Introduction

Ancient literary criticism is not the least studied subject of classical studies. The author of a new book on the topic cannot take it for granted that the field will unconditionally welcome the results of his efforts. So why this book?

A general overview of extant scholarship on ancient literary criticism recognises three major areas of interest. Scholars (i) explore the origins of ancient literary criticism (e.g. in Aristophanes or Plato)[1] or (ii) they interpret the relevant 'technical' treatises (Aristotle's *Poetics*, Ps.Longinus' *On the Sublime*, Ps.Demetrius' *On Style*, etc.) or specific parts of them,[2] or (iii) they provide collections (sometimes annotated and/or translated) of relevant passages from the texts of categories (i) and/or (ii).[3] Conversely, literary criticism in the scholia *is* an underworked topic.[4] Given that there is an undeniable interest in ancient literary criticism, this lack of attention is surprising and, as this book attempts to demonstrate, not justified.[5] For the scholia are apt to put into perspective and supplement the evidence that

[1] See e.g. most recently Ford (2002), Ledbetter (2003), also Harriott (1969), Kennedy (1989: Chapters 1–3).

[2] Scholars either focus on the single treatise, e.g. Halliwell (1986) on Aristotle's *Poetics*, Russell (1964) on Ps.Longinus, Schenkeveld (1964) on Ps.Demetrius, etc., and see also the various articles in Laird (2006), or they present the evidence in the form of a synthesis, e.g. Grube (1965), Fuhrmann ([1973] 1992), Kennedy (1989: Chapters 4–11). The disputed authenticity of *On the Sublime* (Heath 1999) can be ignored in the present context.

[3] See e.g. Lanata (1963), Russell and Winterbottom (1972), Murray (1996).

[4] Cf. Montanari (1993: 355): 'L'analisi di quanto c'è nella scoliografia di terminologia retorica e di ricorso a concetti retorici è un lavoro che è stato fatto in modo molto parziale e limitato.' The last decades have seen only one monograph that is entirely devoted to the subject: Meijering (1987), which despite its great merits leaves sufficient room for further research. The same applies *mutatis mutandis* to other contributions, such as the seminal article by N. J. Richardson (1980). On earlier scholarship see below.

[5] It may be pointless to speculate about the reasons for this lack of attention. It is, however, important to note that the organisational principle of most studies on ancient literary criticism is the individual ancient scholar. Scholia, on the other hand, are very often 'anonymous' (see below on sources) and difficult to date, which is not amenable to this format.

can be gathered from the treatises.[6] Both scholia and treatises have their respective merits and limitations, and much can be gained if one allows one type of source to throw light on the other and *vice versa*.

An important strength of treatises (as compared with the scholia) is their systematic approach. The selection of topics is premeditated and follows a meaningful order. The single phenomenon is given a definition and usually illustrated with an example. Such a systematic approach is not to be found in the scholia because the selection of topics and the order are determined by the text that is commented on (to say nothing of the composite nature and brevity of scholia, on which see below). If one is inclined to deplore the fact that treatises, on occasion, provide too much theory and too little application to actual examples, the scholia probably err in the opposite direction. On the positive side, scholia discuss a much greater number of passages than treatises do. That is to say, the particular term or concept is applied more extensively, whereas treatises tend to focus on one or a few passages (often the *locus classicus* that fits the description particularly well).[7] Since scholia comment on many passages, they can provide a more complex (occasionally even contradictory) picture of the particular literary device.[8] In addition, the scholia attempt, at least in principle, to come to grips with texts in their entirety, whereas treatises select single passages that help make the particular point. As a result, the scholia provide a very good insight into how critics made use of the various scholarly tools in the daily business of explaining the Greek 'classics' in their entirety (hence *The Ancient Critic at Work*).

This also applies, no less importantly, to those questions of literary criticism that the treatises do not discuss at all or only *en passant*. Here again the scholia can provide important supplements to the evidence gained from the treatises.

THE PRESENTATION OF THE MATERIAL AND ITS METHODOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

Two forms of presentation are in principle available for this type of research. Either the main organising principle is the Greek terms, and the account essentially follows, except for the alphabetical order, the format of a lexicon,

[6] As to reconstructing the pre-Aristotelian origins of literary criticism, the scholia prove to be of little help.

[7] Rhetorical handbooks, in particular, are characterised by the recurrence of the same few examples that illustrate a specific phenomenon.

