T. MACCI PLAVTI

MOSTELLARIA

T MACCI PLAVTI

MOSTELLARIA

EDITED WITH NOTES
EXPLANATORY AND CRITICAL

BY

EDWARD A. SONNENSCHEIN
D.LITT. OXON.
PROFESSOR OF LATIN AND GREEK IN THE UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM

SECOND EDITION

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
1907

PREFACE

THE present edition of the *Mostellaria* has been entirely recast in order to bring it into touch with the results of Plautine criticism in recent years. I am indebted especially to the *Editio Minor* of Goetz and Schoell (Fasciculus v, 1896) and, as in my first edition, to the commentary of Lorenz (1866 and 1883). I have also consulted with advantage the editions of Ussing (1888), Leo (1896), and Lindsay (1904). In the matter of the text I have treated the MS. tradition with the greatest respect; but I hold that in corrupt passages a good emendation (i. e. one which is in complete touch with Plautine diction and prosody and as little as possible out of touch with the MS. tradition), even though it is not certain, is better than an admittedly unsound reading of the MSS. Thus I have not hesitated to emend and accept emendations in many corrupt places where the *Editio Minor* contents itself with putting a † or marking a lacuna. At the same time there are many passages of the play in which the experience of the twenty-two years which have passed since the publication of my first edition has convinced me that a suspected reading of the MSS. was sound.

In the explanatory notes I have found an opportunity of emphasizing views which I have at heart as to moods and tenses, which are perhaps best studied in connexion with the oldest extant literary examples of their use.

In regard to metre and prosody I have deliberately avoided in this edition the discussion of vexed questions on which Plautine scholars are divided in opinion. My own views as

to the 'semi-quantitative' character of Old Latin verse and their bearing on fundamental questions of prosody, such as the law of 'Breves breviantes', have been briefly indicated in an article in the *Classical Review* ('Accent and Quantity in Plautine Verse,' 1906, vol. xx, pp. 156–9). To set them forth in detail in the present edition would have demanded more space than I had at my disposal; and I have thought it better to reserve them for a separate work on metre and prosody, on which I have been engaged for many years.[1] Brief references are, however, made to the above article in cases where my special views have a bearing on the text (e.g. note on l. 656). Similarly in regard to the scansion of *ille*, *nempe*, &c., in lines like 210 and 335 *a*, I have contented myself with a reference to an article by Radford in which the latest discussion of rival theories is contained.[2] In the use of ictus-marks in the text I have followed the same principle as in the 'editio minor' of my *Rudens*—a principle which is also adopted in the main by Goetz and Schoell in their latest edition.[3] But these marks are not to be interpreted as implying dissent from the views of Radford

[1] I shall there take account of much recent work, such as the article by Jacobsohn (*Quaestiones Plautinae metricae et grammaticae*), in which he proves that the verse-ending ⏑ — ⏑ —, whether in iambic senarii or in trochaic septenarii, may be preceded by a 'syllaba anceps' or by hiatus, and further applies the same treatment to the second rise of the troch. septen.

[2] 'Plautine synizesis, a study of the phenomena of *brevis coalescens*,' in *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 1905 (vol. xxxvi), pp. 159–61; see also the vol. for 1904 (xxxv), p. 44. Radford's own view as to the pronunciation of the 'dimoric' *ille*, *nempe*, &c., is that there was some reduction in the quantitative value of *both* the syllables, and that it is not necessary to hold with Skutsch that the second syllable was entirely dropped. [A fuller study of the question by the same author has been commenced in the *American Journal of Philology*, 1906 (vol. xxvii), pp. 418–37.]

[3] i.e. Fasciculus ii of the *Editio Minor* (*Bacchides*, *Captivi*, *Casina*), 1904, Praef. p. vii.

in cases where some kind of synizesis may be assumed. For example, my ictus on the *u* of *quattuor* in l. 630 is meant to indicate merely that *-ttuor* forms the rise (or arsis) of the first foot, not that *quattuor* is to be pronounced as three full syllables with the accent on the second. It cannot be too clearly understood that ictus-marks are not indications of word-accent or sentence-accent, but merely a means of dividing lines into feet or dipodies. They serve, in fact, the humble object of helping the reader to scan, though they may and do indirectly furnish evidence of the incidence of word-accent and sentence-accent.

