SED UNDE: word ID written above by corr. rec. (Pr.),
by Iov. (K.)
545 UOBIS ALIENUS: word GETA written above by Iov. (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 PERIS SET OPUS EST MIHI PHRONIONEM AD HANC REM
A PRAEPOSTO AUDACISSIME ONERIS QUIDUIS IMPONE FERET
SOLUS EST HOMO AMICO AMICUS B EAMUS ERGO AD ECM OCIUS
A NUNC QUID EST QUOD OPERA MEC EUOBIS OPUS SIT B NIIHIL UERUM
ET ILLAM MISERAM QUAM EGO NUNC INTUS SCIO ESSE EXANIAMAT
METU
CONSOLARE CESSAS A NIHIL EST AEQUE QUOD FACIAM LUBENS 565
I QUAE VIA IUSTU FACIES B DICAM IN TEIREE MDRO TE NIHIL AMOUR
Z DEPHI E CHREME

561: Mar. and K. suggest line 561 was attributed to
A by A but was given to r by A2 (Mar.); IMPONE
FERET: word hic written above By Lov. (Pr.).
In his app. crit., K. writes "IMPONI EFF. IOV."
572 ILLI: over second I and to the right, letter C
written by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
to read ILLIC
577 CHRE: in his app. crit., Mar. states "A incertum"
579 CONDIIONEM: reference sign to scholia above
first N
580 DICUNDUM: first U 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
TACEBIT DUM INTERCEDET FAMILIARITAS
SITN SPREUERIT ME PLUS QUAM OPUS EST SCITO SCIST
VEREOQUE NE UXOR ALIQUA HOC RESCISCAT MEA
QUOD SI TIT UT ME EXCUTIAM ATQUE AGREDIAR DOMO
ID RESTAT NAM EGO MEORUM SOLUS SUM MEUS
Z SCIO ESSE ET ISTAEC NIHIL RES SOLLICITUDINIST
NEQUE ADGO DEPITEFSCAR UMQAM EXPERIERT
DONEC TIBI ID QUOD POLLICITUS SUM EFFECERO
A GETA Z DEMIPRO E CHREMES
SERVUS SENES II
A EGO HOMINEM CALLIDIOREM UIDI NEMINEM
QUAM PHORMIONEM UENIO AD HOMINEM UT DICEREM
ARGENTUM ESSE ET ID QUO PACTO FIERET OPUS
UX DUM DIMIDIO DIXERAM INTELLEXERAT
GUADEBAT ME LAUDABAT QUAREBANT SENEM
DIS GRATIAS AGEBAT TEMPSI SIBI DARI
QUIA PHAE--------------NIHIL MINUS
AMICUM ESSE QUAM ANTIPONI HOMINEM AD FORUM
IUSSI OPPERIRI EMO ESSE ADDUCTURUM SENEM
SED ECCUM IPSUM QUIS EST. ULTERIOR ATTAT
PATER UENIT SED QUID PERTINUI AUTEM BELVA
AM QUIA QUOS FALLAM PRO UNO DUO SUNT DATI
COMMODIUS ESSE OPINOR DUPLICI SPE UTIER
PETAM HINC UNDA A PRIMO INSTI IS SI DAT SAT EST
SI AB EO NIHIL FIET TUM HUNC ADORIAR HOSPITEM

588 ESSE: word IPA written above by Iov. (Pr.), (K.)
593 OPUS: word OPUS crossed out at the end of the line and written above ESSE by corr. rec. (Pr.). In his app. crit., K. writes "OPUS post FIERET A1"
597 ---------------: what A had is not clear. Letters DRIAE SE OSTENDERET written on and above the line by corr. rec. (Pr.), by A3 (Mar.)
604 INSTI IS SI: Ash. states A as reading INSTIISSI
B ANTIPO A GETA E CHREMES Z DEMIPO A
ADULCENS SERVOUS SENES II
B EXSPECTO QUAM NOX RECIPIAT SE SE GETA
SED PATRUM VIDEO CUM PATRE ADSTANTEM EI MIHI
QUAM TINEO ADVENTUS HUIUS QUO INPELLAT PATREM
A ADIBO HOSCE O SALUE NOSTER CHREMIS E SALUE GETA
A UENIRE SALUO UOLOP EST E CREDO A QUID AGITUR
E NULTA ADUENTERI UT FIT NOVA HIC COMPLURIA
A ITA DE ANTIPOHNE AUDISTIN QUAE FACTA E OONIA
A TUN DIXERAS HIC FACINUS INDIGNUM CHREMIS
SIC CIRCINIRIS ID CUM HOC AGEBAM COMMODUM
A HAM HERCLE EGO QUOQUE ID AGENTIS NECU N CSEDUO
INVENI OPTINOR REMEDITUM HUIU REI E QUID GETA
Z QUOD REMEDITUM A UT AB AB SS F T FIT FORTE UBIAM
MIHI PHORMIS E QUI PHORMIS Z SI QUI ISTITUS E SCIO
A UISUM EST MIHI UT EUS TEMPORAM SEXTENTIAM
PRENDO ROMISOM SULUM CUR NON INQUAM PHORMIS
UIDES INTR US SIC HAECE POTUS CUM BON
A UT COMMODATIUS GRATIA QUAM CUM HALE
ERUS LIBERALIS EST ET FUGITANS LITIAM
NAM CETERNI QUIDEM HERCLE AMICI OMNES
UNO ORE AUTORES FUERAE UT PRAECEPTEM HANC NARET
B QUIS MIE CEEPERAT AUT QLO EUADET HODIE E IN LEGIBUS
PATERM FONNAS DICES SI EAM KRIECERET
IAM ID EXPLORATUMST. EIA SUDABIS SATIS

608 ADVENTUS: originally A mistakenly wrote ADUENTUENTUS
609 SALUE: word crossed out by IoV. (K.), corr. rec. (Pr.)
611 E: E at the beginning of the line crossed out and rewritten above the line before COMPLURIA by IoV. (Pr.), (K.)
614 COMMODUM: reference sign to scholia above the second O
617 Z: Z crossed out by IoV. (K.)
618 SI: in his app. crit., K. states SI was changed to IS by IoV. but no such correction is visible in A
Sic enim inceptas homine ea eloquentia est
uerum pon es esse uicutum eu at tandem tamen
don capis eius es agitur sed facuiniae postquam hominem his uerbis sentio mollirir
soli sumus nunc hic inquam eho quid uis dari
tibi in manum ut erus his desistat litibus
b satini ilii di sunt propitti a nam satis scio
si tu aliquam partem aequi bonique dineris
ut est ille bonus uir tria non commutabitis
uerba hodie inter uos z quis te istic uis sui loqui
e imo non potuit melius peruenier
640
eo quos nos uolumus b occidi z perge eloqui
a a primo homo insaniabat et cedo quid postulat
a quid nimium quantum licuit e dic a si quis eix dare
talentum magnum z immo malum hercle nihil pudet
a quod dixi adeo ei queso quid si filiam
645
suam unicam locare paru retultit
non suscepisse inuentast quee doctem petat
ut ad pausca reedam ac mittam illius inesperitas
haec denique eius fuit postrema oratio
ego inquit a principio amicit filiam
650
ita ut aequum fuerat uolui uxorue uercere
nam mihi ueniebat in mentem eius incommodum
in seruitum pauperem additam dari
sed mihi ofus erat ut aperte tibi uunc fabuler

Line 635 not written by A but supplied by corr.
rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) in uncial letters. The
line reads: HEC HIC FACESAT TU MOLESTUS NE SIES.
Pr. incorrectly states...TUM....

