NEW LIGHT ON THERoman STAGE
A revival of Terence’s Phormio rediscovered

The Terentian didascaliae and the Terentian commentary of Donatus are unique and invaluable sources for the history of the Roman stage. Over a century ago Karl Dziatzko published a series of articles in this journal on the Terentian didascaliae which remain the fundamental starting-point for any treatment of the subject.1 Dziatzko was primarily interested in the puzzle presented by the variants in the textual tradition of the didascaliae. Like a number of scholars before and after him, Dziatzko argued that some of the variants preserved traces of revival performances of Terence’s plays subsequent to the author’s death. When correctly restored the variant notice on the Phormio contained in codex A (the codex Bemmimnus) reaffirms this premise and offers new light on the enduring popularity of the Terentian corpus.

Dziatzko’s articles were based on the work of C. E. Geppert.2 It had long been known that some manuscripts of Terence and Donatus contained variant readings for the didascaliae of Terence’s plays.3 Geppert was the first scholar to undertake a systematic and comprehensive study of the variants.4 Geppert consulted a large


2) C. E. Geppert, Ueber die Terentianischen Didascalien, NJPhP Suppl. 18, 1852, 550–582.

3) Some of the variants were already known to S.V. Pighius, Annales Romanorum, Antwerp 1615; F.W. Schubert, De Romanorum aedilibus libri quattuor (quibus praemittuntur de similibus magistratibus apud potentiores populos antiquos dissertationes duae), Königsberg 1828; and F. Ritschl, Parerga zu Plautus und Terenz, Leipzig 1845.

4) Unfortunately, more recent studies of the textual tradition of Terence have not included analysis of the didascaliae. As Geppert, Dziatzko, W. Wilmanns, De didascalis Terentians, Berlin 1864, R. Kauer and W.M. Lindsay (eds.), P. Terentii Afri Comoediae, Oxford 1961, and P. Wessner (ed.), Ael Donati Commentum
number of the manuscripts of Terence and Donatus as well as many early editions of Terence. His detailed analysis revealed that although there is a large measure of agreement in the majority of manuscripts, a significant number of serious discrepancies exist in the manuscripts of Terence, and between the testimony of Donatus and the Terentian manuscripts. Geppert identified discrepancies as to the games at which the plays were staged, the names of the curule aediles who presided, the names of the lead actor-

5) Thus for instance Donatus and most of the Terentian Mss agree that the first production of the Eunuchus and the Hecyra were staged at the ludi Megalenses celebrated each year in April, but other Mss state they were staged at the ludi Romani held annually in September. In the case of the Phormio the situation is reversed. The majority of Mss say the Phormio was staged at the ludi Romani but Donatus and the codex Bembinus state that it was performed at the ludi Megalenses (see Geppert [above, n. 2] 552 f., 560 f., 563 f.; Dziatzko, RhM 20, 1865, 573 f., 575–7, RhM 21, 1866, 66, 68, 70–3; and below).


The aediles L. Cornelius Lentulus and L. Valerius Flaccus are common to all manuscripts of the didascalia of the Heautontimorumenos, but four codices contain additional names: one adds L. Cornelius Merula (Sorbonne 1768); another has L. Cornelius, L. Lentulus and L. Valerius Flaccus (7906); and two others have Laelius Cornelius Lentulus and L. Valerius Flaccus (Notre Dame 185 and St. Victor 719; see Geppert [above, n. 2] 557, 559; Dziatzko, RhM 20, 1865, 574 f., RhM 21, 1866, 68–70).

Donatus and almost all the Terentian Mss agree that the curule aediles who presided at the first performance of the Eunuchus in 161 were L. Postumius Albinus and L. Cornelius Merula. However, one Mss gives the aediles as L. Piso and L. Cornelius, and another names a M. Iunius and L. Iulius (respectively the Leiden and Bembinus codices, see Geppert [above, n. 2] 552 f.; Dziatzko, RhM 20, 1865, 573 f.).

The didascaliae of the Andria do not survive in the Terentian Mss, but the manuscripts of Donatus, praef. 1.6 plainly name four aediles – viz: M. Fulvius et M. Glabrione Q. Minutio termonii L. Valerio (only codices C, T, and V preserve the cognomen of Minucius and the praenomen of Valerius which commentators overlooked until J. Heurgon, Sur un édile de Térence, REL 27, 1949, 106–8 drew attention to their existence). Fulvius and Glabrio are identical with M. Fulvius Nobilior (cos. 159) and M’. Acilius Glabrio (cos. suff. 154) and were undoubtedly the aediles who presided at the début performance of the Andria in 166 (see Schubert [above, n. 3] 385; Geppert [above, n. 2] 581; Mommsen, Römische Forschungen, Berlin
producer(s), and of the consuls in whose year of office the performance took place, as well as discrepancies as to the type of instrument on which the musical score was intended to be played, the name of the author of the original Greek play, and the sequence in which the plays were originally performed.


7) Most Mss credit the staging of Terence’s plays to L. Ambivius Turpio and L. Atilius Praenestinus, but others name L. Minucius Prothymus, a L. Sergius, and a L. Cassius (see Dzietzko, RhM 20, 1865, 574 f., 577 f., RhM 21, 1866, 66–8, 72, 78, 81 f. and further below).

8) Most Mss of the *Heautontimorumenos* register the consuls as M. Iunius and T. Sempronius (sic), but the codex Bembinus has Cn. Cornelius and M. Iuvenius (see Geppert [above, n. 2] 556 f., 559 f.; Dzietzko, RhM 20, 1865, 574 f., RhM 21, 1866, 68–70).

The *Eunuchus* was first performed in 161 B.C. in the consulship of M. Valerius Messalla and C. Fannius. The majority of the Mss record the consuls as *M. Valerio C. Mummiio Fannio* (see Geppert [above, n. 2] 553, 555; Dzietzko, RhM 20, 1865, 573 f., RhM 21, 1866, 65 f. This is believed to have been the reading of the codex Bembinus but it is illegible at this point. A number of variants of the *gentilicia* Mummius and Fannius are recorded, see Geppert [above, n. 2] 555). Whilst four manuscripts have the reading: *M. Valerio Cornelio Mummiio Fannio* (Regius; 7907; 7914; and Berlin A).

Donatus and all but one of the Terentian Mss agree that the *Phormio* was first performed in 161 in the consulship of M. Valerius Messalla and C. Fannius (see Geppert [above, n. 2] 560 f.; Dzietzko, RhM 20, 1865, 575, RhM 21, 1866, 70 f.; Wessner [above, n. 4] II 346). The one exception is the codex Bembinus which names the consuls as Q. Caspio and Cn. Servilius (on which vide infra).

