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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 \textit{Phormio} is presented to assist the reader in achieving a comprehensive knowledge of the manuscript.

The following comment by Leslie Webber Jones\(^2\) is to be kept in mind as we come to Chapter Four:

\begin{quote}
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.
\end{quote}

In Chapter Four, the fullest textual examination of the

\(^1\)For bibliographical details, see Notes, page 30.  
\(^2\)See 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.

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

INTRODUCTION

History of the Codex Bembinus

"One of the rarest and most valuable manuscripts of Western culture is without doubt the one of the comedies of Terence, Vat. Lat. 3226." 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, 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. 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) known as Porcellio, discovered the codex toward the middle of the fifteenth century.

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

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

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

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

\[
\text{Ber(nardus)} \\
\text{codex mihi carior auro} \\
\text{Bem(bus)}
\]

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

---

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

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 Marciij 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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

\begin{verbatim}
Terentio di lettere maiuscola con scholijs in lettera Longobarda, fu del Bembo, in pergamena in 4v.
\end{verbatim}

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

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{23}Sandys, p. 153.
\item \textsuperscript{24}Prete, 1970, p. 17.
\item \textsuperscript{25}Sandys, p. 153.
\item \textsuperscript{26}F. Ehrle, Fragmenta et picturae vergiliana codicis Vaticanii Latini 3225 phototypice expressa consilio et opera curatorum Bibliothecae Vaticanae (In Vaticano, 1945), p. 17.
\end{itemize}
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. C\textsuperscript{12}D \textsuperscript{CCXCIX}\textsuperscript{30}
sed multa a me diligentia perquisitus beneficio
Egregii viri Dominici Salaee 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.

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

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

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

³Thompson, p. 54.
quire in the extreme lower right hand corner.⁴

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

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

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

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

The scribe marked scene-division by listing the names of the "personae" taking part in the ensuing section. To this list, the rubricator added the type character of each "persona" and the Greek letters which, in the scene, indicate the new speaker. The names of the "personae" are then in black.⁵ These rubrics and titles are the same size as the letters of the text.

⁵Prete, 1954, p. 18.
Latin majuscule book-hand of early manuscripts consists of two styles of writing: a) square and rustic capitals and b) uncial.\(^6\) 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.\(^7\) 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.\(^8\)

Dating of the Bembine Codex has been the subject of many studies which, up to this time, have offered opposing conclusions. E. A. Lowe\(^9\) 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\textsuperscript{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".\textsuperscript{11} Between the two codices he noticed an "evoluzione di gusto"\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{13}

S. Prete\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{11}Pratesi, p. 249.
\textsuperscript{12}Ibid., p. 250.
\textsuperscript{13}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{14}Prete, 1970, p. 24.
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: "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:

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 magis puer est lascivae sagittis
Hoc melius telo pongere corda potis
Nec flammam queras neque alit pectoris ignis
Set tibi vernantum preveat ista facis

---

Fallens erba viret color hic est semper amantum
Tam fugitiva rosa est quam fugitivus amor
Nam quod florico⁠nis gaudet lasciva metallis
Aurum significat vilius esse rosa.

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

The author of the two epigrams is unknown.¹⁷ The
text is in rustic capitals in imitation of the codex and
also in uncial to which the scribe is plainly accustomed.
The seventh century corrector of A copied into the manu-
script the two poems which Poliziano later transcribed
and commented upon in his own copy of the 1475 edition
of Terence.¹⁸

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

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

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

The medial point is the only form of punctuation employed by the scribe of A. The point is placed high in the line of writing between two words and frequently after ellipsis 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 sur-sum." 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 O and Q are not circular but elliptical in form. Straight lines tend to curve as is evident in A, X and V, the latter now be-

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

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 audiueras; 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,6 who signs his name "Ioviales" in cursive on several pages, or a "manus recens" of the seventh/eighth century7 inserted into the manuscript some signs of punctuation such as the "simplex ductus" and the "paragraphos" and further that such signs existed before these correctors. These forms of punctuation were written in the codex according to the norms established by grammarians, and the correctors were forced not only to imitate the writing of the codex but also to imitate the signs of punctuation already existing in the codex.8

Possible errors, and not orthographic variants, occur: on fol. 53r, line 2 ANTHONE is written no doubt instead of Antiphone; on fol. 65r, line 577 what was intended by the scribe when he wrote CHRE is not clear. The doubling of the consonant R in FAMILIORRIOREM, fol. 71r, line 85l, is very likely a dittographical mistake on the part of the Bembine scribe. On fol. 76r, line 1055, the scribe wrote PLAUDIT instead of the imperative form plaudite.

---

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

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

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

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

DAUUS: SERUUS
GETA: SERUUS
ANTIPHO: ADULESCENS
PHAEDRIA: ADULESCENS
DEMIPO: 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 Bembinus

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 Ioviales made only a few corrections particularly of the Hecyra. As Kauer himself states in the introduction to his Oxford text:

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

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

For reasons unknown, Kauer never records 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\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{6}

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

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

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

\(^5\) Mountford, p. 3.  
\(^6\) Ibid., p. 4.  
\(^7\) Ibid., pp. 4-6.
be a close connection between Donatus' commentary on Terence and the scholia here. But Donatus' commentary as we have it today is not the same as the original commentary. 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 remain. Of these, less than 240 bear any relationship to the notes in our version of Donatus. Twenty-six scholia have a parallel in the commentary of Servius Danielis. There still remain more than 1000 items which show no affiliations with Donatus or any other commentary.

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

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

---

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

THE PHORMIO OF THE CODEX BEMBINUS

Conspectus Siglorum.

Notes to Conspectus Siglorum.

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

K. = Kauer

A¹ = the scribe of the codex making his own corrections

A² = "corrector antiquissimus"

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

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

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.
in scripta avellinarum Berocca
INCIPIT

ACTA LUDIS MEGALENSIBUS •Q•

GN SERUILIO COS GRAECA

EPIDICAZOMENOS FACTA EST

S3r I

PIT ACTA TERENTI

PHORMIO

CASPIONE

APOLLODORU

III

•G• SULPICI APOLLINARIS PERIOCHA

CHREMES FRATER ABERAT PEREGRE DEMIPHO

RELICTO ATHENIS ANTHONE FILIO

CHREMES HABEBAT LEMNI UXOREM ET FILIAM

ATHENIS ALIAM CONIUGEM ET AMANTEM UNICAM

GNATAM PHIDICINAM MATER E LEMNO ADUENIT

ATHENAS MORITUR VIRGO SOLA ABERAT CHREMES

FUNUS PROCURAT IBI EAM UISAM ANTIPHO

CUM AMERET OPERA PARASITI UXOREM ACCIPIT

PATER ET CHREMES REUERSI FREMERE DEIN MINAS

TRIGENTA DANT PARASITO UT ILLAM CONIUGEM

HABERET IPSE ARGENTO HOC EMITUR PHIDICINA

UXOREM RETINET ANTIPHO A PATRUO ADGNITAM


2 ANTHONE: Ms. tradition = Antiphone

3 HABEBAT: -is the medial point often used between words

4 ALIAM: -IAM is blurred in the electrostatic reproduction but is discernible in microfilm of Codex Bembinus

11 PHIDICINA: in his app. crit., Mar. incorrectly cites A as reading PHIDICINA
PROLOGUS
POSTquam POEtra UETUS POETAM NON POTEST RETRABERE a STUDIO ET TRADERE HOMINEM IN OTIUM MALEDICTIS DETERRERE NE SCRIBAT PARAT QUI TAT DICTITAT QUAS ANTEHAC FECIT FABULAS TENUIT ESSE ORATIONE ET SCRIPTURA LEUI QUI NUSQUAM INSANUM SCRIPsIT ADULESCEntUM CERQAM UIDERE FUGEREs ET SEXTari CANES ET EM PlorARE ORARE UT SUBUENiAt SIBI QUoD SI INTELLecERsEUS CON STEFIT OLIM NOUA aCTORIS OPERa MAGIs STrTISSE QuAM Sua MINUS MULTO aUDACItER QUAM NUCE LEDIT LAEBERET NUNC SI QuIS EST QUt HOc DICAT AUT Sic COGITET UETUS SI POETA NON LACESSISSET PRIOR Nullum INueniRE PROLOGUN POTOISSERT NOUUS QuEM DICERET CUI MALE DICERET IS SIBI RESPONsUM HOc HABEAT IN MEDIO OMNIBUs PAlwAM ESSE POSITAM Qui ARTEM TRACTENT MUsICAM

4 ANTEHAC: + reference sign to scholia above the H
5 TENUIT: + reference sign to scholia above the I
7 CERUAM: + reference sign to scholia above the E
8 EA: + reference sign to scholia above the EA
9 OLIM: + reference sign to scholia above the I
10 aCTORIS: + reference sign to scholia to left of A
11 aUDACItER: in their app. crit. of the Oxford edition, Kauer and Lindsay cite Iov. as changing AUDACItER to AUDACTER
12 DICAT: letter e added above A by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read DICET; +reference sign to scholia above the I
13 LACESSISSET: +reference sign to scholia above the first S
15 HABERET: - reference sign to scholia above the E
17 TRACTENT: letter A added above E by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A² (Mar.) to read TRACTANT
ILLE AD FAMEM HUNC A STUDIO SYUDUIT REICERE
HIC RESPONDERE VOLUIT NON LACESSERE
BENEDICTIS SI CERTASSE AUDISSET BENE
QUOD AB ILLO ADLATUMST: ID SIBI ESSE RELATUM PUTET
DE ILLO TAM PISEM DICIAM DICUNDI MIHI
PECCANDI CUM IPSE DE SE FERMI NON FACIT
NUNC QUID UELIM ANIMUM ATTENDITE ADPORTO NOUAM
EPIDICAZOMENON QUAM UCANT COMEIDA
GRAECI LATINI PHORMIONEM NOMINANT
QUIA PRIMAS PARTIS QUI AGIT ES ERIT PHORMIO
PARATUS PER QUM RES GERETUR MAXIME
VOLUNTAS UOOSTRA SI AD POETAM ACCESSERIT
DATE OPERAM ADESTE AQUINO PER SILENTIUM
NI SIMILI UTAMUR PORTUNA ATQUE USI SUMUS
CUM PER TUMULTUM NOSTER GRAEX LOCOST
QUEM ACTORIS UIRTUS NOBIS RESTITUIT LOCUM
BONITASQUE UESTRA ADIUTANS ATQUE AQUEANIMITAS

20 CERTASSE: letter T written above final E
21 ADLATUMST: medial point placed between
23 FINEM: reference sign to scholia above the N
25 EPIDICAZOMENON: reference sign to scholia above the D
26 GRAECI: reference sign to scholia above the A
28 RES: reference sign to scholia above the R
29 UOOSTRA: letter O crossed out by corr. rec. (Pr.) and E added above the O to read UESTRA
31 NI: I changed to E by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read NE
32 LOCOST: reference sign to scholia above the C
33 RESTITUIT: reference sign to scholia above the U
34 ADIUTANS: reference sign to scholia above the U
B AMICUS SUMMUS HEUS ET POPULARIS GETA
HERI AD ME UENIT ERAT EI DE RATIOUNCULA
IAM PRIDEM APUC ME RELICUIM PAUXILLIUM
NUMMORUM ID UT CONIFICEREM CONIFICI ADDERO
NAM ERILEM FILIUM EIU M DUXISSE AUDIO
UXOREM EI CREDO MINUS HOC CONRADITUR
QUAM INIQUE COMPARATUMST. II QUI MINUS HABENT
UT SEMPEM ALIQUID ADDANT DIUITIORIBUS
QUOD ILLE UNCIATIM UIX DE DEMENSO SUO
SUUM DEFURATIS GENIUM CONPERSIT MISER
ID ILLA UNIVERSEM ABRIPIT HAUD EXISTIMANS
QUANTO LABORE PARTUM PORRO AUTEM GETA
FERETUR ALIO NUNERE UBI ERA PEPERERIT
PORRO AUTEM ALIO UBI ERIT PUERO NATALIS DIES
UBI INITIABUNT OMNE HOC MATER AUFERET
PUERO CAUSA ERIT MITTUNDI SED UIDEON GETAM

G A T A  B DAUUS

SERUI

SI QUIS ME QUÆRET RUFUS B PRAESTOST. DESINE R OH
AT EGO OBUIAM CONABAR TIBI DAUE B ACCPE EM
LECTUMST. CONUENIET NUMERUS QUANTUM DEBUI
AND TE ET NON RECLEXISSE HABEO GRATIAM
PRAESTERTIM UT NUNC SUNT MORES ADEO RES REDIT

36 RATIOUNCULA: *reference sign to scholia above
UN
43 DEMENSO: *reference sign to scholia above the N
50 PUERO: letter O crossed out by Iov. (K.), by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read Puer
50a r = Greek gamma
50b II: the numeral
53 LECTUMST: *reference sign to scholia above the U
55 B added by Iov. (K.) at the beginning of the line. A has Geta speaking lines 54, 55, 56 (Mar.). B added by corr. rec. according to Pr.
Si quis quid reddet magna hasendast gratia
B sed quid tu es tristis ut ego nescis quo in metu et quanto in periculo suis? Quid istuc est? Scies modo ut tacere possis? Abi si sii insciens cuius tu fidem in pecunia persperexeris
Uerere uerba ei credere? Ubi quid mihi lucrum est? Te fallere? Ergo ausculata? Hanc operam tibi dico
Senis nostri daeum fratre matorem chreemem
Nostin B quid n6? Quid eius gnatum phaedriam
B tanquam te f evenit senibus ambus stimul
Iter illi ut esset nostro in ciliiciam
Ad hospitem antiquum is semen per epistulas
Fellexit modo non montis aurii oportuit
B cui tanta erat res et erat super f desinas
Sic est ingenti B o regem me esse oportuit
f absentes ambic hic tum sensus me filius
Relinquunt: quasi magistrum B o geta provinciam
Cepisti duram mihi usus evenit: hoc scio
Memini relinquique deo irato meo
Coeipi aduersari primo quid uersis opus
Seni fidulis dum sum scapulas peridi
Fuenere in mentem mihi istae B namque insciasti
Advorsum stimulum calces f coepi is omnia
Facere obsequi quae uellent B scisti uti foro
f nosto maii nihil quiquam primo hic phaedria

