

GRAMMAR AND ERUDITION IN SERVIUS'S *COMMENTARY
ON VIRGIL*

ALESSANDRO GARCEA – MARIE-KARINE LHOMMÉ – DANIEL VALLAT (eds.), *Fragments d'érudition. Servius et le savoir antique*. 'Spudasmata. Studien zur Klassischen Philologie und ihren Grenzgebieten', 168. Hildesheim-Zürich-New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 2016, 535 pp., ISBN 978-3-487-15433-6.

The volume under review includes 24 out of the 26 papers delivered at the international colloquium with the same title held in Lyon (France) in April 2014 and sponsored by the *Laboratoire HISOMA* (Histoire et sources des mondes antiques).¹ Its 500 pages bear witness to the outstanding revival of research on the Virgil commentaries by Servius.² The editors are proven experts on either Latin grammatical tradition (Garcea) or specifically in Servius (Vallat, Lhommé), and, consequently, they guarantee the reliability of the contributions to a volume in which "Servian authorities", such as Ramires and Stock, take part.

Mirroring the colloquium from which it originates, the volume appears not to have established any limitations of subject matter, so the papers are in fact organised into five groups: "Exploitation des sources érudites: formes et enjeux", "Linguistique", "Rhétorique et poétique", "Histoire, société et religions de Rome", and "Mythographie".

Besides these thematic blocks, but implicitly highlighting their relevance, A. Garcea provides a penetrating essay on the concept of erudition related to ancient grammar by way of introduction (7–14). He starts with the quadripartite scheme Grafenhan (1843) proposed in his *Geschichte der klassischen Philologie im Alterthum* (1. Religious knowledge, 2. Knowledge about private and public life and institutional history, 3.

¹ This review article has benefitted from a grant from the Spanish "Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad" (Project FFI2014-52808-C2-2-P). It includes a brief description of each of the contributions in the volume. Further remarks are offered for some of them, and a few are discussed in more detail (especially those by C. Conduché and S. Roesch), but this does not mean that they are seen as more valuable than the others. For the sake of brevity, secondary sources are only referenced in the Harvard style (author plus year) if they appear in the volume's bibliographical list, whereas a complete reference is provided for works that do not appear in that list. The volume under review is only referred to with a page number (and footnote number, if required).

² Similar volumes were published in 2004, 2008, 2011 and 2013 (they are listed in footnote 1 in the contribution by Ramires (395)).

Metaliterary reflection and history of literature, and 4. Writings on art). In Garcea's words, this classification "séduit par sa clarté et par son caractère systématique", even if one is shocked by the fact that Grafenhan has not made a distinction between "textes techniques qui n'ont aucun lien avec le domaine littéraire (par exemple ceux des juristes et des arpenteurs) et production érudite à proprement parler" (10). Faithful to this criticism, for each of the subject domains, Garcea (8–10) gives examples of works from the collections of fragments by Funaioli (1907) and Mazzarino (1955) to show how grammarians and scholars, starting with linguistic and literary studies first, often develop specialised research resulting in autonomous work and taking the form of real monographs.

The entangled mess of grammar and scholarship is particularly perceived in works such as the *ad uerbum* commentaries, where all knowledge scattered throughout a literary work is highlighted and explained with reference to the text: the commentator's role was to inform the reader about the very different domains of an encyclopaedic knowledge he used to command "de façon livresque, en grammairien plutôt qu'en vrai spécialiste" (12).

The six papers in the first thematic block bear witness to "book knowledge". Based on its content, the paper by I. Canetta (pp. 17–29) can be ascribed to the second of the domains Grafenhan indicates. It focuses on eight fragments from Varro's *Antiquitates rerum humanarum* collected by Mirsch (1882) in an edition Canetta believes requires thorough revision. This is demonstrated by resorting to three fragments (Serv. *Aen.* 11, 787; 4, 427 and Serv. auct. *Aen.* 4,682), neither of which can be assigned to *Res humanae* with any certainty.

C. Conduché used similar methodological rigour in assigning quotations in her paper (pp. 31–51),³ providing a detailed analysis of the eight references in Servius's commentaries on the influential metricologist Terentianus Maurus (second to third century AD). Special attention is paid in those references (33–4) to the hypothetical attribution (Serv. *georg.* 1, 194) Beck (1993, 379)⁴ made of a phono-orthographical remark on the word *amurca*: *per c scribitur et per g pronuntiatur, ut C. Gaius, Cn. Gnaeus*. The text was thought to be directly connected with verses 893–901 of Terentianus' *De syllabis*: in those verses, after mentioning the writing and pronunciation of the *praenomina* *Gnaeus* and *Gaius*, the grammarian states: *sic amurga(m), quae uetuste saepe per c scribitur, / esse per g proferenda(m) crediderunt plurimi*. Conduché accepts that the remark in Servius is 'une reformulation claire et dogmatique de la conclusion à laquelle était parvenu Terentianus' (33), even though she acknowledges that the fact of it being the only implicit use of

³ In this case the quotations come from a work that is preserved, unlike the preceding one, so Conduché rightly speaks about "quotations" rather than "fragments".

⁴ Cignolo (2002, II 385–6) gives the passage only as a *locus similis*.

