

that is ἐκ νέου and αὐξηθέντα, but does not connect the infinitives 'he kept' and 'he ordered'. Now a particle is needed that connects θρέψαι and κελεύσαι⁷, and the easiest remedy would be to read ἐπεὶ δὲ or ἐπειδὴ <δὲ> instead of transmitted ἐπειδὴ.

I propose that the anecdote preserved by Diogenes Laertius 5.89 should be understood in the following way: Heraclides Ponticus, at an advanced age, reared a young snake. He did not, as is still done often today with pets that grow beyond what their owners can handle, abandon the snake when it had grown to its full size, but kept it. The entry 'Heraclides' in the Suda⁸ goes beyond what is found in the account of Demetrius of Magnesia by stating that Heraclides tamed the snake and kept it, allowing it to share his life and even his bed. For the snake, the bed of Heraclides was a usual place to rest. For the scheme he had devised for after his death, one of Heraclides' servants had to remove his body⁹ and put the snake in a place where it was accustomed to sleeping. The fact that it was fully grown (αὐξηθέντα) explains the effect it had on the mourners: it created a disturbance among most of them (διετάραξε).

University of Colorado at Boulder

E. SCHÜTRUMPF

schutrum@colorado.edu

doi:10.1017/S0009838808000748

⁷ The correct translation of καὶ αὐξηθέντα, ἐπειδὴ τελευτᾶν ἔμελλε would be: 'and after he had grown up, when he was about to die'; however this would deny Heraclides decades of his adult life, whereas he did not die until after he had grown up. Hicks felt this when in his translation he added an additional 'and' before 'being at the point of death' which the Greek text does not have.

⁸ Suda H 461 s.v. 'Ηρακλείδης (vol. 2, p.581, 20–1 Adler). 'Ηρακλείδης ... οὗτος καὶ δράκοντα ἔθρεψε καὶ ἡμέρωσε καὶ εἶχε συνδιατώμενον αὐτῷ καὶ συγκαθεύδοντα.

⁹ Diogenes Laertius 5.89 κελεύσαι τινι τῶν πιστῶν αὐτοῦ τὸ σῶμα κατακρύψαι. In the version of *Excerpta Byzantina*. (n. 2) p. 259, 13 Marcovich reads ἐκέλευσέ τινι τῶν πιστῶν αὐτοῦ τὸ σῶμα κατακρύψαι; αὐτοῦ would go with τῶν πιστῶν, whereas αὐτοῦ, as an indirect reflexive (R. Kühner–B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache* Part II (1898³), vol. 1, 567–8, n. 9), refers to the subject of the main clause, that is, Heraclides ordered to remove his body, αὐτοῦ τὸ σῶμα κατακρύψαι, which makes more sense. Did Hicks with his translation 'he ordered a trusted attendant to conceal the corpse' refer the pronoun (as if it were αὐτοῦ) to τῶν πιστῶν ('trusted attendant'), and not to τὸ σῶμα (which is in his translation simply 'the corpse')?

'SCENES' IN ROMAN DRAMA: A LEXICAL NOTE

No major dictionary of Classical, Christian or Medieval Latin (including Georges, *OLD*, Blaise, Forcellini, Souter, Du Cange, Niermeyer) registers the technical subsense of *scaena* for 'scene', or minimal narrative unit of a dramatic text.¹ This

¹ The closest instance is 'tableau' in *OLD* 5c, with reference to Apuleius *Met.* 6.27; 8.29; 10.23 (see *infra*). The other (main) entries in *OLD* are '1 The background ... against which a play ... is performed. 2 The platform on which actors ... perform. 3a Representation(s) and performance(s) on the stage ... b activity on the stage. 4 a sphere in which actions ... are on public display. 5 A piece of artificial or melodramatic behaviour designed to impress, 'charade', 'theatricals'. b a piece of make-believe, pretence. c a spectacle worthy of the stage, 'tableau'. 6 The background or setting against which events take place, *mise-en-scène*'.

sense, however, is common in modern European languages,² and is also found in Latin (outside the chronological range of *OLD*), in Donatus' commentary on Terence, where it is clearly a well-established critical term.³ What I propose to do in this note is first to draw up the evidence for an earlier dating of the emergence of this sense in Latin, and then to consider the possible implications of this for the appearance of ancient book editions of Roman drama.

