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**Abstract:** A detailed analysis of the scholastic and Eustathian material concerning the variants δόσκεν / δόσκον / δῶκεν in *Il. 14.382* is performed. Examination of the manuscripts and an investigation into the history of the modern studies suggests it is more plausible to conclude that the reading attributed to Aristarchus in the scholia was δόσκον and not δόσκεν. This assessment is congruent with the evidence from Eustathius. The dispute in the critical literature between the evaluation of δῶκεν as a variant or as an explanatory gloss is resolved in favour of the variant, by also considering the recurrent Didymean expression καὶ ἔστιν εὐφραδέστερον.
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The Iliadic passage that forms the object of this investigation is found in the episode on the distribution of weapons that precedes the counterattack by the Achaeans during the absence of Zeus, who has been thwarted as a result of the deceitful ploy conjured up by Hera with the assistance of Hypnos. Poseidon, informed by the latter that the father of the gods is sunken in deep sleep and will for a while be unable to fend off the Achaeans, urges the Greeks to advance, after they have made sure – he clarifies – that the strongest and most valiant men have the biggest shields, and if this is not the case, then the robust warriors should exchange the smaller shields for those held by the the less vigorous soldiers. The Achaeans listen and then obey these exhortations.
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What is of interest here is the form δόσκεν in the last of the lines cited above. Two variants of this form are known: δόσκον (thus “they gave” for “he gave”) and δῶκεν. The first of these forms is attested in several medieval codices and in a IVth century AD papyrus; it also appears as a lemma in the D-scholia ad locum, in which it is glossed with the more prosaic imperfect ἐδίδουν. The second variant, documented in a handful of medieval codices, does not involve anything other than a change in the tense of the verb, simple aorist instead of the iterative form, again without augment, and for the purposes of the arguments I will put forward in this paper, it stands on the same plane as δόσκεν. As has correctly been pointed out by Walter Leaf, “there is little or nothing to choose” between singular and plural: both options are acceptable from the point of view of morphology, syntax, metre and meaning. With the singular (whether δόσκεν or δῶκεν) the meaning is evidently that each warrior hands over his own weapons – on the assumption they are of poor quality – to a soldier who is less sturdy than himself; with δόσκον, it is the heads of the Achaeans, mentioned just above, who assign the poor quality weapons to the less robust warriors. In the first case, the singular would give a structure symmetric with that of the first part of the line, where mention is made of “the valiant warrior” (ἐσθλός), who wears the most robust weapons and would thus be the understood subject of the verb, whereas there would be a variatio as compared to the sentences of the previous lines, in which the verbs (ἐκόσμεον and ἄμειβον) are in the plural and refer to the three kings. In the second case, on the other hand, with δόσκον, the individual line would have an undeclared change of subject which, however, would be easily interpretable by virtue of the parallelism of the entire pericope.

1 P. Morgan = P. Amh. inv. G 22 (IVth cent. AD; LDAB 2120; MP3 00870). Among the medieval mss. that transmit the variant δόσκον, the following should be mentioned, with West 1998–2000, II 59: Townleianus (Lond. Brit. Lib., Burney 86), Oxon. Bodl. Auct. T.2.7 (R), post correcturam, Genavensis 44 (G), equally post correcturam (not the Venetus A in the interlinear space, as shown by inspecting the digital photograph of f. 188r: the mention of this ms., with the specification super lineam [by means of the abbreviation A'] in the apparatus of West must be the result of an oversight); for a more extensive list, see Allen 1931, III 56. The ancient passages that cite this Homeric line (there are four such passages according to the apparatus of West) all quote it with δόσκεν.

2 Sch. D Il. 14.382: δόσκον: ἐδίδουν. ZYQX

3 Among these one should note Ambros. gr. A 181 sup. (74), Marc. gr. 841 (olim 458) and Paris. gr. 2766 (M, N and P according to West’s sigla: see West 1998–2000, II 59). For a more extensive list, see Allen 1931, III 56.

4 Leaf 1888, p. 78. Cf. Leaf 1900–1902, II p. 93: “There seems little to choose between δόσκεν and δόσκον. The former of course is logically consistent, but the latter is quite defensible”.
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Modern editions overwhelmingly favour δόσκεν⁵. In contrast, the opinion of ancient philologists is less clear-cut. In this regard, let us immediately discard the question of athetesis proposed by Zenodotus and Aristophanes for ll. 376–377, containing Poseidon’s incitement to engage in the exchange of weapons and documented in two scholia traceable back to Didymus:

\[
\text{Sch. Did. II. 14.376–377a₁: } <\text{ὅς δέ } κ’ \text{ ἀνήρ—μείζονι δύτω}> \text{ τοὺς δύο Ζηνόδοτος } μὲν \text{ οὐδὲ γράφει, Αριστοφάνης } \text{ δὲ } \text{ ἀθετεῖ. Ti}^i \\
\text{a}_2^i. \text{Ζηνόδοτος } \text{ δὲ } \text{ προηθέτει. A}
\]

For it is by no means true, in contrast to the arguments put forward by some scholars, that the logical consequence of this choice would be the expunction of ll. 381–382 as well, in which the operation is effectively carried out⁶. The objection against ll. 376–377 raised by the Alexandrian scholars, as emerges from two scholia, one of Aristonicus and one of the exegetical class, did not concern a presumed ludicrousness of the manoeuvre described, with the assumption that it should therefore be erased in toto from the Homeric text. Rather, what they belittled as ridiculous (γελοῖον) and senseless (ἄτοπον) was the fact that Poseidon exhorted the most valiant men to take up shields not necessarily because the shields in question were more suitable for them and better, but simply because they were “bigger”, – a fact that would merely have had the effect of encumbering them and impeding their action⁷.