Terentianus' in the commentary poses difficulties. Therefore, she cautiously concludes: "il n'y a donc pas de certitude". We could expand on her concern by adding that, if Servius had really used Terentianus' text, it would be shocking that he overlooked the Greek etymology Terentianus gives as a definite argument for being sure that *amurca* was pronounced with a *g*: *quando ἀμύργη Graeca uox est*. The idea that the parallel passage in Isidore (*orig.* 17, 7, 69) could come from another tradition, judging from its different wording, cannot be ruled out. Admittedly, these problems could be remedied by admitting what Conduché seems to demonstrate later in her paper, namely that Servius cites by heart and with a "mémoire sélective qui n'aurait conservé que des sentences utiles à l'enseignement" (40).

In this contribution, there is a most interesting discussion on the controversial topic of the *c geminum*, as Servius seems to misinterpret Terentianus' position. This is expressed in a very difficult text, which Conduché reads with the aid of Cignolo's interpretation, implying the need to accept Lachmann's conjecture (he supplies *si* in verse 1660).⁵ However, the text can be read without accepting Lachmann's conjecture, if *excludere* is taken to mean 'pronounce' rather than 'delete', as Terentianus attested elsewhere.⁶ Accordingly, the (provisional) meaning of the whole passage could be: "since the rule of language demands that the 'c' is duplicated, the word *hicce* is pronounced in full, (and) there will be a vowel".⁷ The meaning of the passage can be elucidated further with a simple correction, replacing *dabitur* with *labitur*,⁸ and a change in punctuation, so that the text would then read: "... *c geminum quoniam sermonis regula poscit / ut fiat, hicce plena uox excluditur, / uocalis labitur*"... since the rule of language demands that 'c' is duplicated, the word *hicce* is pronounced in full, (and) its

⁵ Ter. Maur. 1656–68 *Dabo et latentem, sed notandum creticum: / solus hic inflexit sensus. Nam primus et istic / pes longiorem tertiam dat syllabam, / c geminum, quoniam sermonis regula poscit / ut fiat hicce plena uox, (si) excluditur / uocalis dabitur. Nec consona pellitur ulla, / nisi quae duabus obstat una uocibus / cum uenit in medium uocesque oblimat adhaerens: / bis senus istam litteram monstrat locus. / At geminum in tali pronomine si fugimus c, / spondeus ille non erit qui talis est: / hoc illud germana fuit, sed et hoc erat alma parens: / iambus ille fiet, iste tribrachys.*

⁶ See *ThLL* V 2, 1271, 47–51, where Ter. Maur. 918 is cited. The same meaning is found in 644 (cf. Cignolo, 2002, II 354), and, if our interpretation is admitted, the passage at issue should be added.

⁷ It may be noted that Lachmann's conjecture does not really solve the difficult passage, since it results in a sort of contradiction, as pointed out by the translations of both Cignolo ('poiché la norma linguistica richiede che la parola completa sia *hicce*, se si elimina la vocale, si avranno due C') and Conduché ("C'est un double [k] que l'on obtiendra, puisque la loi de la langue exige le mot complet *hicce*, si on supprime la voyelle"). Indeed, why does the presence of a double 'c' depend on the deletion of the vowel? Is it not true that the double 'c' is already in the full word (with vowel) *hicce*?

⁸ Admittedly, with an uncommon *lǎ-* (see *ThLL* VII 2, 779, 76–7) which, together with the forms *dabo* (v. 1656) and *dat* (v. 1658), may have triggered the change *labitur* > *dabitur*.

final vowel collapses”.⁹

Some clarification can be added to the explanation (37, fn. 16) offered for the parallel passage in Servius’s commentary on Donatus’s *Ars grammatica*.¹⁰ Conduché detects some problems in the last sentence (*Sed ... proferrī*), and accordingly suggests the possibility of understanding the phrase *pro duabus consonantibus* not as “in place of two consonants”, but rather as “before two consonants”.¹¹ In fact, the text in Servius must be understood as referring to two theoretical possibilities (# is used for syllable segmentation), namely, 1. *hoc#ce#ra#tal#*, 2. *so#lu#si#cin#*; therefore, the phrase *sed ... proferrī* should explain (and clarify?) option 1. This is coherent with the passage in Servius’s commentary where Terentianus is criticised, and it is also coherent with the argumentative structure that we find in some other grammarians (Char. *gramm.* p. 12, 30–3; Ps. Prob. *gramm.* IV 258, 32–4), who provide passages in which the twofold scansion of *hic* and *hoc* relates to the geminated nature of the final *-c*, which seems peculiar of those pronouns and is not observed in other monosyllabic words ending in *-c* (e.g., *nec*). Admittedly, the sentence *debet cum quadam conlisione proferrī* is not easy to understand, and it is not fully accounted for in the translation “il doit être prononcé avec un genre d’élision” (37):¹² as demonstrated by Burghini, who follows the authority of Soubiran, *conlisisio* refers to the clash, but it does not presume the result of that clash.¹³ It seems clear that in Servius’s passage *conlisisio* is meant to demonstrate the pronunciation of the geminate consonant one way or another, which we need to assume to account for the long scansion of *hoc*; admittedly, it is not easy to deduce the kind of pronunciation Servius had in mind.¹⁴

⁹ As in modern interpretations, Terentianus takes a full form *hicce* as the starting point; that form, we are told, loses its final vowel through synalepha (compare Mar. Vict. *gramm.* VI 22, 17–8 at *hicce et hocce pronomibus, si uox sequens a uocali incipiat, e nouissimam detrahetis*). Then Terentianus explains that there is no additional loss of one of the ‘c’ at all, since the only consonant that can be elided is the final *-m*.

