A Close Look at Two Recent Critical Texts of Plautus

Review article of

Questa, C. 2008. *Titus Maccius Plautus: Bacchides*, a cura di C.Q. (Editio Plautina Sarsinatis, 4). Urbino, Quattroventi. 109 p. Pr. €16.00 (pb). Lanciotti, S. 2008. *Titus Maccius Plautus: Curculio*, a cura di S.L. (Editio Plautina Sarsinatis, 8). Urbino, Quattroventi. 87 p. Pr. €16.00 (pb).

Wolfgang David Cirilo de Melo
Universiteit Gent, Vakgroep Latijn en Grieks, Blandijnberg 2, 9000 Gent, Belgium
wolfgang.demelo@ugent.be

Most scholars working on Plautus still use the editions by Leo (Berlin 1895-6) and Lindsay (Oxford 1904-5) because they are generally reliable, but also because they are complete.[1] Naturally, Leo's and Lindsay's texts cannot reflect the great progress that has been made in Plautine studies since. Manuscripts have been re-evaluated (e.g. J, the so-called codex Londiniensis, London, Brit. Lib. Royal 15. C. XI, see Thomson 1986) or used for the first time (K, its French sister manuscript, Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 7890, see Questa 2001); Plautine metre is better understood now than two decades ago, particularly due to the efforts of Cesare Questa (see e.g. Questa 1995 and 2007); and Plautine techniques of composition have been studied in much more detail (see Fraenkel 2007).

Thus the time is ripe for new editions. Individual plays have of course been re-edited from time to time and become the subject of commentaries. But what is still missing is a critical edition of all the plays. At the moment, the most important new texts are the ones in the *Editio Sarsinatis*, which take all the progress made in Plautine studies into account. They all follow the same format: after a brief preface there is an ample bibliography containing editions and secondary literature. This is followed by a list of abbreviations for the manuscripts used. Next comes the text itself with three

---

[1] The text by Ernout (1932-40) has its merits, but is on the whole less reliable.

apparatuses: one for scene headings and the *notae personarum*, a second for line divisions, and a third for variant readings and conjectures. Each edition ends with a collection of all *testimonia* and a *conspectus metrorum*. This format leaves nothing to be desired. Undoubtedly once all plays are edited this new collection will replace both Leo and Lindsay.

As I am currently redoing the Loeb edition of Plautus, the *Editio Sarsinatis* is of course of great interest to me. The text I am producing differs from the Sarsina texts in several respects. On a purely orthographic level, for instance, I am trying to be consistent in using spelling conventions that are familiar to students. The Sarsina texts do not impose such artificial homogeneity on the plays. Naturally, we cannot recover the details of Plautine orthography. The manuscripts contain some genuinely archaic traces, but most spellings go back to the Varronian period or to an even later date (see Redard 1956). The Sarsina texts present us with archaic spellings where they occur in the manuscripts, but where the copyists have modernized the editions also have modern spellings. An experienced scholar will not mind a transmitted spelling *me* even when the scansion demands *med*, but a beginner may sometimes find this confusing. Naturally, there are other differences as well, which will be at the heart of the discussion that follows.

The two latest texts in the Sarsina series are the edition of the *Bacchides* by Cesare Questa and the edition of the *Curculio* by Settimio Lanciotti. I shall now discuss these two texts in turn, explicitly comparing them with Lindsay's text throughout, since this is probably the most easily accessible complete critical edition. Implicitly I am of course also comparing the new texts with my Loeb, and it should be fairly obvious which critical texts I prefer where. Before I begin, I should like to say that I do not wish to comment on line divisions. In several instances Questa and Lindsay differ in line divisions in the *cantica*, and also in their metrical analyses; here Questa is always superior. Lanciotti and Lindsay never differ because the *Curculio* is a metrically more straightforward play.

But let us begin with the *Bacchides*, which is one of Plautus' most famous comedies, despite the fact that its beginning is lost, which makes the plot more difficult to understand. The play became even more important in 1968; it had been known since the nineteenth century that the *Bacchides* is based on Menander's *Dis exapaton*, but when in 1968 Handley identified

some papyrus fragments as belonging to this Menander play, it was for the first time possible to compare a longer stretch of Menander with a Plautine adaptation thereof.

The plot of the *Bacchides* is intricate. Mnesilochus, a young Athenian, goes abroad to bring back gold for his father Nicobulus. On his way he meets and falls in love with the prostitute Bacchis, who already has a contract with a soldier. Bacchis goes to her sister in Athens, who is also called Bacchis. Pistoclerus receives a letter from his friend Mnesilochus and finds Bacchis for him; he himself falls in love with the other Bacchis. When Mnesilochus returns from abroad with his slave Chrysalus, the slave tricks Nicobulus out of his money in order to enable his young master to pay off the soldier. But Mnesilochus hears that his friend is having an affair with Bacchis, and since he does not know that there is a second, he feels betrayed and returns the gold to his father. When he finds out the truth, he persuades Chrysalus to trick the old man a second time. Eventually Nicobulus and Philoxenus, the father of Pistoclerus, find out what is going on and go to the sisters in order to punish them, their sons, and Chrysalus; but the coaxing sisters persuade the old men to give up that plan and to enjoy life with their sons and the slave.