[8] Such contradictions may of course be the result of different authorship.

or one attempts to form clusters of notes that have a significant common denominator (here, a particular concept of literary criticism), irrespective of whether they make use of exactly the same terminology.[9] Both methods have their strengths and their weaknesses. However, the second seemed preferable for the present book for the following reasons.

Firstly, the scholia often comment on questions of literary criticism without recourse to 'standard' technical vocabulary. Instead the critic simply gives a periphrastic description of a phenomenon for which others may use a technical term. Or there may be no technical term at all.[10] With a strict focus on Greek terms these instances are usually lost.

Secondly, a focus on Greek terms works best when the material under discussion is fairly homogeneous. In such a case, one is entitled to start from the assumption that the same term has a similar meaning throughout.[11] However, a very heterogeneous corpus such as the scholia does not fulfil this condition. In the course of doing research for this book it became increasingly clear that the individual terms are often used with so little consistency that a presentation of the evidence which takes the Greek terms as its primary organising principle does not seem advisable.

These two difficulties tip the balance in favour of a presentation which generally concentrates on the underlying concepts. Consequently, it combines and discusses the Greek material under modern rubrics.[12] This entails the potential risk that the modern scholar imposes on the material concepts that are essentially foreign to his ancient predecessors. The problem is a serious one, and an effort has been made throughout to explain the viewpoint of the ancient scholars and to bring out how *they* understand the phenomenon under consideration.[13] Whether this attempt has been successful is for the reader to decide. Moreover, the discussion of the particular concept does, of course, draw attention to technical vocabulary and discuss

[9] The third organising principle, by individual critic, is *a priori* excluded for the reasons given in n. 5. The two methods described in the main text can also be referred to as 'semasiological' and 'onomasiological' respectively.

[10] The absence of a term does not *a priori* mean that the underlying concept is unknown, as Aristarchus knew well (see schol. A *Il.* 14.172c[1] *Ariston.*).

[11] This assumption may, in the individual case, need to be corrected, but this does not disprove the general method as such.

[12] In this connection it is worth mentioning that studies with a professed focus on Greek terminology (e.g. N. J. Richardson 1980, Meijering 1987) also tend to incorporate materials that have been collected according to the method advocated here.

[13] It is important to note that, in any case, this 'requires a kind of translation: primary material *has* to be recast in "alien" concepts or formats in order to be described at all': Laird (2006: 7), who argues that the principle formulated by Kennedy (1989: xii: 'it [is] best to expound the ancient critics in their own terms rather than to recast their thought in alien concepts') is an 'ideal [that] can never be realized'. See also the preceding n.

its semantics whenever it seems appropriate. Together with the Glossary of Greek terms (pages 368–86), this should enable the reader to have the best of both worlds.

The emphasis on the ancient outlook has an impact on how secondary literature is treated in this book. Modern titles which discuss the ancient view of the particular term or concept take a privileged position, and references to such titles try to be exhaustive or at least representative. Conversely, no attempt has been made to document consistently how the literary phenomenon in question is explained in modern scholarship (without recourse to ancient explanations). Such references are given only sparingly because an explanation of how modern scholars understand the various concepts lies beyond the scope of this book. This can also affect its diction. At times, the account resorts to a straightforward description ('this passage is an example of X') in order to avoid the potentially cumbersome repetition of phrases such as 'this passage is said to be an example of X'. Straightforward description of this kind should, however, not be taken as a sign of agreement on the part of modern scholars in general or the author of this book in particular. The goal throughout is to present the viewpoint of ancient scholars.

As to secondary literature that does deal with literary criticism in Greek scholia, it has already been mentioned that it is scarce, despite a noticeable increase in recent years. Conversely, an interest in, as it was called at the time, 'aesthetic' questions inspired a certain number of studies and dissertations in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and they often provide valuable insights and/or collections of relevant scholia (for details see the individual chapters below). There are, however, recurrent difficulties which recommend caution. One is an overemphasis on *Quellenforschung* that often results in two mutually dependent shortcomings. These scholars are often too confident that they can positively identify the source of a scholion.[14] And once they have done so with apparent success, they often stop short and do not look closely enough at the individual instance of the literary phenomenon under discussion and its potential complexities. The latter problem is a general one in that the methods of the period enabled scholars to deal particularly well with questions of textual criticism, whereas literary criticism was often considered second rate and therefore not always

[14] This problem is particularly virulent in the works of Adolf Roemer and, to a lesser degree, those of his pupils, whose criterion for identifying Aristarchean notes often seems to be little more than their own agreement with the point made (M. Schmidt 1976: 14, 23). More generally see the survey of earlier scholarship on the sources of the bT-scholia to the *Iliad* by Schmidt (1976: 9–74), whose conclusions are mostly negative.

pursued with sufficient acumen.[15] Despite these difficulties, however, the relevant studies must not be underrated in their importance and can often be used with great benefit.

