Zeitschrift: Museum Helveticum : schweizerische Zeitschrift für klassische Altertumswissenschaft = Revue suisse pour l'étude de l'antiquité classique = Rivista svizzera di filologia classica

Herausgeber: Schweizerische Vereinigung für Altertumswissenschaft

Band: 80 (2023)

Heft: 2

Artikel: Participle for predicate and vice versa : ancient scholars on morphosyntactic inversion in Greek poetry

Autor: Nünlist, René

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-1049880

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Mehr erfahren

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. En savoir plus

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. Find out more

Download PDF: 01.12.2025

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, https://www.e-periodica.ch

Participle for predicate and *vice versa*

Ancient scholars on morphosyntactic inversion in Greek poetry

René Nünlist, Köln

Abstract: Gegenstand des Beitrags ist eine in der antiken Kommentarliteratur diskutierte morpho-syntaktische Vertauschung in dichterischen Texten, die sowohl in verbaler als auch in nominaler Form nachgewiesen wird. Bei den verbalen Beispielen dominiert die Modusvertauschung (Partizip für Prädikat und umgekehrt), bei den nominalen die Kasusvertauschung (z. B. Genetiv für Nominativ und umgekehrt). Der dafür benutzte Begriff, *tropos antistrophos* (u. ä.), stammt vermutlich von Chairis, einem Schüler Aristarchs. Belegt sind aber auch Alternativbezeichnungen, oder die Vertauschung wird gänzlich ohne Zuhilfenahme von Fachausdrücken beschrieben. Die antiken Kommentatoren nehmen diese Vertauschungen in erster Linie als Phänomen der literarischen Rhetorik wahr, wie sie einem beim Lesen dichtersprachlicher Texte auf Schritt und Tritt begegnet.
Keywords: Antike Literaturwissenschaft, Inversion, Rhetorik, Chairis, Homer.

During the assembly of the gods early in *Odyssey* 1, Athena draws their attention to Odysseus and his plight. She says about him, among other things:

> αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεύς,
> ἱέμενος καὶ καπνὸν ἀποθρῴσκοντα νοῆσαι
> ἧς γαίης, θανέειν ἱμείρεται (*Od.* 1.57–9).

> ... and yet Odysseus, straining to get sight of the very smoke uprising from his home country, longs to die.[1]

A scholion on l. 58 reports an ancient discussion about how to construe this sentence. The relevant scholion is worth quoting in full because it tackles the problem in a generalising way and thus reaches well beyond the explication of the specific passage:

> τρόπον ἑρμηνείας ἀντίστροφόν φησιν εἶναι ὁ Χαῖρις (fr. 8 Berndt), ὅταν ἀντιστρέφωσι τὸν σχηματισμὸν αἱ λέξεις, ὡς τὸ "χασσάμενος πελεμίχθη" (*Il.* 4.535) ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐχάσσατο, καὶ "κονίσαλος ὤρνυτ' ἀέλλης" (*Il.* 3.13) ἀντὶ τοῦ κονισάλου, καὶ "παρῴχηκεν δὲ πλέων νὺξ τῶν δύο μοιράων" (*Il.* 10.252–3), παρὸν οὕτως φάναι, τὸ πλέον τῆς νυκτός, ὅ ἐστι δύο μοῖραι. τὸν αὐτὸν δὴ τρόπον κἀνθάδε Ὀδυσσεὺς καπνὸν ἀποθρῴσκοντα ἱμειρόμενος ἰδεῖν ἧς γαίης θανέειν ἵεται (Buttmann, ἱμείρεται codd.). τινὲς δὲ λείπειν φασὶ τὸ τούτου τυχών (sch. *Od.* 1.58a Pontani).

1 The translation of the Homeric passages follows the one by Lattimore (1951/1967) unless a more literal rendering is needed, all other translations are my own.

> Chairis says that there is an inversion of expression when the words invert their form, for instance, 'receding he staggered back', instead of he receded <staggering back> and 'the dust (nom.) of the storm (gen.) rose' instead of <the storm> of the dust <rose> and 'night (nom.), the bulk of the two parts (gen.), has passed', while it would have been possible to say thus: the bulk of the night (gen.), that is, two parts (nom.). With the same rhetorical trope here too Odysseus, longing to see the smoke rising, strives to die at home. Some others, however, say that 'having achieved this' is missing (sc. in l. 59).