57 B: crossed out by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.). A advanced B from line 55 to line 57 (Mar.)
69 ERAT SUPER: marks made by Iov. (K.) above B of ERAT and up of SUPER indicate a change to SUPERERAT
71 HIC: letter n added above the C by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read HINC
73 DURAM: after this word corr. rec. (Pr.), Iov. (K.) added f. In fact, the Ms. tradition attributes MIHI...PERODID to Geta
75 ADUERSARI: the word HIS added above AD by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read HINC
77 f changed to B by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) at beginning of line; ISTAE B: letter after ISTAE crossed out by Iov. (K.)
78 OMNIA: ea added above O by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
CONTINUO QUANDAM NACTUS EST PUELULLAM
CITHARISTRIAM HANC AMARE COEPI
ERAT QUADAM HIC SOLEBAMUS FERE
PLEBUMQUE EAM OPPERIRI DUM INDE IRET DOMUM
INTRABAM SEDEMUS ILLI INTEREUNI
ADULESCENS QUIDAM LACRUMANS NOS MIRARIER
ROGAMUS QUID SIT NUMNUM AQUE INQUIT AC MODO
PUBERTAS MINI ONUS UISUMET ET MISERAM ET GRAVE
MODO QUANDAM UIDI VIRGINEM HIC VIRGINIAE
MISERAM SUAM MATREM LAMENTARI MORTUAM
EA SITA ERAT EXAUDIORSUM NEQUE ILLI BENTIOULUS
NEQUE NOTUS NEQUE COGNIATUS EXTRA URAM ANCIULLAM
QUISQM ADERAT QUI ADIUTARET FUNUS MISERUSMIST
UIRGO IPSA FACIE EREGIA QUID UERBES OPUS
COMMORAT OMNES NOS IBI CONTINUO ANTIPHO
UGLITISNE EAMUS UISERE ALIUS CENSEO
EAMUS DUC NOS SODES INUNUS
UIDEMUS UIRGO PULCRA ET --- MAGIS DICERES
NIHIL ADERAT ADIUMENI AD PULCHRITUDINEM

88 ILICO: the first I changed to E, the second I changed to L, letter O added above C by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.) to read EI LOCO
91 IILI: letter C added above second I by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read ILLIC
97 EXAUDIORSUM: second U crossed out by corr. rec. (Pr.) and cursive a added above it to read EXAUDIORSAM. Mar. incorrectly cites A as reading EXAUDIORSAM
BENTIOULUS: second U crossed out by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.) and EN added above it by same to read BENTIOULENS
98 ANCIULLAM: 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 HORMIDA
LACRIMAE UESTITUS TURPIS: UT NI UI BONI
IN IPSA INESSET FORMA HAECA FORMAM EXTINGUERENT
ILLE QUI ILLAM ANABAT FIDICINAM TANTUMmodo
SATIS INQUIT SCITAST HOSTER UERO B IAM SCIO
AMARE COEPIT f SCI QUAM QUO EUDAT UIDE
POSTRIDGE AD ANUM RECTA PERTIG OBSECRAT
UT SIBI EIS FACIAT COPIAM ILLA ENIM SE NEGAT
NEQUE EUM AEUQUM AIT: FACERE ILLAM CIUEM ESSE ATTICAM
BONAM BONIS PROGNATAM SI UXOREM UELIT
LEGE ID LICERE FACERE SIN ALIITER NEGAT
NOSTER QUID FACERET NESCIRE ET ILLAM DUCERE
CUPRIERAT ET METEBAT: ABSENTEM PATREM
B NON SI REDISSET B PATER UENIAM DAREM
f ILLE INDOTATAM UERGINEM ATQUE IGNOBILEM
DARET ILLI NUMQUAM FACERET B QUID FIE DENIQUE
f QUID FACERAT EST PARASITUS QUIDAM PHORMIO
HOMO CONFIDENS QUI ILLUM DI ONNES PERDUINT
B QUID IS FECIT d HOC CONSILIUM QUOD DICAM DEDIT
LEX EST UT ORBAE QU SINT GENERE PROXIMI 125
IIS NUBANT: ET ILLOS DUCERE EADEM HAECE LEX IUBET
EGO TE COGNATUM DICAM ET TIBI SCRIBAM DICAM
PATERNUM AMICUM NE ADSEGULABLE UERGINIS
AD INDICES UENIMUS QUI FUERET PATER
QUAE MATER QUI COGNATI TIBI SIT ONNA HAECE 130

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 ILENE
122 FACIAT: letters AC crossed out by Iov. (K.), corr. rec. (Pr.) to read FAT
125 QU : letter I added above by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read QUI
CONFINGAM QUOD ERIT MIHI BONUM ATQUE COMMODUM CUM TU HOMINEM NIHIL REFLUES UINCAT SCILICET PATER ADERIT MIHI PARATAE LITES QUID MEA ILLA QUIDEM NOSTRA ERIT B IOCULAREM AUDACIAM \ PERSUASUM\, DOMINI FACTUMST UENTUMST\, UINCEMUM 135 DUXIT B QUID NARRAS F HOC QUOD AUDIS B Q GETA QUID TE FUTURUMST\, \ FIESCIO HERCLE UNUM HOC SCIO QUOD FORTES PERET\, FEREMUS AEGUS ANIMO B PLACET EM ISTUC UIRIST\, OFFICIUM F IN ME OMNIS SPES MIHI EST B LAUDO \ AD PRECATOREM ADEAM CREDO QUÍ MIHI \ 140 SIC ORET NUNCA MITTE QAESO HUNC CETERUM POSTHAC SI QUIQUAM NIHIL PRECOR TANTUM MODO NON ADDIT UBI EGO HINC ABIERO UEL OCCIDITO B QUID PEDAGOGUS ILLE QUI CITHARISTRIAM QUID ET TERTIUS \ ST TERTIUS \ ST \ ST \ 145 QUID DET FORTASSE\, \ IMMO NIHIL NISI SPERAM \ PATER EUIS REDIT\, AN NON \ NONDUM B QUID SENEM QUOD SPECTATIS UESTRUM \ NON CERTUM SCIO \ EPISIPLAM AB BO ADLAIM ESSE AUDIUI MODO ET AD PORTITORES ESSE DELAAM PETAM 150 B NUM QUID GETA ALIUT ME UIS \ UT BENE SIT TIBI PUEUS NENON HOC PRODIT CAPE DA HOC DORCHE

A ANTIPO B PHAEDRIA

ADEON REM REDISSE UT QUI MIHI CONSULTUM OPTIME UELLET ESSE

145 B: letter B inserted between TENTIUS and NON by A (Pr.)
146 F: letter F inserted between FORTASSE and IMMO by A (Pr.)
150 DELAAM; letter T traced by corr. rec. (Pr.); PETAM: the word HANC added above PETAM by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
153: page damage makes it impossible to read the character designation at the beginning of the line. UELLET: the first L crossed out by Iov. (K.) but he does not change the second L to I
Phaedria patrem ut existimescam ubi in memem eius aduenti
ueniat
quod ni fuissem incogitantias ita expecta—m ut par fuit
155
b quid istuc est a bogitas qui tam audacis facinoris mi

conscius sis
quod uominam in Phormioni id suaderis in memem incidunt
neu me cupidum eo inpositum quod mihi principio
160
Hali non potius essem fuissest tum illus mihi egregre aliquid dies
at non cotti diana cura hanc angers et animum b audio

A dum exspecto quam mox ueniat qui adinat hanc mihi
consuetudinem
b aliis quia defit quod amant aegrest tibi quia superest

DOLET
amores abundas Antipho

nam tua quidem hercle certo uta haece expetenda opandaque
est
ita me di bene ament ut mihi licet tam diu quod amo

frui

165
iam depicisci morte cupio tu concito cetera
quod ego ex hac inopia nunc capiam et quid tu ex ista

coopia
ut ne addam quod sine sumptu ingenium liberalem nactus es
quod habes ita ulusti uxorem sine mala fama palam

beatus ne unum desit qui modeste istaec ferat

170
quod si tibi res sit cum eo lenone quo mihi est tum sentias

a at tu mihi contra nunc uidere fortunatus phaedria
 cui de integro est potestas etiam consulendi quid uelis
retinere amare amittere ego in eum incidi infelix locum

175
ut neque mihi sit amittendi nec retinendi copia
sae quid hoc est uidon ego getam currentem hic aduentre
is est ipsus ei timeo misero quam hic mihi huntiet rem

A geta  r antipho  b phaedria

154 expecta—m: two letters between A and M totally erased
and RE inserted by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read expectarem

157 in: letter I crossed out and E added above N by Iov.

(Pr.), (K.) to read NE

160 B: letter B inserted between animum and audio by A as
it seems to me but Pr. attributes it to the Rubricator

164 certo: letter O erased and E added above erasure by

Iov. (Pr.), (K.), by A2 (Mar.) to read certe;
expetenda: letter E added above TN by Iov. (Pr.) to read
expetenda. On microfilm, letters expet appear darker,
thicker and may be by a hand other than A.
169 ITA: letter C added above A by corr. rec. (Pr.)
170 DESIT: after this work, ANIMOS added above by Iov.
   (Pr.), ANIMUS added by Iov. (K.)
172: one line, present in the Ms. tradition, is not found
   in A but added by corr. rec. (Pr.), (Mar.), by Iov.
   (K.). The addition reads: ITA PLERIQUE INGENIO SUMUS
   OMNIS NOSTRI NOSMET PENITET
176 MIHI SIT: above these words, EIUS added by corr. rec.
   (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.)
178 MISERO: letter O erased by unknown cor. to read MISER
A NULLUS ES GETA NISI IAM ALIQUOD TIBI CONSILIUM CELEBRE.

ITA NUNC INPARATUM SUBITO TANTA TE INPENDENT MALA 180

QVAE NEQUE UTI DEUITEM SCIODE NEQUE QUO MODO ME INDE

EXTRAHAM

QVAE SI NON ASTU PROVIDENTUR ME AUT ERUM PESSUM DABUNT

NAM NON POTEST CELARI NOSTRA DIUTIUS AUDACIA I QUID ILLIC

COMMOTUS UENIT

A TUM TEMPORIS MIHI PUNCTUM AD HANC REM EST ERUS ADEST

I QUOD ILLIC MALUST

A QUOD CUM AUDIERIT QUOD EIUS REMEDIIUM IINVENIAM

IRACUNDIAE 185

LOQUARNE INCENDAM TACEAM INSTIGEM PURGEM ME LAETAM

EHU ME MISERUM CUM MIHI FAEOE TUN ANTIFHO ME EXCRUCIAT

ANIMI

EIUS ME MISERET EI NUNC TEMPO IS NUNC ME RETINET NAM

ASQUE EO ESSET

RECTE EGO MIHI UIDISSEM ET SENIS ESSEM EULUS IRACUNDIAM

ALIQUID CONAVSISSEM ATQUE HINC ME CONICEREM PROTONIS IN

FEDES 190

I QUAM HINC FUGAM AUT FURUM PARAT

A SED UBI ANTIPHONEM REPERRIAM AUT QUA QUARERE INSIISTAM UIAM

B TE NOMINAT I NESCIO QUOD MAGNUM hoc NATIO EXPECTO MALUM

B AH

SANUSNE ES A DONUM IRE PERGAM IBI PLURIMUST B REOCERMUS

HOMINEM STA ILLIC A HEM

195

SATIS PRO IMPERIO QUISQUIS ES I GETA A IPSA EST QUM

VOLUI OBHIM

I CEDO QUID PORTAS OBSECRO ATQUE ID SI POTES UENGO EXPEDI

A FACIAM

IELOQUERE A MODO APUT PORTUM I MEUHE A INTELLEXTI

190 OCCIDI B HEM

I QUID AGAM B QUID AIS A HUIUS PATREM UIDISSE ME ET PATRUM

TUUM

NAM QUOD EGO HUIC SUBITO EXITIO REMEDIIUM INVENIIUM MISER

200 QUOD SI EO MEAE FORTUNAE REDIUNT PHANTUM ABS TE UT

DISTRAHAR

181 NEQUE: O crossed out and C added above it by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.) to read NEC

183 ILLIC: the second I changed to E and C crossed out by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read IILE, 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 E1(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 MIIHI UITA EXPETENDA A ERGO ISTAEC CUM IPA SUNT-

ANTIPHO

NO SUM APUT ME A AQUI OPUS EST NUNC CUM MAXUNE UT SIS

ANTIPHO

NAM SI SENSERIT TE TIMIDUM PATER ESSE ARBITRABITUR 205

COMMERUISSE CULPAM B HOC UERUMST R NON POSSUM INMUTARIER

A QUID FACERES SI ALIUD GRAULIUS TIBI NUNC FACIUNDUM FORET

R CUM HOC NON POSSUM ILLUD MINUS POSSEM A HOC NIHIL EST

QUID HIC CONTERIMUS OPERAM FRUSTRA QUIN ABBEO B ET QUIDEM

EGO R OBSE---

QUID SI ADSIMULO SATINEST A GARRIS R UOLUTM CONTEMPLAMIN.

