

Notes on Donatus' Commentary on *Adelphoe*

John N. Grant

THE ANCIENT COMMENTARY on Terence that has come down to us in the name of Aelius Donatus gives interesting information about the Greek models and the changes which Terence made in his adaptations. The commentary, however, is not the original one of Donatus but a later syncretism of part, at least, of Donatus' work and scholia drawn from other sources.¹ There are scholia which are misplaced or which contradict each other on the same point and not a few which are unworthy of any grammarian. Difficulties are increased by the fact that the text is often corrupt, particularly when Greek quotations are cited. Thus many of the problems concerned with the relationship of Terence to his Greek models remain unsolved. Yet full use of the evidence of the commentary has not been made. I hope to show here that if the wider context in which the relevant scholia stand is analyzed, the relationship of Terence's *Adelphoe* to the Menandrian original can be clarified with respect to the words of Micio at lines 43–44 and to the same character's opposition to a marriage with Sostrata at the end of the play (lines 934ff). I also suggest that the statement in a scholion on line 275 that in Menander Ctesipho intended to commit suicide is erroneous. In addition an emendation of the scholion on line 323 is offered.

I

43 . . . 2 ET QVOD FORTVNATVM ISTI PVTANT *Romani scilicet, qui caelibem quasi caelitem dicunt, et item Graeci, apud quos sunt huiusmodi sententiae—Πάμφιλος ἔχει †ντων πωλουμενον† et alibi γαμεῖ Πάμφιλος· γαμείτω. καὶ γὰρ ἠδίκησέ με.* 3 FORTVNATVM ISTI PVTANT *utique uxorem non ducere. dicit autem Romanis id*

¹ See *Aeli Donati Commentum Terenti*, ed. P. Wessner (Leipzig 1902–08) I *praef.* xlv–xlvii. In this article the text of Donatus is cited from Wessner's edition.

*videri, quos spectatores habet. Menander †τωμανκαριαημυ†
 γυναικ' οὐ λαμβάνω. 4 ET QVOD FORTVNATUM ISTI PVTANT
 quidam putant sic pronuntiandum 'et quod fortunatum isti putant
 uxorem' et haec bona et concinnata locutio est.*

It is unfortunate that the first part of the quotation from Menander in scholion 3 is corrupt, since one would like to know whether Terence diverged from his Greek model at this point. The corruption is such, however, that none of the proposed emendations has won overwhelming support.² The suggestions are often equally plausible—or implausible, if you will—palaeographically, and in the final analysis must all have depended on whether or not their authors thought that Terence followed his original closely at this point. Obviously such emendations cannot by themselves provide an answer to the question of Terence's fidelity of translation at lines 43 and 44 of the *Adelphoe*. An additional criterion has to be found.³ The attempt will be made here to show that if the relevant section of the Donatus commentary is examined more closely than has been done in the past, we do in fact have a yardstick other than palaeographical plausibility by which to judge those conjectures that have been made.

First of all it is necessary to look at the *three* scholia cited above both in terms of content and in the arrangement of that content. They have been prompted by two questions. To whom does *isti* refer? Should one take the relative clause *quod fortunatum isti putant* to refer to *uxorem numquam habui* or to *uxorem* alone? As far as the second question is concerned, the scholiast favored (correctly, I believe) taking *uxorem numquam habui* as the antecedent. Otherwise, he would hardly have troubled to write scholion 2, which is irrelevant if *uxorem* were the antecedent. Moreover, the manner in which the alternative interpretation is given does not indicate the writer's approval of it.⁴ One

² In the discussion of this verse in the Teubner edition of Menander (A. Körte/A. Thierfelder, *Menandri quae supersunt: Pars altera* [Leipzig 1959] 16) the conclusion *versus nondum certo sanatus videtur* is a judicious comment on the attempts that have been made to emend this line.