The note shows that the grammarian Chairis, a member of the school of Aristarchus (ca. 218–144 BC), knew of and applied in his analysis a morphosyntactic inversion to which he referred by means of the term τρόπος ἀντίστροφος (and cognates such as the verb ἀντιστρέφω in the definition).[2] To judge from the parallel passages that are listed in the scholion, the general category τρόπος ἀντίστροφος includes at least two basic sub-types of inversion: verbal and nominal. In its verbal form, the inversion has the effect that the participle stands for the predicate and *vice versa*. Homer's phrase χασσάμενος πελεμίχθη (*Il.* 4.535) actually represents ἐχάσσατο πελεμιχθείς. The two examples given for a nominal inversion operate with an inversion of grammatical cases, nominative for genitive and *vice versa* in both cases. κονίσαλος ... ἀέλλης (*Il.* 3.13) stands for κονισάλου ἄελλα;[3] and πλέων νὺξ τῶν δύο μοιράων (*Il.* 10.252–3) stands for τὸ πλέον τῆς νυκτός, ὅ ἐστι δύο μοῖραι.

The Odyssean passage that actually triggers the note demonstrates that the concept could be applied with some flexibility. Although it clearly involves an instance of verbal inversion, it is not exactly parallel to the example χασσάμενος πελεμίχθη. As the paraphrase in the penultimate sentence of the scholion shows, Chairis is not merely arguing that one must interpret ἱέμενος ... ἱμείρεται as if the Homeric text read ἵεται ... ἱμειρόμενος. He actually has the two verbal forms completely 'trade places' with ἱμειρόμενος now governing καὶ καπνὸν ἀποθρῴσκοντα νοῆσαι and likewise ἵεται governing ἧς γαίης θανέειν:[4] Odysseus, longing to see the smoke rising, strives to die at home. This is an expansion of the verbal inversion for which there is no immediate parallel in the pool of examples (to be discussed shortly). The scholion does not indicate a reason why Chairis interpreted the passage in this way. It is conceivable (but no more) that he was not happy with

2 As is well known, it is generally impossible to determine how accurately scholia and similar sources report what the relevant grammarian actually said on a particular issue. In the present case, however, there is little reason to doubt that Chairis did in fact use words of the root ἀντιστρέφω.

3 Aristophanes of Byzantium (p. 176 Slater) actually read the genitive κονισάλου, but it is not clear whether he had the line end with the Homeric nominative ἀέλλη. The relevant scholion (sch. bT *Il.* 3.13b Did.) is corrupt. In any case, unlike Chairis he did not recognise a rhetorical inversion but altered the text. For Aristarchus' view, see below n. 7.

4 Whereas modern Homerists take ἧς γαίης with the preceding line (Allen, Von der Mühll, van Thiel and West all punctuate after it), the paraphrase shows that Chairis took it with θανέειν.

a 'suicidal' Odysseus who longs to die and rather has him strive to meet his death at home and thus be buried there.[5]

Be that as it may, the term (τρόπος) ἀντίστροφος as used by Chairis has left fairly significant traces in ancient scholarship. But before the relevant witnesses are looked at in some detail, it is worth mentioning at the outset that they do not include the ancient grammarian whose work on Homer is arguably the most important: the numerous fragments of his master Aristarchus provide no attestation of the term ἀντιστροφή (or a cognate). At first sight, this observation might come as a surprise because Aristarchus regularly resorts to the explanation that a particular mood, tense or case actually stands for another one (e.g. infinitive instead of imperative).[6] The crucial difference to Chairis' explanation is that Aristarchus sees it, so to speak, as a one-way road. One specific mood, tense or case in the poetic text represents another mood, tense or case. The fact that the explanation refers to a single linguistic unit and is unidirectional in nature is also reflected in the term that Aristarchus uses to describe the phenomenon: (ἐν)αλλαγή ('change', often in its verbal form [ἐν]αλλάττω). The word or expression under consideration has undergone a 'change' in that poetic discourse parts with standard Greek. Chairis' τρόπος ἀντίστροφος, on the other hand, involves two linguistic units which both appear in the relevant poetic passage and exchange their respective syntactic function.

