interpretations has to be made, the allusion to Octavia's alleged disloyalty would deserve preference as the more straightforward in its context. Further, only with this interpretation is the full humor in the mention of the two Julias and Silanus brought out: Octavia may have been vague about so simple a matter as the priority of duties owed a brother and a husband, but Augustus knows down to the last great-granddaughter and great-great-grandson (in that order)[19] the extent of the wrong that has been done him.[20]

THOMAS A. SUITS

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

19. Augustus' nicety in this respect is the more striking for the complexity of the relationships involved: the Julia who died by the sword was the daughter of Drusus Caesar, son of Tiberius, adoptive son of Augustus; Julia Livilla, who died by starvation, was the daughter of Germanicus Caesar, adoptive son of Tiberius, adoptive son of Augustus; and Lucius Silanus was descended from Augustus through an entirely female line—his mother was Aemilia Lepida, his grandmother was the younger Julia, and his great-grandmother was the elder Julia, daughter of Augustus.

20. I am indebted to Professors Michael P. McHugh and Allen M. Ward, who have kindly read and helpfully discussed with me a draft of this article.

FOUR NOTES ON PLAUTUS' *AVLVLARIA*

I

Aul. 141: tro[7]. The MSS give "nec tibi advorsari certum est de istac re umquam soror." Leo keeps this reading with hiatus after *re*, while Lindsay reads *re⟨d⟩*, adducing as evidence of this form *Merc.* 629, *Pseud.* 19, Pacuv. trag. 237. But most modern scholars doubt the existence of a fifth-declension ablative singular in *-d*, and one would do better to think of other possibilities. Wagner's (1st ed.) and Goetz's solution was to transpose *istac* and *re*, and this is certainly preferable to accepting the hiatus; but (see Lodge, I, 850) *iste* following the substantive to which it is joined is rare: only twenty-one examples in the whole of Plautus are noted by Lodge, and *re istac* is nowhere paralleled. Lindsay suggests *⟨n⟩umquam* in his apparatus (cf. his *⟨n⟩ullam* in 125), but I prefer to transpose *umquam* to a more normal position before *de istac re*; this does away with the hiatus and restores the normal order *istac re*: "nec tibi advorsari certumst umquam de istac re, soror.

II

Aul. 452: tro[7]. The MSS give "etiam intro duce si vis vel gregem venalium," with hiatus after *etiam*. Bothe, Wagner, Francken, and Goetz follow Camerarius in inserting a *⟨huc⟩* after *etiam*; Leo suggests *⟨ite⟩ etiam* in his apparatus, while both he and Lindsay accept the hiatus in their texts. Another possibility would be to read *⟨nunc⟩ etiam*, or better still *nunciam*: cf. 451 (where I find Leo's omission of *intro* preferable to Lindsay's *nunc[iam]*) and 453. Euclio, having retrieved the gold, says "*Now* you can all go in; *now* you can take the whole tribe of slaves in, if you like; *now* you can do all the hurrying about you like!"

There is a great deal to commend a series of three *nunciam*'s, not the least consideration being the clash of *etiam* and *vel*—which I cannot parallel—in the MSS. After a comma *etiam* would have to mean "also," which does not suit the context. *Nunciam*, in abbreviated form, could easily have been mistaken for *etiam*. I therefore read:

ite sane nunciam omnes, et coqui et tibicinae,
nunciam intro duce, si vis, vel gregem venalium,
coquite, facite, festinate nunciam quantum lubet
[451–53].

III

Aul. 69: the words *queo comminisci* begin 69 and 76, and this has caused some editors to suspect corruption. The hiatus (at caesura) after *queo comminisci* in 69, and the spondaic fourth foot *quicquam* in 76 increase the suspicion. (Add the fact that the sense of *comminisci—semper de fictis*, according to Lodge, I, 279—suits 76 well enough, but is a little awkward for 69.)

Now it is true that it is characteristic of

old servant women to chatter and to be repetitive (e.g., *Mostell.* 224 f. and 247; also *Bacch.* 513 and 519*b* for repetition by an *adulescens*), but that the writer deliberately so characterized is very doubtful. One must exercise caution when faced with repetitions of this kind, but I believe we are dealing with some sort of Plautine expansion. At least three possibilities present themselves: (1) 68 was followed in the original by 74; (2) 67 by 74; (3) *queo comminisci* in 69 by *neque quicquam* in 76. The last of these possibilities seems to me most likely. Is it not eminently possible that 69–73 inclusive represent elaboration—on the lines laid down by Fraenkel—by the Roman poet? *Claudus sutor* in 73 is just the kind of thing Plautus might have introduced into the text. The idea of being "thrown out ten times a day" in 69–70 could have been prompted by 38 and 44; the *intemperiae* was perhaps suggested by the *mala res* and *insania* mentioned in 68. Not content with being allusive, Plautus gives concrete examples.

Without 69–73, Staphyla's speech is rather short, but similarly short speeches between an exit and re-entry can be paralleled: cf., e.g., Ter. *Heaut.* 502–507, 559–61. Another objection is that, although the hiatus is eliminated, we are left with the spondaic *quicquam*. But Hingst (*De spondeis et anapaestis in antepaenultimo pede versuum generis duplicis Latinorum* [Diss. Leipzig, 1904], p. 24) concluded that when the spondaic word forms part of a closely connected group of words (cf., e.g., Ter. *Heaut.* 788: *atqui quam maxime*; *Trin.* 527: *etsi scelestus est*) the heavy word ending is permissible. (See also Klotz, *Grundzüge*, p. 324.)

One cannot be dogmatic, but I suspect Plautine elaboration in 69–73, taking the repeated *queo comminisci* as the *indicium Fraenkelianum*.

IV

A similar elaboration may be detectable between lines 90 and 104. In the repeated *iam ego hic ero* it seems likely that we have the *indicium Fraenkelianum*. With the second *iam ego hic ero* Plautus is picking up the original again. What lies between these two points contributes little which is new, merely emphasizing the order that Staphyla must open the door to no one. The vivid examples of Euclio's stingy attitudes—expressed as four witticisms—in 91 ff. could well be Plautine, though none of the things mentioned is specifically Roman. It would be characteristic of Plautus to see here a chance for the kind of elaboration in which he specialized: cf., e.g., *Pseud.* 170–241. The general idea is, "Don't let anyone in on any account": Plautus sees in this a chance for some humorous particular examples. One might compare the cook scene at 280 ff., where the general idea of stinginess is a starting point for a string of fantastic particular examples of Euclio's stingy behavior. (For an analysis of the Plautine element in this scene, see E. Burck's article in *WS*, LXIX [1956], 265–77, and F. Klingner's in *SIFC*, XXVIII [1956], 157 ff.)

But again, one cannot be dogmatic. I believe that 90–104 are Plautine, but it is possible that the repeated orders (see later at 274) are Menandrean, and serve to characterize Euclio's neurotic fear of losing the gold. Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice*, Act II, scene v, offers some striking similarities of repetition in a situation which is basically the same as that in *Aulularia* I. ii. There the repetition serves to underline Shylock's extreme reluctance to leave his house, and his obsession with the possibility of theft.

C. STACE

CHRIST'S HOSPITAL

LUCRETIUS 1. 983

"Effugiumque fugae prolatet copia semper": Bailey renders, "And room for flight ever prolongs the chance of flight." Munro and Diels translate the clause in much the same way. This interpretation goes back at least to Lambinus. Lachmann, Ernout–Robin, and Bailey do not discuss the meaning of this clause in their commentaries; Merrill