TO HEXÊS IN HOMERIC SCHOLIA AND SERVIUS' ORDO

HARRY L. LEVY

Liberal Arts College, Fordham University

The purpose of this paper is to contribute to the study of the methods employed by the Homeric scholiasts in elucidating the *Iliad* to the Greek youth of the Hellenistic period, and by the commentators of the Servian corpus in explaining the *Aeneid* to Roman students of late classical times. To this end, a comparative analysis will be presented of the use of two exegetical terms, τὸ ἐξῆς in the Greek commentaries, *ordo* in the Latin. Both are used in the technical sense of the order or sequence in which the commentator wishes the student to understand the poet's words.[1]

A start upon this type of inquiry into Homeric exegesis was made by Johannes Baar in his 1952 Hamburg dissertation, *Untersuchungen zur Terminologie der Ilias-Scholien*.[2] This thesis, which was unfortunately never published, dealt mainly with the technical use of the term διὰ μέσου, "parenthetical insertion," as employed by the Homeric scholar Nicanor.

Baar's index to technical terms in the scholia on the *Iliad* has provided a tool for some further research in this area,[3] though the index itself, as has been remarked,[4] suffers from the lack of a truly comprehensive

---

[1] A. S. Hunt translates τὸ ἐξῆς as "sequence" in his edition of *POxy.* III (London 1911) 99, commenting on the text printed at page 93, lines 114–16; cf. also *LSJ* s.v. ἐξῆς (3). I know of no discussion of the Servian use of *ordo* in the technical sense of the sequence of a group of words.

[2] Cf. *Jahresverzeichnis der deutschen Hochschulschriften 1952* (Leipzig, VEB Verlag, 1955) 344, and Johannes Baar, *Index zu den Ilias-Scholien* (Baden-Baden, Grimm, 1961), *Vorwort*. I was able to obtain a photocopy of the 120-page typescript of the dissertation from the Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Hamburg, Moorweidenstrasse 40, 2 Hamburg 13; the cost was a little less than $10.00.

[3] Above, note 2.

[4] Cf. J. B. Hainsworth's review of Baar's *Index* in *JHS* 84 (1964) 158–59.

and definitive edition of the Homeric commentaries. When the large-scale edition which is being prepared by Hartmut Erbse appears,[5] it will provide on the Homeric side, as will the Harvard Servius, when completed, on the Vergilian, a firmer base than now exists for a thorough study of both sets of scholia. Computer-assisted preparation of full *indices verborum* should, of course, follow. These would make it possible to study in complete detail the techniques used by the scholiasts. The results of such investigation should in turn throw light upon educational procedures in Hellenistic and late Roman times, in which the study of the *Iliad* and the *Aeneid* played so important a role. In the meantime, with the tools at hand, it is perhaps justifiable to continue the work which Baar started by investigating a kindred pair of scholiastic terms.

The scholia on the first twelve books of the *Iliad* use the term τὸ ἑξῆς, literally "that which follows," at least 119 times in the technical sense referred to above.[6] The term *ordo* is used in the same way in the Servian commentaries on the *Aeneid* at at least 76 points.[7] That Servius understood the term as a technical one is placed beyond doubt by the fact that, in a scholium to be discussed later (below, page 246),

---

[5] Above, note 4. Since this article was completed, Walter de Gruyter and Co. have announced the publication of Vol. 1 of Erbse's edition, containing his preface and the *Scholia Vetera* on *Il.* 1–4.

[6] For a complete list of the Homeric scholia considered, see Table 1, at the end of this article. The sigla used in these footnotes and occasionally in the body of this paper to denote the various bodies of Scholia are explained in the legend accompanying the Table. The examples were located by the use of the list given in Baar's *Index* (above, note 2) 75–76. Baar lists 149 uses of τὸ ἑξῆς in the scholia on *Il.* 1–12; he notes a single (non-technical) instance in A 7.174; another (technical) use which he overlooks brings the total to 150. Of these, 25 are enclosed in parentheses as being non-technical uses. One set of parentheses, that enclosing T 1.4, should be removed. Seven should be added to mark the following as non-technical: A 4.128, 6.134, 6.396, 11. 421; T 12.29; B 8.328, 10.268. With 31 non-technical items (25 − 1 + 7 = 31) removed, the list of 150 is reduced to the 119 technical items shown in Table 1.

[7] See Table 2. In the absence, so far as I know, of an *index verborum* to Servius, I collected the items by reading through the text, using the Harvard Edition for *Aen.* 1–5, Thilo-Hagen for *Aen.* 6–12; I trust that I have not missed any very considerable number of items. I list the non-technical uses of the word *ordo* which I was able to find in the Servian corpus: *Preface* to *Aen.* 1 (2 instances: in the Harv. Ed., 2.1.3 and 2.4.89); *Aen.* 1.69, 76 (*bis*), 265(?), 292, 571, 641, 703, 720, 747; 2.506, 615, 766; *Pref.* to *Aen.* 3 (Harv. Ed. 3.1.3); *Aen.* 3.126, 138, 279(?), 388, 407; 4.12, 555; 5.114, 119, 596, 773; 6.482, 573, 752, 754, 767; 7.137, 698; 8.6, 374, 525; 9.25, 298, 504, 760; 10.125; 11.160, 185, 228, 243, 271; 12.350.

