

## NEW LIGHT ON THE ROMAN 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.<sup>1</sup> 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 Bembinus) 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.<sup>2</sup> It had long been known that some manuscripts of Terence and Donatus contained variant readings for the *didascaliae* of Terence's plays.<sup>3</sup> Geppert was the first scholar to undertake a systematic and comprehensive study of the variants.<sup>4</sup> Geppert consulted a large

---

1) K. Dziatzko, Ueber die Terentianischen Didascalien, RhM 20, 1865, 570–598 and Ueber die Terentianischen Didascalien, RhM 21, 1866, 64–92. Cf. K. Dziatzko, Handschriftliches zu Terenz, RhM 39, 1884, 339–347. Dziatzko had earlier published a treatise entitled De prologis Terentianis et Plautinis quaestiones selectae, Bonn 1863.

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 21615; 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 didascalii Terentianis, Berlin 1864, R. Kauer and W. M. Lindsay (eds.), P. Terenti Afri Comoediae, Oxford 1961, and P. Wessner (ed.), Aeli 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,<sup>5</sup> the names of the curule aediles who presided,<sup>6</sup> the names of the lead actor-

---

Terenti, Stuttgart 1962 all overlooked some variants it is possible that renewed scrutiny of the Mss might reveal other significant omissions.

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).

6) Donatus in the prologue of his commentary and the Mss of the *didascaliae* give the aediles at the first abortive performance of the *Hecyra* in 165 B.C. as Sex. Iulius Caesar and Cn. Cornelius Dolabella (see Geppert [above, n. 2] 563 f.; Dziatzko, RhM 20, 1865, 576 f., RhM 21, 1866, 72 f.; Donatus, prol. 1.3 – Wessner [above, n. 4] II 192 f.), but in the preface of his commentary Donatus gives the aediles as S. Iulius and C. Rabirius (Donatus, praef. 1.6. Caesar appears as *Sexto Tullio* in codex C. See Geppert [above, n. 2] 565; Dziatzko, RhM 20, 1865, 577, RhM 21, 1866, 73; Wessner [above, n. 4] II 190).

The aediles L. Cornelius Lentulus and L. Valerius Flaccus are common to all manuscripts of the *didascaliae* 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 Ms 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. Fulvio et M. Glabrio 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),<sup>7</sup> and of the consuls in whose year of office the performance took place,<sup>8</sup> as well as discrepancies as to the type of instrument on which the musical score was intended to be played,<sup>9</sup> the name of the author of the original Greek play,<sup>10</sup> and the sequence in which the plays were originally performed.<sup>11</sup>

1864, I 100; Wilmanns [above, n. 4] 6 f., 16 f.; Dziatzko, RhM 21, 1866, 64 f.; J. Seidel, *Fasti Aedilicii von der Einrichtung der plebeischen Aedität bis zum Tode Caesars*, Diss. Breslau 1908, 39; T.R.S. Broughton, *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*, New York 1951 [hereafter MRR] I 437). That leaves the appearance of Q. Minucius Thermus and L. Valerius unexplained.

7) Most Mss credit the staging of Terence's plays to L. Ambivivus Turpio and L. Atilius Praenestinus, but others name L. Minucius Prothymus, a L. Sergius, and a L. Cassius (see Dziatzko, 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.; Dziatzko, 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. Mummius Fannio* (see Geppert [above, n. 2] 553, 555; Dziatzko, 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 Mummius 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.; Dziatzko, 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 dextra et sinistra* 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 *tibiis 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; Dziatzko, 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; Dziatzko, 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 Manilius, and the consul Fannius is recorded as *Finnio*, *Phammo* and *Fauno*.<sup>12</sup> In the same category belong some more complex examples. The consuls M. Iunius and T. Sempronius (sic) who appear in most Mss of the *Heautontimorumenos* were long ago recognized as M'. Iuventius Thalna and Ti. Sempronius Gracchus, the consuls of 163.<sup>13</sup> At an early stage the rare *gentilicium* Iuventius was corrupted, perhaps by degrees, into the more familiar Iunius, which in turn inspired further variations.<sup>14</sup> It also seems likely that the aediles L. Piso and L. Corne-

---

fourth (see Geppert [above, n. 2] 556 f.; Dziatzko, RhM 20, 1865, 574 f., RhM 21, 1866, 83 f., RhM 39, 1884, 339 f.; and Watson [above, n. 9] 127 f.).

