The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

The Carthaginian Passages in the 'Poenulus' of Plautus

W. M. Lindsay

The Classical Review / Volume 12 / Issue 07 / October 1898, pp 361 - 364

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00033163, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00033163

How to cite this article:

W. M. Lindsay (1898). The Carthaginian Passages in the 'Poenulus' of Plautus. The Classical Review, 12, pp 361-364 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00033163

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

cachinnorum I take as a cognate object of *ridete*. My interpretation of the first line agrees with that of Prof. Ellis; cf. too his note on 102, 3. But I wish it were possible to retain the *quoque* of the MSS. The epithet *Lydiae* is not really suitable, because the Lago di Garda is not in Etruria as commonly understood. Could not some epithet beginning with a vowel be suggested to follow *quoque*? *o meae* departs a good deal from the ductus litterarum. Possibly *albidae*, suggestive of the *fluctus fremitusque marinus* of these waters; cf. 63, 87 *umida albicantis loca litoris*. *Unidae* would perhaps be too colourless.

2. *domi habeo*: Plaut. *Mil.* 191-194; Ter. *Ad.* 413.

3. *domi* with other verbs: Plaut. *Cas.*

224, *Cist.* 204, Juvenal 13, 57 (*domi videre*). The usage is here well illustrated and its origin shown by Cic. *ad Fam.* ix. 3 *sed quid ego nunc haec ad te, cuius domi nascuntur?* γλαῦκ' ἐς Ἀθήνας. In Livy vi. 36, 9 *quod domi praeceptum erat* we have a slight departure from the original sense of the word ('what they had been told *before-hand*').

4. *domo* 'from one's own resources': Plaut. *Bacch.* 648, *Curc.* 685, *Amph.* 637 ('from within'), *Truc.* 454, *Poen.* 216, *Merc.* 355. Livy xxii. 1, 6 illustrates the origin of this use: *magistratus id a domo ferre* 'brought it from home' = 'had it as their own.' Numerous other instances could doubtless be quoted from Livy.

E. A. SONNENSCHN. E.

NOTE ON VALERIUS FLACCUS IV. 129-30.

nec iam nova morti
hinc erit ulla tuae: reges preme, dure, secundos.

Neptune apostrophizes his son Amycus on the eve of the latter's death at the hand of Pollux. Yielding to the higher power of Jupiter he resigns his son to his fate, and ends his farewell with the words above quoted. The words 'reges preme, dure, secundos' have given much trouble, some even applying them to Jupiter. But the change from *tuae* (Amycus) to *dure* (Jupiter) is intolerably abrupt.¹ Ellis (*Journal of Philology*, vol. ix. p. 56) cut the knot by proposing *treme* for *preme*. But the sense obtained is unsatisfactory, and no change is required. The words mean 'do thou crush

those princes only *who are not thy match*.' From v. 151 we learn that Amycus fought with those who were 'aequae uirtutis egentes,' probably not as the result of deliberate choice, but expressing the simple fact that no one was fit to cope with him. V. 111 indeed tells us that he selected to box with him only those who had 'forma praestantior.' I do not understand the remarks of Mr. Summers (*A study of the Argonauticon of V.F.* p. 74) on these lines: but I do understand that 'tortures' is a mistranslation of 'torquet agens' in v. 111 which surely means that Amycus hurled his victims into the sea. And surely the victims might have the 'forma praestantior' and yet be 'aequae uirtutis egentes,' relatively to Amycus.

J. A. NAIRN.

¹ So Bury, *Hermathena* 8, p. 407.

THE CARTHAGINIAN PASSAGES IN THE 'POENULUS' OF PLAUTUS.

THE recent discovery of a collation of the lost 'codex Turnebi' (*T*) in a Gryphius edition of Plautus in the Bodleian Library (*Class. Rev.* xi. 177, 246) makes it possible to provide a more certain text of the Carthaginian passages in the *Poenulus*. With the help of *T* we can trace the text of the 'Palatine' MSS. (*B C D*) further back than their common original (*P*). We can trace

it as far as an archetype (*P*⁴) apparently little inferior in age to the Ambrosian Palimpsest (*A*), the sole representative of the other tradition of the text of Plautus. And we can detect the errors (e.g. *lucui* for *luful*, v. 945) which were introduced into the text by the scribe of *P*, errors reproduced by all our extant minuscule MSS.