642 A: A crossed out by Iov.? (K.), corr. rec.? (Pr.)
644 NIHIL: word UT added above the line before
NIHIL by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
646 LOCARET: "reference sign to scholia above the
C

Bottom line: Pr. says this line is written in
semi-cursive Italian uncharacteristic
of the seventh century. He notes
that the last word contains an error
and it is not easy to establish what
the corrector intended to write; af
after the letters SI (of SIES) an L
seems to be cancelled out. Then an
E5 follows. The meaning of the final
letters ha is found on the introdutury
page of LOWE, CLA 1 (X).
Aliquantulum quae adferret ut dissoluerem dare quantum ab hac accepito quae sponsast mihi nullam mihi nullam quam istant uxorum datur.

B utrum stultitia facere iuvenum an malitia dicat scientem an incompletem incertum sum.

Z quid si animam debet aager oppositus pignori ob decem minas est 2 age age iam ducat dabo.

A aediculae item sunt ob decem alias 2 oiei nimiunt et ne clama petito nasce a me decem.

A uxori emunda antillulast sum pluscula supellectile opus est sumptum ad nutptas his rebus sane pone inquit decem minas.

Z sescetnas proinde scribit mihi dicat nihil do illas ut etiam inirideat.

E quaeso ego dabo quesce tu modo piliyum fac ut illam ducat nos quam uolimus b ei mihi gita occidisti me tuus fallaciis.

E mea causa eciturum me hoc esset ab aequum amittere.

A quantum potest mi cerstrem inquit faceret si illam dant hac ut tam ne incertos siem.

Z nam illi mihi deinum iam constitueunt dare.

Z iam accipiat illis repudiem renuntiet.

H an ducat a quae quiescum 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 E added above PR and 0 crossed out by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.) to read PERINDE; mihi: word iam added above the line before mihi by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.).

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

675 TAM: letter M added above the line before TAM, letter I added before TAM and T added above TA by Iov. (K.), (Mar.) to read MITTAM.

Pr. notes only MT corrections by corr. rec. to read MITTAM.
FRUCTUM QUEM LEMNI UXORIS REDDUNT PRAEDIA
INDE SUMA UXORI TIBI OPUS ESSE DIXERO

B ANTIPHO A GETA

ADULESCENS SERUUS

B GETA A HEM B QUID EGISTI A EMUNXI ARGENTO SENES
B SATINE EST A NESCIO HERCLE TANTUM TUBBUS SUM
B EUROBERO ALIUD MHI RESPONDICES AC ROGO

A QUID ERGO NARRAS B QUID EGO NARREMEM OPERA TUA
AD RESTIM MIHI QUIDEM RES REDIT PLANISSIME
UT TE QUIDEM OMNES DI DAEQUE SUPERI INFERI
MALI EXEMPLIS PERDAM EM SI QUID UELIS
HUC MANDES QUOD QUIDEM RECTUM UELIS
QUID MINUS UTIBILE FUIT QUAM HOC VOLNUS TANGERE
AUXINARE UXOREM INICTA EST SPES PATRI
POSSILE TULLAM EXTUBDI CEDO NUNC PORRO PHORIO
DUTEM SI ACCIPIER UXOR DUCENDA EST DOMUM
QUID MANDES QUOD QUIDEM QUIDE EST ANIMI

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 VOLNUS: letters O and N crossed out and C written above N by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Ash.) to read UELUS

701 APPARANADAS: letter I written above last A by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read APPARANADIS; NUPTIAS: letter I written above last A by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read NUPTIIS
702 SACRIFICANDI: first I converted to E by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read SACRFICANDI
Declamatio

Interea amici quod pollliciti sunt dabunt
inde iste reddet H quam ob rem aut quid dicet a rogaut
quod res postilla monstra euenunt mihi
Intro iit in abdis ater alienus canis
anguis per influum discidit de tegulis
gallina cecinit interdixit hariolus
harispeux uetur ante brunam autem noui
negotii incipere quaæ causast iustissima
haec fiunt b ut modo fiunt a fiunt me uide
pater exit abi dic esse arguentum phaedriae

Z DEIMPHO E CHEREMES A GETA

S E N E S

II S E R U S

Z QUIETUS ESTO INquam ego curabo ne quid uerborum duit
hoc temere nunquam amittam ego a me qui mihi testis
adhibeam

Cum dem et quam ob rem dem conmemorabo a ut cautust ubi
nihil opus 715
et aquis tta opus factos. et natura dum libidino eadem haec
nunt

Nam si altera illaec magis instasit forsitan nos reiciat
z rem ipsam putasti duc me ad eum ergo a non moror e ubi hoc
cerus

transito ad uxorom meam ut conueniari hanc prius quam hinc
abit
dicat eam dare nos phormioni nuptum ne suscenseat
720
et magis esse illum idoneum qui ipsi sit: familiarior
nos nostro officio non digressos esse quantum iu uelurit
datum esse dotis z quid tua malum id repert e magi

DEIMPHO

NON SATIS EST TUI TE OFICIUM FECISSE SI NON ID PAMA

ADPROBAT

UOLO IPSIUS QUOCO VOLUNTATE HAEQUE FIERI NE SE EECTAM

PRAEDICIET 725

710 INCIPE: first I inserted above the line before N
by A (P.)
713 DUIT: letter N added above IT by corr. rec. (P.),
by iov. (K.) to read DUIT
724 ID: letters EN added above the line after ID by iov.
(P.), (K.) to read IDEM
Z IDEM EGO ISTUC FACERE POSSUM ET MULIER MULIERI MAGIS CONSIDERAT
Z ROGABO E UBI ILLAS NUNC EGO REPERIRE POSSIM COGITO

Θ SOPHONIA
Ε CURINES

NUTRIX
SENEX

QUID AGAM QUEM NIHI AMICUM INUENIAM MISERA AUT QUO CONSILIA
HAEC

REFERAM AUT UNDE AUXILIIU PETAM

NAM UEREOR ERA NE OBI NEUM SAUSUM INDICAB INUURIA

ADIFICIATUR 730

ITA PATREM ADULENCEPS FACTA HAECE TOLERARE AUDIT VIOLENTER
E NAM QUAE HAECE ANUS EST EXAMINATA A FRATRE QUAE BREGASAT

Θ QUOD UT FACERE EGO OFSTAS NE IMPUDE CUM SCIREM INFERNO

NUPTIAS

HASCE ESSE UT ID CONSULAREM INTEREVA UT IN TUMU FORET
E CERTE EDEPOL MASI NE AMUS FALLUUT AUT PERDURIIM PROSPICUIS
OCULI 735