¹⁰ Serv. *gramm.* IV 424, 34–425, 2 *septimus modus est, cum pronomen c littera terminatum uocalis statim subsequitur: est enim longa in hoc, ‘hoc erat alma parens’; breuis in hoc, ‘solus hic inflexit sensus’. Sed quando c pro duabus consonantibus ponitur, debet cum quadam conlisione proferrī.*

¹¹ The passage from Pompeius, put forward on the following page (Pomp. *gramm.* IV 119, 3 *item c littera aliquando pro duabus consonantibus est et facit longam*), actually excludes this second possibility of interpretation. On the passage from Pompeius see most recently A. Zago, *Pompei Commentum in artis Donati partem tertiam*, Hildesheim 2017, II 244 and fn. 241.

¹² A strict elision would lead to a segmentation *ho#ce#ra*, which is not possible in the context.

¹³ In fact, in cases of vowel clash (and vowel + M + vowel) the possibility arises of either a *conlisisio difficilis ac dura* (Don. 662,11–12), or a (*conlisisio*) *lubrica lenisque* (Don. 662,7–8). See J. Burghini, “Sinalefa y eclipsis en Consencio: problemas de interpretación”, *Myrtia* 27, 2012, 177–x96, esp. 181.

¹⁴ It has been proposed that Servius assumed “une espèce de rupture dans le flux de la parole”: so S. Kiss, *Les transformations de la structure syllabique en latin tardif*, Debrecen

The paper by J. Y. Guillaumin (53–64) traces the sources Servius used to build up the three pieces of information about the plant known as *dictamnium* (dittany). In all three cases Servius refers to the plant's medical use. The tradition about this plant's healing properties can be traced back to Aristotle (*H. A.* 612^a, 4), who, in a series of examples illustrating animal instinct, recalls a curious custom of goats in Crete: looking for dittany when they have been wounded by an arrow. Similar remarks are read in Theophrastus and Dioscorides. Among the Romans, Cicero, Valerius Maximus and Pliny follow the same tradition, and the late antique encyclopaedists (Servius, Servius Danielis and Isidorus) might have drawn the relevant information from them. Guillaumin pays special attention to some remarks (such as the etymology of the plant's name), which are shared by Servius Danielis (hereafter *DSeru.*) and Isidorus, but are not in Servius; from that evidence, the author concludes (63) that at least *a part* of the scholia grouped under the labels *Seruius Danielis* or *Seruius auctus* are later than Isidorus. This conclusion is also coherent with the one in a previous paper (Guillaumin 2010).

E. Jeunet-Mancy (65–77) reviews some evidence confirming the idea of a Servius who is a “paganist” rather than simply “pagan”. This paganism of Servius is illustrated through his use of Lucretius, who he refers to often (an account of the references is on page 70). This is remarkable in the social context of the fifth-century Christianised Rome, which is far from an auspicious place for Epicurean ideas. Some of the mentions of Lucretius suggest that, unlike Macrobius, Servius might have a copy of *De rerum natura*. According to Jeunet-Mancy, Servius shows independence of judgement to a certain degree, and although being an essentially Christian public teacher made him respect “une sorte de devoir de réserve”, the nature of his work allowed him to “disséminer çà et là des remarques qui contredisaient ou concurrençaient, de façon toujours implicite, les thèses chrétiennes” (76).

A. Pellizzari (79–96) discusses the image of Greece in Servius's

1971, 18, who seems to be following the interpretation offered by Hill for a passage in which Velius Longus describes the pronunciation of *hoc erat*; in Hill's view, Velius was referring to a “juncture, rather than two genuine consonant phonemes” (A. A. Hill, “Juncture and Syllable Division in Latin”, *Language* 30, 1954, 439–447, esp. 441): *Vel. gramm.* VII 55, 4–6 (= 25, 13–16 De Napoli) *hanc enim naturam esse quarundam litterarum, ut morentur et enuntiatione [enuntiationis De Napoli] sonum detineant, quod accidit et in eo quod dicimus 'hoc est', cum ipsa uastitas litterae in enuntiatione pinguescat* (compare *Diom. gramm.* I 430, 14–15 *quoniam in his pronomibus c litteram crassum et quasi geminatum continet sonum* [a similar passage in *Char. gramm.* p. 12, 30–33 and *Mar. Vict. gramm.* VI 31, 3–5]). An authoritative summary of the whole problem can be read in X. Ballester, *Fonemática del latín clásico*, Zaragoza 1996, 39–40, where a simple gemination in intervocalic position (/hokkest/) is preferred as a solution. However, one cannot reject the possibility that the peculiarity of *hocc* and *hicc* gave place to an exaggerated pronunciation (in the form of a voicing, a fricativization?) of the syllable offset, resulting in the coincidental descriptions by the grammarians of a ‘thick’ and ‘long’ sound (*crassum, pinguescere, morari, detinere, uastitas, geminatum*).

commentaries by first stating clearly that a realistic handling of Greek landscape by Servius is not at all possible, since Virgil himself had dealt with a strictly “literary” Greece. This consideration justifies the inclusion of this paper in the thematic block “Exploitation des sources érudites”, even though the sources are more literary than erudite. Accordingly, the image of Greece that the grammar teacher presents to his students is a timeless stereotype, which indeed provides the teacher with a pretext to add a number of historical, etymological and etiological explanations. Special attention is paid to mountain landscapes, which are sometimes related to rough weather conditions and sometimes to hunting and herding. These areas, mostly preferred by poets such as Arcadia and Helicon, have a prominent role. Allusions to seas, islands, capes and promontories are also analysed in detail.

