

DAVIDE VAGO

Università degli Studi di Genova

The Paleographic Error: The Hellenistic Scholars' Studies about *Iliad* 14, 241 and 21, 363

The skills and care by which the Hellenistic scholarship studies the Homeric text are well-known by scholars. Despite several researches concerning the methodology of Alexandrian scholars (διόρθωσις) have been published in the last decades, the Hellenistic studies about the paleographic error produced by copyists in delivering the Homeric text has not been studied and relevant essays on the subject are lacking.

*In order to clarify the method adopted by Hellenistic scholars to acknowledge and emend the paleographic errors in the Homeric texts, I have taken into account their exegesis on Il. 14, 241 and Il. 21, 363. As regards Il. 14, 241 I have studied two scholia handed down by the manuscript tradition and reaching back to the exegesis of Porphyry and Herodianus; on the other hand, as concerning Il. 21, 363 I have analysed two scholia handed down by the manuscript tradition and the P. Oxy. 221 (2nd century AD) which gives us information about the book 21 of the *Iliad*.*

The aim of my research is: (1) supporting the thesis about the Hellenistic scholars' skills in working on the Homeric text; (2) studying how the acknowledgement of the paleographic error is used in order to restore the Homeric text; (3) showing how in the Hellenistic age this exegetical method has been adopted by several scholars.¹

Keywords: Homer, *Iliad*, Aristarchus, Herodianus, Hellenistic Scholarship

1. Premise

It is well known that Alexandrian philologists worked on the Homeric text with great care and attention.²

In this contribution I will examine two *scholia* that shed light on the Alexandrian diorthotic practice: *Sch. Porph. vel ex. Il. 14, 241c* and *Sch.*

¹ The present paper is the result of a re-work of my master thesis discussed at the Università degli Studi di Genova the day 20 October 2020.

² See, e.g., MONTANARI (1998; 2015a; 2015b; 2018); MONTANA (2011; 2012; 2015); PAGANI (2015).

ex. *Il.* 21, 263e.³ Through the analysis of these *scholia* I will try to demonstrate how the Alexandrian philologists were aware that some textual corruptions may have been produced because of the inability to understand the previous alphabet⁴ and leading to a reading error, thus committing what today is commonly called a ‘paleographic error’.

In the year 403/402 BC, under the archonship of Euclides – as it is known – the Eastern Ionic alphabet (dark blue) was adopted by Athens to write official documents,⁵ previously written in the Attic alphabet (light blue).⁶ The graphemes E/O, applied in Attica before the reform, were used to indicate generally the short light and dark vowel, the long open vowel, and the long closed vowel,⁷ while in the Ionian of Asia, which later became the standard scripture, there were more specific graphemes or digraphs to indicate the short closed (E/O), long open (H/Ω), and long closed (EI/OΥ) sounds. This transition could lead to misunderstandings of texts written in the previous alphabet, thus generating errors that spread throughout the tradition due to the copying of μεταχαρακτηρίσαντες;⁸ already in the Hellenistic age exegetes, at least since Aristarchus, show themselves aware of the risks inherent in this transition, understanding the philological consequences of the phenomenon that occurred in the fifth century.

Thanks to the analysis of the passages taken into account (preceded by a contextualization of the Homeric text to which they refer and an examination of their presence in the manuscripts that carry them, i.e. Venetus A and Townleianus) it will be possible to see how the Hellenistic philologists offer solutions to the corruptions produced in the text by proposing hypotheses about errors’ development.

³ The text of the *scholia* presented is that of ERBSE: see ERBSE (1971: 269) for the *sch.* Did. *Il.* 7, 238c² and ERBSE (1974) for the *sch.* Ariston. *Il.* 11, 104a¹. I myself have sifted through the manuscript witnesses.

⁴ See WEST (2001: 21–23) and PALMER (1980: 94–97).

⁵ See CASSIO (2016²: 117).

⁶ For a taxonomy of Greek alphabets and their coloring see KIRCHHOFF (1877) and CASSIO (2016²: 115–116).

⁷ The signs for the latter sounds will become more regularly fixed around 350 BC: see CASSIO (2016²: 117).

⁸ See COBET (1876: 289) and WEST (2001: 22–23).

2. *Iliad* 14: a case study for μεταχαρακτηρίσαντες

In the course of the book 14 of the *Iliad*, the goddess Hera intends to make her husband Zeus fall into a deep sleep, after having lured him using her sensuality, so as to be able to support the Greeks, contrary to what the Chronius' son had arranged. She then asks Aphrodite for love and lust so that she can go – says Hera misleadingly – to Ocean and Thetis, who have been clashing for a long time: she hopes to make peace between them by using persuasive words and beauty. Aphrodite, believing the deception, decides to help her: she pulls out of her chest an embroidered brassiere, which had hidden inside love, desire, secret conversation and persuasion, and suggests Hera to wear it. The wife of Zeus descends from Olympus and reaches the island of Lemnos, the city of the divine Thoas, where she meets Ὑπνος, brother of Θάνατος,⁹ to whom she turns to force her husband to sleep.

Il. 14, 231–241.

ἐνθ' Ὑπνω ξύμβλητο κασιγνήτῳ Θανάτοιο,
 ἐν τ' ἄρα οἱ φῦ χειρὶ ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἕκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν·
 “Ὑπνε ἄναξ πάντων τε θεῶν πάντων τ' ἀνθρώπων,
 ἤμὲν δὴ ποτ' ἐμὸν ἔπος ἔκλυες, ἦδ' ἔτι καὶ νῦν
 πείθει· ἐγὼ δέ κέ τοι ἰδέω χάριν ἤματα πάντα.
 κοιμήσόν μοι Ζηνὸς ὑπ' ὀφρύσιν ὅσσε φαεινῶ
 αὐτίκ' ἐπεὶ κεν ἐγὼ παραλέξομαι ἐν φιλότητι.
 δῶρα δέ τοι δώσω καλὸν θρόνον ἀφθιτον αἰεὶ
 χρύσειον· Ἡφαιστος δέ κ' ἐμὸς πάϊς ἀμφιγυήεις
 τεύξει' ἀσκήσας, ὑπὸ δὲ θρηῖνον ποσὶν ἦσει,
 τῷ κεν ἐπισχοίης λιπαροῦς πόδας εἰλαπινάζων.”

There with Hypnos he met, brother of Thanatos,
 shook hands with him and spoke words to him and apostrophized him by name:
 “Hypnos, lord of all gods and all mortals,
 in the past you have listened to my words, so also now
 Listen to me: and I will be grateful to you forever.
 Under the eyelashes of Zeus, assume for me the two shining eyes
 immediately after I have lain beside him in love.

⁹About the god Hypnos see GOSTOLI–CERRI (1998: 755), Hes. *Th.* 211–232 and RICCIARDELLI (2018: 129–132).

As a gift then I will give you a beautiful throne always immortal
golden; and Hephaestus, my crooked-legged son
will build it adorning it, under this a stool for your feet will be there,
on which you may spread your scented feet while you eat.”

The *scholium* at verse 241 is located at folium 185r of Venetus A: it is the last in the right/outer margin and ends in the lower margin. The lemma ἐπίσχοιες is present. In the available Iiadic witnesses, both ancient and medieval emerges an alternation between the forms ἐπισχοίας (put in text in West’s edition) ἐπίσχοιες, ἐπισχοίης. Venetus A features ἐπισχοῖες in the Homeric text. The text of the *scholium* is written with several tachygraphic signs. The text contained in the ms. ἐπισχοίης τὸ ἐπισχοίην is corrected by Cobet, and consequently by Erbse, to ἐπισχοίην τὸ ἐπισχοίης¹⁰. The end-of-colon symbol is found only with the dicolon.

