

## The history of a Plautine line: *Menaechmi* 65

GIORGIA BANDINI  
Università degli Studi di Urbino «Carlo Bo»

**Abstract:** The present paper aims at tracking back the origins of an emendation of *Menaechmi* 65, which was suggested for the «first» time by Bernardinus Saracenus in 1499 and that corrects the reading transmitted by the manuscript tradition. Such an emendation could find good support in a passage by Venantius Fortunatus, whose contribution could shed some light on a different textual transmission of Plautus' work.

**Keywords:** *Plautus*; *Menaechmi*; *Venantius Fortunatus*; *Saracenus*.

### Historia de un verso Plautino: *Menecmos* 65

**Resumen:** El presente trabajo tiene por objeto rastrear los orígenes de una enmienda a *Menaechmi* 65, sugerida «por primera vez» por Bernardino Saraceno en 1499, y que corrige la lectura transmitida por la tradición textual. Esta enmienda pudo tener un fundamento en un pasaje de Venancio Fortunato, cuya aportación podría contribuir a esclarecer una visión diferente de la transmisión textual de la obra de Plauto.

**Palabras Clave:** *Plauto*; *Menaechmi*; *Venancio Fortunato*; *Saraceno*.

Ingressus fluuium rapidum ab urbe hau longule,  
rapidus raptori pueri subduxit pedes  
apstraxitque hominem in maximam malam crucem.  
(Plaut. *Men.* Il. 64-66).

This is how Il. 64-66 from the prologue of *Menaechmi* are printed in the critical editions by Ritschl, Leo, Lindsay, Ernout and Gratwick<sup>1</sup>. Here Plautus is

<sup>1</sup> For the sake of completeness it needs to be remarked that the text here presented has only few orthographic variants that differ from the text printed by the various current editions: this is why *hau* comes from B<sup>1</sup> and *haud* from B<sup>3</sup> (Holy See, Bibl. Apostolica, Pal. lat. 1615), from C (Heidelberg, Universitätsbibliothek, Pal. lat. 1613) and from D (Holy See, Bibl. Apostolica, Vat. lat. 3870); the Ambrosian Palimpsest [A: Milano, Bibl. Ambrosiana, G 82 super., now S. P. 9/13-20 = G. STUEMUND (1989)] has no readable traces here; *maximam* is common reading of BCD (A *n.l.*); B is the only manuscript that

giving the background and the circumstances that will lead to the beginning of the actions on stage: an old merchant from Syracuse has two twin sons so much alike that even their mother could not tell who is who. At the age of seven, one of the sons is brought by the father on a business travel to Taranto, but the city is on a holiday mood and the child gets lost in the crowd, just to be found by another merchant later on, a rich man from Epidamnos who takes the boy home with him. The father dies heartbroken at having lost his son, and the other twin gets renamed *Menaechmus* by his grandfather after the lost brother's name. Not having sons of his own, the rich merchant responsible for the finding of the boy adopts him, finds him a woman *dotata* to marry and leaves him as his one and only heir when his time comes to an end. And this is precisely what the lines that I wish to consider are about: the rich merchant, who happens to be in the country after a heavy rain, enters a racing river, slips and dies<sup>2</sup>.

The problems with the exegesis arise at l. 65, where instead of *pedes* the Palatine tradition agrees in transmitting the reading *fides*; unfortunately, as Studemund points out, the Ambrosian Palimpsest gives no readable traces of the last part of that verse. Even though *fides* and *pedes* are homophones and metrically equivalent, as both are iambic words, syntactically and semantically speaking the reading *fides* brings along many problems: (*fluuius*) *rapidus raptori pueri subduxit fides*, as reported by the Palatine manuscripts, would imply the use of *fides* as an accusative plural, which not only, as far as we know, has never happened in Latin, but also has a very unclear meaning<sup>3</sup>.

Thus my interest has been that of trying to find in humanistic manuscripts, often featuring a lot of variant readings, some traces that could shed some light on the whole hermeneutical issue, but such a research has brought up just one and only reading: *fides*. However, from autopsy of the humanistic manuscripts it is clear that most of those manuscripts have the adverb *rapide* instead of the adjective *rapidus*<sup>4</sup> at the beginning of the verse; because of its pa-

---

transmits *apstraxitque*, CD have *abstraxitque* while Studemund does not take a clear position between the two forms. For the text printed in the present paper I have adopted the abbreviation system of *sigla* followed by the *Editio Plautina Sarsinatis* and already used in C. QUESTA (1995).

<sup>2</sup> According to C. QUESTA (2004, p. 59), both the authenticity and the substantial integrity of the prologue of the *Menaechmi* should not be questioned.

<sup>3</sup> See *ThLL* VI s.v. *fides*.