he links it with one of his favorite exegetical terms, *hypallage*, saying *ergo sic intellegamus, aut per ordinem, aut per hypallagen.*[8]   I have found no parallel passage in the Homeric scholia; but that the term τὸ ἑξῆς was recognized as a *terminus technicus* among Greek grammarians is made clear by its use in Apollonius Dyscolus' treatise *De pronominibus.*[9]

If one examines with care these nearly 200 attempts at the elucidation of texts used in literary instruction, it becomes clear that both the Greek and the Latin scholia can be divided as to function into four very nearly parallel groups, as shown in Tables 1 and 2.   The functions are the following:

    I. The removal of parenthetical or other easily separable material so as to clarify the main utterance, which is left in the original order.

    II. The rearrangement of the poet's original word-order, often with the omission (as in I) of intervening words, but with no change in the words retained.

    III. Under the guise of calling attention to the sequence, the alteration of the word-forms or the very words used by the poet, with some rearrangement of word-order, and often with the omission of some words as well.

    IV. A combination of some of the features of I and of III, comprising a small number of cases in which the word-order remains the same, some forms being altered, and some words omitted or added.

Let us discuss these four categories in order.

I. *Excision of parenthetical or other separable material; no other change.* These 47 Homeric and 25 Vergilian scholia (see Tables 1 and 2) are placed first as being the simplest and most straightforward of the lot. They represent some two-fifths of the Greek, and one-third of the Latin examples.   These figures include a sub-category of 17 Greek and 6 Latin items, which will be discussed after we have finished with the main class, consisting of 30 Homeric and 19 Vergilian specimens.

---

    [8] Cf. Serv. on *Aen.* 3.61, CLASSIBUS AUSTROS *hypallage est*, to which *Serv. Dan.* adds *nam classes austris damus* (quoted by *OED* s.v. "hypallage"); also on *Aen.* 3.362.   In the scholia on the last two books of the *Aen.*, we find hypallage used in the commentary on 11.18, 212, 476, 628; 12.66, 139, 204, 219, 340, 350.

    [9] 51A = *Grammatici Latini*, ed. R. Schneider and G. Uhlig (Leipzig 1878–1910) 2.1.41.2–4; *LSJ* s.v. ἑξῆς (3) refers to other occurrences in Apollonius.

On the Homeric side, a good example of the main group is afforded by the scholium on *Il.* 2.99–100.

σπουδῇ δ' ἕζετο λαός, ἐρήτυθεν δὲ καθ' ἕδρας
παυσάμενοι κλαγγῆς.

After a discussion of the possibility of a full stop after λαός, the scholiast offers as an alternative a comma after ἕδρας, and another after λαός, with the understanding that ἐρήτυθεν δὲ καθ' ἕδρας lies διὰ μέσου— in other words, is a parenthesis—so that τὸ ἑξῆς may be deemed to be σπουδῇ δ' ἕζετο λαὸς παυσάμενοι κλαγγῆς. He goes on to say that the schema is Homeric, and equally so is the parenthetical utterance (ἡ διὰ μέσου ἀναφώνησις). In another example of this type, we are told that the four verses *Il.* 2.741–44, dealing with the Centaurs, are a side-narrative διὰ μέσου, so that τὸ ἑξῆς consists of verse 740 followed immediately by 745,

τῶν αὖθ' ἡγεμόνευε μενεπτόλεμος Πολυποίτης
οὐκ οἷος, ἅμα τῷ γε Λεοντεὺς ὄζος Ἄρηος.

In 8 cases out of the 30 the substance of the διὰ μέσου is quoted in whole or in part;[10] in 8 it is indicated by τὰ λοιπά, τὰ ἄλλα, or the equivalent.[11] In 2 places the words διὰ μέσου are replaced by χωρίς or μεταξύ, with explicit indication of the words to be skipped over.[12] In the remaining 12 cases, τὸ ἑξῆς alone is given, and the student is left to figure out what the διὰ μέσου is.[13] Among these is what is perhaps the most famous διὰ μέσου of them all, *Il.* 1.4 Διὸς δ' ἐτελείετο βουλή, which four words the grammarian Eucleides is quoted as removing from τὸ ἑξῆς, *Il.* 1.4–6:

. . . τεῦχε κύνεσσιν
οἰωνοῖσί τε πᾶσι . . .
ἐξ οὗ δὴ τὰ πρῶτα διαστήτην ἐρίσαντε.

On the Vergilian side, there are 19 specimens of the main class. They begin with the lemma *Aen.* 1.65–69 *Aeole, . . . incute vim ventis.*

[10] A 2.99, 2.745, 3.59, 12.228; AD 2.333; T 9.158; BT 1.414, 3.43.

[11] 914: 2.819 as restored by Hunt (above, note 1); A 1.178, 1.234, 2.488, 3.64, 10.256; ABT 6.242; B 3.59.

[12] A 3.379, 9.225.

[13] A 6.479, 7.390, 8.94; ABT 3.411, 12.326; AT 11.672, 12.6; T 1.4 (the reference to Eucleides in the body of the paper), 8.189, 12.322, 12.389; BT 10.176.

