

# Donatus on Terence: The *Eunuchus* Commentary

John Barsby, Dunedin

## 1. Introduction

The commentary of Donatus is an important document in the history of the reception of Terence, illustrating as it does the attitudes and preoccupations of the scholars of late antiquity. The purpose of this paper is to offer a general appreciation of Donatus, highlighting both the areas in which he shared the concerns of modern scholarship and those in which his interests and emphases seem to have differed from our own. To keep the task within reasonable bounds the paper is restricted to the *Eunuchus* commentary, but the general conclusions should be valid for the work as a whole.

## 2. Donatus

The biographical facts about Aelius Donatus are few and well known.<sup>1</sup> He was one of the leading teachers of grammar at Rome, indeed the leading teacher, in the fourth century AD. One of his students was the future St Jerome, who records his master's *floruit* in his *Chronology* under the year 353 AD, which gives us a basic date, and who refers to him three times in all with some warmth as *praeceptor meus*. Donatus wrote two *artes grammaticae*, the *minor* and the *maior*, which were to become the standard Latin grammar of the middle ages until Priscian came back into favour in the 12th century and which enjoyed another heyday in the 15th century and onwards. His commentaries were also important and influential works, both the Terence commentary, which has survived, though not in its original form, and the Virgil one, of which we possess only the prolegomena, though much of its material is preserved in

---

<sup>1</sup> For the testimonia see P. Wessner (ed.), *Aeli Donati Commentum Terenti*, Stuttgart 1902-8, 1, pp. vi-vii.

the Virgil commentaries of Servius and the expanded Servius Danielis. Aelius Donatus is, of course, not to be confused with Tiberius Claudius Donatus, who lived later in the same century and who wrote a quite independent commentary on Virgil.

### 3. The Terence commentary

Donatus' commentary on Terence, as we have it (and we have it in about forty 15th century MSS and in partial form in two earlier ones, of the 11th and 13th centuries), is not a coherent work. As a reader soon discovers, the same lemma may appear twice with a different and even contradictory note the second time; and the second lemma may be shorter or longer or otherwise different from the first one. Moreover the quality of the notes is uneven, to a degree that makes it unlikely that they were all written by the same person. The case was somewhat overstated back in 1844, when William Ramsay declared: "The commentaries are full of interesting and valuable remarks and illustrations; but from the numerous repetitions and contradictions, and, above all, the absurd and puerile traits here and there foisted in, it is manifest that they have been unmercifully interpolated and corrupted by later and less skilful hands."<sup>2</sup> On the other hand the more recent verdict of Robert Browning errs in the opposite direction; his assertion that the commentary "survives, though probably in somewhat modified form" has to be one of the classic understatements.<sup>3</sup>

An important clue to the nature of the existing work is the fact that the MSS present the commentary on a passage of the *Phormio* (lines 348 to 440) in two successive versions, one after the other, which makes it clear that the scribe was copying from two different exemplars. What seems to have happened is that the original commentary was copied by scribes into the margins of MSS of Terence, where it inevitably became to some extent contaminated with notes culled from other sources. Meanwhile the

<sup>2</sup> In W. Smith (ed.), *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*, London 1844, 1, p. 1065.

<sup>3</sup> In E.J. Kenney and W.V. Clausen (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature: II. Latin Literature*, Cambridge 1982, p. 768.

original continuous commentary was lost. At some stage someone decided to reconstitute the original commentary, which meant reassembling it from the notes in the margins of the Terence MSS. It is not clear how many MSS of Terence were used for this purpose; there may have been as many as four, since we occasionally get four versions of the same lemma in the extant version, but the *Phormio* passage suggests that the scribe there was using only two: it looks as if, through weariness or some other distraction, he failed to combine the two at first, and, when he realised his mistake, with no cut-and-paste option open to him, could only add the second set of notes after the first.

The dating of this dual process of dismantling and reassembling is a difficult task. In theory the process could span the period from 4th century AD, the date of the original commentary, to the 11th century, the date of the earliest partial MS of the reconstituted one. In fact scholars have put the reconstitution of Donatus as early as the 6th century and as late as the end of the 8th.<sup>4</sup> But in the end the date does not matter as much as the process. If the process has been correctly deduced, there are major consequences. Some of what we have, even much of what we have, may accurately reproduce the original commentary, but we have no clear means of knowing which parts do and which do not. It is also clear that the extant commentary does not contain the whole of the original work, since there are citations of Donatus elsewhere which are not found in our version, notably in the scholia of the Bembine MS of Terence and in the works of Priscian.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>4</sup> There is an extant letter by Lupus of Ferrières to Benedict III in the middle of the ninth century requesting among other things a MS of Donatus, apparently because his own copy was defective; this would not make much sense if the only Donatus currently available was in the marginalia of scattered Terence MSS.

<sup>5</sup> The fullest recent account of the history of the Donatus commentary is by J.N. Grant, *Studies in the Textual Tradition of Terence*, Toronto 1986, pp. 60-96, where references will be found to earlier discussions. Grant concludes (p. 70) that the compilation of the extant commentary "may have been done in the later half of the eighth century; a date before the seventh century seems improbable." See also M.D. Reeve, 'Aelius Donatus' in L.D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics*, Oxford 1983, pp. 153-6.

## 4. Donatus and the text of Terence

The textual tradition of Terence falls into two branches, one of which consists of a single MS, the Bembinus, known as A, datable to about 400 AD, one of the few MSS of any classical Latin author that has survived from antiquity, and the other a group of medieval MSS of the 9th to 11th centuries, some beautifully illustrated, known collectively as Σ. It follows that, if we had the original Donatus commentary of AD c. 350 and if we could assume that he copied his lemmata accurately from whatever MS he had before him, we would have an independent witness to the text of Terence which was older than the Bembinus and probably also older than the archetype of the Σ branch.<sup>6</sup> However, it would be reasonable to assume that the scribes who incorporated Donatus' commentary into their own texts would have assimilated the lemmata to the readings of those texts and the original Donatus lemmata would have been lost. This means that the lemmata of the extant Donatus are unreliable unless they are corroborated by the notes attached to them. A further problem arises when the notes introduce a second alternative reading (usually preceded by *legitur et*). If we could assume that the alternative readings derived from the original commentary, it would give them major significance as being derived directly or indirectly from another early source; but it might simply be that the '*legitur et*' was added by a scribe further down the chain who had access to another later MS or marginal comment which gave a different reading.