Questa's text is admirable. On several occasions his text is better than Lindsay's because he has chosen better manuscript readings. Thus in l. 64, Lindsay follows B and T and writes *destimulant*. But the form *distimulant*, found in C and D, fits better semantically and is adopted by Questa. In l. 220, the Palatine manuscripts have *istoc*, but a dative *istic*, as found in G and S, makes more sense; Lindsay did not know G and S and opted for *istoc*, while Questa chooses *istic*. In l. 496, Lindsay follows the Palatine manuscripts and reads *cum illo*(*c*). Questa prefers the reading of the palimpsest: *cum hoc*. This means there is a prosodic hiatus after *cum*. Questa's solution is preferable because the person referred to is standing next to the speaker. In l. 503, A has *suo*, while the Palatine manuscripts and the codex Turnebi have *suo meo*. Lindsay opts for the pale *suo*, while Questa picks the undoubtedly correct *meo*, which results in a *para pros-dokian*-joke. In l. 552, the Palatine manuscripts have the standard form *arbitror*, while A has *arbitro*. Lindsay chooses the former, but Questa is certainly right to go for the more difficult reading. L. 672 ends in *quam parum* in A, but in *parum* in the other manuscripts. Lindsay chooses the text of A, which is syntactically easier, while Questa prefers the syntacti-

cally more difficult (but correct) version of the Palatine manuscripts, which also scans better. In l. 951, some manuscripts, including A, have *fata*, others have *facta*. Lindsay writes *fata*, presumably because A and some Palatine manuscripts agree, but *facta*, chosen by Questa, fits the meaning of the passage better. In l. 1097 Lindsay writes *omniaque* with B[4], C, and D. This means that *memorauit* is trisyllabic, hardly a Plautine scansion. Questa rightly prefers the reading *omnia* of B. In l. 1123 the Palatine manuscripts all have *sic*, but Charisius omits it. The text is better with *sic*, and Questa is right to follow the direct transmission, whereas Lindsay prefers the version without *sic*, presumably in order to avoid scanning *eunt* with synizesis, which however is unremarkable.

There are two instances where Questa and Lindsay differ from each other because they have chosen different manuscript readings, and where both readings are equally good. In l. 304, Lindsay prints *quom*, following B and D, which have *qum*. This leads to a legitimate hiatus after the fifth element. Questa follows C, which has *qm*, an abbreviation for *quoniam*. The line scans equally well, but is without hiatus. In l. 922, Lindsay chooses the reading of the Palatine manuscripts, *quicquam temere*, while Questa prefers the reading of A, which has the opposite word order.

There is only one occasion where Questa chooses a manuscript reading that is worse than the one chosen by Lindsay. In l. 488, A has *uideerem* [sic], while the Palatine manuscripts have *uidissem*. The meaning is past unreal ('I would have seen'). Questa opts for *uidissem*, but Lindsay chooses the more difficult and hence preferable reading *uiderem*—the imperfect subjunctive often has past unreal meaning in early Latin, but not later.

There are several cases where Lindsay is more conservative than Questa, who is clearly improving the text. In these instances Questa typically adopts older conjectures. For instance, in l. 38 Lindsay follows B and prints *pol quoque*. The collocation is odd. C and D have *pol ego quoque*, which is too long, but Reiz, who is followed by Questa, changes to *pol ego*, which is best. In l. 66 the transmitted infinitive *penetrare* is syntactically awkward and lacks the necessary reflexive *me*. Bothe's correction to *penetrem me* is right. In l. 153 the manuscripts have *iam*, which makes some sense, but Bothe's correction to *tam* is much better. In l. 223, the manuscripts have the present tense *exigit*, despite the obvious future reference; since the present for the future is restricted in many ways, Bothe's correction to *exiget* is an improvement. In l. 225, *nec quoiquam* only scans

