

Porphyry and ancient scholarship on *Iliad* 10.252-253: Edition, translation and discussion

Abstract: In *Iliad* 10, Odysseus claims that ‘more night has passed | than two parts, but still a third part remains’ (252-253). This gave rise to a Homeric problem, which received a great deal of attention from ancient scholars: If more than two parts of the night have passed, how can a third part remain? The main source for a variety of solutions to it is a lengthy discussion written along the perimeter of three pages of *Venetus B*, an important manuscript of the *Iliad*. The source of this text is almost certainly Porphyry’s *Homeric Questions*. Porphyry presents six different solutions, including those of Apion, Chrysippus and Aristotle (this last a fragment from his lost *Homeric Problems*), as well as a discussion of Odysseus as astronomer. The present paper includes: a critical edition of this text based on a fresh inspection of the manuscript, yielding new readings; an English translation; notes to the text; and an interpretive essay. The paper demonstrates the limitations of earlier editors of the text, and the hope is that it will serve as an example of how properly to approach and present the fragments of Porphyry’s *Homeric Questions*. It also turns out that, for quotations from the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, Porphyry often does not provide the text attributed to him in the recent Homer editions of West.

Keywords: Homer, Porphyry, Aristotle, scholia, Odysseus.

1 Introduction

* **Corresponding authors:** Gertjan Verhasselt, LMU Munich, E-Mail: Gertjan.Verhasselt@klassphil.uni-muenchen.de, Robert Mayhew, Seton Hall University, New Jersey, E-Mail: robert.mayhew@shu.edu

In *Iliad* 10, Diomedes and Odysseus volunteer one night to spy on the Trojans. Odysseus urges them to make a start:

ἀλλ' ἴομεν· μάλα γὰρ νύξ ἄνεται, ἐγγύθι δ' ἠώς,
ἄστρα δὲ δὴ προβέβηκε, παροίχωκεν δὲ πλέων νύξ
τῶν δύο μοιράων, τριτάτη δ' ἔτι μοῖρα λέλειπται. (*Il.* 10.251-253)¹

But let us go, for night is quickly coming to an end, and dawn is near,
and the stars have advanced, and more night has passed
than two parts, but still a third part remains.²

This passage (and especially 252-253) received a great deal of attention from ancient Homeric scholars, and the extant evidence for what they said about it comes almost entirely from the Homeric scholia. There was discussion of possible variants of παροίχωκεν ('have advanced'), none of which alter the meaning of the text.³ But the bulk of the attention in antiquity was devoted to answering some version of the following 'much-discussed question' (in the words of one A scholion from the *Viermännerkommentar* (VMK)):⁴ If *more* than two thirds (or two parts) of the night have passed, how can one third (or a third part) of the night remain?

There is no record of who first raised a question about these verses, but the text that is the focus of the present study tells us that this is one of the ancient questions; and the people who are cited

¹ The text is that of West 1998-2000, I, 297.

² Translations from the Greek are our own.

³ See the text-critical notes below.

⁴ Schol. A *Il.* 10.252a (Erbse) (VMK): ἄστρα δὲ δὴ προβέβηκε, <παρώχηκεν δὲ πλέων νύξ>· διὰ τὸ πολυθρύλλητον ζήτημα καὶ τὰς γεγονυίας ἀποδόσεις.

take us back to the fourth or even the fifth century BC. The major Alexandrian scholars considered verse 10.253 to be an error. Zenodotus excised the verse, while Aristophanes of Byzantium athetised it (i.e. flagged it as spurious),⁵ as did Aristarchus of Samothrace. Aristarchus seems to have athetised it for two reasons: First, it was sufficient to say, in summary fashion, ‘the stars have advanced’, whereas to go on about the remainder of the night, with a view to being accurate, is too elaborate, as if providing the account of some astronomer (ὥσπερ ἀστρονόμου τινός). Second, δύο in the genitive (τῶν δύο) is, he claims, not Homeric.⁶ Further, according to a D scholion at least one scholar attempted to solve the problem with a hyperbaton, i.e. by reading τῶν δύο μοιράων together with ἄστρα δὲ δὴ προβέβηκε in the preceding line, so that the result is purportedly something like: ‘the stars have advanced two parts, and most of the night has passed, but still a third part remains ...’⁷

⁵ Schol. A *Il.* 10.253a1 (Erbse) (VMK) ends: Ζηνόδοτος <οὐ>δὲ ἔγραφεν, Ἀριστοφάνης ἡθέτει. This is the last line of the scholion, the rest of which is presented in the following note.

⁶ Schol. A *Il.* 10.253a1 (Erbse) (VMK): τῶν δύο μοιράων, <τριτάτη δ’ ἔτι μοῖρα λέλειπται>· ἀθετεῖται, ὅτι αὐταρκές τὸ κεφαλαιωδῶς εἰπεῖν «ἄστρα δὲ δὴ προβέβηκε»· τὸ γὰρ τοῦ καιροῦ τοῦτο ἀπαιτεῖ, τὸ δὲ προσδιασαφεῖν κατὰ τὸ ἀκριβές τὸ παρεληλυθὸς καὶ τὸ περιλειπόμενον ὥσπερ ἀστρονόμου τινός. οὐχ Ὀμηρικὸν δὲ καὶ τὸ τῶν δύο· οἱ δύο μὲν γὰρ λέγει καὶ τοὺς δύο, <τῶν δύο δὲ> ἢ τοῖς δύο οὐκ ἔστιν εὐρεῖν παρ’ Ὀμήρῳ. The source is generally taken to be Aristonicus’ *Περὶ τῶν σημείων τῆς Ἰλιάδος*. While it is true that δύο is otherwise not attested in Homer as a genitive or dative, δύο is used as a dative in *Il.* 13.407 and as a genitive in *Od.* 10.515; these are also the only two passages in Homer where the number two is attested in the dative or genitive (so Homer does not use δυοῖν; he does, however, use the dative for the alternative δοιοί). See Römer 1912, 159 and Hainsworth 1993, 177-178. See also the discussion in Eust. *Il.* 10.251 vol. 3 p. 60-61 (van der Valk). Schironi 2018, 537 n. 159 is right to observe that ‘τῶν δύο’ and ‘τοῖς δύο’ are not attested in Homer, but this is not what the scholion intends to say, since ‘οἱ δύο’ and ‘τοὺς δύο’ are not attested either (the only forms attested with the article are τὸ δύο in *Il.* 5.554; 13.345; 19.47, οἱ δύο in *Od.* 12.73 and τὰς δύο in *Il.* 20.271). That is also why Erbse 1969-1988, III, 51 writes οἱ “δύο” μὲν γὰρ λέγει (E 303 al.) καὶ τοὺς “δύο” (B 346 al.). To express the number two, Homer also uses δοιοί/δοιώ. For the view that Aristarchus interpreted this passage despite athetising 10.253, see below n. 282.

⁷ Schol. D *Il.* 10.252(1) p. 373.3-7 (van Thiel²): ἡ ἐν ὑπερβατῶ· «ἄστρα δὲ δὴ προβέβηκε τῶν δύο μοιράων, παρώχηκεν δὲ πλέω νύξ. τρίτη δὲ μοῖρα λέλειπται», δηλονότι ὅλον τὸ τρίτον μέρος. ὥς γὰρ πρὸς τὸ ὑπολειπόμενον τῆς τρίτης μοίρας φησὶ τὸ «πλέω». ἔνιοι δὲ γράφουσιν «πλέη», ἀντὶ τοῦ «πλήρες τῶν δύο μοιρῶν παρώχηκεν»· τριφύλακτον γὰρ θέλει εἶναι τὴν νύκτα. See also schol. A *Il.* 10.252a (Erbse) (VMK): γράφεται καὶ οὕτως ἄστρα δὲ δὴ προβέβηκε τῶν δύο μοιράων, παροίχκεν δὲ πλέω νύξ, τριτάτη δ’ ἔτι μοῖρα λέλειπται. τριφύλακος γὰρ ἦν καθ’ Ὀμηρον ἡ νύξ (so *Venetus* A fol. 131r). Like Dindorf 1875-1877, I, 352, Erbse 1969-1988, III, 48 adopted Cobet’s correction of the Homeric line in this second scholion to ἄστρα δὲ δὴ προβέβηκε, παροίχκεν δὲ πλέω<ν> νύξ | τῶν δύο μοιράων, τριτάτη δ’ ἔτι μοῖρα λέλειπται. However, this might not be necessary. It is possible that this is the result of a misinterpretation of the D scholion as if it means that there was an actual reading that literally transposed the Homeric lines (which would obviously be unmetrical). Note also that the A scholion from the *Viermännerkommentar* shares the reading πλέω with most manuscripts of the D scholion. Moreover, like the D scholion, it refers to the night consisting of three parts. This would also explain why the two Homeric lines are quoted in full, which puzzled Ludwig

Our main source for a variety of answers to this question – solutions to this problem – is an unusually lengthy text written along the perimeter of three folios of *Venetus B*,⁸ an important manuscript of the *Iliad* containing two levels of scholia (eleventh century, and twelfth or thirteenth). Although the text under discussion cites no author, it is generally taken to be an excerpt from Porphyry’s *Homeric Questions*.⁹ Modern scholars have rightly become sceptical with regard to the inclusion of anonymous texts under the fragments of Porphyry.¹⁰ Indeed, in the case of the *Homeric Questions*, the standard edition by Schrader went much too far in including anonymous texts. Schrader included all scholia written in the form of a question in the Homeric scholia (spanning the A, bT and D scholia in the case of the *Iliad*) and even in Eustathius as fragments of Porphyry. This principle was rightly refuted by Erbse.¹¹ However, Porphyry is more likely to be the author of the excerpt than might appear at first sight. *B generally does not name Porphyry at the start of an excerpt, but the other main manuscripts containing the same excerpts – Scorialensis Ω.I.12 (E⁴) and Harleianus gr. 5693 (Bm⁸) – usually cite Porphyry at the start of the excerpt, thus confirming him as the author of the excerpt. Moreover, the attribution of the zetemata excerpts of *B to Porphyry is further confirmed by the numerous parallels with the *Zetemata Vaticana* (i.e.

1884, 315, since the focus in the second part of the scholion is the Aristarchan reading παροίχωκεν. Van der Valk 1963-1964, I, 124-125, who also restored the text like Dindorf, tried to explain this by assuming that the scholion indicates that some critics did not athetise l. 253. However, the scholiast would not have simply used γράφεται to communicate this; for its counterpart οὐ γράφεται is not used to indicate athetesis but to show that the line in question was not written at all (athetised lines were still written but flagged with the *obelus* sign). See the *Glossary of Greek Terms* in Nünlist 2009, 368 s.v. ἀθετέω (ἀθετήσις): “to consider spurious, to mark as spurious (but without excising)” (see also Nünlist 2009, 16 n. 57), and 371 s.v. γράφω, οὐ: “to excise (i.e. athetise in the modern sense)”. For the hyperbaton interpretation, see also Eust. *Il.* 10.252-253 vol. 3 p. 59.15-16 (van der Valk): ἢ καθ’ ὑπερβατόν, ὅτι ἄστρα τὰ πλέω τῶν ἀφ’ ἐσπέρας ὑπὲρ γῆν ὄντων τὰ τῶν δύο μοιρῶν ὄχγετο.

⁸ Digital copies of *Venetus B*, fols. 134v-135v, can be accessed here: <http://beta.hpcc.uh.edu/hmt/archive-dl/VenetusB/>.

⁹ We follow Erbse and others in using “*B” to refer to the later excerpts, which is the type that interests us here. On codex B and the difference between the B and *B scholia, see Erbse 1969-1988, I, xvii-xviii. The scholiast responsible for the material labelled *B is credited with the addition of the excerpts from Porphyry and from Heraclitus the Allegorist in the spaces of the page that were empty. The scribe seems to have later added another set of excerpts from Porphyry (**B), which he introduces with a symbol in red ink. See Schrader 1880, vii-viii; Erbse 1960, 17-29; MacPhail 2011, 8-9.

¹⁰ See especially Johnson 2017 on the ‘minimalist’ approach to the fragments of Porphyry.

¹¹ Erbse 1960, 17-77.

the first book of Porphyry's *Homeric Questions*). As we will show below, the text under discussion is not preserved in the other manuscripts. But the overwhelmingly large number of parallels for other excerpts suggests that Porphyry is most likely to be the author of the excerpt. Therefore, we posit that the excerpts in *B constitute an exception to the 'minimalist' rule, with which we otherwise wholeheartedly agree.

This text makes clear that most ancient literary scholars – or in any case, those whose views Porphyry thought were worth recording – sought to defend these verses as they stand. Here is an outline of the contents of this text (We have embedded these numbers and letters into our text and translation).

1. Introductory remarks on how to approach Homeric problems
2. A paradigm case: *Iliad* 10.252-253 and 'one of the ancient questions'
3. Solutions:
 - a. The solution of 'some'
 - b. The solution of Metrodorus (of Lampsacus the Elder?)
 - c. The solution of Chrysippus
 - d. The solution of 'others'
 - e. The solution of Aristotle
 - f. The solution of Autochthon
 - g. The solution of Apion
4. What stars is Homer referring to, and what exactly does *προβέβηκε* denote?

In this paper, we first provide a critical edition and translation of the Porphyry excerpt (§ 2), followed by text-critical notes (§ 3).¹² We then provide an interpretive essay, in which we discuss the various views presented by Porphyry (§ 4).

¹² These were composed by G. Verhasselt.

2 Edition and translation

Porphyry's *Homeric Questions* are known to us partly in direct and partly in indirect transmission. The first book (which we have dubbed the *Zetemata Vaticana*¹³) is preserved in direct transmission. The rest of Porphyry's work is preserved only through excerpts in the manuscripts of the Homeric epics. For the excerpts on the *Iliad*, the most important manuscript is *Venetus B*. The text discussed in this article is one of those indirectly preserved excerpts. Before presenting our edition and translation of the excerpt, it is necessary to discuss briefly the previous editors of this text.¹⁴

The *Iliad* scholia in *Venetus B* were first published by Villoison in 1788. However, Villoison often seems to have misread the text and to have misinterpreted the abbreviations used in the manuscript.¹⁵ In 1825, Bekker made a new edition, in which he edited all B scholia together with the A and D scholia. Although he inspected *Venetus B*, he only partly collated it and often still relied on the text as edited by Villoison.¹⁶ The Porphyry excerpts on the *Iliad* were re-edited in Kammer's 1863 dissertation. Although Kammer did not inspect *Venetus B* (or any manuscript for that matter), relying instead on Bekker's text, he provided numerous conjectures.¹⁷ He also often suggested deleting sections, which – in his opinion – interrupted the flow of the text. While he often correctly identified interpolations, he went much too far in obelising the text.

¹³ After Schrader's label "Ζητήματα codicis Vaticani". Sodano 1970 also dubs them "zetemi vaticani".

¹⁴ On the editorial history of Porphyry's *Homeric Questions*, see also Sodano 1970, XXI-XXVIII. On the early editions of the *Iliad* scholia, see also Pontani 2006.

¹⁵ On the importance of Villoison's edition, whatever its flaws, see Nagy 2004 ch. 1.

¹⁶ See Bekker 1825, IV: *Venetum alterum (B) [...] et ipse inspexi. quem cum viderem pulcherrime scriptum lectuque facillimum, nolui dubitare de Villoisonis in describendo eo aut fide aut peritia. nunc ne a vero identidem aberraverit vir eruditior quam prudentior, sero vereor.*

¹⁷ Kammer even chose to omit the excerpts in which he had no corrections to offer.

The scholia in *Venetus* B received their first critical edition in the third volume of Dindorf's edition of the *Iliad* scholia in 1877, edited on the basis of a renewed inspection of the original manuscript. In 1888, Schrader published a new edition of the Porphyrian excerpts on the *Iliad*, which remains the standard edition to this day.¹⁸ Schrader's main source is *Venetus* B, but he also used additional manuscripts, particularly the codex Lipsiensis gr. 32 (Li)¹⁹ and the codex Leidensis Vossianus gr. 64 (Le). The former is now known to be an apograph of B, while the latter is an apograph of the codex Scorialensis Ω .I.12 (E⁴). In his monumental edition of the *Iliad* scholia, which covers both the A and bT scholia, Erbse included only the first layer of B scholia, thus excluding all the excerpts from Porphyry. More recently, MacPhail has published a new edition and translation of the Porphyrian excerpts on the *Iliad* preserved in indirect transmission on the basis of *Venetus* B, E⁴ and the codex Harleianus gr. 5693 (Bm⁸) (in addition to Li and Le).²⁰

The text edited here is not found in E⁴/Le, Bm⁸ or Li (the apograph of *Venetus* B). However, it is found in another copy of B not used by previous editors, viz. Vaticanus Palatinus gr. 12 (V²⁰) (thirteenth century)²¹. Since this is a *codex descriptus*, we do not systematically cite its readings, but we do cite it when it corrects a corrupt passage or resolves an abbreviation in B whose resolution is debated. When we cite deviating readings in V²⁰, these should thus be considered the equivalent of conjectures.

¹⁸ In this edition, Schrader also included the first book of Porphyry's *Homeric Questions*. Schrader 1890 later also published an edition of the Porphyrian excerpts on the *Odyssey*. Note, however, that Porphyry did not separate his discussion of the *Iliad* from that of the *Odyssey* and did not present the problems in the order of the Homeric songs. The first book of Porphyry's *Homeric Questions* shows that his discussion alternates between the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Therefore, the distinction of 'Homeric Question on the *Iliad*' and 'Homeric Questions on the *Odyssey*' is a purely modern construct.

¹⁹ The codex Lipsiensis gr. 32 (Li) was used already partly by Villoison and Bekker through a copy made by Stephanus Bergler (the *apographum Hamburgense*). See d'Ansse de Villoison 1788, XLV-XLVII; Bekker 1825, III. The scholia of Li were published by Bachmann 1835.

²⁰ MacPhail's edition is also more restrictive in the inclusion of the texts than Schrader. Unfortunately, this has led him to exclude even some excerpts whose attribution to Porphyry is certain. He also omits the citations of Porphyry's *Homeric Questions* in the D scholia and Eustathius (F 384-402 Smith). See Dorandi 2011; Hillgruber 2014, 494.

²¹ On V²⁰, see Allen 1931, 48; Erbse 1960, 9; 1969-1988, I, xxxii-xxxiii.

Despite the recent edition by MacPhail, the textual constitution is often still problematic, as will become clear from the notes and essay. Our renewed inspection of *Venetus B* also shows that MacPhail (like the editors before him) sometimes misread the text (though far less often than Villoison or Bekker). His translation, which aims to be literal, is also often difficult to understand.²² Moreover, despite its title (*Porphry's Homeric Questions on the Iliad: Text, Translation, Commentary*), MacPhail's book does not offer a commentary on the text (neither a philological nor an interpretive one) but merely offers sporadic footnotes. Furthermore, for our excerpt, MacPhail even omits the end of the text (virtually all of Item 4 in our outline) without any explanation.

²² See van der Horst 2011; Slater 2012, 328-329.

[fol. 134v] [1] ἡ συναγωγή τῶν ζητουμένων γέγονε μὲν ἤδη καὶ παρ' ἄλλοις· ἡμεῖς δὲ τὰ προβλήματα λαμβάνοντες παρὰ τῶν ἐζητηκότων, τὰς λύσεις ἐπικρίνομεν ἃς ἐκεῖνοι ὑπέταξαν τοῖς προβλήμασι, καὶ τινὰς μὲν τούτων ἐγκρίνομεν, τινὰς δὲ παραιτούμεθα, τὰς δ' αὐτοὶ ἐξευρίσκομεν, τὰς δὲ πειρώμεθα διορθοῦν καὶ ἐξεργάζεσθαι, ὥσπερ τοῖς ἐντυγχάνουσιν ἔσται δῆλον.

- 5 [2] αὐτίκα τῶν παλαιῶν ζητημάτων ὁμολόγηται εἶναι τὸ τοιοῦτο, ἐν οἷς φησιν· «ἄστρα δὲ δὴ προβέβηκε, παρώχηκε^w δὲ πλέω^x νύξ | τῶν δύο μοιράων, τριτάτη δ' ἔτι^y μοῖρα λέλειπται» (*Il.* 10.252-253)· πῶς γὰρ, εἰ αἱ δύο μοῖραι ἐξήκουσιν αὐταῖ τε^z καὶ ἔτι^{aa} τούτων πλέον, ἢ τριτάτη μοῖρα λέλειπται, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ τῆς τρίτης μῦριον;

[3a] ὅθεν καὶ τινες προστιθέντες^{bb} τὸ σ ἡξίου «τριτάτης δ' ἔτι^{cc} μοῖρα^{dd} λέλειπται» γράφειν, ἵνα

- 10 τῆς τρίτης μερίς τις ἦ καταλελειμμένη, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὅλη ἡ τρίτη.

[3b] Μητρόδωρος^{ee} (61 fr. 5 DK) μὲν οὖν τὸ πλεῖον δύο σημαίνειν φησὶ παρ' Ὀμήρῳ. καὶ γὰρ τὸ σύνηθες, ὡς ὅταν λέγῃ «νώτου ἀποπροταμών, ἐπὶ δὲ πλεῖον ἐλέλειπτο» (*Od.* 8.475), καὶ «ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν πλεῖον πολυαῖκος πολέμοιο | χεῖρες ἐμαὶ διέπουσι» (*Il.* 1.165-166), σημαίνει<v> <δὲ>^{ff} καὶ τὸ πληρὲς, ὡς ἐν τῷ «σὸν δὲ πλεῖον δέπας αἰεὶ | ἔστηκε» (*Il.* 4.262-263), καὶ ἐν τῷ «πλεῖαί τοι χαλκοῦ

- 15 κλισίαι» (*Il.* 2.226). νῦν οὖν τὸ πλέον^{gg} ἀντὶ τοῦ πληρὲς εἰρησθαι· πλήρης γὰρ ἡ νύξ τῶν δύο

^w παρώχηκε *B : παρώχηκεν Kammer

^x πλέω *B : πλέον Villoison

^y δ' ἔτι Bekker (ex *Il.* 10.253) : δέ τι *B

^z αὐταῖ τε *B : αὐταῖ τε Bekker

^{aa} ἔτι *B : ἐπὶ Villoison

^{bb} πρ^{ο(σ)}τιθέντες *B : προτιθέντες Villoison

^{cc} δ' ἔτι Bekker : δέ τι *B

^{dd} μοῖρα Bekker : μοίρας *B

^{ee} μητρόδωρος *B : Ζηνόδωρος Horn 1883, 92 (thesis III)

^{ff} σημαίνει<v> <δὲ> Diels : σημαί'ν *B : σημαίνει V²⁰ : σημαίνει <δὲ> Schrader

^{gg} πλέον *B : fortasse πλεῖον

μοιρῶν γεγονυῖα παρώχηκε, τριτάτη^{hh} δέ τιⁱⁱ περι<λέ>λειπται^{jj}. διεῖλε δ' εἰς γ', ὡς ἂν τριφυλάκου τῆς νυκτὸς οὔσης.

[3c] Χρύσιππος (*SVF* III *fr.* 772) δὲ, ὥσπερ εἴ τις, φησὶ, περὶ τριῶν ἡμερῶν διαλεγόμενος ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ λέγει μίαν ἀπολείπεσθαι ἔτι ἡμέραν, κἂν^{kk} μὴ περὶ ὄρθρον ποιῆται τοὺς λόγους· οὕτως καὶ
5 τὸν Ὀδυσσεά, εἰ καὶ πλέον ἦν παρωχηκὸς τῶν δύο μοιρῶν, τὴν τρίτην φάναι καταλείπεσθαι, ἐπειδὴ τριμεροῦς οὔσης τῆς νυκτὸς ἕκαστον μέρος ὡς^{ll} ἔν τι λαμβάνεται, ὥστε κἂν ἐλλιπὲς ᾖ τοῦτο καὶ μὴ ὁλόκληρον, ἀλλ' ἀριθμεῖσθαι γε τρίτον^{mm} τῷ τάξιν τῶν μερῶνⁿⁿ ἔχειν τὴν τρίτην. οὕτω γὰρ καὶ ἄνθρωπον †παρὰ πόδα†^{oo} γενόμενον, ἔτι τυγχάνειν τῆς ὅλης^{pp} προσηγορίας ∴

[3d] ἄλλοι δέ φασιν ἔθος ἔχειν τοὺς ποιητὰς τῷ ἀπηρτισμένῳ χρῆσθαι ἀριθμῷ, ὅτε μὲν τὰ
10 ἐπιτρέχοντα τοῖς ἀριθμοῖς περιγράφοντας ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὁλοσχερεῖ καὶ ἀπηρτισμένῳ χρῆσθαι, οἷον^{qq} «χιλιόναυν στρατὸν» φήσειέ <τις ἂν>^{rr} τῶν Ἑλλήνων – ἦσαν δὲ αἱ νῆες χίλια ἑκατὸν ὀγδοήκοντα ἑξ – καὶ ἔτι «πύργους εἴκοσι^{ss} μιᾷ στολῇ, πεζοῖς μὲν ἑνδεκα^{tt}, ναυσὶ δὲ δωδέκα^{uu}» (*TGF* II *Adesp.* *fr.* 432a) ἀντὶ τοῦ κγ'. ὅτε δὲ τὸν προκείμενον περιγράφουσι, τῷ ἐπιτρέχοντι ἀρκούμενοι, οἷον

^{hh} τριτάτη *B : τριτάτης Villoison

ⁱⁱ δέ τι *B : δ' ἔτι Kammer

^{jj} περι<λέ>λειπται Bekker : περίλειπται *B

^{kk} ὥστε κἂν μὴ περὶ ὄρθρον ποιῆται τοὺς λόγους, ἀλλ' ἀριθμεῖσθαι γε τρίτην, τῷ τάξιν τῶν ἡμερῶν ἔχειν τὴν τρίτην, οὕτως καὶ τὸν Ὀδυσσεά, εἰ καὶ πλέον ἦν παρωχηκὸς τῶν δύο μοιρῶν, τὴν τρίτην φάναι καταλείπεσθαι, ἐπειδὴ τριμεροῦς οὔσης τῆς νυκτὸς ἕκαστον μέρος ἔν τι λαμβάνεται, κἂν ἐλλιπὲς ᾖ τοῦτο καὶ μὴ ὁλόκληρον Kammer

^{ll} ὡς om. Villoison

^{mm} τρίτον *B : τρίτην Villoison

ⁿⁿ μερῶν Schrader : ἡμερῶν *B

^{oo} παρὰ πόδα *B : cruces posuimus : παρὰ <μικρὸν ἐξά>ποδα Schrader : πηρὸν τὸν πόδα Diels ap. MacPhail : καίπερ ἄποδα Kammer

^{pp} ὅλης *B : ὅλου Janko ap. MacPhail

^{qq} οἷον coniecimus : ὅταν *B : fortasse οἷον ἂν

^{rr} τις ἂν supplevimus : τις suppl. Schrader

^{ss} εἴκοσι *B : εἴκοσιν Kannicht in Kannicht/Snell 1981, 126

^{tt} ἑνδεκα *B : ἑνδεκ' <ἀλλὰ> Kannicht in Kannicht/Snell 1981, 126

^{uu} δωδέκα *B : δώδεκα Kannicht in Kannicht/Snell 1981, 126

«κατὰ^{vv} μὲν φίλα τέκν'^{ww} ἔπεφνε<v>^{xx} θάλλοντα<ς>^{yy} ἥβᾱ | δυώδεκ'^{zz}, αὐτὸν δὲ τρίτον» (Pind. *fr.*

171 Snell/Maehler), ἀντὶ τοῦ τρίτον καὶ δέκατον· καὶ «τετράτῳ δ' αὐτὸς πεδάθη», φησὶν ὁ

Πίνδαρος (*fr.* 135 Snell/Maehler), ἀντὶ τοῦ τετάρτῳ καὶ δεκάτῳ· «ἡ δὲ γυνὴ τέτορ' [ἦθ']^{aaa} ἡβώοι,

πέμπτῳ δὲ γαμοῖτο» (Hes. *Op.* 698), ἀντὶ τοῦ τεσσαρεσκαίδεκα καὶ πεντεκαίδεκάτῳ^{bbb}. Εὐπολὶς

5 τε Χρυσῷ γένει^{ccc} (*fr.* 298 Kassel/Austin)·

[A]^{ddd}. <δω>δέκατος^{eee} ὁ τυφλὸς, τρίτος^{fff} ὁ τὴν κάλῃν^{egg} ἔχων,

ὁ στιγματίας τέταρτός ἐστιν ἐπὶ δέκα^{hhh},

πέμπτος δ' ὁ πυρρόςⁱⁱⁱ, ἕκτος ὁ διεστραμμένος·

χοῦτοι^{jjj} μὲν εἰς^{kkk} ἑκκαίδεκ'^{lll} εἰς^{mmm} Ἀρχέστρατονⁿⁿⁿ,

10 ἐς τὸν δὲ φαλακρὸν^{ooo} ἑπτακαίδεκ'^{ppp}. [B]. ἴσχε δῆ.