<sup>4</sup> The Department of Textual and Cultural Heritage Sciences, University of Urbino, can count on a collection of microfilm reproductions of surviving plautine humanistic manuscripts; those manuscripts originally possessed by the Vatican and Italian libraries are now described by Alba TONTINI (2002 e 2010). From autopsy of the forty-two extant manuscripts, as far as we know, that transmit Plautus' *Menaechmi*, eight of them give *rapid*, reproduction of D: Holy See, Bibl. Apostolica, Barb. Lat. 97 and Vat. lat. 1629 (= G in the apparatus, manuscript owned by Poggio Bracciolini); Florence, Bibl. Med. Laur., 91 inf. 11 and 36.46, Florence, Bibl. Naz., J I 12; Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, 10027 and Vitri-na 22-5; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Holkam 298. Twenty-seven manuscripts have *rapide*: Augsburg, Staats-und Stadtbibliothek, 2' 126; Holy See, Bibl. Apostolica, Barb. lat. 153, Ottob. lat. 2028, Ottob. lat. 1697 and Vat. Lat. 1633; Cologny-Genève, Fondation M. Bodmer, 138; Bologna, Bibl. Univ., 2282; Florence, Bibl. Med. Laur., 36.36, 36.37, 36.38 and 36.41; Firenze, Bibl. Ricc., 533; København, Kongelige Bibliothek, Thott. 389; Leiden, Universiteitsbibliothek, B.P.L. 8; Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, rep. I

leographic nature, the origin of such a wrong reading (*rapide*) has to be traced back to D, «productive subarchetype» of the humanist so called «twelve comedies»<sup>5</sup>. The manuscript indeed gives the verse, which is omitted in the text and placed at the bottom of the page, preceded by a sign calling out the one placed where the verse should be inserted; this verse, written with a fast *ductus*, gives *rapidus* as abbreviated by shortening, but instead of the most common apostrophe for *-us*, there lies an horizontal slash cutting the ascender of the *d*, and a slash through the ascender of the *d* is the most common humanistic abbreviation for *de*. In fact the adverb *rapide*<sup>6</sup>, which is agreed on by most of the humanistic manuscripts, gives *fides* the possibility of being considered as the subject of *subduxit*, but despite its apparently coherent syntactical structure the chance that a text like this could turn out to be corrupted should not be ruled out. However, if *rapide* had to be accepted, thus making *fides* the subject of the sentence, an implied object would be then needed, or else *subducere* should be constructed with a dative (*raptori*), which is not attested<sup>7</sup>, or, again, it should be considered the possibility of a reflexive value of the verb [*(se) subduxit*] by way of implying a pronoun<sup>8</sup>.

The same kind of research, when conducted on the various editions of Plautus' text, reveals that quite a number of editors, from Merula to Charpentarius, accept *Rapide raptori pueri subduxit fides*<sup>9</sup>, while others, like Ugoletus, provide solution to the exegetical problems by accepting the adverb *rapide* but also by printing the accusative *raptorem*<sup>10</sup>, thus leading to a different set of

5; London, The British Library, Add. 11901 and Burney 228; Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 7889; Perugia, Bibl. Com. Augusta, C 60 C64; Rome, Bibl. Naz. Vitt. Em. II, 365, Bibl. Angelica, 1396; San Lorenzo del Escorial, Biblioteca del Monasterio, T II 8, Q I 13; Toledo, Biblioteca del Cabildo, 101.41; Wien, Oesterreichische Nationalbibliothek, 111 and 3168. Four manuscripts (Holy See, Bibl. Apostolica, Vat. Lat. 1632 and Urb. Lat. 343; Dublin, Library of Trinity College, Abbott. 1486; Granada, Biblioteca Universitaria, B.27) have *rapidū*, abbreviation for *rapidum*, and two (Holy See, Bibl. Apostolica, Vat. lat. 11469; Florence, Bibl. Med. Laur., 36.39) give *rapidus*. The manuscript Budapest, National Széchenyi Könyvtár, Corv. 241 omits the word.

<sup>5</sup> As for the Palatine manuscripts, it should be useful to remember the different circulation of the «first eight comedies» and of the «last twelve» (*Menaechmi* belongs to the last ones). See Alba TONTINI (2002).

<sup>6</sup> Supporting the reading *rapidus* is the fact that the adverb *rapide* is never attested in Plautus, see G. LODGE (1924-1933). It is also interesting to confront it with *Bacch.* 85-86: *Pi. rapidus fluius est hic, non hac temere transiri potest. Ba. Atque ecaster apud hunc fluium aliquid perdundumst tibi, manum da et sequere.* Even though these lines refer to a metaphorical conversation between *Bacchis* and *Pistoclerus*, they seem to recall both circumstances and lexicon of *Menaechmi* (ll. 63-64).

<sup>7</sup> See Ch. E. BENNET (1910-1914, I pp. 4 f.), as pointed out by the scholar, it is true that some verbs, usually transitive, can be found construed intransitively, but that does not seem to happen with *ducere* or *subducere*, at least as far as we know according to the examination of the extant literary sources.