The book is divided into two parts. The first part (Chapters 1 to 12) deals with the more general concepts of literary criticism which ancient scholars recognised in various texts and did not *a priori* consider typical of a particular poet or genre. For the sequence of the chapters in this first part, an attempt has been made to proceed from the more general to the more specific (but to keep thematically related chapters together). The second part deals with literary devices that were primarily seen as typical of a particular poet (Homer, Chapters 13 to 18) or genre (drama, Chapter 19).[16]

Regarding the distribution of the material over nineteen thematic chapters, it should be clear that its primary purpose is to give the book a transparent structure in order to make it more user-friendly. The risk of separating what belongs together is reduced by cross-referencing, a thematic index and a comprehensive *index locorum*. Besides, a 'compartmentalised' presentation of the material is perhaps the most appropriate for a genre that has been described in terms of an 'atomisation' (Most 1985: 36–8) or 'morselisation' (Goldhill 1999: 411–18) of the texts that are commented on.

As to the selection of topics, it goes without saying that approaches and methods of literary criticism are the central focus of attention.[17] Within this group, preference is given to the topics that are discussed prominently in the scholia because, unlike the treatises, the scholia have so far not received the attention they deserve. For the same reason this book does not normally cover questions of literary criticism that are primarily dealt with in the treatises if they do not play an important role in the scholia too. The main criterion in this case is whether or not the evidence of the scholia substantially adds to that of the treatises and other sources.[18] In

[15] It is no less telling that the authors of such 'aesthetic' studies often oscillate between defending and deprecating their topic: e.g. Roemer (1879: v–vi), Lehnert (1896: 5–6), Bachmann (1904: 34–5), Griesinger (1907: 1–3).

[16] Readers will notice that the first part, too, is to some extent dominated by examples that are taken from the Homeric scholia. This is due to the overwhelming position of Homer in ancient scholarship (resulting, among other things, in a corpus of scholia that is quantitatively and qualitatively far superior to any other) and does not contradict the principle of presentation advocated here.

[17] For a brief description of questions other than literary criticism in the scholia see below.

[18] Generally speaking, no topic seems to be altogether absent from the scholia, but on occasion their discussions seem to add comparatively little to what we know from the treatises. Consequently, the following topics are either not discussed at all or only *en passant*: (i) verbal composition (incl. questions of word choice, word order, euphony), on which see e.g. Schenkeveld (1964), Janko (2000); (ii) the various theories of style (e.g. 'grand, middle, plain'; but cf. Chapter 9), on which see e.g. Russell (1964: xxx–xlii, with bibl.); (iii) biographical data, on which see e.g. Blum (1977),

accordance with the decision in favour of an onomasiological approach, the book does, of course, include scholia that do not expressly address questions of literary criticism, but nevertheless reflect such concepts in their argumentation.[19]

There is, especially from an ancient point of view, no clear-cut distinction between literary criticism and rhetoric. The two areas often merge into one another; or rather, literary criticism did not exist as an independent discipline but was a part of rhetoric (and *grammatike*).[20] It seems, nevertheless, justifiable for a study on literary criticism not to try to cover the domain of rhetoric exhaustively. The more 'technical' rhetorical figures such as *epanalepsis*, *isocolon*, *homoioteleuton*, etc. do not really belong to 'literary criticism' and, more importantly, are better studied on the basis of the relevant rhetorical handbooks.[21]

Finally, it will be self-evident that this book does not aspire to completeness in the strict sense. The selection of topics intends to give a representative overview of the major questions of literary criticism that are discussed in the scholia. The examples and references given in the various chapters occasionally strive for exhaustiveness, but are more often, especially in the case of widely used concepts and terms, strictly *exempli gratia*.[22] Such a selectivity might seem questionable (cf. Ford 1991: 147: 'we are always taking from them [sc. the Homeric scholia] what we find

Arrighetti (1987, 1993). The only poet whose biography plays more than a marginal role in the scholia is Pindar (see Lefkowitz 1991: esp. 72–110), in particular the relation to his 'rivals' Simonides and Bacchylides (see Chapter 10). In general, however, the bulk of the evidence on the lives of Greek poets comes from sources other than scholia (see e.g. Lefkowitz 1981).