9) That the score was played on pipes (*tibiae*) is not disputed; the disagreement centres on the type of pipes used. In the case of the *Eunuchus* Donatus has *tibiae dextrae et sinistrae* whereas the Mss only refer to *tibiae dextrae*, on the *Phormio* Donatus and the codex Lipsiensis give *tibiae Serranae* while the majority of Mss cite *tibiae impares* (codex 7915 has *tibius parilibus* i.e. *tibiae pares* and codices 8194 and Berlin B have the nonsensical *tibiae Serranae impares*), and on the *Adelphi* Donatus refers to *tibiae dextrae* and the Mss to *tibiae Serranae* (see Geppert [above, n. 2] 554 f., 563, 573; Dzietzko, RhM 20, 1865, 573 f., 575, 577 f., 594 f.; and J. C. Watson, Donatus’ Version of the Terence Didascaliae, TAPhA 36, 1905, 127 f., 129 f.).

10) The codex Bembinus and Donatus give conflicting testimony as to the author of the Greek play on which Terence’s *Hecyra* was based. The former names Menander, while Donatus, with some dubitation, names Apollodorus (see Geppert [above, n. 2] 566; Dzietzko, RhM 20, 1865, 576 f., RhM 21, 1866, 76 f.; and Watson [above, n. 9] 127 f. The other Mss of Terence omit this information). See also Eugraphius (Wessner [above, n. 4] III 259).

11) The *Heautontimorumenos* is said by some Mss to be the second of Terence’s plays to be staged, but some claim it was the third, and yet others the
In the present context it is the variant names for the curule aediles and consuls that are of most interest. Faced with the existence of these variants it is necessary to make some attempt to account for their occurrence. Either they must be explained as errors of one kind or another, or else another explanation of their appearance is required. Now the manuscripts do indeed contain variant readings for the names of the aediles and consuls which are simple errors, but almost all may be accounted for in one of three ways.

First, some are predictable corruptions of the correct reading. Thus the gentilicium of the consul T. Manlius Torquatus becomes in some instances Mallius and Manlius, and the consul Fannius is recorded as Finnio, Phammo and Fauno. In the same category belong some more complex examples. The consuls M. Iunius and T. Sempronius (sic) who appear in most Mss of the Heautontimoromenos were long ago recognized as M’. Iuventius Thalna and Ti. Sempronius Gracchus, the consuls of 163. At an early stage the rare gentilicum Iuventius was corrupted, perhaps by degrees, into the more familiar Iunius, which in turn inspired further variations. It also seems likely that the aediles L. Piso and L. Corne-

---

12) In the didascalia of the Hecyra Mallius is found in codices 7904 and Sorbonne 1768, and Manilius in 7910, 7913, 8191, and Berlin A and C; see Geppert (above, n. 2) 567. Fannius occurs as Finnio in codex 7917 of the didascalia of the Eunuchus, as Phammo in the Helmstädt codex, and Fauno in codex Berlin B; see Geppert (above, n. 2) 555. Likewise the consul Mummius appears in some Mss of the didascalia of the Eunuchus as Nummio (7900 A, 7901, 7906, 7913, 7915, 8192, Notre Dame 185, Supplement 291, Arsenal codex 27), Numio (7905, 7912, 7194, 8191, Berlin B, Helmstädt codex), and Mimio (Berlin C); see Geppert (above, n. 2) 555.

13) Iuventius was restored as early as the 1536 edition of H. Stephanus. The truth was also known to Pighius and Schubert (above, n. 3) 386. See also Geppert (above, n. 2) 558 f.; Wilmanns (above, n. 4) 8, 17 f.; and Dziatzko, RhM 21, 1866, 69.

14) M’. Iuventius perhaps became M. Iunius by way of intermediate steps such as M. Iuvenius (as he appears in the Bembinus codex. The antecedent M. Iuvenius probably also explains the readings: M. Nevius of Berlin B; and L. M. Ne-
lius registered in the Leiden codex of the *Eunuchus* are a corruption of the curule aediles of 161 viz. L. Postumius (Albinus) and L. Cornelius (Merula). Other variants are also clearly corrupt renderings of the correct reading, though it is not always clear how they were arrived at.

Second, some of the variants are the result of faulty scribal conjecture. As Wilmanns argued it is probable that originally the *praenomina* of the consuls and aediles were represented by the standard ancient abbreviations. Later some scribes evidently decided to expand the initials they found, leading to other errors. Poorly versed in the system of Roman nomenclature, some substituted *gentilicia* for *praenomina*, so that in one case the consul M. Valerius becomes Manlius Valerius, the consul T. Sempronius (sic) appears twice as Tullius Sempronius and twice as Terentius Sempronius, and the aedile L. Cornelius Lentulus becomes in one manuscript Laelius Cornelius Lentulus. Similarly, ignorance of Roman nomenclature or negligence turned the two aediles L. Cornelius Lentulus and L. Valerius Flaccus into three: L. Cornelius, L. Lentulus and L. Valerius Flaccus.

The third kind of spurious variant is also probably the result of scribal negligence. In one instance a third aedile, L. Cornelius Merula, was appended to the names of L. Cornelius Lentulus and

---

15) As Dziatzko, RhM 20, 1865, 574 suggested. The cognomina Albinus and Merula are omitted in some Mss and in the absence of Albino, the gentilicum Postumio might degenerate into the cognomen Pisone.

16) For example it is unclear how Fannio became in one case (7915) Flavinio and in another (7917 A) Serumio (by conflation with Mummio?). Iuventius in one Ms (7917) became M. Sumus!

17) See Wilmanns (above, n. 4) 3 f.

18) Manlius Valerius is found in codex 7905 of the *didascalia* of the *Phormio*; see Geppert (above, n. 2) 562. None of the Mss known to Geppert contained the correct praenomen for the consul Gracchus – i.e. Ti. Tullius Sempronius occurs in codices 7905 and Berlin C of the *didascalia* of the *Heautontimorumenos*, Terentius Sempronius in St.Victor 719 and Berlin A, and Laelius Cornelius Lentulus in Notre Dame 185 and St.Victor 719; see Geppert (above, n. 2) 559; cf. Wilmanns (above, n. 4) 30.

19) Codex 7906 of the *didascalia* of the *Heautontimorumenos*, see Geppert (above, n. 2) 559. Martin Stone suggested to me that L. Lentulus may have initially been a marginal gloss on the reading L. Cornelius which was then incorporated into the main text by a subsequent copyist.
L. Valerius Flaccus. That is almost certainly the product of internal contamination – the scribe having inadvertently imported Merula from the *didascaliae* of the *Eunuchus* and *Phormio* into the *didascalia* of the *Heautontimorumenos*.20

Yet, as Geppert and Dziatzko saw, this leaves a significant body of variants for which textual corruption and scribal error are not a satisfactory explanation. What is to be made of the aediles Q. Minucius Thermus and L. Valerius, C. Rabirius, M. Iunius and L. Iulius, and the consuls Cn. Cornelius, Cornelius and Mummius, Q. Caspio and Cn. Servilius?