if we accept trisyllabic *quoiiquam*; Bothe's correction to *nec <ego> quoi-quam* is commendable. In l. 252, Lambinus writes *quomque* instead of *quaque*; *quomque* is better because a generalizing word is needed. In l. 272 the manuscripts have *ducentos et mille*, which scans if *mille* has apocope of the final vowel; but the word order is unusual and Pareus must be right to change to *mille et ducentos*. In l. 278 the manuscripts have *domum cupientes*, which could be analysed as *domum* (sc. *ire*) *cupientes*; but perhaps Ritschl was right to change this to *domi cupientes*. In l. 369 the manuscripts have *qui* or *cui*, but *quo*, Lambinus' correction, seems more appropriate with *aduenit*; the point is not that someone arrives, but that he arrives somewhere. In l. 394, the manuscript reading *quidem meo* scans, but since *quidem* emphasizes what precedes and since *meo* is emphatic, Bothe's transposition must be correct. L. 480 will not scan as it is transmitted. Leo's addition of *ei* before *ad papillas* is a minor change that makes good sense and gives a metrically correct verse. L. 518 is too short as it stands in Lindsay, unless *mihi* is scanned with a heavy final syllable and *nihilo* with a heavy penultimate, a very unattractive solution. Camerarius adds *illud* between the two words. In l. 592, the manuscripts transmit *negato esse*, which does not scan unless we assume iambic shortening of the stressed second syllable of the imperative, an unusual situation, as Lindsay acknowledges, who marks the passage as corrupt. Acidalius changes to *negat esse*, which of course can undergo iambic shortening and actually makes better sense than the transmitted text. Lindsay takes l. 670 as an[4] + c[reiz], an analysis that seems highly unlikely. Questa analyses the verse as tr[7], just as what follows; he accepts Acidalius' transposition of *mihi respondetis* at verse end (transmitted like this by A and the Palatine manuscripts, hence an old corruption). In l. 673, Bothe's addition of *tu* after *igitur* improves the scansion. In l. 687, Fleckeisen's addition of *tu* before *dedisti* leads to a metrically correct verse; Lindsay marks the line as corrupt. In l. 724-5, the nominative *bellus…locus* is unsuitable for an exclamation. Questa follows Studemund, who changes to an accusative. But Barsby's change is even better because it is less obtrusive: he writes *bellus<t>…locus*. In l. 738 the manuscripts have *em perdundum* or *hem perdundum*, which makes no sense; Camerarius corrects to *est ad perdundum*. L. 803 is too short. Ritschl adds *scelus* after *tu*. In l. 940, the manuscripts have *hunc*, which makes sense, but is not perfect. Lambinus' correction to *hic* (= *ignis*) is preferable. In l. 950, Lambinus adds the necessary *in* before *dolis*;

this means that one has to take *prensus* from the palimpsest (Lindsay, who does not add *in*, takes *deprensus* from the other manuscripts). In l. 1081, *et* makes little sense; Acidalius' correction to *sed* (*set*) is an improvement. In l. 1097ᵃ, Müller adds *in* before *hunc*, not in order to avoid a legitimate prosodic hiatus, but for semantic reasons. In l. 1100ᵃ, Questa changes the manuscript reading *sic* to *bis*, following O. Skutsch; this brings out more clearly the double deception that gave rise to the name of the Greek original. In l. 1105 Leo writes *aerumnai* for transmitted *aerumnae* (or *aerumne*). The archaic, solemn form seems appropriate here, although *aerumnae* would also scan if we assume a hiatus at the change of speaker. In l. 1136-7, *solae liberae* interrupts the rhythm. Hermann deletes the phrase (Lindsay keeps it as a separate colon). In l. 1151, Ritschl's addition of *si* before *possumus* much improves the sense. In l. 1152, Questa accepts Bergk's change from *quam odiosum est* to *quamquam odio est*, which seems marginally better. In l. 1160 the manuscripts have *iam ego ipse*. This scans if we assume a prosodic hiatus between *iam* and *ego* and if *ipse* scans as *ips'*. But Ritschl's solution seems preferable: he changes to *ipsus* (thereby eliminating the hiatus). In l. 1197, the manuscripts have *fiunt*, but since we are dealing with a request or wish rather than a statement, Ussing's correction to *fiant* must be correct. In l. 1201 the manuscripts have *ne is*, which Lindsay marks as corrupt. Leo corrects to *neminis*.

There is only one instance where Lindsay is more conservative than Questa and where Questa's text is less good as a consequence: in l. 1160 Questa follows Leo and changes *prope* to *probe* because he dislikes *prope* in the meaning *paene*. But *prope* also has this meaning in *Persa* 810.

However, there are several occasions where Questa is more conservative than Lindsay, who is actually improving the text. In most cases, the changes Lindsay makes go back to earlier scholars. In l. 146, the transmitted *iturus sum* makes no sense and does not scan. Questa marks the passage as corrupt. Lindsay, following Bothe, prints *ituru's*, which is fine; but perhaps Ritschl's *i prorsus* is even better. In l. 286, Pylades transposes *lembus nostrae naui* to *nostrae naui lembus* in order to avoid a hiatus after the seventh element; this is good, but such hiatuses are not so unusual. In l. 293, Haupt writes *tardare* instead of the odd *turbare* we find in the manuscripts. In l. 315, Hermann adds *huc* after *nilne*, thus avoiding an awkward hiatus. L. 487 is transmitted in both A and the Palatine manuscripts, each time with *opinor*, which does not scan. Lindsay changes to *opino*,