F. Leo, following Spengel,⁴ thought that scene titles went back to the age of the dramatic revivals, in the second century B.C.⁵ This view, however, was later refuted by G. Jachmann,⁶ who rightly objected that scene headings as we have them must go back to a reading edition, not to stage scripts: for example, silent characters present on stage are mostly ignored by scene titles. B. Bader, in his important dissertation,⁷ suggested that a chronological clue to the period when scene headings were inserted can be found in the appearance of the word *lorarii* designating the slaves administering punishment. This word does not appear in Plautus, who speaks generally of *serui*, but occurs in Gellius (*NA* 10.3.19), a passage in which the attendants of Roman magistrates are compared to the comic characters in *scaenicis fabulis qui dicebantur lorarii*. This allusion seems to point to editions of Roman comedy circulating in the second century A.D., the so-called 'Hadrianic' editions, in which some kind of scene divisions were present.

Bader, however, was more cautious, and suggested that this second-century edition contained only a skeletal indication of marginal and interlinear *Sprecherbezeichnungen*, and that a full system of scene headings was deployed much later.⁸ C. Questa, too, has championed the thesis that scene headings developed at a subsequent stage, in the fourth-century codex edition.⁹ This would be the likely period for the metaphorical extension of 'scene' from 'general background' to 'dramatic unit'.¹⁰

² Cf. e.g. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary*¹⁰ (Oxford, 1999), s.v.: '2 a sequence of continuous action in a play, film, opera etc.; a subdivision of an act in a play in which the time is continuous and the setting fixed'.

³ Donatus clearly refers to an edition of Terence with scene divisions, which he calls *tituli*, in the body of the written text. Cf. for example Donatus' comment on *An.* 226 SED MYSIS AB EA EGREDITVR *paraskeue alterius scaenae*, that is he rightly saw the character's words as a cue and a lead to the next 'scene', in our sense. Comment on a paratextual feature of the edition he was using is found in *praef. Ad.* 1.6 *saepe tamen mutatis per scaenam modis cantata, quod significat titulus scaenae habens subiectas personis litteras M. M. C.; item deuerbia ab histrionibus crebro pronuntiata sunt, quae significantur D. et V. litteris secundum personarum nomina scriptis in eo loco, ubi incipit scaena*. Long discussions in the *praefationes* (notably to *An. Ad. Hec. Ph.* and *Eun.*) are devoted to detailed summaries by scenes, with all successive entries and exits carefully noted. *Comm. An. praef.* 3.6 refers to act divisions pre-existing Donatus: *nihil ergo secus factum est ab antiquis, qui ad hunc modum Terentianas fabulas diuiserunt*.

⁴ A. Spengel, 'Scenentitel und Scenenabtheilung in der lateinischen Komödie', *Sitzungsberichte der philos.-philol. und histor. Cl. der königlichen Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 13 (1883), 257–98, esp. 289–90, where scene-divisions brought about only by a change of metre are described as 'die wichtigsten Reste der ältesten, gewiss auf das Bühnenexemplar selbst zurückgehenden Scenenscheidung vor'.

⁵ F. Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen*² (Leipzig, 1912), 14–15.

⁶ G. Jachmann, *Die Geschichte des Terenztextes im Altertum* (Basel, 1924), 45–50.

⁷ B. Bader, *Scenentitel und Szeneneinteilung bei Plautus* (Tübingen, 1970).

⁸ Bader (n. 7), 108, 151.

⁹ C. Questa, *Numeri innumeri* (Rome, 1984), 161–92.

¹⁰ M. Deufert, *Textgeschichte und Rezeption der plautinischen Komödien im Altertum* (Berlin, 2002), 217–22, modifies Bader's thesis in so far as he ascribes the appearance of such paratextual structures to second-century (Hadrianic) editions of Plautus and Terence.