The Terentian Mss assign the *Eunuchus* second place, but Donatus, praef. 1.10 says it was staged third (see Geppert [above, n. 2] 553 f.; Dziatzko, RhM 20, 1865, 573 f., RhM 39, 1884, 339 f.; Wessner [above, n. 4] I 267; Watson [above, n. 9] 139 f.).

The Terentian Mss agree that the *Adelphi* was the sixth play, but Donatus, praef. 1.8 claims it was the second (see Geppert [above, n. 2] 569 f.; Dziatzko, RhM 20, 1865, 577 f., RhM 21, 1866, 78 f., RhM 39, 1884, 339 f.; Wessner [above, n. 4] II 5; Watson [above, n. 9] 139 f.).

12) In the *didascalía* 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 *didascalía* 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 *didascalía* 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).<sup>15</sup> Other variants are also clearly corrupt renderings of the correct reading, though it is not always clear how they were arrived at.<sup>16</sup>

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.<sup>17</sup> 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.<sup>18</sup> 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.<sup>19</sup>

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

---

nus of Sorbonne 1768). From M. Iunius it is a short step to some of the other attested corruptions (such as M. Livius, M. Lucius see Geppert [above, n. 2] 559).

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 *gentilicium 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 *didascalica* 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 *didascalica* 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 *didascalica* 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*.<sup>20</sup>

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.<sup>21</sup>

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 Nitio 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. cxxiii 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. Mummius 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 *didascalía* of the *Eunuchus* where the consuls are registered in some Mss as: *M. Valerio Cornelio Mummio Fannio*.<sup>22</sup> It might be argued that the *praenomen* of the consul C. Fannius was erroneously expanded into the *gentilicium* Cornelius.<sup>23</sup> 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.<sup>24</sup> In any case, that theory fails to account for the appearance and placement of the *gentilicium* Mummius. Rather it would seem the *didascalía* 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.<sup>25</sup> 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.<sup>26</sup> There are other possible traces of editing in the Mss.<sup>27</sup>

---

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 *gentilia* (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 *didascalía* 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 *prae-fatio* of Donatus' commentary on the *Andria* is a duplicate of the aedile L. Valerius Flaccus who presided at the first performance of the *Heautontimorumenos*.<sup>28</sup> Or that the consul Cn. Cornelius in the Bembinus *didascalía* of the *Heautontimorumenos* and the consul Cornelius apparent in some Mss of the *Eunuchus* are the result of confusion with other Cornelii who feature in the *didascalíae*.<sup>29</sup> 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 *didascalíae* and so cannot have been unwittingly transferred to their present location.<sup>30</sup> Alternatively, it might be conjectured these variants are the result of contamination from an external source.<sup>31</sup> 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.<sup>32</sup>

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 *didascalíae* 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.



tinued popularity after his death,<sup>33</sup> 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,<sup>34</sup> 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.<sup>35</sup>

---

33) Varro, *De re rustica* 2.11.11, Horace, *Ep.* 2.1.60–1, Quintilian, *Inst. or.* 11.3.181 f. and Donatus, *Andria* 716.1 all bear witness to contemporary performances of the works of Terence. Witness also the actor's mask inscribed EUNUC found in the Second Century A.D. theatre at Khamissa which implies continued performance of Terence's plays (see S. Gsell and Ch.-A. Joly, *Khamissa, Mdaourouch, Announa, Paris-Algiers 1922*, vol. I Khamissa 111). See further M. Schanz/C. Hosius, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk des Kaisers Justinian, I: Die römische Literatur in der Zeit der Republik*, Munich <sup>4</sup>1927, 118 f.; L. D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission: A survey of the Latin Classics*, Oxford 1983, 412; and J. N. Grant, *Studies in the Textual Tradition of Terence*, Toronto 1986, ix.