<sup>8</sup> See Plaut. *Asin.* 912 *tempus est subducere hinc me*; Lucr. I 1106 *neue terra se pedibus subducat*.

<sup>9</sup> The line *Rapide raptori pueri subduxit fides* is transmitted by the editions by MERULA (1472); SCUTARIUS (1490 and 1495); HERMOLAUS (*s.n.t.*); SARACENUS (1499); PIUS (1500); BEROALDUS (1500); PYLADES (1506); CHARPENTARIUS (1513).

<sup>10</sup> See the editions by UGOLETUS (1510); ANGELIUS (1514); ALDUS (1522); CRATANDER (1523); STEPHANUS (1530); GRYPHIUS (1535); CAMERARIUS (1552); IUNTINA (1554).

problems regarding the semantic value of the word *fides*. According to the commentaries printed by the humanistic editors *Fides*<sup>11</sup> is usually interpreted as a divinity, and the whole episode as a sort of ‘payback’: the divinity would have made the kidnapper pay for taking the child<sup>12</sup>. But, at this point of the comedy, a divine intervention would not be coherent with the plot.

As pointed out by modern editions, the first critical intervention aiming at giving solution to the difficulties of the text was advanced by Bernardus Saracenus, who suggested *pedes*<sup>13</sup> in his Venetian edition (1499)<sup>14</sup>. Saracenus did not print it in the text, leaving it as one of the emendations listed in the last section of his work, which is called «Bernardi Saraceni Veneti emendationes in singulas plautinas comedias quae septingentae ferme sunt: in quibus etiam castigati sunt errores interlocutorum fere quadrigenti». And here is what the humanist says with reference to l. 65: «Vide an potius legendum sit: subduxit pedes»<sup>15</sup>.

<sup>11</sup> The existence of such a deity has multiple attestations within Plautus’ plays: see for instance the *Aulularia*, where the old *Euclio* is willing to hide the pot in the temple of the goddess and then begs her to protect the hideout (ll. 583 584 586 608 611 614 621 667 676), and the prologue of *Casina* (l. 2), a sort of *captatio benevolentiae* of the audience. G. LODGE (1924-1933, I pp. 614-616), s. v. *fides*, gives *Men.* 65 as a corrupt verse and following Ritschl’s first edition wrongly ascribes the reading *pedes* to Pylades.

<sup>12</sup> Noteworthy is the fact that the rich merchant from Epidamnos plays both the roles of kidnapper and benefactor; but even though there is no sign of kidnapping in the plot since the child just gets lost in the crowd (31 *puer inter homines † aberravit a patre*), the prologue nevertheless stresses this specific point (38 *puerum surruptum*, 41 *surrupit alterum*, 58 *surrupuit alterum*, 60 *puerum surrupticium*, 65 *raptori*), which is also stressed in the *argumentum* (2 *surrupit altero*, 3 *surreptici*, 7 *surrepticium*). However and all things considered, there is no incongruity here, since the merchant, even if it is the child who gets lost, does nothing to bring him back home or to find his parents. But it is appropriate to remind that Plautus’ drama is about repetition and *déjà-vu* and, in the narration of the background of different comedies, about what, after Propp, we are used to call ‘initial violation’ established by a kidnapping (for example see prologue in the *Poenulus*); thus it is not to exclude the hypothesis that to those common situations corresponds the use (and the use again) of a same linguistic material and that a certain narrative ‘pattern’ of the prologue could therefore explain the incoherent presence of a ‘kidnapping’.

<sup>13</sup> If, in his first edition Ritschl wrongly assigns the reading *pedes* to Pylades, from the ritschelian edition onwards (also known as *editio maior*) modern editors agreed in assigning the correction to Saracenus, but without pointing the *locus* of the emendation.

<sup>14</sup> See SARACENUS (1499, p. 22 IIIv.) according to the numbering register system (an arabic number followed by a roman number).

<sup>15</sup> Another editor, Ioannes Baptista Pius from Bologna, patron of Isabella Gonzaga and famous teacher in Bergamo, Milan and Bologna, seems to have known the reading *pedes* in the very same years of the publication of the editions by Saracenus: in his edition of Plautus (Milan, 1500), Pius prints *Rapide raptori pueri subduxit fides*, though explaining in footnote what follows «*subduxit*: subter fluendo implicavit et conturbavit pedes numen fidei reverendum quod violaverat ipse menechmus (!)» (could this be seen as a contentious remark that refers to Saracenus’ emendation, which was printed the year before?). However it looks like Pius is definitely sure that the reading *fides* is the right one, and that is why he quotes a passage from Silius Italicus: this is when the goddess Fides answers to Hercules (II ll. 496-506), who has asked her to assist Saguntum: «In fidefragos invehitur his filius alloquente Herculem fide. / ‘Sed me pollutas properantem linquere terras / sedibus iis, tectisque Iovis succedere adegit / foecundum in fraudes hominum genus impia liqui, / et quantum terrent tantum metuentia regna, / et furias auri, nec ulla praemia fraudum, / et super haec ritu horrificos ac more ferarum, / viventis rapto populos, luxuque solutum, omne decus multaue oppressum nocte pudorem, / vis colitur iurisque locum sibi vendicat ensis, / et probris cessit virtus; en aspice gentes / nemo insons pacem servante commercia culpae».