However, if we posit the fourth-century edition as the first to be provided with scene divisions, a series of passages causes one to pause, and provides evidence for a much earlier dating of *scaena* being used in the sense of 'scene'. The evidence I will present does not have a conclusive impact on discussions about the appearance of either the Hadrianic editions of Roman drama or the later fourth-century codex edition, because scene headings may still have been set either as 'titles' or in the margins (as on the Bader–Questa hypothesis). Yet it does affect the way in which we understand that Roman drama was presented in reading editions, and, above all, the way in which we can suppose ancient Roman readers to have felt the acts of a play to be structured, whether as a continuous run, or as a series of distinct units.

(1) fr. 307 Funaioli, in Don. *Ad Ter. Hec. Praef.* 3.6

docet Varro neque in hac fabula neque in aliis esse mirandum quod actus impares scaenarum paginarumque sint numero

(2) Sisenna, *apud* Rufin. *Comm. in metra Ter.* Keil 6.561.9 = 15.14 d'Alessandro

In Aulularia sic: 'haec scaena anapaestico metro est'

(3) Tertullian *Adu. Valentinianos* 13.2

ceterum haec intra coetum Pleromatis decucurrisse dicuntur, prima tragoediae scaena¹¹

(4) Tertullian *Adu. Marc.* 3.11.6

et utique debuerat phantasmatis scaenam decucurrisse ne originem carnis non desaltasset qui personam substantiae ipsius egisset¹²

(5) Lactantius, fr. 2 Brandt, *apud* Rufin. *Comm. in metra Ter.* Keil 6.565.4, 17 = 19.8–9, 14–15 d'Alessandro

(Firmianus ad Probum de metris comoediarum sic dicit): '(...) prologos et primarum scaenarum actiones trimetris comprehenderunt... haec per medios actus varie; rursus in exitu fabularum quadratos, quales diximus in secunda scaena.'

The first passage, the fragment of Varro (= 307 Funaioli) is perhaps the most promising, but it poses some problems. If we could be certain that Donatus is not re-phrasing Varro using later critical terminology, we would certainly conclude that Varro knew of 'scenes' in our sense (if Varro is being quoted verbatim, *paginarum* means 'columns' of a roll, not 'pages' of a codex).¹³ If Varro, instead, is being

¹¹ 'Ces choses se sont déroulées à l'intérieur de l'assemblée du Plerôme, c'est la première scène de la tragédie' (transl. J.-C. Fredouille, Paris, 1980), 111. Tertullian goes on with a further allusion to the theatre: *alia autem trans siparium coturnatio est, extra pleroma dico* ('mais on donne une autre représentation digne du cothurne dans les coulisses, je veux dire hors du Plerôme').

¹² The exact meaning is not entirely straightforward, as one can see from translators' divergent interpretations: 'et assurément ton dieu aurait dû jouer de bout en bout la comédie du Phantôme, sans s'interdire de mimer l'origine de la chair, lui qui avait pris le personnage de cette même substance', R. Braun (Paris, 1994), 115; 'And in fact it was his duty to act out the phantasm motif right to the end, so as to avoid cutting out the scene of the origin of the flesh, seeing he had not cut out the role of that substance itself, E. Evans (Oxford, 1972), 203; 'To act out from its earliest scene the play of his phantasy', P. Holmes (Buffalo, 1885–96), 330.

¹³ *Praef. Ad.* 3.7 contains another reference to methods of act division, in language similar to our passage, but this time with no explicit mention of Varro: *In diuidendis actibus fabulae identidem meminerimus, primo paginarum dinumerationem neque Graecos neque Latinos seruasse, cum eius distributio eiusmodi rationem habeat, ut ubi attentior spectator esse potuerit, longior actus sit, ubi fastidiosior, breuior atque contractior; deinde etiam illud, in eundem actum posse conici et tres et quattuor scaenas introeuntium et exeuntium personarum.* The debt to Varro of both passages is discussed by F. Leo, 'Die Überlieferungsgeschichte der terenzischen Komödien und

paraphrased by Donatus,¹⁴ we are left to wonder what he did name as (unacceptable) criteria for determining the length of plays' acts – possibly only the number of columns, as the quote goes on to say that act division should not be determined by a mere counting of lines, but by the manner in which the plot evolves.¹⁵

