



## DONATUS ON NON-STANDARD LATIN IN TERENCE

ROBERT MALTBY

UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

### **Abstract**

The chapter compares the way in which *uitia sermonis* are treated in Donatus' *Ars Grammatica* with their treatment in his Terence commentary. It also draws some distinctions between the commentaries of Donatus on Terence and Servius on Virgil as concerns these matters. It concludes that whereas Donatus in his *Ars* discusses *uitia sermonis* as features to be avoided in contemporary prose, in his Terence commentary these are treated as literary *figurae* used legitimately in verse for dramatic purposes, such as linguistic characterisation. By contrast Servius' Virgil commentary retains a more prescriptive stance: while some *uitia* in Virgil are shown to have a literary or metrical purpose, Servius is at pains to warn his readers against using them in their own Latin.

### **Résumé**

*Cet article compare la façon dont les uitia sermonis sont analysés dans l'Ars Grammatica de Donat avec leur traitement dans son commentaire à Térence. Il établit également quelques distinctions entre les commentaires de Donat sur Térence et de Servius sur Virgile sur ce point. Il conclut que, si Donat dans son Ars présente les uitia sermonis comme des caractéristiques à éviter dans la prose contemporaine, dans son commentaire de Térence, ceux-ci sont traités comme des figurae littéraires, dont l'emploi en vers, à des fins dramatiques, est légitime, en tant que caractérisation linguistique. En revanche, le commentaire de Servius à Virgile prend un parti plus prescriptif : alors que certains uitia de Virgile sont justifiés comme ayant un but littéraire ou métrique, Servius s'efforce de mettre en garde ses lecteurs contre leur utilisation dans leur propre latin.*

## 1. Introduction

An important role of the ancient commentator was to point out to his audience differences between correct contemporary usage and the language of the literary text being commented on. Underlying these discussions is an explicit or implied prescriptive purpose: the audience should avoid such departures from contemporary norms in their own prose<sup>1</sup>. Our commentators often put forward a number of reasons for their author's choice of non-standard forms. These could be metrical or artistic in origin or could simply be explained by the fact that the language of 'the ancients' (writers in the period from Plautus to Virgil) differed from the usage of the commentators' own time. I have discussed elsewhere Servius' appeal to archaism in such contexts<sup>1</sup>. The present paper focuses on the discussion of *uitia sermonis* in Donatus' Terence commentary. It draws some comparisons between the way such *uitia* are treated in Donatus' *Ars Grammatica* (GL 4, 392-7) and in Servius' commentary on Donatus' *Ars* (GL 4, 443-448). It also underlines some methodological differences between Donatus' Terence commentary and Servius' Virgil commentary in their treatment of apparently non-standard Latin in the authors commented on.

Donatus in his *Ars* lists twelve types of *uitia* as follows:

Don. *Ars* GL 4, 394, 26-28: *uitia duodecim numerantur hoc modo, barbarismus soloecismus acyrologia cacenphaton pleonasmos perissologia macrologia tautologia eclipsis tapinosis cacosyntheton amphibolia.*

Not all these types are mentioned in Donatus' Terence commentary, but an examination of those which are will serve as a framework for this study.

## 2. Barbarism and Metaplasms

To begin with *barbarismus*, this is defined by Donatus as a fault in a single word. Though defined as a *barbarismus* in everyday speech, when such changes in a single word occur in poetry this fault is referred to as *metaplasmus*.

Don. *Ars* GL 4, 392, 5-6: *barbarismus est una pars orationis uitiosa in communi sermone. in poemate metaplasmus.*

---

<sup>1</sup> MALTBY 2016, including a comparison with Donatus' use of archaism (pp. 160-162). For a prescriptive purpose in Servius' Virgil commentary see also KASTER 1988, pp. 182-183.

Further on fourteen types of *metaplasmus* are identified:

Don. *Ars GL* 4, 395, 28-31: *metaplasmus est transformatio quaedam recti solutique sermonis in alteram speciem metri ornatusue causa. huius species sunt quattuordecim, prothesis epenthesis paragoge aphaeresis syncope apocope ectasis systole diaeresis episynaliphe synaliphe ecthipsis antithesis metathesis.*

Cf. Serv. in Don. *Art. GL* 4, 447, 34-37: *nullus est metaplasmus, qui non habeat contrarium: πρόσθεσις ἐπένθεσις παραγωγή, qui fiunt per additionem, contrarii sunt illis qui fiunt per subtractionem, id est ἀφαίρεσις συγκοπή ἀποκοπή.*

Of the four cases of metaplasms discussed in Donatus' Terence commentary, three belong to the well-recognised type of metaplasms by syncope:

Don. *Andr.* 572.4: *SI ID ANIMVM INDVXISTI legitur et 'animum induxisti' et 'animum inducti', sed illud plenum est, hoc per metaplasmm συνκοπήν<sup>2</sup> diminuitur<sup>3</sup>.*

Don. *Eun.* 831.2: *IVSTI συνκοπή metaplasmm pro 'iussisti'*

Don. *Ad.* 689.1: *NVMQVID CIRCVMSPEXTI συνκοπή μεταπλασμός pro 'circumspexisti'.*

Two further examples of this phenomenon simply mention συνκοπή without metaplasms. These are Don., *Hec.* 251.3: *amisti* for *amisisti* (comment: συνκοπή) and *Phorm.* 101: *commorat* for *commouerat* (comment: *figura συνκοπή*).

