absence of scene divisions in the MSS of Greek drama.

Università di Pisa ROLANDO FERRI
r.ferri@flcl.unipi.it
doi:10.1017/S000983880800075X

the interlocked narratives of the dialogue: *πρώτη τοίνυν ἐστὶν συνουσία, ἡ αὐτὰ περιέχουσα τὰ κύρια πρόσωπα καὶ τὴν πρώτην σκηνὴν τῶν λόγων* (similarly also ibid. 630.10, 682.27). The meaning, however, is 'first setting': cf. G.R. Morrow and J.M. Dillon (trans.), *Proclus' Commentary on Plato Parmenides* (Princeton, 1987), 25: 'we have then, first, the original conversation between the principal personages at the scene where it took place'. The 'first scene' is the dialogue between Socrates, Zeno and Parmenides, related by Pythodorus to Antipho ('second setting'), who in turn recounts it to Cephalus ('third setting'), who lastly narrates it to an anonymous audience ('fourth'). *Σκηνή*, then, does not describe a sequence of episodes within the same 'drama', but different settings, discontinuous in time. *CQ*'s anonymous reader helpfully drew to my attention A. Müller, 'Untersuchungen zu den Bühnenalterthümern', *Philologus. Supplementband* 7 (1898), 1–116. Müller (25) mentions the use of the word for 'Theil des Bühnenspiels', but gives by way of parallel only Andron. *De com.* 10 Dübner. *ὁ Τερέντιος … εἰς πέντε σκηνὰς διαιρεῖ τὸ δρᾶμα* (= Ps. Andronicus, *Περὶ τάξεως ποιητῶν* 18–20, in W.J.W. Koster [ed.], *Scholia in Aristophanem* IA [Groningen, 1975], 116), which seems to be the only Greek passage where the word occurs with the meaning 'part of a stage action', even if in this case it means 'act' rather than 'scene'. Koster, however, ascribes authorship of this treatise to the Renaissance Greek scribe Constantine Palaeocappa (cf. id., 'Ad novam editionem Aristophanis et prolegomenorum de comoedia', *Mnemosyne* ser. 4.8 (1955), 22–4).

PLAUTUS, *MILES GLORIOSUS* 1367

In the *Miles gloriosus*, the slave Palaestrio conspires to hoodwink his master, the soldier Pyrgopolynices. Taking leave of the soldier for good just as the trap is to be sprung, Palaestrio teases him with double entendres. Lines 1364–7 as transmitted:

PAL Cogitato identidem tibi quam fidelis fuerim.
si id facies, tum demum scibis tibi qui bonus sit, qui malus. 1365
PYR scio et perspexi saepe, uerum quom antehac, hodie maxume.
PAL scies; immo hodiem eorum factum faxo post dices magis.

1364 identidem ς : dent idem *BCD* | 1365 scibis tibi *CD :* sciuisti *B* | 1366 hodie *BCD :* tum hodie ς | 1367 hodiem eorum *CD :* hodie eorum *B*

For a long time the manuscripts were followed in giving all of 1366 to Pyrgopolynices and all of 1367 to Palaestrio. This necessitated reading *scis* for transmitted *scies* in 1367. It also encouraged seeing in *uerum* at 1366 an adjective rather than a conjunction, favouring in turn the adoption of Camerarius' conjecture *hodie uerum* for the corrupt *hodie(m) eorum* at 1367. So, for example, the Teubner edition of Ritschl *et al.* read:[1]

PAL Cogitato identidem tibi quam fidelis fuerim.
si id facies, tum demum scibis tibi qui bonus sit, qui malus. 1365
PYR scio et perspexi saepe uerum quom antehac tum hodie maxume.
PAL scis? immo hodie uerum factum faxo post dices magis.

[1] *Editio maior*, Leipzig 1878–94; the fascicle containing *Miles gloriosus*, edited by G. Goetz, appeared in 1890.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838808000761 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Now the *uerum* of 1366 was never easy to understand as an adjective. What does the soldier know to be true? It could be Palaestrio's faithfulness to him. *Verum* in the following line would need then to be understood in the same way. But Palaestrio has not been faithful to Pyrgopolynices at all – just the opposite. One half of the riddle – the half that the audience is meant to understand, the soldier not – is thus out of line with the facts. Alternatively, one might take *uerum* in 1366 as predicate to an unexpressed *te esse. Me esse* must then be supplied for *uerum* in 1367.[2] A double meaning can then be had: the first *uerum* would mean 'sincere', 'speaking truth', and the soldier would assume the same sense for the second *uerum*, but Palaestrio would intend also 'in my true nature'. The train of thought is, however, not the clearest, and it is in any case not Palaestrio's truthfulness, but rather his faithfulness, that has been at issue.

Friedrich Leo redistributed the speaking-parts so as to give the soldier *scio et perspexi saepe*, Palaestrio everything from *uerum quom antehac* on.[3] His arrangement affords the economy of retaining *scies* in 1367; the solution should accordingly proceed from it. Leo himself conjectured *hodie me tuom* for *hodie(m) eorum*, citing as parallels *Mil.* 614–15 (*quodne uobis placeat displiceat mihi? quis homo sit magis meus quam tu es?*) and *Poen.* 1218 (*istoc pretio tuas nos facile feceris*). If the former is followed we should have to render *me tuom factum* 'I became your special favourite'; if the latter, 'I was won over to you'. In either case, the string of ambiguities must end in the flatly univocal and in the untrue.

We can have a double meaning, without obscurity, at no higher palaeographical price than was paid for *uerum* or *me tuom*. The last two lines should be printed:

> PYR scio et perspexi saepe. PAL uerum quom antehac, hodie maxume
> scies. immo hodie memorem factum faxo post dices magis.

PYR. I know, and have often observed it. PAL. But you will know it especially today, even if you did before. Why, I'll make sure you say afterward it was today that you were made more aware of it.

Université de Montréal BENJAMIN VICTOR
benjamin_victor@hotmail.com
doi:10.1017/S0009838808000761

[2] So J. Brix, 'Zu Plautus', *NJPhP* 102 (1870), 761–81, at 772–3.
[3] First proposed in 'Lectiones plautinae', *Hermes* 18 (1883), 558–87, at 585; printed in Leo's edition of Plautus (Berlin, 1895–6).

CATILINE'S RAVAGED MIND: *VASTUS ANIMUS* (SALL. *BC* 5.5)

The portrayal of Catiline (*BC* 5.1–8) – which should not, as Karl Büchner among others has pointed out, be considered a digression – continues three major aspects of the proem (but does not form part of it).[1] On the one hand, the fundamental

[1] K. Büchner, *Sallust* (Heidelberg, 1982[2]), 131. I agree with K. Vretska, *De Catilinae coniuratione. Ein Kommentar* (Heidelberg, 1976), ad loc.: 'Mangelnde Formbewältigung in der ersten Schrift? Doch wohl […] zwanghafte Folge aus der Auffassung des Stoffes'. For a discussion

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838808000761 Published online by Cambridge University Press