

T. MACCI PLAUTI

MILES GLORIOSUS

EDITED WITH AN INTRODUCTION AND NOTES

BY

MASON HAMMOND

ARTHUR M. MACK

WALTER MOSKALEW

REVISED BY

MASON HAMMOND

COPYRIGHT © 1963

BY THE PRESIDENT AND FELLOWS OF HARVARD COLLEGE

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

FOURTH PRINTING, 1997

FIRST HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS PAPERBACK EDITION, 1997

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOG CARD NUMBER 63-19145

ISBN 0-674-57437-0 (PBK.)

CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

LONDON, ENGLAND

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Constructions

LXVII. Partitive genitives with neuter pronouns are much favored by Plautus. Not only does he use the familiar *quid negoti* (173 and throughout) and *quid modi* (1311), but also *quantum . . . prolotionis* (253) for *quantam prolotionem*. The phrase *operae non est* (252, 818) appears for *nihil opera est*.

LXVIII. *Similis* in Plautus is always followed by the genitive (instead of, as regularly later, by the dative), as in *tam similem quam lacte lactist* (240), where *lactist* = *lactis est* by prodelision (see LIV); also *alia eius similis sit* (448), and frequently.

LXIX. Plautus, and early Latin generally, frequently uses two coordinate clauses, with no conjunction and with the second in either the indicative or subjunctive as the meaning requires, where classical Latin would make one clause subordinate. Such an arrangement is called parataxis (“setting alongside”) and is common with such verbs as *sino*, *uolo*, and *facio*. Examples with *sino* are *sinite abeam* (1084) and *sine . . . ueniat* (1244). Examples with *uolo* are *uis dicam* (300) and *uin* (see LV) . . . *faciam* (335). In this last example, however, *faciam* in its turn is followed by *uti . . . fateare*, and the regular subordinate clause of purpose is perhaps commoner in this play after *facio* than parataxis; compare *facito ut meminereis* (354) with *facito . . . meminereis* (806–807). *Caue* (see LIX) is regularly followed by a paratactic subjunctive, as *caue . . . faxis* (1245). The paratactic subjunctive is, indeed, frequent in Plautus after many verbs which in classical Latin are followed by an infinitive with a subject accusative.

LXX. Similarly, some verbs may be either parenthetical or paratactic; for example, *quaeso* is generally parenthetical, as in 568, but seems better taken as paratactic in 865. Other verbs which are more frequently used parenthetically, but occasionally paratactically, are *credo* (202, 368), *opinor* (215, 403, 417, 827), and *obsecro* (1219,

1329). *Amabo* (382, 900, 1067, 1084) is frequently used as a pure interjection = “please,” literally “I will love you (if).”

LXXI. Adverbs of direction with final *-ō* are found in Latin; for example, *eo* (from *is*). These words may derive from an ablative construction, but this is not certain. Examples in this play are *isto . . . quo* (455), *hoc* (766), *aliquo* (861), *quo . . . alio* (863), *illo* (1193), and perhaps *alio* (1293, see note).

LXXII. *Fui* is used for *sum* in the perfect passive, as *legatus . . . fuit* (102) and *uectus fui* (118).

Stem Variations

LXXIII. Early Latin frequently showed *-ō-* for *-ē-*, as *uotuit* (emended for *uetuit* in 830), *uortat* for *uertat* (1350, compare *auort-* in 203, 1074, and *deuort-* in 134, 240, 385, 741, 1110), and *uostrum* (174, emended for *uestrarum*).

LXXIV. Inscriptions contemporary with Plautus frequently show *-ei-* for *-ī-* both in stems and in terminations, and there is some manuscript evidence for this in 13, 884, 1085, and 1422 (see notes); in this edition, however, *-ī-* is consistently written.

LXXV. *-i-* for *-e-* or *-ae-* is emended in *spicit* for *specit* (694) and *bītant* for *baetant* (997). This weakening is, of course, regular in compound verbs, as *inspīcit* (638), *transbītat* (997), and, for *-ā-*, *accīpe* (773, 957) or *subīgito* (652, 1402). It also appears in such forms as *tutīn* for *tute-ne* (290, see LV), *hicīne* for *hic-ce-ne* (61), *hancīne* for *han-ce-ne* (626); compare LV.

LXXVI. Latin always shows uncertainty between *-u-* and *-i-* in the superlative endings *-i/umus*, as *optumus* (99 and throughout) and *maxumam* (388 and throughout). The *Miles* also shows *mancupio* (23), *insuliamus* for *insiliamus* (279), *manuplares* (815).