MEA NUTRICEM GNATAE VIDEKO Θ NEQUE ILLE INVESTIGATUR

Ε QUID AGO

Ε QUID EST EUS PATER ADEO MANO DUM HAECE QUAE LOQUITUR

Ε QUID SI EUM NUNC REPERIRE POSSIBIL NIELIS EST QUID UEREBAM
Ε EAST IPSA

CONLOQUAR Θ QUIS HIC LOQUITUR Κ SOPHONIA
Ε ET HUM NOWN NOMINAT

Ε RESPICE AD ME Θ DI OBSECRIO UOS ESTNNE HIC STILPHO Ε NON
Ε NEGAS 740

Ε CONCUNE HINC A FORIBUS PAULULUM ISTOSM SODES SOPHONIA
ΝΕ ME ISTOC POSTHAC NOME APPASSIS Θ QUID NOB OBSCEOR

Ε NE ME

QUEM SEMPER TE ESSE DICITAS Ε ET Θ QUID HAS METUIN FORES
E CONCLUSAM HIC HABEO UXOREM SAEAM USUM ISTUC DE NONIME
Ε ΕO PERPERAM OLM DIXI NE UOS FORTE INPRUDENTES 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 ADEONE; HAECE; in his app crit., K. states "HAECE 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.
EFFUTTIBETIS ATQUE ID PORRO ALIQUA UXOR HABE RISCISCEREBAT
Ω ISTOC POL NOS TE TIC INUENDRE MISERAE NUNQUAM POTUI NUS
E EGO DIC NIHI QUID REI TIBI EST CUM FAMILIAE FAC UNDE EXIS
UBI ILLAE SUNT Ω MISERAM ME HEM QUID EST UITONTE
Ω VIUIT QVATA
MATREM IPSAM EX AEGRITUDINE HAC MISERAM MORS CONSECUTA
EST. 750
E MALE FACTUM Ω EGO AUTEM QUAE ESSE ANUS DESERTA ARGES
IGNOTA
UT POTUI VIRGINEM NUPTEM LOCAUI HIC ADULESCENTI
HARUM QUI EST DOMINUS AEDID E ANTIPOHNIN Ω E ISTI IPSI
E QUID DUASNE UXORES HABET Ω AU OBSECO UNAM ILLE QUIDEM
HANC SOLAM
E QUID ILLAM ALTERAM QUAE DICTUR COGNATA Ω HABE PROCE
E QUID AIS 755
Ω COMPOSITO FACTUMST Ω QUOD MODO HANC ANANS HABERE POSSER
SINE DOTE E DI UESTRAN FIDEM QUAM SABDE FORTE TEMERE
BENIUNT QUAE NON AUREAS OPTARE OFFENDE ADUENIENS
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
Ω NUNC QUID OPUS FACTO SIT UIDE PATER ADULESCENTIS UEBRE
AMO ANIMO INIQUO HOC OPPIDO AIUNT E NIHIL PERICOLDER
SED PER DEOS ATQUE ROMINES MEAM ESSE HANC CAUE RISCISCAT
E QUIDQUAM
Ω NEMO E ME SCIBIT Ω SEQUERE ME INTUS CETERA AUDIES 765
Ω DEMIPO \ A GETA
Ω SENEX \ SERVUS
Ω NOSTRATPE CULPA FACIMUS UT MALIS EXPEDIAT ESSE
DOM NIMIUM DICI NOS BONOS STUDENS ET BENIGNOS
ITA FUGIAS NE PRAETER CASAM QUOD DICUNT NONNE ID SATIS ERAT ACCIPERE AB ILLO INJURIAM ETIAM ARGENTUM. ULTIMO OBJECTUM UT SIT QUI IUUAT DUM ALIUT ALIQUID FLAGITII CONFICIAT 770

A —AIISSIIME IIS NUNC PRAEDEFUNT QUI RUM PRAE FACIUNT
A —RISIIME UT STULTISSIME QUIDEM ILLAE REM GESSERMUS
A NODO UT HOC CONSILIO POSSIBET DISCHI UT ISTAM DUCAT
Z ETIAM HEID DUBIUMST A HAUD SCIO HERCILE UT HOMOST AN MUTET ANINUM Z HEM MUTET MUTEM SI NESCIO UERUM SI PORE DICO 775
Z SIC FACIAN UT FRATER CENSURI UT UXOREM ETIUS HOC TADDUCAM
CUN ISTA UT LOQUATUR TU GETA ABI PRAE NUNITA HANC UENTURAM
A ARGUMENT INVENTUUMST DE TURGO SILETUR
PROCEBM EST NE IN PRASENTI HACE HINC ASEAT QUID NUNC PORBO

QUID FIEIT IN EODEM LUTO HAESEITAS VORSURAM SOLUES
GETA PRAESENS QUOD FUERAT MALUM IN DIEM ABITI PLAGAE
NISI PROSPICIS NUNC HINC DOMUM IDO AC PHALINUM EDUCBO
NE QUID UERATUR PHRIONEM AM ETIUS ORATIONEM
Z DEMIPHO
B NAUSICRATRA

SENEX
MULIER

Z AGE DUM UT SOLES NAUSICRATRA FAC ILLA UT PLACETUR NOBIS
UT SUA VOLUNTATE ID QUOD EST FACIUNDUM FACIT B FACTAM 785
Z PARITER NUNC OPERA ME ADIURES AC RE DUDUM OPTUULATA ES
B FACTUM UOLO AC POL MINUS QUO UIRI CULPA QUAM ME DIGNAMST
Z QUID AUTEM B QUA POL MEI PATRIS BENE PASITA INDIGENS
TUTURAM NAM EX IIS PRAEDES BALENT ARGENTITI BINA
STATIM CAPIEBAT UIR UIRO QUID FRAESTAT Z BINAN QUESO 790
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.)
BACUS SULLORIBUS MULTO TAMEN TALENTA BINA Z HUI
B QUID HANC UIDENTUR Z SCILICET B UIRUM ME NAT UELLEM
EGO OSTENDEREM Z CERTO SCIO B QVO FACTO B PARCE SODES
UT FOSSIS CUM ILLA MEZ TE ADULCESCENS MULIER DEFEXTIGET

B NAUSISTRATA E CHREMES Z DEMIPHO
MULIER
S E N S E II

B FACTIAM UT IUBES SED N E M U I R U M A B S T E EXIRE VIDEO
E EHEM DEMIPHO 795
IAM ILLI DATUM EST ARGENTUM Z CURAUI ILICO E HOMN
DATUM
EI VIDEO UXOREM PANES PLUS QUAM SAT ERAT Z CUR NOLLES
CHEMES

E IAM RECTE Z QUID TU EQUID LOCUTUS CUM ISTAC QUOD REM
HANC DUCIM--

E TRANSEGI Z QUID AID TANDEM Z ABDUCI NON POSTEST Z QUI NON
POSTEST
E QUIA UTERQUE UTRIOQUE EST CORDI Z QUID ISTUC NOSTRA
E MAGNI PRATERFAC

COGNATAM COMPERI ESSE NOSIB Z QUID DELIRAS E SIC ERIT
NON TEMERE DICO REDI MECUM IN MEMORIAM SATINE SANUS ES
B AU OBSECO UIDE ME INCONGATAM PECCES Z NON EST E NI NEGA
PATRIS NOMEN ALIUT DUCTUM EST HOC TU ERRASTI Z NON NORAT
PATREM

E NORAT Z CUR ALIUT DIXIT E NUMQUAMNE HODIE CONCEDES
E NIIIIIIIIIIIIII 805
NEQUE INTELLEGES Z SI TU NIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII NARRAS E PERDIS B MIROR
QUID HOC SIET

B UT PROPELRI ILLI QUAM EGII SUM AC TU NEMOST Z DI VESTRAM
EAMUS AD IPSAM UNA OMNIS NOS AUT SCIRE AUT NESCIRE HOC
UOLO E AH
2 QUID EST E ITAN PARVAM MINI FIDEM ESSE APTE TE Z UIN ME
UN SATIS QAESITUM MINI ISTUC ESE AGIE FIAT QUID ILLA
FILIA
AMICI NOSTRI QUID FUTURUMST E RECTE Z HANC IGITUR MITTINUS
E QUID HI Z ILLA MAREAT E SIC Z IRE IGGITUR TIBI LICIT
NAUSISTRATA
Z EQUIDEM HERCLE NESIO UIN SCIRE AT ITA ME SERUET
IUPPITER

792 NAT UELLEM: letters UM written above the line after
NAT by Iov. (Pr.) to read NATUELL:IM.
Har. incorrectly states A as reading
NATUELLEM
793 CERTO: K incorrectly states "CERTE A2..."
798 DUCIM---: last two letters US (according to Ms. tradition) not visible due to page damage
802 MEMORIAM SATINE: space left in A for rubricator to write character designation unfilled until added corr. rec. (Pr.)
803: Pr. suggests Z as an object of correction by corr. rec. but no other editor mentions it. Further, no such correction is visible on microfilm or xerox
804 DUCTUM: letter I written above the first U by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read DICTUM
806 SIET: K. and MAR. incorrectly state "EST A2..."
807: line omitted from rightful place but written after last line of the folium, line 813. Notice of omission given by a mark in the margin between lines 806 and 808 by A. Before UIN SCIREE, E erased (Pr.)
B Sic pol commodius esse in omnis arbitror quam ut coeperas

B ANTIPHO

ADULENS.