The study of the printed editions of Plautus reveals that the verse *rapidus raptori pueri subduxit pedes* was printed in the text by Hervagius only in 1535<sup>16</sup>.

Such a solution brings along methodological and exegetical problems, since it would be better from a methodological standpoint to defend the transmitted reading (*fides*) and try to explain, where possible, both sense and meaning: apparently, on the other hand, critical and exegetical issues have so far pushed modern editors to accept and print Saracenus' emendation. *Fides* for *pedes* could be paleographically well explained, since in capital writing the confusion between *FI* and *PE* is pretty common, especially when *P* is written in his open form, as also suggested by Lindsay in his apparatus<sup>17</sup>. With the restoration of *pedes*, the verse then follows an alliterating rhythm granted by a context characterized by the strong recurrence of the phoneme *p*, and it is useless to recall Plautus' well known taste for the phonetical construction of the sentences. It should also be added that from a phraseological point of view *rapidus fluiuis* goes along well with *subducere*, a verb that not only within Plautus' production but in Latin in general is usually associated with maritime (or fluvial) activities, as i.e. in *subducere naues*<sup>18</sup>. On such basis *pedes* instead of *fides* should be adopted without reasonable doubts. There is also a passage taken from a poem by Venantius Fortunatus that could bear some echoes of *Men.* 65<sup>19</sup>:

<sup>16</sup> The following editions print in the text *rapidus raptori pueri subduxit pedes*: HERVAGIUS (1535); GEORGIUS MAL.<sup>1</sup> (1536); GEORGIUS MAL.<sup>2</sup> (1542); FABRICIUS (1558); SAMBUCUS (1566); CURIO (1568); LAMBINUS (1577); DOUSA (1598); TAUBMANN<sup>1</sup> (1605); PAREUS<sup>1</sup> (1610); TAUBMANN<sup>2</sup> (1612); PAREUS<sup>2</sup> (1619); GRUTERUS (1621); PONTANUS (1630); PAREUS<sup>3</sup> (1641); BOXHORNUS (1645); GUIETUS (1658); GRONOVIVS (1664); ERNESTI (1760); BOTHE<sup>1</sup> (1809-1810); BOTHE<sup>2</sup> (1821); BOTHE<sup>3</sup> (1831); WEISE (1837-1838); GEPPERT (1845); RITSCHL<sup>1</sup> (1851); BRIX (1866); RITSCHL<sup>2</sup> (1889); LEO (1895-1896); LINDSAY (1910); NIEMEYER (1912); CONRAD (1929); ERNOUT (1936); USSING (1972); GRATWICK (1993).

<sup>17</sup> See also W. M. LINDSAY (1896, pp. 82-89), for example *Most.* 152 *pila* B<sup>3</sup> instead of *filia* B<sup>1</sup>CD (A n.l.) and *Trin.* 649 *facto* A instead of *pacto* P.

<sup>18</sup> The verb *subducere* is attested nine times total within Plautus' extant works, see LODGE (1924-1933, II p. 678), s. v. *subduco*. The above mentioned occurrence included: in the specific meaning of «beaching a boat», in *Bacch.* 305 *subducunt lembum*, *Most.* 738 *quaene (navis) subducta erat tuto in terra?*, and *Cas.* 557 *ut subducam nauim rusum in puluinaria* (the metaphorical use of this last attestation proves once more how frequently the verb was used in this specific meaning); in the broader sense of «pulling up» or «lifting», in *Aul.* 366 *coctam (cenam) sursum subducemus corbulis*; in the meaning of «stealing», in *Curc.* 360 *ego ei subduco anulum* and, metaphorically as «counting», in *Capt.* 192 *subducam ratiunculam* and 371 *subduxit ratiunculam*.

<sup>19</sup> For a detailed bibliography and biography of Venantius Fortunatus, Judith W. GEORGE's monography (1992) is strongly recommended. For an analysis of Venantius' relations with the classics see especially A. MENEGHETTI (1916-1917) and Franca Ela CONSOLINO (1999). It is common knowledge that Venantius' *carmina* often feature lines that are similar to verses that can be found in Virgil, Ovid and Horace; sometimes even a few Catullan lines appear to be echoed by Venantius, which is something interesting since Catullus, together with Plautus, was one of those Latin authors who were not taught at school and whose fame and fortune had gone through ups and downs. On the other hand a lot of work still needs to be done on the presence of Plautus in Venantius. Similarities between the language of the two have been found by S. BLOMGREN (1933, pp. 63 f., 111 f. and 134 f.), with the scholar who lists some *plautini sermonis similitudines*, and by E. LOEFSTEDT (1911, pp. 63 f. and 112).