Plainly none are simple corruptions since they bear little resemblance to the names of the aediles and consuls recorded for the original performances. Indeed, it is difficult to see how the correct names could have become so distorted as to produce the recorded variants.21

20) Merula appears in Sorbonne 1768; see Geppert (above, n. 2) 557.

Internal contamination may be the explanation of another puzzle. Geppert (above, n. 2) 560 and Wilmanns (above, n. 4) 8, 18–19, 22 n. 2 noted a highly anomalous entry for the names of the consuls in the *didascalia* of the *Heautontimorumenos* in the 1508 edition of Terence edited by Guido Iuvenalis and Ascensius – viz. *M. Iunio et Tito Sempronio aut Aulo Nitimo et M. Cornelio*. M. Iunius and T. Sempronius are as noted above recognizable as the consuls of 163, but *Aulo Nitimo et M. Cornelio* have provoked consternation. They are probably the result of contamination and corruption. The *Adelphi* was first staged in the consulship of M. Cornelius Cethegus and L. Anicius Gallus (160). Most Mss refer to Cethegus and Gallus in the form – *Anicio. M. Cornelio* (see Geppert [above, n. 2] 569 and Dziatzko, RhM 20, 1865, 578). I would suggest Anicius and Cornelius were erroneously linked to the *didascalia* of the *Heautontimorumenos* and the *gentilicium* Anicius was corrupted (whether by Iuvenalis and Ascensius or by their source is difficult to judge). The bare *gentilicium Anicio* was converted into a *praenomen* and *gentilicium A. Nicio* or *A. Nitio*, the *praenomen* was then expanded to *Aulo* and the *gentilicium Nicio* or *Nicio* became *Nitimo*. Note that in the *didascalia* of the *Adelphi* both the Venetian editions of Iuvenalis and Ascensius give the consuls as: *A. Nitio M. Cor.* (see p. cxxiiii of the 1512 edition and p. cxxx of the edition c. 1515). The same editions also include other evidence of internal contamination. Both erroneously date the *Andria* in the consulship of *M. Val. C. Mutio fanio* (*sic* – patently a garbled version of the reading *M. Valerio C. Mumnio Fannio*) instead of M. Claudius Marcellus and C. Sulpicius Galus. The former are clearly transposed from the *didascalia* of the *Eunuchus*.

21) Thus M. Fulvius and M. Glabrio (*sic*) are simply incredible as the hypothetical antecedents of Q. Minucius Thermus and L. Valerius. Similarly, C. Rabirius is an improbable putative corruption of Cn. Cornelius Dolabella, and one wonders how the names M. Iunius and L. Iulius could be derived from L. Postumius Albinus and L. Cornelius Merula. Wilmanns (above, n. 4) 27 f. contended Mummius was a corruption of the *gentilicium* of Minucius Prothymus but this is untenable (see Dziatzko, RhM 21, 1866, 67–8).
Equally, the expansion of *nomina* is an inadequate explanation. In fact, there is only one case where the possibility comes into question – the *didascalia* of the *Eunuchus* where the consuls are registered in some Mss as: *M. Valerio Cornelio Mummio Fannio.*

It might be argued that the *praenomen* of the consul C. Fannius was erroneously expanded into the *gentilicium* Cornelius. But if so, that ought to have produced the reading *M. Valerio Cornelio Fannio,* not the *M. Valerio Cornelio Mummio Fannio* found in the Mss. Nor can the *gentilicium* Cornelius be the result of the expansion of the *praenomen* of Mummius since the only Mummius who was ever consul was a Lucius. In any case, that theory fails to account for the appearance and placement of the *gentilicium* Mummius. Rather it would seem the *didascalia* of the *Eunuchus* as we have it is the product of incompetent editing. At some point the names Cornelius and Mummius were inserted betwixt the names of the consuls of 161. Later the *gentilicium* Cornelius was all but excised, though the *gentilicium* Mummius was retained resulting in the entry *M. Valerio C. Mummio Fannio* found in most Mss.

There are other possible traces of editing in the Mss.

---

22) Namely in 7907, 7914, and Regius and Berlin A; see Geppert (above, n. 2) 552 f., 555 f., 581 and Dziatzko, RhM 20, 1865, 573 f., RhM 21, 1866, 65–9.

23) This was the explanation advanced by Wilmanns (above, n. 4) 30. Dziatzko, RhM 21, 1866, 66 accepted this was possible.

24) L. Mummius (cos. 146).

25) Geppert and Dziatzko argued that the variants represent the vestigial traces of a reproduction of the *Eunuchus* in 146 B.C. in the consulship of L. Mummius and Cn. Cornelius Lentulus and that the names of Mummius and Lentulus were conflated with the consuls M. Messalla and C. Fannius in whose consulship the début of the *Eunuchus* was staged.

26) Why the *gentilicium* Cornelius was virtually expunged while Mummius was retained is unclear. Ignorance of Roman nomenclature may have played a role. Presuming the scribes were aware there ought to be only two consuls’ names, they may have ‘corrected’ their source, excising the names judged superfluous. Since scribes were capable of expanding abbreviated *praenomina* into *gentilicia* (as when L., M. and T. became Laelius, Manlius, and Terentius and Tullius, see above), perhaps the reverse operated here – i. e. Cornelius Mummius was taken to be *praenomen* and *gentilicium* and abbreviated to the C. Mummius found in the majority of Mss.