In order to ascertain whether Aristarchus actually had an opinion on this type of inversion, the four Homeric passages (*Il.* 3.13, 4.535, 10.252–3, *Od.* 1.57–9) prove to be of no help because his explanations go in a different direction.[7] There is, however, a single scholion (attributed to Aristonicus) that agrees in spirit, if not in letter, with Chairis' concept. The relevant Homeric passage describes how tall oak trees are cut for Patroclus' pyre in *Iliad* 23:

> ταὶ δὲ μεγάλα κτυπέουσαι
> πῖπτον (*Il.* 23.119–20).
>
> They toppled with great crashing.

5 The explanation of the τινές that is reported in the final sentence of the scholion goes in a similar direction when it urges readers tacitly to understand τούτου τυχών in l. 59. As an alternative to the interpretation given in the main text, Christoph Riedweg suggests to me that the corruption in the penultimate sentence of the scholion might actually run deeper and be corrected in the following way: τὸν αὐτὸν δὴ τρόπον κἀνθάδε Ὀδυσσεὺς καπνὸν ἀποθρῴσκοντα ἵεται (ἱμειρόμενος codd.) ἰδεῖν ἧς γαίης θανέειν ἱμειρόμενος (ἱμείρεται codd.). The proposed correction does away with the exceptionality of the example, but it requires two substantial textual interventions.

6 For a recent discussion of the evidence, see Schironi (2018: 185–203).

7 In *Il.* 3.13 Aristarchus analyses ἀέλλης as a poetic form of the adjective ἀελλώδης ('stormy', sch. A *Il.* 3.13a Ariston., cf. Ap.S. 9.27–8 Bekker = gl. 100 Steinicke). Regarding *Il.* 4.535, he comments on the semantically remarkable use of the verb πελεμίζω ('to shake', sch. A *Il.* 4.535b Ariston.). In *Il.* 10.252–3 he recognises a notorious question (πολυθρύλλητον ζήτημα, sch. A *Il.* 10.252a Ariston.) that he solves by athetising l. 253 (sch. A *Il.* 10.253a[1] Ariston.). No Aristarchean note has been preserved on *Od.* 1.57–9.

In its extant form, the relevant note is very brief:

> ὅτι τὸ ἐναντίον ἔφη· πίπτουσαι γὰρ κτύπον παρεῖχον (sch. A *Il.* 23.119–20a Ariston.).
>
> <There is a diplê in the margin,> because he (sc. Homer) said the opposite. For toppling they produced a crashing noise.

Without the explanatory paraphrase, it would be virtually impossible to determine in which way Homer 'said the opposite' because the phrase is so unspecific and thus polyvalent. The subsequent paraphrase, however, clearly shows that Aristarchus recognised in *Il.* 23.119–20 an instance of the same inversion of participle and predicate as in the scholion quoted at the beginning of this paper.[8] It is therefore legitimate to conclude that he was familiar at least with the concept that underlies Chairis' τρόπος ἀντίστροφος. The terminological side of the issue is more difficult to assess for two reasons. First, the terminological (un)reliability of scholia is an unsolved problem (see n. 2). Second, a single witness, and one of such terseness, hardly provides an adequate basis for far-reaching conclusions. It is nevertheless appropriate to say that the term ἀντιστροφή probably did not belong to Aristarchus' technical vocabulary.[9] This, in turn, might mean that it was Chairis who actually coined it, or, to be more precise, the one who extended its semantic range to have it designate the type of morphosyntactic inversion discussed in this paper.[10]

As to the polyvalent term τὸ ἐναντίον ('the opposite'), it recurs with a comparable function in the discussion of a textual problem in *Iliad* 8. Driven by his recent success on the battlefield, Hector harbours the idea of driving the Greeks off:

> εὔχομαι ἐλπόμενος (vulg., ἔλπομαι εὐχόμενος Zen.) Διί τ' ἄλλοισίν τε θεοῖσιν
> ἐξελάαν ἐνθένδε κύνας κηρεσσιφορήτους (*Il.* 8.526–7).
>
> For in good hope I pray (vulg., Zenodotus: I hope praying) to Zeus and the other immortals that we may drive from our place these dogs swept into destruction.

Aristarchus defends the vulgate and rejects the text of Zenodotus (in turn accepted by West), whose inversion of predicate and participle is referred to by means of

8 Erbse (*ad loc.*) gives pertinent references. Aristarchus' note is not discussed in either Matthaios (1999) or Schironi (2018). More generally, modern scholarship on the inversion discussed in this paper is virtually limited to listing parallels in the *Testimonienapparat* of the relevant editions. An exception is Fraenkel (1950: 3.654 n. 2), who, however, dismisses the explanation given in sch. T *Il.* 16.162c ex. as "*tour de force*".