Nec potuit *raptor* pedibus subducere praedam,  
*Raptori* abduxit sed sua praeda *pedes*.  
 (Ven. Fort. *Carm.* II 16 ll. 37-38).

These lines are taken from a short poem written in elegiac couplets in honour of Saint Medardus<sup>20</sup>. Venantius praises the saint's life and miracles and lingers on a famous example of Medardus' goodness, with the saint who happened to help a man who was actually trying to steal from him: a thief, after robbing the saint of the grapes from his vineyard, was not able to run away from there, «he could not take the loot away on his feet, but his feet took the loot away from him» (ll. 37-38)<sup>21</sup>. The picture is that of the thief standing in the vineyard unable to move like a scarecrow, as if frozen by miracle, still holding the loot in his own hands: he who came to seize was seized indeed; from robber he became the guardian until the Saint ordered him to leave with those same grapes he had come to steal<sup>22</sup>.

Lines 37-38 seem to recall Plautus' verses, an hypothesis suggesting the interesting possibility that the playwright from Sarsina could be the one hiding behind the reminiscences of a learned poet like Venantius. In this regard, worthy of mention are the lexical reminiscences such as the two terms *raptor* and *pedes* and the verb *subduco*, which through the prefix *sub-* suggests a «acción "furtiva"»<sup>23</sup> (see also the insistence on the other compound of *duco*, i.e. *abduco*). Also worthy of mention are the use of *raptor* in dative singular and especially the emphasis given to the term *pedes* by the polyptoton (*pedibus ... pedes*), with *pedes* placed right at the end of the verse; to this should be added the *iunctura* of *pedes* with *subduco* and *abduco*, whose occurrences are extremely rare considering the fact that Plautus' and Venantius' works are the only two among the whole extant Latin production transmitting such a peculiar association<sup>24</sup>. In spite of the different contexts, not only the situations but also the syntax look to me very similar: both passages feature a sudden changing of the

<sup>20</sup> It should be remembered that a prose life of Medardus was written by Venantius, the passage taken from the prose life that corresponds to the verse section here follows: IV, 12 *Tunc praedam gladio sicante corripens, ipse magis praedatus intra patentia septa constringetur et quod effrangere uiolentus uoluit nequaquam euasit.*

<sup>21</sup> Because of the fact that *pes*, botanically speaking, means «petiole», a further possible word-play between the *pedes* of the *praeda* and the *raptor*'s ones should not be ruled out.

<sup>22</sup> For sake of readers' better understanding, ll. 31-46 go as follows: *Qui uoluit furti causa penetrare latentem / te religante sedet, te reserante fugit. / Fur sine perfectu uoto deceptus inani / omnia restituens crimina fraudis habet. / Nam semel ut molles carpsent palmitis uuas, / Non ualuere gradus inde referre foris / Nec potuit raptor pedibus subducere praedam, / Raptori abduxit sed sua praeda pedes. / Ergo suis laqueis coepit miser esse ligatus: / uenerat ut caperet, captus at ipse fuit. / Nec tetigit mustum, sed iniqua mente rotatur, / antea quam biberet, ebria turba iacet. / Incepit seruare magis quam ferre racemos / et datus est custos qui cupit esse rapax, / donec, sancte, tuis uerbis iussisses abire, / ut furtum inpleret, doctus ab hoste redit.*

<sup>23</sup> See B. GARCÍA-HERNÁNDEZ (1980, pp. 205-206).

<sup>24</sup> Such a research was conducted using the Cross Database Searchtool.

subject<sup>25</sup>, whereas ‘*raptor*’ (*mercator* or *fur*) is the subject in the first line, *fluuius* and *praeda* are the ones in the second, therefore the natural element of the river and of the loot overpowers the *raptor*, in a sort of role-swapping which, if it is just hinted at by Plautus, it is emphasized by Venantius (ll. 37-38, 39-40, 43-44)<sup>26</sup>. The different circumstances could explain why the adjective *rapidus* is missing in Venantius’ lines, while Plautus not only definitely insists on it (*rapidum ... rapidus*) but also relates it, not casually and due to their common root, to *raptor*. The abrupt transition, in the Christian text, from the plural form (l. 35 *carpserunt*, l. 36 *ualuere*) to the singular form (l. 37 *potuit*, l. 38 *abduxit*)<sup>27</sup> should also be properly stressed, since Venantius’ switch to the singular form, which is something that occurs in Plautus too, could be another sign of intertextuality. There is one last thing that needs to be considered: that of grapes (*praeda*) taking the feet off the *raptor* is a rather complex and literary image, an image that turns out to be also not so easy to understand and explain: and this is why Venantius’ use of this precise image could be a sign of the fact that it is Plautus’ hypotext that Venantius is intentionally following here.