27) In the *didascalia* of the *Hecyra* the Ms Sorbonne 1768 equips the aedile Q. Fulvius with the *praenomen* R (see Geppert [above, n. 2] 567). Perhaps this is the remnant of the *gentilicium* of the aedile C. Rabirius cited by Donatus. Note also from the Mss of Donatus the reading: *Sexto Iulio Ce. Rabirio* where the *cognomen* Caesar and the *praenomen* of Rabirius have apparently been conflated (see Dziatzko, RhM 20, 1865, 577). See also further below.
Finally, contamination cannot feasibly explain all the variants. We noted one probable instance of internal contamination above. It might be ventured that the aedile L. Valerius in the praefatio of Donatus’ commentary on the Andria is a duplicate of the aedile L. Valerius Flaccus who presided at the first performance of the Heautontimorumenos.²⁸ Or that the consul Cn. Cornelius in the Bembinus didascalia of the Heautontimorumenos and the consul Cornelius apparent in some Mss of the Eunuchus are the result of confusion with other Corneli who feature in the didascaliae.²⁹ Yet even if this suggestion is credited, how are we to account for the names of the aediles Q. Minucius Thermus, C. Rabirius, M. Iunius and L. Iulius, and the consuls Mummius, Q. Caspio and Cn. Servilius? These names are not recorded elsewhere in the didascaliae and so cannot have been unwittingly transferred to their present location.³⁰ Alternatively, it might be conjectured these variants are the result of contamination from an external source.³¹ Hence the aediles L. Valerius, and Q. Minucius Thermus might be supposed duplicates of L. Valerius Flaccus and Q. Minucius Thermus the curule aediles of 201 and 198. But this cannot account for the aediles C. Rabirius, M. Iunius, or L. Iulius, as there is no record of a C. Rabirius, a M. Iunius, or a L. Iulius in the extant lists of curule aediles. Moreover, if the names were believed to be duplicates, it would leave unexplained why certain names were chosen and how they came to be lodged in their present alien context.³²

Unless therefore all these variants are dismissed as fantastic and inexplicable errors, an alternative explanation of their appearance is required. As it is known that Terence’s works enjoyed con-

---

²⁸ If so, this would have to be a case of cross contamination since the aedile L. Valerius Flaccus only appears in the didascaliae of the Terentian manuscripts, not in the Mss of Donatus.

²⁹ That is, with the aediles Cn. Cornelius Dolabella, L. Cornelius Lentulus, or L. Cornelius Merula, or with Scipio Aemilianus, or the consul M. Cornelius Cethegus.

³⁰ Though there is the aedile Sex. Iulius Caesar and in some Mss the consul M’. Iuventius is corrupted into M. Iunius.

³¹ That is some source which could be mined for the names of consuls and aediles such as Atticus’ Liber Annalis, or Livy.

³² Interpolations of this kind would have to be deliberate in which case it is difficult to fathom their author and purpose.
continued popularity after his death, the contention of Geppert and Dziatzko that some of these variants derive from genuine notices on revival performances is an eminently plausible explanation. And while not all the specific conclusions of Geppert and Dziatzko were universally endorsed, most scholars have been willing to follow them at least so far as to accept the premise that the variant or additional names preserved in some Mss do derive from later productions.


34) The work of Geppert and Dziatzko was either unknown to, or ignored by Mommsen when he outlined the history of the curule aedileship in Römische Forschungen, Berlin 1864, I 97–102 and Römisches Staatsrecht, Leipzig 1887, II 482 (Geppert’s article appeared in 1852 long before the publication of ‘Römische Forschungen’ and ‘Römisches Staatsrecht’. The relevant articles by Dziatzko were published in 1865 and 1866, too late to be incorporated into volume I of ‘Römische Forschungen’, but well before the appearance of volume II of ‘Römisches Staatsrecht’ which was first published in 1874–5, with a second and third edition appearing in 1877 and 1887). And the dates that Geppert and Dziatzko assigned some of the revivals on the basis of the variant names were sceptically received by Seidel (above, n. 6) 78 f.; F. Münzer, Iulius (29), RE X 1 (1917) 111; Iunius (22) 964; Iunius (49) 971; Minucius (25), RE XV 2 (1932) 1943 f.; Valerius (5), VIIA 2 (1948) 2296; and Broughton, MRR I 466, 489, 490 n. 5, III 144, 211. See also J. Linderski, The Aediles and the Didascaliae, AHB 1.4, 1987, 83–88.

35) Pighius, Schubert, Ritschl, and Wilmanns also advocated reproductions in order to explain some variants. Among the scholars that accept the argument, at least in principle, note the following: H.T. Karsten, Terentiani prologi quot qualesque fuerint et quibus fabularum actionibus destinati a poeta, Mnemosyne 22, 1894, 176 f.; Watson (above, n. 9) 125 f.; Seidel (above, n. 6) 78 f. (tentatively); Schanz/Hosius (above, n. 33) 105–7 citing further references; Münzer, Minucius (25); Valerius (5) (above, n. 34); W. Kroll, Minucius (46), RE XV 2 (1932) 1956; G. Jachmann, Terentius (36), RE VA 1 (1934) 604, 607; Heurgon (above, n. 6) 106–8; Broughton, MRR I 466, 489, III 144, 211; W. Beare, The Roman Stage: A Short History of Latin Drama in the time of the Republic, London 1964, 116; D. Klose, Die Didaskalien und Prologe des Terenz, Dissertation Bamberg 1966, 12 f. (unavailable to me); F. Leo, Geschichte der römischen Literatur, Darmstadt 1967, I 257 f.; Grant (above, n. 33) 11, 215; Linderski (above, n. 34) 83–88. L. Gestri, Studi Terenziani:
There is a further piece of evidence which reinforces this conclusion that has not previously been fully exploited. One variant has never been adequately explained. The codex Bembinus contains a variant notice for the *Phormio*. It reads:

```
INCIPIT TERENTI PHORMIO
ACTA LVDIS MEGALENSIB Q. CASPIONE
CN. SERVILIO COS GRAECA APOLLODORV
EPIDICAZOMENOS FACTA EST IIII
```

The notice is unusual in two respects. Firstly, it is highly compressed, lacking the usual information concerning the aediles who presided at the performance, the name of the producer, the accompanyist, and the instrument on which the musical score was intended to be played. Secondly, the codex Bembinus is the sole authority for a performance of the *Phormio* at the *ludi Megalenses* in the consulship of Q. Caspio and Cn. Servilius (sic) and as such is in conflict with the testimony of all the other codices of Terence and with Donatus, which assert the play was first performed at the *ludi*