EM 210

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

A SATY EST

EM ISTUC SERUA ET UERBUM UERBO PAR PARI ET RESPONDENAS

NE ET IRASTUS SUIS SAEUICIDICIS DICTIS PROTELET R SCIO

A UI COACTUM TE ESSE INUITUM B EGE IUDICIO A TENES

SET HIC QUIS EST SENEX QUEN UIDEO IN ULTIMA PLATEA IPSUS

EST 215

R NON POSSUM ADDESE A AH QUID AGIS QUO ABIS ANTIPHO

MANE INQUAM R EGOMET ME NOUI ET PECCATUM MEUM

UOBS COMENDO PHANIAM ET UITAM MEAN

B GETA QUID NUNC FIET A TU IAM LITES AUDIES

EGO PLECTAR PENDENS NISI QUID ME FEFELLERIT

SED QUOD MODO HIC NOS ANTIPHONEM MONUIMUS

ID HOMSIT IPSOS FACERE OPORTE--- PHAEORIA

B AUFER MIHI OPORTET QUIN TQU QUID FACIAM IMPERA

---203: 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 OBSECRO

210 A: above A, unknown corrector added PH indicating

Phaedia should say GARRIS

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

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

218 PHANIA: 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 OPORTET
A MEMINISTIN OLIM UT FUERIT UESTRA ORATIO IN RE INCIPITUNDA AD DEFENDENDAM NOXIAM IUSTAM ILLAM CAUSAM FACILEM VINCIBILEM OPTUMAM B MEMINI A EM NUNC IPSAST- OPUS EA AUT SI QUID POTE\S MELIOR ET CALIDIOR B FIEI SEDULIO A NUNC PRIOR ADITO TU EGO IN INSIDIES HIC ERO CENTURIATUS SI QUID DEFICIAS B AGE 230 Z DEMIPHO B PHAECRI A GETA SENEX ADULESCENS SERIUS Z ITANE TANDEM UXORUM DUXIT ANTIPO INIUSO MEO NEC MEUM IMPERIUM AC MITTO IMPERIUM NON SIMILITATUM MEAM REVERETI SALTAM NON PUDERI O PACINUS AUDAX O GETA MONITOR A UIX TANDEM QUID MINI DICECT QUAM CAUSAM REPERIUNT DEMIPOR A ATQUI REPERIAM ALIUT AGE Z AN HOC DICET MINIHI 235 INUITUS FERICI LEX COEGIT AUDIO FATER B PLACES Z UERIUM SCIENTEM TACTUM CAUSAM TRADERE ADVERSARIIS ETIAMNE ID LEX COEGIT B ILLUD DURUM A EGO EXPEDIAM SINE Z INCERTUMST QUID AGAM QUA PRAETER SPEM ATQUE IN CREDIBILE HOC MINI OPTIGIT 239 PERICLA DAMMA EX ILLA PEREGERO REDIENS SEMPER COGITET 243 AUT FILLI PECCATUM AUT UXORIS MORTEM AUT HORBUM FILIAE COMMUNIA ESSE HAE POSSE UT NENG ANO SIT NOUM 245 QUIDQUID PRAETER SPEM BUENIT OMNE ID DETERARE ESSE IN LUCRO O PHAEDELI 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.)
240-242: three lines, present in Ms. tradition, are not found in A
245 HAE 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 FACTUNDUM HORUM NIIHIL QUIQUAM ACCIDET ANINO NOUOM QUIDQUID PRAETER SPEM EURET ODUM ID DEPUTABO ESSE IN LUCRO SED QUID CESSAS HOMINEM ADIRE ET BLANDE IN PRINCIPIO ADLOQUI Z PHAEDRINAE MEI PRATRIS VIDE FILLUM MIHI RE OBUTAM B MI PATRUE SALUE Z SALUE SED UBI EST ANTIPHO B SALUM UENERE Z CREDO HOC RESPONDE MIHI 255 B UALET HIC EST SAT: SATIRE OMNIA EX SENTENTIA Z UELLEM QUIDEM B QUID ISTUC EST Z ROGITAS PHAEDRIA BONAS ME ABSENTE HIC CONFECISTIS NUPTIAS B ERO AN ID SUSCENSES NUNC ILLI Z ARTIFICEM PROBUM EGO ILLI NON SUSCENSEAM IPSUM GESTIO 260 DARI MIHI IN CONSPECTUM NU- CULPA AUT SCIAM LEMEM PATREM ILLUM FACTUM ME ESSE ACERRIMUM B ATQUIN NIHIL FECIT PATRUE QUOD SUSCENSES Z ECCE AUTEM SIMILLA OMNIA OMNES CONGRUUNT UNUM CUM NORIS OMNIS NORIS B HAUER ITAST 265 Z HIC IN NOXAST ILLI AD DEFENDUNDAM CAUSAM ADEST CUM ILLE ABEST PRAEST · TRADUNT OPERAS MUTUAS B SI EST PATRUE CULPAM UT ANTIPHO IN SE ADMISERIT 270 EX QUA RE MINUS REI FORET AUT FAME TEMPERS NON CAUSAM DICO QUIN QUOD MERITUS SIT FERAT

---S: letters ENU appear to me to be written by another hand (corr. rec.7)
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 ADOLESCENTIAE AC UICIT NOSTRA CULPA EST AN IUDICUM QUI SSEPE INVIDIA ADIJNUP DIUITI AUT PROPTER MISERICORDIAM ADDUNT PAUPERI A NI NOSSEM CAUSAM CREDEREM UERA HUNC LOQUI Z AN QUISQUAM IUDEX EST QUI POSSIS NOSCERE TUA IUSTA UBI TUPE UERBEM NON RESPONDAS ITA UT ILLA FECIT B FUNCTUS ADOLESCENTIUS EST OFFICIEL LIBERALIS POSTQUAM AD IUDICES UENTUMST NON POTUIT COGITATA PROLOQUI ITA EUM TUM TIMIDUM IBI STUPEFECIT PUDOR A LAUDO HUNC SED CESEO ADIRE QUAM PRIMUM SENEM ERE SALUE SALIUM TE AUDISSE GAUDEO BONE CUSTOS SALUE COLUMNU EBRO FAMILIAE CUZ COMMENDAVIT PILIUS HINC ABENS HEUM A IAM DUDUM TE OMNES NOS ACCUSARE AUDIO INMERITO ET ME HORUM OMNIUM INMERITISSIMO NAMQUID ME IN HAC RE FACERE UOLUISTI TIBI SERUUM RONINEM CAUSAM ORARE LEGES NON SINUNT NEQUE TESTIMONIO DICTIO EST 3 MITTO OMNIA ADDO ISTUC INPRUDENS TINUIT ADOLESCENS SINO TU SERUUS UERUM SI COGNATA EST MAXUIME NON FUIT NECESSE HABERE SED ID QUOD LEX IUBET DOTE DARETIS QUARERET ALIUM UIRUM

275 EST: in his app. crit., Rauer noted "EST A (corr. man. 2)" but neither Prete nor I see correction here
281 FUNCTUS: letter C added above between N and T by A (Pr.)
284 IBI: second I crossed out and O inserted above by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read "OSTUPE-FECIT"
286 ADUENISSI: the two S's were erased and R added by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read "ADUENIRE"
290 INMERITO: letter T inserted between I and O by A (Pr.) to read "INMERITO"
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"
QUARUNTIONE INOPEH POTIUS DUCERAT DOMUM
A NON RATIO UERUM ARGUMENT DUXEBAT Z SUMERET
ALICUNDE A NIIHIL EST DICTO FACILIUS
300
Z POSTREMO SI NULLO ALIO FACTO PÆANO HUI
DIXIT PULCHRÉ SIQUIDEM QUIquam CREDERET
TE UIUO Z NON NON SIC FUTURUMST NON POTESt
ECOILLAM CUM ILLO UT PARTIA HUPTAM UNUM DlEM
NIIHIL SUAUE MERITUMST HOMINEM COMMONSTRARlER
305
MIHI ISTUM UOLO AUT UBI HABITET DEMONSTRARlER
A NEMPE PHORNIONEM Z ISTUM PATRONUM MULIERS
310
A IAM FAXO HIC ADERIT Z ANTIPHO UBI NUNC EST A FORIS
Z ABI PHAREBRA EUM REQUIRE ATOQUE HUC ADDUC B EQ
RECTA UIA QUlDEM IILLUC A NEMPE AD PAMPHILAM

Z AT EGEO DIOE PENATES HINC SALUTATUM DOMUM
DEUERTAR INDE IBO AD FORUM ATQUE ALIQUIS MIHI
AMICOS ADOUCABO AD HANC REM QUI ADIsIEN
UT NE INPARATUS SII SI UENIAT PHORMIO

A PHORMIO ET GETA

PARASITUS
SERUUS

A ITANE PATRIS ADVENTUM UERITUM HINC ARISSE A EADMUSUM 315
Z PHANIUM RELICRAM SOLAM E SIC A ET IRATUM SENEM
E OPPIDO A AD TE SUMMA SOLUM PHORMIO RERUM REDIT
TUTE HOC INTRISTI TIBI OMNE EST EXEDENDUM ACCINGERE
E OBSECRO TE A SI ROGABIT ET IN TE SPES EST A ECCERE
QUID SI REDDET E TU IMPULISTI A SIC OPINOR E SUBUENI 320

300 NIHIL: the word ALICUNDE is repeated between the
lines above NIHIL by Iov. (Pr.); DICTO:
letter U written above letter O by Iov. (Pr.),
(K.) to read DICTU
304 EGYON: letter E added above and to the right of N
by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read EYONE
306 ISTUM: letter T crossed out and letters PS writ-
ten 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
(K.) nor mention this correction
314 UENIAT: letters AT written above by corr. rec. (Pr.),
letters AD written by Iov. (K.) to read
ATUENIAT, ADEUNIAT respectively
315 PATRIS ADVENTUM: word AIG written above by corr.
rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
A CAEDO SEHEN IAM INSTRUCTA SUNT MINI IN CORDE CONSILIA OMNIA E QUI QUID AGES QUID UTS NISI UTI MANEAT PHANIAM ATQUE EX CRIMINE HOC
ANTIPHONEM EREPTAM ATQUE IN ME OMNEM IAR DIERIUM SENIS E O UR FORTIS ATQUE AMICUS URBN HOC SAREP PHORNIO
UEMOR NE ISTACEC PORTITUDO IN CREMUM BRUMPAT DENTIQUE 325 A AH NON ITA EST FACTUMST PERICULUM IAM PEDUM UISAST UTA QUOD ME CENSES HOMINES IAM DEUERBERASSE USQUE AD NECEM HOSPITES TUM CIUES QUO MAGIS NOU TANTO SAEFIIUS CAEO DHU ENUMQUAM INIURIARUM AUDISTI MINI SCRIPTUM DICAN E QUI ISTUC A QUIA NON RETE ACCIPITRI TENDITUR NEOUE MILIO 330 QUIT MALE FACIUNT NOBIS ILLIS QUI NIHI FACIUNT TENDITUR QUA ENIM IN ILLIS FRUCTUS EST. IN ILLIS OPERA LUDITUR ILLIS ALIUM ET EST PERICULUM UNE ALIUM ET ALIUM POTEST IHI SCIUNT NIHIH ESSE DICES DUENT DAMNATUM DOMUM ALERE NOLUNT HOMINEM EDACEM ET SAPIUNT MIA SENTENTIA 335 PRO MALEFICIO SI BENEFICIUM SUUM NOLUNT REDERE E NON POTEST SATIS PRO MERITO AB ILLO TIBI REFERRE GRATIA A INNO ENIM NEMO SATIS PRO MERITO GRATIAM REGI REPERT TEN ASYMBOLUM UENIRE UCTUM ATQUE LAUTUM E BALINEIS OTTOSUM AB AMINO CUM ILLE ET CURA ET SUMPTU ABSUMTIT 340 DUN TIBI FIT QUOD PLACEAT ILLE RINGITUR TU RIDEAS PRIOR BIBAS PRIOR DECUMBAS DIUSIA APPRITUM E QUI QUIC TUR EST A UII TU DUBITAS QUIE SUMAS QUOD POCISSUM HAEC CUM RATIONEM INEAS QUAM SINT SUAUIA ET QUAM CARA SINT

321 CAEDO: letter A written above E by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read CAEDO
322 QUID: space left between these words probably for character designation
326 EST: word crossed out by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.), corr. rec. (Pr.)
329 ENUMQUAM: letter M written above E by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read ME NUMQUAM
330 REPE: letter C written above ET by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read REPE
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 US by Iov. (Pr.) to read SUMMUM
339 TENE: letter E written above by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read TENE; 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
E UIDEAS TE ATQUE ILLUM UT NARRAS A I IN MALAM CRUCEM
NUMI EUM ESSE EXISTIMASSE NUNQUAM TAM GRAUIS
OB HANC INNUNCITIAS 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 BONUSUM EXPORTOR LECUM CONTEMPOR 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 PETO
SI TIBI PLACERE POTIS ES MIHI UT RESPONDEAS
QUEM AMICUM TUIDM AIS - FUISSE ISTMU EXPLANA MIHI 380
ET QUI COGNATUM ME SIBI ESSE DICERET
A PROINDE EXPISCARE QUASI NON NOSSES Z NOSEM A ITA
EGO ME NEG0 TU QUI AIS REDIGE IN MEMORIAM
A ERO TU SOBRINUM TUUM NON NORAS Z ENICAS
DICT NOMEN A NOMEN MAXINE Z QUID NUNC TACIS 385
A PERI HERCLE NOMEN PEROBDI Z QUID AIS A GETA
SI MEMISSTID QUID OLEM DICTUM SUBICE EM
NON DICO QUASI NON NOSSES TEMPATUM ADUENIS
Z EGO AUTU TEMPTO ET STILPHO A ATQUE ADEO QUID MEA
STILPHOST Z QUEM DIIXIT A STILPHONEM INQUAM EST
NON NOUERAS 390