³ Cf. the statement of P. Sipkema, *Quaestiones Terentianae* (Amsterdam 1901) 64: *sed me iudice versus Menandrei condicio ea est ut nihil nobis prosit in discernendo utrum presse secutus sit graeca Terentius annon.*

⁴ This is, of course, based on the assumption that all the scholia were written by the same person. It is possible that the whole of scholion 4 was written later than the other scholia, but I see no reason to doubt that *utique uxorem non ducere* of scholion 3 and *quidam putant sic pronuntiandum 'et quod fortunatum isti putant uxorem'* of scholion 4 were written by the same

wonders therefore whether the verse quoted from the Menandrian play was a decisive factor in influencing the commentator in his choice of antecedent for *quod fortunatum isti putant*. Was it cited as conclusive evidence for the interpretation he preferred? If, however, one looks more closely at the scholion in which the Menandrian line appears, one sees that the first half (*utique uxorem non ducere*) is related to the problem of punctuation, while the remainder (*dicit autem Romanis id videri, quos spectatores habet*) seems to be a continuation of the topic of scholion 2 and to affirm that, although among Romans and Greeks there is evidence of a common attitude to marriage, *isti* must refer to the Romans. Thus the first half of scholion 3 is closely connected with scholion 4, while the second half of scholion 3 is closely connected with scholion 2. I suggest, therefore, that when the ancient commentary took the form in which it has come down to us the first half of scholion 3 was erroneously placed between parts of the same scholion.⁵

It has now to be decided whether the Menandrian verse should still follow *dicit autem Romanis id videri, quos spectatores habet* or whether it goes with *utique uxorem non ducere* and was quoted baldly and without connective as support for the punctuation which the comment *utique uxorem non ducere* requires. But in other places in the commentary where an alternative interpretation is reported and we are given information of the Greek model, the reference to the Greek play appears after the former: thus *An.* 483.3, *FAC ISTA VT LAVET 'ista' quae ex puerperis sordebant. quidam 'ista' ipsam puerperam dicunt—sic enim et Menander λούσατ' ἀπ'τὴν ἀντίκα—sed . . .*; *An.* 592.1, *QVIDNAM AVDIO legitur et 'audiam'*; *Menander enim sic ait τί ποτ' ἀκούσομαι*; *Eun.* 46.7, *NON EAM NVNC QVIDEM 'non eam' Probus distinguit; iungunt qui secundum Menandri exemplum legunt*. Thus, if we take the Menandrian verse with *utique uxorem non ducere* and link both parts with scholion 4, we find a divergence from the usual pattern, unless we assume (1) that no part of scholion 4 was written by the author of scholion 3 and that scholion 4 was a later addition, or (2) that the Menandrian

hand. Since that individual preferred to take *uxorem numquam habui* as the antecedent, the final part of scholion 4 (*et haec bona et concinnata locutio est*) may be a case of 'damning with faint praise' or the comment of a subsequent writer who found the alternative interpretation attractive.

⁵ Misplaced scholia are not infrequent in the commentary. See R. Sabbadini, "Gli scolii donatiani," *StItal* 3 (1895) 340–41, for examples in the *Eunuchus*.

scholion was also (*i.e.* in addition to *utique uxorem non ducere*) misplaced. On the other hand, if the Menandrian line is taken with *dicit autem Romanis id videri, quos spectatores habet* as the concluding part of scholion 2, the structure of scholion 2 would resemble that of the scholia on *An.* 483, 592 and *Eun.* 46. The evidence suggests, therefore, that the Menandrian line should be taken with scholion 2, and that it was cited in connection with taking *isti* to refer to the Romans.

In addition to the scholia cited above, other testimony of the difficulty which *isti* caused in antiquity is provided by the final part of scholion 5 on this line in the Donatus commentary (*'isti' autem id est hi qui a me dissentiunt*) and by the presence of a scholion in the Bembinus (*isti: qui uxores habent*). My own view on the demonstrative is that Micio is referring, *strictly within the context of the play*, to his fellow citizens, and that *isti* indicates more forcefully than, for example, *quidam* that he himself does not share their belief. Donatus, however, states that *isti* refers to the Roman audience. The ancient commentator was echoed by Karl Dziatzko and Robert Kauer,⁶ who followed Joseph Bach⁷ in believing that there is inherent second personal force in the demonstrative *iste*. But Bach's thesis was ably challenged by Ruth Mildred Keller, who showed convincingly that the primary force of *iste* was strongly deictic.⁸ Admittedly, one explanation of Donatus' denial of the possibility of taking *isti* to refer to the Greeks would be that he recognized a second personal force in *iste*. His purpose in citing the Menandrian line would then be uncertain. It might have been quoted to indicate that there was an allusion to the audience in the Greek play also. But it may have been adduced to show that there was no reference to the audience in Menander and that Terence differed from his original at this point. Other notes on this demonstrative in the ancient commentary show, however, that *iste* was thought to have strong deictic or derogatory force.⁹ It seems, therefore, that the Menandrian line was cited because it was on the basis of this that the scholiast stated that *isti* referred to the Romans.