---

La cronologia, SIFC 13, 1936, 61–105, Terentiana, SIFC 20, 1943, 3–58 and H.B. Mattingly, The Plautine Didascaliae, Athenaeum 35, 1957, 78–88, The Terentian Didascaliae, Athenaeum 37, 1959, 148–173, The Chronology of Terence, RCCM 5, 1963, 12–61 rejected the authority of the *didascaliae* altogether, arguing they are without any basis in official or theatrical records (cf. R. Blum, Studi Terenziani: Didascalie e prologhi, SIFC 13, 1936, 106–116). Mattingly, RCCM 5, 1963, 32 n. 57 cited in support the work of W. Beare. But Beare’s criticisms of the record centred on the reliability of some of the information contained in the Suetonian Life of Terence, not the *didascaliae*. In fact, he argued the *didascaliae* contain some of the few trustworthy details we possess about Terence as “the events in the career of a dramatist most likely to be accurately chronicled were the occasions on which his plays were produced” (The Life of Terence, Hermathena 59, 1942, 23). Beare also accepted that the *didascaliae* indicated revival performances of Terence’s plays (Roman Stage [above, this n.] 116). The rejection of the authority of the *didascaliae* was central to Gestri’s and Mattingly’s contention that the performances of Terence’s plays should be comprehensively redated – a suggestion which they based on their interpretation of the prologues of the plays. Their argument has not won acceptance and the overwhelming majority of scholars accept the testimony of Donatus and the *didascaliae* (for the refutation of Gestri see M.R. Posani, Le didascalie delle comedie di Terenzio e la cronologia, Atti della Reale Accademie d’Italia 7, 1942, 244–51; F. Arnaldi, Da Plauto a Terenzio, Naples 1947, II 103 ff., esp. 109 ff.; and Klose 51–80). As Linderski (above, n. 34) 87 n. 25 aptly commented in this regard, although the *didascaliae* contain doubtful information they also preserve much that may be profitably exploited, whereas interpretation of the prologues is a highly subjective procedure.
Romani in the consulship of C. Fannius Strabo and M. Valerius Messalla (i.e. in 161 B.C.).

How then are we to explain this anomalous notice? A scribal error, or evidence of a revival production? In fact, the answer is a little of each. The entry is the result of the corruption of information recalling a reproduction.

On one point all commentators are in agreement. ‘Caspio’ is readily recognizable as a corruption of the cognomen Caepio used by the patrician Servili. That obvious restoration also accords with the praenomen with which the consul is equipped – Quintus – a favourite praenomen of the Servilii Caepiones. However, this necessary emendation benefits us little since there was never a consular college consisting of a Q. Servilius Caepio and a Cn. Servilius.

Pighius, Schubert and Wilmanns suggested that the notice was the corrupt reflection of a reproduction staged in 150 B.C. over which the brothers Cn. Servilius Caepio (cos.141) and Q. Servilius Caepio (cos.140) presided as curule aediles. Wilmanns claimed the original notice read: Cn. Q. Serviliis Caepionibus aedilib. curulib. According to Wilmanns the text as it stands is the work of an ignorant scribe. Wilmanns observed that the order of the notice as we have it is irregular. Normally, the aediles who presided at the performance are named after the games at which the performance was staged, and the consuls appear on the ultimate line. Consequently,

---

36) See Geppert (above, n. 2) 560–3, 581; Dziatzko, RhM 20, 1865, 575, RhM 21, 1866, 70–2; and Donatus, praef. 1.6 (Wessner [above, n. 4] II 346). Like the codex Bembinus, Donatus states that the games were the ludi Megalenses, not the ludi Romani (see further below).

37) The only consular Servilii Caepiones were: Cn. Servilius Caepio consul with C. Sempronius Blaesus in 253; Cn. Servilius Caepio consul with C. Servilius Geminus in 203; Cn. Servilius Caepio consul with Q. Marcius Philippus in 169; Cn. Servilius Caepio consul with Q. Pompeius in 141; Q. Servilius Caepio consul with C. Laelius in 140; and Q. Servilius Caepio consul with C. Atilius Serranus in 106. Q. Fabius Maximus Servilianus consul in 142 with L. Caecilius Metellus Calvus was a Caepio by birth and brother of the consuls of 141 and 140 but Fabius would not be referred to as Q. Caepio.

38) See Schubert (above, n. 3) 389; Wilmanns (above, n. 4) 12, 21–2. They were followed by F. Leo, Die Ueberlieferungsgeschichte der terenzischen Komödien und der Commentar des Donatus, RhM 38, 1883, 317–47, 342 n. 1. Note that they dated the performance to the year A.U.C. 604 (i.e. 150 B.C.), not A.U.C. 605 (i.e. 149 B.C.) as Dziatzko, RhM 21, 1866, 72 states.

Wilmanns argued the placement of the names Q. Caepio and Cn. Servilius immediately after the games suggests that Caepio and Servilius were in fact aediles, not consuls. Wilmanns contended when some “inscitus homo” came upon the entry Q. Cn. Servilius Caepionibus aedilib. curulib. (sic) he assumed that the name of the first ‘aedile’ had dropped out of the text and transposed the cognomen Caepio in a misguided attempt to ‘correct’ the text. This bumbling scribe also took it upon himself to promote the aediles to consuls.

Geppert and Dziatzko preferred the solution propounded by Ritschl. Ritschl conjectured that the notice as we have it is a confused recollection of a revival performance produced in the consulship of Cn. Caepio and Q. Pompeius (i.e. in 141), or Q. Caepio and C. Laelius (140), the name of Pompeius or Laelius having somehow become obscured. Geppert opted for the former date, as did Dziatzko, who professed the latter less likely on the grounds the necessary corruption was less feasible.

Neither proposition is satisfactory. Wilmanns’ hypothesis was rightly rejected by Dziatzko. The proposed restoration: Cn. Q. Servilius Caepionibus is improbable in itself, but Wilmanns’ explanation of the process by which the putative corruption came about is quite implausible.

Firstly, it is true that the information contained in the didascaliae is generally related in a set order. Usually the title and author of the Latin play are registered first, followed by the games at which the play was staged, next the aediles who presided at the games are named, then the actor(s), and the accompanyist, in sixth place comes the instrument(s) on which the musical score was played, then the author of the original Greek play is specified, followed by a number indicating the sequence in which Terence’s plays were first performed, and finally the consuls in whose year of office the play was produced. However, the order is not invari-
able.\textsuperscript{45} Moreover, as Dziatzko pointed out, the disturbed order of the notice in the codex Bembinus is entirely explicable.\textsuperscript{46} As most commentators agree, originally the \textit{didascaliae} contained information on the début performance of the plays, plus details of subsequent productions. At some point the \textit{didascaliae} were edited and in most instances only information relating to the début performances was preserved. The début performances will have been set out in the manner described above, followed by the notice(s) dealing with reproduction(s). Information on reproduction(s) will have been limited to the games at which the performance took place, the presiding aediles, the actor(s), and the eponymous consuls.\textsuperscript{47} Clearly, in the case of revival performances it was unnecessary to repeat the author of the Greek original, or information pertaining to the musical score, and the sequence in which the play originally appeared was not germane. The copyist of the codex Bembinus, or one of his predecessors, edited the notice regarding the \textit{Phormio} so as to leave only information relating to a reproduction. Since information on the author of the Greek play and the sequence in which

