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. 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, 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, 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; more specifically, I wish to examine the question of auctoritas and the neoterici, the "authors more recent than Virgil," 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 (Paris 1965) 407. For a recent and detailed study of one facet of Servius' instruction revealed in the commentary, see H. L. Levy "Tò hexès 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. Zetzl 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 DServ.: Zetzl 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 Wessner\textsuperscript{6} 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),\textsuperscript{7} and had been accepted by Wessner himself,\textsuperscript{8} whose renewed, detailed inquiry was spurred by the objections of H. J. Thomson.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{10}

It is not, however, the point of chronology which I wish to consider here,\textsuperscript{11} but the part played by the three poets in Servius' system: for Wessner, while placing beyond question of νεωτέρων to designate an author or a usage more recent than Homer (see esp. A. Severyns, Le Cycle épique dans l'écôle 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 virumque cano,' Lucanus 'Bella per Emathios,' Statius 'Fraternas acies alternaque regna profanis.'

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

\textsuperscript{7} See Klotz, Quaestiones Servianae (Grieswald 1882) 1f. (on Lucan and Juvenal); the place of Statius is discussed by Klotz De scholiis Statiani commentatio I (Gymn.–Progr. Treptow am R. 1895) 1-3.

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

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

\textsuperscript{10} See esp. Wessner 296-303, 333-35.

\textsuperscript{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 ‘unus’ ‘stultus’ apud idoneos non inuenitur, ut ait Iuuenalis (3.159) ‘sic libitum uano qui nos distinxit Othoni (to be compared with Aen. 11.715 ‘unus’ ‘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 ‘puluis’ ‘pulueris’. The conclusion which ap-

¹² Wessner 335; ‘um seinen Schulern die Regeln der lateinische Grammatik einzupauen.’

¹³ Cf., for example, G. Higet, *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),\textsuperscript{14} was expressed by Wessner (331ff.) in the following terms:

\ldots die idonei oder firmi\textsuperscript{15} auctores (auch meliores, deren auctoritas sequenda est: Servius in Don. GL IV.409, 33) sind die klassischen Schualtern, 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 Klötz erklärt haben (ich bin ihnen leider \ldots 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

\textsuperscript{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 ‘salve’ apud auctores bonos ter entuustum inuenitur ‘salve, saluere, saluete’); regarding the scholium at Aen. 10.164 (‘Tusciam’ non debemus dicere, quia nequaquam in idoneis auctorisibus 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.

\textsuperscript{15} firmi is a reference to Pomp. GL 5.273, 16ff: ‘ad’ uero cum artis necessitate ‘ad locum’ significt, id est ‘ad amicum uado’, tamen omnes antiqui et idonei et firmi auctores iuxrerunt 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, war 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' signifcat 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 maiiores '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 n 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 RESPONDDES ‘etiam’ aut hortatio est aut conjunctio*) 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 correctionis 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 DLEV7 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 (*QRose*. 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. 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 corripiendi 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 uersatus 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; 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), although there is some indirect evidence to suggest that this use of idoneus is a century older or more. 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. γεγαυ. p. 36, 1ff. Pecorella (= p. 23, 1ff. 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 grauis auctor and idoneus scriptor in Pollio and Gellius.
et Fauorinus quidem, cum uerum 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 doctorem 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 aient. ‘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 graduntur et pedibus iter emetiumtur. propterea negant aput 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 graui 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.: inscite ab Asinio Pollione reprehensum Sallustium, 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, div. 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 *transfretum/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 transsitum transmissumque naibus 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’ naumit recte dici solet, ita ‘transgressus’ etiam naibus factus dici possit?*

\(^{30}\) ibid.: *praesertim cum breuitas tam angusti fretus, qui terram Africam Hispaniamque interfluit, elegantissime ‘transgressionis’ vocabulo, quasi paucorum graduum spatium, definita sit.*
of antiquity.\textsuperscript{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 con-
cerned 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):

\begin{quote}
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 malegue
uelicant.
\end{quote}

The predisposition is evident: the elegantia of Sallust is to be
defended, the ignorance and malevolence of the critics turned
aside.\textsuperscript{32} In this context of aggressive scholarship, it is neces-
sary 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 Sinnius Capito (and