Despite these problems Donatus is regarded by editors of Terence as an important witness to the text, and the apparatus critici of modern editions of Terence are full of references to him. Most of the time the readings of Donatus agree either with A or with Σ or, since Σ itself is not a homogeneous tradition, one of the sub-branches of Σ. In roughly three quarters of their citations of Donatus, the Oxford editors Lindsay and Kauer print the Donatan reading in their text; in other words, faced with variations in the MS tradition, the editors have a propensity to choose whichever one

<sup>6</sup> This point is disputed; the case is strongly argued by Grant (above, n. 5), who puts the appearance of Σ "probably not before the fifth century" (p. 96).

Donatus supports. Sometimes, though not often, the Donatan reading is actually preferred to the whole evidence of the MSS tradition; there are six cases of this in the OCT edition of the *Eunuchus*.<sup>7</sup>

Some examples from the *Eunuchus* follow which illustrate these general points. In each case the Oxford text is given, followed by the OCT apparatus, and then (in italics) the Donatus commentary as reported by Wessner.

1. PA. siquidem hercle possis, nil prius neque fortius. 50  
PA. om. AC<sup>1</sup>P<sup>1</sup>D<sup>1</sup> Don.  
*SI QUIDEM HERCLE POSSIS* διαλογισμός quasi ad alterum.

Editors have traditionally accepted PA. here from the majority of the Σ MSS, which has the effect of terminating Phaedria's preceding speech (from 46) at 49; they then give the whole of 50-70 to Parmeno, in defiance of the fact that all the MSS have PA. at the beginning of line 57. The reason for giving lines 50-6 to Parmeno is that they are addressed to Phaedria and are therefore prima facie not spoken by him; but there is alternative possibility that he is addressing himself, which is how Donatus interprets it, followed by a number of recent editors. This then is an instance of Donatus adding his weight to one side of the question where the MSS are divided, though here the OCT editors are not convinced.

2. TH. ne crucia te obsecro, anime mi, <mi> Phaedria. 95  
mi mi Don.: mi ω  
*ANIME MI <MI> PHAEDRIA* 'mi' uocatiuus est ab eo quod est meus. 2  
*Vide quam familiariter hoc idem repetat blandimentum; uult enim Terentius uelut peculiare uerbum hoc esse Thaidis: adeo totiens dictum est 'tunc hic eras, mi Phaedria?' [86], 'ne crucia te obsecro, anime mi, <mi> Phaedria' [95], 'quaesiu: nunc ego eam, mi Phaedria, multae sunt causae' [144-5], 'mi Phaedria, et tu' [190-1].*

*mi Phaedria* must be the correct reading, because otherwise the line (iambic senarius) is unmetrical. This a simple case of haplography, though it is still curious that none of the MSS of Terence preserve the second *mi*. It should be noted that the lemma of Donatus does not preserve the second *mi* either, but a perusal of his note makes it

<sup>7</sup> 95, 219, 267, 288, 314, 970.

clear that it did stand in his text: the whole point of the note is that Thais uses the phrase *mi Phaedria* as a kind of catchphrase.

3. nam aut iam revortere aut mox noctu te adiget horsum insomnia 219

Don.: -gent ω

2 *MOX NOCTV TE ADIGENT hoc est ad urbem agent.* 3 *INSOMNIA uigiliae. legitur et 'adiget', ut sit 'insomnia' numeri singularis.*

The OCT apparatus implies that Donatus read *adiget*, but his note makes it clear that he actually read *adigent*, but knew of *adiget* as an alternative reading (which would make *insomnia* a feminine singular, though in normal classical usage it is a neuter plural). This then is a case where editors have printed a reading whose only status is that it was known to Donatus as an alternative reading. It probably is the correct reading; a singular *insomnia* is attested in Plautus, Pacuvius, and Caecilius, and in this sort of case there is every chance that the more unusual reading will have been corrupted in favour of the more usual one.

4. PA. viden otium et cibi' quid facit alienu'? GN. sed ego cesso 265

facit etiam Don.: -iat Ape<sup>2</sup>

1 *VIDEN OTIVM ET CIBVS QVID FACIAT ALIENVS rursus Parmeno et facetias dicit et distinguit longiloquium parasiti.* 2 *QVID FACIAT legitur 'quid facit', ut sit figura per modos pro 'quid faciat'.*

The point at issue is whether we should read the indicative in the indirect question here or the subjunctive *faciat*. The indicative is in fact quite common in indirect questions in Terence, especially when they are preceded by *viden*, and there is the added point that *faciat* creates an irregular anapaest before the central diaeresis of the iambic septenarius. Donatus twice has *faciat* in his lemma but in the second note actually explains *facit*; the latter is presumably again an alternative reading with *legitur et* to be understood as in 219.

5. sed Parmenonem ante ostium Thaini' tristem video 267

Don.: Thaidis ω

*THAIDIS legitur et 'Thainis'.*

If *Thainis* is the correct reading, this will be another case where the text of Terence is restored from a reading unknown to our MSS of Terence and known to Donatus only as an alternative reading. The issue here is a metrical one; it is interesting that Donatus never argues textual matters on the basis of metre, though it is something

with which modern commentators are inevitably concerned. The normal genitive of *Thais* is *Thaidis* with a short *i*, but the metre (iambic septenarius) requires a long syllable at this point; it is a sheer act of faith for modern scholars to believe that there is an otherwise unattested form *Thainis* with a long *i*. A better solution may be to regard *Thaidis* as a gloss which crept in from the margin at an early stage of the tradition and ousted a quite different word: Fabia long ago suggested *hic astare*.<sup>8</sup>

6. PA. qui quaeso? CH. amo. PA. hem. CH. nunc, Parmeno, ostendes te qui vir sies. 307

'hem, si cum aspiratione Parmeno; em, si leniter Chaerea' Don.