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Thus among other recorded variations, the author of the Greek original is sometimes placed second after the title and author of the Latin play (as in the codex Bembinus on the \textit{Heautontimorumenos} and the \textit{Adelphi}). Sometimes the accompanyist, or the accompanyist and his instruments, are registered just before the consuls (as in the codex Bembinus and the codex Basilicanum respectively on the \textit{Eunuchus}). And not infrequently the order is disrupted by the omission of some details. In fact, the codex Bembinus never once precisely conforms to the paradigm set out above.
\item See Dziatzko, RhM 21, 1866, 71, 87f.
\item The original complete notice may have been set out as follows:
\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l}
\textit{Incipit Terenti Phormio} \\
\textit{Acta ludis Romanis} \\
$L.\ Postumio\ Albino\ L.\ Cornelio\ Merula}$ \\
aedil.\ cur.\ egere \\
$L.\ Ambivius\ Turpio\ [L.\ Atilius\ Praenestinus]$ \\
$Modos\ fecit\ Flaccus\ Claudii$ \\
$Tibiis\ imparibus\ totam$ \\
$Graeca\ Apollodoru\ Epidicazomenos$ \\
$Facta\ est\ IIII$ \\
$M.\ Valerio\ C.\ Fannio\ cos.$
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
\begin{center}
\textit{Relata\ est\ ludis\ Romanis\ [or\ Megalensibus]} \\
[Aediles] \\
[Actor/Director] \\
[Consuls].
\end{center}
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
the Phormio was performed was included in the notice on the débùt performance, but not in the notice concerning the reproduction, the scribe, who transcribed only the latter, belatedly added Graeca Apollodoru Epidicazomenos Facta est IIII after recording the consuls. Evidently, the scribe was indeed an “inscitus homo” since he failed to comprehend that the words Facta est IIII were irrelevant to the revival performance and he also omitted the names of the aediles and the actor(s). Hence, as Dziatzko saw, the irregular order of the notice does not permit the transmutation of the consuls Q. Caepio and Cn. Servilius into aediles.48

Secondly, Wilmanns conjectured that an incompetent scribe faced with the reading Cn. Q. Serviliis Caepionibus erroneously assumed that the name of the first ‘aedile’ had dropped out of the text and transposed the cognomen in an attempt to restore the requisite two magistrates. But that supposition is vulnerable on a number of fronts. How is it that this scribe when presented with the plural Serviliis Caepionibus thought only one ‘aedile’ was represented? Furthermore, if the scribe believed the name of the first ‘aedile’ had dropped out, why should he assume that the missing ‘aedile’ was a Caepio and transfer the cognomen? He could have supplied almost any cognomen or gentilicium to fill the lacuna he thought he had detected.49 Finally, how is it that the praenomina of the ‘aediles’ came to be reversed? The scenario posited by Wilmanns would have produced the reading: Cn. Caspione Q. Servilio, not the reading we find in the codex Bembinus: Q. Caspione Cn. Servilio.

What is more, a joint aedileship of Cn. Caepio and Q. Caepio in 150 is not credible. Both Cnaeus and Quintus may have held the curule aedileship.50 But a joint aedileship in 150 is not to be counten-
anced. The three brothers Q. Fabius Maximus Servilianus (cos.142), Cn. Caepio (cos.141), and Q. Caepio (cos.140) held high office in rapid succession suggesting they did so *suo anno*, or very nearly so.\(^{51}\) That being so, neither Cnaeus, nor Quintus was of an appropriate age to be aedile in 150.\(^{52}\) Furthermore, the Servilii Caepiones were patricians whereas according to the practice of alternation between the orders in the curule aedileship the year 150 B.C. was a ‘plebeian year’—i.e. was set aside for plebeian candidates.\(^{53}\) Moreover, we can almost certainly name one of the curule aediles of 150, ruling out a joint aedileship of the Caepiones in that year.\(^{54}\) A joint aedileship at

---

\(^{51}\) As Sumner (above, n. 50) 51 rightly concluded.

\(^{52}\) According to the provisions of the *leges annales* candidates for the aedileship were required to be at least 36 years of age, i.e. 37 in their year of office (see A.E. Astin, The Lex Annalis before Sulla, Brussels 1958, 31 f., 37 f., 41 and Sumner, The Lex Annalis under Caesar, Phoenix 25, 1971, 246 f., and [above, n. 50] 6 f.). If, therefore, Cnaeus and Quintus were aediles in 150, it would imply that they were consul at about 47 years of age.

\(^{53}\) The date at which alternation between the orders in the curule aedileship lapsed is not certified (see Mommsen, Römisches Staatsrecht, Leipzig 1887, II 482 and Seidel [above, n. 6] 41 f.), but as I hope to argue elsewhere, the most likely date is in the mid-140’s.

\(^{54}\) The A. Hostilius Mancinus who was curule aedile at an unspecified date (Gellius, N.A. 4.14.1–6) is almost certainly to be identified with the homonymous legate of 149 (see Seidel [above, n. 6] 78; Broughton, MRR I 460 n. 5). The aedile’s run in with the courtesan explains the bandage worn by the legate at the time of the embassy which provoked M. Cato’s famous witticism. Hence the aedileship of Mancinus belongs before 149. Broughton, MRR I 455 opted for 151 (with a query; Seidel offered no date). But the bandage worn by the legate presupposes his injury was recent, hence 151 is too early and the aedileship of Mancinus is best placed in 150 (which was also, unlike 151, a plebeian year).
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a later date is also problematic. If, as it seems, Gnaeus and Quintus held office *suo anno*, had they served together as aediles, their aedileship would have to be dated in 147. Yet this entails the assumption that Quintus, evidently a year younger than Gnaeus, was permitted to stand for the aedileship one year ahead of time. It would also mean that the Caepiones had intended running against Scipio Aemilianus – which is most unlikely.

Clearly, the hypothesis of Pighius, Schubert, and Wilmanns must be rejected. The reading of the codex Bembinus does not warrant the supposition of a joint aedileship of the two Caepiones.

Ritschl’s solution is equally unsatisfactory. Ritschl presupposed that the notice originally took the form: *Cn. Caepione Q. Pompeio cos.*, or *Q. Caepione C. Laelio cos*. That is, Caepio was

55) For the evidence which establishes the existence of an obligatory *bien-nium* between the curule aedileship and praetorship at this period see Astin (above, n. 50) 588 f., and Sumner (above, n. 50) 7 f., 157. Gnaeus was consul in 141 and so can have been praetor no later than 144. Supposing, therefore, that Cnaeus and Quintus were aediles together, 147 is the latest possible date allowing for the obligatory *bien-nium* between the curule aedileship and praetorship.

56) This is not impossible. Sumner (above, n. 50) 10 n. 3 observed that when alternation was the rule a number of individuals observed a *triennium* between the curule aedileship and praetorship followed by a *bien-nium* between praetorship and consulship and plausibly explained the anomaly by suggesting that patricians and plebeians who due to the date of their birth reached the required age for the curule aedileship in the wrong year (i.e. a patrician who turned 37 in a plebeian year or vice versa) were allowed to run a year early rather than incur a year’s delay.

