

Terence's *Comedies*

Edited by

Bernard J. Muir and Andrew J. Turner

Bodleian Digital Texts 2

Oxford, 2011

Foreword

This is the second volume of the Bodleian Digital Texts Series. It provides a high-resolution reproduction of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Auct. F. 2. 13, a twelfth-century illustrated witness to the *Comedies* of the Latin playwright Terence, which is referred to in critical literature by the siglum *O*. The manuscript is recognized to be one of the Library's priceless medieval treasures.

In addition to the facsimile, which also includes images of the exterior of the manuscript, we have prepared a full critical introduction, an annotated transcription of the text of the *Comedies* and scholia as found in *O*, a modified version of the translation of John Barsby, and an apparatus containing nearly 4,000 notes in which the text is compared with important Carolingian witnesses. There is a set of images in which the illustrations in *O* are compared to those in other witnesses. There is also a full analysis, illustrated by hundreds of details, of the illustrations in *O* and the lead point underdrawings upon which they are based. From a consideration of all these factors, we offer here a new insight into the relationship of *O* to other witnesses and the processes by which it came into being.

It is in the nature of a digital text that no two users will ever read it in the same sequence since each reader will select a unique pattern of links reflecting his or her interests at any given moment. Consequently, some essential information is reiterated in various sections of the Introduction to this edition, making it less likely to be inadvertently overlooked.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the following institutions for providing images and the permission to use them: Biblioteca apostolica Vaticana; Bibliothèque nationale de France; Institut de recherche et d'histoire des textes; Escorial, Real Biblioteca (del monasterio San Lorenzo de El Escorial); Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana; Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit; Cambridge, Corpus Christi College; St Gall, Stiftsbibliothek; and Oxford, Oxyrhynchus Papyrus Project (the images of this papyrus are reproduced courtesy of the Egypt Exploration Society). Professor Frank Sear of the University of Melbourne generously allowed us to include some of his photographs of the mosaics and paintings at Pompeii.

The Photographic Services of Oxford University provided the set of high-resolution scans upon which the edition is based. Our thanks are also due to Dr Bruce Barker-Benfield, who gave us both advice and access to the manuscript whenever we needed it. Our publisher at the Bodleian Library, Dr Samuel Fanous, with whom we have developed the Bodleian Texts Series, has always been supportive and helped us with whatever arrangements needed to be made; during the past decade he has become a close friend as well, which has made working together a pleasure. We should like to thank Deborah Susman, Managing Editor, Bodleian Library Publishing, and the Bodleian's graphic designer, Dot Little. The meticulous copy-editing was by JCS Publishing Services Ltd. We should also like to acknowledge the many helpful suggestions made by the anonymous external reader.

The University of Melbourne provided us with a research grant in support of this project, for which we are grateful. Our departments at Melbourne have also been supportive in any way they could: the English Section of the School of Culture and Communication (Muir) and the Centre for Classics and Archaeology of the School of Historical Studies (Turner).

Professor John Barsby (Otago University) agreed to allow us to record him reading some passages of the plays that illustrate the various metres used by Terence; this gives an added dimension to this 'multimedia' production. Professor John Grant (University of Toronto) answered a number of questions we put to him in private correspondence; this has been acknowledged in the commentary where apposite. Dr Peter Kruschwitz (University of Reading) kindly allowed us access to proofs of his collection of essays on Terence.

Professor Rodney Thomson (University of Tasmania) kindly agreed at short notice to read the Introduction and provided a number of invaluable comments on the St Albans provenance of the Oxford manuscript reproduced here and its artwork.

Harvard University Press kindly gave us permission to reproduce a modified version of John Barsby's translation of the *Comedies*, which appeared in the Loeb Classical Library publication of 2001.

Our project team at the University of Melbourne comprised: Abby Robinson, who is our invaluable and reliable project manager, but also worked on adjusting the digital images and other aspects of the project; David Currell, a brilliant young colleague who assisted us in establishing the text and compiling the apparatus; the late Graeme Smith, an expert in Photoshop, who prepared the images included in this edition, including the 21 'comparanda'; and Nicholas Kennedy, who designed and programmed the DVD—we have worked together for more than a dozen years and produced several fine digital products.

Contents

Foreword	2
Acknowledgements	2
1.0 The Manuscript: Date, Provenance and Subsequent History	7
1.1 Origin and Provenance	7
1.2 The Texts: Disposition and Presentation	10
1.3 The Illustrations and their Origins	13
1.4 Stages of Production	17
2.0 Codicology	21
2.1 The Binding	21
2.2 The Parchment and Flyleaves	21
2.3 Corrections and Punctuation	23
2.4 Decorated Initials and the Use of Coloured Inks	24
2.5 Misplaced Lines and Passages	24
3.0 Life of Terence	25
4.0 The Plays	29
4.1 Terence's Plays	29
4.2 Roman Comedy and its Sources	31
4.3 Terence's Plays and the Roman Theatre	34
4.4 Metre and Line Divisions	35

5.0	The Textual Tradition and Editions	38
5.1	The Manuscript Tradition	38
5.2	<i>O</i> and the Other Gamma and Illustrated Manuscripts	41
5.3	Is <i>O</i> Derived Directly from <i>P</i> ?	44
5.4	<i>O</i> and the Printed Tradition of Terence	52
6.0	The Scholia and Gloss Traditions	54
6.1	Scholarship on Terence: Origin and Traditions	55
6.2	Manuscript Tradition of the <i>Commentum Brunsonianum</i> and <i>O</i>	58
6.3	The Content of the Scholia in <i>O</i>	62
6.4	The Glosses	65
7.0	The Illustrative Tradition (with Comparanda)	68
7.1	Illustrations of Comedy and its Context	70
7.2	The Gamma Illustrated Manuscripts	73
7.3	General Observations, Principally on the Relationship between <i>C</i> , <i>P</i> and <i>O</i>	76
7.4	Underdrawings	81
7.5	Scene Labels	82
7.6	Character/Speaker Cues	85
7.7	Comparanda from Various Illustrated Witnesses	86
8.0	Description of the Witnesses Consulted	97
9.0	This Edition and Translation	105

Bibliography	106	
Appendix 1	Original Errors and Corrections in <i>O</i> and <i>P</i>	112
Appendix 2	Divergent Readings in the Scholia in <i>O</i> from Other Manuscripts	113
Appendix 3	The Glosses in <i>O</i> and Other Manuscripts	115
Appendix 4	Details and Descriptions of the Underdrawings and Illustrations	118
Appendix 5	Details and Descriptions of Scene Labels	137
Appendix 6	Details and Descriptions of Character or Speaker Cues	148

1.0 The Manuscript: Date, Provenance and Subsequent History

1.1 Origin and Provenance

The manuscript reproduced in digital facsimile and edited here contains a single work, the *Six Latin Comedies* by the Roman playwright Publius Terentius Afer ('Terence').¹ Its shelfmark in the Bodleian Library, University of Oxford, is 'MS. Auct. F. 2. 13' (the location 'Selden Cupboard 32', is recorded on f. i verso); in editions and critical literature it is assigned the siglum *O*, which is also used here. The manuscript was given to the Bodleian Library in 1704 (see further below). There is a succinct catalogue description of the manuscript by Madan 1922 (pp. 297–8) and much more detailed descriptions in Jones and Morey 1931 (II. 68–93) and Hoeing 1900.

The place of origin of the manuscript is usually stated as being St Albans, where there was an important Benedictine abbey, though there is little firm evidence for this other than the early thirteenth-century *ex libris* or *anathema* in red ink in the upper margin of f. 1r: *Hic est liber s(an)c(t)i Albani q(ue)m q(ui) ei abstulerit aut titulum deleu(er)it anathema sit. Am(en)* ('This book belongs to St Alban: a curse upon anyone who either steals it from him or erases this notice of ownership'). Thomson 1982 notes that neither its script nor its minor decoration belongs to a recognizably "St Albans tradition" (I. 35). He thinks it likely that the manuscript may have been made at St Albans by a visiting team of professionals, though he does not suggest where they may have come from—the artists may possibly have been foreigners, but further comparative art-historical research remains to be done before more can be said on this subject. Both the script and the artwork attest a twelfth-century date for the manuscript, most likely well into its second half.

At some stage between 1326 and 1333 the manuscript appears to have come into the possession of the famous medieval book collector and cleric Richard Bury (1287–1345), the Keeper of the Privy Seal, who was appointed Bishop of Durham in 1333. The *Deeds of the Abbots of the Monastery of St Albans* by Thomas Walsingham recounts how Abbot Richard of Wallingford and some senior monks made the controversial decision to donate four volumes from the monastery library—copies of Terence, Virgil, Quintilian and Jerome's *Contra Rufinum*—to Bury in order to gain his favour in negotiations with the king, and also sold thirty-two other books to him. After his appointment as

¹ Terence's six *Comedies* were written and produced in the 160s BCE. For a discussion of the evidence for the dates of Terence's life, see Section 3.

bishop in 1333, Bury returned some of the books to the monastery library, and others were sold back to St Albans by his executors after his death (p. 200).² But whether the Terence manuscript was amongst these books remains unknown.

On f. ii recto, originally a leaf in a Sanctorale from a fifteenth-century Breviary, trimmed and added in order to protect the manuscript from wear and tear, there are further indications of early ownership. The words *Ego Verres huius libri possessor* ('I, Verres, am the owner of this book') are written in what was originally the gutter of the leaf, while at a later stage the words *Gulielmus Cavendish possessor huius libri* ('William Cavendish is the owner of this book') were written in the space above—subsequently this mark of ownership was heavily erased, but one of the gracelines from the bottom of the erased signature remains and crosses over a letter of the word *Verres*, indicating the proper sequence of ownership. Just who 'Verres' was is unknown, but Madan 1922 notes that the later inscription apparently refers to Sir William Cavendish (d. 1557), "who received grants of monastic land in Hertfordshire, and who married Elizabeth Hardwick in Derbyshire" (p. 298).

On the verso of this folio are the words *Walle, q(uod) Rogerus*. These words appear to refer to Roger Walle (d. 1488), a scribe and cleric who was educated at Oxford and who later became archdeacon of Coventry and Lichfield—he is known to have owned several manuscripts, many of which he himself transcribed.³ An otherwise unknown 'Henry Allen' adds at the bottom of f. 52r, 'henry: Allen: wrote the same: I would for this, he had no blame::' with 'Thomas' added below the first two words.

William Cavendish, as noted, was married to Elizabeth Hardwick, and it appears that it was through her family connections that the manuscript eventually came into the possession of Nic. Frevile Lambton of Durham (whence it has at times in the past been referred to as the *Codex Dunelmensis*, the Durham Codex), who then donated it to the Bodleian Library—this is attested by an inscription on f. iii recto:⁴

² For an outline of the career of Richard Bury, see *ODNB*, IX. 67–9; for Richard of Wallingford, see Emden 1959 (III. 1967).

³ See Emden 1959 (III. 1966). For samples of Walle's hand, see also Parkes 1969, pp. 22–3.

⁴ Madan 1922 (p. 298) notes that T.W. Jackson of Worcester College first concluded that *O* was the lost *Codex Dunelmensis* used by Leng and Bentley in their early eighteenth-century editions (see Section 5.4). Jackson (cited in Madan 1922) notes a close connection between the style of the illustrations of *O* and the Winchester Bible and suggests a possible Winchester provenance for the Bodleian manuscript; he also notes the close textual relationship between *P* and *O*, but

Hunc egregium librum / Bibliothecæ Bodleianæ donavit / Vir Spectabilis / Nic. Frevile Lambton, de Hardwick / in Agro Dunelmensi Armiger / A.D. 1704. ('An illustrious man and knight, Nicholas Frevile Lambton of Hardwick, has given this special book to the Bodleian Library in A.D. 1704').⁵

Other annotations on the front flyleaves include a modern note in pencil on f. i verso:

From folio 17a I conjecture that this MS. Is copied from a 9th c. MS in the / Bib. Nationale—Fonds latini: 7899. See Quentin-Bauchart. *La bibliothèque / de Fontainebleau*. pp. 156-7. E.W.B. Nicholson.

There is also a modern annotation in the centre of f. iii recto: *Ante p. 235. L. folium unum continens / Prisciani de metris comicis / f. 283, 16-284 b, 1. Ed. Ald.* (it is not clear what the 'L' means here).

On f. iv verso, there is a passage referring to the martyrdom of St Alban, written in an early-modern hand imitating the earlier medieval script, which is derived from Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* (I. 7), though not verbatim:

Passus est Beatus Albanus die decimo kalend(arum) Iulij / iuxta Ciuitatem Verulanu(m) A(nn)o Dominicæ Incarna(tionis) / Ducentesimo Octogessimo sexto. Sub Diocletiano / et Maximiniano. ('Blessed St Alban suffered death on 10 Kalends July [22 June] near the city of Verulamium in the year of the Incarnation of our Lord 286, under Diocletian and Maximinian.').

Towards the bottom of f. 2r the name 'Nic: Frevile' appears again, with some Latin words above it reproducing part of the last line of the *Accessus* on this folio (for no apparent reason).

does not think that *P* was the archetype of *O* (a view with which the present editors agree—see Section 5.3).

⁵ Madan 1922 (p. 298) notes that the 'Nic.' here is "probably an error", though it is not clear why this should be the case. Hoeing 1900 (p. 316) outlines the relationship of the Freviles to the manuscript, based upon information published earlier by the Surtees Society:

Hardwick became the property of George Frevile, a Staffordshire gentleman, in 1570. His nephew and heir, Nicholas Frevile, was the maternal grandfather of Frevile Lambton (ob. 1731, aet. 70). The signature, 'Nic. Frevile,' in bold characters, is seen at the bottom of IIr.

Frevile Lambton had inherited the manuscript from his mother, Margaret, who was the daughter of Nic(holas), who had died in 1674.

1.2 The Texts: Disposition and Presentation

The Oxford manuscript opens with a brief synopsis of the life of Terence known as the *Accessus ad Andriam* (folios 1r–2r), followed by the ‘Portrait’ of Terence and the *aedicula* (a mask shrine) for *Andria* (3r), and lastly, a six-line biographical poem on f. 3v (see Section 3 for a discussion of the life of Terence).

The plays then follow, written in poetic lines; each play subsequent to *Andria* begins with a prose Introduction. The plays here are in the so-called ‘Calliopian’ order found in one of the most important manuscript families for the plays of Terence, the g family—*Andria*, *The Eunuch*, *The Self-Tormentor*, *The Brothers*, *The Mother-in-Law* and *Phormio*.⁶ For the purposes of this edition, we are primarily concerned with the origin of *O* and its relationship to the other witnesses for the g tradition, and specifically with the issue of its

⁶ The titles of the plays in the g group in Latin are: *Andria*, *Eunuchus*, *Heautontimorumenos*, *Adelphoe*, *Hecyra* and *Phormio*. The words *Calliopus recensui* appear on folios 33v, 65v, 95r, 126v and 151v. See Section 5.1 and note 3552 for a discussion of who Calliopus may have been. The order of the plays in the d group is often referred to as ‘alphabetic’: *Andria*, *Adelphoe*, *Eunuchus*, *Phormio* (or *Formio*), *Heautontimorumenos* and *Hecyra*. In the earliest witness, *A*, also known as the Codex Bezae Cantabrigiae, the plays are arranged in chronological order: *Andria*, *Eunuchus*, *Heautontimorumenos*, *Phormio*, *Hecyra* and *Adelphoe*. The Codex Bezae Cantabrigiae is the sole surviving representative of another branch of the Terence manuscript tradition; it gets its name from its association with the Italian Bembo family in the fifteenth century.

Until relatively recently, *A* (the ‘Bezae’ manuscript) was the only known Late Antique witness. A few papyrus fragments (fourth century) have been discovered in Egypt; two are reproduced here, courtesy of the Egypt Exploration Society, and may also be seen at the Oxyrhynchus Online Project of Oxford University. They appear to be from a codex rather than a roll. The text is from the *Andria*, 3.4 (l. 605) to 4.1 (l. 668) and 5.4 (l. 924) to 5.6 (l. 979a). A full transcription and a reconstructed and edited text, together with a brief introduction and notes, can be found in Roberts and Skutsch 1957 (pp. 110–23). The text on these papyrus fragments occasionally offers new readings, though these are usually inferior to those in the Bezae codex and the medieval witnesses. On three occasions the false reading of the papyrus accords with the lemmata of Donatus; on a few other occasions the papyrus provides a better reading than the later manuscripts.

In addition to these, a single-sheet, palimpsest fragment of another early fifth-century witness in Rustic Capitals has been discovered among the holdings of St Gall (MS Cod. Sang. 912); the manuscript was originally in large-format parchment sheets, but these were cut up into smaller sheets before the replacement text was written over the Terence.

relationship to *P*. Each play begins with a well-executed, illuminated initial;⁷ large coloured initials appear at the head of major sections of both the plays and the scholia throughout. There are 138 fine illustrations, executed by at least four artists,⁸ one occurring before each scene; two of these, for *Andria*, scenes 5.1

⁷ The illuminated initials are: U (f. 5r), S (f. 35v), N (f. 67v), S (f. 98r), P (f. 130r), and A (f. 154r).

⁸ Jones and Morey 1931 (II. 70–9) discuss in considerable detail the different styles of the four artists, whom they designate A, B, C, and D. They believe that the miniatures in *O* were copied for the most part directly from *P*; wherever there are differences between the two sets of illustrations, they usually attribute it either to the artists' originality or else to their incompetence:

If one thus eliminates the divergences from *P* caused by the use of an illustrated m-manuscript, and the others that may be ascribed to the enterprise of artists A and C, and to the blunders of D, the variations of *O* from *P* are negligible. (II. 82)

However, they also note that sometimes *O* agrees in minor details with *Tur* and other illustrated witnesses against *P*, and as we have just seen, conclude that the artists of *O* must therefore have had access to a second manuscript, from the illustrated m ('mixed') tradition, available to them as they worked. Through this creative configuration of the surviving evidence, Jones and Morey build their case for the relationship between *P* and *O*, but it often seems contorted. There is no good reason why these two witnesses could not have descended from the same archetype with two or more intervening stages of development, which would allow for the differences in detail in their illustrations. In their assembling of corroborative evidence from the scene labels (II. 82–3), they compare evidence from the two manuscripts, but do not take into consideration differences between the labels sketched in lead point and the final ones executed in ink. Indeed, they make little use of the lead-point sketches for the illustrations and how they too differ from final drawings. Our detailed examination of the labels and illustrations, highlighting the differences between the prompts and underdrawings and the finished work, reinforces our argument that *O* was not copied directly from *P*, a case readily made from an analysis of the textual evidence alone.

The identification of Artists A and B of *O* with the early artists of the Winchester Bible by Jones and Morey 1931 (II. 91–3), is today generally accepted by art historians (Kauffmann 1975, p. 102); Kauffmann notes the fine linear treatment of the draperies, with parallel folds across the chest, and the emphatic gestures that occur in both *O* and the Winchester Bible. In his catalogue entry, he cites the analysis of Oakeshott 1950 (p. 51) of the stylistic features of the drawings—the serrated edge at the foot of the garments and the architectural feature, like two ears, at the top of turrets with a trident above (see Kauffmann's illustrations 198–202). Kauffmann 1975 concludes,

The influence of St. Albans on the emergent Winchester School in the mid 12th century is noted elsewhere . . . and the evidence provided by the products of the St. Albans scriptorium in the first half of the century suggests that the Master of the Apocrypha drawings came to Winchester from St. Albans rather than the other way round. (p. 102)

Oakeshott 1950 (p. 51) subsequently identified Artist A with the 'Master of the Apocrypha Drawings', as evidenced in his work in the Winchester Bible and the 'Morgan

and 5.2, are not found in any of the earlier closely related witnesses, and their origin remains a matter of speculation.⁹ Illustrations have been lost on folios excised after the present folio 17 (this would have contained two images, for *Andria*, 3.2 and 3.3; lost are all but two figures for *Andria*, 3.2—compare the same image on f. 10v in *C* and f. 17r in *P*—and for the missing verso, f. 18r in *P* and f. 14r in *N*), 25 (*Andria*, 4.4; see the image on f. 26v in *P*), 47 (*The Eunuch*, 3.3; see the image on f. 48r in *P*) and 163 (two missing, for *Phormio*, 2.4 and 3.1; see the image on f. 160r in *P*) and, of course, on the lost folios containing the end of the final play (*Phormio*, 5.7–5.9, ll. 854–1055).¹⁰ *O* agrees with a number of other manuscripts (although not the modern editions) by dividing two scenes (*The Eunuch*, 5.4 and *The Brothers*, 3.3) into two, and providing illustrations for the new scenes (on f. 60v and f. 107r respectively). One scene has labels (also referred to as the *sigla personarum*) but lacks an

Fragment'. He draws particular attention to two figures in the illustration in *O* for *Andria* (1.1), identifying Symo as the model for the Prophet Hosea (his illustrations 52, 56 and 57), and the figure of the unidentified slave holding the urn on his shoulder with the servant in the top register of the illustrations on the recto of the 'Morgan Leaf' (who is also holding an urn on his shoulder), which he says was designed by the 'Apocrypha Master' and painted by 'The Leaping Figures Master' (his Plate II, facing p. 20). Oakeshott 1981 (p. 54) summarizes the evidence thus:

There is an exceptionally close parallel between the representation of the prophet Hosea and one of the figures in a brilliant drawing in the Terence—a strange sight, because that figure, like the others in the same drawing, is represented wearing the twelfth-century version of an antique comic mask . . . The drawing in the Terence and the figure of the prophet in the initial show not only the same attitude—the figure leaning as he strides forward and holding up a menacing finger to his audience—but, equally clearly, the nick on the knee, the trumpet-shaped folds running up from the right elbow to the back of the cloak, and the curlicue folds in the cloak also.

Based on a prompt now exposed in a painting of King Cyrus in the Book of Ezra ('a' for *azurium*), he concludes that the Master worked with an assistant who finished off the pictures for him (after all, why would the Master write a prompt for himself?).

⁹ This is discussed in Section 7.3.

¹⁰ Although modern editions following witness *A* (f. 72v) record a new scene (5.7) at *Phormio* l. 884, *C* and *P* do not. Presumably this was also the case with *O*, which means that only two illustrations have been lost at the end of the manuscript.

The illustration for *Andria*, 3.1, lost in *O* on the folio excised after the present folio 17, is a group scene featuring six figures in the other witnesses that have the illustration. Two figures from the 'lost' illustration, however, labelled *Glisceriu(m)* and *Lesbia*, were drawn in available space on f. 17v and so survive; the remaining four figures from that illustration have been lost (compare the illustration in witness *P*, f. 17r, which, however, has the character names added below the illustration in a different order by a later hand).

illustration—*The Self-Tormentor*, 5.2 (f. 92r, as is also the case in *P*, f. 92r). On a few occasions one of the other witnesses has an extra illustration for a scene that is not found here or in the closely related witnesses *P* and *C*; for example, in *F* for *The Self-Tormentor*, 3.3.

1.3 The Illustrations and their Origins

O is a member of the *g* family of manuscripts of Terence's plays. All of the illustrated witnesses to Terence's plays derive from an ancestor of this family, commonly referred to as 'G'. There are also other branches of the Terence family of manuscripts that are important for an understanding of the complex textual tradition of the plays, and these cast more light on the genesis of *O*; these are discussed in Section 5.1.

There are 138 illustrations in *O*. The first of these is a framed portrait of Terence (f. 2v), which is carried by two players (compare this on the DVD with the treatment in *P*). Opposite this there are thirteen masks on shelves in an *aedicula* (mask shrine) on f. 3r; the masks represent both male and female figures.¹¹ The characters in the illustrations in *O* are always depicted wearing these masks, as they are in most of the illustrated manuscripts.¹² This is the only *aedicula* in *O*, though one may have been planned for each play since there are blank folios before each of them, with the exception of *The Eunuch* (66v, 96r, 127v and 152r). The closely related Carolingian witnesses *C* and *P* also lack an *aedicula* in this position, which indicates that this rack of masks was missing in a common archetype; unlike *O*, however, they have an *aedicula* before each of the remaining four plays.¹³

¹¹ The corresponding *aedicula* on f. 2 of witness *P* has the letter 'f' above the masks to indicate that the characters wearing them are meant to be women. A recent comprehensive study of masks in Greek and Roman stage performance is by Wiles 1991 (see especially Chapter 5, 'The Roman Mask').

¹² In witnesses *N* and *Tur*, however, the characters are drawn without these theatrical masks and have normal-looking faces. In *F*, some characters have the grotesque-looking masks and others have normal-looking faces; the women generally do not have masks and young men are also often depicted without them.

¹³ In *C*, they are on folios 35r, 50v, 65r and 77r; in *P*, they are on folios 67r, 96r, 125r and 148r. Witness *F* is missing the whole of *Andria* and the first part of *The Eunuch* (up to l. 416), so it cannot be determined if it too originally lacked the *aedicula* before *The Eunuch*; it has *aediculae* for the rest of the plays (on folios 24r, 53v, and 101v), except *The Mother-in-law* (which begins on f. 79v). The other illustrated witnesses have no *aediculae*.

The illustrations in the earlier Carolingian witnesses derive from a Late Antique manuscript, probably dating from the late fourth or early fifth century, which is usually assigned the siglum G.¹⁴ It has been suggested that they may reflect Roman staging practices, and certainly many of the characters are shown making standardized gestures which can be associated with the practices of public speaking.¹⁵ Jones and Morey 1931 argue instead that the illustrations reflect a Greco-Asiatic style that Italy and Gaul were turning to in the fifth century “as the bankruptcy of native Latin art became evident” (II. 220), although this view is rejected in turn by Wright 2006.¹⁶ Nevertheless, all critics

None of the g manuscripts have the *aedicula* for *The Eunuch*, as has been noted. The introductory commentary matter for the play appears in prose on folios 33v–35r; it includes the scholia for the *didascalia*, the Argument, and the scholia for the Prologue. This material is from the *Commentum Brunsianum*, which is also found in witnesses *E* and *K*; the commentary material in the closely related Carolingian witnesses *C* and *P* represents a different tradition (see Section 6 for a detailed discussion of the scholia traditions).

¹⁴ See Jones and Morey 1931, II. 19–24, Grant 1986, pp. 18–59, and Wright 2006, pp. 1–2 (who denotes the parent manuscript *U*). Their view is challenged by Dodwell 2000, who would date them to the third century (pp. 19–21).

¹⁵ Jones and Morey 1931 date the illustrations to the early fifth century and summarize the opinions of other early critics and editors, one of whom (Seroux d’Agincourt) thought the masks contemporary with Terence himself (II. 201–12). Jones and Morey argue that the illustrations do not, in fact, reflect Roman staging since there are many characters and incidents depicted in them that have nothing to do with the action being described (II. 204).

The characters’ hand gestures in the illustrations have been studied in detail by Dodwell 2000 (with numerous supporting illustrations). In the production of classical drama, a wide range of gestures were used to denote emotions and feelings, probably to reinforce the meaning of a play’s action in an outdoor environment where it may sometimes have been difficult to hear every word being uttered by the characters—Quintilian had described in his *Institutio Oratoria*, 11.3.85–7, how gestures “almost equal in expression the powers of language itself” (Dodwell 2000, p. 101, n. 1), which is perhaps an overstatement, but nonetheless stresses their centrality in discourse. Dodwell 2000 documents how many of these gestures were incorporated into non-dramatic illustrations in manuscripts dating from late Anglo-Saxon England—a practice not found elsewhere in Europe (Chapter 4, ‘Anglo-Saxon Gestures’, pp. 101–54). This development in Anglo-Saxon illustration can be associated with the tenth-century Benedictine monastic reform centred at Canterbury and Winchester, and it may well be that an illustrated manuscript of Terence’s plays was its source, especially given the fact that several copies of them are known to have been held at Canterbury, according to catalogue records from a slightly later period.

¹⁶ Jones and Morey 1931 summarize the evolution of artistic styles and trends as evidenced by the illustrations in the surviving witnesses; the School of Reims, in particular, was central to the transformation of the Late Antique style in France into “the sketchy vigour of the Reims style, the genesis of European realism” (II. 220). Wright 2006 comments about Jones and Morey 1931 that:

agree that the most faithful reproductions of the Late Antique illustrations are to be found in *C*.¹⁷

In *O*, however, the clothing and architecture in the *final* illustrations have been ‘modernized’ by the artists—though they remain true to an antique model in portraying the disposition and gestures of characters—and reflect styles and architectural developments of the twelfth century.¹⁸ Jones and Morey 1931 summarize its illustrations thus:

The Oxford miniatures have lithe movement within the poise of their figures; their lines are vigorously serpentine and tensile, coiling with resilient vitality. The contrast is of North and South, the style of one a mode of growth, the other the decadence of imitation . . . Yet the illustrations of *O*, for all their frank revealing of vigorous proto-Gothic style, are in iconography faithful to the formulae established by the illustrator of *g* far back in the fifth century. (II. 219)¹⁹

Important distinguishing features of *O* are the prominence or visibility of the underdrawings for its illustrations, and also its cues in lead point for the rubricators, who added the scene labels (*sigla personarum*) above each

This remains a very helpful book and readers of this book [Volume I] may want to refer to it for peripheral examples, but the text volume that followed in 1931 is unreliable in codicological information and gravely burdened by Morey’s strange notion that the style of the model of our surviving group of copies (i.e. *U*) showed that it was the work of a “Greco-Asiatic” painter at the end of the fifth century. (p. 2)

¹⁷ Both the scribe and one of the artists of *C* are known by name; the former was Hrodgarius, who signed the manuscript on f. 92, and the latter, who works his name into the marginal decoration of the manuscript on f. 3, was Adelricus. There have been attempts to identify these men as monks of Corvey in Germany (see Jones and Morey 1931, II. 34–5; Grant 1986, p. 137), but this is rejected by Bischoff 1966, I. 60–1, n. 34, who argues instead that the manuscript originated in Lorraine, and was commissioned by a wealthy patron associated with the court of Louis the Pious (III. 181). Jones and Morey 1931 note that the illustrations in *C* are “an unusually careful rendition of an antique model” (II. 36).

¹⁸ The illustrations are described in detail in Section 7.0.

¹⁹ They note further that with respect to the whole of the illustrated Terence manuscript tradition,

The Terence miniatures are in fact the outstanding example of the transmission and transformation of antique style. In no other category of mediaeval art can one so plainly see how Latin art was handed on and variously treated by the different epochs and localities that fell heir to it. (II. 219–20)

illustration and the speaker names in the text.²⁰ There are also cues for the rubricator still visible beside many of the coloured initials (all such cues are noted in the commentary and discussed in detail in Section 7.6). There would have been such underdrawings or preparatory sketches for virtually every complex drawing made during the Middle Ages,²¹ but they are not usually visible unless made in the margins, because the finished drawings cover them. The underdrawings in *O* are curious, however, in that they are very crudely or carelessly sketched and are in a different style from the finished drawings—they indicate that the person who made the underdrawings worked from a manuscript with illustrations that reproduced the Late Antique (fifth-century) style, much as seen in *C*, but that the artists of the finished drawings decided to modernize these and cast them in a modern (twelfth-century) style.²² To date these have not been studied or commented upon in any detail, not even by Jones and Morey 1931, who produced the most comprehensive analysis of the artwork and styles of the manuscript's artists.²³ The assumption seems to have

²⁰ Lead point is a plummet or piece of lead alloy used much like a pencil to sketch in initials before inking. Lead point was also used for underdrawings, or for ruling pages. Cues in lead point that instruct the scribe on the placement of text and illustrations can still be found in many ancient and medieval manuscripts.

²¹ A few underdrawings are also readily visible in witness *F*. The illustration of the 'mob scene' in *The Eunuch* (4.7) on f. 14v differs from those in the other witnesses in that the characters are in a flat V-shaped arrangement (compare f. 29v in *C*, f. 55v in *O* and f. 24r in *Tur*, where the characters are aligned horizontally). For a discussion of underdrawings, preparatory sketches and cues for artists and rubricators, see Alexander 1992, pp. 52–71. Medieval readers seem not to have been distracted by or concerned about sketches and prompts left visible in the margins of manuscripts, whereas they may be annoying or mystifying to a non-specialist modern reader. A similar high level of tolerance among medieval readers is seen in their ability to accept the inevitable error level in their texts, created as copyists introduced new, additional errors to a text each time they reproduced it (see Muir 2008 for a discussion of this phenomenon).

²² The underdrawings, prompts and cues in *O* are discussed in detail in Section 7.0. Most notably, the artists draw architectural features in the Romanesque style rather than reproducing the simple doorways of the Late Antique model; they also tend to shorten the hemline of many characters' robes and to draw their feet at more acute angles, giving them a more active or kinetic attitude or appearance. The manner in which the folds of garments are treated is also reflective of twelfth-century techniques.

²³ See Jones and Morey 1931 (II. 70–9) for a discussion of the styles of the different artists. They identify them as A, B, C and D, although they allow that there may have been even more artists involved—"The illustrations of *O* were done by at least four artists" (II. 70). They speculate that 'A' was the head-master of the scriptorium, but again, there is no evidence for this except for the fact that his style is mature and that he was responsible for the earliest illustrations in the manuscript (he completed those in quires I and II, and also the two figures on f. 17v which belong to the illustration of the next folio, now lost). 'B' begins on f. 19r and completes all the illustrations of quires III–XVIII and XXI–XXII, with the exception, oddly, of the last one in both quires XIII (f. 100v) and XVIII (f. 143v); these two illustrations are

been that they are irrelevant for art-historical and codicological studies, but they have proven to be quite important in discussing the relationship between the scene titles here and in the closely related witnesses *C* and *P*, and also the relationship between the scene labels in the illustrated manuscripts and those in the earlier, unillustrated *A* (Bembinus).²⁴

In the outer margin of f. 110v there is a previously unnoticed fifteen-line-tall sketch of a robed woman (perhaps a nun). The sketch is very well drawn and is contemporary with the manuscript. In style, the female figure resembles an image of the Virgin Mary in a twelfth-century Byzantine manuscript now in the National Gallery of Victoria (Melbourne).²⁵

1.4 Stages of Production

O has been copied out mostly in verse lines, with the speaker cues added subsequently by the rubricator.²⁶ During proofreading, a later hand has altered some of the speaker cues where the assignment must have disagreed with

attributed by Jones and Morey 1931 to 'C', but they observe that his style is much like that of 'A'. Given the admitted similarity of style of these two artists, it is not too far-fetched to imagine 'A' returning to add these two illustrations at a later date, rather than to propose a third artist who only became involved on two occasions to add one image. 'D' is responsible for the illustrations of quires XIX–XX.

²⁴ The final rubrics in the scene labels often disagree with the lead-point prompts; every occurrence of these disagreements has been annotated here and the data compared with the titles in *C* and *P*, the latter of which often has two sets of labels (one added by one of its scholiasts) that sometimes disagree with each other. *A* and most of the other unillustrated witnesses have the scene labels before each scene, but not the illustrations themselves.

²⁵ The Gospel Book of Theophanes, MS Felton 710-5, f. 1v, reproduced in Manion 2005, pp. 26–7.

²⁶ The character tags are discussed in detail in Section 7.6. On a few folios a second hand was responsible for these tags; where this happens, it has been noted in the commentary. The tags added by the second, correcting rubricator are in a slightly different colour of ink; these are found on the following folios: 76r, 79r, 101r, 112r, 118v, 125r, 142v, 162v and 169v. The second rubricator's work is easily distinguished from the first's—compare the scene labels on, for example, 164v (first rubricator) with those on 173v (second rubricator). The tags generally consist of a three-letter abbreviation for each character's name, but occasionally, when there is room, the rubricator will write out a name in full. An interesting variation on this occurs on f. 117v, where the rubricator has written out all but one of the cues as the characters' full names; the names of the two speakers are just five letters long (*Demea* and *Micio*), so there was enough space to fit them in (though he just managed to squeeze *Demea*, in l. 3).

another witness considered to be more reliable.²⁷ Folio 159v is the last folio of quire XX. It is interesting to note the different colour of the ink used by the rubricator on f. 160r, the first folio of the next quire; this clearly suggests that the scribe finished a stint of work on one quire and that a brief period elapsed before he started the next one (perhaps just the next day). The disposition of words around the heads or characters at times shows that the scene labels were added after the illustrations were drawn. Note, for example, folios 59v, where the name *So-phrona* is actually hyphenated around her head (and the 'h' added above to correct the original misspelling), and 60r, where *Par-meno* is treated similarly.

The layout and presentation of the plays in *O* is quite systematic, though there are some variations to be seen. The prefatory matter includes: an 'Argument' in poetry,²⁸ prose or both; this is followed by the *didascalia* or production notice, detailing the occasion of the performance of the play, who sponsored and produced it, and who performed the music; and finally, there is a 'Prologue', accompanied by a drawing of its speaker.²⁹ Each scene of the play proper begins with a labelled illustration followed by the text recorded in poetic lines, with one exception where some text lost earlier has been supplied in prose.³⁰ The scholia are treated variously in different witnesses, as is explained in detail in Section 6.0: in witness *E*, they are gathered all together and copied out in a single block before the first play; in *K*, the complete scholia for each play are written together at its beginning; and in others, such as *P* (f. 7r) and *C* (f. 10v), they are written in the margins and/or at the beginning of each scene (as on f. 52v in *O*, with the scholia coming after the illustration and before the

²⁷ We know, for example, that there were several copies of Terence's plays at Canterbury during the later Middle Ages, attesting his enduring popularity, and, wherever the present manuscript may have been copied, it is apparent that there was at least one other copy available for it to be read against.

²⁸ The Arguments for the plays were written by Sulpicius Apollinaris, not Terence, in the second century CE and thereafter became a regular part of the textual tradition.

²⁹ There is no figure accompanying the Prologue to *The Eunuch* in *O*, nor in *C* and *P*, suggesting that it was also missing in the hyparchetype.

³⁰ *The Eunuch*, ll. 285–515; these are also written out as if in prose in *P*, suggesting that there was a replacement passage in their archetype (*F*, which only begins at *The Eunuch*, l. 416, is also written in prose until l. 515). *F*, *L* and *N* are also copied out in verse, like *O* and *P*; *C*, however, is written out almost entirely as if prose.

text proper). In *O*, there is a considerable amount of scholia for *Andria* and *The Eunuch*, but much less for the later plays.³¹

The manuscript was produced by various craftsmen working together systematically (although occasionally the rubricator inadvertently omitted a character cue). A full text frame was first drawn on each sheet of parchment. After the quires were arranged in groups of four sheets (quaternions), the text and scholia were copied from an exemplar, with spaces (usually) twelve lines high being left for the illustrations, as well as appropriately sized spaces for the scene labels, large decorated or illuminated initials and speaker cues. The spacing of the text grid is the same for the main text and the scholia, even though the latter is written in a smaller script. Cues indicating where large and small coloured initials were to be added later by the rubricator were made in the left margin in lead point. After this, someone working from an exemplar in which the illustrations were executed in the Late Antique style sketched the illustrations quickly and rather crudely in lead point, and also added the scene labels.³² The final versions of the labels written in red by the rubricator are often at odds with those in lead point, as is explained in detail in Section 7.5. The final versions of the illustrations were drawn next.³³ The scene labels, coloured initials and speaker cues were added last. The evidence also shows that the large initials were drawn before the speaker cues were added (see, for example, the large green 'N' on f. 105v and the purplish 'I' on f. 92r).

There is ample evidence throughout for this summary. For example, on f. 125v the character cues and the large initial 'F' are contoured around the feet of the slave Syrus, and the names in the scene label are positioned to accommodate the heads and hands of the characters. On f. 88v, the scribe left room in the first line below the space for the illustration of the speaker cues (as

³¹ There is a complete analysis of the scholia tradition in Section 6.0, as well as a full edition and translation of the text as it appears here in *O*.

³² It is interesting that the person who sketched the illustrations in lead point generally reproduced the garments as found in his Late Antique exemplar (they were modified by the artists of the final versions of the illustrations) but not the architectural features; there is no evidence (that has yet been discovered) that the Romanesque buildings are drawn over the simple kind of frames found in, for example, the Carolingian witnesses *C* and *P*.

³³ Besides being modernized with respect to clothing and architecture (as shown in detail in Section 7.0), the final illustrations occasionally omit an element in the underdrawing. See, for example, f. 24v, where part of Mysis' robe in the underdrawings has not been included in the final illustration (directly below her left hand and to the right of the finished version of the robe). And on f. 102r, there is an extension of the scarf of the slave Syrus down the right side of his body in the underdrawing, which is not in the final illustration. Interestingly, this 'unfinished' element of clothing is not found in the closely related witnesses *C*, *P* and *F*.

usual). Then the illustrator drew Clitipho so that his left foot extends down into the text, taking up part of the space left by the scribe for the speaker cues. The large initial 'V' encloses the right foot of Chremes, and the speaker cues for the opening lines of the scene were then added to the left of the 'V'. On f. 114v, the top of the tall initial 'I' follows the contours of Micio's robe. On f. 164v, the large initial 'd' again fits into the contours of Ph(a)edria's foot and robe, and though the outline of the initial is drawn over his right foot, the toe of his slipper has not been coloured in; and, the 'A' of the speaker cue 'PHA' covers part of the outline of his right foot. Note too that the names in the scene label have been broken to accommodate the heads of the characters. On f. 147v, the rubricator did not leave enough room for the whole name 'BACCHIS', so he had to squeeze the 'S' in above the preceding 'I'. On f. 128r, the scribe who entered the scholia did not leave room for the illustration, so the speaker has been placed in the outer margin; by comparison, in witnesses *P* and *C*, he is drawn between the texts of the Argument and the Prologue.