^{vv} κατὰ *B : καὶ Maehler in Snell/Maehler 1989, 137

^{ww} τέκν' Boeckh 1821, 644 : τέκνα *B

^{xx} ἔπεφνε<v> Boeckh 1821, 644 : ἔπεφνε *B : πέφνε Thiersch 1820, 300

^{yy} θάλλοντα<ς> Boeckh 1821, 644 : θάλλοντα *B : θάλλοντ' ἐν Thiersch 1820, 300

^{zz} δυώδεκ' Boeckh 1821, 644 : δυώδεκα *B : δώδεκ' Hartung 1856, 246

^{aaa} τέτορ' [ἦθ'] correximus : τέταρτ' ἦθ' *B : τέταρτον ἔτος Schrader : τετάρτῳ ἔτει Villoison : τέτορ' [ἔτει] Kammer : τέτορ' Dindorf

^{bbb} τεσσαρεσκαίδεκα καὶ πεντεκαίδεκάτῳ coniecimus : τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτ' καὶ πεντεκαιδεκάτ' *B : ιδ'ῳ καὶ πεντεκαιδεκάτῳ V²⁰ : τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτῳ καὶ πεντεκαιδεκάτῳ Villoison

^{ccc} χρυσῷ γένει Bekker : χρυσογένειαν *B

^{ddd} [A] δωδέκατος ... ἑπτακαίδεκ'. [B] ἴσχε δῆ. [A] ὄγδοος ... personas ita distinxit Runkel 1829, 164 : [A] δωδέκατος ... Ἀρχέστρατον. [B] ἐς τὸν δὲ φαλακρὸν ἑπτακαίδεκ'. [A] ἴσχε δῆ. ὄγδοος ... Kaibel ap. Kassel/Austin 1986, 472 : [A] δωδέκατος ... διεστραμμένος. [B] χοῦτοι ... Ἀρχέστρατον. [A] ἐς τὸν δὲ φαλακρὸν ἑπτακαίδεκ'. [B] ἴσχε δῆ. [A] ὄγδοος ... Storey 2003, 271

^{eee} <δω>δέκατος Runkel 1829, 164 : δέκατος *B

^{fff} ὁ τρίτος δὲ δέκατος, τυφλὸς, ὁ καλὴν ἔχων Bothe 1855, 192

^{egg} κάλῃν Schneider 1846, 647 et Emperius 1847, 309 : καλὴν *B : κωλῇν Meineke 1839, 537 : κυλλὴν Bergk : τρίτος ἐπὶ δέχ' ὁ τὴν καλὴν Blaydes 1890, 39 : ὁ καλὴν ἔχων Bothe 1855, 192

^{hhh} ὁ στιγματίας <οὔτος> τέταρτος ἐπὶ δέκα Blaydes 1896, 46

ⁱⁱⁱ πυρρός Runkel 1829, 164 : πύργος *B : πηρός Cobet 1876, 416 : γρυπός Tammaro 1988

^{jjj} χοῦτοι Runkel 1829, 164 : καὶ οὔτοι *B

^{kkk} μὲν εἰς Meineke 1839, 537 : μὲν εἰς *B : μὲν εἴς Runkel 1829, 164

^{lll} ἑκκαίδεκ' Runkel 1829, 164 : ἑκκαίδεκα *B

^{mmm} εἰς Runkel 1829, 164 : ἐς *B

ⁿⁿⁿ ἐς δ' Ἀρχέστρατον | τὸν φαλακρὸν <εἰσιν> ἑπτακαίδεκ' Kaibel ap. Kassel/Austin 1986, 472

^{ooo} ἐς τὸν δὲ φαλακρὸν Meineke 1839, 537 : ἐς δὲ τὸν φαλακρὸν *B : εἰς τὸν δὲ φαλακρὸν Runkel 1829, 164 : ἐς δὲ φαλακρὸν τόνδ' Bothe 1855, 192

^{ppp} ἑπτακαίδεκ' Runkel 1829, 164 : ἑπτακαίδεκα *B

[A]. ὄγδοος^{qqq} ὁ τὸν τρίβων^{rrr} ἔχων^{sssttt}.

- ὅτε δὲ ἕξω προστιθέασιν, ἵνα τὸν πλήρη ἀριθμὸν εἴπωσιν^{uuu}, οἷον Ὀμήρου εἰπόντος «έννεακαίδεκα
μέν μοι ἱῆς ἐκ νηδύος ἦσαν» (*Il.* 24.496), Σιμωνίδης^{vvv} (*fr.* 272 Poltera = *fr.* 54 Page, *PMG* 559)
φησὶ «καὶ σὺ μὲν εἴκοσι παίδων | μᾶτερ ἔλλαθι^{www}». καὶ δεκάτῳ μηνὶ τοῦ τοκετοῦ ταῖς γυναιξὶ
5 γιγνομένου φησὶν Ὀμηρος· «χαῖρε, γύναι^{xxx}, φιλότῃ, περιπλομένου δ' ἐνιαυτοῦ | τέξῃ ἀγλαὰ
τέκνα» (*Od.* 11.248-249). καὶ «ἄλλοι θ' οἱ Κρήτην ἐκατόμπολιν ἀμφενέμοντο» (*Il.* 2.649) καὶ
«πολλοὶ ἀπειρέσιοι καὶ ἐνενήκοντα^{yyy} πόλῃες» (*Od.* 19.174)· ἢ γὰρ κατὰ τὸ ἕτερον προστίθῃσιν ἢ
κατὰ τὸ ἕτερον ἀφαιρεῖ. ὁμοίως καὶ «πρόπαν ἡμᾶρ ἐς ἡέλιον καταδύντα | δαίνυντο» (*Il.* 1.601-
602), οὐχ ἅμα τῇ ἑφ' ἀρξαμένων πίνειν, καὶ «πᾶν δ' ἡμᾶρ^{zzz} μάρναντο περὶ Σκαιῇσι πύλῃσι» (*Il.*
10 18.453), καίπερ βραχέος γινομένου χρόνου [**fol. 135r**] ὑπὲρ τὴν μάχην. καὶ τῶν Ὀλυμπίων δὲ
ἐναλλάξ ἀγομένων διὰ πεντήκοντα μηνῶν καὶ τεσσαράκοντα ἐννέα, οἱ ποιηταὶ
«πεντηκοντάμηνόν» φασὶ τὴν πανήγυριν εἶναι. οὕτως οὖν οὐδὲν κωλύει, καὶ τῆς τρίτης μοίρας
ἐλλιποῦς οὕσης^{aaaa}, <μῆ> οὐχ^{bbbb} ὀλόκληρον^{cccc} τρίτην αὐτὴν ὀνομάσαι μοῖραν ∴
[3e] Ἀριστοτέλης (*fr.* 161 Rose³ = *fr.* 385 Gigon) δὲ οὕτως ἀξιοῖ λύειν, ἐν οἷς φησιν· ἢ εἰς δύο
15 διαίρεσις εἰς ἴσας^{dddd} δύναται γενέσθαι ἐν τούτοις· ἐπεὶ δὲ^{eeee} τὸ πλέον τοῦ ἡμίσεος ἀόριστόν ἐστιν,

^{qqq} ὁ δ' ὄγδοος τίς; ὁ Porson 1812, 286

^{rrr} τὸν τρίβων' Bothe 1855, 192 : τὸν τρίβων *B : τὸν τρίβων^a V²⁰ : τὸ τριβώνιον Villosion

^{sss} ἔχων *B : φορῶν Porson 1812, 286

^{ttt} ὄγδοος ὁ τὸν τρίβωνα < – × – > ἔχων Olson 2016, 465

^{uuu} εἴπωσιν V²⁰ Bekker : εἴπω(σιν) *B : εἴπω Villosion

^{vvv} Σιμωνίδης δὲ Villosion

^{www} ἔλλαθι *B : ἴλαθι vel Ἐκάβη Gaisford 1823, 203

^{xxx} γύναι *B : γυνὴ Villosion

^{yyy} ἐνενήκοντα V²⁰ : ἐνενήκοντα *B : ἐνηνεκοντα Villosion : ἐννήκοντα Bekker

^{zzz} πᾶν δ' ἡμᾶρ Villosion : πανδημᾶρ *B

^{aaaa} καὶ τῆς τρίτης μοίρας ἐλλιποῦς οὕσης del. Kammer

^{bbbb} <μῆ> οὐχ vel [οὐχ] coniecimus

^{cccc} ὀλόκληρον Villosion : ὀλοκλήρου *B

^{dddd} ἴσας Rose 1870, 1504 : ἴσην *B : fortasse ἴσα

^{eeee} ἐπεὶ δὲ Rose 1863, 165 : ἐπειδὴ *B : ἐπειδὴ <δὲ> Sodano 1974, 42 : ἐπεὶ δὴ Barnes/Lawrence 1984, 2432 n. 1

ὅταν^{ffff} τοσοῦτον αὐξηθῇ ὡς τοῦ ὅλου τρίτον ἀπολείπεσθαι, ἀκριβοῦς^{egge} ἂν εἴη τὸ ἀφορίσαι τοῦτο
 καὶ δηλῶσαι ὅσον ἐστὶ τὸ καταλειφθέν, ἵνα ὅσον ηὐξήθη τοῦ ὅλου τὸ ἥμισυ δῆλον γένηται. οἶον
 τῶν ζ´ ἥμισυ τὰ γ´^{hhhh}. εἴπερ διαιρεθῇ τὰ ζ´ εἰς β´ ἴσαⁱⁱⁱⁱ, ἔσται γ´. ἐὰν^{jjjj} τὸ ἕτερον μέρος αὐξηθῇ,
 ἄδηλον πότερον μορίῳ ἀριθμοῦ ἢ ὅλη μονάδι. ἐὰν οὖν ὅλη μονάδι πλέον γένηται, τὸ μέρος τὸ
 5 ὑπολειπόμενον τρίτον ἔσται τοῦ ὅλου, ὥστε καὶ ὁ εἰπὼν τῶν δύο μερῶν θάτερον πλέον
 γινόμενον^{kkkk} καταλελοιπέ<ναι>^{llll} τριτάτην μοῖραν δεδήλωκεν ὅτι ἐν αὐξήσει τὸ πλέον μονάδι
 γέγονε, τεσσάρων γεγονότων τῶν^{mmmm} τριῶν καὶ δύο ὑπολειπομένων, ὅπερ ἦν τῶνⁿⁿⁿⁿ ἑξὶ τὸ
 τρίτον. ἐπεὶ οὖν καὶ τῆς νυκτὸς αἱ δώδεκα μοῖραι εἰς δύο ἴσας μερίδας μερίζεσθαι δύνανται εἰς
 ἑξ^{oooo}, ηὐξήθη δὲ καὶ^{pppp} πλέον γέγονε^{qqqq} θάτερον μέρος, ἄδηλον δὲ τὸ πόσαις ὥραις – καὶ γὰρ
 10 μιᾷ καὶ δύο καὶ τρισὶ καὶ πλείοσιν ἢ αὐξήσεις δύνανται γίνεσθαι – ἀφορίζων^{tttt} ὁ ποιητὴς τὸ ἀόριστον
 τοῦ πλείονος πόσον ἦν, καὶ ὅτι β´ ὥραις ηὐξήθη, ἐπήγαγεν ὅτι τριτάτη μοῖρα λέλειπται, ὡς ὀκτὼ
 μὲν γενέσθαι τὰς παρωχηκυίας ὥρας, καταλείπεσθαι δὲ τέσσαρας, αἵπερ εἰσὶ τοῦ ὅλου τρίτον.
 οὕτω^{ssss} καὶ εἰ δέκα ὀκτὼ εἴη μοιρῶν^{tttt}, ὅτι δίχα διαιρεῖται εἰς ἐννέα, εἴποις δ' ὅτι πλέον^{uuuu} τῶν^{vvvv}
 εἰς δύο μοίρας <νεμομένων ὥρων> παρώχηκεν, ἢ δὲ τρίτη μοῖρα περιλείπεται, δῆλον ποιήσεις ἐκ

^{ffff} ὅταν δὲ Kammer

^{egge} ἀκριβοῦς *B : ἀκριβῶς Villoison

^{hhhh} τῶν ζ´ ἥμισυ τὰ γ´ del. Kammer

ⁱⁱⁱⁱ ἴσα Bekker : ἴσα *B

^{jjjj} ἐὰν <δὲ> MacPhail

^{kkkk} γινόμενον *B : γενόμενον Rose 1863, 165

^{llll} καταλελοιπέ<ναι> MacPhail : καταλέλοιπ *B : fortasse ὁ εἰπὼν <ὡς> (vel <ὅτι>) ... καταλέλοιπε

^{mmmm} τῶν τριῶν *B : ἐκ τῶν τριῶν Kammer

ⁿⁿⁿⁿ τῶν *B : τὴν Villoison

^{oooo} εἰς ἑξ del. MacPhail

^{pppp} καὶ πλέον γεγονὸς del. Kammer

^{qqqq} γέγονε^e V²⁰ : γέγον *B : γεγονὸς Villoison

^{tttt} ἀφορίζων *B : ἀφορίζει Villoison : ἀφορίσας Rose 1863, 165

^{ssss} οὕτω καὶ εἰ ... εἰλήφθαι del. Kammer

^{tttt} μοιρῶν Schrader : μέτρων *B : μερῶν Villoison

^{uuuu} πλέον τῶν εἰς δύο μοίρας <νεμομένων ὥρων> supplevimus : πλέον τῆς εἰς δύο μοίρας <νεμομένης> Janko ap. MacPhail : fortasse πλέον <θατέρου vel θατέρας> τῆς εἰς δύο μοίρας <διαιρέσεως>

^{vvvv} τῶν *B : τῆς Villoison

τοῦ τὸ τρίτον φάναι περιλείπεσθαι, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ζ', ὅτι δώδεκα φῆς^{www} εἰληφθαι. ἔστω^{xxxx} δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ νυχθημέρου τῶν ὥρων^{yyyy} τὸ αὐτὸ ζητούμενον, καὶ λεγέτω^{zzzz} τις ὅτι πλέον τι τῶν εἰς δύο μοίρας νεμομένων ὥρων παρώχηκε τι^{aaaaa}, μὴ ἀφορίσας τὸ πόσον, ἐπαγέτω δὲ ὅτι ἡ τρίτη μοῖρα τοῦ παντός λέλειπται· ὁ δὲ γίνεταί ὅτι τῆς εἰς β' διαιρέσεως εἰς ιβ' καὶ ιβ' γενομένης, τοῦ τρίτου 5 καταλειφθέντος τοῦ παντός, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ὀκτώ, θάτερον μέρος τὸ πλέον ἐν τέτρασιν ἔσχεν, ὥστε ἑκκαίδεκα^{bbbb} ὥρας τὰς πάσας παρεληλυθέναι, ὑπολείπεσθαι δὲ ὀκτώ. ἐν οἷς οὖν εἰς δύο ἴσα^{cccc} καὶ εἰς τρία ἔστι^{dddd} διαίρεσις, ἐάν τις^{eeee} ἴσῃς δύο πλεονάσαντα^{ffff} τὸ γ'^{ggggg} τῆς εἰς γ' καταλίπη^{hhhhh}, ἀφορίζει ὅσῳ πλέον ἢ αὐξήσις γέγονε. σοφῶς οὖν ὁ ποιητὴς τὸ ἀόριστον [τρίτον]ⁱⁱⁱⁱ τῆς αὐξήσεως τοῦ ἡμίσεος δεδήλωκεν ὅσον ἦν, ὅτι ὥραις δύο^{jjjj}, καὶ ὀγδόη^{kkkkk} παρεληλύθει ὥρα, 10 διὰ τὸ^{llll} φάναι «τρίτατη δ' ἔτι^{mmmm} μοῖρα λέλειπται» (II. 10.253). εἰδὼςⁿⁿⁿⁿⁿ γὰρ τις ὅτι ιβ' μὲν αἱ ὥραι πᾶσαι τῆς νυκτός, ὧν ἡ εἰς δύο μὲν μοίρας διαίρεσις ζ' καὶ ζ' ποιεῖ, ἡ δὲ εἰς γ' δ'^{oooo} καὶ δ' <καὶ δ'>^{ppppp}, καὶ ἀκούσας <ὅτι>^{qqqqq} τῆς εἰς δύο μοίρας διαιρέσεως πλέον τι^{rrrr} παρώχηκεν^{sssss},

^{www} φῆς vel φησ(ι) *B : φῆς V²⁰ : φησιν Villosion : φῆς Schrader : φῆς Dindorf

^{xxxx} ἔστω δὲ καὶ ... ἡ αὐξήσις γέγονε del. Kammer

^{yyyy} ἐπὶ τῶν τοῦ νυχθημέρου ὥρων Kammer

^{zzzz} λεγέτω V²⁰ : λεγετώ *B

^{aaaaa} παρώχηκε τι *B : παρώχηκε ἔτι Villosion : παρῶχηκεν ἔτι Bekker : παρώχηκε [τι] MacPhail

^{bbbb} ἑκκαίδεκα Villosion : ἑκκαίδεκα *B

^{cccc} ἴσα Bekker : ἴσα *B

^{dddd} ἔστι *B : ἐστὶ Bekker

^{eeee} τις <τοῦ β' τῆς> MacPhail

^{ffff} τις εἰς δύο πλεονάσαντα *B : τις εἰς δύο πλεονάσαν Kammer : τις <τοῦ β' τῆς> εἰς δύο πλεονάσαντα MacPhail :

fortasse τις <τῆς> εἰς δύο <θατέρου> πλεονάσαντος vel τις <τῆς> εἰς δύο <θάτερον> πλεονάσας

^{ggggg} γ' *B : τρίτον Schrader

^{hhhhh} καταλίπη MacPhail : καταλίποι *B

ⁱⁱⁱⁱ τρίτον del. Kammer

^{jjjj} δύο <ηὐξήθη> Kammer

^{kkkkk} ὀγδόη Villosion

^{llll} τὸ *B : τοῦ Bekker

^{mmmm} δ' ἔτι Schrader : δέ τι *B : δ' ἔτι γὰρ Villosion

ⁿⁿⁿⁿ εἰδὼς ... μεταβάντος del. Kammer

^{oooo} δ' Bekker : ἐς δ' *B : εἰς δ' Villosion

^{ppppp} καὶ δ' suppl. Kammer

^{qqqqq} ὅτι suppl. Schrader

^{rrrr} πλέον τι <τοῦ ἡμίσεος> Kammer

^{sssss} παρώχηκεν *B : παρῶχηκέναι Bekker

εἶτα γνοὺς ὅτι τῆς εἰς τρία τὸ τρίτον ἐπιμένει, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ὥραι τέσσαρες, εὐθὺς γινώσκει ὅτι ἀπὸ τοῦ μεσονυκτίου μεταβάντος^{tttt} β' ὥραι ἦσαν παραλλάξασαι.

[3f] Αὐτόχθων δέ φησιν ὅτι τετελεσμένων τῶν β' μοιρῶν, λειπομένης δὲ τῆς τρίτης, εἰκότως φησὶν^{uuuuu} ὡς παρήλαθε τὸ πλεόν ἢ νύξ οὕσα μοιρῶν β'^{vvvvv}. πλεόν γὰρ μέρος εἰσὶ τῆς νυκτὸς αἱ

- 5 δύο, εἴ γε^{wwwww} τὰ δύο τοῦ ἐνὸς πλείονα. τὸ οὖν «παρώχηκεν»^{xxxxx}, ὅτι παροιχομένων τῶν δύο μοιρῶν τῷ πλείονι ἢ νύξ παρώχηκεν. οὕτω^{yyyyy} γὰρ οὐδ' ἀμάρτημα ἔσται ἐν τῷ «πλέω»^{zzzzz}, ὅπερ θηλυκῶς ἀκούοντές τινες ἡμαρτῆσθαι λέγουσιν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἢ πλείων· ἔστι γὰρ τῷ «πλέω»^{aaaaa} ἢ νύξ παρωχηκυῖα μέρει^{bbbbb}, τουτέστι τῷ πλείονι καὶ μείζονι μέρει παρήλλαχε^{ccccc}, τῶν δύο μερῶν παρωχημένων.

- 10 [3g] Ἀπίων^{ddddd} δὲ αὐτῶν τῶν β' τὸ πλεόν μέρος ἀνηλῶσθαι λέγει, ὥστε καὶ τῆς δευτέρας^{eeeee} εἶναι λείψανον, καὶ <τούτ>ων^{fffff} μὲν^{ggggg} οὖν τὸ πλεόν παρώχηκε, τὸ <δὲ>^{hhhhh} τρίτονⁱⁱⁱⁱⁱⁱ καταλείπεται^{jjjjj}. περὶ γὰρ νύκτας μέσας ἀναστὰς Ἀγαμέμνων ἐγείρει τὸν Νέστορα καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ τινὰς τῶν ἀριστέων, καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν τάφρον προελθόντες πέμπουσι τοὺς κατασκόπους. τὸν δὲ καιρὸν τῆς νυκτὸς ὑποβάλλει καὶ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν πράξεων. ὀπλίσάμενοι γὰρ οἱ κατάσκοποι, ὀφθέντος
- 15 αὐτοῖς τοῦ ὀρνέου^{kkkkk}, εὐξάμενοί τε τῇ Ἀθηνᾶ χωροῦσι πρόσω, καὶ ἐντυχόντες τῷ Δόλῳ οὐκ

^{tttt} μεταβάντος post μεσονυκτίου traiecimus : post παραλλάξασαι habet *B

^{uuuuu} post φησὶν rasura fere 20 litt.

