Ennius, Ann. 79-80 Vahlen reads as follows:
Remus auspicio se deuoet atque secundam
Solus auem seruat.

*Auspicio se deuoet* is the traditional text, but Otto Skutsch in his recent edition of Ennius proposed to read *Remus auspicio sedet*). As Skutsch observes, *deuoet* in the meaning of devoting one's attention to something is "unparalleled and impossible", but his magnificent emendation is based above all on augural terminology: *secundum augures sedere est auspicium captare*

An obscure passage buried in the Terentian Scholia may provide additional and unexpected support. It seems to contain an echo of the original Ennian phrase.

In the Eunuchus of Terence (line 780) the miles Thraso prepares to storm the house of the meretrix Thais, and asks his slave Sanga: *Ubi alii?* Sanga answers:

 Qui malum 'alii'? solus Sannio seruat domi.

*Domus* is the reading of the codex Bembinus, and it was naturally adopted by modern editors; the *recensio Calliopiana* has *domum*

In our text of Donatus there are several interpretations of the passage. First Donatus points out that Terence employs the figure of *παρόμοιον*, alliteration, and adduces as a parallel the Vergilian verse (*Aen. 3.183*): *sola mihi talis casus Cassandra canebat*.

Next he interprets the phrase *solus Sannio s. d.* to mean *remanet et obseruat*, and continues: *nam 'seruat domum' rectum erat, non 'seruat domi' si custodit intellegitur*.

The use of *servo* (and *observo*) in the sense of *custodio* is well known, and the scholiasts and grammarians often comment on it.

In our text of Donatus there are several interpretations of the passage. First Donatus points out that Terence employs the figure of *παρόμοιον*, alliteration, and adduces as a parallel the Vergilian verse (*Aen. 3.183*): *sola mihi talis casus Cassandra canebat*.

Next he interprets the phrase *solus Sannio s. d.* to mean *remanet et obseruat*, and continues: *nam 'seruat domum' rectum erat, non 'seruat domi' si custodit intellegitur*.

So far nothing unusual, but the following scholion arrests attention:

*Vel SERVAT pro sedet et seruat*), ab eo quod sequitur id quod praecedit; nam non seruat nisi qui prius in eodem loco sederit.

H. T. Karsten in his valiant attempt to separate the scholia genuina and spuria refused to attribute this note to Donatus; he assigned it to an unknown commentator, a scholar characterized by a *mira et peculiaris aliqua sapientia*.

Whether this note figured in the original text of Donatus or not, the explanation offered is peculiar indeed. The Scholiast asserts that "one does not keep watch unless he had first sat down in the same place".

Whence this strange idea?) From augury. The Scholiast alludes to the same augural principle that led Skutsch to his brilliant emendation. To appreciate fully this augural connection we have to consider the Vergilian commentary of Servius (and Servius auctus). At *Aen. 9.3-4* Vergil writes:

Luco tum forte parentis

Pilumni Turnus sacrata valle sedebat.

Servius (with a few insignificant additions from Servius auctus) gives three explanations of *sedebat*:

a) ut Asper dicit 'erat', quae clausula antiqua est et de usu remota.

b) secundum Plautum autem 'sedere' est consilium capere, qui inducit in Mostellaria servum dicentem 'sine iuxta aram sedeam, et dabo meliora consilia'.

c) sed secundum augures 'sedere' est augurium captare; namque post designatas caeli partes a sedentibus captantur auguria: quod et supra ipse ostendit latenter, inducens Picum solum sedentem, ut [7.187] 'parvaque sedebat succinctus trabea', quod est augurum, cum alios stantes induxerit.

Servius concludes: erga 'sedebat' aut erat aut consilia capiebat aut augurabatur.

Of these explanations none takes account of Vergil's text. The first goes back to the renowned commentary of Aemilius Asper, and attributes to sedeo an unprecedented sense. Tomsin argued that 'Asper voulait éviter qu'on attribut au héros une attitude oisive indigne de l'épopée et du caractère du lieu'. What repelled Asper and Servius delighted modern commentators: as Forbiger aptly wrote 'sedebat spectat ad solitudinem et otium, cui sedendi verbum bene convenit'. For when Iris came to Turnus he was reposing; Vergil does not represent him as considering anything (explanation b) or still less as taking auspices or performing an act of augury (explanation c). It was solely the verb sedebat that, isolated from its immediate context, triggered in the mind of the Scholiasts those spurious but learned interpretations.

On both counts the prize goes to the augural explication. The commentators saw in Vergil not only a poeta doctus but above all a perfect augur. 'Vergilius amat secretiora dicere; nam totum morem augurum exsecutus est proprietate verborum'—writes Servius auctus in his note on Aen. 1.386. The Scholiasts loved to discover the secretiora; the more abstruse an interpretation the better. Now this procedure does not differ at all from the method of explication applied to Solus Sannio seruat domum. And as the commentary of Servius (and Servius auctus) was based on the work of Donatus, there is no reason to follow Karsten and deny Donatus (or in any case his variorum commentary) this bit of augural lore either in the Vergilian or the Terentian Scholia.

But whereas it was natural to find secretiora in Vergil, such a mode of interpretation was rather odd with respect to Terence for whom nobody claimed any recondite wisdom. It must have been evoked by a very peculiar association, verbal or literary. The obvious starting point is the verb servat. Taken out of the context it could easily conjure up the image of augury, for as Servius auctus points out, servare enim et de caelo et de avibus verbo augurum dicitur (Aen. 6.198), and in fact this usage is attested by numerous examples from Ennius onwards. Still one can doubt if servat alone would have been sufficient to start the Scholiast on his bizarre ride of argument. Another catalyst was opportunely present: solus. Not only sola ... Cassandra canebat, not only the augur Picus was represented accord-