Z NEQUE EGO ILLUM NORMAT NEC MIHI COGNATUS FUIT
QUISQUAM 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 NOSSES: line between OS appears to be unintentional; ITA: after ITA is Z by an unknown hand. According to Ms. tradition EGO...MEMORIAM belongs to Z
AT SI TALENTUM REM RELIQUISET DECEM
Z DI TIBI MALE FACIANT A PRIMUS ESSES MEMORITER
PROPENIEM UESTRAM USQUE AB AI O ATQUE ATAOU
PROPERENS 395
Z IRA UT TU DICES EGO TUM CUM ADTVNISSEM QUI MIHI
COGNATA EA ESSET DICEREM ITIDEM TU FACE
CEDO QUI EST COGNATA E TU NOSTER RECTE HEUS TU CAUE
A DILUCIDE EXPEDITI QUI BUS ME OPORTUIT
IUDICIBUS TUM ID SI FALSUM FUERAT FILIUS
CUR NON REPELLIT Z FILIUM NARBAS MIHI
CUIUS DE STULTITIA DICI UT DIGNUMST- NON POTEST
A AT TU QUI SAPIENS ES MAGISTRATUS ADI
IUDICIO DE EADEM CAUSA ITEM UT REDDANT TIBI
QUANDOQUIDEM SOLUS REGNAS ET SOLI LICET
HIC DE EADEM CAUSA BIS IUDICIO ADIPISCIER
Z ET SI NIHI FACTA INJURIAS UERUM TAHEN
POTIUS QUAM LITES SECTOR UT QUAM TE AUDIAM
ITIDEM UT COGNATA SI SIT ID QUOD LEX IUBET
DOTIS DARE ABDUC HANC MINAS QUINTO ACCIPERE
400
A HAHAE HOMO SUAVIS Z QUID EST NON INIQUITOM POSTULO
AN NE HOC QUIDEM EGO ADIPISCAR QUOD IUS PUBLICUMST
A ITANE TANDEM QUAEAM ITEM UT MERETRICEM UBI ABUSUS
MERCEDEM DARE LEX IUBET ET ATQUE AMITTERE
AN UT NE QUIT TURPE CIUIS IN SESE AMITTERET
405
PROPER EGESTATEN PROXIMO IUS SAST DARI
UT CUM UNO AETATEM DEGERET QUOD TU UETAS

---

395 ATAOU: letter T changed to D by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read ADAOU
398 CAUE: at end of line, PHORMIO written by corr. rec. (Pr.)
413 ABUSUS: word SIS written at end of line by corr. rec. (Pr.) after erasure of two or three letters of A (ES?)
ZITA PROXIMO QUIDEM AD NOS UNDE AUT QUAM OB REM A OHE
ACTUM AIUNT NE AGAS Z NON AGAM IMMO HAUD DESINAM
DO NEC PERFECERO HOC A INEPTIS Z SINE MODO
A POSTREMO TECUM JIHI REI NOBIS DEMIOPHST
TUUS EST DAMNATUS GNATUS NON TU TAM TUA
PRAETERIERAT IAM DUCENDA AETAS Z ORNITA HAECE
ILLUM PUTATO QUAE EGO HUNC DICO DIERE
AUT QUIDEM CUM UXORE HAC EPSUM PROHIBEO DOMO
A IRATUS EST TU TE IDEM MELIUS PECERIS
Z ITANNE ES PARATUS FACERE ME ADUORUM OMNIA
INFELIX A METUIT HIC NOS TAMETSI SEDULO
DISSIMULAT E BENE HABENT TIBI PRINCIPIA A QUINTI QUOD
EST
FERUNDUM PERES TUIS DIGNUM FACTIS PECERIS
UT AMICI INTER NOS SIMUS Z ECON TUAM EXPTETAM
AMICITIAM AUT TE IUSUM AUT AUDITUM UELIM
A SI CONCORDABIS CUM ILLA HABEBIS QUAES TUAM
SENECTUTEM OBLICET RESPICE AETATEN TUA
Z TE OBLICET TIBI HASE A MINUE UERO IRAM Z HOC AGE 435
SARTIS IAM UERBORUMST. NISI TU PROPERAS MULIBREM
ABDUCERE EGO ILLAM LICIAM DIXI PHORMO
A SI TU ILLAM ATTIGERER SECUS QUAM DIGNAMST LIBERAM
DICAR TIBI ADPINGAM GRANDEM DIXI DERNPHO
SI QUID OPUS FUERIT HUS DOME E INTELLEGO
Z QUANPA ME CURA ET SOLICITUDE ADPES
GNATUS QUI ME ET SE HISC INPEDIUIT NUPTIIS

426 A: A appears to me to be by another hand but
no editor has noted it
433 CONCORDABIS: sixth letter erased and replaced
by R in the hand of corr. rec. (Pr.)
439 ADPINGAM: letters AD crossed out and IN writ-
ten 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 ab iuise redierit ne iam an nondum domum.

E ego z uidetis quo in loco res habet sit quod acq dicit hegio. Ego cratimus censeo si tibi uidetur z dic cratine y menis uis. Z te y quae in rem tuam sit uelini facias mihi sic hoc uidetur quod te absente hic filius egit restitui in integrum aequum est et bonum et id imperabris dixi z dic nunc hegio.

Ego sedulo dixisse hunc credo uerum itast quod homines tot sententiae suus cuique mos est mihi non uidetur quod sit factum legibus. Rescindi posse et turpe inceptum est z dic crito. Ego amplius deliberandum censeo restituit in non quid non uidetur quod sit factum legibus. Ego antiphonem quaeram ut quae acta hic sint sciat at eccum video in tempore huc se recipere.

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 Z 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.
Itane te hinc abisse et ----m tueam tutandam allis dedisse
alius tuam rem credidisti magis quam tene animum uersuros
nam ut ut erat alia illi certe quae nunc tibi donist
consules

ne quid propter tuam fidem decepta poteretur nulla
cui nunc miserae spes opesque sunt in te omnes sitae 470
b et quideum ere nos iam dudum hic te absentem accusamus qui
aperitis

a --- ipsum quaerebamus sed ea causa nihil magis depectimus
a loqueru obseco quoniam 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 cessauerit pro te entit a nihil fecit
nuui 475
b tum phormio itideem in hac re ut allis strenuum hominem
phaebuit

a quid is fecit b conpatauit uerbis admodum iratum semen
a eu phormio b ego quod potui porro a mi geta omnis uos amo
b sic habent principia sepe ut dixi adhuc tranquilla res es
mansurseque patrum pater est dux audient
480
a quid eum b ut aiebat
de eius consilio sese uelle facere quod hanc rem attinet
a quantum metus est mihi uideres huc saluom num patruum geta
nam per eum exan ut audio aut uiam aut moriar sententiam
b phaedria tibi adest a ubiam b ecum ab sua palestra exit
foras 485

f phaedria e dorio a antipho b geta
adulescens leno adulescens senus

f dorio audio obseco et non audio f parumper et quin mitte
me
f audi quod dicam e et enim tadeit etiam audire eadem miliens
r at nunc dicam quod lubenter e loqueru audio

466 ----M: the first four letters are blurred but the Ms.
tradition reads UTAM
469 POTERETUR: letter O erased and A superimposed by corr.
rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.) to read PATERETUR
471 ACCUSAMUS: letters AC erased and IN superimposed by
corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read INCUSAMUS
472 ----: two letters at beginning of line blurred but Ms.
tradition reads TE
473 LOQUERE: letters LO can be seen on 64r; L-O: two
middle letters blurred but Ms. tradition
reads LOCO
474 -UM: first letter blurred but Ms. tradition reads NUM
476 PRAEBUIT: word SE written above by corr. rec. (Pr.),
   by Iov. 2 (K.)
479 DIXI: word erased and DICO written by corr. rec. (Pr.),
   by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.)
481 AIEBAT: Mar. incorrectly states that A reads AIBAT
Non quoque te exorare ut naevas triduum hoc quo nunc abis e mirabar si tu mihi uitquum adferres noui. 

A ei metuo lenonem nequid suum suat capiti; b idem ego uxorbor nonnun mihi credis e bariolare; sin fidem ddo e fabulae.

Farneratum istuc beneficium pulcher tibi dices e loci. 

Crude mihi gaudebis facto uerum hercle hoc est e somnia. 

Experire non est longum e cantilenam bandom cantis. 

Tu mihi cognatus tu paribus tu e garabru modo.

Aedon ingenio esse duro te atque inexorabili. 

Ut neque misericordia neque precibus koliri queas. 

Aedon te esse incognitam etque infidentem phaedria sine modo.

Ut nea phaleratis ducas dictis et mean ducitis gratius. 

Miseritum est et usum uinius deus ad lamius. 

Neque antipho alia cum occupatur esset sollicitudine. 

Ut hoc esse mihi objectum malum a quid istuc est autem.

O fortunatis sine antipho a egone. 

Ut qui quod amas domis.

Neque cum huius modo uquam tibi usui ut conflictaris malo.

A mihi dominat imo id quod aiturn auribus teneo lupum.

Nan neque quo pacto me amittam neque uti remaneam scio. 

E ipsum istuc mihi in hoc est a heia ne parum lene sius. 

Nunc quid hic conficit hic cine quod hominissimus. 

Pamphilam mean vendidit a quid vendidit a quin vendidit 510. 

Vendidit a quin indum facinus ancillam ere empto sem. 

Neque exorare ut ne maneat et cum illo ut mutet fidem.

Triduum hoc dum id quod est promissum ab amicis argentum auffero.
Si non tum dedero unum praeterea homum ne oppetibus sties et optundis a haud longumst. id quod orat dorio exortet sinesis idem hic tibi quod boni promeritus fuisses conduxuperit et uerba istaec sunt a pampillanne hac urbe priuari sines tunc praeterea eorum aremendum distrahii poterint pati et neque ego neque tu / ri di tibi omnes id quod es digus duint et ego te compluris aduersum ingeniem heim menses tuli 520 pollicitantem et nihil ferentem flentem nunc contra omnia haec repperi qui det neque lacrum-etu da locum melioribus a certe hercle ego si satiis commemini tibi quidem est olim dies quam ad dares huic praestitutam r factum et num ego istud nego a iam ha praeteritit e non uerum haec ei antecessit e non puabet 525 te unaniiss et minime dub ob rem b sterculinium f dorio itane tandem facere opertet e sic sum si placeo utere a sic nunc decipis et immo enim uero antipho hie me decipit nam hic me huius modi sciebat esse ego nunc esse aliter credidi iste me feuellit ego isti nihilo sum aliter ac ful 530 sed ut haec sunt taken hoc faciam cras mane argentum nisi miles dare se dixit si mihi prior tu attuleris phaedria mea leges utar ut potior sit qui prior ad dandum: uale a phaedria a antipho b geta 533a adulescentes ii servuu a quid faciam unde ego nunc subito huic argentum inuentiam miser

515 OPTUNDIS: Ash. incorrectly cites A as reading OPTUNDIS
518 EORUM: letter E changed to H by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read HORUM
519: f: f changed to A by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. 2 (K.). Pr. says A had NEQUE TUM DI TIBE and that corr. ant. (?) Changed M of TUM to Γ
522 LACRUM-ET: letter A between M and E crossed out by A
526: f: f crossed out and A written above by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
533a A: first A crossed out and Γ written to left of it by corr. rec. (Pr.); 533b SERUU: obvious omission of second S at end of word on part of A
534 A: A crossed out and Γ written over it by corr. rec. (Pr.)
CURRINUS NILILOST QUOD HIC SI POTEST FUSET TERTER 535 TRIDUUM HOC PROMISSUM FUERAT A ITANE HIC PATIEMUR QETA FIERI MISERUM QUI NE VDVM UT DIXIT ADPETERET COMITER QUID QUOD OPUS BENEFICIUM RURSUS CI EXPERIEMUR REDDERE B SCI0 EQUIDEM ESSE AEGUOM A AGE SUGO SOLUS SERUARE HUNC POTES B QUID FACIAM A INENIAS ARGENTUM B CUPIO SED UNDE EDOCE 540 A PATER ADEST HIC B SCI0 SED QUID TUM A AH DICTUM SAPIINTI SAT EST B ITANE A IPA B SANE HERCLE PULCHRE SUADES ETIAM TU HINC ABIS NON TRIUMPHO EX NUPTIS TUIS SI NIIIL NANCISOR MALLI ET ETIAM NUNC ME HUTUS CAUSA QUAREERE IN MALO IUEBS CRUCEM A UERUM HIC DICTIT QUID EGO UOBIS ALIENUS SUM B HAUD PUTO 545 SED PARUMNE EST QUOD OMNIBUS NUNC NOBIS SUSCENSET SENEX NE INSTIGEMUS ETIAM UT NULLUS LOCUS RELINQVATUR PRECI R ALIUS AB OCULIS MEIS ILLAM IN IGNOTUM ABDUCIT LOCUM HEM TUM IGITUR DUM LICET DUM ADOSEM LOQUIMINI MECUM ANTIPHO CONTEMPLAMINI NE A QUAN OB REM AUT QUIDNAM FACTURUS CEDO 550 Q QUOQUO HINC ASPORTABITUR TERRARUM CERTUMST PERSEQUI AUT PERIRE B DI BENE UORTANT QUOD AGAS PDEDEPTETPITA TAMEN A UIDE SI QUID OPIS POTES ADFERRE HUIC B SI QUID QUID A QUARE OBSECOSE NE QUID PLUS MINUSUE FAXIS QUOD NOS POST PIGEAT GETA B QUAREO SALUOS EST UT OPINOR UERUM ENIM METUO MALUM 555 A NOLI METERE UNA TECUM BONA MALA TOLERABIMUS B QUANTUM OPUS EST TIBI ARGENTI LOQUERE (SOLAE TRIGINTA TRIGINTA) HUI. PERCARAST PHAEDRIA ISTAEC UERO ULLIS EST B AGE AGE INENTAS REDDAM R O LEPIDUM B AUFER TE HINC R IAM OPUS EST