^{vvvvv} β' *B : fortasse γ'

^{wwwww} εἴ γε *B : εἴς τε Villoison

^{xxxxx} παρώχηκεν <δὲ πλεόν νύξ κτέ.> Kammer

^{yyyyy} οὕτω γὰρ ... παρωχημένων del. Kammer

^{zzzzz} πλέω dubit. Kammer

^{aaaaa} πλέω *B : fortasse πλέω

^{bbbbb} fortasse [τῷ] πλέω ἢ νύξ παρωχηκυῖα [μέρει]

^{ccccc} παρήλλαχε Villoison : παρήλλ^a *B : παρήλλαξε V²⁰

^{ddddd} Ἀπίων Villoison : ἀπίων *B

^{eeeee} τῆς δευτέρας V²⁰ : τῆς δευ^{tp} *B : τοῦ δευτέρου Kammer : τῆς δεκάτης Villoison

^{fffff} <τούτ>ων μὲν Schrader : ὧν μὲν *B

^{ggggg} ὧν οὖν τὸ πλεόν παρώχηκεν del. Kammer

^{hhhhh} δὲ supplevit Schrader

ⁱⁱⁱⁱⁱⁱ <ὄλον> τὸ τρίτον Kammer

^{jjjjj} καταλείπεται *B : καταλείπεσθαι Kammer

^{kkkkk} ὀρνέου Schrader : ὀρ^v *B : ὀρ V²⁰ : ἐχθροῦ Villoison : ἐρωδιοῦ Bekker

ὀλίγον χρόνον περὶ τὰς ἐρωτήσεις διέτριψαν· καὶ κτείναντες αὐτὸν μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπὶ τοὺς Θρᾶκας
 ἔρχονται· [fol. 135v] καὶ βραδύνουσιν αὐτοῖς περὶ τὸν τούτων φόνον ἢ Ἀθηνᾶ ἐπὶ τὰς ναῦς
 ἀπαλλάττεσθαι παραινεῖ· καὶ ἐπανελθόντες λούονται^{lllll} τε καὶ ἀριστοποιοῦνται, καὶ τότε ἡμέρα
 γίνεται. Ὀδυσσεὺς δὲ λέγει «ἐγγύθι δ' ἦώς» (*Il.* 10.251), τὴν διέξοδον ἐπείγων· οὐδὲ γὰρ εὖλογον
 5 πλησιαζούσης τῆς ἕω κατασκόπους^{mmmmmm} πέμπεσθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάνυ ἐπισφαλέςⁿⁿⁿⁿⁿⁿ. τὸ δὲ πλέω
 δύναται μὲν καὶ ὥς πληθυντικὸν οὐδέτερον παρειληφθαι^{ooooo}. τὰ πλείονα ἐκ τῶν δύο μοιρῶν
 παρῆλθεν· ἢ πλείονα παρὰ μοίρας τὰς δύο, ὥς που καὶ ὁ^{ppppp} Θουκυδίδης λέγει· «ἀλλὰ καὶ ταύτην
 τὴν στρατίαν^{qqqqq} θαλάσση ἤδη πλείω χρώμενοι συνῆλθον^{ttttt}» (*Thuc.* 1.3.5). δύναται δὲ καὶ
 θηλυκὸν ἐνικὸν εἶναι, πτῶσιν αἰτιατικὴν προβάλλον^{sssss}. ἢ νύξ παρῆλθε τὴν πλείονα μοῖραν τῶν
 10 δύο μοιρῶν.
 [4] πιθανῶς δὲ οὐδένα ἄλλον τὴν τῶν ἄστρον πορείαν ἐποίησε φυλάττοντα ἢ τὸν Ὀδυσσεά,
 προοικονομῶν εἰς τὴν Ὀδύσειαν· ἐκεῖ γὰρ αὐτῷ ὁ πλοῦς ἀνύεται «Πληϊάδας ἐσορῶντι^{ttttt} καὶ ὀψέ
 δύνοντα Βοώτην» (*Od.* 5.272). λέγοντος^{uuuuu} τοῦ^{vvvvv} Ὀδυσσεῶς «ἄστρα δὲ δὴ προβέβηκε»,
 ζητήσκειν ἂν τις, τί δηλοῖ τὸ «προβέβηκε» καὶ ποῖά εἰσιν ἄστρα^{wwwww} ἐξ ὧν στοχάζεται τὴν ὥραν.
 15 τὸ γὰρ ἐκ τῆς ἄρκτου λέγειν οὐχ ὑγιές· οὐ γὰρ ἐκ τῶν ἀεὶ φανερῶν^{xxxxx}, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν ἀνατελλόντων

^{lllll} λούονται τε καὶ ἀριστοποιοῦνται Bekker : λούοντ' τε καὶ ἀριστοποιοῦντ' *B : λούονται τε καὶ ἀριστοποιοῦντ V²⁰ :
 λούοντό τε καὶ ἀριστοποιοῦντο Villoison
^{mmmmmm} κατασκόπους Schrader : κατασκόπ *B : κατάσκοπον Villoison
ⁿⁿⁿⁿⁿⁿ ἐπισφαλές V²⁰ : ἐπισφαλ' *B : ἐπισφαλῶς Villoison
^{ooooo} παρειληφθαι <ἴν' ἦ> MacPhail
^{ppppp} ὁ om. Bekker
^{qqqqq} στρατίαν legimus : στρατ' *B : στρατίαν Bekker : στρατὸν Villoison
^{ttttt} συνῆλθον *B : συνεξῆλθον MacPhail
^{sssss} †προβάλλον† <ἴν' ἦ> MacPhail
^{ttttt} πληϊάδας ἐσορῶντι *B^{pc} (πλιάδας *B^{ac}) : Πληϊάδας εἰσορόωντι Villoison : Πληϊάδας <τ'> ἐσορῶντι Kammer :
 Πληϊάδας ἐσορῶντι Schrader
^{uuuuu} fortasse λέγοντος <δὲ>
^{vvvvv} λέγοντος τοῦ Ὀδυσσεῶς ... νυκτὸς ἔην om. Kammer et MacPhail
^{wwwww} <τὰ> ἄστρα Bekker, cf. schol. D *Il.* 10.252(2) p. 373.1 (van Thiel²)
^{xxxxx} ἀεὶ φανερῶν *B : ἀεὶ φαίνεται Villoison : ἀειφανῶν Bekker

καὶ δυομένων τὰς ὥρας τεκμήρασθαι^{yyyyyy} ἔστιν. οἱ δὲ οὐδ' ἐπ' ἄλλου φασὶν^{zzzzzz} οἷόν τε ἢ ἐπὶ τῆς ἄρκτου εἰρῆσθαι διὰ τὸ^{aaaaaa} προκεῖσθαι τὸ προβεβηκέναι^{bbbbbb} [εἰρῆσθαι]^{cccccc}. σημειωσάμενον γὰρ τοὺς τόπους καθ' ὥραν, ὡς ἐπιλαμβάνουσι στρεφόμενοι τῆς ἄρκτου οἱ ἀστέρες, προβεβηκέναι φάναι ἐπὶ πλέον κατὰ τὴν στροφὴν χωρήσαντας· οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ^{dddddd} τῶν Πληϊάδων καὶ Ὑάδων^{eeeeee}

5 καὶ Ὠρίωνος, ἦτοι τὴν ἀνατολὴν^{ffffff} ἐφ' ἃν ποιουμένων καὶ προβεβηκότων ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνατολῆς, †Πληϊάδων†^{gggggg} δύσιν ποιουμένων καὶ ἤδη προβαινόντων εἰς τὴν δύσιν· τὸ αὐτὸ γὰρ καὶ ἐν τῷ «ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ τρίχα νυκτὸς ἔην, μετὰ δ' ἄστρα βεβήκει» (*Od.* 12.312), ἢ ὡς πρὸς ἀνατολὴν ἢ πρὸς δύσιν, τὸ μέντοι τρίχα ἀντὶ τοῦ τρίτον. διχῶς δὲ τὸ τρίτον <...>^{hhhhhh} τό τε κατὰ σχέσιν τὴν πρὸς τὸ πρῶτον. μή ποτε ἐκ τοῦ ζωδιακοῦ κύκλου τὴν ὥραν καταμεμαθηκέναι φησί· τούτου γὰρ εἰς ἱβ' 10 διηρημένου, ζ' μὲν εὐθέως καταδύνοντος ἡλίου βλέπεται, νυκτὸς δὲ προβαινούσης τὰ λοιπά, οὐ τὰ αὐτὰⁱⁱⁱⁱⁱⁱ μὲν ὁρώμενα, τὸν δὲ ἀριθμὸν τὸν ἐξ φυλάττοντα. ἐκ τῶν ζωδίων οὖν τῶν ἐπιφερομένων τῷ δωδεκατημορίῳ τούτῳ, ἐν ᾧ ὁ ἥλιος ἔδω, τὴν ὥραν στοχάζεται Ὀδυσσεύς. ἢ ἀπλῶς πάντα φησί τὰ ἄστρα προβέβηκε, τουτέστι προκεχώρηκεν^{jjjjjj} εἰς δύσιν τὰ ἀφ' ἐσπέρας ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ^{kkkkkk} φανέντα, ὡς καὶ νῦν φαμεν πολὺ προῆλθε τῆς ἡμέρας, εἰς δύσιν λέγοντες προελθεῖν· ἐφ' ᾧ γὰρ 15 ἀπὸ πέρατος εἰς πέρας ἔστι τις^{llllll} δρόμος, ὅταν ἤδη πρὸς τῷ ἐτέρῳ πέρατι ὁρώμενα φαίνηται, προβεβηκέναι λέγοιτ' ἂν ἀφ' οὗ πρῶτον ὁρμώμενα ὥφθη. ὅτι δὲ καὶ τὴν ἡμέραν καὶ τὴν νύκτα εἰς

^{yyyyyy} τεκμήρασθαι *B : τεκμαίρεσθαι Villoison

^{zzzzzz} φασὶν Bekker : φησὶν *B

^{aaaaaa} τὸ Schrader : τοῦ *B

^{bbbbbb} προβεβηκέναι *B : fortasse προβέβηκε

^{cccccc} εἰρῆσθαι del. Villoison

^{dddddd} ἀπὸ *B : fortasse ἐπὶ

^{eeeeee} Ὑάδων Villoison : υἰάδων *B

^{ffffff} ἦτοι τὴν ἀνατολὴν Schrader : ἦτοι δὲ ἀνατολὴ *B : ἦτοι δὲ ἀνατολὴν V²⁰

^{gggggg} πληϊάδων *B : cruces posuimus : del. Schrader : ἢ τῶν ἐφ' ἃν Schrader app. : fortasse ἦ(τοι) ἐφ' ἃν τὴν

^{hhhhhh} lacunam indicavit Schrader : fortasse addendum ἔτεροι δὲ τὸν ἔσπερον καὶ τὸν κύνα καὶ τὸ προβεβηκέναι ἐφ' ἃν ποιεῖται τὴν δύσιν, cf. schol. D II. 10.252(2) p. 373.5-6 (van Thiel²)

ⁱⁱⁱⁱⁱⁱ οὐ τὰ αὐτὰ Bekker, cf. schol. D II. 10.252(2) p. 373.8-9 (van Thiel²) : οὐκ αὐτὰ *B

^{jjjjjj} προκεχώρηκεν ἢ Villoison

^{kkkkkk} ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ *B : εἰς ἀνατολὴν Villoison

^{llllll} ἔστι (vel ἐστί) τίς *B : ἐστί τις Bekker

τρία διαιρεῖ δῆλον· ἐπὶ μὲν γὰρ τῆς ἡμέρας· «ἔσσεται <ῆ>^{mmmmmmmm} ἥως ἣ δείλης ἣ μέσον ἦμαρ» (*Il.* 21.111), ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς νυκτός· «ἀλλ’ ὅτε δὴ τρίχα νυκτὸς ἔην» (*Od.* 12.312).

[1] The collection of the inquiries has appeared already also in other writers; but we, taking the problems from those who have made the inquiries, are evaluating the solutions that they assigned to the problems, and some of them we approve of, whereas others we reject, and some solutions we find ourselves, whereas others we attempt to revise and work out, as will be clear to the reader.

[2] To begin with, the following is agreed to be one of the old questions, where [Homer] says: ‘and the stars have advanced, and more night has passed | than two parts, and a third¹⁷⁰ still remains’ [*Il.* 10.252-253]. For how, if these two parts have passed and even more than this, does the third part remain but not part of the third?

[3a] Hence, some in fact, adding a *sigma*¹⁷¹, thought fit to write ‘and some part of a third remains’, so that some portion of the third is left, but not the whole third.

[3b] Now Metrodorus [61 *fr.* 5 DK] claims that *πλεῖον* means two things in Homer. For [it has] both the customary meaning [i.e. ‘more’ or ‘most’], as when he says ‘after he cut away from the back [of the boar], and *more* [or ‘most’] was left’ [*Od.* 8.475], and ‘but it is my hands that conduct *more* [or ‘the greatest part’] of furious war’ [*Il.* 1.165-166]; <but> [he claims] that it also means ‘full’, as in ‘your cup always stands full (*πλεῖον*)’ [*Il.* 4.262-263], and in ‘your huts are full (*πλεῖται*) of bronze’ [*Il.* 2.226]. So in the present case, [he claims that] *πλεῖον* is used instead of *πληρες*; for the night having become filled with two thirds has passed, and one third remains. And he divided it into three, since the night contained three watches.

^{mmmmmmmm} ἥ supplevimus, cf. schol. D *Il.* 10.252(3) p. 373.3 (van Thiel²)

¹⁷⁰ The Homeric αἱ δύο μοῖραι is the equivalent of the Attic τὰ δύο μέρη here, which is the standard way of saying ‘two thirds’, with τὸ τρίτον μέρος ~ ἡ τριτάτη μοῖρα meaning ‘one third’. However, the interpretations cited further on show that not all ancient writers interpreted it this way.

¹⁷¹ I.e. to τριτάτη, making it the genitive τριτάτης.

[3c] But Chrysippus [*SVF* III *fr.* 772] claims that it is just as if someone, speaking about three days, says on the third that one day still remains, even if he does not make this statement around dawn; so too, although more than two thirds have passed, Odysseus claims that one third is left, since each portion of the night, which is tripartite, is taken as a unit, so that even if this is lacking and not complete, still it is counted as a third because it has the third position among the parts. For so too [he claims] a human being †having just been born† still obtains the whole title [of human].

[3d] Others claim that poets have a custom of using a round number, sometimes by cancelling the remainders in the numbers for the sake of using a whole and rounded one. For instance, <one> might say ‘a thousand-shipped army’ of the Greeks – though the ships were 1186 – and further, ‘twenty columns to a single expedition, eleven to infantry, twelve to ships’ [*TGF* II Adesp. *fr.* 432a], instead of twenty-three. Sometimes they omit the initial [digit], satisfied with the remainder; for instance, ‘he slew his twelve dear children in the prime of their youth, and him third’ [Pind. *fr.* 171 Snell/Maehler] instead of ‘thirteenth’. And ‘he was himself brought down by the fourth’ [Pind. *fr.* 135 Snell/Maehler], says Pindar, instead of ‘by the fourteenth’. ‘Let your wife grow up for four years and let her be married in the fifth’ [Hes. *Op.* 698] instead of ‘fourteen’ and ‘in the fifteenth’. Eupolis in the *Golden Race* [*fr.* 298 Kassel/Austin]:

[A] Twelfth is the blind man, third the man with a hump,

fourteenth the branded man,

fifth the redhead, sixth the squint-eye.

And these men are sixteen up to Arcestratus,

but up to the bald-head seventeen. [B] Hold on!

[A] Eighth is the man wearing the threadbare cloak.

Sometimes they add from without, in order to express a full number; for instance, although Homer says ‘I [*sc.* Priam] had nineteen [sons] from a single womb’ [*Il.* 24.496], Simonides says: ‘you, mother of twenty children, be gracious’ [*fr.* 272 Poltera = *fr.* 54 Page, *PMG* 559]. And although women have childbirth in the tenth month, Homer says: ‘take pleasure in love, woman, | and when a year has gone around, you will bear splendid children’ [*Od.* 11.248-249]. And: ‘others who were dwelling in Crete with a hundred cities’ [*Il.* 2.649] and ‘many countless men and ninety cities’ [*Od.* 19.174]. For he either adds with regard to the one or subtracts with regard to the other. Similarly [he also says] ‘all day long until sunset | they feasted’ [*Il.* 1.601-602], though they did not begin to drink at dawn. And: ‘all day long they fought around the Scaean Gates’ [*Il.* 18.453], although a short time passed over the battle. And although the Olympic Games are held alternately after fifty or forty-nine months, the poets call the festival ‘fifty-monthly’. In this way, therefore, nothing prevents [Homer], even though the third part is defective [i.e. incomplete], from calling it a complete one third.

[3e] Aristotle [*fr.* 161 Rose³ = *fr.* 385 Gigon] thinks to solve it as follows, when he says: Division into two can in this case be into equal [*sc.* parts]. Since ‘more than half’ is indeterminate, when it is increased so much that a third of the whole is left, it would be characteristic of an accurate person to determine this and indicate how much the remainder is, in order to make clear by how much half of the whole has increased. For instance, half of 6 is 3. If 6 were divided into 2 equal parts, [half] will be 3. If either part is increased, it is unclear whether this is by a part of a number or by a whole unit. Now if it becomes greater by a whole unit, the remaining part will be a third of the whole. So too someone saying that, when either of the two parts becomes more, it has left one third, has shown that ‘more’ in growth is by a unit, since three has become four and two remains, which was one third of six. So, since the twelve parts of the night can also be divided into two

equal divisions – into six [each] – and one part increased and has become more, but it is unclear by how many hours – for the increase could be by one or two or three or more – the poet, determining what the indeterminate quantity of the ‘more’ was and that it increased by 2 hours, concluded that one third remains, so that the hours that have gone by were eight, and four are left, which is a third of the whole. So too if it consisted of eighteen parts, since it divides by two into nine, and [if] you said that a majority of the <hours which are divided> into two parts has passed, and one third remains, you will make clear from the fact that you say that one third is left, which is six, that you mean that twelve have been taken away. Let the same investigation be made in the case of the hours of a night-day cycle. Let someone say that of the hours, which are divided into two parts, a small majority has passed, without determining how much, and let him conclude that one third of the whole remains. It becomes clear that with the division into two resulting in twelve and twelve, and with a third of the whole left, which is eight, the one part became greater by four, so that sixteen hours in total have gone by and eight remain. So where there is a division into two equal parts and into three [equal parts], if someone leaves behind a third of the [division] into three †increasing to two†, he defines by how much more there has been an increase. So, the poet wisely has indicated how much the undefined part of the increase of the half was – that [it was] by two hours, and the eighth hour had gone by – by saying ‘and yet one third remains’ [*Il.* 10.253]. For if someone knows that the total number of hours of the night are 12, of which the division into two parts makes 6 and 6, but into 3 [makes] 4 and 4 <and 4>, and if he has heard that of the division into two parts a small majority has passed, then upon learning that a third of the [division] into three remains, which is four hours, he straightaway realises that from the turning of midnight two hours had gone by.

[3f] Autochthon claims that as two thirds had been completed, and one third remained, reasonably [Homer] says that the night, which consists of two parts, had gone by for the most part; for the two [parts] are a greater portion of the night, since two is greater than one. So [Homer says] ‘has passed by’, because when the two parts have passed by, the night has passed by to the greater extent. Indeed, in this way there will not be an error in ‘more’ (πλέω), which some who interpret it as a feminine say is an error for ‘the majority’ (ἡ πλείων) [*sc.* of the night]. For it is by the greater portion that the night has passed by, that is by the greater and larger portion it has been surpassed, since two parts have passed by.

[3g] Apion says that the greater portion of the 2 [parts] themselves has been used up, so that there is also a remnant of the second, and of these the majority has passed by, <but> the third part remains. For Agamemnon, having arisen around midnight, wakes Nestor and with him some of the champions; they advance to the ditch and dispatch the spies. [Homer] inserts the time of night and the multitude of their actions. For after the spies have armed themselves, once the omen is seen by them, they pray to Athena and go onward. Encountering Dolon they spent no little time on questions; and having killed him, thereafter they go to the Thracians, and as they are detained by killing these men, Athena exhorts them to get away to the ships. After they return, they bathe and have breakfast, and then daybreak arrives. Now Odysseus says ‘Dawn is near’ [*Il.* 10.251], urging on the expedition; for it is not reasonable to have spies sent out as dawn approaches, but in fact very risky. The word πλέω [‘more’] can also be taken as neuter plural, ‘the majority of the two parts has passed by’, or ‘more beyond the two parts’, as Thucydides also says somewhere: ‘but already using the sea more, they also came together in this campaign’ [Thuc. 1.3.5]. But it can also be an accusative feminine singular, ‘the night went past the larger part of two thirds’.

[4] Plausibly [Homer] portrayed no one other than Odysseus watching the passage of the stars, as a preparation for the *Odyssey*. For there his voyage is accomplished ‘as he gazes at the Pleiades and late setting Boötes’ [*Od.* 5.272]. When Odysseus says ‘and the stars have advanced’, someone might ask what ‘advanced’ means, and what kinds of stars they are by which he calculates the time. To say this on the basis of Ursa Major is not sound. For it is not possible to indicate the time on the basis of the stars that are always visible but only on the basis of those that rise and set. But some people claim that it cannot have been said about anything other than Ursa Major, because ‘have advanced’ is set forth. Having interpreted the positions according to the hour, as the stars of Ursa Major occupy them while they rotate, [they claim that] he says that they have advanced, since they moved further in their rotation. Other people [claim that he says this] on the basis of the Pleiades, Hyades and Orion, which are either rising at dawn and have advanced from the east, †the Pleiades† are setting and are already advancing towards the west. For the same is also said in the verse ‘but when it was the third watch of the night and the stars had turned their course’ [*Od.* 12.312], referring either to rising or to setting; the ‘third watch’ is used in the meaning of ‘the third part’. ‘The third part’ [can be interpreted?] in two ways <...> in relation to the first. Perhaps he means that he has learnt the time from the zodiac cycle. For since this is divided into 12, 6 are immediately visible at sunset, while the others are visible as the night progresses. They are not the same ones that are seen, but they remain six in number. On the basis of the zodiac signs that follow, Odysseus calculates the time by that sign in which the sun set. Or he simply means that all the stars have advanced, i.e. those that have appeared in the east since the evening have proceeded towards the west, as now too we say that much of the day progressed, meaning that it progressed towards sunset. For, in the case where there is a certain course from one end to the other, when they already appear to be seen at one end, they could be said to have advanced as soon as they have been seen

to start [their course]. And it is clear that he divides both the day and the night into three parts. With regard to the day [he says]: ‘a morning, evening or midday will come’ [*Il.* 21.111]; with regard to the night [he says]: ‘but when it was the third watch of the night’ [*Od.* 12.312].

3 Notes to the Text

A note on orthography

In our edition, we have standardised a number of orthographic variations. Thus, the manuscript sometimes follows other rules for the accents, particularly for cases like οἷζ φησιν (which the scribe writes as οἷζ φησιν). Another case is the negation οὐχ before an aspirated vowel; in such cases, the scribe always writes an apostrophe (e.g. οὐχ' ὄλη), which we have not printed. He also always writes the word ὅτε as ὅτε with smooth breathing, which we have tacitly corrected. Further, he always writes compound numbers as one word (e.g. ὀγδοηκονταέξ), which we have always printed as separate words (so ὀγδοήκοντα ἑξ). Finally, for numbers, the scribe sometimes writes the word out in full (e.g. δώδεκα) and sometimes uses numerals (e.g. ιβ'). Unlike Bekker, Kammer and Dindorf, we have not converted every word into the corresponding numeral.¹⁷²

Text-critical notes

These notes will treat text-critical issues, new readings and problems of interpretation in the Porphyrian excerpt. They will also discuss Porphyry as a witness for the Homeric text by

¹⁷² Also, unlike Sodano 1974, we have not mentioned all these interventions by Bekker, Kammer and Dindorf in our apparatus.

comparing his quotations from Homer with other testimonies and with the transmitted Homer text (in mediaeval manuscripts and papyri).¹⁷³ As it turns out, Porphyry and other testimonia often do not provide the readings attributed to them in the recent Homer editions by West. This may be of particular interest to Homer scholars.

[2] «ἄστρο δὲ δὴ προβέβηκε, παρώχηκε δὲ πλέω νῦξ | τῶν δύο μοιράων, τριτάτη δ' ἔτι μοῖρα λέλειπται». These Homeric lines (*Il.* 10.252-253) are transmitted with the following variants.

For παρώχηκε¹⁷⁴:

- (1) παρώχηκε BTDEG, Hsch. α 7890 (Latte),¹⁷⁵ Choeroboscus, *Scholia in Theodosii Canones* p. 398 (Hilgard),¹⁷⁶ schol. A *Il.* 9.71 (Erbse) (VMK)¹⁷⁷, schol. D *Il.* 10.252(1) (FPal²XZAgBdBm¹²M¹¹V¹³) (lemma) p. 373.1 (van Thiel²)¹⁷⁸, schol. D *Il.* 10.252(3) (lemma) p. 373.1 (FPal²Xh) (van Thiel²), schol. D *Il.* 10.252(4) p. 374.1-2 (van Thiel²), Eust. *Il.* 10.252s. vol. 3 p. 58.19 (van der Valk)
- (2) παρώχηκεν AFC, Arist. *Poet.* 25, 1461a26, [Hdn.] *De figuris* 58, schol. *Od.* 1.58a (Pontani), schol. D *Il.* 10.252(1) (Q) (lemma) p. 373.1 (van Thiel²), schol. D *Il.* 10.252(3) (lemma) (Q) p. 373.1 (van Thiel²), Anonymus I in Aratum 1 p. 89 (Maass)

¹⁷³ The quotations from Hesiod and Thucydides will also be discussed.

¹⁷⁴ The quotation in Achilles Tatius, *Introductio in Aratum* 1.9 p. 8 Di Maria = p. 30 Maass has either παρώχηκε (codex Vaticanus gr. 191 (V)) or παρώχηκεν (codex Laurentianus 28.44 (M)). The codex Vaticanus gr. 381 (T), which forms one family together with V, has παρώγγηκε. Both Maass 1898, 30 and Di Maria 1996, 8 have accepted παρώχηκεν in their editions of Achilles Tatius.

¹⁷⁵ The manuscript of Hesychius reads παρώχηκε, but Latte/Cunningham 2018, 360 corrected this to παρώχηκεν.

¹⁷⁶ The transmitted text of Choeroboscus reads παρώχηκε, which Hilgard 1889, 398 corrected to παρώχηκεν.

¹⁷⁷ Erbse 1969-1988, I, 414 corrected this to παρώχηκεν.

¹⁷⁸ In the codex Parisinus gr. 2556 (P) fol. 74v, the lemma abbreviates the verb as παρώχηκ.

- (3) παροίχωκεν Dorotheus ap. schol. A *Il.* 10.252a.18-20 (Erbse) (VMK), Apollonius Dyscolus ap. schol. A *Il.* 10.252a.22-23 (Erbse) (VMK), schol. A *Il.* 10.252a.15 (Erbse) (VMK)
- (4) παρώχωκεν W, *P.Berol.* inv. 11911+17038+17048+21155, *PSI* I 13 ↓ (παρωχωκ[εν]), Aristarchus ap. schol. A *Il.* 10.252e1 (Erbse) (VMK), schol. T *Il.* 10.252e2.34 (Erbse) (οὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ ὠ̄ κατὰ τροπὴν τοῦ ἦ̄ εἰς ὠ̄) (|χωκ[*P.Oxy.* inv. 100/15(a))

For πλέω:¹⁷⁹

- (1) πλέω ABTFCE, *P.Oxy.* VI 948 fr. a,¹⁸⁰ Arist. *Poet.* 25, 1461a26, Hsch. α 7890 (Latte)¹⁸¹; π 2536 (Latte)¹⁸², schol. A Hom. *Il.* 9.71 (Erbse) (VMK), schol. A Hom. *Il.* 10.252a.15 (Erbse) (VMK)¹⁸³, schol. T *Il.* 10.252-253a (lemma) (Erbse) (exeg.), schol. T *Il.* 10.252-253a.38 (Erbse) (exeg.), schol. T Hom. *Il.* 10.252-253b1 (lemma) (Erbse) (exeg.), schol. D *Il.* 10.252(1) (F^{pc}XZV¹³) (lemma) p. 373.1 (van Thiel²), schol. D *Il.* 10.252(1) (Fh) p. 373.6 (van Thiel²), schol. D *Il.* 10.252(3) (AgBdPBm¹²M¹¹) p. 374.18 (van Thiel²)¹⁸⁴, schol. *Od.* 1.58a (M^a) (Pontani), Eust. *Il.* 10.252s. vol. 3 p. 58.19 (van der Valk)

¹⁷⁹ The quotation in [Hdn.] *De figuris* 58 shows several variants. The α family has πλέων (Marcianus gr. 512 (M) and the corrector of Ambrosianus C 69 sup. (gr. 246) (A²)) or πλέω (Hauniensis GKS 1965 (H) and Laurentianus conv. soppr. 98 (F)), whereas the β family has πλείω (Baroccianus 216 (B) and Vindobonensis phil. gr. 263 (U)) or πλείων (Laurentianus 56.16 (L) and Parisinus gr. 2551 (P)). See Hajdú 1998, 135. The codex Ambrosianus C 69 sup. (gr. 246) (A), which is copied from U, has πλέον. For quotations, however, A has often corrected the text (sometimes on the basis of a lost manuscript of the α family): see Hajdú 1998, 78-81. The quotation in Achilles Tatius, *Introductio in Aratum* 1.9 p. 8 Di Maria = p. 30 Maass has two variants. The manuscripts of the α family (Vaticanus gr. 191 (V) and Vaticanus gr. 381 (T)) have πλέω, but the codex Laurentianus 28.44 (M) has πλέα (a round *alpha* can be easily mistaken for *omega*). Both Maass 1898, 30 and Di Maria 1996, 8 have accepted πλέω in their editions of Achilles Tatius.