ARGENTUM

PARA.SITUS ADULESCENS

A M ARTEM UT EM EAB RES SEH HABENT PRA TRIPOTIGI SSE QUOD

VOLT 820

QUAM SCIUMST. ETIUS MODI IN ANIMO PARE CUPIDITATES

HIC SIMIL ARGENTUM REPPERIT CURA SEH EXPEDITUI

EGO NULLO POSSUM REMEDIO ME EVOLUERE EX HIS TURBIS

Sed Phormio B Antiphon

ADULENS.

Y ARGENTUM ACCEPI TRADIDI LENONI ABDUXI MULIERE

CURAUI PROPRIA UT PHAEDRIA POTERETUR NUM EMISSAS?

B Sed Phormio: Quid ais? Quod est? Qua quies enim?”

Factusquae Phaedria?

817: Pr. suggests M as a correction in a word on this line. Presumably, he is referring to a “touch up” of the M of the last word, HEM.

821 PARE: letters RE written above the line after PARE by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read PARE. First E was supposed to be changed to A to read PARAE.
Quo pacto satietatem amoris ait se uelle absuvere 
y uicissit partis tuas acturus est b quas y ut fugiilet 

Patrem 835

Te suas rogauit rursum ut ages et causam ut pro se diceres 
nam potaturus est. Apuit me ego me ire senibus union 
dicam ad mercatum ancillulum emptum quam dumum dixit 
geta ne cum hic non uident me confecerent credant argentum suum 
set ostium concrepuit. Abs te b uide qui egreditur y getast 

A GETA B ANTIPO Y PHORMIO 

SENUS ADULESCENS PARASITUS

A O FORTUNA O FORS FORTUNA QUANTIS COMMODITATIBUS 

841 QUAM SUBITO MERO ANTIPOPH OUEESTRA 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 proprio inuenerit ut haec quae configerit

SCIAT 845

B NUNC TU INTELLEGIS HIS QUID HIC NARET Y NUM TUB B INIL 

Y TANTUNDEM EGO

A AD LENENEM HIC IRE PEGAM IBI NUNC SUNT B HEUS GETA 

NUM MIRUM AUT NOUM EST REUOCARE CURSUM QUO INSTITUERIS 

SE ADQUC ITA EST QUAM DUDUM QUAM A

B EST

Pergit herbce numquam tu odio tuo me uincies no manes 
A UAPULA B ID QUIDEM TIBI IAM FET NISI RESTITIS UERBERO 
850 A FAMILIORIOREM OPORTEM ESSE HANC MITATUR MALUM SET ISNE 

EST QUEM QUAERO AN NON IPSUS EST CONCREDIARE ACTUTUM B QUID 

EST

A OMNII QUANTUM EST QUI UIUON HOMO HOMINUM ORNATISSIME 

NAM SINE CONTROVERSIA AB DIS SOLUS DILIGERE ANTIPO 

B ITA UELIM SED QUID ISTUC CREDAT ITA ESSE MIE INRECT

UELIM

A SATINE EST SI TE DILIBUTUM GAUDIO REDDO B ENICAS
849 PERGIT: letter T crossed out and S written above by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read PERGIS
850 UAPULA: letters BIS written above by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.), (Ash.) to read UAPULADIS
851 MITATUR: letters NI written above by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read MINITATUR
852 CONGREDIARE: letter A crossed out and I changed to E by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read CONGREDERE
853 ORNATISSIME: letter N crossed out and NO written above OR by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.) to read ONORATISSIME
854 DILIGERE: after the second E, above the line is an I by A (Pr.) and above this I is an S by corr. rec. (Pr.). These observances are made by no other editor.
Ut modo argentum tibi dedimus. Aput forum recta domum sumus profecti interea mittit erus me ad uxorem tuam 860. Quan ob rem a onitito proloquit nam nihil ad hanc rem est antipho. Ubi in gymnasium ire occipio pius ad me accurririt nida pone reprehendit pallio resupinat respicio rogo quan ob rem retinaet me at sese uti tim intro ad eram acced—

Sophronia modo pratrem huc inquit senis introductit. Chremem 865. Eumque nunc esse intus cum illis huc ubi ego audii ad foras suspenso gradu placide ire perexi accessi assitit animam compressi auron admoi ita animum cospi attendere hoc modo sermonem captans y eu geta a hic pulcherrimum facinus auditui itaque paene hercle exclamauit gaudio 870. B quod a quod nam arsifirate b nescio a atqui miflicissimum patruus tuus est pater inducens phario uxor tuae quae oscilatibus facinus audiui itaque paene inquit quae inter se se desse uti tim intro ad eram acced—

Sensus gradu placide ire perexi accessi assitit animam compressi auron admoi ita animum cospi attendere hoc modo sermonem captans y eu geta a hic pulcherrimum facinus auditui itaque paene hercle exclamauit gaudio 870. B quod a quod nam arsifirate b nescio a atqui miflicissimum patruus tuus est pater inducens phario uxor tuae quae oscilatibus facinus audiui itaque paene inquit quae inter se se desse uti tim intro ad eram acced—

Clanculum y somniium utin haec ignoraret suum patrem a aliquid credito phario esse causae sed nec censo potuiessi esse 875 intelligere extra ostium intus quae inter sese ipsi egrirint. B atque ego quoque inaudii illam fabulam a imo etiam dabo quo hagis credas patruus interea inde huc egreditur foras haud multi post cum patre idem inde recipit se intro duxit ait uterque tibi potestatem eius adhibenda dare 880 denique ego missus sum te ut requireremus atque adducerem.
quia ergo rape me quid cffssas a fecero b heus phormio
uale y uale antipho bene ita me di amant factum gaudeo
y phormio
parasitus

y tantam fortuman de improuiso esse his datam
suma eludendi occasiost mihi nunc senes
et phaedrius curam adimere argentariam
ne quotquam suorum aequalium supplex siet
nam idem hoc argentum ita ut datumst. in gratiis
ex datum erit hoc qui cogan re tpsa repperi
nunc gestus mihi volutusque est capiendus nudos
sed hinc concedam in angitortum 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 euenera haec nobis frater prospera
quantum potest nunc conueniundus est phormio
prius quam dilapidat nostras triginta minas
ut auferamus y demipnonem si donist
uisam ut quod z ad nos ad te ibamus phormio
y de eadem hac fortasse causa z ita hercle y credi di
quid ad me ibatis z ridiculum y uerebamin
ne non id facerem quod recepisset semel

