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](#)

Plautina

W. M. Lindsay

The Classical Review / Volume 19 / Issue 02 / March 2005, pp 109 - 111

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00991625, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00991625

How to cite this article:

W. M. Lindsay (1905). Plautina. The Classical Review, 19, pp 109-111 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00991625

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

ON ORIGEN, *CONTRA CELSUM* I.

THE citations in the following notes are made from Koetschau's edition, vol. i.

Orig. c. *Cels.* I. c. xii. (p. 65, ll. 11 ff., Koets.) ἂ δ' εἶπον περὶ Αἰγυπτίων σοφῶν τε καὶ ἰδιωτῶν δυνατὸν ἰδεῖν καὶ περὶ Περσῶν· παρ' οἷς εἰσι τελεταί, πρεσβευόμεναι μὲν λογικῶς ὑπὸ τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς λογίων συμβολικῶς δὲ γινόμεναι ὑπὸ τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς πολλῶν καὶ ἐπιπολαιωτέρων.

In place of γινόμεναι, which can hardly stand, Guet has conjectured γινωσκόμεναι. ἐπισκοπούμεναι might also be thought of; but I should prefer τιμώμεναι, which supplies a better balance to πρεσβευόμεναι: and it should be noted that two codd. actually read γιγνόμεναι.

ibid. lv. (p. 106, ll. 3 f.) μέμνημαι δέ ποτε ἐν τινι πρὸς τοὺς λεγομένους παρὰ Ἰουδαίους σοφοὺς [ἐν]ζητήσῃ ταῖς προφητείαις ταύταις χρησάμενος κ.τ.λ.

Here Koetschau comments: '[ἐν] vor ζητήσῃ tilge ich, da ἐνζήτησις sonst nicht belegt ist und ἐπιζήτησις, woran man denken könnte, bei Origenes nicht vorkommt; ἐν ist vielleicht ursprünglich Variante zu παρά gewesen.' But the right word for 'a disputation' is neither ζήτησις nor ἐπιζήτησις but συζήτησις. Cp. *Acts* xv. 7 πολλῆς δὲ συζητήσεως γενομένης: *ib.* vi. 9 συζητοῦντες τῷ Στεφάνῳ: and with πρὸς c. accus., *ib.* ix. 29 (ὁ Σαῦλος) ἐλάλει τε καὶ συνεζήτει πρὸς τοὺς Ἑλληνοιστάς: *Mk.* i. 27. Nor can it be

objected that συζητήσῃ is palaeographically a difficult correction.

ibid. lvi. (p. 107, ll. 27 ff.) καὶ μέμνημαί γε πάντῃ θλίψας τὸν Ἰουδαῖον νομιζόμενον σοφὸν ἐκ τῆς λέξεως ταύτης· ὃς πρὸς αὐτὴν ἀπορῶν εἶπε τὰ τῷ ἑαυτοῦ ἰουδαϊσμῷ ἀκόλουθα, εἶπε πρὸς μὲν τὸν τῶν ὄλων θεὸν εἰρήσθαι κ.τ.λ.

The repetition of εἶπε is intolerable. It is the second εἶπε that the critics generally suspect: Bouhéreau would remove it, Gundermann would replace it by ἐπεὶ, Koetschau would insert either καὶ before or γάρ after it. But it is quite as likely that it is the first εἶπε that is corrupt; and if we substitute for it ἔπειτα we restore a good classical idiom. Cp. *Soph. Aj.* 761 ὅστις ἀνθρώπου φύσιν βλαστὼν ἔπειτα μὴ κατ' ἀνθρώπου φρονή: *Ar. Ach.* 498: and other exx. in L. and S. s.v. (3). Probably we should also omit the art. τὰ. The sense is that 'in spite of the fact that he was 'floored,' the Jew made a right Jewish answer.'

ibid. lxi. (p. 112, ll. 5 ff.) ἐβουλήθη οὖν αὐτὸν ἀποκτεῖναι, μαχομένης διὰ τὴν κακίαν ἔχων κρίσεις ὑπὸ τοῦ τυφλοῦ καὶ πονηροῦ διαβόλου κινούμενος κ.τ.λ.

I fail to understand μαχομένης κρίσεις. The passage is describing Herod's murderous designs against Jesus, and we need a word expressive of 'blind hostility.' I suppose that what Origen wrote was μαινομένης.

R. G. BURY.

PLAUTINA.

Amph. 179-180:

ME. Hic qui verna natust queritur.

So. Sum vero verna verbero, etc. (P, A n.l.).

Since Sosia is not supposed to have heard Mercury's remark, some editors take exception to his repetition of the word *verna*. But this is a common trick of Plautus. For example, at *Mil.* 1228, Acroteleutium, before her recognition of Pyrgopolynices, unconsciously adapts her remark to an 'aside' of his:

Py. Patiar, quando ita Venus volt.

