

Servius and Idonei Auctores

Robert A. Kaster

The American Journal of Philology, Vol. 99, No. 2 (Summer, 1978), 181-209.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0002-9475%28197822%2999%3A2%3C181%3ASAIA%3E2.0.CO%3B2-P>

The American Journal of Philology is currently published by The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/jhup.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



SERVIUS AND *IDONEI AUCTORES*

The commentary of Servius on the poetry of Virgil has, in the past century, received its share of scholarly attention, largely directed toward the elucidation of the relationship between the (so-called) vulgate Servius and the fuller commentary first published by Pierre Daniel. These researches have succeeded in demonstrating that the scholia of the Servius Auctus (or Servius Danielis, referred to in this paper as DServ.) represent the efforts of an interested reader of Virgil (perhaps of the seventh century, perhaps an Irishman) who blended with his copy of Servius other material available to him, including material drawn from the variorum commentary of Aelius Donatus, one of Servius' own major sources.¹ An important consequence of these efforts is our ability to view with some confidence the commentary of Servius himself in the clarity of isolation, the better to appreciate and evaluate its individuality.

Although not immune to losses and interpolations of the kind found in other collections of scholia on Latin authors, Servius' commentary offers, to a unique degree, a coherent, well-articulated study, a body of instruction which, if largely dependent on older sources of knowledge, nonetheless represents the choice and method of an individual personality. As such, Servius' commentary also offers a unique document in the history of ancient education, an aspect of the work which, although long recognized,² has never received thorough study.

¹ That the vulgate commentary essentially conveys the efforts of Servius (rather than an abridgment) and that the Danieline material offers additions to Servius (rather than the original Servius) was the view of Thilo, against (among others) Scaliger and Ribbeck (as well as Daniel himself): see the preface to vol. I of his edition, pp. vff.; on the relationship between Servius and DServ., see most recently the full discussion (with the important bibliographical references) of G. P. Goold, "Servius and the Helen Episode," *HSCP* 74(1970)101ff., esp. 102-21. All scholia in the following discussion are drawn from Servius proper, with the exception of the note on *Aen.* 11.373, where the material of DServ. is printed in italics.

² See the remarks of E. Thomas, *Essai sur Servius et son Commentaire sur Virgile* (Paris 1880) 182, and the reflections of R. B. Lloyd "Republican

Servius, of course, was a *grammaticus*, that is to say, a teacher on the secondary level,³ responsible for introducing his pupils to literary studies and providing them with a firm grasp of correct Latinity through grammatical drill and the medium of *praelectio*, the expository reading, word by word and line by line, of the text. It should be possible to make use of the commentary to follow the individual *grammaticus* at work and so gain a more precise knowledge of the method and purpose of instruction in the peculiar historical context of late antiquity.

In the present discussion I intend to consider one aspect of the grammarian's task, the teaching of the language itself, and the connection between that teaching and *auctoritas*, the status of authors as models and sources of linguistic usage;⁴ more specifically, I wish to examine the question of *auctoritas* and the *neoterici*, the "authors more recent than Virgil,"⁵ especially the poets Lucan, Statius, and Juvenal. At issue is the relationship of the grammarian to his chosen text, and the use of the text to convey the grammarian's own idea of correct Latinity.

Authors in Servius and the Scholia Danielis," *HSCP* 65 (1961) 326 and Goold (op. cit. n. 1) 135; compare also H. I. Marrou, *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité*⁶ (Paris 1965) 407. For a recent and detailed study of one facet of Servius' instruction revealed in the commentary, see H. L. Levy "Tò hexês in Homeric Scholia and Servius' *ordo*," *TAPA* 100 (1969) 237ff.

³ The best survey of the function of the *grammaticus* remains that of Marrou (op. cit. n. 2), esp. pp. 400ff.

⁴ For one reconstruction of the place of *auctoritas* in the development of Latin grammatical theory, see K. Barwick "Remmius Palaemon und die römische *Ars Grammatica*," *Philologus* Supplementb. 15 (Leipzig 1922) 203-15; compare also the judgment of Marrou (op. cit. n. 2) 404 on the role of *auctoritas* in the grammarian's instruction ("Le latin *est*, il existe enregistré à l'état définitif dans les grands écrivains; la science de la correction, *recte loquendi scientia*, repose en dernière analyse sur l'*auctoritas*: nous retrouvons chez les Latins l'équivalent de l'atticisme des rhéteurs grecs de la Seconde Sophistique, leurs contemporains") and see below at the conclusion of this discussion.

⁵ The use of *neoterici* in this chronological sense is well discussed by J. E. G. Zetzel in an unpublished dissertation, *Latin Textual Criticism in Antiquity* (Diss. Harv. 1972) 53f. and n. 76, in connection with the annotation on *Aen.* 12.605 attributed to Probus in D^{Serv.}: Zetzel points out that this sense results from a transference into Latin scholarship of the use in Greek studies

* * *

In his discussion, still fundamental, of the fortunes of the poets Lucan, Statius, and Juvenal in the Roman academic tradition, Paul Wessner⁶ examined the possibility that Servius himself was first responsible both for using these poets in the explication of Virgil, and for elevating them to a position of *auctoritas*, for including them among the *idonei auctores*, the "suitable authors." The idea had previously been advanced (as little more than an *obiter dictum*) by Richard Klotz (following an observation of his teacher Adolf Kiessling),⁷ and had been accepted by Wessner himself,⁸ whose renewed, detailed inquiry was spurred by the objections of H. J. Thomson.⁹ The latter sought to limit the importance of Servius' contribution and suggested that the poets would have played a significant role at least in the work of Donatus; Wessner, however, argued forcefully that the efforts of Servius were decisive in granting a place to the three *neoterici*.¹⁰

It is not, however, the point of chronology which I wish to consider here,¹¹ but the part played by the three poets in Servius' system: for Wessner, while placing beyond question

of *νεωτερικόν* to designate an author or a usage more recent than Homer (see esp. A. Severyns, *Le Cycle épique dans l'école d' Aristarque* [Liège 1928] 31-61, cited by Zetzel). *neoterici* appears in Servius himself specifically in conjunction with Juvenal (at *Aen.* 11.715), Persius (at 6.187) and Lucan (at 6.320); conversely, Lucan and Statius are once explicitly included among the *ueteres*, at the conclusion of Servius' preface to the *Aeneid*: *ueteres incipiebant carmen a titulo carminis sui, ut puta 'Arma uirumque cano,' Lucanus 'Bella per Emathios,' Statius 'Fraternas acies alternaque regna profanis.'*

⁶ P. Wessner, "Lucan, Statius und Juvenal bei den römischen Grammatikern," *PhW* 49 (1929) 296-303, 328-35; references hereafter by page number.

⁷ See Klotz, *Quaestiones Servianae* (Griefswald 1882) 1f. (on Lucan and Juvenal); the place of Statius is discussed by Klotz *De scholiis Statianis commentatio I* (Gymn.-Progr. Treptow am R. 1895) 1-3.

⁸ See Wessner's contributions at Teuffel *Geschichte d. röm. Lit.*⁶ (Leipzig 1913) Bd. III p. 306 and *RE* 2^e R. II (1923) 1842f.

⁹ H. J. Thomson "Lucan, Statius and Juvenal in the early centuries," *CQ* 22 (1928) 24-27.

¹⁰ See esp. Wessner 296-303, 333-35.

¹¹ I am inclined to agree with the opinion of Alan Cameron (although for somewhat different reasons, which I hope to discuss elsewhere) that Servius is "a manifestation rather than the inspiration" of "the late-fourth-century

the renewal of interest in the poets during the fourth century, also took the occasion of his study to offer a palinode. It was in fact Servius, Wessner stated, who first used Lucan, Statius, and Juvenal in teaching Virgil; but their role—and the role of *neoterici* in general—was wholly subsidiary and illustrative: they were useful for “cramming the rules of Latin grammar into his (i.e. Servius’) pupils,”¹² but were not themselves *idonei auctores*—a view which, with some occasional embroidery or confusion, has passed into general currency.¹³ This retraction of the endorsement once given to the view of Kiessling and Klotz was motivated by several scholia, noted by Wessner, which explicitly opposed *idonei* on the one hand and *neoterici* on the other: so one finds the observation at *Aen.* 2.80 *sane ‘uanus’ ‘stultus’ apud idoneos non inuenitur, ut ait Iuuenalis* (3.159) *‘sic libitum uano qui nos distinxit Othoni* (to be compared with *Aen.* 11.715 *‘uanos’ ‘stultos’ posteriores dicere coeperunt. inde tractum est etiam in neotericis: Iuuenalis . . .*); and at *Aen.* 12.923 *et ‘instar’, ut supra diximus, per se plenum est nec recipit praepositionem, licet Serenus ‘ad instar’ dixerit, quod in idoneis non inuenitur auctoribus*; and at *G.* 4.122 *sane ‘hic cucumis’ ‘huius cucumis’ declinatur, sicut ‘agilis’, secundum idoneos: nam neoterici ‘huius cucumeris’ dixerunt, sicut ‘pulus’ ‘pulueris’*. The conclusion which ap-

revival of interest in Juvenal and other ‘Silver-Age’ Latin poets” (“The Date and Identity of Macrobius,” *JRS* 56 [1966] 30 n. 43).

¹² Wessner 335; “um seinen Schulern die Regeln der lateinische Grammatik einzupauken.”

