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

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

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

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

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

In Chapter Four, the fullest textual examination of the

¹For bibliographical details, see Notes, page 30.
²See page 170 of the present investigation.
Codex Bembinus, and of its Phormio, is made through a review, for the period 1926-1976, of A.) the critical editions, and B.) the textual studies of Terence. In Part A I attempt to improve the condition of Terence's text by identifying and correcting mistaken readings of the six major critical editions containing the Bembine text of the Phormio. In Part B I present the various discussions of the textual history of the Bembinus, "the oldest direct evidence for the text of Terence," and its relationship with the Calliopian recension, the second of the two families of Terentian manuscripts. Also reviewed are theories on meter, scene division, character designation, all issues needed to illuminate a text that time has obscured.

---

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

INTRODUCTION

History of the Codex Bembinus

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

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

---


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

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

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

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

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

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

---

7Prete, 1970, p. 8. Edmund Hauler, "Paläographisches, Historisches und Kritisches zum Bembinus des Terenz," Wiener Studien 11 (1889): 273 n. 5, n. 6. Hauler thinks the poet could have found the codex in a monastery in southern Italy but does not deny that the manuscript could have been in a monastery in northern Italy.
9Hauler, p. 277.
CONTINET LIBER ISTE/ CART CXIII
comedie omnes eunuchus & heauto(n)tumerumenos:/
phormio: hechyra & adelphis pene tota: dempte/
& sunt due cart. finales et Deest item/
& prior andria. videl'(cet) huih libell<ul>

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

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

Some attribute this last inscription to a third person who
might have owned the codex after Porcellio and before
Bembo.10 Others recognize it as in the hand of Porcellio.11
At the end of this same inscription is a notation (§yv) followed by an erasure. This may be an indication of the
price12 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 §yv 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).13 In the space erased there may have been

---

10 Hauler, p. 274.
12 R. Sabbadini, Le scoperte dei Codici latini e
greci ne' secoli XIV et XV (Firenze: 1963): 146 n. 33.
13 Prete, 1970, p. 10. I presume Prete believes
Johannes Pandonj is the parallel of the Italian name
Gianntonio de' (dei) Pandoni since dei is the Italian
genitive. I am inclined to agree with Sabbadini that the
notation indicates the price of the manuscript.
some expression such as "& amicorum".\textsuperscript{14}

When Bernardo Bembo died, his son Pietro (1470-1547)\textsuperscript{15} inherited the codex. In 1491,\textsuperscript{16} the humanist Angelo Poliziano (1454-1494)\textsuperscript{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

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

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

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

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

---

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

\begin{quote}
Terentio di lettere maiuscola con scho-lij in lettera Longobarda, fu del Bembo, in pergamina in 4*. Ful. Urs.
\end{quote}

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

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

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{23}Sandys, p. 153. \\
\textsuperscript{24}Prete, 1970, p. 17. \\
\textsuperscript{25}Sandys, p. 153. \\
\textsuperscript{26}F. Ehrle, Fragmenta et picturae vergiliana codicis Vaticanii Latini 3225 phototypica expressa consilio et opera curatorum Bibliothecae Vaticanae (In Vaticano, 1945), p. 17.
\end{quote}
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{quote}
Furto sublatus Mense Octob. A. C\textsuperscript{12} D CCXCIX\textsuperscript{30} sed multa a me diligentia perquisitus beneficio Egregii viri Dominici Salae Bibliothecae restitutus idibus Dec. eiusdem anni Cai. Marini a Bibl. Vatic.
\end{quote}

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. 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.

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, each quire by tracing small Roman numerals on the last page of the

3Thompson, p. 54.
quire in the extreme lower right hand corner.\textsuperscript{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 $Q\cdot=$ 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.\textsuperscript{5} These rubrics and titles are the same size as the letters of the text.

\textsuperscript{4}Prete, 1970, p. 19; Lowe, p. 5.
\textsuperscript{5}Prete, 1954, p. 18.
Latin majuscule book-hand of early manuscripts consists of two styles of writing: a) square and rustic capitals and b) uncials. The Codex Bembinus survives as one of the oldest manuscripts of the rustic class. As the name suggests, rustic capitals are of a more negligent design, although, as a style of writing for select books, they are no less carefully formed than the square hand. Strokes more slender than square capitals, short cross-strokes oblique and waved, and strokes without finials characterize the rustic hand. Less finished as perfect letters, although accurately shaped, they have received the somewhat misleading title which distinguishes them. The letters F, L and T show a tendency to rise above the line.

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

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

---

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

More recently, A. Pratesi\(^1\) studied Vat. Pal. Lat. 24. Like Lowe, he found this manuscript to have the characteristics of A. Further, he saw that in A the "writing ... is laterally compressed, so as to give the impression of a nervous and broken drawing".\(^11\) Between the two codices he noticed an "evoluzione di gusto"\(^12\) and stated that they came from the same ambiance. He concluded, however, that A dates from the end of the fifth century if not from the beginning of the sixth.\(^13\)

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

---


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

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

\(^13\)Ibid.

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

In a letter to Prete by way of response, Lowe merely stated: In the C(odices) L(latini) 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 magnis puer est lascivae sagittis
Hoc melius telo pongere corda potis
Nec flamma nequas neque alti pectoris ignis
Set tibi vernantum preveat ista facis

Pallens erba viret color hic est semper amantium
Tam fugitiva rosa est quam fugitivus amor
Nam quod floricomis gaudet lasciva metallis
Aurum significat vilius esse rosa.

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

The author of the two epigrams is unknown.\textsuperscript{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 manuscript the two poems which Poliziano later transcribed and commented upon in his own copy of the 1475 edition of Terence.\textsuperscript{18}

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 audiver as; line 658 MALIM for mallim; line 346 COTIO contracted form of coitio; line 78 IS for eis; line 126 IIS for eis; line 41 II for ei; line 582 contracted form in the imperfect SCI-BAM for sciebam; line 856 prefix DI for de; DILIBUTUM; line 179 consonant doubled: REPPERIS; line 461 an aspirated HIS for is; letter T for d: line 151 ALIUT and line 920 APUT; letter O for U: line 656 UOLT and line 696 NERUOM; prol. 11 LEDIT LAEDERET for laedit...which might be harsh sounding.

---


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 (ϛ). It may well be that a corrector of the sixth century, who signs his name "Ioviales" in cursive on several pages, or a "manus recens" of the seventh/eighth century inserted into the manuscript some signs of punctuation such as the "simplex ductus" and the "paragraphos" and further that such signs existed before these correctors. These forms of punctuation were written in the codex according to the norms established by grammarians, and the correctors were forced not only to imitate the writing of the codex but also to imitate the signs of punctuation already existing in the codex.

Possible errors, and not orthographic variants, occur: on fol. 53r, line 2 ANTHONE is written no doubt instead of Antiphone; on fol. 65v, line 577 what was intended by the scribe when he wrote CHRE is not clear. The doubling of the consonant R in FAMILIORRIOREM, fol. 71v, line 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\(^9\) are reference signs placed above the word commented on to safeguard against confusion. The most common of these signs is \(\sim\) cf. fol. 53v, lines: 4, 7, 8, 12, 13. Also found are symbols such as these: fol. 53v, line 4 +; fol. 53v, line 5 \(\sim\); fol. 53v, line 9 \(\sim\); fol. 53v, line 15 \(\sim\); fol. 54r, line 23 \(\sim\); fol. 54r, line 25 \(\sim\); fol. 54r, line 33 \(\sim\); fol. 54v, line 36 \(\sim\); fol. 54v, line 43 \(\sim\).

[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 Bembine

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

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

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

---

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


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

Iov. = 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

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

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

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

Franz Umpfenbach is the author of the first publication of an almost complete collection of the scholia.\(^1\) His article, however, has some defects, namely, the omission of a number of items, misprints, and doubt left in the reader's mind as to what is read in the manuscript and what is the editor's conjecture.\(^2\) Wilhelm Studemund offers valuable supplements to Umpfenbach's work in two articles\(^3\) in which he corrects a portion of Umpfenbach's errors. To James F. Mountford we owe a careful edition of the whole body of the "scholia Bembina" accompanying it with an attempt to answer various questions about the scholia. Mountford\(^4\) is convinced there were two Bembine scholiasts. The Andria and the Eunuchus contain almost as many scholia by the first hand as by the second. In the 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 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. 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.

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

---

5 Mountford, p. 3.
6 Ibid., p. 4.
7 Ibid., pp. 4-6.
be a close connection between Donatus' commentary on Terence and the scholia here. But Donatus' commentary as we have it today is not the same as the original commentary. 8 Two different opinions exist in regard to the relationship of Donatus and the scholia of Phormio 1-59. Paul Wessner 9 believes that the dependence of the scholia on Donatus appears so close that we must admit that our version of Donatus dates no later than the sixth century and that from it are derived the scholia.

Einar Löfstedt 10 does not see enough evidence to prove that our scholia depend on the present version of Donatus and consequently, he holds that the existence of such a version in the sixth century is not proven.

Mountford 11 observes that of the seventy-four scholia concerned, twenty-one are identical with the extant version of Donatus and twenty-eight, although they say the same things, differ in phraseology from Donatus. Mountford favors Löfstedt's theory and attributes this group of scholia to the original Donatus. If this view is correct, these scholia indicate that the present

---

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

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

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

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

12Mountford, p. 122.
13Ibid., p. 125.
14Ibid., 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

A. = the scribe of the codex making his own corrections

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

A. = the original scribe of the codex

corr. ant. = "corrector antiquissimus", 5-6th centuries

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

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

Iov. = Ioviales who made only

m. = Ioviales who made the majority of the corrections and additions; before the scholiast (6th century)

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

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

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


4Marouzeau does not date the last three hands.


6Marti, p. 126.
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INCIPIT TERENCEI PHORMIO
ACTA LUDIS MEGALENSIBUS Q. CASPIONE
GN SERUILIO COS GRAECA APOLLODORU
EPIDICAZOMENOS FACTA EST IIII

•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 ANTIPO
CUM AMERET OPERA PARASITI UXOREM ACCIPIT
PATER ET CHREMES REUERSI FREMER DEIN MINAS
TRIGENTA DANT PARASITO UT ILLAM CONIUGEM
HABERET IPSE ARGENTO HOC EMITUR PHIDICINA
UXOREM RETINET ANTIPO A PATRUS 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 Bemmibus
11 PHIDICINA: in his app. crit., Mar. incorrectly cites A as reading PHIDICINA
PROLOGUS

POSTQUAM POETAR UETUS POSTAM NON POSSET
RETRABERE A STUDIO ET TRADERE HOMINEM IN OTIUM
MALEDICTIS DETERRERE NE SCRIBAT PARAT
QUI ITA DICTITAT QUAS ANTEHAC FECIT FABULAS
TENUIT ESSE ORATIONE ET SCRIPTURA LEUI
QUIA NUSQUAM INSANUM SCRIPIT ADOLESCENTULUM
CERUAM UIDERE FUGERE ET SECTARI CANES
ET EM PLORARE ORARE UT SUBSENIAT SI
QUOD SI INTELLEGERET CON METIT OLIM NOVA
ACTORIS OPERA MAGIS STETTISSE QUAM SUA
MINUS MULTO AUDACITER QUAM NUNC LECTOR
NUNC SI QVIS EST QUI HOC DICAT AUT SIC COGITET
UETUS SI POSTA NON LACESSET PRIOR
NOLLUM INVENIRE PROLOGUM POTISSIMUS NOUUS
QUEM DICERET NISI HABERET CUI MALE DICERET
IS SI RESPMONSUM HOC HABET IN MEDIO OMNIBUS
PALMAM ESSE POSITAM QUI ARTEM TRACTENT MUSICAM

4 ANTEHAC: + reference sign to scholia above the H
5 TENUI: + reference sign to scholia above the I
6 EAM: + reference sign to scholia above the EA
7 OLIM: + reference sign to scholia above the I
8 ACTORIS: + reference sign to scholia to left of
9 A
10 AUDACITER: in their app. crit. of the Oxford
11 edition, Kauer and Lindsay cite
12 Iov. as changing AUDACITER TO
13 DICAT: letter e added above A by corr. rec.
14 (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read DICET;
15 LACESSET: + reference sign to scholia above
16 the first S
17 HABERET: - reference sign to scholia above the
18 B
19 TRACTENT: letter A added above E by corr. rec.
20 (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.) to read TRACTANT
ILLE AD FAMEM HUNC A STUDIO SYDUIT REICERE
HIC RESPONDERE UQUIT NON LACESSERE
BENEDICTIS SI CERTASSE AUDISSET BENE
QUOD AB ILLO ADLATUMST: ID SIBI ESSER RELATUM PUTET
DE ILLO TAM PECAM PÆCAM DICUERI MII
PECCANDI CUM IPSE DE SE FINEM NON FACIT
NUNC QUID UELIM ANIMUM ATTENDITE ADPORTO NOUAM
EPIDICAZOMENON QUAM UOCANT COMOEDIAM
GRÆCI LATINI PHORMIONEM NOMINANT
QUIA PRIMAS PARTIS QUI AGIT ERIT PHORMIO
PARASITUS PER QUEM RÆS GERETUR MAXIME
ULCINTAS UOSTRA SI AD POETAM ACCESSERIT
DATE OPERAM ADESTE ABO QUO ANIMO PER SILENTIUM
NI SIMILI UTAMUR PORTUNA ATQUE UST SUMUS
CUM PER TUMULTUM NOSTER GRÆX NOUS LOCOST
QUEM ACTORIS UVERTUS NOSBIS RESTITUIT LOCUM
BONITASQUE UESTRA ADIUTANS ATQUE AEOANIMITAS

20 CERTASSE: letter T written above final E by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read CERTASSET; +reference sign to scholia above RT
21 ADLATUMST: ·medial point placed between words by A
23 FINEM: +reference sign to scholia above the N
25 EPIDICAZOMENON: +reference sign to scholia above the D
26 GRÆCI: +reference sign to scholia above the A
28 RÆS: +reference sign to scholia above the E
29 UOSTRA: letter O crossed out by corr. rec. (Pr.) and E added above the O to read UESTRA
31 NI: I changed to E by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read NE
32 LOCOST: +reference sign to scholia above the C
33 RESTITUIT: +reference sign to scholia above the U
34 ADIUTANS: +reference sign to scholia above the U
B AMICUS SUMMUS HEUS ET POPULARIS CETA
HARI AD ME UERIT ERAT EI DE RATIUNCULA
IAM PRIDEM APUC ME RELICUIM PAULILLIUM
NUMMORUM ID UT CONFICEREM CONPECI ADFERO
NAM ERILEM FILIUM EIUUS DUXISSSE AUDIO
UXOREM EI CREAEO NUMUS HOC CONFECITUR
QUAM INIQUE COMPARATUMST - II QUI MINUS HABENT
UT SEMPES ALIQUID ADDANT DIUTIORIBUS
QUOD ILLE UNICATIM UIX DE DESENSO SUO
SUVUM DEFRUDANS GENIUM CONPERSIT MISER
ID ILLA UNIERSUM ABRIPIT HAUS EXISTIMANS
QUANTO LABORE PARTUM PORRO AUTEM GETA
FERITUR ALIO NUMERE UBI ERA PEPPERIT
PORRO AUTEM ALIO UBI ERIT PUERO NATALIS DIES
UBI INITIABUNT OMNE HOC MATER AUERET
PEREO CAUSA ERIT MITTUNDI SED UIDEON GETAM