¹⁸⁰ Pace West 1998-2000, I, 297, the papyrus fragment reads πλέω, not πλέων. Since πλεων is followed by a trace of a letter that is compatible with *upsilon* but not *nu* (an oblique with a hook in the left-top corner), the correct reading is πλεω νρ[ξ̣].

¹⁸¹ The manuscript of Hesychius actually reads τῷ πλέω: see Latte/Cunningham 2018, 360.

¹⁸² The manuscript of Hesychius actually reads πλεώνονξ: see Hansen 2005, 125.

¹⁸³ Erbse 1969-1988, III, 48 corrected it to πλέον.

¹⁸⁴ Van Thiel 2011, 374 tacitly adopted Lascaris' correction πλείων.

- (2) πλέων DO, schol. T *Il.* 10.252e2 (lemma) (Erbse), schol. *Od.* 1.58a (HJO) (Pontani), schol. D *Il.* 10.252(1) (Q) (lemma) p. 373.1 (van Thiel²), schol. D *Il.* 10.252(1) p. 373.6 (Q) (van Thiel²), Eust. *Il.* 10.252s. vol. 3 p. 59.16-17 (van der Valk) (εἰ δὲ μετὰ τοῦ ν̄ γράφεται, λέγοι ἄν, ὅτι παρὸχέτο πλέων νὺξ τῶν δύο μοιρῶν)¹⁸⁵
- (3) πλέων W, Choeroboscus, *Scholia in Theodosii Canones* p. 398 Hilgard,¹⁸⁶ Anonymus I in Aratum 1 p. 89 (Maass), schol. D *Il.* 10.252(1) (F^{ac}AgBdPBm¹²M¹¹) (lemma) p. 373.1 (van Thiel²)¹⁸⁷, schol. D *Il.* 10.252(1) (Pal²) p. 373.6 (van Thiel²)
- (4) πλέη schol. D *Il.* 10.252(1) p. 373.6 (van Thiel²) (ἔνιοι δὲ γράφουσιν πλέη)¹⁸⁸
- (5) πλείω schol. D *Il.* 10.252(1) (Pal²) (lemma) p. 373.1 (van Thiel²), schol. D *Il.* 10.252(1) (XZ) (p. 373.6 van Thiel²), schol. D *Il.* 10.252(3) (dV¹³) p. 374.18 (van Thiel²), schol. D *Il.* 10.252(4) p. 374.2 (van Thiel²)
- (6) πλείων G

The Porphyry excerpt implies that the quoted authorities read the following:

Metrodorus: πλεῖον

Chrysippus: uncertain

Aristotle: probably πλέον

Autochthon: πλέω

Apion: uncertain

¹⁸⁵ Eustathius has also recorded πλέων as a *varia lectio* by adding γρ(άφεται) πλέων above πλέω in his quotation of the Homeric line in Eust. *Il.* 10.252s. vol. 3 p. 58.19 (van der Valk) (codex Laurentianus 59.3 fol. 8r).

¹⁸⁶ The transmitted text of Choeroboscus reads πλεόνυξ, which Hilgard 1889, 398 corrected to πλέων νὺξ.

¹⁸⁷ In the codex Angelicus gr. 122 (Ag) fol. 86r, Bodmer 85 (Bd) fol. 91v and Parisinus gr. 2556 (P) fol. 74v, the lemma actually has πλέον ἢ νὺξ.

¹⁸⁸ Note that one manuscript of Achilles Tatius (*Introductio in Aratum* 1.9 p. 8 Di Maria = p. 30 Maass) has πλέα (see n. 179).

For δ' ἔτι:¹⁸⁹

- (1) δ' ἔτι ABCDEFGTW, Hsch. α 7890 (Latte), schol. D *Il.* 10.252(3) (P) (lemma) p. 373.1 (van Thiel²), schol. A *Il.* 10.252a.16 (Erbse) (VMK), schol. Ge *Il.* 10.252 (Nicole), Eust. *Il.* 10.252s. vol. 3 p. 58.19 (van der Valk); Eust. *Od.* 12.312 vol. 2 p. 26.26 (Stallbaum), Anonymus I in *Aratum* 1 p. 89 (Maass)
- (2) δέ τι schol. D *Il.* 10.252(3) (dAgBdBm¹²M¹¹) (lemma) p. 373.1 (van Thiel²)
- (3) δέ τοι schol. D *Il.* 10.252(3) (V¹³) (lemma) p. 373.1 (van Thiel²)

We have followed previous editors of the excerpt in adopting Bekker's conjecture δ' ἔτι.¹⁹⁰ Note, however, that the scribe systematically writes δέ τι when he quotes this Homeric line further on, viz. twice in [3a].

The sigla cited above refer to the following Homer manuscripts:

- A Marcianus gr. 822 (olim 454) = *Venetus* A
- B Marcianus gr. 821 (olim 453) = *Venetus* B
- C Laurentianus 32.3
- D Laurentianus 32.15
- E Scorialensis Y.I.1
- F Scorialensis Ω.I.12
- G Genavensis 44
- O Oxoniensis, New College 298

¹⁸⁹ The quotation in Achilles Tatius, *Introductio in Aratum* 1.9 p. 8 Di Maria = p. 30 Maass has either δ' ἔτι (codex Vaticanus gr. 381 (T)), or δέ τι (codex Laurentianus 28.44 (M)). The codex Vaticanus gr. 191 (V), which forms one family together with T, has δ' ἔστι.

¹⁹⁰ Bekker 1825, 284; Kammer 1863, 65; Dindorf 1875-1877, III, 434; Schrader 1880, 147; Sodano 1974, 42; MacPhail 2011, 170.

T Londinensis, Burneianus 86 = *Townleyanus*

W Vaticanus gr. 1319

The sigla of the D scholia correspond with the following manuscripts:

E⁴ Scorialensis gr. Ω.I.12

Pal² Heidelbergensis, Palatinus gr. 222

Q Vaticanus gr. 33

X Vaticanus gr. 32

Ag Angelicus gr. 122

Bd Bodmer 85

P Parisinus gr. 2556

Bm¹² Londinensis, Harleianus 5727

M¹¹ Ambrosianus L 116 sup. (gr. 502)

V¹³ Vaticanus gr. 1316

These manuscripts fall into two families: d (which comprises E⁴, Pal, Q and X) and h (which comprises Ag, Bd, P, Bm¹², M¹¹ and V¹³). Within the h family, Ag, Bd and P form their own subgroup.¹⁹¹ The readings of the D scholia reported here are based on images of the original manuscripts.

[3b] **νῦν οὖν τὸ πλέον**. If the text were fully consistent, πλέον should be πλεῖον, since this appears to be what Metrodorus read.

¹⁹¹ See Montanari/Montana/Muratore/Pagani 2017, 5.

[3c] †παρὰ πόδα† γενόμενον. As the text is transmitted, the sentence would mean ‘a human having just been born still obtains the whole¹⁹² title’ (with παρὰ πόδα = εὐθέως¹⁹³), but it is doubtful whether that is what Porphyry wrote. He (or Chrysippus) is unlikely to have claimed that newborn babies are normally not called full humans. Thus, the passage has been corrected in several ways. Schrader conjectured reading παρὰ <μικρὸν ἑξά>ποδα γενόμενον, ‘having become just six foot tall’,¹⁹⁴ but this does not explain why such people would not be called full humans either. If it is meant to indicate dwarfs being called humans even if they do not have the full size of regular humans, for instance, a more appropriate size would probably be <τρί>ποδα, <τετρά>ποδα or at the most <πεντά>ποδα.¹⁹⁵ Yet one does not really ‘become’ a dwarf. MacPhail adopted Diels’ conjecture πηρὸν τὸν πόδα γενόμενον, ‘having become maimed in his foot’.¹⁹⁶ Kammer constructed a similar sense with the correction καίπερ ἄποδα γενόμενον ‘although he has become lame’.¹⁹⁷ Indeed, a reference to humans missing some body part would make sense in Chrysippus’ analogy.¹⁹⁸

[3d] οἷον «χιλιόναυν στρατὸν» φήσειέ <τις ἄν> τῶν Ἑλλήνων. The manuscript reads ὅταν χιλιόναυν στρατὸν φήσειε τῶν Ἑλλήνων. Schrader was the first to see that <τις> should be supplemented after φήσειε.¹⁹⁹ All editors have kept ὅταν ... φήσειε,²⁰⁰ but ὅταν + optative is

¹⁹² Janko ap. MacPhail 2011, 170 corrected ὅλης to ὅλου, in which case τῆς ὅλου προσηγορίας means ‘the title of a whole human’.

¹⁹³ See Hsch. π 639 (Latte), s.v. παρὰ πόδα. The plural παρὰ πόδας, however, is far more common: see *LSJ* s.v. πούς A 4b.

¹⁹⁴ Schrader 1880, 148.

¹⁹⁵ παρὰ πόδα might itself also be an error for πεντάποδα (so without Schrader’s παρὰ μικρόν).

¹⁹⁶ MacPhail 2011, 170.

¹⁹⁷ Kammer 1863, 66.

¹⁹⁸ Another solution would be to correct γενόμενον to something like τετρωμένον ‘injured’ or τετμημένον ‘amputated’. However, this corruption (TPΩ or TMH to NO) is palaeographically less straightforward. Moreover, παρά + accusative is not the usual construction for these verbs.

¹⁹⁹ Schrader 1880, 148.

²⁰⁰ D’Ansse de Villosion 1788, 251; Bekker 1825, 285; Kammer 1863, 66; Dindorf 1875-1877, III, 435; Schrader 1880, 148; MacPhail 2011, 172.

impossible. The palaeographically most likely solution is to correct ὅταν (where -αν is abbreviated) to οἷον (in the sense of ‘for instance’) and supplement ἄν after φήσειέ <τις>. Alternatively, ὅταν might be a corruption of οἷον ἄν, in which case we only need to supplement τις after φήσειε. Theoretically, one could also correct the text to ὅταν χιλίοναυον στρατὸν φήσῃ <τις> τῶν Ἑλλήνων, but φήσῃ τις is an uncommon collocation.

«ἢ δὲ γυνὴ τέτορ’ [ἦθ’] ἡβώοι, πέμπτῳ δὲ γαμοῖτο», ἀντὶ τοῦ τεσσαρεσκαίδεκα καὶ πεντεκαίδεκάτῳ. The exact reconstruction of the Hesiodic line (*Op.* 698) is problematic here. The manuscript reads τέταρτ’ · ἦθ’ ἡβώοι, which is both ungrammatical and unmetrical. Villosion and Bekker read τετάρτῳ ἔτει ἡβώοι,²⁰¹ which is not metrical either. Moreover, although the scribe has not written the case ending, the proparoxytone accent in τέταρτ’ implies the reading τέταρτον rather than τετάρτῳ. Kammer corrected the words to τέτορ’ [ἔτει], deleting ἔτει as a gloss,²⁰² not realising that the manuscript does not read ἔτει to begin with. Note also that restoring ἦθ’ to ἔτει only to then delete it is text-critically unsound. Dindorf also read τέτορ’, which he considered to have been corrupted to τετάρτῳ ἔτει (so without the assumption of a gloss).²⁰³ Indeed, the manuscripts and the other testimonies of Hesiod all have the West Greek form τέτορ’.²⁰⁴ Schrader read Porphyry’s text as τέταρτον ἔτος ἡβώοι (with ἔτος as a correction for ἦθ’),²⁰⁵ which is again unmetrical. Schrader’s use of letter spacing indicates that he considers all these words part of the quotation of Hesiod, but it is doubtful whether Porphyry would have written such an unmetrical line.²⁰⁶

²⁰¹ D’Ansse de Villosion 1788, 251; Bekker 1825, 285.

²⁰² Kammer 1863, 66.

²⁰³ Dindorf 1875-1877, III, 435. So also Gigon 1987, 533.

²⁰⁴ Plut. *Amat.* 8.753a; Poll. *Onom.* 1.58; Oribasius *Collectiones medicae* 18.3; Stob. *Flor.* 4.22e.114; *Etym. Magn.* s.v. τέτορε p. 754 (Kallierges); schol. vet. Hes. *Op.* 698a (Pertusi); Moschopulus, *Scholia in Hes. Op.* 698 (Grandolini); Arsenius, *Apophthegmata* 18.63b. See also the papyrus fragment *P.Oxy.* XL 3229 ([τ]ετορ’).

²⁰⁵ Schrader 1880, 148.

²⁰⁶ Cf. Porphyry’s attention to the meter in *Zetemata Vaticana* 17 p. 123.11-13 Sodano (συνεχώρει δὲ τὸ μέτρον εἰπεῖν «ἐς μισγάγκειαν συμμίσγετον ὄβριμον ὕδωρ» (*Il.* 4.453)) and *ad Il.* 9.378 p. 137.14-15 = p. 152 MacPhail (Νέσος δὲ

MacPhail tried to solve this by writing «ἡ δὲ γυνή» τέταρτον ἔτος «ἡβώοι, πέμπτῳ δὲ γαμοῖτο», thus separating τέταρτον ἔτος from the rest of the quotation as a paraphrase.²⁰⁷ However, Porphyry normally does not interrupt poetic quotations with his own prose paraphrase of certain words. Moreover, an error ἡθ' for ἔτος or ἔτει is not palaeographically straightforward, neither in majuscule nor in minuscule script.

Another problem is that reading an accusative τέταρτον contradicts writing the dative τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτῳ in Porphyry's explanation of the word. We would expect Porphyry to use the same case in his exegesis of poetic words, as he does elsewhere. Indeed, the accent on the penultimate syllable in τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτ' and πεντεκαίδεκάτ' implies a reading τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτῳ and πεντεκαίδεκάτῳ.²⁰⁸ This is also the interpretation of the scribe of V²⁰, who copies *B and reads ἰδ' ὦ καὶ πεντεκαίδεκάτῳ. In any case, τέταρτον (ἔτος) and τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτῳ are unlikely to *both* be correct. The only way to make the quotation from Hesiod metrical is to restore τέτορ' and delete ἡθ'. The latter might have originally been an otherwise unattested variant for ἡ δὲ (γυνή), which intruded into the main text. Restoring the cardinal number τέτορ', however, creates the problem that this contradicts the ordinal number τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτῳ. This can be solved by correcting the latter to τεσσαρεσκαίδεκα, which was later corrupted to τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτῳ on the basis of the subsequent πεντεκαίδεκάτῳ.

Finally, Porphyry agrees with the Hesiod codex Parisinus gr. 2771 (C) and Laurentianus 31.39 (D) in reading γαμοῖτο against the codex Messanensis F.A. 11 (E) and Vaticanus gr. 2383 (H), which read γαμεῖτω and γαμεῖτο, respectively.²⁰⁹

ὁ Χῖος καὶ τὸ ᾧ μὴ κύνει οὐδὲν φροντίσας τοῦ μέτρου). See also Porph. *ad Od.* 9.60 p. 84.6-8 (Schrader) (πεζὸν μὲν τὸ φάναι ἀπώλονται οἱ ἐβδομήκοντα δύο, καὶ σχεδὸν ἀδύνατον εἰπεῖν [εἶναι] ποιητικῶς διὰ τὸ μέτρον), although the attribution to Porphyry might be disputed.

²⁰⁷ MacPhail 2011, 172.

²⁰⁸ Note that the scribe of *B does not write the case endings for fourteen and fifteen either, so that the implied reading might equally be τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτου and πεντεκαίδεκάτου (because of the preceding ἀντὶ τοῦ).

²⁰⁹ See Solmsen in Solmsen/Merkelbach/West 1990, 79.

πέμπτος δ' ὁ πυρρός. Like Olson and other editors of Eupolis, we have adopted Runkel's conjecture πυρρός 'redhead'.²¹⁰ Kassel/Austin and the previous editors of the excerpt retained the transmitted πύργος 'tower',²¹¹ which they probably interpreted as indicating a tall person. Olson has rightly pointed out, however, that πύργος is normally not used in this metaphorical sense; and even if that were the sense here, it would not match the other people in this catalogue, who all have some physical defect or slavish attribute.²¹² If used metaphorically, πύργος denotes a hero acting as a stronghold to the army.²¹³ In other words, the word would have a positive connotation. Another possible conjecture is Cobet's πηρός 'disabled, cripple',²¹⁴ although the corruption ΠΥΡΡΟC to ΠΥΡΓΟC is palaeographically more likely than that of ΠΗΡΟC to ΠΥΡΓΟC. Tammaro conjectured γρυπός 'hook-nosed',²¹⁵ which is also possible and palaeographically intelligible. Olson considered this not "enough of a disfigurement to match the others in the catalogue", although the baldhead (φαλακρός) is equally 'disfigured' as someone with a hooked nose, and the speaker also mentions 'the man wearing the threadbare cloak', i.e. a bum/hobo (the τρίβων was typically worn by poor men²¹⁶). Note, however, that, although Eupolis probably wrote πυρρός, it is always possible that Porphyry did in fact read the incorrect πύργος.

²¹⁰ Runkel 1829, 164; Olson 2016, 462; 464; 466. So also Meineke 1839, 537; Bothe 1855, 192; Kock 1880, 333; Edmonds 1957, 410; Storey 2011, 228.

²¹¹ D'Ansse de Villoison 1788, 251; Bekker 1825, 285; Kammer 1863, 66; Dindorf 1875-1877, III, 435; Schrader 1880, 148; Kassel/Austin 1986, 472. MacPhail 2011, 172 also printed πύργος in the main text but translated the word as 'redhead' (as if he adopted Runkel's πυρρός).

²¹² Olson 2016, 464. Red hair is a slavish attribute, indicating someone of Thracian origin. According to Edmonds 1957, 410 n. b, who assumed that the list describes people in the audience, however, the man with red hair may be the politician Hipponicus or the poet Timotheus.

²¹³ So Hom. *Od.* 11.556 about Ajax. See Schiassi 1944, 62 n. 2 and Tammaro 1988.

²¹⁴ Cobet 1876, 416. See also Blaydes 1896, 46.

²¹⁵ Tammaro 1988.

²¹⁶ See Olson 2016, 467. The τρίβων was worn by Spartan men, who were famous for their simple and rugged lifestyle. In Athens, it was worn by poor people and by ascetic philosophers, like Socrates and the Cynics. See Brillant 1919 and Schuppe 1937. According to Edmonds 1957, 410, who considered the catalogue to refer to people in the audience, the man with the threadbare cloak is Socrates.

«χαῖρε, γύναι, φιλότῃτι, περιπλομένου δ' ἐνιαυτοῦ | τέξῃ ἀγλαὰ τέκνα». Previous editors of the excerpt have printed γυνή.²¹⁷ However, the manuscript actually reads γύναι, which is the regular vocative of γυνή. This is also the reading of the manuscripts of Homer. Therefore, West was incorrect to claim that the testimonia of *Od.* 11.248 (which include Porphyry) all read γυνή.²¹⁸

For the Homeric line 11.249, the first word is transmitted under several variants. Porphyry reads τέξῃ, a middle future indicative. Similarly, Zenodotus read τέξεαι. Aristarchus, however, read the active future indicative τέξεις,²¹⁹ which is the reading in the mediaeval manuscripts and the other testimonia.²²⁰

«πολλοὶ ἀπειρέσιοι καὶ ἐννήκοντα πόληες». Most editors of the excerpt have corrected ἐννήκοντα to ἐννήκοντα.²²¹ This is also how the editors of Homer traditionally read the text of *Od.* 19.174.²²² However, there is no solid textual basis for the form ἐννήκοντα. The main Homer manuscripts²²³ and all the testimonia read ἐννήκοντα.²²⁴ In fact, the form ἐννήκοντα does not

²¹⁷ D'Ansse de Villosion 1788, 251; Bekker 1825, 285; Kammer 1863, 66; Dindorf 1875-1877, III, 436; Schrader 1880, 148; MacPhail 2011, 172. Kammer already suggested correcting it to γύναι.

²¹⁸ West 2017, 235. Pace West, most other testimonia actually have γύναι as well: see Anon. in *Hermog. Inv.* vol. 7 p. 851 (Walz) and Eust. *Od.* 11.240 vol. 1 p. 410.13 (Stallbaum). Gell. *NA* 3.16.15, however, has γυνή.

²¹⁹ See schol. *Od.* 11.249 (Dindorf): τέξεις] οὕτω Ἀρίσταρχος. Ζηνόδοτος δὲ κακῶς, τέξεαι.

²²⁰ Gell. *NA* 3.16.15; schol. *D. Il.* 10.252(3) p. 374.12 (van Thiel²); Anon. in *Hermog. Inv.* vol. 7 p. 851 (Walz); Eust. *Od.* 11.240 vol. 1 p. 410.14 (Stallbaum).

²²¹ Bekker 1825, 285; Kammer 1863, 66; Schrader 1880, 148; MacPhail 2011, 172. Only Dindorf 1875-1877, III, 435 kept ἐννήκοντα. D'Ansse de Villosion 1788, 251 wrote the non-existent ἐνηνεκοντα.

²²² So Ludwig 1891, 105; Allen 1919; Bérard 1956, 75; Von der Mühl 1962, 355; Rutherford 1992, 104; Murray/Dimock 1998, 246; van Thiel 1991, 263.

²²³ West 2017, 401 reports that the corrector of the codex Ambrosianus gr. B 99 sup. (gr. 121) (B) has ἐννήκοντα, while the corrector of the codex Marcianus gr. 613 (olim 568) (M) has ἐννήκοντα. He also claims that a second hand in the codex Monacensis gr. 519B (U) reads ἐννήκοντα. The word (found at the bottom of fol. 195v) indeed seems to have been corrected, but it is not entirely certain what correction it intended to make (ἐννήκοντα is possible if the scribe wrote an extremely wide *nu*). The corrector of this codex belongs to Allen's d family, which consists only of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century manuscripts. See Allen 1910, 26. This family also includes the codex Harleianus 6325 (cited by van Thiel 1991, 263), which also reads ἐννήκοντα (fol. 168v). Allen 1910, 27-28 has shown, however, that this family hardly offers any old readings.

²²⁴ See [Pl.] *Minos* 319b; Eust. *Od.* 19.172 vol. 2 p. 196.22 (Stallbaum). Schol. *D. Od.* 19.174b (Ernst) also reads ἐννήκοντα, but Ernst 2006, 352 'corrected' this to ἐν{ε}νήκοντα. The manuscripts of Porph. *ad Il.* 2.649, too, have

even seem to have existed, since it is not attested in any dialect. The only deviating forms are *hevenēkon̄ta* (attested in Heraclea), *ēnēkon̄ta* (attested on Delos and in Phocis), which arose through haplology,²²⁵ and *ēnnēnēkon̄ta* (attested from Hippocrates onwards but mainly used in late antique writers), which probably duplicated *nu* on the basis of *ēnnēa*. The reason why the Homeric text is usually changed is that the line is seemingly unmetrical *πολλοῖ ἄπειρῆσίοι καὶ ἔννῃκοντᾶ πόλῃεζ* as opposed to *πολλοῖ ἄπειρῆσίοι καὶ ἔννῃκοντᾶ πόλῃεζ* (with hiatus after *καὶ*). However, the second syllable of *ēnēnēkon̄ta* can be scanned as long,²²⁶ which is a remnant of an original *digamma* (*ēnēnēkon̄ta* < **ēnefnēkon̄ta* < **h₁neun̄-dkom̄t*-²²⁷).²²⁸ In his edition of the *Odyssey*, West therefore rightly printed *ēnēnēkon̄ta*.²²⁹ However, he was wrong to cite Porphyry as a testimony for the form *ēnnēnēkon̄ta*.

καὶ «πρόπαν ἥμαρ ἐς ἡέλιον καταδύντα | δαίνυντο». MacPhail included the word *καὶ* as part of the quotation from *Il.* 1.601-602.²³⁰ The other editors, however, have not considered it part of the quotation,²³¹ probably rightly so. The Homeric text is transmitted as *ὥς τότε μὲν πρόπαν ἥμαρ*, etc. Although *καὶ* could technically be a variant for *μὲν*, it is not attested in any Homer manuscript nor in any of the testimonies. So it probably belongs to Porphyry, much like in the subsequent quotation from Homer (*Il.* 18.453) the word *καὶ* is not part of the quotation either (*καὶ «πᾶν δ' ἥμαρ μάρναντο περὶ Σκαιῆσι πύλῃσι»*).

ēnēnēkon̄ta, but, as in our excerpt, Schrader 1880, 48 and MacPhail 2011, 68 have changed this to *ēnnēnēkon̄ta*; Bekker 1825, 87 and Dindorf 1875-1877, III, 144, in contrast, kept the transmitted form *ēnēnēkon̄ta*.

²²⁵ See Frisk 1960 *s.v.* *ēnēnēkon̄ta*; Beekes 2010 *s.v.* *ēnēnēkon̄ta*.

²²⁶ The correction *ēnnēnēkon̄ta* in the codex Ambrosianus gr. B 99 sup. (B) might be a later attempt to make the syllable long. Von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1927, 41 n. 1 conjectured reading *ēnnēnēkon̄ta*.

²²⁷ See Beekes 2010 *s.v.* *ēnēnēkon̄ta*. See also Kortlandt 1983, 98-99.

²²⁸ The number 90 is attested once more in Homer in *Il.* 2.602, where *ēnēnēkon̄ta* is metrically regular (*τῷ δ' ἔννῃκοντᾶ γλαφυραὶ νῆεζ ἔστιχῶντο*).

²²⁹ West 2017, 401.

²³⁰ MacPhail 2011, 172.

²³¹ So Bekker 1825, 285; Dindorf 1875-1877, III, 436; Schrader 1880, 148.

«πᾶν δ' ἡμᾶρ μάρναντο περὶ Σκαιῆσι πύλῃσιν». Porphyry agrees with the transmitted text of Homer and with Eustathius²³² against most manuscripts of the D scholia, which read ἐπὶ Σκαιῆσι πύλῃσιν.²³³

πανήγυριν εἶναι. Every editor except Dindorf²³⁴ has overlooked the abbreviation for εἶναι after πανήγυριν.²³⁵

οὐδὲν κωλύει, καὶ τῆς τρίτης μοίρας ἐλλιποῦς οὔσης, <μὴ> οὐχ ὀλόκληρον τρίτην αὐτὴν ὀνομάσαι μοῖραν. The previous editors of the excerpt have all written simply οὐχ ὀλόκληρον.²³⁶ However, this is not the regular construction. The infinitive ruled by verbs of hindrance can have either a pleonastic μὴ or no negation. If the verb of hindrance is itself negated (as is the case in this sentence), the common construction is an infinitive with a pleonastic μὴ οὐ.²³⁷ For this reason, we have conjectured <μὴ> οὐχ ὀλόκληρον. Alternatively, it is also possible to delete οὐχ, since κωλύω is often constructed with a simple infinitive, even if the verb is negated.²³⁸

²³² Eust. *Il.* 18.444-456 vol. 4 p. 211.10 (van der Valk).

