

Lemmata



Lemmata

Beiträge zum Gedenken an Christos Theodoridis

Herausgegeben von
Maria Tziatzi
Margarethe Billerbeck
Franco Montanari
Kyriakos Tsantsanoglou

DE GRUYTER

ISBN 978-3-11-035428-7

e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-035434-8

e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-038767-4

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.dnb.de> abrufbar.

© 2015 Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston

Satz: Michael Peschke, Berlin

Druck und Bindung: CPI books GmbH, Leck

☺ Gedruckt auf säurefreiem Papier

Printed in Germany

www.degruyter.com

Franco Montanari

Aristarchus' Conjectures (once) again*

The idea that the Alexandrian philologists from Zenodotus to Aristarchus, known as authors of *ekdoseis* of Homer, did not engage in collation of copies but merely offered conjectures without documentary basis, and practised only a completely arbitrary “Konjekturalkritik” without comparison among copies, has had a number of supporters, starting above all from the positions of M. van der Valk.¹ The line of interpretation espoused by the latter was also adopted (of course with individually differentiated stances) by H. van Thiel² and most recently by M. L. West.³ However, it is an approach that leads *recta via* to a (quite unfair, I believe) underestimation of the importance and the value of the work performed by the Alexandrians. Arguments against it have been put forward by M. Haslam, M. Schmidt, G. Nagy, J.-F. Nardelli, A. Rengakos and myself.⁴

On the question of the “Konjekturalkritik” often and abundantly attributed to the Alexandrians, Antonios Rengakos observes that it is a theory based on the false presupposition that we have general criteria for distinguishing between conjectures and genuine variants when we are faced with the overall set of readings contained in the erudite sources (chiefly *scholia*), whereas there are in fact no such criteria. Furthermore, in the sources there is no explicit testimony referring to conjectural interventions, and it is impossible to demonstrate that a given reading is the fruit of a conjecture by the philologist to whom the textual choice is attributed. Rengakos has very clearly recapitulated that, on the contrary, there is

* English translation by Rachel Barritt Costa.

1 Valk 1949 and 1963–1964; sharp criticism of van der Valk's ideas has been made in a number of papers: for ex. Rengakos 1993, 38–48; Rengakos 2002a, 146–148; Rengakos 2002b; Rengakos 2012; Montana 2012; Haslam 1997, 70 n. 31: “... he does not concern himself with the transmission. In categorizing readings he operates with an opposition between ‘original, old readings’ and ‘only subjective conjectures’ ... a schematization that is surely too simple to cope successfully with the complex vicissitudes of the Homeric text”.

2 Thiel 1992 and 1997 (see also 1991, *Einleit.*, and 1996, 2010², *Einleit.*) has argued that the readings which the tradition attributes to the Alexandrian grammarians were actually exegetic glosses or mere indirect references or reminiscences of parallel passages, written in a “Rand- und Interlinearapparat,” which Didymus, Aristonicus and others then wrongly interpreted as textual variants; I discuss this rather idiosyncratic vision in Montanari 1998, 4–6; Thiel 1992 is discussed by Schmidt 1997, with a reply in Thiel 1997.

3 West 2001a, 2001b and 2002: discussion in Montanari 2002, 2004, 2009a, 2011, *forth. 1* and *forth. 2*.

4 Haslam 1997; Schmidt 1997; Führer-Schmidt 2001, 6–7; Nardelli 2001 (partic. pp. 52–70, in direct opposition to West's theories); Nagy 2000, 2003, 2004, 2010; Rengakos 2002a, 2002b, 2012; Montanari: see n. 3. On Janko's position, see *infra* n. 26.

actually a considerable amount of plausible evidence of the Alexandrian philologists' knowledge of variants deriving from a comparison among copies.⁵