539 EQUIDEM ESSE: between EQUIDEM and ESSE, six letters of HERCLE erased by A (K.), (Mar.)
540 SED UNDE: word ID written above by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
545 UOBIS ALIENUS: word GHTA written above by Iov. (Pr.), (K.)
544 FAXIS: letter S crossed out and T written above by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
559 INENTAS REDDAM: word EST written above by Iov. (Pr.)
B I AM FERIS SET OPUS EST MIHI PHORKIONEM AD HANC REX
AD VITOREM DARI 560
A PRÆSTOST AUDACISSIME ONERIS QUIDUEIS IMPONE FERET
SOLUS EST HOMO AMICO AMICUS B EAMUS EGO AD EUM OCIUS
A NUNC QUID EST QUOD OPERA MEA UOBIS OPUS SIT B NHILL UERUM
ABI DONUM
ET ILLIAM MISERAM QUAM EGO NUNC INTUS SCIIO ESSE EXAMATUM
METU
CONSOlarE CESSAS A NIIHIL EST AQUE QUOD FACIAM LUBENS 565
G QUA VIA ISTUC PACIES B DICAM IN TINNERE FODO TE HINC ANGUR
Z DE MiPhO E CHERMES

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 Iov. (Pr.).
In his app. crit., K. writes "IMPONI EPP. Iov. (?)
572 ILLI: over second I and to the right, letter C
written by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
to read ILLIC
577 CHER; in his app. crit., Mar. states "A incertum"
579 CONDICIONEM: -reference sign to scholia above
first N
580 DICUNDUM: first C crossed out and E written
above by Iov. (Pr.) to read DICENDUM
582 UOCET: letter C crossed out and L added above
by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to
read UOCLT
TACEBIT DUM INTERCEDET FAMILIARITAS
STIN SPREHERIT ME PLUS QUAM OPUS EST SCITO SCIET
UVEREORQUE NE UXOR ALIQUA HOC RESCISCAT HEC
QUOD SI FIT UT ME EXCUTIAM ATQUE AGREDIAR DOMO
ID RESTAT NAM EGO MEORUM SOLUS SUM MEUS
Z SCIO ESSE ET ISTAEC NIHIL RES SOLlicitudinis
NEQUE ADGO DEPITISCAR UMQUAM EXPERIERTER
DONEC TIBI ID QUOD POLlicitus SUM EFFECERO

A GETA Z DEMIPRO E CHREMES

A EGO HOMINEM CALLIDIOREM UIDI NEMINEM
QUAM PHORMIONEM UENERIO AD HOMINEM UT DICEREM
ARGENTUM ESSE ET ID QUO FACIO FIERET OPUS
UXD DUM DIMITDUM DIXERAM INTELLEXERAT
GAUDEBAT ME LAUDABAT QUAREBDAT SENEM
DIS GRATIAS AGEBAT TEMPUS SIBI DARI
UBI PHAE-------------NIHILO MINUS
AMICUM ESSE QUAM ANTIphoni HOMINEM AD FORUM
IUSSI OPPERIRI EO ME ESSE ADDUCTURUM SENEM
SED ECCUM IPSUM QUIS EST EST.
ULTERIOR ATTAT

PATER UENIT SED QUID PERTINUI AUTEM BELUA
AM QUA QUOS FALLAM PRO UNO DUO SUNT DATI
COMMODIUS ESSE OPTINOR Duplici SPE UTIER
PETAM HINC USDE A PRIMO INSTI IS SI DAT SAT EST
SI AB BO NIHIL FIT TUM HUNC ADORIAR HOSPITEM

588 ESSE: word IMA written above by luv. (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. Let-
ters 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 INSTIISSE
BASILICO AGITA ET GRAEIAE ZEALUM 
ADULCESCENS SERVUS SENIS II

B EXPECTO QUAM MOX RECIPIAT SERE GETA 
SED PATRUM VideO CUm PATRRE ADSTANTEM Ei MIHI 
QUAM TIMEO ADVENTUS HUIUS QUO INPELLAT PATREM 
A ADIBO HOCSE O SALUM NOSTER CRIEME E SALUE GETA 
A VENIRE SALUM UGULP EST E CREDO A QUID AGITUR 
E NULTA ADULEMNTI UT FIT NOVA HIC COMPLURIA 
A ITA DE ANTIPONE AUDISTIN QUAE FACTA E ONNIA 
A TUN DIXERAS HIIC FACTINUS INDIGNUM CHREM 
SIC CIRCUMI E ID CU M HOC AGERAM COMO DUM 
A HAM HERCLE EGO QUODQUO TID AGITANS NECUM SEDULO 
615 INUENQ OPINOR REMEDITM HUIC REI E QUID GETA 
Z QUOD REMEDIT A UT ABl AB TIS FT FIT FORTE OBRIAM 
MIHI PHORIMO E QUI PHORIMO E SI QUi ISTANG E SCIO 
A UTSUM EST MIHI UT BETEMPTA SEMENTIAM 
PRENDO RONIN SOLUM CUr NON INUQAM PHORMIO 
UIDES INTER UOS SIC HAC POTIUS CU M BONA 
UT COMPONAMUS GRATIA QUAM CUM HALA 
ERUS LIBERALIS EST ET PUT FUGITANS LITIUM 
NAM CETERI QUIDEM HERCLE AMICI OMNES 
UNO ORE AU TORS FURET UT PRAECPITEN HANC DARET 625 
B QUID HIC COEPTAM AUT QUD EUNDET HODIE A LAGEBUS 
DATURUM PORNAS DICES SI ILLAM EICERET 
IAM ID EXPLORATUMST. EIA SUDABIS SATIS

608 ADVENTUS: originally A mistakenly wrote ADVENTUENTUS 
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 COMO DUM: reference sign to scholia above the second O 
617 E: E 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
Si con illo incepta homine ea eloquentia est. 

...
ALIQUANTULUM QUAE ADPERRET UT DISSOLVEREM QUAE DEBEOR ETIAM NULLAM SI UOLT DEMPHO DARE QUANTUM AB HAC ACCIPIO QUAE SPONSAST MIHI QUID SI ANIMAM DEBET A AGER OPPOSITUS PIGNORI QUAE DEBEOR ETIAM SI UOLT DEMPHO AEDICULAE ITEM SUNT OB DECEM ALIAS Z OIEI NIMIUNVE ET NE CLAMA PETITO NASCE A ME DECEM UXORI EMUNDA ANCTILLULAST FUM PLUGSCULA SUPELLECTILE OPUS ES SUMPTUM AD NUPTIAS HAB REBUS SANE PONE INQUIT DECEM MINAS SESCENTAS PRONDE SCRIBITI MIHI DICAS NIHIL DO ILLE UT ETIAM INRIDEAT QUESO EGO DABO QUESCE TU MODO FILLUM FAC UT ILLAM DUCAT NOS QUAM VOLUMUS B EI MIHI GETA OCCIDISTI ME TUIS FALLACIII MEA CAUSA EICITUR ME HOC EST AEQUOM AMITTERE QUANTUM POTEST ME CERTOREM INQUIT FACES SI ILLAM DANT HANC UT TAM NE INCERTUS SIEM HAN ILLI MIHI DOTH1 IAM CONSTITUERUNT DARE IAM ACCIPIT ILLIS REPUDIEM RENUNTIET HAN DUCAT A QUAE QUIEM ILLI RES UORTAT MALE OPPORTUNE ADEO ARGENTUM NUNC MECUM ATTULI
FRUCTUM QUEM LEMNI UXORIS REDDUNT PRAEDUM

B ANTIPHO A GETA

ADULESCENS SERUUS

B GETA A HEM B QUID EGISTI A EMUNXI ARGENTO SENES

B SATINE EST A NESCIO HERCLE TANTUM TUSSEI SUM

B EGO UEBBERO ALIUD MIHI RESPONDAS AC ROGO

A QUID ERGO NARRAS B QUID EGO NARREM OPERA TUA

AD RESTUM MIHI QUIDEM RES REDIT PLANISSIME

UT TE QUIDEM OMNES DI DEAEQUE SUPERI INFERI

MALI EXEMPLIS PERDANT EM SI QUID UELLIS

HOC MANDES QUOD QUIDEM RECTUM UELLIS

QUID MINUS UTILIBI FUIT QUAM HOC UOLNUS TANGERE

AUT NOMINARE UXOREM INIICTA EST SPES PATRI

POSSUM ILLAM EXTUDE CEDO NUNC PORRO PHORBUS

DOTEI SI ACCIPPIET UXOR DUCENDA EST DOMUM

QUID FIET A NON ENIM DUCET B NOUI CETERUM

CUM ARGENTUM REPETE DOMUS CAUSA SCILICET

IN NERUOM POTIUS IBIT A NIIHIL EST ANMIPHO

QUIN MALO NARRANDO POSSIT DEPRAUARIER

TU ID QUOD BONI EST EXCERPIS DICIS QUOD MALI

Audi TIBI EGO NARREM OPERA TUA

SPATIUM QUIDEM TANDEM APPARANDAS NUPTIAS

UCANDI SACRIFICANDI DABITUR PAULULUM

681 INDE: cancel marks over N and E by Iov. (K.)

683 EST: word id written above by Iov. (Pr.), (K.)

690 UOLNUS: letters O and N crossed out and C

written above N by corr. rec. (Pr.),

by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Ash.) to read UOLCONS

701 APPARANDAS: letter I written above last A by corr.

rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read APPARANDID;

NUPTIAS: letter I written above last A by corr. rec.

(Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read NUPTIID

702 SACRIFICANDI: first I converted to E by corr.

rec. (Pr.) to read SACRIFICANDI
INTEREA AMICI QUOD POLLICITI SUNT DABINT
INDE ISTE REDDET B QUAM OB REM AUT QUID DICET A ROGAS
QUOD RES POSTILLA MONSTRA EUEHERUNT MIHI
INTRO IIT IN ABDIS ATER ALIENUS CANIS
ANGUIS PER INFLUUIUM DECIDIT DE TEGULIS
GALLINA CECINIT INTERDIXIT HARIOLUS
HARISPEX UETUIT ANTE BRUNAM AUTEM NOUI
NEGOTII INCIPERE QUAR CAUSAT IUSTISSIMA
HAEC FIERT B UT MODO FIANT A FIERT ME UIDE
PATER EXIT ABI DIC ESSE ARGENTUM PHAEDRIAEM

Z DEIMPHO E CHREMES A GETA
SINES II SERUUS

Z QUIETES ESTO INQAM EGO CURABO NE QUID UERBORUM DUIT
HOC TEMERE NONQUE AMITTAM EGO A ME QUIN MIHI TESTIS
ADHEBEAM
CUM DEM ET QUAM OB REM DEM CONMEMORABO A UT CAUTUST UBI
NIHIL OPUS 715
E ATQUI ITA OPUS FACTUS. ET NATURA DUM LIBIDO EADEM HAEC
MANET
NAM SI ALTERA ILLAC MAGIS INSTABIT FORSITAN NOS RECIAT
Z REM IPSAM PUTASTI DUC ME AD EUM EGO A NON MOROR E UBI HOC
ECERIS
TRANSITO AD UXOREM MEAM UT CONVENIAT HANC PRIUS QUAM HINC
ABIT
DICAT EAM DARE NOS PHORMIONI NUPTRUM NE SUSCENSEAT
Z NON MAGIS ESSE ILLAC MAGIS INSTABIT FORSITAN NOS RECIAT
Z REM IPSAM PUTASTI DUC ME AD EUM EGO A NON MOROR E UBI HOC
ECERIS
NON SATIS EST TUEM TE OFFICIAM FECISSE SI NON ID PHORMIONI
ADPROBAT
ULO IPSIS QUOQUE VOLUNTATE HAEC FIERI NE SE ELECTAM
PRAEDICET 725

710 INCIPERE: first I inserted above the line before N
by A (Pr.)
713 DUIT: letter N added above IT by corr. rec. (Pr.),
by Iov. (K.) to read DUIT
724 ID: letters EN added above the line after ID by Iov.
(Pr.), (K.) to read IDEM
z Ídeh ego istuc facere possum e mulier mulieri magis conquinuit.

z rogabo e ubi illas nunc ego reperire possim cogito.

ω Sophrona e Cynikes.

Nuristic e senex.

Quid agam quem nihii amicum inueniam misera aut quo consilia habe.