In the revision of the proof-sheets I have had the assistance of two friends, one of whom, alas, is no longer among us. Professor O. Seyffert of Berlin, with characteristic devotion, read part of the proof as it was going through the press, in spite of the fact that he was suffering from the effects of a paralytic stroke. The comments which he was able to send me before his death in July of last year were not many, but they were of great value. Professor Postgate has most kindly read the whole of the explanatory notes and made several helpful suggestions which I have embodied, sometimes with a reference to his name. And to the Reader of the Clarendon Press I am indebted for the thoroughness with which he has done his work.

As in my *Rudens* (ed. min.), the text is interleaved to facilitate the collecting of notes and comparison of instances.

E. A. S.

BIRMINGHAM:
January 1, 1907.

INTRODUCTION

THE Mostellaria[1], like other plays of Plautus, is founded on a Greek original: this was called Φάσμα, 'The Ghost,' as we learn from the didaskalia, or notice appended to the play by the grammarians (see p. xix). There were several plays of this name belonging to the νέα κωμῳδία; probably the one in question was written by Philemon[2], from whom Plautus also borrowed the plot of his Trinummus and Mercator. Whether the *Phasma Catulli*, a mime of the early empire mentioned by Juvenal VIII. 186, had any connexion with any of these earlier ghost-plays is not known.

The scene is laid in a public street in Athens (cf. 30, 66, 1072) in which stand the houses of Theoropides (or Theopropides[3]) and Simo. The action lasts from early morning[4] till late in the afternoon: cf. notes on I. 1, I. 2, I. 3, I. 4, and lines 579 *redito huc circiter meridiem*, 651 *iam adpetit meridies*, 966 *uide sis ne forte ad merendam quopiam deuorteris*. Between the two houses, which occupy the back of the stage, is the opening of a narrow side-street (*angiportum*, cf. 1046), employed in several passages of the play as a place from which the conversation on the stage may be overheard. The

[1] The word is a feminine adjective derived from *mostellum*, the diminutive of *monstrum* : *Mostellaria* (sc. *fabula*) then means 'A Ghost-story'.

[2] If so, the date of the composition of this Φάσμα falls between the years 289 and 262 B.C. The latter is the year of Philemon's death; for the former see note on line 775 (cf. on 1149), and Hueffner, *De Plauti comoediarum exemplis Atticis* (Göttingen, 1894).

[3] The form of the name is not certain; see under *Personae*.

[4] Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen*, p. 176.

stage is approached by two side doors, that on the left of the spectators leading to or from the harbour, that on the right to or from the market-place or the country (Attica); see Menaechmi 555 f., Amphitruo 333.

Before Simo's house stands the usual altar (cf. Aul. 598).

The Plot.

During the absence abroad of Theoropides, an Athenian merchant, his son Philolaches has been sowing his wild oats. He has fallen in love with a slave-girl named Philematium, and after purchasing her from her owner with borrowed money, has shown the genuineness of his affection for her by presenting her with her freedom. In Act I, Scene 4, we are introduced to a drinking-bout at his father's house, and make the acquaintance of one of his friends, Callidamates, who has come with his sweetheart Delphium. Philolaches is aided and abetted in his prodigal career by the clever and unscrupulous Tranio, a slave to whose special care the old man had committed his son during his absence abroad.

This state of things is interrupted by the news that Theoropides has suddenly returned and is already in the Piraeus, at the very time when the banquet above referred to is in full swing. At this critical moment Tranio, the dissolute and pampered slave (cf. *urbanus scurra, deliciae popli* 15), steps forward and assumes the direction of affairs and the position of hero of the piece. No time must be lost, if detection is to be avoided. The house is promptly locked up. Philolaches, Callidamates, Philematium, and Delphium retreat indoors and are enjoined to keep strict silence: Tranio remains on the ground to meet the enemy. The old gentleman is now made the victim of the slave's inventive genius. He is informed that the house has been shut up for

seven months, owing to the discovery that it was haunted. In an admirable scene Tranio pretends that Theoropides has himself incurred the resentment of the Ghost by knocking at the door of his house, and so converts the ghost-story into a matter of present and patent fact; Theoropides is only too glad to be able to escape with his head wrapped up in his cloak (*capite obuoluto* 424).