In addition to the arguments based on the papyri and on the general practice of book production,⁶ Rengakos has dwelt on this problem in depth, presenting very precise and cogent arguments concerning the testimony offered by the poets of early Hellenism, i.e. of the Zenodotean age, who reveal knowledge of different pre-existing Homeric readings: "Do Hellenistic poets offer cases which prove beyond doubt that they made use of different Homeric manuscripts? In other words, do their works display *Bindefehler* which point to the older Homeric tradition? The answer is clearly 'yes'".⁷ Indeed we may confidently maintain that some of the Homeric variants testified in the lines of the philologist-poets of the Zenodotean age derived from the consultation of manuscripts and collation of copies. To this should be added cases in which it can be demonstrated, by finding veritable conjunctive errors, that the variants chosen by the Alexandrians already existed in a more ancient Homeric tradition.⁸ Pfeiffer himself explicitly supported this argument, reaching the following conclusion: "These three examples from the fifth to the third centuries, in which Zenodotus' text is shown to be based on documentary evidence, show how unjustly he was charged by ancient critics, and by those modern scholars who followed them, with making arbitrary changes for wrong internal reasons".⁹

Besides this indirect evidence, direct evidence can be found and I believe that it is decisive. Explicit testimony is supplied by the scholia, where one finds several undeniable references to the fact that Aristarchus consulted a number of different copies and found them to contain divergent readings: in other words, he certainly availed himself of the direct tradition of the copies he had at hand. The most evident and irrefutable case is that of sch. *Il.* 9.222 *b*, where Didymus reports that Aristarchus accepted a reading because he found that it appeared in this form in some *ekdoseis*. Equally significant is sch. *Il.* 6.4 *b*, where Didymus states that Aristarchus at first accepted a certain reading, but later changed his mind because he had found another reading which he deemed to be preferable.¹⁰

⁵ Rengakos 2012.

⁶ Montanari 2009a, 2009b, 2011, *forth.* 1 and *forth.* 2.

⁷ Rengakos 2002a, 149; cf. Rengakos 1993, 2001, 2002a, 2002b, 2012; an interesting case pertaining to Zenodotus is highlighted by Fantuzzi 2005.

⁸ Lately Rengakos 2012.

⁹ Pfeiffer 1968, 110–114: the citation is on p. 114; the three examples adduced by Pfeiffer concern *Il.* 1.5, *Il.* 1.225–233 and *Il.* 16.432–458, *Il.* 4.88–89. Pfeiffer normally attributed the collation of copies to the great philologists who succeeded Zenodotus: cf. for example p. 173. Pfeiffer's arguments should have been awarded greater consideration. Cfr. now Montana 2012, 31–32 e 49–53.

¹⁰ Cf. Rengakos 2012, 244–248, with bibliography.

Let us first take into consideration *Il.* 9.222 and Didymus' scholia ad loc.

Sch. *Il.* 9.222 *b*¹ (Did.) αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος (ἐξ ἔρον ἔντο): φαίνονται καὶ παρ' Ἀγαμέμνονι πρὶν ἐπὶ τὴν πρεσβείαν στείλασθαι δειπνοῦντες· φησὶ γοῦν “αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σπεύσαν τ' ἐπιόν θ', ὅσον ἤθελε θυμός, / ὠρμώντ' ἐκ κλισίης” (l 177–8). ἄμεινον οὖν εἶχεν ἄν, φησὶν ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος, (εἰ) ἐγγράπτο “ἄψ ἐπάσαντο” ἢ “αἶψ' ἐπάσαντο”, ἵν' ὅσον χαρίσασθαι τῷ Ἀχιλλεῖ γεύσασθαι μόνον καὶ μὴ εἰς κόρον ἐσθίειν καὶ πίνειν λέγωνται. ἀλλ' ὅμως ὑπὸ περιττῆς εὐλαβείας οὐδὲν μετέθηκεν, ἐν πολλαῖς οὕτως εὐρών φερομένην τὴν γραφὴν.

*b*² (Did.) ἄμεινον, φησὶν, εἶχεν, Ἀρίσταρχος, εἰ ἐγγράπτο “ἄψ ἐπάσαντο”.

*b*³ (Did.) {αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἔντο:} Ἀρίσταρχος γράφει “ἄψ ἐπάσαντο”. ἥδη γὰρ ἦσαν παρ' Ἀγαμέμνονι κορεσθέντες· οὐ μετέθηκε δὲ τὴν γραφὴν.