Accordingly, some conjectures about the content of the Greek verse can be made. The Menandrian Micio did not, for example, directly

⁶ K. Dziatzko/R. Kauer, *Terentius: Adelphoe*² (Leipzig 1903) *ad loc.*

⁷ *De usu pronominum demonstrativorum apud priscos scriptores Latinos*, in W. Studemund (ed.), *Studien auf dem Gebiete des archaischen Lateins II* (Berlin 1891) 145–415.

⁸ "Iste Deiktikon in the Early Roman Dramatists," *TAPA* 76 (1946) 261ff.

⁹ See for example the notes in the commentary on *An.* 15, *Ad.* 377, 388, 981.

address the audience in the second person (= *quod fortunatum putatis*), since a change from a direct address to *quod fortunatum isti putant* would provide support for taking *isti* to refer to the Greeks. Secondly, it is most unlikely that *quod fortunatum isti putant* corresponds exactly to what was said at this point in Menander, since an exact translation would not help to show that *isti* must refer exclusively to the Romans. The conclusion that one must come to is that in Menander the old man made no comment on the opinion held either by the audience or by a third party but stated his own belief that bachelorhood was a blissful state. Thus the fragment as printed in the Teubner edition—*χὼ μακάριόν φα<κιν>, γυναικ' οὐ λαμβάνω*¹⁰—is less attractive in sense than a suggestion made by Louis Havet—*τὸ μακάριον τὸ πάνυ, γυναικ' οὐ λαμβάνω*.¹¹

Finally, the change which Terence has made at this point may be connected with Demea's proposal at the end of the play that Micio should marry Sostrata (929ff). Terence may have tried to soften the shock of Micio's acceptance by changing what was a personal opinion of the old man on the blessings of being a bachelor in the Greek play into a comment, implying disagreement, on the attitude of others towards marriage.¹²

II

275 . . . 2 PAENE EX PATRIA ἀποσιώπησις εὐφημισμού χάριν. Menander
mori illum voluisse fingit, Terentius profugere.

Different reasons have been put forward for the change which Donatus tells us Terence made here. It has been suggested that it was made out of concern for consistency in the characterization of Ctesipho,¹³ in order to tone down the emotion,¹⁴ or in the interests of

¹⁰ Based on a suggestion of A. Saekel, *Quaestiones comicae de Terenti exemplaribus Graecis* (Berlin 1914) 54, although the punctuation is different.

¹¹ "Un fragment de Ménandre, *Adelphes*," *RevPhil* 45 (1921) 86–87. Suggestions similar in sense to Havet's were proposed by F. Nencini, *De Terentio eiusque fontibus* (Liburni 1891) 135, and Dziatzko/Kauer, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.6) *ad loc.*, but these are less attractive palaeographically or metrically.

¹² W. G. Arnott, "The End of Terence's *Adelphoe*: Postscript," *G&R* 10 (1963) 143, rightly emphasizes that Micio does not concur with the opinion of *isti*.

¹³ Dziatzko/Kauer, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.6) 16.

¹⁴ G. Jachmann, *RE* 5 A (1934) 615.

realism.¹⁵ I fail to see how the change “dient der Dämpfung des Affekts,” since it is not as if Ctesipho is himself speaking and contemplating what he should do in light of the apparent loss of his girlfriend. As for the consistency of characterization, if one wished to go into the psychological makeup of Ctesipho, a decision to commit suicide could be regarded as more consistent with his portrayal as “ein haltloser und unselbständiger Jüngling” than a decision to leave his homeland. The other motive for the change, a concern for realism on the part of Terence, would be more readily acceptable if the contemplation of suicide was not such a common *motif* in New Comedy¹⁶ and it was not hinted at in other plays of Terence.¹⁷ Nevertheless, this concern for realism still seems to be the best explanation for the change if the statement in the scholion is accepted.

I wish to offer here the suggestion that, while there was a difference between the Terentian and Menandrian plays at this point, the difference was not what the Donatus scholion tells us. Another solution for young men in Ctesipho's plight was to go overseas, often to fight in the Hellenistic armies.¹⁸ An interesting example of this can be found in the *Samia* of Menander. In this play Demeas had suspected that his adopted son Moschion was the father of a child by the Samian woman. The young man reveals the facts of the matter to Demeas, but Moschion's anger at the mistrust shown by his father breaks out in a later monologue (281ff) where he states that were it not for other factors he would not wait around to be accused a second time:

οὐκ ἂν παρόντα γ' αὐτίς ἠτιάσατο
αὐτόν με τοιοῦτ' οὐδέν, ἀλλ' ἀποφθαρεῖς
ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ἂν ἐκποδῶν εἰς Βάκτρα ποι
ἢ Καρίαν διέτριβον αἰχμαζῶν ἐκεῖ.