thus assuming a very old corruption. In l. 619, Lindsay changes *me* to *med* in order to achieve a ba⁴; Questa keeps *me* and scans as ba² + baᶜ. In l. 634, Lindsay changes the transmitted *quid* to *quod* because we are dealing with a relative clause. Questa marks l. 820 as corrupt. Lindsay follows Leo, who heals the verse by changing the *terrae* or *terre* of the manuscripts to *terrai* and adding *iam* after it. Questa indicates that l. 893 is corrupt. Ussing corrects the metre by changing *Latona* to *Lato*. In l. 913, Aldus changes *ille* to *illic*, thereby avoiding a hiatus in an unacceptable place. In l. 987 Lindsay avoids an awkward hiatus by adding *illi* before *Ilio*. In l. 1054, Ritschl changes *exitium* to *exitio*, which is syntactically better. In l. 1198, Ritschl transposes the transmitted *censes sumere*, which improves the metre.

Yet more often Lindsay's changes, normally based on earlier scholars' work, create a worse text. Questa is right to be conservative here. In many cases Lindsay changes in order to avoid a legitimate hiatus, for instance after the fifth element of an iambic senarius. For example, in l. 171 Lindsay follows Reiz and writes *abiui* instead of *abii* in order to avoid a legitimate hiatus. In l. 197, the same happens again: Ritschl writes *illoc* instead of *illo* for the same reason. In l. 235 Lindsay changes *ecquae* to *ecquaen* to avoid an acceptable (though not regular) hiatus. In l. 301 Ritschl adds *illim* after *omne* to get rid of a normal hiatus. In l. 354, Camerarius adds *hinc* after *Ephesum*. In l. 765, Hermann adds *mi* before *esse*. In l. 766, Camerarius changes *illum* to *illunc*. In l. 799, Ritschl writes *illic* for *illi*. In l. 900, Camerarius changes *abiit* to *abiuit*. In l. 1071, Ritschl adds *iam* after *redduco*.

But not all of Lindsay's changes that deteriorate the text have to do with the avoidance of hiatus. L. 142 is corrupt and marked as such by Questa. Lindsay thinks he can save the line by deleting *una*. Yet the beginning *praesentibus illis* still leads to a divided anapaest. It is perhaps best to accept that the line cannot be healed, though one might write *illis praesente* (cf. *Amph.* 400 for the irregular agreement with *praesente*). In l. 245, *primum salutem*, the transmitted text, violates Meyer's law. Bothe transposes. But Meyer's law is a tendency rather than a strict law and we can keep the manuscript reading. In l. 401, most manuscripts have *commodus incommodus* or variants thereof. This will not scan. Questa marks the text as corrupt. Lindsay writes *comincommodus*, following Bergk, who in turn takes B¹ as his starting point, which has *com incomodus*. But is this

type of compound Plautine? Also, we should not forget that B[3] corrects to *comodus incomodus*. In l. 570 the Palatine manuscripts have *paruam*, which goes well with *fidem* and is accepted by Questa. The codex Turnebi has *parum*, which will not scan and could be regarded as a simple mis-spelling of *paruam*. Lindsay changes this to *paruom*, which is syntactically awkward. L. 628 and l. 628[a] consist of wilamowitziani. Lindsay analyses them as one trochaic octonarius and has to change *pectore* to an ablative *pectori*. L. 638 is analysed as wil + adon by Questa. Lindsay believes it to be two dochmii and has to place *mi* behind *te*. In l. 641, Lindsay trans-poses the manuscript reading *hodie facinus feci* to *facinus feci hodie* in order to avoid iambic shortening of the preceding *duplex*; but this shortening is unproblematic. Questa analyses l. 656 as cr[1] + tr[2] + cr[2]. Lindsay changes to cr[4] by deleting *sit*. L. 657 is a cr[2]. Lindsay adds part of the following line and analyses as cr[4], but can only do so by deleting *furetur*. In l. 810 C and D have *Bellorophontem*, while B has *Bellerophantem*. Ritschl writes *Bellorophantam*, but the manuscript evidence does not point to this declension type at all.

There are a few instances in which both Lindsay and Questa change the transmitted text in different ways, and both are good. In l. 23, Lindsay adds *fide* at the end, like Leo, while Questa prefers *malis*, like O. Skutsch. In l. 311, Lindsay assumes a form *illoc* rather than transmitted *illo* to avoid an awkward hiatus. Questa in his apparatus prefers to keep *illo* and to change *me* to *med* instead, an equally good way of dealing with the problem. L. 565 is too short. Lindsay adds *eam* as object of *amare*, while Questa, following Ritschl, leaves the object unspecified and adds *ipse*. L. 584 is too short. Lindsay solves the problem by adding *male* before *mala*. Questa follows Ritschl and adds *quid?* at the beginning of the line. In l. 785 one has to add *nullum*. Whether one adds it after *faciam* like Brach-mann and Lindsay or before like Ritschl and Questa is irrelevant.

