

# The Classical Quarterly

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

Additional services for *The Classical Quarterly*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



---

## Adnotativncvlae Plavtinae

W. M. Lindsay

The Classical Quarterly / Volume 14 / Issue 01 / January 2020, pp 49 - 52

DOI: 10.1017/S0009838800014105, Published online: 11 February 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009838800014105](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009838800014105)

### How to cite this article:

W. M. Lindsay (1920). Adnotativncvlae Plavtinae. The Classical Quarterly, 14, pp 49-52

doi:10.1017/S0009838800014105

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

## ADNOTATIVNCVLAE PLAVTINAE.<sup>1</sup>

*Amph.* prol. 90-91. In the *Amphitruo* Plautus runs great risk of giving offence by bringing Jupiter on the stage. In the prologue (spoken by Mercury) he conciliates the audience by saying that this Jupiter is no god but a mere actor. ('Then know that I, one Snug the joiner, am a lion fell'):

26 sqq. Etenim ille quoi(u)s huc iussu uenio Iuppiter  
Non minu' quam uostrum quiuis formidat malum: (i.e. a flogging, the  
penalty for bad acting, *Cist.* 785)  
Humana matre natus, humano patre,  
Mirari non est aequom sibi si praetimet.

He reminds them that Jupiter is often seen on the stage of Tragedy. And even in Comedy Jupiter is not always left unmentioned. What had happened a year before?

90 sq. Etiam histriones anno ('a year ago') quom in proscaenio hic  
Iouem inuocarunt, uenit, auxilio is fuit.

Appeal had been made a year before on a Roman stage to Jupiter that a certain comedy might win the prize (or make a hit); and it did win the prize. What comedy was this? A play of a rival comedian, e.g. Naeuius? Is Plautus humorously excusing his own failure by allusion to the unfair advantage taken by his rival? Possibly. But there is another possibility, which seems more probable, since allusion to one's own success is more natural. The prologue to the *Rudens* is spoken by Arcturus. This fellow-citizen of Jupiter (*Rud.* prol. 2. Eius sum ciui' ciuitate caelitum) devotes his first thirty lines to an account of Jupiter's arrangement for the detection and punishment of unjust dealing, and ends them with an appeal to the audience to give a just verdict on the play:

28 sqq. Idcirco moneo uos ego haec, qui estis boni  
Quique aetatem agiti' cum pietate et cum fide  
(a line follows which cannot be deciphered in the palimpsest)  
Retinete porro, post factum ut laetemini.

If the *Rudens* was the play for whose success an appeal had been made to Jupiter, not in vain, then the *Rudens* was a year earlier than the *Amphitruo*.

*Bacch.* 107. This interesting announcement of a κῶμος-dance was so written in the minuscule archetype:

Simul huic nescioqui turbae qui (or *quae*?) huc it decedamus (with *hinc* on the margin?),

<sup>1</sup> Since many inquiries have been made, it is well to take this opportunity of recanting the profession in the preface to my large edition of the *Capituli*: 'I hope in time to edit other plays

of this author.' If the palaeography of the *Truculentus* yields its secrets to investigation, the edition of this play may be attempted. But probably of no other.

and was amended in a previous number of this journal to : S. h. nescioquoui t. quae, etc. Professor Havet rightly condemned the abnormal form *quoui* and proposed to insert *nos* after *huic*. I now think the right reading is :

Simul huic nesciōquoui turbae || quae huc it decedamus hinc.

Plautus drew no hard-and-fast line between *nesciōquis* 'some one or other' and *nesciō quis* 'I do not know who.' In *Trin.* 880 we must print *nescioquid* as one word, to avoid an illegitimate division of an anapaest :

Multa simul rogitas : nesciōquid || expediam potissimum.

(Cf. *Men.* 406 ; *Merc.* 365, with *mi* rather than *mihi* ; *Ter. Andr.* 734, etc.)