57) Scipio Aemilianus was a candidate for the curule aedileship of 147 when he was elected consul (Livy, Per. 50; Val. Max. 8.15.3; Vell. 1.12.3; App. Lib. 112; De vir. ill. 58.5). That the Caepiones would have considered competing against Scipio is improbable because the chances of them both being elected ahead of such a popular candidate would have been minimal, and because Scipio and the Caepiones were allies (see A. E. Astin, Scipio Aemilianus, Oxford 1967, 82 f., 89, 98, 126 f., 315 f.).

58) Wilmanns (above, n. 4) 21 objected that the alteration required by Ritschl’s hypothesis was too violent, but as Dziaztko, RhM 21, 1866, 71 observed it pales in comparison to the drastic corruption proposed by Wilmanns himself.

59) Pace Geppert and Dziaztko, of the two alternatives posited by Ritschl the corruption *Q. Caepione C. Laelio to Q. Caspione Cn. Servilio* is surely easier and more credible than the corruption *Cn. Caepione Q. Pompeio to Q. Caspione Cn. Servilio*. Firstly, in the former case the corruption of the *gentilicia* is more feasible (i.e. from *Laelio to Servilio*, as against from *Pompeio to Servilio*). Secondly, the latter corruption would require the *praenomina* of Caepio and Pompeius to be switched, whereas the former would only require a minor change to the *praenomen* of Laelius (i.e. from *C. to Cn.*).
equipped with praenomen and cognomen but no gentilicium, whereas Pompeius, or Laelius, was named by praenomen and gentilicium. Yet that would be highly anomalous. The regular practice of Donatus and the scribes of the didascaliae is to refer to the consuls by praenomina and gentilia alone – even though all but one of the consuls named possessed cognomina. There are only two attested exceptions. Hence, had the notice concerned the consular college of 141 or 140, if it conformed to the normal pattern the consuls should originally have been registered as: Cn. Servilio Q. Pompeio, or Q. Servilio C. Laelio (not Cn. Caepione Q. Pompeio, or Q. Caepione C. Laelio as Ritschl proposed) making it difficult to account for the reading of the codex Bembinus. As it happens, Ritschl was partly right – the original notice must indeed have referred to the consuls in an anomalous fashion – only not in the manner Ritschl envisaged.

The correct explanation is not far to seek. As Pighius, Schubert, Wilmanns, Ritschl, Geppert and Dziatzko all rightly conclud-


61) Apart from Q. Caspio and Cn. Servilius, Donatus and the didascaliae mention five consular colleges – namely the consuls of 166 M. Claudius Marcellus and C. Sulpicius Galus, 165 Cn. Octavius and T. Manlius Torquatus, 163 M’. Iuventius Thalna and Ti. Sempronius Gracchus, 161 M. Valerius Messalla and C. Fannius Strabo, and 160 M. Cornelius Cethegus and L. Anicius Gallus. The consuls, who are only present for the purpose of dating the performances, are normally only equipped with praenomina and gentilia, whereas the aediles and actors are more often than not accorded their full tria nomina.

62) Donatus, praef. 1.6 refers to the consuls who presided at the début performance of the Andria as: M. Marcello et Sulpicio (see Wessner [above, n. 4] I 36; Geppert [above, n. 2] 575 f.; Dziatzko, RhM 20, 1865, 572 f., RhM 21, 1866, 64 f.). The praenomen of Sulpicius is missing in all the Mss and in the oldest modern editions of Donatus (A. Reifferscheid supplied the praenomen Caius, see Geppert [above, n. 2] 579 and Wessner, loc. cit.). And the codex Bembinus on the Adelphi registers the consuls of 160 as: Marco Cornelio Cethego Lucio Gallo (see Geppert [above, n. 2] 569; Wilmanns [above, n. 4] 14 f.; Dziatzko, RhM 20, 1865, 577 f.). All the other Mss have: Anicio M. Cornelio.
ed the notice is indeed the product of the corruption of genuine information recalling a revival performance. The notice should read: Q. Caepione C. Serrano cos – i.e. Q. Servilius Caepio and C. Atilius Serranus the consular college of 106 B.C. Confirmation is ready to hand. In 136 B.C. L. Furius Philus was consul with Sex. Atilius Serranus. The Chronographer of A.D. 354 lists the college as Pilo et Serrano, but the Fasti Hydatiani gives Philo et Servilio and the Chronicon Paschale Φίλον καὶ Σερβιλίου. The corollary is inescapable – the entry Cn. Servilio in the codex Bembinus is a corruption of C. Serrano. It follows, that the notice on the revival production of the Phormio in 106 B.C. was somewhat unusual. The normal mode of reference to the consuls in the didascaliae would lead one to expect that the notice had originally read: Q. Servilio C. Atilio cos. Evidently, that was not the case. At a minimum both consuls were equipped with praenomina and cognomina, but since reference to the consuls by praenomina and cognomina alone is otherwise unparalleled, perhaps originally their tria nomina were cited, and their gentilicia dropped out, or were excised in the course of transmission.

The revival performance of the Phormio in 106 might also explain a number of textual discrepancies. The majority of the Mss place the début performance of the Phormio at the ludi Romani, but the codex Bembinus and Donatus both state that it was performed at the ludi Megalenses. The discrepancy is easily accounted for if it be presumed that the original

63) See CIL I 2 pp.148–9 and Degrassi (above, n. 60) 468 f.
64) Whether the scribe of the codex Bembinus was responsible for the corruption, or simply transmitted what he found in his source, must remain uncertain.
65) Were that so, it would have to be presumed some knowledgeable scribe had subsequently supplied the cognomen Caepio, that the gentilicum Servilius had dropped out, and that the gentilicum Atilius became Servilius. In fact, it is clear that both consuls were equipped with cognomina and as the Fasti Hydatiani and Chronicon Paschale demonstrate the cognomen Serranus was the source of the erroneous gentilicum Servilius.
66) This possibility gains some support from the entry in the codex Bembinus on the Adelphi where the tria nomina of the consul Cethegus remains, but the gentilicum of his colleague is missing (vide supra).
67) See Geppert (above, n. 2) 560–1; Dziatzko, RhM 20, 1865, 575, RhM 21, 1866, 70–2; Wessner (above, n. 4) II 346.
production was staged at the ludi Romani, whilst the performance in 106 was put on at the ludi Megalenses.\(^68\)