Reperam aut unde auxilium petam.

Nam uereor era ne ob meum suadum indigam iniuria.

Adjicatur 730.

Ita patrem adulescentis facta haec tolerare audio uiolenter

E nam quae haec anus est examinata a fratre quae egressast

Quod ut facerem egestas ne inpulit cum scirem infrabras nuptias.

Hacse esse ut id consulerem interer a uita ut in tuto foret

certe edepol nisi me animus fallit aut parum prospicient

Oculi 735.

Meae nutricem gnatae uideo neque ille inquestatur.

E qui est eiusmod ad me ad me manho dum haec quae loquitur

Quod si eum nunc reperire possim nihii est quo uerdar

E eas IPSA.

Concoquor quis hic loquitur e Sophrona.

E et meum nomem nominat

E respice ad me e di obserco uos estme hic stilpho e non

Negas 740.

E concede hinc a foribus paululum istorsum sodes Sophrona

Ne me istoc posthac nomine appellarritis quid non obsecro

E quem semper te esse dictasti e st quid has metuis fores

e conclusam hic habeo uxorlem saevam uerum istuc de nomine

Eo perperam olim dixi ne uos forte infrudentes foris 745.

\[736 \text{ ago: above letter O, only M written very lightly by Iov. (Pr.), (K.)} \]

\[737 \text{ Adeo: letters written above the line after Adeo by Iov. (Pr.), (K.) to read ADEOE; HAECE in his app. crit., K. states "HAEC A: EA Iov. (?)". Letters H and C appear to me to \E} crossed out leaving AE as the reading. These are the only visible corrections.\]
EFFUTTIRETIS ATQUE ID PORRO ALIQUA UXOR HAE RESCISCERET
Θ ISTOC POL NOS TE TIC INUENDRE MISERAE NUNQUAM POTUINUS
Ε ΕΡΟ DIC NIHI QUID RSI TIBI EST CUM FAMILIAE FAC EAC EXIS
UBI ILLAE SUNT Θ MISERAM ME E HER QUID EST UUONTE
Θ UIUIT Qnata
MATREM IPSAM EX AEGRITUDINE HAC MISERAM MORS CONSECUITA
EST 750
E MALE FACTUM Θ EGO AUTEM QUAE ESSEN ANUS DESERTA ARGES
IGNOTA
UT POTUI UIRGINEM NUPTUM LOCAI HUIC ADULESCENTI
HARUM QUI EST DOMINUS AEDlUM E ANTIPHONIN Θ EN ISTI IPSI
Ε QUID DUASNES UXORES HABET Θ AU OBSECRU UNAM ILLE QUIDEM
HANC SOLAM
Ε QUID ILLAM ALTERAM QUAE DICITUR COGNATA Ο HABEC EREX
Ε QUID AIS 755
Θ COMPOSITO FACTUMST. QUO MODO HANC AMAN HABERE POSSIET
SINE DOTE E DI UESTRA PIDE QM QUAE FORTE TEMERE
BUENUNT QUAE NON AUDDEA OPTARE OFFENDI ADUENTIENS
QUOCUM UOLEBAM ET UT UOLEBAM CONLOCATAM AMARI
QUOD NOS AMBO OPERE DABAMUS OPERAR UT FIERET 760
SINE NOSTRA CURA MAXIMA SUA CURA SOLUS FECIT
Θ NUNC QUID OPUS FACTO SIT UIDE PATER ADULESCENTIS UENIT
EUMQUE ANIMO INIQUO HOC OPPIDO AIENT E NIHIL PERICLlST
SED PER DEOS ATQUE HOMINES MEAN ESSE HANC CAUE RESCISCAT
Θ QUIDquam
Θ NEMO E ME SCIBIT E SEQUERE ME INTUS CETERA AUDIES 765

761 SOLUS: letters US erased and A superimposed by corr.
rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read SOLA. K. attributes LA to Iov.
766 MALIS: letter I changed to 0 by corr. rec. (Pr.), by
Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.) to read MALOS
ITA FUGIAS NE PRAETER CASAM QUOD DICUNT NONNE ID SATIS ERAT ACCIPERE AB ILLO INIURIAM ETIAM ARGENTUM: ULTIMO OBJECTIONE UT SIT QUI UUAAT NUM ALIUT ALIQUID FLAGITII CONFICIAT 770 A --ANISSIME IIS NUNC PRAEEMUDE, QUI NON PERE FACIUNT A --ANIISSIME E UT STULTISSIME QUIDEM ILLE REM GESSERIMUS A NODO UT HOC CONSILIO POSSIBIT DISCHI TU ISTAM DUCAT Z ETIAMHE ID DUBIUMST A HAUD SICIO HERCLE UT HOMOST AN MUTET ANIMUM Z IEM MUTET AUTEM Z HESCIUS UERUM SI PORE DICO 775 Z SIC FACIAM UT PRAETER CENSUIR UT UXOREM EUS HOC ADDUCAN CUM ISTA UT LOQUITUR TU GETA AB PRAE NUNTIA HANC UERUTURM A ARGENTUM INVENTUMST PHAEODIR DE TURSEI SILETUR PRORUTIUS EST NE IN PRAESENTI HAEC HINC ASBAT QUID NUNC PORRO QUID FIT IN EODEM LUTO HAEISIS TORSURAM SOLUER 780 GETA PRAESENS QUOD FUERAT MALUM IN DIEM ABIIT PLAGAE NISI PROSPICIAS NUNC HINC DOMUM IDO AC PHANUM EDOCEO NE QUID UEREATUR PHORMIONEM AUT EUS ORATIONEM Z DEMIPHO B NAUSISTRATA SENEX MULIER Z AGE DUM UT SOLES NAUSISTRATA FAC ILLA UT PLACEATUR NOBIS UT SUA VOLTATATE ID QUOD EST FACIUNDUM FACIAT B FACTAM 785 Z PARITER NUNC OPERA ME ADUIUS AC RE DUDUM OPITULATA ES B FACTUM UOLO AC POL MINUS QUO UIRI UIRI CULPA QUAM ME DIGNUMST Z QUID AUTEM B QUIT POL MEI PATRIS BENE PARTA INDIGENTUR TUTATUR NAM EX IIS PRAEDES TALENTA ARGENTITI BINA STATIM CAPEBAT UIR UIRIO QUID PRAESTAT Z BINAN QUESO 790

768 PRAETER: letters MITTAS written above the line after PRAETER by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read PRAETERMITTAS; DICUNT: letters DIC erased and IA superimposed by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read AIUNT
770 CONFICIAT: second I crossed out, letter N written above the line and the C changed to an uncial G (according to Ms. tradition) have disappeared. Iov. does not touch the codex here (Pr.)
771A --ANISSIME: traces of the character designation A remain but the first two letters of the first word PL (according to Ms. tradition) are not visible due to page damage
776 SIC: word SIC (?) erased and ITA superimposed by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.)
780 UORSURAM: letter O erased and E superimposed by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read UERSURAM
790 UIR: word EM written above UIR by Iov. (Pr.), (K.), by A2 (Mar.)
B AC REBUS ULLORIBUS MILTO TAMEN TALENTA BINA Z HUI
B QUID HAC EIDENTUR Z SCILICET B URUM ME NAT UELLEM
EGO OSTENDEREM Z CERTO SCIO B QUO FACTO Z PARCE SODES
UT POSSIS CUM ILLA ME TE ADULESCENS MULIER DEFETICT

B NAUSISTRA T E CHREMS Z DEMPHO
MULIER SEINES II

B FACTAM UT IUBES SED MEUM URUM ABS TE EXIRE VIDEO
E HEM DEMPHO 795
IAM ILLI DATUM EST ARGENTUM Z CURAUI ILICO E HOMEL
DATUM
EI VIDEO UXOREM PAENS PLUS QUAM SAT EAT Z CUR NOLLES

EIAM RECTE Z QUID TU ECQUID LOCUTUS CUM ISTAC QUOD REM
HANC DUCIM--

E TRANSIGI Z QUID AIT TANDEM E ABDUCI NON POTEST Z QUI NON
POTEST
E QUIA UTERQUE UTRIQUE EST CORDI Z QUID ISTUC NOSTRA
E MAGNI PRATERHAC 800
COGNATAM COMPERI ESSE NOSIS Z QUID DELIRAS SIC ERIT
NON TEMERE DICO REDI MECUM IN MEMORIAM SATINE SANUS ES
B AU OBSERCO UIDE NE INCOGNATAM PIECES Z NON EST E NI NEGA
PATEM
E NORAT Z CUR ALTU DIXIT E NUMQUAMNE HODIE CONCEDES
NEQUE INTELLEGES Z SI TU NIHIL NARRAS E PERDIS B MIRROR
QUID HOC SIET 805
B UT PROPELOR ILLI QUAM EGO SUM AC TU NEMOST Z DI UESTRAN
EAMUS AD IPSAM UNA OMNIS NAS AUT SCIRE AUT NESCIRE HOC
UOLO E AH
Z QUID EST B ITAN PARUM MINI FIDEM ESSE APTE TE Z UIN ME
CREDERE 810
EIN SATIS QUEASTUM MINI ISTUC ESSE AGE FIAT QUID ILLA
FILLIA
AMICI NOSTRI QUID FUTURUM E RECTE Z HANC IGITUR MITTIMUS
E QUID HZ E ILLA MANERAT E SIC B IRE IGITUR TIBI LICIT
NAUSISTRA 813
Z EQUIDEM HERCLE NESCIO UIN SCIRE AT ITA ME SERUET
IUPPITER 809

792 NAT UELLEM: letters UM written above the line after
NAT by Iov. (Pr.) to read NATUELEM. Har. incorrectly states A as reading
NATUELEM

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 SCIRE, E erased (Pr.)
B Sic pol commodius esse in omnis arbitror quam ut coeperas

marere hanc nam par liberalis ussit cum uidi mihi 815
z quid iustum negotist et ianne opperuit ostitum z iam e o

Iuppiter

di nos respicient gnatin inihi nuptam cum tuo filio
z hem

quo pacto potuit e non satis tutus est ad narrandum hic
locus

2 at tu intro abi e heus ne fili qui dem hoc nostri
resciscat uolo

b antipho

adulescens

b laetus sum ut meae res seh habent pratri optigisse quod
vult 820

quam scitumst eius modi in animo pare cupiditates
quas cum res aduersae sient paulo medihi possis
hic simul argumentum reperirit cura seh expeduit
ego nullo possim remedio ne evoluerit ex his turbis
quin si hoc celeetur in metu sin patet in probo stem 825
neque me domum nunc reciperem ni mihi esset spepes ostenta
huiusc habendae sed ubinam getam inuenire possim
ut rogen quod tempus conueniunt patrie me capere suadeat

y phormio b antipho

parasitus adulescens

y argumentum accepi tradidi lenoni abdux mulierem

cur au prapro patria poteretur nam emissat

manu 830

nunc uia mihi res etiam restat quae est conficienda optium
ab senibus ad potandum ut habeam nam aliud hic sumas
dies

b sed phormiost quiq ais y quid b quidnam nunc facturus

phaedria

817: Pr. suggests M as a correction in a line 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 PARARE. First E
was supposed to be changed to A to read
PARARE
Quo pacto satietatem amoris ait se uelle absumere

111

Phorn.
849 PÆRÆT: letter T crossed out and S written above by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read PÆRÆS
850 UÆPÆLÆIA: letters BIS written above by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.), (Ash.) to read UÆPÆLÆIS
851 MÆTÆÅ: letters NI written above by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read MÆTÆÅ
852 CÆNGÆDIÆRE: letter A crossed out and I changed to E by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read CÆNGÆREDÆRE
853 OÆRÆTAÆSSIONE: letter N crossed out and NO written above OR by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.) to read OÆRÆTAÆSSIONE
854 DÆLÆÆRE: 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.
In Gaecum ire occipio, puer ad me accurrirt miti. Fidix integram ut sit. Pone reprehendit pallio resupinat respicio rogo. Quam ob rem retineat me sit esse uti iterum intro ad eram.

Sophronia modo pratem huc inquit senes introduxit.

Chremem 865

Euqny nunc esse intus cum illis huc ubi ego audii ad foras

Suspenso gradu placide ire perexi accessi assistiti animam compressi aurem admoi ita animum cospi attendere huc modo sermonem captans. Ei geta a hic pulcherrimum facinus auditi itaque pae ne hercle exilamai gaudiu 870

B quo ad quo nam arbitrare. B nescio a atqui hirificissimae patruus suas est pater intus sieniux uxori tuae.

B quid aumo a cum eius consueuit olu tres ratione.

Quid a quo arbitrate b nescio a atqui hirificissimae patruus suas est pater intus sieniux uxori tuae.

B quid aumo cum eius consueuit olu tres ratione.

Clanculum

Y somnium utin haec ignoraret suum patrem a aliquid credito phormio esse causae sed semis cenius potius eis.

875 intellegere extra ostium intus quae inter esse ipsi
egerint

B atque ego quoque inauduit eam fabulam a imo etiam. Dabo quo hagis credas patruus interea Indie huc egreditur foras haud mutuo poste cum patre idem inde recipere se intro duoduo.

