grammarian, but (as Wackernagel concluded) transmission in a late Ionian *milieu*. There is also evidence that Zenodotus' text was psilotic, and this supports the view that it derives from an Ionian tradition separate from the Attic tradition which was the basis of the Alexandrian vulgate in general. We can modify the description "rhapsode's copy" to "Ionian rhapsode's copy".

And where should Zenodotus have obtained this copy but in Ephesus, his home town? I suppose the studious young man acquired his own copy of Homer as soon as he could afford one, and then continued to use it as his working text throughout his career. He will have come into possession of it sometime before 300. But it might have been written twenty or thirty years earlier, if not more.

This would take us back well into the fourth century, a time when the practice of competitive rhapsodic performances at festivals was still very much alive in Ionian cities. Ephesus itself had been the home of the famous rhapsode Ion, known to us from Plato's dialogue, and of a Panionian festival which Thucydides (3. 104. 3) compares with the old Delian one described in the *Hymn to Apollo*. In the later fifth and early fourth centuries, then, it had been a major centre of Homeric tradition. Ephesian texts of that time no doubt figured among the ancestors of Zenodotus' exemplar.

This does not mean that his text takes us straight back to fifth-century Ionia. Its many errors included a number of forms too modern to be so old. But no matter how many corruptions his text contained: if it came from a line of tradition substantially independent of the Attic *paradosis* that was the principal source of the later vulgate, there must be a good chance that it preserved some good, old readings that were otherwise lost. And in fact, if we consider Zenodotus' readings with an open mind, we find a fair number of excellent variants.

To sum up, we must treat Zenodotus' so-called ἔκδοσις not as the construct of a hare-brained scholar making an unsteady attempt to create order out of a jumble of manuscripts, but as a fourth-century Ephesian rhapsode's text, deformed by many oral variants, arbitrary abridgments, trivializations, modernizations, and so forth, yet drawing on a side-stream of tradition which, having branched off at an early date from the major (Attic) channel, uniquely preserved certain genuine elements of the archaic text.

ANTONIOS RENGAKOS

THE HELLENISTIC POETS AS HOMERIC CRITICS

The rise of Homeric scholarship as an academic discipline coincides with the heyday of Hellenistic poetry. As Rudolf Pfeiffer in his epoch-making *History of Classical Scholarship* has abundantly shown, this is no pure accident but an essential relationship; in other words, the beginnings of philology as a discipline and the new aesthetics informing the poetry of the first half of the 3rd century B.C. are bound intimately together, and the quality of ποιητὴς ἅμα καὶ κριτικός is characteristic of all Hellenistic poets of this period with very few exceptions.

All these Hellenistic scholar-poets can be said to have engaged in Homeric interpretation firstly in so far as their poetry gives proof of great familiarity with the text of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* and allows in numerous places inferences about the way they understood the meaning of a disputed Homeric passage – to varying degrees, this is true of Lycophron and Callimachus, of Aratus and Apollonius Rhodius, of Theocritus and Rhianus, to name but the most important among them. Their poems show a large number of imitations of Homeric phrases, verses, motifs or scenes and reproduces lexical, morphological, syntactical and metrical peculiarities of the old epic to such an extent that it can be used as a veritable treasury for their poets' exegetical and critical engagement with Homer.

Moreover, quite a few of these poets dealt with the Homeric epics as "professional" scholars. Philitas' interest in the constitution of the Homeric text is confirmed by the fact that readings by him on four Iliadic passages have come down to us, all four of them rejected by Aristarchus, who composed a treatise Πρὸς Φιλίταν; Apollonius wrote the first scholarly monograph of the Hellenistic period on Homer, a book titled Πρὸς Ζηνόδοτον and directed against Zenodotus' edition of the two Homeric epics; Rhianus (like Antimachus of Colophon, the

forerunner of Hellenistic poets) prepared an edition of the Homeric text; finally, the *Odyssey* edition expressly attributed to Aratus has unfortunately disappeared without trace.

The task of evaluating the Hellenistic poets' scholarly achievement is therefore doubly important. Not only do their works need to be always interpreted against the background of their omnipresent Homeric model, but also, apart from holding promise of insights into Hellenistic poetic technique, an inquiry into the scholarly aspects of Hellenistic poetry opens up the possibility of approaching two central issues of ancient Homeric scholarship.

First, we can shed some light on the pre-Aristarchean period of the ancient Homeric exegesis (about which we are rather scantily informed due to the loss of such specialized works as Philitas', Simias' or Zenodotus' collections of glosses) by indirectly tracing the Hellenistic poet-scholars' achievement through their literary work. In other words, their performance in the field of Homeric semasiology can serve as a foundation on which a proper evaluation of the works of later Homeric critics such as *e.g.* Aristophanes of Byzantium or Aristarchus can be conducted [1].