In the fourth example the participial form *despicatam*, derived from the rare deponent verb *despicari*, in place of the more normal *despectam* from *despicere*, is said to be a type of metaplasms formed from *despectam* by either ἐπένθεσις or παρένθεσις:

Don. *Eun.* 384.1: *HABENT DESPICATAM contemptam ac despectam, et est ἐπένθεσις μεταπλασμός (PENΘΕΣΙΣ ΜΕΤΑΠΟΣΜΟΣ B: παρένθεσις μεταπλήσμος V: παρένθεσις μεταπλασμός Wessner).*

The reading of the Greek is unclear in the manuscripts and either form is possible, cf.:

Don. *Ars GL* 4, 396, 3-5: *epenthesis est appositio ad mediam dictionem litterae aut syllabae, ut reliquias pro reliquias, induperator pro imperator. hanc alii epenthesis, alii parenthesis dicunt.*

<sup>2</sup> On Greek forms in Donatus see MALTBY 2019.

<sup>3</sup> I follow the text of CIOFFI 2017 for Donatus on *Andria*, and that of WESSNER 1902-5 for Donatus on the other plays.

A further example of *epenthesis*, in this case without any mention of *metaplasmus*, occurs in Donatus' note on *Phorm.* 225:

Don. *Phorm.* 225.2: '*noxiam*,' ... *est epenthesis ab eo quod est 'noxam'. et hoc factum est propter iambica.*

In fact *noxia* is an alternative form of *noxa* and both occur in classical Latin. The final sentence mentioning the iambic metre is possibly added by a later epitomiser<sup>4</sup>. This is the only note in which a metrical explanation of metaplasms is given.

With the exception of *Phorm.* 225.2, Donatus does not give a reason for the metaplasms, nor does he imply that the forms discussed involve any error on Terence's part. In fact an interesting passage in Servius' commentary on Donatus' *Ars* suggests metaplasms could be allowed if required by the metre<sup>5</sup>:

Serv. in Don. *Art. GL* 4, 447, 22-25: *metaplasmi tantum necessitate excusantur... ut cum dicimus 'tetulit', si in metro non poterat dici 'tulit', erit metaplasmus, quoniam necessitatis causa dictum est 'tetulit'.*

As it happens Donatus twice comments on the archaic reduplicated perfect *tetuli* in Terence:

Don. *Andr.* 808: *NVMQVAM HVC TETVLISSEM PEDEM ... sed critici adnotant altius esse caractere comico 'tetulissem pedem'.*

Don. *Andr.* 832: *DVM RES TETVLIT compositum pro simplici est 'tetulit'. et altius quam decet comicum characterem dictum uidetur*<sup>6</sup>.

As I have argued elsewhere<sup>7</sup>, although the reduplicated *tetuli* was regular in Plautus, in Terence the Classical *tuli* had become the norm (15 occurrences) and Terence's two reduplicated forms in the *Andria* were restricted to the speech of old men (808 Crito, 832 Chremes). The aim may have been to characterise their speech as old fashioned. Donatus, however, instead of seeing the reduplicated form as archaic, saw it as a feature of tragic language (cf. Accius *trag.* 116). His comment reflects a common concern of his, namely that the style and content of comedy should not encroach upon that of tragedy<sup>8</sup>. No mention is made in Donatus of *tetuli* being a metaplasms or being required by the metre. In fact it

<sup>4</sup> On the problem of different versions of notes on the same line see ZETZEL 1975, pp. 335-354; JAKOBI 1996, pp. 5-6; CIOFFI 2017, pp. X-XI.

<sup>5</sup> On metaplasms as one of the *uirtutes orationis* see DIEDERICH 1999, pp. 173-175.

<sup>6</sup> CIOFFI 2017, p. 251 prints the sentence *et ... uidetur* in Italics as being a later addition, perhaps imported from Don. *Andr.* 808. In 808 it could be the whole phrase *tetulissem pedem* that was seen as tragic.

<sup>7</sup> MALTBY 1979, p. 138.

<sup>8</sup> MALTBY 2014.

could simply be that Donatus saw reduplicated perfect forms in general as being tragic in tone, whether or not they were archaic. This is shown in his note on Ter. *Ad.* 638 where the old man Micio's use of *pepulisti*, a regular classical perfect form, is seen as tragic in tone:

Don. *Ad.* 638.3: *TVNE HAS PEPVLISTI FORES ... nota 'pepulisti' elatum uerbum et tragico coturno magis quam loquela comicae accomodatum.*

Servius in his Virgil commentary, by contrast, is careful to point out to his readers that in both the cases of metaplasm he discusses, the reason for their uses is metrical necessity. Such forms, he implies, are allowed in poetry, but not in the prose of his pupils. The prescriptive purpose of his commentary is always to the fore. Commenting on Virg. *Aen.* 1.30 *Troas, reliquias Danaum atque immitis Achilli* he says:

Serv. *Aen.* 1.30: *RELIQVIAS ut stet uersus geminauit 'l', nam in prosa reliquias dicimus.*

Servius is, of course, wrong in reading *reliquias* with a double l here, despite it being used as an example of barbarism/ metaplasm in both Donatus' *Ars* and in Servius' *Ars* commentary:

Don. *Ars GL* 4, 392, 10-12: *per adiectionem litterae fiunt barbarismi, sicut 'reliquias Danaum' (Virg. Aen. 1.30), cum reliquias per unum 'l' dicere debeamus.*

Serv. in Don. *Art. GL* 4, 444, 10-11: *quando enim dicit Virgilius 'reliquias', quoniam in metro est, dicimus esse metaplasmm; si soluta esset oratio, barbarismum uocaremus<sup>9</sup>.*

The true metrical explanation is that the initial 'e' of *reliquias* is here long, a genuine by-form used for metrical reasons, as parallels from Lucretius show<sup>10</sup>. What is important for our comparison with Donatus, however, is Servius' insistence in his Virgil commentary on this form being allowed in poetry for metrical reasons *ut stet uersus*, but not in contemporary prose *in prosa reliquias dicimus*. A similar insistence on metrical necessity lying behind the unusual vocative form *Thymbre* is found in Servius' comment on Virg. *Aen.* 10.394 *nam tibi, Thymbre, caput Euandrius abstulit ensis*:

Serv. *Aen.* 10.394: *THYMBRE pro 'Thymber', metri causa metaplasmm fecit.*

<sup>9</sup> Servius corrects Donatus' terminology here by pointing out that this is in fact a metaplasm and not a barbarism.