[19] See, for example, Nicanor's discussion of the punctuation in *Il.* 18.246–8 (schol. A *Il.* 18.247–8 *Nic.*, discussed in Chapter 4).

[20] On the interrelationship between literary criticism and rhetoric see e.g. Classen (1993). Some scholars (e.g. Arrighetti in response to Classen's paper, see Montanari 1993: 358) argue that one should not speak of 'literary criticism', because ancient critics do not do so themselves. This, however, would seem a restriction similar to the limitations of a strict focus on Greek terms (see above). The *grammatike*, defined e.g. by Eratosthenes (*ap.* schol. D. T. p. 160.10–11 Hilgard) as ἕξις παντελὴς ἐν γράμμασι ('the complete skill in literature', see Schenkeveld 1993: 263), could no doubt entail questions of literary criticism. However, the famous κρίσις ποιημάτων ('critical judgment of poems') in the opening section of the *grammatike techne* by Dionysius Thrax (p. 6.2 Uhlig) should not be called into play, since it appears to concern matters of authenticity (Schenkeveld 1993: 264 n. 2).

[21] The relevant material is usefully collected by Ernesti (1795), Volkmann (1885), Lausberg ([1960] 1990), Anderson (2000). For a collection of Iliadic scholia see Erbse (VII: 166–92), but several of his categories seem to be grammatical rather than rhetorical (e.g. infinitive for imperative, etc.). As for Lausberg ([1960] 1990), readers are advised to use the German original. The benefit of the English translation (1998) is impaired by inaccurate translations and typographical errors.

[22] The following rule of thumb applies: lists that give up to, say, five examples and, more importantly, add a paraphrase of the scholion (or the passage that is commented on) usually provide a selection that is meant to be representative.

congenial and discarding the rest'), especially if it results in the suppression of relevant evidence. In the present case, an attempt has been made to provide a platform for 'dissenting voices' too. If none are cited, this should be taken as an indication that I could not find one that expressly disagreed with this particular point or methodological concept.[23] As to completeness itself, it seems very unlikely that it can be achieved with such a large and heterogeneous corpus as the scholia and with the onomasiological approach chosen here.

THE MATERIAL AND ITS CHARACTERISTICS

The focus on literary criticism determined the selection of primary source material. A systematic analysis has been applied to the scholia on the poets Homer, Hesiod, Pindar, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes, Callimachus, Theocritus, Apollonius of Rhodes and the prose writer Lucian. Conversely, the scholia on more 'technical' poetry (Aratus, Nicander, Oppian) rarely deal with questions of literary criticism. The same holds true, albeit for different reasons, for the scholia on the *Batrachomyomachia*, Lycophron and on most prose authors: historiographers (Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon), Plato, the orators (Aeschines, Demosthenes, etc.) and 'technical' prose (e.g. Hippocrates or Dionysius Thrax).[24] Consequently, these other scholia have only been studied selectively, usually in the form of index searches for specific terms. Within the group of 'poetic' scholia, *scholia vetera* and *recentiora* have both been taken into account (provided they have been edited), but the argument of the book mostly rests on *scholia vetera*.[25]

In light of the complementary relation between the scholia and the technical treatises (see above), the latter have been taken into account whenever appropriate.

The interpretation of the Homeric scholia was accompanied by regular consultation of Eustathius' commentaries, especially where the latter helped elucidate the meaning of the former. It is, however, not the goal of this book to analyse Eustathius' terms and concepts of literary criticism in their own right.[26]

[23] To include instances of implicit disagreement would have been impractical.
[24] For a useful description of the various *Scholiencorpora* see Dickey (2007, esp. chapter 2, with extensive bibl.).
[25] On the conventions of quotation see below pages 19-20.
[26] Much relevant information has been collected by van der Valk in the prefaces to his edition (see also n. 38 below).