In one case, both Lindsay and Questa emend, but Questa is clearly superior. In l. 81, the manuscripts have various versions of the first verb; B has *accumbem*, B[2] and C have *accubam*, and D has *accubiam*. Lindsay writes *accumbam*, but in view of the following *accubet*, Camerarius' emen-dation, accepted by Questa, to *accubem* is better.

Sometimes both Lindsay and Questa are conservative and one would like to see some further emendation. In l. 108, both Lindsay and Questa keep the manuscript reading *lectum*. But Tränkle's change to *tectum* makes

better sense. In l. 140 B has *haec intus sit et*, C and D have *haec intus intus sit et*, and S has *hic intus sit et*. Lindsay and Questa mark the passage as corrupt. Leo's correction to *haec <qui emit> intus sit et* is appealing. In l. 293, Lindsay and Questa keep *in portu*, but Barsby's *in ponto* is more sensible. L. 453 does not scan as a trochaic septenarius with *Pistocleri* at the end. Lindsay assumes that this is an octonarius, which seems unlikely. Questa follows Hermann and deletes the word, but this leaves a gap. Perhaps this gap should be filled with something like Ritschl's *hic quidem est*. In l. 498, the Palatine manuscripts have *amicos atque*, which will not scan; the palimpsest has *amicum atque*, which scans, but is awkward because more than one friend is being talked about. Lindsay and Questa accept the reading of the palimpsest. John Trappes-Lomax has suggested a more attractive solution to me: we can keep the plural and delete *atque*. In l. 548 Lindsay and Questa follow Acidalius and accept that *frustrantur* needs to be changed to *frustrant*, but strangely enough they keep the infinitive *frustrari*; surely if Plautus wrote *frustrant* here, he also wrote *frustrare*. If the manuscripts are followed, there is an awkward hiatus in l. 904. Both Lindsay and Questa accept it. Perhaps it is better to follow Leo and add *tibi* after *censeas*, which removes the difficulty and makes syntactic sense (*supplicare* without a dative would be unusual). In l. 1211 the manuscripts transmit the infinitive *applaudere*, dependent on *uolumus* like the infinitive before; while this is syntactically unproblematic, Plautine plays do not end like this, and Bergk's emendation to *applaudite* should be adopted.

From time to time Questa assumes a textual corruption where the transmitted text can perhaps be defended. In l. 123 we find the ablative *poticio*. Questa marks the word as corrupt. Paulus in an excerpt from Festus says that Plautus uses *putitium* in the meaning *stultus*, possibly an extrapolation from this line (*stultior es barbaro poticio*). Perhaps Lindsay is right to accept this word, though its meaning remains obscure, despite the gloss (is it connected with Oscan *puklum* 'son' < **pu-tlo-* (Sanskrit *putrá-*)? Barsby translates as 'babe in arms'.). In l. 280, B has *longum st rigorem*, while C and D have *longum est rigorem*. Questa indicates that the text is corrupt. Lindsay prints *longum strigorem* and assumes an unusually bold metaphor—the reference is to a ship, but Festus tells us that *strigor* means 'strong man'. Perhaps Lindsay is right. In l. 381 the manuscripts have *geruli figulos*, which Saracenus turned into one word ('perpetrators and creators'). Questa assumes corruption; indeed a copulative compound

of this sort is highly unusual in Latin, but perhaps Lindsay is right to accept it. In l. 1068, the manuscripts have *ueluti mihi* at line end. Questa assumes a corruption; Lindsay accepts *ueluti mi* as an admittedly unusual clausula.

Speaker assignment is on the whole unproblematic in the *Bacchides*. But on two occasions Questa differs from Lindsay, and in both cases his assignment seems preferable. *Adibo contra et contollam gradum* in l. 535 is given in its entirety to Mnesilochus by the manuscripts and Lindsay. It seems more likely that Acidalius and Questa are right in assuming that the first half belongs to Pistoclerus (in which case *et* has to be deleted). In l. 568, the manuscripts give *Bacchidem* to Mnesilochus; Camerarius' change, accepted by Questa, makes the scene more lively: he gives the word to Pistoclerus, who is now interrupting Mnesilochus.

A few transpositions, only in Questa, also deserve to be mentioned. Like Langen, Questa transposes l. 68 and 69, which smoothes out the text. L. 499 follows l. 498 in A, but l. 495 in the Palatine manuscripts. Questa accepts the latter order because it also corresponds to what we find in the Menander fragment. Questa places l. 937-40, which are only transmitted in the Palatine manuscripts, after l. 944, achieving a more coherent text.

Sometimes Questa or Lindsay delete a few verses. Questa follows Guyet in excluding l. 519[a-c], not only because they are absent in A and very similar to l. 512-14, but also because of stylistic and metrical oddities, which make it likely that we are dealing with a later addition. Like Kiessling, Questa secludes l. 931, which disrupts the flow of the text. Two other deletions by Questa are less good. Questa follows Guyet and excludes l. 465-6, even though in the apparatus he admits that the verses are "a scurrilitate Plautina non alieni". L. 962-5 are excluded by Questa (following Leo) because they are said to be a later elaboration; the verses could of course also be a Plautine elaboration. Lindsay's only deletion is not commendable. L. 377-8 are excluded by Ritschl (followed by Lindsay) because they are very similar to l. 380-1. However, such repetitions are common and often perfectly Plautine.