---

⁵ Thus in Bekker, Dindorf, Leaf, van Leeuwen (who reconstructs the text χείρον ἔδοσκε), Ludwich, Ameis-Hentze, Allen maior, Mazon, van Thiel, West. La Roche and Monro-Allen prefer δόσκον, which in both editions is indicated as the Aristarchean reading.

⁶ Leaf 1900–1902, II 93: “There is no record of the athetesis of these lines [sc. 381–382] by Ar. or the others, though if 376–77 go, these must necessarily follow”; Wilamowitz 1916, 234 n. 2: “Sie [sc. Zenodot, Aristophanes und Aristarch] hätten dann aber auch 382 auswerfen sollen”; Bolling 1944, 140: “… it is obvious to a modern […] that they [sc. lines 381–382] stand or fall together with 376–7”, who concluded: “That the Alexandrians dealt only with 376–7 cannot be understood except on the belief that they felt free to attack only badly attested lines”; Valk 1963–1964, II 395 and n. 94, who drew the following conclusion from the alleged incoherence of the Alexandrian philologists: “One sees again that the atheteses of the Alexandrians are subjective and do not give a reliable testimony of the original text”.

⁷ Thus correctly Erbse 1974, 635, adn. ad loc.: “… fallitur, qui censet grammaticos Alexandinos, qui versus Ξ 376–7 damnaverunt, etiam v. Ξ 382 proscribere debuisse; neque enim rem ipsam (sc. permutationem armorum) in dubitationem vocaverunt, sed verba vituperaverunt, quibus poeta illic usus est (sc. ὀλίγον et μείζον)”. 
Further confirmation that the Alexandrian scholars had no intention of proposing expunction with regard to l. 382 comes from an annotation ad locum traceable back to Aristonicus. This scholion reveals that the line in question was used precisely as an element of proof against the genuineness of ll. 376–377: the diple that highlighted the line was explained in relation to the fact that it definitively condemns the previous lines, with which it is shown to be in contradiction, since it invokes equipment that is better and not, as is stated in those preceding lines, bigger8.

Let us thus clear the field of the – unfounded – hypothesis that l. 382 should or could have been subject to athetesis. Such an eventuality would in any case be immaterial as far as the discussion on ancient variants in the line is concerned: the expression of a preference for a given reading rather than another within passages for which expunction was being proposed was a widespread practice well documented for the Hellenistic philologists9.

We will now turn to what is found in the sources in relation to the position of the ancient scholars on how the last word of l. 382 should be read. The witnesses available to us are an annotation traceable to Didymus and reproduced in the manuscript Venetus A and, in a more abridged form, in the Townleianus, and an observation by Eustathius.

---

8 Leaf 1900–19022, II 93 mentions this observation without realising that it allows a crucial judgment as to the asserted need for expunction of ll. 381–382 as a consequence of the expunction of ll. 376–377.

According to the text of the Iliadic scholia established by Erbse’s edition, Didymus reported that the reading championed by Aristarchus was δόσκεν, whereas some of the commentaries consulted by Didymus had δῶκεν, which Didymus himself judged to be a more elegant expression. Eustathius, on the other hand, states that the form adopted by the ἀκριβέστεροι is δόσκον and that the meaning of the sentence is “the kings gave” (the fact that Eustathius resorted to the form ἐδίδουν probably indicates that he used D-scholia for this explanation).

Let us now start from the reading attributed to Aristarchus. The debate, among modern scholars, on how the scholia ad locum should be read has led to contrasting results, even though the witnesses present a less controversial picture than might be imagined, as confirmed by checking the digital photographs of the passages in question. As far as Venetus A is concerned, the annotation recording Aristarchus’ position forms part of the group of short scholia jotted down in the internal margin of the manuscript; these scholia, together with those inserted between the text of Homer and the main scholia, were labelled collectively by Erbse as “Textscholien” and, recently, as “Kurznoten” by van Thiel (a definition which, in van Thiel’s perspective, also included the interlinear scholia). It should be noted straightaway that the Iliadic text of A unequivocally has δόσκεν.

By contrast, an examination of the scholion in question points to the conclusion that while the δόσκον defended there (as we will see) by a part of the tradition of studies may not be altogether incontestable, it does appear to be more plausible than the δόσκεν printed by Erbse.

---

10 See West 2001, 73–75.
11 The images of Venetus A are obtained from the site of the Center for Hellenic Studies of the University of Harvard, which, in the framework of the “Homer Multitext” project, published online the high resolution photographs of some Homeric mss. So far, the following have been made available: Venetus A, Venetus B, Marc. 841, Escor. Y.I.1, Escor. Ω.1.12, Genav. 44 (www.homermultitext.org). The line in question is in f. 188r of Venetus A.
A comparison with another “Textscholie” written on the same sheet of the codex, which contains both of the letters, *omicron* and *epsilon*, in competition with each other, merely reinforces this impression (*Sch. Did. II. 14.400b*).