SI QUIS ME QUÆRET RUFUS B PRAESTOST - DESINE R OH
AT EGO OBUIAM CONABAR TIBI DAUE B ACCIPES LECTUMST - CONUENIET NUMERUS QUANTUM DEBUI
SIAM TE ET NON RECLEXISSE HABEO GRATIAM
PRAESTHITUT UT NUNC SUNT MORES ADEO RES REDIT

36 RATIUNCULA: v reference sign to scholia above
43 DEMENSO: n reference sign to scholia above the
50 PUERO: letter O crossed out by Iov. (K.), by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read PTER
50a f: r = Greek gamma
50b ii: the numeral
53 LECTUMST: v reference sign to scholia above
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 QVIS QUID REDDIT MAGNA HABENDAST GRATIA
B SEI QUID TU ES TRISTIS E EGONE NESCIS QUO IN METU ET
QUANTO IN PÆRÆCULOS LAMUS BQUID QUID EST QUICUM
MODO UT TACERE POSSIS SABI SIG SIC INSCIENS
CUIS TU FIDEM IN PECUNIA PERSPEXERIS
UESERE UERBA EI CREDERE UBI QUID MIHI LUCRI EST
TE PALLERE R ERGO AUSCULTA B HANC OPERAM TIBI DICO
SEVIS NOSTRI DAUE FRATREM MAOREM CHUENEM
NOSTIR B QUID NT R QUID EUS GNATUM PHAEDRIAM
B TANQUAM TE R UENIT SENIBUS AMOBUS STIMUL
ITER ILLI IN LEMNO UT ESSET NOSTRO IN CICILIAM
AD HOSPITEM ANTIQUAM IS SENEM PER EPISTULAS
FELLEXIT MODO NON MONTIS AURI POLLICENS
B CUI TANTA ERAT RES ET ERAT SUPER R DESINAS
SIC ES INGENIUM B O REGEM ME ESSE OPORTUIT
R ABSENTES AMBO HIC TUM SENES ME FILIS
RELIQUENT QUASI MAGISTRUM B QUITA PROVINCIAM
CEPSTI DURAM MIHI USUS UENIT HOC SCIO
MEMINI RELINIQUI ME DEO IRATO MEQ
COEPIT ADVERSARI PRIMO QUIC UERVIS OPUS
SENIBUS DUM SUM SCAULAS PERDIDI
R UENERE IN MENTEM MIHI ISTAEBC B NAMQUE INSICIAST
ADUERSUM STIMULUM CALCES R COEPI IS OMNIA
PACERE OBSEQUI QUAE UELLENT B SCISTI UTI FORO
R NOSTER MALI NIIHIL QUCIQVAM PRIMO HIC PHAEDRIAM

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 HIC
73 DURAM: after this word corr. rec. (Pr.), Iov. (K.)
added r. In fact, the Ms. tradition attrib­utes
MIHI...PERIDID to Geta
75 ADVERSARI: the word HIS added above AD by corr. rec.
(Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read HIC
77 R changed to B by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) at
beginning of line; ISTAEBC B: letter after ISTAEBC
crossed out by Iov. (K.)
78 OMNIA: ea added above O by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov.
(K.)
PHORM. 55v

CONTINUO QUANDAM NACTUS EST PUELLULAM
CITHARISTRIAM HANC AMARE COEPTI PERDITE
EA SERUIEBAT LENONI INPURISSIMO
NEQUE QUID DARETUR QUIquam ID CURARANT PATRES
RESTABAT ALIUt NISI OCULOS PASCEREt
SECTARI IN LUDUM DUCERE ET REDUCERE
NOS OTIOS OPERAM DABAMUS PHAEIDRIS
IN QUO HAC DISCEBAT LUDO EXADUERSO ILICO
TOSTRINA ERAT QUANDAM HIC SOLEBAMUS FERE
PLEBUNQUE SAEPAE EXAM OPVERIB DUM IINDE IRET DOMUM
INTEREA DUM SEDEMUS ILLI INTERVENIT
ADULESCENS QUIDAM LACRUMANUS NOS MIRARIER
ROGAMUS QUID SIT NUMquam AEUQUE INQUIT AC MODO
PAupertas MINI ONUS UISUMET ET MISERUM ET GRAUE
MODO QUANDAM UII VIRGINEM HIC VICINIAE
MISERAM SUAM MATREM LAMENTARI MORTUAM
EA SITA ERAT EXADUORUM NEQUE ILLI BENIOLUS
NEQUE NOTUS NEQUE COGNITUS EXTRA URAM ANCILLULAM
QUIquam ADERAT QUI ADIUTARET FVNS MISERITVMST
UIRGO IPSA FACIE EREGIA. QUID UERBIS OPUS
COMMORAT OMNES NOS IBI CONTINUO ANTIPO
UGLISINE EAMUS UISERE ALIUS CENSEO
EAMUS DUC NOS SODES INIUM UNUMIS
UIDEMUS UIRGO PULCHA ET MAGIS DICERES
NIHIL ADEBAT ADIUMENTI AD PULCHRITUDINEM

88 ILICO: the first I changed to E, the second I
changed to L, letter O added above C
91 ILLI: letter C added above second I by corr.
rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by
A2 (Mar.) to read EI LOCO
97 EXADUORSUM: second U crossed out by corr. rec.
(Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read ILIC
98 ANCILLULAM: letter I added above line between
N and C, then ILL crossed out by
corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
to read ANICULAM

---: 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 HACE FORAM EXTINGUERENT
ILLE QUI ILLAM AMABAT FIDICINAM TANTUM MODO
SATIS INQUIT SCITAST NOSTER UERO B IAM SCIO
AMARE COEPIT R
SCI QUAM QUO EUDAT UIDE
POSTRIDIE AD ANUM RECTA FERGIT OBSECRETAT
UT SIBI EIES FACERAT CORTAM ILLA ENIM SE NEGAT
NEQUE EUM AEUQuum AIT, FACERAE ILLAM CIUEM ESSE ATTICAM
BONAM BONIS PROGNATAM SI UXOREM UELIT
LEGE ID LICERE FACERE SIN ALIYER NEGAT
NOSTER QUID FACERET NESCIRE ET ILLAM DUCERE
CUPERAT ET METUBAT. ABSENTEM PATREM

B NON SI REDISSET B PATER UENTIAM DARET

same as above

119 E: letter I added above and to the right of E by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read EI
120 ILLE: letters NE added above by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.) to read ILLENE
122 FACIAT: letters AC crossed out by Iov. (K.), corr. rec. (Pr.) to read FIAT
125 QU : letter I added above by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read QUI
CONFINGAM QUOD ERIT MIHI BONUM ATQUE CONMODUM CUM TU SORUM NIHIL REFELLES UINCAT SCILICET PATER ADERIT MIHI PARATAE LITES QUID MEA ILLA QUDEM NOSTRA ERIT B IOCALarem AUDACIAM \ PERSUASUMST- HOMINI FACTUMST UENTUMST- UINCIMUR 135 DUXIT B QUID NARRAS R HOC QUOD AUDIS B Q O GETA QUID TE FUTURUMST- R NESCIO HICRLE UNUM HOC SCIO QUOD FORS FERET- FEREMUS AEUQO ANIMO B PLACET EM ISTUC UIRIST- OFFICIUM IN ME OMNIS SPES MIHI EST B LAUDO R AD PRECATOREM ADEAM CREDO QUI MIHI 140 SIC ORIT NUNC AMITTE QAESSO 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 GERM ST STIC TENUITER. B NON MULTUM HABET 145 QUOD DET FORTASSE. R IMMO NIHIL NISI SPER MERA B PATER EIES REDIT. AN NON R NONDUM B QUID SENEM QUOD SPECTATIS UEBRUM R NON CERTUM SCIO SED EPITULAM AB RO ADELAIAM ESSE AUDIUI MODO ET AD PORTITORES ESSE DELAIAI PETAM 150 B NUM QUID GETA ALUIT ME UIS R UT BENE SIT TIBI PUIER HEUS NENON HOC PRODIT CAPE DA HOC DORCHIO A ANTIPO B PHAEIDRIA ADULESCENTES II ADEON REM RDISSE UT QUI MIHI CONSULTUM OPTIME UELLET ESSE

145 B: letter B inserted between TENUITER and NON by A (Pr.)
146 R: letter R inserted between FORTASSE and IMMO by A (Pr.)
150 DELALAM: letter T traced by corr. rec. (Pr.); PETAM: the word HANC added above PETAM by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
153: page damage makes it impossible to read the character designation at the beginning of the line. UELLET: the first L crossed out by Iov. (K.) but he does not change the second L to I
PHAEDRIA PATREM UT EXISTIMESCAM UBI IN MENTEM EIIUS ADUENTI
UENIAT
QUOD NI FUISSEM INCOGITANS ITA EXPECTA--M UT PAR FUIT 155
B QUID ISTUC EST A BOGITAS QUI TAM AUDACIS FACINORIS MI
CONSCIUS SIS
QUOD UZINAM IN PHORMIONI ID SUADERE IN MENTEM INCIDISSET
NEE ME CUPIDUM EO IMPULSSET QUOD MIIII PRINCIPIUMST: MALI
NON PETTIVUS ESSEM FUSSERT TUM IILLOS MIIII AEGRE ALIQUO DIES
AT NON COTTIDIANA CURA HARC ANGERET ANIMUM B AUDIO 160
A DUM EXSPECTO QUAM MOX UENIAT QUI ADINAT HANC MIIII
CONSUETUDINEM
B ALIIS QUA DEFIT QUOD AMANT AEGREST TIBI QUA SUPEREST
DOLET
AMORE ABUNDAS ANTIphO
NAM TUA QUIDEM HERCILE CERTO UITA HARC EXPETENDA OP'PANDAQUE
EST
ITA ME DI BENE AMENT UT MIHI LICEAT TAM DIU QUOD AMO
FRUI 165
IAM DEPICISCI MORTE CUPIO TU CONICITO CETERA
QUOD EGO EX HAC INOPIA NUNC CAPIAM ET QUID TU EX ISTA
COPIA
UT NE ADDAM QUOD SINE SUMP'TU INGENIUM LIBERALEM NACTUS ES
QUOD HABES ITA OLUUSTI UXOREM SINE MALA FAMA PALAM
BEATUS NE UNUM DESIT QUI MODESTE ISTAEC FERAT 170
QUOD SI TIBI RES SIT CUM EO LERONE QUO MIIII EST TUM SENTIAS
A AT TU MIHI CONTRA NUNC UIDERE FORTUNATUS PHAEDRIA
CU'I DE INTEGRO EST POTESTAS ETIAM CONSULENDI QUID UELIS
RETNIRE AMARE AMITTERE EGO IN EUM INCIDI INFELIX LOCUM 175
UT NEQUE MIHI SIT AMITTEDI NEC RETINENDI COPIA
SED QUID HOC EST UIDON EGO GETAM CURRENTEM HIC ADUENIRE
IS EST IPSUS EI TIMEO MISERI QUAM HIC MIHI HUNTET REM
A GETA 5 ANTIPHO  B PHAEDRIA

154 EXPECTA--M: two letters between A and M totally erased
and NE inserted by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read EXPECTAREM
157 IN: letter I crossed out and E added above N by Iov.
(Pr.), (K.) to read NE
160 B: letter B inserted between ANIMUM and AUDIO by A as it
seems to me but Pr. attributes it to the Rubri-
cator
164 CERTO: letter O erased and E added above erasure by
Iov. (Pr.), (K.), by A2 (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
SERUS ADULESCENTES

A NULLUS ES GETA NISI IAM ALIQUOD TIBI CONSILIIUM CELEBRE REPERIS
ITA NUNC INPARATUM SUBITO TANTA TE INPENDENT MALA 180
QUAE NEQUE UTI DEUITEM SCIO NEQUE QUO MODO ME INDE
EXTRAHAM QUAE SI NON ASTU PROVIDENTUR ME AUT ERUM PESSUM DABUNT
NAM NON POTEST CELARI NOSTRAS DIUIPS AUDACIAS 
QUID ILLIC COMMOTUS UENIT
A TUM TEMPORIS MIHI PUNCTUM AD HANCREM EST ERUS ADEST
QUID ILLIC MALIST
A QUOD CUM AUDIERIT QUOD EIUSS REMEDIIUM INUENI
IRACUNDIAE 185
LOCURANTE INCENDAM TACEAM INSTIGEM PURGEM ME LATEREM
EHEU ME MISERUM CUM MIHI PAVEO TUM ANTIPOME ME EXCRUCIAT
AMXI EIUSS ME MISERET SI NUNC TEMPO IS NUNC ME RETINET NAM
ABSQVE ES ESSET
RECTE EGO NISI UIDISSIM ET SENIS ESSEH ULUSS IRACUNDIAM
ALIQUID CONSUASISSEM ATQUE HINC ME CONICEREM PRONISUS IN
FEDES 190
\(\text{QUAM HINC FUGAM AUT FURTUM PARAT}^a\)
A SED UBI ANTIHOPHEN REPERIAM AUT QA QUADERE INSISTAM UIAM
\(\text{SIT QUIRIS NUM MAQ MAGNUM HOC NUNTIO EXPECTO}^a\)
\(\text{SANUSNE ES A DONUM IRE PERGAM IBI PLURIMUMST B REOCCUS}\)
\(\text{HOMENEM STA ILICO A HEM}^a\)
195
SATISS PRO IMPERIO QUIDQUIS ES 
\(\text{CEDO QUID PORTAS OBSECRO ATQUE ID SI POTES UENBO EXPENDI}\)
\(\text{A FACIAM}^a\)
\(\text{RELOQUERE A MODO APVT PORTUM}^a\)
\(\text{SIT QUIRIS A INTELEXTI}\)
\(\text{OCXDI B HEM}^a\)
190
\(\text{QUID AGAM B QUAND AIS A HUIUS PATREM UIDISSME ME ET PATRIUM}\)
\(\text{TUUM}\)
\(\text{NAM QUOD EGO HUIC SUBITO EXITIO REMEDIIUM INUENIUM MISER}^{200}\)
\(\text{QUOD SI EO MEAE FORTUNAE RESOINT PHANTUM ABS TE UT}\)
\(\text{DISTRAHAR}\)

---

181 NEQUE: 0 crossed out and C added above it by corr. rec.
(Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.) to read NEC
183 ILLIC: the second I changed to E and C crossed out by
corr. rec. (Pr.) to read ILLE, and above ILLIC, 
NAM written by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
188 EIUSS: letter U crossed out and I added above it by corr.
rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read EI(IS)?
ESSET: letter T crossed out and M added above by corr.
rec. (Pr.), by A2 (Mar.), by Iov. (K.) to read ESSEM
189 MIHI: letter I written between M and H by A (Pr.);
UIDISSEM: letters PRO written above UI by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.) to read PROUIDISSEM but PRO was canceled by same corrector or later one
190 CONUASISSEM: letter I crossed out and A written above by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.) to read CONUASASSEM
191 HINC: letter N crossed out by Iov. (K.), by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read HIC
194 DONUM: letter M written above U by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read DOMUM
195 HOMINEM: after this word, r added by corr. rec. (Pr.) by Iov. (K.) as a sign for Antiphon to say STA ILICO
198 APUT: letters PUT added above the first letter A by A (Pr.). Mar. cites A as reading APORUM
199 ET: word crossed out by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.);
PATRUUM: Mar. incorrectly cites A as reading PATRUOM
200: page damage makes it impossible to read the character designation at the beginning of the line;
SUBITO: above the letter S is symbol possibly denoting omission of word NUNC which is present in other Mss. or Ms. tradition. Corrector unknown
NULLAST MIHI UITA EXPETENDA A EGRO ISTAEC CUM IPA SUNT- 
ANTIPHO
--NTO MAGIS TE ADUGILARE AEQUOMST FORTIS FORTUNA ADIUUAT
R NON SUM APUT ME A TAEQUI OPUS EST NUNC CUM MAXUME UT SIS
ANTIPHO
HAN SI SENSERIT TE TIMIDUM PATER ESSE ARBITRABITUR 205
COMMERUISSE CULPAM B HOC UERUMST R NON POSSUM INMUTARIER
A QUID FACERES SI ALIUD GRAUUS TIBI NUNC FACIUNDUM FORET
R CUM HOC NON POSSUM ILLUD MINUS POSSEME HOC NIHIL EST