The scholium reads *ordo ipse est, et est figura parenthesis:* clear, concise, and to the point.   The lemma itself, exceptionally, is made to serve as the *ordo*.   The word *parenthesis* replaces διὰ μέσου; it occurs in 8 of our 19 specimens, and is itself replaced in one case by the Latin *interpositio*.[14]   In most cases, as in our Aeolus passage, the words to be skipped (*namque tibi divum pater*, etc.) are neither mentioned nor referred to.[15]   In 2 instances, the lemma itself is said to be the parenthetical utterance, and the *ordo* is given in the scholium.[16]   In 3 cases, the parenthetical material is quoted wholly or partially;[17] in 3 others, it is referred to as *cetera*.[18]

If we now compare the Greek and Latin scholia of this main category, we find them pretty much of a piece; in other words, as is scarcely surprising, the Latin commentators imitate their Greek predecessors.

Ia. *Stress upon two or three words of main context.* We have set aside as a sub-class of this category those scholia in which two or three words of the main utterance are singled out to show the connection between or among them.   The boundary between the subsidiary group and the main class is not hard and fast by any means.

Among the 17 Homeric scholia of this sub-group, an interesting example is that on *Il.* 2.484, the invocation to the Muses preceding the Catalogue of the Ships.   Here we are told that τὸ ἑξῆς is ἔσπετε (484) οἵ τινες (487), and that τὰ λοιπά are διὰ μέσου: the material designated as τὰ λοιπά being, of course, the complimentary reference to the Muses.   So, in *Il.* 2.527, Λοκρῶν (527) is brought into sequence with οἳ Κῦνον (531), "those of the Locrians who inhabited Cynos, etc."; thus the explanatory material about the Oïlean Ajax is characterized as τὰ λοιπὰ διὰ μέσου.   In the anacolouthon *Il.* 2.350–53, the

---

[14] *parenthesis:* scholia on *Aen.* 1.65, 3.362, 3.415, 4.105, 11.400, 11.509, 11.739, 12.161; *interpositio:* 12.935.   Incidentally, in the only 2 cases which Baar (above, note 2) 140 lists of the use of the term *parenthesis* in the Homeric scholia, the word is used of cases in which the scholiast believes a vowel has been infixed: A on *Il.* 1.272, -ε- in μαχέοιτο; D on *Il.* 24.79, -ι- in μείλανι.

[15] Scholia on *Aen.* 1.65, 1.198, 1.261, 2.413, 3.374, 4.393, 4.416, 9.810, 10.605, 11.481, 12.273.

[16] Scholia on *Aen.* 3.415, 11.739.

[17] Scholia on *Aen.* 11.400 (in the *Serv. Dan.* version), 11.509, 12. 935.

[18] Scholia on *Aen.* 3.362, 4.105, 12.161.   In contrast to *Serv. Dan.* on 11.400 (cf. above, note 17), Serv. denotes the parenthetical material simply as *cetera*.

accusative ὑπερμενέα Κρονίωνα (350) is brought into τὸ ἐξῆς with the nominative ἀστράπτων (353), the scholiast commenting ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀστράπτοντα. Except for these 3 instances, the Greek use of this technique does not exceed the compass of one or two verses (7 cases of 1 verse, 7 cases of 2). In one comment, on *Il.* 8.435,

$$\text{ἄρματα δ᾽ ἔκλιναν πρὸς ἐνώπια παμφανόωντα,}$$

the scholiast, choosing ἐνώπια παμφανόωντα as his lemma, says that some of his predecessors give τὸ ἐξῆς as ἄρματα παμφανόωντα. This he rejects tersely: οὐκ εὖ.

The 6 Vergilian examples of this sub-class encompass either 1 or 2 verses (3 of each). Thus *Venus* in *Aen.* 1.411 is placed in *ordo* with *dea* in the next verse; in *Aen.* 1.442, as an alternative to Servius' explanation of *quo primum*, which is *hoc est, simul ac venerunt*, the scholiast of *Servius Danielis* offers *vel ordo est "quo primum loco,"* skipping the words between *primum* in 1.442 and *loco* in the following verse. In the passage *Aen.* 3.162–63, *non haec tibi litora suasit Delius | aut Cretae iussit considere Apollo*, Servius points out that the *ordo* is *Delius Apollo*, apparently to prevent the unwary from thinking that two separate divinities are meant. We see in another of these scholia an implicit indication of a scholarly dispute, like the explicit one seen above. In *Aen.* 2.44, *dona carere dolis Danaum*, we are told magisterially *ordo est "dona Danaum," non "dolis Danaum."* We may perhaps add *euge*.

Comparatively, we may note that the device represented by this sub-group is more popular on the Greek than on the Roman side: 17 out of the 47 Homeric cases in the total category, or 36%; 6 out of the 25 Vergilian, 24%.

II. *Re-ordering of original words, with or without omissions.* Having dealt with the cases in which the poets' words, themselves unchanged, are presented by the scholiasts in the original order, with some excisions, let us now take, as the second category, instances in which, for exegetical purposes, the order of the *ipsissima verba* is altered, but the *verba* are unchanged.