Secondly, and perhaps more importantly, crucial information may be gathered from Hellenistic poetry about the Homeric text of the early Hellenistic period [2]. As already noted, all the poetic works of Hellenistic scholar-poets make up a remarkably rich collection of *memoria Homerica,* and on those grounds the study of those works as witnesses to that period's Homeric text is a worthwhile task. On the basis of a comparison between the Homeric text underlying these works and the variants we know from Homeric critics, anonymous or otherwise, we can try to tackle the most disputed question in the history of the Homeric text in antiquity, namely the question of whether ancient critics constituted their text by taking account of manuscripts or worked on it using subjective criteria and by means of conjectures. Any single passage in a Hellenistic poem imitating a

[1] I have treated extensively this subject in my book *Apollonios Rhodios und die antike Homerexegese* («Zetemata» vol. 92), Munich 1994.

[2] The following discussion draws on my *Der Homertext und die hellenistischen Dichter* («Hermes Einzelschriften» vol. 64), Stuttgart 1993.

Homeric verse is apt to make a substantial contribution towards confirming the early evidence for a certain Homeric variant of Alexandrian origin. In other words, Homeric variants which can be shown to lie behind certain passages of *e.g.* the *Argonautica* or Callimachus' poems would have to be seen as early true *variae lectiones* transmitted in manuscripts rather than as late conjectures.

In the present paper I will limit myself to this latter aspect of the Hellenistic poets' "scholarly" activity, that is, to the question of the Homeric text those scholar-poets had at their elbow when writing their poetry. As for the equally important "exegetical" performance of such scholar-poets, suffice it to say that, as some recent contributions have demonstrated, it was mainly Apollonius and Callimachus who, in anticipation of later Homeric scholarship, placed Homeric vocabulary at the centre of their interests and made their poetry into a vehicle for experiment and communication of their Homeric exegesis [3]: systematic employment of Homeric glosses and *hapax* or *dis legomena*, allusion to problems of Homeric interpretation, and the use of the "lexicographical" technique (which is typical of Apollonius in particular and consists in this poet's practice of bringing out all possible meanings of a Homeric gloss in various passages of his epic) are some of the means whereby these poets shape numerous passages in their work into some kind of a Homeric "glossary".

The need to solve the cardinal problem of the Homeric text's history in antiquity (did the Alexandrians collate manuscripts or are their readings based on conjecture?) with the help

[3] Cf. A. Rengakos, *Homerische Wörter bei Kallimachos*, «ZPE» 94, 1992, pp. 21-47, *Id.*, *Lykophron als Homererklärer*, «ZPE» 102, 1994, pp. 111-130; M.G. Bonanno, *Poetae ut Homeri interpretes (Teocrito, Apollonio)*, «Aevum Antiquum» 8, 1995, pp. 65-85; R. Tosi, *Callimaco e i Glossografi omerici*, «Eikasmos» 7, 1997, pp. 223-240; D. Keil, *Lexikalische Raritäten im Homer. Ihre Bedeutung für den Prozeß der Literarisierung des griechischen Epos* («Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium» vol. 35), Trier 1998, pp. 175 ff. Some examples from late epic are adduced by W. Appel, *Zur Frage der interpretatio Homeri bei den späteren Dichtern*, «ZPE» 101, 1994, pp. 49-52. See also F. Montanari's very useful collection of essays, *Studi di filologia omerica antica* II, Pisa 1995 (with the review by E. Dettori, *Filologia omerica antica*, «GIF» 48, 1996, pp. 289-295); important on fundamentals is L.E. Rossi, *Letteratura di filologi e filologia di letterati*, «Aevum Antiquum» 8, 1995, pp. 9-32.

of the Homeric quotations incorporated in the work of Hellenistic *poetae docti* is the more pressing in view of the following fact: a fair number of scholars in recent years show an increasing, and largely ungrounded, respect for a theory (represented mainly by Martinus van der Valk) according to which the Alexandrian scholars offered mere conjectures and, therefore, their arbitrary and worthless readings could be safely brushed aside [4]; meanwhile, some other, methodologically sound, contributions (Klaus Nickau's, for instance) have made hardly any impact at all. Thus, there should be room for a renewed methodical approach, for it seems to me that real progress on this slippery ground is hardly possible without meticulous use of certain well-defined principles.