2.0 Codicology

2.1 The Binding

The seventeenth-century binding of the manuscript is of plain brown leather, rebaked and decorated with some tooling (click the links on the DVD to see images of the front cover, back cover, fore edge, head and tail);³⁴ the cover, which is 222x292 mm, is now very worn and scruffy-looking. It has a stamped decorative double line around its perimeter and a small scrolled-leaf pattern stamped in each of the four corners of both the front and back covers. The spine is 50 mm wide. The cords of the four major sewing stations are represented by ridges on the spine, which divide it into five panels; the ridges each have two cracks in them through which the cords are visible. ‘TERENTIUS’ is stamped in gold in the second panel from the top; this panel is decorated with a fine double line in gold around its four sides. The number ‘32’ is written in the bottom panel, referring to ‘Selden Cupboard 32’ (this location is also noted on f. i verso).

2.2 The Parchment and Flyleaves

The parchment is of varying weights or thicknesses and is of excellent grade throughout. The manuscript was originally made up of twenty-two regular quaternions (i.e. four sheets or eight folios once folded); today it consists of 174 folios—four having been excised before the present foliation was made and two having been added (118 and 119) after quire XV.³⁵ The folios are

³⁴ Used in a strict sense, rebaking refers to the renewal of the original spine covering. The term may also be applied to the reattachment of the original spine material, usually after repair or restoration. Unless a substantial portion of the original spine can be restored and reattached, it is usually replaced in its entirety. In either case, it is customary to lay a new strip of leather over the spine of the text block, over which the original spine is glued. The leather beneath is extended under the leather on the sides, thus effectively creating new joints.

³⁵ There are folios missing after folios 17 (containing *Andria*, ll. 459–80 and two illustrations), 25 (containing *Andria*, ll. 716–42 and one illustration), 47 (containing *Eunuch*, ll. 495–526 and one illustration) and 163 (containing *Phormio*, ll. 437–64 and two illustrations); a number of folios have been also lost at the end of the manuscript, which once contained *Phormio*, ll. 854–1055 and (most probably) two illustrations. Where a folio has been excised, the flesh–flesh, hair–hair pattern in that quire is of course necessarily compromised.

One folio from the end of the manuscript was misplaced at some stage and then rebound as 118, as it contains part of the text from *Phormio*, 5.8 (ll. 894–943), but no illustration. Folio 119 contains a passage from Priscian’s *De Metris Fabularum Terentii* (see Section 6.0).

approximately 221x283 mm in size and ruled for twenty-five lines of text;³⁶ the scholia are written out with the same spacing as the text proper, but in smaller script. The manuscript has been made as a deluxe copy of Terence's plays and so great attention has been paid to its appearance. On f. 52v, for example, the scene is laid out in a representative fashion: the illustration, with scene labels in red Rustic Capitals above it, is twelve lines high; the scholia are written out on the regular text grid with the same spacing as the text proper; and both the scholia and the text begin with a lightly decorated initial in coloured ink, with that for the scholia being on a slightly smaller scale. There are also a small number of interlinear and marginal glosses in the manuscript. The scholia and glossing tradition is discussed in detail in Section 6.0.

A few of the folios had original holes in them from insect bites; these were repaired, probably before the text was copied onto them.³⁷ Others had or sustained tears; these slits were stitched up at some stage, but the thread has now disappeared. There is one such vertical tear or slit towards the bottom of the inner margin of f. 87, and a similar one on f. 137. On f. 98 an original hole from an insect bite in the fourth to second last lines of the text was patched on the verso; the text on the recto has been written around the defect. There is another patched hole on f. 96, but it is in the bottom margin and thus does not affect the text. On f. 171 there is yet another patched hole. On the recto (where the patch has been applied), it falls towards the outer margin and does not affect the text, but on the verso it spans the left bounding line and the scribe and rubricator have written around it. Other folios have small defects to their outer margins; these would have been more significant before the manuscript was cropped during the rebinding process.³⁸ There is also minor water damage to the edge of some folios here and there throughout.³⁹

There are eleven flyleaves in total, one of paper and three of parchment at the front and six of parchment and one of paper at the back; the annotations pertaining to provenance on the front flyleaves are discussed in Section 1.1. There are catchwords visible in the bottom margin of the verso side of the last folio of many quires, though some of these have been partially (and others

³⁶ The scribe ruled the complete folio, including an area that he left blank for the illustrations (usually twelve lines in height).

³⁷ Quite a number of folios have small and insignificant holes in them which do not affect the text; these are 84, 86, 89, 98, 104, 106, 112, 147, 152, 154, 155, 164 and 173.

³⁸ These are 4, 7, 8, 28, 76, 82, 121, 126, 130 and 149. The top outer corner of f. 162 and the three following it are slightly damaged.

³⁹ For example, to the folios around 44 and 88.

completely) cropped; there are also quire numbers (added later) in the same position.⁴⁰ The text frame is approximately 141x152 mm, with single bounding lines that extend to the top and bottom edge of the sheet. The ruling is in light brown ink; the first and last two lines of the text grid extend to the inner and outer edges of the folio. Prickmarks are often visible, though many have been cropped; these features can be readily seen, for example, on f. 14r. Speaker or character cues are placed to the left of the bounding line when they fall at the beginning of a line, and large decorated initials are also often in the margin, either wholly or partially. The foliation is in modern pencil and has sometimes been corrected.⁴¹

2.3 Corrections and Punctuation

A second, later reader has altered the punctuation throughout in black ink, sometimes changing the original punctuation by adding or removing an element and at other times erasing it completely; this person is referred to in the commentary as the ‘black corrector’. Interestingly, many of the alterations either lack sense or are incorrect—for example, question marks are added where there is no question, or they are erased where there is one; all such alterations have been noted in the commentary. This corrector has also frequently added a diacritical mark indicating *spiritus asper* (‘rough breathing’) interlineally above vowels throughout—see, for example, f. 8r, l. 4 ([*h*]eri).⁴² Corrections are usually made by erasing the original reading, but on sixty-six

⁴⁰ Catchwords give the first word (or more) from the next quire, helping to ensure that the quires are assembled in the proper order when the manuscript is bound; they have been noted throughout when they are visible. They can be seen on folios 16v (*cum istuc*, cropped but visible); 23v (*turbat*, cropped but tops visible); 38v (should be *rem habere*—almost completely cropped, but the very top of the wedge of ‘h’ is still there); 53v (*Tu pol*—the tops of some letters are still visible); 61v (*quis h(om)o est*—the tops of some letters are still visible); 69v (*sepe eade(m)*—cropped but visible); 77v (*Nam mi(hi)*—cropped but visible; the ‘N’ is identical to that of the main text, though the latter reads *michi*); 93v (*Eius ut*—cropped but visible); 101v (*verum*); 117v (*Edepol Syrisce*—severely cropped, but some letter tops visible); 135v (*Nemini plura*—the tops of a few ascenders are visible); 143v (*Illius stulcicia*—the spelling with ‘c’ for the text’s ‘t’ here suggests that it was added by someone other than the main scribe); 166v (*Senectus ipsa*); and 174v (*Nam sine*—the rest of *Phormio* has been lost, except for f. 118).

⁴¹ The manuscript was first paginated and later foliated, with the original pagination being cancelled (cf. f. 27r).

⁴² The diacritical mark indicates initial aspiration or the presence of a voiceless glottal fricative (/h/).

occasions letters are expunged (as, for example, in the last line of f. 170v and the third last line of f. 171r, both to the same word, *re[p]perire*).⁴³

2.4 Decorated Initials and the Use of Coloured Inks

Coloured inks are used throughout the manuscript. At the opening of *Andria* (3v), for example, the Biography, the verse Argument and the Prologue all begin with large coloured initials, a blue 'N', red 'S' and green 'P' respectively. The scholia for the first scene have a smaller, but also decorated, blue initial 'U' on f. 4v, and the scene itself begins on f. 5r with a four-line-high illuminated and painted initial 'U'; the remaining scenes also begin with large coloured, but not illuminated, initials. The *explicit* for *Andria* on f. 33v is written in green and red Rustic Capitals, though without any particular pattern or regularity. The *didascalia* for the next play, *The Eunuch*, is written on f. 35r in two columns, with the 'a' and 'b' columns alternating between red and green ink (for the most part). The Argument for *The Self-Tormentor* is written on f. 67r in alternating long lines in red or green ink. Each of the remaining plays is treated in a similar fashion, with only minor variations.

2.5 Misplaced Lines and Passages

On a few occasions in the g manuscripts lines are either out of order or misplaced. For example, on f. 136v the order of the second and third lines should be reversed; on f. 110v, *The Brothers* (3.4), the fourth line down is actually l. 461 of *Phormio* (2.4); and on f. 79v the first three lines properly belong at the end of the scene, after the line beginning with *Dissolui*. All such irregularities are noted in the commentary.⁴⁴

⁴³ All such corrections can be readily discovered using the 'Search' feature of this program.

⁴⁴ The significance of missing or dislocated passages for the establishment of the relationship between various witnesses is examined in detail in Section 5.

3.0 Life of Terence

Publius Terentius Afer, or Terence, is the author of six plays that were produced in Rome in the second century BCE. Our most reliable information about him comes from the plays themselves. In the prologues Terence replies to criticism of his work from certain literary figures, whom he characterizes as spiteful and jealous of his success. He also describes the sources he used for the plays and the circumstances under which some of them were produced; *The Mother-in-Law*, for instance, was only successful on its third performance, since the audiences at the public games where it was produced were distracted by gladiatorial fights and tightrope walkers.

The production notes or *didascalia* that are found at the beginning of each play provide information about the dates of the plays, the games at which they were produced and the producers and musicians. From these notes we can see that Terence was closely associated with the producer Lucius Ambivius Turpio,⁴⁵ who also produced the plays of the comic poet Caecilius Statius,⁴⁶ and who appears as a character in the prologues to *The Self-Tormentor* and *The Mother-in-Law*. Terence's plays were produced at annual public games in Rome, or at special events, such as the funeral games held for the general and statesman Lucius Aemilius Paulus⁴⁷ in 160 BCE. The names of his plays and the probable years of their performances are as follows:

<i>Andria</i>	166 BCE
<i>The Mother-in-Law</i> (first performance)	165 BCE
<i>The Self-Tormentor</i>	163 BCE
<i>The Eunuch</i>	161 BCE
<i>Phormio</i>	161 BCE
<i>The Brothers</i>	160 BCE
<i>The Mother-in-Law</i> (second performance)	160 BCE
<i>The Mother-in-Law</i> (third performance)	160 BCE

⁴⁵ *OCD*, p. 71.

⁴⁶ *OCD*, p. 270.

⁴⁷ *OCD*, pp. 21–2.

Some information about Terence appeared in verse histories of Latin poetry written in the late second and early first centuries BCE, which now only survive in fragments. Porcius Licinus claimed that, despite patronage from three leading figures in Roman society⁴⁸—Publius Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus Africanus, or Scipio Africanus the Younger,⁴⁹ Lucius Furius Philus⁵⁰ and Gaius Laelius⁵¹—Terence was driven into exile in Greece and died in poverty; Porcius seems to imply that Terence was sexually abused by these men. Volcacius Sedigitus⁵² wrote that Terence presented six comedies to the public and set off for Asia Minor, shortly after which he died, but suggested that the plays themselves may in fact have been written by Scipio Africanus the Younger.⁵³ The claim of bogus authorship was repeated by Cicero,⁵⁴ who tells us in a letter of 50 BCE that Laelius was believed to have ghost-written the plays for Terence on account of the eloquent language in them (*Letters to Atticus*, 7.3.10) and by Quintilian,⁵⁵ who about 140 or so years after Cicero states that some people attributed them to Scipio (*Institutio Oratoria*, 10.1.99). These rumours appear already to have been rife in the time of Terence, since he states in the Prologue to *The Brothers* (ll. 15–21) that he was falsely accused of being helped in his work by noble men.

Our main biographical source for Terence is the ‘Life’ attributed to Suetonius,⁵⁶ a much younger contemporary of Quintilian, more famous for his *Lives of the Caesars*. Written at least 250 years after the plays were produced, this ‘Life of Terence’ tells us that he was born in Carthage in Northern Africa sometime after the end of the Second Punic War (202 BCE) and brought to Rome as a slave,⁵⁷ although not as a captive in war. At Rome he so impressed his master, Terentius Lucanus, with his learning and beauty that he was freed

⁴⁸ *OCD*, p. 1226; Courtney 1993, pp. 82–92.

⁴⁹ *OCD*, pp. 397–8.

⁵⁰ *OCD*, p. 616.

⁵¹ *OCD*, p. 811 (2).

⁵² *OCD*, pp. 1610–11; Courtney 1993, pp. 93–6.

⁵³ Cf. Courtney 1993, pp. 89, 95.

⁵⁴ *OCD*, pp. 1558–64.

⁵⁵ *OCD*, p. 1290.

⁵⁶ *OCD*, pp. 1451–2.

⁵⁷ Edited in Wessner 1966, I. 3–10.

by him. Suetonius otherwise tells us that Terence was closely associated with Scipio and Laelius and received their patronage, that his first play *Andria* greatly impressed Caecilius, and that after the publication of his six plays he set out to visit Greece but died on the way, not yet being twenty-five years of age. He states that some authorities placed his death in the consulship of Cn. Cornelius Dolabella and M. Fulvius Nobilior (159 BCE), while the late fourth-century CE *Chronicle* of Jerome records that he died in 158 BCE.⁵⁸ Suetonius expresses doubts about some traditions concerning Terence, such as the statement of Porcius that he died in poverty; Suetonius asserts that Terence's daughter married a Roman knight, while Terence himself left in his will extensive gardens of twenty *iugera* on the Appian Way.

Strong scepticism about other elements in Suetonius' account has been expressed by some modern scholars; for instance, it has been noted that Caecilius is said in the *Chronicle* of Jerome to have died in 167 BCE, a year before the production of *Andria*.⁵⁹ Terence's full name admittedly causes difficulties. The normal Roman custom at the end of the Republic was for a freed male slave to take his first two names from his master and to retain his slave name as a *cognomen* to distinguish him from other members of the family and freedmen; thus if Terence had received his name under this system he would have taken his first two names Publius Terentius from his master, and his *cognomen* Afer (or 'African') would be his slave name. But freedmen did not start to use *cognomina* in inscriptions until the end of the second century BCE,⁶⁰ and Afer is also attested as a *cognomen* in some aristocratic families. It has in fact been argued that the assumption that Terence was reared as a slave may simply be an incorrect deduction from this *cognomen*,⁶¹ and also that the whole story about his origins in Northern Africa may have arisen in order to explain it.⁶² Nevertheless, Suetonius clearly had access to a range of sources long since lost to us, and any scepticism about Terence's North African birth or upbringing as a slave would need to be corroborated by evidence that would substantiate other origins, which is simply lacking. Indeed, if Terence was a freedman as our early sources all state, 'Afer' need not have been his formal *cognomen*, but could simply have been attributed to him by literary scholars based on his ethnicity.

⁵⁸ *OCD*, p. 794.

⁵⁹ Barsby 1999, p. 1.

⁶⁰ *OCD*, p. 1025.

⁶¹ Ireland 1991, p. 1.

⁶² Barsby 1999, p. 1; Brown 1996b, p. 1483.

Some details provided by Suetonius are also found in various medieval traditions concerning Terence. The portraits of him that appear in the illustrated manuscripts always show him as a young man, and the account of his birth in Carthage is repeated in the short biographical poem that appears in our manuscript (see f. 3v). This story is also in the text known as the *Accessus ad Andriam*, which combines a later medieval biography of Terence (known as *Vita Terentii II*) with an Introduction to *Andria*. The *Accessus ad Andriam* circulated widely in the medieval period,⁶³ and is included in our manuscript at folios 1r–2r.

The account of Terence's arrival in Rome in the *Accessus ad Andriam* is pure fantasy. It is taken from the fifth-century Christian historian Paulus Orosius (*Historiae aduersum paganos*, 4.19.6), and confuses Scipio Africanus the younger with his grandfather by adoption, Scipio Africanus the Elder,⁶⁴ who defeated Hannibal at the battle of Zama outside Carthage in 202 BCE and who held his triumph in Rome in the following year. Although Suetonius tells us that Terence was born after this war finished, the *Accessus ad Andriam* states that he was granted his freedom by Scipio Africanus the Elder after his triumph. Orosius also confuses Terence the playwright with Terentius Culleo, a Roman senator who was freed from Carthaginian captivity by Scipio the Elder and who wore a freedman's cap in Scipio's triumphal procession.

⁶³ See Riou 1973, pp. 81–102.

⁶⁴ *OCD*, p. 398.

4.0 The Plays

4.1 Terence's Plays

The six plays of Terence survive today virtually intact. Their plots are repetitive, often incorporating stock elements such as a complex deceit managed by a slave, a mistaken identity and last-minute revelation, or the reconciliation of young lovers, while the pool of character types and names is also very limited.⁶⁵ Such repetitions are inherent in the genre and, as Terence's prologues strongly suggest, his writing had to satisfy the deep philhellenism of his audience; the extent to which he could deviate from his Greek originals and offer something new was severely limited, and his creations were sometimes subject to harsh criticism. Nevertheless, he was always recognized as a skilful writer and versifier; thus Quintilian, despite reservations both about his identity and his use of metres other than iambic trimeters, states that his plays are *in hoc genere elegantissima*, 'the most elegant in this genre' (10.1.99). Brief synopses of his plays (given in the order they appear in *O*) now follow.

Andria, or *The Woman of Andros*, was Terence's first play to be performed. It was based on a play of the same name by Menander (see Section 4.2), but also incorporated material from another play of his, *The Woman of Perinthos*. Terence's play takes its title from a woman from the Greek island of Andros, named Glycerium, who is believed to be the sister of a courtesan, but is in fact the daughter of an Athenian citizen. Her lover, Pamphilus, has made her pregnant, but his father wishes him instead to marry the daughter of a neighbour. The slave Davus persuades Pamphilus to play for time by agreeing to this, and after various twists and turns whereby this bogus marriage becomes more and less likely, a relative of the courtesan arrives from Andros who explains the true situation, so that at the end of the play the lovers are finally allowed to marry.

Eunuchus, or *The Eunuch*, is based on a play of the same name by Menander, although it also includes material from his play *The Flatterer*. It was highly successful in its day, and attracted vehement criticism from a *maleuolus uetus poeta* or 'malicious old playwright' (named by the fourth-century CE grammarian Donatus as Luscus), who claimed that it was plagiarized from earlier Latin plays. In it a courtesan named Thais, who has a precarious legal status as a foreigner in Athens, has to deal with the unwelcome attentions of a braggart soldier, Thraso. Trying to impress her, Thraso presents Thais with a

⁶⁵ The name Chremes, for instance, is used in four plays, most often for an old man, but in *The Eunuch* for a young man, while the slave Dromo and the nurse Sostrata appear in three plays apiece.

beautiful girl he has bought as a slave; this girl had been brought up on Rhodes as Thais' sister, but is in reality an Athenian citizen. Thais' well-to-do Athenian lover Phaedria has a younger brother, Chaerea, who falls in love with the girl and with the connivance of Phaedria's slave disguises himself as a eunuch, entering Thais' house, he rapes the girl. Thais discovers this and is forced to allow Chaerea to marry her, but at the end of the play she obtains legal protection for herself, and she allows the foolish Thraso to stay at her side and provide her with luxuries while devoting all of her attention to Phaedria.

Heauton timuromenos, or *The Self-Tormentor*, is based on a play of the same name by Menander. It centres around two elderly men, Chremes and Menedemus. Some time previously, Menedemus had banished his son Clinia from his household because of his affair with a young girl Antiphila, generally thought to be a poor Corinthian, but who is in fact the daughter of Chremes. Then, racked with guilt about his behaviour to his own son, Menedemus banished himself to his farm and tormented himself with constant physical labour. Chremes tries to intervene, lecturing Menedemus on a father's proper behaviour, and eventually Antiphila's identity is established and she is allowed to marry Clinia. Meanwhile Chremes' own son Clitipho is under the spell of a greedy courtesan, and on his slave's advice becomes involved in various money-making schemes which involve both Clinia and Antiphila; caught out by his father at the end of the play, he is forced to abandon the courtesan and marry properly.

Adelphoe, or *The Brothers*, is based on a play of the same name by Menander, although it also incorporates a scene from a play *Synapothnescontes* by the fourth-century Greek playwright Diphilos.⁶⁶ The play concerns two elderly brothers, Micio and Demea, and their relationships with their sons. Demea lives in the countryside, and preaches frugality and discipline, while the bachelor Micio lives in the city and is highly indulgent to his adopted son, Aeschinus (really the son of Demea). Aeschinus outrageously kidnaps a girl from a pimp's establishment, allowing Demea to indulge his bigotted views, but when it transpires that Aeschinus has in fact done this on behalf of Ctesipho, Demea's son, the tables are turned. Aeschinus has his own romantic problems, having made the daughter of a neighbouring widow pregnant; Micio forgives his son and smoothes over the marriage, while at the end of the play Demea reasserts his authority and forces Micio to marry the widow.

Hecyra, or *The Mother-in-Law*, is based on a play of the same name by the fourth-century Greek playwright Apollodorus.⁶⁷ It was Terence's second

⁶⁶ *OCD*, p. 485.

⁶⁷ *OCD*, pp. 123–4 (3).

play, and one of his least successful, since it was performed three times before achieving critical success. Terence claims in his prologues that the performances were disrupted by tightrope walkers and the rumours of gladiatorial games. In it an Athenian youth, Pamphilus, had been forced by his father into marriage with the daughter of the neighbouring household, Philumena, although he had a long-standing relationship with a courtesan, Bacchis. Before the marriage Pamphilus had raped Philumena without knowing who she was and stolen her ring, which he gave as a present to Bacchis. Refusing to sleep with his new wife, he goes away to Imbros on a business trip; when he returns, he finds out she has given birth. He agrees with Philumena's mother to conceal this, but refuses to take his wife back, causing his father and father-in-law to put pressure on him to abandon Bacchis. The situation is only resolved when Bacchis attends the baths with Philumena's mother, and she recognizes the stolen ring on her finger. Pamphilus is reconciled with his wife and acknowledges his son, while Bacchis accepts the end of her relationship with good grace.

Phormio is also based on a play by Apollodorus. The play is named after its chief protagonist, the parasite Phormio. Phormio works hard to further the romantic interests of two young cousins, Antipho and Phaedria, while their fathers are overseas on business, and succeeds in arranging a marriage with a poor, orphan girl for Antipho, although his father had secretly agreed that he should marry a daughter of his brother's, born to a bigamous marriage on Lesbos. When he returns and discovers the marriage, Antipho's father Demipho is furious, and so Phormio agrees to marry the poor girl himself, provided he receives a large dowry. It is then revealed that the poor girl is the missing daughter from Lesbos, but before the old men can recover the dowry Phormio spends it to buy back Phaedria's beloved flute-girl from a pimp who owns her.

4.2 Roman Comedy and its Sources

Roman comedy is principally known from the surviving works of two writers of the late third and second centuries BCE, Titus Maccius Plautus (d. 184 BCE), and Terence. It is the earliest form of Latin literature which comes down to us complete, and is a rich source for the early forms of the language. Like the plays of Terence, those of Plautus appear to have been produced at public games in Rome,⁶⁸ where the productions were sponsored by wealthy members of the ruling elite, and where they may have competed for audience attention with a variety of other entertainments, such as gladiatorial contests.

⁶⁸ Brown 1996a, pp. 1194–5.

The plays written by Plautus and Terence are known as *fabulae palliatae*, or ‘dramas wearing the *pallium*’ (the *pallium* is the type of cloak associated by the Romans with the Greeks), and the plays acquired this name because Plautus and Terence imitated Greek literary models, especially the style of comedy known as ‘New Comedy’.⁶⁹ Greek New Comedy is principally known to us through Menander (344/3–292/1 BCE),⁷⁰ extensive fragments of whose works were discovered on papyrus in Egypt during the twentieth century.

Menander’s plays are usually set in Athens or Attica, and although there are constant references to travel and trade throughout the Mediterranean, this is always a plot device, allowing one character to be absent for part of the play and return home unexpectedly. There are none of the scathing references to contemporary political, military, literary and philosophical figures we find in the chief writer of Greek Old Comedy, Aristophanes (d. c. 386 BCE).⁷¹ Rather, the plots always deal with domestic issues within households of the property-owning classes. Typical characters include old men locked in feuds, arrogant soldiers, parasites, prostitutes, wealthy but dissolute young men (who nevertheless fall in love with the daughter of a rival household) and slaves. The slaves themselves are either irredeemably sly and lazy, or loyal but cunning, stage-managing complex situations on behalf of their young masters. There is some violence off-stage, either rape or the threat of beatings for slaves, but the plays always end with marriage and reconciliation of the principal characters.

The names of all characters in the Roman *fabulae palliatae* are Greek, the plays are all set in Greek towns such as Athens or Syracuse, and the plot lines are remarkably similar, with the same stock characters and comic situations being used. However, comparison of the language of a fragment of a play by Menander which Plautus used as a source with the version of Plautus himself has indicated that Plautus by no means provided a direct translation of Menander’s work, but combined elements and added material when it suited him.⁷² Fidelity to the Greek originals was a constant issue in the critical debate about these plays. The prologues to Terence’s plays react indignantly to stinging criticisms he received about his changes to the Greek originals, and in these prologues he defends his right to be innovative with the text against the criticisms of his constant bugbear, the *maleuolus uetus poeta* or ‘malicious old playwright’.

⁶⁹ See *OCD*, pp. 370–1.

⁷⁰ *OCD*, pp. 956–7.

⁷¹ *OCD*, pp. 163–5.

⁷² Brown 1996a, p. 1195.

Despite their reliance on the same sorts of Greek literary model, there are also substantial differences between Plautus and Terence. Plautus is much freer than Terence in integrating reminiscences of Roman society or customs into his plays,⁷³ while he also introduces elements from Italian comic traditions, particularly burlesque elements, and the subtlety of characterization which is a feature of Terence's work is largely absent from his.⁷⁴ There are very sharp differences in language as well; noticeably absent from Terence are Plautus' long abusive speeches, usually directed from one slave to another, and full of the most absurd and inventive insults. In his study of Terence's language, Karakasis 2005 noted how Terence stood out from contemporary comic playwrights in his restriction of Greek borrowings and non-Classical Latin forms to particular character types and situations, and that his linguistic purism was in general far more characteristic of the ideals later recommended by Cicero.⁷⁵ This purity of speech no doubt contributed to his later inclusion in the Latin educational curriculum (see Section 6.1), although at the same time he seems to have deliberately cultivated broad, popular appeal, particularly as demonstrated by the large number of generalizations and quasi-proverbial statements that occur in his works.

⁷³ Thus in the opening scene of his play *Amphitruo*, set in Thebes, the slave Sosia, who is sneaking around by night, states that he runs the risk of being arrested by the *tresviri*, three magistrates appointed to keep the streets of Rome safe at night (*Amphitruo*, l. 155). This line was cited by Priscian in *De metris fabularum Terentii et aliorum comicorum*, and appears in the fragment included in *O* on f. 119r.

⁷⁴ See for instance Christenson 2000, pp. 11–12.

⁷⁵ Karakasis 2005, pp. 15–16. The main exception he notes to this pattern is *The Eunuch*, which is heavily influenced by Plautine linguistic style (cf. pp. 141–3).

4.3 Terence's Plays and the Roman Theatre

The Roman theatre of Terence's time is likely to have been relatively simple in its design.⁷⁶ Plays were held in Rome in conjunction with important annual games and special events, such as the funeral games held in honour of Lucius Aemilius Paulus in 160 BCE, and were run concurrently with other entertainments. Thus Terence bemoans in the second Prologue to *The Mother-in-Law*, ll. 33–41 that the first two performances of his play were ruined by rival attractions—boxers, a tightrope walker and the rumour of a gladiatorial show.

The actors at this stage are likely to have been organized in companies, which may have competed with each other to obtain the contracts offered for public entertainments.⁷⁷ Female roles were most probably played by male actors,⁷⁸ a practice which persisted throughout the Empire (it is ridiculed in Juvenal, *Satires*, 3.93–7), although by the time of Donatus it appears that females were customarily playing female roles.⁷⁹

Masks were an integral part of the Greek and Roman stage, allowing a small number of actors to assume a wide variety of roles, including female ones. The theatre was in general a favourite topic for ancient art,⁸⁰ and illustrations of masks are found in a wide variety of media, such as vase paintings, wall paintings, and mosaics; very good examples can still be seen in surviving paintings or mosaics from Pompeii, which was destroyed in 79 CE. These artistic conventions left a strong mark on the illustrated manuscript tradition for Terence. The *aedicula* or mask shrine drawn on f. 3r of our manuscript shows the masks required for the parts in the play, and earlier representatives of the illustrated manuscript cycle such as *C* often reproduce accurate details of them, such as the exaggerated mouths of the male characters on f. 56r.

⁷⁶ See Beare 1964, pp. 164–83, for a full discussion of the seating as well as the stage.

⁷⁷ The extant evidence is discussed by Brown 2002, especially pp. 229–36.

⁷⁸ Brown 2002, p. 236.

⁷⁹ In his commentary note on *Andria*, l. 716, Donatus states that there were a great number of speaking parts assigned to the female character Mysis, regardless of whether the part was played by a man, as was the ancient custom, or a woman, which was the case in his day (*et uide non minimas partes in hac comoedia Mysidi attribui, hoc est personae feminae, siue haec personatis uiris agitur, ut apud ueteres, siue per mulierem, ut nunc uidemus*, Wessner 1966, I. 212).

⁸⁰ See Webster 1995, *passim*.

To what extent the illustrative manuscript cycle reflects ancient theatrical practice is a hotly debated subject. The illustrations in *O* have of course undergone a considerable amount of modernization, as will be shown in detail in Section 7, but *C*, *P* and *F* all exhibit details, including masks and stage curtains, which at first glance suggest the cycle of illustrations may be based on ancient performances. Dodwell 2000 rejected earlier arguments by Jones and Morey 1931 that these illustrations "are the product of literary rather than theatrical usage",⁸¹ and claimed instead that "there are very clear indications that the original artist *did* have an awareness of theatrical practices and traditions",⁸² substantiating his argument with detailed study of the gestures made by characters.⁸³ On art-historical evidence, such as the date of the hairstyles, Dodwell 2000 argued that the illustrative cycle may have originated in the third century CE, possibly in Northern Africa.⁸⁴ However, his conclusions were contested by Marshall 2001, who pointed to the way in which strong artistic traditions functioned independently of the stage, as well as to the development of gestural language independent of the stage.⁸⁵

4.4 Metre and Line Divisions

All of Terence's plays were written in metre. Unlike the standard modern English metres, which are dependent on word stress, Latin verse metres derive directly from Greek models, and consist of lines arranged from metrical feet, which are made up of combinations of long and short syllables.⁸⁶ Modern listeners can find it difficult to distinguish the sounds of these syllables, but ancient theatre audiences were often very knowledgeable about the wording of plays, and listened keenly to the ways in which actors pronounced their scripts; Cicero relates that audiences often cried out or even booed actors off the stage when they pronounced syllables incorrectly (*Orator* 173; *De Oratore*. 3.196).

The Latin comic writers Plautus and Terence modelled their use of metre on their Greek sources, although they made some subtle changes. The most

⁸¹ Jones and Morey 1931, II. 204.

⁸² Dodwell 2000, p. 22.

⁸³ See Dodwell 2000, pp. 22–33.

⁸⁴ Dodwell 2000, pp. 19–21.

⁸⁵ Marshall 2001, pp. 366–8.

⁸⁶ For discussion, see *OCD*, pp. 975–7.

common metre in Greek drama for conversation or narrative was the iambic trimeter, and the early Latin playwrights replaced this with the iambic *senarius*, which has the same number of feet but incorporates a number of minor modifications.⁸⁷ About 54 percent of the verses in Terence are written in iambic *senarii*.⁸⁸ The other metres tended to incorporate extra feet, and Terence frequently changed them from one line to the next. In performance these metres were originally accompanied by music; in Terence they were mostly performed in recitative, and only occasionally sung. John Barsby has prepared for this edition a discussion of the different types of metre, and has made readings of how they might possibly have sounded to audiences; these may be found on the DVD.

The types of metre employed by Plautus and Terence gradually passed out of fashion, and with the decline of learning in the last centuries of the Roman Empire some commentators even alleged that the plays were written in prose. This was fiercely rejected by the sixth-century grammarian Priscian of Caesarea,⁸⁹ who wrote a discussion of the various types of metre in Terence, *De metris fabularum Terentii et aliorum comicorum*. Priscian also criticized sharply the inability of manuscript copyists to understand these metres and to set them out on the page with the correct poetic line divisions.⁹⁰ Use of these line divisions facilitated easy reading of the text, but they were by no means a standard feature of manuscripts.

One of the earliest manuscript fragments we possess of Terence, the palimpsest fragment from St Gall, which dates to the late fourth or early fifth century,⁹¹ is written in *scriptio continua*, a very commonly used style of Latin writing in which not even spaces between words were indicated; often, as in this witness, new manuscript lines began part way through words (see for instance p. 300). Such a style had some advantages in compressing text onto the page, but reading manuscripts such as these allowed required special skills and a high degree of training from the *lector*, or professional reader.⁹² The papyrus

⁸⁷ *OCD*, p. 976.

⁸⁸ Moore 2007, p. 93.

⁸⁹ *OCD*, pp. 1247–8.

⁹⁰ *His igitur exemplis facillime diligentes omnium possunt comoediarum metra comprehendere et uersus, si quos imperitia scriptorum confuderit* ['And so with these examples those studying are able to understand most readily the metres and verses of all comedies, if the ineptitude of scribes has confused them'], Passalacqua 1987, 28.25–7.

⁹¹ Reeve 1983b, p. 415.

⁹² See Parkes 1993, pp. 9–12.

fragment from Oxyrhynchus, which dates perhaps to the fourth century,⁹³ is also written in *scriptio continua*, but words are sometimes separated by means of medial points and commas, and new lines always coincide with the start of new words. Where the beginning of lines can be determined accurately in the papyrus, as for instance on f. 1v, sometimes the lines in the papyrus correspond to Terence's poetic lines, but more often they do not.

The most complete early witness for the text of Terence is *A* (the Codex Bembinus), and in this manuscript different indentations of the text were used in order to indicate to the reader where different metres were used; thus iambic *senarii* are usually written at the normal indentation, but the longer metres were written on longer lines, offset in the left margin and extending far into the right. Sometimes even this length was insufficient for the longer poetic lines, and the concluding words would have to be written at the end of the next line. Very short metrical units were usually treated differently, being offset in the middle of the page, but there was sometimes confusion between these and the endings of longer lines.⁹⁴

O and its most closely related manuscript *P* share almost the same system of line divisions throughout. In general, their lines correspond to the poetic line divisions in Terence (the main exception in both manuscripts is *The Eunuch*, ll. 285–515, which is written in prose),⁹⁵ although longer metrical lines are not specially offset in the margins, as they are in *A*. Rather, longer lines in these two later witnesses were divided into two if they are too long to fit within the ruled area; compare, for instance, the frequent line divisions on f. 11r in *O*, which is written in a combination of the longer metres trochaic *septenarii* and iambic *octonarii*. Because iambic *senarii* tend to fit into the ruled area in both manuscripts, generally they are not divided, and closely match the poetic line divisions (thus compare, for instance, f. 5r in *O*); however, on some occasions the scribe of the immediate ancestor of *O* and *P* appears to have combined two iambic *senarii* into one line, and then divided and offset the lines as if they were longer poetic lines; this occurs in the line beginning *Vix*, seven from the bottom on f. 17v in *O*, and the corresponding text on f. 17r in *P*.

⁹³ Reeve 1983b, p. 415.

⁹⁴ See the discussion in Raffaelli 2007, pp. 73–9.

⁹⁵ See Victor and Quesnel 1999, p. 166.

5.0 The Textual Tradition and Editions

5.1 The Manuscript Tradition

In this facsimile edition of Terence's *Comedies*, we are primarily concerned with details of the textual tradition in so far as they help us to understand the relationship of the witnesses most closely related to *O*. The full manuscript tradition of Terence itself is long and complex. After Virgil, Terence was the most frequently copied Classical Latin author in the Middle Ages: the number of manuscripts which survive today has been estimated to exceed 650, perhaps even 700.⁹⁶

To a large extent this popularity must be due to the use of his plays in the teaching curriculum, both in schools of the Late Antique period and the monasteries of the post-Roman world. This wide dissemination of his works was facilitated by numerous commentaries, which explained such aspects as archaic Latin forms, identified persons and references, or elucidated metre. The two most influential of these works in late antiquity were the commentary of the fourth-century grammarian Aelius Donatus, and the work on Terence's metre by sixth-century grammarian Priscian (the commentary tradition is discussed in Section 6.1).

Extensive modern discussion of the textual tradition of Terence can be found in Grant 1986, while more concise accounts are in Reeve 1983b and Victor 2007. However, many key questions about the relationships of various manuscripts remain to be answered, and the stemmatic principles used by earlier generations of scholars to provide neat schemes for these relationships have themselves come into question. Thus Pasquali 1952 observes that the stemma (a diagram using lines radiating down from various points, like a genealogy) accounts primarily only for vertical evolution within a tradition, and treats horizontal interrelationships as secondary and negative (as already implied by the technical term 'contamination', which is used to describe such influences), although they often provide a far more satisfactory model for explaining variants in a given text.⁹⁷ To give just one instance, we know that within fifty years of *O* being copied, there were at least twelve copies of

⁹⁶ See Reeve 1983b, p. 412, Villa 1984 for a full list of manuscripts, and more recently Victor 2007, p. 1.

⁹⁷ In Pasquali's thinking the image of a spot of oil gradually spreading out until it covers an entire surface best describes the "horizontal transmission" of readings between witnesses (Pasquali 1952, p. 141).

Terence's works in libraries in English Benedictine monasteries.⁹⁸ Anyone studying Terence at, for instance, Christ Church, Canterbury, where there were six copies, could easily have opened a number of these simultaneously and 'contaminated' them by copying glosses and scholia from one to another, or else have compared and corrected the readings in any of them with reference to the others. Certainly the 'black correcting hand' of *O* went through the manuscript and radically changed its punctuation (often incorrectly) as well as making other alterations (see Section 2), suggesting that the corrector was mechanically reproducing the punctuation of what he thought to be a superior witness, rather than actually reading the plays closely himself.

A radical rejection of the stemmatic model comes in an earlier discussion by Victor 1996, where he questions the reliability of the prevalent model for the relationship of the earliest known and reconstructed Terence manuscripts,⁹⁹ and asserts that even key early manuscripts such as *A* can be regarded as belonging "to a patternless array of contaminated manuscripts".¹⁰⁰ In his most recent examination of the textual tradition (Victor 2007), he reverts to a more linear model, although he asserts the need to consider the value of later manuscripts, particularly those originating in Italy, which can often transmit valuable earlier readings that have been lost in the established medieval traditions. A particular case in point is an alternative ending to *Andria*, which was known to Donatus and appears in some manuscripts from the eleventh century onwards,¹⁰¹ although not in *O* or any of its much earlier relatives.

Notwithstanding these uncertainties, it has always been recognized that the most important manuscript in the textual tradition is *A*. *A* is a fourth- or fifth-century manuscript written in Rustic Capitals, most probably in Italy. It is not only the earliest surviving copy of the bulk of Terence's work, but for much of the time provides the best readings, and also preserves early orthography and grammatical forms lost in later witnesses. It copies the plays in the order *Andria*, *The Eunuch*, *The Self-Tormentor*, *Phormio*, *The Mother-in-Law*, *The Brothers*. Unfortunately, most of *Andria* and the final eighty lines of *The*

⁹⁸ There were six copies of Terence in the library of Christ Church, Canterbury, c. 1170 (Thomson 1982, I. 40), as well as three in Rochester c. 1202, one at Worcester in the early twelfth century, and a copy of Plautus and Terence at Bury St Edmunds in the late twelfth century (see the relevant catalogues in Sharpe 1996). In addition to these (presumably) lost witnesses, we know of another twelfth-century copy that was possessed by St Martin's Priory, Dover, which survives now as British Library, Royal MS 15.A.xii.

⁹⁹ Victor 1996, pp. 276–80.

¹⁰⁰ Victor 1996, p. 284.

¹⁰¹ Victor 2007, pp. 8–10.

Brothers are lost in *A*, and so have to be supplied from other manuscripts. Otherwise, we only have a handful of other early fragments of Terence from the Late Antique period; two of these—a palimpsest fragment from St Gall (p. 300) and some tattered papyri from Oxyrhynchus (f. 1r and f. 1v)—are reproduced in this edition.