In conclusion, I do not see any good reason why *pedes* should not be given credit: the emendation suggested for the first time by Saracenus in 1499, but there is also the possibility that Venantius Fortunatus read it in the late VI century, which is something that seems to be supported by a strong Plautine reminiscence transmitted by Venantius’ elegiac couplet. And not only then would such an emendation be well supported by Venantius’ lines: if *pedes* and not *fides* is the right reading – and this is what appears to be suggested by the Christian poet’s verses – a new critical edition of Plautus’ *Menaechmi* could include Venantius’ lines among the *testimonia* of the indirect tradition of Plautus’ work. A little step for those who are interested in studying the reception of a poet whose success, unlike Terence’s, has moved back and forth between fame and oblivion, and a proof that sometimes some examples of that same oblivion should demand careful reevaluation.

giorgiabandini@libero.it

<sup>25</sup> Concerning the passage of Plautus W. M. LINDSAY (1907, pp. 8f.) notes a change of subject so violent «as to be quite ungrammatical» and to be therefore referred «to the carelessness of every-day speech».

<sup>26</sup> As for the protagonists, the finale of this story is not the same, since the plautine *raptor* falls in *maximam malam crucem*, while the one from Venantius’ verses is spared and saved.

<sup>27</sup> See M. REYDELLET (1994, p. 74): «Dans ce récit, on a, aux vers 35 et 42, un passage brutal du singulier au pluriel. La version parallèle de la Vita, 11-14, p. 69, met en scène un seul voleur».

## CRITICAL EDITIONS AND COMMENTARIES OF PLAUTUS

MERULA	<i>Plautinae uiginti comoediae</i> , emendatae per Georgium Alexandrinum [Merulam], Venetiis, opera et impendio Ioannis de Colonia atque Vindelini de Spira, 1472.
SCUTARIUS <sup>1</sup>	<i>Plautinae uiginti comoediae</i> ... recognitae per Eusebium Scutarium, Mediolani, in officina Ulderici Scinzenzeler, 1490.
SCUTARIUS <sup>2</sup>	Plautus, <i>comoediae</i> , Venetiis, s. n. t., 1495.
HERMOLAUS	Plautus cum correctione et interpretatione Hermolai, Merulae, Politiani et Beroaldi et cum multis additionibus, s. n. t.
SARACENUS	<i>Plautinae uiginti comediae</i> (!) emendatissimae cum accuratissima ac luculentissima interpretatione (!) doctissimorum virorum Petri Val-lae Placentini ac Bernardi Saraceni Veneti, Venetiis, per Simonem Papiensem dictum Bivilaqua, 1499.
PIUS	<i>Plautus integer</i> cum interpretatione Ioannis Baptistae Pii, Mediolani, per magistrum Uldericum Scinzenzeler, 1500.
BEROALDUS	<i>Plautus</i> diligenter recognitus per Philippum Beroaldum, Bononiae, per Benedictum Hectoris, 1500.
PYLADES	[ <i>Plauti comoediae</i> ], ed. Pylades Buccardus, a Iacobo Britannico Brixiae impressae, 1506.
UGOLETUS	M. Actii Plauti Asinii <i>comoediae uiginti</i> nuper emendatae et in eis Pyladae Brixiani lucubrationes, Thadaei Ugoleti et Grapaldi virorum illustrium scholia, Anselmi Epiphyllides, Parmae, excusserunt formis Octavianus Saladius et Franciscus Ugoletus, 1510.
CHARPENTARIUS	M. Plauti Sarssinatis (!) <i>comediae uiginti uarroniane</i> (!), ed. Simon Charpentarius, s. l., 1513.
ANGELIUS	Plauti <i>comoediae uiginti</i> nuper recognitae et acri iudicio Nicolai Angelii diligentissime excussae, Florentiae, ex officina Philippi de Giunta, 1514.
ALDUS	<i>Ex Plauti comoediis uiginti</i> , Venetiis, in aedibus Aldi et Andreae Asulani soceri, 1522.
CRATANDER	M. Plauti <i>comoediae uiginti</i> , Basileae, apud Andream Cratandrum, 1523.
STEPHANUS	M. Plauti <i>comoediae uiginti</i> , Parisiis, ex officina Roberti Stephani, 1530.
GRYPHIUS	M. Actii Plauti <i>comoediae uiginti</i> , Lugduni, apud Sebastianum Gryphium, 1535.
HERVAGIUS	M. Accii Plauti Sarsinatis comici festivissimi <i>comoediae uiginti</i> , Basileae, ex officina Ioannis Hervagii, 1535.
GEORGIUS MAI. <sup>1</sup>	M. Actii Plauti <i>comoediae sex</i> , <i>Capteiuei Aulularia Miles Menaechmei Mostellaria Trinummus</i> , Magdeburgi, per Michaellem Lotterum, 1536.
GEORGIUS MAI. <sup>2</sup>	M. Actii Plauti <i>comoediae</i> quinque . . . quibus addidimus <i>Trinum-mum: Capteiuei Aulularia Miles Menaechmei Mostellaria Trinum-mus</i> , Magdeburgae, excudebat Christianus Rodingerus, 1542.
CAMERARIUS	M. Accii Plauti <i>comoediae uiginti</i> , diligente cura et singulari studio Ioachimi Camerarii Pabepergensi emendatius nunc quam ante unquam ab ullo editae, Basileae, per Ioannem Hervagium, 1552.



