

M. N. Kazanskaya  
(Institute for Linguistic Studies, RAS, St. Petersburg)

**ΒΑΘΥΠΕΠΛΟΣ ΕΛΕΝΗ AND ΣΥΡΙΖΟΥΣΑ... ΛΟΓΧΗ:  
on two ‘Homeric’ quotations in Servius (*ad Aen.* 7, 275 and 12, 691)**

Although Servius’ commentary to the *Aeneid* gives a fairly large number of quotations from Greek poetry, his reputation as a Greek scholar has been more than uneven. Despite occasional inaccuracies and inconsistencies in Servius’ treatment of Greek material, however, his commentary preserves invaluable pieces of Greek and Roman exegesis on Homer and Vergil, and even passages that appear at first glance to cite an erroneous parallel should not be discarded without further research. The article presents two case studies involving a supposedly Homeric expression, although neither is found in the Homeric text as we know it. (a) Βαθύπεπλος Ἑλένη appears in Serv. *ad Aen.* 7, 275 as a parallel to Vergil’s *in praesepeibus altis*. The epithet βαθύπεπλος is not attested in Homer, nor in Greek poetry, except Quint. Smyrn. 13, 552. While scholars and editors explained this expression as a misquotation of τανύπεπλος Ἑλένη (*Il.* 3, 228; *Od.* 4, 305; 15, 171), a look at Homeric exegesis and at the lexicographical tradition shows that βαθύπεπλος was actively discussed by ancient scholars: there are traces that in Antiquity it must have been a *varia lectio* for βαθυκόλων at *Il.* 18, 122, and Serv. *ad Aen.* 7, 275 suggests that it also may be reconstructed as a *varia lectio* for Helen’s description as τανύπεπλος. (b) Serv. *ad Aen.* 12, 691 preserves a hexametric fragment that is ascribed to Homer, but bears a distinctive Hellenistic colouring. It is shown that the text of the notice must have contained two quotations, not only the fragment that is preserved, but also οἷστῶν τε ῥοῖζον (*Il.* 16, 361) which is actually an accurate parallel for Vergil’s *striduntque hastilibus aerae*.

*Key words:* Vergil, Homer, Servius, βαθύπεπλος, compound epithets, Alexandrian scholarship, lost Homeric readings, intertextuality.

М. Н. Казанская  
(Институт лингвистических исследований РАН)

**Βαθύπεπλος Ἑλένη и сyрiзoυcα... λoγxη: o двyx ‘гомеровских’  
цитатах у Сервия (*ad Aen.* 7, 275 и 12, 691)**

Комментарий Сервия к *Энеиде* содержит немало цитат из греческой поэзии, однако репутация Сервия как знатока греческого языка была и остается неоднозначной. Часть греческого материала приводится и интерпретируется неаккуратно, но при этом комментарий отражает многовековую филологическую традицию, как римскую, так

и греческую. Это заставляет относиться с вниманием даже к тем параллелям, которые на первый взгляд могут показаться «ошибками».

В статье разбираются два греческих выражения, которые в комментарии Сервия приписываются Гомеру, но не засвидетельствованы в дошедшем до нас тексте гомеровских поэм.

(a) Βαθύπεπλος Ἑλένη приводится в комментарии Serv. *ad Aen.* 7, 275 в качестве стилистической параллели к вергилиевскому *in praesepeibus altis*. Эпитет βαθύπεπλος не засвидетельствован ни у Гомера, ни в греческой поэзии, за исключением Quint. Smyrn. 13, 552. Исследователи и издатели считали это выражение ошибкой вместо τανύπεπλος Ἑλένη (*Il.* 3, 228; *Od.* 4, 305; 15, 171), однако комментарии к Гомеру и греческая лексикографическая традиция показывает, что вариант βαθύπεπλος активно обсуждался античными филологами и критиками гомеровского текста: сохранились следы того, что в античности данный эпитет выступал в качестве варианта к βαθυκόλων в *Il.* 18, 122, а замечание Сервия заставляет предполагать подобное различие и для τανύπεπλος при описании Елены.

(b) В Serv. *ad Aen.* 12, 691 приводится фрагмент гекзаметра, который приписан Гомеру, но отличается явным эллинистическим колоритом. В статье показано, что комментарий Сервия исходно должен был содержать две цитаты — сохранившийся фрагмент эллинистической поэзии и ὀϊστῶν τε ῥοῖζον (*Il.* 16, 361), который действительно представляет собой хорошую параллель к вергилиевскому *striduntque hastilibus aerae*.

*Ключевые слова:* Вергилий, Гомер, Сервий, βαθύπεπλος, двусоставные эпитеты, александрийские филологи, гомеровские различия, интертекстуальность.

Servius has enjoyed a very uneven reputation as a Greek scholar, and especially in the last decades especially his first-hand knowledge of Greek sources and even his competence have been called into question<sup>1</sup>. This is partly due to the poor textual transmission of the Greek quotations in his text, partly to the briefness and occasional inconsistency with which some of the issues involving Greek material are treated, but also to the fact that Servius, for pedagogical reasons, in many cases deliberately chose not to include Greek parallels in his commentary, unless absolutely necessary for the discussion<sup>2</sup>. However, Servius' commentary does preserve a large number of valuable Greek parallels, whether acquired first-

<sup>1</sup> See Cameron 2011: 533; Racine 2015: 53–55, who states bluntly: “We should then minimize the extent of Servius' <Greek> culture acquired at first hand”.

<sup>2</sup> For a full discussion, see Kazanskaya 2021 (in print).

hand or taken from the previous scholarly tradition, and even passages that may appear, at first glance, as errors often contain genuine and important material. This article presents two case studies of Servian “errors” which are not in fact errors at all.

### **Serv. *ad Aen.* 7, 275**

In his note on Vergil’s description of king Latinus’ impressive harras of horses, *stabant ter centum nitidi in praesepeibus altis* “three hundred of <these horses> stood gleaming in high stalls” (*Aen.* 7, 275), Servius comments on the poetic practice of characterizing a person (or, in this case, an animal) by an epithet that describes a material object associated with that person, thus — in a kind of metonymy or synecdoche — evoking a quality of the person in question:

IN PRAESEPIBVS ALTIS multa non propter se, sed propter aliud dicuntur: nam per praesepia alta equorum magnitudo monstratur, ut Homerus βαθύπεπλος Ἑλένη, id est longas per vestes.

ΒΑΘΥΠΕΠΛΟΣ ΑΕΝΗ **A** ΒΛΟΥΤΕΤΛΟCCEΛΕΝΙΤ **R** ΒΑΥΠΕΠΙΑ ΕΟC CΕΑΕΙΤΙ **L**  
ΒΑΟΥΠΕΤΙΟCCEΑΝΤΙ **H** ΒΑΟΥΠΕΠΙΑCCEΑΕΝΙΙ **M** ΒΑΟΥΠΕΠΙΑΟCΕΔΕΝC **F**

«IN PRAESEPIBVS ALTIS: many things are said not for their own sake, but for the sake of something else: for through the height of the stalls, the height of the horses is shown, as Homer βαθύπεπλος Ἑλένη ‘Helen of the deep garment’, i.e. through <her> long garments” (Serv. *ad Aen.* 7, 275).