Most, if not all of the other medieval manuscripts belong to a group sometimes called the ‘Calliopian recension’ (after an otherwise unknown grammarian named Calliopius, whose name appears as editor in these manuscripts in a colophon at the conclusion of each play). Two major families derive from this group, known as the *g* and *d* traditions; these are understood to be descendants of hyparchetypes that are designated *D* and *G*. *D* and *G* themselves are thought to share enough scribal errors to suggest that they have evolved from a common archetype, which is assigned the siglum *S*.

The *g* manuscripts first appear about 825 CE in Northern France; they are characterized by the order of plays: *Andria*, *The Eunuch*, *The Self-Tormentor*, *The Brothers*, *The Mother-in-Law*, *Phormio*. Several of the most important early members of this family are also illustrated, and the many close similarities in position and gesture in the miniatures show that they derive from the same cycle of illustrations in an archetype from the Late Antique period, if not earlier.¹⁰² The most important early members of this family are *C*, *P*, *F* and *Y*, which all date to the ninth century, while *O*, the manuscript edited here, is also a member of this family.

The *d* manuscripts begin to appear during the tenth century in Germany, and their two best representatives are *D* and *p*. The *d* manuscripts tend to copy the plays in the order *Andria*, *The Brothers*, *The Eunuch*, *Phormio*, *The Self-Tormentor*, *The Mother-in-Law*. Besides these two main groups, however, there are a great number of mixed manuscripts (designated *m*), which sometimes exhibit features and readings of *g* manuscripts, and sometimes of *d*. The processes of contamination and confusion increased throughout the medieval period; indeed, a number of readings characteristic of *d* manuscripts can already be found in both *F* and *O*.

¹⁰² For a summary and discussion of earlier scholarship, with a consensus dating of the model for the cycle to the fourth or fifth century CE, see Grant 1986, pp. 18–59. For an earlier date of the third century CE, see Dodwell 2000, pp. 1–21, although this is questioned by Marshall 2001. Whether the illustrated cycle should be associated with the history of the Calliopian recension is questioned by Cameron 2004, pp. 524–5.

5.2 *O* and the Other *g* and Illustrated Manuscripts

O is a member of the *g* family of manuscripts. The *g* tradition is the first complete textual tradition to emerge after *A*; its earliest complete representative *C* was probably copied around 820/30 CE. It provides a number of highly distinct textual readings, which sometimes transmit a more plausible text than *A*, while in sections where *A* lacks text (such as for most of *Andria*) its readings are indispensable.

This family is very closely associated with the Late Antique cycle of illustrations of Terence's plays, and nearly all of its earliest members (*C*, *P*, *F* and *Y*) have them; as well, a number of later members of this textual tradition that do not include this illustrative cycle, such as *K* or *v*, have wide spaces suitable for illustrations left at the start of each scene, as if they were prepared for illustration but the process was for some reason never completed (these spaces were usually filled at a later stage with scholia).

The number of major omissions of text in the original versions of some of the early *g* manuscripts suggests that *G*, the hyparchetype or ancestor of this group, had suffered the loss of a number of leaves or even gatherings; the missing text was later inserted in these early manuscripts from various other sources. Damage to this or an even earlier ancestor is also suggested by the fact that in *The Eunuch*, ll. 285–515 are written as if prose, not verse, in *P* and *O* (although ll. 495–515 are now lost because a folio was excised); in *F*, the extant text of which begins at *The Eunuch*, l. 416, ll. 416–515 are also written as if prose.¹⁰³

As already noted (Section 5.1), there are several instances where individual readings characteristic of the *d* tradition can be found in *O* (discussed in Section 5.3), but there are also two passages where a lengthy portion of text lost in *G* was supplied in *O* from another manuscript source, quite possibly a text related to the *d* tradition. The first of these corresponds to a passage in *C*, *P*, *Y* and *E*,¹⁰⁴ where *Andria*, ll. 804–53 was omitted. These lines comprise the conclusion of scene 4.5, all of 5.1, and the beginning of 5.2, and two illustrations from the beginning of 5.1 and 5.2 are also missing from all of the early illustrated manuscripts in this group. In *C*, *P* and *E* the missing text was supplied on inserted sheets, and the text in *C* is written in verse lines. In *Y* some text appears to have been erased at the bottom of f. 7r, and this area, together

¹⁰³ See Victor and Quesnel 1999, pp. 148–50.

¹⁰⁴ See Grant 1986 pp. 152–3, for the argument that this manuscript was closely related to *F*, and therefore provided further evidence for the original text of *G*.

with the space originally allocated for the illustration for scene 4.5 and the top margin of the verso, has been used for rewriting the three partially or fully missing scenes.

The original configuration of *P* also omitted the *aedicula* for *The Eunuch*, together with the verse argument by Sulpicius Apollinaris for this play and ll. 1–30, which form the first part of Terence's Prologue; the missing lines were eventually added in a second Carolingian hand on the inserted f. 30r–v of this manuscript, which also contains the text missing from *Andria*. The *aedicula*, verse Argument, and entire Prologue to *The Eunuch* (ll. 1–45) were omitted in *C*, and the Prologue was only added much later in a minuscule hand in the bottom margin of the final page of *Andria* on f. 18v. In *Y* the folio which would have contained the Prologue has fallen out,¹⁰⁵ but the initial thirty lines from *The Eunuch* are missing in *E*. In view of this evidence, it seems highly likely then that the *aedicula*, verse Argument, and the first part of the Prologue, possibly all of it, were all missing in the hyparchetype, *G*.

In *O*, however, the text from *Andria* is written in its correct place, and there are also illustrations for the two extra scenes. Because only *O* and two other illustrated manuscripts, *Tur* and *N*, contain any of these illustrations, and all of these manuscripts are relatively late in the tradition, it has been questioned whether these go back to the hyparchetype, or whether they are later medieval inventions; this issue of the authenticity of these illustrations is discussed in Section 7. With regard to the text that is included in *O*, an exhaustive study was undertaken by Grant 1986 to determine its affinities. His conclusion was that this portion of text in *O* showed very close affinities to a number of d manuscripts, including *p*.¹⁰⁶

Likewise, the whole of the Prologue to *The Eunuch* appears in the correct place in *O* on folios 35v–36r (although the *aedicula* and verse Argument are absent), while the text of *The Eunuch*, ll. 1–30 in *O* provides some distinct readings. At *The Eunuch*, l. 10, *O* originally read *in thesauro*, which Donatus tells us was the correct reading in early Latin; the spelling *thensauro* was a later variant. This reading is found in the corrupt form *in thensaro* in *A*, while in the original replacement text added by a second hand in *C* it appears to have been written as *in tesauros*; this reading is also found in the d manuscript *p*.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁵ In his reconstruction of the contents of *Y*, Webb 1911 (p. 59) concluded that at least the first thirty lines of *The Eunuch* would have been missing in this manuscript, but admitted that his reckoning was not accurate enough to determine whether the remaining fifteen lines of the Prologue were present, as in *P*, or not, as in *C*.

¹⁰⁶ Grant 1986, pp. 149–52.

¹⁰⁷ We are grateful to Professor Grant for information about readings in *p*.

Subsequently, it was corrected both in *O* and *C* to *a thesauris*, which is the reading found in most other medieval manuscripts.

At *The Eunuch*, l. 16, *O* reads *desinet* for *desinat*, found in other manuscripts, and *cesset* in *P*; however, *desinet* is also found in the additional text in *C*, as well as *v* and at least one *d* manuscript. At *The Eunuch*, l. 27, *O* reads *imprudētia* for *imprudētia*, found in other manuscripts, including *P*, but the *O* reading is also found in *C* and the *d* manuscript *p*. The jussive subjunctive form *desinat* certainly makes better sense in its context than the future *desinet* found in *O*, but the alternative genitive form *imprudētia* in l. 27 can be read as qualifying the noun *peccatum* (although equally the ablative *imprudētia* makes good sense in this context).

The presence of these highly characteristic readings in both passages, and in particular the correct reading *in thesauro*,¹⁰⁸ suggests that the text in *O* supplementing the lost passages in *G* was supplied from a manuscript which preserved good readings, and which had close affinities to the *d* tradition. At what stage these passages were introduced into *O*, however, and whether they were copied directly into *O* itself, or rather into an intermediate ancestor, needs to be considered in light of the question of the immediate ancestry of *O*, and particularly of whether *O* is a direct copy of *P*, which will be discussed in Section 5.3.

A few amendments by the scribe of *O*, or his source, to problematic readings associated with the *g* tradition, provide useful insights into both the nature of the text and scribal methodology. At *The Eunuch*, l. 331, *O* (f. 44v), *C* and *P* all seem to have originally written *delerare*, instead of the correct reading *deierare* ('to swear'). *C* and *P* amended this word to the correct reading, but the original scribe of *O* corrected it to *delirare* ('to be delirious'); *delerare* is in fact a rare alternative spelling of this word, but it does not make any sense in this context. At *The Eunuch*, l. 728, *C* and *P* originally gave the incorrect form *accumbabam*. In both manuscripts this word was amended to the correct reading *accubabam* ('I was lying alongside'), but in *O* (f. 54r) it appears as *accumbēbam*, the correct form of a related verb ('I was lying at the table') but one not attested in other manuscripts examined here. At *The Self-Tormentor*, l. 906, *C* and *P* originally read *operiere*, a rare and archaic alternative form for the

¹⁰⁸ Professor Grant has suggested in private correspondence that the reading *in thesauro* in *O* may in fact be a corruption of the reading *in thesauros* found in the additions to *C* and in *p*. As, however, the reading *in thesauros* is itself a corruption of the original *in Thesauro* cited by Donatus as the title of a Greek play adapted into Latin by Terence's rival playwright, this would suppose that the scribe of *O* or its exemplar hit accidentally on the correct reading, or else amended it in accordance with Donatus or an otherwise unattested gloss, which is simply unknown.

correct reading *operuere* ('they have opened'). However, the scribe of *O* (f. 91r) wrote *opperiere* ('you will wait'), suggesting strongly that he (or the scribe of his exemplar) tried to make sense out of the unfamiliar word in front of him, although *opperiere* equally does not make any sense in this context (it is immediately followed by the word for 'door'), and is not found in any other manuscript consulted. These amendments, although minor, not only provide additional evidence for the ultimate derivation of *O* from the *g* tradition, but also suggest strongly that the scribe felt capable on occasion of editorial engagement with the text (however inaccurate his amendments may have been).

5.3 Is *O* Derived Directly from *P*?

One question that continues to resurface in scholarship and has significant consequences for the discussion of the illustrations to *Andria*, 5.1 and 5.2 is whether *O* is a direct copy of *P*. This theory has had both strong proponents and dissenters; in particular, it was advanced by E.W.B. Nicholson, the Bodleian librarian from 1882 to 1912, who wrote a short note to that effect on f. i verso.¹⁰⁹

Nicholson's comments were questioned by Hoeing 1900.¹¹⁰ Hoeing adduced the extra illustrations in *O*, as well as the presence of the text of *Andria*, ll. 804–53 and *The Eunuch*, ll. 1–30 in the correct position, as evidence that it could not have been copied from *P*, and he provided a sample list of readings where *O* differs from *P* but agrees with other manuscripts in the *g* family,¹¹¹ although some of these are in fact incorrect.¹¹² He also provided a list of readings where *O* agrees with *P* against other witnesses,¹¹³ and looked at the

¹⁰⁹ The close similarities of *O* to *P* were also noted by T.W. Jackson of Worcester College, although Jackson disputed direct derivation (cited in Madan 1922, p. 298).

¹¹⁰ Hoeing 1900, pp. 320–31. Hoeing notes (p. 320) that this hypothesis "seems to have been founded simply on a comparison of the facsimile of a page of *P* (*And.* 424–434), as given in Bauchart, with the corresponding passage in the Dunelmensis"; however, the line numbers he cites do not correspond to pages in either *O* or *P*.

¹¹¹ Hoeing 1900, pp. 321–2.

¹¹² Thus on p. 321 Hoeing 1900 cites *P* as reading *apprehendit* against *prehendit* in *O* and other witnesses (*Andria*, l. 353); *caute* against *cauit* (*Andria*, l. 444); *quid est* against *quis est* (*Andria*, l. 686); *scio hic* against *scio* (*Andria*, l. 703); and on p. 322 *imperare* against *impertire* (*The Brothers*, l. 320). In fact, in each of these instances *P* agrees with *O*. The errors seem to derive from Umpfenbach's faulty report of manuscript readings; see Webb 1911, pp. 103–7, who cites three of these.

¹¹³ Hoeing 1900, p. 324.

question of verse divisions in the two manuscripts (see Section 4.3), noting the very strong similarities between them.¹¹⁴ Hoeing's theory was that *O* was clearly not a direct copy of *P*, but that the two manuscripts showed such strong similarities that "*O* was copied from a sister manuscript of *CP*, one that was itself copied before *CP*, and before the original had lost *And.* 804–853"; he denoted this missing manuscript as *Y*.¹¹⁵ Hoeing concluded his analysis with a comparison of the text of *Andria*, ll. 804–53 and *The Eunuch*, ll. 1–30 to that in *P*, *C* and the 1870 edition of F. Umpfenbach, and argued that for these passages *O* gave many good readings and was the best representative of its family.¹¹⁶

Webb 1911 accepted Hoeing's basic thesis, using the siglum [w] for the parent manuscript of *O*, but in contrast to Hoeing argued that the text of *Andria*, ll. 804–53 as well as the accompanying illustrations must have been missing in the hyparchetype of the g manuscripts, since they were missing in *CYP*.¹¹⁷ Webb argued instead that both text and illustrations in [w] (and so *O*) were supplied from an illustrated manuscript of the m (mixed) class, which also provided a number of other good readings in *O*.¹¹⁸

Jones and Morey 1931 disputed the conclusions of both Hoeing 1900 and Webb 1911 about the provenance of *O*. They proposed instead that *O* must have been a direct copy of *P*, but that the copyist had also used an illustrated manuscript of the m class, which explained certain similarities in the details of illustrations with later mixed manuscripts like *Tur*, as well as the variant readings noted by Hoeing.¹¹⁹ Their argument was based on three main points. First, they drew attention to numerous close convergences in the illustrations of the two manuscripts, and in particular where apparent errors in *P* were replicated in *O*.¹²⁰ Secondly, they observed that in *P* there are usually two sets of labels to each illustration—one in Rustic Capitals provided by the original rubricator, and another in a minuscule script that often contained variant

¹¹⁴ Particularly in the segment of prose text in *The Eunuch*, ll. 285–515 (discussed in Section 5.2); see Hoeing 1900, pp. 324–7.

¹¹⁵ Hoeing 1900, p. 328.

¹¹⁶ Hoeing 1900, pp. 329–31.

¹¹⁷ Webb 1911, p. 92.

¹¹⁸ Webb 1911, pp. 92–6.

¹¹⁹ Jones and Morey 1931 II. 81, 86.

¹²⁰ Jones and Morey 1931 II. 76–9.

spellings, and that these variant spellings were almost always repeated in *O*.¹²¹ For instance, on f. 7r of *P* the name *Simo* is spelled correctly in the label written in Rustic Capitals, but as *Symo* in minuscules at the foot of the figure; in the corresponding illustration in *O* on f. 8r it is also spelled *Symo*. Finally, they stressed the extremely close agreement of the two manuscripts in the line divisions.¹²²

In his comprehensive survey of Terence transmission, Grant 1986 rejected the arguments of Jones and Morey 1931, and defended the interpretation of Webb 1911. Grant 1986 gave a list of some forty-eight readings where *O* provided the correct reading or agreed with other *g* manuscripts against *P*,¹²³ and, noting the small number of places where *O* demonstrated contamination from another manuscript source, concluded that “the number of instances where *O* is correct against errors in *P* is quite astonishing if *O* was copied from *P*, as Jones and Morey claim. The textual evidence clearly vindicates the relationship established by Webb.”¹²⁴ Grant 1986 agreed with Jones and Morey 1931 about close similarities in many details in the images in the two manuscripts, especially the fleur-de-lys motif associated with Reims, where *P* was probably written (see, for instance, the flower which appears in Bacchis’ hand on f. 76v), but argued that such similarities would arise if the hyparchetype of the two manuscripts was written there.¹²⁵ As noted in Section 5.2, he analysed the text of *Andria*, ll. 804–53 in *O* for its affiliations, and concluded that it was derived from a *d* group manuscript,¹²⁶ although he expressed some uncertainty about the possibility that the illustrations to *Andria*, 5.1 and 5.2 were drawn from this second manuscript source, stating “There is nothing in the two illustrations which leads one to suspect their authenticity. But, conversely, it was not beyond the abilities of an artist to improvise with two miniatures of his own.”¹²⁷

An opposite opinion was suggested in the 1999 study of Victor and Quesnel 1999. Questioning the evidence provided for the relationship of

¹²¹ Jones and Morey 1931 II. 82–4, 90.

¹²² Jones and Morey 1931 II. 87.

¹²³ Grant 1986, p. 146.

¹²⁴ Grant 1986, p. 147.

¹²⁵ Grant 1986, pp. 147–8.

¹²⁶ Grant 1986, pp. 149–51.

¹²⁷ Grant 1986, p. 151.

manuscripts by individual variant readings (which in such a well-known author as Terence were open to question, since copyists could be strongly influenced by their own memories when confronted with variants), they looked instead at evidence offered by colometry, that is, by the poetic line divisions in the manuscripts. In the case of Terence, these poetic line divisions have the potential to provide particularly strong evidence for one manuscript being copied from another, since the poetic metres Terence used were not widely understood in the Middle Ages, and a mistake, once made, would be perpetuated in a manuscript's descendants.¹²⁸ Victor and Quesnel 1999 noted the almost precise correlation of line divisions in *P* and *O*, even in the extensive passage in *The Eunuch*, ll. 285–515 which is written as prose in both manuscripts. They stated that the evidence for direct derivation of the illustrations, as argued by Jones and Morey 1931, was strong, and while acknowledging the textual studies of Hoening 1900, Webb 1911 and Grant 1986, concluded that “Colometric evidence is everywhere compatible with the derivation of *O* from *P*”.¹²⁹

Finally, the recent study of Wright 2006 follows Jones and Morey 1931 in stating that *O* was a direct copy of *P*. Wright 2006 regarded both the close similarities in the errors and details of the illustrations and the line divisions of the prose section at *The Eunuch*, ll. 285–515 as conclusive evidence that one manuscript was directly copied from the other, and ascribed the many textual variations in *O* to “considerable editorial work”.¹³⁰ He dismissed the evidence supplied by Grant 1986 on the grounds that he “fails to understand the normal dependence of an early medieval illustrator on his model”, substantiating this claim solely with reference to the reproduced illustrations in Jones and Morey 1931.¹³¹

As a preliminary observation, it should be noted that even if it could be firmly established that *O* was a direct copy of *P*, another manuscript *must* have been involved at the outset to provide the text of the prose Introductions to each play and of the scholia. The scholia in *P* are a mixture of remarks from Donatus and another, unknown source; they are not distributed evenly, since the opening of the Donatus commentary is written densely in the margins of ff. 3–9 (compare, for instance, f. 6r), while the other commentary only appears sporadically, often in the form of interlinear glosses or else scene summaries

¹²⁸ Victor and Quesnel 1999, p. 141.

¹²⁹ Victor and Quesnel 1999, p. 145, n.13.

¹³⁰ Wright 2006, p. 196.

¹³¹ Wright 2006, p. 196, n. 7.

(compare f. 160r). This extra material in *P* was never used by the scribe of *O*;¹³² rather, he (or the scribe of his exemplar) used the Carolingian commentary tradition known as the *Commentum Brunianum* (see Section 6.2).

Besides a manuscript containing scholia, it is likely that a second manuscript containing *d* readings would have been used by the scribe of *O* to supply the text of *Andria*, ll. 804–53 and *The Eunuch*, ll. 1–30, missing from the hyparchetype *G* (see Section 5.2)—unless of course the manuscript containing the scholia and the *d* text were one and the same. In any event, the question would then arise of why the scribe of *O* chose not to use the equivalent passages in *P* as his source for these lines, since these had been written out carefully on an inserted sheet (ff. 29–30), probably in the late ninth or tenth century,¹³³ and appropriate reference marks to them were made in the margins. If, as argued by Jones and Morey 1931, the illustrations for *Andria*, 5.1 and 5.2 in *O* were based on those in an illustrated manuscript of the *m* class, it is at least possible that the scribe preferred to use the text from this second manuscript as well.¹³⁴ If, however, the artist invented the pictures himself (to compensate for their absence in *P*), there would be no reason why he would turn to another manuscript to supply his missing text when it was already there in front of him.

The textual evidence provided by Grant 1986 of some forty-eight instances where *O* is correct or agrees with the *g* tradition against *P* is compelling, and we have noted a small number of additional readings where *O* agrees with at least one other *g* manuscript against *P*.¹³⁵ Grant's argument

¹³² The only possible exception to this is a very small number of interlinear glosses on ff. 5r and 46r which possibly could derive from *P*, although they may just as well have been taken directly from Donatus or another source. In any case, the vast majority of such glosses in *O* are most closely related to a series of glosses in *v*; see Section 6.4.

¹³³ Munk Olsen 1982, II. 626. The inserted ff. 29–30 were also glossed extensively by the same hand that provided the second series of glosses in *P*; judging by the high level of abbreviation, we date these glosses to the eleventh or twelfth century.

¹³⁴ The manuscript *Tur* was cited by Jones and Morey 1931 (II. 81) as a typical member of this family; however, it provides quite distinct textual readings from *O* in the supplementary passages. Of the seven variants in *Andria*, ll. 804–53 characteristic of *O* which are discussed by Grant 1986 (p. 150), only one (omission of *esse* in l. 809) occurs in *Tur*; moreover, *Tur* has only one of the three variants in *O* from *The Eunuch*, ll. 1–30 which were discussed in Section 5.2, reading *desinet* for *desinat* in l. 16. Finally, *Tur* is written in prose, not poetic lines.

¹³⁵ See Grant 1986, p. 146. We have noted eight additional instances of *O* readings which are correct against *P*, or agree with at least one other *g* manuscript against *P*, although in several cases they might also be taken as evidence for contamination from a *d* manuscript. The relevant readings are as follows:

receives further support from a study of the corrections in the two manuscripts. In cases where *O* has the same original error as *P*, and *P* was subsequently corrected to the right reading, then to argue that *O* was a direct copy of *P* requires either that the scribe of *O* deliberately ignored the correction before him in his exemplar, or that the correction in *P* was made after the copying of *O*. This is also true of where both *O* and *P* have the same original error, and they are both emended to the correct reading. Relevant readings are listed as Appendix 1, and although some of the corrections in *P* cannot be dated, it is nevertheless likely, given their number and distribution, that many of them were made well prior to the copying of *O*. The scribe of *O* therefore either deliberately ignored these corrections, or else his manuscript was not copied from *P* after all, but rather from a closely related witness which transmitted the same errors.

The close study of the stages of the composition of *O* in this edition has also revealed a number of mistaken assumptions by Jones and Morey 1931 about the scene labels in this manuscript and *P*. Jones and Morey 1931 argued that the spelling *SYMO* which is found in the rubrics of *O* prior to f. 28r (instead of the correct *SIMO*) showed that these rubrics were copied directly from the minuscule labels in *P*, and that the spelling of other labels, such as *BACHIS* on f. 85v, *TRASO* on f. 45v, *PHEDRIA* throughout *The Eunuch*, and *ESCHINUS*

The Self-Tormentor, l. 851a. *O* (f. 89v) reads: *sic res abest, quanta de spe decidi*. This line was added by correctors in each of *CPYF*. *YF* read *sic res acta est, quanta de spe decidi*, closely approximating the reading in *O*, but *CP* read: *res acta est, quanta de spe cecidi*.

The Mother-in-Law, l. 161. *O* (f. 132v) reads: *sese*, agreeing with *CYF*; *P* reads: *se*, agreeing with *A*.

The Mother-in-Law, l. 406. *O* (f. 139r) reads: *es perpetuo*, agreeing with *Y* corr. and some d manuscripts; *A* corr. and *F* read: *perpetuo es*; *CP* read: *est perpetuo*.

The Mother-in-Law, l. 785. *O* (f. 149r) reads: *exple*, agreeing with *F* and some d manuscripts; *P* reads: *explete*, agreeing with *ACY*.

Phormio, l. 143. *O* (f. 156v) reads: *addet*, agreeing with *Fv*; *P* reads: *addit*, agreeing with *ACY*.

Phormio, l. 189. *O* (f. 158r) reads: *ego*, agreeing with *ACYF*; *P* reads: *ergo*.

Phormio, l. 195. *O* (f. 158r) reads: *reuo cem*, agreeing with the original reading in *F*, subsequently corrected to *reuo cemus*. *C* reads: *reuo cem(ur)*, it seems, though the final abbreviation may have been added later. *PY* read: *reuo cemus*.

Phormio, l. 850. *O* (f. 174v) reads: *uapulabis*, agreeing with *A* corr., *Y* corr., both modified from *uapula*; the reading *uapulabis* is also found in *v* and some d manuscripts. *CP* originally read: *uapula*; but both emended this to *uapulabo*.

on f. 114v, showed a very close dependence on these minuscule labels.¹³⁶ In many of these cases, however, close examination of the lead-point cues shows that the final spelling used by the rubricator does not correspond to that of the main manuscript used to design the illustrations. On f. 20v the cue for *SYMO* is mostly erased, but enough is visible to suggest that the original spelling was *SIMO*. On f. 45v the cue very clearly reads *THRASO*, instead of *TRASO*. On f. 37v the cue appears to read *PHAEDRIA*, while on f. 114v the initial letter of the prompt *ESCHINUS* has traces of a loop opening to the left, forming an e-caudata, commonly used to spell the digraph *AE*. Jones and Morey 1931 also failed to mention that the e-caudata is used to spell the name *PHAEDRIA* twice in the rubrics, once on f. 36v and again on f. 64v. The coincidences of some final rubrics in *O* with minuscule labels in *P* do not therefore demonstrate that one manuscript was copied directly from the other, since they do not occur in the preliminary stages of manuscript preparation. The spelling variants may in any case have quite another source; many of them can be found, for instance, in the scholia in *O*, which were copied before the final rubrics were drawn.¹³⁷

The strongest evidence to suggest that *O* was copied from *P* comes from the near-exact correspondences of line divisions in the two manuscripts, although it does not by any means obviate the possibility that *O* may have been copied from another manuscript produced from the same exemplar and at the same monastery (Reims) as *P*. The scribe of *O* clearly took great pains with the appearance of his manuscript, and even if we assume that he was ignorant of the precise rules governing the complex poetic metres used by Terence (see Section 4.4), he must have been conscious of the existence of these various types and their importance to a proper presentation of the text, since he copied (most probably as an appendix to this manuscript) Priscian's *De metris fabularum Terentii et aliorum comicorum*, in which Priscian criticizes the inability of manuscript copyists to understand metres and to set them out on the page with the correct poetic line divisions.¹³⁸ It seems very likely, then, that he would have followed the line endings of his exemplar exactly, even in the replacement prose passage at *The Eunuch*, ll. 285–515, where the original verse

¹³⁶ Jones and Morey 1931, II. 83, 90.

¹³⁷ In the scholia the spelling *Traso* occurs twelve times, and *Thraso* once; *Phedria* appears fourteen times (it is never spelled 'Phaedria' here); while *Bachis* occurs eleven times, and *Bacchis* once.

¹³⁸ Passalacqua 1987, 28.25–7; the end of Priscian's work does not survive in *O*, but there is no reason to suppose that the copyist only copied the single folio which survives by chance as f. 119.

divisions had been lost; if his exemplar was therefore not *P* (as is argued here), it must have been a manuscript which had almost the same line divisions.¹³⁹

But additional evidence that in fact suggests that *O* was not copied from *P* comes from examination of false word divisions in these witnesses and others in the *g* family. The earliest Latin literary manuscripts which survive were written in a style known as *scriptio continua* ('continuous writing'), in which no spaces were left between words; this is the style which was used for the earliest extant manuscript of Terence, *A*. Characteristically, subsequent scribes introduced spaces between the words, but sometimes put them in the wrong places, misled by possible alternative readings, or their unfamiliarity with names and archaic forms; these errors were then perpetuated in copies, although sometimes picked up and corrected by copyists.

A striking instance of this can be found in *O* at *The Self-Tormentor*, l. 595 on f. 82r. The reading of the first part of this line in all editions is *Quid tu ecquid*, but *O* spaces it as *Quid tu ec quid*. The syllable *ec* is meaningless in Latin, but the same spacing is found in the *g* manuscripts *C* (f. 43r) and *F* (f. 40v)—both of these witnesses were later glossed with *ecce* ('behold') above *ec*, showing that their correctors understood *ec* as a distinct word, and sought to explain it. In *Y* (f. 20r), which is written with minimal word division, the scribe originally wrote *Quid tu haec quid*, then erased the *ha*; taken together with the readings in the other manuscripts, this strongly suggests that *ec* was the original *g* reading, amended to *haec* in the original text of *Y*.¹⁴⁰ However, *P* (f. 82r) writes *ecquid* without any division between the syllables. If *O* were copied directly from *P*, it would need to be explained how the scribe of *O* hit independently on the meaningless variant found in the other *g* manuscripts.

In some places both *O* and *P* share the same false word division against other witnesses. Thus at *The Self-Tormentor*, l. 962 on f. 92r, *O* reads *sua uia* for *suauia*, and the same spacing occurs in *P* (f. 92r) but not in any other witnesses; likewise, at *The Brothers*, l. 283 on f. 104v, *O* originally read *absoluito te* for *absoluitote*, which is also the reading in *P* (f. 104r). In other instances, however, *O* agrees with them against *P*. At *The Eunuch*, l. 235 on f.

¹³⁹ There is one idiosyncratic difference in the layout of *P* from other Terence manuscripts which *O* does not follow. On f. 3v of *P* the scribe left a gap of approximately six lines in the middle of the Prologue to *Andria*, and when the text resumed marked the first word of l. 14 (*Fatetur*) with a large initial capital, as if it were a new section, although in fact this division breaks a sentence in half. The scribe of *O* may of course have recognized that a new section was not required here, although this does at least show that he did not blindly follow the layout of *P*.

¹⁴⁰ The same correction from *haec* also occurs in the fragmentary *g* manuscript I; see Kauer 1905, p. 117.

42r, *O* originally read *abligurri erat* (another meaningless reading) for *abligurrierat*, and shares this reading with *C* (f. 21v); at *The Eunuch*, l. 1023 on f. 63r, *O* reads *ab eo* for *abeo*, as does *C* (f. 33v); at *The Mother-in-law*, l. 562 on f. 143r, *O* reads *in iussu* for *iniussu*, another reading shared with *C* (f. 72v); and at *Phormio*, l. 614 on f. 168r, *O* originally read *circum iri* for *circumiri*, as do *C* (f. 85v) and *F* (f. 119r).

In summary, there are a number of cogent reasons to show that *O* is not a direct copy of *P*, but rather is descended directly from a manuscript that was produced in the same scriptorium as *P*, as argued by Webb 1911 and Grant 1986. The arguments of Jones and Morey 1931 about the direct relationship of the scene labels are wrong, while the new evidence discussed here for the relationship of *O*, *P* and the other g manuscripts provided by false word divisions is consistent with that provided by textual readings; namely, that *O* and *P* are closely related, but that *O* independently preserves earlier g readings not found in *P*, suggesting strongly that it was not copied directly from this manuscript. If it were, then there must have been a great deal of editorial intervention by the scribe, and for the sake of preserving nonsensical readings such as *ec* and *abligurri erat*.

5.4 *O* and the Printed Tradition of Terence

Given that Terence's plays were copied and studied continually in manuscript form as part of the medieval Latin curriculum, it comes as little surprise that they were also one of the first secular works to be published in the age of printing. The first edition appeared at Strasburg in 1470,¹⁴¹ and in subsequent years there was an explosion of new editions from Germany, France and Italy. The new technologies not only allowed mass production of the text, but also of illustrations. An illustrated German translation of *The Eunuch* appeared in Ulm in 1486, while complete editions of the Latin text with illustrations were published in Lyon in 1493 and Strasburg in 1496.¹⁴² These earliest editions were naturally dependent on the local manuscripts immediately available to their editors, which did not necessarily ensure a good standard of text; most of them are written in prose, and it was not until 1505 that an edition set out in Terence's metres appeared in Florence which made use of earlier studies of the

¹⁴¹ See Reeve 1983b, p. 420; Füssel 2004, p. 55.

¹⁴² For discussion of the origins of the Ulm, Lyon and Strassburg editions, including the relationship of the pictures to contemporary theatrical practice, see Herrmann 1956, II. 23–55; see also Füssel 2004, p. 55.

Codex Bembinus, or *A*.¹⁴³ A critical edition edited by Gabriel Faerno (d. 1561),¹⁴⁴ which was based partly on *A* and other early manuscripts available in Rome, was published in Florence in 1565.

O had remained in private ownership in England until 1704, when it was given to the Bodleian Library (see Section 1.1). However, just prior to this date the last owner, Frevile Lambton, had made the manuscript available to John Leng (1665–1727),¹⁴⁵ who edited an edition of Terence published in Cambridge in 1701. As Lambton had come from County Durham, Leng called the manuscript Codex Dunelmensis (*Dunelmensis* being the Latin adjective for Durham); he gave a lengthy description of it in his edition, describing it as ‘by far the most beautiful’ (*longe pulcherrimum*) of the manuscripts he had examined, and stated that it faithfully transmitted the original verse divisions, and that the illustrations at the start of each scene depicted not only the speaking characters, but also those with mute roles, ‘in the ancient manner’ (*antiquo more*).¹⁴⁶

In 1726 the great English classical scholar Richard Bentley (1662–1742)¹⁴⁷ published a critical edition of Terence which has long been recognized as the finest early edition of his plays.¹⁴⁸ Bentley based his text partly on Faerno’s, praising his use of the most ancient witnesses, but also consulted other manuscripts available to him in England, ‘which easily preserve the glory and dignity of age closest to those of Faerno’ (*qui a Faernianis proximam Vetustatis gloriam & dignitatem facile tutantur*).¹⁴⁹ Bentley seldom cited the manuscripts he used other than with phrases such as *veteres nostri* (‘our old ones’), but, as Warren 1882 explained, Bentley’s notes show conclusively that one of these manuscripts was *O*; indeed, Bentley thought it was the oldest manuscript he consulted, and dated it to 900 CE.¹⁵⁰

¹⁴³ Reeve 1983b, p. 420.

¹⁴⁴ See Sandys 1903, II. 147.

¹⁴⁵ See *ODNB*, XXXIII. 344.

¹⁴⁶ Cited in Hoening 1900, p. 310.

¹⁴⁷ See *ODNB*, V. 291–8; Sandys 1903, II. 401–10.

¹⁴⁸ See the comments of Reeve 1983b, p. 420.

¹⁴⁹ Bentley 1726, Preface.

¹⁵⁰ Warren 1882, pp. 68–70.

6.0 The Scholia and Gloss Traditions

Scholia are notes on a text, providing explanations of words or passages or relevant additional information, and they can range in length from ‘continuous commentary to one-word jottings’.¹⁵¹ Some modern scholars reserve this term strictly for such notes when they are written in the margins of manuscripts;¹⁵² examples of such marginal scholia may be seen in the related manuscripts *C* (e.g. f. 10v) and *P* (e.g. f. 6r). In *O*, most of the commentary text is written below the illustrations in a smaller hand by the main scribe (e.g. f. 16r), a common practice in contemporary manuscripts incorporating passages of scholia into the main text. The term scholia is therefore used here to describe such commentary notes in *O*.

Glosses are notes on particular words, usually written above the line (an ‘interlinear gloss’), providing synonyms, translations, or more detailed explanations of meaning. In *O*, they are written in much smaller scripts in *Andria*, *The Eunuch* and *The Self-Tormentor*; on f. 5r the glossator also wrote such a note in the margin (a ‘marginal gloss’).

The study of scholia in a manuscript such as *O* has its own particular issues and problems. The scribes of a classical literary work, such as the plays of Terence, set out to produce as accurate a copy as possible of their exemplars (the manuscripts from which they were copied); the only conscious exceptions to this were modernizations of spelling (e.g. *cur* for *quor*) and normalization of grammar (e.g. *conueniendus Phormio est* for *conueniendust Phormio*), or else when a scribe critically intervened in order to restore what he thought were correct readings. The nature of scholia, however, was to provide an explanation of an obscure word or difficult phrase or passage for the contemporary reader. They were therefore potentially subject to linguistic change, and could be governed by assumptions made by the scribe (or, more usually, scribes) about the education and literacy of readers. Scholia were not immutable text, in the way that Terence’s plays were; the scribes had some leeway to abbreviate, to omit, or to add as they wished, and they sometimes collated information from different sources.

Scholia were also potentially constrained by the physical layout of manuscripts, and the length to which a scribe wrote about a particular issue might very well be determined purely by the space available to him. Manuscript *P*, which like *O*, has the text of Terence set out in poetic lines with generous

¹⁵¹ *OCD*, p. 1368.

¹⁵² Dickey 2007, p. 11.

areas of blank space around it, offered wide scope to potential scholiasts, and folios 3–9 of the work are heavily annotated with excerpts from Donatus' commentary on Terence. Such generous use of blank space is often found in illustrated deluxe manuscripts where cost was not an issue. These scholia are found in addition to another series of scholia which occur throughout the manuscript (see for instance f. 7r, where they are written at the foot of the illustration). However, many other manuscripts of this period (including *Y*) were written as if prose with relatively narrow margins, and so the amount of commentary material which could be included was more limited, while the writing was often much smaller and highly abbreviated.

Despite these two potential influences, scholia can also show a surprising level of homogeneity between manuscripts from quite different periods. This was no doubt due to innate conservatism in scribal practice, as well as an ingrained respect for the authority of earlier scholarship, and a simple lack of other materials. The very strong similarities which the scholia found in *O* show to those of other manuscripts indicate that the scribe copied them with the same care and accuracy as that with which he copied the main body of text (indeed, the first lines of the scholia usually begin with a small coloured initial, which suggests that they received careful treatment). Even the interlinear glosses in *Andria*, *The Eunuch* and *The Self-Tormentor* show many similarities to those of much older manuscripts from mainland Europe, indicating that they were contained in some exemplar used by the glossator.

6.1 Scholarship on Terence: Origin and Traditions

The development of the ancient literary commentary is closely associated with the foundation of the library in Alexandria in the third century BCE; the form was primarily concerned with providing the correct interpretation of Greek authors such as Homer and Demosthenes. Scholars from Alexandria eventually made their way to Rome,¹⁵³ where they provided a model for the subsequent development of commentary traditions on Latin authors, including Terence. Key concerns of this type of criticism were consolidation and standardization of texts, and the explication of obscure words and forms.

One of the earliest scholars we know of working on the text of Terence was Valerius Probus of Beirut, who seems to have taught in the Flavian period (69–96 CE), and perhaps survived to the reign of Trajan.¹⁵⁴ According to

¹⁵³ Dickey 2007, pp. 3–7.

¹⁵⁴ *OCD*, pp. 1580–1, Kaster 1995, pp. 242–69.

Suetonius, Probus left behind few published works, but a substantial body of observations on ancient forms and usage, and some of his comments on Terence may possibly have found their way into later critical editions or commentaries—a number of observations were later attributed to him by Donatus.¹⁵⁵

Terence's plays became established as a set text in the school curriculum during the imperial period,¹⁵⁶ and accordingly a need soon arose to explain the many archaic Latin forms in his works. This need is reflected in the glosses which are found in the earliest manuscripts of Terence; thus in a papyrus fragment which was found in the Greek-speaking area of Oxyrhynchus in Egypt the Latin word *causa*, which appears in *Andria*, l. 643, is glossed with the Greek equivalent *provfasi~* (P. Oxy. 2401, f. 1 recto). In *A*, which is the earliest extant manuscript of Terence containing the bulk of the plays, there are numerous scholia and glosses, often just one or two words providing synonyms, which appear to have been copied in the sixth century CE.¹⁵⁷ These commentary notes may repeat information which dates back to much earlier stages of scholarship, although whether they are representative of a particular family of scholia, or were just compiled by later scholars working on this one manuscript, is a matter of dispute.¹⁵⁸ In any case, *A* appears to have had no subsequent effect on the medieval transmission of Terence; nearly all later medieval manuscripts belonged to the g, d or mixed families of manuscripts (m), and several independent scholarly traditions became associated with them. These traditions developed in direct response to the major role Terence's work played in the late antique and medieval teaching curriculum.

The influential fourth-century grammarian Aelius Donatus¹⁵⁹ wrote a commentary on Terence, which survives only in the form of scholia excerpted from it. Donatus' comments contain much useful information on Roman social history and accurate definitions of words and phrases, as well as such items as the *didascalía* to *Andria*, lost in all manuscripts of the plays. As noted earlier, extensive extracts from this commentary are found on folios 3–9 of *P*, the manuscript most closely related to *O*; these scholia appear to have been copied

¹⁵⁵ These include repunctuation of the text (comments on *Andria*, l. 720), reassignment of character parts (*The Brothers*, l. 323), and discussions of forms (*Andria*, l. 875, *Phormio*, l. 372).