*HEM, si cum aspiratione Parmeno; em, si leniter Chaerea.*

The assignation of speakers in the MSS of Plautus and Terence is notoriously unreliable. This case is interesting because our existing MSS give no hint of any disagreement; Donatus knows disagreement with regard to both text (*em* or *hem*) and to speaker, and correctly interprets the possibilities (Parmeno 'What!' or Chaerea 'Look!') without expressing a preference. The OCT editors follow the MSS.

7. ut gracilae sient 314

-lae Don., Eugr., Gramm.: -les ω

*GRACILAE SIENT a singulari 'gracila' uenit haec declinatio.*

This is one of a number of cases where Donatus preserves an archaic form in his lemma and then goes on to comment on it, leaving no doubt as to what he actually read. Archaic forms are easily corrupted in the tradition, and a sniff of an archaic form in Donatus is usually enough to persuade editors to print it in their texts of Terence.

##### 5. Donatus and Terence's Greek originals

Terence tells us in the prologue to *Eunuchus* (30-3) that he has imported the characters of the soldier and the parasite (Thraso and Gnatho) from Menander's *Kolax* into his adaptation of Menander's *Eunouchos*. Modern scholars are fascinated with the problem

<sup>8</sup> P. Fabia (ed.), P. Terenti Afri Eunuchus, Paris 1895 ad loc.

of tracing the effects of this importation on the plot of Terence's play, but they have very little external evidence to go on. We possess only a few quotations from each of the two Menander plays from antiquity and some 130 lines of *Kolax* on papyrus. So we look to Donatus for help, in the apparent belief that he had access to the full texts of Menander's plays. It is a not unreasonable belief, since texts of Menander were certainly in circulation in Egypt to the 6th century AD and in Gaul to the 5th,<sup>9</sup> but it is doubtful that it can be supported by the evidence of Donatus himself.

#### a. References to Menander's text

Direct references by Donatus to the text of Menander's *Eunouchos* in fact number only three and to that of his *Kolax* none. The references that he does give to *Eunouchos* confirm that Terence is in two places directly translating Menander (46: *quid igitur faciam* = ἀλλὰ τί ποιήσω and 289 *erilem filium* = τρόφιμον) and in one place mistranslating him (689) but that is all. This last is an interesting case. According to Donatus, Menander actually wrote γαλεώτης γέρων ('a lizard of an old man') with reference to the eunuch's blotched or freckled skin but Terence confused the Greek word γαλεώτης ('lizard') with the word γαλή ('weasel') and wrote *colore mustelino*, which would make the eunuch's skin a reddish brown.

#### b. Other references to Menander

1. *Praef.* 1. 11 *facta autem ex duabus Graecis una est Latina, nam ex Eunoucho et Colace Menandri fabulis haec Eunuchus Terentiana scripta est, non sine crimine, quod multa in hanc translata sint ex multis poetis Latinis: quod totum per prologum purgat atque defendit.*
2. [228] *HIC QUIDEM EST PARASITVS GNATHO haec apud Menandrum in Eunoucho non sunt, ut ipse professus est [prol. 25] 'parasiti personam et militis', sed de Colace translata sunt.*

We might hope to find some general hints in Donatus' Preface about the way in which Terence has combined his two Greek originals, but the statement at *Praef.* 1. 11 tells us nothing that we

<sup>9</sup> See Sidonius Apollinaris, *Ep.* 4, 12, 1.

could not deduce from Terence's own prologue. The same is true of the note at 228.

3. [46. 7] *NON EAM NE NVNC QUIDEM 'non eam' Probus distinguit; iungunt qui secundum Menandri exemplum legunt.*
4. [971] *EX MEO PROPINQVO RVRE HOC adnotandum, quod huius senis nomen apud Terentium non est: apud Menandrum Simon dicitur.*
5. [1001] *QVAM OB REM INSIGNE ALIQVID FACERET manifestius hoc Menander explicat iam pridem infestum meretrici senem propter corruptum ab ea Phaedriam, nunc demum se inuenta occasione vindicaturum.*

Of Donatus' five other direct references to Menander, three deal with relatively minor points. The note at 46. 7 simply confirms that Terence is following Menander in a small point of punctuation.<sup>10</sup> At 971 Donatus tells us clearly that the *senex* in Terence had no name, even though he had one in Menander (Simon) and is given one by Terence's MSS (Demea by A, Laches by Σ). And at 1001 he gives us the slightly puzzling information that Menander explained in more detail the father's attitude to Thais. This implies an omission by Terence but probably of only a line or two and not one of any great moment.

6. [507] *PROFECTO QVANTO MAGIS MAGISQVE COGITO haec persona [Chremes] apud Menandrum adolescentis rustici est.*
7. [539] *HERI ALIQVOT ADVLESCENTVLI bene inuenta persona est [Antipho], cui narret Chaerea, ne unus diu loquatur, ut apud Menandrum.*

The other two direct references to Menander are more significant. The note at 507 offers a pointer to the characterisation of Chremes in Menander, and raises the question whether Terence followed or varied this characterisation; in fact Donatus' subsequent notes (see below) emphasise that Chremes is also portrayed as a 'rustic youth' in Terence. Even more interesting is the note at 539 which clearly points to an adaptation by Terence of Menander's play, namely the addition of an interlocutor to turn what was a long monologue in the original into a dialogue. It is an adaptation which we might not

<sup>10</sup> More interestingly, it confirms that Donatus had access to an edition of Terence by Probus from the later 1st century AD. Probus is cited by Don. also on *Andr.* 875, *Phorm.* 49, 155, 372, 1005, *Ad.* 323; the precise nature of Probus' 'edition' is not known (see Grant [above, n. 5], p. 217 n. 9).

otherwise have suspected, since it has nothing to do with the incorporation of the *Kolax* material.<sup>11</sup>

So we have a smallish number of direct references to Menander, which are more or less interesting in a minor way but tell us nothing of the major process of dovetailing the two *Kolax* characters into the plot of *Eunouchos*.