Let us, then, take a closer look at the methodological line of the two scholars we have just mentioned – their method as illustrated by their principal works, *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad* (2 vols, Leiden 1964) and *Untersuchungen zur textkritischen Methode des Zenodotos von Ephesos* (Berlin–New York 1977) respectively. The question about the true nature of the readings attributed to Zenodotus, Aristophanes of Byzantium and Aristarchus is extremely hard to answer because, as is well known, we lack general criteria whereby we could distinguish easily between the two types of readings (true readings or conjectures). As Nickau has convincingly shown, the only criterion which can yield tangible results is an external one: we must try to prove that Alexandrian variant readings stem from an older tradition; in other words, we must trace genuine conjuction errors (*Bindefehler*) which point to the older tradition of the Homeric text and which then can serve as proof that Alexandrian scholars based their editions on the evidence of older manuscripts too. Once such proof becomes available – and Nickau, as we know, has made it available with utmost rigorousness in Zenodotus' case, even if for just a small number of the latter's readings (though here it is the principle

[4] The main exponents of this view nowadays are R. Janko, *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. IV: *books 13-16*, Cambridge 1992, pp. 22 ff. (cf. *Id.*, «BMCR» 98.5.20 [review of I. Morris–B. Powell (eds.), *A New Companion to Homer*, Leiden 1997] with the reply by G. Nagy) and H. van Thiel, *Homeri Odyssea*, Hildesheim 1991, pp. IX ff., *Id.*, *Homeri Ilias*, Hildesheim 1996, VI.

itself, rather than the number, that matters), the second step is to conduct, on the basis of internal criteria (linguistic, stylistic, metric etc.), a thorough analysis of the individual variants. Of course this case-by-case analysis, as Franco Montanari recently stressed, can only «incline us with more or less good reason and confidence in favor of the one or the other» [5] possibility (true readings or conjectures) – no firm proof is to be expected here.

Van der Valk's procedure is the reverse of this. His method consists in assessing, by means of general, internal considerations, each individual instance in order to decide whether it is genuine readings or conjectures that we have to do with – usually he thinks the reading of the vulgate is the original one, whereas the Alexandrian variants are always conjectures. The problems of this method, which operates without external criteria, leap to the eye as soon as one looks at the Hellenistic poets van der Valk admits as witnesses to the Homeric text. Since Alexandrian readings are mostly considered by him to be subjective conjectures, this scholar takes the agreement between Hellenistic poetic passages and such readings as proof that the latter are conjectures which have been introduced into the Homeric text under the influence of the Hellenistic poets. However, when a Hellenistic poetic passage seems to corroborate the Homeric vulgate against the reading of an Alexandrian critic, then the testimony of the Hellenistic poet is suddenly perfectly valid according to van der Valk. One could not think of a clearer case of *petitio principii*.

Let me give a concrete example of this method. Van der Valk [6] adduces a passage from Apollonius [7] in support of his opinion that in *Il.* 4.363 (τὰ δὲ πάντα θεοὶ μεταμώνια θεῖεν) the correct reading is that of the vulgate μεταμώλια and not μεταμώνια [8]. Immediately after van der Valk reasons the opposite way: he declares that the vulgate reading λαυκανίη (*Il.* 22.325,

[5] F. Montanari, *Zenodotus, Aristarchus, and the Ekdosis of Homer*, in G.W. Most (ed.), *Editing Texts – Texte edieren*, («Aporemata» vol. 2), Göttingen 1998, 2.

[6] *Op. cit.*, vol. 2, p. 628.

[7] 1.491 χρειὼ θεσπίζων μεταμώνιον εἴ κεν ἀλῴης – it is the only *Argonautica* passage where part of the tradition reads μεταμώλιον.

[8] Μεταμώνιος occurs also in Theoc. 22.181, τὰ δ' οὐκ ἄρ' ἔμελλε θεὸς μεταμώνια θήσειν.

24.642; in the second passage λευκανίη is offered by some manuscripts) is «the true Homeric form of the word», whereas he brushes aside Apollonius' testimony, who uses once λευκανίη in his epos (2.192 – οὐδέ τις ἔτλη / μὴ καὶ λευκανίην δὲ φορεύμενος; in 4.18 λαυκανίη is also offered by part of the tradition). It is thus no surprise to find in his *Iliad* book two diametrically different opinions: «Many modern critics hold the opinion that in the works of these poets traces of an older Homeric Text can be discovered [...] I am sceptical» [9] and «we can take it for granted that Apollonius reflects the usage of the archaic text» [10].