¹³ Cf., for example, G. Highet, *Juvenal the Satirist* (Oxford 1961) 186, citing the judgment of Wessner quoted below: “He [i.e., Servius] did not think Juvenal a ‘classical’ author suitable for schools, but placed him with the ‘modernists’ like Lucan and Statius. Still he did consider Juvenal an important writer, whose language although unorthodox was interesting”; contrast Alan Cameron “Literary Allusions in the *Historia Augusta*,” *Hermes* 92 (1964) 370, citing the same passage in Wessner: “Servius is the first writer to quote Juvenal extensively, and the first to allow him any *auctoritas* on questions of Latinity alongside the classical authors, the *auctores idonei*: the first, in fact, to admit him to the canon of ‘classics’” (a statement which is at once almost diametrically opposed to the opinion of Wessner, and much closer to the truth). Part of the reason for the disparity no doubt lies in the difficulty of squaring Wessner’s judgment with the use in the commentary of Juvenal and the other *neoterici*, and in the use of the phrase *idonei auctores* itself: on both questions, see further below.

peared to be demanded by these notices, and others which refer to *idonei (auctores)*,¹⁴ was expressed by Wessner (331f.) in the following terms:

. . . die *idonei* oder *firmi*¹⁵ *auctores* (auch *meliores*, deren *auctoritas sequenda est*: Servius in Don. *GL* IV.409, 33) sind die klassischen Schulautoren, vor allen Cicero und Virgil; ihnen stehen gegenüber die *non idonei*, die *neoterici*, wie Lucan, Statius, Juvenal, Serenus und andere jüngere Autoren bis herab in die jüngste Vergangenheit. Freilich, meinen sie, lässt sich nicht bestreiten, dass *regulas saepe corrumpit auctoritas* (*GL* IV.439, 7), oder dass *contra regulas plurimum sibi adsumpsit auctoritas* (das. 409, 9), also oft eine willkürliche Abweichung von der Regel (*usurpatio*) auch bei den massgebenden Autoren vorliegt, aber solche Formen werden eben durch deren *auctoritas* gedeckt; von dem, was sich die *neoterici* geleistet haben, gilt das Gleiche nicht, bei ihnen liegt *error* oder *abusio* vor, und vor Nachahmung wird gewarnt. Es ist also nicht so, wie Kiessling und Klotz erklärt haben (ich bin ihnen leider . . . gefolgt), dass die Dichter Lucan, Statius und Juvenal von Servius und seiner Gefolgschaft [i.e. later grammarians influenced by Servius] in die Zahl der *idonei auctores* aufgenommen worden seien; sie werden vielmehr von diesen geschieden. Sie werden auch nicht als

¹⁴ For other references to *idonei* (not set in opposition to *neoterici*) see *Aen.* 5.823, 6.154, 9.742, *G.* 3.124 and below (compare also the statements, adduced by Wessner, in *Pomp. GL* 5.152, 25ff. and 273, 16ff.). The use of similar terminology appears perhaps only once in *DServ.* (*Aen.* 5.80 *hoc uerbum 'salue' apud auctores bonos ter enuntiatum inuenitur 'salue, saluere, saluete'*); regarding the scholium at *Aen.* 10.164 (*'Tusciam' non debemus dicere, quia nequaquam in idoneis auctoribus legitur*), which is found only in the *Turonensis* (*T = b* for the text of Virgil), Wessner argues (330, 332) that the note had its origin in Servius, an argument rendered unlikely by the fact that Servius himself uses the forbidden form "*Tuscia*" in the note immediately following (*Aen.* 10.166) and over a dozen times elsewhere; for the view that the note is independent both of Servius and of *DServ.*, see C. E. Murgia, *Prolegomena to Servius 5: The Manuscripts*, University of California Publications: Classical Studies, vol. 11 (Berkeley 1975) 19 n. 37.

¹⁵ *firmi* is a reference to *Pomp. GL* 5.273, 16ff: *'ad' uero cum artis necessitate 'ad locum' significet, id est 'ad amicum uado', tamen omnes antiqui et idonei et firmi auctores iunxerunt quasi 'in loco'* [with citations of *Verg. Aen.* 1.24, *Cic. Verr.* 1.8.22 and *Cat.* 1.8.19]. *ergo licet nobis 'ad' et 'in loco' ponere et 'ad locum' ponere.*

neue Schulmuster anerkannt, wohl aber neben den Schulklassikern berücksichtigen, was früher nicht der Fall war.

Elements of this statement are true beyond doubt: the primacy of Virgil and Cicero especially would not have been open to challenge by others even of the *antiqui* (e.g. Terence, Sallust, Horace), much less by the younger poets; and the scholia noted above would seem to justify the equation *neoterici* : *antiqui* :: *non idonei* : *idonei*. Yet the opposition thus formulated can not stand, for reasons which will themselves become sufficiently clear, but which raise further questions about the use of *auctores* and the nature of *auctoritas*.

Other aspects of the question will be considered below. It is necessary first to present a scholium neglected by Wessner, which both offers specific reasons for doubting the opposition described above, and suggests where we should look to find the origin of the problem. The discussion concerns the phrase *etiam tu* at *Aen.* 11.373, the conclusion of Drances' invective (*etiam tu, si qua tibi uis, / si patrii quid Martis habes, illum aspice contra / qui uocat*):

ETIAM TV heia: nam hortantis aduerbium est hoc loco: Terentius (*An.* 849) '*etiam responde*'. alias 'adhuc' significat et est temporis aduerbium, ut (*Aen.* 6.485) '*etiam currus, etiam arma tenentem*'. *alibi pro coniunctione, ut* (*Aen.* 10.390) '*uos etiam gemini*'. *ponitur etiam pro 'nondum': Afranius (SRPF frg. 421 R²) 'etiam quidquam egisti'*. apud maiores 'etiam' consentientis fuerat, quod tamen in his recentibus idoneis non inuenitur. *non nulli 'etiam tu' pro 'quin tu' tradunt*.

The note at first sight is a jumble, the *disiecta membra* of what may have been a more extensive note in Donatus mingled with the particular lessons which Servius desired to bring home. The scope of Servius' instruction is narrower and more selective: three "adverbial" uses only are considered (*hortantis . . . temporis . . . consentientis*); the reference to the "conjunctive" use, although containing the essentials of the truth, is suppressed,¹⁶ along with the illustrative quotation

¹⁶ Cf. the different opinion produced from the material in *T* (as given in Thilo's apparatus): *eta* (sic) *hoc loco pro coniunctione ut uos etiam gemini, ponitur et pro ñ ut afranius etiam quicquam egisti. non nulli etiam pro quin tu;*

from Terence (*An.* 849) and the alleged use of *etiam* in the sense of *nondum* in Afranius, an entry which properly belongs with the note on *etiam* = *adhuc*.¹⁷ In addition, the last note in DServ. (*non nulli . . . tradunt*) is related in intent not to the end but to the beginning of the scholium,¹⁸ *etiam* as an *aduerbium hortantis*. The connection can clearly be seen in the citation of *An.* 849 in DServ. The citation, although abbreviated, corresponds to the manuscripts of Terence in one important respect, that of offering *responde*: the correct reading, *respondes*, is found only in the lemma of Donatus ad loc. (*ETIAM TV HOC RESPONDES* 'etiam' aut hortatio est aut coniunctio) and in the comment on *Ad.* 550 (4 Wess.):

ETIAM TACES antique pro 'tace', sic in *Andria* 'etiam tu hoc respondes?' pro 'responde'; est ergo correptionis significatio.

Involved is an idiom which appears commonly in Plautus, and a bit less so in Terence,¹⁹ *etiam* with the present indicative in exhortations expressed as urgent questions.²⁰ The final entry in DServ. is intended to draw the connection between the latter construction (which, if we can judge by Donatus' note at *Ad.* 550 and the state of the manuscripts at *An.* 849 and *Heaut.* 235, appeared alien in comparison with the imperative) and a similar idiom, a colloquialism rare outside comedy but particularly common in Terence, the use of affirmative *quin* with the imperative.²¹ For clarity's sake, then (and only for clarity's

on the tendency for the reader of *T* to excerpt "only the extra scholia not in his text of genuine Servius," and to do so "with great liberty," see Murgia (op. cit. n. 7) 19.

¹⁷ With the note on *etiam* = *adhuc*, cf. Donatus at Ter. *An.* 503 NON SATIS ME PERNOSTI ETIAM QVALIS SIM SIMO 'etiam' pro 'adhuc', ut Vergilius (*Aen.* 6.485) 'Idaeumque etiam c., e. a. t.', citing the same verse of Virgil as Servius.

¹⁸ The order and the emphasis found in Servius need not, of course, have been that of his source; cf. n. 16.

¹⁹ In addition to *An.* 849 and *Ad.* 550, cf. *Phorm.* 542 *etiam tu hinc abis?*, *Heaut.* 235 *etiam caues ne uideat forte hic te a patre aliquis exiens?* (where the correcting hands in DLEVη have *caue*).

²⁰ See *TLL* s.v. *etiam* 929, 80ff.