However, both Sisenna and Tertullian (respectively late second century and post-203 [for *Adu. Valentinian.*])¹⁶ provide relatively firm chronological *termini* for the introduction of 'scenes'; Tertullian's polemical, allusive language, particularly, suggests that the term was well established and unambiguous by his day. Tertullian's quote from *Adu. Valentinian.* also suggests that 'scenes' were not found only in editions of comedy, too, since Tertullian speaks of 'the first scene of a tragedy'.¹⁷

Even if we maintain scepticism about the literality of the Varro fragment, 'scenes' must be concluded to predate the fourth-century codex edition, and go back at least to the second century A.D. My guess is that scene divisions were first marked in annotated reading editions, in which metrical differences between successive parts were carefully noted, and led to the introduction of some paratextual signs.¹⁸ This would help to explain why this editorial feature was a purely Roman, not Greek, innovation: metrical changes within the same 'episode' of a play were a feature of Roman drama from the early days, both in comedy and tragedy, where actors seem to have switched from recitative to song with more frequency than in extant Greek drama, perhaps concomitantly with the comparative rarity of choral songs. For this reason, it seems likely that Varro was already acquainted with 'scenes' as we know them: there may have been commentaries on Plautus in his day,¹⁹ and if he was interested in act divisions, it is plausible to imagine that he or his contemporaries reflected on other structural criteria for the subdivision of plays, especially comedy, where the greater number of entries and exits, and empty stage frames, made the pace more rapid and the action more fragmented. Later on, the 'independence of individual scenes' is a well known, indeed notorious, feature of Roman imperial drama. One wonders if, to the various factors which caused this innovation, one should not add the existence of 'scenes' as recognized compositional units from a much earlier date than has generally been assumed.²⁰

der Kommentar des Donatus', *RhM* 38 (1883), 317–47, esp. 327 (Leo refers to A. Teuber, *De auctoritate commentorum in Terentium quae sub Aelii Donati nomine feruntur* [Eberswalde, 1881], 3, which I have not seen). The issue is discussed also in F. Leo, 'Varro und die Satire', *Hermes* 24 (1889), 67–84, esp. 71.

¹⁴ I leave aside here the question of what is Donatus and what his near-contemporary Euanthius in the prefaces to the commentary.

¹⁵ Donatus *ibid.* ... *cum haec distributio in rerum discriptione, non in numero uersuum constituta sit.*

¹⁶ On Sisenna's dates and activity see now Deufert (n. 10), 245–50; R. Herzog and P.L. Schmidt, *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike* (Munich, 1997), 4.255. Deufert, in discussing Sisenna's output, suggests that he wrote a commentary on several plays, organized 'scene by scene' (245), but does not dwell on the implications.

¹⁷ Nothing certain can be said about the Lactantius (died c. 325) fragment of epistle to Probus quoted by Rufinus; cf. Herzog-Schmidt (n. 16) (Munich, 1989), 5.401.

¹⁸ This is not a new hypothesis. The connection between metrical differences and paratextual marginal marks with character names and roles in the second century edition was first advanced in Questa (n. 9), 184–5.

¹⁹ Cf. Deufert (n. 10), 118.

²⁰ Three very short, effective scenes followed by three empty-stage 'frames', for example, are found in *Octavia* 593–689; seven short scenes marked by exits of all characters make up the mime of the Adulteress (though with no paratextual marks): edition in I.C. Cunningham (ed.), *Herodae*

If the meaning of *scaena* as 'subunit of the act' is earlier than Donatus, and perhaps as ancient as Varro, it is tempting to suggest some occurrences of the word in earlier writers which might seem to fit the 'new' meaning. When *scaena* is used in an extended way, it is usually rendered as 'antics, theatricals, show, charade', or 'fiction, plot', or simply 'sight'. If its sense of 'scene' is much earlier than the fourth century, some at least of these passages may demonstrate this.

(1) Petronius *Sat.* 33.5

conuertit ad hanc scaenam Trimalchio uultum²¹

Ad hanc scaenam refers to Trimalchio's servants handing round to the guests the contents of a spectacular dish-tray, to the sound of accompanying loud music; 'show, sight' are acceptable translations, and may be taken to be included in OLD '3a Representation(s) and performance(s) on the stage ... b activity on the stage'. The passage, then, does not seem to require the emergence of the technical meaning of 'scene' as 'subunit', or 'frame, tableau' of a play.