We will turn now to the Townleianus manuscript\(^\text{12}\) which, unlike A, has the reading δόσκον in the Iliadic text and presents the lemma in the corresponding scholion. The final part of the lemma has undergone abbreviation, but the mark of suspension here utilized is the one that generally indicates the -ον ending. Thus the lemma of T likewise seems to document δόσκον as the Aristarchean reading.

\(^{12}\) The Townleianus images are taken from the “Digitised manuscripts” section of the British Library website (www.bl.uk/manuscripts/FullDisplay.aspx?ref=Burney_MS_86): the line in question is in f. 154r.
The ambiguity in the restitution of the scholiastic text has roots that date back a considerable length of time in the history of the studies on this subject. When Arthur Ludwich set about reconstructing Aristarchus’ textual criticism starting from the collection of variants gathered by Didymus (1884–1885), he expressed his position in polemical terms, even in those early years. The reading he assigned to Aristarchus on the basis of his interpretation of the scholia in A and in an apograph of T, which we will mention again below (Monacensis 16 [Victorianus], 16th cent.: V), was δόσκον, but this was in contrast with an opinion put forward by his predecessors – from Villoison to Bekker, Dindorf and Nauck –, who read δόσκεν. The latter reading was however, in Ludwich’s view, “eine reine Willkür”, an act of arbitrary decision-making which, he surmised, could conceivably be attributed to an interference of the Iliadic text of Venetus A, given that, as we have seen, the latter effectively has the reading δόσκεν\textsuperscript{13}. The reading of the variant defended by

\textsuperscript{13} Ludwich 1884, esp. 378. Villoison 1788, 346; Bekker 1825, 403; Dindorf 1875, 54; Nauck 1879,
Aristarchus as δόσκεν was shared, both before and after Ludwich, by La Roche, Leaf and Monro-Allen\.\(^{14}\)

Erbse, on the other hand, consistently expressed himself in favour of δόσκεν, as early as in his study on the manuscript tradition of the *Iliad* that appeared in 1953, as well as in the research he carried out shortly later on the Iliadic editions of Aristarchus, and finally in his edition of the scholia\.\(^{15}\) The origin of his idea can perhaps be sought in a conviction that grew in his mind during his studies on the “Textscholien” of A, and which he did not reconsider thereafter. These scholia, as is known, have sparked a lively debate on the subject of their nature, their genesis and their relation with the corpus of main scholia: they have either been regarded as the work of a distinct redactor not to be identified with the one who was responsible for the main scholia or, alternatively, they have been explained as the product of a single critic who put everything together in the margins of Venetus A\.\(^{16}\) According to Erbse, the “Textscholien” represented a sort of critical apparatus that recorded cases of agreement or disagreement of readings in the *Viermännerkommentar* as compared to those in the *vulgata*\.\(^{17}\) A certain number of

\(^{51}\) In his edition of the *Iliad*, Ludwich (1907, 91) wrote: “δόσκεν Aristarchus teste T, ut ἔνια τῶν [Ἀριστάρχειον] ὑπομνημάτων habuisse videntur”. On his interpretation of the expression δῶκεν ἀντὶ τοῦ δόσκεν which was connected to “some of the commentaries” by the scholion in the ms. A, see below, 95–96. On the authorship of these commentaries, see below, 99–100.

\(^{14}\) La Roche 1876, 58; Leaf 1888, 78; Leaf 1900–1902\(^{2}\), II 93, according to whom “A gives δόσκεν as the reading of Ar., but must be corrected from T”; Monro-Allen 1920, *ad loc*.

\(^{15}\) Erbse 1953, 32; Erbse 1959, 278 and n. 2; Erbse 1974, 655.

\(^{16}\) For the first position: Ludwich 1884, 98–102; Erbse 1953, 34 and 37; Erbse 1960, 127–128; Erbse 1969, XIV; for the second: Valk 1963–1964, I 42, 70–76. In the first case, a problem of precedence also arises, because the A’ scholia seem in some respects to allow the explanation that they were written earlier than the main scholia, while sometimes they contain references specifically to the latter. The two groups of scholia display no substantial differences with regard to the provenance of their content (cf. Valk 1963–1964, I esp. 72): readers are referred to Pagani 2014, 50–51 for considerations regarding the relevance of this argument on the proposal put forward by Mazzucchi 2012, who argues that the A’ scholia constituted the entire scholiastic corpus of one of the two antigraphs he believed to be the ancestors of Venetus A, namely the one endowed with the subscriptions declaring that the exegetical material accompanying the Iliadic text derived from the *Viermännerkommentar*.

\(^{17}\) According to the position recently put forward by van Thiel (2014, I 8, 28–29; IV 125–128), this material should be seen as a complex that frequently maintains Aristarchus’ formulation; more generally, van Thiel argues that it can be traced back to the textual work of the first philologists (Zenodotus, Aristophanes, Aristarchus himself), thus representing the original starting material on which the later commentators based their analyses. The circumstance, often found in the “Kurznoten”, whereby some of the ancient erudites are mentioned by name (as in the case under examination here) is believed by van Thiel to be the result of additions introduced by the gram-
these notes open, as in the case examined here, with the adverb οὕτως; however, this is not a sufficient guarantee of the meaning to be assigned to the immediately following textual elements. Erbse shows that οὕτως sometimes serves to confirm the reading found in the Iliadic text of A, while on other occasions it may be a reference to the variant that is mentioned in the scholion and which contrasts with the text of A. As an example of the first eventuality – οὕτως as a confirmation of the Homeric text of A – Erbse cites precisely the scholion under discussion here\textsuperscript{18}, which should thus be read as: “this is the way (sc. as in the text) Aristarchus said it too”. But there is no reference to the possibility that the form on the manuscript should conceivably be read as δόσκον and not δόσκεν. On the other hand, Erbse does address this problem in his study on the Iliadic editions of Aristarchus dating from 1959, where he awards due consideration to Ludwich’s reading but rejects it in favour of δόσκεν (“schwerlich δόσκον, wie Ludwich referiert” he says), stating that his own version is confirmed by the lemma of T (which, however, is not the case, as we have seen).