²¹ See J. B. Hofmann *Lateinische Umgangssprache*³ (Heidelberg 1951) 68f., Leumann-Hofmann-Szantyr, *Lateinische Grammatik* (Munich 1965) 676. The construction occurs a few times in Cicero's speeches (*QRosc.* 25, *Mil.* 79)

sake; the reconstruction of an Ur-scholium is not intended), we might rearrange the constituent parts of the note thus:

- ETIAM TV (1) *heia; nam hortantis aduerbium est hoc loco: Terentius 'etiam responde'; non nulli 'etiam tu' pro 'quin tu' tradunt.*
 (2) *alias 'adhuc' significat et est temporis aduerbium, ut 'etiam currus, etiam arma tenentem'. ponitur etiam pro 'nondum': Afranius 'etiam quidquam egisti'.*
 (3) *apud maiores 'etiam' consentientis fuerat, quod tamen in his recentibus idoneis non inuenitur.*
 (4) *alibi pro coniunctione, ut 'uos etiam gemini'.*

It is with the third element of Servius' note that we are concerned, the reference to *recentes idonei*.²² While I should like to postpone discussion of the grammatical point which is involved, it is sufficient now to point out that the phrase *recentes idonei* can only refer to post-classical authors; that is to say, Servius, in presenting his instruction, maintained the contrast between *maiores* (synonymous in the commentary with *antiqui, ueteres*) and *recentes* which is implied elsewhere in the opposition of *idonei* to *neoterici*. Why he expressed his teaching as he did, applying the label *idonei* to the *recentes* in a way which appears to contradict those scholia noted by Wessner above, is the question to which we must now turn.

To find an answer we should pursue the clue provided by the phrase itself, *idonei (auctores)*, which in turn leads directly to the question of method, particularly the method of argument and proof. Servius, of course, is of primary interest here in the

and in Virgil (cf. Donatus at *Phorm.* 485 [3 Wess.] *QVIN OMITTE 'quin' modo corripiedi uel imperandi uim habet, ut [Verg. Ecl. 3.52] 'quin age'*); the construction in Virgil is imitated by Ovid (with *Aen.* 6.824f. *quin Decios . . . aspice* compare *Met.* 7.70 *quin adspice . . .* and note also *Met.* 9.383) but avoided by Horace, Tibullus and Propertius. A blending of constructions, *quin* with imperative and present indicative, can be found at *Pl. Asin.* 254f. *quin tu abs te socordiam omnem reice et segnitiem amoue / atque ad ingenium uetus uersutus te recipis tuum.*

²² The word *auctoribus* is added in the fifteenth-century ms (Paris. Bibl. Nat. 7965) given the siglum *D* by Thilo in this part of the commentary.

performance of his didactic task, but Servius' predecessors are involved as well, those whose professions or avocations brought them to draw distinctions and take stands in matters of linguistic form and use. Wessner, noting Gellius NA 2.16.6 (*auctorem idoneum nullum*), observed that the phrase, as a "technical term," must antedate the time of Servius;²³ to my knowledge, *idoneus* is in fact found joined with *auctor* specifically in the area of grammatical inquiry for the first time in Quintilian (1.4.20, on the number of the parts of speech: *alii tamen ex idoneis dumtaxat auctoribus octo partes secuti sunt, ut Aristarchus et aetate nostra Palaemon*),²⁴ although there is some indirect evidence to suggest that this use of *idoneus* is a century older or more.²⁵ However, the term (as a standard or guarantee, for which a definition or specification is always implied, never stated) appears with special frequency in sources deriving from or referring to the second century, a time of opposing linguistic ideologies and burgeoning controversies. The documents of this period reveal with particular clarity the workings of scholarship as an adversary process; and it happens that *idoneus* (*auctor*) is set with notable regularity in contexts of a polemical or tendentious nature. We might consider several of these passages before returning to Servius.

Both the tone of militant scholarship and the vulnerability of the chosen standard are suggested, amusingly, in a well-known anecdote, the difference of opinion between the emperor Hadrian and Favorinus of Arelate, in which the latter found his *idonei auctores* trumped by the former's thirty legions (*H.A. Hadr. 15.12*):

²³ Wessner p. 331 n. 4.

²⁴ The *idoneus auctor* for Palaemon will have been Aristarchus' pupil Dionysius Thrax: see K. Barwick (op. cit. n. 4) 146f., Dion. Thr. *τεχ. γραμ.* p. 36, lff. Pecorella (= p. 23, lff. Uhlig).

²⁵ It happens that *auctor* and *idoneus* are linked by Cicero, but in a literary-historical rather than a grammatical context, at *Brut. 57*: it is worth noting that Cicero is the only author to use the term who both notes the personal nature of the standard applied and supports his opinion with some form of reasoned argument: *primus est M. Cornelius Cethegus, cuius eloquentiae est auctor et idoneus quidem mea sententia Q. Ennius, praesertim cum et ipse eum audierit et scribat de mortuo, ex quo nulla suspicio est amicitiae causa esse mentitum*. See also below on Gell. NA 10.26 regarding *gravis auctor* and *idoneus scriptor* in Pollio and Gellius.

et Fauorinus quidem, cum uerbum eius quondam ab Hadriano reprehensum esset atque ille cessisset, arguentibus amicis, quod male cederet Hadriano de uerbo, quod idonei auctores usurpassent, risum iocundissimum mouit; ait enim: 'non recte suadetis, familiares, qui non patimini me illum doctiorem omnibus credere, qui habet triginta legiones'.

The precise matter at issue, some deviation from *proprietas* (so *usurpassent*), cannot be evaluated. The latter technical term, however, suggests that it was a controversy of the kind discussed by Gellius at *NA* 10.26, where the criticism of Sallust's use of *transgredi* (of ships) by Asinius Pollio²⁶ is noted (10.26, 4-5):

hoc igitur et minus proprie et ἀπερισκέπτως et nullo graui auctore dictum aiunt. "nam 'transgressus'" inquit "a transgrediendo dicitur, idque ipsum ab ingressu et a pedum gradu appellatum." idcirco uerbum 'transgredi' conuenire non putauit neque uolantibus neque serpentibus neque nauigantibus, sed his solis, qui gradiuntur et pedibus iter emetiuntur. propterea negant apud scriptorem idoneum aut nauium 'transgressum' reperiri posse aut pro transfretatione 'transgressum'.

Sallust is here taxed with a negligent departure from literal (etymological) usage (*et minus proprie et ἀπερισκέπτως*) supported by "no weighty authority." The phrase *grauī auctore* performs a function paralleled by *scriptorem idoneum*; to judge from the context of their respective clauses, the former may recapture the precise criticism of Pollio,²⁷ while the latter, appearing in conjunction with *transfretatione*, is

²⁶ 10.26 praef.: *in scite ab Asinio Pollione reprehensum Sallustum, quod transfretationem 'transgressum' dixerit, et 'transgressos' qui transfretassent*. The body of critics is expanded by Gellius (10.26.1) to include *quibusdam aliis* (cf. the plural verbs *aiunt*, *negant* at 10.25, 4 and 5); it is impossible to determine whether those "certain others" had a real existence or are straw men created by Gellius for effect; see J. Kretzschmer *De A. Gellii fontibus, part. I* (Posnan 1860) p. 7, and notes 26 and 27 below.

²⁷ Despite the plural *aiunt*: with ἀπερισκέπτως compare the phrase *parum diligenter* in Pollio's criticism of the *commentarios Caesaris* recorded by Suetonius, *diu. Iul.* 56.4: *Pollio Asinius parum diligenter parumque integra ueritate compositos putat*. The charge of "carelessness", however, is too much a staple of literary polemics to be of great significance as evidence here.

quite clearly Gellius' own variation on the theme: at least, the contention that *transgressus* was misused for *transfretatio* is unlikely to have been Pollio's, since *transfretatio/transfretatio*, for classical *transmitto/transmissio*, does not occur before the second century, the verb first in Suetonius (*div. Iul.* 34.1), the noun in this passage of Gellius.²⁸

Gellius, however, is minded to challenge the criticism, meeting each of the objections in turn (10.26.6ff.). Against the charge of violated *proprietas*, he proceeds by analogy, noting that *cursus*, another word open to the same line of attack, is used regularly and correctly of ships;²⁹ while negligence is denied outright: rather, the offending word expresses with the greatest elegance the narrowness of the Strait of Gibraltar.³⁰ Then *auctoritas*, a subject to which Gellius turns almost pugnaciously (10.26.7 *qui auctoritatem autem requirunt . . . uolo uti respondeant . . .*): both Cato and Lucretius are called upon, the former for his extraordinary metaphorical application of *ambulare* to the movement of ships (*r.r.* 1.3 *oppidum ualidum prope siet aut mare aut amnis, qua naues ambulant*), the latter for his use, "exceedingly more audacious" than that of Sallust, of *gradiens* in conjunction with *clamor* (4.528f. *praeterea radit uox fauces saepe, facitque / asperiora foras gradiens arteria clamor*).

Given the critical premises as Gellius would have understood them, these are reasonable arguments, although such arguments would not have caused Pollio to revise his stern, not to say cross-grained, views: rather, the precedent drawn from Cato, for example, could only further satisfy Pollio that Sallust was at once over-bold in his metaphors and over-fond

²⁸ The last sentence must either be Gellius' own recasting of Pollio's criticism or (perhaps less likely) has been taken over from a comparatively recent source; cf. 10.26.1 where *transfretasse* disrupts the parallel criticisms of nominal and participial usage: *quod in primo historiarum maris transitum transmissumque nauibus factum 'transgressum' appellauit eosque, qui fretum transmiserant, quos 'transfretasse' dici solitum est, 'transgressos' dixit.*

²⁹ 10.26.6: *sed quaero ego, cur non, sicuti 'cursus' nauium recte dici solet, ita 'transgressus' etiam nauibus factus dici possit?*

³⁰ *ibid.*: *praesertim cum breuitas tam angusti fretus, qui terram Africam Hispaniamque interfluit, elegantissime 'transgressionis' uocabulo, quasi paucorum graduum spatium, definita sit.*

of antiquity.³¹ In view of the presuppositions of Pollio's criticism and the stringency of his approach, we might well ask how any *auctor* would have been *satis grauis* to provide a suitable appeal once *proprietas* and *diligentia* had been denied: the author subject to this critical system appears to be shut off on all sides. A Gellius and a Pollio could not help but work at cross purposes, and naturally enough: Gellius was not concerned with the place of Sallust in the literary disputes of the first century B.C., but with his own perception of the historian and his critics. That perception is on record elsewhere (4.15.1):

elegantia orationis Sallustii uerborumque fingendi et nouandi studium cum multa prorsus inuidia fuit, multique non mediocri ingenio uiri conati sunt reprehendere ple-raque et obtrectare. in quibus plura inscite aut maligne uellicant.