Erudition comes again to the foreground in the pages (97–122) that D. Vallat devotes to Servius the commentator’s relationship with astrology. It seems that Servius shares his interest in astrology with Virgil, as reported in the preface to the commentary on *Aen.* 6 (*multa per altam scientiam philosophorum, theologorum, Aegyptiorum*) in a passage where, according to Vallat, the *Aegypti* may well be the ‘Chaldéens’. Vallat places Servius’s astrological remarks in a non-specialised domain, with basic references to planets and signs of the Zodiac, and more specific observations, including astrological interpretations of individual verses: for instance, of *Aen.* 1, 223, on Jupiter abandoning Aeneas, and of *Aen.* 1, 314, commenting on the birth of Aeneas under the sign of Virgo. As Jeunet-Mancy mentions in her paper, Vallat stresses the role of the paganism that Servius demonstrates as a sort of act of resistance, when he gives astrology, a discipline not endorsed by the official authorities, a place in school culture.

The section on “Linguistique” opens with the contribution by C. Brunet (125–41), who, by mainly focusing on the commentary on *Aen.* 4, does not intend to analyse the linguistic accuracy of the etymologies Servius proposes, but rather tries to understand why Servius is led to use those etymologies (127). In fact, examples of well-founded etymologies are only given on 137–8, whereas the preceding pages explore the role of linguistic borrowing, derivation and, especially, paronymy, an important source for etymological explanations, which is abundantly illustrated in this paper. Brunet’s conclusion is that etymology has a dual purpose in Servius’s commentaries. Firstly, it makes a reasoned definition of difficult words possible, which certainly contributes to a basic understanding and to an assimilation of cultural issues, especially pagan ones showing a reluctance to the development of Christendom. Secondly, etymology is a means of asserting classical Latin, and this must be seen as an act of rebellion against the use Christendom was making of classical Latin (for instance, by appropriating political vocabulary to describe church hierarchy).

B. Da Vela and F. Foster (143–53) put forward an interesting comparison

between Servius's commentary on Virgil (obviously not considering *DSeru.*) and Donatus's commentary on Terence. To account for their choice they stress the relevant role both Virgil and Terence played in education in Late Antiquity. They stress, inter alia, the close attention Donatus pays to pragmatic aspects in Terence's plays (gesture, intonation), in contrast with Servius's greater concern for the correct pronunciation of words, especially Greek ones. In explaining this different approach, the authors admit that it is partly due to the distinct literary genre of the corresponding texts (epic vs comedy). A further differential element is the importance Servius, unlike Donatus, gives to historical and religious aspects; according to the authors, this must be explained in relation to Servius's endeavour to preserve the knowledge of pagan customs in a Christianised world, an idea that will be familiar for the reader of this review article.

The comparison between Servius and Donatus (and the *DSeru.*), although with a different aim, is the guiding thread of R. Maltby's revealing paper (155–69) on linguistic change in Servius's commentaries on Virgil. After reviewing the many examples, Maltby concludes that, even if Servius made use of Donatus's commentaries, he stays away from his source in his use of technical terminology (use of *antiquus* instead of *ueteres*), and because his examples of archaism, unlike those in Donatus, have rather a prescriptive than a descriptive aim (the technical word *archaismos* is written by Donatus in Greek letters and by Servius in its Latin form). The remarks in the *DSeru.* are, therefore, closer to Donatus, thus consolidating the hypothesis that they come from Donatus. As for Donatus's commentaries on Terence, the keen reader can complete the evidence Maltby offered with that provided in a documented paper by A. I. Magallón.¹⁵

In Latin grammatical tradition a strong dependence on Greek sources can be observed to the point that the facts of the Latin language are described in accordance with those of the Greek language. For example, it is said that Latin has both long vowels and short vowels to approximate the Greek, and that Latin grammarians detached the interjection from the adverb so they could match the Greeks' number of parts of speech (*partes orationis*). Some grammarians' attempts to find a dual number in Latin follow this line of thought. This is the starting point of C. Nicolas's contribution to the volume (171–90). As already mentioned by Quintilian in the grammatical chapters (*inst.* 1, 5, 42), and much later by Servius on the verb form *conticuere* in Verg. *Aen.* 2, 1, some scholars tried to ascribe a dual number to the Latin language and saw that dual in the perfect forms in *-ere*. That seems to be the case of a certain Antonius Rufus, who is also referred to by Velius Longus concerning orthographic matters. Both Quintilian and Servius reject the

¹⁵ A. I. Magallón García, "El Comentario a Terencio de Donato: la lengua de Terencio y los veteres", *RELat* 2, 2002, 17–32.

view that the form in *-ere* might have been a dual. It is from Quintilian's evidence that Nicolas draws to reconstruct Antonius Rufus's theory of the Latin dual. The paper's value is increased by the diachronic review of the dual number in other Indo-European languages, particularly Greek and Sanskrit, and with the historical explanation of the third person plural ending of the Latin perfect (*-ērunt, -ērent, -ēre*).