²³³ Schol. D *Il.* 10.252(3) p. 374.10 (van Thiel²). ἐπὶ is read in d, Bm¹², M¹¹ and V¹³, while Ag, Bd and P (which constitute one sub-family) read περὶ.

²³⁴ Dindorf 1875-1877, III, 436.

²³⁵ So d'Ansse de Villosion 1788, 252; Bekker 1825, 285; Kammer 1863, 67; Schrader 1880, 149; MacPhail 2011, 172.

²³⁶ So d'Ansse de Villosion 1788, 252; Bekker 1825, 285; Kammer 1863, 67; Dindorf 1875-1877, III, 436; Schrader 1880, 149; MacPhail 2011, 172.

²³⁷ See Goodwin 1896, 322-326; Kühner/Gerth 1904, 207-219; van Emde Boas/Rijksbaron/Huitink/de Bakker 2019, 599-600.

²³⁸ See Kühner/Gerth 1904, 215 n. b; van Emde Boas/Rijksbaron/Huitink/de Bakker 2019, 600 n. 1.

[3ε] ἡ εἰς δύο διαίρεσις εἰς ἴσας δύναται γενέσθαι. The manuscript reads εἰς ἴσῃν (with the case ending abbreviated), which previous editors of the excerpt have also printed.²³⁹ We have followed Rose, however, who corrected ἴσῃν to ἴσας (*sc.* μερίδας or μοίρας), since Porphyry seems to refer to a division into two equal parts, which would require a plural. Alternatively, ἴσῃν could also be corrected to ἴσα (*cf.* εἴπερ διαιρεθείη τὰ ζ' εἰς β' ἴσα further on). Indeed, Sodano (who printed ἴσῃν) translated “la divisione può in questo caso avvenire in due metà uguali” (“the division can in this case be done in two equal halves”),²⁴⁰ which would require ἴσα or ἴσας. MacPhail (who also printed ἴσῃν), in contrast, translated “division into two can *result in* an equal [division] in these circumstances”.

ἐπεὶ δὲ τὸ πλεόν τοῦ ἡμίσεος ἀόριστόν ἐστιν. The manuscript reads ἐπειδὴ τὸ πλεόν, etc. According to Schrader and MacPhail, a new sentence starts with ἐπειδὴ, which is why they adopted Rose’s conjecture ἐπεὶ δὲ for ἐπειδὴ, as we have also done.²⁴¹ Similarly, Sodano corrected the text to ἐπειδὴ <δὲ>.²⁴² Barnes and Lawrence also punctuated before ἐπειδὴ but conjectured ἐπεὶ δὴ.²⁴³ Earlier editors, however, kept the transmitted text, connected this phrase with the preceding sentence and punctuated after ἀόριστόν ἐστιν.²⁴⁴ Breitenberger returned to this earlier interpretation.²⁴⁵ However, logically, the phrase does not give an explanation for the preceding statement (‘Division into two can in this case be into equal [*sc.* parts], since “more than half” is

²³⁹ D’Ansse de Villoison 1788, 252; Bekker 1825, 285; Kammer 1863, 67; Dindorf 1875-1877, III, 436; Schrader 1880, 149; Sodano 1974, 42; MacPhail 2011, 174.

²⁴⁰ Sodano 1974, 44. So also Barnes/Lawrence 1984, 2432: “Division into two may in this case be division into equal parts” and Breitenberger 2006, 312-313: “Die Aufteilung in zwei Teile kann in diesem Fall in gleich große erfolgen” (although they do not specify whether they follow Rose in adopting ἴσας).

²⁴¹ Schrader 1880, 149; MacPhail 2011, 174. See Rose 1863, 165; 1870, 1504; 1886, 129. So also Heitz 1869, 138.

²⁴² Sodano 1974, 42.

²⁴³ Barnes/Lawrence 1984, 2432 n. 1.

²⁴⁴ Bekker 1825, 285; Kammer 1863, 67; Dindorf 1875-1877, III, 436. So also Gigon 1987, 534.

²⁴⁵ Breitenberger 2006, 313; 401.

indeterminate’) but explains what follows (‘Since “more than half” is indeterminate, [...] it would be characteristic of an accurate person to determine this and indicate how much the remainder is’).

καταλελοιπέ<ναι>. The transmitted text ὁ εἰπὼν τῶν δύο μερῶν θάτερον πλέον γινόμενον καταλέλοιπε τριτάτην μοῖραν is ungrammatical. Either we have to follow MacPhail in correcting καταλέλοιπε to καταλελοιπέ<ναι>,²⁴⁶ which is an *accusativus cum infinitivo* ruled by εἰπὼν, or we have to supplement a conjunction ὅτι or ὥς after εἰπὼν to introduce indirect speech.²⁴⁷ The former correction is palaeographically the most likely, since the verb is abbreviated in the manuscript (καταλέλοιπ^π), which may have originally been an abbreviation for καταλελοιπ(έναι).²⁴⁸

εἴποις δ’ ὅτι πλέον τῶν εἰς δύο μοίρας <νεμομένων ὥρων> παρώχηκεν. The manuscript reads πλέον τῶν εἰς δύο μοίρας παρώχηκεν. Previous editors of the excerpt have corrected τῶν to τῆς,²⁴⁹ presumably connecting it with μοίρας and identifying the latter as a genitive. This would then mean ‘more of/than the part (divided?) into two has passed’.²⁵⁰ However, ἡ εἰς δύο μοῖρα is an otherwise unattested collocation, and it is not straightforward to assume an implied ‘divided’. For this reason, MacPhail supplemented the verb, correcting the text to πλέον τῆς εἰς δύο μοίρας <νεμομένης> (as suggested to him by Janko) and translating the phrase somewhat clumsily as “and [if] you said that more of the <divided> into two parts has passed”.²⁵¹ However, this translation

²⁴⁶ MacPhail 2011, 174.

²⁴⁷ Kammer 1863, 67 tried to solve it by putting τῶν δύο μερῶν πλέον γινόμενον καταλέλοιπε τριτάτην μοῖραν between quotation marks, thus identifying it as direct speech. However, in that case, a parenthetic φησι would probably be expected.

²⁴⁸ The infinitive ending -ναι is not written in προβεβηκέ(ναι) φάναι ἐπὶ πλέον (fol. 135v) and τὴν ὥραν καταμεμαθηκέ(ναι) φησί (fol. 135v) either.

²⁴⁹ D’Ansse de Villosion 1788, 252; Bekker 1825, 285; Kammer 1863, 67; Dindorf 1875-1877, III, 437; Schrader 1880, 149; MacPhail 2011, 174.

²⁵⁰ So also Sodano 1974, 45: “e se tu dicessi che è trascorso ‘piu’ della parte divisa in due”.

²⁵¹ MacPhail 2011, 174-175.

assumes that μοίρας is an accusative plural after εἰς, not a genitive singular. Maybe MacPhail assumed an implied διαιρέσεως. Indeed, further on in the text, Porphyry uses such elliptic phrases (τὸ γ' τῆς εἰς γ' (*sc.* διαιρέσεως) καταλίπη and γνούς ὅτι τῆς εἰς τρία (*sc.* διαιρέσεως) τὸ τρίτον ἐπιμένει). However, in those cases, the word διαίρεσις is found immediately before this in a similar construction (ἐν οἷς οὖν εἰς δύο ἴσα καὶ εἰς τρία ἔστι διαίρεσις and ἀκούσας <ὅτι> τῆς εἰς δύο μοίρας διαιρέσεως πλέον τι παρώχῃκεν, respectively) and can thus be easily understood. In order for the sentence to make sense, we would need πλέον τῆς εἰς δύο μοίρας <διαιρέσεως> παρώχῃκεν. Barnes and Lawrence thought in the same direction and translated: “and [if] you were to say that more than one part of the two-part division has gone”,²⁵² which would probably require πλέον <θατέρου/θατέρας> τῆς εἰς δύο μοίρας <διαιρέσεως>. If μοίρας is no longer interpreted as a genitive, however, it may not be necessary to change τῶν to τῆς. A possible solution is to keep the transmitted τῶν and supplement the phrase, for instance, as πλέον τῶν εἰς δύο μοίρας <νεμομένων ὥρων> παρώχῃκεν, ‘a majority of the <hours, which are divided> into two parts, has passed’. Our reason for supplementing this is that this construction is also used in the subsequent sentence (λεγέτω τις ὅτι πλέον τι τῶν εἰς δύο μοίρας νεμομένων ὥρων παρώχῃκε τι). Heitz translated *et [si] dicas duarum partium maiorem praeteriisse*,²⁵³ which would probably require πλέον τῶν δύο μοιρῶν.

ἐάν τις †εἰς δύο πλεονάσαντα† τὸ γ' τῆς εἰς γ' καταλίπη. The text seems to be corrupt. The sense appears to be: ‘if one part of a division into two increases and if someone leaves behind one third of a division into three, he determines by how much the increase has been’. That would require ἐάν τις <τῆς> εἰς δύο <θατέρου> πλεονάσαντος τὸ γ' τῆς εἰς γ' καταλίπη (if πλεονάζω is

²⁵² Barnes/Lawrence 1984, 2432.

²⁵³ Heitz 1969, 138.

intransitive) or perhaps ἐάν τις <τῆς> εἰς δύο <θάτερον> πλεονάσας τὸ γ' τῆς εἰς γ' καταλίπη (if πλεονάζω is transitive). At any rate, πλεονάσαντα seems impossible, since there is neither a masculine accusative nor a neuter plural²⁵⁴ with which it could be connected as a circumstantial participle. Kammer changed the participle to πλεονάσαν,²⁵⁵ probably connecting it with τὸ γ', but that does not give the required meaning. The translation would be 'if one leaves behind one third of the (division) into three, after it has increased to two'. MacPhail corrected the text to ἐάν τις <τοῦ β' τῆς> εἰς δύο πλεονάσαντα τὸ γ' τῆς εἰς γ' καταλίπη, translating this as "if someone leaves behind a third of the division into three exceeding [a half of the division] into two".²⁵⁶ However, his dangling participle 'exceeding' does not solve the problematic case of πλεονάσαντα. It is also doubtful whether τοῦ β' can mean 'half'. Sodano translated "se si facesse la somma di due terze parti" or "if one were to make the sum of two thirds".²⁵⁷ In a footnote, he gave a more literal translation: "se si portasse il terzo della divisione in tre parti (una cioè delle tre parti in cui è stato diviso il tutto) a due ripetentisi (cioè al raddoppio)" or "if one were to bring the third of the division into three parts (i.e. one of the three parts into which the whole has been divided) to two which repeat themselves (i.e. to duplication)".²⁵⁸ But here, too, the case of the participle is ignored (his translation "se si portasse [...] a due" requires εἰς δύο πλεονάσας), and "ripetentisi" ("repeating themselves") comes a bit out of nowhere.

²⁵⁴ The only possible neuter plural is δύο, but connecting πλεονάσαντα with δύο would make no sense and would leave εἰς unconnected with anything.

²⁵⁵ Kammer 1863, 68.

²⁵⁶ MacPhail 2011, 174-175.

²⁵⁷ Sodano 1974, 46.

²⁵⁸ Sodano 1974, 46 n. 95.

καταλίπη. Most editors have kept the transmitted form **καταλίποι**,²⁵⁹ but **ἐάν** + optative is impossible. Either **ἐάν τις** has to be corrected to **εἴ τις**, or **καταλίποι** has to be changed with MacPhail to **καταλίπη**.²⁶⁰ Palaeographically, the latter is more plausible (-οι being an iotacistic error for -η).

σοφῶς οὖν ὁ ποιητὴς τὸ ἀόριστον [τρίτον] τῆς αὐξήσεως τοῦ ἡμίσεος δεδήλωκεν ὅσον ἦν τρίτον. Like Villoison, Bekker and Dindorf, MacPhail has kept the first **τρίτον**.²⁶¹ However, this word should be deleted with Kammer, Schrader and Sodano.²⁶² Porphyry is talking about the number by which one half has increased. It is the increase which is unspecific, not the ‘one third’.

ἀπὸ τοῦ μεσονυκτίου μεταβάντος β’ ὥραι ἦσαν παραλλάξασαι. The manuscript puts **μεταβάντος** after **παραλλάξασαι**, which previous editors have left unchanged.²⁶³ It can only be connected with **μεσονυκτίου**, but this creates an extreme hyperbaton. For this reason, we have moved it after **μεσονυκτίου**.²⁶⁴

[3f] **παρήλθε τὸ πλεόν ἢ νύξ οὔσα μοιρῶν β’**. Autochthon’s explanation is a bit confusing. He first paraphrases Homer, stating that the two parts (or two thirds) have been completed and the third part (or one third) remains (**τετελεσμένων τῶν β’ μοιρῶν, λειπομένης δὲ τῆς τρίτης**). However, he then states that the night has passed for the majority (**παρήλθε τὸ πλεόν ἢ νύξ**) and

²⁵⁹ D’Ansse de Villoison 1788, 252; Bekker 1825, 285; Kammer 1863, 68; Dindorf 1875-1877, III, 437; Schrader 1880, 149.

²⁶⁰ MacPhail 2011, 174.

²⁶¹ D’Ansse de Villoison 1788, 252; Bekker 1825, 285; MacPhail 2011, 174.

²⁶² Kammer 1863, 68; Schrader 1880, 149; Sodano 1974, 44.

²⁶³ D’Ansse de Villoison 1788, 252; Bekker 1825, 285; Kammer 1863, 68; Dindorf 1875-1877, III, 437; Schrader 1880, 150; Sodano 1974, 44; MacPhail 2011, 176.

²⁶⁴ Alternatively, **μεταβάντος** might have originally been a gloss to **παραλλάξασαι** (so **μεταβάσασαι**), which was later corrupted to **μεταβάντος**. However, this speculative theory requires a double correction.

adds that the night consists of two parts (ἡ νύξ οὕσα μοιρῶν δύο). This could be taken to mean that he interprets τῶν δύο μοιράων, like Aristotle, as indicating two halves of the night. However, that is not how he goes on to explain the text. In the interpretation that follows, he contrasts the two parts with one (stating ‘two is greater than one’) and argues that two thirds is the majority of the night (πλέον γὰρ μέρος εἰσὶ τῆς νυκτὸς αἱ δύο), indicating that he is now speaking of two thirds of the night rather than two halves. He then again repeats his point that, if two thirds have passed, the night has passed for the majority (παροιχομένων τῶν δύο μοιρῶν τῷ πλείονι ἡ νύξ παρώχηκεν; cf. also τῷ πλείονι καὶ μείζονι μέρει παρήλλαχε (sc. ἡ νύξ), τῶν δύο μερῶν παρωχημένων at the end). This raises the question whether β’ in ἡ νύξ οὕσα μοιρῶν β’ might be an error (for γ’?), perhaps introduced from the Aristotelian argument. Alternatively, we could translate παρήλθε τὸ πλέον ἡ νύξ οὕσα μοιρῶν β’ as ‘the night has gone by for the most part, if (we were to assume that) it consists of two parts’.

ἔστι γὰρ τῷ «πλέω» ἡ νύξ παρωχηκυῖα μέρει. The word πλέω is a bit problematic. In this sentence, Porphyry seems to want to connect this with μέρει in the sense of ‘for the most part’, as he goes on to explain (cf. τουτέστι τῷ πλείονι καὶ μείζονι μέρει). However, πλέω/πλέω is no regular dative form of the comparative πλείων (neither in Attic prose nor in Homer). Of course, it is nevertheless possible that Porphyry/Autochthon believes that πλέω/πλέω is somehow a Homeric form of the dative comparative, similar to the more familiar πλέω = πλέονα and πλείους = πλέονες/πλέονας. One way to solve the problem is to assume that we should actually read τῷ «πλέω» ἡ νύξ παρωχηκυῖα μέρει, τουτέστι τῷ πλείονι καὶ μείζονι μέρει. Or perhaps more drastically: [τῷ] πλέω ἡ νύξ παρωχηκυῖα [μέρει], τουτέστι τῷ πλείονι καὶ μείζονι μέρει (in which case πλέω would be a regular adverbial accusative). In any case, Porphyry’s/Autochthon’s point

seems to be that πλέω is not an error and should not be corrected to πλείων but is used in an adverbial sense (πλέω = τῷ πλέονι μέρει).

[3g] **Ἀπίων δὲ αὐτῶν τῶν β' τὸ πλεον μέρος ἀνηλῶσθαι λέγει, ὥστε καὶ τῆς δευτέρας εἶναι λείψανον.** The manuscript reads τῆς δευτέρας, presumably with an implied μοίρας. However, since τὸ πλεον μέρος precedes, the switch to a feminine form is somewhat unexpected. Kammer's conjecture τοῦ δευτέρου is what would probably be expected.²⁶⁵ Note, however, that the parallel in the D scholia has τῆς δευτέρας as well.²⁶⁶ An alternative solution would be to supplement αὐτῶν τῶν β' <μοιρῶν> or at the very least to assume that τῶν β' is a feminine plural and thus short for τῶν β' (μοιρῶν).

«ἀλλὰ καὶ ταύτην τὴν στρατίαν θαλάσση ἤδη πλείω χρώμενοι συνῆλθον». Most editors of the excerpt have read τὴν στρατιάν.²⁶⁷ In the manuscript, the word is abbreviated as στρατ'. The acute accent shows that the reading is actually στρατίαν or (without iotacism) στρατείαν. Thus, Porphyry seems to have agreed with the text of Thucydides (1.3.5) as transmitted by the codex Laurentianus 69,2 (C⁴)²⁶⁸ and Monacensis gr. 430 (F) (στρατείαν) / the codex Monacensis gr. 228 (G) (στρατίαν) against the codex Parisinus suppl. gr. 255 (A), Vaticanus gr. 126 (B), Heidelbergensis, Palatinus gr. 252 (E) and Londinensis Add. 11,727 (M), which read στρατιάν

²⁶⁵ D'Anse de Villosion 1788, 252 and Bekker 1825, 286 misread the abbreviation δευ^τρ' as δεκάτης (presumably interpreting this as referring to the tenth hour).

²⁶⁶ Schol. D *Il.* 10.252(3) p. 374.17 (van Thiel²).

²⁶⁷ Bekker 1825, 286; Kammer 1863, 69; Dindorf 1875-1877, III, 438; Schrader 1880, 150; MacPhail 2011, 176. D'Anse de Villosion 1788, 252 read τὴν στρατὸν, which is impossible, since στρατός is masculine.

²⁶⁸ The initial part of codex C (Thuc. 1.1.1-1.15.1) is written in a later hand; hence the siglum C⁴. For the stemmatological position of C⁴, see Alberti 1972, CLXVIII-CLXXI.

(ABEM form one family, to which F normally belongs as well).²⁶⁹ Note, however, that the parallel quotation in the D scholia has στρατιάν.²⁷⁰

The excerpt also agrees with most manuscripts of Thucydides in reading πλείω against the codex Monacensis gr. 228 (G) and the corrector of the codex Londinensis Add. 11,727 (M¹), which read τὰ πλείω.²⁷¹ Finally, it deviates from the *codices veteres* in reading συνῆλθον²⁷² (instead of ξυνῆλθον) but nevertheless agrees with them in so far as it has the prefix συν-/ξυν- against the codex Parisinus gr. 1733 (Pe)²⁷³ (ἐξῆλθον) and Lorenzo Valla's translation (*exierunt*).²⁷⁴ Cobet corrected the text of Thucydides to ξυνεξῆλθον,²⁷⁵ which MacPhail adopted in his edition of the excerpt as συνεξῆλθον,²⁷⁶ but this correction by MacPhail is unnecessary.

πτῶσιν αἰτιατικὴν προβάλλον. MacPhail puts προβάλλον between *cruces*.²⁷⁷ Indeed, a construction προβάλλω πτῶσιν in the sense of 'show a grammatical case' is otherwise unattested. Note, however, that the parallel in the D scholia has προβάλλον as well.²⁷⁸

[4] «Πηϊάδας ἐσορῶντι». The text of *Od.* 5.272 is transmitted by the mediaeval Homer manuscripts as Πηϊάδας τ' ἐσορῶντι.²⁷⁹ This is also how the text is read by Eustathius.²⁸⁰

²⁶⁹ See Luschkat 1960, 21; Alberti 1972, 29. For the transmission of Thucydides, especially the stemma of the *codices veteres*, see Luschkat 1960, 11*-16*; Alberti 1972, XL-LIII. The reading στρατιάν is also found in schol. Thuc. 1.3.5b (Kleinlogel/Alpers).

²⁷⁰ Schol. D *Il.* 10.252(3) p. 374.20 (van Thiel²).

²⁷¹ The lemma of schol. Thuc. 1.3.5b (Kleinlogel/Alpers) also has τὰ πλείω according to A and B; in F, the lemma has καὶ πλείω. See Kleinlogel/Alpers 2019, 270.

²⁷² Schol. Thuc. 1.3.5b (Kleinlogel/Alpers) also has συνῆλθον.

²⁷³ For the relevance of codex Pe, see Alberti 1972, LXXIII-LXXV.

²⁷⁴ Valla's translation was based on a now lost codex. For its text-critical importance, see Alberti 1972, CXIX-CXXXII.

²⁷⁵ Cobet 1873, 428.

²⁷⁶ MacPhail 2011, 176.

²⁷⁷ MacPhail 2011, 176.

²⁷⁸ Schol. D *Il.* 10.252(3) p. 374.22 (van Thiel²).

²⁷⁹ See West 2017, 110.

²⁸⁰ Eust. *Od.* 5.271 vol. 1 p. 215.24 (Stallbaum).

Similarly, the geographer Pausanias quotes the line as Πληϊάδας τ' ἐσορῶντα (with an accusative instead of a dative participle).²⁸¹ In an *Odyssey* scholion, however, the participle appears in a 'distended' form as εἰσορόωντα.²⁸² It also appears in a 'distended' form in the quotation of this line in Achilles Tatius and the Anonymus I in Aratum, viz. as Πληιάδας εἰσορόωντι (with a dative participle).²⁸³ Similarly, an exegetic *Iliad* scholion quotes the line as Πληϊάδας θ' ὀρόωντι.²⁸⁴ The codex Harleianus 5674 fol. 33r may have initially read something similar. In its current form, it reads πληϊάδας [[.]] ὀρόωντι (with an erasure between the two words). Originally, the text probably read πληϊάδας θ' ὀρόωντι, but the corrector erased θ' and wrote τ' ἐσ over it, thus producing the standard reading πληϊάδας τ' ἐσορῶντι, found in the other mediaeval Homer manuscripts.

In the manuscript of the Porphyry excerpt, the line is quoted as πλη(ι)άδας²⁸⁵ ἐσορῶντι. Many editors of the excerpt have corrected this and aligned it with one of the previously discussed readings. Their reason for doing so is that the line in its current form seems to be unmetrical (Πληϊᾶδας ἔσορῶντι / Πληϊᾶδας ἔσορῶντι). Villoison, Bekker and Dindorf corrected the text to Πληϊᾶδας εἰσορόωντι (the reading of Achilles Tatius and the Anonymus I in Aratum),²⁸⁶ Kammer

²⁸¹ Paus. 8.3.7. Rocha-Pereira 1990, 226, Casevitz/Jost/Marcadé 2002, 20 and Moggi/Osanna 2003, 22 have corrected ἐσορῶντα to ἐσορῶντι.

²⁸² Schol. *Od.* 5.272d (Pontani): γρ(άφεται) καὶ «εἰσορόωντα». διχῶς αἱ Ἀριστάρχου. Aristarchus' two editions differed with regard to the reading of the participle. This is what the word διχῶς indicates, which means 'in two ways' and is often used in the Homeric scholia to indicate discrepancies between Aristarchus' first and second edition. According to West 2017, 110, τ' ἐσορῶντι was the reading of Aristarchus' first edition (Ar^a), and τ' ἐσορῶντα the reading of Aristarchus' second edition (Ar^b). Unlike other scholia (e.g. schol. *A Il.* 8.213a1 (Erbse) (VMK): διχῶς αἱ Ἀριστάρχου «ἔργε» καὶ «ἔρυκε»; schol. *Od.* 1.188a (Pontani): διχῶς αἱ Ἀριστάρχου, «εἰ πέρ τε» καὶ «εἰ πέρ τι»), the present scholion does not go on to spell out the two readings. Therefore, reconstructing Aristarchus' readings remains hypothetical. The phrasing of the scholion implies, however, that Πληϊάδας εἰσορόωντα was the reading of one edition of Aristarchus, while his other edition presumably read the vulgate Πληϊάδας τ' ἐσορῶντι).

²⁸³ Achilles Tatius, *Introductio in Aratum* 1 p. 30 (Maass); Anonymus I in Aratum 1 p. 89 (Maass). Note that the manuscripts of Achilles Tatius have πληϊάδας τ' εἰσορόωντι (Vaticanus gr. 191 (V); the Vaticanus gr. 381 (T), which belongs to the same family as V, has πληϊστιάδας τ' εἰσορόωντι) and πλειάδας εἰσορόωντι (Laurentianus 28,44 (M)); Maass 1898, 30 corrected this to Πληϊάδας εἰσορόωντι, probably rightly so, since a distended form is found in all three manuscripts. Di Maria 1996, 8, in contrast, corrected the text to Πληϊάδας τ' ἐσορῶντι.

²⁸⁴ Schol. *AT Il.* 8.93a1 (Erbse) (exeg.).

²⁸⁵ The scribe seems to have initially written πλιᾶδας, as is indicated by the diaeresis, which is normally only used for ι and υ, and then corrected ι to η. It is possible that his exemplar originally had πληϊάδας.

²⁸⁶ D'Ansse de Villosion 1788, 252; Bekker 1825, 286; Dindorf 1875-1877, III, 438.

corrected it to Πληϊάδας <τ> ἔσορῶντι, i.e. the text as it is transmitted in the mediaeval Homer manuscripts.²⁸⁷ Arguably, Kammer's intervention is less drastic than that of the other editors. However, it is possible that Porphyry actually quoted the line as Πληϊάδας ἔσορῶντι, presumably with metrical lengthening *in arsi*.²⁸⁸

τεκμήρασθαι. Previous editors of the excerpt have all printed τεκμαίρεσθαι.²⁸⁹ However, what follows *mu* is written quite narrowly and seems to be *eta* rather than *alpha iota*. Moreover, *rho* is followed by *alpha*, not *epsilon*. So the verb is τεκμήρασθαι, the aorist infinitive. This is also what is read in the codex Vaticanus Palatinus gr. 12 (V²⁰), which copies B.