The predisposition is evident: the *elegantia* of Sallust is to be defended, the ignorance and malevolence of the critics turned aside.³² In this context of aggressive scholarship, it is necessary that *idonei auctores* be found, if *idonei auctores* have been denied: as a term of art *idoneus* necessarily acquires an argumentative edge from the spirit in which it is used by parties on both sides of an issue.

We might compare another discussion in which *idoneus* figures, Gellius' chapter on the history and propriety of the word *soloecismus* (5.20). After noting that *soloecismus* was called (in Latin) *imparilitas* in the time of Sinius Capito (and

³¹ Cf. Suet. *de gramm.* 10.1: *de eodem* [sc. Ateio Philologo] *Asinius Pollio in libro quo Sallusti scripta reprehendit ut nimia priscorum uerborum affectatione oblita ita tradit . . .* and *ibid.* 10.4 *quo magis miror Asinium credidisse antiqua eum* [sc. Ateium] *uerba et figuras solitum esse colligere Sallustio, cum sibi sciat nihil aliud suadere quam ut noto ciuilique et proprio sermone utatur, uidetque maxime obscuritatem Sallusti et audaciam in translationibus.* Cf. also *de gramm.* 15, Aug. 86.

³² Cf. *ibid.* 6 *illi maliuoli reprehensores; with inscite compare 10.26 praef..* above n. 25. The terms of praise and blame are formulaic, virtually a matter of protocol: cf. 18.11.1ff. *non hercle idem sentio cum Caesellio Vindice, grammatico, ut mea opinio est, hautquaquam inerudito. uerum hoc tamen petulanter insciteque . . .*

stribiligo at an earlier period),³³ and after offering Capito's definition of the term,³⁴ Gellius turns to the form of the word itself (5.20, 3-7):

cum Graecum autem uocabulum sit 'soloecismus', an Attici homines, qui elegantius locuti sunt, usi eo sint, quaeri solet. sed nos neque 'soloecismum' neque 'barbarismum' apud Graecorum idoneos adhuc inuenimus, nam sicut *βάρβαρον*, ita *σόλοικον* dixerunt. nostri quoque antiquiores 'soloecum' facile, 'soloecismum' haut scio an umquam dixerunt. quod si ita est, neque in Graeca neque in Latina lingua 'soloecismus' probe dicitur.

The structure and intent of the paragraph are clear: a question, Atticist in motive, followed by two elements of evidence and a solution. The identity of the *Graecorum idoneos* is left to be inferred from the preceding sentence: the reader is meant to understand that Attic authors, or authors following the Atticist standard, are intended.³⁵ The statement that these authors used the adjective *σόλοικον* as a substantive rather than the deverbative *σολοικισμός* (*σολοικίζειν*) is then extended to

³³ On Sinius Capito (probably a younger contemporary of Varro) see Klotz, *RE* 2^e R. III (1927) 246f.; the use of *stribiligo* is elsewhere connected with the grammarian Aurelius Opillus (early first century), cf. *GL* 5.328.8 (= Aurelius Opillus frg. 17, p. 91 *GRF* Fun.); see also n. 33.

³⁴ *ibid.* 2: *quod uitium Sinius Capito in litteris, quas ad Clodium Tuscum dedit, hisce uerbis definit: "soloecismus est" inquit "impar atque inconueniens compositura partium orationis."* The suggestion of M. Hertz (*Sinius Capito. Eine Abhandlung zur Geschichte der römischen Grammatik* [Berlin 1844] p. 27 n. 28)—repeated by Funaioli, *GRF* Sinius Capito frg. 2 p. 458—that Gellius, in presenting the definition, replaced Capito's *imparilitas* with *soloecismus* overlooks both the emphatic *hisce uerbis* of Gellius' introduction and (more importantly and reliably) the probable origin and purpose of *imparilitas* itself: it was the habit at least of later Roman grammarians simply to gloss a Greek technical term with a suitable Latin word, while continuing to use the Greek as the term of art (e.g., Charis. *GL* 1.11.9ff *syllaba est littera uocalis aut litterarum coitus per aliquam uocalem comprehensus. syllabae dicuntur a Graecis παρὰ τὸ συλλαμβάνειν τὰ γράμματα, Latine conexiones uel conceptiones, quod litteras concipiunt atque conectunt; uel comprehensio, hoc est litterarum iuncta enuntiatio*); there is no reason to suppose that *imparilitas* was anything more than such a gloss (as *conexio, conceptio, comprehensio* in the passage of Charisius) or that it ever attained the status of a technical term, even in Capito's own usage.

³⁵ It should be noted that (*Graecorum*) *idoneos* here serves a function precisely parallel to *οἱ δόκιμοι* in the *Ecloga* of Gellius' contemporary, the

include older writers in Latin, leading to the conclusion that *soloecismus* is itself a kind of barbarism.

Both the form and substance of Gellius' solution require examination. Regarding the *Graecorum idoneos*, it can be seen that Gellius (or his source) is at once limiting his category, to which, for example, entry would certainly have been denied Aristotle, who uses *σολοικισμός* exclusively (cf. *Soph. Elench.* 1.3, 1.14, 1.32), and allowing it to remain vague. The latter is the more interesting characteristic: exclusion of an Aristotle would not necessarily cause surprise in the circles of the stricter Atticists; but, if such exclusivity is assumed, it is difficult to discover evidence which would allow *Graecorum idoneos* to be defined in terms of any of the usual Attic models. The name and notion of solecism were known, and the adjective *σόλοικον* used, from the sixth century onward, in *Ionic* authors (as it happens) or in a Xenophon (censured by Phrynichus for "breaking the laws of his native language," *Ecloga* 62 Fischer):³⁶ but the use of *σόλοικον* as a substantive where the abstract *σολοικισμός* would be at home seems comparatively late and rare. There are, on the other hand, a few pieces of indirect evidence which suggest that *σόλοικον* was the preferred form among, if not Attic, then Atticising authors. Thus *σόλοικα* figures in a letter of Cicero which involves a joke (on the part of Lucullus) concerning the writing

Atticist lexicographer Phrynichus (e.g. *Ecloga* 10 Fischer οὐδείς τῶν δοκίμων and passim; cf. *Gloss. Lat.* II *Abav.* [p. 75] ID 9 *idoneum*: probum, aptum, δόκιμον: see below, n. 67.

³⁶ Cf. Hdt. 4.117 φωνῆ δὲ οἱ Σαυρομάται νομίζουσι Σκυθικῆ, σολοικίζοντες αὐτὴ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχαίου, ἐπεὶ οὐ χρηστῶς ἐξέμαθον αὐτὴν αἱ Ἀμάζονες; note particularly the adjectival form in Anacreon frg. 78 Page, κοίμισσον δέ, Ζεῦ, σόλοικον φθόγγον (v. 1. λόγον) (with which compare Hipponax frg. 46 Bergk, both cited in the περὶ βαρβαρισμοῦ καὶ σολοικισμοῦ in Valckenaer *Ammonius* [Leipzig 1822] 178) and (applied, as not infrequently, to manners rather than language) at Xen. *Cyropaed.* 8.3.21 Δαΐφέρνης δέ τις ἦν σολοικότερος ἄνθρωπος τῷ τρόπῳ, and cf. n. 37 below. Xenophon is cited only twice by Phrynichus (*Ecloga* 62 and 93 Fischer), both times to warn against his usage. Yet Xenophon's standing among the Atticising authors presents a more complex question: see, for example, the recent remarks of E. L. Bowie concerning Arrian's use of Xenophon as a model, "Greeks and their Past in the Second Sophistic," *Past and Present* 46 (1970) 25.

of elegant Attic;³⁷ and Phrynichus allows that form to predominate in his *Ecloga*, although even that arch-Atticist appears to have permitted himself a *σολοικισμός*.³⁸ It is most reasonable to suggest, then, that Gellius is here reflecting a particularly strict interpretation of contemporary Atticist orthodoxy, which was buttressed by a necessarily vague appeal to *Graecorum idoneos*.