Sch. Porph. vel ex. Il. 14, 241c. ἐπίσχοιες: τῷ ἐπίσχοιμι ἀκόλουθόν ἐστι τὸ ἐπίσχοις, τῷ δὲ ἐπισχοίην τὸ ἐπισχοίης· καὶ ἴσως ἔδει οὕτως ἔχειν, παρεφθάρη δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν μεταχαρακτηρισάντων· τῷ δὲ χαρακτῆρι γενόμενον ὅμοιον τῷ “ιοίην” καὶ “ἀγαγοίην” παρὰ Σαπφοῖ (fr. 182 et 169 L. – P.) καὶ τῷ “πεπαγοίην” παρ’ Εὐπόλιδι (Eup. fr. 472 K. – A.) εἰκότως ἐβαρυντήθη τὸ ἐπισχοίης, γενόμενον ἐπίσχοιες ὡς Αἰολικόν. οὕτω καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Κοτιαεὺς ἐν τῷ ἰ’ τῶν Παντοδαπῶν. Α

Sch. Porph. vel ex. Il. 14, 241c. you could lay: ἐπίσχοις is the form corresponding to ἐπίσχοιμι, ἐπισχοίης to ἐπισχοίην; and perhaps it was necessary for it to be so, but it was corrupted by transliterators: being similar to the (verbal) form ιοίην (*I would go*) and ἀγαγοίην (*I would lead*) in Sappho and to πεπαγοίην (*I would fix*) in Eupolis,¹¹ it is rightly without the accent on the last syllable ἐπισχοίης (*you could lay*), which becomes ἐπίσχοιες as Aeolic. In this way also Alexander of Cotiaem in book 9 of the *Miscellaneous Things*.

¹⁰ See ERBSE (1974: 619) and COBET (1876: 291).

¹¹ See KASSEL–AUSTIN (1986: 533–534) and OLSON (2017: 235–236).

Erbse is uncertain in attributing this *scholium* to a class, proposing the alternative between Porphyrian material¹² and the repertoire of exegetical *scholia*. A different hypothesis by Schrader also envisaged the possibility that it was a VMK *scholium*, notably Herodian.¹³

The debated issue responds to the question concerning the transition from the Attic to the Ionic alphabet.¹⁴ In this case the exegete analyzes the writing error due to the misunderstanding of the ancient graph E (with its triple value of ε, η, ει). The scholium should be examined in conjunction with *Sch. Hrd. Il. 14, 241b1*:

*Sch. Hrd. καθ.*¹⁵ *Il. 14, 241b1*. {τῷ κεν} ἐπίσχοιες: οὕτως τὴν γραφὴν παρατίθεται ὁ Ἡρωδιανὸς ἐν τῷ ιζ' τῆς Καθόλου (1, 469, 14) καὶ λέγει ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐπίσχοις πλεονασμὸν εἶναι τοῦ ε ἢ συστολὴν τοῦ ἐπισχοίης. A

Sch. Hrd. καθ. Il. 14, 241b1. {on which} you might lay: Herodian thus proposes this spelling in the seventeenth book of the *General Prosody* and says that there is a pleonasm of ε from the form ἐπίσχοις or an abbreviation from ἐπισχοίης. A

Herodian was thus witnessing a lesson ἐπίσχοιες, which he claimed corresponded either to the aorist optative form of thematic verbs (ἐπίσχοις) or to that of athematic verbs (ἐπισχοίης), through various mutations (addition of ε and abbreviation of η, respectively).

¹² His hypothesis had been based on ERBSE's belief, see ERBSE (1960: 96) that the *Homeric Questions* were the exclusive conduit of material from Alexander of Cotiaeum in the *Iliadic scholia*; however, this idea was later discussed (see, e.g., VAN DER VALK [1963–1964: 1, 113–114] and DYCK [1991: 312; 324]). For the connections of Porphyry's work with the Homeric scholastic tradition see ERBSE (1969) IL. For the Porphyry's *Homeric Questions* see SCHRÂDER (1880–1890) and MACPHAIL (2011).

¹³ See SCHRÂDER (1880–1890) and ERBSE (1974: 619).

¹⁴ See WEST (2001: 21–22), CASSIO (2016²: 115–118) and COBET (1876: 289–292, in particular 291 about this *scholium*).

¹⁵ Herodian *scholium* derived not from the *Iliake prosodia* (epitomized and merged with the other three works of Aristonicus, Didymus, and Nicanores), but from the *Katholike prosodia*.

In our *scholium* we further read that one (ἐπίσχοις) is derived from the form ἐπίσχοιμι, the other (ἐπισχοίης)¹⁶ from ἐπισχοίην. The hypothesis is then proposed (ἴσως) that the original form in the text should in fact have been ἐπισχοίης. We then move on to the genesis of error's analysis, which is explained with terminology that finds significant consonance with the one applied by modern philological analysis: the correct form of the verb, in fact, became corrupted (παρεφθάρη) due to the errors by the copyists. It is extremely interesting to note that the scholiast reports the term (in the masculine plural genitive of the aorist participle) τῶν μεταχαρακτηρισάντων to indicate the copyists who produced the text by putting it from an ancient method of writing into a different one, from the Athenian alphabet (light blue) to the Ionic one (dark blue).¹⁷

The exegete also notes that ἐπισχοίης, rightly, is not accented on the last syllable,¹⁸ so both ἐπισχοίης and the alleged Aeolian form ἐπίσχοιες from this point of view are analogous (being both devoid of accent on the last syllable).

We find in closing the mention of an authority, namely the ninth book of the *Miscellaneous Things* of Alexander of Cotiaem, ¹⁹ to whom is not clear, however, how much of the preceding treatment must be referred.

Alexander of Cotiaem was born around 70/80 AD and died around the middle of the second century. He lived in Rome where he used to be a teacher (sophistês), which allowed him to gather a large fortune. He was the teacher of the rhetorician Aelius Aristides, and was chosen by the emperor Antoninus Pius as the tutor of his adopted sons Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus. Less than twenty fragments have come

¹⁶ The verb is also analyzed only from a semantic point of view by Eustathius in 983, 4–5 (see VAN DER VALK [1979: 631]) κοινότερον δὲ ἐπισχεῖν λέγεται τὸ κρατῆσαι 'Prevailing is most commonly called holding'.

¹⁷ For comparisons between Ancient and Medieval μεταχαρακτηρισμός see REYNOLDS–WILSON (2016: 53–58; 85–86).

¹⁸ A prosodic issue, by the way, that reinforces the hypothesis that Herodian is behind this note.

¹⁹ See MONTANA (2018: 1–29) (to which we refer for further bibliography); DYCK (1991: 307–355); MURPHY (1969).

down to us, which testify to interests in 1) lexicon and etymology, 2) grammatical morphology, 3) exegesis. His interest in Homer is testified to us by quotations in Porphyry's *Homeric Matters* and homeric *scholia*.

3. *Iliad* 21, 363: κνίσην μελδόμενος ο μελδομένου?

The second evidence of Alexandrian *diorthosis* related to paleographical error begins with the exegetical scholastic in *Il.* 21, 363e.

Achilles, after having slaughtered innumerable Trojans, is heading towards Ilium, but the river Scamander decides to stop his advance with the impetus of its whirling waters and asks for help to his brother Simoeis so that, joining the fury of their waters, they can protect Troy. They succeed in their intent for a short time, since Hera, worried about Achilles' fate, promptly urges her son Hephaestus to generate a great fire on the plain of Troy while she goes in the middle of the Ocean to blow the hot wind Notus. Hephaestus carries out his mother's orders by going to the plain and blinding up a great fire that sets everything on fire: first the corpses of the men killed by the Pelides, then, approaching the trees around the river (elms, willows and tamarisks), the river plants (lotus, rush, Cyperus)²⁰ finally it devastates the fishes and eels in the river by boiling its waters.

Il. 21, 354–371.