Here the Homeric scholia studied afford 17 cases. In 13 of these cases,[19] the change is limited to the transposition of 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5

---

[19] All those listed in Table I, under II, except 4.429, 7.174, 11.327, 12.289.

words; in this group, when more than 1 word is transposed, the entire set of 2, 3, 4, or 5 words is transported bodily, with no internal change in word-order.   Thus, in *Il.* 2.293,

> καὶ γάρ τίς θ' ἕνα μῆνα μένων ἀπὸ ἧς ἀλόχοιο
> ἀσχαλάᾳ σὺν νηῒ πολυζύγῳ,

the A scholiast recommends a pause after πολυζύγῳ, not, he says, where the majority ridiculously place it, after ἀσχαλάᾳ.   For in τὸ ἑξῆς, he points out, the words ἀπὸ ἧς ἀλόχοιο ἀσχαλάᾳ follow instead of preceding σὺν νηῒ πολυζύγῳ.   So, in the bird-simile of *Il.* 2.459–63, the words κλαγγηδὸν προκαθιζόντων are transposed from verse 463 to a position in τὸ ἑξῆς right after verse 459, where they are nearer the genitive ὀρνίθων.   Where the scholiast holds that lucidity would be gained by having the words denoting the causal factor follow rather than precede the words explained thereby, he uses τὸ ἑξῆς to transfer the better part of *Il.* 2.803 to a position following σημαινέτω in 2.805.   Sometimes an alternative interpretation is clarified by the transposition in τὸ ἑξῆς.   Thus, if in *Il.* 2.642 we put a full stop after ἔην, the word αὐτός will modify Οἰνῆος; if a comma, the whole of the verse will pertain to Meleager.   The scholiast makes the latter possibility clearer by transposing θάνε δέ from its place after ἔην to the end of the verse.

The other 9 cases of the 13—they involve shifting a single word, or 2 words in the original order—are designed to present the scholiast's view of the close connection between the words displaced and those nearer which they are moved; they require no other comment.[20]   Of the remaining 4 cases of the total of 17, there are 3 which differ from those discussed only in that the 2 words displaced in each are also reversed in order.[21]

Finally, the extreme case of this type in the Homeric scholia studied is the following.   The passage is *Il.* 7.171–72:

> κλήρῳ νῦν πεπάλεσθε διαμπερές, ὅς κε λάχῃσιν·
> οὗτος γὰρ δὴ ὀνήσει ἐϋκνήμιδας Ἀχαιούς.

---

[20] A 10.137, 10.199, 11.306, 11.370; ABT 10.424; T 3.166, 9.214, 11.153, 12.295.
[21] ABT 4.429; BT 11.327, 12.289.

The A scholiast on *Il.* 7.174 gives as one possible formulation of τὸ
ἑξῆς the sequence οὗτος γὰρ δὴ διαμπερὲς ὀνήσει, ὅς κε λάχῃσι.
The suprascript numbers show the original order.

The Latin examples in this category are more numerous, not only
absolutely (27 Vergilian to 17 Homeric), but even more strikingly
when viewed proportionally, since the Vergilian cases represent 35%
of the Vergilian grand total, the Homeric only 14% of the Homeric.
The rearrangement of the word-order in most of the Latin cases is
also more extensive than in most of the Greek. To this we shall
return later.

Of the 27 Vergilian cases here discussed, 10 resemble the bulk of the
Homeric instances in this category. In 2, we find the shift of an
entire group of words, the order within the group remaining the same:
(1) *Aen.* 8.15–16 *quem, si fortuna sequatur, / eventum pugnae cupiat,*
where the scholiast of the *Servius Danielis* shifts *si fortuna sequatur* to
follow *cupiat*; (2) in *Aen.* 9.238–41, a Danielian scholiast records a
suggested shift of 9.239 *quaesitum Aenean et moenia Pallantea* from its
place after 9.238 *si fortuna permittis uti* to the end of the passage, after
9.241 *nec nos via fallit euntis.*

The other 8 of these 10 involve the displacement of a single word
only, either to put the words in prose order (e.g. *Aen.* 2.355, *ceu lupi*
for *lupi ceu*), or to point up the connection between the displaced
word and another.[22] One such scholium has the purpose, not so
much of clarifying the passage, as of absolving Vergil from the charge
of solecism. By placing *suasit* before the first *aut* in *Aen.* 10.9–10 *quis
metus aut hos / aut hos arma sequi ferrumque lacessere suasit,* the scholiast
believes that he has avoided the construction *hos suasit,* i.e. *suadeo* with
the accusative, which he regards as σολοικοειδές, though he knows
that it occurs in *Aen.* 12.813 and in Ennius!

The remaining 17 instances in this category are like the example
quoted at the end of the Homeric set, in that they drastically reshuffle
the words under discussion. This may best be shown by quoting
the *disiecta membra* in the Servian *ordo,* with suprascript numbers to
show the original arrangement. Words omitted in the *ordo* are

---

[22] Scholia on *Aen.* 2.143, 3.355, 5.741, 6.317, 7.419, 10.10, 11.232, 11.559.

bracketed at the end of each passage. Where the scholiast gives
alternative *ordines*, these are marked *a* and *b*. A few parenthetical re-
marks by the present author are interspersed.