QUID HIC CONTERIMUS OPERAM FRUSTRA QUIN ABBE B ET QUIDEM
EGO R OBSS---

QUID SI ADSIMULO SATINES SAT A GARRIS R UOLTM CONTEMPLAMINI
EM 210
SATINE SIC EST A NON R QUID SI SIC A PROPESMODUM R QUID SIC
A SAP EST
EM ISTUC SERUA ET UERBUM UERBO PAR PARI ET RESPONDEAS
NE TE IRATUS SUIS SAEVIDICIS DICITIS PROTELET R SCEO
A Ui COACTUM TE ESSE INUITUM B LEGE IUDICIO A TENES
SET HIC QVIS EST SENEX QUEM VIDEO IN ULTIMA PLATEA IPSUS
EST 215
R NON POSSUM ADDESE A AH QUID AGIS QUO ABIS ANTIPHO
MANE INQAM R EGO MET ME NOUI ET PECCATUM MEUM
UOBIS COMMENDO PHANIAM ET UITAM MEAN
B GETA QUID NUNC PIES A TU IAM LITES AUIDIES
EGO PLECTAR PENDENS NISI QUID ME FEFELLERIT
SED QUOD MODO HIC NOS ANTIPHONEM MONUI
S UE NOSMET IPSOS FACERE OPORTET- PHAEADRIA
B AUPER MIHI OPORTET QUIN TUD QUID FACIAM IMPERA

203 --NTO: first two letters blurred but Ms. tradition reads TANTO
208 ------: letters blurred but Ms. tradition reads ILICET
209 OBSE---: three letters blurred but Ms. tradition reads OBSECR
210 A: above A, unknown corrector added PH indicating
Phaedria should say GARRIS
213 PROTELET: above and to the right of this word is PATER
written by corr. rec. (Pr.), by IoV. (K.)
218 PHANIAM: the second A is crossed out and U added above
it by corr. rec. (Pr.)
222 OPORTET: final letter (A?) crossed but and T added
above by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read OPORTET
A MEMINISTIN QLIN UT FUEIT VESTRA ORATIO
IN RE INCIPITUNDA AD DEFENDENDAM NOXIAM
IUSTAM ILLAM CAUSAEM FACILEM UINCIBILEM OPTUMAM
B MEMINI A EM NUNC IPSAST- OPUS EA AUT SI QUID POTEST
MELIOR ET CALIDIOR B FIER SEDULO
A NUNC PRIOR ADITO TU EGO IN INSIDIES HIC ERO
CENTURIATUS SI QUID DEFIICIAS B AGE
225
230
Z DEMIPIO B PHAEDRIA A GETA
SENEX ADULESCENS SERVUS
Z ITANE TANDEM UXORVM DUXIT ANTIPHO INIUSU MEO
NEC MEUM IMPERIUM AC MITTO IMPERIUM NON SIMILATEM MEAM
REVERERI SALTEM NON PUDERI O FACINUS AUDAX O GETA
MONITOR A UX TANDEM SI QUIDmini DICENT QUAM
CAUSAM REPERIERT
DEMORAR A ATQUI REPERIAM ALIUT AGE Z AN HOC DICET MIHI
CREDIBILE HOC MIHI OPTIGIT
235 INUITUS Feci LEX COEGIT AUDIO FATORE A PLACES
Z UERUM SCIENTEM TACITUM CAUSAM TRADERE ADVERSARIIS
ETIAMNE ID LEX COEGIT B ILLUD DURUM A EGO EXPEDIAM SINE
Z INCERTUUM QUID AGAM QUA PRAETER SPEM ATQUE IN
CREDIBILE HOC MIHI OPTIGIT
PERICLA DAMNA EX ILLA PEREGRE REDIENS SEMPER
Z QUID ANO SIT NOUOM
243 AUT FILI PECCATUM AUT UXORIS MORTEM AUT MORBUM
COMMUNIA ESSE HAE POSSE UT NE QUIT ANO SIT NOUOM
245 QUIDQUID PRAETER SPEM Eueniet OMNE ID DEPUTARE ESSE
IN LUCRO
Z PHAEDRIA INCREDIBILEST QUANTUM ERUM ANTE EO SAPIENTIA

228 MELIOR: letter E added by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read MELIORE; CALIDIOR: letter E added by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read CALIDIORE
230 CENTURIATUS: letters SUc added to front of the word by corr. rec. (Pr.), Iov. (K.) to read SUCCENTURIATUS
234 QUAM: word AUT written above by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
235 ALIUT: letter T written by corr. rec. (Pr.); AGE: word AGE erased and CURA added by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
240-242: three lines, present in Ms. tradition, are not found in A
245 HAECS 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 pisistrino uapulandum habendae compedes opus huri factundem horum nihil quiquam accidet animo nooum

Quidquid praeter spem eveniet omné id deputabo esse

Sed quid cessas hominem adire et blande in principio adloqui

Z phaedriam mei fratris uideo filium mihi re obutiam
B mi patruus salue z salue sed ubi est antiphon
B salutem ueni re credo hoc responsa mihi

B utet hic est set. satide omnia ex sententia
Z uellem quidem b quid istuc est z rogitas phaedrias bonas me absente hic confecistas nuptias
B ero an id suscenses nunc illi z artificem probum
egon illi non suscensesam ipsum gestio

260 dari mihi in conspectum nu- culpa aut sciatem

Lenem patrem illum factum me esse acerrimum
B atquin nihil fecit patruus quod suscenses
Z ecce autem similia omnia omnes congruent

Unum cum noris omnis noris b haud itast

265 hic in noxast illi ad defendundam causam adest cum ille abest praestost. tradunt operas mutuas
A probe horum facta inprudens definxit senex
Z nam ni haec ulla essent cum illo haut stares phaedria
B si est patruus culpam ut antiphon in se admirerit 270

Ex qua re minus rei foret aut famae temperans non causam dico quin quod meritus sit ferat.

248 --- s: letters ERU appear to me to be written by another hand (corr. rec.)
253 RE: letter I added before RE by corr. ant. (Pr.) to read IRE
260 EGON: letter E added above N by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read EGONE
261 NU-: letter N written after NU and letters C and SUA written above by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read NUNC SUA
265 UNUM CUM NORIS: Ashmore incorrectly cites A as reading NUM NORIS
266 HIC IN: Kauer wrote in his apparatus: HIC IAM IN A2 but I do not see IAM in the codex
267 ABEST: after this word, HIC added above by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
Sed si quis forte malitia pretus sua
insidias nostrear fecit adulescentiae
ac uicit nostra culpa est an judicium
qui saepe propter inuidiam adjunxit diuiti
aut propter misericordiam addunt pauperi
A ni nossem causam crederem uera hunc loqui
2 an quisquam iudex est qui possit noscere
 tua iusta ubi tupe uerbus non respondes
ita ut ille fecit B functus adulescentuli est
officium liberalis postquam ad iudices
uentrut non putuit cogitata prolocu
ita eum tum timidum Ibi stupefactit pudor
A laudo hunc sed ceasso adire quam primum senem
ere salue saluum te aduenisse gaudeo
bone custos salue columna uero familiae
cui commendaui pilium hinc abiens heum
A iam duum te omnes nos accusare audio
inermiit et me horum omiium inermiissimo
nauquit me in hac re facere uoluiisti tibi
seruam hominem causam orare leges non simunt
neque testimonio dicto est 3 mitto omnia
addo istuc inprudens timuit adulescens sino
tu servus uerum si cognata est maxume
non fuit necesse habere sed id quod lex iubet
dotem daretis quaceret etiam uirum

275 EST: in his app. crit., Kauer noted "EST A (corr. man. 2)" but neither Prete nor I see correction here
281 FUNCTUS: letter C added above between N and T by A (Pr.)
284 IBI: second I crossed out and O added above by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read OBSTUPE-PECIT
286 ADUENISSSE: 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
QUA RATIONE INOPEM POTIUS DUCERAT DOMUM
A NON RATIO ERUM ARGENTI Z SUMERET
ALICUNDE A NIIIL EST DICTO FACILIUS
Z POSTREM0 SI NULLO ALIO FACTO PAENORE A HUI
DIXIT PULCHRE SIQUIDEM QUESUAM CREDERET
TE UIIO Z NON NON SIC FUTURUMST NON POSTEST
EC0U ILLAM CUM IILLO UT PARIAR NUPTAM UNUM DIREM
NIILL SUAUE MERITUMST HOMINEM COMMONSTRARIER
305
MIHIS ISTUM UOLO AUT UBI HABITET DEMONSTRARIER
A NEMPE PHORMIONEM Z ISTUM PATRONUM MULIERIS
A IAM FAKO HIC ADEIRIT Z ANTIFICO UBI NUNC EST A FORIS
Z ABI PHAEDRIO EUM QUERERE ATOUE HUC ADDUC B EO
RECTA UIA QUIDEM ILLUC A NEMPE AD PAMPHILAM
310
Z AT EGO DEOS PENATES HINC SALUTATUM DOMUM
DEUERTAR INDE IBO AD FORUM ATQUE ALIQUOS MIHI
AMICOS ADUCABO AD HANC REM QUI ADJUNT
UT NE INPARATUS SIM SI UENIAT PHORMIO
A PHORMIO E GETA
PARASITUS SERUUS
A ITANE PATRIS ADVENTUM UERITUM HINC ALISSE E ADO MODUM 315
A PHANUM RELICTAM SOLAM E SIC A ET IURUM SENEM
E OPPIDO A AD TE SUMMA SOLUM PHORMIO REDIT
TUTE HOC INTRISTI TIBI OMNE EST EXEDENDUM A CINCGERE
E OBSECRO TE A SI RAGBIT E IN TE SPES EST A ECCERE
QUID SI REDDET E TU IMPUListi A SIC OPINOR E SUBUEN 320

300 NIHIL: the word ALICUNDE is repeated between the
lines above NIHIL by Iov. (Pr.); DICTO:
letter U written above letter O by Iov. (Pr.),
(K.) to read DICTU
304 EGON: letter E added above and to the right of N
by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read EGONE
306 ISTUM: letter T crossed out and letters PS written
above ST by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read I(S)PSUM
310 PAMPHILAM: letters PA appear to be written by
another hand but neither Pr. nor K. nor
(K.) to mention this correction
314 UENIAT: letters AT written above by corr. rec. (Pr.),
letters AD written by Iov. (K.) to read
ATUENIAT, ADEUENIAT respectively
315 PATRIS ADVENTUM: word AIS written above by corr.
rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
A CEDO SENEM IAM INSTRUCTA SUNT MINI IN CORDE CONSILIA OMNIA
E QUID AGES QUID UTS NISI UTI MANEAT PHILINIUM ATQUE
EX CRIMINE HOC
ANTIPHONEM ERIPTAM ATQUE IN ME OMNEM IRAM DERTIEM SENIS
E O VIR FORTIS ATQUE AMICUS URUM HOC SAREPH PHOENIX
UXEOR NE INTHAC PORTITUDO IN IERON ERMAT PATNZE 325
A AH NON ITA EST FACTUM PERICULUM IAM PEDUM UISAST UIA
QUOD ME CENSES HOMINES IAM DEUERERASSE USQUE AD NECEM
HOSPITES TUM CIUES QUO MAGIS NOUI TANTO SAEPUS
CEDO DUN ENUMQUAM INRURARUM AUDRSTI MINI SCRIPTUM DICAN
E QUIT ISTUC A QUA NON RETE ACCIPTI US TENDITUR NEQUE
MILIO 330
QUIT MALE FACIUNT NOBIS ILLIS QUI NIHIL FACIUNT TENDITUR
QUIA ENIM IN ILLIS FRUCTUS EST IN ILLIS OPERA LUDITUR
ALIS ALIUNIT ET PERICULUM INDE ALIUS HOC EST PERFECTO POTEST
MIIHI SCIUNT NIHIL ESSE DICES DUCENT DANNATUM DOMUM
ALERE NOLUNT HOMINES EDAECHM ET SAPIUNT MEA SENTENTIA 335
PRO MALEFICIO SI BENEFICIO SUUM NOLUNT REDDERE
E NON POTEST SATIS PRO MERITO AB ILLO TIBI REFERRI GRATIA
A IMMO ENIM NEMO SATIS PRO MERITO GRATIAM REGI REPERT
TEN ASYMBOLEM UENTIRE UNCTUM ATQUE LAUTUM E BALINEIS
OTTOSUM AB AMINO CUM ILLE ET CURA ET SUMPTU ABSUMITUR 340
DUN TIBI FIT QUOD PLACEAT ILLE RINGITUR TU RIDEAS
PRIOR BIBAS PRIOR DECUMBAS CENA DUBIA APPARTEM
E QUID ISTUC UERBI EST A UBI TU DUBITAS QUID SUMAS POTISSIMUM
HAEC CUM RATIONEM INEAS QUAM SINT SUAUIA ET QUAM CARA SINT

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

Z DEMIPHO T HEGIO Y CRATINUS +Crito +A PHORMO E GETA

SENEX ADUOCATI

III PARASITUS SERUUS

Z ENUQUAM CUQIAM CONTUSILOSIUS
AUDISTIS FACTAM INIURIAM QUAM HAECE EST MINI
ADESTE QUEESO E IRATUS EST A QVIN T HOC AGE
IAM EGO HUNC AGITABO PRO DEUM IMMORTEM
NEGAT PHANTUM ESSE HANC SIBI COGNATAM DEMIPI
HANC DEMIPIO NEGAT ESSE COGNATAM E NEGAT
A NEQUE EUIS PATREM SE SCIRE QUI ERUIT E NEGAT
E IPSUM ESSE OPINOR DE QVO AGEBAM SEQUIMINI
A AEC STILPHEONEM IPSUM SCIRE QUI ERFET E NEGAT
A QVIA EGENS RELICTIS MISERA IGNORATUR PARENTS
NECLEGITUR IPSA UIDE AURITIA QUID FECIT
E SI ERUM INSIMULABIS MALITIAE MALE AUDIES
Z O AUDACIAM ETIAM ME ULTRA ACCUSATUM ADUENIT
A NAM IAM ADOLESCENTI NIHIL EST QUOD SUSCENSEM
SI ILLUM MINUS NORAT QVIPPE HOMO GRANDI
PAUPER CUI OPERA UITA ERAT RURI FERE
SE CONTINERAT IBI AGRUM DE NOSTRO PATR
COLENDEM HABEBAT SARKE INTEREBA MINI SENEX
NARRATAB SE HUNC NECLEGERE COGNATUM SUUM
ATQUE UIRUM QUEM EGO UIDERIN IN UITA OPTIMUM