<sup>10</sup> BAILEY 1947, p. 132; cf. LUCR. 1.1109, 3.656, 8.285.

While Donatus identifies examples of metaplasm as part of Terence's style without further comment, Servius is at pains to point out that such freedom in word formation should be restricted to verse and should not find its way into contemporary prose.

### 3. Solecism

While barbarism/metaplasm refers to a fault in an individual word, solecism refers to a fault in syntax or grammatical agreement, as defined by Donatus:

Don. *Ars GL* 4, 393, 6-9: *soloecismus est uitium in contextu partium orationis contra regulam artis grammaticae factum. inter soloecismum et barbarismum hoc interest, quod soloecismus discrepantes aut inconsequentes in se dictiones habet, barbarismus autem in singulis uerbis fit scriptis uel pronuntiatis.*

Of the three cases in which Donatus' uses the term *soloecismus* in relation to Terence's language, two of the comments claim that in fact no solecism exists, while in the third the point is made that a solecism is appropriate for the uneducated character of the speaker. In the first example:

Ter. *Andr.* 844-845:  
(DAVOS) *ego commodiorem hominem, aduentum, tempus non uidi.* (SIMO)  
*scelus,*  
*quemnam hic laudat?*

Don. *Andr.* 844.5: *SCELVS QVEM. H.L. 'scelus ... hic' non est soloecismus: ad sensum enim non ad uerba respexit.*

Donatus argues that an apparent lack of concord between *scelus* (n.) and *hic* (m.), which would constitute a solecism, does not in fact do so, since the term of abuse *scelus* 'villain', although neuter in gender, in fact refers to a man, so the masculine pronoun *hic* reflects the sense rather than the actual word used. In the second example:

Ter. *Eun.* 539: (ANTIPHO) *heri aliquot adulescentuli coimus in Piraeo.*

Don. *Eun.* 539.2: *COIMVS 'coimus' consensimus atque pepigimus, ne sit soloecismus 'in Piraeo' pro 'in Piraeum'.*

Donatus argues that *coimus* does not mean 'came together' which would require *in* + acc. *in Piraeum* (indicating motion towards), but rather 'came to an agreement' which is correctly constructed with *in* + abl. (indicating place where), so that the phrase does not involve any solecism. In the third example Donatus invents a solecism that does not really exist and attributes it to good linguistic characterisation on Terence's part of an uneducated soldier.

Ter. *Eun.* 1062-1063:

(PHAEDRIA) *quor te ergo in his conspicio regionibus?*

(THRASO) *uobis fretus.*

Don. *Eun.* 1063.1: *VOBIS FRETUS et hoc stulte: quis enim et rivalibus et inimicis fretum esse se dicat? deinde ἀνακόλουθος et uitiosa responsio est: nisi enim addideris 'sum', erit soloecismus conueniens loquenti, impolito homini et militi.*

Phaedria asks his rival, the soldier Thraso, why he still sees him in the vicinity of their mistress' house. The soldier's reply *uobis fretus* means something like 'relying (on your generosity)' with a verb such as *maneo* 'I am staying here' understood. Donatus thinks the phrase *uobis fretus* should be supplied with a verb such as *sum* 'I am relying on you' to complete the sense. In fact such elliptical phrases are a regular part of Terence's conversational style and usually cause no comment from the commentator. Because the speaker here is a lowly soldier, Donatus elevates what is in fact acceptable Latin, to the status of a deliberate solecism. The same soldier Thraso it is argued at Don., *Eun.* 432 (discussed below) uses *stultas sententias* and *uitiosa uerba*. Similarly at Don. *Phorm.*, 249.2 (discussed below) the slave Geta's language is said to be characterised by faulty grammar. In none of the cases of possible solecism mentioned in Donatus' commentary, then, is Terence shown to be guilty of this fault, except in a single example of deliberate linguistic characterisation.

Servius' single reference to solecism in Virgil's text similarly seeks to remove any suggestion that his author was guilty of such a fault. In a description of Ascanius' band of young warriors at the funeral games for Anchises there is a reference to their wearing high on their breast a circlet of twisted gold:

Virg. *Aen.* 5.558-559: ... *it pectore summo  
flexilis obtorti per collum circulus auri*

As they stand the lemma and comment in Servius read as follows:

Serv. *Aen.* 5.558: *IT PECTORE SVMMO sic legendum, ne sit soloecismus. rei inanimali dedit motum dicendo 'it'. 'summum' autem 'pectus' ait pectoris et colli confinium.*

This is somewhat puzzling. The phrase *sic legendum* suggests there must be an alternative reading for the phrase *it pectore summo* and *ne sit soloecismus* suggests that by choosing the correct reading a solecism could be avoided. The only manuscript alternatives offered here are between *it* and *et*. The second sentence in the note clearly refers to a reading *it*. If *it* is the reading recommended in the first sentence to avoid solecism, the fault referred to could be that if *et* is

read<sup>11</sup> the sentence lacks a main verb. Whatever the explanation, Servius' phrase '*ne sit soloecismus*' plays exactly the same role as Donatus' use of the same phrase at Don., *Eun.* 539.2 above.