       1   2   3   8   9   4 5   6   7
1.109*a* tris Notus abreptas mediis fluctibus in saxa latentia torquet [saxa
vocant Itali . . . quae in . . . Aras].

       1   2   3   7   5   4   6
1.109*b* saxa vocant Itali Aras quae mediis fluctibus [in].

      1   7   12   13   2   9   10   11 8   4
2.604 omnem tibi nubem eripiam quae umida circum caligat et mortales
        5   6   3
hebetat visus tuenti [nunc obducta].

       3   1   4   2
2.706 incendia propius volvunt aestus [-que]. (Servius glosses *aestus* with
id est, calorem. Observe the use of word-order to distinguish between
the subject *incendia* and the object *aestus*, both morphologically am-
biguous.)

       1   5   3   2   4
3.132 avidus urbis optatae muros molior. (As in the scholium on *Aen.*
2.44, above, page 242, we are told *non 'avidus molior.'*)

      2   1   6   4   3   5
3.348 lacrimas multum fudit inter verba singula. (This *ordo* is then used
as the basis for rejecting *lacrimans*, a variant reading: *nam si 'lacrimans,'
quid fudit?*)

       1   9   11   2   3   8   10   7   4   5
4.520 tunc numen precatur, si quod curae habet amantes non aequo
        6
foedere [iustumque memorque].

      4 2   3   5   1   6
4.540 fac me autem velle, quis sinet?

      2   6   1   5   7 3   4
5.389*a* tantane dona frustra tolli sines tam patiens? [nullo certamine].

      1   6   2   3   5   4
5.389*b* tantane dona tam patiens sines tolli? [nullo certamine].
(The first *ordo* is given by Servius, the second by *Servius Danielis*.)

      3   2   6   1   5   4
8.378 tuosve labores incassum exercere volui.

      4   2   1   3
8.432 irasque flammis sequacibus.

      1   3   4   2   5
9.235 locum conspeximus qui insidiis patet [ipsi].

          1   4   5   7   2   6   3
9.580 stabat Arcentis filius Arcens in armis egregiis [pictus acu chlamydem
      et ferrugine clarus Hibera, insignis facie, genitor quem miserat]. (In
      the original, the bracketed words stand between *armis* and *Arcens*: the
      latter word is thus literally far-fetched!)

         1   2   10   16   17   7   8   9
10.324 tu quoque Cydon miserande iaceres dum sequeris Clytium
         3   4   5   6   11   12   13   14   15
      flaventem prima lanugine malas ... qui iuvenum tibi semper erant
      [infelix, nova gaudia ... Dardania stratus dextra, securus amorum].
      (The omitted material between *malas* and *qui* is a paraphrase offered
      by the scholiast of *Servius Danielis*: *id est, dum adulescentem sectaris,
      cuius amore flagrabas.* This said, the scholiast neglects Vergil's *amorum*
      as an antecedent to *qui*.)

          1   5   4   6   2   3
10.513 latum limitem ardens agit per agmen [-que]. (It is in connection
      with this passage that Servius makes the remark quoted above, page
      239, on *ordo* and hypallage as alternative techniques for understanding.
      His hypallage would take the form of *lato limite agit*, for he cites *Aen.*
      9.321 *lato te limite ducam*.)

         4   5   1   6   2   3
10.908 in arma undanti cruore animam diffundit [-que].

           1   2   3   5   4
11.658a decus pacis et (*for* -que) ministras belli [sibi dia Camilla delegit ...
       bonae ... -que *iterum*].

           1   3   2   4   9   7   5   6   8
11.658b quas sibi decus delegit ministras bonae pacis et (*for* -que) belli
       [ipsa ... dia Camilla ... -que *iterum*].

          1   2   5   4   6   8   3   7
12.64 accepit vocem matris Lavinia flagrantes genas lacrimis perfusa.

As we said above, there is a striking imbalance between the Latin and
the Greek material in this category, both in the number of instances in
which identical words are reordered, and in the extent of the reorder-
ing. I should like to advance the hypothesis that the sense of a vastly
greater need for reordering—as distinguished from paraphrasing—
the words of the *Aeneid* some 400 years after its composition than for
those of the *Iliad* almost a millennium after it took its canonical form
may be attributed to a difference in the kind of change which the
centuries brought to Latin and to Greek. The Latin language, in the
fourth Christian century, was moving, at the popular level certainly,

toward the relatively fixed word-order which characterizes the modern Romance languages. Modern spoken Greek, as Albert Thumb points out, has largely maintained the ancient Greek freedom in the order of words.[23] Thus we find on the Hellenic side an unbroken tradition of a lesser dependence on word-order as a determinant of meaning than was characteristic of Later Latin. This hypothesis should be tested both by a careful analysis of the word-order in the reorderings and paraphrases of the Homeric scholia and the Servian corpus, and by a comparison of the patterns thus discovered with those of Hellenistic and Byzantine Greek, and of Later Latin at various levels. One thing is abundantly clear: the Roman schoolboy of the fourth Christian century, native speaker of his own brand of Latin though he was, needed a lot of help with Vergil's intricate patterns of word-order, at least in the opinion of an eminent *grammaticus*, who should have known!

