

Creating Digital Editions of Manuscripts: An Exploration of *Iliad* 8 in
the Venetus A and the Escorial Y.1.1 Manuscripts

By Stephanie Lindeborg

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	3
Chapter One: an Introduction to <i>Iliad</i> 8, the Manuscripts, and Scholia.....	4-12
Chapter Two: the Digital Editing Process: Goals and Procedures.....	13-18
Chapter Three: Scholia on Mythological Geography.....	19-23
Chapter Four: Scholia on Odysseus and Scribal Choices in Organization and Content.....	24-34
Chapter Five: Scholia Using the First Person Part One.....	35-41
Chapter 6: Scholia Using the First Person Part Two.....	42-56
Chapter Seven: The Ancient Homeric Scholars.....	57-68
Conclusions.....	69-73
Bibliography.....	74
Appendix 1.....	75-100
Appendix 2.....	101-103

Acknowledgements

There are many people without whom I would not have been able to accomplish as much as I have. It is thanks to Professors Mary Ebbott and Neel Smith that I was first introduced to the Homer Multitext project and taught to read Byzantine Greek manuscripts as well as how to edit these texts into digital editions. Both professors worked endlessly with me on various aspects of this particular project. Professor Ebbott, as my direct advisor, put in incredible amounts of time with me reading scholia and everything I wrote. This thesis would not be half as eloquent without her committed efforts to making me explain myself properly. I would also like to thank my peers who devoted their free time to work on a project for which they were not receiving course credit. Brian Clark, Rebecca Musgrave, David Cieremans, and Patrick Rapuano all contributed to the editing of scholia and poetry of *Iliad* 8 in these two manuscripts. Brian and Rebecca were my co-editors for the scholia and I would not have an edition of the scholia in even one manuscript without their sacrifice of time and energy. These people went above and beyond and have my eternal gratitude for putting up with my perfectionism, panic, and late nights in a computer lab.

Chapter One: an Introduction to *Iliad* 8, the Manuscripts, and Scholia

If *Iliad* 8 were not on its own interesting simply because of the fact that it is a book of the *Iliad*, a literary work that has captured the minds of readers and listeners for not just centuries but millennia, its highly debated status in the scholarly field would secure its position. *Iliad* 8 covers the second day of battle after Achilles removes himself from the battlefield. The book opens with a scene on Olympus, in which Zeus orders the other gods not to interfere on the side of the Greeks lest they incur his wrath. The focus then shifts to the battlefield where the Trojans are repelling the Greeks with great success, so much so that the Greeks begin to retreat.¹ During the retreat one of Nestor's horses is killed, stranding him with the Trojans closing in. Diomedes, son of Tydeus, goes forth to rescue him and the two depart in one chariot, leaving their drivers to take care of Nestor's horses.² Diomedes wishes to press the attack and fight Hector, however, Zeus thunders three times warning him to retreat. Nestor advises Diomedes to retreat, much to Diomedes's chagrin, and ultimately Nestor turns the horses around. The fight continues closer to the Greek ships, pushing them all the way to their temporary walls. At this point, as the gods look on, Hera approaches Athena for assistance in defying Zeus and aiding the Greeks. The goddesses prepare a chariot to go down to battle, but are stopped by Zeus before they can depart.

¹ There is much controversy in ancient and modern scholarship on how to interpret the fact that Odysseus retreats despite Diomedes calling out to him. I will discuss the ancient scholarship in Chapter Four, but a good take on the modern interpretation can be found in Cook 2009: 144-146.

² The chariot rescue is cited by many scholars as parallel to a scene in the *Aithiopis*, which is supposed to be the next story in the Epic Cycle. The crux of most of the debate rests on whether the scene in *Iliad* 8 is the "original" or whether the scene in the *Aithiopis* is the "original." The *Aithiopis* only survives in summaries from Proclus's *Chrestomathy* as well as references from Apollodorus and Pindar. A composite translation of various Greek texts we have about the *Aithiopis* can be found in West 2003:1. The rest of West's article also discusses the validity of this scene as does Cook 2009:146-151. It is my opinion, however, that we need not concern ourselves with whether the *Iliad* or the *Aithiopis* was written or composed first because following the oral tradition of the epics, it is possible that the chariot scene is an archetype of Greek oral epic and that the two stories performed contemporaneously, able to influence the other in creation. Furthermore, it is difficult to make any arguments about the *Aithiopis* when all we have is a summary of the text split among several different authors.

The book ends with a speech from Hector, who celebrates their victories and exhorts his soldiers for the next day of battle, and the Trojans set up camp for the night.

My task for this thesis was twofold. I wanted to examine several of the key issues in *Iliad* 8 that are controversial in both modern and ancient scholarship, and I wanted to examine the scholia of *Iliad* 8 as their own artifact to better understand the ancient tradition of Homeric scholarship that was conducted. As I began to run into issues of time, I gave preference to the latter task. Scholia (singular “scholion”) are scholarly commentaries written alongside the main text of the *Iliad* in medieval manuscripts. They handle a variety of topics, including detailed mythological backgrounds, alternate readings of the text, and grammatical explanations. Using a digital editing process, the details of which I will explain more thoroughly in Chapter Two, I created editions of two manuscripts of *Iliad* 8: the Venetus A and the Escorial Y.1.1.

The Venetus A is our oldest complete source for the *Iliad*. It is a 10th century Byzantine manuscript, currently kept in the Biblioteca Marciana in Venice, Italy. In 2007, the Homer Multitext project took digital, high-resolution photographs of the manuscript, including select photographs in ultra-violet light that reveal text no longer visible to the naked eye. All of these photographs are freely available online for public use.³ The Venetus A is one of the most widely published Homeric manuscripts, known not only for its attestation of the Iliadic text, but also for its sizable scholia. The most complete edition of the Venetus A scholia to date was rendered by Karl Wilhem Dindorf in 1875. A more recent edition by Erbse was published beginning in 1969. Erbse’s edition is a composite edition that represents several different manuscripts alongside the Venetus A, grouping the manuscripts together where their content is similar.

³ Photography can be downloaded for five different manuscripts of the *Iliad* at: <http://www.homermultitext.org/hmt-image-archive/>.

One of these other manuscripts is the Escorial Y.1.1 (sometimes designated by other scholars as the E or E3 manuscript), another complete manuscript of the *Iliad*, probably composed in Byzantium in the 11th century. The Escorial collection is located in a monastery just outside Madrid, Spain. This manuscript was also photographed by the Homer Multitext team and the photographs were published online in 2010. As will be treated with greater depth in subsequent chapters, the scholia of the Y.1.1 represent a parallel tradition to the Venetus A scholia. At times they appear to use similar or even the same sources for their content, but certainly reflect different choices in composition and arrangement. Often, they blatantly diverge and contain material not found in the Venetus A manuscript.⁴

There are several reasons why the Homeric scholia ought to be studied, and I would argue that they are only just starting to be studied in meaningful ways. Until the recent photography was published online, access to the manuscripts has been limited. Outside of the library, the Venetus A can be viewed using the 1901 facsimile edition created by Domenico Comparetti, which itself is not easily obtained and furthermore is challenging to read given the quality of the facsimile.⁵ The scholia are available primarily in the print editions of Dindorf and Erbse, which are a restricted medium for representing manuscripts. These editions follow the tradition of creating a critical edition of texts. The texts of their editions have been edited by a modern interpretation of what the correct text is. The editions represent the text in different ways. Dindorf published an edition of only the Venetus A scholia, in several volumes, which he edited

⁴ This claim is made based on my own anecdotal observations of not finding comparable scholia between the two manuscripts or finding comparable scholia that are in disagreement between the two manuscripts. It is my hope that eventually we will have at our disposal an automated method of comparing content across two manuscripts to quantify the differences between the two.

⁵ It is also worthy to note that there are only a few copies of the Comparetti facsimile available in the United States and, as Blackwell and Dué point out in “Homer & History in the Venetus A” *Recapturing a Homeric Legacy* 2009:14, these copies do not circulate freely.

and corrected as he saw fit, rarely citing his reasons for emendation in the footnotes. His footnotes are used primarily for a select few features he chose to comment on and could not reflect in his main body of text. The Erbse edition, coming just under a hundred years later, is a composite edition of several manuscripts, with portions of text cited by the letters denoting their manuscript or manuscript “family.” A typical entry in the Erbse edition looks something like this⁶:

“**8.1b** ex. <κροκόπεπλος:> ὅταν πολὺ σκότους ἔχῃ, ὀλίγον δὲ φωτός. τὸ δὲ “ῥοδοδάκτυλος” (A 477 al.) ἐναντίον. ποιητικὴ δὲ ἐστὶ περίφρασις, A b (BCE3E4)T ὥσει εἶπεν ‘ἡμέρα μὲν γέγονεν’. A b (BE3E4)T”

The Erbse edition contains a critical apparatus at the bottom of the page where he includes some textual variations he presumably felt were too insignificant to merit separate entries in the main body of his text. Since his edition attempts to group certain manuscripts together, often different readings are represented in the critical apparatus. Occasionally these different readings can be lengthy and meaningful. This critical apparatus is only present in the print edition of his text, not to be found in the widely used Thesaurus Linguae Graecae (TLG) edition. The absence of the critical apparatus in the TLG edition is an even greater problem for the Y.1.1 scholia, as they have only been published in the Erbse edition and not in their entirety. Erbse’s choices with his critical apparatus seem to reflect a preference for the Townley (T) manuscript, another 11th century manuscript of the *Iliad*, kept in the British Museum. The benefit of grouping similar scholia together is useful, helping a reader both organize the types of comments he is reading and

⁶ This selection is taken from the scholia on *Iliad* 8.1. Erbse typically cites the line, gives a letter based on what he deems to be the distinct comments across the manuscripts he reports, the lemma or suggested lemma since not all manuscripts use lemmata as citations, and the text of the scholion. Selections like “A b (BE3E4)T” state that this comment or something like it is found in the A manuscript, the b family of manuscripts, which Erbse claims includes the B, C, E3 (called in this thesis the Y.1.1), and E4 manuscripts, and the T manuscript. Upper case denotes the single manuscript, lower case denotes entire manuscript “families.”

perhaps even analyze the range of the tradition of Homeric scholarship, but I believe that when we start losing genuinely different readings of scholia it goes too far. Erbse also notably excludes portions of scholia known as the “D scholia,” scholia erroneously named after Didymus, which rough estimates from the HMT have placed at about twenty percent of the total material.⁷

If we want to understand the extensive tradition of Homeric scholarship, it is best to have the broadest account of all the evidence. To that end, the Homer Multitext project promotes the creation of diplomatic editions of the Homeric manuscripts. Unlike a conventional critical edition, which seeks to identify one original text and avoid the corruptions of miscopying, a diplomatic edition treats a manuscript as an individual artifact, representing every mark as it appears without attempts to make emendations. The philosophy behind this approach seeks to remedy one of the other major failings of the current editions of the manuscripts and scholia. Manuscripts like the Venetus A and the Y.1.1 were written so that the scholia could be read alongside the main Iliadic text. No current print edition of the manuscripts publishes the scholia with the main text. The manuscripts also contain a variety of non-textual features which are rarely, if ever, mentioned by modern editions. These features often add layers of meaning to the manuscripts and their texts that are still unclear to us or have not been accurately portrayed in our current editions. Ideally no mark on the manuscript goes unpublished, and as will be detailed more thoroughly in Chapter Two, the goals of the HMT editions are to tie associated material together so that in our edition they can be viewed together as the scribes originally intended.

The scholia represent of a body of work and a textual tradition that requires further investigation. We know from citations in the scholia themselves, as well as notes of sources

⁷ For discussion on the different types of Homeric scholia see Dickey 2007: 18-22.

written in some manuscripts, such as the Venetus A, that the scholiast (the scribe or scribes responsible for compiling the material of the scholia) drew from multiple sources to annotate the manuscripts. The Venetus A for example, includes subscriptions at the end of almost every book that include a variation of the following:

πάρακειται τὰ Ἀριστονίκου σημεῖα καὶ τὰ Διδύμου Περὶ τῆς Ἀρισταρχοῦ διορθώσεως
τινὰ δὲ καὶ τῆς Ἰλιακῆς προσωδίας Ἡρωδιανοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῶν Νικάνορος Περὶ στιγμῆς

“Cited are the *Signs* of Aristonicus and Didymus’s *On the Critical Text of Aristarchus* and also some of Herodian’s *Iliadic Prosody* and from Nicanor’s *On Punctuation*.”⁸

The works cited here are extant only as they are preserved in the scholia. One of the ongoing efforts of studying the scholia is the attempt to classify and analyze the types of scholia present in the various Homeric manuscripts. We are not necessarily attempting to go through the scholia and distinguish the original source of each scholion. Such a task would not only require several lifetimes of research, but would also be of little use. By going through and analyzing types of scholia and patterns in how they are written, we do hope to gain a better understanding of the tradition of Homeric scholarship. In this endeavor it is important to consider as many manuscripts as possible. Often the content from manuscript to manuscript is similar enough to be from the same source, but may include a citation of an author present in one manuscript but not another. In order to methodically explore the sources of the scholia, however, we must make sure we are truly representing the manuscripts as they appear.

Part of my subsequent research with the scholia of *Iliad* 8 operates under the assumption that the *Iliad* and other stories of the epic cycle were part of a collective oral tradition. I will outline in brief these assumptions and what they mean for my interpretation of the text and their

⁸ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026:msAsub:8.0

scholia. Our firmest evidence for the oral tradition of Homer stems from the comparisons drawn from Milman Parry's work both with the Homeric texts and with the "living epic tradition of the Yugoslavs."⁹ Parry's careful study in the 1930s revealed several key elements of how an oral tradition works. Albert Lord, who carried on Parry's work after his death, outlines in far greater detail than will appear below the key aspects of oral tradition in his book, *The Singer of Tales*. Lord defines oral epic as follows: "Stated briefly, oral epic song is narrative poetry composed in a manner evolved over many generations by singers of tales who did not know how to write; it consists of the building of metrical lines and half lines by means of formulas and formulaic expressions and the building of songs by the use of themes."¹⁰ Put another way, this means that oral epic poetry is based on learning a specific language that allows for set phrases and units of text that allow a singer to compose rapidly. Not only could singers compose rapidly, but they could compose rapidly in performance.¹¹ Singers would not memorize and recite but rather would use their learned method of expression to compose and perform simultaneously.^{12 13} While all singers would follow the same story--there certainly would not be an *Iliad* in which Patroclus survived for example--each singer would have a unique song and each performance made by the same singer would have variations.¹⁴ Our idea of what can genuinely be considered the *Iliad* is allowed to be more fluid. There is not one original *Iliad*, but rather a variety of "Homeric multiforms" that are legitimate readings of the text.

⁹ Lord 1960: 3.

¹⁰ Lord 1960: 4.

¹¹ Lord 1960: 5.

¹² Lord 1960: 5.

¹³ Also see Nagy *Homeric Questions*: 17.

¹⁴ See Lord 1960: 100 for discussion of how a single singer's performance changes over time.

Many legitimate multiforms have hitherto been disregarded. The scholia are our best source for multiforms, whether they directly offer them or quote sections of the *Iliad* or *Odyssey* that include them. Often in the latter case, we find that these multiforms have been “corrected” in the editions of Dindorf and Erbse to what our modern print editions of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* reflect. While these multiforms are a small percentage of the variety that was likely once present in the oral tradition of Homer, we can start to get a sense of how far ranging the oral tradition once was. The goal is not the impossible task of reconstructing “the work of generations of singers to that moment when some singer first sang a particular song.”¹⁵ The goal is to better understand how oral composition works, what that means for our interpretations of the Homeric texts, and how oral composition in performance factors into the interpretations of the ancient Homeric scholars of Alexandria.

The Homeric scholars of Alexandria play a key role in how I decided to conduct my analyses of the scholia. The major three, who will come up repeatedly in later chapters, especially Chapter Seven, are Zenodotus, Aristophanes of Byzantium, and Aristarchus. Zenodotus and Aristophanes are said to have compiled mainly glosses of Homeric words, but Aristarchus most certainly wrote editions of both the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as well as an extensive commentary.¹⁶ Aristarchus, who dates from the second century BC, is associated with one of the important graphic features of the Venetus A: the critical signs.¹⁷ Aristarchus is said to have written his edition of the *Iliad* and his commentary on two different scrolls: one for the text of

¹⁵ Lord 1960: 100.

¹⁶ Dickey 2007: 18.

¹⁷ Bird, “Critical Signs” in *Recapturing a Homeric Legacy* 2009: 89.

the *Iliad* and another for the text of the commentary.¹⁸ The *Iliad* and its commentary would be linked together by symbols denoting the type of comment Aristarchus had for the line.¹⁹ The critical signs become in large part how we are able to identify Aristarchaen material in the Venetus A manuscript, and then, subsequently, in other manuscripts by analyzing the similarities in content and phrasing. Other instances in the scholia, which I have noted, are those that cite more than one of the big three Alexandria scholars or an Alexandrian scholar and another authoritative source. These sources too have been little studied and often do not appear outside the scholia, making them inherently interesting for study.

The purpose of my investigations into the scholia is both to shed light on issues already discussed at length and to shed light on hitherto untouched issues. My time was unfortunately limited, so I was only able to investigate a select few of the scholia. Many scholia I read and translated, but did not include in subsequent chapters. Overall I translated 68 scholia of the Venetus A, which comprised about 18% of the total. In the Y.1.1 I translated a total of 26 scholia, which comprised 11% of the total. There was much I was not able to read in depth, which makes this project wonderfully open ended. In the following chapters are a survey of some of the scholia I was able to translate and interpret. I hope that they will be representative of the work I accomplished and reflect how necessary it is to continue this type of work through the rest of Book 8 and the *Iliad* as a whole.

¹⁸ Bird, "Critical Signs" in *Recapturing a Homeric Legacy* 2009: 90.

¹⁹ Bird, "Critical Signs" in *Recapturing a Homeric Legacy* 2009: 90; for further explanation on which sign indicate which type of comment see pages 92-94.

Chapter Two: the Digital Editing Process: Goals and Procedures

The immediate goal of my work has been to produce complete, digital, diplomatic editions of Book 8 in the Venetus A and the Escorial Y.1.1 manuscripts. Most of my work has been accomplished in collaborative teams, partners without whom the accuracy of this project would be severely diminished. In addition to assuring accuracy, the collaborative element of this project was a key factor in producing complete digital editions of the scholia in one semester. By creating diplomatic editions, we seek to represent the visual evidence in the manuscripts as accurately as possible, without making any overly presumptive judgments. There are two main textual components to the manuscripts: the main text or poetry of the *Iliad*; and the text of the scholia. In addition, there are numerous graphic elements that must be accounted for in their own distinct way. Ultimately, every mark on the manuscript should be accounted for.

One of the goals of the project is to encode the texts in such a way that makes them as useful as possible to those who wish to study them. We would like our editions to be used as research databases both for ourselves and for other scholars interested in the Homeric scholia. We view these editions as a platform from which we can begin a meaningful study of the *Iliad* and of the tradition of Homeric scholarship. We edit our editions in XML as part of our digitization process. In XML we are able to use TEI (Text Encoding Initiative) markup to accurately reflect the nature of the manuscript. We have a limited set of features we note and mark up, which is also flexible to account for new features as we find them.²⁰ At risk of encoding too many features, as the capabilities of TEI markup are seemingly endless, we have resolved to

²⁰ More will be said about new markup in subsequent chapters.

use a very specific set of elements to avoid making our editions unusable.²¹ The most obvious of our markable features is the citation of personal and place names within the text of the scholia. For example the name Ὀδυσσεύς would be enclosed in personal name tags, looking like this: <persName> Ὀδυσσεύς</persName>. This type of markup, however, does not do enough. As of 2011, we have given personal and place names their own unique identifiers within the Homer Multitext project. Odysseus then looks something like this in our markup: <persName n="pers118"> Ὀδυσσεύς</persName>. The number is arbitrary, meaning only that he happened to be the one-hundred and eighteenth name we added to our master list. This system of identification is used throughout the project, meaning that Odysseus is “pers118” through every single manuscript the project works on. The advantage of this identification system means that we can generate a list of every occurrence of a particular individual or place in any and all editions of text. Other types of markup we include attempt to accurately reflect the physical text. In the main text and in the scholia, we include markup for abbreviations and issues of clarity. We also include markup for quotations within the scholia that will reference other works using URN citation.

Another branch of TEI editing aims to more accurately portray the physical presentation of the manuscript. For example, if you were to look at manuscript of the *Iliad* compared with our modern print editions, even an advanced student of Greek would have a difficult time deciphering the abbreviations, letter forms, and ligatures present in the text. One of the initiatives of the Homer Multitext project has been to create paleographic guides to assist in the process of reading Greek manuscripts. One of the ways we reflect these paleographic features in our

²¹ For example, current TEI P5 markup can allow a user to encode information about folio sides, placement, and even quire arrangement, using the locus element, which we find superfluous. A full list of all the features TEI P5 can encode for manuscripts can be found here: <http://www.tei-c.org/release/doc/tei-p5-doc/en/html/MS.html>.

editions of the text is to use TEI markup. For example a common word like θεός is often abbreviated as merely $\overline{\theta\varsigma}$. Other common Greek words such as ἄνθρωπος, οὐρανός, μήτηρ, and πᾶτερ are similarly abbreviated by omitting the middle of the word. In cases like these we include markup that indicates the abbreviation, notes what the likely expansion is, and offers the reader the choice of the two. Other types of markup in the text generally have to do with issues of clarity. Text on deteriorating pages that cannot be completely distinguished is marked as unclear, for example. Ultimately we wish to produce editions that accurately reflect the manuscripts, their texts, and their features.

Our standard for editing is a team-oriented process. In creating the edition of the main text, while one person reads directly from the photographs of the manuscript, the other marks up a hard copy of the text, noting any differences and changes we need to make to our standard print edition of the *Iliad*. The next part of the process requires at least two, if not three, people. Once again, we have one person reading directly from photos of the manuscript. Another person is working directly from the hard copy markup. The third is editing our edition of the text in a XML document. The process of editing the scholia is more complicated and can be broken down into three main parts: 1) creating an image inventory, 2) editing the Greek texts, and 3) verifying the results.

1) To create an image inventory we begin by isolating a region of interest on the page that corresponds to each scholion. Doing so allows us to create a unique reference that is citable as visual evidence. When we inventory an image, we select a portion of the larger images of each page and designate it as the part of the manuscript that contains an individual scholion. In order to inventory an image, we use an Image Citation Tool designed by the Homer Multitext project

team that allows us to draw a box on an image and gives us a citation for that region of interest in URN notation.²² Each scholion image is assigned its own unique identifier. Everything associated with the scholion is then referenced by this identifier.²³ The importance of these references becomes clear when we get into the editing process.

2) The most efficient way we have found to edit the scholia to date is to compare the text of the Erbse edition, making alterations as necessary, much as we do for the main text of the *Iliad*. When we produce our digital editions of the scholia they are automatically linked to their respective images by matching unique identifiers. This makes our editions instantly verifiable by other members of the Multitext project and by anyone else who may subsequently use our digital editions.²⁴

3) The next step in the process is the most difficult and continually growing aspect of the project: verification. We have several procedures in place for visual review and are continuing to add procedures for automated review, some of which have just been implemented as I completed my work. Many of our steps built into the editing process seek to ensure the accuracy of our editions. The team oriented work flow is aimed at catching mistakes before and while they occur. The imaging part of our process is most easily verifiable. We are able to immediately generate a web page of all the scholia we image. We can immediately review and edit any problems with the imaging process. The editions are more difficult to check. Many typos have become quite common over the course of our work and are easily fixed with a common search and replace. For

²² To view the citation tool visit the following link: <http://folio.furman.edu/projects/cite-roi/index.html?w=800&urn=urn%3Acite%3Ahmt%3Achsimg.VA012RN-0013>. References for different folios and manuscripts can be supplied and the sizes of the page can be altered for viewer preferences.