The phenomenon Servius describes in this entry is indeed well attested (in particular, for women’s epithets in Homer<sup>3</sup>), and was discussed by ancient critics. The Greek parallel quoted by Servius, *ut Homerus βαθύπεπλος Ἑλένη*, shows that he was taking as his starting point the philological discussion surrounding the use of

<sup>3</sup> See, especially, Wackernagel 1934: 195: “In der Tat kann man sagen, daß, wenn Homer durch ein rühmendes Epitheton die Schönheit einer bestimmten Göttin oder menschlichen Frau hervorheben will, er lieber ein Kompositum setzt, wodurch ihr der Besitz eines schönen Körperteils oder Gewandstücks u.dgl. zugeschrieben wird, als daß er sie einfach als καλή bezeichnete”. This stylistic phenomenon was fully recognized by the ancient critics, cf. e.g. καλλίζωνοι· ἀπὸ μέρους (Hsch. κ 443); [ἀργυρό-πεζα] ἀπὸ μέρους ὅλη καλή (schol. Gen. *ad Il.* 1, 538; cf. schol. D *ad Il.* 1, 538); λευκώλενος· λευκόπηγος· ἀπὸ μέρους, ὅλη λευκή καὶ καλή... (Hsch. λ 745); etc. Obviously, in the interpretation of compound epithets of this kind, the part of body or of attire highlighted by the epithet may be significant, evoking its own set of associations.

compound epithets to characterize a woman's overall appearance by emphasizing a single detail (although his application of the same principle to the line on Latinus' horses seems fairly innovative). The choice of the epithet βαθύπεπλος as the Homeric parallel for Vergil's *in praesepeibus altis* fit the logic of Servius' argumentation in this passage remarkably well (due to its polysemy, Latin *altus* would correspond equally well to βαθυ- and αἶψυ- compounds).

However, any attempt to discover the expression βαθύπεπλος Ἑλένη in Homer proves disappointing: indeed, the epithet βαθύπεπλος is not attested in the Homeric poems, or in the archaic literature for that matter; it does not appear as a variant reading in the manuscripts and is not included in the major dictionaries of epic poetry, and the *LSJ* mentions a single usage in Quintus Smyrnaeus (13, 552; this passage will be studied later)<sup>4</sup>. Helen in Homeric poems is, however, characterized thrice by a similar epithet, τανύπεπλος “with garments stretched, i.e. thin and long” (*Il.* 3, 228; *Od.* 4, 305; 15, 171). Given the complex — and shifting — semantics of τανύπεπλος<sup>5</sup>, it would be possible to assume that by late Antiquity the first root of the compound may have been replaced by the simpler synonym βαθυ- (either by Servius or his source), or else that βαθύπεπλος might be a contamination of τανύπεπλος and one of the βαθυ- compounds, such as βαθύκολπος, probably due to Servius' *lapsus memoriae*<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> See *LSJ* 1996, 301 s.v. βαθύπεπλος. The compound is not mentioned by Chantraine (1968–1977), and is absent from *LfgreE*.

<sup>5</sup> Chantraine translates τανύπεπλος “à la robe longue” (Chantraine 1968–1977, 1091 s.v. τανυ-) and “aux longs voiles” (ibid. 883 s.v. πέπλος); *LSJ* gives the translation “with flowing robe” (*LSJ* 1996: 1755 s.v. τανύπεπλος). Risch 1974, 190 thought that τανύπεπλος was created at the stage where the first element of the compound began to be associated with τανύω and no longer with the original adverbial element (that he reconstructs as \*τανύς), but Frisk rightly stresses that for this compound the absolute separation of two meanings is impossible (Frisk 1960, 853, s.v. τανυ-). For a concise and accurate summary of the semantics of τανύπεπλος in the Homeric poems, see A. Hoekstra: “τανύπεπλος: must originally have meant ‘with thin robe’ [...], but was perhaps taken as ‘with flowing robe’ by the poet and his listeners, because in such compounds τανυ- became associated with τανύω” (Heubeck, Hoekstra 1989, 242 *ad Od.* 15, 171). See also Edmunds 2019, 73.

<sup>6</sup> Thus suggested by Friedrich Schoell to Georg Thilo: “Servium autem τανύπεπλος cum βαθύκολπος confudisse” (Thilo 1883–1884: II.2, IV). Apparently for similar reasons βαθύπεπλος Ἑλένη does not appear in the

Nevertheless, a closer look at the philological tradition shows that βαθύπεπλος is actually well represented in lexicographers and the commentaries; even more importantly, in all the scholarly contexts where it is cited βαθύπεπλος is definitely associated with Homer. Thus, the epithet appears in three passages in Eustathius' commentary on the Homeric poems. The first time it is cited in a series of compound epithets applied to women and evoking πέπλος that are meant to illustrate the fact that πέπλος was a strictly women's garment (just as χιτών was men's): ὡς καὶ αἱ βαθύπεπλοι καὶ καλλίπεπλοι δηλοῦσι καὶ ἡ κροκόπεπλος καὶ τὸ «πέπλοισιν ἐκπνεῖ» παρ' Εὐριπίδῃ, "as is shown by '[women] of deep peploses', and '[women] of beautiful peploses', and 'she of the saffron peplos', and the expression 'decks her out with peploses' in Euripides" (Eustath. *ad Il.* 2, 42 = vol. 1, p. 261 van der Valk). In this series, the epithet καλλίπεπλος had been used by Pindar and Euripides (Pind. *Pyth.* 3, 25; Eur. *Tr.* 338), and κροκόπεπλος was used already by Homer of Eos (*Il.* 8, 1; 19, 1; 23, 222; 24, 695); the last expression πέπλοισιν ἐκπνεῖ is well suited to Eustathius' argumentation, as Hippolytus had used it in his diatribe against women to describe how the husband is continuously forced to acquire costly garments for his wife (Eur. *Hipp.* 632). The epithet βαθύπεπλος (used in the plural form, and obviously referring to a context where it had been used to qualify a group of women) is the only epithet in the series that cannot be traced back to a poetic context. In another passage, Eustathius gives another series of epithets applied to women: τὸ δὲ «εὐζωνος» γυναικὸς ἐπίθετον, καθὰ καὶ τὸ βαθύπεπλος καὶ βαθύζωνος καὶ τανύπεπλος, "εὐζωνος 'with a good girdle' is a woman's epithet, the same as βαθύπεπλος 'with a deep peplos', and βαθύζωνος 'with a deep girdle' and τανύπεπλος 'with a peplos stretched long'" (Eustath. *ad Il.* 9, 590 = vol. 2, p. 813 van der Valk). All compounds of this series are attested in Homer, except, once again, βαθύπεπλος<sup>7</sup>; it is also worth

---

section 'Homerus' in Malcolm Davies' *Epicorum Graecorum fragmenta* (Davies 1988: 105–112; cf. Davies' prefatory remark to the section: "monendum est maiorem partem istorum fragmentorum quae sequuntur errore, lapsu memoriae, ludibrio vel sim. ortam esse. quae de 'Homero' dixerunt Dio Chrys. 52.4 [...] consulto omisi"). The assumption is actually an old one: already Robert Estienne in his edition of Vergil with Servius' notes simply replaced the transmitted βαθύπεπλος with τανύπεπλος.