Under the guise of a study on the lexical family of the verb *usurpare* in Servius's works, S. Roesch (191–220) offers a well-documented reflection on the concepts of linguistic norm and deviation. As a starting point, the author takes a shocking piece of evidence: in Servius, unlike in other grammarians, the pejorative use ('use against the norm') of the above-mentioned lexical family occurs much more frequently than the usual one ('use'). In Servius that use covers both morphological (most often) and lexical, syntactical and stylistic issues and even issues pertaining to *realia*. Roesch explains this apparent paradox by emphasising that Servius's attitude towards both the author he comments on and the pupils he addresses his commentaries to in the classroom is ambiguous: concerning Virgil, Servius's remarks have a descriptive and elucidating dimension, whereas a prescriptive dimension is required in classroom practice. Interestingly, at least in Servius's use of the verb, *usurpare* (and lexical family) often seems to show an inchoative aspect ('to start using', 'adopt the use of'). Consequently, by using the verb, the grammarian generally places himself in a moment of either creation or choice between two optional linguistic units/utterances: one is analogically expected, whereas the other is chosen either by the poet (*auctoritas*) or common use (*consuetudo*). For instance, there is a very illuminating contrast between *uti* and *usurpare* in a passage of Servius's commentary on Donatus¹⁶ in which we are told that the ancients 'started to use', 'put to use' certain participles of neuter verbs (*cenatus, nupta, regnata*); therefore, the grammarian says, those participles can still be used (*utimur*) because they are endorsed by authority. However, Servius warns, it is no longer possible to put in use (*non tamen possumus... usurpare*) participles of other neuter verbs. As shown below, these uses can be classified under the meaning of 'abusive use' too.

In contrast, not all the examples collected under the heading "Emplois non-marqués : « utiliser »" (209–12) are unquestionably non-derogatory. For instance, in Serv. *Aen.* 9, 703 the remark on Virgil's use of *taurea* instead

¹⁶ Serv. *gramm.* IV 417, 37–418, 2 *et illud sciendum est, maiores nostros saepe a uerbis neutralibus praeteriti temporis usurpasse participia, ut est regnata triumphata placita nupta pransus cenatus et similia. quibus nos ideo utimur, quoniam auctoritate firmantur; non tamen possumus de aliis uerbis neutralibus similiter quae non lecta sunt usurpare, sed debemus ea tantum quae lecta sunt dicere.* A similar contrast is often found between *dicimus* referring to contemporary use and *usurpatum est* pointing to a form that has been put in use by a literary authority, usually against the expected analogical form: this is the case in Serv. *auct. georg.* 3, 245 (*hic et haec leo* against *haec lea*),

of the allegedly more common *taurina* is not without criticism, as Roesch acknowledges (“l’emploi du suffixe *-eus*, jugé moins approprié que le suffixe *-inus*”); indeed, even if Servius takes the opportunity to introduce Pliny’s doctrine on the irregularity of nominal derivation,¹⁷ we cannot infer from this that Virgil did not choose the less regular form. As for Serv. *Aen.* 7, 532, it describes inventing a personal name from a river name, for which *usurpare* seems to be used¹⁸ with a different meaning, independent from the concept of linguistic norm: therefore, *bene* does not refer to linguistic correctness or regularity, but rather to whether the name is appropriate for its bearer.

Roesch also comments on the use of *usurpatiua species* as applied to the gerund forms.¹⁹ The label is interesting despite Servius not being aware of it. After reporting Baratin’s view (namely that forms in *-ndum* “sont bien des verbes, mais par catachrèse”),²⁰ Roesch puts forward an explanation she considers simpler, namely that an *usurpatiua* verbal form is such because “est « hors norme », peut-être parce qu’elle *usurpat* des désinences nominales, ce qui est contre nature” (214). However, there is no reference to Sluiter’s suggestion,²¹ who prefers a plain etymological understanding of the phrase *usurpatiua species*: this is considered the one that ‘puts into practice’ (*usu exerceri*) the action of the verb, in the same way, Sluiter says, as the gerund is the form that ‘carries’ (*gerere*) the action of the verb.

In my opinion, it could be strongly defended that *usurpatiua species* is such insofar as it ‘appropriates’ (*usurpat*) a verbal voice (the active) that does not correspond to its actual form (passive). That is the characteristic trait of the five forms of the *species usurpatiua*²² stressed by some authors and, most interestingly, that peculiarity makes it possible to relate the category of the *species usurpatiua* to the use of the verb *usurpare*, which several grammarians, including Servius (in the passage commented on above), refer

¹⁷ Discussion on (ir)regularity of derivation can be traced back at least to Caesar and Varro. On this matter see A. Garcea, *Caesar’s De analogia. Edition, Translation, and Commentary*, Oxford 2012, 162–7.