*Bacch.* 1106. To any sane view of the Law of *Breues Breuiantes* the pronunciation *Philōxene* is impossible. Remove the offending Vocative (a gloss to indicate the speaker or a misinterpretation of some marginal indication of a speaker), and we have an Anapaestic Dimeter after Plautus' own heart, with two Spondees balancing two Dactyls :

Saluē. Et tū. Unde agis? Unde homō, etc.

There is twice Hiatus at the change of speaker.

*Merc.* 598-9 (= *Merc.* 842-3). Must we throw this invocation of Fortuna to those wolves, the Interpolation-seekers ?

Diuom atque hominum quae speratrix || atque era eadem es hominibus,  
Spem speratam quom obtulisti || hanc mi, tibi grates ago (*or hanc || mihi*).

In *speratrix* (in spite of the following *spem spēratam*) I see *spēratrix*, Old Latin for *prosperatrix*, a derivative of *spes*, and take the couplet to be some well-known quotation from a tragedy of Naeuius or Liuius Andronicus. Is it not natural that such a quotation should recur in the play, here declaimed by one of the two 'ephebi,' later by the other ?

*Cas.* 23. Since 'brazen' is in Early Latin *ahenus* (3 syll.), and perhaps *aheneus* (4 syll. ; *Truc.* 272 ?), but not *aenus* (2 syll.), *aeneus* (3 syll.), while *aereus* is a much later Adjective, it may be that to the early Dramatists *a(h)es* was as much a disyllable as *ni(hi)l*, and that the traditional reading should be retained in this utterance of the great goddess Credit (*Fides*) :

Eicite ex animo curam atque alienum ahes (aes MSS. Questionable hiatus after *curam*).

*Curc.* 452 ita nugas blatis (a Senarius-ending here ; a Trochaic Septenarius-ending in *Amph.* 626). What is the First Person? *Blato*, not 'blatio.' Why does the *Thesaurus* prefer the latter form with Hosius? The evidence, such as it is (see *Thesaurus* s.v.) favours *blato* both as the Verb and the Verbal Noun.

*Pseud.* 743 :

Eugepae ! lepide, Charine, meo me ludo lamberas.

In spite of *Poen.* 296 (Enimuero, ere, meo me lacessis ludo et delicias facis), I would give *lambero* the sense of *lambo* here and in Lucilius 585 (see Marx's note) :

iucundasque puer qui lamberat ore placentas,

and would suggest that a misinterpretation of Lucilius was the cause of Paul. Fest. 105, 19 (Lamberat : scindit ac laniat).

*Pseud.* 371 :

Ten amatorem esse inuentum inanem quasi cassam nucem ?

Is it not natural to find in *cassus*, -a, -um the Deponent Past Participle of the Neuter Verb *cado* (see *Class. Quart.* VII. 9), like *occaso sole* 'the sun having set'? And in *in cassum* the Verbal Noun *cassus* (*casus*) 'a fall'? Cf. *Poen.* 360 omnia in cassum cadunt. A fallen nut is empty; so the Adjective came to mean 'empty.' An exertion that ends in a fall is made in vain; so *incassum* came to mean 'in vain.'

*Truc.* 695-6. Astaphium's remarks continue till the first word of line 696, where (we may suppose) she holds up a warning finger to the reformed Truculentus and cows him into submission:

AST. Iamne autem ut soles?

Iamne—TRUC. Nil dico, etc.

If we accept this (surely the natural) setting, the last prop for a disyllabic *nihil* in Plautus collapses. Syllaba Anceps at the change of speaker would here be a necessity. There must have been a pause before the serving-man's reply. (How absurd it is to talk of Plautus' Syll. Anc. and Hiatus at a change of speaker as barbarous practices of an immature dramatist! They are a great improvement on Greek monotony.)

*Poen.*, end. In our early Comedies the money-lender (with his large nose) is checkmated at the end of the play. The corresponding Roman Comedy-ending is 'leno periit. plaudite' (*Pers.* 858). In the *Poenulus* we have two versions of the final scene. In one (written in Trochaic Septenarii) the *leno* gets milder treatment than usual, and half-a-dozen lines (1402 sqq.) are devoted to an explanation. In the other (Iambic Senarii) he is trounced more ruthlessly, and the appeal for applause is introduced by this couplet (1368 sq.):

Multum ualete . multa uerba fecimus;

Malum postremo omne ad lenonem reccidit.