### c. Implied references to Terentian adaptation

Another possible clue to Terentian adaptation is the suggestion that, when Donatus says that 'Terentius' does something he means 'Terence as distinct from Menander'. This idea was fully explored in a 1978 article by Harry Sandbach,<sup>12</sup> which came to the conclusion (p. 137) that "Whereas the use of the name *Terentius* can in the notes on *Andria* and *Eunuchus* almost always be plausibly interpreted as implying an implicit contrast with Menander, that is not so in those on *Adelphoe*" (or indeed on the other plays: Sandbach mentions *Adelphoe* because this play is the ultimate focus of his article). There are a number of problems with this theory. It is in principle odd that such a technique should operate in two plays and not in the others. It also requires us to assume not only that Donatus had the text of Menander in front of him and was checking for Terentian adaptations, but also that he chose to identify these with a code rather than by an explicit comparison with the Greek original.

Sandbach examines some fifty passages altogether in Terence where the code (if it is one) might be thought to be in operation. These include a total of fifteen passages from the *Eunuchus* in which, arguing with his usual scrupulous fairness, Sandbach finds Terentian innovation certain in two cases, probable in two, quite probable in four, quite possible in six, and improbable

<sup>11</sup> The meaning of the note seems plain enough, though it has been disputed by an authority as distinguished as Fraenkel: see E. Fraenkel, „Zur römischen Komödie“, MH 25 (1968), pp. 231-42.

<sup>12</sup> F. H. Sandbach, "Donatus' use of the name Terentius and the end of Terence's *Adelphoe*", BICS 25 (1978), pp. 123-45.

in one.<sup>13</sup> The existence of even one counter-example is worrying (and Sandbach admits to eighteen passages altogether in Terence where the code does not seem to work), since a code which does not operate all the time is not a reliable code. And it is arguable that, even where the code does seem to be in operation, it may not be: a good test is whether Donatus' remark could equally have been made by someone who was commenting on Terence's play without reference to the Greek original.

1. [254] *SCITVM HERCLE HOMINEM mire Terentius longae orationi interloquia quaedam adhibet.*
2. [440] *TV PAMPHILAM CONTINVO hic magna οικονομία est, qua Terentius praeparat, quemadmodum iurgium inter Thaidem militemque et Gnathonem per duas partes serpat fabulae.*

We can take as test cases the two places in *Eunuchus* where Sandbach associates Donatus' use of the name 'Terentius' with 'material certainly added to the Greek original' (p. 126). At 254 Donatus is complimenting Terence (*mire*) on interrupting a long monologue (by Gnatho) with asides (by the slave Parmeno). Sandbach argues very plausibly that in the *Kolax* Gnatho delivered an uninterrupted monologue: Parmeno, who is a *Eunouchos* character, would not have been present to interrupt it. So the use of the name 'Terentius' certainly could imply Terentian originality here, but it is hard to see why, if Donatus meant to make this point, he did not spell it out more explicitly. It is also true that the remark as it stands could equally have been made as a comment on Terence's scene per se by someone who was not following the text of the Greek originals.

The second (440) is rather more problematical. This note is potentially an important clue to Terence's fusion of his two Greek originals (as we shall see *oikonomia* is a word which Donatus likes to use with reference to plot construction). Sandbach has no doubt of the implication (p. 126): "Clearly the lines to which this refers are of Terence's composition, being designed to tie Thraso and Gnatho of *Kolax* into the plot of *Eunouchos*." The context is that

<sup>13</sup> Certain 254, 440, probable 143-4, 1027, quite probable 382, 588, 198, 356, quite possible 232, 251, 360, 364, 761, 981, improbable 359.

Gnatho is advising Thraso to pretend to be in love with Pamphila, so that, if Thais annoys him by mentioning Phaedria, Thraso can retaliate by mentioning Pamphila, and if she says "let's invite Phaedria to the party," he can say "let's summon Pamphila to sing for us." This is not quite what happens later in the play, but it can nonetheless be claimed that the 'tit for tat' retaliation that does take place is foreshadowed by the passage under discussion. However, here again it can be argued that Donatus' remark could have been made by someone who was merely commenting on Terence's plot construction per se. Sandbach assumes that *duas partes fabulae* means 'the *Eunouchos* plot and the *Kolax* plot' but there would have been clearer ways of saying this, and *duas partes fabulae* could merely mean 'the first and second halves of the play'.

In fact Donatus provides disappointingly few clues to the questions that modern scholars want to ask about the relation of Terence's plays to his originals. Was there a divine prologue in Menander's *Eunouchos*? Are Gnatho and Thraso additional characters or do they replace some corresponding characters in Menander's *Eunouchos*? If there were corresponding characters, did the rival invite Thais to a dinner-party as in Terence's play? Was there a siege scene in which the rival came to seize the girl back? Is it possible that either of these scenes had some origin in the *Kolax*? Can you transfer characters from another play without transferring with them some element of plot? Above all was Terence's ending, which many have found strange as an ending to the *Eunuch* plot, actually taken over from the *Kolax*?

In face of Donatus' silence on all these issues, the conclusion seems inevitable that either he did not have the evidence to give the answers (i.e. he did not have texts of the Greek plays concerned) or he was just not interested. Or, of course, both. In the former case his comparatively few direct references to Menander will have been taken second-hand from earlier commentators.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>14</sup> Even Sandbach (above, n. 12) admits this possibility: "Even if Donatus was himself unacquainted with Menander, the notes which use the name Terentius may be derived from earlier and better-equipped scholars" (p. 142 n. 4). Among earlier scholars Donatus himself names Asper (*Ad.* 323) and Nigidius (*Phorm.* 233) as well as Probus (above, n. 10); there will no doubt have been others.

## 6. Donatus and Terence's language

Donatus as a grammarian is very much concerned with Terence's language, and much of what he has to say has been gratefully incorporated into modern commentaries. It is not points of syntax which are his major concern, but rather the flavour and precise meanings of words. He is keen to identify archaisms, colloquialisms, and proverbial sayings, and to identify the differences in meaning between near synonyms. He is also full of praise for Terence's various rhetorical skills, especially in the choice of words.