¹⁸ As in Serv. *Aen.* 1, 235 *A SANGVINE TEVCRI Teucrum pro Dardano posuit: Dardanus enim de Italia profectus est, Teucer de Creta: quia solent poetae nomina de uicinis prouinciis uel personis usurpare ...*

¹⁹ Diom. *gramm.* I 395, 30–396, 2 *Vsurpatiua species est huius modi, cum dicimus legendo proficit, id est dum legit; legendi causa uenit, id est ut legat; legendum tibi est, id est necesse est ut legas.*

²⁰ M. Baratin, *La naissance de la syntaxe à Rome*, Paris 1989, 146.

²¹ I. Sluiter, “Grammatici antiqui de gerundio et ἐπιρρήμασι θετικαῖς”, in S. Albert – J. Kramer – W. Schweickard (eds.), *Miscellanea ad linguam Latinam linguasque recentiores attinentia*, Würzburg 1994, 75–87, esp. 80–2.

²² Macr. *exc. gramm.* V 649, 22–23 *sunt autem uniuersa V, amandi amando amandum amatum amatu*

to as participles.²³ Concerning gerund and supine,²⁴ the discussion on their uncertain category (verbs, participles or even adverbs) appears to have prevented modern scholars from grasping the real sense of *usurpative species*.²⁵

The section on “Rhétorique et poétique” includes five papers: three on what can be called Virgil’s “poetic landscape”: the infernos (F. Barrière), Arcadia (F. Collin), the “bucolic” countryside (H. Richer). The other two deal with stylistic figures: metaphor (M. Bouquet) and “hystéron–protéron” (M. Kazanskaya).

Within the references to the underworld in the commentaries, Barrière’s paper (223–37) tries to identify which elements are “Servian” and which can be traced back to Virgil. Special attention is paid to the location of the underworld and its internal structure. The paper emphasises Servius’s interest in ‘la question des Enfers’, since the commentator is not content with commenting on Virgil, but he also compares Virgil’s view of the underworld with the one found in other authors, which is sometimes different. Even if Servius hardly expresses his judgement about conflicting views, Barrière thinks it possible to trace “une préférence de Servius pour une certaine représentation du monde infernal”: drawing from astronomy, Servius relates the underworld with the planets rather than with the earth itself.

Collin takes a different point of view in his long contribution (259–97) on Arcadia. His main interest relies, firstly, on identifying the sources Servius used to describe Arcadia (his sources are either poets such as Hesiod, Theocritus and Nicander, or historians such as Cato and Sallust, or scholars such as Varro and Nigidius). Secondly, he emphasises the way Virgil handles the topic with a different aim in his three works, and also the way the commentator clarifies why the poet says nothing about some details of the topic.

²³ E.g. Don. *gramm.* IV 388, 7 (p. 645, 8 Holtz) *Ab impersonali uerbo participia nisi usurpata non ueniunt*; Explan. in Don. IV 515, 24–7 *scire autem debemus maiores nostros quaedam participia praeteriti temporis usurpasse contra artem a neutralibus uerbis, ut nupta pransus cenatus triumphatus regnatus*; Serv. *Aen.* 10, 444 *AEQVORE IVSSO pro ipsi iussi et est usurpatum participium: nam iubeor non dicimus, unde potest uenire iussus. sic ergo hic participium usurpauit, ut Horatius uerbum, dicens haec ego procurare et idoneus imperor et non inuitus* (Roesch rightly collects this passage on page 204 as a “Problème de voix verbale”). Occasionally the abusive extension implied in *usurpare* when applied to participles does not have to do with voice, but with tense (Serv. *Aen.* 1, 121 *VECTVS qua uehebatur significat. et pro praesenti participio, quod non habemus, praeteritum posuit [...] usurpative*) or person (Dion. *gramm.* I 363, 19–20 *ab hoc impersonali uerbo [scil. paenitet] usurpatum est participium temporis instantis hic et haec et hoc paenitens*).

²⁴ Let us point out, in passing, that the label *supinum* has much to do with voice: “*supinum* tourne autour du sens passif, au moins optionnel, de ces formes” (P. Flobert, *Les verbes déponents latins des origines à Charlemagne*, Paris 1975, 451).

²⁵ Accordingly, the ‘metalepsis’ used by Macrobius (*exc. gram.* V 648, 31–2 *nam uado salutatum hoc est dicere uado salutare aut ut salutem*) should not be understood as demonstrating that *salutatum* is a verb, but rather as emphasising the unexpected active sense of that participle.

In between the two contributions we have just commented on, we find Bouquet's paper (239–258) revealing Servius's original view on Virgilian metaphor, referred to in both the commentary on Virgil and the commentary on Donatus. According to Bouquet, when compared to his predecessors (Charisius, Diomedes, Donatus), Servius is seen to be one step ahead concerning metaphor, for he shows an unpretentious concept of metaphor and comparison, two stylistic figures he describes distinctly, unlike the traditions known to the Romans from Quintilian onwards.