9 If Aristarchus' original note on *Il.* 23.119–20 explicitly spoke of an ἀντιστροφή (*vel sim.*), why would an excerptor be encouraged to water it down to the vague expression τὸ ἐναντίον ἔφη? Whether this in turn is what Aristarchus actually wrote is of course another question.

10 In sources that clearly predate Chairis, the word ἀντιστροφή and its cognates designate various inversions, esp. in philosophical contexts. He may have been influenced by passages where the word designates forms of relation and/or reciprocity (LSJ *s.vv.*).

the term τὸ ἐναντίον, as Didymus and Aristonicus both attest in their notes.[11] Unlike the preceding example, the present one does not refer to a rhetorical inversion but to an actual textual variant.[12] But they both deal with an inversion of predicate and participle, which is thus a possible referent of τὸ ἐναντίον (for another example, see below).

The clearest echo of Chairis' τρόπος ἀντίστροφος is to be found in the rhetorical handbook of Pseudo-Herodian:

> ἐξ ἀντιστρόφου δέ ἐστι φράσις ἡ τὰ συνέχοντα τὴν ἑρμηνείαν ἐνηλλαγμένα ἔχουσα· "ταὶ δὲ μεγάλα κτυπέουσαι | πῖπτον" (*Il.* 23.119–20) ἀντὶ τοῦ πίπτουσαι ἐκτύπουν, καὶ "κάμε τεύχων" (*Il.* 2.101)· καμὼν γὰρ ἔτευξεν. τοιοῦτον δὲ λέγουσιν εἶναι καὶ τὸ "παρῴχηκεν δὲ πλέων νύξ | τῶν δύο μοιράων" (*Il.* 10.252–3). νοείσθω γὰρ τὸ πλεῖον τῆς νυκτός, ὅ εἰσι δύο μοῖραι (Ps.-Herod. *fig.* 58 Hajdú).

> The diction is inverted when the linguistic components that hold together the syntax of the passage are interchanged. <Examples:> 'They toppled with great crashing' instead of toppling they crashed, and 'he worked producing', because he produced working. In the same way they also explain 'the night of the two parts has largely passed'. For it should be understood as the bulk of the night, that is, two parts.

The points of agreement with Chairis are strong.[13] Pseudo-Herodian uses the same term (ἀντίστροφος), gives a comparable definition and adduces both verbal and nominal examples. In the latter case, even the illustrating passage (*Il.* 10.252–3) is identical with one of Chairis'. Among the verbal examples, the former (*Il.* 23.119–20) drew, as already seen, Aristarchus' attention, the latter (*Il.* 2.101) receives the same explanation in the scholia and elsewhere (see below).[14]

The corpus of poetic scholia is where the morphosyntactic inversion has left the most traces. The poets in question are Homer (with the usual preponderance of the *Iliad*), Pindar, Sophocles and Lycophron. The relevant poetic passages more often display a verbal inversion, outdoing nominal inversions by the approximate ratio of 2 to 1.[15]

---

11 οὕτως ἡ γραφή, "εὔχομαι ἐλπόμενος", οὐ τὸ ἐναντίον (sc. ἔλπομαι εὐχόμενος) ("the text reads thus, *euchomai elpomenos*, not the opposite", sch. A *Il.* 8.526b Did., cf. sch. A *Il.* 8.526a Ariston.).

12 Cf. n. 3. At any rate, Aristarchus understands Zenodotus' ἔλπομαι εὐχόμενος as a textual variant (to be rejected), not as an interpretation of the text.

13 The *testimonia* listed by Hajdú (*ad loc.*) do not include what is in fact the closest parallel.

14 Lesbonax (*fig.* 25b Blank) contents himself with verbal examples. His treatment is nevertheless remarkable because the two classic examples taken from Homer (*Il.* 4.535, 2.101) are preceded by a fictitious example. Such a fictitious example is the only one given by Phoebammo in his treatment of ἀντιστροφή (50.3–5 Spengel). The Greek term *antistrophe* is taken up by Servius auctus (*Aen.* 4.500, *georg.* 2.267) and Isidorus (*orig.* 1.37.5). These Latin examples and the ones mentioned in n. 21 are owed to Adam Gitner (*ThLL*).