²³ All scholia in this thesis will be cited by their unique URN references.

²⁴ A succinct explanation of the philosophy behind such a process of verification can be found in Borgman 2007: 70-71.

example, when citing personal names, “pers” is frequently mistyped “pestr,” a simple issue that would result in inaccurate results for name search but easily fixed with common editing tools. A newly developed tool allows us to compile an archive of every word in our editions folio-by-folio. This process identifies where we have words not recognized in our standard LSJ Greek dictionary and allows us to find these “failures” by their URN citation. Often we run into simple issues where the scribe has not included an accent or breathing mark in the appropriate place. Another frequent issue that comes up as an error is differences in Byzantine spelling. Other issues, however, arise from words that do not exist in the LSJ but are, in fact, previously unattested Greek words. One such word that the automation tool has revealed is *ταρταρίζειν*, which we can reasonably suppose from its context in the scholion means something along the lines of “to be cast into Tartarus” or “to fall into Tartarus.” *ταρταρίζειν* has been quite a fascinating find as it appears in both the Venetus A and Y.1.1 scholia.²⁵ The development of our verification process is, as stated above, ongoing, but the more tools we develop to test our results, the more information we have uncovered about these manuscripts.

The final aspect of the editing process is to account for all the features of the manuscripts that cannot be properly expressed in our editions of the text and the scholia. Features in Book 8 alone have required us to rethink how we ought to account for visual features, and some of these will be discussed in later chapters. Other features we have uncovered in both manuscripts include: quire arrangements, epic simile numbers, critical signs, diagrams, drawings, and some features we have yet to explain. Especially for the latter category, we have collected image inventories and catalogued these features for further study. Ultimately we seek to leave no aspect

²⁵ For more on these scholia see Chapter Three: Scholia on Mythological Geography.

of a manuscript unpublished. Having the digital photography continuously at our disposal has allowed us to spend more time with features besides the main text and scholia.

Chapter 3: Scholia on Mythological Geography

While I was editing the scholia of the Venetus A, it became apparent almost immediately that there was unusual content on the Greek concepts of the heavens and the Underworld. The first folio of Book 8 (100v) in the Venetus A contains a simple diagram of an orb divided into four regions: αἰθήρ (aether), ἀήρ (air), αἰδης (Hades), and τάρταρος (Tartarus).²⁶ The presence of a diagram presented a new issue in how we marked up the text for the digital edition of the scholia. What we clearly had was not just a drawing but a figure that included textual elements. Therefore we introduced a new piece of markup to our list of acceptable TEI markup: “figure.” This markup allows us to embed other features such as a description of the figure (in “figDesc”) as well as the textual elements (in “floatingText” etc). There are no other diagrams in the rest of Book 8, nor in the entire Venetus A. The Y.1.1, while marked with the occasional drawing or “doodle,” has no such diagrams either. The Venetus A diagram appears to come in conjunction with a scholion commenting on line 8.12. The text of the scholion, we have transcribed as follows:

ὥς τὰ οὐράνια τρία διαστήματα ἔξει ἀέρα μεχρι νεφελῶν, εἴτα αἰθέρα μέχρι τῶν φαινομενων· οὕτως καὶ ἀπο γῆς εἰς ἄδου· ἀπὸ δὲ ἄδου εἰς Τάρταρον· ἐναντίος δὲ Ὀλύμπῳ ὁ Τάρταρος· ὁ μὲν γὰρ “οὐποτ’ ἀνέμοισι τινάσσεται· οὐδέ ποτ’ ὄμβρῳ” (Od. 6.43) ὁ δὲ καὶ τετάρακται καὶ ψυχρὸς εἶναι δοκεῖ καὶ γοῦν τὸ σφόδρα ῥιγοῦν ταρταρίζειν φασίν. καὶ ὁ μὲν ὅλος καταλάμπεται· ὁ δὲ ἡρόεις ἐστίν

“Since heaven has three distinct parts: the lower air spans up until the clouds, then the aether spans up until the visible places. In a similar way so it goes both from earth to Hades and from Hades to Tartarus, Tartarus is in opposition to Olympus. For the one, “never shook with winds, nor with heavy rain” (Od. 6.43). And the other seemed to be

²⁶ urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA100VN-0603:0.1857,0.8148,0.1511,0.1049

both chaotic and cold, indeed they say that to fall into Tartarus is to be violently cold. The former is wholly shone upon. The latter is murky.”²⁷

It is obvious from the content of the scholion that the diagram is meant to serve as a visual aid, but, of all shapes, why is the diagram a sphere? The text of this particular scholion only explains the ordered stacking of the regions. The issue is explained on the next folio (101r) in a scholion commenting on line 8.16. I transcribed the text of this scholion as follows:

τόσσον ἔνερθ' Αἴδεω:

τοσοῦτον φησὶ τὸν Τάρταρον. ἀφεστᾶναι τοῦ Ἄιδου ὅσον οὐρανός τῃς γῆς. δια δὲ τούτων σφαιροειδῆ τὸν κόσμον συν ἴσθησι κέντρου λόγον ἐπέχουσιν εἰσαγαγὼν τὴν γῆν καὶ τὰς ἀπ' αὐτῆς. ἐμβαλλομένας εὐθείας εἰς ἐκάτερα τὰ περατὰ ἴσας λέγων εἶναι[‡]

“All the way down to Hades:

He says that Tartarus is as far below Hades as Ouranus is above the earth. And on account of these things he makes the cosmos spherical, he has introduced the earth in the relation of the center [of the cosmos], he says that [going] straight from the earth to each opposite side is equidistant.”²⁸

This scholion makes the issue of the sphere obvious. We have no idea if these two commentaries were from the same original source, but they complement each other. The first discusses the divisions between the different parts of heaven and hell with earth in between and the second looks at the relationship between Tartarus and Ouranus in a geographic and mathematical context.²⁹ The question of sources becomes more layered when we look at the comparable scholia in the Y.1.1. The Y.1.1 also divides the contents of these scholia into two separate comments, but its organizing principles are different. Commenting on line 8.13, the Y.1.1 reads:

²⁷ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.6

²⁸ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.14

²⁹ See Euclid *The Elements* Book 11 Definition 16, Book 1 Definitions 15, 16, and 18 on center points.

ἐναντίος Ὀλύμπῳ ὁ Τάρταρος· ὁ μὲν γὰρ. "οὔποτ' ἀνέμοισι τινάσσεται· οὐδέ ποτ' ὄμβρῳ" (Od 6.43)· οὗτος δὲ τετάρακται· καὶ ψυχρὸς εἶναι δοκεῖ· ὅθεν καὶ τὸ σφόδρα ῥιγοῦν ταρταρίζειν φασίν· καὶ ὁ μὲν ὅλος καταλάμπεται ὁ δὲ καὶ ἡεροειδὴς ἐστίν*³⁰

"Tartarus is opposite to Olympus. For the one, "never shook with winds, nor with heavy rain" (Od 6.43). And the other was chaotic and it seemed to be cold, from which they say that to fall into Tartarus is to be violently cold. And the one is wholly shone upon and the other is cloudy."³⁰

In this scholion, the scribe of the Y.1.1, or whichever sources he was copying from, extracts the material discussing the physical conditions of Ouranus and Tartarus. A few scholia later, the scribe includes this commentary on line 8.16:

τὰ οὐράνια ὥς φησι τρία διαστήματα ἔχει· ἀέρα μέχρι νεφελῶν· εἴτα αἰθέρα μέχρι τῶν φαινομένων· καὶ τῆς Διὸς ἀρχῆς· οὕτω καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς εἰς Ἄδου, ἀπὸ δὲ Ἄδου εἰς τὸν Τάρταρον· δῆλον δὲ ὡς τὸ μέσον κέντρον ἴν ἡ γῆ· ἔδει δὲ εἰπεῖν "τόσσον ἔνερθε" γῆς· ὅσον ἀπ' αὐτῆς εἰς οὐρανόν· τάχα οὖν τὸ Αἴδεω ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Ἄδου φησίν*³¹

"The heavens, he [the poet] says, have three distinct parts. The lower air spans up to the clouds. Then the aether spans up to the visible places and the throne of Zeus. And in a similar way so it goes from the earth to Hades, from Hades to Tartarus. And so the earth is clearly as the middle center point. And it is right to say that it is as far beneath the earth as the earth is from heaven. And indeed perhaps he [the poet] calls it Hades because of the rulership of Hades."³¹

There are a few different points to be made about scribal choices in these scholia. First, the scribe of the Y.1.1 or his sources seem to group scholia contents by different themes than the scribe of the Venetus A. The first Y.1.1 scholion on line 8.13, as already stated, handles the physical conditions of Ouranos and Tartarus and their status as opposites. The second scholion

³⁰ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.e3:8.13

³¹ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.e3:8.16

explains both the concept of the four stacked regions and the concept of the universe in which the earth is the center point. Notably the direct reference to the cosmos as a sphere is absent in the Y.1.1 scholia. Another notable point is the differences in how similar contents of the scholia correspond to different lines of the *Iliad* in each manuscript. The first scholion from the Venetus A appears on 110v which contains the first fourteen lines of Book 8. Scholia always appear on the same folio as the lines they comment on and line 8.12 mentions Tartarus. Despite the fact that this scholion does not possess a lemma--that is, a quoted section of the *Iliad* that connects a scholion to the section of text it comments on--it is fairly reasonable to suppose that this reference is correct. If anything we can say for certain that in the Venetus A, this scholion is not commenting on anything after line 8.14. However, the Y.1.1 includes this content on line 8.16. There is no ambiguity here. The scholia of the Y.1.1 are linked to the text through Greek numerals and occasionally non-numerical symbols above the specific words in the line the scholion comments on, working like modern footnotes.³² The second scholion from the Venetus A does appear on line 8.16. It would appear that between the 10th and 11th centuries, a scribe thought that the commentary on 8.12, explaining the divisions of heaven and hell, belonged with the discussion of earth being the center point between Olympus and Tartarus. Furthermore he also decided that the material on the environmental conditions of Olympus and Ouranus was better suited to line 8.13. The Venetus A has another scholion of a similar variety on line 8.13 that reads:

Τάρταρος:

τὸ ὑπὸ τὴν γῆν ἐσκοτισμένον. μέρος κατώτατον τοῦ Ἅδου· καὶ ἐν βαθυτάτῳ κείμενον τόπῳ. ἢ τὸν χαλεπὸν καὶ δυσχερῆ λέγει. ὠνόμασται δὲ, δια τὸ ἐκτετάχθαι καὶ συγκεχύσθαι τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ πάντα· οἱ δὲ τὸ ἀφώτιστον τῆς οἰκουμένης μέρος ἀπεδέξαντο*

³² For a concise explanation of the Milesian number system see Dickey 2007: 131.

“Tartarus:

The place in shade below the earth, it is the bottommost portion of Hades. And he calls it that which lies in the deepest region or that it is both difficult and vexatious. And it is so named because of the drawing out and the confounding of everything in itself. But others understand it as the unlit region of their inhabitation.”³³

This material is not found in the Y.1.1. It indicates a difference in the scribal sources or scribal choices. The scribe of the Venetus A either had access to materials the scribe of the Y.1.1, or the scribe of the Y.1.1 was more selective about the kinds of commentaries he wished to include. These scholia and accompanying features in the manuscripts illustrate differences in scribal practices and choices as they developed in the 10th and 11th centuries.

³³ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.13

Chapter 4: Scholia on Odysseus and Scribal Choices in Organization and Content

In *Iliad* 8, Odysseus emerges as a problematic character. As the Greeks retreat under pressure of Trojan forces, Diomedes presses forward to rescue Nestor from a chariot wreck. Diomedes calls out to those who are retreating urging them to stay and fight. Diomedes specifically calls on Odysseus, who either does not hear Diomedes or hears him and chooses to continue fleeing. The language is unclear and both options are possible. It is especially problematic for our interpretation of Odysseus's character if he ignores Diomedes's plea.³⁴ Heroes do not abandon their comrades to save themselves. It is obvious through the numerous scholia about Odysseus in Book 8, that the ancient Homeric scholars found this issue of interpretation problematic and so they attempt to explain his actions. As I edited the scholia, I began to take a look at more of these scholia about Odysseus.

I found a pair of scholia in the Venetus A and Y.1.1 that take the epithet, πολυμήχανος ("resourceful"), in line 8.93 as their starting point and then begin to detail Odysseus's various skills and titles. The Y.1.1 explains the issue in the typical, paragraph form of scholia. It uses mostly complete sentences, introducing epithets and explaining why Odysseus is referred to as such, alluding to sections of the *Iliad* or *Odyssey* and in one instance quoting the *Odyssey*. I have transcribed the text of this scholion as follows:

πρὸς ἐπιστροφὴν τὸ ἐπίθετον τέθειται· δεῖ γὰρ τὸν στρατιώτην τοιοῦτον εἶναι· γεωργὸς μὲν γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ καλῶς ἐν πόδι καὶ τὴν ἄρπην· καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τῆς γεωργίας ὅπλα κινεῖν γινώσκεται· κυβερνήτης· ἀπὸ τοῦ "πόδα νηὸς" (Od.10.32). ἰθύνειν καλῶς· τέκτων, ἀπὸ τῆς εὐθεσίας τῶν λίθων· καὶ τῆς εὐπριστίας τῶν ξύλων· ναυπηγός, ἀπὸ τῆς νηός· κυνηγός· ἀπὸ τῆς κυναγωγῆς καὶ τῆς ὀρεσινομίας· μάντις ἀπὸ τῶν ἐκβάσεων· μάγειρος ἀπὸ τοῦ ὡς δεῖ ὁπταῖν καὶ δαιτρεύειν· ἱατρός, ἀπὸ τοῦ νόσους γινώσκειν καὶ τάμνειν ἰούς·

³⁴ For further discussion on the reasons why Odysseus's retreat is not necessarily a pointless digression or a poor characterization of Odysseus see Cook 2005: 144-146.

μουσικὸς καὶ ἀοιδὸς. ἐξ ὧδ' ὧν κάλλους καὶ μύθων· πύκτης καὶ παλαιστῆς ἐξ εὐστροφίας
καὶ χειρῶν συμπλοκῆς· τοξότης ἀπὸ διασκέψεως ἀρίστης· ἀκοντιστῆς. ἀπὸ τοῦ εὖ
πάλλειν τὸ δόρυ ῥήτωρ ἀπὸ πιθανότητος· στρατηγός. ἀπὸ φρονήσεως καὶ ἀνδρίας·
στρατιώτης. ἀπὸ πολυμηχανίας καὶ πολυπειρίας*

“The epithet is used because of the retreat. For it is necessary for him to be such a soldier. For he is a farmer [as we know] well from the sickle in the grass and the bill hook and all the things which are necessary for farming. He is a ship-steerer because he keeps the sail straight (Od.10.32). The carpenter, from the good condition of the stone. And from the skillful sawing of wood. The shipbuilder from the ship. The hunter from the hunting packs and from the knowledge of the mountains. The seer from landing places. A cook from as is necessary roasting and cutting up. A doctor, from which there is sickness to diagnose and to cut out arrows. A musician and a minstrel from which there are songs of beauty and speeches. The boxer and the wrestler from versatility and the wrestling grip. The archer, from the best ability to examine. The javelin-thrower, from his good poise with a spear. The orator, from his persuasiveness. The general from his foresight and manly courage. The soldier from craftiness and great experience.”³⁵

A total of about sixteen different categories are mentioned here: farmer, ship-steerer, carpenter, ship-builder, hunter, seer, cook, doctor, musician, boxer, wrestler, archer, javelin-thrower, orator, general, and soldier. In some cases, it is rather difficult to know what episodes in the epic tradition each epithet might refer to, but it becomes clearer when we look at the corresponding scholion in the Venetus A.

The Venetus A does something we had not seen in the manuscript in the previous books.³⁶ It takes each epithet and refers to them in a numbered list.³⁷ This format presented a new issue for us in how we marked up this content in our digital edition of the text. Neither the Dindorf nor the Erbse edition of the text represent this scholion as a list. Neither editor formatted his edition

³⁵ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.e3:8.58

³⁶ Editions of Books 1-7 in the Venetus A have been worked on in recent years under the Homer Multitext project.

³⁷ urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA102VN-0605:0.1723,0.1311,0.2397,0.1821

in such a way and neither editor included the Greek numerals. We felt that not only was the format rare, but it was also integral to the interpretation of the text. Therefore we introduced a new type of markup to our list of acceptable TEI elements: “list.” This markup allowed us to set up the edition in a way that best reflected the fact that we do, in fact, see a list in the manuscript. Set off at some distance, but clearly corresponding to each epithet, the scribe includes either quotes from or references episodes from the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey* to support each epithet. Quoting is much more frequent in the Venetus A version of the scholion, appearing with eleven out of fifteen of the epithets, whereas in the Y.1.1 there is only one quoted section. We have transcribed the text of the Venetus A scholion as follows:

πρὸς ἐπιστροφὴν τὸ ἐπίθετον*	
Α εστι δὲ γεωργος	"ἐν ποίῃ δρεπανον μὲν" (Od.18.368)·
Β κυβερνήτης	"ἄει γὰρ πόδα νηός" (Od.10.32)
Γ τέκτων	ἀπο τῆς κλίνης
Δ ναυπηγός	ἀπὸ τῆς σχεδίας
Ε κυνηγός	ἀπὸ τοῦ Παρνασσοῦ
Ζ μάντις	"φημι τίς μοι φάσθω" (Od.20.100)
Ζ μαγειρος	"δαιτρεῦσαι τὲ καὶ ὀπτησαι" (Od.15.323)
Η ἱατρος	"ὄφρα οἱ εἴ ἱοὺς χρίεσθαι" (Od.1.262-263)
Θ μουσικος	"μῦθον ὥς τ' αοιδός" (Od.11.368)
Ι πύκτης	"πῦν μὲν ἐνίκησα Κλυτομήδεα" (Il.23.634)
ΙΑ παλαιστής	"Ἀγκαῖον δὲ πάλῃ Πλευρώνιον" (Il.23.635)
ΙΒ δισκευτής	παρα Φαίαξιν
ΙΓ τοξότης	"εὖ μὲν τόξον οἶδα" (Od.8.215)
ΙΔ ἀκοντιστής	"δοῦρὶ δὲ ἀκοντίζων" (Od.8.229)
ΙΕ ῥήτωρ καὶ αστρολογος	"Πηληϊάδας θ' ὀρόωντι" (Od.5.272)·

“The epithet is for the retreat.

- | | |
|-------------------|---|
| 1. He is a farmer | "in the grass, curved scythe" (Od.18.368) |
| 2. A steersman | "for I always [steered] the sails of the ship" (Od.10.32) |

3. A carpenter	from the bed ³⁸
4. A ship builder,	from the raft ³⁹
5. A hunter,	because of Parnassos ⁴⁰
6. A seer,	"I say let someone speak to me" (Od.20.100)
7. A chef/butcher	"cutting up and roasting" (Od.15.323)
8. A doctor	"so that they might furnish with poison." (Od.1.262-263)
9. A musician	"he converses like a minstrel" (Od.11.368)
10. A boxer	"boxing I overcame Klytomedes" (Il.23.634)
11. A wrestler	"wrestling I beat Ancaeus of Pleuron" (Il.23.635)
12. A discus thrower	against the Phaician ⁴¹
13. An archer	"I know the bow well" (Od.8.215)
14. A javelin-thrower	"throwing a spear" (Od.8.229)
15. An orator and an astronomer	"looking upon the Pleiades" (Od. 5.272)" ⁴²

One of the first notable differences between these two scholia besides format, is the choice of how to explain each epithet. The Venetus A scholion relies almost entirely on quotations whereas the Y.1.1 scholion summarizes for all but one epithet. This pattern would indicate that the scribes or their sources have different standards for proof on this topic. Since both scholia start the same way, *πρὸς επιστροφὴν τὸ ἐπίθετον*, we are almost certainly dealing with a continued evolution in how this concept was explained to the audience. Quotation or summarization, the way the scholia explain each epithet speaks volumes about the audience of these scholia. The intended audience of these scholia presumably know the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* so well that they understand where

³⁸ Erbse cites Od. 23.189 as the likely reference.

³⁹ Erbse cites Od. 5.243-5.261 as the likely reference.

⁴⁰ Erbse cites Od. 19.428-19.454 as the likely reference.

⁴¹ Erbse cites Od. 8.186-8.198 as the likely reference.

⁴² urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.78

the quotations are coming from and what episodes the scholiast alludes to in his summaries without citations.

Another difference comes in the epithets referred to in each scholion. The Y.1.1 scholion has sixteen different epithets. The Venetus A includes sixteen, but places both orator and astronomer with number 15, notably citing a quotation for astronomy but not oratory. However, matching up the epithets continues to get stranger. Even if we were to say each scholion has sixteen epithets, they do not correspond perfectly. Discus-thrower and astronomer appear in the Venetus A but not in the Y.1.1. The Y.1.1 has general and solider, but the Venetus A does not. Here we likely see not just different choices in how to represent material, but also either differences in source material or different choices in what to include. Differences in sources presume that the Venetus A and Y.1.1 scribes each had material the other did not. Differences in choices presume that they had the same or similar sources and chose to include and exclude information.

As the lines continue, both manuscripts tackle the difficult issue of the phrase οὐδ' ἐς ἄκουσεν (*Iliad* 8.97). The phrase can be translated as “he did not listen” or “he did not hear.”⁴³ The former would imply that Odysseus made an active choice not heed Diomedes’s urgings after he had heard them. The latter would imply that Odysseus never heard Diomedes in the first place. Both manuscripts contain scholia defending Odysseus. The Venetus A has three scholia, two of which are remarkably similar, differing only in the spelling of a few words and the structure of the beginning of the scholia. The first one reads:

⁴³ For a concise summary of the scholarship on this issue see Kelly 2007: 48-49, footnote 55.