The appearance of the verb ἀποφθείρεσθαι in this context in the sense ‘to be gone’ is interesting.¹⁹ Is it possible that this verb appeared in

¹⁵ H. Haffter, “Terenz und seine künstlerische Eigenart,” *MusHelv* 10 (1953) 96; O. Rieth, *Die Kunst Menanders in den ‘Adelphen’ des Terenz. Mit einem Nachwort herausgegeben von Konrad Gaiser* (Hildesheim 1964) 40.

¹⁶ See for example Men. *Pk.* 255, Plaut. *Asin.* 606ff, *Cas.* 307, *Cist.* 248, *Merc.* 472, *Pseud.* 88ff.

¹⁷ *An.* 322, *Hec.* 282, *Phorm.* 686 (see K. Dziatzko/E. Hauler, *Terentius: Phormio*⁴ [Leipzig 1913] *ad loc.*).

¹⁸ See for example Plaut. *Merc.* 644ff, Ter. *Haut.* 117.

¹⁹ Cf. Men. *Sam.* 158, Eur. *HF* 1290.

Ἄδελφοὶ β' in the verse which was the model of lines 274–75 in Terence's play (*tam ob parvolam | rem paene e patria—turpe dictu!*), and that the information about a difference between Terence and Menander with respect to Ctesipho's intentions rests on a literal interpretation of this Greek verb?

Let us suppose that there was such a misunderstanding. Is there any indication of what prompted it? Originally the Greek verse, or at least some part of the verb ἀποφθείρεσθαι, could have been quoted to show that there was no *aposiopesis* in Menander, but it may have been cited as a guide in deciding which verb would have completed the construction in Latin. The first scholion in line 275 reads PAENE EX PATRIA deest 'fugere', quia amatores comici cito comminantur patriam se deserturos, ut amicam consequantur. But because *turpe dictu* suggests a stronger term than *fugere* and because of the alliteration in *paene e patria*, it is more likely that we are to think that the verb which Aeschinus shrinks from saying is *perire* (cf. Plaut. *Capt.* 537, *periisti e patria tua*). Now the fourth scholion on line 274 reads *et deest 'perire', sed τῷ εὐφημικῷ tacetur*. I would conjecture that because of the similar usage of *perire* and ἀποφθείρεσθαι the Menandrian quotation was originally part of scholion 274.4, that the two parts of the scholion became separated and that a late scholiast (or the compiler of the commentary?), confronted with the Menandrian tag in isolation, jumped to the hasty conclusion that in Menander the young man had contemplated suicide.²⁰ In support of this reconstruction of how such a misunderstanding could have happened, it may be said that the same individual could not have written both 274.4 and 275.1. The former is superior in its choice of verb and more likely to go back to the original notes of Donatus. Moreover, this scholion (274.4) is clearly misplaced. It follows a scholion written under the lemma TAM OB PARVVLAM and has no appropriate lemma of its own.

One concluding point. Later in the play (384–85) Demea prophesies what he sees in store for Aeschinus:

*videre videor iam diem illum quom hinc egens
profugiet aliquo militatum.*

²⁰ Traces in the Terentian play of the suicide have been seen in *nunc vivo* (261), if taken literally: so Rieth, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.15) 41. But it is equally possible that the presence in the commentary of a scholion on *nunc vivo* might have contributed to the misunderstanding of the Greek verb.

How much neater would the irony be if in the Menandrian play Ctesipho, the son whom Demea believed *rei dare operam, ruri esse parcum ac sobrium* (95), was himself on the point of going overseas to take up arms before the timely intervention of Aeschinus!