καίετο δ' ἴς ποταμοῖο ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν·
 Ἥφαιστ', οὐ τις σοί γε θεῶν δύνατ' ἀντιφερίζειν,
 οὐδ' ἂν ἐγὼ σοί γ' ὤδε πυρὶ φλεγέθοντι μαχοίμην.
 λῆγ' ἔριδος, Τρωῶας δὲ καὶ ἀντίκα δῖος Ἀχιλλεὺς
 ἄστεος ἐξέλασειε· τί μοι ἔριδος καὶ ἀρωγῆς;
 φῆ πυρὶ καιόμενος, ἀνὰ δ' ἔφλυε καλὰ ῥέεθρα.
 ὡς δὲ λέβης ζεῖ ἔνδον ἐπειγόμενος πυρὶ πολλῶ
 κνίσην μελδόμενος ἀπαλοτρεφῆος σιάλοιο
 πάντοθεν ἀμβολάδην, ὑπὸ δὲ ξύλα κάγκανα κείται,
 ὡς τοῦ καλὰ ῥέεθρα πυρὶ φλέγετο, ζέε δ' ὕδωρ·
 οὐδ' ἔθελε προρέειν, ἀλλ' ἴσχετο· τεῖρε δ' αὐτμή
 Ἥφαιστοιο βίηφι πολύφρονος. αὐτὰρ ὁ γ' Ἥρην
 πολλὰ λισσόμενος ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα·
 Ἥρη τίπτε σὸς υἱὸς ἐμὸν ῥόον ἔχραε κήδειν

²⁰ Typical marsh plant very similar to papyrus.

ἔξ ἄλλων; οὐ μὲν τοι ἐγὼ τόσον αἰτιός εἰμι
ὅσπον οἱ ἄλλοι πάντες, ὅσοι Τρώεσσιν ἄρωγοί.

Burning with the strength of the river, he addressed him and called out to him:

‘Hephaestus, none among the gods can compete with thee,
not even I would fight with you who are so fiery.

Suspend the dispute. In fact the Trojans even immediately the divine Achilles
from the stronghold you drive; what [matters] to me of contention and defense?’

He spoke burning with fire, and over it seethed the beautiful currents.

As also a pot seethes within being pressed by much fire
liquefying the fat of the fattened swine

on every side shuddering, and underneath lies the crackling wood,

so its beautiful currents with fire burned, and boiled the water;

and did not want to flow, but held back: weakened it the blaze

of Hephaestus versatile with violence; but that to Hera

much pleading, addressed words that fly:

‘Hera, why did thy son plummet to torment me

among the others? Yet I am not so responsible as all the others,

as many as come to the Trojans’ aid.

The Genavensis manuscript bears at folium 719 a long *scholium* at verse 363 attributable to the class of *scholia exegetica*. It is written in the right–outside margin (with the exception of the last line, for which the exegete uses the lower mg. since there is no more space in the outer one), and is linked to the text, more precisely to the word κνίση (this is the variant present in the Homeric text of the ms.), by means of a symbol identical to the tachygraphic sign for ὅτι and is without a lemma (Nicole, followed by Erbse, proposes its integration in the form <κνίσην μελδόμενος:>).²¹ There are numerous tachygraphic signs for the desinences and conjunctions γάρ, καί, δέ. Throughout the text there is a recurring error of gemination of the sibilant in the word – declined in several cases – κνίση: there are examples in the third, fourth and seventh lines. The end is marked by its scholastic sign.

Sch. ex. Il. 21, 363e. <κνίσην μελδόμενος:> τὴν κνῖσαν τήκων. καὶ Καλλίστρατος ἐξηγεῖται. “τὴν πιμελὴν τήκων ἀπαλοῦ σός”. Κομανὸς ὁ Ναυκρατίτης γράφει σὺν τῷ ν, “κνίσην μελδόμενος”, ὅπως κείσεται <τὸ> παθητικὸν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐνεργητικοῦ τοῦ μέλδων

²¹ See NICOLE (1891) *ad. loc.* and ERBSE (1977: 212).

τὴν κνῖσαν, καίων. Πεισιστρατος δὲ ὁ Ἐφέσιος καὶ Ἑρμογένης ἐν τῷ Περὶ τῶν <πέντε> προβλημάτων· “ἐγγράπτο, φησί, ΜΕΛΔΟΜΕΝΟ, καὶ δεόν ἦν <τό> υ προσθεῖναι, κακῶς δέ τις τὸ ς προσέγραψεν.” ὁ γὰρ νοῦς “τῇ κνίσῃ τηκόμενου τοῦ σούς”. ὁ μὲν <οὔν> ποιητῆς μέλδεσθαι φησι τὰ ἐψόμενα, οἱ δὲ πεποιήκασι τὸν λέβητα τηκόμενον. ἡ δὲ αἰτία γέγονεν ἐν τῷ μὴ τοὺς ἀρχαίους προστιθεῖναι τῷ ο τὸ υ, ἀλλ’ ὅταν τὴν συλλαβὴν ταύτην βούλωνται γράφειν ου, τὸ ἐν γράμμα σημειοῦσθαι μόνον. γεγραμμένου δὴ οὔτως, “ΚΝΙΣΗΙ ΜΕΛΔΟΜΕΝΟ” καὶ οὐ προσκειμένου τοῦ υ, ὁ μεταγράφων εἰς τὴν νῦν γραμματικὴν οὐκ ἐνόησεν ὅτι, “μελδομένου” ἦν, ἀλλ’ ἄνευ τοῦ υ ἀναγινώσκων ἀδιανόητον ἠγεῖτο καὶ ἡμαρτημένον εἶναι· διόπερ προσέθηκε ἀντὶ τοῦ υ τὸ ς, μελδόμενος ποιήσας. γράφεται οὔν ὁ λέβης τηκόμενος ἀντὶ τοῦ <τηκόμενου> ἀπαλοτρεφέος σιάλοιο. εἰ δέ τις τὸ τηκόμενος φήσει ἴσον εἶναι τῷ τήκων, παραθεῖς ὅτι καὶ ὁ λοιδορῶν λοιδορούμενος λέγεται ἢ, “πεπληγυῖα” (*Il.* 5, 763; *Od.* 10, 238) <ἀντὶ τοῦ πλήσσουσα> καὶ, “πέπληγον δὲ χορόν” (*Od.* 7, 264) ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔτυπτον, κατανοεῖτω τὴν ἀνομοιότητα· βιάσεται γὰρ λέγειν “ὡς δὲ λέβης πυρὶ πολλῶν τήκων”, κωλυούσης τῆς ἐπιφερομένης λέξεως· ἔσται γὰρ ἀσύνητον τὸ σιάλοιο. φανερόν οὔν ὅτι λέγεται τηκόμενου σιάλοιο ζεῖν τὸν λέβητα. οὐ προσγεγραφομένου δὲ πρότερον τοῦ υ, ὁ μεταγράφων, ὅπερ ἔφη, ἐλλείπειν νομίσας τὴν λέξιν, προσέθηκε τὸ ς. Ge