¹⁵⁶ *OCD*, p. 510.

¹⁵⁷ Mountford 1934, pp. 3–4.

¹⁵⁸ See Mountford 1934, pp. 116–26, and *contra*, Zetzel 1975, pp. 339–47.

¹⁵⁹ *OCD*, pp. 494–5.

in the late tenth or early eleventh century.¹⁶⁰ Two comments from Donatus were also incorporated in *O* as glosses to *Andria* (see Section 6.4).

Two works of later scholarship are of particular relevance to *O*: the discussion of metre in Terence by Priscian, and the *Commentum Brunsonianum*. The sixth-century grammarian Priscian is better known for his comprehensive grammar of the Latin language, but as already noted in Section 4.4, he also wrote a shorter discussion of the various types of metre in Terence (*De metris fabularum Terentii et aliorum comicorum*), complaining in his preface that many contemporaries were so ignorant of the basic rules and types of iambic metre that they either denied that Terence's plays were written in metre, or imagined these metres to be utterly obscure.¹⁶¹ Copies of this text circulated mostly in conjunction with the major grammatical work, but a few were also bound with manuscripts of Terence, including *D*.¹⁶² A single folio containing part of this text written in the hand of the main scribe of *O* is found at f. 119r–v. Although it is at present bound out of place part way through *The Brothers*, it has been suggested that it was originally the last leaf of the manuscript.¹⁶³ It may therefore have formed an appendix to the manuscript in its original layout, and been intended to provide a scholarly discussion of metre for readers of this book.

The main body of scholia in *O* derives from the family of scholia known as the *Commentum Brunsonianum*, which is known from a large number of manuscripts. Yves-François Riou, who edited the introductory section to *Andria* (the *Accessus ad Andriam*), mentions seventy-seven manuscripts from the tenth to fifteenth centuries which transmit the *Commentum Brunsonianum* in part or in whole.¹⁶⁴ These scholia have only been published in their entirety once, by Paul Bruns in 1811, and for a long time Bruns' edition escaped the notice of Terence scholars.¹⁶⁵ In contrast to Donatus, this commentary is mostly concerned with giving synopses of the action of the plays, and where it does offer explanations of words or historical characters, often these explanations are very incorrect,

¹⁶⁰ Munk Olsen 1982, II. 627; Reeve 1983a, p. 154.

¹⁶¹ “[M]iror quosdam uel abnegare esse in Terentii comoediis metra uel ea quasi arcana . . . confirmare”, Passalacqua 1987, 19.10–12.

¹⁶² See the list of manuscripts at Passalacqua 1987, pp. xxvii–xxix.

¹⁶³ Thomson 1982, p. 102.

¹⁶⁴ Riou 1997, p. 36.

¹⁶⁵ Riou 1973, p. 80; Jakobi 2007, p. 37.

and reveal much more about the standards of learning at this stage than they do about the plays themselves.

6.2 Manuscript Tradition of the *Commentum Brunsonianum* and *O*

The *Commentum Brunsonianum* is known from a large number of medieval manuscripts, but has only been published once. The eleventh-century manuscript which its editor Bruns used is in fact a relatively poor representative of the tradition,¹⁶⁶ and it is also somewhat later than other manuscripts which contain the commentary. The *Commentum Brunsonianum* first appears in manuscripts of the early-tenth century CE, and it seems to have been compiled prior to 850 CE, since the summary to *The Eunuch* was used by Sedulius Scottus in his commentary on Donatus' *Ars maior*.¹⁶⁷ The compiler may have been a schoolmaster, working in a monastic school, and the work appears to have been intended as an aid to pupils reading Terence as a book, not as plays.¹⁶⁸

Some scholia similar to those in the *Commentum Brunsonianum*, especially on *Andria*, were written in the margins of *C*, in the tenth century or later.¹⁶⁹ Three other manuscripts can be identified as important for understanding the early history of the *Commentum Brunsonianum*, and the particular way in which the scholia are presented in *O*.

The earliest witness *K* is a manuscript of the tenth century, and it contains the *Commentum Brunsonianum* as well as another commentary on Terence by Eugraphius.¹⁷⁰ The notes from the *Commentum Brunsonianum* are grouped together at the start of each play (compare, for instance, the opening page of *The Eunuch* on f. 20v), and typically have three elements: a character tag written in capitals, describing the speaker; a lemma, citing the first few words which begin the passage; and the note itself. The opening folio of this

¹⁶⁶ Halle, Marienkirche, MS 65: it lacks several folios, the scholia for *The Brothers* differ markedly from those in other manuscripts, including *O*, and it lacks a prose preface to *Phormio*.

¹⁶⁷ Jakobi 2007, p. 37.

¹⁶⁸ Jakobi 2007, pp. 38–9.

¹⁶⁹ Riou 1975, pp. 184–5; Schlee 1893, p. 38, dated these scholia to the twelfth century.

¹⁷⁰ Munk Olsen 1982, II. 634–5; Riou 1973, pp. 81–2.

manuscript has been lost. It would have contained several notes referring to the earlier part of *Andria*, and probably a *Vita* of Terence.¹⁷¹

E is a manuscript from the beginning of the eleventh century.¹⁷² The notes from the *Commentum Brunsonianum* on all six plays are grouped together as one long prose text at the start of the manuscript, beginning with the note to the opening lines of *Andria*. The notes contain the same three elements as those in *K*: a character tag in capitals; a lemma and, the note itself. The introductions to the five remaining plays are incorporated within this long prose text; however, the *Accessus ad Andriam*, which incorporates the *Vita* of Terence as well as the Introduction to *Andria*, is found a little later in the manuscript, just before the text of the play itself begins.

Mu is a fragmentary manuscript from the beginning of the eleventh century. It consists of two bifolia, which contain the conclusion of the *Accessus ad Andriam*, notes to *Andria*, and the beginning of the Introduction to *The Eunuch*. As in *K* and *E*, each note is preceded by a character tag and lemma.

In all three of these manuscripts, as well as *O*, there is a peculiarity with regard to the final sentence of the *Accessus ad Andriam*, which explains that the date and circumstances of the first performance of *Andria* are unknown. In *K*, it is found detached from the *Accessus ad Andriam* on f. 2r at the conclusion to the notes to *Andria*, and after the word *FINIT*; the play itself then follows after some other introductory materials. In *E*, where the notes on the six plays are grouped together, the sentence immediately follows the conclusion of the notes to *Andria*. It is written at the beginning of the Introduction to *The Eunuch* on f. 4v, and is preceded by a large initial 'Q' as if it is the first sentence dealing with *The Eunuch*, and does not refer to *Andria*. Likewise, in *Mu* the sentence follows the phrase *TERENTII AFRI ANDRIA FINIT* and at the start of the materials dealing with *The Eunuch*.¹⁷³ This explains how the phrase found its way to the beginning of the new section which begins the Introduction to *The Eunuch* on f. 33v of *O*; the scholia in *O*, or its lost exemplar, must have been copied from a manuscript similar to *E* or *Mu* where the notes were written together as one continuous prose text.

Another sign that the scholia in *O* derive ultimately from a commentary written as continuous prose text is the occasional retention of character tags. *O*

¹⁷¹ Riou 1973, p. 82, conjectured that this *Vita* may have been an abbreviated version of the *Accessus ad Andriam* found in *O*.

¹⁷² Munk Olsen 1982, II. 607; Riou 1973, p. 87; Riou 1978, pp. 51–3.

¹⁷³ Riou 1976, p. 323.

sometimes combines notes on different words in the same block of text beneath an illustration, and the new note is announced by a lemma. However, character tags occur twice in the scholia. On f. 59v the scribe retains the character tag *Chremes* at the end of a note, and mistakenly punctuates after it, making it part of the previous sentence. On f. 63v he retains the name *Traso* before the relevant lemma (compare the same note on f. 20v of *K*, where the character tag *TRASSO* is clearly visible in the third line of the text). Given the mistaken punctuation after *Chremes*, and the way in which no other character tags appear in the scholia, it seems likely that the scribe of *O* or its exemplar used a text which had character tags, that he attempted to remove them all, but that he missed these two instances.

O presents only a partial selection of the scholia; excluding comments on the Introduction and the Prologue of *The Eunuch*, in *K* and *E* there are thirty-two separate scholia to this play, but only fourteen in *O*. It is noticeable that the scholia in *O*, whatever their content, usually refer only to the opening words of a scene beneath an illustration, or to words at most two lines from the beginning. There are two exceptions—a note on *Andria*, l. 638 on f. 22v, which is the last line of a passage in shorter lyric metres which begins this scene, and a note on *The Self-Tormentor*, l. 867 on folios 89rv; however, this note follows immediately on a corrupt note, where the lemma to *The Self-Tormentor*, l. 842, is cited without any comment. It seems likely then either that the scribe of *O* only made provision in his ruling for scholia which were found next to illustrations in his exemplar (as they are written on f. 10v of *C*), ignoring any others which may have been in the margins, or that he chose only to incorporate from a prose commentary only those notes which he judged referred to the illustration.

Another noticeable facet of *O* is that while there are frequent notes in the earlier plays, there is only one note apiece (apart from the introductory sections) in *The Mother-in-Law* and *Phormio*. However, this phenomenon also occurs in the other manuscripts; *E* has only one note to *Phormio* (though not the same note as in *O*), while *K* has just six.

The scholia in *O* generally provide inferior readings to those in *E* and *K*,¹⁷⁴ but occasionally better readings occur.¹⁷⁵ Moreover, *O* shares a number of

¹⁷⁴ Typical confusions are *pariendo* ('by giving birth') for *parendo* ('by obeying') in the explanation of the meaning of *parasitus* in the scholium to *The Eunuch*, l. 232 on f. 41v, and *ipsam* ('herself') for *ipsum* ('himself') in scholium to *The Eunuch*, l. 668 on f. 52v, where the reference is clearly to the man Chaerea and not to the maid-servant Pythias, who is mentioned in the same line.

readings with the text of Sedulius in the Introduction to *The Eunuch* against those in *E* and *K*, suggesting that some readings derive from a very early stage in the transmission of the work. Relevant divergences in *O* from *EK* and agreements with Sedulius are listed in Appendix 2.

Some clues to the text of Terence which the compiler used are provided by discrepancies between the text of the plays and the scholia. The lemma to the scholium to *Andria*, l. 607 on f. 21v, reads *Vbi ille est Dauus*, whereas the main text of *O* agrees with the manuscript tradition by reading *Vbi illic est scelus*. However, both *C* and *v* gloss *illic* with *Dauus*, suggesting that the compiler may have incorporated such a gloss into his text. The *didascalía* to *The Eunuch* on f. 35r omit the name of one of the magistrates (*curule aediles*) for that year (L. Cornelius Merula), and this name is also omitted in *P*, but the corresponding scholia on f. 33v of *O* name him. A revealing error occurs in the scholia to the *didascalía* to *The Mother-in-Law*. The reading *LVDIS MEGALENSIBVS* in *O* on f. 127r is cited as *ludis Romanis* in the scholia on f. 126v. This difference corresponds to uncertainty in the manuscript tradition; both *P* and the original hand in *C* wrote *LVDIS MEGALENSIBVS*, but a corrector in *C* changed this to read *LVDIS ROMANIS*, corresponding to the readings of other manuscripts, such as *F*. The scribe of *O* apparently did not notice the discrepancy between the text of the *didascalía* and his scholium, even though these are set out on facing pages.

The manuscript used by the compiler may also have contained illustrations, or at least more extensive lists of characters in each scene than actually speak. The scholium to *Andria*, l. 28 on f. 4v, provides what appears to be a comment on the illustration, rather than the text of Terence; we are not told what Simo orders the slaves to carry into the house, but the illustration shows them carrying various items, and these are listed by the scholiast ('some of them [carry] fish, some birds, some wine, some milk, and all other such things').¹⁷⁶ The scholium to *The Eunuch*, l. 771 on f. 55v, where the illustration depicts the motley crowd of slaves led by Thraso to Thais' house, includes a comment about the meaning of *lorarius*, written above the picture of the slave Donax. The term *lorarius* does not appear in the text of Terence,¹⁷⁷ but it is

¹⁷⁵ In the Introduction to *The Mother-in-Law* on f. 128v *O* provides correct word order in the phrase *quem per uim* (*per quem uim EK*), and gives the correct gender in *domum paternam* for the variant *domum paternum* in *E* and *K*.

¹⁷⁶ *quidam pisces, quidam aues, quidam uinum, quidam lac, et cetera talia*.

¹⁷⁷ In fact it is only found in extant classical literature in Aulus Gellius, who explains that *lorarii* are the attendants in comic plays who are responsible for chaining and beating whoever their masters order them to punish in this way (*Noctes Atticae*, 10.3.19).

often found in manuscripts of Plautus and Terence in the lists of characters at the start of scenes where just such a character appears.

6.3 The Content of the Scholia in *O*

Each play in *O* is preceded by a lengthy prose text taken from the *Commentum Brunsonianum*. In the case of *Andria*, the Introduction is the *Accessus ad Andriam*, a text which combines a Life of Terence (known as *Vita II*) with a prose Argument (or summary) to the play. The Introduction to *Phormio* consists solely of a prose Argument, but for the other plays the prose Introduction comprises scholia on the *didascalia*, a prose Argument, and scholia on Terence's own Prologue to the play (in *The Brothers* and *The Mother-in-Law* the scholia on the *didascalia* appear on separate folios, while the order of the other two items is reversed).

The other scholia in *O* are written beneath some of the illustrations at the start of new scenes. Most often these scholia provide a brief summary of the dramatic context of the opening speech of the scene; sometimes, however, they provide comments on linguistic matters (such as on the form *istaec* in *Andria*, l. 28 on f. 4v), or else an explanation of a passing reference (such as the identity of Omphale in *The Eunuch*, l. 1027 on f. 63v).

A few specific sources can be identified. The compiler used the *Origines* of Isidore of Seville (c. 560–636 CE)¹⁷⁸ for the note to *Phormio*, l. 230 on f. 159r.¹⁷⁹ He does not appear to have known Donatus' commentary,¹⁸⁰ and while the edition of Bruns contains apparent citations of it,¹⁸¹ these do not occur in *E*, *K*, or *O*, and appear to be later interpolations in the critical tradition. But the compiler did use another work of Donatus, the grammatical text, *Ars maior*, when commenting on the gender of the word *Eunuchus* in the Introduction to *The Eunuch* on f. 34r. In the *Accessus ad Andriam*, which is missing in *K* but found in *E* and Bruns, he used the fifth-century Christian historian Paulus Orosius¹⁸² for an erroneous story about Terence's arrival in Rome and the

¹⁷⁸ *OCD*, p. 768.

¹⁷⁹ He also used Isidore for a note on *The Eunuch*, l. 257 which appears in *K* and *E*, though not in *O* (the note cites in part Isidore's explanation of *liquamen* from *Origines*, 20.3.20).

¹⁸⁰ Cf. Rand 1909, p. 369.

¹⁸¹ Discussed by Jakobi 2007, p. 44.

¹⁸² *OCD*, p. 1078.

chronicle of Jerome (c. 347–420 CE)¹⁸³ for a reference to his manumission, and cited the fifth-century grammarian Rufinus¹⁸⁴ as well as Priscian. Finally, his comments about the triumph of Scipio Africanus on f. 1r, the way in which portraits of actors were depicted with swollen cheeks on f. 1v, about Calliopius reciting Terence's plays on f. 2r, about the festival of Olympian Jupiter at Megale on f. 34r, and part of his explanation of the word *parasitus* on f. 41v, derive from a group of scholia on Horace, which appear to have been compiled in France by 800 CE at the latest.¹⁸⁵

The compiler provided an incorrect explanation for the title of the play *Hecyra*, explaining that it was the name of a place not far from Athens, and this explanation is repeated twice in *O*, on folios 126v and 128r. However, *O* also provides the correct information on f. 126v that the word means 'mother-in-law' in Greek; the same information occurs in the scholia to some other manuscripts, including *D*,¹⁸⁶ and appears to derive from the early sixth-century commentator Eugraphius.¹⁸⁷

The compiler had access to a range of useful grammatical texts, but otherwise shows great ignorance when dealing with early Roman history. The scholia to the *didascalía* of *The Eunuch* on folios 33v–34r are riddled with errors. The scholiast explains the term *curule* in *curule aedile* as referring to the *curia*, or Roman Senate-house, and states that the aediles had authority over this, whereas in fact they were responsible *inter alia* for markets and public games, while the word itself describes the aediles' right to use an ivory chair. He explains the Megalesian Games, which were held in Rome, as games held in the Greek city of Megalopolis, and finding a reference later in the *didascalía* to the Greek playwright Menander, concludes that this is where Menander's original version of the play was recited. He takes the statement *ACTA SECVNDA* as meaning that a second performance of the play was held in Rome—it actually means that the play was Terence's second.

Completely unfamiliar with the Roman system of names, in which *Flaccus Claudi* means 'Flaccus slave of Claudius', he takes *Claudi* as referring to the next word in the sentence, and concocts a fabulous story about how pipes of uneven length are called 'lame' (*claudus*) in Latin, because a lame man has

¹⁸³ *OCD*, p. 794.

¹⁸⁴ *OCD*, p. 1337 (3).

¹⁸⁵ Jakobi 2007, p. 42.

¹⁸⁶ See Schlee 1893, p. 140.

¹⁸⁷ *OCD*, p. 567.

one leg shorter than the other. In the scholia to the *didascalía* of *The Mother-in-Law* on f. 126v he confuses a curule aedile named Sextus Iulius Caesar with the distantly related dictator Gaius Iulius Caesar (born sixty-five years after the first performance of this play). Later in these scholia he states that the second performance of this play was interrupted by funeral games, whereas it was performed *at* the funeral games for Lucius Aemilius Paullus in 160 BCE.

The compiler also misinterprets the text of Terence. When commenting on a scene in *The Eunuch* where the prostitute Thais discusses matters with Chremes (cf. *The Eunuch*, l. 739 on f. 54v), he states that Thais is drunk, whereas it is Chremes in Terence who is drunk. He also states that Thais is preparing to stand up manfully against Thraso, whereas in fact this is what she advises Chremes to do.

In contrast to Donatus, the compiler of the *Commentum Brunsonianum* appears to have been ignorant of Greek. In the scholium to *The Eunuch*, l. 232 on f. 41v, he explains the term *parasitus* or ‘parasite’ as deriving from two Latin terms, *pariendo* (‘bringing forth’) and *assistendo* (‘standing in attendance’), whereas in fact it comes from the Greek *paravsito~* (‘one who eats at the table of another’). In the scholia to the Prologue of *The Brothers* on f. 97r he makes a false division in the title of the Greek play *Synapothnescontes* mentioned by Terence at l. 6 as the model for a scene in his own play, and takes *Synapothnes* and *Contes* as separate words, explaining the second of them as part of the name of the Greek writer Diphilus.

The compiler also shows poor knowledge of archaic linguistic forms in Terence. On f. 4v he incorrectly explains *dum* in *adesdum* in *Andria*, l. 28, as a conjunction; it is in fact a particle commonly used in early Latin with imperative verbs. He explains that an occurrence of the word *ut* in *The Eunuch*, l. 771 on f. 55v, is superfluous, whereas in fact it is often found in Terence in questions of this type. In his note on *The Brothers*, l. 540 on f. 112r, he explains that the word *ne* means *nonne*, which introduces a rhetorical question, whereas it means ‘truly’ here.¹⁸⁸

Some lexical forms he uses show the relatively late date of the *Commentum Brunsonianum*. In the scholia to *Andria*, l. 28 on f. 4v he uses the term *eulogia*, a Christian borrowing from Greek which was originally used for bread which had been blessed for the Eucharist, but which is probably used here in the sense of ‘food and drink’, or else ‘gift’.¹⁸⁹ In the scholium to *The*

¹⁸⁸ The correct interpretations of *dum* and *ne*, however, are found in Donatus.

¹⁸⁹ See *TLL*, V.2, cols 1048–9; *DMLBS*, I. 812–13.

Eunuch, l. 771 on f. 55v, he uses the otherwise unattested form *sanguissuginarius* to mean 'doctor'; this form is clearly a compound of the medieval Latin word *sanguisuga* meaning 'leech', which came to replace the classical Latin *hirundo*.

Some of the syntactical constructions he uses are also characteristic of Late Latin usage. He uses *habeo* and the perfect passive participle, sometimes with the object in agreement, to express the pure perfect active; this usage is sometimes found in Plautus, but became general in Late Latin from the sixth century CE onwards.¹⁹⁰ He uses the ablative form of the gerund in place of a nominative participle; this usage is also found occasionally in early texts, but only became common from the third century CE onwards.¹⁹¹ Two particular uses found in Late Latin are considered the characteristic signs of the change from Latin to Romance languages: the development of the demonstrative pronoun *ille* to assume some functions of the definite article, and the loss of the accusative and infinitive construction to express reported speech or thought, generally replaced by the construction *quod* plus the subjunctive. Both of these tendencies are illustrated in the prose Argument to *Phormio* on f. 153r.¹⁹²

6.4 The Glosses

The glosses in *O* are written above the line, most often in a minuscule, informal glossata script which is occasionally illegible, and they are found only in the first three plays in the manuscript: *Andria*, *The Eunuch* and *The Self-Tormentor*. They are relatively sparse in their distribution; for instance, there is only one gloss in the last 580 lines of *Andria*, and only one in *The Self-Tormentor*. In general the glosses provide synonyms for rare or archaic words in Terence, or clarification of an obscure point, although on one occasion the glossator proposed a variant reading which is altered in the text of other manuscripts of the *g* family; glossing *qui* in *The Eunuch*, l. 288 on f. 43r, he comments *uel (qu)e*, while in both *C* and *P* the final *i* in the main script has been altered to an *e* by a corrector.

¹⁹⁰ E.g. the scholium to *Andria*, l. 29 on f. 4v, *dictum . . . habeas*; or the scholium to *The Eunuch*, l. 232 on f. 41v, *bona sua deuorata habebat*. See Palmer 1954, p. 167; Hofmann 1965, pp. 319–20.

¹⁹¹ E.g. the scholium to *The Eunuch*, l. 971 on f. 61v, *Veniebat autem hoc secum meditando*. See Palmer 1954, p. 324; Hofmann 1965, p. 380.

¹⁹² Cf. the phrases *Dum ergo ipse nimium moraretur Athenis cum alia uxore, illa quae in Lemnio erat* and *ignorabat enim quod ibi alteram haberet uxorem*. For the constructions, see Calboli 1987, p. 21.

Many of the glosses in *O* are related to glosses in other manuscripts of Terence; a collation of these glosses with those in selected manuscripts and the only edition is included as Appendix 3. The closely related manuscript *P*, as noted earlier, contains extensive scholia taken from Donatus on folios 3–9, and the two glosses on f. 5r of *O* appear also to have been excerpted from Donatus. A further gloss on f. 46r of *O* (the addition of the word *rex* above the line) is unique, as far as our examination has shown, to this manuscript and *P*. However, this small number of instances does not permit us to adduce the glosses as further evidence for the relationship of the two manuscripts, particularly in light of the close correspondences of many glosses in *O* to those in other manuscripts.

The main family of glosses which corresponds to the glosses in *O* is found in many Terence manuscripts of the ninth to eleventh centuries, including *C*, *F*, and *K*. These glosses include both synonyms for words and phrases, and brief summaries of action found at the start of each scene, the opening words of which often correspond to the scene summaries of the *Commentum Brunsonianum*. The relationship of the glosses in these manuscripts is complex, and as with the scholia, there is no major modern critical study; the only real edition to date remains that of Schlee 1893, which is poorly annotated, omits many scholia found in *C*, and was sharply criticized for its attempt to divide the scholia and glosses into ‘ancient’ and ‘later’ comments.¹⁹³

Within this family, the closest parallels to the glosses in *O* in the manuscripts examined for this edition occur in *v*. *v* has a number of glosses directly parallel to those in *O*; in particular the wording of a lengthy comment which occurs on f. 57v of *O*. Nevertheless, there are also glosses in other members of this family and *O* which are absent in *v*, showing that *v* cannot have provided a direct source for the glosses in *O*.

The glossator of *O* provides a number of glosses that do not correspond directly to those in other manuscripts, although sometimes he substitutes a second synonym for an archaic form which is being glossed (e.g. when glossing *concede* on f. 53v, he provides *appropinqua* in place of *transi* in the other witnesses). This suggests that he may have used his own judgement at times, although given the great loss of manuscripts from this period it is quite possible that many, if not all, of his innovations go back to a much earlier stage in the transmission.

The solitary gloss which occurs in *The Self-Tormentor*, l. 398, the comment *secum* written above *Vah ergo* on f. 77r, is written in a small script in

¹⁹³ This was described as ‘futile and disastrous’ by Rand 1909, p. 366.

a formal bookhand, quite different from the other glosses. It parallels the corresponding comment in ν , which in turn derives from the fuller comment *secum loquitur* in two other witnesses cited by Schlee 1893.

7.0 The Illustrative Tradition (with Comparanda)

Besides the present manuscript, *O*, twenty other witnesses were consulted to varying degrees during the preparation of this edition,¹⁹⁴ seven of which are illustrated.¹⁹⁵ It would have been ideal to have included numerous comparanda from these other witnesses in the present edition, but the cost of doing so was prohibitive. In the event, more than two dozen full-colour, high-resolution images from these witnesses are presented here and referred to throughout for purposes of comparison. There are also several images of masks from the buildings at Pompeii, made from original photographs.¹⁹⁶

The discussion of the illustrative tradition is necessarily complex and has been subdivided into sections. Three large components of this discussion will focus on: 1) the underdrawings; 2) the scene labels above the illustrations; and, 3) the character or speaker cues in the text proper. Hundreds of details have been taken from the manuscript in order to illustrate the discussion; each of them is accompanied by an analytical comment. The analysis of the underdrawings and scene labels focuses naturally on the difference between the preliminary and final artwork and text. As noted in Section 1.3, the underdrawings and lead-point scene labels were drawn very crudely, and the person who did them used an exemplar in which the illustrations reproduced the Late Antique style found in the Carolingian witnesses *C* (executed by three artists) and *P* (executed by two artists). However, the four (or more) artists responsible for the final illustrations and labels here deliberately rejected this ‘old-fashioned’ style of drawing and ‘modernized’ it; this decision can be attributed either to a commissioning patron of the manuscript or to the director of the scriptorium responsible for the work (often the *precentor*). This entailed a number of things: 1) the conversion of the earlier simple architecture to the contemporary Romanesque style; 2) the drawing of clothing in the contemporary twelfth-century style, which often entailed shortening characters’

¹⁹⁴ There is a comprehensive description of the witnesses in Section 8. Witness *B*, for example, was not used because it has virtually nothing to offer—it now has just two illustrations, the author portrait and the *aedicula* for *Andria*, and these are by “a hopelessly bad artist” in the opinion of Jones and Morey 1931 (II. 48).

¹⁹⁵ The illustrated witnesses consulted in the preparation of this edition have the sigla: *C*, *P*, *F*, *Tur*, *Y*, *N*, *L*. Reproductions of the images from the Tours manuscript (*Tur*) are available from the Institut de recherche et d’histoire des textes (CNRS) on the website of the Ministry of Culture of France (‘Enluminures’).

¹⁹⁶ We are grateful to Professor Frank Sear of the University of Melbourne for letting us use these in the present edition. They may be compared to the masks on the *aedicula* from f. 3r of *O*, f. 2v of *P*, and in *C*.

robes; 3) the removal of *segmenta* found on some characters' robes in witnesses *C* and *P*;¹⁹⁷ and the drawing of characters' feet at a more acute angle so that the action looks more kinetic. On a few occasions, some elements found in the underdrawings are absent in the final illustrations; this may have happened either through oversight or through deliberate decision.¹⁹⁸ These changes have all been noted in the caption for each detail. The details from the underdrawings can be sorted and retrieved by 'keywords'; these are: Hand, Foot, Ground, Disposition, Omission, Artefact, Head, Clothing, Leg, Body, Hat, Gesture and Building.

For the past seventy-five years, the two-volume study of the illustrative manuscript tradition of the plays of Terence by Jones and Morey 1931 has been the published authority in this field,¹⁹⁹ and those seriously interested in the Terence illustrations are encouraged to direct their attention to that work, since it is not our intention or agenda to reproduce their research and commentary here. Many of their observations, however, have since been challenged and where relevant such points have been noted in our commentaries.²⁰⁰

¹⁹⁷ Sometimes they are round rather than square in shape; see Jones and Morey 1931, II. 30, 42–3, for further discussion of these (and in Vol. I, figs 27–8 for analogues from the Vienna Genesis and the Rossana Gospels, and plates 198–9, 203–4, 259–60, 305, 310–11 and 316–17 for examples from various Terence witnesses). The earliest examples of these on tunics appear in catacombs on the short tunics of humble characters in the third century and “became frequent in painting in the fourth century” (II. 43). This gives a date in the range of the fourth to sixth century for the archetype of *C* and *P*.

¹⁹⁸ Besides being ‘modernized’ with respect to clothing and architecture, the final illustrations occasionally omit an element in the underdrawing. See, for example, f. 24v, where part of Mysis’ robe in the underdrawings has not been included in the final illustration (directly below her left hand and to the right of the finished version of the robe). And on f. 102r, there is an extension of the scarf of the slave Syrus down the right side of his body in the underdrawing, which is not in the final illustration. Interestingly, this ‘unfinished’ element of clothing is not found in the closely related witnesses *C*, *P* or *F*.

¹⁹⁹ Jones and Morey 1931 are limited, however, in their scope since their study concludes *c.* 1200 CE and so miss out on important later developments in the illustrative tradition, which extended well into the age of printing (see Section 5.4).

²⁰⁰ The comments of Wright 2006 on Jones and Morey’s work reflect current critical opinion:

This remains a very helpful book and readers of this book [Volume I] may want to refer to it for peripheral examples, but the text volume that followed in 1931 is unreliable in codicological information and gravely burdened by Morey’s strange notion that the style of the model for our surviving group of copies (i.e. U) showed that it was the work of a ‘Greco-Asiatic’ painter at the end of the fifth century. (p. 2)

There is no 'set formula' for illustrating a particular scene, and the order of the characters cannot be related simply to the scene labels in witness *A* or some other early (but now lost) witness, since they at times disagree on detail. The order of the characters (from left to right) in an illustration usually corresponds to the order in which they appear or first speak in a scene, unless it is a group scene where several characters are on the stage from the outset; divergences from this are annotated in the scene labels commentary (Section 7.5). In *The Mother-in-Law*, 5.4, one character (Pamphilus) is present twice, reflecting the structure of the scene, in which he participates in two stages of the action. In scene 4.2 of the same play, Laches is illustrated, though he does not feature in that scene at all. In general, characters who do not have a speaking part are often either left out or, if there, are not identified in the scene label.

7.1 Illustrations of Comedy and its Context

A large number of depictions of characters and masks from Roman drama survive in mosaics and wall paintings dating from the Classical world up through the Late Antique period, attesting the centrality of drama in everyday life. There is no manuscript evidence, however, to indicate that literary texts were illustrated until at the earliest the late fourth or early fifth century.²⁰¹ At that time, an interest in depicting narrative in literary manuscripts first begins to emerge, as is evidenced by the important codices, the Vatican Vergil (BAV, MS Vat. lat. 3225, c. 400) and the Roman Vergil (BAV, MS Vat. lat. 3867, probably late fifth century).²⁰² The overall quality of these manuscripts, together with the generosity of their scale and layout or *mise-en-page*, indicate that they were in all likelihood commissioned by wealthy patrons; as would

²⁰¹ A few paintings and mosaics from Pompeii are included among the comparanda in DVD for this edition.

²⁰² Sadly, only seventy-five folios of the Vatican Vergil survive, and these are but scattered fragments of a much larger work. The Roman Vergil is a larger, more pretentious book, but its illustrations are not of the quality of the earlier manuscript and reflect Classical art in a state of decadence as it evolved into early medieval painting. The Ambrosian Iliad (Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, MS F. 205 Inf., thought to have been produced in Constantinople between 493 and 508) is the only other illustrated classical literary manuscript from this period; it is of a similar date to the Roman Vergil, but sadly it too has been reduced to a set of miniatures by vandals who excised them from their original textual context. The Classical and Christian iconographic sources and influences on the style of the illustrations in these Vergil manuscripts has been examined in Wright 1993 and 2001. Wright's dating of these manuscripts and his assignment of a Roman provenance to them has been challenged vigorously in Cameron 2004.

have been the case also with the illustrated manuscripts of Terence's plays (such as the present witness, *O*, and also *C* and *P*).

These narrative cycles often have as their source for 'set scenes' images derived from coins, triumphal arches, diptychs etc., and other incidents found either in formal art from the Roman Empire or in early Christian catacomb painting. At approximately the same time that these Classical illustrated literary manuscripts were made, illustrated biblical manuscripts began to appear, at first in the area around the Eastern Mediterranean, especially Syria. Their novelty, and the special regard in which these manuscripts were held, is reflected in the fact that a number of them are produced on parchment stained with imperial purple dye.

These manuscripts include the Vienna Genesis (Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, cod. theol. gr. 31; probably Syrian, sixth century), the oldest well-preserved extant illustrated biblical manuscript.²⁰³ Some of its forty-eight illustrations are framed and others are not, inviting comparison with the Roman Vergil; the illustrations are in a Roman naturalistic style characteristic of the period. As with some of the Terence illustrations, a character may appear two or three times when more than one episode is depicted in a painting. The Sinope Gospels (or Codex Sinopensis; Paris, BNF, ms gr. 1286) is a mid-sixth-century Byzantine manuscript, perhaps from Syria or Palestine, written in Greek in silver and gold inks on purple parchment, and contains five illuminated miniatures (rather than an extended 'cycle'). The Rabbula Gospels (Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, cod. Plut. I, 56, a Syriac translation of the Gospels) was completed in 586; it gets its name from its scribe, who signed himself 'Rabbula' on one of its folios. It has seven illustrations plus a series of decorated and illustrated canon tables. It shows influences, in particular, of both Hellenistic art (in its draped figures) and Persian art (in its decorative motifs). The Rossano Gospels (or Codex purpureus Rossanensis, named for the colour of its parchment; Rossano Cathedral, Diocese Museum of Sacred Art) is a sixth-century Byzantine manuscript written in either Syria or Palestine and taken to Rossano in the ninth or tenth century; it contains the Gospels of Matthew and Mark (somewhat mutilated)—presumably a second volume, containing the other two Gospels, has been lost.

²⁰³ The manuscript is an abbreviated fragment of the Greek Septuagint translation, containing just twenty-four folios with illustrations at the bottom of each side (suggesting an earlier text in scroll format as a possible exemplar or source), which depict episodes from Genesis. It is estimated that the manuscript originally contained ninety-six folios and therefore 192 illustrations, if they were in the same format as the extant folios. The script is in silver ink on purple parchment.

These developments provide a context for the first illustrated Terence manuscript, since it is evident that the earliest such codex, now lost, was made in the Late Antique period (the late fourth or early fifth century). As noted elsewhere here, the earliest surviving witness for the plays (*A*) dates from the late-fourth to early-fifth century, but is not illustrated—it has scene labels but was never meant to contain pictures. The earliest surviving illustrated witness (*C*) dates from the early ninth century, but it is executed in a Late Antique style.²⁰⁴ At that time, it is quite certain that the plays were no longer performed, so *C*, being illustrated, may be considered something of an anachronism or anomaly—the norm, as evidenced by the approximately six hundred witnesses, was for an unillustrated text, most likely to be used for teaching. The origin of the illustrative cycle as evidenced by *C* and the other Carolingian witnesses will never be known for certain, but scholars have given it the siglum G, indicating that all of the subsequent illustrated (g) manuscripts derive from it. What is apparent, however, is that from Carolingian times onwards there was an interest in producing deluxe editions of Terence with a full cycle of illustrations.

Scholars vigorously debate the relationship between the various witnesses and the influence that one witness may have had on another. It is argued, for instance by Wright 2006, that after *C* was produced (probably for the Royal Court in Northern France) its exemplar was taken to Reims, where *P* was subsequently made (pp. 1–2). Based on an assessment of all available evidence, textual and illustrative, the present editors do not support this direct relationship between these two manuscripts, since the similarities and differences between *P* and *O* strongly suggest that *P* and *O* represent a distinct branch of the g tradition and that at least one other stage of transmission lies between *P* and the Late Antique hyparchetype.

Any discussion of the relationship between the various witnesses must take a number of factors into consideration: not only the illustrations, but also the main text of the plays; the scholia, glosses and commentary; the scene labels; and, with respect to *O* in particular, the underdrawings and lead-point

²⁰⁴ Arguing from internal references to the names of specific monks, Jones and Morey 1931 argued that *C* was produced at Corvey approximately in the period 822–56 (II. 27–35); Grant 1986 agrees with this dating (p. 137). This dating and the place of origin have been challenged subsequently, with Bischoff 1966 associating it with the royal court in Lorraine, rather than Corvey (III. 181). Reeve dates *C* more narrowly to 820–30 (p. 416). Wright 2006 describes it as “Aachen, Court of Louis the Pious, c. 825” (p. 3); Wright asserts without reservation that the exemplar of *C* was the very manuscript edited or published by Calliopius around 400 CE, which he designates ‘U’ (for *Urhandschrift*). He states that this ‘U’ was then taken to Corbie where it was again copied in the mid-eighth century in a witness now known as *Y*. Subsequently ‘U’ was taken to Reims in the second half of the ninth century and copied again, in a witness now known as *P*.

cues for the scene labels. To date no one has considered all of these things in their discussion, especially the unique situation in *O*, which is a major shortcoming of earlier critical work. The relationship between the final scene labels and illustrations in *O* and their drafts and cues, which were executed in lead point, is complex. A detailed analysis of them (provided here) offers further evidence about the question of whether or not *O* was copied directly from *P*.

7.2 The Gamma Illustrated Manuscripts

Jones and Morey 1931 provide a detailed comparative description of all the illustrated Terence manuscripts (thirteen in all); the commentaries here sometimes take their observations further and reinforce our conviction (and that of several other scholars), contra Jones and Morey, that *O* is not derived from *P*. The following discussion, taken together with the comparanda, provides an introductory overview of the extant witnesses to the illustrative tradition; a detailed analysis of each of the comparanda is found in Section 7.7.

C is one of the two earliest illustrated witnesses, dating from around 820–30,²⁰⁵ its paintings are by three artists of varying ability. The illustrations are painted in full colour, though the artists use different palettes. The illustrations seem to have had for their model a Late Antique exemplar which itself essayed to reproduce artwork in a classical Roman style, as evidenced both by the characters' garments and the stage props (doorways, altars, etc.); such fidelity to the past is to be expected in Carolingian art. The illustrations are generally equivalent in height to twelve lines of text (which is written as if prose) and are placed before each new scene with scene labels above in Rustic Capitals—these are discussed in detail in Section 7.5. This arrangement is the norm for the *g* manuscripts, though there are occasionally exceptions either in the placement of the illustration or in the script used for the scene labels; where these differences occur in witnesses *C*, *P* and *F* it has been noted in the commentaries (Sections 7.4, Underdrawings, 7.5, Scene Labels and 7.6, Character/Speaker Cues).

P was probably written within thirty years of *C* and was copied in Reims.²⁰⁶ Unlike *C*, its miniatures are shaded ink drawings rather than fully painted (though there is a bit of highlighting in green paint on Davus' mask on f. 18r). The illustrations are the work of two artists, the first of whom (down to

²⁰⁵ See Section 8.3 for more detail.

²⁰⁶ Wright 2006 states unequivocally that *C* and *P* are from the same archetype (p. 1)—see Section 8.13 for further discussion.

f. 97r) is more deft and impressionistic; Jones and Morey 1931 describe the second artist as “less expressive, more conventional; the movement is stiffer and the faces more wooden” (II. 56). Its miniatures too are usually equivalent in height to twelve (poetic) lines; they are in the same traditional style as those in *C*, as would be expected. (Witnesses *C* and *P* are compared with *O* in more detail in Section 7.3.) As has been noted, from a consideration of various textual and illustrative data, the present editors do not believe that *O* was copied from *P*; rather that they had a common ancestor not too far removed from *P*.

Witness *B* is a poor copy of *C*; though it originally had an incomplete series of illustrations down to the end of *Andria*,²⁰⁷ today all but two have been obliterated, those for the frontispiece and for the *aedicula* for *Andria*, with blank spaces being left throughout the manuscript for the uncompleted cycle. Witness *Y* (sometimes referred to as ‘J’) was written at Corbie in the third quarter of the ninth century. Though it is important for the textual tradition of the *g* manuscripts, it has an incomplete cycle of illustrations, which ends on f. 11v. The artist of the surviving illustrations was hopelessly inept— (Jones and Morey 1931 realistically but ruthlessly describe his work as “difficult to credit with any style at all, and consequently difficult to classify” (II. 96). The surviving illustrations are in the same tradition as those of *C* and *P*, though they seem to be closer to the former (see Section 7.7.1.9 for more detail and two comparanda).