A few years later, van der Valk, in his work concerning the text and the scholia of the \textit{Iliad} (1963–1964), also considered the testimony of Eustathius, who assigned the reading δόσκον to “the more precise ones” (οἱ ἀκριβέστεροι).

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

The first question that needs to be addressed is who or what Eustathius had in mind when he used the label ἀκριβέστεροι. Van der Valk believed that this expression of praise was used by Eustathius substantially as an equivalent of the designation “Apion and Herodorus”, another problematic formulation that occurs about sixty times in the Eustathian \textit{Commentary}\textsuperscript{19}. I will provide a more

\textsuperscript{18} Erbse 1953, 32.

\textsuperscript{19} See Valk 1963–1964, I 11, who says: “Thus he refers by this term (sc. οἱ ἀκριβέστεροι) to VMK or at least to the Commentary which contained it” (my italics): there is a notable difference between talking about VMK material and making a reference to the commentary in which Eustathius read the material in question, i.e., apparently, “Apion and Herodorus” (ApH): if, as will be stated immediately \textit{infra} in the text, ApH was probably a cognate of Venetus A, the exegetical material it contained was unlikely to have been only of the VMK type. While it is obvious that Eustathius could have been referring to the commentary he was consulting, as a material object, it is certainly hard to believe he was able to distinguish (or that he had any interest in so doing) which class of scholia each of the annotations he utilised actually belonged to.
detailed analysis of this problem elsewhere\textsuperscript{20}: what is important here is to note that the commentary by Apion and Herodotus invoked by Eustathius (ApH) has been interpreted as a close cognate of Venetus A\textsuperscript{21}, although the precise connection between the two manuscripts has not been conclusively determined. Equally uncertain is the exegetical typology of the work utilized by Eustathius (a continuous commentary or marginal scholia), as well as the identity of the mysterious pair to whom he attributes it. But what is clear is that it was a source in which Eustathius found, among other things, the material we generally classify as dating back to the \textit{Viermännerkommentar}\textsuperscript{22} (VMK), that is to say the compulsory work which acted as the catchment basin by means of which a portion of the body of acquisitions built up by the erudite scholars of the Hellenistic age – Aristarchus \textit{in primis} – found its way into the margins of Venetus A\textsuperscript{23}. I have shown elsewhere that an identification \textit{tout-court} either of the Eustathian phrase \textit{οἱ ἀκριβέστεροι} with the commentary he calls “Apion and Herodorus”, or of the latter with the VMK material, can prove to be problematic and that, more generally, Eustathius’ terminology does not seem to be sufficiently reliable to guarantee univocal identifications\textsuperscript{24}. Thus it would be hazardous to take the Eustathian remark that \textit{δόσκον} belongs to the usage preferred by “the more precise ones” as constituting definitive evidence in favour of attributing this reading to Aristarchus. However, van der Valk based his argument first and foremost on the manuscript documentation, and it was only at a subsidiary stage that he invoked the Eustathian remark.

\textsuperscript{20} An updated picture, with an appraisal of the associated bibliography, can be found in Pagani forthcoming.

\textsuperscript{21} According to Valk 1963–1964, I 1–69 (cf. Valk 1971, LXI), it was in fact a descendant of an ancestor that was shared by Venetus A as well; thus already in Erbse 1960, 121–173. On the other hand, in the view of Mazzucchi 2012, 442–447, the work of Apion and Herodorus was one of the two antigraphs used by the copyist of Venetus A.

\textsuperscript{22} The term is now universally accepted, even though Erbse himself (1969, XII) defined it as “\textit{verbum} haud satis memorabile”. In addition to \textit{excerpta} from VMK, the ApH of Eustathius was likely to have contained, according to Erbse 1953, 21–22, a good quantity of D-scholia, but probably had no (or only a very small number of) exegetical scholia.

\textsuperscript{23} The philological-grammatical works, all dating back to the first imperial age, excerpted in VMK are: Aristonicus’ \textit{On signs}, Didymus’ \textit{On the diorthosis of Aristarchus}, Herodian’s \textit{Prosody of the Iliad} and Nicanor’s \textit{On Punctuation}. Nothing more is known about VMK than the information supplied by the subscriptions of Venetus A; it is not clear who assembled it and when. According to Lehrs 1882, 31–32, followed by Ludwig 1884, 78–82, a period considerably later than the life of Herodian cannot be proposed; a datation within the 4\textsuperscript{th} cent. has been advocated by van der Valk 1963–1964, I 107, followed recently by Dickey 2007, 19, while Erbse 1969, XLV–XLVIII went as far as extreme Late Antiquity (5\textsuperscript{th}–6\textsuperscript{th} cent.). For further details, readers are referred to Pagani 2014, esp. 46–47.