\textsuperscript{31} Cf. Suet. de gram. 10.1: de codem [sc. Ateio Philologo] Asinius Pollio
in libro quo Sallusti scripta reprehendit ut nimia priscorum uerborum
affectatione obliua ita tradit ... and ibid. 10.4 quo magis miror Asinium
credidisse antiqua eum [sc. Ateium] uerba et figuram solitum esse coligere
Sallustio, cum sibi sciat nihil aliud suadere quam ut noto ciuile et proprio
sermone utatur, uide etque maxime obscuritatem Sallusti et audaciam in
translationibus. Cf. also de gramm. 15. Aug. 86.

\textsuperscript{32} Cf. ibid. 6 illi maluoli reprehensoris; with inscire 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 ineruditio. uerum hoc tamem
petulanter inscireque ...

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


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. The statement that these authors used the adjective σολοικὸν as a substantive rather than the deverbative σολοικισμός (σολοικιζέων) is then extended to

33 On Sinnius Capito (probably a younger contemporary of Varro) see Klotz, RE 2nd R. III (1927) 246f.; the use of stribiligo is elsewhere connected with the grammarians 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 uitlem Sinnius Capito in litteris. quas ad Clodium Tuscum dedit, hisce uerbis definit: ‘soloecismus est’ inquit ‘impar atque incomeniens compositura partium orationis.’ The suggestion of M. Hertz (Sinnius Capito. Eine Abhandlung zur Geschichte der römischen Grammatik [Berlin 1844] p. 27 n. 28)—repeated by Funaioli. GRF Sinnius 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 vocalis aut litterarum coitus per aliquam vocalem comprehensus. syllabae dicuntur a Graecis παρὰ τὸ συλλαμβάνειν τὰ γράμματα. Latine conexiones uel conceptiones, quod litteras concipiant atque connectunt; 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 δόξωι in the Ecloga of Gellius’ contemporary, the
include older writers in Latin, leading to the conclusion that *solecismus* is itself a kind of barbarism.

Both the form and substance of Gellius’ solution require examination. Regarding the *Graecorum idones*, 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 *σόλοικισμός* 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 idones* 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 *σόλοικισμός* 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 **σολοίκον** τῶν **δοκίμων** and passim; cf. **Gloss. Lat.** II *Abav.* [p. 75] 1D 9 *idoneum*: **probūm, aptum, ὀκουμον**; see below, n. 67.

36 Cf. **Hdt.** 4.117 φωνὴ δὲ οἱ Σαναρμάται νομίζοντας Σκυθικῆς, σολοικίζοντες αὐτῇ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄρχαιον, ἐπεὶ οὐ χρηστῶς ἐξεμαθην αὐτήν ἰπ Ἀμαζόνες; note particularly the adjectival form in Anacreon frg. 78 Page. **κοίμουν δὲ, Ζεῦ, σόλοικον φθόγγον** (v. 1. λόγον) (with which compare Hipponax frg. 46 Bergk, both cited in the *peri βαθώρασιμοῦ και σολοικίσιμον* in Valckenaer *Antonius* [Leipzig 1822] 178) and (applied, as not infrequently, to manners rather than language) at Xen. *Cyropaed.* 8.3.21 Δαίφερνης δὲ τις ἦ σολοικότερος ἀνθρώπως 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;\textsuperscript{37} and Phrynichus allows that form to predominate in his Ecloga, although even that arch-Atticist appears to have permitted himself a σολοικισμός.\textsuperscript{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:\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{37} ad Att. 1.19.10 (60 B.C.) commentarium consulatus mei Graece composi-
tum misi ad te: in quo si quid erit quod homini Attico minus Graecum eruditumque ideatur, 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 σόλοικαν quam tyrannoctones in caelo esse. tyranni facta defendi and ad Att. 2.10 (59 B.C.) est enim ὑποσόλοικος, cum uelim uitare omnium deliciarum suspicio-

\textsuperscript{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 τραγικών σολοικισμῶν, ibid. 520B οὐ στίχων οὐδὲ ποιημάτων, ἄλλα βίων ἄστοχήματα καὶ πλημμέλημα καὶ σολοικισμοῖς, symp. 731Ε βαρβαρισμῶν ἡ σολοικισμόν, Luc. urb. auxc. 23 σολοικισμῶν ἐμπλημένον; but Plut. Dion. Syrac. 17.3 οὐδὲν εἶν τῇ διαίτῃ σόλοικον . . . οὐδὲ τυφαινικών οὐδὲ ἐπιτεθερμημένον, Luc. Demon. 40 Πολυβίου δὲ τινος, κομμη ἀπαιδεύτων ἀνθρώπων καὶ σολοίκων, εἰπόντος . . . 