- IUNTINA M. Accii Plauti poetae antiquissimi *comoediae omnes*, Florentiae, per haeredes Bernardi Iunte (!), 1554.
- FABRICIUS M. Accii Plauti *comoediae uiginti* diligente cura Ioachimi Camerarii Pabepergensis editae. Accesserunt iam indicationes quoque multorum a Georgio Fabricio Chemnicensi collectae, Basileae, per Ioannem Hervagium et Bernhardum Brand, 1558.
- SAMBUCUS M. Accii Plauti *comoediae uiginti* opera et diligentia Ioannis Sambuci, Anverpiae, ex officina Christophori Plantini, 1566.
- CURIO M. Accii Plauti *comoediae uiginti*, Basileae, ex officina Hervagiana, per Eusebium Episcopium, 1568.
- LAMBINUS M. *Accius Plautus* opera Dionysii Lambini Monstroliensis emendatus, Lutetiae, apud Ioannem Macaeum, 1577.
- DOUSA M. Accii Plauti *fabulae superstites uiginti* ex recensione Dousica, Francofurti, excudebat Ioannes Saurius, impensis Petri Kopffii, 1598.
- TAUBMANN<sup>1</sup> M. Accii Plauti *fabulae uiginti superstites*, cum novo et luculento commentario doctorum virorum opera Friderici Taubmani, s.l., apud Zachariam Schurerum bibliopolam, 1605.
- PAREUS<sup>1</sup> M. Accii Plauti *comoediae uiginti superstites*, Iohannes Philippus Pareus restituit et notis perpetuis illustravit, Francofurti, impensis Jonae Rhodii in cuius bibliopolio prostant, 1610.
- TAUBMANN<sup>2</sup> M. Accii Plauti *comoediae uiginti superstites*, studio et industria Friederici Taubmanni, Wittebergae, apud Zachariam Schurerum bibliopolam, 1612.
- PAREUS<sup>2</sup> M. Accii Plauti *comoediae uiginti superstites*, curis secundis Iohannis Philippi Parei, Neapoli Nemetum, impensis haeredum Jacobi Fischeri, 1619.
- GRUTERUS M. Accii Plauti *comoediae* ex recognitione Jani Gruteri, s.l., apud Zachariam Schurerum, 1621.
- PONTANUS M. Accii Plauti *comoediae* ex museo Iohannis Isaci Pontani, Amstelodami, apud Iannem Ianssonium, 1630.
- PAREUS<sup>3</sup> M. Accii Plauti *comoediae uiginti superstites*, Philippus Pareus tertium recensuit, Francofurti, vaenit in officina libraria Philippi Jacobi Fischeri cuius sumptibus prodiit, 1641.
- BOXHORNIIUS M. Accii Plauti *comoediae* ex museo Marci Zueri Boxhornii, Lugduni Batavorum, apud Franciscum Hackium, 1645.
- GUIETUS M. Accii Plauti *comoediae* in quatuor tomos digestae. Ex recognitione Francisci Guieti, opera et studio Michaelis de Marolles, Lutetiae Parisiorum, apud Petrum l' Amy, 1658.
- GRONOVIIUS M. Accii Plauti *comoediae*, ex recensione Iohannis Frederici Gronovii, Ludguni Batavorum, ex officina Hackiana, 1664.
- ERNESTI M. Accii Plauti *quae supersunt comoediae* ex recensione Iohannis Frederici Gronovii, cum praefatione Iannis Augusti Ernesti, I-II, Lipsiae, impensis Gotth. Theophili Georgii, 1760.
- BOTHE<sup>1</sup> M. Atti Plauti *comoediarum*, I-III, in usum elegantiorum hominum ed. Fr. H. Bothe, Berolini 1809-1810.
- BOTHE<sup>2</sup> M. Atti Plauti *comoediae*, rec. Fr. H. Bothe, Halberstadii 1821.
- BOTHE<sup>3</sup> M. Atti Plauti *comoediae*, cum variarum lect. delectu tertium ed. Fr. H. Bothe, II [*Bacchides Epidicus Menaechmi*], Stuttgartiae 1830.