346 COTIOST: letter I written above OT by corr. rec.
(Pr.) to read COTIOST; ACERRIMA: second A
written by corr. rec. (Pr.)
347 POST ILLAM: letters IA written above M by corr. rec.
(Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Ash.) to read
POSTILLA IAM
350 AGE: letter S added by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.),
by A2 (Ash.) to read AGES
351 IMMORTEM: word PIDEN added at end of line by Iov.
(Pr.), (K.). Traces of the name "Ioviales"
can be seen just below correction.
357 EGENS: letter A written above by A (Pr.) to read AEGENS
358 FECIT: second letter erased and A written in by another
hand. Letter A written in place of E by corr. rec. (Pr.), by A2 (Mar.) to read PACIT.
"faciat Iov." (K.)
364 PATR: E added by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read PATRE
367 ATQUE: letters UEM added above ATQ. by Iov. (Pr.) to
read AT QUEM
E ÚDEAS TE ATQUE ILLUM UT NARRAS A I IN MALAM CRUCEM
NAM IN EUM ESSE EXISTIMASSE NUNQUAM TAM GRAUIS
OB HANC INTIMCITIAS CAPEREM IN ULESTRAM FAMILIAN 370
QUAM IS ASPERNATUR NUNC TAM INLIBERALITER.
E PERGIN ERO ABSENTE MALE LOQUI INPURISSIME
A DIGNUM AUTEM HOC ILLOST E AIN TANDEM CARCER Z GETA
E BONORUM EXORTOR LECUM CONTORCTOR Z GETA
A RESPONDE E QUIIS HOMOST EHEM Z TACE E ABSENTE ABSENTE

TE INDIGNAS SEQUE DIGNAS CONTUMELIAS
NUNQUAM CESSAVIT DICERE HODIE Z DESINE
ADULESCENS PRIMUM ABS TE HOC BONA UENIA PETO
SI TIBI PLACERE POTIS ES MIHI UT RESPONDEAS
QUEM AMICUM TUUM AIS - FUISE ISTUM EXPLANA MIHI 380
ET QUI COGNATUM ME SIBI ESSE DICERET
A PROINDE EXPISCARE QUASI NON NOSSE Z NOSSEM A ITA
EGO ME NEGRO TU QUI AIS REDIGE IN MEMORIAM
A ERO TU SOBRINUM TUUM NON NARAS Z ENICAS
DIEC NOMEN A NOMEN MAXINE Z QUID NUNC TACIS 385
A PERI HERCLE NOMEN PEROIDI Z QUID AIS A GETA
SI MEMISIT ID QUID OLM DICTUMT SUBICE EM
NON DISCO QUASI NON NOSSEZ TEMPATUM ADUENIS
Z EGO AUTEM TEMPTO E STILPHO A ATQUE ADEO QUID MEA
STILPHOST Z QUEM DIXIT A STILPHONEM INQUAM EST
NOUEZAS 390

Z NEQUE EGO ILLUM NORAM NEC MIHI COGNATUS FUIT
QUISQUAM ISTOC NOMINE A ITANE NON TE HORUM PUDET

369 NI EUM: letters SITA written above by corr. rec. (Pr.), letters ITA written above by A2 (Ash.)
380 AIS - second S crossed out by A
382 NOSSES: line between OS appears to be unintentional; ITA: after ITA is Z by an unknown hand. According to Ms. tradition EGO...MEMORIAM belongs to Z
AT SI TALENTUM REM RELIQUISET DECEM
Z DI TIBI MALE FACIANT A PRIMUS ESSES MEMORITER
PROGENIEM UESTRAM USQUE AB AUS ATQUE ATAUO

PROPERENS 395
Z IPA UT TU DICES EGO TUM CUM ADVENISSEM QUI MIHI
COGNATA EA ESSET DICEREM ITIDEM TU FACE
CEDO QUI EST COGNATA ET EU NOSTER RECITE HEUS TU CAUE
A DILUCIDE EXPEDIEU QUIBUS ME OPORTUIT
IUDICIBUS TUM ID SI FALSUM FUERAT FILIUS
CURI NON REPELLIT Z FILIUM NARBAS NIHI
CUIUS DE STUDITIA DICI UT DIGNUMST NON POTEST
A AT TU QUI SAPIENS ES MAGISTRATUS ADI
IUDICIO DE EADEM CAUSA ITERUM UT REDDANT TIBI
QUANDOQUIDEM SOLUS REGNAS ET SOLI LICET
405
HIC DE EADEM CAUSA BIS IUDICII ADIPISCIER
Z ET SI NIHI FACTA INIURIAS UERUM TAHEN
POTIUS QUAM LITES SECTOR AUT QUAM TE AUDIAM
ITIDEM UT COGNATA SI SIT ID QUOD LEX IUBET
DOTIS DARE ABDUC HANC MINAS QUINQUE ACCIPERE
410
A HAHAHAE HOMO SUAUIS Z QUID EST NUM INIQUOM POSTULO
AN NE HOC QUIDEM EGO ADIPISCAR QUOD IUS PUBLICUMST
A ITANE TANDEM QUAESO ITEM UT MERETRICEM UBI ABUSUS
MERCEDEM BARE LEX IUBET ET ATQUE AMITERRERE
AN UT NE QUIT TURPE CIUIS IN SESE AMITERRERE
415
PROPER EGESTATEM PROXIMO IUS SAST DARI
UT CUM UNO AETATEM DEGERET QUOD TU UETAS

395 ATAUO: letter T changed to D by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read ADAUO
398 CAUE: at end of line, PHORMIO written by corr. rec. (Pr.)
413 ABUSUS: word SIS written at end of line by corr. rec. (Pr.) after erasure of two or three letters of A (ES?)
ZITA PROXIMO QUIDEM AD NOS UNDE AUT QUAM OB REM AE OHE
ACTUM AIUNT
NE AGAS Z NON AGAM IMMO HAUD DESITAM
DONEC PERFCRERO HOC A INEPHTS Z SINE MODO 420
A POSTREMO TECUM NIIHIL REI NOBIS DEMIPHST
TUUS EST DAMNATUS GNATUS NON TU NAM TUA
FRATERERAT IAM UDCENDA AEYTAS Z OMNIA HAEC
ILLUM PUTATO QUAE EGO HUNC DICO DICERE
AUT QUIDEM CUM UXORE HAC IPSUM PROHIBEO DOMO 425
A IRATUS EST TU TE IDEM MELIUS FECERIS
Z ITAHE ES PARATUS FACERE ME ADUOSQM OMGIA
INPEXLA A METUIT HIC NOS TAEPTAS SEDULO
DIDISSLUAT E BENE HABENT TIBI PRINCIPIA A QUIN QUOD
FERNUNDUM PERES TUIS DIGNUM FACTIS FECERIS
430
UT AMICI INTER NOS SIMUS Z ECON TUAM EXPETAM
ANIMITION AUT TE USUM AUT AUDITUM UELIM
A SI CONCORDABIS CUM ILLA HABLEIS QUAE TUAM
SENECTUTEM OBLECTET RESPICE AETATEM TUAM
Z TE OBLECTET TIBI HASE A MINUE UERQO IRAM Z HOC AGE 435
SATIS IAM UERBORUMST. NISI TU PROPERAS MULIEREM
ABDUCERE EGO ILLAM EICIAM DIXI PHORMIO
A SI TU ILLAM ATTIGERIS SECUS QM DIGNUMST LIBERAM
DICAM TIBI ADPINGAM GRANDEM DIXI DEMIPHO
440
SI QUID OPUS FUERIT HEUS DOME E INTELLECO
Z QUANPA ME CURA ET SOLICITUDINE ADPISCIT
GNATUS QUI ME ET SE HISCE INPEDIUUT 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 INDINGAM
440 DOME: letters MO written above ME by corr.
rec. (Pr.) to read DOMO ME
Neque mihi in conspectu prodit ut saltem sciam quid de ea re dicat quidue sit sententiae
abi ute redierit ne iam an nondum domum

E ego z uidetis quo in loco res had sit quid acq dic nostrum censeo si tibi uidetur z dic carnin y mehi uts

" TE Y QAE IN REM TUAM SINT UELIN PHACIAS MIHI.

Sic hoc uidetur quod te absente hic filius egit restitui in integrum aequo est et bonum et id imperabris dixi z dic nunc hegio

Ego sedulo dixisse hunc credo uerum itast quod homines tot sententiae suus cuique nost es mihi non uidetur quod sit factum legibus rescindi posse et turpe inceptum 2 dic crito

Ego amplius deliberandum censeo res magna est y nuncquid nost 2 fectis quis probe incertior sum multo quam dudum et negant redisse 2 frater est expectandus mihi 460

His quod mihi dederit de hac be consilium id sequar percurcatat ibo ad porcum quoad se recipiat

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

A antiphon b geta

Adulescens servus

A enim uero antiphon multis modis cum istoc animo es utiperandus 465

445 DOMUM: word etiam written above DOMUM in cursive style by Iov. (Pr.), (K.) to read NONDUM etiam DOMUM

448 UIDETUR: letter R appears to be the correction of a half-erased letter (N?) in the hand of A

449 QUAE: word EGO written above by Iov. (Pr.), (K.)

461 SEQUAR: both K. and Mar., each in their own app. crit., cite A2 as changing SEQUAR to EXSEQUAR but Í 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 tuam tutandam allis dedisse
alias tuam rem credidisti magis quam tete asinaduressuros
nam utut erat alia illi certe quae nunc tibi donist
consuleres
ne quid propter tuam fidem decepta poteretur nali
cui nunc miserae speis obeseque sunt in te omnes sitae 470
b et quidem ere nos iam dudum hic te absentem accusamus qui
adieris
a—ipsam quaerebam sed ea causa nihil magis depecimus
a locuere obsceco quonam in l—o sunt res et fortunae maeae
—um quid patri subobet b nihil etiam a quid spei porrost
b nescio a an
b nisi phaedria hau cessavit pro te eniti a nihil fecit
nou 475
b tum phormio itidem in hac re ut allis strctos hominem
phaebuit
a quid is fecit b conputavit ubris admodum iratam senem
a eu phormio b ego quod potui porro a mi geta omnis uos amo
b sic habent principia sese ut dixi adhuc tranquilla res es
mancurosque patruum pater est dun hic adueniat
480
a quid eum b ut aiebat
de eiu consilio sese uelle facere quod hanc rem attinet
a quantum metus est mghi uidere hic saiuom nunc patruum geta
nam per etus unam ut audio aut uitam aut moriar sententiam
b phaedria tibi adest a ubi niam b eccum ab sua palaestra exit
foras 485
\[\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{PHAEBRIA} & \text{E} & \text{DORIO} & \text{A} & \text{ANTIPH} & \text{B} & \text{GETA}
\end{array}\]
\[\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{ADULESCENS} & \text{LENO} & \text{ADULESCENS} & \text{SERIUS}
\end{array}\]
\[\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{DORIO} & \text{AUDIO} & \text{OBSECO} & \text{E} & \text{NON} & \text{AUDIO}
\end{array}\]
\[\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{DORIO} & \text{ANTIPH} & \text{E} & \text{QUIN} & \text{OMITTE}
\end{array}\]
\[\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{AUDI} & \text{QUOD} & \text{DICAM} & \text{E} & \text{AT} & \text{ENIM}
\end{array}\]
\[\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{ENIAM} & \text{TABDET} & \text{ETIAM} & \text{AUDIRE} & \text{EADEM} & \text{MILIENS}
\end{array}\]
\[\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{FAT AT NUNC DICAM} & \text{QUOD} & \text{LUBENTER} & \text{E} & \text{LOQUERE} & \text{AUDIO}
\end{array}\]

466 ----m: the first four letters are blurred but the Ms.
tradition reads utiam
469 poteretur: letter o erased and a superimposed by corr.
rec. (pr.), by iov. (k.), by a2 (mar.) to read poteretur
471 accusamus: letters ace 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 d 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 quo te exorare ut naves triduum hoc quo nunc abis e nitarar si tu mihi uitquam adperses noui.

A et metuo lenones nequid suo suat capit; b idem ego ubor
nonsum mihi credis e bariolae; sin fidem do e fabulae.

Farbearatum istuc beneficium pulchre tibi dices e loci.

Credes mihi gaudebis facto uerum hercle hoc est e somnia.

Experire non est longum e cantilenam bandoe cantis.

Tu mihi cognatus tu paribus tu e garrasi modo.

Ad eon ingenio esse duro te atque inexprabili.

Ut neque misericordia neque precibus kotiri queas
ad eon te esse incogitativen atque inexpress fradia sine
modo.

Ut me phaleratis duscas dictis et meum ductis gratiss 500

A misericorsst e iu eris uincor b quam uteque est similis

Ut me phaleratis duscas dictis et meum ductis gratiss.

O fortunatissime antipho a eone g qui quod amat domist

Neque cum huius modi umquum tibi usum ut conflictarist

Mal 505

A mihin domist immo id quod atint auribus teneo lupum

Nan neque quo pacto me amatam neque uthi repetem scio
e ipsum istuc mihi in hoc est a hela ne parum lento.

Nunc quid hic conficit g hicine quod homo inhumanissimus

Pamphilam meam uendidit a quid uendidit a ain uendidit 510

Uendidit g quam indum factus ancillan ere empto meo.

Nequeo exorare ut me maneat et cum illo ut mutet fidem

Triduum hoc dum id quod est promissum ab amicis argentum

Aufero

493: Prete states that the correction I occurs in this line but it is not visible in either the xerox or the microfilm. Prete suggests original text had IOCI.

494 UERUM: above the first U, E written by Iov. (Pr.), (K.) to indicate that Dorio says the words UERUM... SOWMA; SOWMA: letter a crossed out and UN written above by Iov. (Pr.), (K.), by A2 (Mar.) to read SOMNIT.