III

323 QUID FESTINAS MI GETA *Probus personae assignat hoc Sostratae, Asper non vult ad omnia servum respondere, sed nutricem putat hoc loqui.*

servum] Sostratam Westerhovius, eram Smutny, *utrumque male; nam ad omnia Geta responderet, si Sostrata totum hoc QUID FESTINAS . . . RECIPE diceret*

The commentary records here a difference of opinion in antiquity as to the speaker of the words *quid festinas, mi Geta? animam recipe* (323–24). The Terentian manuscripts follow Probus in giving them to Sostrata, but I am inclined to follow Aemilius Asper and some modern editors (Dziatzko, Stampini, Fleckeisen², Kauer-Lindsay) in assigning them to Canthara. The double response or reaction would be quite in keeping with Terence's technique,²¹ and elsewhere in this scene there is a tendency to rob Canthara of the small part that she has (see the assigning of parts in the manuscripts at lines 336 and 343). The problem which I wish to touch on here, however, concerns the text of the scholion in the Donatus commentary.

Wessner's criticism of the emendations of Westerhovius and Smutny is justified, but the text as he left it makes little sense. The second part of the scholion (*Asper non vult ad omnia servum respondere, sed nutricem putat hoc loqui*) would be comprehensible if the problem was whether the words should be assigned to the *servus* Geta or to the *nutrix* Canthara, but obviously the choice lies between Canthara and her mistress Sostrata. That is why Westerhovius and Smutny replaced *servum* by *Sostratam* and *eram* respectively. Surgery, however, has been applied to the wrong place. I suggest that one should read *Asper non vult ad <verba d>ominae servum respondere, sed nutricem putat*

²¹ Cf. for example *Phorm.* 198, 616–17; and see G. Luck, *Über einige Interjektionen der lateinischen Umgangssprache. Kritische Beiträge zu Plautus und Terenz* (Heidelberg 1964) 33ff; also J. Andrieu, *Étude critique sur les sigles de personnages et les rubriques de scènes dans les anciennes éditions de Térence* (Paris 1940) 15ff, 53ff.

hoc loqui. The mistake would have been an easy one palaeographically. The scribe's eye jumped from the preposition *ad* to the same sequence of letters in *verba dominae*. The change from *ominae* to *omnia* would have followed almost automatically.

IV

- 938 1 EGO NOVVS MARITVS *apud Menandrum senex de nuptiis non gravatur: ergo Terentius εὐρητικῶς*. 2 EGO NOVVS MARITVS ANNO DEMVM QVINTO ET SEXAGESIMO FIAM ATQVE ANVM DECREPITAM DVCAM *quis quid quando quomodo: quis 'ego', quid 'novus maritus', quando 'anno demum quinto et sexagesimo', quomodo 'anum decrepitam ducam'*.
- 939 1 ATQVE ANVM DECREPITAM DVCAM *facete hoc addidit, tamquam faciendum hoc esset, si puella duceretur seni*.
- 938 3 ANNO DEMVM QVINTO ET SEXAGESIMO *haec aetas est, ut Varro ait, etiam comicorum senum*.

The first scholion on line 938 has provoked much discussion on the nature and extent of Terence's divergence from the Greek original in this section of the play. The older interpretation of the scholion, proposed by Lessing,²² that it signified that there was no proposal of marriage to trouble Micio in the Menandrian play, has been abandoned and correctly so.²³ The words must mean that there was a marriage in the Greek play but that Micio made no objection to it, as he does in the Roman version. If one judges the two playwrights on the Aristotelian canon of τὸ εὐκός, then Terence must appear decidedly the superior, since it is difficult to accept that Micio should readily accede to Demea's request. Rather than admit the Latin writer's superiority, however, Friedrich Leo supposed that there was preparation for the marriage earlier in the Greek play, whereby Micio's immediate assent to the proposal was quite understandable,²⁴ while Otto Rieth thought that we would never know how Menander made the marriage acceptable, but that we could assume that Micio's assent was to be seen as an expression "seiner heiteren grosszügigen

²² *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*, hundertstes Stück (15 April 1768).

²³ For a brief history of the views held on this scholion see Arnott, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.12) 141; see also Rieth, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.15).

²⁴ *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* I (Berlin 1913) 245.

und hilfsbereiten 'Menschlichkeit'."²⁵ The conclusion that will be drawn here from an examination of the play itself and of the scholia on this line in Donatus is that Terence was responsible for only part of the resistance offered by Micio.