Agamemnon has summoned the army chiefs to his tent and has prepared a banquet for them (9. 90), and the sumptuous meal is eaten before the ambassadors start out on their mission (9.174–178). Then the ambassadors make their way to Achilles' tent, where they again tuck in to the lavish spread put on for them, and Odysseus' speech begins only “after they had eaten and drunk their fill”: αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἔντο (v. 222). The line evidently raised a number of queries: given that, before setting out for their embassy, the ambassadors had already feasted at Agamemnon's banquet ὅσον ἤθελε θυμός (v. 177), how could they feel the pangs of hunger and thirst again shortly afterwards and how could they be expected to gorge themselves on the food and quaff the libations once more (in the manner of a typical Homeric scene)? Sensing this incongruity, Aristarchus says it would have been better if the poet had written ἄψ ἐπάσαντο or αἶψ' ἐπάσαντο, therefore αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἄψ ἐπάσαντο “after they had once again partaken in the drink and food” or αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος αἶψ' ἐπάσαντο “after they had rapidly sipped the drink and tasted the food”.¹¹ Had it been worded in this manner, the line would have portrayed the ambassadors as honouring the grand banquet laid out for them merely so they could please Achilles, rather than devouring the food voraciously as if they were ravenous.

There follows an interesting judgment by Didymus on Aristarchus' philology: “But nevertheless he ὑπὸ περιττῆς εὐλαβείας did not change anything, since in many *ekdoseis* he had found the reading handed down in this form”. How should one interpret ὑπὸ περιττῆς εὐλαβείας unless it be “through extraordinary prudence” or possibly even “as a result of excessive cautiousness, beset by excessive scruples”? In short, Aristarchus was not convinced that the text he found in many

11 The verb πατέομαι with the gen. as in *Il.* 19.160, 24.641 and a number of times in the *Odyssey*.

editions was genuinely reliable and he had a conjecture (or rather, two possible conjectures) as to how to improve it and make it more plausible, but he was so cautious – perhaps even too cautious – that he made no attempt to change a text he regarded as incoherent by introducing what would effectively have been a conjecture of his own.

This piece of evidence is rightly underlined by various scholars¹² and cannot be dismissed out of hand, as does M. L. West in a truly surprising manner¹³:

This does not mean that Aristarchus said ‘I find this reading in many manuscripts, and therefore do not venture to alter it’; it is Didymus’ way of saying that Aristarchus refrained from putting the reading he would have preferred into the text because he had no manuscript authority for it. Didymus knew that Aristarchus consulted more than one text, because he cited different scholars’ readings on different occasions, but it is just his own assumption that Aristarchus systematically checked ‘many’ copies before discussing any reading.

I have already highlighted, elsewhere, the methodological error that leads West to maintain that Aristarchus (like other Alexandrian philologists) did not collate copies: as compared to an ideal “systematically checking ‘many’ copies”, the established fact of consulting “more than one text” is rendered meaningless in this context, as if to say that the collation of copies is performed only when one makes a systematic *recensio* in modern terms, searching for *all* the known and available copies. When dealing with such a superficially quantitative vision, it is vital to be aware that we are facing a problem of principles and method, not of quantity of the data or quality of the results (see below). The principle which holds that comparisons are made among various copies and the differences are noted is certainly present, though not in terms of a systematic procedure, which was obviously unthinkable at the time, but it does signify a genuine idea of textual philology which had the aim of establishing the correct text.¹⁴

Furthermore, I must confess that West’s considerations on the meaning of this scholium strike me as completely unmotivated and I feel obliged to restrict myself to what the scholium actually states, namely that Aristarchus pointed out a difficulty in the text but, according to Didymus, he was too cautious to change what he found in the copies he consulted (who can say how many he examined? Only Aristarchus himself could tell us) if such a modification sprang purely from

¹² Nagy, Janko, Rengakos and myself: cf. Rengakos 2012, 244–248, with bibliographical information.

¹³ West 2001a, 37 n. 19.