Ait uterque tibi potestatem eius adhibendae dare 880

Denique ego missus sum te ut requirerem atque adducerem.
Vale Y VALLIANTIPER GRANDITIAE(MAXIMUS),

Y PRORARIO

Y TANTAM FIUMQINQRONIPRIA ESSE HIS DATAM

SUNNA ELUDENDI OCCASIST MIHI NUNC SENES

ET PHAEKDRIA CURAM ADIMERE ARGENTARIAM

NE QUOTQUAM SUORUM AQUALIUM SUPPLEX SIET

NAM IDEM HOC ARGENTUM ITA UT DATUMST: INGRATISS

EX DATUM ERIT HOC QUI COGAM RE TPSEA REPPERI

NUNC GESTUS MIHI VOLTUSQUE EST CAPIENDUS NODOS

SED HINC CONCEDAM IN ANTIHORTUM HOC PROXIMUM

INDE HISCE OSTENDAM ME UBI ERUNT EGRESSI FORAS

QUO ME ADSIMULAREM IRE AD MERCATUM NON EOR

Z DEMPHO E CHREMES Y PHORMIO

SENES II PARASITUS

Z DIS MAGNAGNAS MERITO GRATIAS HABEO ATQUE AGO

QUANDO EUENERE HAEC NOS FRATER PROSPERE

QUANTUM POTEST NUNC CONVENIENDUS EST PHORMIO

PRIUS QUAM DILAPIDAT NOSTRAS TRIGINTA MINAS

UT APFARMUS Y DEMIPHONEM SI DONIST

UISAM UT QUOD Z AD NOS AD TE IBAMUS PHORMIO

Y DE EADEM HAC FORTASSE CAUSA Z ITA HERCLE Y CREDDI

QUID AD ME IBATIS Z RIDICULUM Y UEREBAMINI

NE NON ID FACEREM QUOD RECEPISSE SEMESEM

882 HEUS: HEUS crossed out and words O MI written above by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
Heus qualia quanta iacet ne paupertas est tamen
adhuc curaui unum hoc quidem ut mihi esset fides
z estne ita ut dixi liberalis e oppido
y idque adeo uenio ad uos nunquam demipho
paratum ne esse ubi uolitissimum date
nam omnis posthac mihi res ita ut par fuit
postquam id tantopere uol uelle animadueram
z ad hic dehorsatus est ne ne illam ibi darem
nam qui erit rumor populi inquit si id feceris
olim cum honeste potuit tum non est data
eam nunc extrudis turpest ferme eadem omnia
quae tute dudum coram me incusaueras
y saties superbe inluditissis me qui uogas
quia ne alteram quidem illam potero ducere
nam quo re redibo ad eam quam contemptism
et tum autem antiphonem video ad se ne amittere
iniitum eam inque 2 tum autem video illiium
iniitum sane multierem ab se amittere
sed transi sodes ad forum atque illam mihi
argentum cursum iube rescribit Phormio
y quodque ego discrissi porbo illis quibus debui
z quid igitur fact et si suis mihi uoxem dare
quam despondisti ducam sin est. ut uelis
manere iiam apud te dos hic maneat demipho
nam non est aequum ne propter uos decipi

915 SATIS: letter N written above second S by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.) to read SATIN
917 RE: letter O written above the line before RE by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read ORE; REDIBO AD: letters REDIBO A seem to be retouched by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
921 ILLIT: letter T added above the line after ILLU by A (Pr.)
925 SIN: letter N written above I by A (Pr.)
Cum ego uestri honoris causa repudium ALTERAE
REMISERIM QUAE DOTIS TANTUDEM DABAT
Z I IN MALAM REM EIRC Cum ISTANC MAGNIFICENTIA
FUGI TUE ETIAM HUNC CREDIS TE IGNORARIES
AUT TUA FACTA ADEO Y INRITOR Z TUE HANC DUCERES
SI TIBI DARETUR Y FAC PERICULUM Z UT FILLUS
CUM ILLA HABIT ABUT TE HOC UESTRUM CONSILIUM FUIT
Y QUEASO QUID NARRAS Z QUIN TU MIHI ARGENTUM CEDO
Y INMO UERO UXOREM TU CEDO Z IN IUS AMBULA
Y IN IUS ENIM UERO SI PORRO ESSE ODIOSI PÆRGIS
Z QUID FACIES Y EGONE UOS ME INDOTATIS MODO
PATROCINARI PORTASSE ARBITRANTIMI
ETIAM DOTATIS SOLEO E QUID ID NOSTRA Y NIIHIL
HIC QUANDAM NORAM CIUIS UIR UXOREM E HEM Z QUID EST
Y LEMNI HABUIT ALIAM Y NULLUS SUM Y EX QUA FILLIAM
SUBSEP ET EAM CLAM EDUCAT E SEPUTUS SUM
Y HAEC ADEO ILLI TAM DENABRASO E OBSECRO
NE FACTIAS Y OH TUNE IS ERAS Z UT LUDOS FACIT
E MISSUM TE FACTUM Y FABULAE E QUID UOS TIBI
ARGENTUM QUOD HABES CONDOMARUM TE Y AUDIO
QUID UOS MALUM ERO MIH SIC LUDIFICABAMINI
INEPTI UESTRA PÆRILI SENTENTIA
NOLO UOLO UOLO NOLO RURSUM CAPE CEDO
950 QUOD DICTUM INDICTUMST. QUOD MODO ERAT RATUM INRITUMST
E QUO FACTO AUT UNDE HAEC HIC RESPuuIT Z NESCEO
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 hic si quid iubet
et assequere retine dum ego huc seruos euoco
et enim nequeo solos accurrere y una in uiriast
tecum z lege agito ergo y alterast tecum chiem
et rape hunc y sic agitis enim uero uocest opus
nauisstrata exit e os opprime inpurum uide
quantum ualet y nauisstrata inquam z non taces
y tacean z nisi sequitur pugnos inuenirem ingere
y uel oculum excule est ubi uos uliscar probo
b nauisstrata e chremes z demipho y phormio
mulier senes ii parasitus

b qui nominat me hem quid istuc turbaeast obsecuro
mi uir y hem quid nunc obstipuisu b quis hic homost
non mihi respondes y hicine ut tibi respondent
qui hercle ubi sit- nescit e caue isti quicquam credas
y abi tange si non totus friget me enica
e ni nihil est b quid ergo quid istic narrat y iam
scies

ausculta e pergine credere b quid ego obseque huc
credam qui nihil dixit y delirat miser
timore b non pol temerest quod tu tam times
et egeo timeo y recte saine quando nihil times
et hoc nihil est quod ego dico tu narrar z scelus 1000

988 inuenirem: second i changed to t by corr. rec.
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
DE QUAE TEMPORIS ANNO MORTEM OBIVIT . . .

IBI NARRAT Y OHE TU FACTUMST. ABS TE SEDULO
PRO FRATRE B MI NON MIHI DICES E A.T B QUID AT
E NON OPUS EST DICTO Y TIBI QUIDEM AT- SCITO HIC OPUS
IN LEMNO 2 IEM QUID AIS 2 NON TACES Y CLAM TE E TI
MIHI

Y UXOREM DUXIT B MI HOMO DI HELIUS DUINT
Y SIC FACTUMST B PERI MISERA Y ET INDE FILIAM
SUSCIPIT IAM URAN DUM TU DORMIS E QUID AGINUS
B PRO DI IMMORTALIS FACTUS MISERANDUM ET MALUM
Y HOC ACTUMST B AN QUICQUAM HODIEST FACTUM INDIGNIUS
QUI MIHI AD UXORES UENTUNTST_ TUM FIUNT SENES

DEMIPHO TE APELLO NAM CUN HOC IPSO DISTAEBAT LOQUI
HAECINE ERANT ITIONES CREBRAE ET MANSIONES DIUTINAE
LENNI HAECINE ERAT EA QUAE NOSTROS MINUIT FRUCTUS UILLITAS
2 EGO NAUSISTRATA ESSE IN HAC RE CULPAM MERITUM NON NEGO
SJD EA QUIN SIT IGNOSENTIA Y UERBA FIUNT MORTUO
1015
Z NAM NEQUE NECELENTIA TUA NEE ODO IO FECIT TIO
UINOLENTUS FERE ADHINC AHNOS QUINDECIM MULIECULAR
EAM COMPRESSIT UNDER HAC NATAS NEQUE POSTILLA UNQUAM
ATTIGIT

EA MORTE OBIT DE MEO ABIIT QUI FUIT IN RE HAC SCRIPULUS
QUAM OB REM TE ORO UT ALIA FACTA TUA SUNT QEHU ELSISO
FERS 1020

B QUID EGO AEUO ANIMO CUPIO MISERA IN HAC RE IAM DEFUGIER
SED QUID SPEREM AETATUM PORRO MINUS PECCATURUM FUDEM
IAM TUM EAT· SENEX SENCETUS SI UEREBUNDOS FACIT
AN MIA FORMA ATQUE AETAS HUNC MAGIS QUAM TUNC EXPETENDAST
DEMIPHO

1003 EST DICTO: BETWEEN THESE TWO WORDS, LETTER O CROSSED OUT BY A
1009 B:B WRITTEN ABOVE THE LINE BEFORE AN BY RUBRICATOR (PR.)
1011 CUM: LETTERS NE WRITTEN ABOVE BY CORR. REC. (PR.), BY Iov.
LETTER T ADDRESSED TO TO READ MEUCUM IPSO
WORD CROSSED OUT BY Iov. (K.)
1013 HERTUM: LETTER U CROSSED OUT AND A WRITTEN ABOVE
BY CORR. REC. (PR.) , BY Iov. (K.), BY A2 (MAR.)
TO READ HERTUM
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 QUAM TUNC: WORDS CROSSED OUT BY CORR. REC. (PR.), BY Iov. (K.)
Quid mihi hic adfert quam ob rem expectem aut sperem foro non fore
exsequias chremeti quis est commodum ire em tempus est
sic dabo age nunc phormicen qui ulget laccisito
paxo talii sit pactatus atque hic est infortunio
redeat same in gratiam supplici sat sis mihi
habet haec ei quod dum utque ad aures offianiat
b at nee merito credo quid ego nunc ea commenorem demipho
singulatim qualis ego in hunc fuerim si noui aequo omnia
tecum b meriton hoc meo uidetur factum z minime gentium
ubrum iam quando accusando fieri infectum non potest
ignoce orat confitetur furgat quid uis amplius
1035 y enim uero prius quam haec dat ueniam mihi prospiciam et
phaedriae
heus nausistrata prius quam huic responds temere audire
b quid est
y egon minas triginta per fallaciem ab illoc abstuli
eas dedi tuo gnato is pro sua amica lenone dedit
e hem quid aios b aedon hoc indignum tibi uidetur filius
1040 homo adulescents si habet unam amicam tu uxores duas
nihil pudere quo ore illum obiurgabis respondes mthi
z faciet ut uolles b imo ut xemiam scias sentientiam
neque ego ignogo neque promitto quicumque neque respondes
prios quam gnatum uidero siue iudicio permitto omnia
quod is iubebit facian y mulier sapientes es nausistrata
b satin tibi est y imo uero pulchre discerno 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 uin Porphio
vestrae familiae Hercule amicus et tuo summis Phaedriae
B Porphio at ego Ecastor posthac quod potero quod uoles 1050
factamque et diciam y benigne dicis B pol meritumst tuum
y uin prihnum hodie facere quod ego gaudeam nauisstrata
et quod tuo uiro oculi doleant B cupio y ne ad cenam uoca
B pol uiro uoco y eamus intro hic B fiat set ubi est
Phaedria
iudex 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.2

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

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

53v

Top Margin:

1 [haec acta est ludis Megalensibus Chorinto (Cornelio)*
   Merula aedile curuli et L. Postumio alstro (Albino)*/
   [3?] agentibus in rebus Cassio Atilio et Bambio
   (Ambrilio),* modificante Flacco Claudi filio tibiis
   Serranis/[2?]; tota deuerbis quoque facetissimis
   et gestum disiderantibus scaenicum et suauissimis
   ornatis/ [cant]icis fuisse dictaque (fuit. edita-) est
   quarto loco com<edia>, Valerio et G. Fannio consulibus.

Left Margin: POSTQUAM

[nota postquam] apud uete/[res non modo praeterito
   tem/[pori sed etiam praesenti iungi/ [ut postquam
   nos Amaryllis/ [habet G<aleata> r<eliquit>. quamqua]m
   sunt qui/ [postquam pro q]uoniam ac/[c]ipi uelint].

Suprascript: POETA UETUS

Luscius Lanuuinus

*The didascalia of the mss. of the Calliopian family and
the Commentum Donati support these names.*
Right margin:
2 transeunte: 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]enicorum/<m>/ [comparat et laed]et (-it)
   aduer/[sarium].

Left margin DICAT-COGITET

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

Bottom margin, with reference wrongly to line 16

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

Right, with reference sign to LACESSISSET PRIOR

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

Right margin: NOUUS

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

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

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

54r

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

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

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

Suprascript: ADLATUM

21 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 qu<a>er<it>is.

Left margin: ADPORTO NOUAM

adporto nouam: / sed Latinam.
Left, with reference sign to EPIDICAZOMENON

(Mountford's edition reads "right")

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

Suprascript: LATINI

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

Bottom margin, with reference to GRAEICI

formon dicitur gr<ae>ecum (-us) spartum (-us); ab hoc parasito nomen est, vel ex [uentris]/ capacitate; unde Formio correpta prima syllaba Apollodorum e[st. non a for]/mula ut quidam putant. ergo inde parasitus uilissimae 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 φoρMioNeM dici non φaρΜioNeM a [formione]/ conpositum. φoρΜioN enim non φuρΜioN Gr<ae>eci scribunt. et forma cum [dicitus sylla]/bam producimus non corripimus.