Of the Carthaginian passage of ten lines

(Iambic Senarii), which are spoken by Hanno on his first appearance on the stage (Act v. Sc. i.), and which are followed by a Latin version in eleven (or ten) lines (vv. 950–60), there were two versions in antiquity. One of these (vv. 930–39), providing a smooth and intelligible text, was adopted by the archetype of *P*⁴; the other (vv. 940–49), which offers more difficulty to interpreters, was adopted by the archetype of *A*. But this second version seems also to have been jotted in the margin of the archetype of *P*⁴, having been excerpted, we may guess, from a MS. of the *A* family. For it appeared in *P*⁴ incorporated in the text immediately after the first version, but with its first four lines written as three, and these grievously curtailed and corrupted.¹

In *A* each line is written continuously without division of the words. In *P*⁴ both Carthaginian passages had probably the words divided. This division has been in the main preserved in our extant MSS. (*B C D*),² and seems to have been preserved in *T* also. But it has probably suffered from the tendency of mediaeval scribes to write short words along with neighbouring long words and to break up foreign vocables into elements that might resemble Latin forms. Nor can we be sure that the variants from *T*, entered on the margin of the Oxford Gryphius, reproduce faithfully the word-division of *T*. Here is a list of them, with the uncertain letters in italic type:—930 ythalonium, 931 erybar, uimysthi, 932 ad ed in (adedin?), bynuui (bymy? possibly belonging to v. 933), 933 bymarob hamolomim, 935 yssiderbrum (-am?), liful, 937 elycothi sith, 938 ydchid lithly, 939 choth iufim (tu-?), 940 exalnim altimocum esse, 945 butune celtummco (celtu mmco?), mucro liful. We should expect to find, in accordance with the ordinary practice of mediaeval scribes, confusion of the following letters in our MSS.:—(1) *y*, *i*, *u*; especially substitution of *i* for *y*, (2) *c* and *ch*, *t* and *th*, *p* and *ph*, (3) *f* for *ph*. And the transcription of foreign, unintelligible words would aggravate the tendency of a scribe to transpose the vowels of neighbouring syllables or to attach *h* to the wrong consonant of two consonants in proximity. In early minuscule, a script in which *P* and the original of *T*

were apparently written, *c* and *t*, *y* and *r*, *a* and *u* were very similar in form. Both in minuscule and in majuscule script *ii* was easily mistaken for *u*.

Here is what seems to be the best available text of the two versions, with a list of the more important variants. For a full list of variants the student must consult (1) Studemund's Apograph of the Ambrosian Palimpsest (Berlin, 1889), (2) the critical apparatus of the large Teubner edition (Leipzig, 1884), (3) my 'Codex Turnebi of Plautus' (Oxford, 1898).³ Doubtful letters and words are in italics.

First Version, contained only in *P*⁴ (the proto-archetype of (1) *P*, the archetype of our extant minuscule MSS., and of (2) *T*, the 'codex Turnebi').

- 930 ythalonimualonuthsicatorathismacom-
syth
chymlachchunythmumysthyalmysthyba-
ruimysehi
liphocanethythbynuthiadedinbynuii
bymarobsyllohomalonimuybymysyrtho-
ho
bythlymmothynnoctothuulechantida-
maschon
935 yssidobrimthifyelthchylschonchemli-
ful
ythbinimysdyburthinnochotnuagorast-
ocles
ythemanethihychirsaelychotsithnaso
bynnnydchiiluchilygubulimlasibitthym
bodiallytheraynnynnuyslymmonchothiu-
sim

Notes:—The Greek letter X, the 'nota personae' of Hanno was prefixed to v. 930. The scene-heading was HANNO POENVS LOQUITVR. 930 ythalonim *P*, ythalonium *T*. The reading of *T* seems at first sight to be confirmed by the MSS. of Rufinus in *Metr. Terent.* vi. 560, 28 K. Rufinus quotes from Sisenna's commentary on the *Poenulus* the explanation of *halonium* (so the MSS.) as the Carthaginian word for god, to be pronounced with the first (?) syllable ⁴ long: Sisenna in commentario Poenuli Plautinae fabulae sic. 'Halonium Poeni dicunt deum; et producenda syllaba metri gratia, sicut exigit iambus). But *-ium* for *-im* is a natural change for a mediaeval scribe to make (cf.

¹ How far the corruption is due to the torn or illegible state of the marginal jotting, and how far to erroneous transcription of un-Latin letters, or to an attempt to Latinize un-Latin words, is a point for Semitic scholars to decide.

² Notice the interpunctuation in *B* between these words of v. 935 yth chil ys chon chem liful, and these of v. 936 yth binim ysydybur etc., etc.

³ Beside the actually recorded variants of *T*, one may within limits infer the reading of *T* from the absence of any record of its divergence from the reading of the Gryphius text.