¹⁴ I will not repeat here the arguments already spelled out in in Montanari 2011, *forth. 1 and forth. 2* (with the previous bibliography).

his own conjectural assumption. Personally, for reasons of caution I would not venture to argue that this philological mode of operating was the only one applied by Aristarchus with total and absolute rigor. It cannot be ruled out, indeed it is perhaps quite probable, that he sometimes did introduce his own conjectures even if they were devoid of documentary support, but it is an established fact that we have no general criteria for distinguishing coherently between what springs from a conjecture and what represents a testified variant. Yet this by no means implies that one of the two categories is misleading and should be excluded when we are faced with the overall set of readings contained in the erudite sources. The Alexandrian philologists' production of an *ekdosis* must have involved both aspects: conjectural emendations as well as choice among variants detected through the collation of copies. And while there is no explicit testimony referring to conjectural interventions and it is impossible to demonstrate that a given reading is the fruit of a conjecture by the philologist to whom the textual choice is attributed, there is, nevertheless, a considerable amount of plausible evidence of the Alexandrian philologists' knowledge of variants deriving from a comparison among copies.¹⁵

Again, West goes so far as to state: "Not once does he [*scil.* Aristarchus] appeal to the authority of manuscripts".¹⁶ However, this fails to take into account that there are several cases clearly testifying to the fact that Aristarchus did check different copies and effectively made use of them. One of the most explicit and evident instances is found in the *scholia* of Aristonicus and Didymus on *Il.* 6. 4.

Sch. *Il.* 6.4a (Ariston.) μεσσηγὺς Σιμόεντος (ἰδὲ Ξάνθοιο ρόων): ὅτι ἐν τοῖς ἀρχαίοις ἐγγράφτο "μεσσηγὺς ποταμοῖο Σκαμάνδρου καὶ Στομαλίνης": διὸ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασι φέρεται. καὶ ὕστερον δὲ περιπεσὼν ἔγραψε· μεσσηγὺς Σιμόεντος ἰδὲ Ξάνθοιο ρόων· τοῖς γὰρ τοῦ ναυστάθμου τόποις ἡ γραφή συμφέρει, πρὸς οὓς μάχονται.

Sch. *Il.* 6.4b (Did.) μεσσηγὺς Σιμόεντος (ἰδὲ Ξάνθοιο ρόων): πρότερον ἐγγράφτο "μεσσηγὺς ποταμοῖο Σκαμάνδρου καὶ Στομαλίνης". ὕστερον δὲ Ἀρίσταρχος ταύτην¹⁷ εὐρὼν ἐνέκρινεν.¹⁸ Χαῖρις (fr. 2 B.) δὲ γράφει "μεσσηγὺς ποταμοῖο Σκαμάνδρου καὶ Σιμόεντος".

It is quite clear that Didymus is reporting a change of opinion on the part of Aristarchus, who had been having second thoughts and subsequently (ὕστερον) decided to change the reading he had previously accepted (and commented on, as part of his *hypomnemata*), because in the meantime he had found another that

¹⁵ Most recently Rengakos 2012 (on "Konjekturalkritik" p. 247); see also Montanari 2011, *forth. 1 and forth. 2* (with bibliography).

¹⁶ West 2001a, 37.

¹⁷ Erbse ad loc.: ταύτην τὴν γραφὴν **b** (fort. rectius).

¹⁸ ἐπέκρινε T, ἐπέκρινεν b: ἐνέκρινεν Bekker (vd. Erbse ad loc.).

he regarded as better. This is a perfect counterbalance to the case of *Il.* 9.222: there he refrained from changing the only reading he found in his copies (*scil.* in all the ones he had seen), whereas here he opted in favour of change because he had, in the meantime, come across a copy with a reading he believed was preferable.¹⁹

Two interesting cases in which Aristarchus had second thoughts and changed his textual choice can be found in the scholia to *Iliad* 18.207 and 9.464.²⁰ Let us start with the observation put forward by Didymus in *sch. Il.* 18.207a:

Sch. *Il.* 18.207a (Did.): ὥς δ' ὅτε καπνὸς ἰὼν (ἐξ ἄστεος αἰθέρ' ἵκηται): οἱ περὶ Διονύσιον τὸν Θραῖκα φασὶν Ἀρίσταρχον πρῶτον ταύτην χρώμενον τῇ γραφῇ μεταθέσθαι καὶ γράψαι “ὥς δ' ὅτε πῦρ ἐπὶ πόντον ἀριπρεπὲς αἰθέρ' ἵκηται”· ἐμφοτικῶς τὸ ἐν πολέμῳ πῦρ ἐπιτεθὲν τῷ Ἀχιλλεῖ παρέβαλε τῷ ἐν πολέμῳ ἀπτομένῳ.