As indicated in the subtitle of the book, the focus is on Greek materials. It is clear, though, that, for example, Servius on Vergil or Donatus on Terence draw on essentially the same tradition as their Greek peers. However, a systematic incorporation of Latin materials would have required adding a completely new dimension and discussing the relation between Greek and Latin terminology (despite the fact that Latin commentators often use Greek terms). It seemed preferable to proceed step by step and to leave such a comparison to future research. As a result, Latin sources are taken into account only selectively.

CHARACTERISTICS OF SCHOLIA

One goal of this book is to make the scholia better accessible. In order to help the reader deal with the material (in particular the scholia that are not quoted and translated here), it will be useful to describe the external characteristics of scholia, starting with the ones that can be an obstacle to a correct understanding.[27] Most important are:

Composite nature: scholia can consist of up to five basic elements: (i) the lemma (i.e. the verbatim quotation of the passage under discussion; on the principles of quoting see below); (ii) a translation of (part of) the passage; (iii) a paraphrase of (part of) the passage;[28] (iv) quotation(s) (e.g. of parallel passages); (v) the commentator's own words (e.g. explanations). The identification of these five basic elements can be complicated by the following facts: (a) the transition from one element to the next can be very abrupt (cf. on brevity below); (b) all five elements are written in essentially the same language;[29] (c) all five elements can occur several times in a single scholion. Modern editions of scholia try to clarify the picture by highlighting the lemma (usually by spacing it out) and/or setting it off (colon or square bracket after the lemma), by putting quotation marks

[27] The present account only lists a few salient points. For a general introduction to reading scholia see Dickey (2007).

[28] Obviously, it is impossible to draw a sharp dividing line between translation and paraphrase. The latter can, but need not be, introduced by expressions such as ὁ δὲ λόγος (τοιοῦτος), τὸ λεγόμενον (τοιοῦτον), τὸ δὲ ἑξῆς (τοῦ λόγου), ὁ νοῦς or ἡ διάνοια. Note, however, that τὸ ἑξῆς can also introduce a repetition of the passage under discussion which re-establishes the natural word order (also expressed by ἡ ἀκολουθία), or may simply mean 'what comes next'.

[29] The general point perhaps needs to be qualified. Lemma and quotation reproduce, of course, the language of the text under discussion, whereas the three other parts are written in a generic Attic Greek, often with distinctly late features (on which see below). However, it will be evident that a modern reader finds τὸ δὲ εἶπες "εἶπας" Ἀρίσταρχος γράφει, κακῶς· εἰπών γὰρ ἀεὶ καὶ εἴποιμι λέγομεν (schol. b *Il.* 1.106*e Did.*) more difficult to understand than 'Aristarchus writes εἶπες as εἶπας, wrongly; for we always say εἰπών and εἴποιμι'.

around verbatim quotations[30] and by separating the various notes on the same line (a, b, c, etc.). Even so the reader must reckon with abrupt changes that can affect virtually every aspect: subject-matter, level of sophistication, etc. To be on the safe side, it is advisable not to take it for granted that what appears as one scholion in the printed edition automatically represents the unequivocal view of a single scholar on one particular issue. This composite and heterogeneous nature of the scholia also advises against making rash generalisations with regard to the scholia on a particular author, let alone the corpus as a whole.

Brevity: scholia can be very short and elliptical, and take many things for granted that the reader is expected to infer for himself or herself. There are three possible sources for this apparent laconism: (i) the original commentator; (ii) the scholar(s) who excerpted the commentaries (ὑπομνήματα), especially when transferring the notes to the more limited space on the margins of the manuscript;[31] (iii) textual corruption. Of these, the second factor is no doubt the one that is most often to be held responsible for the brevity of the scholia. Textual corruption is particularly insidious because it comprises a component of randomness, whereas in the two cases of deliberate brevity one can at least assume that what is left is meant to make sense. But even then, the omissions can be puzzling and create difficult ambiguities.[32] When trying to fill these gaps by inference, the modern reader is well advised to apply a careful analysis to the various sources of information, not least to the text that is commented on in the scholion.[33]

Different system of reference: in the absence of the modern system of consistently numbering ancient texts (e.g. *Il.* 1.366), ancient scholars refer to passages by means of verbatim quotation, usually the word(s) from the beginning of the line (e.g. ᾠχόμεθ' ἐς Θήβην, i.e. *Il.* 1.366).[34] This applies both to the lemma and to quotations within the scholion. One consequence is that, contrary to modern practice, the lemma does not necessarily quote the word(s) which is/are actually explained in the scholion. The quotation helps the ancient reader to find the passage as such (hence the focus on the

[30] Unfortunately, this only applies to actual quotations, but usually not to translations or paraphrases.