It does not seem, however, that the effect of *idoneos* is limited to the sentence in which it appears; for Gellius' statement concerning *nostri antiquiores* is, on examination, quite odd. It is not simply that Gellius is unique in insisting on the form *soloecum*, in the use of which he is himself not entirely consistent:³⁹ he is the only Latin author to use that form at all. This does not, of course, prove that no other author *could* have used *soloecum*. Yet it is not necessary to argue *thus* to contend that Gellius' statement—that "our more ancient authors readily used *soloecum*, whereas I doubt that they ever used *soloecismus*"—is insupportable. The available evidence leads us back sufficiently far to suggest that the appeal to *nostri antiquiores* is without substance: beginning with the

³⁷ *ad Att.* 1.19.10 (60 B.C.) *commentarium consulatus mei Graece compositum misi ad te: in quo si quid erit quod homini Attico minus Graecum eruditumque uideatur, non dicam quod tibi, ut opinor, Panhormi Lucullus de suis historiis dixerat, se, quo facilius illas probaret Romani hominis esse, idcirco barbara quaedam et σόλοικα dispersisse . . .*; cf. also the usage (not with reference to language) at *ad Att.* 14.6.2 (44 B.C.) *nihil enim tam σόλοικον quam tyrannoctonos in caelo esse, tyranni facta defendi* and *ad Att.* 2.10 (59 B.C.) *est enim ὑποσόλοικον, cum uelim uitare omnium deliciarum suspicionem, repente ἀναφαίνεσθαι non solum delicate, sed etiam inepte peregrinantem.*

³⁸ For *σόλοικον* in Phrynichus' *Ecloga*, see 118, 140, and 422 Fischer; *σολοικισμός* appears at *Ecloga* 128. With Phrynichus compare the practice of Plutarch and Lucian, who simply and regularly use *σολοικισμός* as the nominal form, *σόλοικος* as the adjectival: Plut. *de curios.* 520A *τραγικῶν σολοικισμῶν*, *ibid.* 520B *οὐ στίχων οὐδὲ ποιημάτων, ἀλλὰ βίων ἀστοχήματα καὶ πλημμελήματα καὶ σολοικισμούς*, *symp.* 731E *βαρβαρισμὸν ἢ σολοικισμὸν*, Luc. *uit. auct.* 23 *σολοικισμῶν ἐμπιπλάμενον*; but Plut. *Dion. Syrac.* 17.3 *οὐδὲν ἐν τῇ διαίτῃ σόλοικον . . . οὐδὲ τυραννικὸν οὐδὲ ἐπιτεθρυσμένον*, Luc. *Demon.* 40 *Πολυβίου δέ τινας, κομιδῇ ἀπαιδέυτου ἀνθρώπου καὶ σολοίκου, εἰπόντος . . .*

³⁹ *soloecum* reappears at 17.2.11; *soloecismus* is heard in the verdict of a *grammaticus* at 15.9.3, although the *grammaticus*, after the manner of these encounters, is later called *semidoctus* (*ibid.* 6); but note *soloecismus* at 1.7.3ff.

period of the earliest stirrings of grammatical studies at Rome, the time of Lucilius⁴⁰ (whose usage Gellius surely would have known), those whose thoughts led in the direction of prescriptive grammar used *soloecismus* as the standard technical term. Unless the depredations of time have, with a strange selectivity, set the state of the evidence topsy-turvy, the reverse of Gellius' contention must be true.

The position of Gellius himself in these avowals is uncertain. One might suggest that he was here imposed upon by his source,⁴¹ which had assumed a staunchly Atticist position on a standing question, offering assurances under the vague auspices of *Graecorum idoneos* and extending those assurances to include *nostri antiquiores*. One might also suggest that these were assurances which Gellius would have been predisposed to believe.⁴² The element of predisposition which can be gathered from this chapter and 10.26 above is certainly not unique,⁴³ although it should not be taken fairly to characterize Gellius' philology. The point of interest here is the use of *idoneus* in the method of argument. As is consistent with the nature of the evaluative term, it is susceptible to fluid application; and the examples above emphasize the personal and subjective element, the opinion held or reached first, and the evidence characterized accordingly. In such surroundings

⁴⁰ Pomp. *GL* 5.289.8ff. (on the number and kinds of solecism): *nam [Lucilius] ait sic. 'adde soloecismum genera atque uocabula centum'* (= frg. 1100Marx = 1110Krenkel).

⁴¹ The suggestion of Kretzschmer (op. cit. n. 25) 61, that the arguments of 5.20.3-7 are derived from a different source than the substance of 5.20.1-2 must in essence be correct, although it is not possible to say with certainty that Gellius was first responsible for the fusion.

⁴² Gellius may have been all the more ready to believe that *soloecum* was the correct form precisely because it was not the form used by the *uulgus* (including the *grammatici*, a generally unloved group whose many embarrassments Gellius is quick to record, in whose usage *soloecismus* was certainly the standard technical term); compare the opposition at *NA* 2.20.4, one of the refrains that runs throughout the work: *nunc uulgus dicit . . . haut usquam memini apud uetustiores scriptum*.

⁴³ Compare, for example, 2.16.5ff., where the phrase *auctorem idoneum nullum* (noted, but not evaluated by Wessner, see above n. 22) is set argumentatively against the testimony of *omnium ferme annalium* (ibid. 3) and *multi* (ibid. 6) to deny the validity of the explanation (in fact correct) of *Aen.* 6.763 *tua postuma proles* offered by Caesellius Vindex; see also n. 66 below.

idoneus simply assumes the role of a commendatory, *non idoneus* of a stigmatizing epithet. It can be shown that, although Gellius and Servius represent different aspects of the grammatical tradition, insofar as the former is an amateur and the latter a professional, both use this particular technical term in a similar fashion.

If we turn, then, to consider the role of *idonei auctores* in Servius, particularly in connection with the *neoterici*, it will be useful briefly to consider several scholia which are concerned with the use and authority of the latter, in order to gain a preliminary notion of their place in Servius' system. We might begin with a note singled out by Wessner,⁴⁴ on *G.* 2.288:

FORSITAN ET SCROBIBVS QVAE S.F.Q. ut etiam supra (2.50) diximus, 'scrobes' masculini sunt generis: nam et Cicero in Oeconomicis sic dicit, et Plautus ait (cf. *Amph.* frg. 12 Linds.) 'sexagenos in dies scrobes'. minor autem est Lucani et Gracchi auctoritas: nam Lucanus ait (8.756) 'exigua posuit scrobe', Gracchus 'abunde fossa scrobis est', quod exemplum in Terentiano est.

The authority of Lucan here takes second place (together with one of the *ueteres*, Gracchus), a circumstance in itself perhaps not surprising: yet the process of decision which appears to take place in the note, of *auctoritas* outweighing *auctoritas* to determine correct usage, is not entirely what it seems. Servius' statement must be viewed (as he himself indicates) with reference to the opinion already registered at *G.* 2.50:

SCROBIBVS nos 'scrobes' genere dicimus masculino, licet Lucanus dixerit contra artem 'exigua posuit scrobe'.

This is the understanding with which Servius approaches v.288, the matter in fact already decided: *scrobis* is masculine *secundum artem*, Lucan's use runs *contra artem*. Two questions necessarily arise: what of the *ars*? and, what of *auctoritas* at v.288? The insistence upon the masculine gender is hardly universal among the grammarians: rather, where a rule is to be found at all, the word is regarded as feminine.⁴⁵ The significant exception is Probus *cath. GL* 4.20,1ff:

⁴⁴ p. 331 n. 5, where the scholium is termed "bezeichnend"; see further below.

⁴⁵ Phocas *GL* 5.418.12ff. *cetera* [i.e. beyond those third declension nouns in

'bis' [sc. nomina terminata] tertiae sunt declinationis. nam 'bis' faciunt genetiwo, 'hic Anubis' uel 'Vcurbis', 'huius Anubis' uel 'Vcurbis' (nomen ciuitatis lectum in Sallustio), 'hic scrobis' 'huius scrobis' genere masculino; sic Plautus 'sexagenos scrobes': 'haec Saetabis' 'huius Saetabis': 'hic' et 'haec impubis' 'huius impubis'; Vergilius 'comitemque impubis Iuli'. poterit et 'impubis' 'impuberis', sicut Tullius 'filiumque eius impuberem'.

That there is involved a source common to Probus and Servius is suggested not simply by the opinion expressed regarding *scrobis*, but by the abbreviated and reversed quotation of Plautus unique to the pair;⁴⁶ Servius' source may also have had an illustrative quotation from Cicero's *Oeconomicus*.⁴⁷ The point to be emphasized here is that Servius himself appears to have been responsible for creating the contest of *auctoritas*. The question of conflict does not enter into the notice of Probus. *scrobis* is simply masculine, a fact illustrated by Plautus, just as *impubis* is illustrated by Virgil and *impuberis* (-rem) by Cicero: Probus is not distracted by either a contravening rule (as found, e.g., in Phocas) or contradictory *exempla*. Servius, however, both knew the feminine usage in Lucan and

'-nis' or '-cis', or those longer by a syllable in the genitive than in the nominative, cf. Prisc. *GL* 2.159.27ff.] *qualibet consonante 'is' syllabam praecedente feminini generis sunt et eiusdem declinationis, tertiae scilicet, nominatiuum et genetiuum parem habentia, ut 'haec auis', 'haec classis' . . . 'haec scrobis', 'haec scobis', 'haec bilis', cf. Non. 225.7ff. SCROBES feminino genere, masculino Plautus Amphitryone (frg. 12 Linds.) 'ibi scrobes fodito sexagenos in dies'; idem Aulularia (frg. 3 Linds.) 'ego ecfodiebam in die denos scrobes'; Priscian, while adhering to the general rule found in Phocas (cf. *GL* 2.161.13ff.), treats *scrobis* as a monosyllable, *GL* 2.320.24ff. in 'obs' feminina Latina: 'haec scobs' 'huius scobis' et 'scrobs' 'huius scrobis' (sic alii; sed Probus nominatiuum protulit similem genetiwo), quod Plautus masculino genere profert in Amphitryone 'ibi scrobes effodito tu plus sexagenos in dies' (cf. Prisc. *GL* 2.168.5ff. with the same quotation from Plautus, and Terentianus Maurus below, n. 47).*

⁴⁶ In Servius' note the phrase in *dies* is interpolated in the Vaticanus; compare the 'sexagenos scrobes' of Probus and Servius with the citations in Nonius and Priscian above, n. 43. Wessner, who did not take the entry of Probus into account, suggested an "older source such as Caper" (p. 331 n. 5) for Servius; I find no reason for this supposition.