Sch. *Il.* 18.207b (Did.): Ἀρίσταρχος “ὥς δ' ὅτε πῦρ ἐπὶ πόντον ἀριπρεπὲς αἰθέρ' ἵκηται”· καὶ γὰρ ἄτοπόν φησι πῦρ εἰκάζεσθαι καπνῷ.

Dionysius Thrax tells us here that Aristarchus had initially accepted the reading ὥς δ' ὅτε καπνὸς ἰὼν ἐξ ἄστεος αἰθέρ' ἵκηται, presupposed by the scholium as a lemma (Ἀρίσταρχον πρῶτον ταύτην χρώμενον τῇ γραφῇ), but later changed his mind (μεταθέσθαι καὶ γράψαι), adopting the reading ὥς δ' ὅτε πῦρ ἐπὶ πόντον ἀριπρεπὲς αἰθέρ' ἵκηται.

Very interesting in terms of the issues it raises is the case where Didymus once again cites Dionysius Thrax in *sch. Il.* 9.464b:

Sch. *Il.* 9.464b (Did.): ἀμφὶς ἑόντες: Διονύσιος ὁ Θραῖξ ἐν τῷ Πρὸς Κράττητα διὰ τῆς ἵπποδρομίας φησὶ γεγραμμένου “ἀντιόωντες” μεταθεῖναι τὸν Ἀρίσταρχον ἀμφὶς ἑόντες.

According to Didymus, in the treatise Πρὸς Κράττητα Dionysius Thrax indicated that Aristarchus had changed the earlier reading ἀντιόωντες (γεγραμμένου ἀντιόωντες: whereas previously it was written ἀντιόωντες), replacing it (μεταθεῖναι) with the reading ἀμφὶς ἑόντες. It is worth noting the parallel in the use of the verb μετατίθημι to underline the textual change: μεταθεῖναι here, μεταθέσθαι in the previous case. There is still (in my view) a serious problem in interpreting exactly what is meant by the expression διὰ τῆς ἵπποδρομίας, but this is not of crucial importance for the question at hand and it can be set aside, postponing its examination to another occasion.²¹ What is relevant here is that the

¹⁹ Cfr. Rengakos 2012, 245.

²⁰ Cfr. Montanari 2000, 483–486, with bibliography.

²¹ Discussion of the problem in the bibliography quoted by Montanari 2000, 485, n. 13 and 14. It was apparently believed that Aristarchus favoured ἀμφὶς ἑόντες on the basis of a comparison with one or more lines belonging to the episode of the chariot race during the funeral games

scholium informs us that this Aristarchean textual choice and the reasons lying behind it are discussed by Dionysius Thrax in his monograph *Against Crates*.

In the scholiastic-erudite tradition, with its brachylogic annotations, information on Aristarchus' second thoughts is in most cases restricted to the fact that two different choices are provided for the same place. Rather less frequently (probably on account of reduction of the exegetic material during formation of the scholiographic *corpora* and the choices made by the epitomators) traces remain of a discussion among later philologists who were seeking to determine at what stage of the situation Aristarchus had ceased his investigations, what had prompted his decision in favour of one choice or another, or in what circumstances he had second thoughts or changes of opinion on textual choices.²² In the case of *Il.* 6.4 the textual change is explicitly stated as resulting from the discovery of a better reading, and *Il.* 9.222 mentions that Aristarchus' cautious attitude made him reluctant to be swayed purely by his own conjecture and he was therefore unwilling to change the reading found in many copies he had consulted.²³ In philological terms, this is effectively equivalent to use of the direct tradition for text constitution; the question of utilisation of the indirect tradition has already been addressed above. The situation is aptly summarized by the words of Rengakos:²⁴

Der Rückgriff der Alexandrinischen Philologie auf die direkte und die indirekte Homer-Überlieferung ist also in den Scholien selbst bezeugt. Ausdrückliche Zeugnisse der Konjekturekritik der Alexandriner sind leider in den Scholien nicht mit Sicherheit zu identifizieren.