\textsuperscript{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 Lucilius\textsuperscript{40} (whose usage Gellius surely would have known), those whose thoughts led in the direction of prescriptive grammar used \textit{solecismus} as the standard technical term. Unless the deprivations 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,\textsuperscript{41} which had assumed a staunchly Atticist position on a standing question, offering assurances under the vague auspices of \textit{Graecorum idoneos} and extending those assurances to include \textit{nostri antiquiores}. One might also suggest that these were assurances which Gellius would have been predisposed to believe.\textsuperscript{42} The element of predisposition which can be gathered from this chapter and 10.26 above is certainly not unique,\textsuperscript{43} although it should not be taken fairly to characterize Gellius’ philology. The point of interest here is the use of \textit{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

\textsuperscript{40} Pomp. \textit{GL} 5.289.8ff. (on the number and kinds of solecism): \textit{nam [Lucilius] ait sic, adde solecismum genera atque vocabula centum} (= frg. 1100Marx = 1110Krenkel).

\textsuperscript{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.

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

\textsuperscript{43} Compare, for example, 2.16.5ff., where the phrase \textit{auctorem idoneum nullum} (noted, but not evaluated by Wessner, see above n. 22) is set argumentatively against the testimony of \textit{omnia ferme annalium} (ibid. 3) and \textit{multi} (ibid. 6) to deny the validity of the explanation (in fact correct) of \textit{Aen}. 6.763 \textit{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:


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 ‘exiguam 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

That there is involved a source common to Probus and Servius is suggested not simply by the opinion expressed regarding scrobiis, 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. scrobiis 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

\(^{46}\) In Servius’ note the phrase in dies is interpolated in the Vaticanus; compare the ‘sexagenos scrobis’ 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 grammerian.
thought he knew of a similar usage of Gracchus to be found in Terentianus Maurus; 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:


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],
’siritps’, uelut dixit disertus Gracchus alter Gaüs.

It is worth noting in passing that this is precisely the kind of visual or mnemonic slip conjectured by Goold, (op. cit. n. 1) 138ff., 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 productur, quod et nunc sequi debemus*) is obviously significant; 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 nominativi
recte ‘o’ littera productur, 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 varios renouando dolores’. plerumque tamen a Vergilio productur . . .).
Vergilius hanc rationem secutus est Graecam, ut longas ponat frequenter, 'canto quae solitus si quando': 'canto', 'to' longa est [et in aliis] posita. tamen inueniuntur uerba apud ipsum Vergilium, ubi breuis sit 'o', 'nunc scio quid sit amor'. ecce breuis est. neoterici autem omnes, Statius et alii, maiores sunt in illa parte quae breuis 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 scholiwm 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.\(^5^0\)

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 Statiani (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 Iuuenalitis (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 ut uanior, qui ignorant eiusdem stultitia 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 emporiibus honorum remiserat, exigenda promulgavit.
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 econdes quam taetros et molestos et inlepidos, quos Graeci μορθηρούς et φοτικούς 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, 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.

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 (Iug. 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 FALSV VM AVT VANVM AVT FICTVM EST CONTINV POALM ‘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 veritati, ‘uanum’ nec possibilis nec uerisimile, ‘fictum’ totum sine uero sed uerisimile. 3 ‘falsum’ loqui mendacis est, ‘fictum’ callidi, ‘uanum’ stulti. 4 ‘falsum’ loqui culpae est, ‘fictum’ uersutiae, ‘uanum’ uercordiae. Servius’ judgment, once formed, is retained and elaborated, hence the scholium at Aen. 11.715 VANE LIVGS aut fallax, aut inaniter iactans: nam ‘uanus’ ‘stultus’ posteriores dicere coeperunt. inde tractum est etiam in neotericis: Iuuenalisis . . . 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 ponant: Persius (2.10) ‘o si ebulliat patruus, praeclarum funus! et o si’, and 8.560 O MIHI PRAETERITOS REFERAT SI IUPPI TERE 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 volunt; nam Juuenalis ait (12.13) ‘sanguis iret et a magno ceruix feriendah magistro’, Vergilius (4.687) ‘atque atros siccat ab 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 unus 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.