⁴⁷ It is, of course, possible, perhaps even likely, that Servius' note is ultimately dependent upon Probus, the reference to Cicero representing an addition to the material gleaned from the grammarian.

thought he knew of a similar usage of Gracchus to be found in Terentianus Maurus;⁴⁸ a decision, therefore, was made, and in favor of the *ars*. The process of Servius' judgment moves, then, in a path more circular than linear: Lucan's violation of the rule of the *ars* is noted first (*G.* 2.50), the value of his *auctoritas* expressed second, to confirm the received rule (*G.* 2.288), in a fashion which has as much to do with the authority of the *ars* and Servius' own tradition as with the *auctoritas* of Cicero and Plautus.

It would be incorrect, however, to suggest that this pair of scholia is typical of the status of Lucan (and the other *neoterici*); Servius' method is a different question. A significant point of comparison is provided by the note at *Aen.* 6.104, on the quantity of final *-o*:

NON VLLA LABORVM O VIRGO 'o' licet sit naturaliter breuis in Latinis sermonibus, apud Vergilium tamen pro longa habetur, ut hoc loco 'uirgo', item alibi (6.841) 'quis te magne Cato tacitum', exceptis 'ego', ut (1.46) 'ast ego quae diuum', 'duo', ut (11.285) 'si duo praeterea', 'scio', ut (*Ecl.* 8.43) 'nunc scio quid sit amor', et 'nescio', ut (*Ecl.* 3.103) 'nescio quis teneros oculus mihi fascinat agnos'. apud alios 'o' nisi in Graecis nominibus non producit, quod et nunc sequi debemus. dicunt tamen quidam quod 'o' tunc producit in nominativo, quando et in genetivo producta fuerit. quod falsum est: nam et Vergilius produxit 'uirgo', cum 'uirginis' faciat, et Lucanus 'Cato' corripuit, ut (9.227) 'nos Cato da ueniam', cum 'Catonis' faciat. item 'Iuno' cum producat Vergilius, Stadius tamen corripuit.

⁴⁸ Servius' citation actually combines a misquotation with a misattribution; the relevant passage of Terentianus (concerned with monosyllabic nouns) runs as follows (*GL* 6.354, vv. 985ff.):

nempe et esse litterarum syllaba una sex potest,
 graeca cum duplex duabus soluitur nostratibus,
 dixerit si forte quidam 'scrobs abunde fossa est' [*ed. prin.*:
 erit post Lachmann Keil],
 'stirps', uelut dixit disertus Gracchus alter Gaius.

It is worth noting in passing that this is precisely the kind of visual or mnemonic slip conjectured by Goold, (*op. cit.* n. 1) 138f., to account for Servius' singular attribution to Catullus (*C.* 1.2) of the use of *pumex* in the feminine.

In the scholium, which includes consideration of both verbal and nominal morphology (see below on Pompeius), the abandonment of Virgil in favor of *alios* and an impossibly inflexible rule (*apud alios 'o' nisi in Graecis nominibus non producitur, quod et nunc sequi debemus*) is obviously significant;⁴⁹ more immediately revealing, however, is the argument which follows, Servius' attempt to refute a theory which challenges his own formulation (*dicunt tamen quidam . . .*). The rival explanation can in fact be found in "Probus" *de ult. syll.* (*GL* 4.220, 18ff):

in nominibus masculinis et femininis casu nominatiuo recte 'o' littera producitur, quia et in genetiuo singulari producta est, ut 'Cato' et 'ratio', ut 'quis te magne Cato tacitum', ut 'arduus arma tenens non te rationis egentem'.

Servius' objection is absolute and, with the final example, illuminating in its use of *auctores*. First the examples of *uirgo* and Lucan's scansion of *Cato* are advanced: as it happens both exceptions (although in different verses of Virgil and Lucan) are dealt with in the *de ult. syll.* (*ibid.* 24ff.). Then Servius plays his trump, the case of *Iuno*. Here Virgil's prosody would support the conflicting view: the usage of Statius is therefore produced in opposition. In the proof, the usages of Virgil and Lucan are first balanced, with Virgil countered by Statius at the last. The net effect of the three stages is thus both a refutation of the opposing view and a reconfirmation of the position first assumed, that Virgil "unnaturally" lengthens the *-o*, while the correct quantity can be found *apud alios*, for example *Cato* in Lucan and *Iuno* in Statius. Such is the point of Servius' note, and so much emerges from a similar discussion by a grammarian otherwise influenced by Servius, Pompeius (*comm. Don. GL* 5.232,30ff.):

hoc tu scire quidem debes, ut naturali ratione breuis sit prima persona. tamen auctores produxerunt. et paene

⁴⁹ With the rule stated here, compare the scholia at, e.g., 4.291 (*QVANDO . . . sane 'quando' 'do' breuis est naturaliter, sic Serenus 'quando flagella ligas ita liga'. Vergilius usurpat . . .*) and 4.413 (*PRECANDO . . . in hoc modo 'do' naturaliter breuis est; sic Terentianus 'ut uitae dubius uarios renouando dolores'. plerumque tamen a Vergilio producitur . . .*).

Vergilius hanc rationem secutus est Graecam, ut longas ponat frequenter, 'canto quae solitus si quando': 'canto', 'to' longa est [et in aliis] posita. tamen inveniuntur uerba apud ipsum Vergilium, ubi brevis sit 'o', 'nunc scio quid sit amor'. ecce brevis est. neoterici autem omnes, Statius et alii, maiores sunt in illa parte quae brevis est, quam in illa quae longa est, contra Vergilium. omnis ergo 'o' in prima persona semper corripitur exceptis monosyllabis.

It is uncertain that Pompeius' note, which touches only on the verb, represents an inference drawn from the specific scholium of Servius. The lesson concerning Statius and the *neoterici*, however, clearly is the same: they are, in this matter, *maiores*, of greater weight, the authors to be followed.⁵⁰

In each of the cases above, the use and validity of the *auctores* is adjusted on an *ad hoc* basis, according to the lesson which Servius seeks to teach. The rule or distinction is preserved, the instructor's presentation of *auctoritas* is used as a means of impressing the distinction upon the student. Other formulae were available to serve similar didactic ends: a variation on the approach can be found, for example, at *Aen.* 2.273, where the *auctores* (in this case Horace and Statius) are segregated from the rule itself:

BIGIS secundum artem modo dixit, quae exigit ut quae de pluribus constant plurali numero dicantur, ut 'bigas', 'quadrigas', 'mappas'. sed haec plerumque corrumpit auctoritas, ut Horatius (*Epist.* 1.5, 22) 'ne sordida mappa', item Statius (*Theb.* 1.338) 'rorifera gelidum tenuauerat aera biga'.

A like impulse, the maintenance of doctrine, figures in the first of the scholia in which *idonei* play a part, a matter of *differentia*, the distinction in the meaning of words. The note concerns *Aen.* 2.79f. (*nec si miserum Fortuna Sinonem / finxit, uanum etiam mendacemque improba finget*):

VANVM fallacem. et uanus est qui etiam sine utilitate mentitur, mendax qui tantum ad decipiendum. sane 'uanus'

⁵⁰ Cf. in Servius' note: *apud alios . . . quod et nunc sequi debemus*. See also Klotz *De scholiis Statianis* (above, n. 7), p. 1; the passage of Pompeius is, curiously, among those adduced by Wessner, p. 331, to support his verdict regarding the *neoterici*.

'stultus' apud idoneos non inuenitur, ut ait Iuuenalis (3.159) 'sic libitum uano qui nos distinxit Othoni'.

A pair of distinctions is actually involved, between *uanus* and *mendax* on the one hand, and two possible meanings of *uanus* on the other: the integrity of the former depends to a great degree (in the structure of Servius' note) upon the establishment of the latter. The statement that *uanus* and *mendax* denote two distinct species of liar, the one lying even to no advantage, the other lying only to deceive, appears to have its origin in the definition of *uanus* as one who (deprived of the truth himself) says what is manifestly untrue;⁵¹ the notion of speaking an obvious falsehood (which itself might properly be distinguished from *fallax*, with which *uanus* is glossed initially in the scholium) is expressed in Servius' definition by the phrase *sine utilitate*, the result set in place of the act. It is on this pair of definitions that Servius rests his interpretation of the verse; and the first of the definitions must be secured against another sense of *uanus* known to Servius, *stultus*.

It happens that the elements of this further distinction appear in a chapter of Gellius (18.4) concerned with the use of *uanior* and *stolidior* in Sallust.⁵² In an anecdote set in Gellius' youth, an arrogant Sallustian scholar, on being approached and questioned by Sulpicius Apollinaris (with the young Gellius in his train), denies that there is any difference to be found between the two words (as any fool should know, 18.4.6: "*ipso quippe Cn. Lentulo stolidior est et uanior, qui ignorat eiusdem stultitiae esse uanitatem et stoliditatem*"). Apollinaris himself, however, is able to provide the solution (18.4.10):

nos autem postea ex Apollinari didicimus 'uanos' proprie dici, non ut uulgus diceret, desipientes aut hebetes aut

⁵¹ Cf. *Gloss. Lat. I Ansil.* VA 135 *uanus est qui manifesta negat, mendax qui occultat*; compare the distinction drawn by Nigidius Figulus between *mentiri* and *mendacium dicere* (preserved in Gell. 11.11.1-2): "*qui mentitur, ipse non fallitur, alterum fallere conatur; qui mendacium dicit, ipse fallitur*". *item hoc addidit: "qui mentitur" inquit "fallit, quantum in se est; at qui mendacium dicit, ipse non fallit, quantum in se est"*.