("enim non" are in majuscules except e which is uncial; M, N, R are often used in the Greek words)
Right margin: PRIMAS

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

Top margin, with reference sign to RES

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

Right margin: PER SILENTIUM

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

Right margin: MOTUS LOCOST

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

Bottom margin, with reference sign to LOCOST

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

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

antiqui sic ma/luerunt quam / adiuuans.

[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 facetiae<ue> cernuntur et
talis (sales) comoeci. id enim est artis poetics ut
dum narrationi argumenti detur opera idem tamen res
agi/ et comoedia spectari uideatur.

Left margin:
[amicus a voluntate, po/[pularis a fortuna]. popula/
[ris eiusdem condicionis/ [generisque; Sallustius
popu/[laris sceleris] sui.

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

Suprascript: POPULARIS
socius.

Suprascript: ERAT EI
36 deest nam.

Top margin, extreme left. Reference sign over RATIUNCULA
36-7 [opportuna]/ diminutio in ser/[orum] ma[xima
paup]/[ertate]. pausillulum,/ [quartus] gradus
di/[minationis]: paulum/ [paululum pauxillum
pau]xillulu<m>.
Left margin: CONFICEREM

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

Right margin: CONFECI

quasi reddendi mora/ <non> <h>abere fuit.
(Solidus in Mountford's edition is omitted)

Suprascript: NAM...EIUS

39 mire se adplicat ad argumentum.

Suprascript: EI

40 uxori.

Right margin: CONRADITUR

apta in uerbo difficultas, ut/ minas decem Conradet
ali/cunde et conra/si omnia.
(Scribe wrote "difficoltas" and then wrote "u" over "o")

Left margin:

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

Right margin:

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


Right, with reference sign to DEMENSO

uel a mense uel a mensura.

Right margin: GENIUM

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

Suprascript: CONPERSIT

seruauit.

Right margin: PARTUM

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

Left margin: FERIETUR


Right margin: NATALIS

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

50 facete de mulieribus.

Right margin: ACCIPE

52 hoc cum gestu offerentis/ dicitur.

Left, with reference sign to: LECTUMST

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

Bottom margin: AMO TE

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

Right margin: HABEO GRATIAM

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

55r

Suprascript: HABENDAST GRATIA

56 deest ei.

Right margin:

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

Right margin: SED
discensus ad argumentum.

Right margin: METU ET ... PERICULO
et futuri tempor(is periculum)/ diciet et futuri me(tum).

SED
58 necessario ignarus inducitur Da(us ut narrandi/
sit locus.

MODO
59 modo:/ tantummodo, ut Urgilius modo Iup/iter
adsit.

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

PLECTAR
220 puniar
Left margin: CENTURIATUS

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

239 Only traces of a two-line scholium remain.

Right margin: ECCERE

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

Right margin: BONA UENIA

378 sine lite.

Suprascript: UENIA

    gratia.

Left margin: EXPISCARE

382 fraudulenter temp/tare.

Suprascript: PORROST

474 dehinc in futuru<m>.

Left margin: CONFUTAUIT

477 redarguit.
Suprascript: SUAT
491 excogitet.

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

Right margin: GARRI
496 res ineptas loquere.

Suprascript: TRIUMPHO
543 gaudeo.

Left, with reference sign to CONDICIONEM
579 nuptiarum.

Suprascript: ALIQUA
585 aliquo modo.

Right margin: BELUA
601 stultus.

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

nuptum daret, / id est conlocaret.

Suprascript: SUSCEPISSE

abuisse.

Right margin: EMUNXI ARGENTO SENES

argentum [ei]s abstuli.

Right margin: MINUS UTIBILE

uitiosum et peri/culosum.

(peri- and -osum seen on 67v)

Left margin: QUOT RES

quantae causae.

Right margin: HARIOLUS

diuinandi peritus.

Right margin: NAM QUAE

pro quaenam./ U<e>rg<ilius> quarto lib<ro> / Georgicoru<rn~
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 aces alienum acceptum mutuo sol[ues].

Suprascript: IN DIEM ABIIT
781 dilatum est.

Suprascript: RE
786 pecunia a<ut> argento.

Right margin: OPITULATA ES
iuvasti.

(Mountford's edition reads 73v)

Left margin: GLADIATORIO
964 gladiatorio: disperato.

(Mountford's edition lacks a solidus after "gladiatorio")
alibi ad dominas qui/ affectant uiam.

1028 affectus.

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

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

A SURVEY, CHRONOLOGICALLY ORDERED, OF
A. CRITICAL EDITIONS OF TERENCE;
B. TEXTUAL STUDIES OF TERENCE; FROM 1926 TO 1976.

PRELIMINARY

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

I have not been able to secure certain works:

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

---

Vittorio Soave, *Terenzio, Commedie*, Torino, U.T.E.T., 1953 ordered January 29, 1976 through the Inter-library Loan system (Tescari's review of Soave's edition gives no indication that this work is anything but a translation); G. Coppola, *Terenzio, Commedie*, Torino, Chiantore, 1927.6

---


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 $\Sigma$ have a common archetype, $\phi$, 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 ($\xi$). 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 A^2 (?); 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.) A^2; A reads ID SEQUEAR with no correction. Line 476 se praeb. Iov.\(^2\); the corrector adds SE only above the line. Line 501 verbis Iov. (?); A reads UERIS with no correction. Line 561 inp. feret A: inponi eff. Iov. (?); A reads INPONE FERET and the corrector adds HIC above the line to read INPONE HIC FERET. Line 618 is\(\text{J}\) 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 sietj 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 Ξ and further, that J and Y 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: "DRIAE SE OSTENDERET in ras. A3".

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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


In the section of his introduction subtitled "De Terenti textus historia antiqua aetate", Prete expounds the theories of various scholars. We single out Gunther Jachmann because Prete inclines in part to his opinion. The central question in the history of the text of Terence lies in the establishment of the relationship between the two families of the codices of Terence, A and ω or ε. 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 ω. It is possible to affirm that these new readings derive from other manuscripts now lost. b) Donatus, in his commentary, mentions codices containing readings which are not present in our manuscript tradition. Therefore Donatus must have known of codices no longer extant. c) Donatus gives testimony that the division of scenes in some manuscripts of Terence contained letters (M·M·C·, "mutatis modis canticum", and DV, "deverbium") referring to the musical nature of the scene itself. These signs are absent from the extant transmission but were evidently present in the manuscripts Donatus knew. Owing to these factors, Prete postulates the existence of a manuscript of Terence in the time of Donatus which follows a different tradition (X). From this tradition, depend, in part, the Codex Bembinus (A), its three correctors, Donatus and the Calliopian family (ω). Whether X depends on ϕ, Prete does not say. The following stemma illustrates Prete's theory:
Prete collates twenty-three individual manuscripts of Terence to establish his critical text. In his apparatus criticus he mentions the following editors: Muretus, Guyetus, Bothe, Wagner, Fleckeisen, Umpfenbach, Dziatzko, Lindsay and Kauer, and Marouzeau.

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

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

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


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


Furthermore, I have found five instances where the readings are questionable: Line 125 qui J i in ras. A\textsuperscript{R}; A reads QU with the letter I added above by the corrector rec. (Prete). Line 169 ut J om. A (add. A\textsuperscript{R}); 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\textsuperscript{R}; 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\textsuperscript{R}; 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.
225 "noxia" for "noxa"; 91 "illi" for "illic".

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 "apte" 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 Phormio on lines 92, 206, 305, 306, 406, 535, 589, 603, 632, 697, 931, 978, 1021.


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

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

iambic septenarius here intrudes on a series of octonarii. Ernout objects to the final word and approves of Bentley's addition of "-ere" after "conciuisse" and indicates how the variant "conciiuerit" 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 "conciiuerit". 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 A[LP]VD) is correct. Craig concedes there is some evidence for a variant of "insuerit".

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

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

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

Craig makes conjectures about the dates of each grammarian. He asserts that Arusian, who dedicated his
Exempla Elocutionum\(^1\) to Olybrius and Probinus, consuls in 395 A.D., must have flourished toward the end of the fourth century. We know for certain that Nonius\(^2\) lived before Priscian (ca. 500 A.D.) and after Apuleius (ca. 150 A.D.) but Craig states: "We shall be content with putting him in the period fourth or fifth century" (p. 52). Craig suggests that Eugraphius\(^3\) may have lived at "the end of the fifth or the beginning of the sixth century" (p. 84). Again, Craig maintains that the Calliopian recension is to be dated after the grammarians who cited Terence from a copy of an edition of which A is the only surviving representative.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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


We have more than four hundred Terence citations in the manuscripts of Priscian, a grammarian at the beginning of the sixth century. Craig cites only twelve examples where Priscian agrees with the minuscule manuscripts (Σ) of Terence against A: Andria 922 "dixi" Σ, "dico" A, "audieris" Σ, "audierim" A; Eunuchus 32 "Eunuchum suam" Σ, "Eunuchum suum" A; 104 "fictum" Σ, "finctum" A; 300 "dices" Σ, "dicet" A; 666 "potesse" Σ, "posse" A; 744 "attinere" Σ, "pertinere" A; Phormio 768 "aiunt" Σ, "dicunt" A; 989 "exclude" Σ, "exculpe" A; Eunuchus 779 "non posse fieri" Σ, "fieri non posse" A; Phormio 88

In the history of the text of Terence an interesting question is whether sufficient evidence exists to prove that the Terence known to Servius had been already tampered with by "Calliopius", or that Servian versions betray the existence in his time of the edition of Terence implied by the small group (s') 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 Calliopin text, if he should use such instances as Andr. 330-1 (Aen. VI 664): "mereat" and "poni" for "commereat" and "adponi" Σ; 74 (Aen. VIII 412): "primo" for "primum" Σ; 708 (Aen. IX 693): "quo te agis" for "quo hinc te agis" Σ - though Servius may be quoting from memory. Craig concludes that the argument that Servius did not use the A text is without foundation.


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

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


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

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


In a study entitled Die Geschichte des Terenztextes im Altertum (Basel, Reinhardt, 1924), Gunther Jachmann
deals with mistakes common to our sources for establishing the unity of the Terentian tradition during a certain period. He admits that the traces of this unity are few in number. Marouzeau believes he can reduce the list of alleged examples by, first of all, categorizing some errors as "fautes à faire", that is to say, inevitable. For example, Eunuchus 241 "amisti" PCED²; "amisisti" A; "amisit" Donati C. Secondly, readings which editors interpret as common mistakes are not always mistakes. Marouzeau points out that Eunuchus 79 "ecc", 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.² 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 Λ 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 Λ and that of the other codices. In effect, Fehl assails the opinion of Lindsay

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


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

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

Examination of the character signs permits us to discuss with precision the history of the Terentian manuscripts. Independence of A and £ had already been realized before the signs were introduced systematically into the text. The absence of true common errors in A and £ 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 £ before the third century, or even to renounce the hypothesis of a tradition common to A and £. It invites us to revise the delicate problems of distribution of replies and even the structure of the dialogue in general.

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


Andrieu agrees with Jules Marouzeau 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 conficiet suas.

The manuscript tradition presents the following versions:

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

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

---

The text of Eugraphius:

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

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

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

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

In mēn/tēm uē/nīt; nām/gue adūlēs/cēns// quam īn/
minimā/ spe situs/ ērit

Tām fā/cīlū/mē pātrī'/ pācem īn// lēges/ conficī/
et sū/as/

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

As a summary, the author gives three types of 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: \( \Delta \) \( \Theta \) \( \Delta \varepsilon \) \( \zeta \) \( \Theta \) and \( \Delta \phi \) \( \psi \) \( \omega \). The cantor is always designated by \( \omega \). The scribe reserves \( \Theta \) \( \Delta \phi \) \( \psi \) 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., \( \Pi \) Pamphilus, \( \Delta \) 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": \( \Upsilon \) Sannio, \( \Upsilon \) Syrus, \( \Sigma \) Sostrata, \( \Upsilon \) Sophrona Nutrix. For characters whose initial letter is "C", the scribe devises
this system: H Chremes, X Ctesipho, Y Clitipho, 1 Clinia, R (a Roman letter) Canthara, C/ Chaerea, CRA Cratinus, CRI Crito.

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


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


Twenty examples of the Latin interjection "vah" or "uah" exist in the text of Terence: nine in the Heautontimorumenos, eight in the Adelphoe, two in the Andria, one in the Eunuchus, none in the 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 (ūaḥ) or a monosyllable (uāḥ) with syneresis. We thus keep the form
"uah" and dispense with the correction in the passages where it figures.


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

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

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

In chapter three, Prete traces the history of the text of Terence according to the theories of Jachmann, Lindsay/Craig and Marouzeau/Andrieu. Prete also illustrates them graphically:

[Diagram of Jachmann, Lindsay-Craig, Marouzeau-Andrieu theories of the history of Terence's text]
In chapter four, Prete discusses the scholia of the Codex Bembinus, particularly as presented in the 1934 edition by James F. Mountford.

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


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

Domo me eripuit, 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-
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 Calliopian recension (Σ), compared with A, presents a series of changes evidently intentional. The editor of the recension, Pasquali continues, sought to facilitate the reading, simplifying the constructions, completing elliptical phrases, adding little words wherever he thought necessary, and substituting current vocabulary for archaic. These changes the editor made without regard for meter and sometimes without having understood the text which he arbitrarily changed.

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


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

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

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

A PHORMIO € 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, K. "Die Personbezeichnungen im Bembinus des Terenz."  

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.

Prete, Sesto. Il Codice di Terenzio Vaticano Latino 3226.  

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

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


³In my own apparatus criticus I have chosen his 1970 decisions over those of 1954.

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

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


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

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

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

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