503 A QUID: letter h written above Q by Iov. (Pr.), (K.) thereby making A represent speaker and first letter of Am.

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

511 G crossed out and E written above by Iov. (Pr.), (K.); INDUM: letters IGN written above DU by Iov. (Pr.) to read INDIGNUM.
Si non tum dedero unam praeterea horam ne oppressus sit
et optundis a haud longum-

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 7

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 7 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 7 written over it by corr. rec. (Pr.)
CURI MINUS NIHILOST QUOD HIC SI POTE FUSET EXORATUR 535
TRIDUUM ECC PROMISSUM FUERAT A ITANE HINC PATIEMUR GETA
PIERI MISERUM QUI NE DUDUM UT DIXIT ADUERRET CONTIBER
QUIN QUOD OPUS BENEFICUM RURSUS EI EXPERIEMUR REDDERE
B SCIO EQUIDEM ESSE AEUQOM AI AECI RNO SOUS SERHARE
HINC POTES
B QUID FACIAM A INENIAS ARGUMENT B CURIO SED UNE EDOECE 540
A PATER ADEST HIC B SCIO SED QUID TUM A HI DICTUM SATIINTI
SAY EST
B ITANE A IRA B SANE HERCLE PULCHRE SUADES ETIAM TU HINC ABIS
NON TRIUMPHO EX NUPTIIS TUIS SI NIIIL NANCER MALLI
NT ETIAM NUNC ME HUIUS CAUSA QUAEERERE IN MALO IUEAS CRUCEM
A UERUM HIC DICIT B QUID EGO UOBLIS ALIENS SUM B HAUD
PUTO 545
SED PARUM ES QUOD OMNIUS NUNC NOBIS SUSCENSET SENEX
NE INTEGEMUS ETIAM UT NULLUS LOCUS RELINQUITUR PRECIE
Alius AB oculis suis IMUS IN IGNOTUM ABUCET LOCUM HEM
TUM IGITUR UM LICET UM ADSUM LOQUIMINI MECUM ANTHRO
CONTREMINI MEA QUAM OB REM AUT QUIDNAS FACTURUS
Cedo 550
QVOQO HINC ASPOBABIUR TERRARUM CERTUNST PERSEQI
AUT PERIRE B DI BENE UOATANT QUOD AGAS PETERPETIN TAMEN
A UIDE SI QUID OPIS POTES ADFERRE HUC B SI QUID QUID
NE QUID PLUS MINUSUE FAXIS QUOD NO POST PIGEAT GETA
B QUADER SALUS ES UM OPINOR UERUM ENIM MITUO MALUM 555
A NOLI METUERE UNA TECUM BOHA MALA TOLERABIMUS
A UERUM QUINTUM OPUS EST TIBI ARGENTI SOLAE TRIGINTA
B QUARENTA PENNAI EST TIBI ARGENTI LOQUERE /
SALAE TRIGINTA
B TRIGINTA HUI: PERCARST PHAEANIA R ISTAE UEREO UOIL EST
B AGE AGE INUENTAS REDDAM B Q LEPIDUM B AUFER PE HINC
B IAM OPUS EST

539 EQUIDEM ESSE: between EQUIDEM and ESSE, six
letters of HERCLE erased by A
540 SED UNEE: word ID written above by corr. rec. (Pr.),
by Iov. (K.)
545 UOBLIS ALIENS: word GETA written above by Iov. (Pr.),
(K.)
554 FAXIS: letter S crossed out and T written above by
corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
559 INUENTAS REDDAM: word EST written above by Iov. (Pr.)
B IAM FERIS SET OPUS EST MIHI PHRONIEMEM AD HANC REX

A PRAESTOST AUDACISSIME ONERIS QUIDUIS IMPONE FERET
SOLUS EST HOMO AMICO AMICUS B EAMUS ERGO AD EUM OCIUS
A NUNC QUID EST QUOD OPERA MEA UOBIS OPUS SIT B NIIHIL UERUM
ABI DONUM
ET ILLAM MISERAM QUAM EGO NUNC INTUS SCIO ESSE EXAMINATUM
METU
CONSOLOARE CESSAS A NIIHIL EST AQUE QUOD FACIAN LUBENS 565
\[\text{GUA UIA ISTUC PACIES E DICAM IN TERRERE NODO TE HINC AMOR}\]

Z DEIMPHO E CHREMES

SEISES

II

Z QUID QUA PROPECTUS CAUSA HINC ES LENNUM CHREME
ADDUXYT TECUM FILIAM E NON Z QUID ITA NON
E POSTQUAM UIDET ME HUI S MATER ESSE HIC DIUTIUS
SIMUL AUTEM NON MANEBAT AETAS VIRGINIS
HEAM NECLENTIAM IPSA CUM OMNI FAMILIA
AD ME PROPECTAM ESSE AEBDANT Z QUID ILLI IAM DII
QUESO IGITUR COMORABERE USI ID AUDIERAT
E POL ME DETINUIT MORBUS Z UNDE AUT QUI E ROCAS
SISNCTUS IPSA SORBUS SED UENISS EAS
SALUAS AUDIUI EX NTA- QUI ILLAS UEXERAT
\[\text{Z QUID CHATO OPTIGNET ME ABSENTE AUDIISTI CHER}
\]
E QUID QUIDEM ME FACTUM CONSILI CERTUM FACIT
NAM HANC CONDICIONEM SI CUI TULERO EXTRARIO
QUO FACTO AUT UNDE MIHI SIT DICUNDUM ORDINAT
\[\text{Z MIHI PIDELEM ESSE AQUE AQUE EXECUM SUM NIIH}
\]
SCIBAM ILLE SI ME ALIENUS ADFINEM UCSET

561: Mar. and K. suggest line 561 was attributed to A by A but was given to \( \gamma \) by \( \alpha_2 \) (Mar.); IMPONE
FERET: word hie 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 CHRE: 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 UCSET: letter C crossed out and L added above
by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read UCSET
TACEBIT DUM INTERCEDET FAMILIARITAS

SIN SPREHURIT NE PLUS QUAM OPUS EST SCITU SCIST

VEREOQUE NE UXOR ALIQUA HOC RESCISCAT MEB

QUOD SI TIT UT ME EXCUTIAM ATOQUE AGRERIAT DOMO

ID RESTAT NAM EGO MEORUM SOLUS SUM MEUS

Z SCIO ESSE UT ISTAEC NIHII RES SOLLICITUDINIST

NEQUE ADOQ DEPITSCAR UMQUAM EXPERIOER

DONEC TIBI ID QUOD POLLICITUS SUM EFFECERO

A GETA Z DEMIPRO E CHREMES

SERVUS SENES II

A EGO HOMINEM CALLIDIOREM UIDI NEMINEM

QUAM PHORMIONEM UENIO AD HOMINEM UT DICEREM

ARGENTUM ESSE ET ID QUO PACTO FIERET OPUS

UXX DUM DIMIDIAM DIXERAM INTELLEXERAT

GAUDEBAT ME LAUDABAT QUAREBAND SENEM

DIS GRATIAS AGERBAT TEMPUS SIBI DARI

UBI PHAE-----------------NIHIL MINUS

AMICUM ESSE QUAM ANTIPHONI HOMINEM AD FORUM

IUSSI OPPERIRI EO ME ESSE ADDUCTURUM SENEM

SED ECCUM IPSUM QUID EST. ULTERIOR ATTAT

PHAEDRIAE

600

PATER UENIT SED QUID PERTINUI AUTEM BELUA

AM QUIA QUOS FALLAM PRO UNO DUO SUNT DATI

COMMODIUS ESSE OPINOR DUELI SPECUTER

PETAM HINC UT HAC A PRIMO INSTI IS SI DAT EST

SI AB EO NIHIL FIET TUM HUNG ADORIAR HOSPITEM

605

588 ESSE: word IPA written above by Iov. (Pr.), (K.)

593 OPUS: word OPUS crossed out at the end of the line and written above ESSE by corr. rec. (Pr.). In his app. crit., K. writes "OPUS post FIERET A1"

597 ----------------------: what A had is not clear. Letters DRIAE SE OSTENDERET written on and above the line by corr. rec. (Pr.). by A3 (Mar.)

604 INSTI IS SI: Ash. states A as reading INSTIISSI
ADUENTUS: originally A mistakenly wrote ADUENTUENTUS

609 SALUE: word crossed out by Iov. (K.), corr. rec. (Pr.)

611 E: E at the beginning of the line crossed out and rewritten above the line before COMPLURIA by Iov. (Pr.), (K.)

614 COMMODUM: reference sign to scholia above the second O

617 Z: Z crossed out by Iov. (K.)

618 SI: in his app. crit., K. states SI was changed to IS by Iov. but no such correction is visible in A
Sic unus inceptas hominum ea eloquentia est uerum ponere esse iucum eum at tandem tamen non capis eius res agitur sed pecuniae postquam hominem his uerbis sentio mollirr
soli sumus nunc hic inquam eho quid uis dari

B Satin illi di sunt propitii a nam satis scio

si tu aliquam parentem aequi bonique dixeres
ut est ille bonus eur tria non commutabitis

vera hodie inter uos uis te iustae iussit loqui

E immo non potuit melius perueniur

eo quod nos uolumus b occidz 2 perge eloqui

a primo homo insaniat et cedo quid postulat

a quid nimium quantum licuit et dic a si quis ei dare

talamentum magna in immo malum hercle nihil puderet

a quod dixi adeo ei queso quid si pliarm

suam unicum locaret parui rettulis

non suscipisse inuentast quae dotem petat

ut ad paucua redam ac mittam illius inepitas

haec denique eius fuit postrema oratio

ego inquit a principio amici filiam

it a te aequou fuerat uolui uxorui ducere

nam mihi uenierat in mentem eius incommodium

in seruitutem paupere inuere darum

sed mihi opus erat ut aperte tibi nunc fabuler

Line 635 not written by A but supplied by corr.
rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) in ucial letters. The
line reads: nec hic facesat tur molestus ne sie.

Pr. incorrectly states... tum...

462 a: a crossed out by Iov.? (K.), corr. rec.? (Pr.)

464 NIHIL: word UT added above the line before

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

466 LOCARET: reference sign to scholiam above the C

Bottom line: Pr. says this line is written in
semi-cursive Italian uncharacteris-
tic of the seventh century. He notes
that the last word contains an error
and it is not easy to establish what
the corrector intended to write; af-
after the letters SI (of SIESS) an L
seems to be cancelled out. Then an
es follows. The meaning of the final
letters ha is found on the introduc-
tory page of lowe, clA 1 (X).
Aliquantulum quae adferret ut dissoluerem dare quantum ab hac accipio quae sponsast mihi nullam mihi nalli. Quam gustarum ad uxoribus, si usu.

B utrum stultitia facere iunc an malitia dicam scientem an iniquitatem incertus sum quid si animam debet a ager oppositus pigori ob decem minas est 2 age age iam ducat dabo a aedicularae item sunt ob decem aliar 2 oiei nimiung f ne clama petito nasce a me decem.

A uxori emunda sanctulias tunc pluscola supellectile opus est sumptum ad uantias his rebus sane ponte inquit decem minas.

Z sescantas proinde scritto mihi dicas nihil do ille ut etiam inrideat e queso ego dabo quiesce tu modo filium fac ut illam ducat nos quam volumus b ei mihigetto occidisti me tuis fallaciis.

E mea causa eicitur me hoc est abquom amittere a quantum potest me certorem inquit face si illam dant hanc ut tam ne incertus siem nam illi mihi dotin iam constituehnt dare z iam accipiat illis refusum renuntaet han ducat a quae quinm illi res uortat male e opportune adeo argentum nunc mecum attuli.

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

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

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

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

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

675 TAM: letter M added above the line before TAM, letter I added above TAM and T added above TA by Iov. (K.), (Mar.) to read MITTAM. Pr. notes only MT corrections by corr. rec. to read MITTAM.
FRUCTUM QUEM LEMNI UXORIS REDDUNT PRAEDEA
INDE SUMA UXORI TIDI OPUS ESSE DIXERO

B ANTIPHO A GETA

ADULESCENS SERVUS

B GETA A HEM B QUID ECISTI A EMUNXI ARGENTO SENES
B SATINE EST A NESCIO HERCLE TANTUM TISSUS SUM
B ERO UERBERO ALIUD MIHI RESPONDES AC ROGO
A QUID ERO NARRAS B QUID EGO NAREM OPERA TUA
AD RESTIM MIHI QUIDEM RES REDIT PLANISSIME
UT TE QUIDEM OMNES DI DAEQUE SUPERI INFERI
MALIS EPPICIS PENDAM EM SI QUID UELIS
HUC MANDES QUOD QUIDEM RECTUM UELIS
QUID MINUS UTILEM FUIT QUAM HOC UOLNUS TANGERE
AUT NOMINARE UXOREM INICTA EST SPES PATRI
POSSIT ILLAM EXTRUIDI CEDO NUNC FORO PHORBIO
DOTEM SI ACCIPIET UXOR DUCENDA EST DOMUM
QUID PIET A NON ENIM DUCET B NOUI CETERUM
CUM ARGENTUM REPETET NOSTRA CAUSA SCIICICT
IN NERUUM POTIUS IBI A NIHIL EST AMEPHO
QUIN MALE NARRANDO POSSIT DEPARVARIER
TU ID QUOD BONI EST EXCERPIS DICIS QUOD MALI
AUDI NUNC CONTRA SI ARGENTUM ACCEPERIT
DUCENDA EST UXOR UT AIS CONCEDO TIBI
SPATIUM QUIDEM TANDEM APPARANDAS NUPTIAS
UOCANDI SACRIFICANDI DABITUR PAULULUM

95

TER.

682

FRUCTUM QUEM LEMNI UXORIS REDDUNT PRAEDEA
INDE SUMA UXORI TIDI OPUS ESSE DIXERO

B ANTIPHO A GETA

ADULESCENS SERVUS

B GETA A HEM B QUID ECISTI A EMUNXI ARGENTO SENES
B SATINE EST A NESCIO HERCLE TANTUM TISSUS SUM
B ERO UERBERO ALIUD MIHI RESPONDES AC ROGO
A QUID ERO NARRAS B QUID EGO NAREM OPERA TUA
AD RESTIM MIHI QUIDEM RES REDIT PLANISSIME
UT TE QUIDEM OMNES DI DAEQUE SUPERI INFERI
MALIS EPPICIS PENDAM EM SI QUID UELIS
HUC MANDES QUOD QUIDEM RECTUM UELIS
QUID MINUS UTILEM FUIT QUAM HOC UOLNUS TANGERE
AUT NOMINARE UXOREM INICTA EST SPES PATRI
POSSIT ILLAM EXTRUIDI CEDO NUNC FORO PHORBIO
DOTEM SI ACCIPIET UXOR DUCENDA EST DOMUM
QUID PIET A NON ENIM DUCET B NOUI CETERUM
CUM ARGENTUM REPETET NOSTRA CAUSA SCIICICT
IN NERUUM POTIUS IBI A NIHIL EST AMEPHO
QUIN MALE NARRANDO POSSIT DEPARVARIER
TU ID QUOD BONI EST EXCERPIS DICIS QUOD MALI
AUDI NUNC CONTRA SI ARGENTUM ACCEPERIT
DUCENDA EST UXOR UT AIS CONCEDO TIBI
SPATIUM QUIDEM TANDEM APPARANDAS NUPTIAS
UOCANDI 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
ULCUS
701 APPARANDAS: letter I written above last A by
corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read
APPARANDIS; NUPTIAS: letter I
written above last A by corr. rec.
(Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read
NUPTIAS
702 SACRIFICANDI: first I converted to E by corr.
rec. (Pr.) to read SACRIFICANDI
Interea amici quod polliciiti sunt dabunt
inde iste reddet b quan ob rem aut quid dicet a rogas
quod res postilla monstr a euerunt mihi
intro iit in abdis ater alienus canis
anguis per infuliuium dedit te tegulis
gallina cecinit interdixit hariolus
harispeut ante brunam autem noui
negotii incipere quae causast iustissima
haec fiunt b ut modo fiunt a fiunt me uidem
pater exit abi dic esse arguentum phaedriae

Z DEMIPHO E CHREMIS AGETA

Z quiets esto inquam ego curabo ne quid usurbarum duet
hoc temere nunquam amittam ego a me quin mihi testis
adhibeam
cum dem et quam ob rem dem convenerabo a ut cautust ubi
nihil opus

e atqui tta opus factost. Et natura dum libido eadem haec
manet
nam si altera illae magic institat forsitam nos reiciat
z rem ipsam putas dic me ad eum ergo a non moror e ubi hoc
egeris
transito ad uxorem meam ut conueniat hanc prius quam hinc

abibit

dicat eam dare nos phormiuni nuptum ne suscenseat
t270
e magis esse illum idoneum qui ipsi sit: familiarior
nos nostro officio non digressos essequantur quantum est usque

a velut

postilla monstraurunt quod polliciiti sunt dabunt

تقدم: First I inserted above the line before N by A (Pr.)
713 DUET: letter N added above IT by corr. rec. (Pr.),
by Iov. (K.) to read DUET
724 ID: letters EN added above the line after ID by Iov. (Pr.), (K.) to read IDEM
Z IDEM EGO ISTUC FACERE POSSUM ET MULIER MULIERI MAGIS CONSEMPIT
Z ROGABO E UBI ILLAS NUNC EGO REPERIRE POSSIM COGITUM