#### 4. General faults, indicated by the terms *uitium/uitiose/uitiosus*

The use of these general expressions referring to various kinds of linguistic faults is more common in Servius (26) than in Donatus (4). Three of Donatus' four uses occur in contexts of what Donatus sees as linguistic characterisation, where, in Donatus' view, Terence uses faulty language to reflect the speech of lower characters, as we saw in Don. *Eun.* 1063.1 (discussed in 2 above). A fourth example, where to avoid a *uitium* the relative *ubi* must be understood as temporal, a usage taken over in later Latin by *quando*, reflects a diachronic linguistic difference between Donatus' time and that of Terence. The greater frequency of these terms in Servius once more seems to result from his more prescriptive attitude, emphasising that the faults in question should be avoided by his audience in their own Latin prose. To begin with Donatus' four cases:

Ter. *Eun.* 432: (THRASO) *risu omnes qui aderant emoriri...*

Don. *Eun.* 432: *RISV OMNES QVI ADERANT EMORIRI disciplina est comicis ut stultas sententias ita etiam uitiosa uerba ascribere ridiculis imperitisque personis, ut Plautus (Mil. 74) 'ibus denumerem stipendium' inquit ex persona militis. itaque hic 'emoriri' dixit, at uero Atticus adulescens in Heaut. (971 Ctesipho) 'emori cupio'. uide igitur poetam pro loco ac tempore scire quid dicat.*

The speaker is the soldier Thraso, the same as in *Eun.* 1063 (discussed above). In both cases Donatus comments on Terence's characterisation of his speech as uneducated. The point at issue here is his use of the archaic fourth conjugation form *emoriri* for the regular *emori*. This is the only use of *emoriri* in Terence. At *Heaut.* 971, as Donatus points out, the young man Ctesipho uses the more modern form *emori*, as does the old man Demipho at *Phorm.* 956 (an occurrence not mentioned by Donatus). For the uncompounded verb Terence uses only the inf. *mori* (*Eun.* 66, 772). In Plautus *emori* occurs twice (*As.* 810 and *Mil.* 721) and *emoriri* only at *Ps.* 1222 (by the soldier's hanger-on Harpax), whereas the uncompounded *moriri* (*As.* 121, *Capt.* 732, *Cist.* 271, *Rud.* 684) is more common than *mori* (*Bac.* 519c, *Truc.* 972). The fourth declension forms were clearly on the way out in Plautus, but by Terence's time the single occurrence of *emoriri* would have stood out as archaic. Donatus on this occasion is perhaps

<sup>11</sup> A variant probably introduced by a grammarian who did not like a verb of motion like *it* to be linked with an ablative *pectore* instead of an accusative.



correct in seeing it as a piece of intentional linguistic characterisation. Donatus' second example is the *uitiosa responsio* of the soldier Thraso at *Eun.* 1063 discussed in section 2 above. Donatus' third example is of a *uitiosa elocutio* attributed to the slave Geta, again, according to Donatus, for the purposes of linguistic characterisation.

Ter. *Phorm.* 248-249:

(GETA) *meditata mihi sunt omnia mea incommoda erus si redierit.  
molendum esse (usque u.l.) in pistrino, uapulandum; habendae compedes.*

Don. *Phorm.* 249.2: *HABENDAE COMPEDES uitiosam locutionem seruili personae dedit Terentius; nam integrum esset, si diceret 'habendas compedes'. unde quidam non 'esse' sed 'usque' legunt.*

In fact the lemma for 249.1 reads *usque: MOLENDVM VSQVE IN PISTRINO*, whereas the writer of 249.2 must be commenting on the reading *molendum esse*, as this is the cause of the *uitium* and he suggests *usque* as an alternative. It is known that different notes on the same line can comment on different lemmata as a result of the way in which our text was put together from marginal notes in the text. There is obviously a problem in the Latin here with a change from the indirect statement (with acc. + inf.) construction in *molendum esse ... uapulandum* to the direct statement in *habendae compedes*. Modern editors either put a strong stop after *uapulandum* (as in Kauer Lindsay's Oxford text above) or print *usque* for *esse* (so Dziatko-Hauler 1913).

Again Donatus does not criticise Terence for this apparent fault but sees it as a dramatically motivated choice, characterising Geta's language as incompetent. Two further examples of this, where Donatus sees a slave's language as characterised by incompetence occur at *Hec.* 311 and *Phorm.* 186:

Ter. *Hec.* 311: (PARMENO)

*... quia enim, qui eos gubernat animus, eum infirmum gerunt.*

Don. *Hec.* 311.3: <'infirmum gerunt'> ἐσχηματισμένως ἀντὶ τοῦ 'infirmus est'. <sed> ἀνακολουθία ista conuenit seruo.

Ter. *Phorm.* 186: (GETA)

*loquarne? incendam. taceam? instigem. purgem me? laterem lauem.*

Don. *Phorm.* 186.5-6: *sed quid sibi uult 'purgem me', cum idem sit loquarne? an quia potest purgatio et per defensorem aut patronum induci? hoc quidam putant, sed melius est haec et perturbatae et seruilis imperitaeque personae uerba sine arte esse <nec> sui uim significatus habere.*

In Donatus' final example of a possible *uitium* in Terence, this can be avoided if the audience understands *ubi* to mean 'when' and not 'where'. In this

case the possible misunderstanding stems from the linguistic usage of Donatus' own time where *quando* rather than *ubi* would be more common in this sense.