τὸ προβεβηκέναι. This might be an error for τὸ «προβέβηκε», since Porphyry generally quotes the Homeric words in their original conjugations and declensions.

οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν Πληϊάδων καὶ Ὑάδων καὶ Ὠρίωνος. The sentence is elliptic: οἱ δὲ (*sc.* φάναι Ὅμηρον/Ὀδυσσέα) ἀπὸ τῶν Πληϊάδων καὶ Ὑάδων καὶ Ὠρίωνος, 'other people claim that [Homer/Odysseus says this] on the basis of the Pleiades, Hyades and Orion'. However, it is possible that ἀπὸ is an error for ἐπὶ, since this is the preposition used before (οἱ δὲ οὐδ' ἐπ' ἄλλου φασὶν οἷόν τε ἢ ἐπὶ τῆς ἄρκτου εἰρησθαι), so that the meaning would be 'other people claim that [Homer/Odysseus says this] about the Pleiades, Hyades and Orion'.

²⁸⁷ Kammer 1863, 69.

²⁸⁸ Schrader 1880, 150 and MacPhail 2011, 178 printed Πληϊάδας ἔσορῶντι.

²⁸⁹ D'Ansse de Villoison 1788, 252; Bekker 1825, 286; Dindorf 1875-1877, III, 438; Schrader 1880, 151.

†Πληϊάδων† δύσιν ποιουμένων καὶ ἤδη προβαίνοντων εἰς τὴν δύσιν. The transmitted text is obviously corrupt here. The phrase is preceded by οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν Πληϊάδων καὶ Ὑάδων καὶ Ὠρίωνος, ἥτοι τὴν ἀνατολὴν (corrected from ἥτοι δὲ ἀνατολὴ) ἑώαν ποιουμένων καὶ προβεβηκότων ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνατολῆς ‘Other people [claim that he says this] on the basis of the Pleiades, Hyades and Orion, which are either rising at dawn and have advanced from the east’. The required text would therefore probably be ἥ(τοι) ἑώαν τὴν δύσιν ποιουμένων καὶ ἤδη προβαίνοντων εἰς τὴν δύσιν ‘or are setting at dawn and are already advancing towards the west’.²⁹⁰ Alternatively, it is possible that Porphyry is no longer talking about the Pleiades, Hyades and Orion here. This might be suggested by the parallel in the D scholia, which read ἔνιοι μὲν οὖν Πληϊάδας φασὶ καὶ Ὑάδας καὶ τὸν Ὠρίωνα καὶ τὸ προβεβηκέναι τὴν ἀνατολὴν ἑώαν ποιεῖσθαι, ἕτεροι δὲ τὸν ἔσπερον καὶ τὸν κύνα, καὶ τὸ προβεβηκέναι ἑώαν ποιεῖσθαι τὴν δύσιν.²⁹¹ So it is possible that Porphyry has moved on to another interpretation and is now talking about the Evening Star and Sirius as stars that set at dawn.

διχῶς δὲ τὸ τρίτον <...> τό τε κατὰ σχέσιν τὴν πρὸς τὸ πρῶτον. As Schrader indicated, some text appears to have fallen out after τρίτον.²⁹² Porphyry seems to have talked about two ways of interpreting ‘the third part’ (or ‘one third’). If we do not supplement a reference to the Evening Star and Sirius in the aforementioned corrupt passage, it is possible that such a note was originally found in the lacuna here.

²⁹⁰ Schrader 1880, 151 simply deleted Πληϊάδων, but in his apparatus he suggested correcting this to ἡ τῶν ἑώαν, although he added that more may have fallen out.

²⁹¹ Schol. D II. 10.252(2) p. 373.4-6 (van Thiel²).

²⁹² Schrader 1880, 151.

«ἔσσεται <ῆ> ἥως ἢ δειλῆς ἢ μέσον ἥμαρ». The manuscript quotes *Il.* 21.111 as ἔσσεται ἥως ἢ δειλῆς ἢ μέσον ἥμαρ. Previous editors of the excerpt have kept this text,²⁹³ but the line is unmetrical as such, and Porphyry is unlikely to have written that. For this reason, we have supplemented <ῆ> ἥως on the basis of the transmitted Homer text (with ῆ lost through haplography).²⁹⁴ The conjecture is further supported by the parallel D scholion, which also reads ἢ ἥως.²⁹⁵ Moreover, this is also how Porphyry reads the line in the first book of the *Homeric Questions*.²⁹⁶

Porphyry (as presented by *B) also reads δειλῆς with the Homer manuscripts AFTG (alongside Apollonius Sophista, the *Suda*, the *Etymologicum Genuinum* and the *Etymologicum magnum*)²⁹⁷ and against the rest of the Homer manuscripts and the other testimonia, which have δειλῆ.²⁹⁸ Note, however, that in the first book of his *Homeric Questions*, Porphyry seems to have read δειλῆ instead.²⁹⁹ The nominative δειλῆ also seems to have been the reading of Aristarchus and

²⁹³ D'Ansse de Villosion 1788, 253; Bekker 1825, 286; Dindorf 1875-1877, III, 439; Schrader 1880, 151.

²⁹⁴ This error is also found in schol. A *Il.* 10.252a (Erbse) (VMK) (Erbse 1969-1988, III, 49 supplemented <ῆ> ἥως with Ludwig), schol. T *Il.* 21.110c1 (Erbse) (exeg.), Eust. *Il.* 10.252s. vol. 3 p. 59.2 (van der Valk).

²⁹⁵ Schol. D *Il.* 10.252(3) p. 373.2-3 (van Thiel²).

²⁹⁶ Porph. *Zetemata Vaticana* 11 p. 63 (Sodano) = *ad Il.* 6.201 p. 96 (Schrader). The Vaticanus gr. 305 (V), the only manuscript that preserved book 1 of Porphyry's *Homeric Questions*, reads ἔσσεται ἥως, but the excerpts of this passage in *B, the codex Scorialensis gr. Ω.I.12 (E⁴) and the Harleianus gr. 5693 (Bm⁸) all have ἔσσεται ἢ ἥως. See Sodano 1970, 62-63.

²⁹⁷ Apollonius Sophista *Lexicon* s.v. ἥως p. 85 (Bekker); *Suda* η 417, s.v. ἥως; *Etymologicum Genuinum* s.v. δειλῆ (Vaticanus gr. 1818 fol. 98v); *Etym. Magn.* s.v. δειλῆ p. 261 (Kallierges). One manuscript of the *Suda* (Parisinus gr. 2625 (A)) has δειλῆ: see Adler (1931) 576. The *Suda* also incorrectly quotes the line as ἔσσεται ἥμαρ ἢ ἥως, etc. Note further that the transmitted text of Apollonius actually reads ἔσσετε for ἔσσεται. Eust. *Il.* 21.106-113 vol. 4 p. 464.22 (van der Valk) records δειλῆς as a variant (κατὰ δέ τινας δειλῆς).

²⁹⁸ *Etymologicum Symeonis* δ 90 (Baldi), s.v. δειλῆ; *Lexicon αἰμωδεῖν* ε 198 (Dyck), s.v. ἔσται; schol. bT *Il.* 8.66b (Erbse) (exeg.); schol. A *Il.* 10.252a (Erbse) (VMK); schol. T *Il.* 21.110c1 (Erbse) (exeg.); schol. b *Il.* 21.110b2/c2 (Erbse) (exeg.); schol. T *Il.* 21.111c1 (Erbse) (exeg.) (δίχα οὖν τοῦ ᾗ δειλῆ); schol. Procl. Hes. *Op.* 578-581 (Pertusi); Phot. *Lexicon* η 314 (Theodoridis), s.v. ἥως; Eust. *Il.* 10.252s. vol. 3 p. 59.2; 11.84 vol. 3 p. 157.22; 21.106-113 vol. 4 p. 464.22 (van der Valk). Note that one manuscript (Parisinus gr. 2708 (B)) of Proclus' scholion on Hesiod has δειλῆς: see Pertusi 1955, 163. Also, like the *Suda*, Photius reads the Homeric line as ἔσσεται ἥμαρ ἢ ἥως (although he does not repeat ἥμαρ at the end).

²⁹⁹ Porph. *Zetemata Vaticana* 11 p. 63 (Sodano) = *ad Il.* 6.201 p. 96 (Schrader). Note, however, that excerpt in the codex Scorialensis gr. Ω.I.12 (E⁴) reads δειλῆς.

Didymus.³⁰⁰ In his Homer edition, however, West adopted Fick's conjectures ἦ' for ἦ and δείλη for δείλη(ς).³⁰¹

4 Discussion

4.1 Porphyry's introduction [1-3a]

The text seems to reproduce the introduction to some section of Porphyry's *Homeric Questions*, explaining his approach to answering such questions³⁰². It is unlikely to be the beginning of the work itself, however, as the first book is extant in the manuscript tradition, and this is not how it begins.³⁰³

Porphyry mentions that 'the collection of the inquiries has appeared already also in other writers' (ἡ συναγωγή τῶν ζητουμένων γέγονε μὲν ἤδη καὶ παρ' ἄλλοις). Schrader claimed that Porphyry's work was based on three collections: a Peripatetic collection (also containing all pre-Aristotelian material), a Stoic collection (providing allegorical explanations) and an Alexandrian collection.³⁰⁴ According to Schrader, the reference to a συναγωγή τῶν ζητουμένων proves his use of such collections.³⁰⁵ Although the three-source hypothesis was not adopted by subsequent

³⁰⁰ See schol. A *Il.* 21.111d (Erbse) (VMK) (Ἀρίσταρχος χωρὶς τοῦ σ, «δείλη»); schol. A *Il.* 21.110a (Erbse) (VMK) (οὕτως δὲ χωρὶς τοῦ σ γραπτέον, ὡς καὶ Διδύμω δοκεῖ ἐν τῇ διορθώσει); schol. T *Il.* 21.110c1 (Erbse) (exeg.) (καὶ χωρὶς τοῦ σ τὸ «δείλη», ὡς καὶ Δίδυμός φησιν); schol. b *Il.* 21.110b2/c2 (Erbse) (exeg.) (τὸ δὲ «δείλη» χωρὶς τοῦ σ, ὡς φησι Δίδυμος).

³⁰¹ West 1998-2000, II, 245.

³⁰² See Kammer 1863, 5; Rose 1863, 165; Dindorf 1875-1877, III, XII-XIII; 434; Schrader 1880, 367-68; 370; 421; 1890, 169; Erbse 1960, 64.

³⁰³ See Sodano 1970. But note van der Valk 1963-1964, I, 104 n. 75: "this question formed the beginning of Porphyry's book"; Pontani 2019, 48 n. 3: "on a l'impression d'avoir ici l'ouverture d'un livre [...] ou de l'œuvre entière" (we find the former much more likely).

³⁰⁴ Schrader 1880, 368-427; 1890, 172-200.

³⁰⁵ Schrader 1880, 421.

scholars, Gudeman did accept the existence of an Alexandrian collection, which he considered to be attested in the current excerpt³⁰⁶. According to Erbse, however, this is not what the text says at all. In his view, Porphyry instead *contrasts* his work with such collections and stresses that, unlike such compilations, he consulted the original works.³⁰⁷

Porphyry announces in this programmatic statement that he draws on the inquiries of others and evaluates their solutions. He states that he agrees with some but rejects others and adds that some solutions are his own, while others are based on a revision and expansion of solutions proposed by other writers. Indeed, his discussions in the *Homeric Questions* often take the form of a catalogue of solutions proposed by previous writers.³⁰⁸

To illustrate his approach, Porphyry begins with one of the old questions. He quotes *Il.* 10.252-253, and then presents the Homeric question (in the following form): ‘For how, if these two parts have passed and even more than this, does the third part remain but not part of the third?’ Indeed, Porphyry goes on to give a list of possible solutions that have been proposed by other writers. However, despite what he announces at the start of the excerpt, he does not critically evaluate the solutions here, nor does he explicitly reject any of these. In other excerpts, in contrast, Porphyry engages more actively with the discussed solutions.

For the first solution, Porphyry reports that ‘some in fact, adding a *sigma* [i.e. to *τριτάτη*, making it the genitive *τριτάτης*], thought fit to write “and a part of a third remains”, so that a portion of the third is left, but not the whole third’.³⁰⁹ Porphyry seems to raise this sort of solution

³⁰⁶ Gudeman 1927, 2513.

³⁰⁷ Erbse 1960, 64-65.

³⁰⁸ For Porphyry’s method in the *Homeric Questions*, see Pontani 2019, especially pp. 48-53.

³⁰⁹ Eustathius may be alluding to this interpretation in Eust. *Il.* 10.252-253 vol. 3 p. 59.10-12 (van der Valk): ἡ αἱ δύο ὅλαι μοῖραι παρώχοντο καὶ σὺν αὐταῖς μέρος τι καὶ τῆς τρίτης, ὥς μὴ ὅλην αὐτὴν περιλείπεσθαι (although he does not go so far as to state that *τρίτη* should become *τρίτης*). Alternatively, he might also be referring to Chrysippus’ interpretation (see §4.3 below).

only to set it aside as a representative of attempted solutions through emendation generally. That is, it is probably not meant to be part of the main discussion of serious solutions.³¹⁰

4.2 Metrodorus [3b]

The first real solution cited by Porphyry is that of Metrodorus. This is probably Metrodorus of Lampsacus the Elder, a student of Anaxagoras who is mentioned in Plato's *Ion* (530c = 61 *fr.* 1 DK).³¹¹ Other scholars have identified him as Metrodorus of Chios (a student of Democritus and author of a work entitled *Τρωϊκά*³¹²) or Metrodorus of Lampsacus the Younger (a friend of Epicurus and author of a work *Περὶ ποιημάτων*³¹³).³¹⁴ Metrodorus of Lampsacus the Younger seems especially unlikely, since, according to Plutarch, Metrodorus did not consider knowledge of Homer necessary.³¹⁵ Horn even conjectured changing *Μητρόδωρος* to *Ζηνόδωρος*, thus

³¹⁰ See also Porph. *ad Od.* 5.334-337 p. 56-57 (Schrader) = schol. *Od.* 5.334e (Pontani), where he states that Aristotle's emendation of the word *αὐδήεσσα* to *αὐλήεσσα* or *οὐδήεσσα* (*fr.* 171 Rose³ = *fr.* 394.1 Gigon) is not a solution (*λύσαι μὲν οὖν οὐ βεβούληται, sc. Ἀριστοτέλης*). See the discussion in Hintenlang 1961, 89-93, Breitenberger 2006, 417-418 and Verhasselt 2020, 246-248.

³¹¹ See Schrader 1880, 384; Lanata 1963, 246-247 with n. 4; Freeman 1949, 277-278; Pfeiffer 1968, 35; Sodano 1974, 47 n. 98; Richardson 1975, 68; Cassio 2002, 123; Pontani 2005, 28; Pagani 2006; Novokhatko 2015, 37-38. The fragment is included in Diels/Kranz 1952, 49-50 as 61 *fr.* 5 with a question mark.

³¹² The title is attested in Ath. 4.184a (= Metrodorus Chius 70 B 3 DK = *FGrH* 43 F1: *Μητρόδωρος δ' ὁ Χῖος ἐν Τρωϊκοῖς*) and schol. *Ge Il.* 21.444c (Erbse) (exeg.) (= Metrodorus Chius 70 B 4 DK = *FGrH* 43 F2: *Μητρόδωρος ἐν Τρωϊκοῖς*).

³¹³ See Phld. *De rhetorica* 2, *PHerc.* 1674 col. 49.27 – col. 51.29 p. 145-149 Longo Auricchio = vol. 1 p. 85-89 Sudhaus (~ Metrodorus *fr.* 20-21 Koerte); *PHerc.* 1672 col. 20.28 – col. 21.17 p. 213-215 Longo Auricchio = vol. 1 p. 119-20 Sudhaus (not in Koerte); *De rhetorica* 3, *PHerc.* 1506 col. 40.17-29 – col. 41.21 p. 17 Hammerstaedt 1992 = vol. 2 p. 241-242 Sudhaus (not in Koerte); col. 44.18-31 p. 20 Hammerstaedt 1992 = vol. 2 p. 247-248 Sudhaus (~ Metrodorus *fr.* 23 Koerte). Plut. *Non posse suaviter vivi secundum Epicurum* 12.1094e quotes the work as *Περὶ ποιητῶν* (= Metrodorus *fr.* 24 Koerte).

³¹⁴ See Sengebusch 1855, 133-134. The text is included in the fragments of Metrodorus of Chios by Alfieri 1936, 336 and F. Jacoby, *FGrH* 43 F4. See also Erbse 1960, 45-46. Diels/Kranz 1952, 234 do not print the text but give it its own fragment number (70 B 5) with a cross-reference to Metrodorus of Lampsacus the Elder. This attribution is rejected, however, by F. Jenkins, *BNJ* 43 F4.

³¹⁵ Plut. *Non posse suaviter vivi secundum Epicurum* 12.1094e = Metrodorus *fr.* 24 Koerte: *ὅθεν μὴδ' εἰδέναι φάσκων, μεθ' ὁποτέρων ἦν ὁ Ἔκτωρ, ἢ τοὺς πρώτους στίχους τῆς Ὀμήρου ποιήσεως ἢ πάλιν τὰ ἐν μέσῳ, μὴ ταρβήσης*, 'Therefore, you do not have to be disturbed if you admit that you do not even know which side Hector was on, or the first lines of Homer's poetry or those in the middle'. According to Erler 1994, 219, Metrodorus' work discussed 'poetological' problems. However, according to Plutarch (*Non posse suaviter vivi secundum Epicurum* 2.1087a), Metrodorus calumniated Homer in many works. So if Metrodorus discussed Homeric problems, it was probably not

identifying him as Zenodorus, author of a work *Περὶ τῆς Ὀμηρικῆς συνηθείας*.³¹⁶ However, this correction seems unnecessary. The main reason for rejecting the identification of Metrodorus as the pupil of Anaxagoras is that the fragment offers no allegorical interpretation of Homer, which Metrodorus was known for.³¹⁷ However, this does not mean that Metrodorus was unable to offer more ‘grammatical’ interpretations. In fact, the Stoics were known for allegorical interpretations, too, but in the current excerpt, Chrysippus is cited for a ‘grammatical’ interpretation as well (see §4.3 below).

In any case, Metrodorus reads *πλεῖον* and claims that it can mean two things in Homer – that is, it is a homonym.³¹⁸ One meaning is the customary one: ‘more’. But he claims that it can also mean ‘full’ (*τὸ πλήρες*), as it does for instance in *Il.* 2.226, ‘your huts are full of bronze’ (*πλεῖαί τοι χαλκοῦ κλισίαι*) and *Il.* 4.262-263, ‘your cup always stands full’ (*σὸν δὲ πλεῖον δέπας αἰεὶ ἔστηκε*). And this less common meaning is the one that solves our problem. In the Homeric epics, Metrodorus says, the night is divided into three watches (*τριφυλάκου τῆς νυκτὸς οὔσης*), and so what Homer is in fact saying here is that a full two parts of the night have passed – not more than two part – and a third part remains. Richardson calls this a “very strained reading”.³¹⁹ Breitenberger is more specific: the problem is that only the neuter singular *πλεῖον* is homonymous in this way. For instance, the feminine nominative singular of the comparative of *πολύς* is *πλείων* or *πλέων*,

to solve them but to criticise Homer (much like the work of Zoilus of Amphipoli). According to Plutarch, Epicurus (*fr.* 228 Usener) and Metrodorus spoke of ‘poetic confusion’ (*ποιητικὴ τύρβη*) and ‘Homer’s buffoonery’ (*Ὀμήρου μωρολογήματα*).

³¹⁶ Horn 1883, 92 (thesis III). On Zenodorus, see Pusch 1890, 135-147. The title is attested in schol. bT *Il.* 18.356b (Erbse) (exeg.) (*Ζηνοδόρω τῷ συγγράμματι Περὶ τῆς Ὀμήρου συνηθείας*). *Suda* ζ 78, s.v. *Ζηνόδοτος* erroneously lists it under the works of Zenodotus of Alexandria. Zenodorus is cited by Porphyry in *Zetemata Vaticana* 18 p. 129 Sodano (= Porph. *ad Il.* 16.174 p. 214 (Schrader) = Porph. *ad Od.* 4.477 p. 48 (Schrader) = schol. *Od.* 4.477h1 (Pontani)) and *ad Il.* 18.22 p. 220 (Schrader) = p. 230 (MacPhail).

³¹⁷ See Diog. Laert. 2.11 = Metrodorus 61 *fr.* 2 DK, Tatianus, *Ad Gr.* 21 = Metrodorus 61 *fr.* 3 DK and Hsch. α 299 (Latte), s.v. *Ἀγαμέμνονα* = Metrodorus 61 *fr.* 4 DK.

³¹⁸ The interpretation of Lanata 1963, 246-247 is incorrect. In her edition of the fragment of Metrodorus, she only printed *Μητρόδωρος μὲν οὖν τὸ «πλεῖον» δύο σημαίνειν φησί παρ’ Ὀμήρῳ*, which she incorrectly translated as “Metrodoro afferma che in Omero *πλεῖον* significa «due»”.

³¹⁹ Richardson 1975, 68.

but the feminine nominative singular of πλέως/πλεῖος ('full') is πλέα/πλεία. So, if one tried to defend πλεῖον in verse 252, it cannot modify νύξ (which is feminine) to mean 'full night' or 'night is full'. Yet in his paraphrase, this is precisely what Metrodorus is claiming: 'for the night (νύξ), having become filled (πλήρης, fem.) with two parts, has passed, but a third remains', etc.³²⁰ This is probably why the D scholia report the variant πλέη, an Ionic form of πλέα.³²¹ Metrodorus probably interpreted πλεῖον as an adverbial accusative: 'the night has passed in a manner that is full of two thirds'. Note that the scribe is inconsistent with regard to Metrodorus' reading. At the beginning, he says that it is πλεῖον, but at the end he writes πλέον (unless the latter is merely a scribal error).

The interpretation that the word means 'full' also recurs in an A scholion on *Il.* 9.71,³²² an exegetic bT scholion on *Il.* 10.252-253³²³ and in Hesychius' lexicon.³²⁴ Interestingly, these texts circumvent the problem by reading πλέω instead of πλεῖον. This suggests that they interpret it as a nominative feminine singular, since they explain it not as πλήρης but as πλήρης.³²⁵ However, this

³²⁰ See Breitenberger 2006, 402.

³²¹ Schol. D *Il.* 10.252.1(1) p. 373.6-7 (van Thiel²): ἔνιοι δὲ γράφουσιν «πλέη» ἀντὶ τοῦ πλήρης τῶν δύο μοιρῶν παρώχηκεν· τριφύλακτον γὰρ θέλει εἶναι τὴν νύκτα.

³²² Schol. A *Il.* 9.71 (Erbse) (VMK): πλεῖται {τοι οἶνον κλισίαι}: ὅτι πλεῖται ἀντὶ τοῦ πλήρης. πρὸς τὸ «παρώχηκε δὲ πλέω νύξ» ἀντὶ τοῦ πλήρης. Van der Valk 1963-1964, II, 232 concluded, on the basis of this scholion, that Aristarchus interpreted this passage, similarly explaining πλέω as πλήρης. So also Lührs 1992, 14 n. 49; 60-61 with n. 145. Although Aristarchus athetising l. 253 (as discussed above) does not preclude his having offered an interpretation of πλέω(ν) in l. 252, the interpretation πλέω = πλήρης probably presupposes reading it together with l. 253 ('filled with the two parts'). Moreover, the argument in schol. A *Il.* 10.253a1 (Erbse) (VMK) that l. 253 is superfluous seems to imply that it interprets πλέω(ν) as 'for the most part', which would contradict the interpretation πλέω = πλήρης. We are therefore sceptical that schol. A *Il.* 9.71 (Erbse) (VMK) preserves Aristarchus' interpretation. According to Friedländer 1853, 155-156, it is a heavily condensed rendition of Aristonicus' argument, who supposedly originally said that the word πλέων in *Il.* 10.252 was *misinterpreted* by some as a synonym of πλήρης. However, such an interpretation cannot be reconstructed on the basis of the actual text. So also Lührs 1992, 61 n. 144.

³²³ Schol. bT *Il.* 10.252-253a (Erbse) (exeg.): <παρώχηκεν δὲ> πλέω νύξ | τῶν δύο μοιράων, <τριτάτη δ' ἔτι μοῖρα λέλειπται>· παρήλθον τῆς νυκτὸς αἱ δύο πλήρεις μοῖραι, ὥς τὸ «μέλαινά τ' ἄστρον ἐκλέλοιπεν εὐφρόνη» (Soph. *El.* 19), ἵν' ἢ τὸ «πλέω» ἀντὶ τοῦ πλήρης.

³²⁴ Hsch. α 7890 (Latte): ἄστρον δὲ δὴ προβέβηκε· παρώχηκεν δὲ πλέω νύξ τῶν δύο μοιράων, τριτάτη δ' ἔτι μοῖρα λέλειπται. ἤτοι εἰς τρεῖς μοῖρας διαιρετέον, καὶ τὸ πλέω ἀντὶ τοῦ πλήρης ἀκουστέον, ἵνα ἢ, ὅτι πλήρης τῶν δύο μοιρῶν ἡ νύξ παρελήλυθεν.

³²⁵ The meaning 'full' also recurs in a prose paraphrase in the codex Scorialensis Ω.I.12 (E⁴) fol. 38r, which shows that it interprets πλέω as an adverbial accusative: τ' ἄστρον δὲ προέβη· παρήλθε δὲ ἡ νύξ, τὸ πλήρες τῶν δύο μοιρῶν· ἡ τρίτη δὲ μοῖρα ἔτι ὑπολέλειπται.

creates the problem that πλέω is not a regular feminine form either. Perhaps the critics who defended this interpretation erroneously thought of the paradigm as (m.) πλέως, (f.) πλέω, (n.) πλέων (instead of πλέως, πλέα, πλέων), a paradigm that is otherwise unattested.

4.3 Chrysippus [3c]

The next solution (after a raised dot and gap of three letters) comes from the Stoic Chrysippus.³²⁶ There are several fragments in which Chrysippus offers solutions for Homeric problems.³²⁷ Although no title is attested, he may have written a separate work on this,³²⁸ like the Stoic Zeno of Citium³²⁹. Usually the Stoics are associated with allegorical interpretations of Homer. However, unlike his teacher, Cleanthes, Chrysippus does not seem to have interpreted Homer allegorically.³³⁰

Chrysippus starts by making the comparison with a group of three days. If two days have passed, on the third day, we can say that a third day remains, even if we do not make this statement at the start of the day. So, we call a day a day even past dawn (i.e. even when only part of a day remains); and in the same way, Homer is here calling one part of the tripartite night one full part of the night, even though only a portion of that part remains (like Metrodorus, Chrysippus divides the night into three parts). So there are three parts of the night, more than two parts have past, and

³²⁶ According to Erbse 1960, 46, Porphyry knew Chrysippus' solution (together with that of Metrodorus) through a commentary of the Roman period, which was also used in the Geneva scholia.