Ac. Veneri pol habeo gratiam, etc.

Cf. *Amph.* 309 and other passages.

Asin. 632:

Hic med amantem ex aedibus †delegit† huius mater (P, A n.l.).

Although Plautus can use compounds of *lego* in extraordinary fashion, e.g. *Curc.* 424 (cited by Nonius p. 290 Me. for *diligat* 'dividit'), it is difficult to accept *delegit* here. In the majuscule archetype of the Palatine MSS. DELEGIT and DEIECIT were practically identical; so that Camerarius' *deiecit* is, we may say, the traditional reading. Fleckeisen preferred *ieiecit*, because the notion of 'throwing down' is unsuitable. But if we read with attention Cicero's remarks on the verb

deicio in the speech pro Caecina 31, 89 *sqq.*, we must infer that in every-day language *deicio* 'I evict' was used where *icio* would be strictly correct.

Cas. 814. When the marriage-procession, with Chalinus dressed up as the bride Casina, appeared on the stage, it would be necessary for the disguise to be momentarily revealed to the spectators. The words *iam oboluit Casinus procul* are clearly an 'aside' of Chalinus, as he removes the veil for an instant and shows his laughing face to the audience.

Mil. 304 :

Quam mox horsum ad stabulum iuvenix recipiat se <e> pabulo (P, A n.l.).

Camerarius' insertion of *e* is preferable to Bothe's <a>. Cf. *Amph.* 684 se r. huc ex hostibus, *Aul.* 710 se r. ex eo loco, *Men.* 883 se r. ex opere, *Poen.* 821 se r. e fano,

Mil. 863 : Quo[t] tu agis ? (P, A n.l.).

Why do editors change *tu* to *te* and cite *Isid. Orig.* 9, 3, 64? For one is strongly tempted to read *tu* in the *Isidore*-passage, and besides *Isidore* may refer to *Most.* 562, or even *Trin.* 1078, or *Pers.* 235. From *Poen.* 333 quó agis (A : quo agis te P) we might be inclined to suppose *agis te* in all its occurrences in this phrase to be a perversion of an original *agis*. But a wider survey of Plautine usage shews that both phrases were allowed. We have intransitive *ago* in *Bacch.* 1106 unde agis ? (P, A n.l.), *Pers.* 216 quo agis ? (B : abis CD, A n.l.). We have transitive *ago* in *Pers.* 482 unde agis te ? (APT), *Trin.* 1078 quo (quonam A) tu te agis ? (AP), etc. 'Quo tú agis ?' is related to 'quo agis ?' as 'quid tú ais ?' to 'quid ais ?' The article *ago* in the new Thesaurus will supply more examples.¹

Mil. 1042 : virtute et forma, factis (P, A n.l.).

This type of *Asyndeton* recurs elsewhere, e.g. *Mil.* 1161 : lepide et facete, laute, *Rud.* 930 agrum atque aedis, mancupia.

Most. 73. The country-slave is warning the town-slave.

GR. Ita est. Sed unum hoc scito, nimio celerius

Venire quod †molestet‡ quam illud quod cupide petas.

TR. Molestus ne sis nunciam, i rus, te amove (P. A n.l.).

¹ Surely the conjecture in *Amph.* 1042, *me agam* for *me ducam*, hardly deserves a place (p. 1372) in the Thesaurus.

That *molestē* is a scribe's mistake, his eye having been caught by *molestus* in the line below, is clear from the form of *Tranio's* reply. Had *Grumio* used the word, *Tranio* would have expressed himself differently, e.g. *Tu saltem molestus ne sis*. I conjecture *obest*.

Most. 601. Was the disarrangement of the *Mostellaria* in the Palatine archetype due to the resemblance of vv. 601 and 886* ?

Most. 1067 : ludificabor (AB¹) : ludificabo (B²CD).

From *Most.* 832, where *ludificat* is required by the metre, but where both families of MSS. offer *ludificatur*, we infer a tendency of scribes to change the Active to the Deponent form. The normal conjugation of the word in *Plautus*² is *ludifico, ludificatus sum, ludificare*. But it will not do to expel from the text of *Plautus* the Deponent form, *ludificor*. In *Poen.* 548 *ludificatur* is required by the metre.

Pers. 97. Satyrio prefers 'thick' scup.

Quasi †iuream† esse ius decet collyricum.

Nolo in vesicam quod eat, in ventrem volo (P, A n.l.).

In minuscule MSS. *iu* and *ui* are indistinguishable. So the traditional reading may be really *viream*. Can this be the Latin cognate of English 'wire,' known to us in the plural *viriae* 'a bracelet' ? *Osthoff (Morph. Unters.* 4, 164) argues for the length of the *i* in the first syllable. *Körting (Lat.-rom. Wörterbuch, s.v.)* favours the short quantity.