F, another important witness to the *g* textual tradition, is acephalous, lacking *Andria* and *The Eunuch*, ll. 1–415; there are also folios missing at its end, so that *Phormio* ends at l. 832. Its illustrations are by one artist; he has again drawn garments and props in the traditional or Classical style. The figures have shading in blue, violet and (rarely) red; the violet is used as a wash on characters’ faces (masks are generally not used here). Though its cycle is closely related to those in witnesses *C* and *P*, it disagrees with them both in detail at various times.²⁰⁹

With witness *L*, there is the beginning of a departure from strict adherence to the Late Antique style of illustration found in the Carolingian witnesses. Though the illustration cycle was never completed and ends on f. 11v, spaces have been left for the drawings throughout (with two exceptions,

²⁰⁷ We have not had the opportunity to examine the manuscript *in situ*, but Wright 2006, who has, says that the manuscript was originally illustrated to the end of *Andria* and that all but two of the illustrations were erased in the fifteenth century so that room could be made for commentary (p. 186).

²⁰⁹ See Section 7.7.4 for two comparanda, and Jones and Morey 1931 (II. 104–19) for a detailed discussion of the differences among these witnesses.

The Eunuch, 1.1 and 1.2). The scene labels (usually in brown Rustic Capitals) for five of the miniatures are positioned in the margin rather than above the scene, and more detailed descriptions are added in either Rustic Capitals or Caroline Minuscules. The characters do not wear masks and the artist has either added details gleaned from the text—so that he depicts Simo with a walking stick in order to show his age—or else altered the characters' gestures to make them more lively and expressive (as seen in a comparison of f. 5r in *L* with f. 8r in *O*, which can be seen on the DVD). This phenomenon or innovation of the artist actually reading the text and modifying the traditional illustrations is found in two later witnesses as well (*N*, in particular).²¹⁰

Witness *K* has just one illustration, although blanks were left throughout for the full cycle; these were subsequently filled in with scholia and commentary. We believe that the style of this single illustration supports an attribution to the south-east of France. On the DVD, Comparandum 5 compares the treatment of Calliopius here with the Terence portrait in *Tur*. The treatment of the architecture, here once again contemporary and developed, is odd in that it is an essentially flat layout with an admixture of diagonal perspective. *Zp* has only three miniatures, though a full cycle was intended; the three have not been reproduced in this edition.²¹¹ Witness *S* has just ten illustrations and spaces left for three others throughout the manuscript. In the first illustration, Calliopius sits enthroned before a lectern with an open codex on it, much as in *K*, and looks similar to a traditional evangelist portrait. Terence himself is positioned to the right of Calliopius and his adversary (as identified in the Prologue), Luscius Lanuvinus and another (unidentified) person are seated to his left. This image and several others are reproduced in colour in Buonocore 1996 (pp. 219–23). In the image for *Andria*, 3.4 (p. 223) we can see a radical departure from the traditional depiction for this scene: for example, the building on the left in *C*, *P* and *O* has been moved to the right side of the illustration, and Chremes stands half in and half out of it. Inside the house, which has developed Romanesque architecture, a huge fish lies on a table and an additional slave, not found in other witnesses, stands on the table holding a knife with which he is about to prepare it. All of the characters have short tunics, and their gestures and appearance are unrelated to earlier depictions of this scene. *S*, with *N* and *Tur*, may properly be referred to as 'illuminated'.²¹²

²¹⁰ See Section 7.7.5.1 and Jones and Morey 1931 (II. 122–9) for further discussion.

²¹¹ See Jones and Morey 1931 (II. 158–62) for a detailed analysis of the style of the illustrations.

²¹² See Jones and Morey 1931 (II. 164–74) for a detailed analysis of the style of the illustrations.

The illustrations in *Tur* are fully painted, with a rich and varied palette. As in the other later manuscripts, the architecture is contemporary and developed (compared to the minimalist doorways of the Carolingian witnesses). The characters are depicted without masks; the men have full heads of hair (in a variety of colours) and the women's heads are covered with mantles or kerchiefs (on the DVD see comparanda 1 and 5). The sleeves of the women's robes are bell-shaped, as also seen in *S* and *O*. The old men (*senes*) wear a medieval chlamys over their tunic, instead of the Classical *pallium*. Male slaves (*servi*) are depicted in profile and the young men (*adulescentes*) have the three-quarters face of the antique tradition. There is little difference in the dress of these two groups. The artist of *Tur* takes considerable liberty with details found in witnesses truer to the Late Antique (and consequently the Carolingian) style, making it difficult to position him exactly in the tradition.²¹³

7.3 General Observations, Principally on the Relationship Between *C*, *P* and *O*

In *A* and other unillustrated manuscripts, there is usually a set of labels before each scene of a play (even though there are no illustrations); the order of the names in these generally reflects the order in which the characters speak in each scene—characters without speaking parts are sometimes not listed. Such labels are also found above each illustration in the illustrated manuscripts, though the order of the names is sometimes different—all such instances have been noted in the commentary here. There are many gaps in our understanding of the relationship between the different groups of surviving manuscripts and of possible contamination between them, which give rise to a range of critical opinions about how best to interpret the available evidence. The major figures in this debate are Jachmann 1924, Jones and Morey 1931, Grant 1986 and Wright 2006. It is not our intention to reproduce their detailed arguments here, since those interested in the debate will find it clearly set out in their substantial monograph studies. The present discussion focuses on *O* and how it differs from closely related g manuscripts, in particular *P*, *C* and *F* (with occasional reference to other witnesses, including *A*, the oldest substantial witness to the plays). Moreover, there is a lack of agreement among critics about the date at which the illustration cycle was first created, once again because the sparse evidence can be interpreted variously; the consensus today among critics is that the illustrations originated in the late-fourth or early-fifth century.

²¹³ See Jones and Morey 1931 (II. 176–92) for a detailed discussion of his innovative style.

A central issue in this debate is whether or not the illustration cycle was devised for a g manuscript, since it can be readily demonstrated that the actions depicted in some of the miniatures are at odds with the text as preserved in the g manuscripts. There are also occasions when it seems that scene divisions have been adjusted during the transmission of the text and that the artists have conflated existing illustrations, collapsing two episodes into one miniature and removing evidence for a scene division. The scene divisions in *O* are very close to those in *P*, *C* and *F*, but not identical. For example, for *The Self-Tormentor*, *C* has separate illustrations for scenes 5.1 and 5.2, but *P*, *F* and *O* have *C*'s illustration (with modification of the character labels) of 5.2 for their 5.1 and have no illustration for 5.2; *P* and *O* have a set of labels before scene 5.2, however, which indicates that there has been some adaptation or reconfiguration of the earlier illustrative tradition in these manuscripts.

Non-speaking or mute characters are often omitted from these scene labels, suggesting that the rubricator or artist may have been reading the plays and only including the names of figures that had speaking parts. It is also observable that groups of figures known to be present as part of a crowd are sometimes not depicted. As mentioned above, there is a high degree of coincidence between the order of the characters in the illustrations and the order of names in the scene labels in the unillustrated manuscripts, which are essentially based on the order in which the characters speak in a scene. However, at *The Brothers*, l. 776, for example, the labels reflect the order in which the characters speak, but *A* (Bembinus) and *D* have a different order in their labels. Grant 1986 argues that the cycle of illustrations in the g group of manuscripts was not created to illustrate a text in that tradition, but was incorporated into it at an early stage from a non-g manuscript; he notes that the illustration at *The Brothers*, l. 364 (3.3),

demonstrates clearly that the illustrations were created for a non-Callopian MS, one which read *rediero* and not *uenero*, which must have been the reading of s and therefore of g [see his Figure 1, p. 16]. In addition, the problems posed by the miniature at *Haut*. [*The Self-Tormentor*] 381 and the discrepancy between *C* and *PF* [and *O*] with respect to the miniatures and scene divisions at *Haut*. 874 and 954 are best explained if the cycle of illustrations was *not* conceived for a g text but was added to a g MS from a different part of the tradition. . . . This is most unlikely to have been either an ancestor or a descendant of the Bembinus. (pp. 39–42)

Three aspects of the manuscript are discussed in subsequent sections here: 1) the lead-point underdrawings (Section 7.4), the initial rough sketching of each illustration; 2) the scene labels (Section 7.5), the identifying tags or names

appearing above each character in an illustration; and 3) the character cues (Section 7.6), the cues or abbreviated names of characters used within the text itself to identify a speaker.

An ancestor of the extant *g* manuscripts had early on lost two folios containing *Andria*, ll. 804–53, and of course also the two accompanying illustrations for scenes 5.1 and 5.2; thus we would expect no evidence for these illustrations. Illustrations are, however, found in *O*, as is the text (which elsewhere in the tradition was lost and then supplied later in different ways in various witnesses—see Section 5.2 for further discussion), written by the original scribe in its proper place.²¹⁴ Grant 1986 believes that these illustrations are probably fabrications of a medieval artist (p. 154), while Jones and Morey 1931, who argue that *O* is a direct copy of *P*, believe that they were supplied from a *m* or mixed manuscript that was available to the scribes and artists of *O* (II. 81). They would account for the divergences from *P* in *O* as mainly reflecting creative impulses ('originality') by its artists. It should be noted, however, that these illustrations have been planned for in the exact same way that the rest of those in *O* have: both lead-point cues for the scene labels and outlining for the drawings are present and were executed by the same person who did the rest throughout the manuscript (they exhibit his same 'careless' style); see folios 28r and 28v for the evidence.

As has been indicated in various sections and commentaries elsewhere in this edition, it is our opinion that *O* is *not* copied directly from *P*. There is extensive evidence for this to be found in variants in the text, scholia, scene labels, speech allocation, line division and treatment of missing passages, and a brief review of the illustrative evidence provides a further strong argument for this. Here we differ sharply from the opinion of Jones and Morey 1931, whose arguments on this issue are at times highly inconsistent. Thus wherever the illustrations in *O* are very close in detail to those in *P* or identical in a particular detail, they cite this as evidence for the former being a copy of the latter; yet

²¹⁴ Fraenkel 1964 drew attention to the spaces left for illustrations in the inserted leaves containing the text of *Andria* (ll. 804–53) in both *P* and *C*, and argued that this showed that illustrations would have been in the exemplar used for the inserted folios, since if the scribe had used an unillustrated manuscript the text would have followed on immediately without a gap (p. 518, n. 1). Of course, it could also be argued that the scribes left spaces for illustrations on the assumption that a suitable manuscript would be found, or that an artist could independently create illustrations which matched those of the original. Moreover, in *P*, the spaces left at the start of the new scenes on folio 28r–v are much smaller than those allocated for illustrations in the manuscript itself. Nevertheless, the space allocated in *C* for the illustrations on the inserted folio 16r–v closely matches the spaces allocated throughout the remainder of the manuscript. The illustrations for *Andria*, 5.1 and 5.2 are also found in (the post-Carolingian manuscripts) *N* and *Tur*.

whenever there is disagreement in detail they ascribe it either to the “originality” of the artists or to their lack of ability to reproduce what was in front of them. Moreover, in addition to listing numerous illustrations in which one or more details in *O* are different from what is found in *P* (see, for example, II. 71–2 and 81–90), they readily note that there are occasions when *O* disagrees with *P*, but agrees with other extant illustrated manuscripts (*Tur*, *F*, etc.), using phrases such as “*O* deliberately departs from *P*” (II. 81) to account for the differences.

The textual evidence discussed in Section 5.2 shows that the scribe of *O* may well have used a manuscript related to the *d* group in order to provide the missing portions of text in *Andria* and *The Eunuch*, but the use of another illustrated manuscript to augment the illustrations is far more questionable, simply given the comparative rarity of illustrated manuscripts. In fact, the evidence in support of this proposed relationship of *O* and *P* and the divergences in the illustrations of these manuscripts can just as easily be accounted for by positing a common ancestor not too far back in the past, and by examining closely the successive stages in the preparation of the illustrations in *O*.

Part of the problem in Jones and Morey 1931 can simply be ascribed to a lack of access to good-quality images of the manuscript. As a study of the details in the underdrawings and the scene labels in *O* clearly shows, many details of the original sketches and labels (e.g. costume details, gestures, the label *II* indicating a second old man, young man, or slave) are in fact closer to those in other illustrated manuscripts, such as *P* or *C*, than the finished illustrations. While this may at first glance seem to argue in favour of the direct derivation of *O* from *P*, it also calls into question the assertions of Jones and Morey 1931 about the “originality” of the artists; if there is originality in the illustrations, it exists in the final versions, not in the preliminary sketches made when the manuscript was being designed. Because the preliminary sketches themselves are rough, and in places covered by ink or difficult to see, it is much harder to use them as evidence for specific innovations in *P* being disregarded by the artist of *O*. Nevertheless, the original version of the robe of the slave Geta on f. 169v, which reached down to his shoes in the preliminary sketch, is far closer to the version in *C* than to that in *P*, which begins half way down his calf.

The evidence provided by the sketches and cues also argues against another assertion of Jones and Morey 1931, namely, that the labels in *O* are copied directly from a series of minuscule labels in *P* (II. 82–4). In fact, it was demonstrated in Section 5.3 that the spellings of the original labels in *O* conformed far more closely to the original labels in *P*, rather than to the

minuscule set of labels. However, in the cues on f. 85v there appears to be further evidence for the artist of *O* not using *P* directly, since traces of a *II*, omitted in *P* but present in *C*, can be seen after the name *DROMO*.

Most important for Jones and Morey's discussion is the fleur-de-lys held by Bacchis in the illustration to *The Self-Tormentor*, 2.4, which they say the artist of *P* introduced to cover up an error he had made in copying his exemplar. This is also the evidence used to establish the place of origin of *P* as Reims (which is not disputed here). The same fleur-de-lys solution is found in *O* (f. 76v); Jones and Morey 1931 reject the possibility of this common error being in a common exemplar for no good reason, saying that "it is far more probable that the error was original with *P*" and was copied directly from there into *O* (II. 78–9). Yet as Grant 1986 convincingly argued,

The presence of the Rheims fleur-de-lys is indeed significant. It occurs elsewhere in *P* and *O* on the summit of the aedicula of the *Andria*. . . . Its presence shows that the error in the miniatures at IV.1 in *P* and *O* originated in Rheims, but not necessarily that it originated with the illustrator of *P*. Since the provenance of *P* is Rheims, without the evidence of the text the conclusion of Jones and Morey might be acceptable. But when the textual evidence conflicts so strongly with the explanation of Jones and Morey, another explanation must be sought. The obvious one is that the *hyparchetype* of *P* and *O* was executed at Rheims, and that *P* and *O* have inherited the error from this hyparchetype (p. 148).

There are some striking differences in the treatment of this illustration in *O* and *P*. The treatment of the hair of every character is radically different (the hair of Clitipho in *P* is much longer than that in *OCF*). Also, in *O* Antiphila's left hand is not to be seen on Clinia's left shoulder, whereas it is in *CPF*. The robes of Bacchis, Antiphila and Clitipho have *clavi* around their edges in *O*, but not in *P* (the *clavus* in the robe of Clitipho parallels the prominent stripe also found in *F*). Clitipho's robe extends much further down in *O* and Syrus' hand touches it at a different point. Syrus' left elbow is treated differently (being higher in *O*) and he lacks the belt or sash around his waist seen in *P*, as well as its extension hanging downwards from his waist (this is completely absent in *O*). Textually, both the lead-point prompts and the final scene label in red Rustic Capitals exhibit points of difference with the labels in *P* (on this particular folio *P* does not have the extra set of labels in Caroline Minuscules); most notable is the treatment of the labels for Clinia and Clitipho (*P* (f. 77r) has *CLINIA CLITIPHO ADULESCENTES II*, whereas *O* has the singular *ADVLESCENS*, as *C*, but lacks the numeral). Yet Jones and Morey 1931 only discuss the fleur-de-lys, ignoring not only the underdrawings, but these other highly visible differences.

7.4 Underdrawings

Introductory comments on the lead-point underdrawings in the present manuscript (*O*) are found in Sections 1.3, 1.4 and 7.0. Though there have to have been underdrawings or sketches for the illustrations in the other illustrated manuscripts, they must have been executed more carefully and ‘to size’ than those in *O* because they are not visible.²¹⁵ It is the careless execution of those in *O* that makes them interesting—if they had been done carefully, they too would be invisible. The person who did the underdrawings clearly had a manuscript with images similar to those in *C* and *P* in front of him, executed in Late Antique style, though the present editors do not accept that that exemplar was *P*; both the textual evidence (see Section 5.3) and details in many of the underdrawings and scene labels argue against this direct relationship (see the preceding section for discussion of some of the important differences).

The underdrawings usually reproduce the Late Antique style of clothing, though from the outset the decision seems to have been made to ‘update’ the architecture by replacing the simple doorways of the earlier witnesses with complex Romanesque-style buildings. The final drawings in *O*, however, extend this modernization to include the characters’ clothing (hemlines are often raised). Most remarkable in the underdrawings is the ‘crudity’ of the treatment of hands and feet: hands are often drawn as if the characters are wearing mitts; at other times the length of the (exposed) fingers is dramatically exaggerated. The feet also often lack refined detail, but more important is that the angle of the feet is changed in the final drawings so that it is more acute, endowing the scenes with a greater sense of movement or kinetic energy. Heads are sometimes repositioned in the final drawings, though it is not clear why in individual instances, since this is not the rule.

Full details and descriptions of the underdrawings and illustrations in *O* can be found in Appendix 4.

²¹⁵ A few underdrawings are also readily visible in witness *F*. The illustration of the ‘mob scene’ in *The Eunuch* (4.7) on f. 14v differs from those in the other witnesses in that the characters are in a flat V-shaped arrangement (compare f. 29v in *C*, f. 55v in *O* and f. 24r in *Tur*, where the characters are aligned horizontally). For a discussion of underdrawings, preparatory sketches and cues for artists and rubricators see Alexander 1992, pp. 52–71. Medieval readers seem not to have been distracted by or concerned about sketches and prompts left visible in the margins of manuscripts, whereas they may be annoying or mystifying to a non-specialist modern reader; a similar high level of ‘tolerance’ among medieval readers is seen in their ability to accept the inevitable error level in their texts, created as copyists introduced new, additional errors to a text each time they reproduced it (see Muir 2008 for a discussion of this phenomenon).

7.5 Scene Labels

In witness *O*, above each illustration there are scene labels identifying the speakers. As can be seen readily from the many details below, the cues for these labels are written hurriedly and carelessly, usually in minuscule script rather than the Rustic Capitals used by the rubricator. On numerous occasions the lead-point cues disagree with the final form of the names written in ink. Occasionally a figure does not have an identifying label in *O*, if they are present but do not have a speaking part in that scene (as, for example, in the case of Chaerea on f. 48r). On f. 9v, the label for Archilis was added later in minuscule in order to correct an error in the original labeling in Rustic Capitals; this corrector also added a squiggly or wavy line to indicate that the words *MYSIS ANCILLA* belong together.

The use of Roman numerals with some of the epithets caused considerable confusion among the scribes of the illustrated witnesses and is a major point of difference between *P* and *O*—the former usually has the case and number correctly, the plural with the number *ii*, whereas the rubricator of *O* obviously did not know how to interpret the numbers in the scene labels and has a singular form where a plural is required.²¹⁶ Sometimes the numbers in the scene labels of *O* were subsequently erased (as on f. 104r; see detail ‘104ra’ below), further evidence of an attempt to remove something not properly understood. The person responsible for the lead point cues, however, usually includes the numbers that have been rejected by the rubricator or erased by a later corrector or reader. The spelling of names in the cues is also often at odds with the final versions recorded by the rubricator; numerous examples of this are detailed below. The rubricator often improvises when writing the labels by using ligatures and digraphs (æ for ‘e’ or ‘ae’; see f. 43v and detail 43vb below, and also f. 36v and detail 36va below), and splits names in two, placing half on either side of a character’s head (see 48v and detail 48va below) ; on f. 57v (detail 57va below), he uses the common abbreviation ‘T’ with an ‘I’ above it for ‘-TRI-’.

The scene labels on f. 45v are interesting for the discussion of the relationship between *P* and *O*. In the latter, the lead-point cue has the spelling *thraso miles*, whereas the rubricator has written *TRASO MILES* (even though he uses the abbreviation *THR* as a cue for this character in the text proper). *P* has

²¹⁶ Most often with *senex* or *adulescens*, where *senes* or *adulescentes* is the required plural form; all instances of incorrect agreement in *PCO* have been noted in the commentary. On one occasion in *O* (f. 19r), ‘II’ was *added* by a corrector.

THRASO MILES in Rustic Capitals above the illustration, but *Traso miles* in Caroline Minuscles below it. If the lead-point scribe in *O* had *P* before him, it is not apparent why he would have chosen the spellings of the later, Caroline script over those of the original rubric since they contain essentially the same data. On f. 63v, the lead-point cue has *thraso* and the rubric *THASO*; in *P*, the rubric has *THRASO* and the minuscule label has *traso*. If the rubricator of *O* was indeed following the minuscule labels in *P*, then he is often prone to error; a different explanation seems more likely, one which does not have to interpret the evidence so often to support its case.

On f. 48v, the rubricator incorrectly wrote the name *CHARINUS* (the name of a character in the previous play) for Chaerea, but a corrector has noted this in the margin and the rubric was subsequently altered to the correct form (unfortunately the lead-point cue is illegible here and the corrector forgot to add the first 'E'). The name is lacking in the rubric of *P*, though it is in the minuscule label there. The robes of the two youths are treated in completely different ways in *P* and *O* (note the *clavi* along the edges of their robes, for example, and the treatment of Chaerea's leggings or stockings).²¹⁷

In order to demonstrate further the complexity and degree of variance found among the different witnesses when labelling the illustrations, consider the case of *The Eunuch*, 3.4. In *O*, the figure on the left is identified as *ANTIPHO ADULESCENS*; and the figure on the right, exiting from Thais' house and peeking at Antipho around a post, is unlabelled (f. 48r). From the text we know that this is meant to be Chaerea, dressed as a eunuch. In *P* (f. 49r), Antipho is labelled in Rustic Capitals, as in *O*, and the same label has later been added in minuscule beneath the illustration;²¹⁸ Chaerea, positioned in *P* as in *O*, is not identified. *C* has the same labelling as *O* and *P*, but a later hand has incorrectly added *CHAEREA* to the left of Antipho; this has been cancelled subsequently by yet another corrector. Interestingly, in the next scene (3.5), the rubricator of *C* (f. 25v) has incorrectly reversed the labels; a corrector has cancelled *CHAEREA* and added the same tag beside the figure on the right in an informal capital script. In *F* (f. 7v), both figures are identified (and correctly so) in minuscule script (the scribe's preferred script, though at times he also uses Rustic Capitals). *Y*, which lacks illustrations from f. 11v onwards (and also the one for this scene on f. 11r), has no labels where it has illustrations, but from f.

²¹⁷ The *clavus* was a stripe down the edge of a garment, in either a different colour (such as purple) or a different material.

²¹⁸ It is clear that the labels in minuscule script were added later because the same hand has added them to the folios inserted to supply text on those lost or excised earlier (folios 29, *Andria*, ll. 804–41, and folio 30, *Andria*, ll. 842–53 and *The Eunuch*, ll. 1–30).

21v often has them in Rustic Capitals above the spaces left blank for its (unfinished) illustrations. For this scene, it lacks both the illustration and the labels. *Tur* (f. 20r) has the two characters arranged as in *CPOF*, and they are correctly identified in Rustic Capitals; *Cherea* (as his label is spelt here), however, stands outside the closed door of Thais' house, which lacks the post in front of it present in the other witnesses (it is included to suggest that this is why Antipho can see him but he cannot see Antipho).

Since *P* is often discussed as the ancestor of *O*, it is important in this context to discuss its scene labels in some detail; they are the most complex among the extant illustrated manuscripts. *P*, like *O* and *C*, originally had scene labels in Rustic Capitals. At some stage after the replacement sheet—the present folios 29–30, containing ll. 804–53 of *Andria* and ll. 1–30 of *The Eunuch*—was inserted in *P*, one of its scholiasts went through the entire manuscript and wrote out a second set of labels for most scenes in a minuscule script.²¹⁹ Since the second set of labels is often identical to those already there in Rustic Capitals, it is not immediately apparent why this was done.

If the originals had faded and were hard to read, then this might explain it, but most of them are still very legible. Moreover, he has not added them to every scene; for example, they are lacking on folios 110v, 111v, 113r, 114v, and elsewhere in *P*. On f. 88v, the original Rustic Capital label is missing, but the minuscule label has been put in (confirming that a second manuscript is at hand and being consulted). The labels in minuscule script are not a duplicate set, however, in that they are often either at variance with those in Rustic Capitals or supply additional or different information. For example, on folios 32r, 47r, 56v, 85v, 159v, 161r and 164r, the characters' names are listed in a different order. On f. 99r, the original label has *DEMEA MICIO SENES II*, whereas the minuscule label has *demea micio fr(atr)es senes*, adding the detail that they are the 'brothers' that the play is about, but leaving out the *ii*. On f. 89r, the minuscule hand adds *duo* where neither it nor *ii* appears in the original label; in *O*, the epithet (89r) after *MENEDEMUS* is *SENEX* and there is no number following it.²²⁰ On f. 90r of *P*, the original label has *ii* below Menedemus' name, but no *senes* to go with it; the minuscule hand leaves the

²¹⁹ On the supplied folios he has put in the scene labels for *Andria*, 5.1 and 5.2, though the illustrations themselves were not added; this may have been either because they were not present in his exemplar or because there was no one available who could draw them properly. The illustrations are also missing in *C*, but so are the scene labels; interestingly, the replacement text copied into *C* is in verse lines, whereas the rest of the text is in long lines of prose, indicating that the exemplar used here was in poetic lines (see Section 5 for further discussion).

²²⁰ When two old people (*senes*) are not standing adjacent to each other (in *O*), the rubricator repeats the whole epithet rather than using the numeral 'II'.

number out (*O* merely lists the four characters' names). On f. 77r, five characters' names are given in the original label: *BACCHIS MERETRIX ANTIPHILA MULIER CLINIA CLITIPHO ADULESCENTES II SYRUS SERUUS*; the minuscule hand changes the epithet for Antiphila to *meretrix*, has *adolescens* in the singular after *CLINIA*, and omits the *ii* (*O* reads like *P*, but has the singular epithet *ADULESCENS* below *CLINIA*). In a few instances, the minuscule label offers less detailed information (e.g., on folios 159v and 161r); on f. 127r, there are no separate minuscule labels, but epithets were added to the original labels by the minuscule hand (unusually, the original labels above the characters here were not written in the same Rustic Capitals used elsewhere throughout *P*, but in a mixed-case script). On folios 23r and 73v, the minuscule hand has the correct plural form (*adolescentes*), whereas the original label had a singular with *II*; *O* has *ADULESCENS* but no accompanying number on either occasion. On f. 49v, the original label for an illustration featuring two characters merely has *ANTIPHO II*, whereas the minuscule hand has the more descriptive and accurate label, *demes antipho adolesce(n)tes duo*; *O* identifies the two characters correctly as *ANTIPHO CHAREA*. Sometimes an illustration has just one set of labels in *P*, but it can be either those in Rustic Capitals (as on folios 134v and 145v) or those in minuscule (as on f. 88v). There are no labels at all on f. 26v.

It is quite clear that the scholiast who added the second set of scene labels in minuscule script in *P* was either taking them from another available (perhaps unillustrated) witness to the plays or was reading the plays and adjusting or devising the labels as he went. He may, on the other hand, have taken them from the exemplar of his scholia text. It is also clear that the labels in *O* do not derive from *P* (or *C*); further evidence to corroborate this conclusion is presented throughout the textual commentary.

Full details and descriptions of the scene labels in *O* can be found in Appendix 5.

7.6 Character/Speaker Cues

The earliest substantial witness for the plays, the Codex Bezae Cantabrigiae (witness *A*) is unillustrated and written in Rustic Capitals, which gives it the stately appearance of a deluxe manuscript, though it is damaged considerably, lacking most of its first play, *Andria* (which begins at l. 888), and the final lines of its last play, *The Brothers* (it stops at l. 914, so that ll. 915–97 are wanting). Though it lacks illustrations, character cues are placed before each scene, preceded by a character of the Greek alphabet, so that, for example, on f. 10v at the beginning of scene 2.2 of *The Eunuch* there is an uppercase alpha [A] before

the character label *GNATHO PARASITUS* and a beta [B] before *PARMENO SERUUS*. These letters are used as shorthand space-savers throughout the text to identify speakers. In the surviving illustrated manuscripts under consideration here (primarily *CP* and *F* because of their closer affiliation with *O*, but also *TurYN* and *L* occasionally), this system has been abandoned and abbreviated forms of characters' names appear before their spoken parts; occasionally, when the scribe had left sufficient room, the rubricator put in the complete name of the speaker in *O*.

Differences between the allocation of speeches in *CP* and *O* are listed throughout the captions as they occur. The discussion here focuses primarily on errors and corrections to the cues in *O*; an illustrative detail is linked to each of these annotations. A corrector has noted some errors and omissions in the margin and they have subsequently been either corrected or inserted.

Full details and descriptions of the scene labels in *O* can be found in Appendix 6.

7.7 Comparanda from Various Illustrated Witnesses

7.7.1

The following images are from witnesses *P*, *Y* and *K*, currently held by the Bibliothèque nationale de France.

7.7.1.1 ms lat. 7899, f. 2v: *Andria*, Beginning (before the Argument): The *aedicula* has thirteen masks on four shelves. The columns are in three sections and have a spiral design; the capitals are made from acanthus leaves (giving the columns a classical Corinthian appearance) and have (inverted) concave impost blocks between them and the lintel. There is also an acanthus-leaf design in the triangular pediment above the lintel. This is the only *aedicula* in any of the illustrated manuscripts where the scribe has identified whom the masks represent, occasionally writing an 'f' above a mask to indicate that it represents a female character; viz., above the last mask on the top shelf, the third mask on the second shelf, and the first mask on the third shelf. Note the following comparanda: *O* and *P* (6); *P* and masks from Pompeii 7 and 8, and *O* and masks from Pompeii (9).

7.7.1.2 ms lat. 7899, f. 6r: *Andria*, 1.1: There are four characters depicted here; Simo and Sosia are identified in both the Rustic Capital and minuscule labels, whereas the two slaves on the right are unidentified (and do not have speaking parts). The provisions carried by the slaves here are similar to those depicted in *C* (f. 4v), but they are treated quite differently in *O* (f. 4v). See the

comparison of the treatment in *O* and *P* (Comparandum 11): the servant on the left in *O* has two birds slung over a staff placed on his right shoulder, and the urn he is carrying on his left shoulder has two handles, whereas it lacks handles in *P* and *C*; the slave with the birds in *PC* holds them in his right hand, which crosses over his body to the left, rather than over his shoulder. The slave on the right had a sheaf of grain over his left shoulder in *O*, but here and in *C* this is merely a single stock of a plant. In his right hand he holds three fish on a ring as he does in *C* and *O*. The small black squares on the tunics of Sosia and the slave to his immediate right are *segmenta*, used in Late Antique painting as decorative elements on clothing.²²¹ Note the extensive scholia, keyed to the text by an elaborate system of symbols and Greek letters.

7.7.1.3 ms lat. 7899, f. 7r: *Andria*, 1.5: The labels here are in both Rustic Capitals (above) and minuscule script (below); the latter offer more information, indicating that Simo is the father (the *pr* abbreviation) of Pamphilus and that Davus is a slave of Simo. The doorway has a very basic, three-element composition. The feet of both actors (Simo and Davus) are planted firmly on the undulating ground surface.

7.7.1.4 ms lat. 7899, f. 17r: *Andria*, 3.1: Lesbia and Glicerium stand to the left of the doorway; there are five labels in minuscule script below the picture—*misis simo davus lesbia gliceriu(m)*—but none in Rustic Capitals. The labels in *C* include *PAMPHILVS* (third from the right, f. 10v), who is the unlabelled character here. In *O*, a folio which held most of this scene has been excised after 17v; the four characters to the right of the doorway have been lost, but the artist squeezed Glicerium and Lesbia (note that the names are in the opposite order in *P* and *C*), pictured inside the former's house, into some blank space beside the text on f. 17v; labels for these two characters were then added in minuscule script above the building in the upper margin. The doorway is made of undecorated simple posts here in *P* (and in *C*), but is an elaborate Romanesque building with towers in *O*. A curtain affixed to the lintel in three places is gathered together with a sash in the middle in *P* and *C*. Comparandum 10 shows the illustration in all three witnesses, *O*, *C* and *P*.

7.7.1.5 ms lat. 7899, f. 18r: *Andria*, 3.2: This scene was on a folio now excised and lost from *O* (after f. 17); it is also found in *N* and *C* (f. 11r), where

²²¹ Sometimes they are round rather than square in shape; see Jones and Morey 1931, II. 30, 42–3, for further discussion of these (and in Volume I, figs 27–8 for analogues from the Vienna Genesis and the Rossana Gospels, and plates 198–9, 203–4, 259–60, 305, 310–11 and 316–17 for examples from various Terence witnesses). The earliest examples of these on tunics appear in catacombs on the short tunics of humble characters in the third century and “became frequent in painting in the fourth century” (II. 43). This gives a date in the range of the fourth to sixth century for the archetype of *C* and *P*.

the three characters are labelled *LESBIA DAUUS SIMO*, as here (see Comparandum 17 to see the treatment here and in *N*; note that there are no minuscule labels here in *P*. Lesbia is entering the scene from Glycerium's house on the left, which has a more elaborate doorway than that usually found in *P* and *C*, and judging from the decoration on it in both it goes back to a common ancestor.

7.7.1.6 ms lat. 7899, f. 26v: *Andria*, 4.4: There are no labels at all here, but in *C* the characters are labelled *CHREMES MISIS DAVVS* (f. 15r); there is a newborn lying on the ground in front of the doorway to Glycerium's house. The feet of the three characters are firmly planted on the undulating ground. The infant seems to be lying on a bed of straw or hay. The simply drawn door consists of four elements; it is not clear why the artist has drawn nails through the vertical elements (they are not in *C*). Note how prominent the heavily incised text grid is here.

7.7.1.7 ms lat. 7899, f. 48r: *The Eunuch*, 3.3: This illustration was on a folio now excised and lost after f. 47 in *O*. There are three figures here, but the two sets of labels (one above and one below) identify only two of them, *Chremes adulescens* and *Pythias ancilla* (with minor spelling variants). The label in Rustic Capitals over the character on the right is placed incorrectly, as the middle character is actually Pythias; in *C* (f. 25r), the character on the right is correctly labelled *DORIAS*. The doorway is more elaborate than that usually found in *P* and *C*, and judging from the decoration on it in both it goes back to a common ancestor.

7.7.1.8 ms lat. 7899, f. 160r: *Phormio*, 3.1: This illustration was on a folio now excised after f. 163 in *O*. The labels in Rustic Capitals here agree with those in *C* (f. 83r); there are no minuscule labels. The surface of the ground undulates dramatically here, whereas in *C* the area below the two speakers almost looks as if their shadows, rather than the surface of the ground.

7.7.1.9 ms lat. 7900, f. 4r: *Andria*, 2.4–5: Two scenes are illustrated on this folio, neither of which has labels. In fact, only the first illustration in the early part of the manuscript has a label (*Simo*, on f. 2r); the incomplete illustration cycle ends on f. 11v (at *The Eunuch*, 4.3, though there is no illustration for 4.2). Scene labels are again present from *The Self-Tormentor*, 4.4 till the end of the manuscript, though they are quite faint at times. Compare these illustrations with those in *O*, folios 16r and 16v.

7.7.1.10 ms lat. 16235, f. 20r: *The Eunuch*, Prologue: Note the upside-down drypoints in the lower margin: one is an odd-looking quadruped, which seems to have a beak and something flowering from the end of its scorpion-like tail. The legs and feet/hooves of a second animal can be seen to its left (in its

inverted position). The scholia are grouped together at the beginning of each play, and the glosses are both interlinear and marginal.

7.7.1.11 ms lat. 16235, f. 41r: *The Self-Tormentor*, Prologue: Calliopius, as editor and scribe and depicted in the tradition of an evangelist portrait of St John, is seated in a doorway beneath an arch (see Comparandum 2 for an image of Menander as author); he holds a pen with his right hand and turns a page of a manuscript containing Terence's plays (presumably) with his left. The style of architecture is Romanesque; the picture looks squashed or compressed because the figure of Calliopius is disproportionately large. Compare the treatment here with that of Terence in *Tur*.

7.7.2

The following images are from witness *C*, currently held by the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (Rome, Vatican City).

7.7.2.1 ms vat. lat. 3868, f. 2r: Portrait of Terence: this framed medallion panel-portrait (similar to one now lost in the Vatican Vergil originally on f. 58r—its imprint can be seen on f. 57v) is the finest painting in this manuscript, apparently done by the senior and most experienced artist; it shows great detail and a variety of palette. Two masked characters support the frame, which rests upon a fine columnar pedestal.

7.7.2.2 ms lat. vat. 3868, f. 10v: *Andria*, 3.1: The labels here include *PAMPHILVS* (third from the right), who is unlabelled in *P* (f. 17r). In *O*, a folio which held most of this scene has been excised after 17v; the four characters to the right of the doorway have been lost in *O*, but the artist squeezed Glycerium and Lesbia, pictured inside the former's house, into some blank space beside the text on f. 17v (note, however, that the names are in the opposite order here and in *P*). The doorway is made of undecorated, simple posts here and in *P*, but is an elaborate Romanesque building with towers in *O*. A curtain affixed to the lintel in three places is gathered together with a sash in the middle here and in *P*.

7.7.2.3 ms lat. vat. 3868, f. 14v: *Andria*, 4.3: The slave Davus presents the maid (*ancilla*) Mysis with the newborn here; the treatment of the doorway and knotted curtain is similar in *P* (f. 26r); in *O* (f. 25v, and compare the treatment in *O* and *N*), the curtain is treated differently. The altar (mentioned in l. 726) from which Davus tells Mysis to take some branches to place on the ground beneath the child is a regular feature on the Roman stage; it is more urn-shaped here and in *P* (f. 26r) than in *O* (f. 25v), where it is almost barrel-shaped. See Wright 2006 (p. 28) for discussion of this image and its representation of an altar. There has been no attempt in *O* to depict the branches, whereas they

feature here and in *P*. Note that this is the only instance where the artist of *O* has reproduced the doorway in a style more akin to the Late Antique model, rather than replacing it with one in the contemporary Romanesque style.

7.7.2.4 ms lat. vat. 3868, f. 53r: *The Brothers*, 2.1: The order of the characters' names in the scene label has been corrected here: the character second from the left was originally labelled *AESCHINUS*, but this has been expunged and *PARMENO* is written above; the character on the right, originally *PARMENO SERUUS*, has been corrected in similar fashion and is now identified simply as *AESCHINUS* (without an epithet). In *P* and *O*, Sannio has the epithet *LENO* and is the leftmost character. The second character from the right, who is unlabelled here as well as in *P* (f. 100v) and *O* (f. 100v, and see Comparandum 19 for *C* and *O* compared), is Bacchis; neither she nor Parmeno has a speaking part in this scene. In *P*, there is a doorway at the extreme right of the illustration, behind Aeschinus. In *O*, the epithet for Parmeno is incorrectly spelled (*SEERUUS*).

7.7.2.5 ms lat. vat. 3868, f. 56r: *The Brothers*, 3.3–4: Unusually, there are two illustrations for scene 3.3 here and in *P* (ff. 106v–107r), *O* (106v–107r, and Comparandum 12 for the treatment here and in *O*), and *F* (ff. 63v–64r), and space has been left for two illustrations in *Y* (f. 28r), though they were never drawn. In *Tur* (f. 46r), space was not left for the first of the two illustrations for 3.3 (Demea standing alone). The figure on the left in the lower drawing, holding the fish, is unlabelled here, but is identified as Dromo in *POF*, and in the scene label in *Y*. Here and in *PF* there is just one eel in the bucket or pot, but there are two in *O*. There are three fish pictured altogether here, as in *PFTur*, but there are only two in *O*. In *Tur*, Dromo (unlabelled) sits within the doorway of a Romanesque building with a tower and is filleting one of the fish with a knife (a unique detail). Grant 1986 notes that the action on the left here, where Syrus issues instructions to Dromo as he leaves the house (to clean the fish), depicts the text of ll. 376–8. He compares the verb in witness *A* (*rediero*) with that in the Calliopian manuscripts (*uenero/reuenero*) to show that the artist had before him an exemplar with the former reading ('when I return home'), which led to his inaccurate depiction of the action here; he concludes from this, contra Jachmann 1924, that the illustrations for the plays "must have been drawn initially for a non-Calliopian MS" (pp. 25–6).

7.7.3

The following images are from witness *Tur*, currently held by the Bibliothèque municipale, Tours (France).