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 <sup>3</sup>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 <sup>3</sup>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:

INCIPIIT 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 accompanist, 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 commedie 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 f., 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.).<sup>36</sup>

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 Servilii. 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.<sup>37</sup>

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.<sup>38</sup> Wilmanns claimed the original notice read: *Cn. Q. Servilius Caepionibus aedilib. curulib.*<sup>39</sup> 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.

39) Wilmanns (above, n. 4) 12. On p. 21 Wilmanns reversed the *praenomina* and supposed the notice originally read: Q. *Cn. Servilius Caepionibus*.

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.<sup>40</sup> 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.<sup>41</sup> Geppert opted for the former date, as did Dziatzko, who professed the latter less likely on the grounds the necessary corruption was less feasible.<sup>42</sup>

Neither proposition is satisfactory.

Wilmanns’ hypothesis was rightly rejected by Dziatzko.<sup>43</sup> 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 accompanist, 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.<sup>44</sup> However, the order is not invari-

40) Geppert (above, n. 2) 562 f., 581; Dziatzko, RhM 21, 1866, 71 f. Ritschl’s hypothesis was discounted by Wilmanns (above, n. 4) 21.

41) Ritschl (above, n. 3) ventured in a note on pages 250 f.

42) Dziatzko, RhM 21, 1866, 71. Dziatzko was followed by Karsten (above, n. 35) 177 f., Jachmann (above, n. 35) 607, Münzer, Servilius (46), RE IIA 2 (1923) 1781, Broughton, MRR I 477, Schanz/Hosius (above, n. 33) 106, and most recently by M.D. Reeve in Reynolds (above, n. 33) 412.

43) RhM 21, 1866, 71 f.

44) See Geppert (above, n. 2) 579–80; Wilmanns (above, n. 4) 52 ff.; Dziatzko, RhM 20, 1865, 578 ff.; and Jachmann (above, n. 35) 601 f.

able.<sup>45</sup> Moreover, as Dziatzko pointed out, the disturbed order of the notice in the codex Bembinus is entirely explicable.<sup>46</sup> As most commentators agree, originally the *didascaliae* contained information on the début performance of the plays, plus details of subsequent productions. At some point the *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.<sup>47</sup> 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 *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

---

45) 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 *Heautontimorumenos* and the *Adelphi*). Sometimes the accompanist, or the accompanist and his instruments, are registered just before the consuls (as in the codex Bembinus and the codex Basilicanum respectively on the *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.

46) See Dziatzko, RhM 21, 1866, 71, 87f.

47) The original complete notice may have been set out as follows:

*Incipit Terenti Phormio*

*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.*

*Relata est ludis Romanis [or Megalensibus]*

[Aediles]

[Actor/Director]

[Consuls].

the *Phormio* was performed was included in the notice on the début 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.<sup>48</sup>

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.<sup>49</sup> 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.<sup>50</sup> But a joint aedileship in 150 is not to be counten-

---

48) Note too that the customary order is also disturbed in the *didascalia* of the *Hecyra* which preserves some information on the second and third performance of that play.

49) Supposing that a scribe had been confronted with Wilmanns’ reading *Cn. Q. Serviliis Caepionibus*, and assumed the first name had dropped out, if he attempted to correct the text I think it more likely, given the kind of onomastic errors perpetrated by copyists (vide supra), that he would have expanded the second *praenomen* so as to form another *gentilicium* – e.g. *Cn. Quinctio* (or *Quinctilio*) *Servilio Caspione*.

50) Pighius, Schubert, and Wilmanns produced no corroborative evidence, but Valerius Maximus 8.5.1 states that the brothers progressed: *per omnes honorum gradus ad summam amplitudinem*. The phrase *per omnes honorum gradus* is tantalizing, but falls just short of proof that both Cnaeus and Quintus were aedile. It

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.<sup>51</sup> That being so, neither Cnaeus, nor Quintus was of an appropriate age to be aedile in 150.<sup>52</sup> 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.<sup>53</sup> Moreover, we can almost certainly name one of the curule aediles of 150, ruling out a joint aedileship of the Caepiones in that year.<sup>54</sup> A joint aedileship at