Sch. ex. *Il.* 21, 363e. <κνίσῃν μελδόμενος> dissolving the fat. Callistratus also interprets “melting the fat of a tender swine.” Comanus of Naucratis writes it with the υ (i. e. in the accusative) “κνίσῃν μελδόμενος” so that there is the passive (i. e. μελδόμενος) instead of the active μέλδων τὴν κνῖσαν, meaning burning. Instead Pisistratus of Ephesus and Hermogenes in the writing *On the Five Problems* say: “It was written ΜΕΛΔΟΜΕΝΟ and it was necessary to add the υ, but mistakenly one added the sigma: in fact the concept is “while the pig melts in the fat”. <So> the poet says that what is cooked melts, but some have understood that it was the cauldron that was melted. The cause was determined by the fact that the ancients did not add the υ to ο, but when they wanted to write this syllable ου, they marked only one letter. So since it was written like this “ΚΝΙΣΗΙ ΜΕΛΔΟΜΕΝΟ” and since the υ was not placed near it, the one who transcribed it into the present alphabet did not understand that it was “μελδομένου”,

but reading it without the υ he thought it was unintelligible and believed it was wrong; therefore he placed the sigma in place of the υ , creating $\mu\epsilon\lambda\delta\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$. The melting cauldron is therefore written in place of “<melting> the tender swine”. If one will assert that [the middle form] $\tau\eta\kappa\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ is equivalent to [the active one] $\tau\acute{\eta}\kappa\omega\nu$, citing as an argument that even $\lambda\omicron\iota\delta\omicron\rho\acute{\omega}\nu$ can be said $\lambda\omicron\iota\delta\omicron\rho\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ or, “ $\pi\epsilon\pi\lambda\eta\gamma\upsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$ ” (*Il.* 5, 763; *Od.* 10, 238) <in place of $\pi\lambda\acute{\eta}\sigma\sigma\upsilon\sigma\alpha$ > and “they beat the ground dancing” (*Od.* 7, 264) instead of $\epsilon\tau\upsilon\pi\tau\omicron\nu$ (they struck), he should try to pay attention to the difference; for it will make it difficult to say “ $\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \delta\grave{\epsilon}\ \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\beta\eta\varsigma\ \pi\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\ \pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\omega}\ \tau\acute{\eta}\kappa\omega\nu$ ” (when the cauldron melted with great fire) since the word that follows prevents it: in fact the expression “of the swine” will be unintelligible. It is therefore clear that it is said that while the swine melts, the cauldron boils. Since at first the υ was not written in addition, the copyist, as indeed I have said, judging the word to be lacking, added a sigma.

After providing a simpler formulation to indicate the concept of the melting of fat ($\mu\epsilon\lambda\delta\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ equals $\tau\acute{\eta}\kappa\omega\nu$), the *scholium* transmits a doxography that gives an account of an ancient discussion about the correct constitution of the text and, consequently, the interpretation of this passage. The only oscillation documented in the manuscripts in our possession concerns $\kappa\nu\acute{\iota}\sigma\eta\nu/\kappa\nu\acute{\iota}\sigma\eta$ (as can be seen from West’s edition),²² while the witnesses we possess agree in handing down the participle $\mu\epsilon\lambda\delta\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ in the nominative singular, to be agreed therefore with the the phrase’s subject $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\beta\eta\varsigma$ (v. 362). The *scholia* records traces of an ancient discussion that concerned not only the alternative between the accusative and dative for $\kappa\nu\acute{\iota}\sigma\eta\nu/\kappa\nu\acute{\iota}\sigma\eta$ but also the case of the participle. The first reported position is that of Callistratus²³ who interpreted this pericope to mean $\tau\eta\nu\ \pi\iota\mu\epsilon\lambda\acute{\eta}\nu\ \tau\acute{\eta}\kappa\omega\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\lambda\omicron\upsilon\ \sigma\upsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ evidently reading $\kappa\nu\acute{\iota}\sigma\eta\nu$ in the accusative (it is glossed by $\tau\eta\nu\ \pi\iota\mu\epsilon\lambda\acute{\eta}\nu$), as the object complement of the participle $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\delta\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ in the nominative (glossed by $\tau\acute{\eta}\kappa\omega\nu$) and taking $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\lambda\omicron\tau\omicron\rho\epsilon\phi\acute{o}\varsigma\ \sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\lambda\omicron\iota\omicron$ (‘translated’ by $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\lambda\omicron\upsilon\ \sigma\upsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$) as the specification complement of the object complement.

²² See the Homeric text above mentioned WEST (1998–2000: 2, 257) and MONRO–ALLEN (1963b: 199).

²³ See MONTANA (2007–2008: particulary 1–4); MONTANA (2008: *passim*); MONTANA (2012: 47–48); PFEIFFER (1973: 301–302) and BOUDREAUX (2019: 48–51).

Callistratus is a scholar who was, most likely, mentored by Aristophanes of Byzantium. His ἀκμή is placed in the middle of the second century BC. He studied the Homeric poems, Hesiod, Pindar, Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes, and Cratinus (with less certainty Aeschylus and Eupolis). It is not known whether he made new *ekdoseis* of the texts or worked on those of his master Aristophanes, nevertheless the *sch.* at *Il.* 3, 18a suggests that he edited the Homeric poem (καὶ ἢ Ἀριστοφάνους καὶ ἢ Καλλιστράτου κτλ. 'the edition of Aristophanes and that of Callistratus'). There are 35 certain fragments of Homeric exegesis (15 in the *scholia* to the *Iliad* and 20 to the *Odyssey*, in addition to a couple handed down by etymological tradition): these fragments come from the works Πρὸς τὰς ἀθετήσεις, Περὶ Ἰλιάδος and Διορθωτικά. The *corpus* of *scholia* in which the Alexandrian philologist is most quoted, however, is the one to Aristophanes in which we read his name about 30 times (19 citations in the *Frogs*, 7 in the *Birds* and 6 in the *Wasps*). The sources also mention a miscellaneous collection of his Σύμμικτα and the erudite writing Περὶ ἑταιρῶν.

The same textual arrangement and exegesis are attributed by the *scholia* to Comanus of Naucratis.²⁴

Not much is known about this scholar, who lived in the 2nd century BC: he was a contemporary of Aristarchus. We know neither the titles of his works nor the quantity, however, from the twenty-one fragments preserved we can assume that he dealt with exegesis to Homer, although some clues might suggest an interest in Hesiod, in the language of the Attic writers and in prosodic issues. He used the traditional tools of Homeric exegesis: the analysis of the text's literal sense, the use of μεταφορά, and the need to adhere to the historical verisimilitude of Homer's time. Although Aristarchus' fame was greater than that of the Naucratis, here the latter's variant has been reported at the expense of the coincident by Aristarchus':²⁵ as far as we know from another *scholi-*

²⁴ See mainly NOVEMBRI (2018: particularly 2–3) to which we refer for further bibliography, SOLMSEN (1945: 115–116); SCHMIDHAUSER (2008: 331–334) and MONTANA (2015: 141, n. 375).

²⁵ Regarding the relationship between Aristarchus and his contemporary, we would certainly know more from the work Πρὸς Κομανόν of Aristarchus himself, of which

um ad loc. (21, 363c), Aristarchus' position thus included:²⁶ κνίσῃν in the accusative, direct complement of μέλδομενος in the nominative.²⁷

Then the analysis, with a δέ that would seem a typical index of the scholiastic compilation, moves on the interpretation of Pisistratus of Ephesus²⁸ and Hermogenes:²⁹ the introductory formulation seems to associate Pisistratus to the opinion of Hermogenes (see *infra*), but the *scholium*'s mentions only the latter's work (known also from *scholium* 363c) entitled Περί τῶν <πέντε>³⁰ προβλημάτων of which apparently it reports a *verbatim* quotation. The text that these scholars thought was correct, is κνίσῃ μέλδομένου ἀπαλοτρεφέως σιάλοιο ('while the tender swine melts in fat') thus believing that the verse contained an absolute genitive with σιάλοιο as subject (with ἀπαλοτρεφέως as attribute) and κνίσῃ as dative of limitation. What is most interesting to our discussion is the explanation that is given to support their interpretation over the traditional one: the two hypothesized that the erroneous confusion in the case of the participle had arisen because of the ancient spelling ΜΕΛΔΟΜΕΝΟ – which in the Attic alphabet represented μέλδομένου: they propose that someone, not understanding the value of the final O, as such unexplained, thought about a fallen sigma and believed he had to restore it, introducing it unduly. The opinion of Hermogenes is also recorded, more briefly, in the *scholium ad Iliad* 21, 363c,³¹ where, however, no mention is made of Pisistratus.³² We cannot say more about the relationship between the two scholars, however it has been speculated that one was a source for the other.³³

we have testimony from *Sch. Did. Il.* 1, 97–99; 2, 798a; 24, 110b¹. Scholars who have interpreted Πρὸς to mean 'against' have assumed that there was adversity between the two scholars (see DYCK [1988: 221–262]); on the contrary, it is possible to interpret the preposition as a dedication.