Kazanskaya's study on the figure of hystéron–protéron (299–318) is fully justified in this section. The figure is mainly studied in the Servian corpus, even if an initial chapter of “état de la question à l'époque de Servius” is actually a brief review of the philological approach to the figure in Greek (from Aristarchus, describing the figure as one of the typical traits of Homeric style, until Eustathius), and in Roman tradition (from Cicero and Pliny the Younger to Servius himself). As for Servius, a chapter on terminology is first offered to observe the use of *hysteroproteron* and *hysterologia*, which reveals the grammarian's concern for the use of accurate terminology. This is followed by Servius's personal approach to hystéron–protéron; we are told that, when addressing the passages analysed by other grammarians, Servius hardly mentions their names, but interestingly he does so in two passages relating to hystéron–protéron, Serv. auct. *Aen.* 1, 150, where Cornutus is mentioned, and Schol. Bern. *Aen.* 1, 179, where Donatus is the explicitly acknowledged source. The first of these passages is discussed in detail, since it is quite controversial,²⁶ and Kazanskaya rightly shows her discontent with the interpretations proposed so far: “aucune véritable solution n'a encore été trouvée” (308). Cugusi is on the right path when he proposes that the *praeposterum* Cornutus sees under acceptance of *uolunt* concerns “la reciproca posizione di *faces et saxa* da una parte, di *arma* dall'altra (ci si aspetterebbe prima la menzione del generico 'aferrare le armi', poi il conseguente lancio di tizzoni ardenti e sassi)”. Still Cugusi's proposal can be nuanced: in my view, the oddity in the Virgilian verse (if *uolunt* is accepted) is not that the specific *faces et saxa* come first and the generic *arma* come later, but rather that the crowd, eager to fight, is longing for *mere* stones

²⁶ Serv. auct. *Aen.* 1, 150 *IAMQVE FACES ET SAXA VOLANT multi non 'uolant', sed 'uolunt' inuenisse se dicunt. sed Cornutus uerendum, ait, ne praeposterum sit faces uelle, et sic saxa, cum alibi maturius et ex ordine dictum sit 'arma uelit poscatque simul rapiatque iuuentus'*. The author refers to approaches to the passage by Timpanaro and Lazzarini, but misses the more recent analysis by P. Cugusi, “Lucio Anneo Cornuto esegeta di Virgilio”, in I. Gualandri – G. Mazzoli (eds.), *Gli Annei, una famiglia nella storia e nella cultura di Roma imperiali. Atti del Convegno internazionale di Milano - Pavia, 2-6 maggio 2000*, Como 2003, 211–44, especially 233–4. This study has been brought to my notice by my colleague Marcos A. Pérez Alonso, who has recently contributed the entry “Cornutus” to the web project directed by A. Garcea, *Grammatici disiecti: Sources fragmentaires pour l'histoire de la grammaire latine* (the entry can be accessed online at <https://gradis.hypotheses.org/238>).

and torches instead of *real* arms (the ones the youth first demand in *Aen.* 7, 340, an example of a logical order), which are absurdly then mentioned, whereas we would expect the crowd to want real arms to fight first, and then, in their absence, settling for stones and torches. Kazanskaya concludes that Servius, unlike the general consensus of grammar handbooks, usually offers an alternative explanation for the use of the figure, whereas he omits all reference to the effect it provokes.

By studying the use of four adjectives—*bucolicus*, *amoebaeus*, *rusticus* and *pastoralis*—in Servius's commentaries, H. Richer (319–49) tries to outline the history of the reception, perception and study of the bucolic genre. As rightly stressed, the use of those words can represent the opinion of an individual, but also a whole tradition that goes back to Theocritus. There is special consideration of how the Theocritean phrase βουκολικὰ ἀοιδά (Theoc. 7, 49) is recalled by Servius *carmen amoebaeum*, even if it is not known whether Servius himself created the phrase or he borrowed it from another author, for the loan word *amoebaeus* is only further found in Diomedes (*gramm.* I 481, 25), who uses it to name a type of verse. Equally interesting are the remarks on the other adjectives dealt with: *rusticus* is used by Servius to correspond to Theocritus' βουκολικός, with an additional metapoetic nuance enabled by Virgil himself when he applies this adjective (usually having a pejorative sense) to the Muse (*eccl.* 3, 84).

The miscellaneous section on Roman history, society and religion is opened by M. L. Delvigo's contribution (353–67), where attention is paid to how Servius perceives and stresses Virgil's effort in connecting the topics of his epic poem (which can be defined as “come eziologico”) with elements of the *mos Romanus*. By doing this, the scholiast presents the commented work as a kind of encyclopedy provided by an erudite poet for the most diverse areas of knowledge. Romans must see in the history of Aeneas not only the beginning of their own history, but also the foundations of their civilization: religious rituals, civil ceremonies, social and military practices, family customs. The story of Dido is also presented as an “*aition* di quella ostilità che opporrà lungamente Cartagine a Roma” (354). Apart from the well-recognised etiological intention of these episodes, Delvigo proposes the existence of an “*implicito discorso eziologico de natura più vasta e pervasiva, anche se a volte sottile e quasi impercettibile*” (357). It is precisely in relation to this hidden discourse that the role of the commentator becomes highly relevant, since Servius turns into the guard (sometimes the only one) of the keys to interpret the connection between the *Aeneid* and Roman civilization.