Wessner noted\(^{56}\) 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.):

\[
\text{unius ergo generis nomina ‘mis’ syllaba terminata ‘ris’ faciunt genetiuum, ‘hic uomis’ ‘hic cucumis’, ‘huius uomeris’ et ‘cucumeris’. Martianis cum genere ‘cucumerem rectum’.}
\]

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 servant in ‘er’ terminatorem, id est accepta ‘is’ faciunt genetiuum, ut ‘hic puluis’ et ‘puluer’ ‘pulueris’, ‘hic cucumis’ et ‘cucumer'
nouns in -is which in genetiuo crescunt. 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. Where and how Servius came by this item can only be a matter of speculation: 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. And it is with a similar function that idonei appears in the note with which we began this discussion (Aen. 11.373):


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

60 So Servius uses neoterici 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 cumumis nominatiuus, ‘huius cumuminis’, sed hoc maluit poeta quod eufonia 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 cumumis, and so construed cumum as a genitive, chosen for the sake of “euphony” instead of cumumin (the latter form representing a conflation of the declension of cumumis 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 ‘instaur’, 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) ‘instar’ declinat, ut ‘nectaris’, et caret praepositione, ut ‘peregre’. quamuis Serenus lyricus ‘ad instar’ dixerit, et Aen. 6.865 INSTAR similitudo, 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 Plautus\textsuperscript{63} and Cicero (\textit{Q. Rosc.} 9; more often, not surprisingly, in the epistles and in the philosophical works), twice in the \textit{Satires} of Horace, but thereafter only in Seneca \textit{Contr.} and the \textit{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 \textit{vät};\textsuperscript{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-

\textit{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 \textit{apparatus}).

\textsuperscript{63} The usage, although not recorded in \textit{TLL}, probably appears at least once in Terence, at \textit{Hec.} 811f., which is punctuated thus in Kauer-Lindsay: Par.: \textit{nil dicam aliud?} Bacchis: etiam: cognosce anulum illum Myrrinam i gnatae suae fuisse; compare Pl. \textit{Amph.} 544f (lup.: numquid uits? Alc.: etiam: ut actutum aduenas) and Donatus ad loc. (\textit{ETIAM COGNOSSE ANVLVM MYRRINAM ‘etiam’ aduerbum est uel consentientis uel reminiscitens; sed magis reminiscitens modo; sic Cicero [Verr. II.2.87] ‘etiam, quod paene praeterii, capella quaedam est mire facta’.)

\textsuperscript{64} See J. Samelsson ‘Ultra non etiam silere’ quid significat’ \textit{Eranos} 4 (1900–02) 7-9, Hofmann \textit{Umgangssprache} p. 40f.; for etiam in the Itala and the Vulgate, see \textit{TLL} s.v. \textit{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;\(^5\) apparent contradictions may result in part from the insertion of the neoterici into a system to which they were once alien.\(^6\) 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.\(^7\)

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

\(^5\) 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.

\(^6\) The distinction itself was soon to be effaced: in grammatical writings of the fifth century, the Silver Latin poets come to be termed uetere (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.

\(^7\) 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 DENO PINGVI sane ‘pingue’ generis est neutri: et ita in omnibus idoneis inuentur; nam nec ‘pinguedo’ nec ‘pinguedudo’ 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
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*comparatius gradus generis est semper communis, doctior, excepto uno, ut ait Probus (cf. instit. 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 ablatu iuunxit, ut Horatius (Serm. 1.5.1) . . ; Sallustius accusativus . . ; 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 genetium figurate ponitur: Sallustius (lug. 25.10) . . . legimus et per accusativum, sed uti non possimus: 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.