Ω SOPHRONA E CURIENAE
NUTRIX SESEX

Ω QUID AGAM VEC RIH MINI AMICUM INUENTIAM MISERAM AUT QUOD CONSILIA

HAEC

REFERAM AUT UNDE AUXILIIUM PETAM

NAM VEROER ERA NE OB MEUM SUASUM INDICIA INIURIA

ADIFICATUR 730

ITA PATREM ADULESCENTIS FACTA HAEC TOLERARE AUDIO VIOLENTER
E NAM QUAE HAEC ANUS EST EXAMINATA A FRATRE QUAE EGRESSAST

MEO

Ω QUOD UT FACEREM EGESTAS NE IMPULSUM SCIREM INFIRMAS

NUPTIAS

HASCE ESSE UT ID CONSULABREM INTEREA UITA UT IN TUTO FOETR

E CERTE DESEPOLL MNE ANIMUS FALLI AUT PARUM PROSPICIENT

OCULI 735

MEAE NUTRICEM GNATAE VIDEO Ω NEQUE ILLE INVESTIGATUR

E QUI AGO

Ω QUI EST EUS PATER E ADEO MANEO DUM HAEC QUAE LOQUITUR

E QUOD SI EUM NUNC REPERIPOSSE POSSIM NIHIL EST QUOD UERERAM

E EAST IPSA

CONCLEVAR Ω QUIS HIC LOQUITUR E SOPHRONA

Ε ΚΩ Ε ΜΗΜΟΝΟΝ ΝΟΝΕΦΑΤ

Ε RESPICE AD ME Ω DI OBSECRo UOS ESTNE HIC STILPHO E NON

ΝEGAS 740

Ε CONCEDE HINC A FORIBUS PAULULUM ISTORSUM SODES SOPHRONA

E ME ISTOC POSTHAC NOMINE APPELLASSIS Ω QUID NON OBSCREGO

ΕS

QUEM SEMPER TE ESSE DICITASTI E ST Ω QUID HAS METUIS FERES

Ε CONCULSUM HIC HABEO UXOREM SAEUAM UERUM ISTUC DE NOMINE

ΕO PERPERAM OLM DIXI NE UOS FORTE INPUDENTES FORIS 745

736 AGO: above letter Ω, only Η written very lightly by Iov. (Pr.), (K.)

737 ADEO: letters NE written above the line after ADEO by Iov. (Pr.), (K.) to read ADDONE; HAEC: in his app. crit., K. states "HAEC A: EA Iov. (?) ." Letters Η and C appear to me to Æ cross out leaving AE as the reading. These are the only visible corrections.
EFFUTTIBETIS ATQUE ID PORRO ALIQUA UXOR HAB. RESCISCERET 
E ISTOC POL NOS TE HIC INUENIRE MISERAE NUNQUAM POTUIMUS
E BEO DIC NIHI QUID REI TIBI EST CUM FAMILIAE FAC UNDE EXIS
UBI ILLAE SUNT E MISERAM NE E HEM QUID EST UIUQESTE
\(\) \(\)UIII QUATA
MATREM IPSAM EX AEGRITUDINE HAC MISERAM MORS CONSECUITA
EST . 750
E MALE FACTUM E EGO AUTEM QUAE ESSE ANUS DESERTA AERGENS
IGNOTA
UT POTUI VIRGINEM NUPTEM LOCAUI HUIC ADULESCENTI
HARUM QUI EST DOMINUS AEDIFICIUM \(\) EN ISTI IPSI
E QUID DUASNE UXORES HABET E AU OBSECO UNAM ILLE QUIDEM
HANC SOLAM
E QUID ILLAM ALTERAM QUAE DICITUR COGNATA HASC PROCREAT
E QUID AIS 755
\(\) COMPOSITO FACTUMST. QUO MODO HANC ANANS HABERE POSSIT
SINE DOTE E DI ESTRAN FIDEM QUAM SABBLE FORTE TEMERE
BUENINT QUAE NON AODDEA OPTARE OFFENDI ADIENIENS
QUOCUM UOLEBAM ET UT UOLEBAM CONLOCATAM AMARI
QUOD NOS ANBO OPERE MAXIMO DABANUS OPERAM UT FIERET
SINE NOSTRAN CURA MAXIMA SUA CURA SOLVS FECIT
\(\) NUNC QUID OPUS FACTO SIT UIDE PATER ADULESCENTIS UENIT
EUIQUE ANIMO INTIQUO HOC OPPIDO FERRE AIUNT E NIHIL PERCIST
SED PER DEOS ATQUE HOMINES MEAN ESSE HANC CAUE RESISCAT
QUIESquam
\(\) NEMO E ME SCIBIT E SEQUERE ME INTUS CETERA AUDIES 765
Z DEMIPH0 A GETA
SEIX SED EUS
Z NOSTRAPTE CULPA FACIMUS UT MALIS EXPEDITAT ESSE
DUM NIMIUM DICI NOS BONO STUDIUS ET BENVIGNOS

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 CASAH QUOD DICUNT NONNE ID SATIS ERAT ACCIPERE AB ILLO INIURIAM ETIAM ARGUMENTUM. ULTO OBIECTUM UT SIT QUI UBUAT DUM ALIUS ALIQUID FLAGITII CONFICAT 770

A --ANISSIME IIS NUNC PRAEHLUNT QUI QUOD PRAM FACIUNT
A --RISSIME Z UT STULTISSIME QUIDEM ILLE REM GESSERIMUS
A NODO UT HOC CONSILIO POSSIBET DISCHI UT ISTAM DUCAT
Z ETIAMNE ID DUBIUMST A HAUD SCIO HERCLE UT HOMOST AN NUTET ANIMUM Z IEM MUTET MUTEM A NESCIO UERUM SI PORER DICO 775
Z SIC FACIAM UT FRATER CENSURIS UT UXOREM EIUS HOC ADDUCAM CUIH ISTA UT LOQUITUR TU GETA ABI PRAE NUNTIA HANC UENTURAM
A ARGUMENTUM INVENTUMST DE TURGO SILETUR
PROIESUM EST NE IN PRAESENTI HAC HINC ASBAT QUID NUNC
PORRO
QUIT FIEIT IN EODEM LUTO HAESETAS UORSUM SOLUBUS
GETA PRAESENS QUOD FUERAT MALUM IN DIEM ABIT PHAGAE
NISI PROSPICIS NUNC HINC DOMUM ICO AC PHANUM EOCIBEO
NE QUID UEREATUR PHORMINEM AUT EUS ORATIONEM

Z DEMIPHO B NAUSIERTATA

SENEX MULIER

Z AGE DUM UT SOLES NAUSIERTATA FAC ILLA UT PLACETUR NOBIS
UT SUA VOLUNTATE ID QUOD EST FACIUNDUM FACIAT B FACIAM 780
Z PARITER NUNC OPERA ME ADUIURES AC RE DUDUM OPITULATA ES
B FACTUM UOLO AC POL MINUS QUOD UIRI CULPA QUAM ME DIGNUMST
Z QUID AUTEM B QUA POL MEI PATRIS BENE PASTA INDOLENTIY
TUTATUR NAM EX IIS PRAEDELIS TALENTA ARGENTIITI BINA
STATIM CAPEBAT UIRI URO QUID PRAESTAT Z BINAN QUASEO 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 CONFICAT: second I crossed out, letter N written above the line and the C changed to an uncial G by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read CONFICAT

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

772 --RISSIME: first two letters of the first word UR (according to Ms. tradition) not visible due to page damage
776 SIC: word SIC (?) erased and ITA superimposed by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.)
780 UORSURAM: letter O erased and E superimposed by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read UERSURAM
790 UIR: word EM written above UIR by Iov. (Pr.), (K.), by A2 (Mar.)
REBUS UILLORIBUS MULTO TALENTA BINA Z HUI
B QUID HADIC UIDENTUR Z SCILICET B UT RURUM ME NAT UELLEM
EGO OSTENDEREM Z CERTO SCIO Z PARCE SODES
UT POSSIS CUM ILLA NE TE ADOLESCENS MULIER DEFIGET

B NAUSISTRATA E CHERMES Z DEMPHO
MULIER SENES II

B FACTAM UT IUBES SED NEUM UIRUM ABS TE EXIRE UIDEO
E EHEM DEMPHO
IAM ILLI DATUM EST ARGENTUM Z CURAUI ILLICO E HOM LEN
DATUM
EI UIDEO UXOREM PAENS PLUS QUAM SAT ERE Z CUR NOLLES
CHERMES
I AM RECTE Z QUID TU ECQUID LOCUTUS CUM ISTAC QUIDAE REM
HANC DUCIM

E TRANSEGI Z QUID AIT TANDEM Z ABDUCI NON POTESE Z QUI NON
POTESE
E QUA UTERQUE UTRIQUE EST CORDI Z QUID ISTUC NOSTRA
E MAGNI PRAETERHAC
COGNATAM COMPERI ESSE NOSIBIS Z QUID DELIRAS Z CUR
NON TEMERE DICO REDI MECUM IN MEMORIAM SATINE SANUS ES
B AU OBSERCIO UIDEO NE INCOGNATAM PECCES Z NON EST E NII NEGA
PATRIS NOMEN ALIUT DUCTUM EST HOC TU ERRASTI Z NON NORAT
PATREM
E NORAT Z CUR ALIUT DIXIT E NUMQUAM HODIE
CONCEDES
NEQUE INTELLEGES Z SI TU NIHIU NARRAS E PERDIS B MIROR
QUID HOC SIET

B UT PROPELOR ILLI QUAZ EGO SUM AC TU NEMOS Z DI UESTRA
EAMUS AD IPSAM UNA OMNIS NOS AUT SCIRE AUT NESCIRE HOC
UOLO A AH
2 QUID EST E ITAN PARVAM MINI FIDEM ESSE APUT TE Z UIN ME
CREDERE
UIN SATIS QUESITUM MINI ISTUC ESSE AC FIAT QUID ILLA
FILIA
AMICI NOSTRI QUID FUTURUMZ E RECTE Z HANC IGIURU MITTINUS
E QUID SUZ ILLA MANES E SIC Z IRA IGIURU TIBI LICIT
NAUSISTRATA
2 EQUIDEM HERCLE NESIO UIN SCIRE AT ITA ME SERUET
IOPPITER

792 NAT UELLEM: letters UT 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 AZ..."
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 quum ut coeperas
manere hanc nam per liberalis usast cum uidi mihi 815
z quid istuc negoti ist e iam opperuit ostium z iam et o
Iuppiter
di nos respiciunt gnatae inihiu nuptas cum tuo filio
z hem
quod pacto potuit e non sat is tus est ad narrandum hic
locus
z at tu intro abi e heus ne fili quidem hunc nostri
resciscat uol0

B Antiphon
Adulescens

B Laetus sum ut meae res sehe habent pratri optigisse quod
vult 820
quam scitumst. eius modi in animo paret cupiditates
quas cum res aduersae sienit pau lo mederi possis
hic simul argentum repperit cura see expeditiu
ego nullo possim remedii ne evoluere ex his turbis
quin si hoc celetur in metu sin patefit in probo stem 825
neque me domum nunc recuperem ni mihi esset spez ostenta
huibsece hancendae sed ubinam getam inuenire possim
ut rogen quod tempus convieniunt patriis ne capere suadeat

Y Phormio B Antiphon
Paraspus Adulescens

Y argentum accepi tradidi lenoni abduxi muliere4
curaui proprium ut phaedria poteretur nam emissat
manu 830
nunc uha mihi res etiam restat quae est conficienda optium
ab senibus ad potandum ut habeam nam aliquod hoc sumas
dies
B sed phormiost. quid ais y quid b quidnam nunc facturus
phaedria

817: Pr. suggests M as a correction in a word on this
line. Presumably, he is referring to a "touch up"
of the M of the last word, HEM
821 PARE: letters RE written above the line after PARE
by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read PARE. First E
was supposed to be changed to A to read
PARAE
Quo facto sate tatem amoris ait se uelle absumere
et uicissim partis suas acturus est b quaes y ut fugit et

Quaem substito ero antiphone ueste hunc onerastis
diem

B quid nam hic sibi uolt a nosque amicos eius exonerastis
metu

Sed ego nunc mihi cesso qui non uemem hunc onero pallio
adque hominem propio inuenere ut haec quae convigerit

Sci cant 845

B nunc t interlegis hic quid hic narret y nunc tu b nihil
y tantundem ego

A ad lenonem hinc ire pergam ibi nunc sunt b heus geta
num mirum aut nouum est rurcastum quo instiueris
b geta

A pergite hercle nunc quam tu odio tuo me uinces b non manes
A uapula b id quidem ibi iam fi et nisi restititis uberber 850
A familiariorem oportet esse hunc mitatur malum set isne

E est

Quem quaero an non ipsus est congrepdiare actum b quid

A omni quantum est qui uiuont homo hominum ornatisim
nam sine controversya ab dis solus diligere antiphono
b ita ueliam sed quid istuc credam ita esse multis sect

Ueliam 855

A satine est si te dilibatum uadio reddo b enicas
849 PERGIT: letter T crossed out and S written above by
corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read PERGIS
850 UAPULA: letters BIS written above by corr. rec. (Pr.),
by Iov. (K.), by A2 (Mar.), (Ash.) to read
UAPULADIS
851 MITATUR: letters NI written above by corr. rec. (Pr.)
to read MINITATUR
852 CONGREDIARE: letter A crossed out and I changed to E by
corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read
CONGREDEERE
853 ORNATISSIME: letter N crossed out and NO written above
OR by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.),
by A2 (Mar.) to read ONORATISSIME
854 DILIGERE: after the second E, above the line is an I
by A (Pr.) and above this I is an S by corr.
rec. (Pr.). These observances are made by
no other editor.
Quin tu Hunc polllicitationes aufer et quod fers cedo a oh tu quoqueaderas phormio y aideram sed tu cessas a accepem ut modo argentun tibi dedimus. Aput forum recta donum sumus profecti interea mittit erus me ad uxorrem tuam 860 quan ob rem a onitio proloqui nam nihil ad hanc rem est antiplus ubi in gynaecum ire occipio puier ad me accurririt nida pone reprehendit pallio resupinat respicio rogo quan ob rem retineat me ait se se utitum intro ad eram acced- suspensa gradu placide ire perexi accessii assitit animam compressi auerei admoi ita animum coepei attendere hoc modo sermonem captans y eu geta a hic pulcherrimum facinus audui itaque pae ne hercle exclaumai gaudio 870 bu quod a quod nam arbitrare b nescio a atqui mireficissimum patruus tuus est pater inuenius phanio uxorri tuae b quid a su cum eius conueuit olim matre in lenno clanculum y somnium utin haec ignoraret suum patrem a aliquis credito phormio esse cauac sed hen cenzen potius esse onita 875 intellegere extra ostium intus quae inter se esse ipsi egerint b atque ego quoque inauduii illam fabulam a immo etiam dabo quo hagis credas patruus interea inde huc egreditur foras haud multo post cum patre idem inuo recipit se intro dendo ait uterque tibi potestatem eius adhibendae dare 880 denique ego missus sum te ut requirem atque adducere