Some more points. In l. 11, Lindsay supplemented the missing bit as *quoiatis tibi uisust*, a good conjecture made by Ritschl. Now, however, we have the reading of manuscript Z of Priscian, and we should supplement the passage from there, as Questa does, as *cuiatem esse aiebat*. L. 106 is

transmitted twice, once before l. 107, once after it. Lindsay deletes the first occurrence, but the flow of the text is better if we delete the second, like Questa. Lindsay scans 979-9ᵃ as gly + ity. Questa analyses them as part of a trochaic system and hence has to accept a lacuna of two elements at the end of 979ᵃ.

Finally, a few words should be said about the beginning of the play. We have fragments of the lost beginning transmitted by various grammarians. Questa follows the order in Lindsay, which he knows cannot be original; but Questa does not attempt to improve on it because of the uncertainties involved. Some uncertainties will of course always remain, but the order proposed for example by Barsby (1991) seems preferable.

We can now turn to the *Curculio*, Plautus' shortest play. The action is straightforward: Phaedromus, a young, insolvent Epidaurian, loves Planesium, a chaste girl kept in a brothel. Phaedromus sends his hanger-on Curculio off to get money. Curculio meets a soldier who has deposited money at a banker's in Epidaurus. Anyone who brings a letter sealed with his signet-ring to the banker can get the money and then exchange it for the girl. Curculio steals the ring from the soldier and frees the girl for Phaedromus. The soldier comes, and when he wants to take revenge, he is discovered to be Planesium's brother. Peace is restored, Planesium can marry her lover, the soldier gets his money back, and Curculio gets free meals for the rest of his life.

Lanciotti's new edition of the play is excellent. Where he differs from Lindsay because he picks a different manuscript reading he is invariably better. In l. 123, Lindsay accepts the reading *hic* of the Palatine manuscripts, but Lanciotti rightly prefers *hoc*, found in S, which makes more sense because the reference is to wine. In l. 487, Lindsay reads *prode* (with B³, which has *pro de*), but Lanciotti's *prae* makes more sense and occurs (with variants) in VEJK. In l. 603, Lindsay, as often, prefers the reading of B; B has *uo is*, which he corrects to *uero is*. But B is not always superior. V and E also have *uois*, but a corrector of E changed this to *tuos*, and J and K also have *tuus*. This makes much more sense and is rightly preferred by Lanciotti. In l. 612, Lindsay reads *bullis* with J and E, while Lanciotti reads *bulbis* with BVK. Lindsay misses the pun: *bulbi* can be 'choice morsels', but also 'throws of the dice'.

Sometimes Lanciotti changes the text (following earlier scholars), improving it considerably, while Lindsay is more conservative. In l. 156,

Lanciotti adopts Muretus' *st* for the less appropriate *sed* found in the man-
uscripts. In l. 163, Schoell adds *te* after *et*, which makes the contrast
between speaker and addressee much clearer. In l. 323 Lindsay accepts the
manuscript reading *suis*, but this genitive needs a long *-u-* in order to scan
and the existence of such a form is highly doubtful. Lanciotti accepts
Scaliger's correction to *sueris*, but takes this as an accusative (against
Scaliger, but with Ernout). In l. 452, Langen deletes *nam*, which is usu-
ally absent in this type of sentence. In l. 716 Luchs changes *illius* to *huius*,
which fits the context better.

Occasionally Lanciotti is too conservative and Lindsay's changes, often
taken over from earlier scholars, improve the text. In l. 344, Lindsay
adopts two changes: with Camerarius, he reads *pro is* instead of *pro his*—
there is no deictic force here at all—and with Baehrens he changes the
odd *coaccedunt* to *eo accedunt*. In l. 394 Lindsay again follows Camerarius
and changes *hi* to *i* because there is no deictic force.

Some of these changes also get rid of hiatuses in unusual places: in
l. 382 Lindsay accepts Bentley's addition of *mi* before *emere*. In l. 389, the
manuscripts have *qui operto capite*. Bothe transposes to *operto capite qui*.
In l. 446, the text contains an awkward double hiatus. Lindsay avoids the
problem by assuming that one *omnem* has been lost by haplography. In l.
582, the manuscript reading is *esse aiebat sese*. Camerarius writes *sese aie-
bat esse*.

But sometimes Lindsay's changes are no good. In l. 26, Lindsay, follow-
ing Pylades, transposes the manuscript reading *esse oportet* to avoid a legit-
imate hiatus after the fifth element. In l. 667 Lindsay (with Fleckeisen)
changes *ille* to *illic* (also nominative) for the same reason. In l. 352, Lind-
say changes the acceptable *me morari* of the manuscripts to *demorari*. In l.
425 Lindsay changes the locative *istic* to *isti* without any reason.