7.7.3.1 ms 924, f. 13v: *The Eunuch*, Prologue: This illustration of Terence reading his plays to an audience consisting of twenty people is not found in any

other witness. Terence sits above, in the second storey of the building, beneath a Romanesque arch (which is supported by just one column). Compare the treatment here with that of Calliopius on f. 41r in *K*.

7.7.3.2 ms 924, f. 23r: *The Eunuch*, 4.7: This ‘mob’ scene is also found in *P* (f. 56v), *C* (f. 29v), *O* (55v) and *F* (14r, and Comparandum 1 for the treatment in *O* and *F*). The distribution of the characters and the items that they are holding varies among the witnesses. Here the first four on the left are unidentified, and the others are, from left to right: *SANNIO THRASO GNATO THAIS CHREMES*. The character names have epithets in *P*, where the order of the characters is different in the Rustic Capital and minuscule labels: Rustic has: *GNATO PARASITO SANGA THRASO MILES DONAX LOBAR SIMALIO SERISCUS THAIS MERET(RIX) CHREMES ADULESCENS*; minuscule has: *traso miles gnato parasitus sanga simallio siristas dorax locaris serui chremes adolescens thais meretrix*. The final two character names should be reversed in the minuscule labels since the female character is second from the right. In *C*, the names do not align well with the characters, but the order is: *THRASO MILES GNATO PARASITUS DONAX LORARI SIMALIO SYRICUS SANGA THAIS MERETRIX CHREMES ADULESCENS*; *SYRICUS* has been corrected from earlier *SYRUS* and *SANGA* from *TANGA*. In *O*, the order is: *GNATO SANGA THRASO DONAX LORAR SIMALIO SIRISCUS THAIS CHREMES*. In *F*, the order is: *GNATO PARASIT(US) SANGA TRASO MILES* (written lower down, above the third character, in the same script) *SIMALIO DONAX LORARIUS SYRISCUS THAIS MERETIUS[?] CREM(ES) ADOLESCENS*. Here there is a building (Thais’ house) at the far right and in *F* the two last characters on the right are standing on the other side of a doorway; the alignment of the characters in *F* is V-shaped rather than having them standing on level ground. There is neither a building nor a doorway in *PCO*. There is also the outline of the head and arm of an extraneous figure in the space above the two central characters in *F*. Thraso has no hat here, but in *F* he wears a pointed (Phrygian-style) cap; in *PCO*, one character (variously labelled) wears a pillbox-shaped hat. In *PCOF*, Sanga holds a sponge in his raised right hand. Thais wears a crown in *PCO*, but has a scarf on her head here and in *F*. In *PCOF*, none of the characters holds a bag or purse in his hand, as the left-most character and Sannio do here.

7.7.4

The following images are from witness *F*, held by the Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Milan (Italy).

7.7.4.1 H 75 inf, f. 14r: *The Eunuch*, 4.7: This ‘mob’ scene is also found in *P* (f. 56v), *C* (f. 29v), *O* (f. 55v), and *Tur* (f. 23r, and Comparandum 1 for the treatment in *O* and *Tur*). The distribution of the characters and the items that

they are holding varies among the witnesses. Here the two last characters on the right are standing on the other side of a doorway, and the alignment of the characters is V-shaped rather than having them standing on level ground. In *Tur*, there is a building (Thais' house) at the far right. The order of the characters is: *GNATO PARASIT(US) SANGA TRASO MILES* (written lower down, above the third character, in the same script) *SIMALIO DONAX LORARIUS SYRISCUS THAIS MERETIUS[?] CREM(ES) ADOLESCENS*. In *Tur*, the first four on the left are unidentified and the others are from left to right *SANNIO THRASO GNATO THAIS CHREMES*. The character names have epithets in *P*, where the order of the characters is different in the Rustic Capital and minuscule labels. Rustic has: *GNATO PARASITO SANGA THRASO MILES DONAX LOBAR SIMALIO SERISCUS THAIS MERET(RIX) CHREMES ADULESCENS*; minuscule has: *traso miles gnato parasitus sanga simallio siristas dorax locaris serui chremes adolescens thais meretrix*. The final two character names should be reversed in the minuscule labels since the female character is second from the right. In *C*, the names do not align well with the characters, but the order is: *THRASO MILES GNATO PARASITUS DONAX LORARI SIMALIO SYRICUS SANGA THAIS MERETRIX CHREMES ADULESCENS*; *SYRICUS* has been corrected from earlier *SYRUS* and *SANGA* from *TANGA*. In *O*, the order is: *GNATO SANGA THRASO DONAX LORAR SIMALIO SIRISCUS THAIS CHREMES*. There is neither a building nor doorway in *PCO*. There is also the outline of the head and arm of an extraneous figure in the space above the two central characters here. Thraso has no hat here, but in *F* he wears a pointed (Phrygian-style) cap; in *PCO* one character (variously labelled) wears a pillbox-shaped hat. In *PCOF* Sanga holds a sponge in his raised right hand. Thais wears a crown in *PCO*, but has a scarf on her head here and in *Tur*. Here and in *PCO*, none of the characters holds a bag or purse in his hand, as the left-most character and Sannio do in *Tur*.

7.7.4.2 H. 75 inf, f. 22v: *The Eunuch*, 5.9: The characters here are *Phedria chærea Gnato Traso* (written in mixed case); Traso wears a pointed (Phrygian-style) cap. In other witnesses the labels sometimes include epithets, so that *O* (f. 64v) has *PH(A)EDRIA ADULESCENS CH(A)EREA II GNATO PARASIT(US) THRASO* (without a cap or hat). The Rustic Capital label in *P* (f. 65r) has the same order as *O*, but adds the epithet *MILES* to *THRASO*; the minuscule label has *phedria cherea adolscentes gnato parasitus traso miles*, thus having the correct plural suggested by the *II* in the other labels. Thraso wears a pillbox-style hat here, as also in *C* (f. 34r). The labels in *C* are *PHAEDRIA ADULESCENS CHEREA II GNATHO PARASITVS THRASO MILES*. Here and also in *PC*, the artist has drawn an undulating ground-line.

7.7.5

The following images are from witness *L* and *N*, held by the Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, Leiden (The Netherlands).

7.7.5.1 Lips. ms 26, f. 5r: *Andria*, 1.2: The characters here are identified as *SIMO SENEX* and *DAUUS SERUUS*; their gestures are different from those in *P* (f. 7r), *C* (f. 6r) and *O* (f. 8r), and Simo is given a crutch or walking stick by the artist in order to indicate his old age, a detail not found in *PCO* (see comparandum 18 for the treatment in *O* and *L* compared). In *P* (Rustic Capitals label), *C* and *O* there are no epithets accompanying the character names, but in the minuscule label of *P* further information is given: *simo p(ate)r pamphili* and *davus famul(us) symonis*. The doorway has the 3-post simple composition usually depicted in *P* and *C* (without a knotted or tied curtain, however), but here and in *O* the doorway is part of a complex Romanesque structure with a tower. The artists of *PCO* add a basic ground-line. Note that the characters here are not wearing masks.

7.7.5.2 Voss. LQ 38, f. 1r: Author portrait before the plays: This illustration is a radical departure from the traditional formula, as found in *P* (f. 2r), *C* (f. 2r) and *O* (f. 2v), where two robed, standing figures hold up a medallion portrait of Terence between them; here he is pictured sitting on a building-shaped bench (its lower level is a series of arches), recalling the illustration at the beginning of *The Eunuch* in *Tur* (f. 13v, and Comparandum 3 for a comparison of the treatment here and in *O*), where he is seated in the upper storey of a building reading his plays to an audience of twenty people. The rubric, highlighted with green and purplish paint, says *INCIPIT ARGV(M)EN(T)VM TEREN- / TII AFFRI IN ANDRIA*. Among the other witnesses, *P* alone identifies the poet as Terence, and in the facing text on f. 1v also includes the nominal element *AFRI*, reflecting the tradition that he was African by birth (see Section 3.0). The listeners here are not wearing masks, as the figures in *PCO* are, and they have hoods over their heads; they look on attentively as Terence speaks to them.

7.7.5.3 Voss. LQ 38, f. 1v: *Andria*, Prologue: In *P* (f. 3r), *C* (f. 4r) and *O* (f. 3v, and Comparandum 3 for the treatment here and in *O*), a lone, standing figure, speaker of the Prologue, holding a cloth in his left hand and pointing upwards with his right (in *O*, he stands beside the text and is thus pointing towards it). Here the artist depicts Terence dictating his play to a scribe who is seated at a lectern or copying desk shaped like a small building. The text is being copied onto a scroll rather than into a codex, and the scroll curls over the top of the desk and hangs down towards his feet. Terence holds a staff with a ball on its top in his left hand and gestures towards the scribe with the pointed index finger of his right hand. He is seated on a cushioned stool, which is also

shaped like a small building (with columns). Note that the characters here are not wearing masks.

7.7.5.4 Voss. LQ 38, f. 14r: *Andria*, 3.2: This scene was on a folio which has been excised and lost from *O* (after f. 17); it is also found in *C* (f. 11r) and *P* (f. 18r), in both of which the three characters are labelled *LESBIA DAUUS SIMO*; there is no minuscule scene label in *P*. Here, in addition to the three main characters, labelled *LESBIA*, *SYM(O) DAUUS*, Glycerium, her child by Pamphilus, and her maid are depicted within the house. The house is crenellated and ornate and has three towers and a tiled roof, whereas in *P* and *C* it is represented by a simple patterned doorway (the doors have a similar design in *P* and *C*, suggesting a common ancestor). In *P* and *C*, the artists have drawn a ground line, which is absent here. Lesbia is about to enter the house here, but in *P* and *C* she stands to the right of the doorway and gestures back towards it. In *Tur* (f. 6v) most of the illustration has been excised, but an ornate Romanesque-style building remains on the left side of the page. Note that the characters here are not wearing masks.

7.7.5.5 Voss. LQ 38, f. 20r: *Andria*, 4.3: The slave Davus presents the maid (*ancilla*) Mysis (*Missis* here) with Glycerium's newborn child (by Pamphilus) here, having just come out of Glycerium's house (which is not depicted in *CPO*). The altar (mentioned in l. 726), from which Davus tells Mysis to take some branches to place on the ground under the child, is a regular feature on the Roman stage; here the altar is squarish in shape, whereas it is more urn-shaped in *C* (f. 14v) and in *P* (f. 26r), while in *O* (f. 25v) it is different again. There has been no attempt made in *O* to depict the branches, whereas they feature here and in *CP*. The building on the left is quite ornate and in the Romanesque style; in *P* and *C*, it is reduced to a simple doorway with a knotted curtain. In *O* (f. 25v), the doorframe is more substantial and the curtain is treated differently. Note that the characters here are not wearing masks.

7.7.5.6 Voss. LQ 38, f. 32r: *The Eunuch*, 2.2: The artist has read the text and inserted details he thinks appropriate that are not in any of the other witnesses—fish, birds, a rabbit and a butchered steer; these things are mentioned or suggested by Gnatho in his speech ('Everybody ran up delighted to see me, the snack sellers, the fishmongers, the butchers, the cooks, the poulterers, the spratsellers', etc.). He also adds the stand on which these either hang or are placed—this is evidence that the N artist is reading the text and using information found there to compose his imaginative illustrations (he does so on several occasions). None of the characters is labelled here. In *PCO*, there are three characters, two of whom are identified; *O* (f. 41v, and Comparandum 13 for the treatment here and in *O*) depicts a woman and two men, but has *GNATO PARASITUS* above the woman, nothing above the first male figure,

and *PARMENO SERVVS* above the one on the right; the woman is probably not identified because she does not have a speaking part—for this reason she has been left out here as well. In *C* (f. 21v), the woman on the left is identified generically as *PUELLA*, and Gnatho's name appears correctly above him. In *P* (f. 41r), the label in Rustic Capitals has *GNATHO PARASITUS PARMENO SERUUS*, with the first of these incorrectly placed above the maid on the left, as in *O*; the minuscule labels agree with the Rustic Capitals, though with the spelling variant *gnato*. The staff held by the character on the far left (Gnatho) is not found in the other witnesses. Note that the characters here are not wearing masks.

7.7.5.7 Voss. LQ 38, f. 65r: *The Self-Tormentor*, 3.2: In *C* (f. 42r), *P* (f. 80r), *O* (f. 79v), and *F* (f. 38v), two figures only, Syrus and Chremes, are depicted in this illustration. The domed building with a person exiting from it seems to anticipate the next scene, in which case the person is probably Clitipho. *O* identifies the characters as *SYRUS SERUUS CHREMES SENEX*, as do *C* and *P* (in both its sets of labels); *F* just has their names, without epithets. *CPF* depict a ground line, which in *O* and here is lacking (see Comparandum 20 for *N* and *O* compared). Note that the characters here are not wearing masks; they also gesticulate with both hands, whereas in the other witnesses the left hand holds onto or is enfolded within the characters' robes.

In *The Self-Tormentor* 2.4, Barsby 2001 (I. 219) notes in his 'stage direction' that Bacchis and Antiphila are accompanied by maids and baggage. This is illustrated in *Tur* (f. 32r), where eight women accompany them, with Syrus and Clinia to the right, and with a doorway behind them. The labels in *O* are *BACCHIS MERETRIX ANTIPHILA MULIER CLINIA ADULESCENS CLITIPHO SYRUS SERUUS*, as they are also in *P* (f. 77r) and *C* (f. 40v), though they add a *II* to go with the *Adulescentes* (incorrectly in the singular in *C*). The minuscule labels in *P* omit *Clitipho* and, consequently, the *II*. Grant 1986 (pp. 22–5) notes that Clitipho does not rightly belong here since he leaves the stage at l. 380, the end of the previous scene, and challenges Jachmann's conclusion that this is evidence that this miniature was created for a g text. Grant 1986 argues that the miniature depicts two different parts of the scene. He notes that the figures of Clitipho and Syrus, on the right, "suit perfectly the stage action at 375–80" and that the stage action of ll. 406–8 is shown on the left (Bacchis, Antiphila and Clinia), making this scene a conflation. (Grant 1986 concedes, however, that when two scenes are conflated in an illustration, the earlier action is usually depicted on the left and the later on the right.) *F* (f. 35v) has the characters in the same order as *PCO*, but without any epithets. The illustration in *N* (f. 62r), which lacks labels, is unlike any of the others: it has a building on the left, two male figures in the centre (Clinia and Syrus,

presumably, with Clitipho not represented) and two female characters on the right (Bacchis and Antiphila).

In *A* (f. 38r), the earliest witness to the text (which is unillustrated), the scene labels do not include Clitipho, and the two women on the left, Bacchis and Antiphila, are labelled *meretices II*, even though Antiphila, who only appears in this scene, is not a prostitute. Jachmann 1924 (p. 104) concludes that the assignment of ll. 400b–1 to Clitipho in *v*, an unillustrated *g* manuscript, "preserves what was in the gamma archetype against the other *g* MSS, all of which give these words to Clinia, and that, accordingly, this error, unique to *G*, demonstrates that the miniatures were originally conceived for a *g* text" (paraphrased in Grant 1986, p. 22). Grant 1986 rejects this idea and proposes that the present illustration has become slightly misplaced during transmission and that it properly belongs after l. 375. He believes that originally there were two illustrations for the one scene, one at l. 375 and the other at l. 381 where, however, there was no scene division. The steps by which he accounts for the illustrations being conflated and moved to before l. 381 are complex and perhaps unlikely; he himself observes that 'There is no parallel within the tradition for such a positional change of a miniature' (p. 25).

8.0 Description of the Witnesses Consulted

8.1 *A* (Vatican City, Biblioteca apostolica Vaticana, ms lat. 3226)

A, sometimes called the Bembinus, is the earliest and most valuable manuscript for Terence's plays. It was probably written in the fourth or fifth century in Italy (Munk Olsen 1982, II. 598–9; Reeve 1983b, pp. 414–15; for a date of second half of the fifth century, see Wright 2006, p. 203), and was later glossed with an important series of early scholia in the sixth century (edited in Mountford 1934, and discussed further in Zetzel 1975, pp. 339–54). Its readings are quite distinct and, in many cases, superior to those of the *g*, *d* and mixed manuscript traditions, which almost exclusively provided the sources for the later medieval copyists. *A* contains the plays in the order *Andria*, *The Eunuch*, *The Self-Tormentor*, *Phormio*, *The Mother-in-Law*, *The Brothers*. Unfortunately, nearly all of *Andria* as well as part of the Prologue to *The Mother-in-Law* and the conclusion to *The Brothers* are lost, making us dependent on the later traditions for the text of these plays. The plays are written in verse lines, and an elaborate system of stichometry (the use of layout to indicate metre) is used in order to distinguish between different kinds of poetic lines (discussed by Raffaelli 2007).

8.2 *B* (Vatican City, Archivio di San Pietro, Basilicanus ms H. 19)

B is a manuscript of Terence's works of the tenth or eleventh century, probably written in a monastic scriptorium in Northern France, perhaps either Corbie or Cluny (Munk Olsen 1982, II. 640–1; Jones and Morey 1931, II. 46–52; Von Büren 1994 *passim*). It contains the six plays in the *g* order, and is a direct copy of *C*. A description by David Wright and plates are also found in Buonocore 1996 (pp. 200–2).

8.3 *C* (Vatican City, Biblioteca apostolica Vaticana, ms lat. 3868)

C is an illustrated manuscript of Terence's works, probably written around 820–830 in the Lorraine area of Northern France for a wealthy patron associated with the court of Louis the Pious (Munk Olsen 1982, II. 644–5; Reeve 1983b, p. 416 and n. 33; Bischoff 1966, III. 181. Mütterich 1990 suggests the royal court at Aachen. For argument in favour of the older thesis that it was written at the monastery of Corvey in Germany, see Grant 1986, p. 137). It contains the six plays in the *g* order; the plays are written as if prose, apart from the Prologue to *Andria* and the text on the inserted f. 16 (providing

the missing text to *Andria*, ll. 804–53), which are written in verse lines. *C* has long been recognized as one of the most important early witnesses for the text of the g tradition (cf. Grant 1986, p. 137; Victor 2007, pp. 1–2).

The brilliantly coloured and highly detailed illustrations in *C* (discussed in Jones and Morey 1931, II. 27–45) are also recognized as “being remarkably accurate copies of classical originals” (Dodwell 2000, p. 4). The whole series of illustrations is reproduced and discussed in detail by Wright 2006. Reproduced in this edition are f. 10v, f. 14v, f. 53r, and f. 56r.

8.4 *Ca* (Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 231)

Ca is an unillustrated manuscript of Terence’s works from the first half of the twelfth century written in Germany (Munk Olsen 1982, II. 602). It contains the six plays in the g order; the plays are written as if prose, apart from the prologues, which are written in verse lines (iambic *senarii*). It has a superficial resemblance to *O*, in that *Phormio*, ll. 894–942 are misplaced; they are written in *Ca* on ff. 90r–v immediately after *The Mother-in-Law*, l. 812, which breaks off in mid sentence, and resumes at the top of the next folio (in *O*, *Phormio*, ll. 894–943, are contained on a loose folio, which was rebound in the manuscript as f. 118 at the end of a quire (XV) of *The Brothers*, together with the loose folio of Priscian).

8.5 *D* (Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana, Plut. 38.24)

D is an unillustrated manuscript of Terence’s works from the tenth or eleventh century, written in Germany or Northern France (Munk Olsen 1982, II. 608–9), or at St Gall in Switzerland (Reeve 1983b, p. 415 and n. 25). It is one of the principal witnesses for the d tradition of Terence’s works (Grant 1986, pp. 97–135) and contains the plays in the order *Andria*, *The Brothers*, *The Eunuch*, *Phormio*, *The Self-Tormentor*, *The Mother-in-Law*. The plays are written partly in verse lines, and partly as if prose (Victor and Quesnel 1999, p. 143).

8.6 *E* (Escorial, Real Biblioteca del monasterio San Lorenzo de El Escorial, ms S.III.23-I)

E is an unillustrated manuscript of Terence’s works from the beginning of the eleventh century, which was written in Spain (Munk Olsen 1982, II. 607; Riou 1973, pp. 87–9; Riou 1978, pp. 51–3). It contains four of the six plays, written

in verse lines. After the conclusion of *The Brothers* the manuscript breaks off. Although of relatively late date, the manuscript is an important witness for the g tradition, and appears to be closely related to *F* (Grant 1986, pp. 152–3). *Andria*, ll. 804–53, were missing in the original text of this manuscript, and were added at a later date on an inserted sheet, while *The Eunuch*, ll. 1–30, are missing altogether.

The manuscript is also important because it contains one of the earliest copies of the *Commentum Brunsonianum*. The notes from the *Commentum Brunsonianum* on the six plays are all grouped together as one long prose text at the start of the manuscript, beginning with the note to the opening lines of *Andria*. The introductions to the five remaining plays are incorporated within this long prose text; however, the *Accessus ad Andriam*, which incorporates the *Vita* of Terence as well as the introduction to *Andria*, is found a little later in the manuscript, just before the text of the play itself begins.

8.7 *F* (Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, ms lat. H. 75 inf. [S. P. 4 bis])

F is an illustrated manuscript of Terence's works of the ninth or tenth century written in France, probably from the neighbourhood of Reims or Orléans (Munk Olsen 1982, II. 622; Reeve 1983b, p. 417 and n. 42; Grant 1986, p. 137). At some stage the manuscript lost its opening quires, including all of *Andria* and *The Eunuch*, ll. 1–415, and more folios were lost at the conclusion of the manuscript, which now finishes at *Phormio*, l. 832 (the endpapers for this manuscript are made up of pages from a humanistic manuscript of Plautus). The surviving plays of Terence in *F* are in the g order and are written in verse lines. The manuscript has often been considered to be one of the most important early witnesses to the development of the g tradition (cf. Grant 1986, pp. 137, 152–4), although some critics have questioned its reliability as a pure witness for this tradition, arguing that while it contains important early variants, it has been contaminated in places by readings from other traditions (e.g. Victor 2007, p. 2; also cf. Reeve 1983b, p. 417).

F is certainly one of the major witnesses for the illustrative tradition of Terence's plays (see Jones and Morey 1931, II. 102–19; Wright 2006, pp. 197–201). Reproduced in this edition are f. 14r and f. 22v.

8.8 *K* (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, ms lat. 16235)

K is a manuscript of Terence's works of the tenth century, perhaps written in South-Eastern France (Munk Olsen 1982, II. 634–5). It contains the six plays in the *g* order, written partly as if prose and partly in verse lines. The manuscript contains a single illustration, a portrait of Terence on f. 41r, but spaces sufficient for illustrations were left at the start of every scene; these spaces were later filled with the commentary of Eugraphius.

The manuscript also contains the earliest extant copy of the *Commentum Brunsonianum* (Riou 1973, pp. 81–2). The notes from the *Commentum Brunsonianum* are grouped together at the start of each play, and typically have three elements: a character tag written in capitals, describing the speaker, a lemma citing the first few words which begin the passage, and the note itself. The opening folio of this manuscript was lost. This would have contained several notes referring to the earlier part of *Andria*, and probably a *Vita* of Terence. Riou 1973 (p. 82), conjectured that this *Vita* may have been an abbreviated version of the *Accessus ad Andriam* that is found in *O*.

8.9 *L* (Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, ms Lipsianus 26)

L is an illustrated manuscript of Terence's works of the first half of the eleventh century, probably copied in the monastery of Mont Blandin at Ghent, Belgium (Munk Olsen 1982, II. 613–14); Jones and Morey 1931 (II. 120-1) would date it to the late tenth century. It contains the six plays in the *g* order, written in verse lines.

L contains illustrations of Terence for part of *Andria*, finishing with the illustration for *Andria*, 3.2 on f. 11v (see Jones and Morey 1931, II. 120–9). Reproduced in this edition is f. 5r.

8.10 *I* (Lyon, Bibliothèque municipale, ms 788-IX)

I is a fragmentary manuscript, now consisting of seven pages, probably written in the mid-ninth century in the neighbourhood of Paris (Munk Olsen 1982, II. 620; Wright 2006, p. 191). The surviving text comprises *The Self-Tormentor*, ll. 522–904, which is written as if prose, but verse divisions are marked throughout the text (Kauer 1905, p. 114). The fragment is unillustrated, although at times errors in the order of the lists of characters at the start of new

scenes suggest that it was copied from an illustrated manuscript similar to *C* (cf. Kauer 1905, p. 120).

8.11 *Mu* (Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 29214 (3. [formerly 29004 c])

Mu is a fragmentary manuscript containing the *Commentum Brunsonianum* from the beginning of the eleventh century, written either in Italy or at Regensburg in Southern Germany (for Italy, Munk Olsen 1982, II. 651; for Regensburg, Hauke 1994, p. 26; the full text is printed by Riou 1976). It consists of two bifolia, which contain the conclusion of the *Accessus ad Andriam*, notes to *Andria*, and the beginning of the introduction to *The Eunuch*.

8.12 *N* (Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, ms Vossianus lat. Q. 38)

N is an illustrated manuscript of Terence's works of the tenth or first half of the eleventh century, copied in France, perhaps in the monastery at Fleury (Munk Olsen 1982, II. 615; Reeve 1983b, p. 416; Victor and Quesnel 1999, p. 142). It contains the six plays in the *g* order, written in verse lines.

N contains illustrations of Terence for the first part of the manuscript, finishing with the illustration for *The Self-Tormentor* 3.2 on f. 65r (see Jones and Morey 1931, II. 130–51). Like *O* and *Tur*, *N* provides images for *Andria* 5.1 and 5.2, which are missing in the other *g* manuscripts (on ff. 22v and 23r; the latter illustration was torn, and much of it lost). Reproduced in this edition are folios 1r, 1v, 14r, 20r, 32r and 65r.

8.13 *P* (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, ms lat. 7899)

P is an illustrated manuscript of Terence's works written in the ninth century, probably near Reims (Munk Olsen 1982, II. 626–7; Reeve 1983b, p. 416). It contains the six plays in the *g* order written in verse lines. *P* has long been recognized as one of the most important early witnesses for the text of the *g* tradition (cf. Grant 1986, p. 137; Victor 2007, pp. 1–2). It is also of particular relevance for this edition, since it is very closely related to *O*; indeed, it seems highly likely that the parent manuscript of *O* was copied in the same scriptorium as *P* and from the same exemplar.

P is also a major witness for the illustrative tradition (see Jones and Morey 1931, II. 53–67; Wright 2006, pp. 192–7). Reproduced in this edition are folios 2v, 6r, 7r, 17r, 18r, 26v, 48r and 160r.

8.14 *p* (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, ms lat. 10304)

p is an unillustrated manuscript of Terence's works from the tenth or perhaps eleventh century, written in France (Munk Olsen 1982, II. 633; the later dating is questioned in Reeve 1983b, p. 415 n. 26). It is one of the principal witnesses for the *d* tradition of Terence's works (Grant 1986, pp. 97–135), and contains the plays in the order *Andria*, *The Brothers*, *The Eunuch*, *Phormio*, *The Self-Tormentor*, *The Mother-in-Law*, written as prose.

8.15 *P* (Oxford, Oxyrhynchus Papyri 2401)

P is a fragmentary papyrus manuscript found at Oxyrhynchus consisting of two damaged folios, probably written in the fourth century in Egypt (Reeve 1983b, p. 415; Roberts and Skutsch 1957, p. 110). The surviving text comprises *Andria*, ll. 602–68 and 924–79a; the ending of this play appears to incorporate the alternative second ending to this play, which was known by Donatus but does not appear in the manuscript tradition until relatively late (see Roberts and Skutsch 1957, p. 123; Grant 1986, p. 7; Victor 2007, pp. 8–10). The manuscript was glossed at an early stage, both in Latin and Greek, suggesting that it formed part of a school text for Greek-speaking Egyptians.

Reproduced in this edition are f. 1r and f. 1v.

8.16 *S* (Vatican City, Biblioteca apostolica Vaticana, ms lat. 3305)

S is an illustrated manuscript of Terence's works from the end of the eleventh century, copied in the south of France (Munk Olsen 1982, II. 643). It contains the six plays in the *g* order, written as if prose. It also contains ten illustrations (see Jones and Morey 1931, II. 163–74); these have not been reproduced in this edition. A description by David Wright and plates are also found in Buonocore 1996 (pp. 218–23).

8.17 *Sa* (St Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, ms 912 pp. 299–300, 313–14)

Sa is a palimpsest manuscript, which contains as its lower script fragmentary text from *The Self-Tormentor*, ll. 857–78, written in a hand of the fourth or fifth century, probably in Italy (Reeve 1983b, p. 415). The sheet on which it was written was cut in two horizontally, the text was mostly erased, and then it was folded over and used to form part of a glossary (Lowe 1934, VII. 38). The original script can barely be recovered, but was written in Rustic Capitals in *scriptio continua*. The text and its relationship to other manuscripts are discussed in Craig 1931 and Pasquali 1952, 367–8. Reproduced in this edition is p. 300.

8.18 *Tur* (Tours, Bibliothèque municipale, ms lat. 924)

Tur is an illustrated manuscript of Terence's works from the middle of the twelfth century, probably copied in St Martin's monastery at Tours, or else at a location in its near vicinity, such as Angers (Munk Olsen 1982, II. 638–9). It contains the six plays in the *g* order, written as if prose.

Tur also contains a series of brilliant colour images, including a unique portrait of Terence reciting the plays to a medieval audience on f. 13v; unfortunately, the manuscript was vandalized by a collector at some stage, and many of these have been cut out (see Jones and Morey 1931, II. 175–92). Like *O* and *N*, *Tur* provides images for *Andria* 5.1 and 5.2 (both on f. 11r), which are missing in the other *g* manuscripts. Reproduced in this edition are folios 13v and 23r.

8.19 *v* (Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, ms 448 [420])

v is an unillustrated manuscript of Terence's works from the eleventh century, probably written in Northern France at the scriptorium of Saint-Amand-en-Pévèle; it also contains a copy of the *Ilias Latina* (Munk Olsen 1982, II. 639–40). The manuscript contains the six plays in the *g* order, written in verse lines. It is closely related to *F*, and shares some of its erroneous verse divisions (cf. Grant 1986, pp. 137–8, although it is not cited by Victor and Quesnel 1999). It also contains an important series of interlinear glosses which are closely related to the glosses in *O* (see Section 6.4).

8.20 *Y* (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, ms lat. 7900 [sometimes cited as 'J'])

Y is an illustrated manuscript of Terence's works of the third quarter of the ninth century written in France, probably at the monastery of Corbie (Munk Olsen 1982, II. 627–8; Reeve 1983b, p. 417 and n. 37). The manuscript contains the six plays in the *g* order, written as if prose. *Y* has recently been recognized as an important early witness for the text of the *g* tradition (see Grant 1986, pp. 139–45; Victor 2007, pp. 1–2).

Y contains illustrations of Terence for the first part of manuscript, finishing with the illustration for *The Eunuch*, 4.3 on f. 11v (see Jones and Morey 1931, II. 94–101; Wright 2006, pp. 187–91). Following this, blank spaces were left for illustrations before every scene, while at f. 21v the rubricator began (irregularly) to write character labels at the top of the space to match the illustrations. Reproduced in this edition is f. 4r.

8.21 *Zp* (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, ms lat. 7903)

Zp is an illustrated manuscript of Terence's works of the first half of the eleventh century copied in France, perhaps at the monastery at Fleury (Munk Olsen 1982, II. 629–30; Wright 2006, pp. 201–2). It contains the six plays in the *g* order. The three illustrations it contains are each by different artists and are of varying quality (see Jones and Morey 1931, II.155–62); they have not been reproduced in this edition.

9.0 This Edition and the Translation Here

The text of this edition is based on a comparison of *O* with the other illustrated family manuscripts listed in Section 8, with particular attention being paid to *CPF* in the textual commentary; there are approximately 4,000 textual notes. In the notes, a reading in *O* is sometimes referred to as 'unique'; this is used with reference to our examination of the principal illustrated witnesses, but we have often looked at readings in unillustrated manuscripts such as *Ca*.

We have checked our text against the major modern editions; occasionally we found errors in their apparatuses and these have been noted in the commentary. Barsby's Loeb Classical Library volumes are not a full critical edition, but we have noted his readings where apposite. He graciously gave us permission to include his translation; it has been adapted, however, to reflect our edited text based on witness *O*.

It is in the nature of a digital text that no two users will ever read it in the same sequence since each reader will select a unique pattern of links, reflecting his or her interests at any given moment. Consequently, some essential information is reiterated in various sections of this edition so that there is less chance that it will be overlooked inadvertently.

Bibliography

Abbreviations

<i>DMLBS</i>	R.E. Latham and others, eds, <i>Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources</i> . London 1975–
<i>ODNB</i>	H.C.G. Matthew and Brian Harrison, eds, <i>Oxford Dictionary of National Biography</i> . In association with the British Academy. 60 vols. Oxford 2004.
<i>OCD</i>	Simon Hornblower and Antony Sparworth, eds, <i>Oxford Classical Dictionary</i> . 3rd edn. Oxford 1996
<i>TLL</i>	<i>Thesaurus Linguae Latinae</i> . Leipzig, Stuttgart, Munich 1894–

Works cited in this edition

Alexander 1992	Alexander, Jonathan J.G., <i>Medieval Illuminators and their Methods of Work</i> . New Haven 1992
Barsby 1999	Barsby, J., <i>Terence: Eunuchus</i> . Cambridge 1999
Barsby 2001	Barsby, J., ed., <i>Terence</i> . 2 vols. Cambridge MA 2001
Beare 1964	Beare, W., <i>The Roman Stage: A Short History of Latin Drama in the Time of the Republic</i> . 3rd edn. London 1964
Bentley 1726	Bentley, Richard, ed., <i>Publii Terentii Afri Comoediae</i> . Cambridge 1726
Bischoff 1966	Bischoff, B., <i>Mittelaltliche Studien: Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Schriftkunde und Literaturgeschichte</i> . 3 vols. Stuttgart 1966–81
Brearley 1975	Brearley, D., ed., <i>Commentum Sedulii Scotti in maiorem Donatum grammaticum</i> . Toronto 1975
Brown 1996a	Brown, P.G.M., ‘Plautus’, in Simon Hornblower and Antony Sparworth, eds, <i>Oxford Classical Dictionary</i> 3rd edn. Oxford 1996, pp. 1194–6
Brown 1996b	Brown, P.G.M., ‘Terence’, in Simon Hornblower and Antony Sparworth, eds, <i>Oxford Classical Dictionary</i> 3rd edn. Oxford 1996, pp. 1483–4

TERENCE'S *COMEDIES*

- Brown 2002 Brown, P.G.M., 'Actors and Actor Managers at Rome in the Time of Plautus and Terence', in Pat Easterling and Edith Hall, eds, *Greek and Roman Actors: Aspects of an Ancient Profession*. Cambridge 2002, pp. 225–37
- Buonocore 1996 Buonocore, Marco, *Vedere i Classici. L'illustrazione libraria dei testi antichi dall'età romana al tardo medioevo*. Vatican City 1996
- Calboli 1987 Calboli, Gualtiero, 'Aspects du latin mérovingien', in József Herman, ed., *Latin vulgaire—latin tardif. Actes du 1er Colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif. (Pécs, 2–5 septembre 1985)*, Tübingen 1987, pp. 19–35
- Cameron 2004 Cameron, Alan, 'Vergil Illustrated between Pagans and Christians. Reconsidering "the late-4th c. Classical Revival", the dates of the manuscripts, and the places of production of the Latin Classics', *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 17 (2004), 502–25
- Christenson 2000 Christenson, David M., ed., *Plautus: Amphitruo*, Cambridge 2000
- Courtney 1993 Courtney, E., *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*. Oxford 1993
- Craig 1931 Craig, J.D., 'A Palimpsest Fragment of Terence', *Classical Review* 45 (1931), 215–16
- Dickey 2007 Dickey, Eleanor, *Ancient Greek Scholarship. A Guide to Finding, Reading, and Understanding Scholia, Commentaries, Lexica, and Grammatical Treatise, from their Beginnings to the Byzantine Period*. Oxford 2007
- Dodwell 2000 Dodwell, C.R., *Anglo-Saxon Gestures and the Roman Stage*. Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 28. Cambridge 2000
- Emden 1959 Emden, A.B., ed., *A Bibliographical Register of the University of Oxford to A.D. 1500*. 3 vols. Oxford 1959
- Fraenkel 1964 Fraenkel, Eduard, 'Anzeige von Jachmann, Terentius Vaticanus', in *Kleine Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie*. Rome 1964. II. 517–24
- Füßel 2004 Füßel, Stephan, *Gutenberg und seine Wirkung*. 2nd edn. Frankfurt 2004
- Grant 1986 Grant, J.N., *Studies in the Textual Tradition of Terence*. Toronto 1986
- Hauke 1994 Hauke, Hermann, *Katalog der lateinischen Fragmente der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek, München Vol. I, Clm 29202–29311*. Wiesbaden 1994

TERENCE'S *COMEDIES*

- Herrmann 1954 Herrmann, Max, *Forschungen zur Deutschen Theatergeschichte des Mittelalters und der Renaissance*. ed. from 1914 version by H. Schieman. 2 vols. Dresden 1954
- Hoeing 1900 Hoeing, C., 'The Codex Dunelmensis of Terence', *American Journal of Archaeology* 4 (1900), 310–38
- Hofmann 1965 Hofmann, J.B., and Anton Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*. Munich 1965
- Ireland 1991 Ireland S., *The Mother-in-Law*. Warminster 1990
- Jachmann 1924 Jachmann, G., *Die Geschichte des Terentztextes im Altertum*. Basel 1924
- Jakobi 2007 Jakobi, Rainer, 'Das Commentum Brunsonianum', in P. Kruschwitz, W.-W. Ehlers and F. Felgentreu, eds, *Terentius Poeta*. Munich 2007, pp. 37–48
- Jones and Morey 1931 Jones, L.W., and C.R. Morey, *The Miniatures of the Manuscripts of Terence prior to the Twelfth Century*. 2 vols. Princeton 1931
- Karakasis 2005 Karakasis, Evangelos, *Terence and the Language of Roman Comedy*. Cambridge 2005
- Kaster 1995 Kaster, Robert A., ed., *C. Suetonius Tranquillus; De grammaticis et rhetoribus*. Oxford 1995
- Kauer 1905 Kauer, Robert, 'Handschriftliches zu Terenz', *Wiener Studien* 27 (1905), 111–37
- Kauffmann 1975 Kauffmann, C.M., *Romanesque Manuscripts 1066–1190*. London 1975
- Lowe 1934 Lowe, E.A., *Codices Latini Antiquiores*. 12 vols. Oxford 1934–66
- Madan 1922 Madan, A.F., H.H.E. Craster, R.W. Hunt and P.D. Record, *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford*. 7 vols in 8. Oxford 1922–53
- Manion 2005 Manion, M.M., *The Felton Illuminated Manuscripts in the National Gallery of Victoria*. Melbourne 2005
- Marshall 2001 Marshall, C.W., Review Article: 'C.R. Dodwell, Anglo-Saxon Gestures and the Roman Stage', *Mouseion* 45 (2001), 365–8
- Moore 2007 Moore, T.J., 'Terence as Musical Innovator', in P. Kruschwitz, W.-W. Ehlers and F. Felgentreu, eds, *Terentius Poeta*. Munich 2007, pp. 93–109

TERENCE'S *COMEDIES*

- Morello 1997 Morello, Giovanni, *Miniaturen: Bilder aus den kostbarsten Kodizes des Mittelalters und der Renaissance*. Stuttgart 1997
- Mountford 1934 Mountford, J.F., ed., *The Scholia Bembina*. London 1934
- Muir 2008 Muir, Bernard J., 'Interrogating a Witness: The Case for MS Crouch 10', *Script & Print* (Special Issue) 32.1 (2008), pp. 36–48
- Mütherich 1990 Mütherich, Florentine, 'Book Illumination at the Court of Louis the Pious', in Peter Godman and Roger Collins, eds, *Charlemagne's Heir: New Perspectives on the Reign of Louis the Pious (814–840)*. Oxford 1990, pp. 593–604
- Munk Olsen 1982 Munk Olsen, B., *L'étude des auteurs classiques latins aux xi^e et xii^e siècles*. 3 vols in 4. Paris 1982–9
- Oakeshott 1950 Oakeshott, Walter, *The Sequence of English Medieval Art*. London 1950
- Oakeshott 1981 Oakeshott, Walter, *The Two Winchester Bibles*. Oxford 1981
- Palmer 1954 Palmer, L.R., *The Latin Language*. London 1954
- Parkes 1969 Parkes, Malcolm B., *English Cursive Bookhands 1250–1500*. Oxford 1969
- Parkes 1993 Parkes, Malcolm B., *Pause and Effect: An Introduction to the History of Punctuation in the West*. Berkeley CA 1993
- Pasquali 1952 Pasquali, G., *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*. 2nd edn. Florence 1952
- Passalacqua 1987 Passalacqua, Marina, ed., *Prisciani Caesariensis Opuscula: Vol. I De figuris numerorum, De metris Terentii, Praeexercitamina*. Rome 1987
- Raffaelli 2007 Raffaelli, R., 'Die metrische Präsentation des Terenztexts in der Antike: Der Codex Bembinus', in P. Kruschwitz, W.-W. Ehlers and F. Felgentreu, eds, *Terentius Poeta*. Munich 2007, pp. 73–91
- Rand 1909 Rand, E.K., 'Early Mediaeval Commentaries on Terence', *Classical Philology* 4 (1909), pp. 359–89
- Reeve 1983a Reeve, M.D., 'Aelius Donatus: *Commentary on Terence*', in L.D. Reynolds, ed., *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics*. Oxford 1983, pp. 153–6
- Reeve 1983b Reeve, M.D., 'Terence', in L.D. Reynolds, ed., *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics*. Oxford 1983, pp. 412–20