ὥς ἔφατ' οὐδ' ἐσάκουσαι:

προς τὸ ἀμφιβολὸν πότερον οὐκ ἀντελάβετο καθόλου τῆς φωνῆς δια τὸν θόρυβον, ἢ ἀκούσας γὰρ ἐπαρεπέμψατο, ὅπερ δέχεται ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος

“So he spoke, but he did not hear/listen:

Regarding the ambiguity, whether he [Odysseus] did not generally perceive his [Diomedes's] voice on account of clamor, or having heard him he passed along, as Aristarchus takes it.”⁴⁴

The second one reads:

οὐδ' ἐσάκουσεν,

"οὐδὲ ἤκουσεν" ἐξηγεῖται δὲ πότερον οὐκ ἀντελάβετο καθόλου τῆς φωνῆς δια τὸν θόρυβον, ἢ ἀκούσας παρεπέμψατο, ὅπερ δέχεται ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος

“He did not hear/listen,

"οὐδὲ ἤκουσεν" It is interpreted whether he [Odysseus] generally did perceive his [Diomedes's] voice on account of clamor, or having heard him he passed along, which is how Aristarchus takes it.”⁴⁵

A third Venetus A scholia, begins in a similar way to the second one, but goes off in another direction to further explain the issue. It reads as follows:

οὐδ' ἐς ἤκουσεν:

"οὐδὲ ἤκουσεν" ἐξηγεῖται δὲ πότερον ἄρα οὐδ' ὅλως ἤκουσεν ὁ Ὀδυσσεὺς, ἢ οὐκ ἐπέισθη δειλίαν τοῦ ἥρωος κατηγοροῦσιν ἀγνοοῦντες τὸ "οὐδ' ἐσάκουσεν", οὐ γὰρ τὸ παρακοῦσαι. ἀλλὰ τὸ μὴ αἰσθεσθαι τελείως δηλοῖ καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἦν δειλὸς τῶν ἄλλων ἐσχατος φεύγων καὶ τῇ βραδυτῇ τὸ φιλοκίνδυνον ἐπιδεικνύμενος *⁴⁶

“He did not hear/listen

"οὐδὲ ἤκουσεν" he interprets whether Odysseus did not wholly hear, or whether he was not persuaded. They charge the hero with cowardice, ignoring the "οὐδ' ἐσάκουσεν." For

⁴⁴ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.81

⁴⁵ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.82

it is not “not listening.” But rather it is a lack of perfect perception, and because he is not a coward since he flees last of all the other men and because of his slowness he is a specimen of a man who loves danger.”⁴⁶

These scholia overlap in their content, leading to a couple different possibilities. Since the first and second scholia end the same way and the second and third scholia start the same way, it is possible that the second scholion is a mistaken combination of the two copied at some point by accident. It certainly does not seem to contribute anything new to the discussion. Either way these scholia offer both alternatives in interpretation. The first two offer both alternatives, citing a tradition that Odysseus’s behavior can be explained because of the noise of battle. This issue becomes complicated under the consideration of Diomedes’s traditional epithet *βοὴν ἀγαθός*, generally translated as “lord of the war cry.” Surely a lord of the war cry would have no problems raising his voice over the thunder of battle. Certainly something along this line of reasoning made sense to scholars like Aristarchus, whom both these scholia cite as favoring the latter opinion that Odysseus heard Diomedes and kept on retreating. The third scholion notably disagrees with Aristarchus, an notable fact since he was one of the most prominent ancient Homeric scholars. This scholion takes the opinion that Diomedes’s choice to stay was unusual and that Odysseus seems like a coward because he is the only person singled out in the retreat. Within just these three scholia we can see a range in the development of opinions on the controversial issue. Being both third in order and seeming to respond to discussion in the first two, I would argue that the third scholion reflects a later development in the Homeric scholarship and possibly one that was working with and responding to the work of Aristarchus.

⁴⁶ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.83

The Y.1.1 also comments on line 8.97, but focuses primarily on justifying Odysseus's actions rather than discussing the various interpretations. The scholia of Y.1.1, after stating that there are two interpretations of the word, defend the actions of Odysseus as if it does not really even matter that there are possibilities for different interpretations. Instead the scholion in this manuscript highlights how unreasonable it would be to accuse him of cowardice. The opposing viewpoint is not fully represented in this manuscript and Aristarchus goes unmentioned on the topic. The text of the scholion on line 8.97 in the Y.1.1 reads:

οὐκ ἤσθετο ὑπὸ τοῦ θορύβου· ἢ οὐκ ἐπείσθη διὰ τὸν καιρόν· φεύγει γὰρ σὺν Αἴαντι καὶ θεομαχεῖν οὐ θέλει· πῶς γὰρ δειλός· ὁ μετὰ πάντας φεύγων· οὐ γὰρ ἂν Διομήδης τοῦτον μόνον ἐκάλει·[✱]

“He does not hear because of the noise or he is not persuaded because of the crisis. For he flees with the Ajaxes and he does not want to wage war against the gods. For how is that cowardly? He is fleeing with everyone else. Because Diomedes would not have called out to him alone.”⁴⁷

This scholion is perhaps the most vehement defense of Odysseus. Here we can see signs of scribal choice in content. The scribe of the Y.1.1 or one of his sources at some point decided that the appropriate interpretation of line 8.97 was that regardless of whether Odysseus heard Diomedes, he is part of a larger retreat and just happens to be the one named man in the retreat. It is noteworthy that the viewpoints of Aristarchus are left out entirely. We can determine that there is some Aristarchean material in the Y.1.1 because there are many citations of him. Not only is the name left out, but his preference is also abandoned. Clearly this material did not make the cut for the Y.1.1.

⁴⁷ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.e3:8.62

These lines do not seem to be the only part of Book 8 where Homeric scholars found Odysseus's actions problematic. Later in the book, after the Greeks have all retreated and are making their stand at the ships, the poetry begins to describe the various Greek heroes that go forth into battle following Diomedes (*Iliad* 8.261-8.267). Ancient Homeric scholars seem to be quite alarmed that Odysseus is not included in this list of men, perhaps because they are already uncomfortable with the fact that Odysseus might have ignored Diomedes's request for aid less than two-hundred lines earlier. Regardless of why, the discussion sheds light on the mind of an ancient Homeric scholar that the absence of a character merits a commentary. The Venetus A includes for line 8.266 the following comment:

Τεῦκρος δ εἵνατος
 ὅτι πάντων ὑποστρεψάντων, μόνος ὁ Ὀδυσσεὺς παρέμεινε πρὸς ταῖς ναυσὶν ὥστε τὸ
 ἐπάνω εὐκρινὲς "ὡς ἔφαθ' οὐδ' ἐσάκουσεν" (Il. 8.97) ὅτι ἐκουσίως παρεπέμψατο*

“Teucer was ninth

The sign is there because everyone turned around, only Odysseus remained next to the ships so that the above line is in good order "as he spoke he did not listen" (Il. 8.97) because he voluntarily sent himself past.”⁴⁸⁴⁹

This scholion quotes the problematic passage in line 8.97. Furthermore the source for this comment seems to be making a judgment on how to interpret the verb ἐσάκουσεν. The scholiast, by saying that Odysseus voluntarily continued to retreat, would imply that Odysseus heard Diomedes and continued to retreat anyway. This source then, seems to take the point of view that Odysseus's behavior was cowardly and the reason he does not play a further role in the immediate circumstances is that he is still in retreat.

⁴⁸ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.182

⁴⁹ For explanation of why ὅτι is translated “the sign is there because” see Dickey 2007: 122.

The Y.1.1 also has a comment on these lines, but seems to take a different approach from the Venetus A scholia. The Y.1.1 scholion focuses more on why some men are given more prominence in these lines, and why this deference is no reason for readers to believe Odysseus is not a part of the action. The text of that scholion reads:

διήρηκεν ὡς μέλλων περὶ αὐτοῦ λέγειν· ἔνδον δέ ἐστι Ὀδυσσεὺς τὸν λαὸν διεγείρων. ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Θόαντος μέμνηται· καὶ οὐ πάντως ἐστὶ δειλός *⁵⁰

“The poet makes a distinction because he is about to speak about him [Teucer]. But Odysseus is within rousing the soldiers. Thoas is also not mentioned and he [Thoas] is not entirely cowardly [either].”^{50 51}

According to this source, the reason men like Teucer and the Ajaxes are mentioned here is because they are about to be major players in the immediate action. The scholiast also asserts that Odysseus is certainly among the men roused to action and is not a coward. The scholia are not going to give us a clear answer on whether or not Odysseus was a coward and ignored Diomedes. That is not the purpose of my discussion. What these scholia do highlight is that manuscripts and sources can disagree about a problematic passage. These scholia also speak to the scribal choices. The Venetus A scribe very matter-of-factly includes a scholion that passes a judgment on earlier lines and its implications on the present lines. The Y.1.1 scribe includes the exact opposite opinion. It seems highly unlikely that the scribes would not have been aware that the ambiguity was a problematic issue with varied opinions, but each scribe seems to have chosen sides and not included the opposing opinion for these lines. These differences may also

⁵⁰ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.e3:8.181

⁵¹ Erbse rightly notes to see *Iliad* 7.168, where the poetry lists the Greeks who might be capable of fighting Hector. This is a similar list to the one here in *Iliad* 8.261-8.267, with the notable exceptions of Odysseus and Thoas. This list seems to explain the otherwise odd reference to Thoas in this scholion.

speak to the scribal sources. It seems like an important enough issue that the scribes and their sources were probably well aware of the various sides of the argument and somewhere in the process they made decisions to exclude one piece of information over another.

Chapter 5: Scholia Using the First Person Part One, Speeches

Part of what makes analyzing the scholia for patterns in Homeric scholarship difficult is that until now it has been nearly impossible to automate searches for specific features. Because we now have digital editions to work with, it is much easier to automate the search process. Thanks to the software that performs automated checks on each and every word of the scholia, I was able to work from lists of every word that appear in the scholia, folio by folio, with the scholia identifier for quick reference. While this process still required some manual checking for features, one of the goals for the future of the Homer Multitext project is to further automate this searching so that one can set parameters and pull up all possibilities in a single search. For now, using a combination of automated and manual checking, I pulled together lists of several different types of scholia to further investigate. One type I was able to investigate with a fair amount of depth was scholia that use the first person outside the context of quotations. Because the process is not fully automated, I will make no claims that my list is fully comprehensive. I began my search looking into the scholia of the Venetus A because I can thus far only run automated searches only through the Venetus A. Most of the scholia I was able to find in the Y.1.1 came from a combination of less reliable manual check and pure luck.

As I began to go through the first person scholia it became apparent that there were several different types at play. The first type that I will discuss here in this chapter use the first person to take the reader into a character's thoughts to explain the motivations behind what is done or said in the poetry. I will begin most of my analyses from the Venetus A scholia primarily because the Y.1.1 often either does not have comparable scholia or the comparable scholia do not use the same first person constructions.

We have three separate instances in the Venetus A scholia of *Iliad* 8 where the first person is used to explain a character's thoughts or motivations. The first of these appears on line 8.408, when Zeus remarks that it is in Hera's nature to attempt to obstruct his plans and since it is her nature, he cannot be angry with her. The scholion reads:

αἰεὶ γάρ μοι ἔωθεν ἐνικλᾶν ὅττι νοήσω·
 "ἐνικλᾶν" ἐμποδίζειν ἢ μεταφορὰ ἀπο τῶν εἰς τὰς ἀσπίδας ἀποθραυομένων δοράτων·
 οὕτως δὲ γραπτέον "ὅττι κεν εἴπω" οἷον κατακάμπτειν καὶ μὴ ἐὰν τὰ ὑπ' ἐμοῦ εἰρημένα
 καὶ πάλιν ἐξῆς ἐν οἷς ἡ Ἴρις φησιν (Il. 8.422) "ὅττι κεν εἴπη" γράφεται 𐀀

“For she is always accustomed to hinder me in whatever I have devised:
 ἐνικλᾶν means “to hinder.” It is a metaphor from spears being struck against shields. And it must be written like so "ὅττι κεν εἴπω." That is, to hinder and not to permit what is said by me. Again it is later written in the lines [that] Iris says (Il. 8.422) “ὅττι κεν εἴπη”⁵²

This scholion was particularly difficult to figure out, especially as it seems to tackle two different issues: first the vocabulary choice of ἐνικλᾶν and second what the proper turn of phrase is for the latter half of the line. Imbedded in this second issue is the curious phrase ὑπ' ἐμοῦ, “by me.” In context of the speech and the lines, the only logical conclusion is that the scholiast is imitating the voice of the poetry. We have seen other instances where a scholion explains the actions of a character in the poetry. What makes this one different enough that it merits the use of the first person?

Consulting the Y.1.1 proved fairly unfruitful on the subject of this scholion. While there is a comparable scholion in the Y.1.1 manuscript, it contains only some of the material found in the Venetus A and does not continue. Nor does it use the first person like the Venetus A does. The text of this scholion, also commenting on 8.408, reads as follows:

⁵² urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.261

ἐμποδίζειν· εἴληπται δὲ ἡ μεταφορὰ, ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς τὰς ἀσπίδας ἀποθραβομένων δοράτων*

"to hinder" and the metaphor is taken from spears being struck against shields."⁵³

This difference reveals aspects of scribal practices and what sources were available. The Y.1.1 scholion is almost verbatim of the first line of the Venetus A scholion. It is quite probable that the two scribes were copying this first sentence from the same source. The question is why does the Venetus A scholion continue and the Y.1.1 end? One possibility is that the Venetus A scribe copied the complete text offered by the source and the Y.1.1 scribe only copied the first sentence, either because he was saving space or did not think the rest of the comment was fitting for the manuscript. Another possibility is that the second portion of the comment was already missing from the source the Y.1.1 scribe was consulting, and he therefore could not add it to the manuscript. Yet another possibility is that the Venetus A scribe compiled his scholion from more than one source, the second of which the Y.1.1 scribe did not have or did not want to use.

The second instance of a first person reference to a character's thoughts in the Venetus A appears on lines 8.524-8.525, where Hector declares an end to the day's battle, saying that they have enough success for one day and he looks towards continued victory at dawn. The scholion reads:

μῦθος δ' ὅς
ἀθετοῦνται δύο στίχοι. δι' ὅτι τῇ ἐξῆς οὐδὲν λέγει καὶ τὸ ὑποτακτικὸν ἄρθρον ἀντι
προτακτικοῦ παρείληπται "ὅς μὲν" ἀντὶ τοῦ "ὁ μὲν." ὁ δὲ νοῦς ἐστὶ τοιοῦτος περὶ μὲν τῶν
νῦν καὶ τήμερον συντετέλεστέ μοι ὁ λόγος καὶ οὐδὲν παραλέλειπται περὶ δὲ τῶν εἰς
αὐρίον ὑπο τὴν ἑω μηνύσω *

⁵³ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.e3:8.283

“The counsel which:

The two lines are athetized because the poet says nothing in the following lines⁵⁴ and he substitutes the relative pronoun "ὅς μὲν" instead of the definite article "ὁ μὲν." But the intention is of this sort: concerning the things now and today, the speech has been completed by me and nothing is left out and, concerning the things happening tomorrow, at dawn I will reveal them.”⁵⁵

The scholion is a little difficult to understand, but it appears to be saying describing the reasons why Aristarchus marks these lines to be athetized.⁵⁶ Nonetheless the scholiast also wants to explain why these lines might fit here. That is why we have a discussion of intent (voûς) and we have the first person referring to Hector’s reasons for speaking. This scholion does two things to advance the discussion. First, it is also a speech, indicating that perhaps when we have first person references explaining a character’s thoughts it is because it is in the context of a speech. A speech merits the use of the first person whereas ordinary narration does not. Second, because we can associate the first half of the scholion with Aristarchus, what does this association mean about the second half that uses the first person? Do we assume that because the first half is likely Aristarchaen, the second half might be? Or can we rule out the second half being Aristarchaen because it contradicts Aristarchus’s viewpoint? If the latter is true than we can begin to make hypothesize sources that responded to Aristarchus’s work. There is no comparable scholion in the Y.1.1 for a comment on lines 8.524-8.525.

⁵⁴ i.e. Hector makes no speech at dawn even though he claims he will.

⁵⁵ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.324

⁵⁶ Though Aristarchus’s name is not mentioned in the scholion, he is the most likely source for this athetization as he is known to be associated with the critical signs, which appear in the Venetus A text marking these lines for athetization.

The last scholion in the Venetus A that uses the first person that I will examine appears immediately afterwards on line 8.526. Here we are still in the midst of Hector's speech, this time discussing the phrase "εὖχομαι ἐλπόμενος." The text of the scholion reads:

εὖχομαι ἐλπόμενος
ὅτι Ζηνοδοτος γράφει "ἔλπομαι εὐχόμενος". οὐ κατα τὸν Ἑκτορα δὲ τὸν οὕτως
ἐπηρμένον λέγει, ἐλπίζω εὐχόμενος τοῖς θεοῖς· ἐπιεικὲς γὰρ τουναντίον γὰρ οἰκεῖον
"εὖχομαι ἐλπόμενος" καυχώμαι ἐλπιδοποιούμενος ὑπο τοῦ Διὸς καὶ τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν

"I pray having hoped:

The sign is there because Zenodotus writes "ἔλπομαι εὐχόμενος." He does not say Hector is lifted up thusly, I feel hope praying to the gods. Because the opposite is suitable and appropriate, "I pray, feeling hope." I speak aloud being made hopeful by Zeus and the other gods."⁵⁷

Again we have a rather complicated mincing of words, but the crux of the argument appears to rest on the alternative Zenodotus offers and what the logical order of hoping and praying would be. Does one receive hope and therefore pray or does one pray and therefore become hopeful? There is little change of meaning overall, but the most notable part of this scholion is again the use of the first person to describe Hector's actions and motivations in the speech. We also have another strong reference to Aristarchaen material in this scholion. Typically scholia that start with ὅτι can be translated "the sign is there because" and are associated with Aristarchus's critical signs. Here, he presumably disagrees with Zenodotus and thinks instead that the appropriate reading of the line is "εὖχομαι ἐλπόμενος." If that much can be inferred from the fact that there is a critical sign and the note that Zenodotus offers an alternate reading, the rest of the

⁵⁷ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.325

scholion agrees with Aristarchus's choice. The question remains, is that because it is Aristarchaen material or because whichever source is responsible happens to agree with Aristarchus.

The Y.1.1 can shed further light on the issue with an intriguing comparable scholion on lines 8.526-8.527. It reads:

ὄρα τὸ παλίμβολον Ἑκτορος· τῇ γυναικὶ ἔλεγεν "ἔσσεται ἡμᾶρ ὅτ' ἂν ποτ' ὀλώλῃ Ἴλιος ἱρὴ" (Il. 6.448). ὧδε δὲ ἄλλως· ἐκεῖ μὲν γὰρ τῶν Τρώων ἡττωμένων δύσελπις ἦν· ἐνταῦθα δὲ τῇ μάχῃ κρατῶν. ἐλπίζει τὰ χρηστά⁵⁸

"Look at the change of mind of Hector. He was speaking to his wife "The day shall come when sacred Ilion is destroyed" (Il. 6.448). And it is so elsewhere. For there he is despondent because the Trojans were inferior. But here he hopes for good fortune because they are superior in battle."⁵⁸

This scholion does not talk about the alternate reading Zenodotus offers for this line, but like the Venetus A scholion it discusses Hector's thoughts, and examines how Hector's attitude towards the war has shifted. There is some discussion of his hopes, but it is only presented as argument for why Hector's attitude has changed, not an issue of whether he hoped before he prayed or vice versa. The most intriguing aspect of this scholion is the use of the imperative: ὄρα. It is extraordinary that the reader of the scholia is so directly called upon to examine an issue. This kind of participatory reading is intriguing and has led me to consider the stylistic choices of a scholiast.

It is notable that all of these scholia that use the first person, and in the Y.1.1's case an imperative, appear in the context of speeches. Perhaps we ought not try to trace these scholia to a particular source, but to a particular practice. It is possible that using the first person or an

⁵⁸ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.e3:8.390

imperative is not unusual in the context of explaining speeches. Unfortunately, my data is limited to the scholia I have discussed above. More definitive conclusions could be made using the rest of the scholia in the manuscript, scholia in other Homeric manuscripts, and perhaps even an examination into scholia on other texts, particularly those that frequently include speeches.

Chapter 6: Scholia Using the First Person Part Two; I the Editor, We the Editors, We the Greeks

The other first person scholia I investigated fit together in a nebulous fashion, which gave me great difficulty as I attempted to classify them. I found that even where I could distinguish categorically distinct uses of the first person, the scholia often used a combination of the different types. Scholia that did not use the first person in speeches used the first person to mean one or more of the following groups: “I” as in a specific editor or scholar, “we” as in a group of editors or scholars, or “we” as the collective Greek-speaking, Hellenistic people. I will take a look at the scholia I read, distinguishing the groups as much as is permissible, starting with the most general of these scholia: the scholia that use “we” to refer to a collective Greek people.

The first of these scholia in the Venetus A refers to line 8.429. In this section, after Zeus prevents Hera and Athena from aiding the Greeks, Hera declares that it is not worth waging war against Zeus so it is better to let circumstances unfold naturally with either the Greeks or the Trojans slaying the other and achieving victory. It would appear that Hera’s sudden change of heart, on a topic she so vehemently debated, unsettled scholiasts, for the scholion in the Venetus A reads:

+ τῶν· ἄλλος μὲν ἀποφθείσθω·
ὅταν εἰς τὴν ἀξίαν ἀτενίσῃ. τῶν θεῶν· τότε φασὶν αὐτοὺς μὴ κινεῖσθαι τῇ περὶ θνητῶν ὥς
οὐδὲ ἂν ἡμεῖς περὶ μυρμήκων· ὅταν δὲ ἐπιλογίσῃται τὴν ποιητικὴν ἔπεται τοῖς μύθοις καὶ
τὴν ὑπόθεσιν ἐκτραγωδεῖ συμμαχίας καὶ θεομαχίας παραγῶν

“Let one of them perish:

Whenever he [the poet] is looking at the reputation of the gods, then he says they would not be moved by anything concerning mortals. Just as we would not be moved concerning ants. But whenever he considers poetry, he follows the stories and makes the subject famous: bringing about alliances and wars among gods.”⁵⁹

⁵⁹ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.269

Barring a few differences in punctuation and accentation, the comparable scholion in the Y.1.1 is verbatim the same. It reads:

ὅτ' ἂν εἰς τὴν ἀξίαν ἀτενίσῃ τῶν θεῶν, τότε φησὶν αὐτοὺς μὴ κινεῖσθαι περὶ θνητῶν· ὥς οὐδὲ ἂν ἡμεῖς περὶ μυρμήκων· ὅτ' ἂν δὲ ἐπιλογίσῃται τὴν ποιητικὴν, ἔπεται τοῖς μύθοις καὶ τὴν ὑπόθεσιν ἐκτραγωδεῖ. συμμαχίας καὶ θεομαχίας παράγων*

“Whenever he [the poet] is looking at the reputation of the gods, then he says they would not be moved by anything concerning mortals. Just as we would not be moved concerning ants. But whenever he considers poetry, he follows the stories and makes the subject famous: bringing about alliances and wars among gods.”⁶⁰

This scholion, without a doubt, uses the first person plural to refer to humankind in general. Humankind should understand the disinterest of the gods as similar to the ambivalence of humans towards inferior creatures like ants. The second half of these scholia sheds light on how the Homeric scholars viewed the tradition of epic poetry. The first argument in the scholia explains why Hera appears to lose interest so easily. The second part explains that she does not lose interest for long. Even if humans are as interesting as ants, she and the other gods display a great deal of vested interest in the affairs of humankind in the *Iliad* and in other works of Greek literature. It would seem that the Homeric scholars viewed the emphasis on the gods’ involvement in the affairs of humans in epic poetry as unrealistic but entertaining fantasy. It is the will of the poet that makes the gods act with such extraordinary attention to human affairs. The phrase τὴν ὑπόθεσιν ἐκτραγωδεῖ, which I have translated after much deliberation as “he makes the subject famous,” indicates that the composition of themes and stories in the Homeric epics are popular because the poet creates drama amongst the gods. We could compare it to the

⁶⁰ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.e3:8.308

way the Greeks and Romans were fascinated by the lives of eminent men more powerful than they. Humankind on the whole is fascinated by the gods, beings more powerful and to a large extent unfathomable. The mystery in their behavior makes for good story-telling.