But so far only the first difficulty has been overcome. Theoropides returns when he has recovered from his fright, having made inquiries of the person from whom he bought the house: the latter has indignantly denied the whole story. The situation is complicated by the appearance of the money-lender Misargyrides, who demands payment of interest long overdue. Tranio finds himself between two fires. But he is equal to the occasion. He advises Theoropides to go to law with the refractory vendor of the house. The debt he does not deny, but explains it as a necessary means of raising money *to buy another house*, when the old one had to be abandoned. He even induces Theoropides to promise payment next day, and Misargyrides departs pacified.

'Where then is this new house?' asks Theoropides. Tranio is in doubt for a moment, but decides to locate it next door. Philolaches, he says, has bought the house of his neighbour Simo, and at a ludicrously small figure. The delight of the old man of business knows no bounds; his son is a chip of the old block. Yet another awkward demand of Theoropides—that he should be shown over the house—is met by the reminder that there are ladies therein, whose permission must first be asked. (That Philolaches is not in present possession of the house, but in the country, is not explicitly stated in the text as we have it, but seems rather to be assumed or inferred; cf. note on 929.) Theoropides

promises to wait until Tranio has spoken to the present occupant, Simo, and leaves the stage.

In the interview with Simo that follows Tranio pretends that his master wishes to inspect the house with a view to imitating certain parts of it: he is himself, says Tranio, about to build an additional wing to his own. Simo remarks, ironically, that he might have chosen a better model, but consents, and also promises not to breathe a syllable about the misdemeanours of Philolaches. Tranio now summons Theoropides. He informs him that Simo regrets the bargain he has made, and begs him to say nothing about the purchase *out of consideration for his neighbour's feelings*. Thus primed for the interview, the two old men are allowed to meet and the inspection of the house takes place, without either of them discovering that he is a puppet in Tranio's hands. The latter is all the while on the alert to twist any ambiguous phrase into evidence that makes for his story of the purchase. So far Tranio has been entirely successful: when his master orders him to go to the country to fetch Philolaches, he employs this, his first moment of leisure, to release the rioters from the 'state of siege' (1048) by means of a back-gate leading into the *angiportum*.

But the whole device is, after all, only a temporary measure. Theoropides must ultimately discover that Simo has not really sold his house. This truth Tranio recognizes in 1054:—

nam scio equidem nullo pacto iam esse posse haec clam senem.

The discovery has indeed been already made through an untoward incident. According to a custom frequently alluded to in the plays of Plautus, slaves called *aduorsitores* (cf. on 313) come to fetch their master Callidamates from the banquet, and knock loudly at the door of the house supposed

by Theoropides to be haunted. Theoropides warns them off, but is only laughed at for his pains: from the lips of these slaves, to whom he is a perfect stranger, he learns that for the last three days his house has been the scene of one long debauch. He hastens to Simo, who, in answer to his anxious inquiries, denies explicitly that he has ever had any business transactions with either Philolaches or Tranio. The whole truth dawns upon the unhappy father: the ghost-story is a fabrication. His mind is now filled with one purpose—he will have his revenge on the slave who has so impudently hoaxed him. Simo enters into his plans and lends him a number of flogging-slaves (*lorarii*), with whom he lies in wait for Tranio. The day of reckoning has now come; but the indomitable Tranio rises once more to the emergency. Instead of running away, he meets his master with a smiling face and innocent air; and the moment the latter shows signs of bringing out the *lorarii*, calmly seats himself upon the altar in front of the house of Simo—a place of refuge from which social and religious feeling forbade Theoropides to drag him. Meanwhile Callidamates arrives as peacemaker. He promises that Theoropides shall not be out of pocket by his son's extravagance, and makes profession of deep contrition in the name both of himself and his friend. Theoropides is partly pacified. But Tranio shall not escape unpunished. The slave himself certainly does not contribute to bring about such a result. He assumes an air of provoking indifference, and answers the threats of Theoropides with light banter and impudent taunts. But Callidamates is importunate. He will not yield in his entreaties that Tranio be pardoned. Tranio's last speech is a bright idea. 'Pardon me? why not indeed?' he says: 'I shall be sure to get into some scrape to-morrow and then you can punish me for