On two occasions, both Lindsay and Lanciotti change the transmitted
text, and the changes are equally good. L. 80 is too short. Lindsay changes
ubi to *ubiubi*, while Lanciotti follows Guyet and writes *ubi ego*. In l. 639
iste, the transmitted form, cannot be correct. Bothe, followed by Lan-
ciotti, changes to the dative *isti*, while Lindsay prefers the dative *istae*.

But several times both Lindsay and Lanciotti change the transmitted
text and Lanciotti is clearly superior. In l. 284 some manuscripts have *nec
quisquam est*, others *ne quisquamst*. The verse is too short. Lindsay
improves the line by inserting *usquam* between *nec* and *quisquam*, but

Langen's *nusquam quisquam est*, accepted by Lanciotti, is more elegant. L. 517 is also too short as it is transmitted in the manuscripts. Lindsay changes *bene sit* to *bene siet*, which leads to an awkward divided element almost at the end of the verse. Lanciotti's solution is preferable. He follows Pylades and adds *ut* before *bene*. L. 595 is particularly interesting. In a slightly corrected version the trochaic septenarius looks like this: *peior quam haec est; quae ubi med hunc habere conspicata st anulum.* This verse is too long. Pylades, followed by Lindsay, deleted *quam haec est*, which is a fairly radical solution. JKE[c] have *me* rather than *med* or *met*. Gruterus, who adopts the more recent form, then writes *habere hunc* rather than *hunc habere*. In this he is followed by Lanciotti, and rightly so; it is not unlikely that Plautus used the conservative spellings *med*, *ted*, and *siem* even where the metre demands the more modern pronunciations *me, te*, and *sim*.

There is only one occasion where both Lindsay and Lanciotti change and actually Lindsay's change is more compelling. In l. 125, the Palatine manuscripts have the unmetrical *eueniunt*; Lindsay changes to *ueniunt*, while Lanciotti accepts Fleckeisen's *euenunt*, a form which probably never existed, despite subjunctives like *euenant* (for a discussion of such forms see de Melo 2007, ch. 10).

In one case both editors change in the same way, but further improvement seems possible: in l. 142 the manuscripts have *misera afficitur*. Lindsay and Lanciotti transpose, like Goetz, but perhaps it is better to read *misera affligitur* with F. Skutsch; the metre is the same, whichever correction one prefers.

Naturally, there are also cases where progress can be made because both editors are too conservative. In l. 43, Reiz's addition of *sed* at the beginning of the line would have avoided a hiatus in an awkward position. L. 189 is unmetrical as it stands, a fact acknowledged by both Lindsay and Lanciotti. In my opinion the easiest way to heal the verse would be to delete *est*, or (with Ussing) to place it behind *homini*. In l. 345 both Lindsay and Lanciotti accept *dedisti* with harsh iambic shortening of the accented second syllable; Fleckeisens *dedistin*, also with iambic shortening, but of an unaccented second syllable, is more in line with the rules. In l. 356 B[3] and the *Gallica recensio* (J and K) have *anulum*, and this reading is accepted by Lindsay and Lanciotti. Naturally, one hesitates to

change a metrical reading in such a case, but the text does not make much sense: the soldier would have been mad to risk losing his signet-ring in a game of dice, and since later on he lost the game, there would have been no need for Curculio to steal the ring. Therefore, Leo's correction to *amiculum* may well be right. In l. 374 both editors print *plus alieni est*, the reading of the Palatine manuscripts, and mark that this does not scan. Lindsay has *alieni ampliust* in his apparatus, which seems a reasonable change. L. 401 is unmetrical as it stands in Lindsay and Lanciotti; Bentley's replacement of *non* by *haud* would have yielded a correct line. In l. 415, Lindsay and Lanciotti both accept a highly suspect double hiatus which could easily be avoided by Fleckeisen's addition of *mea* after *uestimenta*. In l. 461, the word order in the manuscripts is *caue in te sit mora*, with hiatus after *caue*. This is acceptable and followed by Lindsay and Lanciotti, though Müller's transposition to *caue mora in te sit* is more elegant and avoids the hiatus. In l. 493 a corruption is indicated by Lindsay. Lanciotti accepts the text as it is. It has to be said that the hiatus at the change of speaker is indeed unproblematic, but there is no regular incision. Perhaps Leo's emendation to *et quidem meminisse* should be adopted. In l. 622 the manuscript reading *male* is unmetrical; Lindsay and Lanciotti mark the text as corrupt. Leo's emendation to *miles* is elegant and perhaps correct. In l. 629 Lanciotti accepts an awkward hiatus. Lindsay tries to avoid this hiatus by writing *uti* (with long *i*) instead of *ut*. Becker's solution is more elegant; he inserts *te* between *quaeso* and *ut*. In l. 682 Lindsay and Lanciotti have *uelut* as in the manuscripts, but Leo's *uel ille* (with iambic shortening) is preferable because otherwise the subject remains too vague. In l. 697 Lindsay and Lanciotti follow the manuscripts and read *condemnatum*, but since no judgment has been pronounced, Pius' *indemnatum* seems better.