15 The poetic passages that the various sources identify are, for verbal instances: *Il.* 1.243, 1.611, 2.101 (≈ 19.368), 4.535 (= 5.626, 13.148), 11.546, 11.570–1, 13.395–6, 14.256–7, 15.581, 23.119–20,

The individual interpretations as such are generally straightforward and pose few problems, if one ignores the fact that they rarely justify why the passage actually ought to be understood in this way. The actual challenge for the modern reader is the terminological inconsistency and variety of the relevant sources. Pseudo-Herodian's second illustration of a verbal inversion provides a good example. The relevant Homeric line deals with Agamemnon's sceptre,

> τὸ μὲν Ἥφαιστος κάμε τεύχων (*Il.* 2.101, cf. 19.368).

... that Hephaestus worked producing.

The explanation given by the bT-scholion consists of two parts:

> καμὼν ἔτευξεν. ἀντιστροφὴ ὁ τρόπος (sch. bT *Il.* 2.101 ex.).

He produced working. The trope (sc. that Homer uses here) is an inversion.

The note first gives a 'translation' and thus reverses the inversion and then labels it accordingly. The D-scholion on the same passage is almost identical, with the crucial difference that it speaks of an **ἀναστροφή**. Erbse (1988: 188) plausibly suggests that the text of the scholion should have read ἀντιστροφή, an error which in fact occurs elsewhere.[16] One of the relevant examples is worth looking at more closely because, in addition to the error, it resorts to the term that Aristarchus may have used in his analysis of *Il.* 23.119–20: τὸ ἐναντίον (see above). In the Homeric passage in question Achilles sounds a note of warning if in the future many Greeks were to die at Hector's hands:

> ... εὖτ' ἂν πολλοὶ ὑφ' Ἕκτορος ἀνδροφόνοιο
> θνῄσκοντες πίπτωσι (*Il.* 1.242–3).

... when in great numbers dying at manslaughtering Hector's hands they drop.

Od. 1.58, 2.315, S. *OC* 1409–10; nominal instances: *Il.* 3.13, 10.252–3, 16.162, *Od.* 4.802, Pi. *P.* 1.5–6, 4.279, *I.* 1.18, S. *El.* 19, Lyc. *Alex.* 13, 880; special cases (discussed below): *Il.* 4.124, 15.17. The list is unlikely to be complete (see below). Statistical observations are therefore to be taken with caution.

16 See sch. bT *Il.* 1.243 ex. (subsequently declared corrupt by Erbse in his *Corrigenda*), sch. D *Il.* 5.626; the confusion also occurs in Eustathius (e.g. 1286.14–15 [= 4.677.5–8 v.d.Valk] on *Il.* 23.33, see Erbse *ad loc.*; cf. also Eust. 179.10–13 [= 1.274.32–275.1 v.d.Valk], where he uses both terms in virtual juxtaposition). The mss. of the very Odyssean scholion quoted at the beginning of this paper transmit both ἀντιστρέφωσι and ἀναστρέφωσι (not reported in Pontani's *app. crit.*, but see Ludwich and Berndt *ad loc.*). The risk of error is particularly high with the respective verbs in the perfect tense because a single τ makes all the difference (e.g. ἀν[τ]έστραπται). The confusion of the nouns can also be documented in the opposite direction, e.g., sch. *Od.* 3.408e1/2 Pontani reads ἀντιστροφή instead of ἀναστροφή (retraction of the accent).

The relevant note first identifies the inversion by means of the 'mistaken' term ἀναστροφή and then justifies the analysis:

> ἀναστροφὴ ὁ τρόπος· τὸ ἐναντίον γὰρ γίνεται (sch. bT *Il.* 1.243 ex.).
>
> The trope is an inversion. For the opposite is happening.