One reason for much of the comic flavor of the ending of the play is that Micio and Demea reverse rôles. Up to this point Micio has come off the victor in their confrontations. He has countered Demea's outbursts and accusations by lecturing him on ethics (e.g. 101ff, 821ff), by telling him to mind his own business (114ff), or by allowing him to believe that he sees nothing wrong in the actions against which his brother is protesting (748ff). Faced by these tactics Demea is reduced to helpless silence of outraged incredulity. Now in the final meeting (924 to the end of the play) Micio's pride in his knowledge of and adherence to what is right and proper (cf. 64, 98, 593, 601, 803) is utilized by Demea for his own purposes against Micio when he describes the actions which he proposes Micio should do as *decens* (928, 948, 954) and *aequom* (933, 960, 968, 976: cf. also *recte datur* 951, and *tu tuom officium facias* 980).²⁶ Micio on the other hand seems unable to produce any rational argument against Demea. Now the reversal of rôles is brought out quite clearly in the line in which Micio opposes the prospect of marriage (934–46). To enlist the aid of Aeschinus against Micio, Demea appeals to him in words (*si tu sis homo* 934) which recall what Micio had said to Demea in their first confrontation (*si esses homo* 107). Moreover, Micio reacts to the suggestion of Demea in much the same way that Demea did when he believed that Micio was going to allow Aeschinus to keep the *psaltria* in the same house as his new bride (746ff). The verbal similarities are clear:

<i>ineptis</i> (934)	<i>ut video tuam ego ineptiam</i> (749)
<i>deliras</i> (946)	<i>senex delirans</i> (761)
<i>satin sanus es?</i> (937)	<i>sanum te credis esse?</i> (748)

I believe, therefore, that if one accepts what the scholion in Donatus states, Terence's purpose in departing from his original at 934–46 was probably to exploit further the comic possibilities of the situation.²⁷

²⁵ *Op.cit.* (*supra* n.15) 120.

²⁶ The most obvious example of Demea's use of Micio's own armament is at lines 953–54, where he explicitly quotes Micio's earlier remark (833–34) in order to persuade Micio to give Hegio the usufruct of a piece of land: cf. 958, *suo sibi gladio hunc iugulo*.

²⁷ On this aspect of Terence's originality see W. Ludwig, "The Originality of Terence and his Greek Models," *GRBS* 9 (1968) 169ff.

It has to be admitted, however, that if Terence is responsible for much of the content of lines 934–46, his contribution has been fitted so neatly into the framework of the play that without Donatus Terentian workmanship would never have been suspected. Naturally this does not constitute grounds for denying to Terence much of what appears in these lines. Such an argument assumes that Terence inevitably left traces of any alteration that he made. Other grounds must be found if we wish to ascribe to Menander most of the content of 934–46.

Two points to this end can be made. First, Micio shows reluctance to accede to all the other propositions put to him by Demea at the end of the play, and pressure has to be exerted before he yields. Since there is no evidence to believe that Micio did not resist in these other cases in Menander, it is difficult to accept that Micio should immediately agree to the most startling of his brother's proposals. The second point concerns the relationship between the *ὑποκείμενα* and the final outcome of the play. It is not until Micio's words at 809ff that we learn of the reasons for the adoption of Aeschinus by Micio:

*tu illos duo olim pro re tolerabas tua,
quod satis putabas tua bona ambobus fore,
et me tum uxorem credidisti scilicet
ducturum. eandem illam rationem antiquam optine.
conserva, quaere, parce, fac quam plurimum
illis relinquant, gloriam tu istam optine.*

We can infer from these lines that Demea gave Aeschinus to Micio because of two happily coincident sets of circumstances. First, Demea did not think that his estate would be sufficient for two sons to inherit; and secondly, Micio had not married, as Demea had earlier expected, and therefore had no sons of his own as heirs. The first reason for the adoption is invalidated when Demea comes to his senses and decides to give up the *vita dura* (859–60), the purpose of which was to accumulate as much money as possible (868–69). He has thus learned by experience the truth of Sostratos' words to his rich father in the *Dyskolos* (811–12):²⁸

*πολλῶ δὲ κρεῖττον ἔστιν ἐμφανῆς φίλος
ἢ πλοῦτος ἀφανῆς, ὃν κὺ κατορύξας ἔχεις.*

²⁸ See E. W. Handley, *The Dyskolos of Menander* (London 1965) *ad loc.* and on lines 807–10.