III. *Alteration in the form and word-order of the text.* It would be tempting to suppose, on the Greek side (for the Romans, as usual, fell heir to a developed tradition), that our three types of scholia grew, the second from the first, the third from the second, in chronological order. The acceptance of this hypothesis, its rejection, or its setting aside with a *non liquet*, will have to await the appearance of the complete edition of the Homeric scholia and the index thereto desiderated above. Chronology aside, we may certainly say descriptively that this third category departs from the text furthest of the three in its search for exegesis, for it involves a change not only in the order of the words, but in their forms, and indeed in the very identity of the words themselves in many cases.

In all, there are 51 instances of this category in the Homeric scholia. We shall postpone (for Sections IIIa and IIIb) the consideration of the 20 which are solely concerned with compound verbs, and shall turn to the remaining 31 (see Table 1, under III proper).

Among these, we find at one pole a group of 10 showing very slight changes, involving what might be called the *aggiornamento* of Homeric Greek to *Koinê*: the insertion of an article or copula, a pro-

noun, or the noun ἄνδρες (to make a cardinal number more concrete),[24] or the substitution for a Homeric form of an item from the *Koinê*, either lexical or morphological: σὺν αὐτῷ for οἱ σύν, λίθου for λᾶος, πεδίου for πεδίοιο.[25]   At the other pole, we find the freest sort of paraphrase, under the guise of τὸ ἑξῆς: among the most flagrant cases are these three, (1) GD on *Il.* 4.218–19, (2) BT on 8.10–11, (3) A on 11.365.

1. ἐπ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἤπια φάρμακα εἰδὼς | πάσσε: τὸ ἑξῆς· ἐπέπασσεν αὐτῷ πρᾶα καὶ προσηνῆ φάρμακα παυστικὰ τῶν ὀδυνῶν.

2. ὃν δ᾽ ἂν ἐγὼν ἀπάνευθε θεῶν ἐθέλοντα νοήσω | ἐλθόντ᾽ ἢ Τρώεσσιν ἀρηγέμεν ἢ Δαναοῖσι: τὸ ἑξῆς· ὃν ἂν ἐγὼ ἴδω τῶν θεῶν χωρὶς ἐμοῦ ἐλθόντα εἰς τὴν μάχην, θέλοντα Τρωσὶν ἢ Ἕλλησι βοηθῆσαι (the B scholium inserts, between ἐμοῦ and ἐλθόντα, the words καὶ δίχα τῆς ἐμῆς ἐπιτροπῆς).

3. ἦ θήν σ᾽ ἐξανύω γε καὶ ὕστερον ἀντιβολήσας: τὸ δὲ ἑξῆς ἐστί, κατεργάσομαι δή σε καὶ ἀνελῶ, καὶ τέλος τῇ πράξει ἐπιθήσω, ἐξ ὑστέρου ἀπαντήσας.

My point here is not that the scholiasts have paraphrased rather freely. This is common enough in the scholia.   What is startling is that instead of calling the paraphrase the λόγος or νοῦς of the passage, as usual,[26] they present their reworkings as τὸ ἑξῆς.   There are 12 instances which equal or approach the 3 which I have quoted in full.[27]   It should be noted that the T and D scholia are represented in this category out of all proportion to their total contribution to the collection.

Why this desire to pass off the λόγος or the νοῦς as τὸ ἑξῆς?   Did it sound more scholarly?   Or was it force of habit compounded with professorial absentmindedness?   Perhaps τὸ ἑξῆς was on the way toward developing an extended meaning, that of the "gist" of a passage.

Having found 10 cases at one pole and 15 at the other, we are left

---

[24] A 8.306; ABT 12.288; AB 9.539; AD 8.189–90; T 5.461, 8.562; BT 4.453.

[25] A 8.106, 10.19, 12.462.

[26] νοῦς: e.g. A 2.99; λόγος: e.g. A 1.157, 1.290–91, 1.603, 2.435, 3.59.

[27] A 11.413; T 11.515; BT 4.286, 5.412, 8.213, 9.357, 9.374; D 1.509, 2.160, 2.278, 3.162, 11.558.

with a middle group of 6,[28] making up the total of 31 referred to above.

Before proceeding to the 20 Greek cases involving compound verbs, which have no analog in the Latin material, let us treat the 22 Vergilian instances which belong to the same category as the 31 Homeric cases just discussed. Here, though the reordering of Vergil's *ipsissima verba* continues to be extensive, paralleling that which we saw in the Servian corpus in Section II, the use of paraphrase is on the whole less prevalent than on the Greek side. Though exact boundaries are hard to set, I should consider 10 examples as belonging to the lighter end of the series,[29] 10 to the middle group,[30] and only 2 to the other extreme. These last 2 are:

> 3.220–21 laeta boum passim campis armenta videmus / caprigenumque
> pecus nullo custode per herbam. Servius, giving *per herbam* as the
> lemma, goes on: ordo est, non "per herbam," sed "per campos in
> herbis videmus armenta."