\textsuperscript{24} Pagani forthcoming.
for confirmation (as Ludwich had done, before him\textsuperscript{25}). Thus it was by invoking
not only the authority of Ludwich but also his personal inspection of the text that
van der Valk substantiated his view that Venetus A had δόσκον, in contrast with
the text established by Dindorf. As far as T was concerned, van der Valk believed
that the lemma found in this manuscript was δόσκεν; he explained the difference
as compared to A by noting that incorrect lemmas were a habitual occurrence in
T, although, as we have seen, such an explanation is probably quite unnecessary
since there would appear to be no reason to construe the abbreviation of T as
anything other than -ον. Having thus established the documentary framework,
van der Valk drew the conclusion that the text of the scholia was \textit{supported}
by Eustathius’ annotation, which had presumably come from the same scholiastic
material\textsuperscript{26}.

Erbse’s edition of the scholia, which as far as book Ξ is concerned dates back
to 1974, opts to print δόσκεν, both in A and in T, as noted above. In the apparatus
of the \textit{testimonia} he rejects the contrary view held by Ludwich and van der Valk,
presenting the positions of both these scholars as if they were based exclusively
on the Eustathian parallel. Erbse then proceeds to dismiss the parallel itself on
the basis of the fact that the δόσκον recorded by Eustathius could derive from
other sources and not from the scholia: \textit{“Hinc profectus (i.e. from the passage of
Eustathius, which Erbse cites immediately prior to this point) Ludwich […] Aris-
tarcho variam lectionem δόσκον attribuit (vide Valk II 151). Quod probari nequit.
Ne scimus quidem, num Eustathius δόσκον, quae lectio et in papyro Morgan […]
et in compluribus codicibus Homeri occurrit, in scholiis inveniret. Certe non est, cur
hanc formam pro lectione Aristarchea ducamus”\textsuperscript{27}. The reading δόσκον in A
is relegated to the apparatus, where the judgment passed on the arguments put
forward by van der Valk is: “probabilitate carent”, while Ludwich’s position is
accompanied by an “improbabiliter”. As far as the scholion in T is concerned,
Erbse’s apparatus confirms the lemma that appears in the printed text (δόσκεν)
and records a variant δόσκον in V, the apograph of T already invoked by Ludwich.

\textsuperscript{25} Ludwich 1884, 378.
\textsuperscript{26} Valk 1963–1964, II 151 n. 307: “Dindf. wrongly gives δόσκεν. However, the Ven. A, as Ludwich
(AT I, 378 f.) rightly observes, has δόσκον (I checked the text). T says δόσκεν] οὕτως Ἀρίσταρχος.
We know, however, that the lemmata of T are often incorrect. Eust. who says that δόσκον was
given by the ‘akribesteroi’, no doubt follows A […] and so confirms the latter’s reading”. On the
other hand, elsewhere in the same book (Valk 1963–1964, I 10 n. 40), he argues that the Aris-
tarchean reading was effectively δόσκεν and that Eustathius attributed δόσκον (and not δόσκεν)
to the άκριβεστέροι, on the assumption that this was a more \textit{recherché} reading (clearly he failed
to make his text uniform).
\textsuperscript{27} Erbse 1974, 655 (\textit{test. ad loc.}) (my italics).
And although Erbse himself (while admitting that this codex was “imperfectum et mendosum”) maintained that it could be of some value in certain cases “praesertim cum multa lemmata recte addita sint”\textsuperscript{28}, nevertheless this did not induce him to reconsider the problem.

As a result of the authoritative prestige Erbse’s editorial work enjoyed, when van der Valk – upon publishing the text of Eustathius’s Iliadic Commentary (1979) – had to consider the issue again, he maintained that in our scholia “lectio δόσκον non commemoratur” (!): as a consequence, he fell back on the hypothesis that the archbishop could have come across this reading in scholia that have since been lost, or alternatively that he could have found δόσκον in the copy of the Iliad that he used as his reference manuscript and mistakenly assigned this reading to Aristarchus on account of a hasty reading of the text of the scholia (it is worth bearing in mind that the difference actually involves a change in only one letter)\textsuperscript{29}.

In van Thiel’s very recent edition of the Aristarchean fragments involving the Iliad\textsuperscript{30}, one finds that the form printed in the A\textsuperscript{im} scholion is δόσκεν. This is supposedly designed to ensure δόσκεν against the δῶκεν of the commentaries (which we will turn to shortly) and not against the variant δόσκον, while the lemma of T is correctly restored as δόσκον. The latter, however, is explained as a secondary insertion, whose form is seen as due exclusively to the influence of the Iliadic text of T, which effectively has δόσκον.

In sum, the deciphering of the witnesses leads to the constitution of a coherent text, which, furthermore, seems to have a possible confirmation in the Eustathian parallel, albeit taking into account the limitations of this parallel, as mentioned earlier. I would therefore read οὕτως Ἀρίσταρχος δόσκον in A and δόσκον· οὕτως Ἀρίσταρχος in T. There remains the possibility that the tradition has handed down to us – unanimously – a corrupt text, but there do not seem to be any cogent reasons to suggest such an eventuality.