882 heus: heus crossed out and words o mi written
above by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
HIEUS QUANTA QUANTA IAEC ME PAUPERAS EST TALEM ADHUC CURAUI UNUM HOC QUIDEM UT MIHI ESSET FIDES
Z ESTNE ITA UT DIXI LIBERALIS E OPPIDO Y IDQUE ADEO UENIO AD UOS NUNTIATUM DEMIPRO
PARATUM NE ESSE UBI VOLITIS UXORUM DATE
NAM OMNIS POSTHABUI MIHI RES ITA UUT PAR FUIT
POSTQUAM ID TANTOPERE UOL UELLE ANNADEUERERAM
Z AD HIC DEHORTATUS EST ME NE ILLAM TIBI DAREM
NAM QUI ERIT RUMOR POPULI INQUIT SI ID FECERIS
OLIM CUM HONESTE POTUIT TUM NON EST DATA
EAM NUNC EXTRUDI TURPEST HERM EADEM OMNIA
QUE TUTE DUDUM CORAM ME INCUSAIERAS
Y SATIS SUPERBE INCLUDITIS ME Z QUI Y ROGAS
QUIA NE ALTERAM QUIDEM ILLAM POTERO DUCERE
NAM QUO RE REDIBO AD EAM QUAM CONTEMSPERIM
E TUM AUTEM ANTIPHONEM VIDEO AD SIEE AMITTERE
INUITUM EAM INIQUE Z TUM AUTEM VIDEO FILIUM
INUITUM SANE MULIEREM AB SE AMITTERE
SED TRANSI SODES AD FORUM ATQUE ILLUM MIHI
ARGENTUM RURSUM IUBE RESCRIPT PHORHIO
Y QO UDE EGO DISCRIPSI POREO ILLIS QUIDUS DEBUI
Z QUID IGIITUR FIT Y SI UIS MIHI UXOREM DARE
QUAM DESPONDISTI DUCAM SIN EST UT UELIS
MANERE ILLAM APUT TE DOS HIC MANEAT DEMIPRO
NAM NON EST AEGUUM ME PROPTER UOS DECIPI

915 SATIS: letter N written above second S by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.) to read SATIN
917 RE: letter O written above the line before RE by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read ORE; REDIBO AD: letters REDIBO A seem to be retouched by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
921 ILLUM: letter T added above the line after ILLUM by A (Pr.)
925 SIN: letter N written above I by A (Pr.)
CUH EGO UESTRI HONORIS CAUSA REPUDIUM ALTERAE
REMISERIM QUAE DOTIS TANTUNDENUM DABAT
Z I IN MALAM REM HINC CUM ISTANC MAGNIFICENTIA
FUGITIUE ETIAM HUNC CREDIS TE IGNORARIER
AUT TUA FACTA ADEO Y INRITOR Z TUE HANC DUCERES
SI TIBI DARETUR Y FAC PERICULUM Z UT FILLUS
CUM ILLA HABIT APUT TE HOC UESTRUM CONSILIUM FUIT
Y QUAESO QUID NARRAS Z QUIN TU MIHI ARGENTUM CEDO 935
Y INMO UERO UXOREM TU CEDO Z IN IUS AMBULA
Y IN IUS ENIM UERO SI PORRO ESSE ODIOSI PERSISTIS
Z QUID FACIES Y EGONE UOS ME INDOTATIS MODO
PATROCINARI PORTASSE ARBITRANMINI
ETIAM DOTATIS SOLEO E QUID ID NOSTRA Y NIHIL
HIC QUANDAM NORAM CIUIS UIR UXOREM E HEM Z QUID EST
Y LEMNI HABUIT ALIAM E NULLUS SUM Y EX QUA FILIAM
SUBSEPIET ET TAM CLAM EDUCAT E SEPULTUS SUM
Y HACE ADEO ILLI TAM DENARRASO E OBSECRO
NE FACTAS Y OH TUNE IS ERAS Z UT LUDOS FACIT
945
E MISSUM TE FACTUS Y FABULAE E QUID UTS TIBI
ARGENTUM QUOD HARES CONDORAMUS TE Y AUDIO
QUID UOS MALUM ERCO ME SIC LUDIFICABAMINI
INEPTI UESTRA PULERE SENTENTIA
NOLO UOLO UOLO RURSUM CAPE CEDO 950
QUOD DICTUM INDICTUMST. QUOD MODO ERAT RATUM INRITUMST
E QUO FACTO AUT UNDE HACIE RESCIUIT 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 SCIO
ET MONSTRE ITA ME DI AMEN SIMILE Y INICI SCRUPULUM

HICINE UT A NOBIS HOC TANTUM ARGENTI AUFERAT
TANT AMEN EMORSI HERCLE SATIUS EST
ANIMO UIRILMI PRAESENTIQUE UT SIS PARA
UIDES PECCATUM TUUM ESSE ELATUM FORAS
NÆQUE IAM IN CELARE POSSE TE UXOREM TUM
NUNC QUOD IPSA EX ALIIS AUDITURAST CHREMI
ID NOSMET INDICARE PLAÇABILIS EST
TUN HUNC INPURATUM POTERIMS NOSTRO MODO
ULCISICI Y ATTAT NISI NINI PROSPICIO HAEERO
HI GLADIATORIO ANIMO AD ME ADJECTAM ULIAN
E AT UEREO UT PLACARI POSSIT 2 BONO ANIMO ES
EGO REDIGAN US IN GRATIAM HOC FRETUS CHREMI
CUM E MEDIO EXCESSIT UNDE HAEC SUCECTANT TIBI
Y ITANE AGITIS MECUM SATIS ADSTUTE
ADGREDIMINI UT BONO ANIMO ES
E GO REDESAM US IN GRATIAM
HOC FRETUS CHREMI
CUM E MEDIO EXCESSIT UNDE
HAEC SUSCEPTAST TIBI
NEQUE HUIUS SIS VERTUS MPRIMARIAE
QUIN NOUS MODO EI FACERES CONTUMELIAM
UENDAS NUNC PRECIBIUS LAITUM PECCATUM TUM
NISI DESPO SUM IlicIST ITA TIBI INCENSAM DABO
UT NE RESTINGUAS LACRIMIS SI EXTILLAUERIS
MALUM QUOD ISTITI DEAEQUE OMKIS DUINT
TANTANE ADJECTUM QVENQUA 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 asportarius
in solas terras e in id redactus sum loci
ut quid agam illo nesciam prorsum e ego scio
in ius eamus y in ius huc si quid iubet
e adsequere retine dum ego huc seruos euoco
2 enim nequeo solus accurrere y una injuriast
tecum y lego agito ergo y alterast tecum chirem
e rape hunc y sic agitis enim uebo uocest opus
nausistrata exit e os opprimum uide
quantum ualet y nausistrata inquam z non taces
y tacean e nisi sequitur pugnos iueniarem ingere
y uel oculum exculce est ubi uos ulescobar proba

B NAUSISTRATA E CHREMES Z DEMIPHO Y PHORMIO

MULIER SENES II

PARASITUS

B QUI NOMINAT ME HEM QUID ISTUC TURBAEST OBSERCIO
NI UIR Y HEM QUID NUNC OBSTIPUITSI B QUIS HIC HOMOST
NON NIHI RESPONDES Y HICINE UT TIBI RESPONDENT
QUI HERCLE UBI SIT- NESCIT E CAUE ISTI QUICUAM CREDAS
Y ABI TANGE SI NON TOTUS FRIGET ME ENICA
E NIHIIL EST B QUID ERGO QUID ISTIC NARRAT Y IAN

AUsculta E PERGIn CREDERE B QUID EGO OBSECO HUC
CREDAM QUI NIHIIL DIXIT Y DELIRAT MISER
TIMORE B NON POL TEMEREST QUOD TU TAM TIMES
E ECON TIMEO Y RECTE SANE QUANDO NIHIIL TIMES
ET HOC NIHIIL EST QUOD EGO DICO TU NARRA Z SCelUS 1000