- Riou 1973 Riou, Y.-F., 'Essai sur la tradition manuscrite du *commentum Brunsonianum* des comédies de Térence', *Revue d'histoire des textes* 3 (1973), pp. 79–113
- Riou 1975 Riou, Y.-F., and C. Jeudy, 'Tradition textuelle et commentaire des auteurs classiques latins conservés dans les manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Vaticane', in *La cultura antica nell'occidente latino dal vii all'xi secolo*. Settimane di studio del centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo 22, I. 179-229
- Riou 1976 Riou, Y.-F., 'Le *Commentum Brunsonianum* des Comédies de Térence dans le Clm 29004c', in G. Cambier, ed., *Hommages à André Boutemy*. Collection Latomus 145. Brussels 1976, pp. 315–23
- Riou 1978 Riou, Y.-F., 'Gloses et commentaires de comédies de Térence dans les manuscrits de la bibliothèque du monastère San Lorenzo el Real de l'Escorial', in G. Cambier, C. Deroux and J. Préaux, eds, *Lettres latines du moyen âge et de la Renaissance*. Collection Latomus 158. Brussels 1978, pp. 5–55
- Riou 1997 Riou, Y.-F., 'Les commentaires médiévaux de Térence', in N. Mann and B. Munk Olsen, eds, *Medieval and Renaissance Scholarship: Proceedings of the Second European Science Foundation Workshop on the Classical Tradition in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*. Leiden 1997, pp. 33–49
- Roberts and Skutsch 1957 Roberts, C.H., and O. Skutsch, 'Extant Classical Authors: 2401. Terence, *Andria*', in E. Lobel, C.H. Roberts, E.G. Turner and J.W.B. Barns, eds, *Oxyrhynchus Papyri Part 24*, Oxford 1957, pp. 110-23
- Sandys 1903 Sandys, John E., *A History of Classical Scholarship*. 3 vols. Cambridge 1903–8
- Schlee 1893 Schlee, F., ed., *Scholia Terentiana*, Leipzig 1893
- Sharpe 1996 Sharpe, R., J.P. Carley, R.M. Thomson and A.G. Watson, *English Benedictine Libraries: The Shorter catalogues*. Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues 4. London 1996
- Thomson 1982 Thomson, R.M., *Manuscripts from St Albans Abbey 1066–1235*. 2 vols. Bury St Edmunds 1982; revised edn 1985
- Victor 1996 Victor, B., 'A Problem of Method in the History of Texts and its Implications for the Manuscript Tradition of Terence', *Revue d'histoire des textes* 26 (1996), pp. 269–87
- Victor and Quesnel 1999 Victor, B., and B. Quesnel, 'The Colometric Evidence for the History of the Terence-Text in the Early Middle Ages', *Revue d'histoire des textes* 29 (1999), pp. 141–68

TERENCE'S *COMEDIES*

- Victor 2007 Victor, B., 'New Manuscript Sources of the Terence-Text', in P. Kruschwitz, W.-W. Ehlers and F. Felgentreu, eds, *Terentius Poeta*. Munich 2007, pp. 1–14
- Villa 1984 Villa, Claudia, *La «Lectura Terentii», Volume Primo: Da Ildemaro a Francesco Petrarca*. Padua 1984
- von Büren 1994 von Büren, V., 'Note sur le ms. Vaticano Arch. S. Pietro H 19 et son modèle Vaticano lat. 3868: Les Térence de Cluny?', *Scriptorium* 48 (1994), pp. 287–93
- Warren 1882 Warren, Minton, 'On Bentley's English MSS of Terence', *American Journal of Philology* 3 (1882), pp. 59–71
- Webb 1911 Webb, R.H., 'An Attempt to Restore the Archetype of Terence Manuscripts', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 22 (1911), pp. 55–110
- Webster 1995 Webster, T.B.L., *Monuments Illustrating New Comedy*. 3rd edn. 2 vols. London 1995
- Wessner 1966 Wessner, P., ed., *Donatus: Commentum Terenti*. 3 vols. Leipzig 1902–8; reprinted Stuttgart 1966
- Wiles 1991 Wiles, David, *The Masks of Menander: Sign and Meaning in Greek and Roman Performance*. Cambridge 1991
- Wright 1993 Wright, David, *The Vatican Vergil: A Masterpiece of Late Antique Art*. Los Angeles 1993
- Wright 2001 Wright, David, *The Roman Vergil and the Origins of Medieval Book Design*. London 2001
- Wright 2006 Wright, David H., *The Lost Late Antique Illustrated Terence*. Vatican City 2006
- Zangemeister 1899 Zangemeister, C., ed., *Paulus Orosius: Historiae aduersum paganos*. Leipzig 1899
- Zetzel 1975 Zetzel, J.E.G., 'On the History of Latin Scholia', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 79 (1975), pp. 335–54

Appendix 1: Original Errors and Corrections in *O* and *P*

Play	Line	<i>O/P</i> original reading	<i>P</i> changes to	Comments	
<i>Andria</i>	238	omit: <i>hodie</i>	Adds s.l.	Originally omitted in <i>Cv</i> also	
	531	<i>nollit</i>	<i>nolit</i>	Also corrected in <i>O</i> ; originally <i>nollit</i> in <i>C</i>	
<i>The Eunuch</i>	47	<i>men</i>	<i>me</i>		
	269	<i>hisce</i>	<i>hi ce</i>	<i>O</i> amends to <i>hiice</i>	
	298	<i>semen</i>	<i>senem</i>		
	300	<i>illum</i>	<i>illum</i>		
	400	<i>quod</i>	<i>qui</i>	Also corrected in <i>O</i> ; originally <i>quod</i> in <i>AC</i>	
<i>The Self-Tormentor</i>	545	<i>figit</i>	<i>fingit</i>		
	593	<i>atque</i>	<i>atqui</i>	Originally <i>atque</i> in <i>F</i> also	
	620	<i>quod siet</i>	<i>quid siet</i>		
	942	<i>dotis</i>	<i>doti</i>	Originally <i>dotis</i> in <i>C</i> also	
<i>The Brothers</i>	275	<i>dictum</i>	<i>dictu</i>	Originally <i>dictum</i> in <i>C</i> also	
	520	<i>prosum</i>	<i>prorsum</i>	Also corrected in <i>O</i> ; originally <i>prosum</i> in <i>C</i>	
	614	<i>quid</i>	<i>quit</i>	<i>quid</i> also found in some δ mss	
	860	<i>mitto</i>	<i>omitto</i>	<i>mitto</i> also found in <i>CF</i> ; <i>omitto</i> is the reading of <i>A</i>	
	<i>The Mother-in-Law</i>	92	<i>uiuendi</i>	<i>uidendi</i>	Also corrected in <i>O</i> in margin
		618	omit: <i>id</i>	Adds s.l.	Originally omitted in <i>C</i> also. <i>id</i> is omitted in <i>A</i>
<i>Phormio</i>	221	<i>quomodo</i>	<i>quodmodo</i>	<i>quomodo</i> also found in <i>C</i>	
	275	<i>iudicium</i>	<i>iudicum</i>	Also corrected in <i>O</i>	
	559	omit: <i>hinc</i>	Adds in mg.	Originally omitted in <i>CF</i> also	
	630	<i>meum</i>	<i>eum</i>		
	667	<i>inquit</i>	<i>inquit</i>	<i>inquit</i> also found in <i>ACF</i>	
	768	<i>casam</i>	<i>causam</i>	Also corrected in <i>O</i> s.l. <i>causam</i> is also found in <i>F</i> and some δ ; mss	

Appendix 2: Divergent Readings in the Scholia in *O* from Other Manuscripts

a) Readings in *O* which are inferior to those in *EK*

Iubeo Chremetem (scilicet, salutare) (on *Andria*, l. 533 on f. 19v) [Iubeo Chremetem (scilicet, saluere) *K*]

pariendo (on *The Eunuch*, l. 232 on f. 41v) [parendo *EK*]

praeferunt (on *The Eunuch*, l. 541 on f. 48v) [praefecerunt *EK*]

illam (on *The Eunuch*, l. 668 on f. 52v) [illum *EK*]

accipiat (on *The Eunuch*, l. 739 on f. 54v) [eripiat *EK* = Terence]

pater (on *The Eunuch*, l. 912 on f. 59v) [frater *EK*]

uisus (on *The Eunuch*, l. 1002 on f. 62v) [iussus *EK*]

dum illam confutationem . . . ueniret (on *The Eunuch*, l. 1025 on f. 63v) [dum post illam confrontationem . . . ueniret *EK*]

illum (on *The Self-Tormentor*, l. 381 on f. 76v) [= *K*; illam *E*]

circumuersa (on *The Self-Tormentor*, l. 512 on f. 80r) [circumcursa *EK* = Terence]

narrauit (on *The Brothers*, l. 364 on f. 107r) [narrauimus *EK* = Terence]

Tesiphonem Syrus (on *The Brothers*, l. 517 on f. 111r) [Ctesipho Syrum *EK*]

liceret reuertentis patris legibus se esse coactum illam ducere (*Accessus ad Phormionem* on f. 153r) [diceret reuertenti patri legibus se esse coactum illam ducere *EK*]

in prima centuria (on *Phormio*, l. 230 on f. 159r) [sub prima centuria *EK* = Isidore]

b) Readings in *O* which are preferable to those in *EK*

Clinia filius Menedemi et Clitipho filius Chremetis (on *The Self-Tormentor*, l. 175 on f. 71v) [Clinia filius Chremetis *EK*]

anulum quem per uim detraxerat (*Accessus* to *The Mother-in-Law* on f. 128v) [anulum per quem uim detraxerat *EK*]

ad domum paternam (*Accessus* to *The Mother-in-Law* on f. 128v) [ad domum paternum *EK*]

c) Readings in *O* which do not agree with *EK* and Sedulius

Parmenonem nomine (*Accessus* to *The Eunuch* on f. 34r) [nomine Parmenonem *EK*, Sedulius]

amore ardoris (*Accessus* to *The Eunuch* on f. 34v) [ardore amoris *EK*, Sedulius]

traderet. quae (*Accessus* to *The Eunuch* on f. 34v) [traderet. quem *EK*, Sedulius]

adulescens Charea (*Accessus* to *The Eunuch* on f. 34v) [adulescens *EK*, Sedulius]

habitu (*Accessus* to *The Eunuch* on f. 34v) [habitu etiam *EK*, Sedulius]

ephebus (*Accessus* to *The Eunuch* on f. 34v) [ephebusque *EK*; ephebus quae Sedulius]

Pamphilam (*Accessus* to *The Eunuch* on f. 34v) [Pamphilam illam uidelicet *EK*, Sedulius]

domum eius (*Accessus* to *The Eunuch* on f. 34v) [domum illius *EK*, Sedulius]

optatam uoluptatem (*Accessus* to *The Eunuch* on f. 34v) [optatum *EK*, Sedulius]

d) Readings in *O* which agree with Sedulius against *EK*

mitteret ei (*Accessus* to *The Eunuch* on f. 34r) [mitteret ei et *EK*]

puellam quae (*Accessus* to *The Eunuch* on f. 34v) [puellulam quae *EK*]

qui uocatur [uocabatur Sedulius] (*Accessus* to *The Eunuch* on f. 34v) [cuius nomen erat *EK*]

inquiens data (*Accessus* to *The Eunuch* on f. 34v) [inquiens donata *EK*]

Appendix 3: The Glosses in *O* and Other Manuscripts

a) Glosses only in *O*

Ne (*Andria*, l. 324 on f. 13r): id est, certe [nonne *v*; pro ualde Schlee 1893]

quin (*Andria*, l. 399 on f. 15v): id est, quare non [cur non Schlee 1893]

siet (*Andria*, l. 919 on f. 31r): id est, prosit

Cariam (*The Eunuch*, l. 126 on f. 38v): uel, hinc Asiam [prouinciam *CKv*]

huius (*The Eunuch*, l. 202 on f. 40r): id est, de hoc [scilicet Thrassonis nomine *CKv*]

Di uestram fidem (*The Eunuch*, l. 418 on f. 46r): id est, adtestor [interpello *CFK*]

usque (*The Eunuch*, l. 471 on f. 47v): id est, certe [ualde *CKv*, Schlee 1893]

contaminet (*The Eunuch*, l. 552 on f. 49r): id est, quis

concede (*The Eunuch*, l. 706 on f. 53v): id est, appropinqua [transi huc *v*; transi, o eunuche *CFK*]

technam (*The Eunuch*, l. 718 on f. 53v): id est, ars mala [fraudem *v*; fraudem, inuentionem, imposturam *CF*, Schlee 1893]

Iam dudum aetatem (*The Eunuch*, l. 734 on f. 54v): id est, per longum tempus elapsam [per spatium temporis *CFKv*, Schlee 1893]

monumentis (*The Eunuch*, l. 753 on f. 55r): id est, cartis donationis huius puelle [cartis *v*; cum cartis ubi continebatur quemadmodum empta fuerat a matre thaidis *CFK*, Schlee 1893]

manipulus (*The Eunuch*, l. 776 on f. 56r): id est, exercitus hominum [conductor hominum *v*, Schlee 1893]

angiportum (*The Eunuch*, l. 845 on f. 58r): id est, uenellam

b) Glosses in *O* similar to those in *P* or Donatus

pretium (*Andria*, l. 39 on f. 5r): id est, libertatem [libertatem dicit *P*, Donatus; libertate indulsi *v*]

haud muto factum (*Andria*, l. 40 on f. 5r): id est, non penitet me [Vetuste non me paenitet *P*, Donatus]

quem indicis praefecerat (*The Eunuch*, l. 413 on f. 46r): rex [rex *P*]

c) Glosses in *O* similar to those in *v*

impensae (*The Eunuch*, l. 413 on f. 46r): id est, maxume [maxime *v*; diligenter, studiose, maxime Schlee 1893; diligenter *CK*]

obdo (*The Eunuch*, l. 603 on f. 50r): id est, circumpono [circumpono *v*]

expedi (*The Eunuch*, l. 694 on f. 53r): id est, narra [narra *v*; narra, expone Schlee 1893; expone *CK*]

nebulo (*The Eunuch*, l. 717 on f. 53v): id est, mendax [mendax *v*; mendacissime *CF*]

Vsque adeo (*The Eunuch*, l. 741 on f. 54v): id est, ualde; id est, in tantum [ualde in tantum *v*; in tantum *CFK*, Schlee 1893]

apage sis (*The Eunuch*, l. 756 on f. 55r): id est, tace si uis [id est tace si uis *v*; tace si uis et conquiesce uel recede *CFK*, Schlee 1893]

nebulo (*The Eunuch*, l. 785 on f. 56r): id est, tumidus [tumidus uanus uel obscurus *v*; uanus, piger Schlee 1893; piger *FK*]

quid illuc hominis est (*The Eunuch*, l. 833 on f. 57v): id est, quid in illo homine est qui tali habitu uenit ad nos, nihil namque hominis in eo est sed tantummodo monstrum est. [quid hominis in illo est qui tali habitu uenit ad nos? nihil namque hominis in eo est, sed tantummodo monstrum *v*; nihil hominis in eo est, sed totum est monstrum *CFK*]

in pedes quantum queo (*The Eunuch*, l. 844 on f. 58r): id est, erexi me in pedes quantum potui [scilicet erexi me *v*]

Vah (*The Self-Tormentor*, l. 398 on f. 77r): secum [secum *v*]

d) Glosses *O* similar to those in the other g-manuscripts

Cedo (*Andria*, l. 383 on f. 15r): dic [dic *CKv*]

exspectat (*The Eunuch*, l. 447 on f. 46v): id est, admittitur, *or possibly* admiratur [admiratur *CK*, Schlee 1893]

deuerticulum (*The Eunuch*, l. 635 on f. 51r): id est, diuersorium [diuersorium meum *CFKv*, Schlee 1893]

uietus (*The Eunuch*, l. 688 on f. 53r): [...]as fractus [uiribus fractus *CFKv*, Schlee 1893]

ante uorterim (*The Eunuch*, l. 738 on f. 54v): id est, antecesserim [antecesserim *Cv*; antecesserim hanc *K*; pro hanc antecesserim Schlee 1893]

interminata (*The Eunuch*, l. 830 on f. 57v): id est, minata [id est, minata *CKv*; minata *F*]

derisum (*The Eunuch*, l. 860 on f. 58r): id est, ad deridendum [id est, ad deridendum *CFKv*]

Appendix 4: Details and Descriptions of the Underdrawings and Illustrations

- 4va Symo's left hand is clearly visible here, but not in *PC*; note too that the utensil in Sosia's hand is also different here from *PC*. [Hand]
- 4vb Compare the things carried by these characters with *P* (f. 6r) and *C*. In *C* the middle slave carries a similar urn on his left shoulder, but it lacks handles, and he holds a single bird in his right hand which is at waist height. The slave on the right holds the fish on a ring in a similar manner to that here, but has only a single stick/frond over his left shoulder. On f. 6r in *P*, the treatment is similar to that in *C*. [Artefact]
- 4vc The angle of Symo's foot is quite different from the underdrawing. [Foot]
- 8ra Symo's left thumb and forefinger are visible here, but are covered in *PC*. [Hand]
- 10ra Note ground surface line here (as in *P*); *C* lacks ground surface. [Ground]
- 13va Details of the underdrawing are visible around the hand for the first time; this artist also seems to be taking more care than the others. [Hand]
- 13vb The left hands of Pamphilus and Charinus are visible here, but are covered in *PC*. [Hand]
- 16r Note that to this point the underdrawings have scarcely been visible.
- 16va Davus' right hand is visible here, but is covered in *PC*. [Hand]
- 17ra Symo's left hand is fully exposed here, but is covered in *PCF*. [Hand]
- 17vb In *PC* these two figures stand on the other side of the doorway to indicate that they are within the house; here they are in the doorway. Moreover, in *PC* their hands are not joined together as here. Glycerium is more obviously pregnant here than in the illustrations in *PC*. [Hand, Disposition]

- 19ra This is the first time that the extremely long fingers characteristic of the underdrawings are visible. [Hand]
- 19rb A detail of Symo's robe seen in the underdrawing has not been included in the final drawing. [Clothing, Omission]
- 20va The angle of Symo's foot is quite different here from in the underdrawing. [Foot]
- 21va The original outline of Davus' head can be seen to the right. [Head]
- 21vb Pamphilus' left hand is clearly drawn here, but in *PC* it is covered by the robe; note his elongated fingers in the underdrawing. [Hand]
- 21vc In *P*, Davus' legs are also crossed, but not in *C*. [Leg]
- 22va The outlines of the heads of all three characters are clearly seen in the underdrawing. [Head]
- 22vb The angles of Charinus' feet are quite different from the underdrawing. [Foot]
- 24va An element of Mysis' robe seen in the underdrawing here has been omitted. [Clothing, Omission]
- 24vb The outlines of the heads of Mysis and Pamphilus are clearly seen in the underdrawing. [Head]
- 24vc Details of the sketching of the robe in the underdrawing can be seen here. [Clothing]
- 24ve The left hands of the characters are all visible here, but are covered in *PC*. [Hand]
- 25va Note the extremely elongated fingers in the underdrawing. [Hand]
- 25vb The outline of Davus' head is clearly visible in the underdrawing. [Head]
- 25vc The way that the curtain is knotted around the door post recalls the treatment occasionally in the Late Antique tradition as replicated in *P* (f. 103r) and *C* (f. 54r); the shape and style of the altar is very different from that in *P* or *C*.
- 27ra The outline of Crito's body is clearly seen in the underdrawing. [Body]

- 27rb The sketching for Davus' right leg is clearly visible in the underdrawing. [Leg]
- 27rc The left hands of Crito and Mysis are clearly visible here, but are covered in *PC*. [Hand]
- 28vb Note that at this stage the artist has not begun to raise the hemline of the slaves' robes. [Clothing]
- 29va The underdrawing artist has begun to draw the very elongated fingers regularly now. [Hand]
- 30va Crito's left hand is visible in *O* and *P*, but is covered in *C*; Simo's left hand is visible only in *O*. [Hand]
- 30vb The outlines of the characters' heads are clearly visible in the underdrawing. [Head]
- 30vc The edge of Pamphilus' robe extends further down in the underdrawing. [Clothing]
- 32va The fingers of Charinus' left hand are visible here, but not in *PC*; the fingers are elongated in the underdrawing. [Hand]
- 32vb The outline of Davus' head extends considerably to the right in the underdrawing. [Head]
- 37vc Phedria's left hand thumb and index finger are visible here in so far as they are strongly delineated though perhaps covered by the robe; they are covered in *PC*. [Hand]
- 40vb Phedria's left hand is visible here, but is covered in *PC*. [Hand]
- 41vb Gnato's right foot is covered here, but is visible in *PC*. [Foot]
- 41vc Gnato's left hand is visible here and in *P*, but is covered in *C*. Note the mitt-shape of the underdrawing. [Hand]
- 43va The outline of Parmeno's mouth and jaw in particular are sketched more to the left in the underdrawing. [Head]
- 45va The box-shaped hat of the soldier Traso, as drawn in *PC*, has been made into a crown here; the underdrawing artist appears to have drawn the box-hat, so it is the final artist who has changed its shape. [Hat]

- 45vb Gnato's left hand is clearly visible here, but is covered in *C*. In *P*, there is a small three-shaped squiggle to the right of his robe, which was perhaps an attempt to suggest his fingers (though *P*'s artist does not usually reveal details of the left hand). [Hand]
- 47rb Details of the sketching of Gnato's robe hem and feet are clearly seen in the underdrawing. [Clothing, Feet]
- 47rc The top of the pointed hat is slightly higher in the sketching; Parmeno's shoulder is sketched much further to the right in the underdrawing. [Hat, Body]
- 47rd This is the first illustration where the artist has dramatically shortened the robe of the slave (though the original line is very faint and hard to see). In *PC*, the slave generally has a full-length robe like the other characters. [Clothing]
- 48ra The shine-through is very prominent here (and elsewhere often) and might be confused at first with details of the underdrawing.
- 48vb Charea's robe is longer in the underdrawing. [Clothing]
- 48vc Charea's gesture indicates 'Love'. [Gesture]
- 50va Dorias holds her head at a more acute angle and has longer flowing hair here than in *PC*; note that her dress has deep decorated sleeves reflecting twelfth-century fashion (as with the decorated neckline). [Clothing, Head]
- 51ra The hemline of Phedria's robe rises more dramatically here than in *PC*, which reflect Late Antique fashion more faithfully. [Clothing]
- 51rb Phedria's gesture indicates 'Puzzlement'. [Gesture]
- 51va Pythias has a long flowing sash in the underdrawing. [Clothing, Omission]
- 51vb Pythias' and Phaedria's left hands are clearly visible here, but are covered in *PCF*. [Hand]
- 51vc The bottom right edge of Phedria's robe and the angle of his left foot are quite different in the underdrawing. [Clothing, Foot]
- 52vb Pythias' whole head is sketched much further to the left in the underdrawing. [Head]

- 52vc Dorus' robe outline and hem are different in the underdrawing; the hems of Phedria's and Dorus' robes are also longer. [Clothing]
- 52vd This is a good example of a left hand which seems to have some detail of its fingers drawn, but not all; they are covered in *PCF*. [Hand]
- 52ve The sketch indicates that a domed roof was originally intended here, though a flat roofline, sometimes with domed turrets or towers, is generally the norm. [Building]
- 54rb Details of C(h)remes' feet and robe are dramatically different in the underdrawing. [Foot, Clothing]
- 54rc Pythias's left hand is clearly visible here, but it is covered in *PCF*. [Hand]
- 54vb There is dramatic raising of the hemline of Chremes' robe here; his feet are also treated very differently in the underdrawing. [Clothing, Foot]
- 54vc Thais' gesture indicates 'Approval'. [Gesture]
- 54vd All three characters have clearly drawn left hands; they are covered in *PCF*. [Hand]
- 54ve The book held by Pythias here is a box in *PCF*. The artist may have noticed the gloss here: the text refers to a box (*cistella*), but the gloss in *O* has *id est cartis donationis huius puelle*, 'that is, with the documents pertaining to the presentation of the girl'. The glosses to *CF* both mention *cum cartis*. [Artefact]
- 55vb The hemline of Gnato's and Sanga's feet are treated quite differently in the underdrawing. [Clothing]
- 57ra Thais' gesture indicates 'Belligerence'. [Gesture]
- 57rb Thais wears a crown in *OP*, but not in *CF*. [Hat]
- 57vb Chaereas' thumb is further to the right in the underdrawing. [Hand]
- 57vc Thais wears a crown in *OP*, but not in *CF*. [Hat]
- 59vb C(h)remes' thumb extends higher and his sleeve lower in the underdrawing. [Hand, Clothing]

- 59vc Pythias' left hand is clearly visible in *O*, but is covered in *PCF*.
[Hand]
- 60ra Parmeno's hand has greatly elongated fingers in the underdrawing.
[Hand]
- 60rb Pythias' left hand is clearly visible in *O*, but is covered in *PCF*.
[Hand]
- 60va Pythias' hand is sketched further to the right in underdrawing.
[Hand]
- 61va Laches' hand and robe are sketched more to the right in the
underdrawing. [Clothing]
- 61vb Both of Parmeno's feet are sketched more to the left in the
underdrawing. [Foot]
- 62vb The sketching for Parmeno's head is further to the right in the
underdrawing. [Head]
- 62vc The sketching for Pythias' mouth and other features are clearly
visible in the underdrawing. [Head]
- 62vd Pythias' left fingers are clearly visible in *O*, but are covered in *PCF*.
Note too his elongated fingers in the underdrawing. [Hand]
- 63vb A long, flowing sash, which is not in the final illustration, can be
clearly seen in the underdrawing as part of Parmeno's clothing.
[Omission, Clothing]
- 63vc Parmeno's hair extends further down in the underdrawing. [Head]
- 63vd Thraso's hemline is longer in the underdrawing. [Clothing]
- 63ve Gnato's hand has very elongated, carelessly drawn fingers in the
underdrawing. [Hand]
- 64vb Phedria's whole body has sketching around it in the underdrawing,
including a lot of detail at the bottom of the robe. [Body,
Clothing]
- 67ra The outline of the Prologue speaker's hand is much larger and has
elongated fingers in the underdrawing. [Hand]
- 67rb The Prologue speaker's foot is finer, thinner, and on a sharper
angle in finished drawing. [Foot]

- 67rc The Prologue speaker's left hand is clearly visible in *O*, but is covered in *PCF*. [Hand]
- 68vb The outline of Chremes' robe is sketched further to right in the underdrawing. [Clothing]
- 68vc *P* also has a plough on the right side of this scene, though it is not elevated as high as here; *CF* have a bundle of grain instead of the plough. The scythe of Menedemus is drawn best in *F*; it looks like a crescent moon wrapped around a rod in *OPC*. [Artefact]
- 71ra The outline of Clitipho's head can be clearly seen in the underdrawing. [Head]
- 71rb The outline of Clitipho's robe can be clearly seen in the underdrawing. [Clothing]
- 71rc Clitipho's gesture indicates 'Dissent'. The outlining of Clitipho's upper body can be clearly seen in the underdrawing. [Gesture, Body]
- 72ra The outlining of Clitipho's head and shoulder can be clearly seen in the underdrawing. [Head]
- 72rb Clitipho's hemline extends lower in the underdrawing. [Clothing]
- 73rb Clinia's robe is longer and his feet are feet angled less in the underdrawing. [Clothing, Foot]
- 73rc Clinia's left hand is clearly visible in *O*, but is covered in *PCF*. [Hand]
- 73vb The sketching of Dromo's sash extends further to the left in the underdrawing. [Clothing]
- 73vc Clinia's gesture indicates 'Sorrowing'. Note too the elongated fingers of Clitipho and the outline of Clinia's head in the underdrawing. [Gesture, Head, Hand]
- 73vd This is a good example of how details of the thumb and index finger of left hands can be seen in *O*, whereas they are completely covered in *PCF*. [Hand]
- 76va Syrus' foot is longer in the underdrawing; his right foot was originally flat on the ground, as it is in *C*. [Foot]

- 76vb Clinia's robe is longer in the underdrawing. [Clothing]
- 76vc Antiphila's hat is more upright and positioned higher in the underdrawing. [Hat]
- 76vd The article held by Bacchis is also in *P*, but is not in *CF*; it is not mentioned in the text. [Artefact]
- 77va The extended hands of both characters have very elongated fingers in the underdrawing. [Hand]
- 77vb Menedemus' gesture indicates 'Compliance'. [Gesture]
- 79va The hemline of Syrus' robe is considerably lower in the underdrawing. [Clothing]
- 79vb Chremes' gesture indicates 'Insistence'. [Gesture]
- 81ra Clitipho's fingers are elongated and Syrus' hand, also elongated, is mitt-shaped in the underdrawing. [Hand]
- 81rc Chremes' left hand is clearly visible in *O*, but is covered in *PCF*. [Hand]
- 84ra The angle of Syrus' feet are less acute in the underdrawing. [Foot]
- 84va The hemline of Syrus' robe has been raised considerably and his sash is positioned higher in the underdrawing. [Clothing]
- 84vb Clinia's hand is crudely drawn, has elongated fingers, and is positioned much further to the right in the underdrawing. [Hand]
- 85vb Dromo's sash extends more to left in the underdrawing. [Clothing]
- 85vc Clinia's hemline extends lower in the underdrawing. [Clothing]
- 85vd Dromo's little finger, which is pointing upwards in the underdrawing to indicate that he is speaking aside in confidence to Syrus (the raised small finger is the gesture for 'Eavesdropping'), has not been included in the final illustration; it is, however, in *PC*. [Gesture, Omission, Hand]
- 86va Syrus' hemline has been dramatically raised and his sash made thinner; his right foot is positioned further to the left in the underdrawing. [Clothing, Foot]

- 88ra Syrus' sash element, on the left in the underdrawing, has not been included in the final illustration. His hand is also mitt-shaped and crudely drawn. [Hand, Omission, Clothing]
- 88rb Clitipho's hand has elongated fingers and Syrus' is mitt-shaped in the underdrawing. [Hand]
- 88va Chremes' left hand is clearly visible in *O*, but is covered in *PCF*. [Hand]
- 88vb Clitipho's fingers are elongated and crudely drawn in the underdrawing. [Hand]
- 88vc Syrus' tunic is hiked up well above the knee, whereas it is full-length in *PCF*; in *C*, Syrus is much shorter than the other characters and hunched over. [Clothing, Body]
- 89rb Menedemus' left hand is clearly visible in *O*, but is covered in *PCF*. The left hand of Chremes is the type where the shape of the thumb and index finger is outlined but the rest of the fingers are not distinguished. [Hand]
- 89rc The outline of Menedemus' head was further to the left in the underdrawing, and his beard extends slightly further to the right. [Head]
- 90rb Menedemus' robe is much longer in the underdrawing. [Clothing]
- 90rc Syrus' robe is much longer in the underdrawing, as is his sash; his right foot was on a less acute angle. [Clothing, Foot]
- 90re Menedemus' left hand is clearly visible in *O*, but is covered in *PCF*. [Hand]
- 93ra Chremes' robe is much longer in the underdrawing. [Clothing]
- 93rb Chremes' gesture indicates 'Forcefulness'. [Gesture]
- 93rc The hands of both characters are outlined crudely in the underdrawing and have elongated fingers. [Hand]
- 93vb The left hands of Clitipho and Sostrata are clearly visible in *O*, but not in *PCF*. Note that a lot of the sketching around the three hands is visible in the underdrawing. [Hand]

- 94vc Clitipho's fingers are quite elongated in the underdrawing, and his robe is sketched further to the left; his right foot is also flatter to the ground. [Hand, Foot, Clothing]
- 96va The Prologue speaker's head and hand are clearly outlined in the underdrawing, and his fingers are elongated. [Head, Hand]
- 96vb The Prologue speaker's left hand is clearly visible in *O*, but is covered in *PCF*. [Hand]
- 97va Micio's left hand is clearly visible in *O*, but is covered in *PCF*. The underdrawing for the right hand has greatly elongated fingers. [Hand]
- 99ra The characters' hands are mitt-shaped in the underdrawing. [Hand]
- 100vb Unusually, virtually no trace of the underdrawing can be seen here.
- 102ra Syrus has the sketching of a sash in the underdrawing, which has not been included in the final illustration; there is no sash in the other witnesses. The outline of his head is further to the left in the underdrawing. [Omission, Clothing, Head]
- 102rb Sannio's robe is longer in the underdrawing, and the angle of his feet is less acute. [Clothing, Foot]
- 102rc Syrus has a much longer robe in the underdrawing. [Clothing]
- 102rd Syrus' fingers are greatly elongated in the underdrawing, and those of Sannio are sketched more to the left. [Hand]
- 102re The artist has drawn Sannio's left hand as if under the cloak (in that it is rounded), but has then added four lines to indicate the fingers (thus it is transitional between having the hand covered and having the fingers exposed). [Hand]
- 103va In the underdrawing the details of Ctesipho's hip and the outline of his robe can be seen clearly. [Body, Clothing]
- 103vb Ctesipho's left hand is clearly visible in *O*, but is covered in *PCF*. His right hand is crudely drawn, larger and further to the right in the underdrawing. [Hand]
- 103vc Syrus' foot is raised higher and on a more acute angle in the finished illustration, creating a greater impression of motion. [Foot]

- 104rb Sannio's hemline is raised considerably in the finished illustration; note too the outline of Syrus' shin on the left side in the underdrawing. [Clothing, Foot]
- 104va Canthara's gesture indicates 'Surprise'. [Gesture]
- 104vb Sostrata has greatly elongated fingers on both hands in the underdrawing. [Hand]
- 105rb The left hands of Sostrata and Canthara are clearly visible here, but are covered in *PC*. [Hand]
- 105rc The back bottom edge of Sostrata's robe is in the underdrawing but not in the finished illustration. [Clothing, Omission]
- 106va Demea's gesture indicates 'Pondering'. [Gesture]
- 107ra The number and configurations of fish and eels are treated differently in each of *PC* and *F*. [Artefact]
- 107rc The building in the underdrawing has a rounded or arched roofline and is sketched further to the right. [Building]
- 109ra (H)egio's gesture indicates 'Approval/Acquiescence'; Geta's gesture indicates 'Supplication'. [Gesture]
- 109rb Demea's gesture indicates 'Restraint'. [Gesture]
- 109rc Demea's left hand is visible in *O*, but not in *PCF*. [Hand]
- 110va This drawing of a robed lady in the margin has not been noticed before in critical literature; see Section 1.3.
- 111rb Syrus' robe is much longer in the underdrawing, and the angle of his feet is less acute. [Clothing, Foot]
- 111va Syrus' robe and sash are much longer in the underdrawing, and the angle of his feet is less acute. [Clothing, Foot]
- 111vc The bottom edge of Demea's robe is different in the underdrawing; the sketching of his feet can be clearly seen as well. [Clothing, Foot]
- 111vd Clitipho's (actually, it is Ctesipho) left hand is clearly visible in *O*, but is covered in *PC*. [Hand]

- 113ra The robes of both characters are longer in the underdrawing; changes to the angles of their feet are clearly seen here as well. [Clothing, Foot]
- 113rb Hegio's left hand is clearly visible in *O*, but is covered in *PC*. Note also the crudeness of the underdrawing for the right hand with its very elongated fingers. [Hand]
- 113va Aeschinus' left hand is clearly visible in *O*, but is covered in *PC*. Note also the crudeness of the underdrawing for the right hand. [Hand]
- 114va Micio's left hand is clearly visible in *O*, but is covered in *PC*. Note also the crudeness of the underdrawing for both right hands. [Hand]
- 114vb The sketched outline of (A)eschinus' head is clearly visible here. [Head]
- 116ra Demea's walking-stick is sketched further to the right in the underdrawing; there is a good deal of sketching visible around his feet and along the edge of his robe. [Artefact, Foot, Clothing]
- 116rb The sketching of Demea's right hand is crude; some outline of his arm is also visible. [Hand, Body]
- 116vb Micio's left hand is clearly visible in *O*, but is covered in *PC*. Note also the crudeness of the underdrawing for both right hands, with their elongated fingers. [Hand]
- 116vc The angle and shape of Demea's feet are quite different in the underdrawing. [Foot]
- 117va Syrus' robe is considerably longer in the underdrawing; his hands are elongated and the angle of his feet is less acute. [Clothing, Foot, Hand]
- 117vb Syrus' hands are considerably elongated in the underdrawing. [Hand]
- 120rb The sketching for the sash is positioned lower in the underdrawing; Syrus' left hand has elongated fingers in underdrawing. Note that Demea's cape was drawn before Syrus' fingers were. [Hand, Clothing]

- 120rc The feet of all three characters were originally sketched straight downwards or more vertically, and all figures were positioned lower or slightly further down on the folio. [Foot]
- 122ra Syrus' robe is much longer on the left side in the underdrawing, and the angle of his left foot is quite different. [Clothing, Foot]
- 122rb The positioning of Demea's right foot, in particular, is quite different in the underdrawing. [Foot]
- 122rc The fingers of both characters are considerably elongated in the underdrawing. [Hand]
- 123ra Geta's robe is much longer on the right side in the underdrawing. [Clothing]
- 123rb The fingers of both characters are considerably elongated in the underdrawing. [Hand]
- 123va Geta's robe is dramatically longer in the underdrawing, and his sash is sketched further to the right. [Clothing]
- 123vb Syrus' sash is sketched further to the right in the underdrawing. [Clothing]
- 124va Demea's whole head is sketched further to the right in the underdrawing. [Head]
- 124vc Micio's left hand is clearly visible in *O*, but is covered in *PC*. [Hand]
- 124vd The feet of all three characters here are dramatically altered from the underdrawing sketches. [Foot]
- 125va This is a good example of the order in which things were done: the large initial *F* is made around the already-drawn foot of Syrus (note how the red ink is on top of the outline of his foot); there is also an *f* prompt in the outer margin for the initial.
- 125vc Aeschinus' feet are dramatically different in the underdrawing. [Foot]
- 125vd The outlines of the characters' heads can be seen quite clearly in the underdrawing. Note that the thread used to repair the parchment earlier is now missing. [Head]

- 128ra The scribe who entered the scholia here did not leave room for the illustration so the speaker has been placed in the outer margin; in *PC*, he is drawn between the Argument and the Prologue (neither of these witnesses has such an extensive passage of commentary here because of their different treatment of the scholia).
- 130ra Philotis' rather bizarre flowing hair is not drawn this way in either *P* or *C* (see also 143v); note that her head is more upright in the underdrawing. [Head]
- 130rb Syra's rather bizarre flowing hair is not drawn this way in either *P* or *C* (see also 143v). [Head]
- 130rd Philotis' left hand is visible only in *O*. Also, her right foot is raised only here; in *PC* it is firmly on the ground, as it is in the underdrawing. [Hand, Foot]
- 130va Parmeno's robe is dramatically longer in the underdrawing. [Clothing]
- 130vb The outlining of the head and hand of Syra is very clear in the underdrawing; she has typically elongated fingers. [Hand, Head]
- 133va The angle of Laches' right feet is significantly different in the underdrawing. [Foot]
- 133vb Sostrata's left hand is clearly visible in *O*, but is covered in *PC*. [Hand]
- 133vc Sostrata's head is positioned further to the right in the underdrawing. [Head]
- 134va Laches' head is positioned further to the left in the underdrawing. [Head]
- 134vb Sostrata's gesture indicates 'Sadness'. Unusually, her left hand is drawn in *PC* also. [Gesture, Hand]
- 135va Sostrata's left hand is clearly visible in *O*. Furthermore, the way she has tucked it in behind her right hand here is also unique; in *PC*, where it is covered, it extends to the right of her body and her right hand is raised higher. [Hand]
- 136ra Parmeno's feet and sash are positioned differently in the underdrawing. [Foot, Clothing]