If we then raise the question of what reasons Aristarchus may have had for preferring δόσκον as opposed to δόσκεν, we stray into the field of mere speculation since, as we showed in the opening section of this paper, both variants are fully legitimate. Likewise, no well-grounded motivations can be found for the question as to whether in this circumstance the philologist was basing his arguments on documentary evidence or upon a mere conjecture. Van der Valk believed that Aristarchus changed δόσκεν into δόσκον on account of an implaca-

\textsuperscript{28} Erbse 1969, XXIX.
\textsuperscript{29} Valk 1979, 663, \textit{ad Eust. ad Il.} 992, 43.
\textsuperscript{30} Thiel 2014, II 504.
ble rationalism applied to the Homeric text: the version with δόσκεν would have allowed readers to draw the conclusion that every valiant soldier had a weapon of poor quality to be handed over to a bungling warrior, whereas with δόσκον, which entrusts the army leaders rather than each of the valiant warriors with the task of assigning lower-quality weapons to the less skilled warriors, the afore-mentioned implausible situation would be averted. However, there appears to be nothing to support this argument in the witnesses available to us.

We will now turn to the assertion contained in the main scholion of Venetus A and, in a highly condensed form, in the second part of the scholion of the Townleianus: “some of the commentaries” (further below we will examine the meaning that can be attributed to this expression) had δῶκεν ἀντὶ τοῦ δόσκεν. Here too, opinions in modern criticism are divided on the interpretation of the scholiastic note, first and foremost due to the polysemy of the technical expression ἀντὶ τοῦ: on the basis of the generic meaning “instead of”, formulations such as “x ἀντὶ τοῦ y” may indicate that “x is an alternative reading for y”, but also that “x in a certain passage means y” or that “y is what one would expect in the place of x”.

According to Ludwich, the Didymean usus of the expression ἀντὶ τοῦ should lead to excluding the possibility that the phrase recorded a variant, and should instead tip the scales in favour of an interpretive gloss. However, in this manner the text of the scholion would effectively mean that “δῶκεν in the Iliadic passage in question signifies δόσκεν”, i.e. that “δόσκεν is what one would expect rather than δῶκεν”, which is exactly the opposite of what one would reasonably assume. For this reason, Ludwich found himself constrained to modify the scholiastic statement by inverting the two terms, thus reading: δόσκεν ἀντὶ τοῦ δῶκεν. However, the data derivable from an examination of the scholiastic passages collected by Ludwich simply show a minority presence of ἀντὶ τοῦ as a signal of the introduction of a variant, as compared to the ἀντὶ τοῦ that introduces a gloss in Didymus, but not its total absence, which would have been more problematic. Furthermore, a certain number of scholia regarded by Ludwich as examples of ἀντὶ τοῦ introducing a gloss should actually not be counted, because they were subsequently assigned not to Didymus but to different sources (exegetical scholia, Aristonicus,

32 Dickey 2007, 224; cf. Slater 1989, 53–54, who, in a study on “the many ways in which an interpretation can become a variant” (54), seeks to demonstrate how ambiguous expressions such as this one, the verb γράφω, and the words τινές / ἔνιοι can have been the source of pseudo-variants in the ancient erudite tradition.
33 Ludwich 1884, 378–379, followed by Leeuwen 1895, 386, app. ad loc.
Nicanor)\textsuperscript{34}, so that the proportion between the two uses is destined to become more balanced.

The opposite proposal, namely that δῶκεν was recorded as a variant, has been put forward by Erbse\textsuperscript{35}, who rejected Ludwich’s version by pointing out that δῶκεν is indeed documented by the manuscript tradition as a \textit{varia lectio}\textsuperscript{36}. However, I fear that an objection of this kind is likely to prove weak, as it is exposed to the objection – pre-emptively advanced by Ludwich himself – that what was originally a gloss then penetrated into the text and established itself as an alternative to the term which, previously, the putative gloss had simply been intended to explain\textsuperscript{37}. Such a phenomenon is perfectly normal in the process of text transmission. Rather the claim that δῶκεν of the commentaries was intended as a variant could, instead, be substantiated more satisfactorily by assessing the plausibility of the two competing interpretations. In this case, the hypothesis of the gloss seems to lose ground in favour of the variant: if we have to explain δόσκεν in common terms, what we can expect is, for instance, the form that one finds in the D-scholia (ἐδίδουν, an imperfect, with the regular augment), rather than a form without the augment, which is attested elsewhere in Homer and – quite by chance? – represents a perfect substitute, from the metrical point of view, for δόσκεν. Besides, that the meaning of our scholion is the recording of a variant is also something that West takes as already fully established, without even awarding any consideration at all to the alternative, in his discussion on the \textit{hypomnemata} used by Didymus\textsuperscript{38}.