(2) Tacitus *Ann.* 14.7

scaenam ultro criminis parat

Tacitus *Ann.* 14.7 describes the moment at which Anicetus, Nero's main agent in the plot to assassinate Agrippina, throws down a sword at Agerinus' legs, and so, with a probably unintended echo of the sword motif at Seneca *Phaedra* 896–7,²² accuses Agrippina's freedman of attempting to murder Nero and has him taken into custody. Here *scaenam criminis parat* is much closer to simply 'scene', but can still be interpreted as evolved from senses 'background, setting', or 'pretence, fiction'.²³

(3) Apul. *Met.* 6.27

uidet ... memorandi spectaculi scaenam²⁴

Apuleius' passage is perhaps closest to the 'new' sense of *scaena*, because the genitive *spectaculi* excludes other meanings, such as 'background', or 'theatricals', or 'intrigue'. *Scaena* can only be here 'action, episode as part of a show'. OLD 'tableau' is appropriate, and presupposes the establishment of the technical meaning: a theatrical narrative, or one assimilated to a theatrical narrative, is now visualized as a sequence of distinct moments, somehow felt as separate 'frames', our 'scenes'. A theatrical atmosphere is also conjured up by the ensuing comment: *non tauro, sed asino dependentem Dirce aniculam*, in which the old woman is cruelly compared to a famous Euripidean figure, often represented in art.²⁵ *Scaena* is a frequent word in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, but it is perhaps no coincidence that at least two other passages in the novel fit this meaning,²⁶ and I take this as a strong indication that the

Mimiambi cum appendice fragmentorum mimorum papyraceorum (Leipzig, 1987), 47–51. On the 'independence of individual scenes' see R. J. Tarrant, 'Senecan drama and its antecedents', *HSCP* 82 (1978), 213–63 (esp. at 228–31), with reference to earlier studies on this topic.

²¹ 'Trimalchio turned towards this fine sight': transl. M. Heseltine and W.H.D. Rouse, rev. by E.H. Warmington (Cambridge, MA and London, 1987), 59.

²² Ph. *Hic dicet ensis quem tumultu territus / liquit stuprator ciuium accursum timens*.

²³ 'Making up a stage effect to sustain the charge' is the translation provided by H. Furneaux ad loc. (Oxford, 1907); 'anticipated it by setting the stage for a charge of treason', J. Jackson (Cambridge, MA and London, 1937), 119.

²⁴ 'She ... beheld a truly memorable scene', E.J. Kenney (London, 2004), 107; 'what a dramatic and memorable scene she witnessed', P.G. Walsh (Oxford, 1994), 115.

²⁵ For example in Pompeii, House of the Vettii.

²⁶ The two further instances of *scaena* = 'tableau' given in OLD, Apuleius *Met.* 8.23 *turpissimam scaenam patefaciunt* and 9.27 *scaenam propudiosae mulieris patefecit*, both in contexts of sudden revelations of lovers embracing, are undoubtedly actions, not background sets.

definition of 'scenes' for 'parts of an act' was already current, especially if we read the Apuleius passages against the background of the second-century evidence for 'scenes' discussed above.

Finally, I wish to raise briefly the question of how *scaena* came to acquire the meaning 'specific moment of a wider dramatic narrative' from the original one of either *scaenae frons*, or *proscenium*, that is 'stage', 'stage-background' or 'theatre' generally. One possibility is that this meaning originated with some kind of show, not preserved in our evidence,²⁷ in which scene changes were a more frequent event. The Greek word *σκηναί* has been identified at Delos as a synonym for *πίνακες*, wooden panels inserted into the openings of the stage facade to change the setting.²⁸ In Roman theatre some scene changes were produced by the means of the so-called *scaenae ductiles*, or *uersiles* (mentioned in Servius, *ad Verg. Georg.* 3.24).²⁹ All this evidence is difficult to evaluate, but perhaps changes of setting were more familiar to theatre goers than our literary evidence suggests, and may have had a part in the process by which *scaena* came to acquire this new meaning.