Donatus' contribution and interests in this area can best be demonstrated by lists; for reasons of space the various notes are not here quoted in full.

### a. archaisms

Donatus identifies some fifteen archaisms in *Eunuchus*, his favourite terms being *sic ueteres*, *antique*, and the Greek ἀρχαϊσμός. It is interesting that both the *figura etymologica* and what we would call the anticipatory accusative come under this heading. Various types can be distinguished:

form: *hisce* for *hi* (269), *nostrarum* for *nostrum* (677), *quisquam* as feminine (678), *ausim* for *audebo* (884), *solae* as dative feminine singular (1004);  
 declension: *gracilae* for *graciles* (314);  
 gender: *penus* as all three genders (310);  
 case: *indulgeo* + accusative (222);  
 mood: *cum do* for *cum darem* (792);  
 prepositions: *discere de* for *discere a* (262);  
 style: *quid uestis mutatio?* = *quid uestem mutausti?* (671); imperatives + *sis* (799);  
 pleonasm: *nunc nuper* (9), *nemo homo* (549), *luserat ludum* (586), *scis me in quibus sim gaudiis* (1035).

### b. colloquial expressions

Donatus is very good at interpreting the tone and giving the precise sense of common colloquial expressions, both in general terms and in the particular context, usually by means of the characterising



genitive (e.g. [171] *QVID ISTIC hoc adverbium consentire incipientis est*). Examples are: *quid istic?* (171, cf. 388), *uide quid agas* (224), *quid agitur?* (271), *papae* (317), *quidni?* (328), *rogo numquid uelit* (341), *alias res agis* (348), *amabo* (537), *quid ais?* (654), *au* (680, cf. 899), *attat* (727), *canis* (803), *quid nunc agimus? / quid agimus?* (811), *obsecro* (826), *uero* (912), *si dis placet* (919), *di vestram fidem* (924), *actum est* (985), *quid uis faciam* (1054), *heia* (1065), *recte facitis* (1084).

#### c. proverbial expressions

Donatus is quoted as a source for 14 of the 33 instances of proverbs and popular sayings identified by Otto<sup>15</sup> in Terence's *Eunuchus*; Donatus also identifies a couple of proverbial expressions not noted by Otto. Donatus' usual term is *prouerbiu* or *prouerbiale*, which includes popular expressions as well as proverbs in the modern sense; he also uses the Greek παροιμία. Examples which use these terms are: *tota erras uia* (245), *salua res est* (268), *quid tu tristis?* (304), *istaec in me cudetur faba* (381), *e flamma petere cibum* (491), *quod scis nescis* (722), *sine Cerere et Libero friget Venus* (732), *ouem lupo commisisti* (832), *quasi sorex hodie perii* (1024), *praesente absente* (1058), *hoc saxum uoluo* (1085). In addition to these, Donatus offers explanations of *lepus est* at 426 (ἄλληγορία) and *extrema linea amare* at 640.

#### d. synonyms and near-synonyms

Donatus is very keen to distinguish words of similar or related meaning, sometimes perhaps too keen, even fanciful, but always interesting. Examples are: *actum est / ilicet / peristi* (54), *falsum / uanum / fictum* (104), *imprudens / ignarus* (136), *sola / habeo neminem* (147), *speres / exspectes* (195), *loci / ordinis* (234), *facete / lepide / laute* (427), *praedicem / laudem* (564), *tacemus / reticemus / obticemus* (820), *inventor / inceptor / perfector* (1035), *festiuitas / facilitas* (1048), *donum / praemium* (1057), *fatuus / insulsus / tardus* (1079).

<sup>15</sup> A. Otto, *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer*, Leipzig 1890.

#### e. identifying rhetorical skills

Donatus has a number of adverbs which he uses repeatedly to commend Terence on his use of language (sometimes also on his dramatic skill). The sheer amount of commendation is noteworthy: Donatus really appreciates his author. The commonest adverb is *bene*, an all-purpose commendation (some 41 examples), then *mire* (37) mostly in the sense 'wonderfully well', then *proprie* (14), usually for the careful use of words in their precise senses. He is also very good at analysing passages to show how each word is carefully chosen to create its own effect. One example may suffice. Gnatho is persuading Phaedria and Chaerea that Thraso should be kept on as a lover of Thais rather than being thrown out.

[1072] *MILITEM EGO RIVALEM RECIPIENDVM CENSEO artificiose satis semel intulit omne quod durum dictu ad persuadendum erat. nam quod 'militem' et 'riualem' dixit, ad eam rem ualet, ut magis admittendus sit quam excludendus. et simul fiducia sic dicentis parat animos ad audienda quae dicet. . . . 3 CENSEO <uide> uirtutem poetae: non dixit 'peto' sed 'censeo', tamquam illis iam consulat, non pro milite agat. 4 MILITEM EGO RECIPIENDVM considera, quo uultu hoc dicendum sit, et intelleges et 'militem' et 'riualem' et 'recipiendum' et 'ego' et 'censeo' quanta significant. non enim dixit 'Thrasonem' sed 'militem', quod ad stultitiam ualet nomen; nec 'socium' sed 'riualem', quod ostendit, quandoquidem riualis in meretrice capiendus, hunc potius eligendum; nec 'non excludendum' sed 'recipiendum' dixit, ut et ostenderet adeo prodesse, ut etiam de industria retinendus sit; et non 'uolo' aut 'rogo' sed 'censeo', ut consiliarius, non parasitus uideatur loqui, nam quod 'ego' addidit nunc, eo dicto usus est, quo uti solent qui plus in negotio uident ...*

#### 7. Donatus and Terence's plot construction

As noted above, the concerns of modern scholars with regard to Terence's plot construction are very much bound up with the question of his adaptation of his Greek originals. Apart from that, we are interested in his handling of the exposition and the dénouement, the exploitation of suspense, surprise and dramatic irony, and in the coherence and balance of the double plot. Donatus' favourite word for plot construction is οἰκονομία (in the sense 'management'), and his main interest is in the foreshadowing of, or preparation for, future events, and in particular of the ending



(501, 719). Thus at 230 a mention of Pamphila's beauty foreshadows Chaerea's falling in love with her; at 611 Chaerea's apprehension at the prospect of his father's return prepares for that event; and at 719 Pythias' planned revenge on Parmeno prepares for the intervention of the father and his consent to the marriage. There is a reference to 'the two parts of the play' at 440 (see above); the only real reference to the management of the double plot (i.e. the two love affairs of Phaedria and Chaerea) is at 629, where Donatus comments on the timing of Phaedria's return from the country.