<sup>7</sup> The epithet εὐζωνος appears in *Il.* 1, 429; 6, 467; 9, 366; 9, 590; 9, 667; 23, 261; 23, 760; βαθύζωνος appears in *Il.* 9, 594; *Od.* 3, 154; cf. Hes. fr. 205 Merkelbach–West; besides the three contexts, where τανύπεπλος is

noting that here βαθύπεπλος appears side by side with τανύπεπλος, as an independently existing compound. Finally, in the note on *Od.* 1, 121, βαθύπεπλος is discussed together with ἐλκεσίπεπλος:

τὸ μέντοι τῶν γυναικῶν ἐλκεσίπεπλον, αἷς ὁ πέπλος ἐν τῷ βαδίζειν ἐφέλκεται διὰ τὸ βαθὺ τοῦ ἱματισμοῦ, εἴη ἂν κληρὸς τοῖς Ἰταλοῖς ἐκ τοῦ Τρωϊκοῦ Αἰνείου. Ἑλληνὶς γὰρ γυνή, οὔτε βαθύπεπλος, οὔτε ἐλκεσίπεπλος παρ' Ὀμήρῳ εὔρηται, “however, women’s trait of ἐλκεσίπεπλον ‘with training peplos’, whose peplos as they walk trails on the ground because of the deepness of their dress, would have been inherited by inhabitants of Italy from the Trojan Aeneas. For in Homer no Greek woman is called either βαθύπεπλος ‘with peplos flowing in a deep fold’ or ἐλκεσίπεπλος ‘with a training peplos’ ” (Eustath. *ad Od.* 1, 121 = vol. 1, p. 31 Stallbaum).

The epithet ἐλκεσίπεπλος is attested three times in the *Iliad* in the formular antithesis Τρῶας καὶ Τρωάδας ἐλκεσιπέπλους (*Il.* 6, 442 = 22, 105; the two accusatives are separated by the verb in 7, 297), and once in Hesiod’s *Catalogue of women*, of Theban women (Καδμηΐδες ἐλκεσίπε[πλοι, fr. 193, 2). On the whole, it seems reflect a stereotypical depiction of the inhabitants of Asia Minor already current in the archaic age, as the Ionians (remarkably, not only women, but men as well) are characterized by a similar compound evoking training garments, Ἰάονες ἐλκεχίτωνες (*Il.* 13, 685; cf. *hHom.Ap.* 147)<sup>8</sup>. It is important to stress, however, that none of these usages of ἐλκεσίπεπλος and ἐλκεχίτων carries any pejorative connotations, both epithets simply emphasizing a difference in dress. However, ancient scholars viewed ἐλκεσίπεπλος, and as we know from other sources, βαθύκολπος, as restricted to barbarian women (seemingly, with the idea that they did not arrange their garments with the same neatness as Greek women), and the last phrase in Eustathius’ note refers to this interpretation of ἐλκεσίπεπλος (and, by extension, also of βαθύπεπλος). In particular, we know from the scholia that Aristarchus criticized Zenodotus’ conjecture at *Il.* 2, 484, replacing Μοῦσαι Ὀλύμπια δώματ’ ἔχουσαι

---

applied to Helen, it appears in *Il.* 18, 385 = 18, 424 (of Thetis), *Od.* 12, 375 (of Lampetie), *Od.* 15, 363 (of Ctimene).

<sup>8</sup> On ἐλκεσίπεπλος and ἐλκεχίτων, see Kirk 1990, 220 *ad Il.* 6, 441–3 and Janko 1992: 133 *ad Il.* 13, 685–8 who evokes the mention of this idiosyncrasy in dress in Asiatic (fr. 13) and Thucydides (1, 6, 3). It is tempting to connect it also with Sappho’s scathing remark about a woman who does not know how to arrange her dress neatly at the ankles (Sapph. fr. 57 Voigt).

with Μοῦσαι Ὀλυμπιάδες βαθύκολποι<sup>9</sup> on the grounds that in Homeric epics βαθύκολπος is applied exclusively to Barbarian women, and that the poet thus would never have applied such an epithet to the Muses<sup>10</sup>:

<Δαρδανίδες> βαθύκολποι: οὐδέποτε τὰς Ἑλληνίδας βαθυκόλπους φησίν. πῶς οὖν Ζηνόδοτος γράφει „ἔσπετε νῦν μοι Μοῦσαι Ὀλυμπιάδες βαθύκολποι”; “Dardanian women with gowns flowing to the ground in a deep fold: nowhere does <Homer> say of Greek women βαθύκολποι. So how could Zenodotus write, ‘sing now to me, Muses, daughters of Olympus, with garment flowing to the ground in a deep fold?’” (schol. T *ad Il.* 18, 339, Aristonicus).

Ὀλύμπια δώματ’ ἔχουσαι: ὅτι Ζηνόδοτος γράφει „Ὀλυμπιάδες βαθύκολποι”. οὐδέποτε δὲ τὰς Ἑλληνίδας γυναῖκας βαθυκόλπους εἶρηκεν, ὥστε οὐδὲ τὰς Μοῦσας, “it is noted that Zenodotus writes: ‘<Muses>, daughters of Olympus, with garments flowing to the ground in a deep fold’. Nowhere did <Homer> call Greek women βαθύκολποι, consequently, he would not call Muses so” (schol. A *ad Il.* 2, 484, Aristonicus).