³²⁷ Chrysippus, *SVF* III fr. 769-777.

³²⁸ See Pontani 2005, 41.

³²⁹ The list of Zeno's works in Diog. Laer. 7.4 attests a work of *Homeric Problems* in five books (Προβλημάτων Ὅμηρικῶν πέντε). See also Zeno, *SVF* I fr. 274-275. Zeno does not apply allegory to Homer; he does, however, offer an allegorical interpretation of Hesiod's *Theogony* (*SVF* I fr. 103-105; fr. 118; fr. 121; fr. 167; fr. 169; fr. 276). See Steinmetz 1986, 19-23; 1994, 523-524 and Long 1992, 48; 50-51; 59-64.

³³⁰ For Chrysippus' Homeric studies, see Buffière 1973, 150-152, Steinmetz 1986, 26-28 and Long 1992, 48-50; 58-59. For Cleanthes, see Buffière 1973, 137-154, Pépin 1976, 125-131 and Steinmetz 1986, 23-25.

Homer (or Odysseus) is informally calling what remains of the third part ‘the third part’. Chrysippus then seems to draw a comparison with ‘incomplete’ humans. His argument seems to be that we call people full humans, even if they are missing certain body parts.³³¹

4.4 ‘Others’ [3d]

The fourth solution (after a special three-dot punctuation and a gap of three letters) is like the third: ‘Others claim that poets have a custom of using a number that has been made uniform’ – i.e. they tend to round numbers up or down in some way. In the lengthy passage that follows (the second longest), many examples from various poets are provided. Porphyry starts by giving examples of numbers that are rounded down. First, he quotes a line mentioning an army of 1000 ships (χιλιόναν στρατόν), perhaps a quotation from Euripides’ *Orestes*.³³² This refers to the Achaean fleet sent to Troy, which in fact consisted of 1186 ships.³³³ This is followed by a quotation from an anonymous tragedy, which mentions 20 columns for one expedition but then specifies that there are 11 for the infantry and 12 for the ships, thus showing that they are in fact 23 in total.³³⁴ These are examples which omit the ‘subsequent digit(s)’ (τὰ ἐπιτρέχοντα τοῖς ἀριθμοῖς), i.e. the remainder (in our examples, ,αρπς’ becomes ,α, and κγ’ becomes κ’). Porphyry then adds that the opposite, viz. omission of the first digit (τὸν προκείμενον), is also found. He first quotes two

³³¹ See the text-critical note above on the problematic words παρὰ πόδα.

³³² Eur. *Or.* 351-352 (ὁ χιλιόναν | στρατόν ὁρμήσας). So Schrader 1880, 148 and Sodano 1974, 48 n. 100. MacPhail 2011, 173 n. 110 cited Euripides’ line *exempli gratia*. The Greek fleet is also called χιλιόναυς in Eur. *Andr.* 106, *IA* 174 and *Rhes.* 262.

³³³ This explanation also recurs in schol. Eur. *Or.* 353.02 (Mastronarde) (τῷ δὲ ἀπηρτισμένῳ ἀριθμῷ ἐχρήσατο· τοσαῦται γὰρ ἦσαν αἱ νῆες τῶν Ἑλλήνων, ,αρπς’), schol. Eur. *Andr.* 106 (Schwartz) (τῷ ἀπηρτισμένῳ ἀριθμῷ ἐχρήσατο· εἰσὶν γὰρ αἱ νῆες ,αρπς’), schol. Lycoph. *Alex.* 210 (Leone) (ὁ χιλιόναυς τῷ τελείῳ δὲ ἀριθμῷ ἐχρήσατο) and Tzetz. *Scholia in Lycoph. Alex.* 207 (Scheer) (τὰς δὲ ρπς’ ναῦς παρέλιπε τῷ ἀπηρτισμένῳ μόνῳ χρησάμενος ἀριθμῷ· ἦσαν γὰρ αἱ πᾶσαι νῆες τῶν Ἑλλήνων ,αρπς’). The number of ships is 1196 in schol. Eur. *Andr.* 106 (Schwartz) (τῷ ἀπηρτισμένῳ ἀριθμῷ ἐχρήσατο· εἰσὶ γὰρ αἱ νῆες χίλιαι ρος’).

³³⁴ *TGF* II Adesp. fr. 432a.

passages of Pindar. The first quotation mentions an unnamed person (presumably Heracles) killing twelve children and ‘him’ (i.e. the father) third, i.e. thirteenth (so with γ’ for ιγ’).³³⁵ The second quotation from Pindar states that another unnamed man (here Oenomaus) was brought down by the fourth suitor (Pelops), i.e. the fourteenth (so with δ’ for ιδ’).³³⁶

Porphyry then quotes a line from Hesiod’s *Works and Days*, which states that a woman should grow up for four year and be married in her fifth year,³³⁷ which Porphyry interprets as being short for ‘fourteen’ and ‘fifteenth’ (so with δ’ and ε’ for ιδ’ and ιε’, respectively).³³⁸ This is then followed by an extensive quotation from Eupolis’ *Golden Race*, which gives a catalogue of deformed or otherwise ugly men.³³⁹ In this list, Eupolis uses ‘third’, ‘fifth’, ‘sixth’ and ‘eighth’ in the sense of thirteenth, fifteenth, sixteenth and eighteenth (so γ’, ε’, ζ’ and η’ for ιγ’, ιε’, ις’ and ιη’, respectively).³⁴⁰

Porphyry next quotes examples of numbers that are rounded up. This is the category that is relevant for our Homeric problem. He first contrasts Homer with Simonides. In Homer, Priam is said to have had 19 sons ‘from a single womb’ (i.e. from Hecabe),³⁴¹ while Simonides, according

³³⁵ Pind. *fr.* 171 Snell/Maehler. Pindar probably recounts the story of Heracles killing Neleus together with all his sons (except Nestor). So Boeckh 1821, 644.

³³⁶ Pind. *fr.* 135 Snell/Maehler. A longer version of this fragment (with the preceding number, from which the first digit can be derived) is found in schol. vet. Pind. *Ol.* 1.127a (Drachmann) (πέφνε δὲ τρεῖς καὶ δεκ’ ἄνδρας | τετάρτῳ (Porphyry has τετράτῳ) δ’ αὐτὸς πεδάθη). The scholiast explicitly states that the fragment (taken from Pindar’s *Thrēnoi*) is speaking of Oenomaus and the suitors of Hippodameia.

³³⁷ Hes. *Op.* 698.

³³⁸ So also Poll. *Onom.* 1.58 (ὅταν δὲ εἴπη ὁ Ἡσίοδος «ἡ δὲ γυνὴ τέτορ’ ἡβώοι» τετταρακαίδεκα ἔτη λέγει, προσαριθμουμένων τῶν δέκα) and Moschopolus, *Scholia in Hes. Op.* 698 (Grandolini) («ἡ δὲ γυνὴ τέτορ’ ἡβώοι», ἀντὶ τοῦ τέτταρα ἐπὶ δέκα· τουτέστιν, ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἐπὶ τέσσαρα καὶ δέκα ἔτη ἀκμαζέτω, τῷ πέμπτῳ δέ, ἀντὶ τοῦ τῷ πεντεκαίδεκάτῳ, γαμοῖτο, ἀντὶ τοῦ γαμείσθω, τουτέστιν εἰς γάμον ἐρχέσθω). However, Hesiod probably means the fourth and fifth year *since the start of puberty*. So Spohn 1819, 66, van Lennep 1847, 155-156, Goettling/Flach 1878, 267, Paley 1883, 96-97 and West 1978, 327. See also *LSJ* s.v. ἡβᾶω A1.

³³⁹ According to Cobet 1876, 416, this is a description of the chorus. According to Crusius 1892, and Edmonds 1957, 410 n. b, however, the speaker is describing people in the audience. Kaibel ap. Kassel/Austin 1986, 472, in turn, claimed that this is a list of potential candidates for the office of *stratēgos*. See also the discussion in Olson 2016, 465.

³⁴⁰ In these cases, ἐπὶ δέκα is implied, which Eupolis writes out in full for the fourteenth man (ὁ στιγματίας τέταρτός ἐστιν ἐπὶ δέκα). For the fragment of Eupolis, see especially Storey 2003, 271-273 and Olson 2016, 462-468.

³⁴¹ Hom. *Il.* 24.596.

to Porphyry, has rounded this number up to 20.³⁴² This is followed by a number of examples where Homer himself has rounded up a number. Thus, in Homer, after having slept with Tyro, Poseidon says that she will bear splendid children ‘when a year has gone around’ (περιπλομένου δ’ ἐνιαυτοῦ),³⁴³ although pregnancy lasts nine months, not a full year.³⁴⁴ This is followed by a reference to the contradiction between *Il.* 2.649 and *Od.* 19.174 regarding the number of cities in Crete. In the Catalogue of Ships in the *Iliad*, Crete is said to have 100 cities (ἐκατόμπολιν), whereas according to Odysseus’ fictitious tale in the *Odyssey*, it has 90 cities (ἐνενήκοντα πόλεις). Porphyry states here that either the *Iliad* passage has added ten or the *Odyssey* passage has subtracted ten. This was a famous problem also treated by Aristotle.³⁴⁵ Interestingly, the explanation in the current text differs from Porphyry’s interpretation given elsewhere, viz. that either 100 in the *Iliad* is a metaphor for many, or that, in the *Odyssey*, Homer does not mean that Crete has *only* 90 cities, i.e. saying that there are 90 cities does not exclude the possibility of there being 100 cities.³⁴⁶

³⁴² Simon. *fr.* 272 Poltera = *fr.* 54 Page, *PMG* 559. Homer and Simonides are also contrasted in schol. Theoc. *Id.* 15.139 (Wendel) (εἴκατι· εἴκοσι παίδων. τῷ ἄρτίῳ ἀριθμῷ ἀποκέχρηται ὡς καὶ Σιμωνίδης. Ὅμηρος ἐννεακαίδεκα λέγει). The person addressed in Simonides is Hecabe. According to Schneidewin 1839, 396 and Hartung 1857, 164, the person speaking is the ghost of Achilles. This is based on [Longinus], *Subl.* 15.7, which mentions a poem of Simonides (*fr.* 277 Poltera = *fr.* 52 Page, *PMG* 557), where the ghost of Achilles appears above his tomb to the Greeks as they depart to return home (καὶ κατὰ τὸν ἀπόπλουν τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐπὶ τάχιλλέως προφαινομένου τοῖς ἀναγομένοις ὑπὲρ τοῦ τάφου, ἦν οὐκ οἶδ’ εἴ τις ὄψιν ἐναργέστερον εἰδωλοποίησε Σιμωνίδου). Blass 1874, 157, in contrast, connected the fragment with an anonymous fragment (*Adesp.* *fr.* 47 Page, *PMG* 965 = Dio Chrys. *Or.* 33.59) and assumed that the poem told the story of Hecabe, who ended up transforming into a dog. In this case, the person speaking would be the poet himself. Blass’ interpretation is extremely speculative, however. See also Poltera 2008, 511-512.

³⁴³ Hom. *Od.* 11.248-249.

³⁴⁴ The D scholiast comments with greater specificity (schol. D *Il.* 10.252(3) p. 374.12-13 (van Thiel²)): ‘For to reach birth not a whole year is completed, but 273 days’ (εἰς γὰρ ἀποκύησιν οὐ πληροῦται ὅλον ἔτος, ἀλλὰ διακόσιαι καὶ ἐβδομήκοντα καὶ τρεῖς ἡμέραι).

³⁴⁵ Arist. *fr.* 146 Rose³ = *fr.* 370 Gigon = Porph. *ad Il.* 2.649 p. 48-49 (Schrader) = p. 68 (MacPhail). See Hintenlang 1961, 67-69, Breitenberger 2006, 383-385, Mayhew 2019, 96-98 and Verhasselt 2020, 232-236. The contradiction was one of the arguments for the Chorizontes or Separators to claim that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were written by two different poets. See schol. A *Il.* 2.649 (Erbse) (VMK): πρὸς τοὺς Χωρίζοντας, ὅτι νῦν μὲν ἐκατόμπολιν τὴν Κρήτην, ἐν Ὀδυσσεΐᾳ δὲ ἐνενηκοντάπολιν.

³⁴⁶ Porph. *ad Il.* 2.649 p. 49 (Schrader) = p. 68 (MacPhail). The metaphorical explanation was used by the Alexandrian grammarians to refute the Chorizontes. See schol. A *Il.* 2.649 (Erbse) (VMK): ἤτοι οὖν ἐκατόμπολιν ἀντὶ τοῦ πολύπολιν. This A scholion also gives the alternative explanation given by Porphyry in the current text, viz. that

Similarly, Porphyry indicates that Homer says that ‘all day long until sunset | they feasted’ (*Il.* 1.601-602), although they did not begin to drink at dawn, and ‘all day long they fought around the Scaean Gates’ (*Il.* 18.453), although the actual battle was much shorter. The final example is a non-Homeric one. Porphyry points out that, although the Olympic Games take place after either 50 or 49 months, poets nevertheless systematically call the festival ‘fifty-monthly’ (πεντηκοντάμηνος).

‘In this way, therefore’, these ‘others’ conclude, ‘nothing prevents [Homer], even though the third part is incomplete, from calling it a complete third part’³⁴⁷. Ultimately, this sounds a lot like Chrysippus’ solution, which may be why it follows right after his. The main difference is that Chrysippus considers the Homeric line/calculation to be inexact, whereas the other explanation argues that poets often omit the first or second digit and often prefer round numbers.

4.5 Aristotle [3e]

The next and lengthiest solution to the problem (again, after three-dot punctuation and a gap of three letters) is Aristotle’s, almost certainly from his lost *Homeric Problems*.³⁴⁸ As no one is more important than Aristotle, he warranted a special indication in the left margin: his name, with an

Homer has rounded up the number in the *Iliad* and offers the correct number in the *Odyssey* (ἢ ἐπὶ τὸν σύνεγγυς καὶ ἀπαρτίζοντα ἀριθμὸν κατενήνεκται νῦν, ἐν Ὀδυσσεΐᾳ δὲ τὸ ἀκριβὲς ἐξενήνοχεν, ὥς παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ). Aristotle (*fr.* 146 Rose³ = *fr.* 370 Gigon = Porph. *ad Il.* 2.649 p. 48-49 (Schrader) = p. 68 (MacPhail)) solved the problem by pointing out that the lines are spoken by two different people, viz. Homer in the *Iliad* and Odysseus in the *Odyssey*; as long as it is not the same person who is speaking, such contradictions are allowed. Other solutions were offered by Heraclides Ponticus (Aristotle’s fellow student in the Academy, who also wrote a work of *Homeric Solutions*) and the historian Ephorus. They considered *both* numbers to be correct. According to Heraclides (*fr.* 99 Schütrumpf = Porph. *ad Il.* 2.649 p. 48-49 (Schrader) = p. 68 (MacPhail)), there were originally 100 cities, but after the Trojan War, Idomeneus and his men destroyed ten cities; so when Odysseus returned home, he heard of this and thus adjusted the number. According to Ephorus (*FGrH* 70 F146 = Strabo 10.4.15.479c), conversely, Crete originally had 90 cities, but after the Trojan War, Althaemenes founded ten new cities.

³⁴⁷ Cf. schol. D *Il.* 10.252(3) p. 374.7-18 (van Thiel²).

³⁴⁸ On the nature of this work, see Mayhew 2019, and Verhasselt 2020.

asterisk to the left and special punctuation (:–), usually reserved to mark the end of a scholion, to the right.

But before turning to Porphyry's presentation of Aristotle's solution, we need to say something about Aristotle's mention of this same problem in *Poet.* 25, a chapter devoted to answering objections to Homer and solving Homeric problems.³⁴⁹ At one point, he presents a dozen ways of solving these problems. Some should be solved, he says, by assuming ambiguity (ἀμφιβολία).³⁵⁰ Aristotle gives as an example half of *Il.* 10.252 ('and more night has passed', παρώχηκεν δὲ πλείω νύξ), though he seems to have in mind the verse that follows as well and the Homeric problem that concerns us.³⁵¹ Here Aristotle merely adds: 'for πλείω in this passage is ambiguous' (τὸ γὰρ πλείω ἀμφίβολόν ἐστιν). Some scholars have assumed that this is a highly abbreviated reference to the lengthy discussion presented by Porphyry.³⁵² But it is also possible that in *Poet.* 25 he is referring to the solution of Metrodorus, who claimed that πλεῖον means two things in Homer.³⁵³ This would not be the only case of Aristotle providing examples of a solution from someone else.³⁵⁴

³⁴⁹ Halliwell 1998, 327-328 writes: "*Poetics* 25 has the look of being a compressed summary of an already worked out scheme of problems and their solutions. But I am not aware of any clear evidence for the date of the *Homeric Problems*". On the connection between *Poet.* 25 and the *Homeric Problems*, see Römer 1884; Carroll 1895; Hintenlang 1961, 106-141 and Verhasselt 2020.

³⁵⁰ Arist. *Poet.* 25, 1461a25–26.

³⁵¹ Some scholars have inferred from Aristotle's quotation that his copy of the *Iliad* did not have line 253. So Bolling 1925, 126 and von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1916, 60 n. 1.

³⁵² So Wachsmuth 1863, 33-34; Heitz 1865, 266; Schrader 1880, 419; Carroll 1895, 48; Hintenlang 1961, 79 n. 1; Sodano 1974, 51-53; Nickau 1977, 55; Schmitt 2011, 718; Mayhew 2019, 19-20. Wilamowitz even claimed that the fragment of Aristotle in Porphyry is spurious. However, Nickau has rightly pointed out that Metrodorus' interpretation presupposes reading τῶν δύο μοιράων of line 253 as well ('filled with two thirds').

³⁵³ See Bywater 1909, 340-341; Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1916, 60 n. 1; McGuire 1977, 74; Breitenberger 2006, 402. Aristotle makes clear in his *Sophistical Refutations* (4, 166a14-21) that there are three modes of homonymy and ambiguity (τρεῖς τρόποι τῶν παρὰ τὴν ὁμωνυμίαν καὶ τὴν ἀμφιβολίαν), the first being when an account or word properly means more than one thing (ἢ ὁ λόγος ἢ τοῦνομα κυρίως σημαίνει πλείω). See Hintenlang 1961, 78. Aristotle's examples here are the word ἀετός and κύων. He does not explain precisely what he means, but ἀετός can mean *eagle*, *omen*, *eagle-ray* and *pediment*; and, κύων can mean *dog*, *dog-fish* (i.e. a shark), *the Dog-Star* (i.e. Sirius), a shameless person, a Cynic philosopher, etc.

³⁵⁴ For instance, in the *Poetics*, Aristotle cites a solution κατὰ προσῳδίαν of Hippias of Thasos (*Poet.* 25, 1461a21-23). What might speak against this interpretation is that Aristotle quotes the word as πλείω and then refers to it as πλείω («παρώχηκεν δὲ πλείω νύξ»: τὸ γὰρ πλείω ἀμφίβολόν ἐστιν). Neither of these is a form of πλέω/πλεῖος, unless we were to interpret the word as a dative πλέω/πλείω (sc. μέρει?). The question is whether Aristotle overlooked this. He is certainly less careful in terms of linguistic accuracy than the Alexandrian grammarians.

In any case, Aristotle’s solution, according to Porphyry, goes as follows. He interprets πλέον as meaning ‘more than half’ and argues that this is indeterminate. To say that ‘more’ is indeterminate (ἀόριστον) arguably qualifies this as a solution according to ambiguity, though that is not clear. Aristotle first gives an example unrelated to the scene in *Iliad* 10: Six can be divided into two equal parts or halves (of three each). When one says that a half is increased (αὐξηθῆναι), it is unclear whether one means increased by a portion of a number or by a whole unit. If it is increased by a whole unit – by one here – then three becomes four, which leaves two of the original six, i.e. it leaves a third. Aristotle then applies this logic to our passage. The night consists of 12 parts, which can be divided into two equal halves of six hours each. One half has increased, but it is unclear by how much. It could be by one, two, three or more. Homer therefore specifies that one third is left and, in doing so, determines the unspecified increase. If half of the night (which is six hours) has increased by two hours, then eight hours have gone by, and four remain, which is one third of the night. So, in saying that one third of the night is left, Odysseus is neither getting the math wrong (the worry behind this Homeric problem) nor being informal and imprecise (as Chrysippus and others would have it). Rather, by saying that a third of the 12 hours is left (which is four), he indicates that half of the night (which is six) has increased by two, i.e. eight hours have gone by.³⁵⁵ This would mean that dawn is approaching only in the sense that they are twice as close to dawn as they are to midnight, not that dawn is imminent.

Porphyry goes on in the remainder of the passage to show how this same process applies to any number that can be divided evenly into two parts and into three parts. He gives as examples first the number 18, and then the 24 hours of the full day. By stating that one third remains, it is implied

³⁵⁵ This explanation also recurs as an anonymous tradition in schol. bT *Il.* 10.252-253a (Erbse) (exeg.): οἱ δέ, τὸ πλεον τῶν δύο μοιρῶν αὐτῆς παρῆλθεν ἡ νύξ, δύο δὲ μοῖραι ὀκτὼ ὥραι. τούτων τὸ πλεον, ὃ ἐστὶν ἐπτά, παρῆλθεν, ἐσμὲν δὲ ἐν ὀγδόῃ ὥρᾳ, λείπονται δὲ τέσσαρες.

that 12 have passed and 6 remain in the case of the number 18, and 16 have passed and 4 remain in the case of the number 24. Porphyry then returns to the Homeric example and argues that Homer has wisely indicated how much the undefined part of the increase was. If you know that the hours of the night are 12, a number which can be divided both into two equal parts (of six each) and into three equal parts (of four each), then stating that one third remains is tantamount to saying that, from the turning of midnight, two hours have gone by.

The additional numerical examples with regard to 18 and the 24 hour day-night cycle and the conclusion are not included as part of the fragment of Aristotle by Rose.³⁵⁶ The passage was included, however, by Heitz and Gigon,³⁵⁷ although Heitz indicated that he was unsure whether the extra part, which was omitted by Rose, belonged to Porphyry or Aristotle. According to Sodano, Porphyry has elaborated on the Aristotelian solution, as he announces that he does in the introduction (τὰς δὲ πειρώμεθα διορθοῦν καὶ ἐξεργάζεσθαι).³⁵⁸ Sodano argued that the fragment of Aristotle runs from Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ οὕτως ἀξιοῖ λύειν to αἵπερ εἰσὶ τοῦ ὅλου τρίτον. This is then interrupted by Porphyry's expansion, which runs from οὕτω καὶ εἰ δέκα ὀκτὼ εἴη μοιρῶν to ἀφορίζει ὅσῳ πλέω ἢ αὐξησις γέγονε. According to Sodano, these further numerical examples (regarding numbers 18 and 24) interrupt the logical coherence. He also claimed that the word νυχθήμερον is only attested from the first century AD onwards and is therefore an argument against attributing this part of the text to Aristotle.³⁵⁹ His claim about νυχθήμερον is incorrect, however. The word is attested as early as Bolus of Mendes (third/second century BC) and the astronomer

³⁵⁶ Rose 1863, 165; 1870, 1504; 1886, 128-129.

³⁵⁷ Heitz 1869, 138-139; Gigon 1987, 533-534.

³⁵⁸ Sodano 1974, 46-51. See also Erbse 1960, 65.

³⁵⁹ Sodano 1974, 50 n. 103.

and mathematician Theodosius (second/first century BC).³⁶⁰ Moreover, the argument itself has little value, since Porphyry probably paraphrases Aristotle anyway.

According to Sodano, Porphyry then reprises Aristotle's argument from σοφῶς οὖν ὁ ποιητὴς το διὰ τὸ φάναι τριτάτη δ' ἔτι μοῖρα λέλειπται. Sodano then claimed (like Kammer) that the text from εἰδὼς γάρ τις ὅτι το μεταβάντος is an interpolation by a later scribe, which summarises the Aristotelian interpretation. Kammer himself gave a similar interpretation, except that he attributed the additional numerical examples not to Porphyry but to a later interpolator.³⁶¹ However, it is perhaps exaggerated to claim that these examples interrupt the train of thought. In fact, Aristotle himself started the discussion with a non-Homeric example (about the number six).

There are a few oddities in Aristotle's interpretation. (1) He assumes that τῶν δύο μοιράων in our passage refers to the two equal halves of the night, and not two out of three parts. So he interprets τῶν δύο μοιράων as indicating two parts/halves (and not the more logical 2/3) but then accepts τριτάτη μοῖρα as meaning 1/3. (2) He seems to assume that a whole unit in this context is or can be two hours, though perhaps this is not odd if his view is that a whole unit is any divisor, as opposed to a fragment or any non-divisor. (3) He takes παρόχηκεν δὲ πλέω νύξ | τῶν δύο μοιράων ('more night has passed of/than the two parts') to mean that one of the two parts of night has increased. It is hard to imagine that this is what the author of the *Iliad* truly had in mind. (4) Aristotle may have read πλέον rather than πλέω, since Porphyry writes ὥστε καὶ ὁ εἰπὼν τῶν δύο μερῶν θάτερον πλέον γινόμενον καταλέλοιπε τριτάτην μοῖραν. Since he writes the Homeric τριτάτην, this implies that πλέον might also be the Homeric form read by Aristotle.

³⁶⁰ Bolus, *Physica et mystica* vol. 2 p. 41; p. 42; *Ad Leucippem* vol. 2 p. 55 (Berthelot-Ruelle); Theodosius, *De diebus et noctibus* p. 144 (Fecht).

³⁶¹ Kammer 1863, 67-68.

One point which Aristotle glosses over, however, is how he interprets the sentence grammatically. In his paraphrases, he uses θάτερον μέρος as a subject, which explains the form πλέον.³⁶² In Homer, however, the subject is νύξ. The only way he might have interpreted πλέον is as an adverbial accusative: ‘the night has passed for the majority of its two parts’.