---

implies the Caepiones attained more than just the praetorship and consulship. However, it does not necessarily mean they held both the quaestorship and the curule aedileship. While it is probable that the quaestorship was not an obligatory step in the *cursus honorum* prior to the laws of Sulla (see A. E. Astin, *The Lex Annalis before Sulla*, Latomus 16, 1957, 611–613; E. Badian, *Caesar's Cursus and the Intervals between Offices*, JRS 49, 1959, 85 f., *Forschungsbericht: From the Gracchi to Sulla* [1949–59], *Historia* 11, 1962, 198; and G. V. Sumner, *The Orators in Cicero's Brutus: Prosopography and Chronology*, Toronto 1973, 111). The aedileship was never obligatory and in Valerius Maximus' days was no longer part of the patrician *cursus* at all (see Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht*, Leipzig <sup>3</sup>1877, I 555 f.; C. Cichorius, *Die Neuordnung der Staatsämter durch Augustus*, *Römische Studien*, Leipzig and Berlin 1922, 285–8; H.C. Heiter, *De patriciis gentibus quae imperii Romani Saeculis I, II, III fuerint*, Diss. Berlin 1909, 6, 16–19). Consequently, Valerius Maximus might describe the Caepiones as having progressed *per omnes honorum gradus* even if they had only been quaestor, praetor and consul.

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, *Römische Forschungen*, 1864, I 97–102, *Römisches Staatsrecht*, Leipzig <sup>3</sup>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).

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.<sup>55</sup> 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.<sup>56</sup> It would also mean that the Caepiones had intended running against Scipio Aemilianus – which is most unlikely.<sup>57</sup>

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.<sup>58</sup> Ritschl presupposed that the notice originally took the form: *Cn. Caepione Q. Pompeio cos.*, or *Q. Caepione C. Laelio cos.*<sup>59</sup> That is, Caepio was

---

55) For the evidence which establishes the existence of an obligatory *biennium* 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 Gnaeus and Quintus were aediles together, 147 is the latest possible date allowing for the obligatory *biennium* 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 *biennium* 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 (Liv. 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 Dziatzko, *RhM* 21, 1866, 71 observed it pales in comparison to the drastic corruption proposed by Wilmanns himself.

59) Pace Geppert and Dziatzko, 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*.<sup>60</sup> 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 *gentilicia* alone – even though all but one of the consuls named possessed *cognomina*.<sup>61</sup> There are only two attested exceptions.<sup>62</sup> 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-

---

60) Of course, Q. Pompeius had no *cognomen*. Laelius was sometimes equipped with the sobriquet *Sapiens*, but not in the *fasti* and he is never styled *C. Sapiens* (see Münzer, Laelius [3], RE XII 1 [1924] 406 f.; A. Degraasi, *Inscriptiones Italiae XIII 1: Fasti Consulares et Triumphales*, Rome 1947, 125, 468–9; E. Badian, *The Clever and the Wise: Two Roman Cognomina in Context*, in: N. Horsfall [ed.], *Vir Bonus Dicendi Peritus: Studies in celebration of Otto Skutsch's eightieth birthday*, London 1988, 6–12; and D.R. Shackleton Bailey, *Onomasticon to Cicero's Letters*, Stuttgart 1995, 159).

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 *gentilicia*, 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* Φίλου καὶ Σερβιλίου.<sup>63</sup> The corollary is inescapable – the entry *Cn. Servilio* in the codex Bezae is a corruption of *C. Serrano*.<sup>64</sup> 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.<sup>65</sup> 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.<sup>66</sup>

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 Bezae and Donatus both state that it was performed at the *ludi Megalenses*.<sup>67</sup> The discrepancy is easily accounted for if it be presumed that the original

---

63) See CIL I<sup>2</sup> pp.148–9 and Degraasi (above, n. 60) 468 f.

64) Whether the scribe of the codex Bezae 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 *gentilicium* Servilius had dropped out, and that the *gentilicium* 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 *gentilicium* Servilius.