Before we pass on to the discussion of individual Hellenistic passages which can shed light on the Homeric text of the early Alexandrian period, some points on methodology are in place here. The point needs hardly to be laboured that indirect testimonies of the Homeric tradition, especially those which are no quotations in the strict sense of the word, are of doubtful value. In the case of Hellenistic poets particular caution should be exercised for an additional reason: due to the Hellenistic technique of *variatio*, positive proof of the dependence of Hellenistic forms, expressions etc. on relevant Homeric passages is only possible in a very restricted number of instances. Therefore, for the comparison between a Hellenistic and a Homeric passage to be viable two conditions should be fulfilled: first, the passage of any given Hellenistic poet, which is supposed to give textual information about a particular Homeric verse, should display the qualities of a "quotation", *i.e.* narrative situation, context and expression should allude to the Homeric verse in question and only to it. Second, whenever there is no "quotation" in the sense just defined, the Hellenistic expression or word at issue must be shown to have been modelled on the single occurrence of a corresponding expression or word in the Iliadic or Odyssean verse to which it is assumed to be pointing; in other words, the turn of expression (or word for that matter) has to be an ἅπαξ λεγόμενον, if possible in the same verse position. For instance, if a Homeric hapax *x*, variously appearing

[9] *Op. cit.*, vol. 2, p. 78.

[10] *Op. cit.*, vol. 2, p. 637; van der Valk is talking about the forms νείσομαι and νίσ(σ)ομαι.

as either x^1 or x^2 in the tradition, occurs as x^1 in the *Argonautica*, it is a legitimate inference that Apollonius read x^1 in his Homeric text.

Despite the difficulties pointed out above, and also despite the problems inherent in the use of "quotations" when discussing the issue of the Homeric text in antiquity – the diametrically opposed results reached by Labarbe and Lohse in connexion with Homeric quotations in the Platonic dialogues is a good caution tale [11] – I believe that the evidence of Hellenistic poetry is not to be disregarded; we must remember that we are dealing here with learned poets whose use of Homer, informed as it is by scholarly aspirations, can be radically different from the more spontaneous, instinctive and by strictly scholarly standards still unfettered use of the Homeric epics in earlier times – a fact, that makes them all the more valuable for our purposes.

I may add here that Homeric scholars in antiquity too were not strangers to the idea that Homeric quotations in post-Homeric poets, who offer a variant preserved in the Homeric tradition, can be of help in estimating how old (and thus, eventually, how correct) that variant is. I don't need to give any example – they are well-known. Let me only say that Aristarchus was one of them who repeatedly made such use of Homeric quotations in post-Homeric poets, but also his rival Crates of Mallos [12]. In modern times this method has been applied by such pre-eminent scholars as Wolf, Schulze, Wackernagel or Pasquali [13].

So much for method and methodology. Let us now pick up the question we began with: do Hellenistic poets offer cases which prove beyond doubt that they made use of different Homeric manuscripts? In other words, do their works display *Bindefehler* which point to the older Homeric tradition? The answer is clearly "Yes".

[11] Cf. J. Labarbe, *L'Homère de Platon*, Liège 1949 and G. Lohse, *Untersuchungen über Homerzitate bei Platon*, «Helikon» 4, 1964, pp. 3-28; 5, 1965, pp. 248-295, and 7, 1967, pp. 223-231.

[12] Cf. my *Der Homertext*, cit., pp. 28ff.

[13] *Ibid.*, pp. 30ff.

Arg. 3.881 is a case in point: τῇ θ' ἅμα Νύμφαι ἔπονται ἀμορβάδες, αἱ μὲν ἀπ' αὐτῆς / ἀγρόμεναι πηγῆς Ἀμνισίδος. This passage from the famous Artemis-Medea simile has clear affinities with a pre-Alexandrian variant we owe to Megacleides, Homer's fourth-century B.C. Peripatetic interpreter. Apollonius draws here on a well-known *Odyssey* passage (6.102ff., the Artemis-Nausikaa simile), where lines 6.105f. read as follows: τῇ δέ θ' ἅμα Νύμφαι, κοῦραι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο, / ἀγρονόμοι παίζουσι· γέγηθε δέ τε φρένα Λητώ. We know that Megacleides read v. 106 as ἀγρόμεναι παίζουσιν ἀνὰ δρία παιπαλόεντα. Both Apollonius and Megacleides use the participle ἀγρόμεναι instead of the rarer ἀγρονόμοι. The *Argonautica* passage displays thus a "conjunctive error", in other words an error common to Apollonius' Homeric text and the older tradition, thus offering proof that for his Homeric text Apollonius took account of older manuscripts. In this conjunction it should be added that Megacleides' Homeric text must have commanded a certain respect in early Hellenistic period, as is suggested by the fact that Zenodotus too followed this older Homeric critic at least once; more particularly, since Megacleides in the first book of his treatise Περὶ Ὁμήρου disregarded *Il.* 21.195 (οὐδὲ βαθυρρείταο μέγα σθένος Ὠκεανοῖο), Zenodotus, who according to Aristonicus *ad loc.* did not write this verse, was in all probability acting on documentary evidence [14].