Some of the first person plural scholia blur the line between the audience and the author. For instance the first person plurals in a scholion of the Venetus A on line 8.284, can be interpreted as the collective audience, collective scholarly opinion, or both. Discussing Teucer's lineage and his status as a bastard, the scholion reads:

Ἡρακλῆς⁶¹

πορθήσας Ἴλιον Ἰσιώνην τὴν Λαομέδοντος θυγατέρα Πριαμοῦ δὲ ἀδελφὴν ἔλαβεν αἰχμάλωτον καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῇ γέρας Τελαμῶνι ὥς συστρατεύσαντι αὐτῷ ἄφ' ἧς ἔσχε Τευκρον ὁ Τελαμών ὥς οὖν ἀπο Τρωϊκῆς γυναικὸς τεχθέντα τὸν παῖδα Τεῦκρον ἐκάλεσαν προ ἀναπέμψαντες τὸν τόνον καὶ ποιήσαντες κύριον. Τευκροῖ γὰρ οἱ Τρῶες ἀπο τοῦ βασιλεύοντος αὐτῶν Τεύκρου. ἡ δὲ ἱστορία ἀκριβέστερον εἴρηται παρά τε ἄλλοις πολλοῖς καὶ παρα Ἀπολλωνίῳ τῷ γραμματικῷ ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ τῶν γενῶν· ἐζήτηται δὲ πῶς ἐξ ἀπάντων ἐπαινέσας τὸν Τεῦκρον νῦν ἐπιφέρει νόθον· ἡμεῖς δὲ φαμέν τοῦτο μὴ εἶναι πρὸς αἰσχύνῃς· δια τὸ παρα τοῖς παλαιοῖς ἔθος κρατοῦν, ἐτίμων γὰρ τοὺς νόθους ἐπ' ἴσης τοῖς γνησίοις· ἄλλως τε· εἰ καὶ αἰχμάλωτος ἡ Ἰσιώνη, ἄλλα βασιλὶς· ἔτι δὲ καὶ αὐξήσεως ἔνεκεν τοῦτο εἰρησθαι φαμέν ὅτι τῇ ἀρετῇ· καὶ τοὺς γνησίους ὑπερέβαλεν*

“Heracles:

Heracles laid waste to windy Ilium and he took captive the daughter of Laomedon and sister of Priam and gave her as a gift to Telemon since he joined him on the expedition. From her, Telemon had Teucer. Since he brought into the world by a Trojan woman, he called the child Teucer, moving the accent back and making it a proper noun. For the Trojans were called the Teucrians from their king Teucer. The story is more precisely told by many others and by Apollonius the grammarian in the second generation. It is asked how having received praise from everyone Teucer is now a bastard. We say that it was not a cause for dishonor. Because the custom of the ancients prevails. For they honored bastards equally with legitimate children. And otherwise if someone was a spearman or a

⁶¹ Ἡρακλῆς does not appear in line 8.284, but is clearly written in the semi-uncial script of lemmata.

commoner but a royal. And on account of the magnification, we say that this is said for excellence that he surpasses the legitimate children.”⁶²

Because the speaker in this scholion is citing other scholars, one of whom is explicitly named, it is quite possible that the “we” in this scholion indicates a collective scholarly opinion, the speaker agreeing with the sources he consulted. However, the scholion is also talking about issues of Greek culture and popular opinion, making it quite likely that the “we” refers to a Greek collective whole.

Another ambiguous scholion can be found in the Venetus A on lines 8.371-8.372. In these lines, after Hera appeals to Athena to aid the dying Greeks, Athena expresses her dissatisfaction with Zeus’s order for the gods to abstain from helping the Greeks. These particular lines recount Thetis’s request of Zeus in Book 1 when she asked Zeus to give Achilles glory. One scholiast felt it was superfluous for Athena to recount the story, especially to Hera who knows it perfectly well and so the scholion reads:

ἥ οἱ γούνατ' ἔκυσσε:
ἀθετοῦνται δύο στίχοι ὅτι οὐκ ἔδει κατὰ μέρος διηγῆσασθαι καὶ ταῦτα πρὸς τὴν καλῶς
εἰδυῖαν. καὶ μὴν οὐδὲ ἡμεῖς περισσόν τι προσιστοροῦμεν *

“She who kissed his knees:

The two lines are athetized because it is not necessary to describe in detail piece by piece and to one who already knows these things well. And indeed we do not narrate further something superfluous.”⁶³⁶⁴

⁶² urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.197

⁶³ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.241

⁶⁴ The two lines suggested for athetization read:
ἥ οἱ γούνατ' ἔκυσσε καὶ ἔλλαβε χειρὶ γενείου,
λίσσομένη τιμῆσαι Ἀχιλλῆα πτολίπορθον
“She [Thetis] who kissed his knees and grasped his chin with her hand,
begging that Achilles, besieger of cities be honored.”

This scholion leaves open several possibilities for the mysterious first person plural. One option is that the scholiast is talking about general good practices of story-telling. It is not good form to be repetitive or continue to narrate something that has already been explained at length. Conversely this philosophy would mean that the good reader or listener would be expected to remember everything that was said, even seven books of poetry later. Another option is to interpret the “we” in a far more limited sense. This “we” could refer to the Homeric scholars themselves. The scholiast could be talking about a generally agreed upon standard accepted by most Homeric scholars not to over-narrate an event that has been brought up previously. This interpretation, if it is correct, reflects the basic intentions of the ancient Homeric scholars as they sought to regularize and interpret their editions of the *Iliad*. A further limitation on this interpretation of the first person plural could narrow it down to two individuals, the author of this particular scholion and a source with which he agrees.

Other scholia are much easier to interpret. For example, there are two first person plural scholia in the Venetus A, which use the verb συνάπτωμεν. In these scholia the verb appears to indicate a preference for joining multiple lines together. The first scholion appears on line 8.95, where Diomedes laments that Hector will call him a coward if he retreats. The scholion reads:

μή τις τοι φεύγοντι:
 τινὲς διατέλλουσιν ἐπὶ τῷ φεύγοντι, καὶ συνάπτωμεν δὲ ὅλον τὸν στίχον ἵσμεν ὅτι οὐ τὸ
 μετάφρενον φεύγει [‡]

“May someone to you fleeing:
 Some make a distinction after the “φεύγοντι,” but let us also join the whole line. We
 know that a man's back does not flee.”⁶⁵

⁶⁵ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.80

Here the issue is punctuation for clarity. Some sources, otherwise unattributed, believe that a punctuation mark of some kind, probably a comma by our modern standards, should be present after φεύγοντι to make it clear that it is the entire man fleeing and not his back. συνάπτωμεν seems to be a collective we that includes the readers and the scholiast. ἴσμεν is also a first person plural and could be the same “we” as συνάπτωμεν but might also be just the readers.

The second scholion appears on line 8.171, where Zeus thunders three times to indicate that the Trojans are closer to victory, which causes the Greeks to retreat towards their ships. The scholion reads:

σῆμα τιθεῖς Τρώεσσι·
βραχὺ διασταλτέον ἐπὶ τὸ “Τρώεσσιν”· αὐτὸ γὰρ τὸ σημεῖον πρὸς τὸ σημαινόμενον
ὑπαντήσας εἶρηκε νίκην· ἐὰν δὲ συνάπτωμεν γίνεται σολοικοφανές *

“Giving the sign to the Trojans:

There ought to be some short pause after “Τρώεσσιν.” Because the sign itself indicates the signal for the subsequent victory. But if we join it together, it is incorrect syntax.”⁶⁶

Again the scholiast discusses punctuation, this time arguing that it should be present. Here the collective “we” would appear to refer to scholiasts. It is unclear whether this is the “royal we” or whether the scholiast is perhaps referring a source with which he agrees.

Other first person plurals speak to issues of interpretation and clarity. The Venetus A has a scholion on line 8.168, where Diomedes is debating whether to face Hector or retreat. The scholion reads:

⁶⁶ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.132

‡ἵππους τὲ στρέψαι:

ὅτι ὑποτάσσουσιν. "ἢ μήτε στρέψαι μήτ' ἀντίβιον μαχέσασθαι" (Il. 8.168a) οὐκ ἔστιν δέ· τὸ γὰρ "διάνδιχα" (Il. 8.167) οὐκ ἔστι δύο ἐμερίμνησεν ἐναντία ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ φερόμεθα "στρέψαι τοὺς ἵππους καὶ μάχεσθαι" *

"[Debating whether] to turn the horses around

The sign is there because it is in the subjunctive. "Neither to retreat nor to fight the enemy" (Il. 8.168a). But that is not so. For he was "of two minds" (Il. 8.167). It was not that he was worried about two different things, but that we interpret it the same: "to turn his horses and fight".⁶⁷

Here the speaker is almost definitely consulting more than one source. It seems a likely explanation that the scholiast consulted a source, agreed with this unnamed source, and unfortunately we have lost the knowledge of what this source was.

Other scholia of this type are similarly unclear. A scholion on line 8.355 of the Venetus A cites a disagreement with the scholar Aristarchus, but we have little idea of who the disagreeers are other than that they must be writing subsequent to the works of Aristarchus to cite him by name and disagree with him. The scholion reads:

ἀνεκτῶς:

ὥς ἀνδρικῶς Ἀρίσταρχος περισπᾷ λέλεκται δὲ ἡμῖν περὶ τῆς προσωδίας ὅποτε διελάβομεν περὶ τοῦ "ἢ δὴ λοίγια ἔργα τάδ' ἔσσεται οὐκέτ' ἀνεκτά" (Il. 1.573)

"Bearably:

Like ἀνδρικῶς, Aristarchus pronounces it with a circumflex, but it is said by us, regarding pronunciation, because we make a distinction regarding the [use of the word in] "ἢ δὴ λοίγια ἔργα τάδ' ἔσσεται οὐκέτ' ἀνεκτά".⁶⁸

⁶⁷ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.131

⁶⁸ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.236

Some of the scholia offer a better insight into the goals of the mystery first person plural commentators. A scholion of the Venetus A and a scholion of the Y.1.1 offer thoughts on the works these commentators produced. We should be careful, however, not to assume that the two scholia refer to the same individuals, especially because these notes are coming from two different manuscripts, but also because we can never be truly sure. The first of these scholia comments on lines 8.535-8.537 and reads:

αὐριον ἦν ἀρετην:

ὅτι ἢ τούτους δεῖ τοὺς τρεῖς στίχους μένειν οἷς τὸ ἀντίσιγμα παράκειται, ἢ τοὺς ἐξῆς τρεῖς οἷς αἱ στίγμαι παράκεινται⁶⁹ ἢ τοὺς ἐξῆς τρεῖς⁷⁰· εἰς γὰρ τὴν αὐτὴν γεγραμμένοι εἰσὶ διάνοιαν· ἐγκρίνει δὲ μᾶλλον ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος τοὺς δευτέρους δια τὸ καυχηματικώτερος εἶναι τοὺς λόγους ὁ δὲ Ζηνόδοτος τοὺς πρώτους τρεῖς οὐδὲ ἔγραφεν τὰ αὐτὰ δὲ λέγει περὶ τῶν στίχων τούτων ὁ Δίδυμος⁷¹ ἃ καὶ ὁ Ἀριστόνικος· δι ὃ οὐκ ἐγράψαμεν τὰ Διδύμου⁷²

“Tomorrow, which [will see] his excellence:

The sign is there because it is necessary to keep these three lines, on which he places an anti sigma. Or the following three, on which the stigma are placed. Because they explain what the meaning is. But Aristarchus rather accepts as genuine the second three because the words are more loudly boastful. But Zenodotus accepts as genuine the first three and he does not write the second three. But regarding these lines Didymus says the same things, as does Aristonicus, for which reasons we did not write the things of Didymus.”^{72 73}

Whoever the first person plural is in this scholion, it is clear that they are working with different editions of the *Iliad* and making judgments about what text to represent in a new edition. This

⁶⁹ Erbse notes to compare to *Iliad* 8.538-8.540.

⁷⁰ This phrase was marked with a series of dots written above it, a practice which in the Venetus A denotes that the words should not be present.

⁷¹ Erbse cites p. 115 Schm.

⁷² urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.340

⁷³ Antisigma indicate lines Aristarchus believes belong elsewhere and stigma indicate lines Aristarchus thinks are questionable but not necessarily worthy of athetization.

edition is coming after Zenodotus, Aristarchus, Aristonicus, and Didymus and its compiler had access to their works. How far back should we attempt to date this commentary? Is it the next generation of scholars after these named men or is it a later comment, possibly even from the scribe of the Venetus A? We will certainly not be able to tell from a single scholion.

The scholion in the Y.1.1 similarly discusses variant readings. This scholion refers to line 8.377-8.378 and reads:

ἡθικῶς καὶ τοῦτο πρὸς τὸ "ὁ δὲ μαίνεται οὐκ ἔτ' ἀνεκτῶς" (Il. 8.355)· "προφανεῖσα" δὲ γράφει Ἀρίσταρχος· δυνικῶς· ὁ δὲ Ἡρωδιανὸς· "προφανείσας" βούλεται· συστέλλων Δωρικῶς τὸ "α"· ᾧ καὶ πειθόμεθα*

“Expressively and this regarding the [line]: "one who rages beyond what can be endured" (Il. 8.355). Aristarchus writes "προφανεῖα" in the dual. But Herodian would rather "προφανείσας" contracting the alpha in the Doric dialect, by which we are also persuaded.”⁷⁴

The poetic text in this manuscript reads προφανείσας, corresponding to the version of the text this scholion prefers. Therefore it is possible that the “we” of this scholion refers to the scribe or scribes who assembled the Y.1.1 or their preferred source. These scholia certainly need more work and, like many of the issues I investigated, will benefit from a broader range of data to draw from.

Finally, there are first person singular scholia that appear to cite a particular editor’s or scholar’s opinion on the text. Most of the scholia I was able to read come from the Venetus A, one of the first of which refers to line 8.178, where in a speech to the Trojans, Hector calls the temporary walls the Greeks built around their ships weak and ineffective. The scholion reads:

⁷⁴ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.e3:8.264

ἀβληχρά:⁷⁵

Ἡρακλείδης ὁ Μειλήσιος βαρύνει ὡς ἄσητα. λόγῳ δὲ χρῆται τούτῳ ὡς ὅτι βληχρον ἐστὶ τὸ ἰσχυρόν ὅπερ κατα στέρησιν ὀφείλει λέγεσθαι "ἄβληχρος" ὡς "ἄκακος" σημαίνει γὰρ τὸ ἀσθενές. ἢ μέντοι παράδοσις ὀξύνει τὸ "ἀβληχρὰ" καὶ "ἀβληχρὴν" (Il. 5.337) πεισθεῖσα πρῶτον τῷ παρασχηματισμῷ ὡς ἀπλῶ, οὕτως γὰρ παρεσχηματίσθη ὡς "πενιχρά" "ψυχρά" λέγω δὲ θηλυκῶς οὕτως "ἀβληχρά" οὐ κοινωνοῦντός ποτὲ τοῦ γένους· λέγω δὲ ὁ "ἀβληχρὸς" καὶ ἡ "ἀβληχρος". ἄλλως τε ἡδὴ αὐτὸ τὸ "βληχρὸς" σημαίνει. ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖστον μᾶλλον τὸ ἀσθενές Ἀλκαῖος "θ" "βληχρῶν ἀνέμων ἀχείμαντοι πνοαί"· καὶ ὁ Νίκανδρος "βληχρὸν γὰρ μυδὸς οἷα μυληβόρου ἐν χροῖ νύγμα"· τούτῳ δὴ πλεονάσαν τὸ "α" φυλάξει τὸν αὐτὸν τόνον ἀεὶ οἶδα γὰρ τὸ ἄβορος ἄγαυρος ἄσταχυς *⁷⁶

“Weak:

Heraclides the Milesian⁷⁶ writes it with a grave accent on the ultima, like "ἄσητα"⁷⁷, and he uses this word as a stronger version of "βληχρον." It ought to mean "not weak" like "ἄκακος" means "not evil," but it means "ἀσθενές" ("without strength"). Indeed, grammatical tradition marks it with an acute accent. "ἀβληχρὰ" and "ἀβληχρὴν" (Il. 5.337) prevailed first by declining as if it is uncompounded. For so they are declined like "πενιχρά" and "ψυχρά." And I write it in the feminine since in this way "ἀβληχρά" does not have any common gender. And I write "ὁ ἀβληχρὸς" and "ἡ ἀβληχρος." Elsewhere already "βληχρὸς" means the same thing. For the most part, since [the meaning] is ἀσθενες [without strength] instead. Alcaeus 8 has "βληχρῶν ἀνέμων ἀχείμαντοι πνοαί" "not stormy blasts of weak wind."⁷⁸ And Nicandros writes "βληχρὸν γὰρ μυδὸς οἷα μυληβόρου ἐν χροῖ νύγμα" "for the weakness of the mouse was a sort of millstone-eating, like pricking on the skin."⁷⁹ Indeed adding the alpha to it keeps the accent in the same place. Because I know that the accent is always the same in "ἄβορος," "ἄγαυρος," and "ἄσταχυς."⁸⁰

⁷⁵ In the text of the *Iliad* in the Venetus A, the word is written ἀβληχρ' with a grave accent floated above the elision mark.

⁷⁶ Erbse cites fr. 7 C.

⁷⁷ We are still uncertain as to what the scholiast means by ἄσητα as it does not appear in the LSJ and any logical substitutions for Byzantine orthography do not make sense, and it furthermore does not have a grave accent on the ultima as the βαρύνει would indicate.

⁷⁸ Erbse cites fr. 319 L. – P.

⁷⁹ Erbse cites ther. 446.

⁸⁰ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.133

The scholion discusses the issues of accenting and deciphering the meaning of ἀβληχρ' in line 8.178. Everything is thrown into question by the presence of the initial alpha and whether it is an alpha-privative or an intensifier. What we can tell so far about the mysterious first person commentator, is that he uses verbs like λέγω and οἶδα, he comments on issues of accentation and meaning, and he had at his disposal other editions of *Iliad* (namely one by a certain Heraclides) and a knowledge of Greek poetry besides the Homeric epics to quote.

The issue gets even more intriguing when we look at the Y.1.1. This manuscript too has a scholion on line 8.178, but instead of commenting on ἀβληχρ' this scholion comments on οὐδενόσωρα. The scholion reads:

ὅφ' "ἐν" τὸ "οὐδενόσωρα". εἰ καὶ σπάνιος ἡ τοιαύτη σύνθεσις· λέγω δὲ ἐξ ἀποφάσεως καὶ συνδέσμου καὶ τῆς ἐνὸς γενικῆς τελείας· τινὲς δὲ οὐδενὸς φυλακτικά· πιθανὸν δὲ καὶ τὸ ὑπογούου ἔργου μεμνησθαι. τῶν Ἀχαιῶν τὴν πρᾶξιν ἐξευτελίζοντα.*

From "ἐν" ("one") "οὐδενόσωρα." Because such a compound also is rare. But I say it is [a compound] from the negation and the conjunction [i.e. δε] and from the genitive ending "ἐνὸς." But others preserve it as "οὐδενός." But it is persuasive to remember that it is a recent work [i.e. the wall], when he [Hector] is greatly disparaging the action of the Achaeans.⁸¹

It is tempting to think that the authors of these two scholia are the same person, but we must keep in mind that this scholion appears in a different manuscript from the first one and nothing is attested about οὐδενόσωρα in the Venetus A. Still, this scholion uses the same verb λέγω and has a similar preoccupation with analyzing the components of the word. This scholion treads more in the realm of etymology than the Venetus A scholion, but it is highly believable that this scholion hails from the same source as the Venetus A scholion on this line. It is possible that there was a

⁸¹ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.e3:8.107

single source that discussed these types of inquiries and the scribes selected different scholia for this line for their respective manuscripts. Continued research into scholia that discuss word etymologies would be a fruitful first step as we investigate this issue further. If we can find similar patterns in the text of the scholia then we can begin to assemble a reasonable argument about the sources of the scholia.

Another scholion that uses the first person is the most debatable case I found. It appears on lines 8.188-8.190, where Hector talks about how Andromache feeds his horses. The issue at stake is the appropriate order of the lines. The scholiast here argues for one order on the basis that wine must be mixed before it is consumed and therefore the poetry should talk about mixing first. The scholion reads:

ὕμῃν παρ προτέροισι
τὸ ἐξῆς τοῦτο ἐστὶν "ἢ εμοὶ ὅς πέρ οἱ θαλερὸς πόσις εὐχομαι εἶναι" (190) "οἶνον τ' ἐγκεράσασα πιεῖν ὅτε" μοι "θυμὸς ἀνώγοι" (189) ἴστεον δὲ ὅτι προ τοῦ εὐρεθῆναι τὴν τῶν ποτηρίων χρῆσιν κέρασιν ἔπινον *⁸²

“Set before you:

This is the appropriate line order in my opinion: "ἢ εμοὶ ὅς πέρ οἱ θαλερὸς πόσις εὐχομαι εἶναι" (190) then, "οἶνον τ' ἐγκεράσασα πιεῖν ὅτε θυμὸς ἀνώγοι" (189) and one must see that before being able to make use of the drinking cups they mix the drink.”⁸²

This particular scholion poses a challenge because the use of the first person is subtle. It also debatable whether or not this is a genuine first person outside of a quote. We have what appears to be an out of place use of μοι, located in the middle of the second quoted line in the scholion. It is not unusual for a scholiast to interrupt a quote, but generally it is done with a verb like φημί. The Venetus A does not include the μοι in the main line of the poetry and its presence would

⁸² urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.137

render the line unmetrical, although still grammatically and logically correct. I would be less inclined to believe that this is a genuine first person if we did not have a similar usage in another scholion.

An earlier scholion on line 8.150, similarly uses the personal pronoun to express a preference for a specific reading. In these lines, Diomedes discusses the shame he would feel at Hector deriding him for retreating, saying that he would rather be swallowed up by the earth than endure it. The scholion reads:

ὥς πότ' ἀπειλήσει
ὅτι οὐκ ἐν τῷ καθόλου "εὐρεῖαν" λέγει, ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ "εὐρεῖα" ἢ γῇ γένοιτο ἀντὶ τοῦ "εὐρὺ
χάσμα" ποιήσει *

“So that he may someday boast:

The sign is there because in general he [the poet] does not say “εὐρεῖαν,” but in my opinion the earth would become “εὐρεῖα” instead of it making a “broad chasm.””⁸³

Here there is no question that the ἐμοὶ is genuinely a first person reference. There is no quote it could be a part of and it does not seem like a likely error. This scholion starts with the word ὅτι, which leads me to believe that it is quite possibly attributable to Aristarchus.⁸⁴ There is also a dipole on the line, further reinforcing this hypothesis. It would be wonderful if we could reinforce this hypothesis with evidence from the Y.1.1. Unfortunately the Y.1.1 scholion not only has no citation of any particular source, but it also has slightly different content. It reads:

τὸ "εὐρεῖα" ἀντὶ τοῦ "εὐρέως" κρείσσων δέ φησι θάνατος ψόγου*

⁸³ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.117

⁸⁴ Scholarship on this aspect of ancient Homeric scholarship is quite recent. The HMT has published this initial blog post: <http://homermultitext.blogspot.com/2012/06/identifying-aristarchean-commentary-in.html>. Further work by Thomas Arralde, a fellow undergraduate contributor to the Multitext project, will be published in a forthcoming article by the Center for Hellenic Studies.