988 IuENIREM: second I changed to T by corr. rec.
(Pr.) to read IN UENTREM
990 HEM...UIR: Written above the line before
Hem by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.),
by Az (Mar.) pointing to the name of
Chremes and indicating that he speak
these words
TIBI NARRET Y OHE TU FACTUMST. ABS TE SEDULO
PRO FRATRE B MI HOMO DI HELIUS DUINT
Y SIC FACTUMST B PERI MISERA Y ET INDE FILIAM
SUSCEPTIT IAN URAM DUM TU DORMIS E QUID AGINUS
B PRO DI IMMORTALIS FACTUS MISERANDUM ET MALUM
Y HOC ACTUMST B AN QUIQUAM HODIEST FACTUM INDIGNIUS
QUI MIHI AD UXORES UENTUNST. TUM FIUNT SENES
DEMISPO TE APPELLO NAM CUN CPC IPSO DISTAEDET LOQUI
HAECINE ERANT ITIONES CREBRAE ET MANSIONES DIUTINAE
LENNI HAECINE ERAT EA QUAE NOSTROS MINUIT FRUCTUS UILLITAS
2 EGO NAUSICRATZA ESSE IN HAC RE CULPAM MERITUM NON NEGIO
SED EA QUIN SIT IGNOSCENDA Y UERBA FIUNT MORTUO
1015
Z NAM NEQUE NECLEGENTIA TUA NEQUE ODO ID FECTU TIO
UINOLENTUS PERO AHUNG AHNOS QUINDECIM MULIECULAM
EAM COMPRESSIT UNDE HAC NATAST NEQUE POSTILLA UNQUAM
ATTIGIT
EA MORTE OBITZ DE MEDIO ABIIT QUI FUIT IN RE HAC SCRIPULUS
QUAM OB REM TE ORO UT ALIA FACTA TUA SUNT AQUE ANIMO HOC
FERUS 1020
B QUID EGO AEGO ANIMO CUPIO MISERA IN HAC RE IAN DEFUGIER
SED QUID SPEREM AETATUM PORRO MINUS PECCATURUM PUDEM
IAM TUM ERAT. SENEX SENECTUS SI UERECUNDOS FACIT
AN MEO FORMA ATQUE ARTAS HUNC MAGIS QIAM TUNC EXPETENDAST
DEMISPO

1003 EST DICTO: between these two words, letter O crossed out by A
1009 B:B written above the line before AN by rubricator (Pr.)
1011 CUM: letters MB written above by corr. rec. (Pr.), by IoV. (K.), by A2 (Mar.) to read NECUM: IPSO:
word crossed out by IoV. (K.)
1014 MERITUM: letter U crossed out and A written above by corr. rec. (Pr.), by IoV. (K.), by A2 (Mar.)
to read MERITAM
1015 QUIN: letter N crossed out by IoV. (K.), (Mar.) by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read QUI
1019 DE: letter D crossed out by corr. rec. (Pr.), by IoV. (K.) to read E
1022 PUDIM: letter D crossed out and T added above by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read PUDIM
1024 QIAM TUNC: words crossed out by corr. rec. (Pr.), by IoV. (K.)
Quid mihi hic adfert quam ob rem expectem aut sperem porro non fore

Exsequias chremiti quibus est commodum ire em tempus est
Sic dabo age hunc Phormienim qui uidet laccisito
Faxo tali sit pactatus atque hic est infortunio
Redeat sane in gratiam supiplici satis est mihi
Habet haec ei quod dum uituat usque ad auremoggianiat

Bat meo meritio credo quid ego nunc ea commodorem demiphio
Singularim qualis ego in hunc puerein s noui aequo omniam
tecum b meriton hoc meo uidetur factum z minime gentium
Uerum iam quando accusando fieri infectum non potest
Ignoscce orat confitetur purgat quid uid amplius

Y enim uero prius quam haec dat ueniam mihi prospiciam et

Phaedries

Heus nausistratae prius quam huic responds temere audi

B quid est

Y ego minas tringinta per fallaciab ab illoc abstuli
Eas dedi tuo gnato is pro sua amica lenone dedit
E hem quid ais b adeon hoc indicum tibi uidetur fallius

Homo adulescens si habet unus amicam tu uxores duas

Nihili pudere quo ore illum obturgabes responde mihi
Z faciet ut uolac b inmo ut xamiam sicam sententiam

Neque ego ignoscce neque promittio quicquum neque respondus

Prius quam gnatum uidere siue iudicio permitto omnia

Quod is iubebit faciatur y mulier sapiens es nausistrata
B satin tibi est y inmo uero pulchre disceto et probe

1026: character designation Y added at the beginning of the line by corr. rec. (Pr.)
1031 EA: EA crossed out by Iov. (K.)
1033 MERITON: letter N written above the line after
MERITO by A (Pr.), by A2 (Mar.)
ET PRAETER SPEM B TUUM NOMEN DIC QUID EST Y MHNIN

PHORMIO UESTRAE FAMILIAE HERCLE AMICUS ET TUO SUMMUS PHAEDRIAEB

PHORMIO AV EGO ECASOTOR POSTHAC QUOD POTERO QUOD UOLES 1050

FACTAMQUE ET DICAM Y BENIGNE DICIS B POL MERITUMST TUUM

Y UIN PRINUM HODIE FACERE QUOD EGO GAUDEAM NAUSISTRATA

ET QUOD TUO UIRO OCULI DOLEANT B CUPIO Y ME AD CENAM UOCA

B POL UIRO UOCO Y EAMUS INTRO HINC B FLAT SET UBI EST

PHAEDRIA

IUIDEX NOSTER Y IAM HIC FAXO ADERIT UOS UALETE ET

PLAUDIT 1055

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.\footnote{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."

\footnote{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 alṣro (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]æterito
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 UETUS
Luscius Laniuinus

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

2 trae<nt>re>: ueteres so/nantius, nam nos le/uius tradere ut e contrario/ illi tralatum, nos translatu<m>. ("te" of ueteres is a suprascript of the scholiast himself)

Right, with reference sign to DICTITAT

4 inpudentiam ostendit/ frequentatiuo uerbo.

Left, with reference sign to ANTEHAC

hic etiam lentum/ [accusatorem] facit qui pr<a>e/

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
om/nia nouitate. potuit enim dicitur (dici cur) stetit/
et non exacta est. ob hoc et olim et noua.

Left, with reference sign to ACTORIS
10 [suffragium sca]enicoru<em>/ [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<em>rg<em>lius>] et mihi iam/ [multi crudele
can]ebant a<rtificis> s<celus>.

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

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

Right margin: NOUUS
14 quod supra pr<a>etermisit/ hic reddidit nouus.
15 [mirae haberet quasi dubium/ [non sit maledicen] dum esse/ [Lusco].

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 poetae quidquid s/cribsissent.

Left, with reference sign to CERTASSE
20 certasset: pro/oocasset; 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 proverbialiter: 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 qa>er<it>is.

Left margin: ADPORTO NOUAM
adporto nouam: / sed Latinam.
138

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/zominos s/crabitur. debuit/ ergo dicere
Epi/dicazomenem (-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 Formio correpta prima syllaba Apollodorum e[st.
non a for]/mula ut quidam putant. ergo inde parasitus
uillissimae condicionis hom[o dictus est.]/ si enim a
formula esset nomen comoediae protra<h>eremus primam
syll[abam, si a formi]/one corripere debemus. uidis (-es)
 Ergo φοπΜιονΗς dici non φαπΜιονΗς a [formione]/
compositum. φαρΜηθ εnim non φαρΜηθ 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 secundarum 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 expect[tatoris (spec-) est;]/ recte ergo [addidit per silentium].