Of equal demonstrative value are variants shared by a Hellenistic poet, an Alexandrian edition and an early Ptolemaic papyrus. Here too the coincidence of three different sources speaks for a documentary origin of the variant in question. In *Il.* 6.4 the vulgate and Aristarchus (on second thoughts) read: μεσσηγὺς Σιμόεντος ἰδὲ Ξάνθοιο ῥοάων. The ἀρχαῖα ἀντίγραφα (and initially Aristarchus) read μεσσηγὺς ποταμοῖο Σκαμάνδρου καὶ στομαλίμνης instead, while Aristarchus' pupil Chaeris preferred μεσσηγὺς ποταμοῖο Σκαμάνδρου καὶ Σιμόεντος. Pap. *Il.* 410 (= P. Hibeh 193, 270-230 B.C.) (likewise Pap. *Il.* 270 = P. Tebt. 899, second half of the 2nd cent. B.C.) read *Il.* 6.4 in the version of the ἀρχαῖα ἀντίγραφα. The remarkable expression στόμα λίμνης is also attested in the *Argonautica*, 4.1571f. δεῖξε δ' ἄπωθεν / φωνήσας πόντον τε καὶ

[14] Cf. Nickau, *op. cit.*, p. 56.

ἀγχιβαθὲς στόμα λίμνης, while στομάλιμνον is attested also in Theoc. 4.23 (καὶ μὰν ἐς στομάλιμνον ἐλαύνεται ἔς τε τὰ Φύσκω). In view of this fortunate concentration of sources it is rather strange that στομαλίμνης should have been branded (*e.g.* by van der Valk, Stephanie West or Geoffrey Kirk [15]) a "Hellenistic" conjecture – a disastrous description, often and offhandedly applied. However, such convergence of three contemporary witnesses (the P. Hibeh, Apollonius and Theocritus) suggests that the hypothesis that a conspicuous *varia lectio* here and there in the Homeric text originated from Hellenistic poetic passages, (as Thomas Allen maintained, dismissing the Alexandrian poets as witnesses for the Homeric text [16]), is unfounded, for, in a case like that, who is supposed to depend on whom? Is it possible that it was Theocritus who first used the expression which later, in an unknown chronological order, Apollonius introduced in the *Argonautica* while an anonymous Homeric scholar took it up so influentially that στομαλίμνης found its way into the ἀρχαῖα ἀντίγραφα as well as into the early Ptolemaic papyrus – and all this in the case of a Homeric passage which in its vulgate version gave no cause for alteration? Further proof of the variant's genuineness in the Homeric text is offered by the fact that the place name Στομαλίμνη is attested in the island of Cos (see Str. 14.2.19, C 657). It is hardly conceivable that the place name and the *varia lectio* in *Il.* 6.4 originated from Hellenistic verse; στομαλίμνη can thus only have arisen in *Il.* 6.4.

Also important for my argument are Hellenistic poetic passages in which the underlying Homeric text has preserved traces both of the vulgate and of a variant departing from the vulgate – a clear sign that the Hellenistic poet in question draws simultaneously on two different diplomatic sources. A passage from the Iliadic catalogue of the Trojans (*Il.* 2.855), where the cities of the Paphlagonian coast are listed, is a case in point. Among these Paphlagonian cities are, according to the vulgate, Κρῶμνάν

[15] Cf. van der Valk, *op. cit.*, vol. 2, p. 88, S. West, *The Ptolemaic Papyri of Homer*, Köln-Opladen 1967, p. 73 and G. Kirk, *The Iliad: A Commentary.* Vol. II: *books 5-8*, Cambridge 1990, *ad loc.*

[16] T.W. Allen, *Homer: the Origins and the Transmission*, Oxford 1924, pp. 213ff.