²⁶ About this position see *scholium* to 21, 363c: ERBSE (1977: 210–212).

²⁷ See WEST (1998–2000: 2, 257).

²⁸ About this author see BACIGALUPO (2020) to which we refer for further bibliography, and SCHMIDT (1987: 65–69).

²⁹ About this author see IPPOLITO (2005) and CADOUX (1938: 233).

³⁰ Integration, clearly, is done on the basis of the *scholium* 21, 363c.

³¹ See ERBSE (1977: 210–212).

³² See BACIGALUPO (2020: 3).

³³ See BACIGALUPO (2020: 3–4).

Not much is known about Pisistratus of Ephesus: the time in which he carried out his activity of exegesis is unknown and he is mentioned only at this point of the *Iliadic scholia* and by Diogenes Laërtius (2, 60).

Information about Hermogenes is more copious. They are conveyed by an inscription of Smyrne (CIG 3311) which also hands down a list of the titles of his works. Son of Caridemus and husband of Melitina (see CIG 3350) he was a great scholar of medicine as evidenced by his *Ἱατρικά*, in 77 books. He also wrote historiographical texts with a *History of Smyrna* and the *Histories of Foundations of Cities*, a *πίναξ Ῥωμαίων καὶ Σμυρναίων*, a *διαδοχὴ κατὰ χρόνους* and other scholarly works including the writing *On the Five Problems*, mentioned in the *scholium* but not recorded in the epigraph.

Going back to the content of the *scholium* at 21, 363e, the discussion continues by pointing out the fact that the participle is of middle diathesis, therefore, in a context where *κνίση* dative of limitation and not *κνίσην* accusative was read, it is not transitive: *μέλδων* is different from *μελδόμενος* as well as *τήκων* from *τηκόμενος*. Therefore, the exegete argues that the cauldron boils over while the fat of the swine melts.

We close the *scholium* with the resumption, in *Ringkomposition*, of the crucial theme: the error is due to the misunderstanding of the vowel O because of the ancient *μεταχαρακτηρισμός*.

Important to consider in our discussion is the papyrus fragment of *P. Oxy.* 221 (TM 60508/LDAB 1631)³⁴ which preserves the so-called *Commentary of Ammonius*³⁵ to *Il.* 21, 1–363. The papyrus, a fragment of a roll, contains on its *verso* the *Commentary*, whose writing, distributed in 17 columns, is assigned to the middle of the 2nd century AD, while the *recto* (*P. Oxy.* 220, first half of the 2nd century AD) contains a metrical treatise.

The attribution to Ammonius, son of Ammonius, is due to an inscription found between column X and XI: *Ἀμμώνιος Ἀμμωνίου γραμματικὸς ἐσημειώσαμην*. He probably lived between the middle of

³⁴ See GRENFELL–HUNT (1899: 53–85) and for more information about the papyrus the following note and the site: <https://www.trismegistos.org/text/60508>.

³⁵ See PONTANI (2005: 65; 136; 269) and PAGANI (2006: particularly 1–2 about the date of the papyrus).

the 1st century AD and the middle of the 2nd century AD: the dating elements are derived from the same commentary, which provides a *terminus post quem*, containing references to grammarians of Augustan age and a probable *terminus ante quem*, never mentioning the later Herodian, Antonine age. It follows that the identification with other homonyms is impossible since it is known an Ammonius, *Ammonii filius*, as head of the library of Alexandria, student and successor³⁶ of Aristarchus, composer of a commentary on the *Iliad*, whose activity is placed, however, in the middle of the 2nd century BC, another Ammonius who comments to the *Odyssey* at the end of the 1st century AD is known from P. Lit. Lond. 30 + P. Sijpesteijn 3 (LDAB 1382)³⁷ in which Ammonius is quoted with the monogram AM which is however identified by some with the same Ammonius Alexandrinus disciple of Aristarchus,³⁸ a third Ammonius is the author of a lexicon *De adfinium vocabulorum differentia* whose dating is uncertain, however the material seems not to date back beyond the 1st century AD, not to mention the different horizon of research interests.

The close relationship between Ammonius' *Commentary* and this *scholium* transmitted by the ms. Genavense has been recognized as an indication that the scholar responsible for this layer of the exegetical apparatus of the ms. Ge³⁹ also had at his disposal material in some form derived from this *hypomnema*.⁴⁰

The papyrus testifies that the explanation of *μελδόμενος* through the hypothesis of an error related to *μεταχαρακτηρισμός* already dated back to Crates of Mallus (fr. 32 Broggiato).

On this basis two reflections can be made: 1) Pisiistratus and Hermogenes did not elaborate the explanation independently, but simply rec-

³⁶ About this Ammonius see MONTANA (2006: 1–3) and D'ALESSANDRO (2018: particularly 109–111).

³⁷ See GRENFELL–HUNT (1899: 54).

³⁸ See D'ALESSANDRO (2018: 160–161).

³⁹ ERBSE identifies this as the first of five hands intervening at different times in the manuscript.

⁴⁰ See ERBSE (1969: XLII; LIX); ERBSE (1977: 78–121); LONDON (2011: 175–176); PAGANI (2019: 351–352).

orded a doctrine elaborated by Crates⁴¹ alone (see *infra*), reporting, according to Müller,⁴² a *verbatim* quotation (ἐγγέγραπτο – σούς);⁴³ 2) it has been argued by Helck⁴⁴ that Pisistratus, along with Hermogenes, was a Crathean school grammarian, whatever this may mean for a figure like Hermogenes, several centuries away from Crates.

Crates of Mallus was the leading exponent of Hellenistic philology in Pergamum and was a contemporary of Aristarchus. *Suida*⁴⁵ defines him as a 'Stoic philosopher' nicknamed 'the Homeric and the critic'. According to the story of Suetonius (*De grammaticis et retoribus* 2, 1), we owe to him the birth of philological interest in Rome: he was in fact sent by Attalids in diplomatic mission to the Senate, around 168 BC, but was forced to stay in Rome because of a broken leg, so he devoted himself to teaching. The influences of his Stoicism were also felt on the philological work: in fact he made the theory of costume his own, with the consequent maintenance of a particular and eccentric linguistic form in opposition to the Alexandrian method that preferred the regularity:⁴⁶ this dichotomy, which we inherit from the account of Varro on the alleged dispute between anomalists and analogists, has been greatly reduced by modern criticism; however, we must not forget that this diatribe may entail the circulation of different texts, depending on where the text was written. As far as literary criticism is concerned, it seems that Crates favored the allegorical interpretation of the texts.⁴⁷ The only two titles of his works that have been transmitted regard some of his works of Homeric exegesis: the Διορθωτικά (perhaps in eight or nine books) and the Ὀμηρικά. The Διορθωτικά probably carried the bulk of the philological work on the Homeric poems, with the treatment of critical-textual problems,⁴⁸ unlike the second work of more general argument. The two

⁴¹ About Crates see, for the edition of the text, BROGGIATO (2001: particularly 43–44; 195–197 about our *casus studii*); HELCK (1905). Also see MONTANA (2012: 61–64).

⁴² See MÜLLER (1912: 30).

⁴³ See BACIGALUPO (2020: 3).

⁴⁴ See HELCK (1905: 68; 73); BARTH (1984: 184–185).

⁴⁵ *Suid.* κ 2342 see ADLER (1933: 182).

⁴⁶ See MONTANA (2012: 62).

⁴⁷ See MONTANA (2012: 63).

⁴⁸ As such it is interpreted by ERBSE (1959: 288) and following.

works must have belonged, in all probability, to the genre of the *hypomnemata*,⁴⁹ even if some scholars – like Pfeiffer⁵⁰ – consider them to belong to that of the monograph. It would seem, judging from the surviving fragments, that Crates did not work on an ἔκδοσις⁵¹ of the Homeric poems as Aristarchus did. Little else has come down to us besides fragments on the Homeric writings: a few remnants of exegesis concerning Alcman, Stesychorus, Pindar, Hesiod, and Euripides.