LXXVII. This last example likewise illustrates the fact that early Latin wrote regularly *-cl-* and frequently *-pl-* where later Latin intruded a *-u-* between the consonants, as *hercle* (see note on 19), *periculum* (635, 1151); *extempulo* is emended in 461 for the regular *extemplo* (578 and throughout).

LXXVIII. Early Latin regularly pronounced *-ōs* for *-ūs* and *-ōm* for *-ūm* after consonantal *-u-*, as in the masculine nominative singulars *seruos* (Arg. I 2), *conseruos* (145), *tuos* (176), *auos* (373). This *-ō-* for *-ū-* is particularly regular in the forms of the relative and interrogative, as *quom* for *cum* (2; the preposition is always *cum*), *quoius* for *cuius* (17), *quoi* for *cui* (97). The manuscripts vary between *quor*, *qur*, and *cur*; in this edition *quor* is written regularly (see note on 317).

LXXIX. It may be noted in this connection that the manuscripts show *delices* for *deliques* (844), and *cassabant* (851), if this is from *quasso* and not a frequentative from *cado*.

LXXX. *ab-* and *ob-* were probably pronounced *ap-* and *op-* when combined before *s-* and *t-* as well as before *p-*, but the spelling with *b* is given in this edition for ease of reference to dictionaries.

Case Forms of Declensions

LXXXI. *Mers* (728), for the later *merx*, and *lacte* (240), for the later *lac*, show the survival of old nominative forms.

LXXXII. Latin poets, until the time of Lucretius, sometimes used the archaic feminine genitive singular disyllabic ending *-āī* for the usual monosyllabic diphthong *-āē*, as in *comoediāī* (84) but *comoediāē* (86). Other examples of this archaic genitive singular are *sapientīāī* (236, emended), *siluāī* (1154, emended), *nostrāī* (519, emended), and *aquāī* (552, emended). The use of this genitive in *magnāī rēī publicāī* (103) creates a tone of solemnity fitting to public duty.

LXXXIII. *-ūm* (*-ōm* after *u*, see LXXVIII) is a common ending in the genitive plural of *o*-stems in Plautus, as *deum* (676, 679) but *deorum* (736), and *uostrum* for *uostrorum* (174, possessive adjective; compare the regular genitive plural *uestrum*). This termination was not a contraction of *-orum*; it corresponds to that in the other declensions and to the Greek *-ōn*. In later Latin this ending was retained in certain specialized words besides *deum* and *uestrum*; for example, *sestertium* and *nummum*.

LXXXIV. *-d* was apparently commonly added in archaic Latin to the ablative singular of first and second declension nouns and to the accusative and ablative of the first and second singular personal pronouns, as *med* (517, accusative) and *ted* (58, accusative), both emendations. Indeed, restoring a final *-d* often eliminates hiatus in the text, but this has not been done in the present edition. Some editors consider the lengthening of *quid* in *quīd iam* (277, and throughout) as preserving the old abl. *quī + d* rather than as lengthening by position (see LX) before consonantal *i*.

Pronouns

See *tuos* (LXXVIII), *uestrum* (LXXXIII), *med* and *ted* (LXXXIV).

LXXXV. *-pte* (*suompte*, 391), *-te* (*tute*, 196 and throughout; see on *tutin* in LV and note on 290), *-met* (*egomet*, 265 and throughout), and similar emphatic suffixes are found more frequently in Plautus than in less colloquial writers.

Ipsus (1061, 1388) = *ipse*.

Eapse (141) and *eampse* (1069) prove that *ipse* was originally compounded from *is* and *-pse*. Such double declensions as *eapsa* occur in Plautus.

LXXXVI. Archaic forms of *is* include *ae*, feminine dative singular (348; *ibus*, dative plural (74); *īs*, dative plural (732, 735).

Quis is more common as the feminine interrogative pronoun than *quae*; see on 361, 436, 807, 925, 969.

Quī is used as an adverbial ablative = “how” from the interrogative (296 and throughout) and as an ablative of means = “whereby” from the relative (139, 691, 692, 768); in 779 (see note) it is an indefinite intensifier of an emphatic particle.