τ' Αἰγιαλόν τε καὶ ὑψηλοὺς Ἐρυθίνους. From Strabo (12.3.10, 545 C) we know the variant Κ(ρ)ωβίαλόν τε (instead of τ' Αἰγιαλόν). This variant is attested also in the *Argonautica*, 2.942, where the Argonauts sail along the same Paphlagonian coast: Κρωβίαλον Κρῶμνάν τε καὶ ὑλήεντα Κύτωρον. According to Strabo (7.3.6, 298 C and 12.3.26, 553 C), Apollodorus thought that Homer «did not know» the cities of the Paphlagonian coast [17]. This can only mean one of two things: either *Il.* 2.853-5 with Κύτωρος, Σήσαμος, Κρῶμνα, Αἰγιαλός (or Κ[ρ]ωβίαλος), Ἐρύθινοι and the river Παρθένιος were unknown to Apollodorus (and his source Eratosthenes) or they were rejected by them. Indeed, some scholars have assumed that these verses were interpolated into the Homeric text only in the 2nd or 3rd century B.C. This, however, is demonstrably wrong since according to *Et. Gen.* Antimachus had already read (fr. 61 W. = 183 M.) the verse quoted by Apollonius. The fact that the *Argonautica* passage 2.930-945 lists all places named in *Il.* 2.851-5 (the river Parthenius, Sesamos, Erythinoi, Krobialos, Kromna, Kytoros, and even Aigialos, the city eliminated in the Strabo quotation), proves beyond doubt that Apollonius knew both versions of *Il.* 2.855.

Finally, another category of passages is that in which a Hellenistic poet seems to be anticipating a reading which in the tradition of the Homeric text is first attested by some later critic. The Hellenistic passage proves clearly that the *varia lectio* in question is of a documentary nature; in other words, the Hellenistic poet and the later critic have both been falling back on the same manuscript evidence. There is a fairly high number of such instances, so I will only give a few examples here featuring, in chronological order, variants of Rhianus, Aristophanes of Byzantium and his pupil Callistratus and, finally, Aristarchus.

Callimachus' work intersects with Rhianus' Homeric text at *Il.* 23.81, where the vulgate and Aeschines, *Tim.* 149 offer the following text (Patroclus prophesies that Achilles is to die

[17] *FGrHist* 244 F 157: Παφλαγόνας τε τοὺς ἐν τῇ μεσογαίᾳ ἱστορηκέναι παρὰ τῶν πεζῇ τοῖς τόποις πλησιασάντων, τὴν παραλίαν δὲ ἀγνοεῖν. Καὶ εἰκότως γε· ἄπλουν γὰρ εἶναι τότε τὴν θάλατταν ταύτην, καὶ καλεῖσθαι Ἄξενον etc.

soon): τείχει ὕπο Τρώων εὐηγενέων ἀπολέσθαι. However, due to its anomalous formation the adjective εὐηγενέων is inadmissible here. Rhianus, followed by Aristophanes, read εὐηφενέων. The corruption probably goes a long way back since the offensive εὐηγενέος is already attested in *h.Ven.* 229 (εὐηγενέος τε γενείου) in the sense "noble". The correct εὐηφενής has left numerous traces in the Hellenistic period. To begin with, there is the participle εὐηφενέοντα which surfaces in *Epica Adespota* 4.13 Pow. (from P. Oxy. 1794); also, the two Callimachean *proton legomena* ῥυηφενίῃ (*Jov.* 84 ἐν δὲ ῥυηφενίην ἔβαλές σφισιν, ἐν δ' ἅλις ὄλβον) and ῥυηφενές (fr. 239.2 *SH*) go clearly back to the adjective favoured by Rhianus. Although Rhianus is sometimes suspected of having imitated Callimachus, it is not likely that his εὐηφενής was first triggered by Callimachus' new formations ῥυηφενίη or ῥυηφενές. It is no less interesting that the other *Iliad* reading lies behind [Theoc.] 27.43 ἐξ εὐηγενέων· ἀλλ' οὐ σέθεν εἰμὶ χερείων.

The *Argonautica* text also comes into contact with Rhianus' edition of the *Odyssey* in one passage. In 3.1088f. there is mention of Deucalion ὃς πρῶτος ποίησε πόλεις καὶ ἐδείματο νηοὺς / ἀθανάτοις. The passage clearly echoes *Od.* 6.9f. (Nausithous settles the Phaeacians in Scheria), where the vulgate reads ἀμφὶ δὲ τεῖχος ἔλασσε πόλει καὶ ἐδείματο οἴκους, / καὶ νηοὺς ποίησε θεῶν καὶ ἐδάσσατ' ἀρούρας whereas Rhianus had θεοῖς. The fact that the middle ἐδείματο is a *hapax legomenon* in Homer as well as in the *Argonautica* proves that 3.1088f. is modelled on the aforementioned *Odyssey* passage. In his study on Rhianus's Homeric text Karl Mayhoff long ago assumed that Rhianus had taken over *hanc lectionem ex vetusto exemplari* [18]; his suggestion is finely confirmed by the *Argonautica* passage [19].

[18] K. Mayhoff, *De Rhiani Cretensis studiis Homericis*, Programm des Vitzthumschen Gymnasiums, Dresden 1870, p. 70.