This note provides the reader with a neat paradox. On the one hand, it is a rare exception in that it actually gives a reason for the analysis as morphosyntactic inversion. On the other, this reason is far from being self-evident. In what way is the opposite happening? A possible hypothesis might be that this critic posits a certain hierarchy in the sense that the more important action (here: dying) should be expressed by the predicate, the less important action (here: dropping) by the participle. Such a notion of relative importance and its adequate expression may well underlie the interpretation of other examples as well (e.g. withdrawing would then be seen as the more important action than staggering in *Il.* 4.535). At any rate, this kind of instruction would fit a didactic context where great poets such as Homer are studied not least as models to be followed in one's own writing. Be that as it may, the term τὸ ἐναντίον again designates a morphosyntactic inversion in sch. bT *Il.* 1.243 ex.[17]

Considering terminological variants for this inversion, a particularly prolific provider might, at first sight, be Eustathius. At least his commentary on the same verbal inversion that Chairis adduces in fr. 8 Berndt, χασσάμενος πελεμίχθη (*Il.* 4.535), reads as follows (quoted by Erbse *ad loc.*):

> ἱστέον δὲ καὶ ὅτι ἀντιστρόφως πως ἔθηκε τὰ τοῦ λόγου μέρη, ὡς οἱ παλαιοί φασιν· ἐχρῆν γὰρ εἰπεῖν ὅτι ὁ δὲ πελεμιχθεὶς χάσατο, ἤγουν μετακινηθεὶς ὑπεχώρησε. καὶ ἔστι καὶ τοῦτο πρωθύστερον σχῆμα, ὃ καὶ ὑστερολογία λέγεται, καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ εὑρίσκεται (Eust. 505.35–8 = 1.801.21–5 v.d.Valk).
>
> N.b. he (sc. Homer) somehow put the parts of speech by inversion, as the ancients say. For he should have said 'staggering back he receded', that is, turning away he withdrew. And this too is a *prôthusteron schêma*, which is also called *husterologia*, and can be found elsewhere.

The first term, ἀντιστρόφως, is explicitly said to derive from ancient sources (i.e. scholia and the like). This in itself is remarkable because Eustathius can also be shown to use the 'mistaken' variant ἀναστροφή (and cognates) in order to refer to a morphosyntactic inversion (cf. n. 16). The two alternative terms that he suggests, πρωθύστερον (σχῆμα) and ὑστερολογία, normally designate the rhetorical phe-

17 It recurs in this function in sch. Pi. *P.* 1.8 and sch. Pi. *I.* 26a. They both discuss nominal examples but adduce the verbal parallel of the Homeric *locus classicus* χασσάμενος πελεμίχθη (*Il.* 4.535). The same combination of interpreting a nominal passage and adducing this particular verbal parallel can be found in sch. S. *El.* 19.

nomenon that is often called *hysteron proteron:* the inversion of a temporal sequence such as ἅμα τράφεν ἠδ' ἐγένοντο (*Il.* 1.251, "together with him they had grown and had been born").[18] In fact, *Il.* 4.535 is the only case where Eustathius actually applies these two terms to a morphosyntactic inversion. The reason seems to be that what for others might involve a hierarchy of importance (cf. above) is for him primarily a question of temporal sequence. In his reconstruction of the events, Thoas first needs to leave his former position in the battle line before he can actually withdraw. In this connection it is worth pointing out that in his analysis Eustathius not only swaps participle for predicate and *vice versa* but also alters the word order: ἐχρῆν γὰρ εἰπεῖν ὅτι ὁ δὲ πελεμιχθεὶς χάσατο, ἤγουν μετακινηθεὶς ὑπεχώρησε. In other words, he primarily comments on the inverted temporal sequence and less on the inversion of participle and predicate.[19] Read against this backdrop, it is comprehensible that neither πρωθύστερον nor ὑστερολογία designate a morphosyntactic inversion elsewhere in his voluminous commentaries.

The latter term has nevertheless left a trace in the extant material: the textual transmission of sch. bT *Il.* 1.243 ex. (quoted above) is not unanimous. Instead of ἀναστροφή (in mss. C and T), two manuscripts provide an interesting *varia lectio* each: ὑστερολογία (M^1, 13th cent.) and ὑστερολογή (P^{11}, 14th cent.). With a palaeographical error obviously being excluded, they testify to an alternative tradition that treated such inversions under the rubric ὑστερολογία (*vel sim.*).[20]

Still with a view to possible terminological variants, the widespread use and pertinent definition of the Greek-looking term *hypallage* in Servius' commentary on Vergil easily induces one to expect relevant attestations in Greek sources as well.[21] The result is, however, largely negative. With the exception of a late scholion on Aristophanes' *Clouds* and an intriguing *varia lectio* in Latin script in an Odyssean scholion, the term ὑπαλλαγή (and cognates) does not refer to morphosyntactic inversions in Greek texts.[22] Either the relevant sources have not been transmitted to posterity or the Latin tradition coined the term *suo Marte.*

Eustathius' explanation and translation of *Il.* 4.535 (quoted above) blends inverted word order with inverted syntactic function. This amalgamation can be paralleled in the scholia in two further ways. First, the expression ἀλλάττω τὴν

18 Cf. e.g. van der Valk on Eust. 97.44–5 (with ref.), in rhetoric 'Tryphon' II *trop.* 26 (ὑστερολογία), West 1965: 247–8.