857 AUFER: letter S written above R by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read AUFAER
863 REPREHENEDIT: letters RE crossed out and AD added above by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read ADPREHENDIT
864 SESE: first S crossed out and S written above ES by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.) to read ESSE; ACCED----: last three letters ERE (743) on 71v
874 UTIN: letter N appears to me to be crossed out by Iov. (?) to read UTI. No editor mentions it
877 INAUDUII: letters IN crossed out by Iov. (K.), by corr. rec. (Pr.) to read AUDUII
878 PATRUUS: word TUUS written above the line after PATRUUS by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
880 ADHIBENDAE: letters DH crossed out by Iov. (K.), corr. rec. (Pr.) to read ABERAEB
B QUIN ERGO RAPE ME QUID CFSSAS A FECERO B HEUS PHORMIO
VALE Y VALE ANTIPIPHO BENE ITA ME DI AMEN FACTUM GAUDEO
Y PHORMIO
PARASITUS

Y TANTAM FORTUMAN DE INPROQUIO ESSE HISPATAM
SUMMA ELUDENDI OCCASOST MIHI NUNC SESES
ET PHAEIDRIAE CURAM ADIMERE ARGENTARIAM
NE QUOQUAM SUORUM AEQUALIUM SUFFIX SIEIT
NAM IDEM HOC ARGUMENT ITA UT DATUMST. INGRATAS
EX DATUM ERIT HOC QUI COGAM RE TPSE REPPERI
NUNC GES TUS MIHI VOLUTSQUE EST CAPEINDUS NODOS
SED HINC CONCEDAM IN ANTI FORTUM HOC PROXIMUM
INDE HISCHE OSTEYEMAN ME UBI ERUNT EGRESSI FORAS
QUO ME AD SIMULARAM IRE AD MERCATUM NON EO

Z DEMIPHO E CHREMES Y PHORMIO

SESES II PARASITUS

Z DIS MAGNAGNAS MERITO GRATIAS HABEO ATQUE AGO
QUANDO EUENERE HAECE NORIS FRATER PROSPERE
QUANTUM POTEST NUNC CONVENEINDUS EST PHORMIO
PRIOUS QUAM DILAPIDAT NOSTRAS TRIGINTA MINAS
UT AUFERAMUS ET DEMIPHONEM SI DOMIST
UISAM UT QUOD Z AD NOS AD TE IAMBAS PHORMIO
Y DE EADEM HAC FORTASSE CAUSA Z ITA HERCLE Y CREDIDI
900 QUID AD ME IBATIS Z RIDICULUM Y UBERBAMINI
NE NON ID FACEREM QUOD RECEISSE SEMEL

882 HEUS: HEUS crossed out and words 0 MI written
above by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
HEUS QUANTA QUANTA IAEC NOE PAUPERTAS EST TAMEN
ADHUC CURAUDI UNUM HOC QUIDEM UT HIHI ESSET FIDES
Z ESNNE ITA UT DIXI LIBERALIS E OPPIDO
905
Y IODE ADEO UENIO AD UOS NUNTIATUM DEMPHO
PARATUM NE ESSE UBI VOLTIS UXOREM DATE
Nam omnis posthabui mihi res ita ut par fuit
Postquam id tantopere uol uelle annaueueram
Z AD HIC DEHORTATUS EST NE NE IIAM TIBI DAREN
910
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 incussaueras
Y Satis superbe inluditis me qui y rogas
Quia ne alteram quidem illam potero ducere
Nam quo re redibo ad eam quam contemserim
E tum autem antiphonem video ad se Eam annitare
Inquitum Eam inque 2 tum autem video filium
Inquitum sane multierem ab se annitare
Sed transi sodes ad forum atque illut mihi
920
Arguentum cursorium ube rescript Phormio
Y quodne ego discrispi poni illis quius debui
Z quid inquit fie? et si uez mihi uxorere dare
Quam despondisti ducam sin est. ut uelis
Manere illam aput te dos hic maneant dempho
Nam non est aequum me propter uos decipi

915 SATIS: letter N written above second S by
corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.), by
A2 (Mar.) to read SATIN
917 RE: letter O written above the line before
RE by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.)
to read ORE; REDIBO AD: letters REDIBO A
seem to be retouched by corr. rec. (Pr.),
by Iov. (K.)
921 ILLUT: 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 tantiundem dabant
z i in malam rem iunct cum istan magnificentia
fugitutue etiam nunc credis te ignorantem
aut tua facta adeo y ininitor z tu hanc duceres
si tibi daretur y fact periculum z ut filius
cum illa habit aput te hoc uestrum consilium fuit
y quae so qui narras z quin tu mini argentum cedo 935
y inmo uero uxorome tu cedo z in tuis ambula
y in tuis enim uero z si porro esse odioi si pergitis
z quid facies y egone uos me indotatius modo
patrociniari fortasse arbitramini
etiam dotatis soles e quid id nostra y nihil 940
hic quandam noran cuius uir uxorome e hem z quid est
y lemit habits aliam y NULLUS SUM y ex qua filliam
susceptit et eam clam educat e sepultus sum
y haec adeo illi tam denabraso y obsebro
ne factas y oh tune is eras z ut ludos facit
et missum te factum y fabulae e quid uis tibi
argentum quod hares condorumus te y audio
quid uos malum ergo me sicut ludificabanimi
inepti uestra puerili sententia
no lo uolo uolo no lo rursum cape cedo
quod dictum indictumst. quod modo erat ratum ininitumst
z quo facto aut unde haec hic rescuitt z nescio

930 istan: letter n crossed out by corr. rec. (pr.)
to read istan
934 habit: letters et written above the line after
habit by corr. rec. (pr.), by lov. (k.) to read habit
945 eras z ut: z written above the two words by
rubricator (pr.)
951 dictum: letter d added above the line before the
i by a (pr.)
NON HOC PUBLICITUS SCELUS HINC ASPORTARIER
IN SOLAS TERRAS E IN ID REDACTUS SUM LOCI
UT QUID AGAM ILLO NESCIAM PRORSUM E EGO SCIO
IN IUS EAMUS Y IN IUS HUC SI QUID IUBET
E ADSEQUERE RETINE DUM EGO HUC SERUOS EUOCO
E ENIM NEQUEO SOLUS ACCURRERE Y UNA INJURIAS
TUCEM Z LEGE AGITO ERGO Y ALTERAST TECUM CHEREM
E RAPE HUNC Y SIC AGITIS ENIM UEO UOCES OPUS
NAUSISTRATA EXIT E OS OPPRIME INPURUM UIDE
QUANTUM UALET Y NAUSISTRATA INQUAM Z NON TACES
Y TACEAN E NISI SEQUITUR PUGNOS INUENIREM INGERE
Y UEL OCULUM EXCELE EST UBI UOS ULCISCAR PROBE
B NAUSISTRATA E CHREMES Z DEMIPWO Y PHORMIO

CHREMIS, Z ASKELUS Z DEMIPO Y PHORMIO

MULIER SENSES II PARASITUS
B QUI NOMINAT ME HEM QUID ISTUC TURBAEST OBSEORO
MI UIR Y HEM QUID NUNC OBSPITIPSTI B QUIS HIC HOMOST
NON NIIH RESPONSDES Y HICINE UT TIBI RESPONSDET
QUI HERCLE UBI SIT? NESCIT E CAUE ISTI QUIQUAM CREDAS
Y ABI TANGE SI NON TOTUS FRIGET ME ENICA
E NIIHIL EST B QUID ERO QUID ISTIC NARRAT Y IAM
SCIES

AUSCULTRA E PERGING CREDERE B QUID EGO OBSEORO HUC
CRESAM QUI NIHIL DIXIT Y DELIRAT MISER
TIMORE B NON POL TEMEREST QUOD TU TAM TIMES
E ECON TIMEO Y RECTE SANE QUANDO NIHIL TIMES
ET HOC NIHIL EST QUOD EGO DICO TU NARRA Z SCEIOUS

998 INUENIREM: second I changed to T by corr. rec.
(Pr.) to read IN UENTREM

990 HEM...UIR: written above the line before
Hem by corr. rec. (Pr.), by Iov. (K.),
by AZ (Mar.) pointing to the name of
Chremes and indicating that he speak
these words
TIBI NARRET Y UNE TU FACTUMST. ABS TE SEDULO PRO FRATE B MI HOMO DI HELIUS DUINT Y SIC FACTUMST B FORI MISERA Y ET INDE FILIAM SUSCEPIT IAM UMAM DUM TU DORMIS E QUID AGNIS B PRO DI IMMORTALIS FACTUS MISERANDUM ET MALUM Y HOC ACTUMST B AN QUITQUAM HODEST FACTUM INDIIGNIUS Q'UI MIHI AD UXORES UENTUNST. TUM FIUNT SENES DEIMPHO TE APPello NAM HOC IPSO DISTAEBIT LOQUI HAECLINE ERANT IPONES CREBRAE ET MANSIONES DIUTINAE LEMNI HAECLINE ERAT EA QUAE NOSTROS MINUIT FRUCTUS ULLITAS SEGO NAUSISTRAYA ESSE IN HAC RE CULPAM MERITUM NON NEGQ SED EA QUIN SIT INCORDA EA UERBA FIUNT MORTOQ 1015 2 IAM NEQUE NECLEGENTIA TUA NEQUE ODIO ID FECTU TIO UNOLO NUSE FERE AHINC AHINS QUINDECEM MULIERECLAM EAM COMPRRESSIT ENDE HAECA NATAST NEQUE POSTILLA UNQUAM ATTIGIT EA MORTE OBIT DE MEDIO ABIIT QUI FUIT IN RE SACRIPULUS QUAM OB REM TE ORO UT ALIA FACTA TUA SINT AEGO ANIMO HOC PERAS 1020 B QUID EGO AEGO ANIMO CUPIO MISERA IN HAC RE IAM DEFUNGIER SED QUID SPEREM AETATEM PORRO MINUS PECCATURUM PUDEM IAM TUM ERAT SENEX SENECTUS SI UERCUNDOS FACIT AN MEA FORMA AUTQUE AETAS NUNC MAGIS QUAM TUNC EXPETENDAST DEIMPHO 1003 EST DICTO: BETWEEN THESE TWO WORDS, LETTER O CROSS OUT BY A 1009 B:B WRITTEN ABOVE THE LINE BEFORE AN BY RUBRICATOR (PR.) 1011 CUM: LETTERS NS WRITTEN ABOVE BY RUBRICATOR (PR.), BY IOV. (K.) TO READ MECUM IPSO WORD CROSS OUT BY IOV. (K.) 1014 MERITUM: LETTER U CROSS OUT AND A WRITTEN ABOVE BY CORR. REC. (PR.), BY IOV. (K.) TO READ MERITAM 1015 QUIN: LETTER N CROSS OUT BY IOV. (K.), (MAR.) BY IOV. (K.) TO READ QUI 1019 DE: LETTER D CROSS OUT BY CORR. REC. (PR.), BY IOV. (K.) TO READ E 1022 PUDIM: LETTER D CROSS OUT AND T ADDED ABOVE BY CORR. REC. (PR.) TO READ PUDIM 1024 QUAM TUNC: WORDS CROSS OUT BY CORR. REC. (PR.), BY IOV. (K.)
Quid mihi hic adfert quan ob rem exspectem aut sperem
porro non fore

Exsequias chremeti quibus est commodum ire em tempus est
sic dabo age Nunc Phormionem qui uilet lacessito
Pavo tali sit pactatus atque hic est infortunio
reedit sanie in grataiam supplici satis est mihi
Habet haec ei quod dum uitat usque ad Aurem Ognianiat
B at neo merito credo quid ego Nunc ea commemorem demipho
Singulato qualis ego in nunc fuisse s novi adequ omnia
tecum B meriton hoc meo uidetur factum z minimum gentium
urum iam quando accusando fieri infectum non potest
ignosc ore capitaer fugat quid uis amplius

Y enim uero Prius quam haec dat ueniam mihi prospiciam et

Phaedriei
Heus nausistrata Prius quam huic responds temere audi
B quid est

Y ego minas tringinta per fallaciam ab illoc abstulii
Eas dedit tuo gnavo is pro sua amica lenone dedit

E hem quid ais B adeon hoc indignum tibi uidetur fallius
404 Homo adulescens si habet unam amicam tu uxores duas
nihil pudere quo ore illum obturgatis respondere mihi
z factet ut uoles B inmo ut xemiam scias sententiam
neque ego ignoscro neque promitto quicumque respondeo
Prius quam gnavum uidere siue iudicio permittio omnia
1045 quod is iubebit faciant Y mulier sapiens es nausistrata
B satin tibi est y inmo uero fulchre discedo et probe

1026: character designation Y added at the beginning of
the line by corr. rec. (Pr.)
1031 EA: EA crossed out by Iov. (K.)
1033 MERITON: letter N written above the line after
merito by A (Pr.), by A2 (Mar.)
Et praeter spem B tuum nomen dic quid est y mihi
Phormio

uestrae familiae Herculius amicus et tuo summus Phaedriae
B Phormio at ego Ecastor posthac quod potero quod voles 1050
factamque et dicam y benigne dicis B pol meritudm tuum
y uin primum hodie facere quod ego gaudeam nauisstrata
et quod tuo uiro oculi doleant B cupio y ne ad cenam uoca
B pol uscori uoco y emuis intro hic B fiat set ubi est
Phaedria

Iuex nostre 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, 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.
SCHOLIA IN THE PHORMIO

The Scholia of the Phormio are in "hand 2".

53v

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

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

Suprascript: POETA UETUS
   Luscius Lanuuitinus

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

2 transe: ueteres so/nantium, nam nos le/uis 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/ [terita ingerat et] de quibus iam/ [iudicatum] est.

Top margin, with reference sign to TENUI

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

Left, with reference sign to CERUAM

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

Right, with reference sign to EAM

8 haec omnis per<s>tasys tragi/ca est et ideo in com<o>edia ui/tiosa dicitur (du-?).
Top margin, with reference sign to OLIM
9 olim: quasi dicat, cum nondum Térentius scriberet,
id est bonorum penuria./ noua autem ostendit commendari
omnia nouitate. potuit enim dicitur (dici cur) stetit/
et non exacta est. ob hoc et olim et noua.

Left, with reference sign to ACTORIS
10 [suffragium sca]enicoru[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]érentius qui prologos de maledictis
<habet, hoc responsum si/[bi h]abeat: aduersarium
coegissee. nam quid faceret Téren/[tius] cum de palma
artis musicæ certandum uideat sibi esse.

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

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

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

Right margin: OMNIBUS

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

Left margin: PALMAM

17  [palmam: dixit] causa/[m certaminis].

54r

Left margin: AD FAMEM

18  nam uendere/ solebant poe/tae quidquid s/cribsissent.

Left, with reference sign to CERTASSE

20  certasset: pro/uocasset; ab eo/ quod praecedit/ id quod sequitur. / U<e>rg<ilius> nec te cer/tasse priorem/ paeniteat.

Right margin:

bene certasset quia supra d[ixit in medio o<mnibus> pal]/mam esse quasi dicat quid[quid in certa]/men uener[it in eo uincen]/ dus aemulu[s est].
Right margin:

certamen studium ipsum/est sed etiam [contentio]/ne
definitur. U[e]<rg<ilius> et certa]/men erat, Cor[ydon
cum Thyr]/side, [magnum].