⁴ The lengthening of this syllable is mentioned apparently as one of a number of other metrical licences (real or seeming) of Plautus, such as the lengthening of the first syllable of *litrone*.

v. 1023 below) in order to adapt the ending to a Latin form, and may possibly have been made independently by the scribe of *T* and the scribe of the archetype of the Rufinus MSS. Sisenna's remark clearly proves that the Carthaginian lines are Iambic Senarii like their Latin translation (vv. 950-60). 931. The marginal *erybar* (*eybar* ?) *uimysthi* (*uiniysthi* ?) of the Oxford Gryphius may be miswritten for *chybaruimysthi* or the like. 932 Whether the Oxford variant *bynuii* (*bynuy* ? *byiny* ? possibly for *bymy* ?) refers to this line or the next (*hamolomim bymy* ?) is open to doubt. *P* may have had *bynuii*. 933. The ending of the Oxford marginal entry is difficult to decipher, *hamolomim*, or *-iui*, or *-ine*. It can scarcely be *-inur*. The *urby* of *B* for the *uyby* of *CD* is merely the common mistake of transcribing as *r* the early minuscule form of *y*. 935. In the Oxford marginal entries *o* is often miswritten as *r*, so that *yssiderbrum* (*-am*) may represent *yssidobrum* or the like. The confusion of *-um* and *-im* is frequent both in majuscule and in minuscule MSS. 936. *thinnochot B*, *-chut CD*. There is no evidence of *T* to enable us to decide; but the text of *B* in the *Poenulus* is in much better repute than that of the original (*P^{ov}*) from which *C* and *D* were directly transcribed. 937. *aelychot P*, *elycothi T*. The initial *e* of the *T*-reading may have been *ae* in the original. 938. *idchillihiy P*, *ydchid lithyly T*; *lasibit thim B*, *lasibit thym P^{ov}*, 939, *bodi B*, *body P^{ov}*; *mon P*, *Tn.l.*; *choth lusim P*, *choth iufim* (*tufim* ?) *T*.

Second Version, contained in *A* (the Ambrosian Palimpsest), and, in a less perfect form, in *P^A* :—

him

940 *ythalonimualonuthsycorathiisthymaco-*
msyth
combaitumamtialmellotiambear
iulecanthiconaalonimbabardechore
batsellihunesobinesubicsillimbaim
esseantidamasconalemuedubertefet
 945 *oonobunthunecelthumcommucrolu-*
ful
altanimausduberithemhyacharistoclem
sittesedanecnasotersahelicot
alemusdubertemurmycopsuestitti
aoccaaneclitorbodesiussilimlimmimco-
lus

Notes :—In *P^A* was prefixed the Scene-heading HANNO (?) POENVV PYNICE (?) DV. (sc. 'Diverbium,' i.e. in Iamb. Sen.) The Scene-heading in *A*, perhaps identical, is now illegible. 940-3. For these four lines *P^A* had only three, which in *P* appeared in this form :—

N. exanolimuolanussuccurratimistaltim-
 acumesse
 concubitumabellocutimbeatlulacantic-
 hona
 enuseshuiecsilihcpanasseathidmascon

The fourth line in *P^A* began with *alem* etc.; the fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth correspond closely with vv. 945-9 of *A*. 940 The line began with *exalonim* in *P^A*. Is the *ex-* a corruption due to a prefixed *X*, the 'nota personae' of Hanno (see above)? The excessive length of the line in *A* and in *P^A* makes one suspect that a suprascript variant had been incorporated in the verse. If so, the *al* of *altimacumesse* of *P^A* may have been merely the symbol AL. (i.e. 'aliter'). *A* has between *sicorathi* and *syth* the curious jumble *isthymhimihymacom*. 941 Unfortunately there are no *T*-variants for this line (nor for the three following). The *P*-reading is clearly Latinized (cf. *succurrat* for *sicorathi* in the preceding line). Does *cutim*, compared with *tiam* of *A*, suggest some original like *chthym*? 942 *iulecanthe(i)cona A*, *lulacanticthona P*. 943 The opening part of the line in *A* cannot be deciphered with certainty. The *P*-text differs widely from the *A*-text of the remaining part. 944 (end) *fet A*, *fel P*. In majuscule writing *t* and *l* are easily confused. 945 *d(o)ono A*, *ono P*; *bunthunec A*, *butune P^A*; *celthumcommucro A*, *celtummcomucro P^A*. 946 *duberithemhu A*, *ouberhenthyp P*. 947 *sittesedanec A*, *etteseanec (-nehc ?) P*; *tersa A*, *ctelia P*. 948 *temurmu A*, *termi P*; *titi A*, *tipti P*. 949 *aocca A*, *aode P*; *iussilimlimmim A*, *iussumlimnim P*.