On the other hand, the shift of meaning from 'stage', or 'setting' to 'part of a stage action' was a natural development in both languages, and we cannot rule out that it became established at some point even in Greek. As things stand, however, the Greek evidence, including the scholia to dramatic texts, ignores the technical sense of 'scene',³⁰ a conclusion which squares with the palaeographic evidence provided by the

²⁷ Scene changes are a feature of extant dramas, even in the fifth century, but only very occasionally.

²⁸ For the evidence on *σκηναί* for 'movable flats, painted scenery' cf. R. Vallois, 'Les théâtres grecs; skéné et skénai', *REA* 28 (1926), 171–9 (esp. 176–7); M.-Ch. Hellmann, 'Recherches sur le vocabulaire de l'architecture grecque, d'après les inscriptions de Delos', *BEFAR* 278 (1992), 374–7; J.-C. Moretti, 'Formes et destinations du proskénion dans les théâtres hellénistiques de Grèce', *Pallas* 47 (1997), 13–39 (esp. 19–20, exerting scepticism at this view). I thank E. Csapo for advice on this point.

²⁹ The Servius passage is discussed in W. Beare, *The Roman Stage*³ (London, 1964), 284, 300–2; the evidence on scene changes in Roman theatres is also collected by P. Kragelund, 'History, sex, and scenography in the *Octavia*', *SO* 80 (2005), 112–13. One should note, however, as *CQ*'s anonymous reader reminds me, that these *scaenae ductiles* may have been used to change the scene between plays rather than within them.

³⁰ In Greek, I have looked at passages in which *σκηνή* is modified by a genitive (for example Innoc. *Epist. ad clerum et populum Constantinopolitanum*, PG 52.537 Migne, τὴν σκηνὴν τῶν κακῶν ἣν πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν ἐθήκατε), a demonstrative, an adjective implying a sequence, such as 'another', or a numeral, but I have found nothing really comparable to the usage of Donatus. Arnott (*Menander*, Loeb [Cambridge, MA and London, 1996], vol. 2, 354) interprets Clem. *Strom.* 2.15.64.2 τὸν γὰρ κωμικὸν ἐκείνον Θρασωνίδην ἄλλῃ σκηνῇ 'παιδισκάριον μὲ' φησὶν 'εὐτελὲς καταδεοῦλῳκεν' as 'another scene has the comic character Thrasonides saying ...', but 'another scene' here is deceptive. Clement lists a series of examples from different plays (*Ajax*, *Medea*, *Phaedra* among others), and surely he means 'another stage', comic as opposed to tragic. It is thus best to translate 'another play', as Philip Schaff did in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 2 (Edinburgh, 1867), 362. Similarly ambiguous is the rendering in C. Mondésert (trans.), *Clément d'Alexandrie. Les Stromates*, vol. 2 (Paris, 1954), 86: 'et à Thrasonidès, ce fameux personnage comique, une autre scène prête ces paroles...'. The Clement passage, however, shows what a fine line there is between 'scene' for 'stage, drama' generally, and 'scene' for 'single episode within a play'. The closest to the Latin meaning seems to occur at Phil. *Imagines* 2.10.4 τὸ κυριώτατον τῆς σκηνῆς Ἀγαμέμνων ἔχει κείμενος ... ἐν μειρακίοις καὶ γυναίοις ('The most prominent place in the scene is occupied by Agamemnon, who lies ... among boys and women-folk', trans. Fairbanks, Loeb, 1931), a passage to which my attention was drawn by L. Battezzato's *BMCR* review of C. Kraus et al., *Visualizing the Tragic* (Oxford, 2007). The meaning is 'stage, show, tableau'. Proclus has πρῶτῃ σκηνῇ in *Comm. in Plat. Parm.* 625.27 Cousin, where he describes

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 τοῖνυν ἐστὶν συνουσία, ἣ 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 διαίρει τὸ δράμα* (= 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 hodiern eorum factum faxo post dices magis.

1364 identidem *ς* : dent idem *BCD* | 1365 scibis tibi *CD* : sciusti *B* | 1366 hodie
BCD : tum hodie *ς* | 1367 hodiern 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.