This overall evidence indicates that when engaging in text criticism, the Alexandrians – whose methods reached their most refined achievements with Aristarchus – based themselves not only on text-internal conjectural proposals but also on external and diplomatic resources, consisting in choice among variants they found or noticed in a non-univocal tradition composed of the copies they

held in honour of Patroclus in Book XXIII (Erbse, *ad loc.*, indicates Ψ 330 vel 393); but in my view the terms of the Aristarchean comparison seem somewhat unclear and further investigation is required.

²² In previous works I examined some issues concerning the form and characteristics of the Alexandrian *ekdosis*, where I focused in particular on the long-standing and hotly debated question of the number and sequence of Aristarchus' editions and commentaries of Homer, and also devoted attention to the problems raised by Ammonius' testimony on the second *ekdosis* of Aristarchus (*Il.* 10, 397–99 and 19, 365–68, with the associated scholia): cf. Montanari 1998, 2000, 2002, 2004, 2009a, 2011, *forth.* 1, *forth.* 2; Montana 2012, 49–53; Montana 2014.

²³ Cf. Rengakos 2012, 244–248.

²⁴ Rengakos 2012, 247.

had available and were thus able to consult. It would seem, therefore, that the burden of proof is on whoever seeks to strip the Alexandrian grammarians of any knowledge of variants deriving from collation of copies, attributing to them only arbitrary conjectures, rather than the opposite: the fact is that we do have, at the very least, convergent evidence in favour of knowledge of variants – and I would go so far as to say that we have real proof.²⁵

In a nutshell: we must make it clear once and for all that we are dealing with a problem of principles and methods, not of the quantity of the data (number of collated copies or of variants discussed) or of the quality of the results (right or wrong from our own point of view). We are not concerned with establishing the minimum number of copies to be subjected to comparison or of variants to be taken into consideration before one can even begin to speak of philology, nor with determining how many “correct” readings or “good” interpretations are needed before it makes sense to speak of philology. The tendency (inappropriate, in my opinion) to scoff at the opinions of the Alexandrian philologists in terms of modern Homeric studies should by no means translate into the tendency to discredit their historical significance, which needs to be correctly positioned and contextualized. It is mistaken to blur the distinction between the two planes.²⁶

²⁵ See most recently Rengakos 2012; Montana 2012.

²⁶ Janko 2002, pp. 658–662, seems to render this concept explicit rather more clearly. His position on the methods of the Alexandrian philologists is not an extremist unilateral stance: he believes that the majority of their readings are indeed arbitrary conjectures (by the Alexandrians themselves or possibly of more ancient origin), but he does not go so far as to deny the recourse to manuscripts and comparison among copies as part of their *ekdosis* work (for Zenodotus, Janko 1992, p. 23: “His caution was salutary, given the abundance of interpolated texts; he certainly had MS authority for some omissions”; for Aristarchus, Janko 1992, p. 27, and Janko 2002: “This [i.e. sch. *Il.* 9.222] certainly implies that Aristarchus did check manuscripts for variant readings”). On the one hand, Janko argues, there stands the problem of the origin of their proposed text choices (subjective emendation, comparison among copies) and therefore of their working procedures; on the other, he points out, “my own concern, as a Homerist, has always been whether such readings are authentic”. Perfectly clear: modern philologists can to some extent be severe regarding the opinions of the Alexandrians, considering them to be fairly acceptable or fairly unacceptable from their own point of view (Janko is very negative: “what counts is that they *are* conjectures, and nearly all bad”: 1992, p. 24; 2002, p. 661), but they cannot downplay the fact that the ancient Alexandrians emended and compared exemplars to correct the Homeric text, a method that combined interpretation of the text with awareness of the history of the tradition. An extremely apt remark, perfectly applicable to Alexandrian philology as well, is offered by Cassio 2002, p. 132, on the issue of pre-Alexandrian criticism: “The earliest scholarly approach to the Homeric text is totally foreign to us ... we do right to think along very different lines, but we should never forget that it was the commonest approach to the Homeric text in the times of Socrates, Plato and Aristotle. As a consequence, we ought to be wary of looking at it with a superior smile, and ought to try to understand its motives in more depth instead”.