What is the relation of this second version to the first? Of the end of the play there are also two versions; though, unlike the two versions of the Carthaginian passage, both appear in *A* and in the 'Palatine' recension. The earliest edition of Plautus we may conceive to have been made with the help of stage-copies; and where two stage-copies exhibited different versions, either a choice was made or the two rivals were adopted side by side. The determination of the relation of the second to the first version of the Carthaginian passage would throw welcome light on the history of the 'Palatine' and 'Ambrosian' recensions.

It remains to exhibit the best available text of the other Carthaginian lines and words in Plautus :—

Poen. 994 *Auo* (*AP^A*).

995 *annobynmythymballebechaedreanech* (*annobynmythymballeudradaitannech A* anno muthum balle bechaedre anech *P^A*).

998 auo (AP^A) donni (AP^A).
1002 mēharbocca (mēpharbuā A , mē har-
bocca P^A).

1006 rufe (Latin?) ennychoissam (ru-
fee(y?)nnychoissam A , rufēen nuco istam
 P^A).

1010 muphursa (AP^A) miuulec hi an na
(P , AT n.l.).

1013 lechlachananilimniichot (lechlach-
nanilimniichto A , laechlachananiliminichot
 P).

1016 assam (assam A , issam P).

1017 palumergadetha (palumirgadetha A ,
palumergadetha P).

1023 muphonnimsycorathim (mufonnim-
si(y?)ccorathim A , muphonnium suchorachim
vel -him P^A).

1027 gunebelbalsameniyrasa (gunebbal-
samemly(i?)ryla A , gunebelbalsamenierasan
vel -am P^A).

1141 auonesilli (auammailli A , haudones-
illi P).

hauonbanesillimustine (hauonbanesill . .
mustine A , hauon bene si illi in mustine P).

1142 mepsietenestedumetalannacestimim
(mi(e?)pstaetemestæsdumetalan . . . sti— A
messiestenestedum— T , mepsietenestedumet-
alannacestimim P).

1152 lachanna (lach . . na A , lachanam P^A).

I may add that an 'African' word *mu*,
strangely included by Charisius (i. 240, 3 K.)
among Latin interjections, appears in a
play (the 'Caecus' or 'Praedones') at-
tributed to Plautus:—

A. Quis tu es qui ducis me? B. Mu. A.
Perii hercle, Afer est.

W. M. LINDSAY.

BLAYDES' ADVERSARIA.

Adversaria in varios poetas graecos et latinos,
by FRED. H. M. BLAYDES. Halis Saxon-
um, 1898.

MR. BLAYDES has given us some 200
pages of notes and conjectures on the Latin
and Greek poets of which the majority will
be of value to many students. To some of
the writers—and they are very numerous—he
has paid greater attention than to others,
and his work certainly deserves the attention
of readers of Theognis, Theocritus, Pindar,
Horace, of Aeschylus and of the fragments
of the Greek Tragedians. It is not merely

that many of his conjectures and emenda-
tions of the texts of these writers are in-
genious and sometimes almost convincing,
but his pages in hundreds of brief notes
contain the conjectures of others and happy
illustrations or elucidations such as a per-
usal of classical writers unremitted during
a long life can alone furnish.

Mr. Blaydes' book is we notice printed
and published at Halle and the type and
matter is as good as the contents are on the
whole interesting to students of the classics.

F. C. CONYBEARE.

ROHDEN AND DESSAU'S PROSOPOGRAPHIA IMPERII ROMANI.

Prosopographia Imperii Romani. Pars III.
($P-Z$). *Consilio et auctoritate Aca-*
demiae Scientiarum Regiae Borussicae.
(*Berolini apud Georgium Reimerum.*
MDCCCLXXXVIII). 25 Marks.

WITH laudable promptitude comes the
third volume of a work which, as we can
affirm from use of the earlier volumes
(published last year), is invaluable for pur-
poses of reference. Some notice of the
general scope of the book appeared in the
Classical Review for Dec. 1897. It is a sort

of Dictionary of Biography, as complete as
anyone could wish where the materials are
quite solid and trustworthy, but omitting all
theories and reconstructions of character, and
giving chiefly facts of public, official, or
historical value. It could never have been
written without incessant and restless
thumbing of indices to other works, as well
as of the works themselves. But the labour
has not been in vain. The preparation of
the third volume was assigned to P. v.
Rohden, and, on his illness, was completed
by H. Dessau, the compiler of vol. ii, who