The second reason, Micio's failure to marry, would be invalidated when he agrees to marry Sostrata if there was the prospect of an heir from the union; but this is explicitly excluded by Demea, who humorously adduces as a point in favor of the marriage the fact that Sostrata is past the age of childbearing (931). The old age of Sostrata is further emphasized by Micio at 938–39:

*ego novos maritus anno demum quinto et sexagensumo
fiam atque anum decrepitam ducam?*

If the age of Sostrata was not specified, there is no reason why an Athenian audience should not have seen the marriage as a means of producing an heir, given the early age at which girls married in Athens.²⁹ There would then be complete agreement between the *ὑποκείμενα* and the ending of the play, and there would be no loose end hanging from this closely woven plot structure.

Is it simply coincidence, then, that Donatus records Terence's variation from his model, not at the beginning of Micio's resistance (e.g. at 934), but at line 938, where Micio's own age and (in 939) Sostrata's age are raised as objections to the marriage? If one looks at the Donatus scholia cited *supra*, two points can be made. The second scholion on 938 is pointless, uninformative, and unlikely to be the work of Donatus,³⁰ and, once this scholion is expunged, a scholion on 939 comes between two on line 938. It is possible that this intervening scholion (939.1) is misplaced,³¹ but another explanation which is linked with the remarks made above can be put forward. I suggest that 938.2 was a late addition to the original notes made by Donatus and that this scholion has split two parts of one scholion which originally read like something in this vein: *apud Menandrum senex de nuptiis non gravatur <sic>: ergo Terentius εὔρετικῶς et 'atque anum decrepitam ducam' facete [hoc] addidit, tamquam faciendum hoc esset, si puella duceretur seni*. The source of the Greek word *εὔρετικῶς* is uncertain, and the word may be a conjecture of Lindembrog (see Wessner *ad loc.*). But there certainly seems to have been a Greek word, and if it was omitted at an early period of the transmission of Donatus' own

²⁹ Cf. Andoc. 1.124–27; the mother-in-law of Kallias has given birth to a child, allegedly by him. Note also how in Plautus' *Aulularia* Megadorus envisages the possibility of a wife who is *media aetate* falling pregnant (162ff).

³⁰ This scholion was thought to be spurious by H. T. Karsten, *Commenti Donatiani ad Terenti fabulas scholia genuina et spuria* II (Leiden 1913) 110.

³¹ See *supra* n.5.

notes, the situation was ripe for the following *quotation* to have been mistaken for a lemma. What was originally one scholion of Donatus became two, and these were then separated by 938.2. Donatus was originally and primarily making the point that in Menander Micio did not raise the question of age as an obstacle to the marriage. The scholiast then made the further point that Terence added the reference to Sostrata as an *anus decrepita*.³²

Support for believing that Terence might have added the reference to Micio's age may be adduced from comparison of line 44 of Terence's play and the Menandrian verse quoted in Donatus at this point (see the beginning of this article). The present tense *λαμβάνω* suggests that the Menandrian Micio did not regard himself as being too old for marriage, while the Latin *uxorem numquam habui* gives the impression of a much older man. The conjecture that Terence was responsible for the mention of Micio's age (and of Sostrata's) was made by Otto Rieth³³ on the basis of the differences noted here. But he further believed that the whole section (934–46) was the work of Terence. I have tried to show, on the basis of (1) the inherent implausibility in believing that the Menandrian Micio readily agreed to marriage while resisting Demea's other proposals, (2) the agreement of 934–46 with the *motif* of the reversal of rôles at the end of the play, (3) the greater economy of the *ὑποκείμενα* if a child could result from the marriage, (4) the position at which Donatus tells us of the change which Terence made, and (5) the apparent dislocation of scholion 939.1, that Terence's contribution is probably confined to lines 938–39.³⁴

SCARBOROUGH COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

May, 1971

³² For the order in the second part of the scholion (quotation-adverb-verb), cf. *Ad.* 43.5, et '*putant*' bene dicit is cui displicet aliena sententia; 116.2, et '*maximam partem*' optime dicit; 192.2, et '*quid si nolo*' nove dictum. Much more common, however, is the order adverb-verb-quotation (cf. e.g. *Ad.* 11.3, 61.1, 65.2, 71.2 etc.) or adverb-quotation-verb (cf. e.g. *Ad.* 40.2, 47.1, 70.4, 89.2, 119.4, 142.1, 143.3).

³³ *Op.cit.* (*supra* n.15) 119.

³⁴ I believe that Aeschinus was present in this scene in Menander and do not believe that the lie which he utters at 940 (*promisi ego illis*—he has had no opportunity to have made such a promise) is necessarily the work of Terence. But see Rieth, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.15) 118.