The position espoused by van Thiel is more complex. In his edition of the \textit{Iliad}, he introduces a specific \textit{siglum} in the apparatus \textit{ad loc.}, to call attention to

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{34} Ludwich 1884, 379 and n. 1. On the basis of Ludwich’s repertory (which cannot be considered as exhaustive, given that it closes with “u. s. w.”), the expression ἀντὶ τοῦ can be recognized as a means of introducing an interpretive gloss in: \textit{Sch. Did. Il.} 1.423b; 2.111b; 3.10b; 3.18a; 5.249a; 7.238c\textsuperscript{1}; 16.313; 17.149b\textsuperscript{1}; 19.386a; 21.363a (Did. + ex.); 21.558a; 21.611b; 23.120a; 23.198b; 23.244c (ex. [Ariston. vel Did.]); 24.192b\textsuperscript{1}; 24.636a. The following cases should however be eliminated from the list, as they can probably be traced to sources other than Didymus: \textit{Sch. ex. Il.} 1.535a; \textit{Sch. ex. (?) Il.} 2.35a; \textit{Sch. Ariston. Il.} 3.11b (which, additionally, has textual problems); \textit{Sch. ex. Il.} 4.18; \textit{Sch. Nic. Il.} 14.499c; \textit{Sch. ex. Il.} 23.317a\textsuperscript{1}. The expression ἀντὶ τοῦ definitely introduces a variant in: \textit{Sch. Did. Il.} 8.23a\textsuperscript{1}; 14.40b; 20.308; 22.93c\textsuperscript{1}. I believe that a systematic investigation designed to assess the meaning of ἀντὶ τοῦ in an extensive manner over the entire range of Didymean scholia is not of crucial value for the purposes of the present research.
  \item \textsuperscript{35} Erbse 1959, 278: “eine von der Vulgata und von Aristarchus Text abweichende Variante”.
  \item \textsuperscript{36} Erbse 1974, 655, \textit{app. ad loc.}: “δόσκεν ἀντὶ τοῦ δῶκεν propos. Ldw. (vix recte; nam in codd. Homeri etiam v.l. δῶκε occurrit)”.
  \item \textsuperscript{37} Ludwich 1884, 379.
  \item \textsuperscript{38} West 2001, 75.
\end{itemize}
the fact that δῶκεν should be understood as an interpretive or corrective element, since presumed variants recorded by the scholia as deriving from a commentary or from a monograph must, for this very reason, have been observations representing a comment or conjectures.39 Analogously, in the recent edition of the Aristarchean fragments on the Iliad, van Thiel speaks at this point of “interpretierendes (oder korrigierendes) δῶκεν der Kommentare”40. This conviction is, in my view, easily contestable, in its excessive (and unrealistic) schematism: that a commentary or a treatise may include a mention of a variant, for the most disparate reasons (to discuss it, defend it, criticise it, use it as a parallel) is perfectly natural. Precisely by starting out from an idea of this kind, Erbse formulated the proposal that Aristarchus’ commentaries could in some sense be considered as including his ekdosis, given that they must presumably have contained all the ideas which, as a grammarian, he had developed on the constitution of the text.41 The conviction that it was feasible to turn to material originating from a hypomnemata or a treatise as a source for information of an ecdoitic nature was shared by Didymus: it has in fact been demonstrated that although Didymus did have access, in some form, to the Aristarchean diorthosis, as emerges from several of his statements,42 he appears to have more generally awarded priority to use of the documentation offered by commentaries and treatises, also in relation to textual questions.43 One can briefly recall the case of the scholion on Il. 2.111b, where Didymus asserts that “if we were to prefer the syngrammata rather than the hypommnemata, specifically
on account of their precision, we would write that Ζεύς με μέγας Κρονίδης (an expression that had a rival reading in the form of Ζεύς με μέγα Κρονίδης) is the text according to Aristarchus” and, immediately afterwards, that “in the treatise Against Philitas he (Aristarchus) did indeed adopt this reading (τῇ γραφῇ κέχρηται)”44. However, according to van Thiel, Didymus had already been the victim of the misunderstanding which, in van Thiel’s view, has persisted through to modern times, also affecting the most recent studies. It is a misunderstanding that becomes even more serious in van Thiel’s broader vision, which holds that the concept of the variant should be excluded in toto from erudite Hellenistic practice, not only – as already mentioned – with regard to commentaries and treatises but also in reference to annotations jotted down by grammarians in their own copies of the literary texts. What van Thiel believes is that such jottings merely represent references inserted for the sake of comparison, or alternatives included with the aim of adding a comment, rather than variants handed down by the tradition or textual proposals45. I have discussed elsewhere46 this interpretation, which I find difficult to demonstrate; therefore I will not go into further details here.

That Didymus’ aim, in this case too, was to record the existence of a variant – contrary to Ludwich’s assumption – seems to be confirmed by the fact that he passed a judgment of comparative quality on δῶκεν, as documented in the closing part of the scholion: καὶ ἔστιν εὐφραδέστερον, “and it is said better / is an expression belonging to a more elegant type of language”. This evaluative observation is found in another three Didymean scholia:

Sch. Did. Il. 2.435a1: μηκέτι νῦν δηθ’ αἳλη λεγόμεθα: αἱ μὲν Ἀριστάρχου. […] Ζηνόδοτος δὲ ποιεῖ “μηκέτι νῦν ταῦτα λεγόμεθα”. Καλλίστρατος δὲ ἐν τῷ πρῶτῳ Περὶ ὶλιάδος οὕτως προφέρεται “μηκέτι δὴ νῦν αὐθί λεγόμεθα”. καὶ ἔστιν εὐφραδῆς μάλλον, ἀλλ’ οὐκ Ἀριστάρχειος, ταῦτα δ’ οἱ Δίδυμος. A

Sch. Did. Il. 3.227a: κεφαλήν τε καὶ εὐρέας ὤμους: οὕτως σὺν τῷ τέ ἡ Ἀριστοφάνους. καὶ ἔστιν εὐφραδέστερον. A