Τρωϊάδων βαθυκόλπων: πρὸς τοὺς γράφοντας „ἔσπετε νῦν μοι, Μοῦσαι Ὀλυμπιάδες βαθύκολποι”, ὅτι ἐπὶ βαρβάρων τὸ ἐπίθετον τίθησιν, “Dardanian women with gowns flowing to the ground in a deep fold: nowhere does <Homer> say of Greek women βαθύκολποι. So how could Zenodotus write, ‘sing now to me,

<sup>9</sup> Curiously, modern scholars focus on Aristarchus disapproval of Zenodotus’ reading (cf. Lehrs 1882: 111–112; Nünlist 2009: 304; Schironi 2018: 333), but do not attempt to reconstruct the reasoning behind it. In favouring Μοῦσαι Ὀλυμπιάδες βαθύκολποι Zenodotus seems to have felt that Ὀλύμπια δώματ’ ἔχουσαι was at odds with the Muses’ association with Mount Helicon: he thus preferred to replace it with Ὀλυμπιάδες, Hesiod’s epithet for the Muses that highlights their bond with Zeus (*Theog.* 25 and 52; on Ὀλυμπιάδες, see West 1966: 152 *ad Theog.* 3–4). The epithet βαθύκολποι was added to fill the end of the verse, and its choice was not random, but based on a poetic authority — Pindar called Muses βαθύκολποι (ἀμφί τε Λατοίδα σοφία βαθυκόλπων τε Μοισᾶν, *Pyth.* 1, 12). For the association with Pindar’s use of βαθύκολποι, cf. Nickau 1977, 36 who views *Pyth.* 1, 12 as a parallel, not as Zenodotus’ source.

<sup>10</sup> Lehrs 1882: 112 notes not only strengths, but also the weaknesses of Aristarchus’ argumentation: “Subtilis observatio, quamquam fortasse ad rem expediendam non satis firma: nam praeter hos duos locos et praeterea unum (Σ 122) καὶ τινα Τρωϊάδων καὶ Δαρδανίδων βαθυκόλπων sane non reperitur in Homericis. Sed iam in hymnis promiscue haberi nihil valet contra Aristarchum. *Ven.* 257 νύμφαι μιν θρέψουσιν ὄρεσκῶι βαθύκολποι”.

Muses, daughters of Olympus, with garments flowing to the ground in a deep fold'?" (schol. A *ad Il.* 24, 215b).

The resemblance in wording is a clear indication that all three scholia go back to the same philological discussion and to Aristarchus' authority. In view of this interpretation, Eustathius' Ἑλληνίς γὰρ γυνή, οὔτε βαθύπεπλος, οὔτε ἔλκεσίπεπλος παρ' Ὀμήρῳ εὔρηται, totally in line with the scholia cited, reflects a different aspect of the same discussion and shows that βαθύπεπλος appeared on par with ἔλκεσίπεπλος and βαθύκολπος as a compound that, according to the Aristarchian school, could only be applied to Barbarian women. Incidentally, τανύπεπλος would have been excluded from the discussion, as in Homer it is used to characterize Helen, and some of feminine deities.

An associated, but slightly different scholarly context in which βαθύπεπλος appeared can be reconstructed from the lexicographers and dates to I cent. BC at the latest. Apollonius Sophista in his *Homeric Lexicon* summarizes the discussion of βαθύπεπλος by Apion:

βαθυπέπλων ὁ Ἀπίων καλῶν. τὸ αὐτὸ σημαίνει καὶ βαθυζώνων καὶ βαθυκόλπων· φαίνεται γὰρ ἐκ τῶν τοιούτων ἐπιθέτων ἅμα μὲν τὰ μεγέθη τῶν σωμάτων, ἅμα δὲ τὸ σεμνὸν τῆς περιστολῆς· φαίνονται γὰρ μέχρι τῶν σφυρῶν καλυπτόμεναι, ὅθεν καὶ ἔλκεσίπεπλοι λέγονται καὶ βαθύζωνοι “βαθυπέπλων: Apion ‘beautiful’. It denotes the same as βαθυζώνων καὶ βαθυκόλπων: for from such epithets transpires at the same time the height of the bodies and the solemnity of the attire. They appear to be draped to their ankles, thence they are also called ἔλκεσίπεπλοι ‘training their peplos’ and βαθύζωνοι ‘with deep girdles’ ” (Ap. Soph. *Lex. Hom.* p. 50, s.v. βαθυπέπλων = Apion 28 Neitzel).

Apion of Alexandria, cited in this entry, was one of the best known and extremely controversial figures among the Homeric scholars of the time; his *Λέξεις Ὀμηρικαί* was an important source for Apollonius Sophista, who includes a large number of his interpretations in his own *Lexicon*<sup>11</sup>. As the structure of Apollonius' entry shows, Apion viewed βαθύπεπλος as a Homeric epithet meriting an independent discussion: in particular, the form of genitive plural used in the rubric, βαθυπέπλων, clearly shows that the epithet was taken from a poetic context, and seeing that

<sup>11</sup> On Apion, his biography and reputation, see especially Damon 2008; Neitzel 1977: 289–190. On Apion in Apollonius Sophista, see Damon 2008: 338; Neitzel 1977: 207–209; Haslam 1994: 269ff.



Apollonius Sophista's lexicon specialized in Homer, it appears that both for Apion and for Apollonius who quotes him βαθυπέπλων was indeed a Homeric reading<sup>12</sup>. Apion's interpretation is summarized in the first phrase (ὁ Ἀπίων καλῶν) and expanded on in the rest of the notice. He seems to have applied the exegetical principle that a compound epithet should not be taken as a mere indication of the one detail that it highlights, but must refer, in a kind of *pars pro toto*, to one or several qualities of the person thus qualified (on this principle, see n.1): thus, βαθύπεπλος would imply that the women thus characterized were tall (τὰ μεγέθη τῶν σωμάτων), and also to the general solemnity of their attire<sup>13</sup>. This also allowed him to view βαθύπεπλος as equivalent to βαθύζωνος and βαθύκολπος (as highlighting parts of garment, whereas βαθύπεπλος refers to the gown as a whole), and to compare it with ἐλκεσίπεπλος. Apollonius' entry (in the form in which it is preserved) does not quote the Homeric context in which the form βαθυπέπλων appeared; however, the phrase φαίνονται γὰρ μέχρι τῶν σφυρῶν καλυπτόμεναι seems to refer to a specific set of women, and the addition ὅθεν καὶ ἐλκεσίπεπλοι λέγονται καὶ βαθύζωνοι suggests that this part of the entry reflects the same scholarly tradition as Eustath. *ad Od.* 1, 121 = vol. 1, 31 Stallbaum.

This gloss enjoyed a fairly rich afterlife in lexicography due, primarily, to the authority of Apollonius' *Lexicon Homericum*<sup>14</sup>. The closest, both chronologically and in the wording of the overall interpretation, is Hesychius' entry: βαθυπέπλων· καλὰ ἱμάτια ἔχουσῶν, "βαθυπέπλων: having beautiful garments" (Hsch. β 64 Latte), where καλὰ ἱμάτια ἔχουσῶν seems to reflect καλῶν from

<sup>12</sup> Pace Neitzel 1997: 228 (*ad* Apion 28 βαθυπέπλων) who supposes an error due to conflation of other Homeric compounds: "Möglicherweise lag bei [Apollonios Sophista] eine Vermengung der beiden homerischen Wörter εὔπεπλος (Z 372) und βαθύκολπος vor".