> 12.72–74 ne, quaeso, ne me lacrimis neve omine tanto / prosequere in
> duri certamina Martis euntem, / o mater; neque enim Turno mora
> libera mortis. Servius, writing *neque enim Turno mora libera mortis* as
> the lemma, gives, as an alternative exegesis, the following: ordo est:
> ne, quaeso, mater, ne me lacrimis (id est tanto mortis omine) prosequaris,
> ad duri Martis certamina proficiscentem: neque enim Turno mora
> libera est non eundi post iam promissum singulare certamen. (Another
> paraphrase follows, but this one is not fobbed off as an *ordo*.)

An inspection of Table 2 under heading III will show an anomaly which I believe worthy of note. Elsewhere in the Table the scholia are fairly evenly divided (especially in proportion to the relative contributions of each) between the tradition which is represented only by the *Servius Danielis* on the one hand, and, on the other, by either Servius alone or by the combined tradition. Under this rubric alone, that of *ordines* which do not simply omit parenthetical material, or reorder Vergil's own words, but which actually change the words that Vergil wrote, the *Servius Danielis* is outnumbered 20 to 2. I

---

[28] A 8.441, 11.297; AT 7.73; TD 5.864; BT 3.446; GD 4.439.

[29] Scholia on *Aen.* 1.195, 2.645, 3.73, 4.517, 7.122, 7.346, 10.244, 10.345, 10.385, 10.797.

[30] Scholia on *Aen.* 1.133, 1.181, 2.348, 3.686, 4.229, 4.656, 5.773, 9.258, 9.759, 10.454.

suggest that we may have here a clue to one of Servius' own pet class-room procedures.

Having finished with the Servian corpus in this category, let us now turn to those examples of τὸ ἑξῆς in the Homeric scholia studied which deal with compound verbs. These fall into 2 groups.

IIIa. *Synthesis.* The first group consists of 15 cases (see Table 1)which, if supplemented by 9 which are incidental to passages already con-sidered,[31] will total 24. These involve the synthesis of compound verbs from what schoolboys of my generation were taught, with some scholarly reservations, to call examples of *tmesis*: that is, the separation of a simple verb from what became, in Classical Greek, the prefix of a compound verb. Incidentally, neither the word *tmesis* nor any other special technical designation for this phenomenon occurs in the passages here studied: the synthesis of the verb is presented simply as τὸ ἑξῆς. Thus, in the A commentary on *Il.* 1.67, for the lemma ἀπὸ λοιγὸν ἀμῦναι, we find the scholium τὸ ἑξῆς ἐστὶν ἀπαμῦναι, and a little lecture on the accent of ἀπό. Also in A, in ἀπόντα as τὸ ἑξῆς of *Il.* 1.541 ἀπονόσφιν ἐόντα, we see a modernization of ἐόντα analogous to that discussed above, page 248, for πεδίοιο. The remaining examples are of the same kind.

IIIb. *Analysis.* The reverse of the procedure just discussed appears in 5 cases, all from the A commentary (Table 1). Here a verb which the standard Homeric text gives as a compound is analyzed by the scholiast into a simple verb and a preposition governing a noun. A single example will suffice. The scholium on *Il.* 2.109, for the lemma ἔπε' Ἀργείοισι μετηύδα gives τὸ ἑξῆς as μετ' Ἀργείοισιν ἔπεα ηὔδα. One wonders what the scholiast would have said had the latter been the lemma.

IV. Finally, for the sake of a certain degree of completeness, we shall refer here to 2 Homeric and 2 Vergilian scholia which occupy a middle ground between our categories I and III. Here, basically, the poet's words are kept in the original order, with minor changes or additions, and some omissions (see Tables 1 and 2).

I have said "a certain degree of completeness" deliberately. A

---

[31] A 8.441, 10.19; AT 7.73; T 11.515; BT 8.213; GD 4.218; D 2.160, 2.278, 11.558.

thorough study of our old philologists' techniques would require a wider and deeper consideration both of the reordering and of the paraphrasing of the poets' language throughout the commentaries, whether or not these procedures are labeled as τὸ ἑξῆς or as *ordo*, as λόγος or as *sensus*. Perhaps when the proper tools are available the foregoing discussion may serve to suggest some of the lines of investigation to be followed.

TABLE I

	914	A		ABT	AT	AB
I. Omission of Parenthetical or Separable Material	2.819	1.178 1.234 2.99 2.488 2.745 3.59 3.64	3.379 6.479 7.390 8.94 9.225 10.256 12.228	3.411 6.242 12.326	12.6 11.672	
(Sub-Tot. I)	(1)	(14)		(3)	(2)	
Ia. Stress on Separate Words		1.305 2.484 2.527 4.468 9.302	10.375 10.475 12.177 12.434	8.435 12.393		
(Sub-T. Ia)		(9)		(2)		
Sub-T. I & Ia	1	23		5	2	
II. Reordering of Identical Words		2.293 2.642 2.805 7.174	10.137 10.199 11.306 11.370	2.463 4.429 10.424		
Sub-T. II		8		3		
III. Alteration in Form and Order		8.106 8.306 8.441 10.19	11.297 11.365 11.413 12.462	12.288[a]	7.73	9.539
(Sub-T. III)		(8)		(1)	(1)	(1)
IIIa. Synthesis of Verb		1.67 4.97 5.308 6.357	7.6 7.425 9.456	1.541		
(Sub-T. IIIa)		(7)		(1)		
IIIb. Analysis of Verb		2.109 4.94 4.99	10.95 12.60			
(Sub-T. IIIb)		(5)				
Sub-T. III + IIIa + IIIb		20		2	1	1
IV. Form Altered, Order Same		1.396	5.329			
Sub-T. IV		2				
Not Considered[d]		4.539				
Sub-T. NC		1				
Grand Total	1	54		10	3	1

  [a] Virtually identical with the second τὸ ἑξῆς in the BT scholium on 12.289, which is therefore not counted separately.