Right margin: MOTUS LOCOST

32 apparat <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 attribuuntur]/ ab aedilibus; unde loco motus dicitur qui suas <h>oras non o[btinuerit inter prae]/cedentes et consecuturos. ergo proprie dixit.
33 [laudat actor]em; est enim [po]le[tae utile; qui exclusus
[totiens animum non abiecerit].

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

antiqui sic ma/luerunt quam / adiuuans.

54v

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

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

Left margin:

[amicus a uoluntate, po/[pularis a fortuna. popula/[ris eiusdem conditionis/ [generisque; Sallustius popu/[laris sceleris] sui.

Right margin:

popularis: ciuilis est, populo/lo amatus est, cuius est hu/milis populoque factus ut/ sordidum popularemq<ue> ciuitati.

Suprascript: POPULARIS socius.

Suprascript: ERAT EI

36 deest nam.

Left margin:  CONFICEREM

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

Right margin:  CONFECI

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

    (Solidus in Mountford's edition is omitted)

Suprascript:  NAM...EIUS

39  mire se adplicat ad argumentum.

Suprascript:  EI

40  uxori.

Right margin:  CONRADITUR

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

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

Left margin:

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

Right margin:

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

43 [10?] olen expen/ [10]erat sic sester/ [12]sis in
       sester/ [12]ario assis/ [12]đ ergo <h>ype/[rbolicos
       per] unciam dixit.

Right, with reference sign to DEMENSO

uel a mense uel a mensura.

Right margin: GENIUM

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

Suprascript: CONPERSIT

       servuauit.

Right margin: PARTUM

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

Left margin: FERIETUR

47 [ad paupertatem r]ettulit; nam/ [et damnum plaga]
       et res sanguis/ [dicitu]r. bene fe/[rie]tur.

Right margin: NATALIS

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

50 facete de mulieribus.

Right margin: ACCIPE

52 hoc cum gestu offerentis/ dicitur.

Left, with reference sign to: LECTUMST


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 lect]um 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 necessarium fui[sse pecuniam].
Left of lines 56-58: SED

57 sed: particula/ transitum significat ad mentionem alterius/ rei.

Right margin: SED
discensus ad argumentum.

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

Left of lines 59-61: QUID ISTUC EST

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

Left of lines 61-62: MODO

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

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

Left margin: PLECTAR

220 puniar
Left margin: CENTURIATUS

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

239 Only traces of a two-line scholium remain.

Right margin: ECCERE

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

Right margin: BONA UENIA

378 sine lite.

Suprascript: UENIA

  gratia.

Left margin: EXPISCARE

382 fraudulenter temp/tare.

Suprascript: PORROST

474 dehinc in futurum<

Left margin: CONFUTAUIT

477 redarguit.
491 excogitet.

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

Right margin:  GARRI
496 res ineptas loquere.

65r

Suprascript:  TRIUMPHO
543 gaudeo.

65v

Left, with reference sign to CONDICIONEM
579 nuptiarum.

66r

Suprascript:  ALIQUA
585 aliquo modo.

Right margin:  BELUA
601 stultus.

66v

Right, with reference sign to COMMODUM
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.

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

Right margin: UORSURAM SOLUES
780 aes alienum acceptum mutuo soluis.

Suprascript: IN DIEM ABIIT
781 dilatum est.

Suprascript: RE
786 pecunia a ut argento.

Right margin: OPITULATA ES
iuuasti.

(Mountford's edition reads 73v)

Left margin: GLADIATORIO
964 gladiatorio: desperato.

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

alibi ad dominas qui/ affectant uiam.

75v

Left margin: MACTATUS

1028 affectus.

Right margin: OGGANIAT

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

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

A SURVEY, CHRONOLOGICALLY ORDERED, OF

A. CRITICAL EDITIONS OF TERENCE;

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

PRELIMINARY

Three sources have been utilized to locate pertinent works for this chapter: a) Marouzeau's *L'Année Philologique*;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., *Térence, 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);
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Vittorio Soave, Terenzio, Commedie, Torino, U.T.E.T., 1953 ordered January 29, 1976 through the Inter-library Loan system (Tescari's review\(^5\) of Soave's edition gives no indication that this work is anything but a translation); G. Coppola, Terenzio, Commedie, Torino, Chiantore, 1927.\(^6\)

---


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


In his "Conspectus Siglorum" Robert Kauer maintains that A (Codex-Bembinus), written in the fourth or fifth century, is corrected by the original scribe, designated A^1, and by a second hand (before Ioviales), A^2, 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 Ioviales^2 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 E 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 (ά). Briefly, the Calliopian recension is attributable to an inferior revision of a
text of the family A.

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


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

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

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

As for the text of the Phormio in volume II, there are eight instances of incorrect readings in Marouzeau's apparatus criticus regarding the Bembine text: on line 11 Marouzeau incorrectly cites A as reading FHIDICINA instead of PHIDICINA; on line 97 EXADUERSUM instead of EXADUORSUM; on line 199 PATRUUM instead of PATRUOM; 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 NATUEELLEM instead of NATUELLEM; on line 806 he incorrectly states "EST A²..." but A reads SIET without any correction; on line 838 he cites A as reading DUDUM QUAM instead of

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

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

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

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

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

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


In the section of his introduction subtitled "De Terenti textus historia antiqua aetate", Prete expounds the theories of various scholars. We single out Gunther Jachmann because Prete inclines in part to his opinion. The central question in the history of the text of Terence lies in the establishment of the relationship between the two families of the codices of Terence, A and ω or ξ. Errors common to A and ω 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 φ. He believes that φ, 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 ω 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 \( \omega \). 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 (\( \omega \)). Whether X depends on \( \phi \), 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 C. In my present investigation, I have found, with Prete, that modern editors of the comedies of Terence follow A very faithfully.


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


Rubio provides an apparatus criticus for each play of Terence. He follows Prete's interpretation of the correctors of A: "A= Codex Bembinus (Vat. lat. 3226), saec. iv.-v. A²= ipse codicis Bembini librarius. A³= corrector antiquus. Iov. = corrector Ioviales, saec. v-vi. A⁴=corrector recens, saec. vii-viii." There are seventeen instances of error in the editor's citations of the Bembine text of the Phormio: line 66 in Lemmo A; A reads IN LEMNO. Line 110 inquit scita est A; A reads INQUIT SCITAST. Line 198 apud portum J aportum A (corr. A¹); A reads APUT not
apud. Line 211 quid si sic J quid sic A; A reads QUID SI SIC. Line 243 damna exsilia A; A reads DAMNA EX ILLA.
Line 286 aduenisse J aduenire A (corr. A^f); A reads ADUENIRE and A^f changed it to ADUENIRE. Line 351 pro deum inmortalium A; A reads PRO DEUM IMMORTALIUM. Line 417 ut J ita A; A reads UT. Line 451 aequomst et bonum A; A reads AEQUOM 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. A^f; A reads QU with the letter I added above by the corrector rec. (Prete). Line 169 ut J om. A (add. A^f); 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. A^f; 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 A^f; A reads FECIT and is changed to FACIT by a corrector (Prete, Marouzeau).
B. TEXTUAL STUDIES OF TERENCE.


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

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

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

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


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

Hecyra 313 reads: "fortasse unum aliquod uerbum inter eas iram hanc conciusisse" (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 suprascript "ere" does not fully explain why "conciuisse" should be corrupted to "conciuerit". He concludes that a solitary iambic septenarius at Hecyra 313 is not indefensible.

