

expressed in the synodical letter of the eastern bishops at the council of Sardica, *CSEL* 65, p. 64, but mistakenly follows them in attributing this directly to Hilary of Poitiers).

These two volumes amply testify to the depth and diversity of current interest in Ammianus, and the wide range of international scholarship now pointed in his direction. While it will be clear that the Budé edition and S.'s commentary are to some extent aimed at different audiences (and the present reviewer's historical bias is likely to lead him more often to consult S.), it is none the less beyond question that 'late Romanists' of all persuasions will find much in both to enlarge their understanding of the fourth century's principal historian.

University of Durham

E. D. HUNT

DONATUS

R. JAKOBI: *Die Kunst der Exegese im Terenzkommentar des Donat*. (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte, 47.) Pp. ix + 210. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1996. DM 148. ISBN: 3-11-014458-1.

The Terentian commentary of Aelius Donatus is preserved not in its original fourth-century form but in a compilation of uncertain date marred by repetitions, self-contradictions, omissions, and disordered scholia. It has long been recognized, however, as containing many perceptive comments on the language and dramatic art of Terence, not least by Lessing, whose praise of Donatus in the *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* is J.'s starting point. The only critical edition of the whole work is Wessner's Teubner text (1902–5), on which, as supplemented by J.'s teacher Otto Zwierlein, he relies for his knowledge of manuscript readings. It is not his purpose to contribute, except through occasional conjectures, to the establishment of the text, or to investigate the genesis of our extant Donatus—essentially he follows Wessner—but to make a systematic analysis of the contents with reference to ancient notions of the grammarian's task and in comparison with a wide variety of ancient commentaries and writings on grammar, rhetoric, and literary criticism.

J.'s book is the first such overall analysis to be published. In successive chapters he discusses groups of scholia dealing with: *anagnorisis*, the correct reading of the text involving voice, gesture, and punctuation; *diorthosis*, the establishment of the text; metre (a very small part of the commentary); grammatical analysis, considered under parts of speech, accident, and syntax; linguistic analysis, largely concerned with etymologies, the distinction between near-synonyms, and *proprietas*; style, particularly Terence's use of ellipse, asyndeton, and pleonasm, and his cultivation of an educated colloquial style at the level appropriate to comedy; rhetoric, for example in connection with *status* and the structure of speeches; humour, as derived from wordplay, comic error, and stock characters; dramatic structure; and finally *ethopoeia*, under which the main themes are the consistency and plausibility of characters, the degree of their conformity to type, and their observance of moral propriety.

J. conducts the reader through this wide range of contents with admirable clarity and conciseness. Quotations from Donatus are plentiful and well-chosen to illustrate

the argument, and J. does not shrink from examining tangled passages where the nature of the compilation is particularly evident. His admiration for Donatus is as obvious as that of Donatus for Terence. He rejects the description 'variorum commentary', preferring to describe it as a largely original work which made use of its predecessors; when Donatus calls his Virgilian commentary a *munus collaticium*, this reflects the *topos* of modesty and does not exclude a critical evaluation of inherited materials.

Some important themes which might have been given separate treatment in a longer book have to be followed through various chapters. Interpolations are one: they have to be excluded from a consideration of the grammarian's own techniques, and it would be useful to have a summary of the criteria for recognizing them. J. ascribes *Andria* 303.4 to a pedantic schoolmaster, on the assumption that Donatus' audience were too advanced to need the statement of an elementary rule. J.'s conception of this audience emerges gradually: he writes in different places of 'readers', 'pupils', and those with a knowledge of Greek. In a longer book he might have developed the contrast between Servius as a prescriptive school commentator and Donatus as a descriptive commentator for the already educated. The straightforward question of where Donatus is right or wrong about Terence is one into which J., quite justifiably, does not allow himself to be drawn too often.

Inevitably any reader will disagree with J. about this or that detail. Not all his conjectures and interpretations are convincing. The condition of the lemmata as transmitted makes his view that Donatus deliberately inserted a false variant into the lemma of *Eunuchus* 312.1 dubious. At *Hecyra* 730.4 <*haud*> cannot stand, as *haud muto factum* would mean 'I have no regrets'. At *Adelphoe* 867.1 the textual difficulty is better solved (with Zwielerlein) by deleting *et* or *sed* than by placing *et* in quotation marks (it is *duxit uxorem* which *cum magno significatu addendum est*; compare *Eunuchus* 354.1). J. would replace *iustum* at *Phormio* 452.2 with *honestum*, and may be right as far as Donatus himself is concerned (though Quintilian *Inst.* 3.8.26 makes *iustum* a species of *honestum*); but the limit of editorial ambition must be to restore the compilation, not the original. The relationship between the tropes *metalepsis* and *ab eo quod sequitur id quod praecedit* needs further exploration, and is not one of complete equivalence; Quintilian *Inst.* 8.6.19 could be mentioned. More often, one's reaction will be to ask how J. can be sure of some quite possibly correct assertion, such as that all notes giving derivatives and including a certain formula must be ascribed to Donatus (p. 101), or that those on the declension of Greek personal names must all go back to Aemilius Asper (p. 79).

No such quibbles should be taken as denying the high quality of this book, which abounds in fascinating particular insights as well as presenting a clear overview. It is accurately printed, with very few errors. Its usefulness is enhanced by an index locorum including almost 1,000 scholia from the commentary itself. J. has written a valuable and almost comprehensive guide which will be of great help to readers of this difficult text.

Thesaurus Linguae Latinae, Munich

JOHN BLUNDELL