1. [230] *FACIE HONESTA* οἰκονομία, qua ostenditur amaturus Chaerea, si quidem hanc Parmeno ipse miratur.
2. [434] *PVRGON EGO ME DE ISTA THAIDI* οἰκονομία ad litem futuram inter militem et Thaidem.
3. [501] *SI FORTE HVC CHREMES ADVENERIT* οἰκονομία ad litem futuram et exitum fabulae. et hoc non audit miles; nam si audiret, nimis irasceretur.
4. [611] *PATER NE RVRE REDIERIT* praeparatur iam interuentus senis.
5. [629] *DVM RVS EO COEPI EGOMET* iam tempus est reuocandi in scaenam Phaedriam, postquam acta sunt omnia, quae illius absentiam desiderabant.
6. [719] *INVENIAM HODIE POL PAREM* hic iam προσοικονομία ad futurum exitum fabulae <est>; nam dum se ulciscitur Pythias, fit iudicium patri Chaereae et confirmantur nuptiae.

#### 8. Donatus and Terence's characterisation

Modern scholars are interested in general in the sympathy and coherence of Terence's characters, their relation to the stock types, and their relation to their counterparts in Menander. Donatus basically shares these concerns, except for the last. He tries to establish a type for Chremes, he looks for a sympathetic portrayal of Thraso, he sees Thais as a *bona meretrix* contrary to type, and he worries about Chaerea's behaviour.

##### a. Chremes

Chremes, though labelled in the text (204) and in the scene headings as an *adulescens*, does not belong to any of the traditional types of young men. He functions in the play as a recognition agent, which is a role more usually played by older relatives or

nurses. Donatus' comment, as noted above, that 'rusticity' was the hallmark of Chremes' character in Menander is therefore interesting; he is also keen to point out 'rustic' elements in his characterisation in Terence.

1. [531] *EGO SVM CHREMES* uide quantum distet ac uaria sit huius rusticitas 'ego sum Chremes' a faceta meretricis disciplina 'o capitulum lepidissimum' . . .
2. [736] *NISI QVIA CORREXIT MILES QVOD INTELLEXI MINVS* hoc uidetur sapientius et facetius dici quam ab ebrio rustico adulescentulo debuisset.
3. [745] *AD ME QVID QVASI ISTVC* et rusticus et timidus et pudens commotus est meretriculae dicto.
4. [755] *QVANTAS COPIAS ADDVCERE* . . . conuenit tamen rudi et rustico adulescenti sex homines 'copias' dicere: militem, parasitum, Donacem, Syrisum, Simalionem, Sangam.
5. [803] *DIMINVAM EGO CAPVT TVVM HODIE NISI ABIS* rusticus dixit 'caput tuum diminuum', quam si diceret 'diminuum tibi caput.'

Related to this characterisation is Donatus' use of the words *simplex* (736, 769) and *rudis* (770) of Chremes.

##### b. Thraso

[446] *SIQVIDEM ME AMARET TVM ISTVC PRODESSET GNATHO* hic uersiculus personam militis et Gnathonis pro oeconomia inducitur, qua uerisimile fit facile militem ferre posse anteponi sibi Phaedriam, qui se semper intellexerit non amari. nam si hoc tollas, aut excludendus est Phaedria aut ex dolore militis in hac fabula fit exitus tragicus. 2 Et hoc miles<sup>2</sup> ut sapiens locutus est. ergo meminisse conuenit ridiculas personas non omnino stultas et excordes induci a poetis comicis, nam nulla delectatio est, ubi omnino qui deluditur nihil sapit.

This is a very interesting approach to the characterisation of Thraso; it is scarcely a line of argument that would occur to a modern commentator. To us Thraso is a pompous idiot and he deserves whatever he gets at the end of the play: there is no risk of tragedy, whether he believes that Thais really loves him or not. The point that we would want to make about Thraso is that he differs from the average *miles gloriosus* in that, instead of being absurdly conceited about his attractiveness to women, he is pathetically diffident about Thais' affections. And we would also want to point out that in this respect he actually differs from his model Bias in

Menander's *Kolax*, as we know not from Donatus but from a chance quotation in Athenaeus.<sup>16</sup>

### c. Thais

[198] *ATQVE EX ALIARVM INGENIIS NVNC ME IVDICET* hic Terentius ostendit uirtutis suae hoc esse, ut peruulgatas personas noue inducat et tamen a consuetudine non recedat, ut puta meretricem bonam cum facit, capiat tamen et delectet animum spectatoris.

This note must be one of the most frequently quoted notes from the play. In fact it is interesting more for its conception of the audience's sensitivity to variations on the stock characters than for its insight into Terence's portrayal of Thais. No doubt in general terms Thais can be regarded as a good *meretrix*.<sup>17</sup> But modern scholars would add the qualification that, though her heart is in the right place and Terence's general treatment of her is sympathetic, she does still have some of the less desirable characteristics of the traditional *meretrix*, demanding presents from both Thraso and Phaedria, and she is trying to exploit the situation so as to find herself a protector at Athens.

This note also raises again the question of the use of the name 'Terentius'. The statement reads as praise of Terence, and it rather implies that it was Terence who varied the stock characterisation rather than Menander. But it would be very unwise to infer that Thais in Menander's *Eunouchos* was a bad *meretrix*. It would be even more unwise to infer that *meretrices* in Menander were normally bad; we know better in that we have surviving plays of Menander where the *meretrix* is good (Habrotonon in *Epitrepontes* is the clearest example). If by 'Terentius' Donatus is implying 'Terence as distinct from Menander' we have further reason to question the extent of Donatus' familiarity with Menander. But is it not possible, if a distinction is being made, that he means 'as distinct from Plautus'?