It is “ἐὐρεῖα” instead of “ἐὐρέως,” and he says that death is better than disgrace.⁸⁵

The two scholia agree on the same reading of the line, but offer different rejected alternatives. Occasionally we find that an Y.1.1 scholion will reinforce the theory that the ὅτι scholia of the Venetus A are attributable to Aristarchus but not so in this case. Here we find an instance of slightly differing traditions between the two manuscripts.

Returning again to issues of first person singulars in the scholia, one of the few first persons I managed to find in the Y.1.1 appears in a scholion on line 8.70. Here, Zeus is seen weighing the fates of the Achaeans and the Trojans before battle. The scholion debates the logical issue of why there are two separate fates when there is only one outcome to the battle. I transcribed the scholion as follows:

πῶς δύο κῆρας ἐντίθησιν ὁ Ζεὺς ὥσπερ ἀνὰ μίαν ἑκατέρου στρατοῦ. ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἐξῆς⁸⁶ πλείους αὐτὰς φησιν· "αἱ μὲν Ἀχαιῶν κῆρες" (Il. 8.73)· ὅτι αἱ δύο καὶ πολλαὶ ἂν εἶεν· λέγομεν γοῦν διττὰ πράγματα· πλειόνων δὲ ἔμφασιν διδόντος τοῦ ὀνόματος, εἰκότως ἐν τῇ μεταλήψει πλεονας εἶπεν· ἔστι δὲ τὸ σχῆμα. συνεκδοχικῶν σχημάτων ἐν· κῆρ δὲ εἴρηται παρὰ τὸ καίω· διὰ πυρὸς γὰρ ἔθαπτοντο· εἰ δὲ τὴν ψυχὴν δηλοῖ. παρὰ τὸν κηρόν· δίκην γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὰ μαθήματα ἐν ἑαυτῇ ἀπομάττεται⁸⁷

“How does Zeus set down two fates as there is one end for each army? In these matters they say that "πλείους" is a logical arrangement of words: "αἱ μὲν Ἀχαιῶν κῆρες" ("the fates of the Achaeans") (Il. 8.73). Because there may be "δύο" two or "πολλαὶ" many. Indeed I say that matters are twofold. But others it is "πλειονων" with the noun giving emphasis. Similarly in a change of case he [the poet] said "πλεονας." It is a figure of speech, one of the measuring out together figures of speech. Death is said to be like burning. Therefore one is put to rest through fire. If it releases the soul as if it were. For one customarily searches for knowledge in oneself.”⁸⁷

⁸⁵ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.e3:8.90

⁸⁶ Erbse notes to compare to *Iliad* 8.73-8.74.

⁸⁷ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.e3:8.44

One of the first things that struck me about this scholion is that is arranged much like one of Porphyry's Homeric Questions. It presents a problem of logic and resolves it. In fact, there is a lengthy entry on the topic in Schrader's edition of Porphyry's Homeric Questions, *Porphyrii quaestionum Homericarum ad Iliadem pertinentium reliquiae*.⁸⁸ Some of the thoughts expressed in the Schrader edition appear similar. If anything, we may have a highly abbreviated, slightly adapted version of that text. It would be useful to further investigate this connection to the Homeric Questions and what that means for the mysterious first person present in this scholion.

Speaking more generally about first person scholia, we can make a few more observations about the type of scholia that use the first person. When the first person scholiast uses the personal pronoun he is making judgements on the Iliadic text, be it understanding the logic behind the poetry or making decisions about what is genuine text of the *Iliad*. This practice is something that most of the scholia generally do but rarely with such a personal endorsement. It is possible, though not definitively proven, that we might be able to attribute some of this material to Aristarchus or perhaps another famous scholar. We cannot make too many assumptions about how interconnected these scholia were. They use different styles or combinations of styles. They comment on varying topics, and there are rarely parallels between the two manuscripts. Further research across a wider range of data and a refined automated search system are necessary to continue investigating these scholia and the patterns between them.

⁸⁸ Edition published in the Teubner in 1880.

Chapter 7: The Ancient Homeric Scholars

The scholia that cite the ancient Homeric scholars are fruitful for discussion, not only because studying them reveals some of the intricacies of relationships between the scholars and their texts but also reveals aspects of how their work was handed down to us. By systematically analyzing the content of these scholia I was able to formulate hypotheses about how the work of the ancient scholars is presented. In particular, as I began to pull references to multiple Alexandrian scholars, I noticed that they were not always referenced in the nominative singular. In this chapter, I would like to investigate some of the methods by which the scholia refer to the Alexandrian scholars. Many modern scholars have weighed in on the topic and have offered suggestions, some more forcefully than others, as to how we should handle these references and what we should conclude about the Alexandrian scholars and their works. I will offer some new suggestions on the issue.

The first type of these references to the Alexandria scholars has been fairly authoritatively handled by Eleanor Dickey in *Ancient Greek Scholarship*. Often the scholia refer to an ancient scholar in the accusative singular, preceded by οἱ περὶ. For example, see this scholion of the Venetus A on line 8.290:

οἱ περὶ Ζηνόδοτον καὶ Ἀριστοφάνη "ἴπω":

Zenodotus and Aristophanes and those who agree with them [write] ἴπω.⁸⁹

Dickey writes that: “περὶ commonly has an inclusive use when preceded by a form of οἱ, so that οἱ περὶ Ζηνόδοτον (literally “those around Zenodotus,” i.e. Zenodotus’ followers) means

⁸⁹ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msAim:8.200

‘Zenodotus and his followers.’”⁹⁰ When we see scholia that use περί like this, we can begin to piece together a picture of not just Aristophanes coming after Zenodotus and agreeing with his choices, but subsequent scholars who were using the works of both authors to write their commentaries.

Another plural that is perhaps less definitively understood, appears as αἱ and the genitive form of a scholar’s name (e.g. αἱ Ἀριστάρχου or αἱ Ζηνοδότου). The question is: what does αἱ refer to? West, writing under the assumption that we should attribute scholia using this formula to Didymus, states that Aristarchus published two separate editions (ἔκδοσεις) of the *Iliad*.⁹¹ West’s theory, however, only accounts for Aristarchus, not other ancient scholars who also appear with αἱ, and is furthermore predicated on the assumption that the scholia he analyzes are attributable to Didymus, who the end of book subscriptions in the Venetus A indicate as writing about the διόρθωσις of Aristarchus.⁹² However, Gregory Nagy urges caution in how we should interpret the idea of an edition.⁹³ He further outlines the historical view of Aristarchus’s works, based on the combined works of Pfeiffer and Janko.⁹⁴ This interpretation of Aristarchus’s work is that Aristarchus first wrote an edition (ἔκδοσις) of Homer and a commentary (ὑπόμνημα) based on the edition of his predecessor, Aristophanes of Byzantium, and then wrote a separate edition and commentary thereafter.⁹⁵ According to West’s theory, the nominative plural αἱ refers to these two distinct editions and not the commentaries, but we ought to keep in mind that the evidence

⁹⁰ Dickey 2007: 119.

⁹¹ West, *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad*. 2003: 61-62.

⁹² See Chapter One above.

⁹³ Nagy *Poetry as Performance*: 115-116.

⁹⁴ Nagy *Poetry as Performance*: 115; also see footnote 40.

⁹⁵ Nagy *Poetry as Performance*: 115; Pfeiffer 1968: 215.

for this theory is the scholia themselves and the scholia are not explicit. We should also note that the nominative plural itself does not imply specifically two, but only more than one of something. We must also keep in mind that the scholarly discussion I have outlined pertains only to the work of Aristarchus and does not consider the other ancient scholars similarly referred to with the nominative plural feminine article.

I propose another option for interpretation: that the plural form of the definite article does not refer to multiple editions, since the word for edition or text is omitted, but based on the content of the scholia, could refer to the text and the commentary written by each ancient scholar. This interpretation does present some problems because the article always appears in the feminine, meaning the omitted word ought to be feminine and plural. The word for commentary, ὑπόμνημα, is neuter, and therefore unlikely to be intended by αἱ. As we have seen with a phrase like οἱ περὶ Ζηνόδοτον, Greek can often express an inclusive idea without that being the literal translation. As Nagy cautions, ἔκδοσαις might not refer specifically to an edition by our modern interpretation, rather it might refer to texts of the ancient scholars in a broader sense or, as Nagy suggests, a text of a more critical nature.⁹⁶ Nagy discusses the rather complicated relationship between an ἔκδοσαις and a διόρθωσις.⁹⁷ Both terms we can generally define as a text or an edition, but διόρθωσις would appear to have a stricter sense of being a text that seeks some sort of authority or correctness.⁹⁸ Both terms are also feminine and therefore could be implied by the feminine plural article. Nagy outlines this possibility somewhat explicitly, though points out, as many other scholars do, that we have little idea of how “critical” we could consider a

⁹⁶ Nagy *Poetry as Performance*: 115-116.

⁹⁷ Nagy *Poetry as Performance*: 115-116.

⁹⁸ See Pfeiffer 1968: 216.

διόρθωσις.⁹⁹ It is unlikely that a διόρθωσις would be anything like our modern sense of a critical edition. The root meaning of the word would suggest some measure of selectivity and revision in the production of the text, but what that entailed to an Alexandrian scholar is unclear to us. We may also want to consider the physical artifacts written by the Alexandrian scholars. They wrote their editions before the codex was widely used. Therefore they wrote their editions of the *Iliad* on one scroll and their commentaries on another, hence creating two separate artifacts. To play it on the conservative side, I have chosen to translate αἱ as “the texts.” When we look at the wording of the scholia, we begin to see a clear pattern that two different artifacts must be referred to. For example on line 8.213, a scholion reads:

τῶν δ' ὅσον ἐκ νηῶν ἀπο πύργου τάφος ἔεργε:
διχῶς αἱ Ἀριστάρχου· "ἔεργε" καὶ "ἔρυκε".¹⁰⁰

“The trench encloses the space all the way from the ships to the tower:
The texts of Aristarchus have it two ways: "ἔεργε" and "ἔρυκε."”¹⁰¹

The main text in the Venetus A reads ἔεργε, indicating a preference by the Venetus A scribe or his source for one version over the other. It is entirely possible that ἔεργε is a reading that Aristarchus included in his edition of the text and ἔρυκε is another reading he includes in his commentary. The scholion does not give any evidence for which form might be right or a later emendation by Aristarchus from one edition of the *Iliad* to another. Therefore I think it unlikely that the two readings come from two different editions Aristarchus produced.

⁹⁹ Nagy *Poetry as Performance*: 115-116. See also Eleanor Dickey’s definition for διόρθωσις in Dickey 2007: 232. Also see Pfeiffer’s discussion of Zenodotus, Aristarchus, and the verb διορθοῦν in Tzetzes in Pfeiffer 1968: 105-107, 110-111.

¹⁰⁰ The scholia continues on from here, but for the sake of this point, the remaining comments are unnecessary.

¹⁰¹ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.152

We should also consider, before we get too attached to the idea that we should interpret the feminine plural article as evidence that Aristarchus wrote two separate editions, that the nominative plural feminine article appears with names besides Aristarchus. In the *Iliad* 8 scholia alone, we also see the αἱ with the names of Herodian and Aristophanes. I would venture to predict that we would find αἱ with the names of other scholars if we expanded the investigation beyond *Iliad* 8. Future inquiries aside, the evidence cannot be overlooked. Before we make assumptions on only the text of Aristarchus, we must consider that we have the same evidence appearing with Herodian and Aristophanes of Byzantium. It seems a serious assumption to claim that these authors also wrote multiple editions.

In the presence of αἱ with names besides that of Aristarchus, it becomes increasingly apparent that we ought not rely wholly on what we might be able to ascertain from what might be the text of Didymus. In a scholion on line 8.296, we find the genitive singular of Herodian, after αἱ Ἀριστάρχου. Here I made my translation of the text based on two assumptions. One, that the punctuation between δεδεγμένος and Ἡρωδιανοῦ, as you will see below, indicated a distinction between two separate sentences, and two, that the parallel of Ἀριστάρχου and Ἡρωδιανοῦ permits us to supply αἱ with Ἡρωδιανοῦ. I have transcribed this scholion as follows:

ἐκ τοῦ δὴ τόξοισι δεδεγμένος·
οὕτως αἱ Ἀριστάρχου διὰ τοῦ "γ" "δεδεγμένος"· Ἡρωδιανοῦ διὰ τοῦ "χ" "δεδεγμένος".
καὶ φασὶ Διογένης. ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασι. ὅτι "εἰρωνευόμενος" λέγει οἶον "δεξιούμενος
τοῖς τόξοις"· τὸ γὰρ δεδέχεσθαι δεξιούσθαι ἐστὶν οὐκ ἀχαρὶς ἢ ἐξήγησις †

“From that moment waiting with bows:

Thus the texts of Aristarchus have δεδεγμένος with a gamma. The texts of Herodian have “δεδεγμένος” with a chi. And Diogenes says in the commentaries, that he writes

“εἰρωνεύμενος” something like “δεξιούμενος τοῖς τόξοις.” Because to wait/expect is to welcome not without charm or explanation.”¹⁰²

I find it unlikely that the plural refers to a single text of Aristarchus and a single text of Herodian because there is no conjunction and if it was a single text from each other, it would make more sense if both scholars were cited in the nominative singular with an active verb. Therefore we are most likely considering more than one artifact from each scholar. If we were only meant to understand one artifact from Herodian, it seems more likely that the scholiast would have provided the singular ἦ with his name. Notably the formulation of citation changes when the scholion references Diogenes and refers specifically to his commentaries.¹⁰³ The scholion specifically uses the phrase ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασι to refer to Diogenes’s commentaries. It seems more than likely that the scholiast is choosing to distinguish here to what sort of work he refers. Therefore it is likely that the plural article refers to some type of work that is not merely a ὑπόμνημα, but something else. I think it is more probable that the αἱ is not referring to separate editions of Aristarchus or Herodian, but both to their editions and to their respective commentaries or works that offer variant readings. If there were two different editions of a scholar’s text, it would make the most sense to note that there are two when they are in disagreement, but if that were the case, why would the scholion refer to two editions if they agree? It would make more sense if the scholiast refers to the readings of Aristarchus and Herodian by citing the scholars in the nominative. Therefore there must be some other reason

¹⁰² urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.199

¹⁰³ This Diogenes is likely Diogenes of Tarsus, who is said to have made inquiries into poetry, likely Homeric poetry, according to Diogenes Laertius X.118.

multiple texts are being noted. I think it is the case that the scholion wants to draw the reader's attention to the idea that both the text and a scholarly commentary note these readings.

The scholia of *Iliad* 8 offer a plethora of examples, but at risk of discussing the issue ad nauseam, I will detail only one more scholion. Discussing the unusual use of βέλος to indicate not the weapon but the wound itself in like 8.513, the scholion reads:

‡ἀλλ' ὥς τις τούτον¹⁰⁴ γε βέλος
ὅτι "βέλος" εἶρηκε τὸ τραῦμα ὁμωνύμως τῷ τιτρώσκοντι. αἱ Ἀριστοφάνους "πέσσοι".
Παρμενίσκος δὲ ἐν τῷ α Πρὸς Κράτητα¹⁰⁵ ὡς Ἀριστάρχειον γραφὴν προφέρεται, "ἀλλ' ὥς
τις κείνων γε"[‡]

“But so that some missile:

The sign is there because he said the weapon to indicate the wound, it being a homonym for wounding. The texts of Aristophanes have πέσσοι. And Parmeniscus¹⁰⁶ in Book One of Regarding Dominance, like the Aristarchean writing, has "ἀλλ' ὥς τις κείνων γε."¹⁰⁷

Here again we see a scholar besides Aristarchus appearing with the feminine plural article to offer a variant reading of the line. Also cited are a work by Parmeniscus and the vague “Aristarchean writing.” It may be worth pondering that γραφή is also a feminine noun, equally a possibility for the noun understood by the feminine article. However, the singular here would imply that there is only one possibility for the Aristarchean writing, making the theory of two separate editions unlikely because the reader would not know which edition to reference. If the γραφή is just the text or the commentary, or even the collective of the two, the reader would have

¹⁰⁴ The lemma has τούτον, but the line in the Venetus A reads τούτων. The difference in readings is likely explained by differences in Byzantine orthography, that often exchanges omicrons for omegas and vice versa.

¹⁰⁵ Erbse cites fr. 2 Br.

¹⁰⁶ Parmeniscus appears to be a little known grammarian and commentator who is only preserved in the scholia of Homer and a few other authors.

¹⁰⁷ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.321

little trouble distinguishing the source. Returning to the issue of Aristophanes's texts as mentioned in this scholion, we can conclude that Aristophanes wrote more than one text from which the scholiast could draw. Especially given that the line requires some explanations of logic and vocabulary, it is more than likely that Aristophanes would have written some sort of commentary for this line. If indeed he did then we can ponder the possibility that the plural article indicates that in the process of studying the texts, the Alexandrian scholars and those who followed them would consult both editions of the text and their commentaries and allude to both in their explanations of multiforms.

Another variation of this type of reference appears as the singular article ἡ with the genitive singular of a scholar. I would propose that in the singular, the scholiast refers either to just the poetic text or some sort of critical investigations of the text. One example of this usage can be found on line 8.304 of the Venetus A. I have transcribed the scholion as follows:

Ἀρίσταρχος "Αἰσύμνηθεν" καὶ ἡ Ζηνοδοτοῦ καὶ ἡ Ἀριστοφάνους

"Aristarchus writes: "Αἰσύμνηθεν" as does the text of Zenodotus and the text of Aristophanes."¹⁰⁸

In the Venetus A, the word appears without breathings as Αἰσύμνηθεν and in the Y.1.1 it appears with a smooth breathing as Αἰσύμνηθεν. One of the more problematic references to works of Aristarchus appears on line 8.405 of the Venetus A. The scholion reads:

ἔλκε ἀπαλθήσεσθον
ἐν τῇ ἑτέρᾳ τῶν Ἀριστάρχου "ἔλκε ἀπαλθήσονται" καὶ μήποτε κρείττων τὰ ἔλκη
ἀπαλθήσονται *

¹⁰⁸ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msAim:8.213

“They shall thoroughly heal the wounds:

In the other [text] of Aristarchus it is "ἔλκε ἀπαλθήσονται" and there never is the superior form: "ἔλκη ἀπαλθήσονται."¹⁰⁹¹¹⁰

It is unclear what exactly is meant by ἑτέρα. What is this “other thing” of Aristarchus? This reference could perhaps support West’s hypothesis that Aristarchus wrote two editions of the *Iliad* but which edition is this one? If it is not another edition of the *Iliad* text, then what is it? I suggest that it could be referring to another *scroll*, i.e. the scroll that contains Aristarchus’s commentary on the *Iliad*, not his text.

Other references to the Alexandrian scholars are fairly clear. Occasionally they are used with prepositions like ἐν, πρὸς, and παρὰ. ἐν and πρὸς seem to be used when referring to specific readings in texts. For example, a scholion on line 8.166 of the Venetus A reads:

‡ ἐν τῇ Ζηνοδοτοῦ "ποτμον ἐφήσω"‡

“In the text of Zendotos [it is] "ποτμον ἐφήσω."¹¹¹

A scholion using πρὸς on line 8.56 reads:

παυρότεροι:

ὅτι ἐλάσσους ἀεὶ τοὺς Τρῶας συν τοῖς ἐπικούροις λέγει ἢ δε ἀναφορὰ πρὸς ἐκεῖνα τὰ ἀθετούμενα, "πολλέων ἐκ πολίων ἐγχέσπαλοι ἄνδρες" (Il. 2.131)· καὶ πρὸς Ζηνόδοτον γράφοντα,· "μυρία δ' ἐν πεδίῳ"¹¹²‡

¹⁰⁹ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.259

¹¹⁰ The scholion seems to be saying that the contracted form, which is considered the superior form, never appears in the text of Homer. This argument would make sense as contracted forms originated long after the beginning of the epic tradition.

¹¹¹ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msAint:8.128

¹¹² Erbse recommends comparing to *Iliad* 8.562.

“Smaller

The sign is there because he [the poet] always says the Trojans with their allies are a smaller group. And the repetition with respect to those athetized lines, for example "πολλεων ἐκ πολίων ἐχξέσπαλοι ἄνδρες" (Il. 2.131) as opposed to the work of Zenodotus "μυρία δ' ἐν πεδίῳ".¹¹³

πρός we could more specifically translate as “as opposed to” with the implication of a disagreement. Both ἐν and πρὸς in these scholia appear with quoted alternatives for the text. On the other hand, παρὰ seems to be used when talking about athetization and lines that do not exist in some editions of the text. For example on line 8.284 of the Venetus A, a scholion reads:

καί σε νόθον περ ἑόντα:
παρα Ζηνοδότῳ, οὐδε ἦν· ἠθέτητο δὲ καὶ παρα Ἀριστοφάνει ὅτι ἄκαιρος ἡ γενεαλογία
καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσα προτροπὴν ἀλλὰ τοῦναντίον ὀνειδισμὸν καὶ ἀποτροπὴν *

“And indeed you being a bastard:

In Zenodotus,¹¹⁴ the line was not there. And it is athetized in Aristophanes because the family history is inappropriate and does not suit an exhortation but rather is a reproach and a dissuasion [from action].¹¹⁵

The scholion is discussing the controversial point in the narrative where Agamemnon is exhorting the other Greeks, but notably and to the modern and some ancient ears inappropriately, pointing out that Teucer is the illegitimate son of Telamon. In this scholion, παρὰ is used to refer to the editions of the main text produced by both Zenodotus and Aristophanes and discuss their approach to dealing with the line.

¹¹³ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.47

¹¹⁴ According to the LSJ παρὰ with the dative can be used in the technical sense to mean “in” when introducing a quotation or perhaps in this case referring to a specific point in a text since the scholia refer to athetization rather than quoted lines.

¹¹⁵ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.196

We have a similar occurrence on line 8.557 of the Venetus A, where the scholion reads:

ἔκ τ' ἔφανεν πᾶσαι:

ἀθετεῖται ὅτι οἰκειότερον ἔχει κατὰ τὴν Πατρόκλου ἐπιφάνειαν.¹¹⁶ καὶ ὁ ἐξῆς¹¹⁷ δὲ συναθετεῖται αὐτῷ ἐκεῖ γὰρ αἰφνίδιον βούλεται ἐπίλαμψιν παραστῆσαι αἰφνιδίως Πατρόκλου ἐπιφανέντος· ἐνταῦθα δὲ παρατεταμένην νηνεμίην κατ' εὐδίαν· οὐκ εφέροντο δὲ οὐδὲ παρα Ζηνοδότῳ. ἠθέτει δὲ καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης *

“From which everything is seen:

The line is athetized because it is rather similar to the looking down on Patroclus. And what follows is athetized along with it because he wishes to stand there suddenly illuminated, so that Patroclus may be viewed suddenly. But there the stillness is stretched out for tranquility. It is not transmitted in Zenodotus's edition. And Aristophanes also athetized it.”¹¹⁸

Here too, we find the reference to Zenodotus's edition leaving out a line with the preposition

παρὰ. We have yet another case again on line 8.371 of the Venetus A, which reads:

οὐδὲ παρὰ Ζηνοδότῳ ἦσαν *

“The lines were not in Zenodotus's edition.”¹¹⁹

On the topic of athetization, it has been fairly well established that the critical signs present in the Venetus A harken back to the critical signs of Aristarchus, who we know marked lines for athetization with a horizontal bar called an obelus.¹²⁰ As we can see from the last three scholia mentioned above, different scholars had different methods of dealing with problematic lines.