We report below the text of column 17 of *P. Oxy.* 221, rr. 19–34:

κν{ε}ί-
 [σην μελδ]όμενος<:> Ἀρίσταρχος καὶ
 [ἢ Καλλιστ]ράτου· σὺν τῶ<ι> ν κνίσην,
 [ἴν' ἦ<ι> σὺς] τὴν κνίσαν τήκων, ὁμοί-
 [ως τῶι "κ]νίσην δ' ἐκ πεδίου ἄνε
 [μοι φέρο]ν". κνίση δὲ οὐ μόνον ὁ ἐ-
 [πίπλου]ς, ἀλλ<λ>ᾶ πᾶν λίπος. τὰ κν{ε}[ί-]
 [ση δὲ ο]ὐδέποτε εἴρηκεν Ὅμηρο[ς].
 [κυρίως] δ' ἐστὶ μέλδειν, ὡς Δίδυ-
 [μος, τ]ὰ μέλη ἔδειν. ὡμοίωσε δὲ
 [τὴν μέ]ν ὑπὸ τῶ<ι> ὕδατι γῆν τῶ<ι> λέ-
 [βητι, τ]ὸ δ' ὕδωρ τῶ<ι> λίπει. Κράτη[ς]
 [δ' ἐν Δ]ιορθωτικῶν γραφομέ-
 [νου "ME]ΛΔΟ<ME>N<O>" φησὶν ἀντὶ τοῦ με[λ-]
 [δομέ]νου διὰ τὸ τοὺς ἀρχαίους
 [τῶ<ι> ο τ]ὸ ὑ μὴ προστιθέναι ἀγνο-

Dissolving the fat<:> Aristarchus and [the edition] of Callistratus (sc. wrote) with the ν κνίσην, so that it is 'melting the fat of the pig' in the same way as 'the fat from the plain the winds carried'⁵² (*Il.* 8, 549). κνίση is not only omentum, but every fat. κνίση (sc. neuter plural).

⁴⁹ See BROGGIATO (2001: XXI).

⁵⁰ See PFEIFFER (1973: 239).

⁵¹ See BROGGIATO (2001: XXI).

⁵² Here κνίση indicates the smoke that is released from cooking the fat: the matter is also indicated in the *scholium* 21, 363c (see *infra*) and in Porphyry himself, from whom part of the material of the *scholium* is derived: see *Quaest. Hom.* 1, 253, 14.

Homer never said this.

μέλδειν (dissolve) is in the proper sense, as Didymus says, the wearing out of limbs (τὰ μέλη ἔδειν). He compared the earth under the water to the cauldron and the water to the fat. Crates in the Διορθωτικά says that being written ΜΕΛΔΟΜΕΝΟ for μελδομένου due to the fact that the ancients did not added the υ to the omicron, not knowing[?]

In the fragment of the *Commentary* we can note the presence of a headword: κν{ε}ί- [σὴν μελδ]όμενος that identifies the words that will be the focus of the analysis and it is the same as the one at *scholium* 363c (see below). The first variants reported in this ancient doxography are those of Aristarchus and Callistratus: κνίσην must be an accusative held by the middle participle μελδόμενος, so the information reported by the *Commentary* and the *scholium* coincide, however the the tradition of the *scholia* conveys the information about the two exegetes in two different *scholia*, witnessed by two different manuscript traditions (363c from b and T and 363e from Ge). It is pointed out, immediately following, that κνίση (*scil.* accusative plural neuter) finds no evidence in the Homeric poems, so the exegete accepts this as evidence in favor of the accusative singular with νι, which, on the contrary, has other parallels including *Il.* 8, 549, which is reported. A par-etymological reflection on the word μέλδειν (*to dissolve*) is then reported: it is traced back to Didymus who would consider the verb derived from the crasis of (τὰ) μέλη ἔδειν (*to consume the limbs*). This reference to Didymus is the terminus post quem for the dating of the *Commentary*. They are then further clarified the metaphoric terms established by Homer: the boiling cauldron corresponds to the earth under the river, while the melting fats are equated to the boiling water. It is reported later, in the doxography, the interpretation of Crates that originally there was μελδομένου written with the final vowel graph Ο (see above), then misunderstood. This is the same opinion, conveyed by *scholium* 363e, of Pisistratus and Hermogenes, who are not mentioned in the *Commentary*; it should be noted, however,

that, on the contrary, in *scholium* 363e only the reflection of the epigones is reported, but no name of Crates is mentioned.

In fact, Broggiato indicates in the apparatus of the parallels⁵³ the composite exegetical and Porphyrian *scholium* handed down from the mss. bT to 21, 363c: this is a further piece that helps delineate the picture of the ancient ecdotic and exegetic discussion of this passage:

Sch. ex. | Porph. *Il.* 21, 363c. κνίση μελδόμενος: σὺν τῷ ν Αρίσταρχος “κνίσην” τὸ δὲ “μελδόμενος” ἀντὶ τοῦ τήκων. “κνίσην” δὲ πᾶν τὸ πιμελές. Τινὲς δὲ οὐδετέρως ἤκουον “τὰ κνίση”, b(BCE³) T καὶ τὸ “μελδόμενος” ἀντὶ ἐνεργητικοῦ τοῦ μέλδων, ὃ ἐστὶ τήκων· ἀλλ’ οὐδὲν τῶν εἰς –ος οὐδετέρων ἀδιαίρετόν ἐστὶ παρ’ Ὀμήρῳ κατὰ τὸ πληθυντικόν· τείχεα γὰρ καὶ βέλεα λέγει· τί οὖν ἐστὶ T τὸ “Τηλέμαχος τεμένη νέμεται”; (*Od.* 11, 185) T οὕτως οὖν καὶ τὰ “κνίση μελδόμενος”. b(BCE³) T ἀλλ’ αἰ παρ’ Ὀμήρῳ ἡ κνῖσα θηλυκῶς εἴρηται. Ἐρμογένης δὲ ἐν τῷ Περί τῶν πέντε προβλημάτων γράφει “κνίση μελδόμενου”, ἴν’ ἡ “τῆ κνίση μελδόμενου”. b(BCE³) T τινὲς δὲ “κνίσην μελδομένου”, ἴν’ ἡ συὸς τηκομένου τὴν κνῖσαν· μέλδειν δὲ κυρίως τὸ τὰ μέλη ἔδειν· b(BCE³) T ἄμεινον δὲ τῆ συνήθει γραφῆ χρῆσθαι “κνίση μελδόμενος” ἀντὶ τοῦ λιπαινόμενος. Καὶ ἔστι “μελδόμενος” ἀντὶ τοῦ τὰ μέλη ἀλδόμενος, ὡς ἀλλαχοῦ “μέλε’ ἤλδανε ποιμένι λαῶν” (*Od.* 18, 70). T | σημαίνει δὲ ἡ κνῖσα καὶ τὴν ἐκ τῶν κρεῶν ἀναθυμίασιν, ὅταν λέγῃ “καὶ τότε με κνίσης ἀμφήλυθεν ἡδὺς αὐτμή” (*Od.* 12, 369) καὶ “κνίση δ’ οὐρανὸν ἴκεν” (*Il.* 1, 317). Σημαίνει δὲ καὶ τὸ λίπος, ὡς ἐπὶ τῶν γαστέρων ἔφη “ἐμπλείην κνίσης τε καὶ αἵματος” (*Od.* 18, 119). Σημαίνει δὲ καὶ τὸν ἐπίπλου, ὡς ὅταν λέγῃ “κατὰ τε κνίση ἐκάλυψαν δίπτυχα ποιήσαντες” (*Il.* 1, 460–461)· διπλᾶ γὰρ ποιήσαντες τὰ κνίση τοὺς μηρούς ἐκάλυψαν. “δίπτυχα” δὲ αὐτὰ τὰ κνίση “ποιήσαντες”. ἐπεὶ γὰρ δύο οἱ μηροί, τὸν ἐπίπλου εἰς δύο διελόντες ἐκάτερον τῶν μηρῶν θατέρῳ μέρει τοῦ ἐπίπλου ἐκάλυπτον. B(BE³) T Καὶ ἔστιν ἐν τῇ κωμωδία (IV p. 687 M. = fr. Ad. 608 [III p. 517] K.) τὸ ἐνικὸν οὐδέτερον, “τὸ κνῖσος ὀπτῶν ὀλλύεις τοὺς γείτονας”. T

⁵³ See BROGGIATO (2001: 43).