- 136rb Pamphilus' left hand is clearly visible in *O*, but is covered in *PC*; note too that the fingers of his right hand are elongated in the underdrawing. [Hand]
- 137va The hands of both characters are dramatically different in the underdrawing, where they are crudely sketched. [Hand]
- 137vb The angle of the feet of Parmeno and Pamphilus is significantly altered and the hemlines of their robes are slightly raised. [Foot, Clothing]
- 137vc Details of the sketching of the tower and its arch are clearly seen in the underdrawing. [Building]
- 138ra Pamphilus' right foot is pointing to the right in *PC*, as it is in the underdrawing here; the artist has altered it so that it points to the left. The left foot points more downwards than in the underdrawing. [Foot]
- 138rb Pamphilus' fingers are considerably elongated in the underdrawing. [Hand]
- 139vb Sosia's robe is much longer in the underdrawing. [Clothing]
- 139vc Pamphilus has a crudely drawn large mitt-shaped hand in the underdrawing. [Hand]
- 140va Laches has dramatically elongated fingers in the underdrawing. [Hand]
- 140vc Laches' left hand is clearly visible in *O*, but is covered in *PC*. [Hand]
- 142ra An original sash (or a different arrangement of the robe) seen here between Phidippus' legs was not included in the final illustration. [Clothing, Omission]
- 142rb Phidippus has a crudely drawn mitt-shaped hand in the underdrawing. [Hand]
- 142rc Myrrhina's gesture indicates 'Fear'. [Gesture]
- 143va Sostrata has long flowing hair down her back (as on f. 130r); her hair is short in *PC*, but longer in *F*. [Head]

- 143vc Sostrata's right hand was positioned much lower in the sketch; Pamphilus has a crudely drawn mitt-shaped hand in the underdrawing. In *PCF*, Sostrata's left hand, which is clearly visible here, is covered by her robe. The left hand of Pamphilus has its thumb visible. [Hand]
- 143vd Laches' gesture indicates 'Eavesdropping'. Note that his little finger is greatly elongated in the underdrawing. [Hand, Gesture]
- 144vc Sostrata's left foot originally pointed to the right (as it does in *PC*). [Foot]
- 144vd The left hands of all three characters are clearly visible in *O*, but not in *PC*. [Hand]
- 145rb Pamphilus *adulescens* has a beard here, but should not; he may also have a beard in *PF* (it is not clear in the microfilm images). [Head]
- 145rc The left hands of Laches and Pamphilus are clearly visible in *O*, but are covered in *PC*. [Hand]
- 147vb Bacchis' left hand is clasping her right here: none of the other witnesses has this detail. Note too that the fingers are elongated in the underdrawing. [Hand]
- 147vc In the underdrawing, the back of Laches' headgear terminates in a point; this is a unique detail. [Hat]
- 147vd In the underdrawing, Laches' left foot extends further downwards. [Foot]
- 148vb The position of Phidippus' right foot is crudely sketched in the underdrawing; and Laches' robe was originally longer. [Foot, Clothing]
- 148vc The left hands of the Nutrix, Phidippus and Laches are clearly visible in *O*, but are covered in *PC*. [Hand]
- 149vb Bacchis wears a 'crown' here and in *P*, but not in *CF*. [Hat]
- 149vc In other related witnesses, Parmeno holds the sash in his left hand, and only Bacchis' right hand is visible; here her left hand is also clearly visible, and her index finger points upwards. [Hand, Clothing]

- 149vd Details of the outline of Parmeno's sash and Bacchis' sleeve can be seen in the underdrawing. [Clothing]
- 150vb Pamphilus' hand and fingers are clearly visible in *O*, but are covered in *PC*. Bacchis' hand is roughly sketched in the underdrawing. [Hand]
- 150vc The artist has put a spring in the step of the characters here; in *PC*, their feet are firmly on the ground. [Foot]
- 152va The speaker's feet were originally treated quite differently: in *PC*, his feet are firmly on the ground, as in the underdrawing here. [Foot]
- 154ra Unusually for *O*, the robe of Davus, a slave, has not been shortened; that of the other slave, Geta, is full-length on the verso of this folio and also on f. 166v. Elsewhere throughout this play, he has the dramatically shortened tunic usually assigned to slaves by the artists of *O*. [Clothing]
- 157rb Antipho's fingers are clearly visible in *O*, but are covered in *PC*. [Hand]
- 157vc The artist has positioned Geta so that his right foot steps around the initial *N* and descends down into the margin; in *PC*, he stands firmly on the ground and has no spring in his step. [Foot]
- 159ra Geta's robe has been dramatically shortened (its original hem can be seen just above his right ankle). [Clothing]
- 159rc Demipho's fingers are clearly visible in *O*, but are covered in *PC*. [Hand]
- 161rb Geta's robe has been dramatically shortened here; it is full-length in *PCF*. [Clothing]
- 162rb In *CF*, Cratinus holds a book in his left hand; in *P*, Hegio seems to hold a roll or some parchment. Note the outlining of his raised arm and shoulder here. [Artefact, Body]
- 162rc The side of Cratinus' robe and his left leg and foot are positioned further to the right in the underdrawing. [Clothing, Foot, Body]
- 162rd Demipho's fingers are clearly visible in *O*, but are covered in *PC*. [Hand]

- 164vb Antipho's fingers are clearly visible in *O*, but are covered in *PC*; *F* is damaged so details cannot be confirmed. [Hand]
- 164vc Geta has a crudely drawn mitt-shaped hand in the underdrawing; it extends considerably lower than the finished hand. [Hand]
- 165vb The characters' feet are considerably different in the underdrawing. Note too that the *O* artists tend to draw what look like socks or decorated tops to the boots (the patterns match the bands of trim on their robes), whereas in *PC* they seem to have laced-up boots. [Foot, Clothing]
- 165vc Geta's right hand is positioned slightly higher in the underdrawing. [Hand]
- 166va The characters' extended hands are considerably different in the underdrawing, that on the right being large and crudely drawn with elongated fingers. [Hand]
- 167ra Geta's robe has been dramatically shortened here; it is full-length in *C* and only slightly shorter than that in *P*. [Clothing]
- 167rb Geta's head and hair outline extends further to the left in the underdrawing. [Head]
- 167vb Geta's robe has been dramatically shortened here; it is full-length in *PC*. [Clothing]
- 167vc Antipho is standing in the margin, signalling with his raised right hand that he is eavesdropping because after his first speech here he stands aside and listens to the others. [Gesture]
- 169va The raised hands of Antipho and Geta have greatly elongated fingers in the underdrawing. [Hand]
- 169vb Geta's robe has been dramatically shortened here; it is full-length in *C* and only slightly shorter than that in *P*. [Clothing]
- 169vc Antipho's left hand is clearly visible here, but is covered in *PCF*; his right hand is mitt-shaped in the underdrawing. [Hand]
- 170vc Geta's robe has been dramatically shortened here; it is full-length in *C* and only slightly shorter than that in *P*. [Clothing]
- 170vd Chremes' left hand is clearly visible in *O*, but is covered in *PCF*. [Hand]

- 171rb The hands and sleeve are considerably different in the underdrawing; Chremes' is a crudely drawn mitt-shaped hand and Sophrona's has very elongated fingers. [Hand]
- 171rc Sophrona has a crudely drawn mitt-shaped hand in the underdrawing. [Hand]
- 172ra The outlining of the hands of Demipho and Geta is dramatically different in the underdrawing, where they both have very elongated fingers. [Hand]
- 172vc Demipho's robe is drawn further to the right in the underdrawing. [Clothing]
- 173vb The outline of Antipho's head is considerably further to the left in the underdrawing. [Head]
- 173vc The positioning of Antipho's legs and feet is dramatically different in the underdrawing; they are more perpendicular, as in *PCF*. [Foot]
- 174rb Phormio's left hand is clearly visible in *O*, but is covered in *PCF*. The left hand of Antipho also seems to be uncovered, but the details of fingers not clear; it is covered in *PCF*. [Hand]
- 174rc The outline of Phormio's sleeve is further to the right in the underdrawing, and the outline of the right side of his cloak is further to the left. [Clothing]
- 174rd Antipho's hair is very clearly drawn here. In *P* (scenes 5.5 and 5.6), he is depicted wearing what looks like a polka-dot scarf over his hair. [Head, Clothing]
- 174va Details of Phormio's left hand can be seen here. The left hand of Antipho also seems to be uncovered, but the details of fingers not clear; in *PCF* the hands of both are covered by their robes. [Hand]
- 174vb Geta the slave's tunic is hiked up above the knee here (as usual for a slave), but it is full-length in *PC*. [Clothing]

Appendix 5: Details and Descriptions of Scene Labels

- 9va There is a wavy line drawn to link the name *Mysis* with *ancilla*. The figure in the doorway is the housekeeper, Archilis, who doesn't have a speaking part in the play; her name is mentioned, however, in the text. The name *Archilis*, which has been added under the arch here in a different ink by the person who drew the wavy line, is not in either *P* or *C*. The rather bizarre hairstyle of Archilis is closer to that in *C* than *P*, but is unlike the treatment of hair anywhere else in the manuscript (*O*).
- 16ra The latter half of *Pamphilus* is written over an erasure.
- 17va This part of the image on the missing/excised folio was drawn after the text was copied (as can be clearly seen). The tags were added later and are not in red ink. In *P* and *C*, the complete group is squeezed onto one folio (see Comparandum 10 on the DVD). In *P*, the formal tags are missing: there are only five names (in the wrong order) beneath the image, written in minuscule script.
- 19rc Note that an extraneous letter has been erased after *h*. The *.ii.*, found also in *PC*, was added later in brown ink; *P* has the grammatically correct plural form *SENES*, whereas *OC* have the singular *SENEX*.
- 20vb This is the first prompt for a character tag that can be clearly seen. The prompt reads *SIMO* and the rubric *Symo*; for the importance of this discrepancy, see Section 5.3.
- 21vd Notice that the prompts in the underdrawings are generally in minuscule/lowercase, whereas the rubricator generally writes the tags in red Rustic Capitals.
- 24vd *PC* both have the *.II.* as here, but only *P* has the grammatically correct plural form *ADULESCENTES*.
- 28ra The prompt in the underdrawing has *chremes senes*, whereas the rubricator has *CREMES SENEX* (lacking the *h*); then the underdrawing has *simo duo* and the rubric merely *SIMO*. *PC* lack this illustration (and the one for the next scene, 5.2), but *P* has the tags *Chremes symo senes duo* (in minuscule script). A different rubricator may have inserted the tags on folios 28r–30v, where a variant spelling of *SIMO* is used and the script has slightly different features.

- 28va The underdrawing has *chremes*, but the rubric has *CHREMES*, with the *H* added above; a word has been erased after *CHREMES* in the rubric, probably *SENES* (which is in *P*, though the illustration itself is missing). The underdrawing has *simo .ii.*, the *ii* going with the erased *SENES* (plural), also erased here; finally, the underdrawing has *lolarius*, whereas the rubric uses a 9-shaped *-us* abbreviation in order to avoid violating the bounding line too much.
- 36va *PC* have the spelling *ADOLESCENS* here; note that the rubricator uses an e-caudata here and an *NS* ligature.
- 37va The *Th* ligature in the tag is not in the prompt.
- 37vb The underdrawing has *phaedria*, whereas the rubric has *PHEDRIA*.
- 40va The underdrawing scribe has written the adjectives or role descriptions beneath the proper names, whereas the rubricator has written the words sequentially; thus it is difficult to see the adjectives now beneath the proper names in the rubric.
- 41va There are three characters here, but only two name tags. The figure on the left is Pamphila; the tag above her belongs to the middle figure. The prompt has *gnatho*, whereas the rubric has *GNATO*. In *C*, the central figure is labelled correctly, but the female originally had no tag; subsequently, someone has written *puella* above her in a finer script. In *P*, the layout of the tags is as here (*O*).
- 43vb The e-caudata of the underdrawing is replaced in the rubric by an a-e ligature or digraph (*æ*).
- 45vc The underdrawing has *thraso*, whereas the rubric has *TRASO*, which is of some interest since when the rubricator adds the speaker cues to the text he uses *THR* for this character.
- 47ra The list of character tags is different in each of *OPC*; here it is: *Gnato*, *Thraso miles*, *Thais*, [unnamed character], *Parmeno servus*, *Pythias*, [unnamed]; *P* has the first three similarly labelled, then *PAR*, *EUNUC(US)* *CHEREA*, *Virgo*, [illegible squiggle, but the minuscule tag below the illustration has *ancilla* for the last figure]; *C* has: *GNATHO parasitus*, *TRASO miles*, *THAIS*, *CHEREA U(EL)* *EVNVCHO* (above *ANTIPHO* crossed out), *PARMENO*, [unnamed], *PYTHIAS*'.
- 48rb The figure here who lacks an identifying tag is Cherea (according to the text). He is unidentified in *P*, as here, perhaps because he

doesn't have a speaking part in this short scene. In *C*, the two characters had tags, but they were wrongly assigned. The earlier misplaced *CHAEREA* tag has been crossed out and rewritten beside the figure in the doorway (so too in the next scene). They are properly identified in *F* (also in the next scene).

- 48va The character tag has been corrected following the corrector's cue in inner margin (the rubric apparently had *CHARINUS* earlier, but the *I* has been altered to an *E* and an *A* added in brown ink; there is a Charinus in the preceding play in *O*, which may have caused this slip by the rubricator.
- 52va The prompt has *eunuchus*, whereas the rubric has *EUNUCUS*.
- 54ra The prompt has *adulescens*, whereas the rubric has the incorrect spelling *ADULENS*.
- 54va The prompt *adulescens* can be seen below *meretrix*; the final rubrics have been shifted significantly here.
- 55va There is a good deal of confusion in the assignment of tags in this mob scene. The order in *C* is: [unnamed], *THRASO MILES*, *GNATO PARASITUS*, *DONAX LORARI*, *SIMALIO*, *SYRICUS* [corrected], *TANGA* [corrected to *SANGA*], *THAIS MERETRIX*, *CHREMES ADULESCENS*; *P* has *GNATO PARASITUS*, *SANGA*, *THRASO MILES*, *DONAX LORAR*, *SIMALIO*, *SERISCUS*, *THAIS MERETRIX*, *CHREMES ADULESCENS* (the minuscule tags are: *Traso miles*, *Gnato parasitus*, *Sanga*, *Simalio*, *Siriscus*, *Dorax locaris*, *serui*, *Chremes adolescens*, *Thais meretrix*). *F* is radically different with the characters arranged in a flat V-shaped pattern, with two characters positioned at the far right on the other side of a doorway: *Gnato parasitus*, *Sanga*, *Thraso miles*, *Simalio*, *Donax lorarius*, *Syriscus* *Thais meretrix*, *Chem(es) adolescens*, with an incompletely sketched figure above the centre of the group (f. 14r) (compare also the treatment on f. 23r in *Tur*).
- 55vc In the rubric, the scribe had initially left out the *H* and written *R* in its place, but he altered it to an *H* and writes a second *R* (*calamo currente*, as also on 63r). He also leaves out, for want of room, the *adulescens* of the underdrawing.
- 57va The e-caudata of the prompt becomes an *AE* in the rubric (*CHAEREAS*); the rubricator uses *T* with a superscript *I* for *TRI* in *MERET(RI)X*.

- 59va The prompt has *chremes*, whereas the rubric has *CREMES* (without the *H*); the *h* of *SOPHRONA* was inadvertently left out by rubricator, but subsequently added (*calamo currente*) when he noticed his mistake.
- 62va The rubricator has for some reason left *SER* unfinished (the *-UUS* is missing and there is no evidence of an erasure).
- 63ra In the rubric, the scribe had initially left out the *H* and written *R* in its place, but he altered it to an *H* and wrote a second *R* (*calamo currente*, as also on 55v).
- 63va The prompt has *thraso*, whereas the rubric has *THASO* (with the *R* omitted).
- 64va *Phedria* has an e-caudata in both the prompt and rubric; *ADULESCENS* of the rubric is not in the prompt; *miles* in the underdrawing is omitted in the rubric; the 9-shaped *-us* abbreviation is used in both the prompt and the rubric.
- 68va The prompt correctly has *chremes*, whereas the rubric has *CREMES*, though he routinely uses the tag *CHR* for this character in the text.
- 73ra The prompt has *clitipho .ii.*, whereas the rubric has *CLITIPHO* (and the singular *ADVLESCENS* instead of the required plural, *ADVLESCENTES*).
- 73va The prompt has *dromo .ii.*, whereas the rubric has *DROMO*. Both *P* and *C* include the *II*, but *P* has the correct plural form *SERUI*, whereas *C* has the singular *SERUUS*.
- 77vc The prompt has *senes .ii.* (a very faint *.ii.*), whereas the rubric merely has *SENES*. *P* has *SENES II* and *C* has *SENEX*; *F* has just their names.
- 81rb The *R* in *SERVUS* of the rubric actually is on top of the brown ink of the drawing.
- 85va *O* has *DROMO*. [his head] *SYRUS SERVI* [his head]; note the plural for the adjective. *C* has *DROMO .II. SIRVS SERVVS*, whereas *OP* lack the *II*; the *SERVI* (plural) here and in *P* is required grammatically.
- 85ve *OP* have the character labels in the proper order; *C* has the labels *PHRYGIA* and *CLINIA* reversed, even though they should be hard

to confuse because one is clearly female and the other male. *A* (f. 45r) has a different order yet again: *BACCHIS MERETRIX CLINIA ADULESCENS SYRUS SERUI DROMO II PHRYGIA ANCILLA*.

89ra *P* has the grammatically correct plural form (*SENES*) here. *C* has *SENEX*, as in *O*, but has *.II.* after it; if it were once there, there is now no trace of the numeral in *O*.

90ra *C* repeats the same grouping of Menedemus and Chremes that it has for the previous scene, and perhaps rightly so, since the same two characters are the only speakers here (*The Self-Tormentor*, ll. 874–954). In *OPF*, there is no illustration for scene 5.2 because it has been used here; it is at scene 5.2 that these four characters actually take the stage, and their tags in *O* are in the order, *Clitipho adulescens*, *Menedemus senex*, *Chremes senex*, *Syrus servus*—*A* indicates a scene break with labels at both l. 874 and l. 954. The order in the labels here in *O* (and in *P*) reflects the order in which they speak in ll. 954–1002. For a comprehensive discussion of the disagreement between the disposition of the illustrations in *PCF*, see Grant 1986 (pp. 26–42). He notes that this illustration (in *POF*) corresponds to that for scene 5.2 in *C* (f. 48r), but that the first and third characters have changed positions. He observes, moreover, that,

the first figure in *PF* [and *O*] (Menedemus) corresponds exactly to Chremes, the third figure in *C* . . . The second and fourth figures in both miniatures [and in *O*] are drawn in exactly the same fashion, but in *PF* [*O*] the second figure is named Chremes, while in *C* it represents Menedemus. Syrus occupies the same position in both illustrations and is drawn in the same way (pp. 27–8).

He discusses in considerable detail the position of the raised left hand of Chremes in *PF* [*O*] at scene 5.1, showing that the illustration refers to ll. 904–10.²²² The argument here is complex and should be read in full, but Grant 1986 concludes that

the figures of Menedemus and Chremes at 874 in *PF* [*O*] were originally drawn to illustrate 5.1. I also conclude that the four-figure miniature at 874 in *PF* [*O*] was the only illustration for 874–1002 in the immediate illustrated g archetype of *CPF* [*O*]. (pp. 36–7)

²²² Grant 1986 (p. 35) argues this contra Jachmann 1924 and Jones and Morey 1931.

He further observes that the figures of Clitipho and Syrus were “originally drawn to illustrate the action at 982–3”. Thus the artist has chosen to depict two parts of the action in this scene in one illustration, and this is related to the fact that the manuscript from which he was copying originally had different scene divisions and that he had to make adjustments to the illustrations as he went. Grant 1986 interprets the evidence as indicating that “cycle of illustrations was *not* conceived for a g text but was added to a g MS from a different part of the tradition”.²²³

- 90rd *SENEX* has probably been erased after *CHREMES* here. *P* lacks *SENES*, but has a *II*; *C* has *MENEDEMUS SENEX CHREMES II*.
- 92ra There is no illustration here for these tags, as has been explained earlier (note to 90ra), the illustration has been wrongly associated in *OPF* with scene 5.1. Grant 1986 (pp. 26-42) discusses the implications of the scene divisions and the distribution of illustrations (in *PCF*) for 5.1 and 5.2.
- 93va *MULIER* is perhaps the word erased here below *SOSTRATA*; the prompt *senex* has not been reproduced in the rubric; both words occur in *PC*.
- 94va The prompt has *chremes .ii.*, whereas the rubric merely has *CHEMES*. (with the *R* omitted); *SENEX/S* has probably been erased under *-EDEMUS*. *P* has *SENES*, referring to both characters, and *C* has *SENEX* beneath each of their names.
- 94vb The rubricator has used an *NS* ligature in an attempt to observe the bounding line.
- 99ra The prompt has *demes senes micio .ii.*, as does *P*; *C* has the singular *SENEX* with the *II*.
- 100va The rubricator has accidentally put an extra *E* in *SEERVVS*; no prompts are visible here.
- 100vc The third character here is the music-girl Bacchis; she is not identified in *OPC* because she does not have a speaking part in the play; *F* labels her *Meretrix*. The tags are confused and altered in *C*: *SANNIO*, *AESCHINUS* (expunged, with Parmeno added above), [unnamed] (=Bacchis), *PARMENO SERUUS* (expunged, with

²²³ The stemma illustrating this development appears as Figure 3 on p. 42 of Grant 1986.

Aeschinus added above)'; the order in *P* is as in *O. A* (f. 100v) has
SANNIO LENO BACCHIS MERETRIX AESCHINUS
ADULESCENS PARMENO SERUUS.

- 104ra The word *EIDEM* has been erased after *SYRVS*, and *.II.* after *SANNIO*; both are in the underdrawing and also in *P*. *C* has *SERUUS* for *EIDEM*, and also the *II*.
- 104rc *.II.* has been erased after *CTESIPHO*; *P* and *C* both have the *II*, and *P* has the grammatically correct plural, *ADULESCENTES*.
- 104vc *C* lacks the word *NUTRIX*.
- 105ra The prompt has *eidem* after *SOSTRATA*, as do *PC*; it is not apparent who is 'the same' since Sostrata is neither a slave (like Geta) or an *anus* (like Canthara), but is better called a *matrona*.
- 107rb *P* does not have a character tag for Dromo.
- 111ra *adulescens* in the prompt is obscured by the erasure and correction on the end of *CTESIPHO*.
- 111vb The prompt has *ctesipho*, which is correct; the rubricator has inadvertently substituted a character name from the previous play. *C* lacks the word *ADULESCENS*.
- 113rc *PC* have *II* with the tag for Hegio; *P* has the grammatically correct form *SENES*, while *C* reads as here.
- 113vb The prompt has an e-caudata, whereas the rubric has *AE*.
- 114vc The prompt has an e-caudata, whereas the rubric has just an *E*.
- 116va The prompt (and the original rubric) here is the same as the rubric in *P*: *micio senes demeae .II.*; here a subsequent reader has erased *senes* (after *Micio*) and (it seems) the *.II.* after *Demea*. *C* is as in *P*, but with the singular, *SENEX*.
- 120ra *PUER* (meaning slave) is used uniquely here for *servus* elsewhere; *P* has the same tags. *C* has *DROMO* (perhaps with *PUER* erased after it), then *SERUUS* for the *IDEM* in *OP*. Dromo is only depicted elsewhere in this play in the extra or second illustration for 3.3; *A*, interestingly, has *PUER* also, on f. 113v; on f. 105r, his only other appearance in the play, *A* denotes him as *COCUS*, the 'cook'.

- 120va The underdrawing prompts here have *micio senes demea .ii.*; the rubric has *SENEX* (singular). A later reader has erased the *.II.* of the rubric after *DEMEA*. *PC* read as in the underdrawing here, but *P* has the grammatically correct plural, *SENES*.
- 124vb The prompt has an e-caudata, whereas the rubric has *AE*.
- 124vf *eidem* has been erased after *DEMEA* in the rubric, and may also have been erased in the prompt at the same time.
- 125vb *eidem* has been erased after *DEMEA* in the rubric (the punctus after the erased word remains); the *eidem* of the prompt was erased at the same time. *C* has *EIDEM* after *DEMEA*, as does *P*; *P* lacks the third and fourth tags (*AESCHINUS* and *MICIO*).
- 130rc *C* has the same rubrics as here; *P*'s rubric originally consisted of just the two names, but *meretrix* and *lena* have been added later in a minuscule script.
- 130vc The tags are simpler in *P* than here and in *C*; the rubrics in *P* seem to have been added later on f. 127v, as also on the recto (the script is also different).
- 134vc The prompts here have *phidippus senes* (erased) *laches .ii.*. A later reader has erased the *SENES/X* after *PHIDIPPUS* and *.II.* after *LACHES* in the rubric. *PC* read as in the underdrawing here, but with *P* having the grammatically correct plural, *SENES*.
- 139va The rubric has *PARMENO SOSIA*. (with *II.* erased), *PAMPHILUS ADVLESCENS*. The prompt has *parmene serui sosia .ii. pamphilus* (with an *m* abbreviation added above) *adulescens pamphilus adulescens* (twice). The last figure's tag has been erased, but seems to have been short and ended in *-a*, so most likely *SOSIA*; *F* has *ORLANDO(!)* added later as a tag; the fourth figure is not identified in *PC*; *C* is incorrect in its tags: *PARMENO SERVVS SSOSIA II PAMPHILUS*.
- 140vb The name *phidippus* has been erased in the prompt, as has been the *.ii.*, going with *SENEX*, in the rubric. *P*'s tags are as originally in the underdrawing here, but with the grammatically correct plural, *SENES*; *C* omits the descriptive adjectives *SENES* and *ADULESCENS*.
- 143vb The prompt has *pamphil(us) adulescens laches senes*; the rubric has *PAMPHIL(US) ADVLESCE(N)S LACHES SENEX* (note the *senes-*

SENEX variant). *P* has *SENES* and *C SENEX*. It is noteworthy that Laches is included in the illustration since he does not have a speaking part in this scene; his name does not appear at the beginning of the scene in *A* (f. 89v). He does belong here in a sense, however, since the opening sentence of the next scene tells us that he has been standing off to the side and listening (he gestures with his right hand to indicate that he is eavesdropping). In *F*, he has no tag, presumably because the rubricator didn't know who he was since he is not mentioned in this particular scene.

- 144va The prompt has *laches senex*, whereas the rubric has *LACES SENEX*.
- 144vb The prompt has *adulescens*, whereas the rubric has *ADVLESCE(N)S* (abbreviated).
- 145ra The prompt has *adulescens*, whereas the rubric has *ADVLESCE(N)S* (abbreviated in order to avoid violating the bounding line); the rubric *.II.* is erased below *LACHES*; *P* has the *.II.*, as does *C*, and both have *SENEX*, whereas *P* usually has the grammatically correct plural form (*SENES*).
- 147va The prompt has *laches*, whereas the rubric has *LACES*.
- 148va *F* has a different order for the tags: *bacchis nutrix* [the next is not clear] *laches phidippus*; *C* has the same order as here, but has *Phidippus senex Laches ii* (as in the prompt here); the order in *P* is as here, but has *PHIDIPPUS SENES LACHES II* (correct grammatically); here the prompt has *phidippus senex laches .ii.*; the rubric omits *SENEX* and has a wrap mark before *-RETRIX*.
- 149va There is no underdrawing prompt for *PARMENO SERVVS*.
- 150va The rubric has *BACCHIS MERETIX*, with the *IX* added above because her head is in the way; presumably the *T* with the *I* above is an abbreviation for *TRI* (as on f. 57v).
- 152vb Note that the figure of the speaker was drawn before the rubricator added the Argument. In *C* (f. 77v), he stands against the left bounding line and the Prologue is written (in prose) down the centre and the right side of the folio.
- 154va The word *SERVUS/-I* has been erased after *GETA*, and *ii.* after *DAVVS*. in the rubric; *PC* have *GETA SERUI DAUUS .II.*

- 157ra The prompt has *adulescens*, whereas the rubric has *ADVLES*. (without an abbreviation sign).
- 157va The rubric has *SERVS* (for *SERVVS*), *ANTIPHO*. (with *II*. erased after it); the prompt has *eidem*, which is not in the rubric. The prompt has *.ii.* below *phedria*. *C* has *ANTIPHO EIDEM PHAEDRIA II*; *P* has *ANTIPHO EIDEM PHEDRIA* (with *.ii.* perhaps erased).
- 159rb Note the *NS* ligature here, probably used in order to avoid running too close to Phedria's head with the rubric; *C* omits *ADULESCENS*.
- 161ra The prompt has the abbreviated form *parasit(us)*, whereas the rubric has *PARASITUS*.
- 162ra The order of the characters is different in *P*: *Phormio Geta Demipho Hegio Cratinus* (*Crito* seems to be missing, but may be hidden in the gutter of the available image); the order in *C* is as here. The order in *F* is also as here, but with variant spellings.
- 164va The prompt has *antipho .ii.*, whereas the rubric has *ANTIPHO*, without the *ii*. *P* and *C* have the *.II.*; *F* is damaged and illegible.
- 165va The prompt has *.ii.* after *antipho* (it is hard to see here for the most part); *PC* both have the *II* in their rubrics, though it has been left out here. *P* has the grammatically correct form *ADULESCENTES*.
- 166vb The prompt has *chremes .ii.*; whereas the rubric merely has *CHREMES*. *PC* both have the *II*, but it is wanting in *F*.
- 167va The prompt has *chremes .ii.*, the rubric *CHREMES*. *PC* have the *II*. *F* has the tags in a different order: *Antipho Geta Cremes Demipho*; this follows *A*, which has *CHREMES SENES DEMIPHO II* for the last two characters.
- 169vd Note the way that the rubricator has broken the *H*, placing half on either side of Antipho's head.
- 170va The prompt has *cremes* (with *h* missing) *.ii.*, the rubric *CHEMES* (with *R* missing) and *.II.* erased. *P* has *CHREMES DEMIPHO SENES GETA SERUUS*; *C* has *DEMIPHO SENEX CHREMES II GETA SERUUS*, inverting the first two characters, which follows the order in *A*.
- 170vb The rubric has *SENES*, with the first *S* erased, whereas the prompt has *senes*.

- 170ve The rubric has *SERVS* (for *SERVVS*).
- 171ra The prompt has *sophrona anus*, with *r* added above; the rubric has *SOPHRONIA ANUS.*, with *I* erased. *P* has *SOPHONA* in its rubric, but *sophrona* in its minuscule tag.
- 172va The prompt has *nausistra-/ta mulier* (on two lines). The rubric omits the *V* in *NAVSISTRATA* and then inserted it as a ligature on *A*.
- 172vb The prompt has *chremes senex*, whereas the rubric has *CREMES SENEX*. Note that when two old people or slaves are not standing adjacent to each other the rubricator repeats the whole word (*SENEX/SERVVS*) rather than using *II*.
- 172vd The prompt for the rubricator has been written here in the top margin as well as in its normal position within the space left for the illustration; this kind of repetition happens only here.
- 173va The prompt has *antipho adulescens*, whereas the rubric has *ADVLESCES* (with *N* omitted) *ANTIPHO*. Unusually, the word order is inverted and the rubric is in a different hand from earlier tags.
- 174ra It is not clear whether the *PH* ligature was intentional; perhaps the *H* was left out and subsequently squeezed in as a ligature (as on f. 172v).

Appendix 6: Details and Descriptions of Character or Speaker Cues

- 5ra The cue for the rubricator cannot be seen here (a cue can be seen, for example, on f. 98r at the beginning of *The Brothers*). Illuminated initials such as this are found at the beginning of each play.
- 7va The rubricator apparently left out two cues initially, which has been noted by the corrector; they were subsequently added.
- 13vc A corrector has erased an extraneous speaker cue here.
- 20vc Cues for the rubricator to add speaker cues before these two short speeches are in the outer margin (one is cropped).
- 24ra The rubricator apparently wrote *CAH* at first; when the error was detected he erased the final letter and added the *H* above *CA*.
- 24vf The rubricator has placed the *h* above the *CA*, probably because he realized that he had not left himself enough space for a three-letter cue.
- 25ra The rubricator has written *CA* for *CHA* (as he did on f. 24r–v, but there he corrected them to *CHA*).
- 28vc There is a cue (*a*) for the rubricator in the outer margin.
- 29vb Text has been erased after *SIM*. The cues are out of order, as noted in the textual commentary. The rubricator got things back in order by writing *DAV* above *CHR* here.
- 31ra The *SYM* cue here should say *CRI*; the speech by *SYM* begins with *eho*.
- 36vb The cue for the rubricator has been cropped away here (a cue can be seen, for example, on f. 98r at the beginning of *The Brothers*). Illuminated initials such as this are found at the beginning of each play.
- 46ra The cue *THR* is partly hidden in the gutter here.
- 46rb A corrector has altered the speaker cue from *CHR* to *Gnato*.
- 48rc Note the cropped cues on the tab of the excised folio.

- 48rd The rubricator accidentally left the *H* out as he was writing the cue and has subsequently added it above.
- 52ra The cue for Phedria has been inserted in brown ink over an erased cue in red ink; it is not clear what (incorrect) name cue was originally here (*P* has *PHA*).
- 53ra Original cue *PYT* has been over-written in brown ink and changed to *Phe* (*P* has *PHA*).
- 53rb The rubricator uses abbreviations for ‘eunuch’ (e.g. *EVNV*) for a few speeches on this folio and its verso; his normal practice is to refer to speakers by their names.
- 55ra *CHR* has been erased before the first line here; the corrector added a cue for the rubricator in the gutter, which he has then subsequently inserted before l. 2.
- 56ra It seems that the red cue was originally left out; a corrector has noted in the outer margin that it needs to be inserted and the rubricator has subsequently done this.
- 56rb A cue has been covered by the patch used to repair the parchment here; however, the tail of the *R* (*THR*) can still be seen.
- 56va The *THA* cue was added by the rubricator after the corrector noted that it had been overlooked in the margin.
- 59ra The scribe did not leave room for the character cue, so the rubricator has squeezed it in above. (*P* has *CHA* in its proper place).
- 64ra It seems that the red cue was originally left out; a corrector has noted in the outer margin that it needs to be inserted and the rubricator has subsequently done this.
- 67va The cue for the rubricator has been mostly cropped away here (a cue can be clearly seen, for example, on f. 130r at the beginning of *The Mother-in-Law*). Illuminated initials such as this are found at the beginning of each play.
- 68vd The rubricator originally left out the *h*; he has subsequently written it above (perhaps because he had just written *CREMES* above the illustration, rather than *CHREMES*). Note also the cropped cue (*q*) in the other margin for the large decorated initial.

- 73ve The red cue (for *CLIN*) has been left out before *Ei*; this has been noted by the corrector in a cropped cue in the outer margin, but the rubricator has failed to add it.
- 76ra A corrector has noted in the outer margin that three speaker cues were incorrect here; subsequently they were adjusted by the rubricator (note the slightly darker ink).
- 76ve Note the cues in the outer margin for the two initials here (*e* and *E*).
- 77vd Note the cue in the outer margin for the initial (*L*) here.
- 79ra A corrector has noted in the outer margin that a speaker cue was incorrect here; subsequently it was adjusted by the rubricator (note the slightly darker ink).
- 80ra The cues for the rubricator can be seen in the gutter; the second *h* is almost completely hidden now, but its shoulder is visible here.
- 82ra There is a gap after *tibi* in *P* (f. 82v), either for a character cue or indicating an erasure. *A* (f. 43r) has the same cues as *OCY*, but not the space left in *P*. At the end of the second line here, the cue *SYR* has been omitted before *non est opus* in the *g* family; thus the character cues are assigned incorrectly for the rest of the scene (*SYR* and *CHR* must be substituted for each other to get the correct speakers). *A* (f. 43r) has the cues in their proper positions.
- 87va The corrector has noted in the outer margin that two speaker cues have been omitted here; subsequently they have been squeezed in by the rubricator.
- 88rc The cue for the initial (*n-N*) is mostly concealed in the gutter here.
- 89rd The cue for the initial (*m-M*) is partly concealed in the gutter here.
- 91va It seems that the red cue was originally left out; a corrector has noted in the outer margin that it needs to be inserted and the rubricator has subsequently done this.
- 93rd Since the scribe had left sufficient room here, the rubricator has uncharacteristically inserted the speaker's whole name.
- 93vc The cue for the initial (*tall-s-S*) can be seen in the outer margin here.
- 97ra The cue for the rubricator (*p-P*) can be seen in the gutter.

- 98ra The cue for the rubricator (*tall-s-S*) can be seen in the gutter here. Illuminated initials such as this are found at the beginning of each play.
- 101ra The speaker cue has been corrected/alterd in a slightly darker ink.
- 103vd The red cue (*The*) has been left out before *hem*; this has been noted by the corrector in the gutter, but the rubricator has failed to add it later; *The* is odd since *CTES* is used elsewhere here.
- 104rd Two cues for the rubricator (*u-U/V*) can be seen in the gutter.
- 105rd Two cues for the rubricator (*o-O*) can be seen in the gutter.
- 105va The cropped cue for the initial (*n-N*) can be seen in the outer margin here.
- 107rd The cue for the rubricator (*d-D*) can be seen in the gutter.
- 107re The cue for the rubricator (*o-O*) can be seen in the gutter.
- 107va The cue for the rubricator (*o-O*) can be seen in the outer margin.
- 109va The cue for the rubricator (*p-P*) can be seen in the outer margin.
- 110ra The partly hidden cue for the rubricator (*m-M*) can be seen in the gutter.
- 111rc Two cues for the rubricator (*a-A*) can be seen in the gutter.
- 112ra A corrector has noticed an incorrect cue in the text and noted it in the margin; the rubric was subsequently adjusted—note the darker colour of the red ink.
- 112rb Two cues for the rubricator (*n-N*), one partly hidden, can be seen in the gutter.
- 114vd The cue for the rubricator (*i-I*) can be seen in the outer margin.
- 116vc The cue for the rubricator (*i-I*) can be seen in the outer margin.
- 118ra The cue for the rubricator (*d-d/D*) can be seen in the gutter.
- 118rb The rubricator originally wrote *CR* here, but has corrected himself and added an *H* above.

- 118va A corrector has noticed an incorrect cue in the text and noted it in the inner margin; the rubric was subsequently adjusted—note the darker colour of the red ink.
- 120rd Two cues for the rubricator (*e-e/E*) can be seen in the gutter.
- 120vb The cue for the rubricator (*h-H*) can be seen in the gutter.
- 120vc The cue for the rubricator (*p-P*) can be seen in the gutter.
- 120vd The significance of this *r* is unclear.
- 122va The cue for the rubricator (*n-N*) can be seen in the outer margin.
- 123rc The cue for the rubricator (*e-e/E*) can be seen in the gutter.
- 123vc The cue for the rubricator (*o-O*) can be seen in the outer margin.
- 124ve The cue for the rubricator (*i-I*) can be seen in the outer margin.
- 125ra A corrector has noticed two incorrect cues in the text and noted it in the inner and outer margins; the rubrics were subsequently adjusted—note the darker colour of the red ink.
- 125ve The cue for the rubricator (*f-F*) can be seen in the outer margin.
- 128rb The cue for the rubricator (*h-h/H*) can be seen in the gutter.
- 130re The cue for the rubricator (*p*) can barely be seen in the gutter here. Illuminated initials such as this are found at the beginning of each play.
- 130vd The cue for the initial (*tall-s-S*) can be seen in the outer margin here.
- 131ra The cue for the initial (*tall-s-S*) is partly hidden in the gutter here.
- 137vd The cue for the rubricator (*n-N*) can be seen in the outer margin.
- 138rc The cue for the rubricator (*n-N*) is partly hidden in the gutter.
- 139vd The cue for the rubricator (*a-A*) can be seen in the outer margin.
- 140ra The scribe failed to leave room for the speaker cue here, so the rubricator has inserted it above.
- 142va *PHI*, in darker ink, is written over an erased speaker cue.

- 149ve The partly-cropped cue for the rubricator (*e-e/E*) can be seen in the gutter.
- 150vd The cue for the rubricator (*u-U/V*) can be seen in the outer margin.
- 154rb The cue for the rubricator (tail of an *a*) can barely be seen in the gutter here. Illuminated initials such as this are found at the beginning of each play.
- 156ra The speaker cue (*DAV*) has been corrected in a darker ink.
- 158va The corrector has noted that the rubricator failed to insert the speaker cue here; it has subsequently been added.
- 160va In the text, *DEM* is twice followed by an erasure (ll. 7 and 21); because of the space left available here by the scribe, the rubricator wrote out the wrong full name, which he or someone else has subsequently corrected. The letters *EA* are similar to those in *GETA* on same folio.
- 162re The speaker cue was originally omitted, which has been noticed by the corrector; it was subsequently added by the original rubricator but in a darker ink.
- 165ra It is not clear why the corrector has asked for this to be inserted; in related manuscripts (e.g. *PC*) the speech of *ANT* continues here.
- 169ve A corrector has noticed a missing speaker cue here and has marked where it ought to be inserted; the rubricator has subsequently added it in slightly darker ink.
- 170vf The rubricator has written a second set of cues here; *P* (f. 167r) and *C* (f. 86v) agree with the original assignment. As altered, they agree with the assignment in *A* (f. 68v).
- 173ra Two speaker cues have been omitted here: *DEM* before *Non* and *CHR* before *Numquam*; they are both found in *P* (f. 169v) and *C* (f. 88v).
- 173vd The speaker cues have been adjusted here so that they now agree with those in *P* (ff. 169v–170r) and *C* (f. 88v).
- 174vc The scribe failed to leave room for the speaker cue here, so the rubricator has added it above the line.