A particular aspect in Roman religion, the figure of *pontifices* and *flamines*, is analysed in the paper by M. K. Lhommé (369–94), who tries to show Servius's determination (more marked in *DSeru.*) to connect those priestly figures with fictional characters such as Aeneas and Dido. In this commitment, he makes use of a scholarly tradition that can be traced back at

least to the end of the Republic, even if we know this mainly through Festus and Gellius. In addition to the rich bibliography used by Lhommé, we have the monograph by F. Marco Simón, since it revises some of the thesis on the *flamen Dialis*, which had been put forward in the abundantly cited work by J. H. Vanggaard (1988).²⁷

G. Ramires's paper (395–404) raises a fundamental and controversial aspect of the relationship between Servius and Virgil: the risk of assigning the latter's ideas or attitudes to the former, since the boundaries between them are often diffuse. This problem is illustrated by analysing Servius's attitude towards women; Ramires poses the question whether Servius adheres to or departs from the misogynistic view held by many ancient writers. Showing his excellent knowledge of the commentaries on Virgil, the author reviews Servius's stance on female characters or roles, a stance in which slight misogyny is detected alongside some prudery. Even if virtually irrelevant in Ramires's argument, concerning the story of *Licymnia*, the relationship of *ex stupro educauerat* and *dulcia furta* does not raise the difficulties that the author detects (403): *stuprum* refers, as elsewhere in Servius, and as *furtum* does, to a 'furtive', illicit, relationship,²⁸ also evoked by the adverb *furtim*, whose immediate reference is birth recognition, but also indirectly recalls the illicit relationship between the *rex* and the *serua*.

It might be no exaggeration to state that the most famous epithet in Latin literature is the one Virgil applies to Aeneas, i.e. *pius*, a word with a complex, controversial meaning that is both epic and religious and which has been the object of many studies. However, some special meanings of the term have received less attention, for example its relationship with the "exactitude rituelle" and the one referring more generally to human obligation with gods, parents and friends and with no direct connection to cult. These uses of *pius* are dealt with by M. Simon (405–13), who analyses, for instance, the scholium on *far pium* in *Serv. Aen.* 5, 745, which is elucidated with the aid of another scholium in *DSeru. (ecl. 8, 82 Quid enim est pium nisi castum?)*, so it is shown that it does not refer to *pius Aeneas* at all. More attention is paid to *Serv. Aen.* 7, 21 (*PII PATERENTVR TROES ergo impii qui pertulerunt: impii autem propter occisa Solis armenta*), a passage in which the Trojans are said to be *pii* in contrast with the Greek *impii*: this points to an ancient controversy that might come to the foreground in the context of the quarrel between East and West at the end of the fourth century AD. This could account for Servius's trouble in dealing with Aeneas' controversial *pietas*,

²⁷ F. Marco Simón, *Flamen Dialis. El sacerdote de Júpiter en la religión romana*, Madrid 1996.

²⁸ On the double meaning of *stuprum* ('rape' and 'adultery'), see, for instance, J. N. Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*, London 1982, 201 (and 167–8 on *furtum*), and E. Fantham, "Stuprum: Public Attitudes and Penalties for Sexual Offences in Republican Rome", *EMC* 35, 1991, 267–91.

which makes the commentator bound to a conscious manipulation of the Homeric reference.

F. Stok (415–34) pays attention to the different approaches found in Servius and *DSeru.* on Virgilian anachronisms, which Horsfall studied and classified in the corresponding entry of the *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*. Stok focuses on the non-explicit anachronisms, in other words those relating the story of Aeneas with facts that are obviously post-Homeric. On the contrary, the author does not deal with explicit anachronisms, those linking the origin of rites or toponyms which arose later to Homeric times. The aim of these anachronisms is just to emphasise a continuum between the epic past and the Augustan present, and this is not contested by commentators. Servius takes a more respectful attitude towards the poet, whereas *DSeru.* overtly classifies non-explicit anachronisms as examples of *prolepsis*, a term that had already been used by Alexandrian scholars as an equivalent of *anachronismós*.

Three papers relating to mythology close the volume. Two of them deal with specific myths: the one by F. Daspet (437–64) focuses on the legend of the blackberry bush in Servius's commentary on the *Eclogues*; the one by M. Lafond (465–78) examines the complexity of the figure of Hercules. As for the third of the mythological contributions, the one by C. Longobardi (469–97) shows a more general scope, since it analyses the influx Servius had in later commentaries on mythological matters; the myths under consideration are those of Pelops and Hippodamia, Procne and Philomela, and Daedalus.

After the contributions, the nineteen pages, including more than 500 bibliographical references, give an idea of the wide range and depth of the topics addressed in the volume. Fundamental matters, such as Servius's education, his relationship to *DSeru.*, his position on Christendom and his attitude on the commented poet touch most of the papers, so that when they are read closely, they reveal a fruitful dialogue between experts. Following the "English abstracts" is an "Index auctorum" (turned into an "Index locorum" for Servius), which closes a volume full of "savoir" and "érudition", thus a worthy representative of the prestigious series "Spudasmata" in Olms publisher, which offers the book in the well-bound paperback edition we have handled, and in electronic format (ISBN: 978-3-487-42180-3).

JAVIER URÍA
 Universidad de Zaragoza
 juria@unizar.es