LXXXVII. *-ce* = “here,” a demonstrative suffix (see *ecce* in LXXXVIII, and *cēdō* in XCVIII), was added to many cases of the demonstrative pronouns, sometimes in its full form and sometimes shortened to *-c* by loss of the final *-e* (see LIX). In the latter form it appears regularly in Latin in the nominative, dative, accusative, and ablative singular of all genders and in the neuter nominative and accusative plural of the pronoun *hic*, *haec*, *hōc*; likewise in the adverbs *hīc*, *hīnc*, *illīc* and *illīnc* (5). In the *Miles* the following forms also appear:

hicine, masculine nominative singular (61); and *hīcine*, adverb (181).

hancine, feminine accusative singular (626).

hōcine = *hod-ce-ne*, neuter accusative singular (309).

hisce, masculine nominative plural (374, 486, 1334).

hasce, feminine accusative plural (33, 1023, 1166).

illīc, masculine nominative singular (22 and throughout); it probably does not occur in this text (but see on 1388) for the adverbial locative *illī* (288, 1279).

illaec, feminine nominative singular (210 and throughout) and neuter accusative plural (1126).

illuc, neuter nominative and accusative singular (36 and throughout) and adverbial accusative (659).

illac and *illoc* are not found in this text for the adverbial ablatives *illa* and *illo* (67 and 1193).

istīc, masculine nominative singular (558, 1397); and *istīc*, feminine dative singular (1093), and adverb (337, 421, 1089) for *istī* (225).

istaec, feminine nominative singular (46 and throughout) and neuter accusative plural (31, 195).

istunc, masculine accusative singular (771, 988, 1425).

istanc, feminine accusative singular (751, 770).

istuc, neuter nominative or accusative singular (19 and throughout) and adverbial accusative (618).

istoc, neuter ablative singular (359, 851); but *isto*, adverbial ablative (455).

LXXXVIII. *Ecce* (203 and throughout) perhaps derives from *ed* (for *id*) and the demonstrative enclitic *-ce* (see LXXXVII). In Plautus it is combined with an accusative of exclamation; in later Latin with a nominative.

eccum (25 and throughout), *eccam* (319 and throughout), and *eccos* (1310, 1428) appear to be combinations of *ecce* with either *eum*, *eam*, *eos*, or *hum*, *ham* (the simple forms of *hunc*, *hanc*), *hos*.

eccillam (789) represents a combination of *ecce* and forms of *ille*, *illa*, *illud*.

eccere (207) derives from *ecce* and *re(m)*.

LXXXIX. *ec-* combines with forms of the relative, interrogative, and indefinite pronouns:

ecquis, masculine nominative singular (1297); *ecqua*, feminine nominative singular (794);

ecquam, feminine accusative singular (782); and *ecquid*, neuter accusative singular (42) and adverbial accusative (902, 993, 1106, 1111).

Verb Stems

xc. Perfects are frequently contracted in Plautus — not only those in which the consonantal *-u-* is dropped, as *sisti* (1072) for *siuisti*, but also those whose stems end in *-x* before a termination containing *-s-*, as *dixis* (283) for *dixeris*, *despexe* (553) for *despexisse*, and *instruxti* (981, emended) for *instruxisti*. *Admissee* (1287) is found for *admississe*.

xcI. *-ss-* appears instead of *-uer-* in the future perfect active indicative *mulcassitis* (163), in an old future perfect active infinitive

impetrassere (1128), and in the perfect active subjunctives *optassis* (669), *uerberassis* (emended in 799), and *amassis* (1007).

xcII. A future and past stem formed with *-s-* (like the Greek future and aorist) is used by Plautus to form future indicatives and perfect subjunctives (often used with present meanings). The most common forms are *faxo*, future indicative (463, 1367); *faxis*, perfect subjunctive (624) or equivalent to a present subjunctive, either subordinate (1125, 1245, 1372) or potential (1417). Similar subjunctive forms are *ausit*, potential (11); *dixis*, hortatory (283); *empsim*, potential (316); *subrepsit*, subordinate (333).

xcIII. *Āio* is regularly scanned with a long first syllable, as if originally *āi(i)o* (compare *māior* as against *māgis*), and is therefore marked as synizesis at its one occurrence (548) in this text; similarly *āiunt* (976, 1225). And *āis* must be scanned as a disyllable in 627; elsewhere it may be disyllabic or by synizesis *āis* (337, 358, 366); Plautus, not in this play but elsewhere, may make the *a-* of *ais* long. He seldom, if ever, makes the *a-* of *ait* long; it may be scanned either *āit* or *ait* in 430 and 1032 but must be *ait* in 91 and 126. In this text, *āibas* is emended in 320 and *āibant* in 66, but *āiēbat* occurs in 1107.

xcIV. *Fīō* in its various forms regularly has *-ī-* except in *fīt* (in this text, this is long by position in 117, 757, and ends the verse in 1253). Early Latin occasionally shows a long *-ī-* in the infinitive and imperfect subjunctive, but in this play these may be scanned *fīērī* (37 and later occurrences) and *fīērēt* (950; the only imperfect subjunctive form in this play, and here a tribrach).