Ter. *Eun.* 1088: (GNATHO) *Thraso, ubi uis accede.*

Don. *Eun.* 1088.3: '*ubi nisi 'quando' intellexeris, uitium est.*

Servius' discussion of *uitia* in Virgil revolves around a number of points which his audience should consider as faults, but which were not so considered by the Virgil and the *ueteres*. To a present day audience some of these are quite surprising, such as alliteration:

Virg. *Aen.* 2.199-200: *hic aliud maius miseris multoque tremendum obicitur*

Serv. *Aen.* 2.199: *MAIUS MISERIS MVLTOQVE ut (Aen. 5.866) 'sale saxa sonabant' et (Aen. 3.183) 'casus Cassandra canebat'; nam apud ueteres a similibus incipere uitiosum non erat.*

Serv. *Aen.* 3.183: *CASVS CASANDRA CANEBAT haec compositio iam uitiosa est: quae maioribus placuit, ut (Aen. 3.82) 'Anchisen agnouit amicum' et (Aen. 5.866) 'sale saxa sonabant'.*

Also surprising is Servius' classification of homoeoteleuton as a *uitium*. In his note on *Aen.* 11.646, for example, its avoidance is seen as motivating Virgil's use of *Messapus* as a vocative:

Virg. *Aen.* 11. 463-5: '*tu, Voluse, armari Volscorum edice manipulis, duc,*' ait, '*et Rutulos. equitem, Messapus, in armis, et cum frater Coras, latis diffundite campis.*

Serv. *Aen.* 11. 464: '*Messapus' autem ut diceret, uitauit ὁμοιοτέλετον: nam uitiosum erat 'Voluse' 'edice' 'Messape'. ergo 'Messapus' aut anitiquus uocatiuus est, ut (Aen. 8.77) ... 'fluuius' ... item, (Aen. 12.192) ... 'Latinus' ...: aut certe nominatiuus est pro uocatiuo<sup>12</sup>.*

Another matter for concern is that Virgil sometimes has two epithets referring to a single noun, a practice which Servius castigates as *uitiosum apud Latinos*:

Virg. *Aen.* 2.392-3: *clipeique insigne decorum induitur*

Serv. *Aen.* 2.392: *INSIGNE DECORVM ornamentum decorum: non enim sunt duo epitheta, quod apud Latinos uitiosum est. fecit hoc tamen Vergilius*

<sup>12</sup> The *nominatiuus pro uocatiuo* explanation has a precedent at DON. *Phorm.* 324.3: *O VIR FORTIS ATQVE AMICVS nominatiuum pro uocatiuo posuit.*

*in paucis uersibus, qui tamen emandati sunt, ut (Ecl. 3.38) 'lenta quibus torno facili super addita uitis', cum antea 'facilis' fuerit.*

Virg. Ecl. 3.38: *lenta quibus torno facili (u.l. facilis) super addita uitis*

Serv. Ecl. 3.38: *QVIBVS TORNO FACILIS Donatus sic legit; legitur tamen et 'torno facili' ad excludenda duo epitheta, quod est in latinitate uitiosum, si sit 'lenta facilis uitis'.*

Servius comments on other possible examples of this in his notes on *Aen.* 3.70 (*lenis crepitans*), *Aen.* 6.552 (*aduersa ingens*), *Georg.* 4.19 (*tenuis fugiens*) and *Georg.* 4.369 (*saxosusque sonans*). In two cases Servius suggests emendation of Virgil's text (*Ecl.* 3.38, *Georg.* 4.369). The fact that a number of the examples involve a present participle (*Aen.* 3.70, *Georg.* 4.19, *Georg.* 4.369), which may have influenced Virgil's choice of expression, is not mentioned by Servius.

Often an explanation of the syntax is needed to show that Virgil is not guilty of a *uitium*:

Virg. *Aen.* 4.350: *et nos fas extera quaerere regna*

Serv. *Aen.* 4.350: *ET NOS FAS 'nobis fas' dicimus, sed hoc loco non est iungenda elocutio, ne sit uitium: nam legimus (Aen. 2.157) 'fas mihi Graeorum sacrata resolvere iura'. sed hoc dicit: fas est etiam nos extera regna requirere.*

Here *fas* (*sc. est*) is to be seen as introducing an indirect statement with *nos* (acc.) + inf. *quaerere*.

Similarly at:

Virg. *Aen.* 5.426: *constitit in digitos extemplo arrectus uterque*

Serv. *Aen.* 5.426: *CONSTITIT hic distinguendum propter uitium, ut sit 'arrectus in digitos'*

Servius points out that *in digitos* does not go with *constitit* (which would require *in digitis*) but with *arrectus* where *in* + acc. is required.

Virg. *Aen.* 6.743-4: *exinde per amplum mittimur Elysium...*

Serv. *Aen.* 6.743: *EXINDE una pars orationis est ... ne praepositio iungeretur aduerbio, quod uitiosum esse non dubium est.*

The joining of prepositions with adverbs became increasingly common in late colloquial Latin, e.g. *de mane* ('in the morning', 'tomorrow', cf. Fr. *demain*). The grammarians warned against such uses, e.g.:

Serv. in Don. Art. GL 4, 416, 16-19: *generaliter tenendum est quod aduerbiis non debet coniungi praepositio separatim. nemo enim dicit 'de sero', 'de modo'; unde nec 'de mane' dicere debemus, quod plerique in usu habent.*

By explaining that *exinde* is a single part of speech Servius absolves Virgil from such a *uitium*. He had a precedent for this in Donatus' Terence commentary, where Donatus had defended Terence in a similar vein for his use of *derepente*, making it clear that to separate the two words as *de repente* would not be correct Latin:

Don. Hec. 518.2-3: *'derepente' una pars orationis est, ut 'defessus'; aduerbiis enim praepositiones separatim non adduntur ... nam si separaueris, non est Latinum 'de repente'.*

Servius returns to the same point later on in his commentary:

Serv. Aen. 7.289: *ABVSQVE 'abusque' et 'adusque' usurpatiuè dicimus: praepositio enim nec aduerbio iungitur nec praepositioni, 'usque' autem aut praepositio est aut aduerbium.*

## 5. Other Specific Faults

We saw in section 1 above that, in addition to barbarism and solecism, Donatus lists in his *Ars* a further ten named *uitia* as follows:

Don. Ars GL 4, 394, 27-28: *acyrologia cacemphaton pleonasmus perissologia macrologia tautologia eclipsis tapinosis cacosyntheton amphibolia.*

As with general faults (section 3) reference to these specific faults is more common in Servius' Virgil commentary than it is in Donatus' Terence commentary. Terms that Donatus uses in his *Ars* are avoided by him for the most part in his commentary, while Servius makes free use of them in his<sup>13</sup>. The explanation is once more that Servius is more prescriptive in his specification of faults to be avoided by his readers, while Donatus again indicates how some of these apparent faults are in fact not *uitia* but simply *figurae*<sup>14</sup> appropriate for comic language, either as an aid to linguistic characterisation or as characteristic of the spoken language. While part of Servius' aim in his commentary is to teach

<sup>13</sup> The figures are as follows: Servius *acyrologia* (1), *cacemphaton* (1), *pleonasmus* (8), *perissologia* (6), *tautologia* (2), *eclipsis* (6), *tapinosis* (10), *cacosyntheton* (1), *amphibolia* (9); Donatus *macrologia* (2), *ellipsis* (97), *amphibolia* (14).

<sup>14</sup> On the use of *figura* as one of the *uirtutes orationis* see DIEDERICH 1999, pp. 175-194. It is defined by Quintilian simply as a departure from ordinary language, QUINT. *Inst.* 9,1,4 *figura ... confirmatio quaedam orationis remota a cumuni et primum se offerente ratione.*

the rules of the grammatical *Artes*, Donatus is more concerned with the literary use made by Terence of his departures from standard Latin. Donatus' literary viewpoint is well illustrated by his treatment of two of the supposed faults mentioned in the above list, *macrologia* and *ellipsis*:

In both Donatus' uses of *macrologia* the term is used to indicate the use of a long-winded expression to characterise a character's language. So with the old man Micio in the opening of the *Adelphoe*:

Ter. *Ad.* 68: (MICIO) *mea sic est ratio et sic animum induco meum*

Don. *Ad.* 68.3: *ET SIC ANIMVM INDVCO MEVM senilis macrologia.*

Similarly on the slave Syrus' phrase *diuiduom face* at *Ad.* 241 Donatus comments:

Don. *Ad.* 241.1: *DIVIDVVM FACE hoc est diuide: figura macrologia.*

In his commentary, as opposed to in his *Ars*, Donatus defines *macrologia* as a rhetorical figure *figura*, rather than a *uitium*. This feature is not named in Servius or Servius Danielis. In the Virgil commentaries *pleonasmus* is used to refer to such phrases as *uoce refert* where *uoce* is seen as superfluous<sup>15</sup>. or *perissologia* where two near-synonyms are linked, such as *mentem animumque*<sup>16</sup>. Both these features are listed in Donatus' *Ars* under *cetera uitia*<sup>17</sup>, but are avoided by Donatus in his Terence commentary where *abundat* is used for such general pleonasm.

The fault from this list *cetera uitia* mentioned most frequently in the Terence commentary is ellipse. He has some 97 examples in all, as compared with a mere 7 in Servius and Servius Danielis. In Donatus it is seen as a positive feature, lending a certain colloquial elegance to the diction of the plays and adding reality to Terence's depiction of emotional speech. It is defined by Donatus in his *Ars* as follows:

Don. *Ars GL* 4, 395, 11-12: *eclipsis est defectus quidam necessariae dictionis, quam desiderat praecisa sententia, ut 'haec secum' (Virg. Aen. 1.37): deest enim 'loquebatur'.*

Donatus in his commentary refers to ellipse as a *figura* on a number of occasions (e.g. *And.* 3001.1, *Ad.* 582) and sees it as something characteristic of Terence's style<sup>18</sup> (e.g. *And.* 51.1: *mira ἔλλειψις et familiaris Terentio*; 120.2:

<sup>15</sup> Examples at SERV. *Aen.* 1.208; 614; 4.359; 11.535; *Georg.* 2.1; 3.501; SERV. DAN. *Aen.* 2.524.

<sup>16</sup> Examples at SERV. *Aen.* 1.658; 2.40; 6.11.

<sup>17</sup> DON. *Ars GL* 4, 395, 3-6.

<sup>18</sup> A point made by JAKOBI 1996, p. 114.