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

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

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

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

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

1This is an alphabetical list of nouns, adjectives, verbs, and prepositions which have more than one construction. The grammarian, Arusian, also made citations from Sallust's Historiae.

2This grammarian and lexicographer is the author of De compendiosa doctrina which consists of twenty books. The first twelve deal with points of grammar, and the last eight deal with miscellaneous information. Nonius is our chief authority for many fragments of early writers, and especially of Varro's poetry.

3Eugraphius is the author of a commentary on Terence. His chief interest lies in rhetorical qualities and characterization of the plays and often he simply paraphrases the text of Terence.

Jones subjects to careful scrutiny the conclusions of J. D. Craig in the latter's *Ancient Editions of Terence* (London 1929). Following the same order of presentation as Craig, Jones discusses each grammarian individually and offers his own findings. Since Arusian's quotations of Terence agree with against A in six good cases and with some and manuscripts against A in three possible cases and with manuscripts against A and in one possible case, Jones concludes Arusian had access to and to 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 manuscripts alone against others, three times; with manuscripts alone against others, five times; with (i.e., and 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
759 "conlocatam filiam" Σ, "conlocatam amari" A; Adelphoe 608 "ipsis coram" Σ, "ipsi coram" A. The evidence is overwhelming that Priscian used the A text and not the Calliopion text. Craig emphasizes his point by mentioning Umpfenbach's preface (LIX-LXII) to his critical edition of Terence (1870) where anyone can see from Umpfenbach's collection of passages how faithfully Priscian reproduces A's readings as opposed to those of Σ or some of the minuscule manuscripts (γ and δ whose common parent is the Calliopian text Σ) of Terence.


In the history of the text of Terence an interesting question is whether sufficient evidence exists to prove that the Terence known to Servius had been already tampered with by "Calliopius", or that Servian versions betray the existence in his time of the edition of Terence implied by the small group (δ) of minuscule manuscripts. Common sense suggests that Servius, a grammarian about 400 A.D., knew the contemporary edition of Terence, the Codex Bembinus. Yet, according to Craig, the history of the text
of Terence has been written on the assumption that the grammarians and commentators were familiar with every variety of edition. Craig here endeavors to show that Servius used the A text. As positive evidence of this, Craig points to Eun. 268 (Aen. I 436), Phorm. 175-6 (Aen. XI 699), Ad. 329 (Aen. I 208), Haut. 72 (Ecl. II 34; Aen. I 548). Craig adds that it would be possible to go on to prove that Servius did not employ the Calliopian text, if he should use such instances as Andr. 330-1 (Aen. VI 664): "mereat" and "poni" for "commereat" and "adponi" 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 coin-
cides with the Codex Bembinus instead of with z: Hecyra
605 (A. iv, 435); Hecyra 618 (G. iii, 305); Eunuchus 268
(G. iv. 104; A. i, 436); Adelphoe 790-791 (A. ii, 424).
According to Craig, these four examples are more than
sufficient to discredit the argument that the Terence quo-
tations 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, Jules. "Critique Des Textes: Fautes Par Inter-
version Chez Térence". REL IX (1931): 224-226.

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 "eccam", the unanimous reading of the manuscripts, is corrected uniformly by editors to "eccam", under the pretext that the word does not have a nominative form.

II

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

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


Craig in this note explains how the evidence of Donatus' Commentary may be of assistance in establishing the text of Terence, and at the same time how disappointingly vague and contradictory the existing version of Donatus is. He offers three examples to prove his points: 1) Andria 226 (Codex Bembinus, however, does not begin till line 889); 2) *Eunuchus* 230: "facie honesta. mirum ni ego me turpiter hodie hic dabo" in which A reads "egomet", not "ego me". The quotation of Donatus (Phormio
text in antiquity. Fehl, on page 13, states the aim of the treatise: to make a comparison of the readings of the Bembinus and of the hypothetical exemplar of all the 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 Σ 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 sys-

tematic introduction of signs into a text which was

previously devoid of them.

The rubric, like the character signs, is not au-

thentic. 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 manu-

scripts. Independence of A and Σ had already been realized

before the signs were introduced systematically into the
text. The absence of true common errors in A and Σ proves

this. There are, however, common pseudo-errors caused by

successive and independent mistakes in the two families

or by inevitable mistakes which have no testimonial value.

Examination of the character signs permits us to

place the separation of A and Σ before the third century,
or even to renounce the hypothesis of a tradition common
to A and Σ. It invites us to revise the delicate pro-

blems 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 design-
nations 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 facillum 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.

¹Jules Marouzeau, "Notes de critique téréntienne," REL, XII (1934): 49. See above, p. 175.
183

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.
gquam (ms. G.)

In their apparatus criticus Kauer-Lindsay comment: "duo
versus in unum a librariis fusos sic fere refigendos
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 mën/tem uē/nīt; nām/gue ądūlēs/cēns// quam īn/
imīmā/ spe situs/ ērit

Tām fā/cīllu/mē pātri'/ pācem īn// lėgēs/ cōnfīcī/
et sū/ās/

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

As a summary, the author gives three types of explana-
tion 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 Ω. The scribe reserves Θ Ψ for female characters.

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

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

The scribe of p employs a system of Greek letters according to the initials of the name of the character, e.g., Π Pamphilus, 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, Η Syrus, Σ Sostrata, Σ Sophrona Nutrix. For characters whose initial letter is "C", the scribe devises
this system: H Chremes, X Ctesipho, ¥ Clitipho, † 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

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

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.
"uah" and dispense with the correction in the passages where it figures.


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

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

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

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

Prete adds five reproductions of the Codex Bembinus: Adelphoe, fol. 111r; Eunuchus, foll. 9r, 9v, 11r; Heautontimormenos 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:

\[Dorne me eripuit, uerberauit, me inuito abduxit meam: Ob male facta haec tantidem emptam postulat sibi tradier! Homini misero plus quingentos colaphos infregit mihi!\]

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

1 G. Jachmann, Die Geschichte des Terenztextes im Altertum (Basel: Reinhardt, 1924).
2 cf. my review of Prete, 1950.
4 cf. my review of Andrieu, 1939, 1940.
5 For a stemma, see 1954 review.
ments nor does Andrieu prove Jachmann's false. Prete believes that Jachmann's theory is the most probable: the Bembine and Calliopian recension are derived from a common source at a time when other Terentian editions existed. We can deduce from grammarians that at times they are not referring to one of the existing families. If this source common to A and Σ 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 Σ) which transmitted the plays of Terence, he believes that
the Calliopin recension ($\Xi$), 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 Calliopin 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 $\Xi$ follows a diverse method. The purpose of this study is to examine the principles involved.

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

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

A PHORMIO € GETA
PARASITUS SERUUS

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

Z DEMIPHO € CHREMES
SENES II

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

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


This volume of *Studi e Testi*, very strangely not listed in *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.
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Prete's presentation of corrections and correctors in the form of a list has its disadvantages. By simply noting the letter of correction without reporting the lemma of the text, Prete often leaves the reader in doubt about the true object of correction, especially where, as is so often the case, his reproduction is very difficult to read. Also, Prete does not report in his list deletions made by the various correctors, deletions in fact mentioned in his critical edition. Examples of such deletions are these: line 834: ABSUMERE A, SUMERE corr. rec.; line 877: INAUDIUI A, AUDIUI corr. rec.; line 880: ADHIBENDAE A, ABENDAE corr. rec.; line 1015: QUIN A, QUI corr. rec.; line 1019: DE MEĐIO 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 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

1Prete 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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