Which is the original version, and which is the re-cast (*retractatio*) made when the play was re-staged? It is Plautus' way to throw his final scene into Trochaic Septenarii, the rousing metre that would attune the spectators for a round of applause; and even on that single count the trochaic scene can claim to be the original. Apparently both the treatment of the *leno* and the length of the play had provoked criticism, and the scene was re-written (in Iambic Senarii) to correct the one fault and excuse the other. In the trochaic scene (line 1415) fun is poked at a plump *tibicina* in the troupe; and a similar jest at her expense appears in the *Aulularia* (line 332). To the date of the play we get a (possible) hint in line 524:

Praesertim in re populi placida atque interfectis hostibus,

a line which suggests that the close of the Second Carthaginian War seemed to Plautus a good opportunity for an adaptation of a Greek play about a Carthaginian, the *Καρχιδόνιος*. 'Poenulus' was a later title; that of Plautus was 'Patruus' (Hanno is uncle of that singularly unpleasant youth, Agorastocles):

(prol. 53-54) *Καρχιδόνιος* uocatur haec comoedia;

Latine Plautus 'Patruos' Pulti-phagonesides.

The play was popular, to judge from the many traces of re-casts. To the first performance after the author's death part of the prologue, as Marx has shown, should be assigned, with its punning allusion to the Histrian War (lines 4 and 44) and its quotations from the favourite tragedy of the day, Ennius' adaptation of the Achilles, a play written by Aristarchus of Tegea. One of the quotations shows an Infinitive without a governing Verb in our MSS. (line 16):

Bonum factum esse, edicta ut seruetis mea.

It need not be altered. The audience would be familiar with the context.

*Epid.* 15. On Thesprio's return with his master from a campaign he meets his fellow-slave Epidicus, and the two have a talk :

EP. Vix adipiscendi potestas modo fuit. TH. Scurra es. EP. Scio  
Te esse equidem hominem militem. TH. Audacter quamuis dicito.

'I could scarcely catch you up just now. What a "knut" you are! Oh! I know you're an army man. You may take your oath of that.' This marks *scurra* as military slang for a stay-at-home, a 'civvy' (Hotspur would say a 'popinjay'). In *Trin.* 202 I scent a pun on *assiduus* 'a rate-payer' (ab asse dando) and *assiduus* (*adsiduus*):

Urbani assidui ciues, quos scurras vocant.

*Rud.* 829. Is *Corp. Gloss. Lat.* V. 337, 23, a Donatus gloss? (Utpote significat ut possumus, ut potestis, ut possunt. Nam pote et non pote potest et non potest dicunt Tusc[i]. And should the last word be *rustici*? Cicero (*Brut.* 172) makes the old market-woman say: Hospes, non pote minoris. The *potest* of the MSS. in the Rudens-line is not so close to *potis est* as to :

Ut pote sunt (st) ignaui homines, sati' recte monent. 'Pretty good advice from such rascals.'

We should refuse the emendation :

Ut potes (Nom. Plur.) ignaui homines, etc. (with Hiatus in the word-group ign. hom.).

*Pseud.* 146-7. Between a trochaic and an iambic passage stand two lines of which the second is clearly iambic, though its scansion offers a difficulty :

Ut ne peristromata quidem aequae picta sint Campanica  
Neque Alexandrina beluata tonsilia tappetia (-silia Tribrach!).

If we make the first trochaic, that involves the impossible -mata qui- (Tribrach); if iambic, the equally impossible -stromata (Dactyl) or -mata qui- (Tribrach). *Stich.* 378 Trochaic (Tum Babylonica et *peristroma* tonsilia et tappetia), with *peristroma* Plur., and *Trin.* 247 Iambic (Ibi illa pendentem ferit : iam amplius orat : non satis), with a Choriambus for third metrum, suggest this Iambic Octonarius (with Choriambus for second metrum):

Ut ne peristroma quidem ae || que picta sint Campanica.

W. M. LINDSAY.