⁵² 18.4.4 = *Hist.* 4. frg. 1 Maur.: *at Cn. Lentulus patriciae gentis, collega eius, cui cognomentum Clodiano fuit, perincertum stolidior an uanior, legem de pecunia, quam Sulla emptoribus bonorum remiserat, exigenda promulgauit.*

ineptos, sed, ut ueterum doctissimi dixissent, mendaces et infidos et leuis inaniaque pro grauibus et ueris astutissime componentes; 'stolidos' autem uocari non tam stultos et excordes quam taetros et molestos et inlepidos, quos Graeci *μοχθηρούς* et *φορτικούς* dicerent.

Two aspects of the explanation (for which Nigidius is noted as the source, 18.4.11) are particularly interesting: the equivalence of *uanos* and *mendaces* in establishing the *proprietas* of *uanus*,⁵³ and the method of argument, by now familiar, here pitting the *uulgus* against the *ueterum doctissimi*. Although Gellius is consistent in his use of *ueteres* where Servius is not in his use of *idonei*, the phrase *ueterum doctissimi* is to the Gellian explanation what *idoneos* is to the Servian: a means of commending the opinion by commending the source. The meaning 'stultus', perceived by Servius as potentially disruptive of his adopted scheme, although it is at the same time logically related to the definition he favors, must be dismissed, and with it the testimony of Juvenal.⁵⁴

This interpretation of the argumentative function of *idonei* above can be confirmed if we consider other scholia which find Servius acting as the opponent of a comparable distinction. As the defender of the foregoing *differentia*, Servius found it to be

⁵³ Cf. DServ. at *Aen.* 1.392 *quidam 'uani' 'mendaces' tradunt*, with illustrative quotations from Sallust (*Jug.* 24.9) and Terence (*Ph.* 525).

⁵⁴ The logical connection was perceived by Donatus at Ter. *Eun.* 104 (1-4 Wess.), esp. sections 3-4 of his note: 1 SI FALSVM AVT VANVM AVT FICTVM EST CONTINVO PALAM 'falsum' est quo tegitur id quod factum est, 'uanum' est quod fieri non potest, 'fictum' quod factum non est et fieri potuit. 2 uel 'falsum' est fictum mendacium simile ueritati, 'uanum' nec possibile nec uerisimile, 'fictum' totum sine uero sed uerisimile. 3 'falsum' loqui mendacis est, 'fictum' callidi, 'uanum' stulti. 4 'falsum' loqui culpa est, 'fictum' uersutiae, 'uanum' uecordiae. Servius' judgment, once formed, is retained and elaborated, hence the scholium at *Aen.* 11.715 VANE LIGVS aut fallax, aut inaniter iactans: nam 'uanus' 'stultus' posteriores dicere coeperunt. inde tractum est etiam in neotericis: Iuuenalis . . . For similar consistency, where *neoterici* are concerned, in the use of prior judgment as a benchmark for subsequent evaluation of a specific usage, compare especially the scholia at *Aen.* 6.187 *SI aduerbium rogantis et optantis est per se plenum, sicut et 'o', quamquam neoterici haec iungant et pro uno ponant: Persius (2.10) 'o si ebulliat patruus, praeclarum funus! et o si', and 8.560 O MIHI PRAETERITOS REFERAT SI IVPPITER ANNOS et 'o' et 'si' optantis sunt . . . quae nunc iunguntur; nam singula ante ponebantur, ut*

to his advantage to segregate Juvenal from the *idonei* and so implicitly deny his *auctoritas*. But the testimony of Juvenal (though not of Juvenal alone) is applied quite differently when a similar distinction is to be opposed rather than upheld. So we find the following note at *Aen.* 8.106:

TEPIDVSQVE CRVOR frustra quidam cruorem pecorum, sanguinem hominum uolunt; nam Iuuenalis ait (12.13) 'sanguis iret et a magno ceruix ferienda magistro', Vergilius (4.687) 'atque atros siccabat ueste cruores';

or again, at *Aen.* 1.2, involving another of the *neoterici*, Lucan:

FATO PROFVGVS . . . 'profugus' autem proprie dicitur qui procul a sedibus suis uagatur, quasi porro fugatus. multi tamen ita definiunt, ut profugos eos dicant qui exclusi necessitate de suis sedibus adhuc uagantur, et simul atque inuenerint sedes non dicantur profugi sed exules. sed utrumque falsum est; nam et 'profugus' lectus est qui iam sedes locauit, ut in Lucano (4.9f.) 'profugique a gente uetusta Gallorum Celtae miscentes nomen Hiberis' et 'exul' qui adhuc uagatur, ut in Sallustio (*Hist.* 5 frg. 17 Maur.) 'qui nullo certo exilio uagabantur'; adeo exilium est ipsa uagatio.

In these scholia, the *neoterici* stand shoulder to shoulder with the *antiqui* in establishing *proprietas*, Juvenal with Virgil, Lucan with Sallust. The variation of the status and application of the authors in the context of *ad hoc* argument again is evident.⁵⁵

It is necessary to consider in detail one further scholium which offers an antithesis between *idonei* and *neoterici*. The note concerns the morphology of the word *cucumis*, at *G.* 4.122:

(6.187) . . . ergo unum uacat. quantum ad antiquitatem; antiquitatem refers to Servius' perception of classical usage: the attested use of *o si* in wishes commences, in fact, with Hor. *Serm.* 2.6.8f. *o si angulus ille / proximus accedat, qui nunc denormat agellum* (cf. *Aen.* 11.415 *quamquam o si solitae quicquam uirtutis adesset* . . .), while the use of *si* by itself, taken by Servius to be standard, is rare, see Leumann-Hofmann-Szantyr *Lat. Gramm.*, p. 331.

⁵⁵ Compare also Servius' use of Lucan to justify a particularly forced bit of punctuation (which, interestingly, is found also in the Mediceus) at a difficult passage, *Aen.* 3.379f.

CRESCERET IN VENTREM CVCVMIS . . . sane 'hic cucumis' 'huius cucumis' declinatur, sicut 'agilis', secundum idoneos: nam neoterici 'huius cucumeris' dixerunt, sicut 'pulus' 'pulueris'.

Wessner noted⁵⁶ that the *catholica* of Probus provides an example drawn from Martial (11.18.10) for the form associated with the *neoterici* in Servius (*cath. GL* 4.24,30ff.):

unius ergo generis nomina 'mis' syllaba terminata 'ris' faciunt genetiuis, 'hic uomis' 'hic cucumis', 'huius uomeris' et 'cucumeris'. Martialis cum genere 'cucumerem rectum'.

The citation, however, is mistaken, for the word appears in the nominative in Martial's verse ([*rus*] *in quo nec cucumis iacere rectus / . . . possit*); yet the misquotation, which was probably, as often with such things, the result of faulty memory, is itself revealing when read in the context of Probus' note. That grammarian knew only the declension *cucumis*, *-meris*, which was then imposed upon the usage of Martial in the process of providing an illustrative quotation; a natural mistake, since at least from the time of Varro (*Rust.* 1.2.25, *Ling.* 5.104) every Latin author who had occasion to write of cucumbers in the oblique cases (surely a finite set in any event) used that same declension—with the exception of the elder Pliny, whose *Naturalis Historia* provides the only instances of the form urged by Servius.⁵⁷ Now as in the case of Gellius and *soloecum*, the unique usage of Pliny should not be pressed too far; yet, again as in the case of Gellius, the category of *idoneos* must come under question. The fact is that the oddity of Servius' teaching is emphasized not only by the word's attested usage, but by the treatment it is accorded by his colleagues. Although there is a certain conflict among the grammarians regarding the permissible form of the nominative,⁵⁸ *cucumis* is treated uniformly as one of the anomalous

⁵⁶ Wessner 330.

⁵⁷ Pliny's usage, however, is not absolute, cf. *NH* 22.51~27.24 *odorem cucumeris*.

⁵⁸ Compare Prisc. *GL* 2.249.15ff. *illa quoque tam in 'is' quam in 'er' finita nomina regulam seruant in 'er' terminatorum, id est accepta 'is' faciunt genetiium, ut 'hic puluis' et 'puluer' 'pulueris', 'hic cucumis' et 'cucumer'*

nouns in *-is* which *in genetiuo crescunt*.⁵⁹ Servius is lending his support to what appears to be a piece of extreme analogist doctrine: *neoterici* in his note is perhaps the result of an inference drawn from an entry such as we find in Probus, with its quotation of Martial, and is used to dismiss the standard declension in the face of the adopted form.⁶⁰ Where and how Servius came by this item can only be a matter of speculation:⁶¹ less uncertain is the purpose of *idoneos*. The word commends the peculiar form, guarantees its validity, and so serves as a form of shorthand, at once conveying and enforcing the lesson to be learned.⁶² And it is with a similar function that *idonei* appears in the note with which we began this discussion (*Aen.* 11.373):

'*cucumeris*', '*hic cinis*' et '*ciner*' '*cineris*', '*hic uomis*' et '*uomer*' '*uomeris*' with *Caper uerb. dub. GL* 7.109.4 *cucumis, non cucumer*.

⁵⁹ Cf., in addition to Probus and Priscian above, *Charis. GL* 1.41.24ff.~88.29ff.

⁶⁰ So Servius uses *neotericus* elsewhere only when the value of the testimony is slighted, see the scholia cited above, nn. 5 and 53.