<sup>13</sup> We find the same idea in the scholia on the meaning of τανύπεπλος (see schol. BEQ *ad Od.* 4, 305 Pontani; cf. Apoll. Soph. s.v. τανύπεπλος). Building on these ancient interpretations, L. Edmunds has recently argued that τανύπεπλος was used by Homer to highlight the impressiveness of Helen's public appearances (Edmunds 2019: 73–74).

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Haslam 1994: 107 who compares the impact of Apollonius' *Lexicon Homericum* on the ancient lexicographical tradition to the importance of Ebeling, Authenrief, *LSJ* or of *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos* for modern students of Homeric language.

Apollonius' entry<sup>15</sup>. Other lexica, on the other hand, preferred to retain the idea that βαθύπεπλος emphasized the women's tall stature, without reproducing Apion's argumentation in full: βαθυπέπλων· μεγάλων, ἐκ τοῦ παρακολουθοῦντος “βαθυπέπλων: great, by implication” (*Suda* β 36 Adler = *Lex. Seguer.* p. 178 Bachmann, s.v. βαθυπέπλων); cf. βαθυπέπλων· μεγάλων, ἐκ ἴτων παρακολουθούτων†, “βαθυπέπλων: great, from accompanying properties” (Phot. *Lex.* 24 Theodoridis) and βαθυπέπλων· μεγάλων (*Cyr. Lex.* 63, 14 Drachmann). Except the latter entry, the simple gloss μεγάλων is followed by the explanation ἐκ τοῦ παρακολουθοῦντος “judging from attendant property”<sup>16</sup>. Remarkably, these lexica retained the genitive plural form βαθυπέπλων for their rubric, despite the fact that they no longer specialized solely in the language of Homer, and that βαθύπεπλος could be illustrated by references to other poets<sup>17</sup>: this is clear indication of the entry's derivation from Apion and Apollonius Sophista. Finally, in a stroke of good luck, *Zonarae Lexicon* (XII–XIII cent.) in an entry where the wording and the form of the rubric show that it goes back to the same tradition, seems to preserve traces of the quotation of the original context where βαθυπέπλων appeared:

<sup>15</sup> This resemblance is noted by Latte (1953, I: 306); Neitzel 1977: 228 (*ad* Apion 28 βαθυπέπλων) suggests that Hesychius might be rendering Apion's exact formulation, while Apollonius Sophista had simplified it: “[die Erklärung Apions] muß ursprünglich ähnlich oder ebenso wie bei Hsch. gelautet haben”.

<sup>16</sup> For other examples of this type of logical deductions concerning accompanying properties, see Hsch. ε 980; κ 4737; σ 336; χ 129; *Suda* α 3019; τ 384; τ 772; *Zon. Lex.* p. 1246 (s.v. κονίσουσιν). In the entries above we chose to translate ἐκ τοῦ παρακολουθοῦντος as “by implication”.

<sup>17</sup> In the *Suda* lexicon, for example, the compound βαθύπεπλος also appears in a quotation in the entry εὐμάρεια: Εὐμάρεια: ἡ εὐκολία. λέγεται δὲ καὶ ἡ εὐκοσμία παρὰ Μάρκῳ Ἀντωνίνῳ. καὶ ἐν Ἐπιγράμμασι· οὐ βαθύπεπλος εὐμαρις (*Sud.* ε 3574 Adler; cf. *Zon. Lex.* p. 909: Εὐμάρεια. ἡ εὐκολία. λέγεται καὶ ἡ εὐκοσμία. οὐ βαθύπεπλος εὐμαρις. καὶ ἡ ἠσυχία. Ἡρόδοτος. τοῦτο φυγῆς τῷ Ἀννίβα πλείονα εὐμάρειαν παρέσχεν). The epigrammatic quotation οὐ βαθύπεπλος εὐμαρις seems to be a misquoted expression from Antipater of Sidon's epigram on the actress Hipparchia, οὐ βαθύπελμος εὐμαρις “not the thick-soled [Asiatic] shoe” (*A.P.* 7, 413, 3–4; neither Adler 457 *ad* ε 3574, nor Schironi 2002, 232 note the difference in the epithet), its appearance in this entry being due to a confusion in the lexicographical tradition of the nouns εὐμαρις and εὐμάρεια.

Βαθυπέπλων. μεγάλων, ἐκ τοῦ παρακολουθοῦντος. καὶ γυναικῶν βαθυπέπλων, “βαθυπέπλων: great, by implication; and women with garments falling in deep folds” (*Zon. Lex.* p. 372).

The expression καὶ γυναικῶν βαθυπέπλων could not have appeared in the dactylic hexameter for prosodic reasons, but the presence of καὶ and the position of the expression in the entry suggests that it was originally a poetic quotation, albeit simplified in the course of transmission. There is in fact a verse in the *Iliad* that may well have been adapted so: καὶ τινα Τρωϊάδων καὶ Δαρδανίδων βαθυκόλπων “and one of the Trojan and Dardanian women, with the folds of their dress falling deep” (*Il.* 18, 122). The distinction between the two groups of women, Τρωϊάδων καὶ Δαρδανίδων, would not serve the lexicographers’ purpose and could be simplified to γυναικῶν; but the entry seems to show, together with indirect evidence from other lexica (especially, the detailed entry in Apollonius Sophista) that βαθυπέπλων was an ancient variant reading for βαθυκόλπων in *Il.* 18, 122.

In view of the evidence on the independent existence of the epithet βαθύπεπλος that can be gathered from commentaries on Homer and from lexicographers, the one literary appearance of the epithet βαθύπεπλος in Greek poetry appears in a different light:

[...] ἥς εἵνεκά φασι καὶ αὐτὴν  
Ἥλεκτριν βαθύπεπλον ἐὼν δέμας ἀμφικαλύψαι  
ἀγλύι καὶ νεφέεσσιν ἀνηναμένην χορὸν ἄλλων  
Πληιάδων αἱ δὴ οἱ ἀδελφειαὶ γεγάασιν, “for [that city], they say, even Electra, with her peplos flowing in a deep fold, shrouded her form in mist and clouds, quitting the chorus of the rest of the Pleiads, who are indeed her sisters” (Quint. Smyrn. 13, 551–554).

The way βαθύπεπλος is used here shows that it is certainly not a compound newly invented by Quintus: Electra in question is the mother of Dardanus and, as later Trojan women in Homer, she is qualified by her training garment; moreover, Quintus engages in sophisticated play with the philological discussion of the epithets ἐλκεσίπεπλος, βαθύκολπος and βαθύκολλος by having Electra, already characterized as βαθύπεπλος, conceal her form even more in a gesture of withdrawal. Incidentally, this would not be the only case when Quintus’ poem preserves traces of an ancient variant reading<sup>18</sup>.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. van der Valk 1964, 655, who views Quint. Smyrn. 10, 415 as proof that the reading περιστρέφεται in *Il.* 5, 903 was attested in antiquity.

