

New Pauly entry on Greek Scholia by Dyck

(τὰ σχόλια/tà *scholia*, Lat. *scholia*). The sg. σχόλιον (*scholion*), a diminutive of σχολή (*scholē*, [Leisure](#)), appears at first in the sense of 'learned discussion' (Cic. Att. 16,7,3); later 'note' to an author (Marinus, Vita Procli 27), then 'marginal note' (Anastasios Sinaites, *Viae Dux* 3,1,1-3; 24,134-136). Scholia are thence exegetical comments, written beside the text in the margins of medieval [manuscripts](#) and attested since the 6th cent. AD.

I. Greek

A. General

Scholia survive on a number of Greek authors. They were excerpted from ancient commentaries ([Commentary](#)) which as a rule are no longer extant (though remnants of some commentaries survive on [papyrus](#); [Hypomnema](#)); in modern editions they are printed as commentaries, with lemmata restored if necessary (key-words to which the respective explanations refer). The process of transfer from commentary to scholia is, with some exceptions, set in the 5th-6th cents. AD [1; 2. vol. 2, 547; 3. 96-97]. Scholia vary greatly in the quality of the textual traditions on which they are based and, accordingly, in their value to the modern scholar. They may, at their best, preserve ancient textual variants lost in the medieval tradition and remnants of ancient exegetical or critical lore; at their worst they may transmit false inferences that ancient scholars drew from the immediate context or from Homeric usage [4]. Glosses ([Glossography](#)) are definitions that may be organized alphabetically (as in a lexicon) rather than according to the sequence of words in a given text; the boundary between scholium and gloss is fluid insofar as glosses may be excerpted also from glossaries and entered in the margin of texts.

Editions of scholia which meet the highest standards, i.e., are based on a complete recensio and stemmatic analysis of surviving witnesses and classify the texts according to their probable sources, have been slow to appear. We still depend all too often on editions in which scholia are merely distinguished by the sigla of the manuscripts in which they occur, with no attempt made to analyze the separate strands of the tradition, so that remains of ancient *hypomnemata* rub shoulders with rhetorical analyses of Roman imperial date or elementary explanations intended for the Byzantine schoolroom [5]. What follows is a summary of the most important developments in scholia research since Gudeman [6] (1921).

Dyck, Andrew (Los Angeles)

B. Archaic and Classical Literature

The major achievement in this field has been the monumental edition (1969-1988) of the Iliadic scholia by H. Erbse [2] based upon a careful analysis of the complex tradition into its individual components. It has stimulated interest in the Homeric studies of various ancient philologists [7-11] and authors [12-14]. The D-Scholia and their forerunners, the so-called *scholia minora*, have been edited both from medieval manuscripts and from papyrus sources ([15-17a]; a new edition of the Odyssean scholia remains a desideratum). To a more limited extent the Hesiodic scholia also give access to ancient traditions (including doctrines of Aristarchus [4]), those to the *Works and Days* being based in part on a *hypomnema* of Proclus [2] who will have derived learned matter from Plutarch [2]; the scholia to the *Theogony* are inferior, however. Italian scholars have provided critical editions of both

sets of scholia [18, 19]. A new edition of John [Tzetzes](#)' scholia is still needed to replace [20]. Among the lyric poets the scholia to Pindar comprise the major corpus ([21] is now supplemented by [22]).

Some progress can be registered in the study of scholia to the tragedians, above all the new editions of those on Aeschylus [23, 24]. The excellence of the Sophoclean scholia has long been recognized. This is particularly true of those on the Oedipus Coloneus [25], their quality due to the fact that [Didymus \[1\] Chalkenteros](#)' commentary was subject to less shortening here than elsewhere; cf. [26] for the sources and history of this collection, which proves to be an amalgam of commentaries by Didymus, Pius (2nd cent. AD) and Salustius (4th/5th cents. AD), with some admixture of matter from other sources: Herodian, *Scholia minora* and Diogenianus' lexicon. Byzantine scholia on Oedipus Tyrannus: [27]. Recent years have seen publication of new material for Euripides, cf. notably [28. 108-110] (scholia in the Jerusalem palimpsest). For the Byzantine triad [29] a set of anonymous metrical scholia has seen the light, as well as a study of the tradition of the Palaeologan scholia [30]. Finally, the exegetical scholia to Euripides' *Phoenissae* (preserved in MSS Parma 154, mid-fourteenth cent., and Modena α.U.9.22, mid-fifteenth cent.) have been published by [31], who finds elements of disparate origin ([Moschopoulos](#), Thomas Magistros, [Demetrius \[43\]](#) [Triclinius](#) and others.) [43].

The scholia to Aristophanes form an unusually rich and important corpus. Since the [Suda](#) has received a number of such scholia, the new edition of that lexicon by [32] has brought clarity to a part of the tradition [29]. In addition we now have scholia to several plays in the palaeographically detailed edition by [33], which carefully segregates Byzantine and earlier scholia. For the sources [34] remains fundamental.

The scholia to Attic prose authors have made considerable strides since 1921, including new editions of the scholia to Thucydides, Plato [1], Demosthenes [2] and Aeschines [32-35]; the sources of the Demosthenic scholia have been clarified by [39]. For Isocrates, however, we still rely on [40].

Dyck, Andrew (Los Angeles)

C. Hellenistic and Imperial Literature

As the Hellenistic poets have generally risen in recent years in both interest and estimation, so the study of their scholia has marked a significant advance, largely thanks to the works of [41-44] (critical editions of the scholia to Theocritus and Apollonius Rhodius [2] as well as detailed studies of the transmission. [45] includes the meager scholiastic remains on Callimachus [3]. For the scholia to Aratus: [46]; scholia to Nicander: [47; 48]; index to Tzetzes' scholia to Lycophron in [49; 50]. As in the case of Homer, a better knowledge of the scholia to Alexandrian poetry has led to closer study of the ancient scholars whose doctrines are preserved in them; hence the new edition of the grammarian Theon of Alexandria (Augustan Period), albeit without attention to papyrus evidence [51].

Gudeman's exclusion [6] of some collections of scholia as not pertaining to classical Greek *belles lettres* is hard to justify in a *Realenzyklopädie*. Those to Dionysius Thrax have been well edited [52] and contain valuable remnants of ancient linguistic theory [53. 19].

The scholia to Lucian are remarkable for the terms of abuse they apply to this author [54. 336]; their sources have been clarified by [55]. There are also extant scholia to Marcus [II 2] Aurelius [56], Aelius Aristides [57], Maximus [I 1] Tyrius [58], Pausanias [59], Oppian's *Halieutica* [60-62], the rhetoricians Aphthonius [63] and Hermogenes [64], to Gregory [3] Nazianzen [65; 66], and Oribasius [67].

Dyck, Andrew (Los Angeles)

D. Prospects

Although considerable progress has been made in the editing of scholiastic texts since 1921, much yet remains to be done. In some traditions (Aristophanes, Demosthenes) Renaissance explanations masquerading as medieval scholia have only quite recently been unmasked. In addition, research of ancient scholarship and other areas of philology is interdependent, with progress in lexicography and scholia-studies going hand in hand (see above on the Aristophanes scholia). Apart from new editions of texts and studies of sources, future research on scholia is likely to stress the impact of Alexandrian learning on Greek and Latin authors. Alexandrian scholars' perceptions have influenced for instance Horace's *imitatio* of Pindar [14. 280-281 = 158-160]. There is room for a good deal more work along such lines.

Dyck, Andrew (Los Angeles)