Pers. 105-7 :

SA. Pernam quidem

Ius est adponi frigidam postridie.

TO. Ita fieri ius-i (P, A n. l.).

Bugge changed *ius est* to *iusses* (i.e. *iussisses*, 'you should have ordered'). But the traditional readings in this line and in a passage of *Petronius* (c. 35 *suadeo inquit Trimalchio cenemus. Hoc est ius [v.l. in] cenae*) support each other.

Poen. 1051. The form *Antidamas* should not be questioned, for it is at least the form used by *Hanno* (vv. 934, 955), if not also by *Agorastocles* (v. 1058).

Pseud. 615 : solus secum A : secum solus P.

² *Priscian* (vol. i. p. 392 H.) ascribes to the 'vetustissimi' the use of *ludifico* for *ludificor*. On *ludificatus sum* see the (defective) passage in *Nonius* (p. 476 Me.).

The former is the invariable order in Plautus. See *Aul.* 52, 190, *Merc.* 364.

Rud. 96. Sceparnio thinks it is time to begin tile-making in order to repair the damage done to his master's roof by the storm.

Si sapiam, hoc quod me mactat concinnem lutum (P, An. 1.).

A Latin verb *maccare*, to knead (cf. Greek μάσσειν), is presupposed by Romance words like Ital. *maccare* (see Körting s.v.). One is almost tempted to re-write the line thus:

Si sapiam, hoc quod me mactat ego maccem lutum.

At any rate there seems to be a play on the words *macto* and (the supposed) *macco* both in this line and in *Anth.* i. 199, 42 (*Vesp. Ind.*): Pistor ego macto flavas sine sanguine messes.

Rud. 384: quem illorum observet falsust, 'he is at a loss which of them to watch.'

The Subjunctive is not only the right reading, but was the reading of the majuscule Palatine archetype. For not only is *observet* offered by CDB² (while B¹ had apparently *observatur*), but we may almost infer that it was also the reading of T. For in the Bodleian collation of the Codex Turnebi the *observet* of the printed text is left without any written variant.

Rud. 687-8:

Tr. Bonum ánimum habete. PA. Nam, ópsecro, unde ánimus mi invenitur?

Tr. Ne, inquam, timete; adsidite hic in ara. AM. Quid istaec ara, etc. (P. A n. 1.).

Duaren's marginalia (the Bodleian collation of the Codex Turnebi) offers as the reading (presumably) of T: unde istec animus mihi invenitur. It is however possible that Duaren has miscopied Turnebus' collation and that Turnebus wrote *istec* as the T-reading in v. 688 (for *ista* of the printed text).

At the end of some plays of Plautus (and of Terence) the request for applause was in the archetype of our MSS. preceded by the Omega symbol Ω. On the strength of Horace *A.P.* 155 donec cantor 'vos plaudite' dicat, this symbol was interpreted as CANTOR. And since there are a few,

though not many, instances of the substitution of P for C in the text-tradition (e.g. *anpillas* for *ancillas*, *Men.* 801), the last line of the *Persa*, which appears in our MSS. (BCD) thus:

Spectatores bene valete leno periit plaudite pantio,

was printed by editors

Spectatores, bene valete; leno periit. CANTOR Plaudite.

But the recently found collation of T has altered the case. For T, it now appears, had *pantes*, not *pantio*. And from Turnebus' marginal note we may infer that T shewed in conjunction with *pantes* the symbol Ω. For Turnebus has added: *pariter* (then follows what Turnebus presumably wrote as Ω and Duaren has copied as &, the symbol for *et*, as in &c. for *etc.*) *vero chorum loquentem* (Duaren has miscopied this word as *loquenti*) *significat ut fine praecedentis comoediae 'curemus Ω plaudite.'* I take it that the majuscule archetype (of TBCD) had

Ω

ΠΑΝΤΕC PLAUDITE

and that the minuscule copy T exhibited this correctly, while in the minuscule original of BCD the suprascript Ω, misread as IO, had been mistaken for a correction of the final syllable of *pantes*, producing *pantio*. So the symbol Ω does not represent CANTOR, but implies that all the actors (on the stage at the time, I suppose) came forward and asked the applause of the audience. The Latin expansion of this symbol was GREX or CATERVA, and, when the request for applause is so long as to be worthy of a separate heading (like a Scene-heading), the one or the other of these words was used in ancient editions. The word would be, I fancy, preceded by this symbol, just as a proper name in a Scene-heading was preceded by a 'nota personae' taken from the Greek alphabet.

From the form of the heading of *Truc.* IV. iii. in our MSS.:

SENEX ANCILLAE II ADVLESCENS,

we may infer that Plautus assigned a name, not only to the 'ancilla Phronesii' (viz. *Sura tonstrix*, v. 405), but also to the 'ancilla Calliclis.'

W. M. LINDSAY.