- WEISE M. Acci Plauti *comoediae quae supersunt ad meliorum codicum fidem* rec. C. H. Weise, I-II, Quedlinburgi et Lipsiae 1837-1838.
- GEPPERT *Die Menächmen* des Plautus lat. und deutsch, mit einer Einleitung über die Characterrolle des Parasiten herausgegeben. von C. E. Geppert, Berlin 1845.
- RITSCHL<sup>1</sup> T. Macci Plauti *Comoediae*, ex rec. et cum appar. critico Fr. Ritschlii, II 3 *Menaechmos*, Bonnae 1851.
- BRIX Ausgew. Komödien des T. Maccius Plautus für den Schulgebr. erkl. von J. Brix: *Menaechmi*, Leipzig 1866.
- RITSCHL<sup>2</sup> T. Macci Plauti *comoediae*, rec. instrum. critico et prolegom. auxit Fr. Ritschl socii operae adumtis G. Loewe, G. Goetz, Fr. Schoell, III 5 *Menaechmi*, rec. Fr. R., editio altera a Fr. Schoell recognita, Lipsiae 1889.
- STUEMUND T. M. Plautus, *Fabularum reliquiae ambrosianae: codicis rescripti ambrosiani apographum*, confecit et edit G. Studemund, Berlin 1889.
- LEO T. Macci Plauti *Comoediae*, rec. et emend. F. Leo, I-II, Berolini 1895-1896.
- LINDSAY T. Macci Plauti *comoediae*, recogn. brevique adn. critica instruxit W. M. Lindsay, Oxonii 1904-1905 (ed. corr. 1910).
- NIEMEYER Ausgew. Komödien des T. Maccius Plautus erkl. von J. Brix. Drittes Bändchen: *Menaechmi*. Fünfte Auflage bearb. Von M. Niemeyer, Leipzig-Berlin 1912.
- CONRAD Ausgew. Komödien des T. Maccius Plautus erkl. von Brix-Niemeyer. Drittes Bändchen: *Menaechmi*. Sechste Auflage bearb. von F. Conrad, Leipzig-Berlin 1929.
- ERNOUT Plaute, *Comédies*, texte établi et trad. par A. Ernout, IV 1, Paris 1936.
- USSING Commentarius in *Plauti comoedias*, denuo edendum cur. A. Thierfelder, I-II, Hildeschein-New York 1972.
- GRATWICK Plautus, *Menaechmi*, ed. by A. S. Gratwick, Cambridge 1993.

## CRITICAL EDITIONS AND COMMENTARIES OF VENANTIUS

- KRUSCH *Venanti Honori Clementiani Fortunati. Presbyteri Italici Opera Pedestria*, recensuit et emendavit B. Krusch, in *MGH IV 2*, Berlin 1961<sup>2</sup> (1885).
- LEO *Venanti Honori Clementiani Fortunati. Presbyteri Italici Opera Poetica*, recensuit et emendavit F. Leo, in *MGH IV 1*, Berlin 1961<sup>2</sup> (1885).
- REYDELLET *Venance Fortunat. Poèmes, texte établi et traduit* par M. Reydellet, I-II, Paris 1994.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BENNET, Ch. E., *Syntax of Early Latin*, I-II, Boston 1910-1914.
- BLOMGREN, S., *Studia Fortunatiana*, Upsaliae, 1933.
- CONSOLINO, Franca Ela, *L'eredità dei classici nella poesia del VI secolo*, in *Prospettive sul Tardoantico*, G. Mazzoli – F. Guasti (ed. by), Como 1999, pp. 86-90.
- GEORGE, Judith W., *Venantius Fortunatus. A Latin Poet in Merovingian Gaul*, Oxford 1992.
- GARCÍA HERNÁNDEZ, B., *Semántica estructural y lexemática del verbo*, Reus 1980.
- LINDSAY, W. M., *An introduction to Latin textual emendation based on the text of Plautus*, London 1896.
- LINDSAY, W. M., *Syntax of Plautus*, Oxford 1907.
- LODGE, G., *Lexicon Plautinum*, I-II, Leipzig 1924-1933.
- LOEFSTEDT, E., *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der lateinischen Sprache*, Leipzig 1911.
- MENEGHETTI, A., *La latinità di Venanzio Fortunato*, Torino 1916-1917.
- TONTINI, Alba, *La tradizione umanistica di Plauto*, in *Due Seminari Plautini*, C. Questa – R. Raffaelli (ed. by), Urbino 2002, pp. 57-88.
- *Censimento critico dei manoscritti plautini. I. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana*, «MAL» XV 4, 2002, pp. 271-534.
- *Censimento critico dei manoscritti plautini. Le biblioteche italiane*, «MAL» XVI 1, 2010, pp. 1-500.
- QUESTA, C., *Titi Macci Plauti cantica edidit apparatu metrico instruxit Caesar Questa*, Urbino 1995.
- *Sei letture plautine*, Urbino 2004, pp. 59-75 (= Tito Maccio Plauto. *I Menecmi*. Introduzione di C. Questa. Traduzione di M. Scàndola, Milano 1984, pp. 61-82).
- RITSCHL, Fr., *Opuscula philologica*, I-V, Lipsiae 1866-1879.