66) This possibility gains some support from the entry in the codex Bezae on the *Adelphi* where the *tria nomina* of the consul Cethegus remains, but the *gentilicium* 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*.<sup>68</sup>

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.<sup>69</sup> The *didascaliae* name L. Ambivius Turpio and L. Atilius Praenestinus.<sup>70</sup> 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.<sup>71</sup> 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,<sup>72</sup> while Donatus credits the *Eunuchus* to L. Numidius Prothymus and L. Ambivius Turpio,<sup>73</sup> and some Mss attribute the *Adelphi* to L. Atilius Praenestinus and Minutius Prothymus.<sup>74</sup> Sergius is unknown, but Prothymus is identifiable as L. Minucius Prothymus, the man who introduced masks to the performance of tragedy.<sup>75</sup>

---

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 comedia 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.<sup>76</sup> Thus C. Publicius Pollio was lead actor, director and producer of Plautus' *Epidicus* and *Stichus*.<sup>77</sup> The same conclusion is supported by the prologues of Terence's *Phormio* and *Hecyra* which indicate the lead actor staged the production.<sup>78</sup> 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.<sup>79</sup> 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*.<sup>80</sup> Donatus and the codex Lipsiensis, on the other hand, name the *tibiae Serranae* (i. e. *tibiae pares*).<sup>81</sup> Various explanations for the discrepancy have been advanced.<sup>82</sup> But another pos-

---

Roman Stage, CQ 33, 1939, 139–146; G.E. Duckworth, *The Nature of Roman Comedy: A study in popular entertainment*, Princeton 1952, 92f.; D. Wiles, *The Masks of Menander. Sign and Meaning in Greek and Roman Performance*, Cambridge 1991, 129f.).

76) Dziatzko, RhM 20, 1865, 587–91, RhM 21, 1866, 65–70, 72, 75 f., 78, 81 f. Geppert (above, n. 2) 556 f. considered this explanation, but also envisaged the possibility that Ambivius and Atilius might both be actors (i.e. the protagonist and deuteragonist). Cf. Wilmanns (above, n. 4) 26 ff.

77) See Plautus, Bacchides 214 f., and the *didascalia* of the *Stichus*. Dziatzko observed that this also corresponds with what we know of Aesop and Q. Roscius.

78) See the prologue of the *Phormio* lines 30 ff. and the second prologue of the *Hecyra* lines 52 ff.

79) Dziatzko's argument has been accepted by most scholars (see Karsten [above, n. 35] 177 f.; Watson [above, n. 9] 126 f.; Kroll [above, n. 35] 1956; Jachmann [above, n. 35] 604; Schanz/Hosius [above, n. 33] 104, 106). Geppert (above, n. 2) 563 and Dziatzko, RhM 21, 1866, 72 were unsure whether to accept or reject the name Cassius.

80) See note 9 above.

81) Codex 7915 also nominates the *tibiae pares*. The antilogous reading *tibiae Serranae impares* found in codices 8194 and Berlin B looks like a misguided attempt to reconcile contradictory sources.

82) Watson (above, n. 9) 126 f. provides a convenient summary of the explanations offered to account for the discrepancies concerning the musical score of the *Phormio*, the *Eunuchus*, and the *Adelphi*. Some suggest a change of *tibiae* during the

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*.<sup>83</sup>

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.<sup>84</sup> 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*.<sup>85</sup>

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.

---

performance – as was the case with the *Heautontimorumenos*. Some argue the confusion is due to a change of instruments at revival performances. Others prefer arbitrary changes as a result of confusion in antiquity about the various types of *tibiae* (for evidence of which compare the testimony of Donatus, *De com. ex.* 8.11, Servius, ad *Aen.* 9.615 and Diomedes, p. 492 K, and see Dziatzko, *RhM* 20, 1865, 594 f.). Others favour contamination in the course of transmission.

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.<sup>86</sup> 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.<sup>87</sup>

Sydney

Patrick Tansey

---

86) Namely, the question as to the date at which alternation between the patrician and plebeian orders in the curule aedileship broke down.

87) I should like to acknowledge my debt to Martin Stone who read and commented on a draft of this paper, offering many helpful suggestions and saving me from a number of errors. I should also like to thank Professor J. Linderski and Professor T. P. Wiseman for their encouragement to publish this excerpt from my doctoral dissertation. Needless to say, I alone bear responsibility for any residual shortcomings.