[19] On Rhianus's qualities as Homeric critic cf. F.A. Wolf, *Prolegomena ad Homerum* (1795), Hildesheim 1963, (188) p. 144 n. 57: «cetera modestum viri ingenium produnt»; J. La Roche, *Die Homerische Textkritik im Alterthum* (1866), Hildesheim 1992, p. 44: «In Rücksicht auf die Textkritik aber verdient Rhianus den besten Kritikern mit Ausnahme Aristarchs an die Seite gestellt zu werden»; S. West in *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey.* Vol. I: *Introduction*

An instance of agreement between the Homeric texts of Aristophanes of Byzantium and Apollonius of Rhodes is offered by *Il.* 7.31f. According to the text of Zenodotus and part of the tradition, Apollo says to Athena ἐπεὶ ὣς φίλον ἔπλετο θυμῷ / ὑμῖν ἀθανάτοισι, διαπραθέειν τόδε ἄστυ. Aristophanes of Byzantium read ὑμῖν ἀμφοτέρῃσι (*i.e.* Hera and Athena), Aristarchus and the other Homeric manuscripts ὑμῖν ἀθανάτῃσι. Now, in *Argonautica* 3.104, yet another quotation from the *Iliad*, Apollonius rather than following Zenodotus' text repeats Aristophanes' reading. Here Aphrodite talks to Hera and Athena, that is, to the goddesses implied by Aristophanes' reading in the *Iliad* passage: νῦν δ' ἐπεὶ ὔμμι φίλον τόδε δὴ πέλει ἀμφοτέρῃσι.

The case of Callistratus concerns *Od.* 12.252. Porson had already seen that Callistratus' reading of this verse ἰχθύσι τοῖς ὀλίγοισι δόλον κατὰ δείλατα βάλλων with δείλατα meaning "bait" instead of the tradition's εἴδατα (also approved, according to Didymus *ad loc.*, by Aristarchus) is presupposed in Callimachus, fr. 177.17 Pf. ἐπεὶ σμίνθοις κρυπτὸν ἔτευχε δόλον· / ἐν δ' ἐτίθει παγίδεσσιν ὀλέθρια δείλατα δοιαῖς. The imitation of this *Odyssey* passage by Callimachus is clearly confirmed by δείλατα, for which the Hellenistic poet is our only testimony, and also by δόλον in the preceding verse. The question which arises once again, namely whether Callimachus and Callistratus were reading the same Homeric text or whether Callistratus was prompted by Callimachus (as Hartmut Erbse or van der Valk expressly contended [20]) can be safely answered in favour of the former alternative in view of the fact that Callimachus is clearly imitating the *Odyssey* passage.

and Books I-VIII by A. Heubeck, St. West, J. B. Hainsworth, Oxford 1988, p. 45: «(Rhianus's readings) suggest good sense and acute observation of Homeric usage».

[20] H. Erbse, *Homerscholien und hellenistische Glossare bei Apollonios Rhodios*, «Hermes» 81, 1953, p. 179; M. van der Valk, *Textual Criticism of the Odyssey*, Leiden 1949, p. 168. The same view is held by H.-L. Barth, *Die Fragmente aus den Schriften des Grammatikers Kallistratos zu Homers Ilias und Odyssee*, Diss. Bonn 1984, pp. 20ff. Cf. R. Schmidt, *Commentatio de Callistrato Aristophaneo*, in A. Nauck, *Aristophanis Byzantii grammatici Alexandrini fragmenta*, Halle 1848, p. 321, n. 37.

That Callistratus should have inserted the conjecture δείλατα into the *Odyssey* passage through his reading of Callimachus' poem is *a priori* unlikely.

Variants transmitted under the name of Aristarchus are also attested in the *Argonautica*. The first instance is 2.649 (εἰρεσίῃ δ' ἀλίαστον ἔχον πόνον), where the phrase ἀλίαστον πόνον anticipates Aristarchus' reading in *Il.* 2.420 (the situation referred to in the Homeric passage is strongly similar to that in Apollonius' epic as both come after a *peira*): πόνον δ' ἀλίαστον ὄφελλεν (ἀμέγαρτον vulg.). In *Od.* 4.567 the vulgate and nearly the whole of the indirect tradition read ἀλλ' αἰεὶ Ζεφύροιο λιγὺ πνείοντας ἀήτας / Ὠκεανὸς ἀνίησιν ἀναψύχειν ἀνθρώπους; by contrast Aristarchus read Ζεφύροιο λιγὺ πνείοντος ἀήτας. In 4.837 Apollonius imitates the *Odyssey* passage and presupposes Aristarchus' reading νῆα σαωσέμεναι, Ζεφύρου λίγα κινυμένοιο.