19 The altered word order might also explain why he occasionally uses the 'mistaken' term ἀναστροφή ('inverted word order', among other things), cf. n. 16.

20 This is a chance find. It is perfectly possible that more such examples lurk in the various *apparatus critici* because they inevitably slip through the net of TLG searches and the like.

21 Cf. esp. Serv. *Aen.* 1.9: *figura hypallage, quae fit quotienscumque per contrarium verba intelleguntur* ("<The passage displays> the figure *hypallage*, which occurs whenever words are understood by means of the opposite"), illustrated by two *loci classici* (*Aen.* 3.61, 4.22). Isidorus (1.36.22) takes up both the definition and the first parallel. Note the use of *per contrarium* (≈ τὸ ἐναντίον) in the definition.

22 Cf. sch. rec. Ar. *Nu.* 845d3, where the actual term is μεθυπαλλαγή. In sch. *Od.* 4.802a most mss. read ἀντιστρόφως, but ms. V^1 (1360/65) has *yppallage* (sic, in Latin letters).

τάξιν ('to change the order'), which normally describes inverted word order, is at least once used for a morphosyntactic inversion.[23] Second, a normal *hysteron proteron* can also be referred to by means of the 'morphosyntactic' term ἀντιστρόφως (sch. bT *Il.* 24.206 ex.). All in all, it seems justified to conclude that, in actual practice, there is some terminological and conceptual uncertainty among the various grammarians (and/or the scribes).

A similar uncertainty might be at the base of the scholion (sch. T *Il.* 19.368 ex.) that surprisingly designates the verbal inversion κάμε τεύχων (*Il.* 2.101 ≈ 19.368, cf. above) by means of the term ἀντίφρασις ('antiphrasis'). Is this a simple error for ἀντίστροφος, possibly fostered, for instance, by the presence of a *compendium* in the exemplar? Or does ἀντίφρασις essentially have the same meaning here as τὸ ἐναντίον in the examples above?[24]

As always, critics are perfectly able to discuss particular phenomena without resorting to standard technical vocabulary. In the case of morphosyntactic inversions, they usually confine themselves to 'translating' the relevant phrase into standard Greek (as in the first part of sch. bT *Il.* 2.101 ex., quoted above). Needless to say, these notes are substantially more difficult to trace because the usual semasiological search methods (TLG, word indices) inevitably fail to catch them. The fact that the scholia on the *Iliad* alone provide at least eight examples is a reminder of how many more might lurk in other sources.[25] Therefore, it does not seem advisable at this stage to draw conclusions of a statistical nature.

The treatment by Chairis (fr. 8 Berndt) and Pseudo-Herodian (*fig.* 58 Hajdú), both quoted above, displays a neat distinction between examples for verbal and nominal inversions respectively. But a scholion on *Il.* 15.17 does not hesitate to mingle the two when it glosses the Homeric phrase καί σε πληγῇσιν ἱμάσσω ("and I lash you up with strokes") with καί σε ἱμάσθλῃ πλήξω ("and I strike you with lashes", sch. T *Il.* 15.17d ex.). The use of the term ἀντεστραμμένως proves that this critic recognises a morphosyntactic inversion comparable to those discussed above, except that a noun takes the place of a verb and *vice versa*. Similarly, though without the use of a technical term, two redactions of a note on *Il.* 4.124 render the expression κυκλοτερὲς ... ἔτεινεν ("he pulled <the string> to <have the bow> form a circle") respectively with τείνας ἐκύκλωσεν and τείνας κυκλοτερὲς

23 See sch. bT *Il.* 23.119–20b ex. (discussing the same passage as Aristarchus, see above). The expression ἀλλάττω τὴν τάξιν designates a normal *hysteron proteron* e.g. in sch. T *Il.* 10.576 ex., sch. T *Il.* 11.317b ex. (for metrical reasons), sch. T *Il.* 22.406 ex., sch. T *Il.* 24.446a ex., sch. D *Od.* 17.30 (ed. Ernst).