Sch. Did. Il. 15.49b1: <βοῶπι:> Ἀριστοφάνης μετὰ τοῦ σ “βοῶπις”· καὶ ἔστιν εὐφραδέστερον. A

b2: βοῶπις: οἱ μὲν “βοῶπι”, Ἀριστοφάνης δὲ “βοῶπις”· καὶ ἔστιν εὐφραδέστερον. T

---

44 For a study on this scholion, see Pagani 2015, with bibliography.
46 Pagani 2015.
In all three of these passages, the remark is incontrovertibly used to describe a particular reading, evidently the form that Didymus favoured, in comparison to other variants; in one case (2.435a1) Didymus goes so far as to specify that the variant he considers to be more appropriate does not coincide with the Aristarchean textual choice. Now if, in the passage we have been examining, Didymus had considered δῶκεν as an explanatory gloss of δόσκεν, the annotation in question would undeniably have made no sense at all. Given this realisation, any arguments to the contrary that could be deduced from the different Didymean usus of ἀντὶ τοῦ invoked by Ludwich will inevitably be weakened (and in any case the Didymean usus clashes with the sequence of terms handed down according to the scholiastic text). In the light of these considerations, it becomes plausible to assert that Didymus’ intention in mentioning δῶκεν was to record a further variant pertaining to the line in question, which also happened to be the variant he preferred. Despite the reservations expressed by van Thiel, who feels that the ancient scholars had already misundertood what were intended to be erudite explanations, taking them to be variants or conjectures47, there seems to be no well founded reason for denying that the scholion under consideration here documents the existence of the variant δῶκεν in Il. 14.382 in antiquity as well.

The final piece of the mosaic to be dealt with here is the issue of the source from which Didymus obtained information concerning the existence of this variant. He identifies this source by giving it the generic label of ἔνια τῶν ὑπομνημάτων. While Ludwich48 assigned these commentaries to Aristarchus without discussing the question at all, Erbse believed them to be anonymous pieces of writing49. The hypothesis of an Aristarchean authorship has recently been taken into consideration by Martin West, who extensively debated the relevant problems. He has considered the possibility that indefinite expressions of this type, which are recurrent in Didymus, could be linked to the hypomnemata “par excellence” to which Didymus had recourse, namely those of Aristarchus. West rightly cautions against overconfidence in this regard, as we have positive documentation that Didymus did have knowledge of hypomnemata by at least one other author (an otherwise unknown Diogenes50). Nevertheless, he shows that here too there

48 Ludwich 1907, 91: cf. above, n. 13.
50 On this figure see Pagani 2016.
would be no serious drawbacks associated with the Aristarchean hypothesis\textsuperscript{51}. Admittedly, it would result in a contradiction with the statements contained in the “Textscholie” of A and in the first part of the scholion of T (where, irrespec-
tively of whether one wishes to maintain the reading δόσκεν or give preference, as I believe is more appropriate, to the version δόσκον, what is documented is
something other than δῶκεν). However, this is not sufficient reason for ruling out
the possibility that the commentaries in question may have been those of Aris-
tarchus, since the different reading could have been found in one of the ekdoseis
of Aristarchus, and second thoughts by this grammarian have been widely and
reliably demonstrated in the scholiastic documentation\textsuperscript{52}.

In conclusion, I believe it is more plausible that Didymus ascribed to Aris-
tarchus the reading δόσκον, as seems to emerge clearly from the manuscript tra-
dition of the two scholia ad locum, and that he also recorded the variant δῶκεν,
which he had found in some of the hypomnemata he had at hand and which he
appreciated as more correct. That δῶκεν could also be traced back to Aristarchus
is conceivable, but cannot be proven. As far as the pattern of debate among the
scholars is concerned (it is a debate that unfolds in part at a distance, since it
spans a good two hundred years of philology), I have dared to add my voice to
an already congested chorus: I hope that I have not hereby committed an act of
hybris, but that I have succeeded, at least, in unravelling the terms of the ques-
tion.

\textsuperscript{51} West 2001, 74–75: “Aristarchus may be understood as the subject in other places where we
find just ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασι [...] or διὰ τῶν ὑπομνημάτων. [...] Didymus does name one other
author of ὑπομνήματα [...] an otherwise unknown Diogenes [...]. That should warn us not to
assume too readily that all references to ὑπομνήματα must be those of Aristarchus. [...] Didymus
several times uses the vague expression ἐν τισι or κατ᾿ἔνια τῶν ὑπομνημάτων. Are these Aris-
tarchus’? That is not inconsistent with their being set in opposition to αἱ ἐκδόσεις [...] Even at Ξ
382d\textsuperscript{1}, where a scholion in the inner margin of A, οὕτως Ἀρίσταρχος, “δόσκεν”, is complement-
ed by one in the outer, ἔνια δὲ τῶν ὑπομνημάτων “δῶκεν” ἀντὶ τοῦ “δόσκεν”, the ὑπομνήματα
may be Aristarchean, as ‘Aristarchus’ in the first note may well stand for αἱ Ἀριστάρχου, i.e. the
ἐκδόσεις”.

\textsuperscript{52} See for ex. Montanari 2000, Montanari 2003, Pagani 2015; on the form of the ekdosis, see
Montanari 2015, with previous bibliography.
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