The reproduction of 106 is also a possible explanation of the intrusion of the gentilicium Cassius in the text of Donatus. Donatus attributes the performance and production of the Phormio to L. Cassius Atilius and L. Ambivius.\(^69\) The didascaliae name L. Ambivius Turpio and L. Atilius Praenestinus.\(^70\) Ambivius Turpio and Atilius Praenestinus are familiar names as they are credited with staging most of Terence’s plays in most Mss. Ambivius Turpio is also known from other sources as an actor who had a long and successful career.\(^71\) Hence Cassius, who is otherwise unknown, is routinely excised. Yet variants are also attested for other plays. Some Mss ascribe the Hecyra to L. Ambivius and L. Sergius Turpio,\(^72\) while Donatus credits the Eunuchus to L. Numidius Prothymus and L. Ambivius Turpio,\(^73\) and some Mss attribute the Adelphi to L. Atilius Praenestinus and Minutius Prothymus.\(^74\) Sergius is unknown, but Prothymus is identifiable as L. Minucius Prothymus, the man who introduced masks to the performance of tragedy.\(^75\)

---

\(^{68}\) Wilmanns, Geppert and Dziatzko all presumed the revival performance had taken place at the ludi Megalenses in order to explain the discrepancy regarding the games.

\(^{69}\) See Wessner (above, n. 4) II 346.

\(^{70}\) See Geppert (above, n. 2) 562 f.; Wilmanns (above, n. 4) 26 f.; Dziatzko, RHM 20, 1865, 575, RHM 21, 1866, 72.

\(^{71}\) See Cicero, De sen. 48; Tacitus, Dialogus 20; Symmachus, Ep. 1.31.3, 10.2; cf. Iulius Paris, 1.1.17.

\(^{72}\) See Geppert (above, n. 2) 563 f., 568 f., 581; Dziatzko, RHM 20, 1865, 576 f., RHM 21, 1866, 75 f., 78. Donatus, praef. 1.6 refers only to L. Ambivius, but in his prologue 1.3 has: virtute actorum L. Ambivii et L. Turpionis est commendata (see Geppert and Dziatzko, loc. cit. and Wessner [above, n. 4] II 190, 193).

\(^{73}\) See Geppert (above, n. 2) 556; Dziatzko, RHM 20, 1865, 574 f., 577 f., RHM 21, 1866, 66–8.

\(^{74}\) See Geppert (above, n. 2) 569–73, 581; Dziatzko, RHM 20, 1865, 577 f., RHM 21, 1866, 81 f. Donatus, praef. 1.6 has: agentibus L. Ambivio et L., qui cum suis gregibus etiam tum personati agebant (see Geppert and Dziatzko, loc. cit. and Wessner [above, n. 4] II 4).

\(^{75}\) Evanthius, De comoedia 6.3. Unfortunately, the floruit of L. Minucius Prothymus cannot be established on the basis of this statement since the sources are contradictory on the author and date of the introduction of masks to the Roman stage (compare Evanthius with Donatus Eunuchus and Adelphi praef. 1.6; Festus, 238 L; Diomedes, p. 489 K; cf. Cic. De Or. 3.221. On which see C. Saunders, The Introduction of Masks on the Roman Stage, AJPh 32, 1911, 58–73; A.S.F. Gow, On the Use of Masks in Roman Comedy, JRS 2, 1912, 65–77; W. Beare, Masks on the
Furthermore, Dziatzko argued that the mention of two men is anomalous since other evidence indicates that the lead actor also directed and produced the play. Thus C. Publicius Pollio was lead actor, director and producer of Plautus’ *Epidicus* and *Stichus*. The same conclusion is supported by the prologues of Terence’s *Phormio* and *Hecyra* which indicate the lead actor staged the production. It follows, Dziatzko argued, that L. Ambivius Turpio was responsible for the original productions and Atilius Praenestinus, Minucius Prothymus, Sergius, and possibly Cassius were responsible for later revival performances. Perhaps, therefore, Cassius was the lead actor and impresario of the reproduction of the *Phormio* in 106.

One also wonders whether the revival of 106 might not be in some way related to the conflicting testimony concerning the musical score of the *Phormio*. According to the majority of the Terentian Mss the score of the *Phormio* was intended to be played on the *tibiae impares*. Donatus and the codex Lipsiensis, on the other hand, name the *tibiae Serranae* (i.e. *tibiae pares*). Various explanations for the discrepancy have been advanced. But another pos-
sibility suggests itself in the light of the revival of 106. Perhaps the cognomen Serranus confused an inattentive scribe and he inadvertently substituted *tibiae Serranae* for the reading *tibiae impares.*

Why the copyist of the codex Bembinus, or one of his predecessors, elected to transcribe only information relating to the reproduction of 106 must remain a mystery. The process of editing in the *didascaliae* has generally produced the opposite result with information relating to début performances being preserved and material concerning subsequent productions being excised. Evidently the *didascaliae* were originally intended as a complete record of the performance of the Terentian corpus, but later copyists only concerned themselves with the début performances and dispensed with references to reproductions. Yet the copyist of the codex Bembinus, or one of his antecedents, has it would seem transmitted the latest performance of the *Phormio* recorded in his source (presumably the original unabridged version of the *didascaliae*) instead of the début of the play. If so, that might have a bearing on the question of the source of the *didascaliae.*

With the restoration of the text comes a significant accretion to our knowledge of the history of the Roman stage. There can be little doubt that a revival performance of Terence’s *Phormio* was staged at the *ludi Megalenses* of 106 B.C. in the consulship of Q.

---

83) Obviously such an error would have to have occurred before the corruption of the cognomen Serranus. Otherwise the term *tibiae Serranae* rarely occurs in the Terentian *didascaliae* (the only other instances being in codices A, Basilicanum, Vaticanus, and Ambrosianus on the Adelphi).

84) The *didascalia* of the *Hecyra* is the exception in that it mentions the first three performances of the play. However, the case of the *Hecyra* was extraordinary as the first and second performances were abandoned and a record of the first two abortive performances may have been retained in order to make sense of references to them in the prologue.

85) If, as is sometimes suggested, the source of the *didascaliae* was a treatise of Varro’s, or the work of a scholar of the early empire, it is curious that the most recent production of the *Phormio* to be mentioned was staged back in 106 B.C. In view of the popularity of Terence we might expect the latest performance of the *Phormio* to be closer to the source’s own time.
Servilius Caepio and C. Atilius Serranus. Unfortunately, the notice does not name the curule aediles who presided at the performance. Had it done so, it might have helped solve another engaging riddle. Nonetheless, the restoration of the notice is further confirmation that the variants preserved in some Mss of the *didascaliae* and in Donatus do in fact derive from genuine records of reproductions of Terence’s plays. The notice also provides additional evidence of the enduring popularity of Terence’s plays, and of the value of the *didascaliae* and Donatus as sources.

Sydney Patrick Tansey