ἔλλειψις *Terentiana*; *Eun.* 143.2: *mundat Terentius, ut solet, res huiusmodi per ἔλλειψιν suam*). The positive effect of this rhetorical feature is frequently commented on (e.g. *Phorm.* 142.3: *ut solet eleganter per ἔλλειψιν*; *Eun.* 479.3: *honesta ἔλλειψις*; *Ad.* 198.2: *decora locutio per ἔλλειψιν*; *Ad.* 265.5: *apta ἔλλειψις*; *Ad.* 277.5: *bona ἔλλειψις*)<sup>19</sup>. In the case of *honesta* in *Eun.* 479.3 and *decora* in *Ad.* 198.2 the ellipse serves to preserve decorum by not mentioning sexual matters. Often Donatus comments that the words omitted by ellipse are to be replaced by a facial expression on the part of the actor, e.g. *Don. And.* 232: *QVIA COMPOTRIX EST in uultu remansit oratio. deest enim per figuram ἔλλειψιν ‘ideo illam uult arcessi’*; *Eun.* 499.2: *ἔλλειψις ethica, in qua plus uultu significatur quam uerbis*. In other cases the ellipse is said to be appropriate in the expression of emotion, e.g. *Don. Eun.* 65.1: *familiaris ἔλλειψις irascentibus ... nec potest complere orationem qui et secum loquitur et dolore uexatur*; *Don. Ad.* 264.1: *NIHIL POTE SVpra ἔλλειψις per admirationem; subauditur ‘esse’ uel ‘dici’*.

Servius' (and Servius Danielis') references to this feature in his commentary are, as we have said, much less frequent (Servius 3; Servius Danielis 4). He uses the same Latinized form *eclipsis* as is found in Donatus' *Ars* (*GL* 4, 395,11), rather than the Greek ἔλλειψις, found in the Terence commentary and the comments simply state that the *figura* is present, usually without giving any positive or negative valuation (*Aen.* 1.65 definition, differentiation from *parenthesis* (as also at *Aen.* 12.161) and illustration from *Aen.* 1.135; *Aen.* 8.18; *Serv. Dan. Aen.* 9.393). In three cases, however, a more positive explanation for the *figura* is given. So at *Serv. Dan. Aen.* 9.51: *EN AIT eclipsis festinationis exprimendae gratia* the ellipse is said to reflect the haste of the speaker; *Serv., Aen.* 11.823: *POTVI absolute, uel pugnare uel uiuere*: *add. Dan. necessaria enim eclipsis in defectione, quae ex arte non semel posita est* (of the dying Camilla); *Serv. Aen.* 8.18: *TALIA PER LATIVM ‘gerebantur’ subaudis: et est formosa eclipsis*.

Just as Donatus identifies ellipse as a characteristic of Terence, often used to give a realistic depiction of everyday speech, so Servius identifies the avoidance of *tapinosis* or lowly speech, inappropriate for epic, as a characteristic of his author (*Serv., Aen.* 2.482 *ut solet*; 10.763 *more suo*). This term occurs in Donatus list of *cetera uitia* at *Ars GL* 4, 395, 13-17, but is not found in Donatus' Terence commentary. I have discussed this feature of Servius' commentary in detail elsewhere<sup>20</sup> and so a single example will here suffice:

<sup>19</sup> For ellipse as a *uitium* in the *Artes* but as a literary *figura* in the commentators see DIEDERICH 1999, pp. 207-209.

<sup>20</sup> MALTBY 2011, pp. 66-68.

Serv. Aen. 1.118: *IN GVRGITE VASTO: tapinosis est, id est rei magnae humilis expositio. prudenter tamen Vergilius humilitatem sermonis epitheto subleuat, ut hoc loco 'uasto' addidit.*

Other examples where an adjective is added to a supposedly lowly word to avoid this fault are noted in Serv. Aen. 1.465; 2.20; 482, 3.197; 10, 763. Servius recognises that epic must preserve a certain dignity of style. On occasion this also involves the use of lengthened forms, which in the *Ars* are castigated as examples of metaplasm by epenthesis (as with *induperator* at Don. *Ars GL* 4, 396, 4). So Serv. Aen. 2.14: *DVCTORES sonantius est quam 'duces', ut (Aen. 2.557) 'regnatorem Asiae': quod heroum exigit carmen.* Again what would be a *uitium* in the *Artes* becomes a *figura* serving a literary purpose in the commentators.

In the case of *ellipsis* and *tapinosis*, then, technical terms for *uitia* found in Donatus' *Ars* are used by our commentators either to show that their poetic use enhances their author's style (Donatus on ellipse) or that a potential *uitium* is artfully avoided (Servius on *tapinosis*).

The final term in Donatus' list of *cetera uitia* which is used by both Donatus and Servius in their commentaries is *amphibolia* 'ambiguity', which is slightly more common in Donatus (14) than in Servius (9). Donatus' *Ars* gives a short definition, followed by a list of common types:

Don. *Ars GL* 4, 395, 20-26: *amphibolia est ambiguitas dictionis, quae fit aut per casum accusatiuum, ut siquis dicat 'audio secutorem retiarium superasse'; aut per commune uerbum, ut siquis dicat 'criminatur Cato', 'uadatur Tullius', nec addat quem uel a quo; aut per distinctionem, ut 'uidi statuam auream hastam tenentem'. fit et per homonyma, ut siquis aciem dicat et non addat oculorum aut exercitus aut ferri. fit praeterea pluribus modis, quos percensere omnes, ne nimis longum sit, non oportet.*

The commonest type mentioned by Donatus is that mentioned first in the *Ars*, namely cases of the acc. + inf. construction in which it is unclear which acc. is the subject and which the object of the inf. Twice Donatus praises Terence for his use of this type of ambiguity:

Ter. *Ad.* 85-86: *neque legem putat tenere se ullam*

Don. *Ad.* 86.1: *TENERE SE VLLAM bene 'tenere' quia 'legem'. et est ἀμφιβολία oratoria.*