Sch. ex. | Porph. *Il.* 21, 363c. κνίση μελδόμενος: Aristarchus writes with the ν κνίσην and means μελδόμενος in the sense of τήκων. With κνίσην meaning anything that is greasy. Some interpreted as neuter τὰ κνίση and [the middle] μελδόμενος in place of the active μέλδων, meaning τήκων; but in Homer in the plural there is no contracted form among the neutrals in -ος: in fact he uses the forms τείχια (walls) and βέλεα (darts)⁵⁴; why then is there that verse Τηλέμαχος τεμένη νέμεται⁵⁵ (Telemachus owns the lands) (*Od.* 11, 185)? Thus there could also be κνίση μελδόμενος. But in Homer κνῖσα (the fat) is always used in the feminine. Hermogenes in *On the Five Matters* chooses the *varia lectio* κνίση μελδομένου so that it is τῇ κνίση (sc. dative⁵⁶) μελδομένου; some instead κνίσην μελδομένου so that it is 'dissolving the swine in the fat part (acc. of relation)'; dissolving in the concrete sense [indicates] eating the limbs (τὰ μέλη ἔδειν); it is better to use the usual *lectio* κνίση μελδόμενος in the sense of "anointing" (λιπαινόμενος). And μελδόμενος is in the sense of τὰ μέλη ἀλδόμενος (increase the limbs), as elsewhere μέλε' ἦλδανε ποιμένι λαῶν (*Od.* 18, 70) (invigorated to the shepherd of nations the limbs); ἡ κνῖσα in fact also means the exhalation [of fumes] from the flesh, when he says "and then the sweet scent of fat enveloped me" (*Od.* 12, 369) and "the fragrance reached heaven" (*Il.* 1, 317). | It also means fat, as [when] it says about the stomach "filled with fat and blood" (*Od.* 18, 119). And it also means the caul, as when it says "they wrapped (sc. the thighs) in fat making a double layer" (*Il.* 1, 460–461); for by making the fat double they hid the thighs. "Making" the fat itself "double"; since they are two thighs, cutting the caul in two, they hid each of the two thighs with one of the two parts of the caul. And one finds in the play the neuter singular, τὸ κνῖσος ὀπτῶν ὀλλύεις τοὺς γείτονας (Adesp. fr. 866 K. – A.)⁵⁷ (you kill your neighbors with the fat of grilled things).

⁵⁴ Instead of forms τείχη and βέλη.

⁵⁵ HEUBECK in his text of the *Odyssey* (see HEUBECK [1983: 108]) chooses the non-contracted form εα and reports in apparatus the following: 'τεμένεια Ar.: τεμένη codd., testes τέμενος Fick'.

⁵⁶ The clarification serves to emphasize that the dative is meant: the article is unequivocal, unlike the noun alone, depending on whether the *iota subscriptum* is written or not.

⁵⁷ See KASSEL–AUSTIN (1995: 250).

The *scholium* is of interest to the discussion, first of all, because it proves the Aristarchean intervention on the Homeric text, which coincides with the information reported by the *Commentary* of Ammonius. Also related to the text on the papyrus is the question of the neuter plural κνίση: the *scholium* reports in fact that in Homer there are no contracted forms of the neuter plural of nouns of the athematic declension in -ος; it is introduced then, with a rhetorical question, the fact that in *Od.* 11, 185 a noun with the contracted plural seems to be attested, but to counter this argument one says that the point is also that this noun in Homer is always feminine, so it would not be possible to call in the accusative plural form κνίση, since the feminine form would have been κνίσας. We then move on to a discussion of the text chosen by Hermogenes in his work *On the Five Matters* (thanks to this *locus* it has been possible to heal the exegetical *scholium* at *Iliad* 21, 363e). Here the name of Hermogenes is given, as we have already explained above, without that of Pisistratus of Ephesus.

Then the *scholium* dwells upon the meanings of the terms μελδόμενος (including the Didymean paronymology) and κνίσα which is explained as the exhalation of fumes (see also the text of the papyrus analyzed above) for which a parallel is reported from the twelfth book of the *Odyssey*.

4. Conclusions

The two cases I have analyzed hand us down considerations of philologists belonging to the Hellenistic and imperial age (conveyed by the scholiastic material) regarding the possible causes of corruption of the Homeric text.

The *scholia* I have considered in this contribution focus on paleographical and writing errors: Aristarchus had already realized the large number of errors caused by the change of alphabet in the 5th century.

The *scholia* which I have taken into account allow us to confirm the accuracy of the Alexandrian diorthotic work,⁵⁸ since they testify the interest in the research of the text corruption reason and, consequently, of the genesis of the error. This way of proceeding, formulating hypotheses on why the text was corrupted and giving possible reasons, indeed finds

⁵⁸ See e.g. MONTANARI (2015a) and the bibliography cited there.

many similarities with what is done by modern philologists; a fact that is also linguistically reflected in the *Iliad* 14, 241 *scholium* analyzed above, which speaks about the text corruption perpetrated by copyists who made changes to the alphabet.

The fact of having found an answer to a *locus vexatus* and having cured it indicates an accurate philological sensitivity towards the Homeric text, which undoubtedly corroborates the interpretative line according to which Alexandrian ecdotic practice took place following specific *criteria*. To affirm this does not imply, clearly, that Hellenistic philology made use of scientific methods as modern philology does today, nor that the texts reflections were always accurate and correct, nevertheless, it is appropriate to emphasize their diorthotic effort.

Moreover, these *scholia* report various doxographies which allow us to understand – or to guess at least – the large number of philologists who worked on the Homeric text, of which there probably remained traces in the library in the form of *ekdoseis*, *hypomnemata*, συγγράμματα, or some other.

Bibliography

- ADLER 1933 A. ADLER (ed.): *Suidae Lexicon K–O*, I, 3. Leipzig 1933.
- BACIGALUPO 2020 V. BACIGALUPO: *Pisistratus* [1]. 2020. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278_Pisistratus_1_it. 2020. 06. 03.
- BARTH 1984 H. L. BARTH: *Die Fragmente aus den Schriften des Grammatikers Kallistratos zu Homers Ilias und Odyssee*. Bonn 1984.
- BOUDREAUX 1919 P. BOUDREAUX: *Le texte d'Aristophane et ses commentateurs*. Paris 1919.
- BROGGIATO 2001 M. BROGGIATO (ed.): *Cratetes of Mallus, I frammenti, edizione, introduzione e note*. La Spezia 2001.
- CADOUX 1938 C. J. CADOUX: *Ancient Smyrna: a History of the City from the Earliest Times to 324 A.D.* Oxford 1938.
- CASSIO 2016² A. C. CASSIO: *Storia delle lingue letterarie greche*. Firenze 2016².
- COBET 1876 C. G. COBET: *Miscellanea critica quibus continentur observationes criticae in scriptores Graecos praesertim Homerum et Demosthenem*. Leiden 1876.
- D'ALESSANDRO 2018 G. D'ALESSANDRO: *Ammonio di Alessandria. Testimonia*. SCO 64 (2018) 107–170.
- DYCK 1988 A. R. DYCK (ed.): *Comanus of Naucratis: The Fragments of Comanus of Naucratis*. Berlin – New York 1988.