Returning to Servius and his *ut Homerus* βαθύπεπλος Ἑλένη, it may be argued that the grammarian (or his source) was indeed referring to an ancient variant reading where βαθύπεπλος replaced τανύπεπλος in *Il.* 3, 171, *Od.* 3, 228 or 15, 305 (or in all these contexts at once). Obviously, this went against the tradition that no Greek woman wore her dress to the ground, which would account for the elimination of βαθύπεπλος from the edited text. However, the fact that Servius uses βαθύπεπλος as an illustration of the stylistic principle behind compound epithets highlighting a detail suggests that the tradition that Servius was using derived from Apion's interpretation of βαθύπεπλος: cf. the similar wording in βαθύπεπλος Ἑλένη, *id est longas per vestes* <*Helenae magnitudo monstratur*> (Serv. *ad Aen.* 7, 275) and φαίνεται γὰρ ἐκ τῶν τοιούτων ἐπιθέτων [...] τὰ μεγέθη τῶν σωμάτων (Apion 28 Neitzel = Apoll. Soph. *Lex. Hom.* p. 50, s.v. βαθυπέπλων). In other words, Servius' passage appears to preserve not only a Homeric variant reading, but also a piece of Alexandrian exegesis that had been taken over by Roman philological tradition<sup>19</sup>. The practical conclusions from this case study are that (a) βαθύπεπλος Ἑλένη in Servius should be retained without correction as a precious indication of a variant reading unknown from Homeric manuscripts, but discussed by authoritative Homeric scholars; and (b) that βαθύπεπλος would merit a much fuller representation in modern lexicographical works, as it not only appeared in Quintus Smyrnaeus, but also served as a variant reading in at least two distinct Homeric contexts (to βαθυκόλπων in *Il.* 18, 122, and to

<sup>19</sup> See Farrell 2008, who views the relationship between Servius and Alexandrian scholarship preserved in the Homeric scholia in the following way: “To state the situation as pointedly as possible, it may be that some similarities between Servius' commentary and the Homeric scholia are the result of a desire on the part of the Roman commentator to emulate Homer's critics in the same way that Vergil emulated Homer” (Farrell 2008: 122); cf. in his analysis of Serv. *ad Aen.* 2, 239, “it is not unlikely that in this case the allusive program of the *Aeneid* caused the exegetical tradition to develop in such a way that the intertextual relationship between Servius and the Homeric scholia parallels that between Vergil and Homer” (Farrell 2008: 123). In the case of βαθύπεπλος, the reception of Apion's interpretation of Homer's use of compound epithets may actually have been quite direct: we know that Apion taught in Rome under Tiberius and Claudius (cf. his biography in the *Suda*, α 3215 Adler; see also Damon 2008: 340–342, *et passim*).

τανύπεπλος in *Il.* 3, 171, *Od.* 3, 228 and 15, 305) and is well attested in ancient scholarship.

### Serv. *ad Aen.* 12, 691

As Turnus rushes forth to stop the battle, preferring to spare his men and to decide the battle's outcome by a one-on-one combat with Aeneas, Vergil describes the besieged city thus:

[...] *disiecta per agmina Turnus  
sic urbis ruit ad muros, ubi plurima fuso  
sanguine terra madet striduntque hastilibus aurae*, “through disjoint troops Turnus thus rushes to the city's ramparts, where the most earth is wet with the blood that was spilt, and the air is wheezing with shafts” (*Aen.* 12, 689–691).

In the midst of the action-packed and dynamic narrative these verses provide a calm, almost detached perspective (specially because of the descriptiveness of *terra madet striduntque... aurae*). Servius notes briefly in his commentary to this verse:

STRIDVNTQVE HASTILIBVS AVRAE Homerus συρίζουσα† μακεαον  
ισιτιτατε λόγχη (Serv. *ad Aen.* 12, 691).  
CYPIZOYCA MAKEAON ICITITATE AONXH **AS** CYPIZOCA MAKEAON ICITITATE  
AONXH **R** CYPIOICA MAKEAOH ICITITATE AONXH **H** CYPIZOYCA AKEAOPII  
CITITATE AONXH **M** CYPIZOICA AONXH **F**

The Greek quotation is manifestly corrupt and has been emended in different ways. Hugo Stadtmueller proposed two possibilities: συρίζουσα μαχητάων ἰθὺ πτάτο λόγχη “whistling, the spear of the fighters flew straight” or συρίζουσα μαλ’ ἐν δίναις εἰσέπτατο λόγχη “whistling the spear flew out in whirls (?)”. Friedrich Schoell, whom Georg Thilo consulted while working on his edition, suggested a rather cruel emendation συρίζουσα μακεδνὴ Ἀμάζονος ἦπτετο λόγχη “whistling, the high spear touched the Amazon”. Early editions of Greek epic fragments printed συρίζουσα λόγχη without the corrupt middle<sup>20</sup>. Th. W. Allen offers a more attentive approach to the fragment, noting that MAKEAON could be corrected into μακεδνόν (cf. Schoell's suggestion cited above), and ICITITATE into ἴστατο or (with an obvious error in aspiration) ἴπτατο (Allen 1961, V:151 *ad fr.* 23). Finally, in 1966 M. L. West, building on Allen's

<sup>20</sup> E.g. Kinkel 1877, I, 74; the quotation was still given in this reduced form, συρίζουσα λόγχη, by Knight 1932, 181 n. 7, who considered it a fragment of an early epic.

suggestion for the second word, proposed the correction συρίζουσα Μακεδονίς ἵπτατο λόγχη “whistling flew the Macedonian spear”. This emendation has since been universally accepted<sup>21</sup>. Indeed, Charles Murgia in the Harvard edition of Servius prints this scholium thus<sup>22</sup>:

691. STRIDVNTQVE HASTILIBUS AVRAE Homerus συρίζουσα

| λόγχη, id est stridor lanceae. | Μακεδονίς ἵπτατο λόγχη.

Even before M. L. West’s reconstruction of the epithet Μακεδονίς the line had a distinctly Hellenistic colouring. The noun λόγχη is a word for spear that is never used by Homer; it does appear in the *Batrachomyomachia* (vv. 129, 167 and 300), though, but as part of the distinctly Hellenistic comic attempt to engage with traditional arming scenes known from the Homeric epics<sup>23</sup>. The onomatopoeic verb συρίζω describing a whistling or hissing sound is attested of objects only from the classical times<sup>24</sup>. As it is, the verse cited by Servius was surely taken from one of the historic hexametric poems of the Hellenistic period. As to its subject-matter and authorship, West, and later Hollis and Cameron, suggested that it might have been a poem on the campaigns of Alexander the Great,

<sup>21</sup> See his short note West 1966. This correction is reproduced in *Epicorum Graecorum fragmenta* (Davies 1988: 110 ‘Homerus’ F24) and the *Supplementum Supplementi Hellenistici* (Lloyd-Jones 2005: 130 fr. 1189); it is included by M. Schmidt in *Lfgre* 1955–2010, IV, col. 262 s.v. συρίζω, and cited with approval by Skutsch 1985: 631; Hollis 1992: 281 n.22; Cameron 1995: 282.