Demea, discussing Micio's son Antipho, is ambiguous here, in Donatus' view, as to whether Antipho keeps to no law or no law holds Antipho back. Similarly on Chremes' words at Terence *And.* 563-564: ... *at ego non posse arbitror / neque illum hanc perpetuo habere neque me perpeti* Donatus comments *amphibolian de industria posuit* on the question of whether *illum* (Pamphilus) or

*hanc* (Glycerium) is subject of *habere*. Similar ambiguities of this type are discussed at *And.* 896, *Hec.* 88, 201, 772, *Phorm.* 366. Another common type in Donatus' commentary is the question of objective versus subjective genitive. At *And.* 262, for example, a phrase like *patris pudor* could mean either 'respect for my father' or 'my father's respect for me'. Similar examples occur at *And.* 156, 261, *Hec.* 176. Such cases are simply stated to be ambivalent, without any further discussion of their dramatic purpose. In one case Donatus explains how Terence avoids *amphibolia*:

Ter. *Phorm.* 32-33: *quom per tumultum noster grex motus locost, quem actoris uirtus nobis restituit locum.*

Don. *Phorm.* 33.3: *RESTITVIT LOCVM bene repetiuit 'locum', ut ἀμφιβολίαν uitaret, ne 'quem' tumultum dicere uideretur.*

Servius, by contrast, is simply interested in solving possible cases of *amphibolia* by using metrical and other arguments in favour of one particular interpretation (Serv. *Aen.* 1.492, 1.698, *Georg.* 4.238). He does not discuss the ambiguous acc. + inf. types, so common in Donatus, but has three examples of the *distinctio* type, mentioned in the *Ars* quotation above, in which the ambiguity is to decide which of two nouns a particular adjective refers to (so *Aen.* 1.492, 1.698, 10.124). In one case, of the homonym type which does not figure in the Terence commentary, Servius praises Virgil for his use of a word with a double meaning:

Serv. *Aen.* 7.637: *CLASSICA IAMQVE SONANT bene posuit amphiboliam: nam classicum dicimus et tubam ipsam et sonum.*

## 6. Conclusions

It is clear from the above discussion that the Donatus of the Terence commentaries has a very different purpose in mind when discussing deviations from standard Latin than he does in his *Ars*. Generally speaking the *uitia* of the *Ars* consist of examples of faulty Latin to be avoided by those attempting to write and speak correctly in prose. These are treated in the Terence commentary as literary *figurae*, often serving the purpose of accurately characterising the language of individual speakers, mirroring either their lack of education or their aroused emotional states. Terence is after all a *puri sermonis amator* (Caes. Fr. 1 Funaioli ap. Suet. *Vit. Ter.* 7); incorrect diction and corrupt grammar should not to be found in his text. Where such faults appear to be present Donatus presents an explanation or an alternative reading or some other extenuating circumstance, such as archaism appropriate to language of Terence's time, to excuse his author of any grammatical impropriety. He never states explicitly that his readers should not imitate Terence's usage. Servius in his Virgil commentary stands, by contrast,



midway between the literary critic and the language teacher. While he recognises that certain non-standard features of Virgil's style are demanded by his literary purpose he is not afraid to warn his readers not to follow the epic author in some of his more eccentric usages, especially when these foreshadow later developments in colloquial Latin. More frequently, Servius is at pains to illustrate that faults in Vergil are only apparent and can be explained away by metrical necessity, by choosing an alternative reading or simply by providing a better analysis of the syntax. Both Donatus and Servius in their commentaries follow the ancient rhetorical tradition in pointing out that what are referred to as *uitia* in the *Artes* apply to mistakes in prose and may, on occasion, be sanctioned in verse as *figurae* when used for specific literary purposes.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BAILEY C. (ed.) 1947 (1949<sup>2</sup>), *Titi Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura Libri Sex*, Vol. I, Oxford.
- CIOFFI C. (ed.) 2017, *Aelii Donati quod fertur Commentum ad Andriam Terenti*, Berlin-Boston.
- DIEDERICH S. 1999, *Der Horazkommentar des Porphyrio im Rahmen der Kaiserzeitlichen Schül- und Bildungstradition*, Berlin-New York.
- DZIATZKO K. – HAULER E. 1913, *P. Terentius Afer: Phormio*, Leipzig.
- JAKOBI R. 1996, *Die Kunst der Exegese im Terenzkommentar des Donat*, Berlin-New York.
- KASTER R.A. 1988 (1997<sup>2</sup>), *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley.
- MALTBY R. 1979, "Linguistic Characterization of Old Men in Terence", *CPh* 74, pp. 136-147.
- 2011, "Servius on Stylistic Register in his Virgil Commentaries", in *The Latin of Roman Lexicography*, R. Ferri (ed.), Pisa-Roma, pp. 63-74.
- 2014, "Donatus on 'Appropriate Style' in the Plays of Terence", in *Terence and Interpretation, Pierides Studies in Greek and Latin Literature I*, S. Papaioannou (ed.), Newcastle, pp. 201-222.

- 2016, “Discussion of Diachronic Linguistic Change in Servius’ Virgil Commentaries”, in *Fragments d’érudition: Servius et le savoir antique*, A. Garcea, M.-K. Lhommé, D. Vallat (eds.), Hildesheim, pp.155-169.
- 2019, “Greek in Donatus’ Terence Commentaries”, in *Lemmata Linguistica Latina: Vol. I, Words and Sounds*, N. Holmes, M. Ottink, J. Schrickx, M. Selig (eds.), Berlin-Munich-Boston, pp. 312-328.

WESSNER P. (ed.) 1902-1905, *Donatus: Commentum Terenti*, Vol. I-II, Leipzig.

ZETZEL J.E.G. 1975, “On the History of Latin Scholia”, *HSCP* 79, pp. 335-354.