both things at once.' Such a miscreant is irresistible, and the play concludes with the promise, extracted from Theoropides, that bygones shall be bygones.

The Mostellaria is one of the best of the plays of Plautus. The characters are drawn with a masterly hand: Tranio is almost an Iago in his 'architectonic' faculty for intrigue; Philematium is one of the most charming figures in Plautus. Her pretty simplicity of character and girlish delight in dress are portrayed with effective naturalness, and her gratitude and faithful devotion to her lover and benefactor Philolaches raise her above her class. Simo too is a very well drawn character. He belongs to a class often ridiculed in Plautus—husbands of old, ugly and bad-tempered wives whom they have married for the sake of their money. His discontent shows itself in cynical sneers and a certain malignity of temper. He is secretly amused by the misdeeds of Tranio and Philolaches, of which he is fully cognizant; and he even takes pleasure in the idea of keeping his neighbour Theoropides in the dark about them. But when there is a chance of seeing Tranio flogged, he is quite ready to lend his *lorarii*. He is totally without the capacity for sympathy, and remains a mere outsider to the action. Theoropides is the narrow-minded, mercantile Philistine, the chief notes of whose character are avarice, superstition, and childish vindictiveness. His only grievances are the pecuniary loss he fears he may suffer, and the wounding of his *amour propre*. Callidamates claims sympathy by his frank good nature; the reader is willing to condone his vices. The minor characters are none of them colourless. Grumio[1], the honest but

[1] The reason why Plautus makes no use of Grumio in the discovery of Tranio's misdeeds is that it was unnecessary to do so: Theoropides gets the information otherwise (IV. 2).

uncourageous country slave, Scapha, the would-be temptress of Philematium, the merry Delphium, the pampered and effeminate Phaniscus, the jealous Pinacium have all their clearly marked traits, and stand out as living figures. Perhaps the least effective character in the drama is the prodigal son, Philolaches.

The management of the plot and humorous business deserves all praise. But in criticizing the play as a whole, it is impossible to conceal certain defects. We are not quite clear about the ultimate fate of Tranio. But what about Philematium? The thread of her destiny is completely lost. Without attempting to prescribe a happy ending for the love-story, such as that suggested by Lorenz[1], the reader notes that Philematium, being the daughter of non-Athenian parents, could not after manumission become the wife of her liberator. The interest excited in the couple thus remains unsatisfied. Tranio has become so completely the hero that Philematium and Philolaches are forgotten. But, as Professor Bradley says in his *Shakespearean Tragedy* (1904, p. 70), how many comedies are there in the world which end satisfactorily? Shakespeare has many improbabilities in the winding up of his comedies; and the comedies of Aristophanes generally fall off in interest and effectiveness at the end.

The Mostellaria in Modern Literature.

The Mostellaria, though it has not exercised so wide an influence on modern literatures as some other plays of Plautus (notably the Amphitruo, the Aulularia, the Menaechmi,

[1] There might have been an *ἀναγνώρισις*, whereby Philematium might have turned out to be the daughter of Athenian parents—a device often employed in the New Comedy.

and the Miles Gloriosus), has nevertheless been often imitated.[1] An Italian translation by Geronimo Berrardo was produced on the stage in 1501; and the following adaptations are based wholly upon the plot of the Mostellaria, though the names of the *dramatis personae* have been changed: *I Fantasmi* by Ercole Bentivoglio (1545); *Le Retour Imprévu* by Jean François Regnard (1700), which was the immediate source of *The Intriguing Chambermaid* by Henry Fielding (acted at Drury Lane, 1733; in this play the rôle of Tranio is assigned to the scheming servant girl Lettice); *Abracadabra* by 'the Danish Plautus' Ludwig Holberg (1684–1754; in this version all the female characters are omitted). Besides these adaptations there are a number of plays—enumerated in the following paragraphs—which are partly based on the Mostellaria or contain episodes or reminiscences from it.