- DYCK 1991 A. R. DYCK: *The Fragments of Alexander of Cotiaenum*. ICS 16 (1991) 307–335.
- ERBSE 1959 H. ERBSE: *Über Aristarchs Iliasausgaben*. *Hermes* 87 (1959) 275–303.
- ERBSE 1969 H. ERBSE (ed.): *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (Scholia Vetera)*. Vol. I, *Scholia ad libros A–Δ continens*. Berlin 1969.
- ERBSE 1974 H. ERBSE (ed.): *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (Scholia Vetera)*. Vol. III, *Scholia ad libros K–Ξ continens*. Berlin 1974.
- ERBSE 1977 H. ERBSE (ed.): *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (Scholia Vetera)*. Vol. V, *Scholia ad libros Υ–Ω continens*. Berlin 1977.
- GOSTOLI–CERRI 1998 A. GOSTOLI–G. CERRI: *Homer: Iliade*. Milano 1998.
- GRENFELL–HUNT 1899 B. P. GRENFELL – A. S. HUNT: *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Part II. London 1899.
- HELCK 1905 I. HELCK: *De Cratetis Mallotae studiis criticis quae ad Iliadem spectant*. Leipzig 1905.
- HEUBECK 1983 A. HEUBECK (ed.): *Homer: Odissea, Volume III, libri IX–XII*. Milano 1983.
- IPPOLITO 2005 A. IPPOLITO: *Hermogenes*. 2005.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278_Hermogenes_it. 2020. 06. 04.
- KASSEL–AUSTIN 1986 R. KASSEL – C. AUSTIN: *Poetae comici Graeci (PCG), Vol. V Damoxenus – Magnes*. Berlin – New York 1986.
- KIRCHHOFF 1877 A. KIRCHHOFF: *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Alphabets*. Berlin 1877.
- LUNDON 2011 J. LUNDON: *Homeric Commentaries on Papyrus: a Surve*. In: S. Matthaios – F. Montanari – A. Rengakos (eds.): *Ancient Scholarship and Grammar*. Berlin – New York 2011, 159–179.
- MACPHAIL 2011 J. A. MACPHAIL Jr. (ed.): *Porphyry: Porphyry's Homeric Questions on the Iliad. Text, Translation, Commentary*. Berlin – New York 2011.
- MONRO–ALLEN 1963 D. B. MONRO – T. W. ALLEN (eds.): *Homer: Homeri Opera: tomus II Iliadis libros XIII–XXIV continens, recognoverunt brevique adnotatione critica*. Oxford 1963.
- MONTANA 2006 F. MONTANA: *Ammonius [2] Alexandrinus*. 2006.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278_Ammonius_2_Alexandrinus_it. 2020. 06. 13.
- MONTANA 2007–2008 F. MONTANA: *Callistratus*. 2007–2008.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278_Callistratus_it. 2020. 06. 12.
- MONTANA 2008 F. MONTANA: *Il grammatico Callistrato nella "diadoche" alessandrina*. MH 65 (2008/2) 77–98.
- MONTANA 2011 F. MONTANA, *The Making of Greek Scholiastic Corpora*. In: F. Montanari – L. Pagani (eds.): *From Scholars to Scholia. Chapters in the History of Ancient Greek Scholarship*. Berlin – New York 2011, 105–161.

- MONTANA 2012 F. MONTANA: *La filologia ellenistica. Lineamenti di una storia culturale*. Pavia 2012.
- MONTANA 2015 F. MONTANA: *Hellenistic Scholarship*. In: F. Montanari – S. Matthaios – A. Rengakos (eds.): *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship*, 1. Leiden – Boston 2015, 60–183.
- MONTANA 2018 F. MONTANA: *Alexander [6]*. 2018. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278_Alexander_6_Cotiaeus_it. 2020. 06. 08.
- MONTANARI 1998 F. MONTANARI: *Zenodotus, Aristarchus and the Ekdosis of Homer*. In: G. W. Most (ed.): *Editing Texts 1–2*. Göttingen 1998, 1–21.
- MONTANARI 2015a F. MONTANARI: *From Book to Edition*. In: S. Pollock – B. A. Elman – K. K. Chang (eds.): *World Philology*. Harvard 2015, 25–44.
- MONTANARI 2015b F. MONTANARI: *Ekdosis. A Product of the Ancient Scholarship*. In: F. Montanari – S. Matthaios – A. Rengakos (eds.): *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship*, 2. Leiden – Boston 2015, 641–672.
- MONTANARI 2018 F. MONTANARI: *Ancient Scholarship today*. In: M. Ercoles – L. Pagnani – F. Pontani – G. Ucciardello (eds.): *Approaches to Greek Poetry*. Berlin – Boston 2018, 345–354.
- MÜLLER 1912 C. MÜLLER: *Über den Papyruskommentar zum Φ der Ilias*. München 1912.
- MURPHY 1969 F. J. MURPHY: *Alexander of Cotyaeum, Instructor of Marcus Aurelius*. Ph. D. diss. Tufts University 1969.
- NICOLE 1891 J. NICOLE: *Les scolies Genevoises de l'Iliade*. Geneve 1891.
- NOVEMBRI 2018 V. NOVEMBRI: *Comanus*. 2018. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278_comanus-it. 2020. 06. 04.
- OLSON 2017 S. D. OLSON (ed.): *Eupolis: Eupolis, Einleitung, Testimonia und Aiges–Demoi (Frr. 1–146). Fragmenta comica 8.3*. Heidelberg 2017.
- PAGANI 2006 L. PAGANI: *Ammonius [3] Ammonii filius*. 2006. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278_Ammonius_3_Ammonii_filius_it. 2020. 06. 10.
- PAGANI 2015 L. PAGANI: *L'eredità di Aristarco. Uno scholikon agnoema nella tradizione esegetica antica (Sch. Il. 2, 111)*. SIFC 13 (2015/1) 73–94.
- PAGANI 2019 L. PAGANI: *Papyrus Commentaries on the Iliad*. In: S. Boots – P. De Leemans – S. Schorn: *Sicut dicit: Editing Ancient and Medieval Commentaries on Authoritative Texts*. Turnhout 2019, 321–362.
- PALMER 1980 L. R. PALMER: *The Greek Language*. London – Boston 1980.
- PFEIFFER 1973 R. PFEIFFER: *Storia della filologia classica dalle origini alla fine dell'età ellenistica*. Napoli 1973.
- PONTANI 2005 F. PONTANI: *Sguardi su Ulisse: la tradizione esegetica greca all'Odissea*. Roma 2005.
- REYNOLDS–WILSON 2016⁴ L. D. REYNOLDS – N. G. WILSON: *Copisti e filologi: la tradizione dei classici dall'antichità a tempi moderni*. Roma – Padova 2016⁴.

- RICCIARDELLI 2018 G. RICCIARDELLI (ed.): *Hesiod: Teogonia*. Milano 2018.
- SCHMIDHAUSER 2008 A. U. SCHMIDHAUSER. *Κομάνος*. CQ 58 (2008/1) 331–334.
- SCHMIDT 1987 M. SCHMIDT: *Κνίστην μελδόμενος*. *Aristarch und die moderne Vulgata im Vers Ilias Φ 363*. Glotta 65 (1987/1) 65–69.
- SCHRÄDER 1880–1890 H. SCHRÄDER (ed.): *Porphyrus: Porphyrii Quaestionum Homericarum reliquiae*. Leipzig 1880–1890.
- SOLMSEN 1945 F. SOLMSEN: *Comanus «of the First Friends»*. CPh 40 (1945) 115–116.
- VAN DER VALK 1963–1964
M. H. A. L. H. VAN DER VALK: *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad*. Leiden 1963–1964.
- VAN DER VALK 1979 M. H. A. L. H. VAN DER VALK (ed.): *Eustathius: Eustathii archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes*, 3. Leiden 1979.
- WEST 1998–2000 M. WEST (ed.): *Homer: Ilias*, 2. Leipzig – Stuttgart 1998–2000.
- WEST 2001 M. WEST: *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad*. Leipzig – Stuttgart 2001.