¹¹⁶ Erbse cites *Iliad* 16.299 as fruitful for comparison.

¹¹⁷ Erbse claims the line referred to is *Iliad* 16.300.

¹¹⁸ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.346

¹¹⁹ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.246

¹²⁰ Bird, “Critical Signs” in *Recapturing Homeric Legacy* 2009: 92.

Zenodotus frequently prefers to omit problematic lines as evidenced by the above scholia.

Aristophanes, we can see, has some method of marking lines for athetization. Whether he has a system of critical signs that are the same as Aristarchus' or similar is unknown. However, we can start to draw conclusions about the practices of these ancient scholars as individuals and how they dealt with problems in the text.

Other issues with the Alexandrian scholars begin to get at the fundamental questions we have about the texts they produced and what they entailed. It is a difficult issue because our evidence for their works comes largely from the scholia themselves. The scholia are rarely explicit and much is left to the interpretation of the reader and the individual creativity of the scholar producing solutions. The feminine plural article and what we ought to supply as a noun, for instance, has been debated by scholars for decades. The more we begin to understand about the practices of the Alexandrian scholars, through close study of references to them, the closer we can get to determining what is implied by $\alpha\iota$ and the closer we can get to answer the broader questions of how critical were their critical editions and how close the ancient sense of an edition is to our modern sense of an edition.

Conclusions

A project like this one is monumental to say the least and it is of course thanks to many people that I was able to accomplish as much as I did. Still, there is much left to be investigated. While I was able to start forming conclusions about scribal practices and ancient Homeric scholarship, it is glaringly obvious that many of the issues I investigated require further exploration. For example, the first person scholia should be examined more thoroughly in Book 8 as we refine the tools of our automated searches. The automated verification system is currently available only for the Venetus A scholia and searches for specific words and forms must be conducted manually, subject to human error. Because of the narrow scope of my project, I only looked at scholia on *Iliad* 8. The first person scholia should be examined across the other books of the *Iliad*, across more than two manuscripts, across other Homeric texts, and ideally across the scholia on other works and authors. The analysis I conducted with the first person scholia can only be substantiated by examining a broader range of case studies.

On the subject of the automation tools: as I began to conduct research using the verification tools, I became familiar with their limits and what would make them more useful in the future. At the time of this writing, the automated verification system is designed only for the Venetus A scholia, and at first only the main scholia of the Venetus A. What I was able to search for often changed on a weekly basis as this system was being refined. I conducted much of the search process manually. With continued refining, eventually the automated verification tool can be used for manuscripts besides the Venetus A and can be used to define searches morphologically and topically. One of my interests I did not get to explore as much as I would have liked is scholia that discuss how a line or lines should sound in performance. There are

several scholia that talk about accentation and pronunciation, but they are incredibly difficult to find without translating every scholion. The scholia would be easier to identify if it was possible to search for specified vocabulary entries.

Another of my ongoing projects is to assemble technical terms. There are often words in the scholia that have a particular technical sense that is not expressed in the LSJ entry if it appears in the LSJ at all. Greek technical vocabulary, as can be seen by some of the translations I have rendered in the above chapters, can be as specific as a word that means “put an acute accent on the penultimate syllable of a word” in question. My most useful resource for decoding these terms is the glossary of grammatical vocabulary in Eleanor Dickey’s *Ancient Greek Scholarship*.¹²¹ As Dickey says herself, this is not a complete dictionary. In the last year, the Homer Multitext project has started to assemble its own glossary of grammatical terms and cite them with examples in the scholia. Citations are useful because often the meaning of a term is only made clear through its context. For example, if we look at Dickey’s entry for the verb βαρύνω it reads: “(of letters or syllables) to pronounce without an accent, mark with a grave accent; (of words) pronounce without an accent on the final syllable, mark the final syllable with a grave accent, (mid.) have no accent on the final syllable (in practice, normally restricted to recessive accentation).”¹²² While Dickey’s definition is thorough and even offers distinctions when talking about different topics, in practice, it is not so easy to pick the correct definition for translation. The word came up frequently as I started initial investigations into scholia about how the poetry should sound. In that instance, there is quite a bit of difference between an accent that is grave and no accent at all. With a citation of an example scholion, users of the HMT glossary

¹²¹ Found on pages 219-265.

¹²² Dickey 2007: 229.

would not only be given definitions in their grammatical sense but also within their respective contexts. It then becomes possible to analyze the situations in which a certain definition is used to enable us to translate them with more ease and more accuracy. This is a project that remains ongoing beyond the work I have accomplished on *Iliad* 8.

Another issue made apparent by the automated verification tools is the presence of words that simply do not exist in the LSJ but otherwise appear to be legitimate Greek words. While I was unable to run an automated verification for the Y.1.1, anecdotal evidence has revealed a similar state of affairs. It would be foolish to assume that unattested words do not occur in other books of the *Iliad*, in other manuscripts of the *Iliad*, or in manuscripts of other works. Already these discoveries have the potential to form a supplement to the LSJ and a more thorough search for such words ought to be conducted.

As I edited the main text of the *Iliad* in the Venetus A, I began to notice curved lines appearing under length words that looked as if they were long compounds.¹²³ By chance, I happened to edit and translate one scholion that discussed on these compounds on line 8.527.

The scholion reads:

κήρεσσι φορήτους
συνθέτως ἀνέγνω ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος καὶ οἱ πλείους ἴσως δὲ ἐπεὶ ἀναλύει αὐτὸ "οὓς κῆρες
φορέουσιν" (Il. 8.528) ἔθος γὰρ αὐτῷ πολλάκις τὰ σύνθετα ἀναλύειν. οὐδέποτε δὲ δοτικῇ
ἐπεκτεταμένη, κατ' ἀρχὴν συντέθεται οἷον πᾶσι καὶ πάντεσσι· "πασιμέλουσα" (Od.
12.70), οὐχὶ παρατὴν πάντεσσι ἢ σύνθεσις "Ναυσικάα" "Ναυσίθοος", "ἐγχεσίμοροι"
"τειχεσιπλήτης". κατ' ἀρχὴν δὲ προσέθηκα, διὰ τὸ παρ' Ἐπιχάρμῳ¹²⁴ κατατέλος
συντεθειμένον "γυναικ' ἄνδρεςσι ποθεινοί". εἶπερ οὖν τοῦτο ἀληθές. δηλονότι
παράλογον, τὸ "κηρεσσιφορήτους" κατα σύνθεσιν ἀναγνωστέον, ἀλλ' ὅμως ἐπεκράτησεν
ἡ Ἀριστάρχειος δι' ὃν εἶπομεν λόγον *

¹²³ urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA110VN-0613:0.7195,0.6722,0.155,0.024

¹²⁴ Erbse cites fr. 218 K.

“Urged on the Fates:

Aristarchus read it well as a compound, and the majority likewise also when he resolves it into its elements it: "οὐς κῆρες φορέουσιν" (Il. 8.528). Because it is customary for him to resolve the compound often. But never lengthening out the syllable in the dative, at the beginning it is compounded like "πασι" and "πάντεσσι" in "παειμέλουσα" (Od. 12.70). The compound is not only derived from from "πάντεσσι," [for example] "Ναυσικάα" "Ναυσίθοος", "ἐγγεσίμοροι" "τειχεσιπλήτης." I placed it at the beginning, according to the [argument] from Epicharmos, and I compound it at the end like "γυναικ' ἄνδρεσσι ποθεινοί." Indeed if that is true it is clear that it is contrary to the rule. The "κηρεσσιφορήτους" must be read as a compound, but nevertheless the Aristarchean edition is the authority according which logic we say it."¹²⁵

The compound in question in this scholion is marked with one of these curved, connecting lines.

One of the questions I would like to answer, but did not have the time to investigate was, whether other words marked with these connecting lines have scholia that discuss their compound nature.

In Chapter One, I described by task in investigating the scholia as twofold. I wanted to investigate issues that have plagued scholarship for quite some time and I wanted to investigate new issues as revealed by the scholia of *Iliad* 8. I alluded briefly above to the controversial chariot scene and its relation to the other tale of the epic cycle, the *Aithiopis*. Many modern scholars have cited the scholia as a source for much of their discussion and due to time constraints I was not able to look into the issue fully. A brief cursory look through the scholia of both manuscripts yielded little results on the issue. In fact, the one scholion I did find in the Y.1.1 justified the necessity of the scene. The scholion appears on line 8.114 and reads:

¹²⁵ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.326

ἐν σχήματι ἐδήλωσε τὸ δοκοῦν παραλελειφθαι· οὐ γὰρ εἴρηκεν ἀνωτέρω ποῖοι ἦσαν οἱ
θεράποντες· φασὶ δὲ τὸν Σθένελον ἀπὸ τοῦ τείχους κατενεχθέντα τρωθῆναι τὸ σκέλος δια
τοῦτο οὐ πολεμεῖ ἀλλ' ἡνιοχεῖ Διομήδει*

In the line he has shown that is expected that he be left behind. For he has not said
previously/above where the charioteers were. They say that Sthenelos having been
brought down from the walls was wounded with respect to his leg and because of this he
did not fight but rather held the reins for Diomedes.¹²⁶

The necessities of time required me to turn my investigations to more pressing issues that could
be researched with less strenuous methods and would contribute more to scholarly pursuits.

I can say with no reservations that my work merely scratched the surface of what can be
done in researching the Homeric scholia. I attempted to provide a survey of the kinds of issues
that can be investigated and what they can reveal about ancient Homeric scholarship. Several of
the topics I did discuss, as I have mentioned above, merit further investigation, and many topics I
have alluded to deserve investigation in the future. It is my hope that my work can serve as a
launching point for how to conduct research like this and what sort of inquiries can be made. It is
my plan to continue working further with *Iliad* 8 after this thesis and to expand my investigations
as far as I reasonably can.

¹²⁶ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.e3:8.68

Bibliography

- Borgman, Christine L. *Scholarship in the Digital Age: Information, Infrastructure, and the Internet*. The MIT Press, Cambridge: 2007.
- Cook, Erwin F. "On the 'Importance' Of *Iliad* Book 8." *Classical Philology*, Vol. 104, No. 2 (April 2009), pp. 133-161. University of Chicago Press. JSTOR. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/605340>>.
- Dickey, Eleanor. *Ancient Greek Scholarship*. Oxford UP, Oxford: 2007.
- Du  , Casey, ed. *Recapturing a Homeric Legacy*. Harvard UP, Cambridge, MA: 2009.
- Kelly, Adrian. *A referential commentary and lexicon to Iliad VIII*. Oxford UP, Oxford: 2007.
- Lord, Albert B. *The Singer of Tales*. 2nd Ed. Mitchell, Stephen and Gregory Nagy, eds. Harvard UP, Cambridge: 1960.
- Nagy, Gregory. *Homeric Questions*. University of Texas Press, Austin: 1996.
- . *Poetry as Performance: Homer and Beyond*. Cambridge UP, New York: 1996.
- Pfeiffer, Rudolf. *History of Classical Scholarship: From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*. Oxford UP, London: 1968.
- West, M. L. "Iliad and Aethiopis." *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 53, No. 1 (May 2003), pp.1-14. Cambridge UP. JSTOR. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3556478>>.
- . *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad*. K.G. Saur Verlag GmbH, Munich: 2001.

Appendix 1

It has been my approach to always begin my study of the scholia with as little commentary from modern scholars as possible. I prefer to let the evidence speak for itself. Therefore for the use of the reader, I offer this Appendix which contains the full Greek text of all the scholia I have quoted and any other scholia I would consider relevant to the topics I discuss but did not have the space to include in my main chapters. I also provide my accompanying translations into English.

Chapter One:

πάρακειται τὰ Ἀριστονίκου σημεῖα καὶ τὰ Διδύμου Περὶ τῆς Ἀρισταρχοῦ διορθώσεως τινὰ δὲ καὶ τῆς Ἰλιακῆς προσωδίας Ἡρωδιανοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῶν Νικάνορος Περὶ στιγμῆς

“Cited are the *Signs* of Aristonicus and Didymus’s *On the Critical Text of Aristarchus* and also some of Herodian’s *Iliadic Prosody* and from Nicanor’s *On Punctuation*.”¹²⁷

Chapter Three:

Line 8.12

ὥς τὰ οὐράνια τρία διαστήματα ἔξει ἀέρα μεχρι νεφελῶν, εἴτα αἰθέρα μέχρι τῶν φαινομένων· οὕτως καὶ ἀπο γῆς εἰς ᾄδου· ἀπὸ δὲ ᾄδου εἰς Τάρταρον· ἐναντίος δὲ Ὀλύμπῳ ὁ Τάρταρος· ὁ μὲν γὰρ “οὐποτ’ ἀνέμοισι τινάσσεται· οὐδέ ποτ’ ὄμβρῳ” (Od. 6.43) ὁ δὲ καὶ τετάρακται καὶ ψυχρὸς εἶναι δοκεῖ καὶ γοῦν τὸ σφόδρα ῥιγοῦν ταρταρίζειν φασίν. καὶ ὁ μὲν ὅλος καταλάμπεται· ὁ δὲ ἡρόεις ἐστίν

“Since heaven has three distinct parts: the lower air spans up until the clouds, then the aether spans up until the visible places. In a similar way so it goes both from earth to Hades and from Hades to Tartarus, Tartarus is in opposition to Olympus. For the one, “never shook with winds, nor with heavy rain” (Od. 6.43). And the other seemed to be both chaotic and cold, indeed they

¹²⁷ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026:msAsub:8.0

say that to fall into Tartarus is to be violently cold. The former is wholly shone upon. The latter is murky.”¹²⁸

Line 8.16

τόσσον ἔνερθ' Αἴδεω:

τοσοῦτον φησὶ τὸν Τάρταρον. ἀφεστᾶναι τοῦ Ἄιδου ὅσον οὐρανὸς τῆς γῆς. δια δὲ τούτων σφαιροειδῆ τὸν κόσμον συν ἴστησι κέντρου λόγον ἐπέχουσιν εἰσαγαγὼν τὴν γῆν καὶ τὰς ἀπ αὐτῆς. ἐμβαλλομένας εὐθείας εἰς ἐκάτερα τὰ περατὰ ἴσας λέγων εἶναι*

“All the way down to Hades:

He says that Tartarus is as far below Hades as Ouranus is above the earth. And on account of these things he makes the cosmos spherical, he has introduced the earth in the relation of the center [of the cosmos], he says that [going] straight from the earth to each opposite side is equidistant.”¹²⁹

Line 8.13

ἐναντίος Ὀλύμπῳ ὁ Τάρταρος· ὁ μὲν γὰρ. "οὔποτ' ἀνέμοισι τινάσσεται· οὐδέ ποτ' ὄμβρῳ" (Od 6.43)· οὗτος δὲ τετάρακται· καὶ ψυχρὸς εἶναι δοκεῖ· ὅθεν καὶ τὸ σφόδρα ῥίγοῦν ταρταρίζειν φασίν· καὶ ὁ μὲν ὅλος καταλάμπεται ὁ δὲ καὶ ἡεροειδὴς ἐστίν*

“Tartarus is opposite to Olympus. For the one, "never shook with winds, nor with heavy rain" (Od 6.43). And the other was chaotic and it seemed to be cold, from which they say that to fall into Tartarus is to be violently cold. And the one is wholly shone upon and the other is cloudy.”¹³⁰

¹²⁸ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.6

¹²⁹ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.14

¹³⁰ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.e3:8.13

Line 8.16

τὰ οὐράνια ὥς φησι τρία διαστήματα ἔχει· ἀέρα μέχρι νεφελῶν· εἴτα αἰθέρα μέχρι τῶν φαινομένων· καὶ τῆς Διὸς ἀρχῆς· οὕτω καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς εἰς Ἄδου, ἀπὸ δὲ Ἄδου εἰς τὸν Τάρταρον· δῆλον δὲ ὡς τὸ μέσον κέντρον ἴν ἡ γῆ· ἔδει δὲ εἰπεῖν "τόσσον ἔνερθε" γῆς. ὅσον ἀπ' αὐτῆς εἰς οὐρανόν· τάχα οὖν τὸ Αἶδεω ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Ἄδου φησίν*

“The heavens, he [the poet] says, have three distinct parts. The lower air spans up to the clouds. Then the aether spans up to the visible places and the throne of Zeus. And in a similar way so it goes from the earth to Hades, from Hades to Tartarus. And so the earth is clearly as the middle center point. And it is right to say that it is as far beneath the earth as the earth is from heaven. And indeed perhaps he [the poet] calls it Hades because of the rulership of Hades.”¹³¹

Line 8.13

Τάρταρος:

τὸ ὑπὸ τὴν γῆν ἐσκοτισμένον. μέρος κατώτατον τοῦ Ἄδου· καὶ ἐν βαθυτάτῳ κείμενον τόπῳ. ἢ τὸν χαλεπὸν καὶ δυσχερῆ λέγει. ὠνόμασται δὲ. δια τὸ ἐκτετάχθαι καὶ συγκεχύσθαι τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ πάντα· οἱ δὲ τὸ ἀφώτιστον τῆς οἰκουμένης μέρος ἀπεδέξαντο*

“Tartarus:

The place in shade below the earth, it is the bottommost portion of Hades. And he calls it that which lies in the deepest region or that it is both difficult and vexatious. And it is so named because of the drawing out and the confounding of everything in itself. But others understand it as the unlit region of their inhabitation.”¹³²

¹³¹ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.e3:8.16

¹³² urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.13

Chapter Four:

Line 8.93

πρὸς ἐπιστροφήν τὸ ἐπίθετον τέθεται· δεῖ γὰρ τὸν στρατιώτην τοιοῦτον εἶναι· γεωργὸς μὲν γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ καλῶς ἐν πόδι καὶ τὴν ἄρπην· καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τῆς γεωργίας ὅπλα κινεῖν γινώσκεται· κυβερνήτης· ἀπὸ τοῦ "πόδα νηὸς" (Od.10.32). ἰθύνειν καλῶς· τέκτων, ἀπὸ τῆς εὐθεσίας τῶν λίθων· καὶ τῆς εὐπριστίας τῶν ξύλων· ναυπηγὸς, ἀπὸ τῆς νηὸς· κυνηγὸς· ἀπὸ τῆς κυναγωγῆς καὶ τῆς ὀρεσινομίας· μάντις ἀπὸ τῶν ἐκβάσεων· μάγειρος ἀπὸ τοῦ ὡς δεῖ ὅπταν καὶ δαιτρεύειν· ἱατρὸς· ἀπὸ τοῦ νόσους γινώσκειν καὶ τάμνειν ἰοῦς· μουσικὸς καὶ ἀοιδὸς· ἐξ ᾧδων κάλλους καὶ μύθων· πύκτης καὶ παλαιστής ἐξ εὐστροφίας καὶ χειρῶν συμπλοκῆς· τοξότης ἀπὸ διασκέψεως ἀρίστης· ἀκοντιστής· ἀπὸ τοῦ εὖ πάλλειν τὸ δόρυ ῥήτωρ ἀπὸ πιθανότητος· στρατηγός· ἀπὸ φρονήσεως καὶ ἀνδρίας· στρατιώτης· ἀπὸ πολυμηχανίας καὶ πολυπειρίας[‡]

“The epithet is used because of the retreat. For it is necessary for him to be such a soldier. For he is a farmer [as we know] well from the sickle in the grass and the bill hook and all the things which are necessary for farming. He is a ship-steerer because he keeps the sail straight (Od. 10.32). The carpenter, from the good condition of the stone. And from the skillful sawing of wood. The shipbuilder from the ship. The hunter from the hunting packs and from the knowledge of the mountains. The seer from landing places. A cook from as is necessary roasting and cutting up. A doctor, from which there is sickness to diagnose and to cut out arrows. A musician and a minstrel from which there are songs of beauty and speeches. The boxer and the wrestler from versatility and the wrestling grip. The archer, from the best ability to examine. The javelin-thrower, from his good poise with a spear. The orator, from his persuasiveness. The general from his foresight and manly courage. The soldier from craftiness and great experience.”¹³³

¹³³ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.e3:8.58

Line 8.93

πρὸς ἐπιστροφὴν τὸ ἐπίθετον*

A εστι δὲ γεωργος	"ἐν ποίῃ δρεπανον μὲν" (Od.18.368)·
B κυβερνήτης	"ἀεὶ γὰρ πόδα νηός" (Od.10.32)
Γ τέκτων	ἀπο τῆς κλίνης
Δ ναυπηγός	ἀπὸ τῆς σχεδίας
E κυνηγός	ἀπὸ τοῦ Παρνασσοῦ
Ζ μάντις	"φημι τίς μοι φάσθω" (Od.20.100)
Z μαγειρος	"δαιτρεῦσαι τὲ καὶ ὀπτησαι" (Od.15.323)
Η ἰατρος	"ὄφρα οἱ εἴ ἱοὺς χρίεσθαι" (Od.1.262-263)
Θ μουσικος	"μῦθον ὥς τ' αοιδός" (Od.11.368)
Ϊ πύκτης	"πῦν μὲν ἐνίκησα Κλυτομήδεα" (Il.23.634)
ΙΑ παλαιστής	"Ἀγκαῖον δὲ πάλῃ Πλευρώνιον" (Il.23.635)
ΙΒ δισκευτής	παρα Φαίαιξιν
ΙΓ τοξότης	"εὖ μὲν τόξον οἶδα" (Od.8.215)
ΙΔ ἀκοντιστής	"δουρὶ δὲ ἀκοντίζων" (Od.8.229)
ΙΕ ῥήτωρ καὶ αστρολογος	"Πληϊάδας θ' ορόωντι (Od.5.272)·

“The epithet is for the retreat.

- | | |
|--------------------|---|
| 1. He is a farmer | "in the grass, curved scythe" (Od.18.368) |
| 2. A steersman | "for I always [steered] the sails of the ship" (Od.10.32) |
| 3. A carpenter | from the bed ¹³⁴ |
| 4. A ship builder, | from the raft ¹³⁵ |
| 5. A hunter, | because of Parnassos ¹³⁶ |
| 6. A seer, | "I say let someone speak to me" (Od.20.100) |
| 7. A chef/butcher | "cutting up and roasting" (Od.15.323) |

¹³⁴ Erbse cites Od. 23.189 as the likely reference.

¹³⁵ Erbse cites Od. 5.243-5.261 as the likely reference.

¹³⁶ Erbse cites Od. 19.428-19.454 as the likely reference.

- | | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| 8. A doctor | "so that they might furnish with poison." (Od.1.262-263) |
| 9. A musician | "he converses like a minstrel" (Od.11.368) |
| 10. A boxer | "boxing I overcame Klytomedes" (Il.23.634) |
| 11. A wrestler | "wrestling I beat Ancaeus of Pleuron" (Il.23.635) |
| 12. A discus thrower | against the Phaician ¹³⁷ |
| 13. An archer | "I know the bow well" (Od.8.215) |
| 14. A javelin-thrower | "throwing a spear" (Od.8.229) |
| 15. An orator and an astronomer | "looking upon the Pleiades" (Od. 5.272)" ¹³⁸ |

Line 8.97

ὥς ἔφατ' οὐδ' ἐσάκουσαι:

προς τὸ ἀμφιβολον πότερον οὐκ ἀντελάβετο καθόλου τῆς φωνῆς δια τὸν θόρυβον, ἢ ἀκούσας γὰρ ἐπαρεπέμψατο, ὅπερ δέχεται ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος

“So he spoke, but he did not hear/listen:

Regarding the ambiguity, whether he [Odysseus] did not generally perceive his [Diomedes's] voice on account of clamor, or having heard him he passed along, as Aristarchus takes it.”¹³⁹

Line 8.97

οὐδ' ἐσάκουσεν,

"οὐδὲ ἤκουσεν" ἐξηγεῖται δὲ πότερον οὐκ ἀντελάβετο καθόλου τῆς φωνῆς δια τὸν θόρυβον, ἢ ἀκούσας παρεπέμψατο, ὅπερ δέχεται ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος

¹³⁷ Erbse cites Od. 8.186-8.198 as the likely reference.