⁶¹ The *dubii sermonis lib. VIII* of Pliny obviously suggest themselves as a point of origin, in view of the use found in the subsequent *Nat. Hist.*; but while it is not difficult to find the application of analogist principles in the extant fragments of Pliny's grammatical work, there is no evidence, direct or indirect, to support such a conjecture in this specific case. The possibility that a misunderstanding and/or a mistaken inference on the part of Servius (or his source) contributed to the first part of the scholium can not be ruled out: cf. the note in *schol. Bern. ad loc., CVCVMIS* '*haec cucumis*' *nominatiuus, 'huius cucuminis*', *sed hoc maluit poeta quod eufoniam sequitur*, where mention of the feminine gender (impossible in view of the preceding *tortusque*), and the reference to *eufonia*, seem to suggest that the author of the note took *tortus* to be a noun, the subject of *cresceret in uentrem cucumis*, and so construed *cucumis* as a genitive, chosen for the sake of "euphony" instead of *cucuminis* (the latter form representing a conflation of the declension of *cucumis* and *cacumen*); it is quite possible that some similar chain of events, leading to the specious *idoneos*, occurred in Servius.

⁶² So at *Aen.* 12.923 *ATRI TVRBINIS INSTAR . . . et 'instar', ut supra diximus, per se plenum est nec recipit praepositionem, licet Serenus 'ad instar' dixerit, quod in idoneis non inuenitur auctoribus*, the final clause simply adds emphasis to a position assumed in a controversial matter, a view already twice stated, at both *Aen.* 2.15 *INSTAR nomen est indeclinabile, licet Probus (cath. GL* 4.17.2) '*instaris*' *declinet, ut 'nectaris', et caret praepositione, ut 'peregre', quamuis Serenus lyricus 'ad instar' dixerit*, and *Aen.* 6.865 *INSTAR similitudo. et est nomen, quod non recipit praepositionem: 'ad instar'*

ETIAM TV . . . apud maiores 'etiam' consentientis fuerat, quod tamen in his recentibus idoneis non inuenitur.

Again the point of view is signaled, but now in the form of a warning. As noted before, the phrase *recentes idonei* can only refer to post-classical authors; and the distinction here between *maiores* and *recentes* regarding this use of *etiam* is, within certain limits, accurate. Affirmative *etiam* ('yes' of conversation) occurs in Plautus⁶³ and Cicero (*Q. Rosc.* 9; more often, not surprisingly, in the epistles and in the philosophical works), twice in the *Satires* of Horace, but thereafter only in Seneca *Contr.* and the *Epistles* of the younger Pliny; neither of the latter works would have come within the grammarian's purview. The continued presence of this use of *etiam* in colloquial speech, however, is suggested by its regular use in the Itala (rather less regularly in the Vulgate) to render *vaí*;⁶⁴ and it is perhaps the colloquial presence which impelled Servius to comment on the usage, which is hardly well suited to the context. Servius, that is, must put the student on his guard against the possible error, and at the same time bolster the interpretation against a contradictory appeal to the *maiores*: the use of *idonei* serves both ends. The technical term, then, can be seen to possess an interest beyond its tendentious application to individual passages: when viewed together, the twin oppositions, *maiores* and *recentes idonei* on the one hand and *idonei* and *neoterici* on the other, suggest the growing pains of the grammarian's system, the problems produced by the assimilation of new material, and the means of circumvent-

enim non dicimus. quod Probus declarat (on the difficulty of the final clause, where Thilo's mss are divided *declarat* RLM *declarato* H: *declinat* ASF, see Thilo's *apparatus*).

⁶³ The usage, although not recorded in *TLL*, probably appears at least once in Terence, at *Hec.* 811f., which is punctuated thus in Kauer-Lindsay: Par.: *nil dicam aliud?* Bacchis: *etiam: cognosse anulum illum Myrrinam / gnatae suae fuisse*; compare Pl. *Amph.* 544f (Iup.: *numquid uis?* Alc.: *etiam: ut actutum aduenias*) and Donatus ad loc. (*ETIAM COGNOSSE ANVLVM MYRRINAM 'etiam' aduerbium est uel consentientis uel reminiscetis; sed magis reminiscetis modo; sic Cicero [Verr. II.2.87] 'etiam, quod paene praeterii, capella quaedam est mire facta'.)*

⁶⁴ See J. Samelsson "'Ultra non etiam silere' quid significat" *Eranos* 4 (1900–02) 7–9, Hofmann *Umgangssprache* p. 40f.; for *etiam* in the Itala and the Vulgate, see *TLL* s.v. *etiam* 931,56ff.

ing (if not solving) those problems in a way consistent with the grammarian's understanding of the text and conducive to the teaching of correct Latin.

* * *

Wessner's recantation was unnecessary: the younger poets possess *auctoritas* of their own, are "suitable authors", and are used to further Servius' didactic purpose in ways not essentially different from the *antiqui*;⁶⁵ apparent contradictions may result in part from the insertion of the *neoterici* into a system to which they were once alien.⁶⁶ It is necessary, on the other hand, to regard the use of (*non idonei*) critically, as a fluid term of convenience rather than a reference to an immutable standard, for its appearances in Servius (and others) demonstrate the readiness with which it can acquire the meaning, "those whom I choose to adduce (or discount) and whom I would have you follow (or avoid) in this particular matter." The word, very often, indicates the result, not the basis, of a given decision.⁶⁷

The process of decision, and the purpose which the *auctores* serve, requires further, precise study. The canons of Latin grammar, although largely traditional, were not monolithic or impervious to controversy and idiosyncratic interpretation, as

⁶⁵ It should of course be noted that if the Servius of the commentary is identical with the *Servius magister* of the famous subscription in the Juvenal ms Leid. 82 of the tenth century ("Legi ego Niceus Romae apud Servium magistrum et emendavi," cf. the subscription in Laurent. 34.42, s.xi: "Legi ego Niceus apud M. Serbium Romae et emendavi"), then there is *prima facie* evidence for Servius' use of Juvenal as a school-author, since *apud Servium magistrum* (or *apud M. Serbium*) can mean nothing other than "in the school of Servius"; it should also be noted that if Nicaeus, so often given credit for producing a "critical edition" of Juvenal, was a pupil in Servius' school, then, in the normal course of events in a Roman education, he is not likely to have been more than fifteen years old.

⁶⁶ The distinction itself was soon to be effaced: in grammatical writings of the fifth century, the Silver Latin poets come to be termed *ueteres* (cf. the preface of Servius himself, above, n. 5), and a century after Servius' work, in Priscian, Classical and Silver Latin authors alike share the classification *uetustissimi*.

⁶⁷ Compare Servius' notes at *Aen.* 9.742 (on the chronology of the war in Latium) where *plerique sed non idonei commentatores* are dismissed in the face of the testimony of Livy and Cato, and *G.* 3.124 *DENSO PINGVI sane pingue' generis est neutri: et ita in omnibus idoneis inuenitur; nam nec pinguedo' nec pinguetudo' latinum est*; see also Pomp. *GL* 5.152.33ff.

is evident in more than one of the examples above. In the specific case of Servius, his appeals to the *auctores* have equally to do with his own perception of doctrine (and the refutation of the mistakes of others), and with the didactic method, the degree to which instruction consisted of imposing an understanding of Latin *on* the texts, rather than deducing that understanding *from* the texts. In relation to the *auctores*, the processes of the schools were at no time simply or systematically deductive: to this extent there is a significant difference between the Classicism of a Servius and the Atticism of, say, a Phrynichus.⁶⁸ Scholia which give evidence of what might be called expressions of pure *auctoritas* are in fact very few;⁶⁹ rather more frequent are occasions when instruction must proceed in spite of the texts, where the *abusio* and *uitium* of an author—including Virgil—must be noted and counterbalanced. There is, I think, something yet to be learned about the relationship between author and instruction in the schools of late antiquity; especially the school of the *grammaticus*, whose business it was “to cram the rules of Latin grammar” into the heads of his pupils.⁷⁰

ROBERT A. KASTER

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

comparatiuus gradus generis est semper communis, doctior, excepto uno, ut ait Probus (cf. *instiit. GL* 4.61.3ff.), *senior. nam senex dicimus, senior non possumus dicere, de femina. tamen inuenimus lectum apud antiquos, non idoneos tamen*; cf. n. 42 above, on Gellius.

⁶⁸ Contrast the statement of Marrou, above n. 4; it would be instructive to conduct a tripartite comparison of method and purpose in Servius, in Phrynichus' *Ecloga* (an extremely polemical and idiosyncratic work which is at the same time rigidly deductive) and the *exempla elocutionum* of Servius' contemporary, the rhetor Arusianus Messius.

⁶⁹ Note *Aen.* 8.233 *STABAT ACVTA SILEX paene omnes 'hunc silicem' dixerunt; nam et Varro et Lucretius ita dicunt. tanta tamen est Vergilii auctoritas, ut persuadeat nobis etiam 'hanc silicem' dici* (cf. Quint. 1.6.2 and 1.5.35) and *Aen.* 2.713 *VRBE EGRESSIS hic ablatiuo iunxit, ut Horatius (Serm. 1.5.1) . . . ; Sallustius accusatiuo . . . ; ergo utrumque dicimus*; but, cf. *Aen.* 3.278 *TELLVRE POTITI 'potior' et 'illa re' dicimus et 'illius rei'*; *sed per septimum in usu est, per genetiuum figurate ponitur: Sallustius (Iug. 25.10) . . . legimus et per accusatiuum, sed uti non possumus: Terentius (Ad. 871)* . . .

⁷⁰ I wish to thank Ms. Diana White and Profs. W. V. Clausen, H. C. Gotoff and M. Murrin for their valuable criticisms of an earlier draft of this paper.