<sup>16</sup> Ath. 13, 587d = Men. *Kol.* fr. 4 K-T.

<sup>17</sup> In spite of D. Gilula, "The concept of the *bona meretrix*: a study of Terence's courtesans," *RFIC* 108 (1980), pp. 142-65.

### d. Chaerea

There is a tendency in modern scholarship to dismiss Chaerea as a rapist and to assume that Terence intends to portray him as a despicable and unsympathetic character. It is notable that Donatus makes repeated attempts to exonerate Chaerea or at least to mitigate the offence.

Donatus does this in two ways, first by insisting on Chaerea's extreme youth and susceptibility to love (301, 320) and secondly by insisting that the rape was not premeditated but was prompted first by the coincidence of circumstances (292, 364, 604) and then by the painting in Thais' house of Jupiter entering the chamber of Danae (584, 604).

1. [292] *OCCIDI NEQVE VIRGO EST VSQVAM* in hac scaena nouus amor adhuc ephebi et consilium dehonestandae uirginis ostenditur tanta uirtute poetae comici, ut hoc commentum non quaesitum esse sed occurrisse sua sponte uideatur.
2. [301] *PRAEVT HVIVS RABIES QVAE DABIT* et hic ostenditur iampridem motus in res uenerias Chaerea, et magna poetae cura est, ne incredibile uideatur adulescentulum, qui pro eunucho deduci potuerit, tam expedite uirginem uitiasse. quocirca artifex summus quod aetati non potest, naturae attribuit Chaerae, ut calidior ingenio et ante annos amator non libidinem in sese sed quandam rabiem designauerit in uenerios appetitus.
3. [320] *MEA NIHIL REFERT DVM POTIAR MODO* non hoc personae attribuendum est sed affectui; non enim quia Chaerea est, sed quia amator, dicit se parui facere quemadmodum potiat, dum potiat.
4. [364] *VT MANCIPIA HAEC ITA VT IVSSI uide <id agere>* Terentium, ut non quaesita esse haec fallacia, sed ipsa se obtulisse uideatur.
5. [584] *RESPECTANS TABVLAM QVANDAM PICTAM* bene accedit repente pictura ad hortamenta aggrediendae uirginis, ideo quia non ad hoc uenerat Chaerea, ut continuo uitaret puellam, sed ut uideret audiret essetque una [= 367, 574], cum nihil amplius cogitare ausus fuerit, usque dum picturam cerneret.
6. [604] *AN EGO OCCASIONEM* et bene 'insperatam' [sc. occasionem]: aliud enim sibi promiserat, ut supra diximus, non quod pictura occasioque persuasit.

### 7. Donatus and Terentian ethics

The interest here is twofold, what Donatus suggests about Terence's scheme of morals and values and what he reveals of his own.

## a. The rape

We may suspect that the Romans of Terence's day took rape, and especially the pre-marital rape of a future bride, very much more in their stride than we would. We may also suspect that this kind of rape was more of a problem for Donatus in the mid-4th century AD than it was for Terence's contemporaries in the mid-2nd century BC. Besides insisting that in Chaerea's case the rape was not premeditated, Donatus notes that Terence includes in his narrative of the rape a number of echoes of the traditional preparation of a bride for marriage, thus foreshadowing the happy ending and putting the whole episode in a more favourable light. The elements are the bath, the summoning, and the laying out.<sup>18</sup>

1. [581] PAVCAE QVAE CIRCA ILLAM ESSENT relictæ nonnullæ, ut lauari possit ea uirgo, quæ sub uitii huius occasione nuptura est. hoc enim totum sic inducit poeta, ut non abhorreat a legitimis nuptiis, in ea præsertim quæ uxor futura est.
2. [592] DVM HAEC MECVM REPVTO ACCERSITVR LAVATVM INTEREA VIRGO. seruauit ordinem nuptiarum. et proprio uerbo quasi de nuptura dixit 'accersitur'...; nam ipse illam est habiturus uxorem.
3. [593] DEINDE EAM IN LECTVM COLLOCARVNT uide an aliquid desit a legitimis nuptiis; nam et ipsum uerbum 'collocarunt' proprium est et ascribitur pronubis.

This is a piece of intertextual reading worthy of modern scholarship; whether it is a true perception of Terence's intentions is an open question. It does have the salutary function of taking us out of our own world and its assumptions and putting us back into the world of antiquity; it is interesting that Donatus can even by implication suggest that the reality of the wedding night experience of the 16-year old virginal bride was in some way akin to rape.

## b. The picture of Zeus and Danae

There are two other things in *Eunuchus* on which Donatus feels very strongly. On 584 and 589 he objects to the Zeus and Danae story as unedifying, using words like *turpis* and *indignus* (here of course he is in good company, including Plato and St Augustine).

<sup>18</sup> See K. Philippides, "Terence's *Eunuchus*: elements of the marriage ritual in the rape scene", *Mnemosyne* 48 (1995), pp. 272-84.

1. [584] IOVEM QVO PACTO DANAAE MISISSE AIUNT bene 'aiunt', et quia fabula et quia tam turpis Ioui quam apta meretrici.
2. [589] VENISSE CLANCVLVM PER IMPLVVIVM haec omnia non ut difficilia factu, sed ut humilia et Ioue indigna proferuntur, ut merito sequatur 'ego homuncio hoc non facerem?', quod non solum non Ioui, sed ne homini quidem nisi furi aptum erat.