24 The rhetorical trope ἀντίφρασις is sometimes defined by means of τὸ ἐναντίον (e.g. Trypho *fig.* 204.4ff. Spengel). The same scholion (sch. T *Il.* 19.368 ex.) has been included in his edition of the D-scholia by van Thiel, who corrects its text to ἀντιστροφή.

25 These are: sch. bT *Il.* 1.611b ex., sch. bT *Il.* 4.124a ex., sch. bT *Il.* 10.252–3a ex., sch. T *Il.* 11.546a ex., sch. T *Il.* 11.570–1 ex., sch. T *Il.* 13.395–6 ex., sch. bT *Il.* 15.581 ex., sch. T *Il.* 16.162c ex. (presumably based on Porphyry 1.212.12 Schrader, who compares the *locus classicus* χασσάμενος πελεμίχθη, see Erbse *ad loc.*).

ἐποίησεν ("pulling he made a circle", sch. bT *Il.* 4.124a[1/2] ex.). These mixed examples again testify to a certain freedom in applying the concept.[26]

The same holds true for the note that recognises in *Il.* 13.395–6 (οὐδ' ὅ γ' ἐτόλμησεν δηΐων ὑπὸ χεῖρας ἀλύξας | ἂψ ἵππους στρέψαι, "he did not have daring, shrinking from the hands of the enemy, to turn the horses about") a verbal inversion not of participle and predicate as in all the examples referred to above, but of participle (ἀλύξας) and infinitive (στρέψαι).[27]

The evidence collected and discussed in this paper shows that over time some 25 passages in Greek poetry attracted the attention of various ancient critics who recognised in them instances of a morphosyntactic inversion that, generally speaking, could be either verbal (usually predicate for participle and *vice versa*) or nominal (one case for another and *vice versa*). While the list of critics who took an interest in the phenomenon includes Aristarchus, it probably was his pupil Chairis who introduced a technical term for it: τρόπος ἀντίστροφος (and cognates). The new term faced the difficulty of being easily mixed up with similar-sounding terms of a different meaning (e.g. ἀναστροφή). For this reason or another, alternative expressions such as τὸ ἐναντίον ('the opposite'), though polyvalent and therefore potentially misleading, remained in use, to say nothing of the notes that do not make use of technical vocabulary at all. The morphosyntactic inversion under consideration was seen as a phenomenon primarily of rhetoric. At any rate, it appears to have left no trace in the extant grammars. The relevant notes tend simply to state the presence of the inversion in the poetic passage under consideration (occasionally adducing parallels), but do not address the question of why the relevant poet may have chosen to use it and to what effect. The main goal apparently was to alert the readers to the presence of a departure from standard Greek in the poetic text under consideration, arguably with a view to the readers' own efforts when composing a text that aims to emulate its poetic model. The presence of fictitious examples in some rhetorical handbooks points in a similar direction.

Bibliography

Berndt, R., *De Charete, Chaeride, Alexione grammaticis eorumque reliquiis*, Königsberg 1902.

Erbse, H., *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem*, 7 vols., Berlin–New York, 1967–88.

Fraenkel, E., *Aeschylus, Agamemnon*, 3 vols., Oxford 1950.

Lattimore, R., *The Iliad of Homer*, Chicago 1951.

Lattimore, R., *The Odyssey of Homer*, New York 1967.

26 One of the two examples in Servius auctus (*georg.* 2.267) equally mixes nominal and verbal inversion.

27 As Erbse (*ad loc.*) observes, the note itself (sch. T *Il.* 13.395–6 ex.) has been abbreviated to the point of being incomprehensible, but Eustathius' commentary on the same passage (939.38–40 = 3.493.28–31 v.d.Valk) helps to clarify the picture.

Matthaios, S., *Untersuchungen zur Grammatik Aristarchs: Texte und Interpretation zur Wortartenlehre*, Göttingen 1999.
Schironi, F., *The Best of the Grammarians*, Ann Arbor 2018.
Slater, W.J., *Aristophanis Byzantii fragmenta*, Berlin–New York 1986.
West, M.L., 'Tryphon, *De tropis*', *CQ* 59, 1965, 230–48.

Correspondence: René Nünlist, Universität zu Köln, Institut für Altertumskunde, Albertus-Magnus-Platz, D-50923 Köln, rene.nuenlist@uni-koeln.de