<sup>22</sup> In this edition, in case where Servius’ commentary differs from *Servius Danielis* version, the text of *Servius Danielis* is printed in the left column, and Servius’ text in the right column.

<sup>23</sup> See Kelly 2014, who shows that the author of *Batrachomyomachia* in the two arming scenes where λόγχη appears (124–31 and 161–5) was responding to Zenodotus’ emendation of Homer’s text in the scene of the arming of Paris (*Il.* 3, 330–338); Kelly makes no note, however, of the use of un-Homeric λόγχη. For different words for spears and shafts in Homer, see Trümper 1950: 52–54; cf. Bakker, van den Houten 1992: 5–7 on the distinction between the two most frequent words for spear in Homer, ἔγχος and δόρυ.

<sup>24</sup> See LSJ 1996, 1731 s.v. συρίζω. M. Schmidt’s entry in *Lfgre* 1955–2010, IV, col. 262 s.v. συρίζω is in fact misleading: based on two contexts, *hHom.Herm.* 280 (μάκρ’ ἀποσυρίζων) and the ‘Homeric’ συρίζουσα λόγχη cited by Servius, he obliged to postulate the meaning “*pfeifen*, vom Pfeifen durch den Mund [...] und vom ‘Schwirren’, e.s. durch die Luft fliegenden Speers”.

or else of one of Hellenistic dynasts that presented themselves as being of Macedonian descent<sup>25</sup>.

However, this raises two questions:

(a) how did a quotation, mentioning the Macedonian spear (Μακηδονίς λόγχη), end up being mistaken for Homer's in Servius' commentary? However critical one may be of Servius' knowledge of Greek, the incongruity is glaring;

(b) could Vergil's *striduntque hastilibus aerae* (*Aen.* 12, 691) in a passage fraught with recognizable Homeric allusions really be an imitation of a verse from a (presumably, not widely known) Hellenistic historic epos?

M. L. West 1966 avoided these two problems altogether. Otto Skutsch made an attempt to answer the first question by suggesting that Servius (or his source) might have taken the quotation from some scholarly work where the author was indicated simply as ὁ ποιητής, and was then mistaken for Homer<sup>26</sup>. Hollis and Cameron show awareness of the second problem: Hollis dismisses it by emphasizing Vergil's vast reading and erudition<sup>27</sup>, and Cameron uses the problem to argue in favour of a well-known Hellenistic poet (Cameron 2005: 282).

I would like to suggest a different reconstruction, one that seems to resolve both questions. The image of wheezing, whistling, hissing

<sup>25</sup> Thus, West 1966: “Μακηδονίς λόγχη suggests the campaigns of Alexander (cf. Dion. Per. 210 Ἀύσονις αἰχμή of the Roman armies); these were celebrated by little-read poets such as Choerilus of Iasus, Anaximenes (of Lampsacus?), and Agis of Argos, but it is conceivable that they were also alluded to by some better-known poet in the context of Dionysius' conquest of India”. Hollis, without speculating on the author, suggested a Hellenistic epic on Alexander, a later king of Macedon or one of the dynasties that prided themselves on their Macedonian descent. Cameron 1995, 282, unwilling to accept the idea that Vergil would have imitated a little-known epic poem, suggested that the fragment might derive from Callimachus' *Galateia*.

<sup>26</sup> “Sometimes, as in Serv. *Aen.* 12, 691 συρίζουσα Μακηδονίς ἵπτατο λόγχη [...], the error is inexplicable, except in terms of a confusion between the two senses of ὁ ποιητής as ‘the poet (of whom I am speaking)’ and ‘Homer’ (see Allen's nos. XXI and XXII)” (Skutsch 1985, 631).

<sup>27</sup> “So Virgil, who did not disdain the *Bellum Histricum* of Hosius or the *Annales Belli Gallici* of Furius, may have taken note of the Hellenistic counterparts to such works” (Hollis 1992, 282).

shafts is one that Vergil likes<sup>28</sup>, and Serv. *ad Aen.* 12, 691 is not the only passage of the commentary where it was noted by Servius. Thus, in his note on a similar expression in *Aen.* 11, 863 the grammarian cites Homer: *TELI STRIDOREM Homerus* ἔκλαγξεν δ' ἄρ' ὄϊστός (Serv. *ad Aen.* 11, 863), where the Greek quotation is adapted from *Il.* 1, 46, ἔκλαγξαν δ' ἄρ' ὄϊστοί, “the shafts resounded...” (with the notable change of number in order to suit Vergil’s *teli stridorem*; incidentally, from the point of view of context, this is not an ideal parallel, as in Homer the shafts resounded in Apollo’s quiver). Servius thus seems to have traced the image in different contexts and sought parallels in Homer. I would like to suggest that in his note on *Aen.* 12, 691, before the Hellenistic quotation συρίζουσα Μακηδονίς ἵπτατο λόγχη that was preserved in the manuscripts, Servius had actually cited from Homer’s description of Hector on the battlefield:

[...] ὃ δὲ ἰδρεΐη πολέμοιο  
 ἀσπίδι ταυρεΐη κεκαλυμμένος εὐρέας ὦμους  
 σκέπτει' ὄϊστῶν τε ῥοΐζον καὶ δοῦπον ἀκόντων, “but <Hector> in his experience of war, protecting his broad shoulders with his ox hide shield, was looking at the whistling of arrows and at the thud of spears” (*Il.* 16, 359–361).

Indeed, this parallel fits well not only the wheezing arrows in Vergil (*Aen.* 12, 691), but also the tonality of the passage, as Homer had presented Hector contemplating in a calm, detached way the flying shafts and thudding spears (cf. *ubi plurima fuso / sanguine terra madet striduntque hastilibus aurae*). Servius probably would have only cited ὄϊστῶν τε ῥοΐζον, and then followed it with a quotation from a less important Hellenistic poet that had been sought out by an earlier commentator of Vergil (his original note might have been as simple as “Homerus ὄϊστῶν τε ῥοΐζον. et συρίζουσα Μακηδονίς ἵπτατο λόγχη”). Later, in the course of the transmission of Servius’ text, the Homeric quotation (given that it was probably an incomplete line, and that it contained a fairly obscure word ῥοΐζος) would have been eliminated, and the indication *Homerus* that had once introduced it was transferred to the quotation from the Hellenistic epic.

<sup>28</sup> Tarrant 2012: 267 in his commentary *ad loc.* lists *Aen.* 11.799, 9.632, 12, 319, 12, 859, 12, 926. Cf. his note on the construction *striduntque hastilibus aurae*: “Blurring the distinction between the object that creates sound and the surrounding space is natural and easy; compare, e.g., ‘the hall was abuzz with rumours’ ”.