  [b] Erroneously listed by Baar (above, note 2) 76 as belonging to D alone.

  [c] The base is 117, because of the two omissions (see next note).

  [d] These two scholia have been set aside for further study; they are obscure.

Numerical references separated by a period (e.g. 2.819) are to books and verses of the *Iliad*. The scholia are grouped as in Baar's *Index* (above, note 2) *Vorwort*, ftn. 2, and *passim*. The

AD	T	TD	BT	B	GD	D	Total	%^c
2.333	1.4		1.414	3.59				
	8.189		3.43					
	9.158		10.176					
	12.322							
	12.389							
(1)	(5)		(3)	(1)			(30)	
	3.169		2.350					
	4.371		5.80					
	11.305							
	12.149							
	(4)		(2)				(17)	
1	9		5	1			47	40
	3.166		11.327					
	9.214		12.289					
	11.153							
	12.295							
	4		2				17	14
8.189	5.461	5.864	3.446 8.10		4.218	1.509		
	8.562		4.286 8.213		4.439^b	2.160		
	11.515		4.453 9.357			2.278		
			5.412 9.374			3.162		
						11.558		
(1)	(3)	(1)	(8)		(2)	(5)	(31)	
9.147	1.408		1.25	2.100		4.221		
			2.39					
			9.7					
(1)	(1)		(3)	(1)		(1)	(15)	
							(5)	
2	4	1	11	1	2	6	51	44
							2	2
			7.53					
			1				2	0^c
3	17	1	19	2	2	6	119	100

siglum 914 refers to the listing of POxy. 1086 in Roger Pack, *The Greek and Latin Literary Texts from Greco-Roman Egypt*[2] (Ann Arbor 1965).   Scholia A and B will be found in Vols. 1 and 3, respectively, of Dindorf's edition of the *Scholia Palaea* (Oxford 1885 and 1887); Scholia T in Maass' edition of the Scholia Townleyana (Vol. 5 of the Dindorf edition, Oxford 1887).   Scholia D, taken by Baar from Laskaris' edition of 1519, I have consulted in Asulanus' edition of 1521 (Venice, Aldus); cf. M. van der Valk, *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad* (Leiden 1963) 1.202, ftn. 1.   Scholia G, published by Nicole in 1891 (Geneva and Basel), have been photograph-ically reproduced by Georg Olms (Hildesheim 1966), with a new foreword by Hartmut Erbse.

TABLE 2

	S			SD		Total	%
I. Omission of	1.65	3.362	11.509	3.415	10.605		
Parenthetical or	1.198	3.374	12.161	4.105	11.481		
Separable Material	1.261	9.810	12.273	4.393	11.739		
	2.413	11.400	12.935	4.416			
(Sub-Total I)		(12)			(7)	(19)	
Ia. Stress on Separate		1.411			1.442		
Words		2.44			2.384		
		3.162			8.174		
(Sub-Total Ia)		(3)			(3)	(6)	
Sub-Total I & Ia		15			10	25	33
II. Reordering of	2.143	6.317		1.109	9.235		
Identical Words	2.604	7.419		2.355	9.238		
	2.706	9.580		3.132	10.10		
	3.348	10.513		4.540	10.324		
	4.520	10.908		8.15	11.232		
	5.389	12.64		8.378	11.559		
	5.741			8.432	11.658		
Sub-Total II		13			14	27	35
III. Alteration in Form	1.133	4.517	10.244	3.686			
and Order	1.181	4.656	10.345	4.229			
	1.195	5.773	10.385				
	2.348	7.122	10.454				
	2.645	7.346	10.797				
	3.73	9.258	12.74				
	3.221	9.759					
Sub-Total III		20			2	22	29
IV. Form Altered,				1.603	11.562		
Order Same							
Sub-Total IV					2	2	3
Grand Total		48			28	76	100

Numerical references separated by a period (e.g. 1.65) are to books and verses of the *Aeneid*.
The column headed SD lists scholia which appear *only* in the so-called *Servius Danielis*.
Those listed under S are either found in Servius proper only, or are common to both traditions.
The format of the Harvard Edition (*Aen.* 1–5) makes it possible to state that all of the scholia
on *Aen.* 1–5 appearing under S are common to both traditions (in two cases, 1.195 and 5.389,
there are minor differences). For *Aen.* 6–12, the format of the Thilo-Hagen edition does not
regularly provide indicia which would make it possible to decide which scholia occur only in
Servius proper.