¹³⁸ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.78

¹³⁹ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.81

“He did not hear/listen,

"οὐδὲ ἤκουσεν" It is interpreted whether he [Odysseus] generally did perceive his [Diomedes's] voice on account of clamor, or having heard him he passed along, which is how Aristarchus takes it.”¹⁴⁰

Line 8.97

οὐδ’ ἐς ἄκουσεν:

"οὐδὲ ἤκουσεν" ἐξηγεῖται δὲ πότερον ἄρα οὐδ’ ὅλως ἤκουσεν ὁ Ὀδυσσεύς, ἢ οὐκ ἐπείσθη δειλίαν τοῦ ἥρωος κατηγοροῦσιν ἀγνοοῦντες τὸ "οὐδ’ ἐσάκουσεν", οὐ γὰρ τὸ παρακοῦσαι. ἀλλὰ τὸ μὴ αἰσθεσθαι τελείως δηλοῖ καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἦν δειλὸς τῶν ἄλλων εσχατος φεύγων καὶ τῇ βραδυτῇ τὸ φιλοκίνδυνον ἐπιδεικνύμενος *

“He did not hear/listen

"οὐδὲ ἤκουσεν" he interprets whether Odysseus did not wholly hear, or whether he was not persuaded. They charge the hero with cowardice, ignoring the "οὐδ’ ἐσάκουσεν." For it is not “not listening.” But rather it is a lack of perfect perception, and because he is not a coward since he flees last of all the other men and because of his slowness he is a specimen of a man who loves danger.”¹⁴¹

Line 8.97

οὐκ ἦσθετο ὑπὸ τοῦ θορύβου· ἢ οὐκ ἐπείσθη διὰ τὸν καιρόν· φεύγει γὰρ σὺν Αἴαντι καὶ θεομαχεῖν οὐ θέλει· πῶς γὰρ δειλὸς· ὁ μετὰ πάντας φεύγων· οὐ γὰρ ἂν Διομήδης τοῦτον μόνον ἐκάλει·*

¹⁴⁰ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.82

¹⁴¹ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.83

“He does not hear because of the noise or he is not persuaded because of the crisis. For he flees with the Ajaxes and he does not want to wage war against the gods. For how is that cowardly? He is fleeing with everyone else. Because Diomedes would not have called out to him alone.”¹⁴²

Line 8.266

Τεῦκρος δ εἵνατος

ὅτι πάντων ὑποστρεψάντων, μόνος ὁ Ὀδυσσεὺς παρέμεινε πρὸς ταῖς ναυσὶν ὥστε τὸ ἐπάνω εὐκρινὲς "ὡς ἔφαθ' οὐδ' ἐσάκουσεν" (Il. 8.97) ὅτι ἐκουσίως παρεπέμψατο*

“Teucer was ninth

The sign is there because everyone turned around, only Odysseus remained next to the ships so that the above line is in good order "as he spoke he did not listen" (Il. 8.97) because he voluntarily sent himself past.”^{143 144}

Line 8.266

διήρηκεν ὡς μέλλων περὶ αὐτοῦ λέγειν· ἔνδον δέ ἐστι Ὀδυσσεὺς τὸν λαὸν διεγείρων. ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Θόαντος μέμνηται· καὶ οὐ πάντως ἐστὶ δειλός *

“The poet makes a distinction because he is about to speak about him [Teucer]. But Odysseus is within rousing the soldiers. Thoas is also not mentioned and he [Thoas] is not entirely cowardly [either].”^{145 146}

¹⁴² urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.e3:8.62

¹⁴³ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.182

¹⁴⁴ For explanation of why ὅτι is translated “the sign is there because” see Dickey 2007: 122.

¹⁴⁵ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.e3:8.181

¹⁴⁶ Erbse rightly notes to see *Iliad* 7.168, where the poetry lists the Greeks who might be capable of fighting Hector. This is a similar list to the one here in *Iliad* 8.261-8.267, with the notable exceptions of Odysseus and Thoas. This list seems to explain the otherwise odd reference to Thoas in this scholion.

Chapter Five:

Line 8.408

αἰεὶ γάρ μοι ἔωθεν ἐνικλᾶν ὅτι νοήσω·

"ἐνικλᾶν" ἐμποδίζειν ἢ μεταφορὰ ἀπο τῶν εἰς τὰς ἀσπίδας ἀποθραυομένων δοράτων· οὕτως δὲ γραπτέον "ὅτι κεν εἴπω" οἷον κατακάμπτειν καὶ μὴ ἐὰν τὰ ὑπ εμοῦ εἰρημένα καὶ πάλιν ἐξῆς ἐν οἷς ἡ Ἴρις φησιν (Il. 8.422) "ὅτι κεν εἴπη" γράφεται *

“For she is always accustomed to hinder me in whatever I have devised:

ἐνικλᾶν means “to hinder.” It is a metaphor from spears being struck against shields. And it must be written like so "ὅτι κεν εἴπω." That is, to hinder and not to permit what is said by me. Again it is later written in the lines [that] Iris says (Il. 8.422) “ὅτι κεν εἴπη”¹⁴⁷

Line 8.408

ἐμποδίζειν· εἴληπται δὲ ἡ μεταφορὰ, ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς τὰς ἀσπίδας ἀποθραβομένων δοράτων*

"to hinder" and the metaphor is taken from spears being struck against shields.”¹⁴⁸

Lines 8.524-8.525

μῦθος δ' ὅς

ἀθετοῦνται δύο στίχοι. δι' ὅτι τῇ ἐξῆς οὐδὲν λέγει καὶ τὸ ὑποτακτικὸν ἄρθρον ἀντι προτακτικοῦ παρείληπται "ὅς μὲν" ἀντὶ τοῦ "ὁ μὲν." ὁ δὲ νοῦς ἐστὶ τοιοῦτος περὶ μὲν τῶν νῦν καὶ τήμερον συντετέλεστέ μοι ὁ λόγος καὶ οὐδὲν παραλέλειπται περὶ δὲ τῶν εἰς αὐρίον ὑπο τὴν ἑω μηνύσω *

“The counsel which:

The two lines are athetized because the poet says nothing in the following lines¹⁴⁹ and he substitutes the relative pronoun "ὅς μὲν" instead of the definite article "ὁ μὲν." But the intention

¹⁴⁷ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.261

¹⁴⁸ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.e3:8.283

¹⁴⁹ i.e. Hector makes no speech at dawn even though he claims he will.

is of this sort: concerning the things now and today, the speech has been completed by me and nothing is left out and, concerning the things happening tomorrow, at dawn I will reveal them.”¹⁵⁰

Line 8.526

εὐχομαι ἐλπόμενος

ὅτι Ζηνοδοτος γράφει "ἔλπομαι εὐχόμενος"· οὐ κατα τὸν Ἑκτορα δὲ τὸν οὕτως ἐπηρμένον λέγει, ἐλπίζω εὐχόμενος τοῖς θεοῖς· ἐπιεικὲς γὰρ τουναντιον γὰρ οἰκεῖον "εὐχομαι ἐλπόμενος" καυχώμαι ἐλπιδοποιούμενος ὑπο τοῦ Διὸς καὶ τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν

“I pray having hoped:

The sign is there because Zenodotus writes "ἔλπομαι εὐχόμενος." He does not say Hector is lifted up thusly, I feel hope praying to the gods. Because the opposite is suitable and appropriate, "I pray, feeling hope." I speak aloud being made hopeful by Zeus and the other gods.”¹⁵¹

Line 8.526-8.527

ὄρα τὸ παλίμβολον Ἑκτορος· τῇ γυναικὶ ἔλεγεν "ἔσσεται ἡμᾶρ ὅτ' ἂν ποτ' ὀλώλῃ Ἴλιος ἱρὴ" (Il. 6.448). ὧδε δὲ ἄλλως· ἐκεῖ μὲν γὰρ τῶν Τρώων ἡττωμένων δύσελπις ἦν· ἐνταῦθα δὲ τῇ μάχῃ κρατῶν. ἐλπίζει τὰ χρηστά[‡]

“Look at the change of mind of Hector. He was speaking to his wife "The day shall come when sacred Ilion is destroyed" (Il. 6.448). And it is so elsewhere. For there he is despondent because the Trojans were inferior. But here he hopes for good fortune because they are superior in battle.”¹⁵²

¹⁵⁰ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.324

¹⁵¹ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.325

¹⁵² urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.e3:8.390

Chapter Six:

Line 8.429

+ τῶν· ἄλλος μὲν ἀποφθείσθω·

ὅταν εἰς τὴν ἀξίαν ἀτενίσῃ· τῶν θεῶν· τότε φασὶν αὐτοὺς μὴ κινεῖσθαι τῇ περὶ θνητῶν ὥς οὐδὲ ἂν ἡμεῖς περὶ μυρμήκων· ὅταν δὲ ἐπιλογίσῃται τὴν ποιητικὴν ἔπεται τοῖς μύθοις καὶ τὴν ὑπόθεσιν ἐκτραγωδεῖ συμμαχίας καὶ θεομαχίας παραγών

“Let one of them perish:

Whenever he [the poet] is looking at the reputation of the gods, then he says they would not be moved by anything concerning mortals. Just as we would not be moved concerning ants. But whenever he considers poetry, he follows the stories and makes the subject famous: bringing about alliances and wars among gods.”¹⁵³

Line 8.429

ὅτ’ ἂν εἰς τὴν ἀξίαν ἀτενίσῃ τῶν θεῶν, τότε φησὶν αὐτοὺς μὴ κινεῖσθαι περὶ θνητῶν· ὥς οὐδὲ ἂν ἡμεῖς περὶ μυρμήκων· ὅτ’ ἂν δὲ ἐπιλογίσῃται τὴν ποιητικὴν, ἔπεται τοῖς μύθοις καὶ τὴν ὑπόθεσιν ἐκτραγωδεῖ· συμμαχίας καὶ θεομαχίας παράγων*

“Whenever he [the poet] is looking at the reputation of the gods, then he says they would not be moved by anything concerning mortals. Just as we would not be moved concerning ants. But whenever he considers poetry, he follows the stories and makes the subject famous: bringing about alliances and wars among gods.”¹⁵⁴

¹⁵³ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.269

¹⁵⁴ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.e3:8.308

Line 8.284

Ἡρακλῆς¹⁵⁵

πορθήσας Ἴλιον Ἰσιώνηγντὴν Λαομέδοντος θυγατέρα Πριαμοῦ δὲ ἀδελφὴν ἔλαβεν αἰχμάλωτον καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῇ γέρας Τελαμῶνι ὥς συστρατεύσαντι αὐτῷ ἀφ' ἧς ἔσχε Τευκρον ὁ Τελαμών ὥς οὖν ἀπο Τρωϊκῆς γυναικὸς τεχθέντα τὸν παῖδα Τευκρον ἐκάλεσαν προ ἀναπέμψαντες τὸν τόνον καὶ ποιήσαντες κύριον. Τευκροῖ γὰρ οἱ Τρῶες ἀπο τοῦ βασιλεύοντος αὐτῶν Τεύκρου. ἡ δὲ ἱστορία ἀκριβέστερον εἴρηται παρά τε ἄλλοις πολλοῖς καὶ παρα Ἀπολλωνίῳ τῷ γραμματικῷ ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ τῶν γενῶν· ἐζήτῃται δὲ πῶς ἐξ ἀπάντων ἐπαινέσας τὸν Τευκρον νῦν ἐπιφέρει νόθον· ἡμεῖς δὲ φαμέν τοῦτο μὴ εἶναι πρὸς αἰσχύνῃς. δια τὸ παρα τοῖς παλαιοῖς ἔθος κρατοῦν, ἐτίμων γὰρ τοὺς νόθους ἐπ' ἴσης τοῖς γνησίοις· ἄλλως τε· εἰ καὶ αἰχμάλωτος ἡ ἰσιώνη, ἄλλα βασιλὶς· ἔτι δὲ καὶ αὐξήσεως ἔνεκεν τοῦτο εἰρησθαι φαμέν ὅτι τῇ ἀρετῇ· καὶ τοὺς γνησίους ὑπερέβαλεν*

“Heracles:

Heracles laid waste to windy Ilium and he took captive the daughter of Laomedon and sister of Priam and gave her as a gift to Telemon since he joined him on the expedition. From her, Telemon had Teucer. Since he brought into the world by a Trojan woman, he called the child Teucer, moving the accent back and making it a proper noun. For the Trojans were called the Teucrians from their king Teucer. The story is more precisely told by many others and by Apollonius the grammarian in the second generation. It is asked how having received praise from everyone Teucer is now a bastard. We say that it was not a cause for dishonor. Because the custom of the ancients prevails. For they honored bastards equally with legitimate children. And otherwise if someone was a spearman or a commoner but a royal. And on account of the magnification, we say that this is said for excellence that he surpasses the legitimate children.”¹⁵⁶

¹⁵⁵ Ἡρακλῆς does not appear in line 8.284, but is clearly written in the semi-uncial script of lemmata.

¹⁵⁶ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.197

Lines 8.371-8.372

ἥ οἱ γούνατ' ἔκυσσε:

ἀθετοῦνται δύο στίχοι ὅτι οὐκ ἔδει κατὰ μέρος διηγήσασθαι καὶ ταῦτα πρὸς τὴν καλῶς εἰδυῖαν.
καὶ μὴν οὐδὲ ἡμεῖς περισσόν τι προσιστοροῦμεν *

“She who kissed his knees:

The two lines are athetized because it is not necessary to describe in detail piece by piece and to one who already knows these things well. And indeed we do not narrate further something superfluous.”^{157 158}

Line 8.95

μή τις τοι φεύγοντι:

τινὲς διατέλλουσιν ἐπὶ τῷ φεύγοντι, καὶ συνάπτωμεν δὲ ὅλον τὸν στίχον ἴσμεν ὅτι οὐ τὸ
μετάφρενον φεύγει *

“May someone to you fleeing:

Some make a distinction after the “φεύγοντι,” but let us also join the whole line. We know that a man's back does not flee.”¹⁵⁹

Line 8.171

σῆμα τιθεῖς Τρῶεσσι·

βραχὺ διασταλτέον ἐπὶ τὸ “Τρῶεσσι”· αὐτὸ γὰρ τὸ σημεῖον πρὸς τὸ σημαινόμενον ὑπαντήσας
εἶρηκε νίκην· ἐὰν δὲ συνάπτωμεν γίνεται σολοικοφανές *

¹⁵⁷ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.241

¹⁵⁸ The two lines suggested for athetization read:

ἥ οἱ γούνατ' ἔκυσσε καὶ ἔλλαβε χειρὶ γενείου,
λίσσομένη τιμῆσαι Ἀχιλλῆα πολίπορθον
“She [Thetis] who kissed his knees and grasped his chin with her hand,
begging that Achilles, besieger of cities be honored.”

¹⁵⁹ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.80

“Giving the sign to the Trojans:

There ought to be some short pause after “Τρώεσιν.” Because the sign itself indicates the signal for the subsequent victory. But if we join it together, it is incorrect syntax.”¹⁶⁰

Line 8.168

‡ἵππους τὲ στρέψαι:

ὅτι ὑποτάσσουσι. "ἢ μήτε στρέψαι μήτ' ἀντίβιον μαχέσασθαι" (Il. 8.168a) οὐκ ἔστιν δέ· τὸ γὰρ “διάνδιχα” (Il. 8.167) οὐκ ἔστι δύο ἐμερίμνησεν ἐναντία ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ φερόμεθα “στρέψαι τοὺς ἵππους καὶ μάχεσθαι” *

“[Debating whether] to turn the horses around

The sign is there because it is in the subjunctive. "Neither to retreat nor to fight the enemy" (Il. 8.168a). But that is not so. For he was "of two minds" (Il. 8.167). It was not that he was worried about two different things, but that we interpret it the same: "to turn his horses and fight".”¹⁶¹

Line 8.355

ἀνεκτῶς:

ὡς ἀνδρικῶς Ἀρίσταρχος περισπᾶ λέλεκται δὲ ἡμῖν περὶ τῆς προσωδίας ὅποτε διελάβομεν περὶ τοῦ "ἢ δὴ λοίγια ἔργα τάδ' ἔσσεται οὐκέτ' ἀνεκτά" (Il. 1.573)

“Bearably:

Like ἀνδρικῶς, Aristarchus pronounces it with a circumflex, but it is said by us, regarding pronunciation, because we make a distinction regarding the [use of the word in] "ἢ δὴ λοίγια ἔργα τάδ' ἔσσεται οὐκέτ' ἀνεκτά".”¹⁶²

¹⁶⁰ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.132

¹⁶¹ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.131

¹⁶² urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.236

Lines 8.535-8.537

αὔριον ἦν ἀρετην:

ὅτι ἢ τούτους δεῖ τοὺς τρεῖς στίχους μένειν οἷς τὸ ἀντίσιγμα παράκειται, ἢ τοὺς ἐξῆς τρεῖς οἷς αἱ στιγμαὶ παράκεινται¹⁶³ ἢ τοὺς ἐξῆς τρεῖς¹⁶⁴. εἰς γὰρ τὴν αὐτὴν γεγραμμένοι εἰσὶ διάνοιαν· ἐγκρίνει δὲ μᾶλλον ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος τοὺς δευτέρους δια τὸ καυχηματικωτέρους εἶναι τοὺς λόγους ὁ δὲ Ζηνόδοτος τοὺς πρώτους τρεῖς οὐδὲ ἔγραφεν τὰ αὐτὰ δὲ λέγει περὶ τῶν στίχων τούτων ὁ Δίδυμος¹⁶⁵ ἃ καὶ ὁ Ἀριστόνικος· δι' ὃ οὐκ ἐγράψαμεν τὰ Διδύμου*

“Tomorrow, which [will see] his excellence:

The sign is there because it is necessary to keep these three lines, on which he places an anti sigma. Or the following three, on which the stigma are placed. Because they explain what the meaning is. But Aristarchus rather accepts as genuine the second three because the words are more loudly boastful. But Zenodotus accepts as genuine the first three and he does not write the second three. But regarding these lines Didymus says the same things, as does Aristonicus, for which reasons we did not write the things of Didymus.”^{166 167}

Lines 8.377-8.378

ἠθικῶς καὶ τοῦτο πρὸς τὸ "ὁ δὲ μαινεται οὐκ ἔτ' ἀνεκτῶς" (Il. 8.355)· "προφανεῖσα" δὲ γράφει Ἀρίσταρχος δυϊκῶς· ὁ δὲ Ἡρωδιανὸς· "προφανείσας" βούλεται· συστέλλων Δωρικῶς τὸ "α"· ᾧ καὶ πειθόμεθα*

¹⁶³ Erbse notes to compare to *Iliad* 8.538-8.540.

¹⁶⁴ This phrase was marked with a series of dots written above it, a practice which in the Venetus A denotes that the words should not be present.

¹⁶⁵ Erbse cites p. 115 Schm.

¹⁶⁶ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.340

¹⁶⁷ Antisigma indicate lines Aristarchus believes belong elsewhere and stigma indicate lines Aristarchus thinks are questionable but not necessarily worthy of athetization.

“Expressively and this regarding the [line]: “one who rages beyond what can be endured” (Il. 8.355). Aristarchus writes “προφανεία” in the dual. But Herodian would rather “προφανείσας” contracting the alpha in the Doric dialect, by which we are also persuaded.”¹⁶⁸

Line 8.178

ἀβληχρά:¹⁶⁹

Ἡρακλείδης ὁ Μειλήσιος βαρύνει ὡς ἄσητα. λόγῳ δὲ χρῆται τούτῳ ὡς ὅτι βληχρον ἐστὶ τὸ ἰσχυρόν ὅπερ κατα στέρησιν ὀφείλει λέγεσθαι “ἄβληχρος” ὡς “ἄκακος” σημαίνει γὰρ τὸ ἀσθενές. ἡ μέντοι παράδοσις ὀξύνει τὸ “ἀβληχρά” καὶ “ἀβληχρήν” (Il. 5.337) πεισθεῖσα πρῶτον τῷ παρασχηματισμῷ ὡς ἀπλῶ, οὕτως γὰρ παρεσχηματίσθη ὡς “πενιχρά” “ψυχρά” λέγω δὲ θηλυκῶς οὕτως “ἀβληχρά” οὐ κοινωνοῦντός ποτὲ τοῦ γένους· λέγω δὲ ὁ “ἀβληχρὸς” καὶ ἡ “ἀβληχρος”· ἄλλως τε ἡδὴ αὐτὸ τὸ “βληχρὸς” σημαίνει. ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖστον μᾶλλον τὸ ἀσθενές Ἀλκαῖος “θ” “βληχρῶν ἀνέμων ἀχείμαντοι πνοαί”· καὶ ὁ Νίκανδρος “βληχρὸν γὰρ μῦδος οἶα μυληβόρου ἐν χροὶ νύγμα”· τούτῳι δὴ πλεονάσαν τὸ “α” φυλάξει τὸν αὐτὸν τόνον ἀεὶ οἶδα γὰρ τὸ ἄβορος ἄγαυρος ἄσταχυς *

“Weak:

Heraclides the Milesian¹⁷⁰ writes it with a grave accent on the ultima, like “ἄσητα”¹⁷¹, and he uses this word as a stronger version of “βληχρον.” It ought to mean “not weak” like “ἄκακος” means “not evil,” but it means “ἀσθενές” (“without strength”). Indeed, grammatical tradition marks it with an acute accent. “ἀβληχρά” and “ἀβληχρήν” (Il. 5.337) prevailed first by declining as if it is uncompounded. For so they are declined like “πενιχρά” and “ψυχρά.” And I write it in the feminine since in this way “ἀβληχρά” does not have any common gender. And I write “ὁ ἀβληχρὸς” and “ἡ ἀβληχρος.” Elsewhere already “βληχρὸς” means the same thing. For the most

¹⁶⁸ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.e3:8.264

¹⁶⁹ In the text of the *Iliad* in the Venetus A, the word is written ἀβληχρ’ with a grave accent floated above the elision mark.

¹⁷⁰ Erbse cites fr. 7 C.