Rather, in a historical perspective, all that was needed in order for there to be a decisive step forward in intellectual achievement was the very fact of understanding and addressing the problem, even if only partially, erratically and incoherently. The crucial milestone was the realization that a literary text had a multifaceted history of transmission, during which it could become distorted at various points; the correct text (i.e. what is authentic *versus* what is spurious, and what was the original wording) could then be restored by conjecture or by choosing the best reading among those offered by a divergent tradition.²⁷ The idea of the recognition of damage in a text and of finding a way to repair it reveals that the organic unity between interpretation and textual criticism had become established. Although much progress still remained to be made, and Wolfian scientific philology, the modern critical edition and scientific commentary were still in the distant future, our viewpoint – far from being an anachronism – is the historical evaluation that a nodal step was taken in the period from Zenodotus to Aristarchus.

Bibliography

- Cassio 2002 = A. C. Cassio, Early Editions of the Greek Epics and Homeric Textual Criticism in the Sixth and Fifth Centuries BC, in: Montanari (ed.) 2002b, 105–136.
- Conte 2013 = G. B. Conte, *Ope ingenii. Esperienze di critica testuale*, Pisa 2013.
- Fantuzzi 2005 = M. Fantuzzi, Euripides (?) Rhesus 56–58 and Homer Iliad 8.498–501: Another Possible Clue to Zenodotus' Reliability, *CPh* 100, 2005, 268–273.
- Führer-Schmidt 2001 = R. Führer-M. Schmidt, Homerus redivivus [on: *Homeri Ilias*, rec. M. L. West, vol. I, Stuttgartiae et Lipsiae 1998], *GGA* 253, 2001, 1–32.
- Haslam 1997 = M. Haslam, Homeric Papyri and Transmission of the Text, in: *A New Companion to Homer*, ed. by I. Morris and B. Powell, Leiden-New York-Köln 1997, 55–100.
- Janko 1992 = R. Janko, *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Gen. Ed. G. S. Kirk, Vol. iv: *books 13–16*, Cambridge 1992.
- Janko 2002 = R. Janko, Seduta di chiusura, in: Montanari (ed.) 2002b, 653–671.
- Montana 2012 = F. Montana, *La filologia ellenistica. Lineamenti di una storia culturale*, Pavia 2012.
- Montana 2014 = F. Montana, Gli Omeri di Aristarco in fumo: Gal. indol. 13, *Prometheus* 40, 2014, forth.
- Montanari 1998 = F. Montanari, Zenodotus, Aristarchus and the Ekdosis of Homer, in: *Editing Texts – Texte Edieren*, Ed. by G. W. Most [Aporemata 2], Göttingen 1998, 1–21.
- Montanari 2000 = F. Montanari, Ripensamenti di Aristarco sul testo omerico e il problema della seconda ekdosis, in: *Poesia e religione in Grecia*, Studi in onore di G. Aurelio Privitera, a cura di M. Cannatà Fera-Sim. Grandolini, Napoli 2000, 479–486.

²⁷ See now Conte 2013, pp. 44–50.