[31] The exact details of the textual history of scholia are extremely difficult to reconstruct (see e.g. Erbse 1960 and below pages 17-19).

[32] For example, the scholia regularly omit the subject of the sentence. This often leads to the question whether the subject is the poet or a character (cf. below n. 68) or whether the subject is the same as in the previous sentence, which should not *a priori* be taken for granted.

[33] In recognition of this fact, the scholia quoted in this book will normally be contextualised by means of a brief paraphrase of the passage under discussion. Readers will nevertheless find it useful to have a copy at hand of the texts that are primarily commented on in the scholia (see above).

[34] There are, of course, other systems of reference such as intermarginal notes written above the word(s) in question or corresponding signs.

beginning of the line), just as line numbers do in a modern commentary. The specific point of reference within the line need not be spelled out as part of the quotation.[35] The same system also applies to quotations (e.g. of parallels) within the scholion. A few words from the beginning of the line have the same function as 'cf. *Il.* 1.366' in a modern commentary. Occasionally, the quotation of the first few words can even refer to a passage of several lines (i.e. 'cf. *Il.* 1.366ff.').[36] The ancient reader was expected to supply the rest for himself by either remembering or, less probably, looking up the relevant passage.

Late Greek: in terms of language, the scholia often display characteristics that are typical of late Greek. This applies to both vocabulary and syntax. Readers who are primarily familiar with classical Greek may profit from consulting specialised works of reference in addition to their usual handbooks.[37]

Technical vocabulary: the general difficulties of late vocabulary are increased by technical jargon that often comes from a grammatical or rhetorical background. Here again it is advisable to consult specialised works of reference.[38]

In addition to the characteristics that can impede a proper understanding, other features worth mentioning are recurrent patterns of argumentation. It should, however, be borne in mind that scholia are a very heterogeneous 'genre'. The features listed in this section recur with some frequency, but do not, of course, apply to all the scholia.

[35] Modern editions of scholia usually 'correct' the lemma by means of supplementing and excising (e.g. schol. A *Il.* 1.404*a Ariston.* {αἰγαίων·} ὁ γὰρ αὖτε ⟨βίῃ οὖ πατρὸς ἀμείνων⟩). Such an editorial practice no doubt makes life easier for a modern reader, but is likely to be foreign to ancient practice (van Thiel 1989).

[36] E.g. schol. T *Il.* 15.64*c ex. (Did.?)* quotes only the first few words from *Il.* 1.366 and *Od.* 23.310, but the context makes it clear that the commentator has in mind *Il.* 1.366–92 and *Od.* 23.310–42.

[37] For morphological and syntactical peculiarities, there is a very useful list by Schneider (1910a) based on Apollonius Dyscolus but equally applicable to the scholia and other 'technical' texts. Grammars on the Greek of the New Testament (e.g. Blass and Debrunner 2001) are also helpful. For general vocabulary, LSJ can be supplemented by Lampe's *Patristic Greek Lexicon* (1961) and the old *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (Stephanus 1831–65); see also the next n.

[38] For grammatical terminology see Leidenroth (1884: only words beginning with α; 1903: words beginning with ε) and Heubach (1885), who both focus on the Homeric scholia. More generally see the annotated word indices in Uhlig (1910), Schneider (1910b), Lallot (1997: II 423–39), Dalimier (2001: 437–75) and Dickey (2007: 219–65); cf. also the grammatical dictionary by Bécares Botas (1985, not always reliable). Terms of textual criticism in the scholia are explained by Heubach (1889, 1903). For rhetorical terminology see especially Ernesti (1795), Volkmann (1885), Lausberg ([1960] 1990), Anderson (2000). Much can be learned for the scholia from van der Valk's notes on Eustathius' terminology (these notes can easily be found by means of the Index III (Keizer 1995: 299–474), which marks the annotated passages with an *). See also the Glossary of Greek terms on pages 368–86. The collection of critical vocabulary in papyrus commentaries to the *Iliad* by Nardi (1977) does not give explanations and is mostly superseded by Erbse's indices.