That Shakespeare knew the play, either in the original or in a translation,[2] is shown not only by his having taken from Plautus the names Tranio and Grumio for two waiting-men

[1] See Reinhardstöttner, *Spätere Bearbeitungen plautinischer Lustspiele* (1886).

[2] There was no *English* translation of any of the plays of Plautus in the sixteenth century except that of the Menaechmi by W. W. (probably William Warner), published in 1595, i. e. some ten years later than the date of the *Comedy of Errors*. It seems at least as likely that Shakespeare read the Mostellaria in the original as that he was acquainted with one of the Italian versions referred to above. The evidence that Shakespeare knew Latin is growing stronger every year. I have recently shown that Portia's great speech in the *Merchant of Venice*, IV. 1, 184–200, is based on Seneca's *De Clementia*, of which there was no English translation prior to that of Lodge, published in 1614, i. e. some twenty years after the probable date of the *Merchant of Venice* (see my paper at the Congress of Arts and Science, St. Louis, U.S.A., 1904, vol. iii, p. 189 f., republished in the *National Review* for June, 1906).—I hope before long to publish evidence showing the influence of Plautus upon many plays of Shakespeare.

in his *Taming of the Shrew*—names which do not occur in the earlier play called *The Taming of a Shrew* (A.D. 1594) on which the play of Shakespeare is based—but also by the general resemblance which the Tranio of Shakespeare bears to the Tranio of Plautus. In both plays Tranio is the tempter of his young master (*T. of Sh.* I. 1, 1–47) whom he had been specially charged to watch over by that master's father:—

> For so your father charged me at our parting;
> 'Be serviceable to my son,' quoth he;
> Although I think 'twas in another sense.

(*T. of Sh.* I. 1, 218–220, cf. Most. 25–28.) The knocking at the door and the beating of Grumio in *T. of Sh.* I. 2 is paralleled by Most. I. 1: the indignation of the old master against Tranio is the same in both plays (*T. of Sh.* V. 1, 42 f., Most. IV. 3 end, V. 1); so too the begging off of Tranio from punishment (*T. of Sh.* V. 1, 132 f., Most. 1159 f.).[1]

Ben Jonson's *Alchemist* (first acted 1610) is not an adaptation of the Mostellaria; but the Mostellaria has exercised an influence upon the episode in which the housekeeper *Face* excludes *Lovewit* from his house by means of a made up story; his prototype, both in action and character, is Tranio; and that the Mostellaria was present to the author's mind is shown by some direct quotations, e.g. Act V, Scene 2:

> Nothing's more wretched than a guilty conscience:

cf. Most. 544:

> *nihil est miserius quam animus hominis conscius.*

The English Traveller by Thomas Heywood (1633) is far more deeply indebted to the Mostellaria. Side by side with the main plot there is a by-plot, occupying about

[1] See E. W. Fay in *American Journ of Phil.* xxiv. 3, pp. 245–248.

half of the action, and this is simply a reproduction of the Mostellaria: Tranio is represented by the serving-man *Reignald*, Grumio by *Robin*, Philolaches by *Lionell*, Theoropides by *Old Lionell*, Callidamates by *Rioter*, Simo by *Master Ricott*, Philematium by *Blanda*; Scapha is the name of the old servant woman in both plays. This by-plot stands in a very loose connexion with the main plot, which appears to have been considered by the author as too thin to form a play by itself.[1] Another play in which the Mostellaria occupies a similar position is *Le Comédien Poète* by Montfleury (1674); here the play of Plautus forms the first Act, which is almost entirely disconnected with the rest of the play. There are many other modern plays which are said by some writers to be based to a greater or less extent on the Mostellaria; for example *The Drummer or The Haunted House* by Addison; but the main lines of the plot are so different that the connexion is doubtful. The *Ariodosio* by Lorenzino de' Medici (1549) owes something to the Mostellaria in one scene; but it is in the main based upon the Aulularia of Plautus, with reminiscences from other plays;