Verbal Endings

xcV. *-ier* is a common alternative termination of the present passive and deponent infinite, as *sectarier* (91, deponent) and *haberier* (594); note also *commonerier* (881) followed in the same verse by *commoneri*.

xcvi. *-ibo* frequently forms the future of the fourth conjugation, as in *mentibitur* (35, 254), and *scibis* (1365). In other plays *-ibo* often appears in the future of compounds of *do*. *Quibo* (1240) is the regular future of *queo*, like *ibo* (259 and elsewhere) of *eo*; compare *adibo* (1242), *peribis* (404).

xcvii. The original imperatives *dice*, *duce*, and *face* lost the final *-e* in classical Latin because of their frequent use in spoken word groups (compare LIX). *Fer* (1343, 1387) probably never had the final *-e*, since the verb stem lacks the “thematic” vowel. In this play *dice* (in 256, 1405 emended) is found for *dic* (440 and throughout). *Duce* does not appear for *duc* (930, 1303), but *circumduce* is used in 221. *Face* appears for *fac* (277, 1360) at the ends of 335 and 812 and within the verse at 345 and 1034 (emended).

xcviii. *Cēdō* (226 and throughout), an imperative word = “give,” is made up of the demonstrative *cē-* (LXXXVII) = “here” used as a prefix and an old imperative *dō*. Since both its syllables are short, it may be readily distinguished from *cēdō* = “I yield.”

xcix. Plautus frequently retains original *-ī-* in the third person singular of the perfect active indicative, as in *astitit* (213), *exhibīt* (832), and *potuīt* (1076); in the third person singular present subjunctive *sīt* (242); and in the perfect subjunctive, as in *dixerītis* (862; as against *diffregerītis* in 156 and *uiderītis* in 157, 160); *-ī-* occasionally appears in the future perfect indicative, by analogy with the perfect subjunctive, though not in this play (see note on 1176).

Forms of Sum

c. *Siēs* (1181, 1279), *siet* (199), and *sient* (227, 597, 1316, 1358) appear as the present subjunctive for *sim* since they represent (frequently by emendation in this edition) the old optative in *-ie-* (the Indo-European mood of wish). In other plays of Plautus similar subjunctives are also found for the forms of *possum*.

ci. *Fuat* (299, 492) and *defuam* (595, emended) show forms in the present subjunctive from the root of the perfect. *Fūerim* (1364) retains an original *-ū-* in the perfect stem.

cii. *Foret* (53, 170, 1083) is found as a common alternative for the imperfect *esset*.

ciii. *Es* (25 and throughout), the second person singular of the present indicative and present imperative of *sum*, is regularly long in Plautus and Terence.

TEXT

civ. The text of Plautus' twenty-one plays (see xi) is preserved in two closely related manuscript forms. One is a palimpsest now in the Ambrosian Library in Milan (number G 82 *sup.*), designated by the letter A. Leaves from a manuscript written probably in the fourth century A.D. in a script called “rustic capitals” were erased and reused in the eighth or ninth century for a copy of the books of Kings and Chronicles from the Bible. The underwriting was detected and made legible through the use of acids by A. Mai, prefect of the Ambrosian Library and later a Cardinal, who published in 1815 those legible passages which differed from, or added to, the text of his time. In 1889, the German scholar W. Studemund published a meticulously thorough copy of the palimpsest. Because the original leaves were not reused in order or entirely and because Mai's acids seriously damaged the pages, the palimpsest is full of longer or shorter gaps, though it alone preserves fragments of the last play, the *Vidularia*. It also contains very considerable portions of the *Miles*.

cv. The other form is represented by three manuscripts, of which two were originally in the library of the Elector of the Palatinate at Heidelberg, so that the group is called the Palatine manuscripts. Both of these were given to the Vatican Library in Rome in 1622. One is still there, under the name Palatinus Vaticanus number 1615,