Two more problems seem worth discussing before we can turn to speaker assignment. The second half of l. 574 is missing. Lindsay adds *meus* at the end, which is a reasonable guess in view of the parallel asseveration that follows; it also has a possessive pronoun at the end of the enumeration in l. 577. In l. 636 Lindsay considers the vocative *Planesium* suspect because the clause contains the imperative plural; but Lanciotti is right to accept the line as it stands because there are good parallels for this (e.g. *Poen.* 604: *intro abite, Agorastocles*).

Speaker assignment in the later parts of the play is problematic. The manuscripts have Curculio disappear suddenly, after l. 678, and some editors like Lindsay or Monaco (1969) have followed them. But it is not believable that the main character, who appears fairly late in the play, also disappears so early. Thus, giving Curculio a greater part is clearly a good thing. In l. 712-13, *me…tarpezita* and *non taceo* are given to the soldier by VEK and Lindsay. Lanciotti follows B[3], which assigns these sentences to Curculio. In l. 687, *et…uolo* is assigned to Phaedromus by the manuscripts (and Lindsay); the same goes for *atque…uomere* in the following line. Lanciotti gives both sentences to Curculio. On two occasions, both Lindsay and Lanciotti change the speaker assignments of the manuscripts, but Lanciotti's changes are better; he gives more to Curculio. The first case is l. 691-2, where *delicatum…dedi* is assigned to the soldier by the manuscripts. Pistoris, followed by Lindsay, gives this to Phaedromus, but Lanciotti's solution of giving it to Curculio seems best. The second case is l. 694, where *quicquid…potius* is given to Phaedromus by the manuscripts. Leo and Lindsay reassign this to the soldier. Again, Lanciotti rightly gives the words to Curculio. Once, Lanciotti follows the manuscripts in assigning a question to Curculio, but Lindsay wrongly wants to change: in l. 605 the question *quid nunc?* is assigned to Curculio by the manuscripts, yet Ribbeck, followed by Lindsay, gives it to Planesium. Lanciotti is more conservative. In my opinion, the question makes much more sense in the mouth of Curculio. On one occasion I would prefer to give a passage to Curculio against Lindsay and Lanciotti: l. 729 is spoken by the soldier in Lanciotti's edition, as in the manuscripts. Seyffert, followed by Lindsay, gives it to Phaedromus. Perhaps it would be best to give this last line to Curculio. Finally a word about a speaker assignment not involving Curculio. In l. 693 *collum…crucem* is assigned to the soldier by the manuscripts. Lanciotti is right to follow them. Leo and Lindsay give the words to Phaedromus.

It is time to summarize. I think it has become clear that although I do not always agree with Questa and Lanciotti, their editions are simply superb and present enormous progress. Their apparatuses and metrical conspectuses are very helpful, and unless new important manuscripts are discovered, it seems unlikely that there will be any need for new critical editions of these two plays. My debt to these two books will immediately be clear to anyone who will look at my Loeb edition. The layout of the

books is also of a very high quality and typographical errors are almost absent.[2]

References

Barsby, J.A. 1991. *Plautus: Bacchides*, ed. with tr. and comm. (3rd corr. repr. Warminster)

de Melo, W.D.C. 2007. *The Early Latin Verb System: Archaic Forms in Plautus, Terence, and Beyond* (Oxford)

Fraenkel, E. 2007. *Plautine Elements in Plautus*, tr. of the German edn. (Berlin 1922) and the Italian addenda (Florence 1960) by T. Drevikovsky, F. Muecke (Oxford)

Handley, E.W. 1968. *Menander and Plautus: A Study in Comparison*, an inaugural lecture delivered at University College London 5 February 1968 (London)

Monaco, G. 1969. *Plauto: Curculio* (Palermo)

Questa, C. 1995. *Titi Macci Plauti Cantica* (Urbino)

———— 2001. *Per un'edizione di Plauto*, in: *Giornate Filologiche «Francesco Della Corte»*, II (Genoa), 61-83

———— 2007. *La metrica di Plauto e di Terenzio* (Urbino)

Redard, G. 1956. *Le rajeunissement du texte de Plaute*, in: *Hommages à Max Niedermann* (Brussels), 296-306

Thomson, R. 1986. *British Library Royal 15. C. XI: A Manuscript of Plautus' Plays from Salisbury Cathedral (c. 1100)*, Scriptorium 40, 82-7

---

[2] The only typographical errors that should be mentioned are in Questa's metrical conspectus. L. 979-84[a] do not form a tr sy[11], but a tr sy[24]; similarly, l. 1092-9 are not an an sy[28], but an an sy[30].