## c. Flatterers

On 232 and 244 and a number of other passages Donatus inveighs very powerfully against flattery (*assentatio*) and the inversion of values which it represents

1. [232] DI IMMORTALES HOMINI HOMO QUID PRAESTAT exprimit [sc. haec scena] autem parasitum et sub eius uerbis corruptos mores in assentationem ostendit, prorsus ut honestae quoque personae in huiusmodi culpa inuentae sint, ut alibi [Andr. 68] 'obsequium amicos, ueritas [sc. odium parit].' 2 DI IMMORTALES hoc iam mire et pro saeculi ac temporum reprehensione satirice Terentius, quod apud eum 'stultum' uocat simplicem parasitus et 'intelligentem' malum.
2. [244] AT EGO INFELIX NEQVE RIDICVLVS uehementer inuectus est in tempora et mores poeta sub hac persona, in qua hominem ita inducit paenitere probitatis suae, ut se 'infelicem', non 'honestum' dicat et non 'nolo' sed 'non possum'.

## 8. Donatus on staging and performance

One might not expect a grammarian to display much interest in staging and performance; yet Donatus has some 80 notes on these matters in the course of *Eunuchus*. He is good at envisaging the entry of a character (of Gnatho at 232, Pythias at 643, Thraso at 771), and in one case offers a very imaginative interpretation of a simple exit (Thais ushering Chaerea into her house at 908). He will envisage the action, suggesting when characters kiss (90), embrace (95), shove (379) or touch (536) each other; he will suggest appropriate gestures or facial expressions (revealing incidentally that he is not envisaging a performance in masks), including the jocular (235), happy (273), supplicatory (281), hurt but confident (472), and self-satisfied (497), and he will give guidance on the delivery of the text, whether this should be done confidently (469) or hesitantly (823) or interspersed with laughter (1011), frequently

suggesting that the words of a particular phrase should be pronounced separately for special effect (379, 530).

#### a. Entries and exits

1. [232] *DI INMORTALES HOMINI HOMO QVID PRAESTAT* in hac scaena non stans sed quasi ambulans persona inducitur; consistit tamen aliquantulum intuens spectatores, dum secum loquitur.
2. [643] *VBI EGO ILLVM* hoc initio ostenditur tamquam persequens fugientem progressa esse persona.
3. [771] *HANCINE EGO VT CONTVMELIAM* hic rursus inepti uanitas militis demonstratur ad amicam tamquam ad hostilem exercitum pergentis irritato animo, concito cursu, undanti chlamyde, trepidi et quatientis caput.
4. [908] *I PRAE SEQVOR* manifestum est, cur meretrix docta capiendorum more iuuenum praeire uelit Chaeream: ut in consequendo ipsa sit tardior; uult enim illi liberum sine arbitris cum puella esse colloquium et licitum amorem. . . . nam neque ipsa ingreditur cum Chaerea neque ingredi simul permittit Pythiam.

#### b. Stage action

1. [90] *MISSA ISTAEC FACE* . . . Sed bene intellegit, qui hoc a meretrice ridente molliter et osculum porrigente dici accipit.
2. [95] *NE CRUCIA TE OBSECRO ANIME MI <MI> PHAEDRIA* haec rursum nisi amplectens adulescentem mulier dixerit, uidebitur 'ne crucia te' sine affectu dicere.
3. [536] *MALAM REM* . . . Et apparet illum manu tactum esse, qui sic irascitur, quia dixit 'mi Chremes' . . .

#### c. Face and gesture

1. [235] *ITIDEM PATRIA QVI ABLIGVRIERAT BONA* hoc ioculari uultu dicitur.
2. [273. 2] *NIHIL QVIDEM* dicens 'nihil' mutauit uultum Parmeno in laetitiam.
3. [274. 3] *VRO HOMINEM* sibi hoc gestu et uultu parasitico dicit. 5 *VT FALSVS ANIMI EST* similiter et Parmeno secum seruili gestu.
4. [281] *PAVLVLVM DA MIHI OPERAE* hoc quasi supplicantis uultu ad irrisionem dicitur.
5. [472] *VBI TV ES et ACCEDE* uultu eo dicitur, quo debuerat dicere et laesus dicto aemulorum et confidens statim eos se confutare conspectu Chaereae.
6. [497] *QVID RIDES et hoc eo uultu dicitur, quasi sibi conscius sit miles facete dicti conuittii.*

7. [859] *VIX ME CONTINEO* . . . Ergo hoc gestu et digito et motu corporis est adiuuandum.

#### d. Verbal delivery

1. [379. 4] *TIBI EQVIDEM DICO <MANE>* singillatim ista pronuntianda sunt, ex quibus intellegatur non cessare Chaeream, quin adhuc impellat et trudat.
2. [469] *ISTOS FORAS EXIRE QVOS IVSSI OCIVS* cum fiducia et alto uultu pronuntiat.
3. [530] *HEVS HEVS ECQVIS HIC EST* haec separatim pronuntianda sunt, nam apparet inter haec uerba pulsatam ianuam personare.
4. [823] *QVIS FVIT IGITVR* haec cunctatiue pronuntianda sunt, quia aut inuita indicat aut dubitat de nomine ignoti aut trepidat per timorem . . .
5. [1011] *AT ETIAM PRIMO* haec omnia sic in scaena pronuntiata sunt, ut risu interrumpi uerba puellae uiderentur . . .

#### 9. Conclusion

As we should expect, Donatus' insights into the Latin language are immensely valuable. He does not share our fascination with the relation of Terence's plays to their Greek models, and it may be that he did not have access to texts of the latter. He is interested in aspects of characterisation and plot construction, though he does not pursue these in such detail as do modern scholars. On ethical questions he displays some unease with the rape, and strongly disapproves both of flattery and of unseemly tales about the gods. Most unexpected is his lively concern with matters of performance and delivery.

# SPUDASMATA

Studien zur Klassischen Philologie und ihren Grenzgebieten  
Begründet von Hildebrecht Hommel und Ernst Zinn  
Herausgegeben von Gottfried Kiefner und Ulrich Köpf

Band 80

DRAMATISCHE WÄLDCHEN

2000



GEORG OLMS VERLAG HILDESHEIM · ZÜRICH · NEW YORK

# DRAMATISCHE WÄLDCHEN

Festschrift für Eckard Lefèvre  
zum 65. Geburtstag

Herausgegeben von  
Ekkehard Stärk und Gregor Vogt-Spira

2000



GEORG OLMS VERLAG HILDESHEIM · ZÜRICH · NEW YORK