There is one curious confirmation that *Il.* 16, 361 might have been discussed elsewhere together with *συρίζουσα Μακηδονίς ἵπτατο λόγχη* — Nonnus in his *Dionysiaca* seems to fuse these two passages in one in his description of Dionysus' spear:

[...] ἵπταμένη δὲ  
 Βακχιάς ἐρροίζησε δι' ἠέρος ἔγχεος αἰχμῆ  
 ἄνδρα βαλεῖν ἐθέλουσα, “flying, the point of Bacchus' spear  
 wheezed, wishing to touch (i.e. wound) the man...” (Nonn. *Dion.*  
 30, 307–309).

This parallel was first recognized by Hollis and later discussed by Cameron who surmised that *συρίζουσα Μακηδονίς ἵπτατο λόγχη* might have been known to Nonnus from one of the collections of Vergilian “thefts”<sup>29</sup>. Neither of them recognizes that *ἐρροίζησε* must reflect Homer's *οἰστῶν τε ροίζον καὶ δοῦπον ἀκόντων* (*Il.* 16, 361).

### Bibliography

- Allen, Th. W. 1961: *Homeri opera. Vol. V: Hymni, Cyclus, Fragmenta, Margites, Batrachomyomachia, Vitae*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Bakker, E.J. van den Houten, N. 1992: Aspects of Synonymy in Homeric Diction: An Investigation of Dative Expressions for Spear. *Classical Philology* 87(1), 1–13.
- Cameron, A. 1995: *Callimachus and his Critics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Cameron, A. 2011: *The Last Pagans of Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chantraine P. 1968–1977: *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque : histoire des mots*. Vol. I–IV. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Damon, C. 2008: ‘The Mind of an Ass and the Impudence of a Dog’: Scholar Gone Bad. In: I. Sluiter, R. M. Rosen (eds.) *KAKOS: Badness and Anti-Value*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 335–364.
- Davies, M. (ed.) 1988: *Epicorum Graecorum fragmenta*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht.
- Edmunds, L. 2019: *Towards the Characterization of Helen in Homer: Appellatives, Periphrastic Denominations, and Noun-Epithet Formulas*. Berlin; Boston: de Gruyter.
- Farrell, J. 2008: Servius and the Homeric Scholia. In: S. Casali, F. Stok (eds.) *Servio: stratificazioni esegetiche e modelli culturali*. Bruxelles: Éditions Latomus, 112–131.
- Frisk, H. 1960: *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

<sup>29</sup> See Hollis 1992: 282 and Cameron 2005: 282, n. 108.

- Heubeck, A. Hoekstra, A. 1989: *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*. Vol. II: *books IX–XVI*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hollis, A. S. 1992: Hellenistic Colouring in the *Aeneid*. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 94, 269–285.
- Janko, R. 1992: *The Iliad: A Commentary* / gen. ed. G.S. Kirk. Vol. IV: *books 13–16*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kazanskaya, M. N. 2021 (in print): [Issues of translation and linguistic adaptation in Servius and in the Servius Danielis: on the basis of the discussion of Homeric allusions to the Aeneid in the commentary]. In: Ivanov, S. V. (ed.) *Perevod i yazykovaya adaptaciya v literaturnykh tekstakh srednevekovoy Evropy* [*Translation and Linguistic Adaptation in Literary Texts of Medieval Europe*]. Saint-Petersburg.
- Казанская, М. Н. 2021 (в печ.): Вопросы перевода и языковой адаптации у Сервия и в Servius Danielis: на материале заметок к гомеровским аллюзиям в Энеиде. В: С. В. Иванов (ред.) *Перевод и языковая адаптация в литературных текстах средневековой Европы*. СПб.
- Kelly, A. 2014: Hellenistic Arming in the *Batrachomyomachia*. *Classical Quarterly* 64(1), 410–413.
- Kinkel, G. 1877: *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Lipsiae: B.G. Teubner.
- Kirk, G. S. 1990: *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. II: *books 5–8*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Knight, W. J. F. 1932: Iliupersides. *The Classical Quarterly* 26(3–4), 178–189.
- LfgreE* 1955–2010 — *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos* / begründet von Br. Snell. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht.
- LSJ* 1996 — Liddell, H. G. Scott, R. 1996: *A Greek-English Lexicon* / revised and augmented by H. G. Jones, with the assistance of R. McKenzie and the cooperation of many scholars. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Latte, K. (ed.) 1953: *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*. Vol. I. Hauniae: Ejnar Munksgaard.
- Lehrs, K. 1882: *De Aristarchi Studiis Homericis*. Leipzig: S. Hirzel.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (ed.) 2005: *Supplementum supplementi Hellenistici* / indices conficit M. Skempis. Berlin; New York: W. de Gruyter.
- Murgia, Ch. E. (ed.) 2018: *Serviani in Vergili Aeneidos libros IX–XII Commentarii* / completed and prepared for publication by R. A. Kaster. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nickau, Kl. 1977. *Untersuchungen zur textkritischen Methode des Zenodotos von Ephesos*. Berlin, New York: W. de Gruyter.
- Neitzel, S. (ed., comm.) 1977. *Apions Γλωσσαι Ὀμηρικαί*. In: K. Alpers, H. Erbse, A. Kleinlogel (eds.) *Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker*, Bd. 3. Berlin; New York: W. de Gruyter.

- Nünlist, R. 2009. *The Ancient Critic at Work: Terms and Concepts of Literary Criticism in Greek Scholia*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- OLD 1968 — *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Racine, F. 2015: Servius' Greek Lessons. In: E. P. Archibald, W. Brockliss, J. Gnoza (eds.) *Learning Latin and Greek from Antiquity to the Present*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 52–64.
- Risch, E. 1974: *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*. 2 Aufl. Berlin; New York: W. de Gruyter.
- Schironi, Fr. 2002: Il testo di Marco Aurelio conservato dalla *Suda*. *Studi classici e orientali* 47(2), 209–233.
- Schironi, Fr. 2018: *The Best of the Grammarians: Aristarchus of Samothrace on the Iliad*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Skutsch, O. (ed., comm.) 1985: *The Annals of Q. Ennius*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Tarrant, R. (ed., comm.) 2012: *Virgil, Aeneid XII*. Cambridge; New York; Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- Thilo, G. (ed.) 1883–1884: *Servii Grammatici quae feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii*. Vol. II.1–2: *Aeneidos librorum VI–XII commentarii*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.
- Trümper, H. 1950: *Kriegerische Fachausdrücke im griechischen Epos: Untersuchungen zur Wortschatz Homers*. Freiburg in der Schweiz: Paulusdruckerei.
- van der Valk, M. 1964: *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad*. Part 2. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Wackernagel, J. 1934: Indoiranica. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen* 61(3–4), 190–208.
- West, M. L. 1964: An Epic Fragment in Servius. *The Classical Review* 14, 242.