¹⁷¹ We are still uncertain as to what the scholiast means by ἄσητα as it does not appear in the LSJ and any logical substitutions for Byzantine orthography do not make sense, and it furthermore does not have a grave accent on the ultima as the βαρύνει would indicate.

part, since [the meaning] is *ασθενες* [without strength] instead. Alcaeus 8 has "*βληχρῶν ἀνέμων ἀχείμαντοι πνοαί*" "not stormy blasts of weak wind."¹⁷² And Nicandros writes "*βληχρὸν γὰρ μῦδος οἷα μύληβόρου ἐν χροῖ νύγμα*" "for the weakness of the mouse was a sort of millstone-eating, like pricking on the skin."¹⁷³ Indeed adding the alpha to it keeps the accent in the same place. Because I know that the accent is always the same in "*ἄβορος*," "*ἄγαυρος*," and "*ἄσταχυς*."¹⁷⁴

Line 8.178

ὕφ' "ἐν" τὸ "οὐδενόσωρα". εἰ καὶ σπάνιος ἡ τοιαύτη σύνθεσις· λέγω δὲ ἐξ ἀποφάσεως καὶ συνδέσμου καὶ τῆς ἐνὸς γενικῆς τελείας· τινὲς δὲ οὐδενὸς φυλακτικά· πιθανὸν δὲ καὶ τὸ ὑπογύου ἔργου μεμνήσθαι. τῶν Ἀχαιῶν τὴν πρᾶξιν ἐξευτελίζοντα·*

From "ἐν" ("one") "οὐδενόσωρα." Because such a compound also is rare. But I say it is [a compound] from the negation and the conjunction [i.e. *δε*] and from the genitive ending "ἐνὸς." But others preserve it as "οὐδενός." But it is persuasive to remember that it is a recent work [i.e. the wall], when he [Hector] is greatly disparaging the action of the Achaeans.¹⁷⁵

Lines 8.188-8.190

ὕμῃν παρ προτέροισι

τὸ ἐξῆς τοῦτό ἐστιν "ἡ εμοὶ ὅς πέρ οἱ θαλερὸς πόσις εὔχομαι εἶναι" (190) "οἶνον τ' ἐγκεράσσα πιεῖν ὅτε" μοι "θυμὸς ἀνώγοι" (189) ἴστεον δὲ ὅτι προ τοῦ εὔρεθῆναι τὴν τῶν ποτηρίων χρῆσιν κέρασιν ἔπινον *

¹⁷² Erbse cites fr. 319 L. – P.

¹⁷³ Erbse cites ther. 446.

¹⁷⁴ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.133

¹⁷⁵ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.e3:8.107

“Set before you:

This is the appropriate line order in my opinion: "ἢ εμοὶ ὅς περ οἱ θαλερὸς πόσις εὕχομαι εἶναι" (190) then, "οἶνον τ' ἐγκεράσασα πιεῖν ὅτε θυμὸς ἀνώγοι" (189) and one must see that before being able to make use of the drinking cups they mix the drink.”¹⁷⁶

Line 8.150

ὥς πότ' ἀπειλήσει

ὅτι οὐκ ἐν τῷ καθόλου "εὐρεῖαν" λέγει, ἀλλ' εμοὶ "εὐρεῖα" ἢ γῆ γένοιτο ἀντι τοῦ "εὐρὸν χάσμα" ποιήσει ⚘

“So that he may someday boast:

The sign is there because in general he [the poet] does not say “εὐρεῖαν,” but in my opinion the earth would become “εὐρεῖα” instead of it making a “broad chasm.””¹⁷⁷

Line 8.150

τὸ "εὐρεῖα" ἀντὶ τοῦ "εὐρέως" κρείσσων δέ φησι θάνατος ψόγου⚘

It is “εὐρεῖα” instead of “εὐρέως,” and he says that death is better than disgrace.¹⁷⁸

Line 8.70

πῶς δύο κῆρας ἐντίθησιν ὁ Ζεὺς ὥσπερ ἀνὰ μίαν ἐκατέρου στρατοῦ. ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἐξῆς¹⁷⁹ πλείους αὐτὰς φησιν· "αἱ μὲν Ἀχαιῶν κῆρες" (Il. 8.73)· ὅτι αἱ δύο καὶ πολλαὶ ἂν εἶεν· λέγομεν γοῦν διττὰ πράγματα· πλειόνων δὲ ἔμφασιν διδόντος τοῦ ὀνόματος, εἰκότως ἐν τῇ μεταλήψει πλέονας εἶπεν· ἔστι δὲ τὸ σχῆμα. συνεκδοχικῶν σχημάτων ἔν· κῆρ δὲ εἴρηται παρὰ τὸ καίω· διὰ πυρὸς γὰρ

¹⁷⁶ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.137

¹⁷⁷ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.117

¹⁷⁸ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.e3:8.90

¹⁷⁹ Erbse notes to compare to *Iliad* 8.73-8.74.

ἔθαπτοντο· εἰ δὲ τὴν ψυχὴν δηλοῖ. παρὰ τὸν κηρόν· δίκην γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὰ μαθήματα ἐν ἑαυτῇ ἀπομάττεται*¹⁸⁰

“How does Zeus set down two fates as there is one end for each army? In these matters they say that "πλειους" is a logical arrangement of words: "αἱ μὲν Ἀχαιῶν κῆρες" (“the fates of the Achaeans”) (Il. 8.73). Because there may be "δυο" two or "πολλαι" many. Indeed I say that matters are twofold. But others it is "πλειονων" with the noun giving emphasis. Similarly in a change of case he [the poet] said "πλεονας." It is a figure of speech, one of the measuring out together figures of speech. Death is said to be like burning. Therefore one is put to rest through fire. If it releases the soul as if it were. For one customarily searches for knowledge in oneself.”¹⁸⁰

Line 8.352

νῶϊ

ἡμῖν κοινῇ διαλεκτῷ Δωριεῖς γὰρ φασὶν "ἄμμες" Αἰολεῖς "ἄμμε". Ἀττικοὶ δὲ "νῶ" Ἴωνες ἡμεᾶς ἔστι δὲ ἀντωνυμία δυϊκῇ ὀρθῆς καὶ αἰτιατικῆς πτώσεως ἡμῶν· καὶ ἡμῖν *¹⁸¹

“It is our common dialect, because the Dorians say "ἄμμες" the Aeolians say "ἄμμε" and the Attics say "νῶ." The Ionians says ἡμεᾶς, but the pronoun is dual, nominative and accusative cases, ἡμῶν and ἡμῖν.”¹⁸¹

Lines 8.233-234

Τρώων ἀνθ' ἑκατόν τε:

ἐπὶ τὴν ἀνθ' συλλαβὴν ἢ ὀξεῖα ἵνα τὸ πλήρες ᾗ ἅντα οὕτως δὲ ἀξιοῖ Δημήτριος ὁ Γονύπεσός. καὶ ἐμοὶ δὲ οὕτως ἀρέσκει τὸ τῆς διανοίας· ἀντικρὺς γὰρ Τρώων ἑκατόν καὶ διηκοσίων εἰς ἕκαστος στήσεσθαι φησίν. οὐ γὰρ κωλύεται ἢ τοῦ ἅντα σύνταξις εἴ γε ἐπὶ γενικὴν φέρεται*¹⁸²

¹⁸⁰ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.e3:8.44

¹⁸¹ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.234

“Facing a hundred Trojans

There is an acute accent on the syllable *ανθ* because it is the full form *αντα* as Demetrios of Gonypesus correctly thought. And on my part, this way of literary interpretation is acceptable. For clearly each man says that he would make a stand against 100 or even 200 Trojans. (you need it to take the genitive because *ἐκατον* would be genitive if it was declinable) For the syntax of *αντα* is not delayed (not because it's throwing an accent back to take Trojans but because it's taking the "genitive" if *ἐκατον* were declinable), unless it takes the genitive.”¹⁸²

Chapter Seven:

Line 8.290

οἱ περὶ Ζηνόδοτον καὶ Ἀριστοφάνη "ἵππῳ":

Zenodotus and Aristophanes and those who agree with them [write] *ἵππῳ*.¹⁸³

Line 8.213

τῶν δ' ὅσον ἐκ νηῶν ἀπο πύργου τάφος ἔεργε:
διχῶς αἱ Ἀριστάρχου· "ἔεργε" καὶ "ἔρυκε".¹⁸⁴

“The trench encloses the space all the way from the ships to the tower:

The texts of Aristarchus have it two ways: "ἔεργε" and "ἔρυκε."”¹⁸⁵

¹⁸² urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.167

¹⁸³ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msAim:8.200

¹⁸⁴ The scholia continues on from here, but for the sake of this point, the remaining comments are unnecessary.

¹⁸⁵ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.152

Line 8.296

ἐκ τοῦ δὴ τόξοισι δεδεγμένος:

οὕτως αἱ Ἀριστάρχου διὰ τοῦ "γ" "δεδεγμένος". Ἡρωδιανοῦ διὰ τοῦ "χ" "δεδεχμένος". καὶ φασὶ Διογένης. ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασι. ὅτι "εἰρωνευόμενος" λέγει οἶον "δεξιούμενος τοῖς τόξοις". τὸ γὰρ δεδέχεσθαι δεξιοῦσθαι ἐστὶν οὐκ ἀχαρὶς ἢ ἐξήγησις *

“From that moment waiting with bows:

Thus the texts of Aristarchus have δεδεγμένος with a gamma. The texts of Herodian have “δεδεχμένος” with a chi. And Diogenes says in the commentaries, that he writes “εἰρωνευόμενος” something like “δεξιούμενος τοῖς τόξοις.” Because to wait/expect is to welcome not without charm or explanation.”¹⁸⁶

Line 8.513

‡ἀλλ' ὥς τις τοῦτον¹⁸⁷ γε βέλος

ὅτι "βέλος" εἶρηκε τὸ τραῦμα ὁμωνύμως τῷ τιτρώσκοντι. αἱ Ἀριστοφάνους "πέσσοι". Παρμενίσκος δὲ ἐν τῷ α Πρὸς Κράτητα¹⁸⁸ ὡς Ἀριστάρχειον γραφὴν προφέρεται, "ἀλλ' ὥς τις κείνων γε"*

“But so that some missile:

The sign is there because he said the weapon to indicate the wound, it being a homonym for wounding. The texts of Aristophanes have πέσσοι. And Parmeniscus¹⁸⁹ in Book One of Regarding Dominance, like the Aristarchean writing, has "ἀλλ' ὥς τις κείνων γε."”¹⁹⁰

¹⁸⁶ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.199

¹⁸⁷ The lemma has τοῦτον, but the line in the Venetus A reads τοῦτων. The difference in readings is likely explained by differences in Byzantine orthography, that often exchanges omicrons for omegas and vice versa.

¹⁸⁸ Erbse cites fr. 2 Br.

¹⁸⁹ Parmeniscus appears to be a little known grammarian and commentator who is only preserved in the scholia of Homer and a few other authors.

¹⁹⁰ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.321

Line 8.304

Ἀρίσταρχος "Αἰσύμνηθεν" καὶ ἡ Ζηνοδοτοῦ καὶ ἡ Ἀριστοφάνους

“Aristarchus writes “Αἰσύμνηθεν” as does the text of Zenodotus and the text of Aristophanes.”¹⁹¹

Line 8.405

ἔλκε ἀπαλθήσεσθον

ἐν τῇ ἐτέρᾳ τῶν Ἀριστάρχου "ἔλκε ἀπαλθήσονται" καὶ μήποτε κρείττων τὰ ἔλκη ἀπαλθήσονται *

“They shall thoroughly heal the wounds:

In the other [text] of Aristarchus it is "ἔλκε ἀπαλθήσονται" and there never is the superior form:

"ἔλκη ἀπαλθήσονται."”¹⁹²¹⁹³

Line 8.166

‡ ἐν τῇ Ζηνοδοτοῦ "ποτμον ἐφήσω"*

“In the text of Zendotos [it is] "ποτμον ἐφήσω.””¹⁹⁴

Line 8.56

παυρότεροι:

ὅτι ἐλάσσους ἀεὶ τοὺς Τρῶας συν τοῖς ἐπικούροις λέγει ἡ δε ἀναφορὰ πρὸς ἐκεῖνα τὰ ἀθετούμενα, "πολλων ἐκ πολίων ἐγγέσπαλοι ἄνδρες" (Il. 2.131)· καὶ πρὸς Ζηνόδοτον γράφοντα,· "μυρία δ' ἐν πεδίῳ"¹⁹⁵ *

¹⁹¹ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msAim:8.213

¹⁹² urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.259

¹⁹³ The scholion seems to be saying that the contracted form, which is considered the superior form, never appears in the text of Homer. This argument would make sense as contracted forms originated long after the beginning of the epic tradition.

¹⁹⁴ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msAint:8.128

¹⁹⁵ Erbse recommends comparing to *Iliad* 8.562.

“Smaller

The sign is there because he [the poet] always says the Trojans with their allies are a smaller group. And the repetition with respect to those athetized lines, for example "πολλεων ἐκ πολίων ἐχξέσπαλοι ἄνδρες" (Il. 2.131) as opposed to the work of Zenodotus "μυρία δ' ἐν πεδίῳ".¹⁹⁶

Line 8.284

καί σε νόθον περ ἔόντα:

παρα Ζηνοδότῳ, οὐδε ἦν· ἡθέτητο δὲ καὶ παρα Ἀριστοφάνει ὅτι ἄκαιρος ἡ γενεαλογία καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσα προτροπὴν ἀλλὰ τοῦναντίον ὀνειδισμόν καὶ ἀποτροπὴν *¹⁹⁷

“And indeed you being a bastard:

In Zenodotus,¹⁹⁷ the line was not there. And it is athetized in Aristophanes because the family history is inappropriate and does not suit an exhortation but rather is a reproach and a dissuasion [from action].”¹⁹⁸

Line 8.557

ἔκ τ' ἔφανε πᾶσαι:

ἀθετεῖται ὅτι οἰκειότερον ἔχει κατὰ τὴν Πατρόκλου ἐπιφάνειαν.¹⁹⁹ καὶ ὁ ἐξῆς²⁰⁰ δὲ συναθετεῖται αὐτῷ ἐκεῖ γὰρ αἰφνίδιον βούλεται ἐπίλαμψιν παραστῆσαι αἰφνιδίως Πατρόκλου ἐπιφανέντος· ἐνταῦθα δὲ παρατεταμένην νηνεμίην κατ' εὐδίαν· οὐκ εφέροντο δὲ οὐδὲ παρα Ζηνοδότῳ. ἡθέτει δὲ καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης *²⁰¹

¹⁹⁶ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.47

¹⁹⁷ According to the LSJ *παρὰ* with the dative can be used in the technical sense to mean “in” when introducing a quotation or perhaps in this case referring to a specific point in a text since the scholia refer to athetization rather than quoted lines.

¹⁹⁸ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.196

¹⁹⁹ Erbse cites *Iliad* 16.299 as fruitful for comparison.

²⁰⁰ Erbse claims the line referred to is *Iliad* 16.300.

“From which everything is seen:

The line is athetized because it is rather similar to the looking down on Patroclus. And what follows is athetized along with it because he wishes to stand there suddenly illuminated, so that Patroclus may be viewed suddenly. But there the stillness is stretched out for tranquility. It is not transmitted in Zenodotus's edition. And Aristophanes also athetized it.”²⁰¹

Line 8.371

ουδὲ παρὰ Ζηνοδότῳ ἦσαν *

“The lines were not in Zenodotus's edition.”²⁰²

Line 8.337

Ἕκτωρ δ' ἐν πρώτοισι:

αἱ Ἀριστάρχου χωρὶς τοῦ "ν" "Ἕκτωρ δὲ πρώτοισι"· καὶ ἔστιν ὁ δὲ Ἕκτωρ ἐπὶ τοὺς πρώτους ὄρμα *

“Hector among the first:

The texts of Aristarchus have it without the nu and it is: "Ἕκτωρ δὲ πρώτοισι." Hector was hastening on at the front lines.”²⁰³

Line 8.157

οὕτως δια τοῦ "α" "τραπε" αἱ Ἀριστάρχου

“The texts of Aristarchus have it this way: "τραπε" with the alpha.”²⁰⁴

²⁰¹ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.346

²⁰² urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.246

²⁰³ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.227

²⁰⁴ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msAim:8.124

Conclusions:

Line 8.527

κήρεσσι φορήτους

συνθέτως ἀνέγνω ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος καὶ οἱ πλείους ἴσως δὲ ἐπεὶ ἀναλύει αὐτὸ "οὓς κῆρες φορέουσιν" (Il. 8.528) ἔθος γὰρ αὐτῷ πολλάκις τὰ σύνθετα ἀναλύειν. οὐδέποτε δὲ δοτικῇ ἐπεκτεταμένη, κατ' ἀρχὴν συντέθεται οἷον πᾶσι καὶ πάντεσσι· "πασιμέλουσα" (Od. 12.70), οὐχὶ παρατὴν πάντεσσι ἢ σύνθεσις "Ναυσικάα" "Ναυσίθοος", "ἐγγεσίμοροι" "τειχεσιπλήτης". κατ' ἀρχὴν δὲ προσέθηκα, διὰ τὸ παρ' Ἐπιχάρμω²⁰⁵ κατατέλος συντεθειμένον "γυναικ' ἄνδρεςσι ποθεινοί"· εἶπερ οὖν τοῦτο ἀληθές. δηλονότι παράλογον, τὸ "κηρεσσιφορήτους" κατα σύνθεσιν ἀναγνωστέον, ἀλλ' ὅμως ἐπεκράτησεν ἡ Ἀριστάρχειος δι' ὃν εἵπομεν λόγον †

“Urged on the Fates:

Aristarchus read it well as a compound, and the majority likewise also when he resolves it into its elements it: "οὓς κῆρες φορέουσιν" (Il. 8.528). Because it is customary for him to resolve the compound often. But never lengthening out the syllable in the dative, at the beginning it is compounded like “πασι” and “πάντεσσι” in "πασιμέλουσα" (Od. 12.70). The compound is not only derived from from “πάντεσσι,” [for example] "Ναυσικάα" "Ναυσίθοος", "ἐγγεσίμοροι" "τειχεσιπλήτης." I placed it at the beginning, according to the [argument] from Epicharmos, and I compound it at the end like "γυναικ' ἄνδρεςσι ποθεινοί." Indeed if that is true it is clear that it is contrary to the rule. The “κηρεσσιφορήτους” must be read as a compound, but nevertheless the Aristarchean edition is the authority according which logic we say it.”²⁰⁶

Line 8.114

ἐν σχήματι ἐδήλωσε τὸ δοκοῦν παραλελειφθαι· οὐ γὰρ εἴρηκεν ἀνωτέρω ποῖοι ἦσαν οἱ θεράποντες· φασὶ δὲ τὸν Σθένελον ἀπὸ τοῦ τείχους κατενεχθέντα τρωθῆναι τὸ σκέλος δια τοῦτο οὐ πολεμεῖ ἀλλ' ἡνιοχεῖ Διομήδει‡

²⁰⁵ Erbse cites fr. 218 K.

²⁰⁶ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA:8.326

In the line he has shown that is expected that he be left behind. For he has not said previously/ above where the charioteers were. They say that Sthenelos having been brought down from the walls was wounded with respect to his leg and because of this he did not fight but rather held the reins for Diomedes.²⁰⁷

²⁰⁷ urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.e3:8.68

Appendix 2

As mentioned above, one of the principles upon which the Homer Multitext project prides itself is providing immediate verification for its editions. Since my editions are far from being published outside this thesis, that instant verification is not possible. Ideally when my editions are published, a user of the edition would be able to show or hide the text, the scholia, and the corresponding images. In order to allow for verification, I have provided below the cited images for every scholion that appears in Appendix 1, in the order that they appear in Appendix 1. These URN cited images can be plugged into the HMT image citation tool at the following link:

<http://shot.holycross.edu/hcmid/projects/hmt/iliad8.html>.

Chapter One:

urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA100VN-0603:0.306,0.1033,0.4055,0.0345

Chapter Three:

urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA100VN-0603:0.1875,0.7784,0.715,0.1427

urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA101RN-0102:0.1767,0.1802,0.625,0.0531

urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.E3-97bisv-98r:0.5067,0.7055,0.3233,0.0545

urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.E3-97bisv-98r:0.498,0.75,0.3293,0.0805

urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA101RN-0102:0.178,0.1539,0.626,0.0491

Chapter Four:

urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.E3-99v-100r:0.1446,0.7424,0.3349,0.114

urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA102VN-0605:0.1723,0.1311,0.2397,0.1821

urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA102VN-0605:0.1843,0.3051,0.226,0.0586

urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA102VN-0605:0.1829,0.3536,0.2394,0.0635

urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA102VN-0605:0.1874,0.4096,0.2391,0.1281

urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.E3-99v-100r:0.4803,0.1805,0.3397,0.0557

urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA105VN-0608:0.1906,0.6104,0.216,0.077

urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.E3-102v-103r:0.4894,0.7694,0.3251,0.0742

Chapter Five:

urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA108VN-0611:0.184,0.435,0.2396,0.1589
urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.E3-105v-106r:0.7323,0.5632,0.1169,0.0763
urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA110VN-0613:0.1908,0.5746,0.23,0.1012
urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA110VN-0613:0.196,0.6615,0.2308,0.0925
urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.E3-108v-109r:0.1091,0.3918,0.1129,0.1333

Chapter Six:

urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA109RN-0110:0.1596,0.1226,0.6504,0.0655
urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.E3-106v-107r:0.1897,0.6957,0.3269,0.0724
urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA106RN-0107:0.1689,0.5031,0.6506,0.2686
urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA107VN-0610:0.2156,0.7885,0.68,0.0667
urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA102VN-0605:0.4317,0.1828,0.4271,0.0433
urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA104RN-0105:0.1763,0.151,0.6229,0.0474
urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA104RN-0105:0.1589,0.1169,0.6377,0.0491
urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA107VN-0610:0.1676,0.2445,0.2264,0.0781
urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA111RN-0112:0.1788,0.1448,0.6344,0.0847
urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.E3-105v-106r:0.2326,0.6897,0.242,0.0707
urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA104RN-0105:0.1786,0.1712,0.6383,0.1929
urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.E3-101v-102r:0.111,0.0685,0.3763,0.0652
urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA104RN-0105:0.5946,0.5971,0.2346,0.0905
urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA103VN-0606:0.206,0.3207,0.1889,0.0637
urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.E3-100v-101r:0.5,0.1702,0.32,0.0454
urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.E3-98v-99r:0.5029,0.721,0.3223,0.0844
urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA107VN-0610:0.1776,0.173,0.7148,0.0454
urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA105RN-0106:0.5997,0.3317,0.2183,0.115

Chapter Seven:

urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA106RN-0107:0.5706,0.5664,0.0431,0.0322
urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA104VN-0607:0.1637,0.6258,0.7217,0.1783
urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA106RN-0107:0.1634,0.7627,0.6546,0.0521
urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA110VN-0613:0.1824,0.407,0.2408,0.0883
urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA106VN-0609:0.3903,0.3697,0.0637,0.0498
urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA108VN-0611:0.188,0.3289,0.2316,0.0781
urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA103VN-0606:0.8006,0.6962,0.0537,0.0429
urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA101VN-0604:0.1906,0.5784,0.2386,0.074
urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA106RN-0107:0.6214,0.4357,0.1946,0.0749
urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA111RN-0112:0.1628,0.7501,0.6372,0.0763

urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA107VN-0610:0.424,0.6666,0.0416,0.0388
urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA107RN-0108:0.62,0.4506,0.1956,0.0802
urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA103VN-0606:0.4069,0.5351,0.0617,0.0311

Conclusions:

urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.VA110VN-0613:0.2012,0.723,0.6928,0.0982
urn:cite:hmt:chsimg.E3-99v-100r:0.4911,0.6652,0.3257,0.102