- Montanari 2002a = F. Montanari, Alexandrian Homeric Philology. The Form of the Ekdosis and the variaie lectiones, in: *Epea Pteroenta. Beiträge zur Homerforschung*, Festschrift für Wolfgang Kullmann zum 75. Geburtstag, hrsg. von M. Reichel und A. Rengakos, Stuttgart 2002, 119–140.
- Montanari (ed.) 2002b = *Omero tremila anni dopo. Atti del Congresso di Genova 6–8 luglio 2000*, a cura di F. Montanari, con la collaborazione di P. Ascheri, Roma 2002.
- Montanari 2004 = F. Montanari, La filologia omerica antica e la storia del testo omerico, in: *Antike Literatur in neuer Deutung*, Festschr. für Joachim Latacz, hrsg. von Anton Bierl, Arbogast Schmitt, Andreas Willi, München-Leipzig 2004, 127–143.
- Montanari 2009a = F. Montanari, Ekdosis alessandrina: il libro e il testo, in: Manuel Sanz Morales- Myriam Librán Moreno (eds.), *Verae Lectiones. Estudios de crítica textual y edición de textos griegos, Exemplaria Classica*, Anejo I, 2009, Huelva-Cáceres, 143–167 (Pl. 1–8).
- Montanari 2009b = F. Montanari, Un papiro di Eschine con correzioni (P.Oxy. 2404): considerazioni sull'ekdosis alessandrina, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 55, 401–411.
- Montanari 2011 = F. Montanari, Correcting a Copy, Editing a Text. Alexandrian Ekdosis and the Papyri, in: *From Scholars to Scholia. Chapters in the History of Ancient Greek Scholarship*, Edited by Franco Montanari and Lara Pagani [TCSV 9], Berlin-New York, De Gruyter, 2011, 1–15.
- Montanari forth. 1 = F. Montanari, From Book to edition: Philology in Ancient Greece, in: *World Philology*, Edited by Sheldon Pollock, Benjamin Elman, and Ku-ming (Kevin) Chang, Harvard Univ. Press, forthcoming.
- Montanari forth. 2 = F. Montanari, Ekdosis. A Product of the Ancient Scholarship, in: *Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship*, ed. by Stephanos Matthaios, Franco Montanari, Antonios Rengakos, Leiden-Boston, forthcoming.
- Nagy 2000 = G. Nagy, on *Homeri Ilias*, rec. M. L. West, vol. I, Stuttgart and Leipzig 1998, *BMCR* 2000.09.12.
- Nagy 2003 = G. Nagy, on M. L. West, *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad*, München-Leipzig 2001, *Gnomon* 2003, 481–501.
- Nagy 2004 = G. Nagy, *Homer's Text and Language*, Urbana and Chicago 2004.
- Nagy 2010 = G. Nagy, *Homer the Classic*, Cambridge Mass. 2010.
- Nardelli 2001 = J.-F. Nardelli, on *Homeri Ilias*, rec. M. L. West, vol. II, Munich-Leipzig 2000, *BMCR* 2001.06.21.
- Pfeiffer 1968 = R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginning to the End of the Hellenistic Age*, Oxford 1968 (München 1978²).
- Rengakos 1993 = A. Rengakos, *Der Homertext und die hellenistischen Dichter*, Stuttgart 1993.
- Rengakos 2001 = A. Rengakos, Apollonios Rhodius as a Homeric Scholar, in: *A Companion to Apollonius Rhodius*, ed. by Th. D. Papanghelis and A. Rengakos, Leiden-Boston-Köln 2001, 193–216.
- Rengakos 2002a = A. Rengakos, The Hellenistic Poets as Homeric Critics, in: Montanari (ed.) 2002b, 143–157.
- Rengakos 2002b = A. Rengakos, on *Homeri Ilias*, rec. M. L. West, *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad*, München-Leipzig 2001, *BMCR* 2002.11.15.
- Rengakos 2012 = A. Rengakos, Bemerkungen zum antiken Homertext, in: *Homer, gedeutet durch ein großes Lexikon*, hrsg. von Michael Meier-Brügger, Berlin-Boston 2012, 239–252.

- Schmidt 1997 = M. Schmidt, *Variae lectiones oder Parallelstellen: Was notierten Zenodot und Aristarch zu Homer?*, *ZPE* 115, 1997, 1–12.
- Thiel 1991 = *Homeri Odyssea*, rec. H. van Thiel, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 1991.
- Thiel 1992 = H. van Thiel, Zenodot, Aristarch und Andere, *ZPE* 90, 1992, 1–32.
- Thiel 1996, 2010² = *Homeri Ilias*, rec. H. van Thiel, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 1996, 2010².
- Thiel 1997 = H. van Thiel, Der Homertext in Alexandria, *ZPE* 115, 1997, 13–36.
- Valk 1949 = M. van der Valk, *Textual Criticism of the Odyssey*, Leiden 1949.
- Valk 1963–1964 = M. van der Valk, *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad*, I–II, Leiden 1963–64.
- West 2001a = M. L. West, *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad*, München-Leipzig 2001.
- West 2001b = M. L. West, Response by M. L.W. on Nagy and Nardelli, *BMCR* 2001.09.06.
- West 2002 = M. L. West, Zenodotus' Text, in: Montanari (ed.) 2002b, 137–142.