Suprascript: ADLATUM
21 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 qua<er<it>is.

Left margin: ADPORTO NOUAM

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

25 manifeste/ hic errat Terentius; nam haec/ fabula
Epidica/zomini (-mene) dicta est/ a puella, de qua/
Iudicium est, cum/ sit alia fabula/ eiusdem Apollo/dori
Quae Epidica/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 GRAECI

formon dicitur gr<a>ece saccum (-us) spatium (-us);
ab hoc parasito nomen est, uel ex [uentris]/ capacitate;
unde Formio correpta prima syllaba Apollodorum ε[st.
non a for]/mula ut quidam putant. ergo inde parasitus
uillissimae condicionis hom[o dictus est.]/ si enim a
formula esset nomen comoediae protra<h>eremus primam
syll[abam, si a formi]/one corripere debemus. uidis (-es)
ergo φορμίονεμ dici non φαρμίονεμ a [formione]/
conpositum. φωρμίοι ε[rim non φαρμοι Gr<a>eci scribunt.
et forma cum [dicimus sylla]/bam producimus non
corripimus.
("enim non" are in majuscules except e which is uncial;
M, N, R are often used in the Greek words)
Right margin: PRIMAS

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

Top margin, with reference sign to RES

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

Right margin: PER SILENTIUM

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

Right margin: MOTUS LOCOST

32 apparet <H>ec[yram ante Phormionem]/ actam ess[e cui contigit id quod]/ quae ... (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]/cédentes et consecuturos. ergo propre dixit.
Bottom margin, last line: ACTORIS UIRTUS

33 [laudat actor]em; est enim [po]letae utile; qui exclusus [totiens animum non abiecerit].

Bottom margin, with reference sign to RESTITUIT LOCUM
bene uitabit (-uit) ne per amphiboliam et tumultum intell[egeremus].

Left, with reference sign to ADIUTANS
antiqui sic ma/luerunt quam / adiuuans.

54v

Top margin:

35 [quod in omnibus fere comoediis in quibus] perplexa argumenta sunt te/neri solet, id in hac quoque Terentius seruat ut personam extra argumentum/ inducet; 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.

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

Left margin:

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

Suprascript: POPULARIS socius.

Suprascript: ERAT EI
36 deest nam.

Left margin: CONFICEREM

38 [conficerem: prop]riae; nam/ [fieri pecuni]am dicaba/
   [nt. Sallustus quae p]ecunia ad/ [Hispaniense bellu]m
   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 uxor[...i].

Right margin: CONRADITUR

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

Left margin:

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

Right margin:

42 mire addant non dent et/ non aliquando sed semper.
Left margin: UNCIATIM
43 [10?] olen expen/ [10]erat sic sester/ [12]sis in
ster/ [12]ario assis/ [12]d ergo <h>ype/ [rbolicos
per] unciam dixit.

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

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

Suprascript: CONPERSIT
seruauit.

Right margin: PARTUM
46 partum: qaesitum dixit pro/priae; nam nullus partus
est sine/ labore.

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

Right margin: NATALIS
48 natalis non pure ponen/dum est. nam et <h>ora nata/lis
dicitur et dies ut hic./ aput <H>oratium pars uio/en/tior
natalis <h>orae./ U<e>rg<ilius> rusticitiati serui/ens
meus est natalis/ Iolla.
50 facete de mulieribus.

52 hoc cum gestu offerentis/ dicitur.


54 [a]mat quod reddidit pecuniam. red<\>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.

56 deest ei.

ostenditur gratiarum [actione ue]/re necessariam fui[sse pecuniam].
SED

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

Right margin: SED
discensus ad argumentum.

Right margin: METU ET ... PERICULO
et futuri tempor(is periculum)/ dict et futuri metum.

SED

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

Left of lines 61-62: MODO
59 modo:/ tantummodo, ut Ur<e>rg<ilius> modo Iup/piter
adsit.

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

58r

Left margin: PLECTAR
220 puniar
Left margin: CENTURIATUS

230 [parat]us 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.
491 excoigit.

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

Right margin: GARRI
496 res ineptas loquere.

543 gaudeo.

Left, with reference sign to CONDICIONEM
579 nuptiarum.

585 aliquo modo.

Right margin: BELUA
601 stultus.

614 tantum quod.
67r

Left, with reference sign to LOCARET

646 nuptum dare, / id est conlocaret.

Suprascript: SUSCEPSSE

647 <h>abuisse.

68r

Right margin: EMUNXI ARGENTO SENES

682 argentum [ei]s abstuli.

Right margin: MINUS UTIBILE

690 uitiosum et peri/culosum.

(peri- and -osum seen on 67v)

68v

Left margin: QUOT RES

705 quantae causae.

Right margin: HARIOLUS

708 diuinandi peritus.

69r

Right margin: NAM QUAE

732 pro quaenam./ U<e>rg<ilius> quarto lib<ro> / Georgicoru<m> nam quis te iu/uenum conf<identissime>.

(Mountford's edition lacks a solidus after "Georgicoru<m>"
Top margin: EGESTAS

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

70r

Above QUOD DICUNT: NE PRAETER CASAM

768 ne ante casam transeas.

Right margin: UORSURAM SOLUES

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

Suprascript: IN DIEM ABIIT

781 dilatum est.

Suprascript: RE

786 pecunia a<ut> argento.

Right margin: OPITULATA ES

iuuasti.

74r

(Mountford's edition reads 73v)

Left margin: GLADIATORIO

964 gladiatorio:/ desperato.

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

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\(^5\) of Soave's edition gives no indication that this work is anything but a translation); G. Coppola, *Terenzio, Commedie*, Torino, Chiantore, 1927.\(^6\)

---


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


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

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

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


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

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

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

As for the text of the Phormio in volume II, there are eight instances of incorrect readings in Marouzeau's apparatus criticus regarding the Bembine text: on line 11 Marouzeau incorrectly cites A as reading FHIDICINA instead of PHIDICINA; on line 97 EXADUERSUM instead of EXADUORSUM; on line 199 PATRUOM instead of PATRUUM; on line 461 Marouzeau cites A² as changing SEQUAR to EXSEQUAR where no correction seems to be visible; on line 481 he incorrectly states that A reads AIBAT instead of AIEBAT; on line 792 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 $A \ reco.$ 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

---

$^1$Volume 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 Bem- binus 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 ε), 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 B. In my present investigation, I have found, with Prete, that modern editors of the comedies of Terence follow A very faithfully.


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


Rubio provides an apparatus criticus for each play of Terence. He follows Prete's interpretation of the correctors of A: "A= Codex Bembinus (Vat. lat. 3226), saec. iv.-v. A¹= ipse codicis Bembinii librarius. A²= corrector antiquus. Iov. = corrector Ioviales, saec. v-vi. A³=corrector recens, saec. vii-viii." There are seventeen instances of error in the editor's citations of the Bembine text of the Phormio: line 66 in Lemmo A; A reads IN LEMNO. Line 110 inquit scita est A; A reads INQUIT SCITAST. Line 198 apud portum J aportum A (corr. A¹); A reads APUT not
apud. Line 211 quid si sic J quid sic A; A reads QUID SI SIC. Line 243 damna exsilia A; A reads DAMNA EX ILLA. Line 286 aduenisse J aduenire A (corr. A$^r$); A reads ADUENIRE and A$^r$ changed it to ADUENIRE. Line 351 pro deum inmortalium A; A reads PRO DEUM IMMORTALIUM. Line 417 ut J ita A; A reads UT. Line 451 aequomst et bonum A; A reads AEOQUOM EST ET BONUM. Line 515 obtundis A Prete; A and Prete (1954) read OPTUNDIS. Line 724 sat A; A reads SATIS. Line 792 natuuellem A; A reads NAT UELLEM. Line 821 in animo parare A; A reads IN ANIMO PARE. Line 896 conueniundust Phormio A; A reads CONUENIUNDUS EST. Line 934 habitapud A; A reads HABIT APUT. Line 970 quae lubitum fuerit peregre A; A reads QUAE LIBITUM FUERIT PEREGRE. Line 1008 inmortalis A; A reads IMMORTALIS.

Furthermore, I have found five instances where the readings are questionable: Line 125 qui J i in ras. A$^r$; A reads QU with the letter I added above by the corrector rec. (Prete). Line 169 ut J om. A (add. A$^r$); 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$^r$; 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$^r$; 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 "apti" A for "adepti" Σ, and 1065 "Archonidi" (gen.) A for "Archonidis" Σ. The manuscripts have without exception transmitted the infinitive passive in "-ier" faithfully everywhere and Donatus does not comment on it. This form occurs in the Phormio on lines 92, 206, 305, 306, 406, 535, 589, 603, 632, 697, 931, 978, 1021.


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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

\textsuperscript{3}Eugraphius is the author of a commentary on Terence. His chief interest lies in rhetorical qualities and characterization of the plays and often he simply paraphrases the text of Terence.
Jones subjects to careful scrutiny the conclusions of J. D. Craig in the latter's *Ancient Editions of Terence* (London 1929). Following the same order of presentation as Craig, Jones discusses each grammarian individually and offers his own findings. Since Arusian's quotations of Terence agree with \( \varepsilon \) against \( A \) in six good cases and with some \( \gamma \) and \( \delta \) manuscripts against \( A \) in three possible cases and with \( \gamma \) manuscripts against \( A \) and \( \delta \) in one possible case, Jones concludes Arusian had access to \( \gamma \) and to \( \delta \) - 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 \( \gamma \) manuscripts alone against others, three times; with \( \delta \) manuscripts alone against others, five times; with \( \varepsilon \) (i.e., \( \delta \) and \( \gamma \) 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 "excluder" Σ, "exculpe" A; Eunuchus 779 "non posse fieri" Σ, "fieri non posse" A; Phormio 88
"exaduorsum" Σ, "exaduerso" A, "ei loco" Σ, "ilico" A; 759 "conlocatam filiam" Σ, "conlocatam amari" A; Adelphoe 608 "ipsis coram" Σ, "ipsi coram" A. The evidence is overwhelming that Priscian used the A text and not the Calliopian text. Craig emphasizes his point by mentioning Umpfenbach's preface (LIX-LXII) to his critical edition of Terence (1870) where anyone can see from Umpfenbach's collection of passages how faithfully Priscian reproduces A's readings as opposed to those of Σ or some of the minuscule manuscripts (γ and δ whose common parent is the Calliopian text Σ) of Terence.


In the history of the text of Terence an interesting question is whether sufficient evidence exists to prove that the Terence known to Servius had been already tampered with by "Calliopius", or that Servian versions betray the existence in his time of the edition of Terence implied by the small group (δ) of minuscule manuscripts. Common sense suggests that Servius, a grammarian about 400 A.D., knew the contemporary edition of Terence, the Codex Bembinus. Yet, according to Craig, the history of the text
of Terence has been written on the assumption that the grammarians and commentators were familiar with every variety of edition. Craig here endeavors to show that Servius used the A text. As positive evidence of this, Craig points to Eun. 268 (Aen. I 436), Phorm. 175-6 (Aen. XI 699), Ad. 329 (Aen. I 208), Haut. 72 (Ecl. II 34; Aen. I 548). Craig adds that it would be possible to go on to prove that Servius did not employ the Calliopian text, if he should use such instances as Andr. 330-1 (Aen. VI 664): "mereat" and "poni" for "commereat" and "adponi" 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 "ecca", the unanimous reading of the manuscripts, is corrected uniformly by editors to "eccam", under the pretext that the word does not have a nominative form.

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

On occasion, a corrector suppresses a monosyllable, e.g., at Eunuchus 236 Ioviales crosses out "oh" written by A.

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


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

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

---

2J. J. Savage, review in CW XXXIV, 1940-1941, pp. 221-2.
and Craig by emphasizing the common history of A and 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 Α and Σ had already been realized before the signs were introduced systematically into the text. The absence of true common errors in Α and Σ proves this. There are, however, common pseudo-errors caused by successive and independent mistakes in the two families or by inevitable mistakes which have no testimonial value.

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

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


Andrieu agrees with Jules Marouzeau¹ that common errors in A and Σ are not evident for establishing the unity of the manuscript tradition of Terence. The examination of "double" lines in Terence confirms the independence of the two traditions. Here is one of the many examples Andrieu offers: Heautontimorumenos 997, 997a, 998:

the text of Kauer-Lindsay:

In mentem venit; nam quam maxume huic visa haec suspicio
Erit uera, quamque adulescens maxume quam in minima spe situs
Erit, tam facillum patri' pacem in leges 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
uisa 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
uersus in unum a librariis fusos sic fere refingendos
putamus".

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

In mēn/tēm uē/nīt; nām/quē ōādūlēs/cēns// quam īn/
minimā/ spe sītus/ ērit

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

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

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

Andrieu observes that the scribe of the Codex Bembinus employs a rigid system for noting the distribution of roles among actors. The Bembine scribe uses the following letters taken from the Greek alphabet: Α θ Έ Ζ Θ and ρ φ ψ ω. The cantor is always designated by ω.

The scribe reserves Θ ι Ω for female characters.

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

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

The scribe of p employs a system of Greek letters according to the initials of the name of the character, e.g., Π Pamphilus, Δ Davus. Difficulties arise when a second character has the same initial. The scribe is obliged to find a solution by devising another system as he does for characters whose names begin with the letter "S": Ι Sannio, Η Syrus, S Sostrata, Σ Sophrona Nutrix. For characters whose initial letter is "C", the scribe devises
this system: H Chremes, X Ctesipho, \( \Upsilon \) Clitipho, \( \uparrow \) 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 (ũah) or a monosyllable (uāh) with syneresis. We thus keep the form
"uah" and dispense with the correction in the passages where it figures.


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

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

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

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

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


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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{A} & \quad \text{PHORMIO} \quad \varepsilon \quad \text{GETA} \\
& \quad \text{PARASITUS} \quad \text{SERUUS}
\end{align*}
\]

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):

\[
\begin{align*}
2 & \quad \text{DEMIPHO} \quad \varepsilon \quad \text{CHREMES} \\
& \quad \text{SENES} \quad \text{II}
\end{align*}
\]

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

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


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

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


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

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

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


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

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

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

A. Editions of Terence


B. Books


Cian, V. *Un decennio della vita di M. Pietro Bembo (1522-1531)*. Torino: Loescher, 1885.


Kirchner, Ioachim. *Scriptura Latina Libraria a saeculo primo usque ad finem medii aevi LXXVII imaginibus illustrata cura Ioachimi Kirchner*. Monachi: in aedibus Rudolfi Oldenbourg, MDCCCCLV.


Thompson, Edward M. *An Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography.* Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1912.


C. Articles


------------- "Zu Terenz." Wiener Studien XXII (1900): 56-114.


------------------. "La tradizione del testo di Terenzio nell'antichità." Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica XXV (1951): 111-134.


The dissertation submitted by Elaine M. Coury has been read and approved by the following Committee:

Rev. Joseph S. Pendergast, S.J.
Professor, Classical Studies, Loyola

Dr. Leo M. Kaiser
Professor, Classical Studies, Loyola

Dr. James G. Keenan
Associate Professor, Classical Studies, Loyola

Dr. John F. Makowski
Assistant Professor, Classical Studies, Loyola

Dr. JoAnn Stachniw
Assistant Professor, Classical Studies, Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Ph.D.

May 1, 1976

Date

Director's Signature