[1] Heywood no doubt agreed with the principle subsequently enunciated by Fielding: 'The ancients may be considered as a rich common, whereon every person who hath the smallest tenement in Parnassus has the right to fatten his muse. Nor shall I ever scruple to take to myself any passage which I shall find in any ancient author to my purpose *without setting down the name of the author from whom it was taken*' (quoted by Professor Paul Shorey in his address on the 'Relations of Classical Literature to other branches of learning' at the Congress of Arts and Science, St. Louis, 1904, vol. iii, p. 384; the italics are mine). In his *Captives* (licensed 1624, first printed by Mr. A. H. Bullen in his *Collection of Old English Plays*, vol. iv, 1885) Heywood has taken the main plot from the Rudens of Plautus and the by-plot (according to Mr. J. A. Symonds, in a letter to the *Academy*, dated Dec. 7, 1885) from Masuccio's *Novellino*.

on this play was founded *Les Esprits* by Pierre Larivey (1579).

The Text.

The principal MSS. containing the Mostellaria, or parts of it, are :—

(i) The Ambrosian palimpsest (*A*), a MS. of the fourth or perhaps even of the third century A.D.—one of the oldest MSS. of a Latin author in existence. But only parts of it are extant; of this play we have 354 lines, viz. 576–613, 630, 631, 632, 653–723, 759–796, 826–858, 891–1026 (+4 lines), 1042–1073.

(ii) The three 'Palatine' MSS. (*B, C, D*), dating from about the eleventh century A.D.

(iii) The 'Codex Lipsiensis' (*F*), a MS. of the fifteenth century, and of no authority compared with that of the other MSS. referred to above.

Besides these MSS. we have occasional quotations of passages by grammarians and other scholars, which, being based on some ancient authority, sometimes throw light on the readings of MSS. which have been lost.

The first printed edition (the 'editio princeps') was published at Venice, 1472.

The textual notes at the end of this edition do not form an *apparatus criticus*; they are limited to cases in which there is divergence of opinion among recent editors as to the true reading. But all readings for which the present editor is responsible are accompanied by a note. Readings of the Palatine MSS. are here given in black type and accompanied by the symbol *P*, minor discrepancies between *B, C,* and *D* being as a rule disregarded. The symbol *P* thus points to the readings of the *archetype* of *BCD*—a MS.

which, if we possessed it, would probably be found to be of similar age and authority to *A*. Readings of *A* are given in black capitals.

The chief modern editions to which reference is made are that of Ritschl (re-edited by Schoell, 1893), the 'editio minor' of Goetz and Schoell (Fasciculus V, 1896), the edition of Leo (vol. ii, 1896), that of Ussing (2nd ed., 1888), and that of Lorenz (2nd ed., 1883). Account has also been taken of the recent edition of Lindsay (*Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis*, vol. ii, 1905), in which fuller information will be found as to the readings of the MSS.; but for a complete *apparatus criticus* the reader must be referred to Schoell's ed. of Ritschl (1893).

Owing to the intimate connexion between prosodical and metrical questions on the one hand, and questions of reading on the other, remarks on these topics are given side by side in the critical notes.

Words, or parts of words, printed in italics in the text are *omissions* (not merely errors) of the MSS. The numeration of lines in the margin is that of Ritschl, which is generally accepted by modern editors, even where it does not correspond exactly to their own constitutions of the text, for the sake of convenience of reference. But in the headline of each page are given the Act, Scene, and Verse according to the traditional description introduced into Plautus by the Italian editors of the Renaissance. This division of the plays of the old Latin dramatists into five acts rests on no contemporary authority; it is not indicated in any extant MS., and we have no evidence, external or internal, which would lead us to suppose that it was employed by the Latin dramatists themselves or by their Greek originals, the writers of the New Comedy; on the contrary