To sum up. On the testimony of Hellenistic poets a considerable number of Alexandrian readings can be shown to be of a documentary character. Conjunction errors pointing to the older Homeric tradition, use of a Homeric variant common to a Hellenistic poet, an early Ptolemaic papyrus and an Alexandrian edition, simultaneous occurrence of a vulgate reading and of a variant departing from the vulgate, clear anticipation of readings which had hitherto been known under the name of later Homeric critics – all this cumulative evidence points to the conclusion reached by Franco Montanari that the Alexandrians must be credited with «a genuine effort to compare different copies available to them and [...] to choose among variants» [21]. Of course, the testimony of the Hellenistic poets does not entitle us to sustain the authenticity of all Alexandrian readings [22], but it definitely helps establish the

[21] F. Montanari, *op. cit.*, p. 2; the same view is held by Michael Haslam in his masterly essay *Homeric Papyri and Transmission of the Text*, in I. Morris – B. Powell, *A New Companion to Homer*, Leiden 1997, pp. 55-100.

[22] What the Homeric text of the Alexandrian poets proves is, strictly speaking, not that Alexandrian variants are genuine readings; in principle, such variants may well have been the result of earlier conjectures (from the 5th or 4th century B.C.) simply adopted by the Alexandrians. However, on the other hand Hellenistic poets prove beyond doubt that the Homeric critics of the Alexandrian pe-

opinion which is beginning to prevail among scholars according to which Alexandrian Homeric criticism is a mixture of conjectural emendation and selection between textual variants as the likeliest solution to the problem.

One last point. Is it perhaps possible to appeal to the evidence of Hellenistic poetry with a view to drawing the same conclusion with regard to two of the most important aspects of Homeric scholarship in antiquity, namely the athetesis and the omission of verses? And there is a second, more general question too: how are we to judge the Hellenistic poets as Homeric scholars? Are these poets also competent in matters of literary criticism? There is an important observation to be made here. The fact that a poet opts for a particular Homeric variant in his own work does not necessarily mean that he considered the variant correct in the Homeric text too; he may well have disapproved of the variant as un-Homeric, but he may have taken it over into his poem all the same because he thought it served his immediate poetic pursuits. It should be emphasised that the testimony of Hellenistic poets must only be exploited in the context of the history of the Homeric transmission and not with a view to assessing their "scholarly" qualities as such. It is thus impossible to judge Apollonius and Callimachus as Homeric critics on the evidence of their poetry.

Similar difficulties arise in the case of the athetesis. We can note the fact that a Hellenistic poet is quoting a verse athetised by Zenodotus, Aristophanes or Aristarchus and perhaps see this as an indication that he found nothing to complain about. In the case of the far fewer Homeric verses which were omitted by critics and which have left traces in a Hellenistic poem, it can be safely assumed that they were known to the poets concerned and were deliberately left out by Homeric scholars – and not because those scholars were not aware of them. However, what any particular Hellenistic poet thought non genuine, which atheteseis of Zenodotus'

riod did have recourse to older manuscripts too in order to constitute their own Homeric editions, even if in so doing they admitted into their text conjectures of older scholars without being aware of it.

he approved of and which atheteseis of Aristophanes or Aristarchus' he had anticipated – this we simply cannot tell. At this point Hellenistic poems as witnesses to the Homeric text completely fail us [23].

[23] In the concluding discussion Richard Janko raised objections to this view on the grounds that the Homeric variants traced in Hellenistic poetic works are hardly capable of proving that the *poetae docti* were in the business of assessing manuscripts since such variants either reflect discussions among scholars or derive from Homeric rhapsodes; moreover, the number of the variants in question is small. I find all three points made by Janko rather weak. Whether those variants were discussed in scholarly circles or not, the fact of the matter is that scholars were familiar with them—and on documentary evidence, at that. It is less than likely that, instead of consulting the Homeric manuscripts of the Mouseion, Alexandrian scholar-poets were habitués of rhapsodic performances hectically jotting down variants. Finally, this is a matter of principle rather than of numbers: when we know for certain that even a handful of Alexandrian variants are genuine readings rather than mere conjectures we are fully entitled to claim that the Alexandrians not only conjectured but also collated manuscripts.

STORIA E LETTERATURA
RACCOLTA DI STUDI E TESTI
210

OMERO
TREMILA ANNI DOPO

a cura di
FRANCO MONTANARI

con la collaborazione di
PAOLA ASCHERI

202/04 Bh 290



ROMA 2002
EDIZIONI DI STORIA E LETTERATURA

UNIVERSITÄT HAMBURG