Finally, Breitenberger was right to point out that the division of the night into 12 hours/parts is un-Homeric.³⁶³ Instead, Homer seems to have divided the day and the night into three parts each.³⁶⁴

4.6 Autochthon [3f]

Once again there follows three-dot punctuation and a gap of three letters. The next solution is from the grammarian Autochthon (second century AD).³⁶⁵ He argues that, if two thirds of the night have been completed (and one third is left), Homer logically states that the night has passed for the majority. He also argues against certain unnamed people (who say that πλέω is or should be a nominative feminine singular) that it is not necessary to correct πλέω to πλείων. Autochthon thus seems to consider πλέω to be an adverbial accusative (being the equivalent of τῷ πλείονι μέρει) and τῶν δύο μοιράων to be an epexegetical/appositive genitive ruled by πλέω. The result is

³⁶² Cf. ἐὰν τὸ ἕτερον μέρος αὐξηθῇ, [...] ἐὰν οὖν ὅλη μονάδι πλέον γένηται; τῶν δύο μερῶν θάτερον πλέον γινόμενον καταλέλοιπε τριτάτην μοῖραν; ἐπεὶ οὖν καὶ τῆς νυκτὸς αἱ δώδεκα μοῖραι εἰς δύο ἴσας μερίδας μερίζεσθαι δύνανται εἰς ἕξ, ηὐξήθη δὲ καὶ πλέον γέγονε θάτερον μέρος; δῆλον γίνεται ὅτι τῆς εἰς β' διαιρέσεως εἰς ιβ' καὶ ιβ' γενομένης, τοῦ τρίτου καταλειφθέντος τοῦ παντός, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ὀκτώ, θάτερον μέρος τὸ πλέον ἐν τέτρασιν ἔσχεν.

³⁶³ Breitenberger 2006, 401-402.

³⁶⁴ See *Il.* 21.111; *Od.* 12.312; 14.483. See also schol. A *Il.* 10.252a (Erbse) (VMK), schol. D *Il.* 10.252(3) p. 373.3-5 (van Thiel²), schol. A *Il.* 21.111a (Erbse) (VMK), Eust. *Il.* 10.252s. vol. 3 p. 58-59 (van der Valk). Porphyry also mentions this in his discussion of Metrodorus (διεῖλε δ' εἰς γ', ὡς ἂν τριφυλάκου τῆς νυκτὸς οὔσης) and Chrysippus (τριμεροῦς οὔσης τῆς νυκτός) and at the end of the excerpt (ὅτι δὲ καὶ τὴν ἡμέραν καὶ τὴν νύκτα εἰς τρία διαιρεῖ δῆλον).

³⁶⁵ On Autochthon, see Pagani 2005; Filoni 2009. Autochthon was a teacher of the orator Alciphron: see Alciphron, *Epistulae* 3.42.2. His interpretations are transmitted mainly through the exegetic bT scholia.

something like: ‘The night has mostly passed, i.e. by two thirds, and one third remains’. This is in fact an approach that some modern scholars have taken in explaining these verses.³⁶⁶

4.7 Apion [3g]

The next solution is that of the Alexandrian scholar Apion (ca. 30 BC to AD 45). He is perhaps best known for heading an embassy to Caligula to complain about the Jews of Alexandria, and for being the titular character of Josephus’ *Contra Apionem*. This part of Porphyry’s text is rather cryptic, but so far as we can tell, his solution to the Homeric problem is decidedly odd: ‘Apion says that the greater portion [τὸ πλεόν μέρος] of the two [parts] themselves has been used up, so that there is also a remnant of the second, and of these the majority has passed by, but the third [part] remains’.³⁶⁷ It might seem that he is claiming that the night consists of two parts, most of which has passed – i.e. all of one part and some of the second part, leaving a third portion that remains. But we think that the interpretation that best makes sense of Apion’s text as presented by Porphyry is that (1) Apion implies that the night consists of three parts, (2) the majority of the first two parts has passed, (3) thus a remnant of the second part is left, (4) and in addition to this the third part too remains. Consider the following example: if each part is exactly $1/3$ ($= 4/12$) of the night and if the majority of the first two parts is for instance equal to $6/12$,³⁶⁸ then we can say that

³⁶⁶ See Grossmann 1866, 26; Düntzer 1877, 53; Ameis/Hentze 1888, 22; *Lfgre* s.v. πολὺς II 4 (Nordheider); Breitenberger 2006, 400-401. Unlike Autochthon, however, these scholars read πλέων.

³⁶⁷ This interpretation also seems to recur in schol. T *Il.* 10.252-253b1 (Erbse) (exeg.): πλέω <νύξ> | τῶν δύο μοιράων· τὴν πλείονα μοῖραν τῶν δύο μοιρῶν, ἵνα λείπηται μέρος τι τῶν δύο καὶ ἡ τρίτη τελεία; schol. b *Il.* 10.252-253b2 (Erbse) (exeg.): τὸ δὲ ὅλον οὕτως· παρήλθεν ἡ πλείων ἤδη μοῖρα τῶν δύο τῆς νυκτὸς μοιρῶν, ἵνα λείπηται μέρος τι τῶν δύο καὶ τρίτη τελεία. So also Eust. *Il.* 10.252-253 vol. 3 p. 59.8-10: ἄδηλον γὰρ εἴτε τῶν δύο μοιρῶν τὴν πλέω μοῖραν παράφηκεν ἡ νύξ, ὥς λείπεσθαι τι καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν δύο μοιρῶν καὶ τὸ ὅλον τριτημόριον. See also the paraphrase by Theodorus Gaza (p. 151 Theseus 1812): τὰ ἄστρα δὲ προκεχώρηκεν εἰς δύσιν, παρήλθε δὲ ἡ νύξ εἰς πλείονα τῶν δύο μοιρῶν, ἡ τρίτη δὲ μοῖρα ὑπολείπεται (παρήλλακται δὲ ἡ νύξ τὰ πλείονα ἐκ τῶν δύο μοιρῶν, ὥστε λείπεται μέρος τι τῶν δύο, καὶ ἡ τρίτη τελεία).

³⁶⁸ This could in fact be any amount above one third ($4/12$) and less than two thirds ($8/12$).

the majority of the first two parts (which are $2/3 = 8/12$ in total) has passed and a remnant of the second part (*sc.* $2/12$) is left, in addition to the $1/3 (= 4/12)$ that constitutes the third part (in this example, $6/12$). This would mean that Apion interprets *παρώχηκε δὲ πλέω/πλέον νύξ τῶν δύο μοιράων* as ‘the night has passed for the majority of the two parts (*sc.* of three)’, with *τῶν δύο μοιράων* as a partitive genitive. This line of reasoning makes better sense of what Apion presents next, namely, an enumeration of events between the departure of the spies and the arrival of daybreak. In this case, Apion is arguing that Homer cannot be saying that $2/3$ of the night has passed, because $1/3$ is not enough to accommodate all the other things that happen afterwards, though he thinks that as much as half the night would be enough.

Apion then adds: ‘Odysseus says “dawn is near” (*Il.* 10.251), urging on the expedition (*τὴν διέξοδον ἐπείγων*); for it is not reasonable to have spies sent out as dawn approaches, but in fact very risky’.³⁶⁹ He may be responding to an additional Homeric problem here, *viz.* why does Odysseus say that dawn is near? For if dawn truly is near, it would be foolish to send out spies at such a time. Apion’s sketch of the action of *Iliad* 10 in fact makes it clear that Odysseus’ ‘dawn is near’ is false. But he has a solution to the problem: the clever, dissembling Odysseus merely *says* that dawn is near, so that his companions will hurry up.

One of the main questions is from which work Apion’s comment on this Homeric passage was taken. His two main works were *Aegyptiaca* (in which he argued against the Jews) and *Glossae Homericæ* (a Homeric lexicon). Some scholars have also assumed that he wrote commentaries on Homer.³⁷⁰ Cohn and Erbse, in contrast, claimed that such fragments on Homer belong to other

³⁶⁹ Cf. schol. T *Il.* 10.252b1 (Erbse) (exeg.): ἄστρα δὲ δὴ προβέβηκε· ἄτοπον πρὸς ἡῶ κατασκόπους πέμπεσθαι. κατεπείγων οὖν φησιν; schol. b *Il.* 10.252a2/b2/c2 (Erbse) (exeg.): ἥδη πρὸ τῆς ἐξόδου περὶ τοῦ καιροῦ συμβουλεύει, κατεπείγων αὐτόν· ἄτοπον γὰρ πρὸς ἡῶ κατασκόπους πέμπεσθαι. δεόντως οὖν αὐτὸν εἵλετο.

³⁷⁰ So Lehrs 1837, 33, Volkmann 1864, 1243, Baumert 1886, 7; 47-52, esp. 48-49 and van der Valk 1963-1964, I, 301 with n. 464; 437 with n. 122.

works, especially the *Aegyptiaca*, although they did not explicitly connect the citation of Apion in our excerpt with this work.³⁷¹ Apion may have included the word πλέω in his Homeric lexicon. It is also possible that he commented on Homer in his lectures/speeches. Such speeches on Homer earned him the nickname of Ὀμηρικός and are attested in Seneca.³⁷²

This is followed, without any special punctuation or break, with a brief comment on the two ways of understanding the word πλέω. This might still be part of the fragment of Apion or perhaps Porphyry's comment on it. According to Erbse, Porphyry expanded Apion's interpretation with excerpts from *hypomnemata* which were also at the basis of the D scholia³⁷³. In any case, Porphyry or Apion argues that the word πλέω can be interpreted as either neuter plural or feminine singular. The comment on πλέω as a neuter plural shows that the genitive τῶν δύο μοιράων can be either a partitive genitive (τὰ πλείονα ἐκ τῶν δύο μοιρῶν) or a genitive of comparison (πλείονα παρὰ μοίρας τὰς δύο). To attest the use of πλέω as a neuter plural, Porphyry cites a passage from Thucydides.³⁷⁴ In his comment on πλέω as an accusative feminine singular, he argues that μοῖραν is implied (τὴν πλείονα μοῖραν τῶν δύο μοιρῶν).

4.8 Astronomy in Homer [4]

The excerpt ends (after a raised dot and a gap of one letter) with a long discussion of Odysseus as an astronomer – and specifically, of which stars Odysseus used to calculate how many hours were left in the night, and what precise movement προβέβηκε denotes. Porphyry begins by stating that Homer has plausibly portrayed Odysseus alone as watching the passage of the stars as a

³⁷¹ Cohn 1894, 2806; Erbse 1960, 52 with n. 1. See also Pontani 2005, 63 and the discussion in Bacigalupo 2019.

³⁷² Sen. *Ep.* 88.40.

³⁷³ Erbse 1960, 65 with n. 1.

³⁷⁴ Thuc. 1.3.5.

prelude³⁷⁵ to the *Odyssey*, where Odysseus' voyage concludes 'as he gazes at the Pleiades and late setting Boötes' (*Od.* 5.572).³⁷⁶ MacPhail's edition ends his presentation of this Porphyry 'fragment' here, without mention, explanation, or justification,³⁷⁷ even though nothing but a raised dot and a space of one letter separates this line from what follows.⁽⁴⁾ And what follows is 28 lines of Greek in Schrader's edition of Porphyry's *Homeric Questions*.³⁷⁸ This material is quite similar to a long D scholion, which might have led MacPhail to consider it not part of our Porphyrian text.³⁷⁹ While it is true that Porphyry moves to another, related Homeric problem, this does not prove that the excerpt ends right before this, much less that the last part is not derived from Porphyry. If the last part were truly a separate excerpt or scholion, it would probably have been introduced with its own sign³⁸⁰. The omission by MacPhail is all the stranger, since he does include the words *πιθανῶς δὲ οὐδένα ἄλλον ... ὁψὲ δύνοντα Βοώτην*, which already introduce the new argument.

Porphyry first discusses the view that the stars mentioned in Homer refer to Ursa Major. He rejects this view, since the time can only be calculated on the basis of stars that rise and set, which Ursa Major (as a circumpolar constellation) obviously does not do, since its stars are always visible. Critics who do consider the constellation to be Ursa Major appear to have argued that the

³⁷⁵ For the meaning of *προοικονομῶν*, see Nünlist 2009, 42: "(προ)οικονομεῖν (and cognates) always means 'to motivate in advance', to prepare for'. This may, at times, include the notion 'to adumbrate, to hint at', but never goes so far as to indicate explicit prolepsis".

³⁷⁶ This argument also recurs in schol. T *Il.* 10.252-253a (Erbse) (exeg.): ὅθεν καὶ τὸ «Πληϊάδας τ' ἔσορῶντι» φησὶ περὶ τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως. *προοικονομεῖ* οὖν, φασί, τὴν Ὀδύσσειαν.

³⁷⁷ MacPhail 2011, 178. So also already Kammer 1863, 69.

³⁷⁸ Schrader 1880, 150 comments: *λέγοντος κτλ. sine ullo intervallo neque ullo signo interposito in cod. (f. 135^b) iis quae iam edidimus subiunguntur.*

³⁷⁹ In a follow-up article, G. Verhasselt will re-edit this scholion and discuss its relation to Porphyry. In all likelihood, the D scholion and Porphyry go back to a common source.

³⁸⁰ The only possible objection is that a connective *δέ* might be expected to introduce the new sentence. However, this can easily be supplemented after *λέγοντος*. Note also that in [3e] *ἐὰν τὸ ἕτερον μέρος αὐξηθῇ* is not introduced with *δέ* either.

hour can be calculated on the basis of its position in the rotation around the Pole Star. In this interpretation, προβέβηκε would mean ‘move further in their rotation’.

The second interpretation cited by Porphyry considers the stars to refer to the Pleiades, Hyades and Orion, which do rise and set. In a passage that is partly corrupt,³⁸¹ Porphyry seems to have said that these either rise or set at dawn. So, in this interpretation, προβέβηκε refers to either rising (advancing from the east) or setting (advancing towards the west³⁸²). Indeed, the times when the Pleiades, Orion and the Hyades rise and set vary throughout the year. During the vernal equinox, for instance, Orion *sets* six hours after sunset, but during the autumnal equinox it *rises* six hours after sunset. Alternatively, it is possible that, in the corrupt text, Porphyry argued that, if the stars refer to the Pleiades, Hyades and Orion, προβέβηκε refers to rising; but the stars may also refer to the Evening Star and Sirius, in which case προβέβηκε refers to setting. However one chooses to correct the text, Porphyry then quotes another line of Homer (*Od.* 12.312), which mentions the progression of the stars (ἀλλ’ ὅτε δὴ τρίχα νυκτὸς ἔην, μετὰ δ’ ἄστρα βεβήκει). He then seems to have discussed two interpretations of τρίχα = τὸ τρίτον, but whatever he wrote about this appears to have fallen out.

Porphyry next discusses the possibility that the stars refer to the zodiac cycle. The signs of the zodiac are 12 in number. Six are visible at sunset, and the others become visible as the night progresses. Porphyry says that the zodiac signs visible at sunset are not always the same, but their number is always six. By observing in which sign the sun sets, Odysseus is thus able to calculate the time of night on the basis of whatever zodiac signs are visible then.

³⁸¹ See the text-critical notes above.

³⁸² The interpretation ‘advancing towards the west’ was adopted in the prose paraphrase of Homer in the codex Vaticanus gr. 1316 fol. 146v (V¹³) probably under the influence of the D scholia: τὰ δὲ ἄστρα προέβη πρὸς δύσιν· ἡ δὲ πλείων νύξ προῆλθε καὶ διέβη τῶν δύο μοιρῶν. See also the paraphrase by Theodorus Gaza (p. 151 Theseus 1812): τὰ ἄστρα δὲ προκεχώρηκεν εἰς δύσιν, παρήλθε δὲ ἡ νύξ εἰς πλείονα τῶν δύο μοιρῶν, ἡ τρίτη δὲ μοῖρα ὑπολείπεται (παρήλλακται δὲ ἡ νύξ τὰ πλείονα ἐκ τῶν δύο μοιρῶν, ὥστε λείπεται μέρος τι τῶν δύο, καὶ ἡ τρίτη τελεία).

The last interpretation presented by Porphyry is the simplest. Homer simply means that *all the stars* have advanced, i.e. those stars that had already appeared have advanced towards the west. In other words, προβέβηκε does not have to refer to *either* rising *or* setting.

Porphyry closes his discussion (at least as it is presented in the excerpt) by stating that Homer divides the night as well as the day into three parts. As attestations of this, he quotes *Il.* 21.111 (three parts of the day) and *Od.* 12.312 (three parts of the night).³⁸³

The purpose of this material might be to answer the claim of Aristarchus (mentioned at the outset) that verse 253 is suspect, because it unnecessarily provides the kind of account an astronomer would give. On the view defended here, Odysseus is precisely the kind of man who *would* possess astronomical wisdom. This same view is found in Eustathius in a discussion of *Iliad* 10.252-253, likely relying on lost ancient sources. He writes: ‘Observe also that the resourceful one [ὁ πολυμήχανος, i.e. Odysseus] is practising philosophy here (φιλοσοφεῖ) – the one who in the *Odyssey* observes the Pleiades and the Hyades and the next stars in the sequence – and from the nightly signs of the Zodiac above the earth he figures out the time’, etc.³⁸⁴

Van der Valk, commenting on *Il.* 10.252-253, remarks: “As for the Homeric passage, we may observe that the ancient critics seem to have needlessly plagued themselves. Apparently, the night was divided into three parts”³⁸⁵ – as if that settled the matter. Even more negative, Hainsworth

³⁸³ Cf. Eust. *Il.* 10.252-253 vol. 3 p. 58.26–p. 59.3 (van der Valk): ἰστέον δὲ καὶ ὅτι τριφύλακτον κατὰ τοὺς παλαιούς ὁ ποιητὴς βούλεται εἶναι τὴν νύκτα, ὃ ἐστὶ τριῶν φυλακῶν, τριμερῇ ποιῶν αὐτήν, καθὰ καὶ τὴν ἡμέραν, ὅτε εἴπη «ἔσσεται ἡὼς ἢ δειλὴ ἢ μέσον ἡμαρ».

³⁸⁴ Eust. *Il.* 10.252-253 vol. 3, p. 59.3-8 (van der Valk): ὅρα δὲ καὶ ὅτι φιλοσοφεῖ κἀνταῦθα ὁ πολυμήχανος, ὁ ἐν Ὀδυσσεΐᾳ Πλειάδας ὀρών καὶ Ὑάδας καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς ἄστρα, καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὑπὲρ γῆν νυκτερινῶν ζφιδίων τὴν ὥραν καταμανθάνει, κτλ. On Odysseus as πολυμήχανος, see e.g. *Od.* 1.205 and (as an epithet) 5.203 (πολυμήχαν’ Ὀδυσσεῦ).

³⁸⁵ Van der Valk 1963-1964, II, 232-233.

calls our Homeric problem, and the discussion it engendered, ‘silly’ and ‘of depressing pedantry’.³⁸⁶ Yet the energy devoted to answering it, and the many different solutions offered, provide a fascinating look at the lengths to which ancient literary scholars would go to defend Homer. We hope that the foregoing has made this clear.

Our paper also aims to be a case study in or example of how to approach and present the fragments/excerpts of Porphyry’s *Homeric Questions*. Already Erbse had outlined what a new edition of Porphyry’s *Homeric Questions* should look like,³⁸⁷ but such an edition still remains a *desideratum*. It is also important to avoid the limitations or flaws of earlier editors (see above p. 4-5). Indeed, a renewed inspection of the manuscripts often yields new readings. Text-critical issues are also often connected with interpretive problems. Ideally, these should be discussed in a commentary that accompanies a new edition. With our paper, we hope to have illustrated the kind of commentary one would expect from the subtitle of MacPhail’s book – *Text, Translation, Commentary* – of which the third element is not to be found there.

Acknowledgements: We would like to thank the journal’s two referees for their useful comments on the penultimate version of this paper.

Bibliography

Adler, A. (ed.) (1931), *Suidae lexicon*. II, A-Θ, Stuttgart.

Alberti, G.B. (ed.) (1972), *Thucydidis Historiae*. I, *Libri I-II*, Rome.

Alfieri, V.E. (1936), *Gli atomisti. Frammenti e testimonianze: traduzione e note*, Bari.

³⁸⁶ Hainsworth 1993, 178.

³⁸⁷ Erbse 1960, 72-73. For a summary in English of Erbse’s proposal, see Slater 2012, 325-326.

- Allen, T.W. (1910), *The Text of the Odyssey*, London.
- Allen, T.W. (ed.) (1919), *Homeri opera. IV, Odysseae libros XIII-XXIV continens*, 2nd ed., Oxford.
- Allen, T.W. (1931), *Homeri Ilias. I, Prolegomena*, Oxford.
- Ameis, K.F. / Hentze, C. (eds.) (1888), *Homers Ilias. I.4: Gesang X-XII*, 3rd ed., Leipzig.
- Bacigalupo, V. (2019), “Apion”, in: F. Montanari / F. Montana / L. Pagani (eds.), *Lexicon of Greek Grammarians of Antiquity*, Brill Online.
- Bachmann, L. (ed.) (1835), *Scholia in Homeri Iliadem quae in codice Bibl. Paull. Acad. Lips. leguntur*, I, Leipzig.
- Barnes, J. / Lawrence, G. (1984), “Fragments”, in: J. Barnes (ed.), *The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation*, Princeton, 2384–2465.
- Baumert, H. (ed.) (1886), *Apionis quae ad Homerum pertinent fragmenta*, Königsberg.
- Beekes, R.S.P. (2010), *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*, Leiden-Boston.
- Bekker, I. (ed.) (1825), *Scholia in Homeri Iliadem*, I, Berlin.
- Bérard, V. (ed.) (1956), *L’Odyssée. “Poésie homérique”. III, Chants XVI-XXIV: texte établi et traduit*, 5th ed., Paris.
- Blass, F. (1874), “Zu den griechischen Lyrikern”, in: *RhM* n.s. 29, 149–158.
- Blaydes, F.H.M. (1890-1896), *Adversaria in comicorum Graecorum fragmenta*, I-II, Halle.
- Boeckh, A. (ed.) (1821), *Pindarou ta sōzomena. Πινδάρου τὰ σωζόμενα. Pindari opera quae supersunt*, II.2, Leipzig.
- Bolling, G.M. (1925), *The External Evidence for Interpolation in Homer*, Oxford.
- Bothe, F.H. (ed.) (1855), *Poetarum comicorum Graecorum fragmenta*, Paris.

- Breitenberger, B. (2006), “Literaturwissenschaft, Symptotisches, Poesie”, in: H. Flashar / U. Dubielzig / B. Breitenberger (eds.), *Aristoteles, Fragmente zu Philosophie, Rhetorik, Poetik, Dichtung: Übersetzt und erläutert*, Berlin, 291–437.
- Brillant, M. (1919), “Tribôn”, in: E. Saglio (ed.), *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines d’après les textes et les monuments* 5, 414–416.
- Buffière, F. (1973), *Les mythes d’Homère et la pensée grecque*, 2nd ed., Paris.
- Bywater, I. (ed.) (1909), *Ἀριστοτέλους Περὶ ποιητικῆς (Aristotelous Peri poiētikēs): A Revised Text with Critical Introduction, Translation and Commentary*, Oxford.
- Casevitz, M. / Jost, M. / Marcadé, J. (eds.) (2002), Pausanias, *Description de la Grèce*. VIII, *Livre VIII. L’Arcadie: texte établi par M.C., traduit et commenté par M.J. avec la collaboration de J.M.*, 2nd ed., Paris.
- Cassio, A.C. (2002), “Early editions of the Greek epics and Homeric textual criticism in the sixth and fifth centuries BC”, in: F. Montanari / P. Ascheri (eds.), *Omero tremila anni dopo: atti del congresso di Genova 6-8 luglio 2000*, Rome, 105–136.
- Cobet, C.G. (1873), *Variae lectiones quibus continentur observationes criticae in scriptores Graecos*, 2nd ed., Leiden.
- Cobet, C.G. (1876), *Miscellanea critica quibus continentur observationes criticae in scriptores Graecos praesertim Homerum et Demosthenem*, Leiden.
- Cohn, L. (1894), “Apion 3”, in: *RE* 1.2, 2803–2806.
- Crusius, O. (1892), “Eupolis fr. 276 K.”, in: *Philologus* 51, 663.
- d’Ansse de Villosion, J.-B.-G. (ed.) (1788), *Ὅμηρον Ἰλιάς σὺν τοῖς σχολίοις (Homērou Ilias sun tois scholiois). Homeri Ilias ad veteris codicis Veneti fidem recensita: Scholia in eam*

antiquissima Ex eodem Codice aliisque nunc primum edidit cum Asteriscis, Obeliscis, aliisque Signis criticis, J.-B.-G.d'A.d.V., Venice.

Di Maria, G. (ed.) (1996), *Achillis quae feruntur astronomica et in Aratum opuscula: De universo. De Arati vita. De Phaenomenorum interpretatione*, Palermo.

Diels, H. / Kranz, W. (eds.) (1952), *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, I, 6th ed., Berlin.

Dindorf, W. (ed.) (1875-1877), *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem ex codicibus aucta et emendate*, I-IV, Oxford.

Dorandi, T. (2011), Rev. of MacPhail 2011, in: *Sehepunkte* 11, <<http://www.sehepunkte.de/2011/10/20281.html>>

Düntzer, H. (ed.) (1877), *Ιλιάς (Ilias). Homers Ilias: Erklärende Schulausgabe*, II.1, 2nd ed., Paderborn.

Edmonds, J.M. (ed.) (1957), *The Fragments of Attic Comedy*, I, Leiden.

Emperius, A. (1847), “Adversaria”, in: F.G. Schneidewin (ed.), *Adolphii Emperii Brunopolitani opuscula philologica et historica amicorum studio collecta*, Göttingen, 304–352.

Erbse, H. (1960), *Beiträge zur Ueberlieferung der Iliasscholien*, Munich.

Erbse, H. (ed.) (1969-1988), *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (scholia vetera)*, I-VII, Berlin.

Erlar, M. (1994), “Die Schule Epikurs”, in: H. Flashar (ed.), *Die Philosophie der Antike. IV, Die hellenistische Philosophie*, Basel, 203–490.

Ernst, N. (ed.) (2006), *Die D-Scholien zur Odyssee: Kritische Ausgabe*, PhD. Diss., University of Cologne.

Filoni, A. (2009), “Il grammatico Autottone, i Cari e i κανόνες degli scudi omerici”, in: *ARF* 11, 25–36.

- Freeman, K. (1949), *The Pre-Socratic Philosophers: A Companion to Diels, Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, 2nd ed., Oxford.
- Friedländer, L. (ed.) (1853), *Aristonici Περὶ σημείων Ἰλιάδος reliquiae emendatiores*, Göttingen.
- Frisk, H. (1960), *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg.
- Gaisford, T. (ed.) (1823), *Poetae minores Graeci*, III, Leipzig.
- Gigon, O. (ed.) (1987), *Aristotelis Opera*. III, *Librorum deperditorum fragmenta*, Berlin.
- Goettling, C. / Flach, H. (eds.) (1878), *Hesiodi carmina*, 3rd ed., Leipzig.
- Goodwin, W.W. (1896), *The Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb*, New York.
- Grossmann, G. (1866), *Homerica*, Bayreuth.
- Gudeman, A. (1927), “Λύσεις”, in: *RE* 13.2, 2511–2529.
- Hajdú, K. (ed.) (1998), Ps.-Herodian, *De figuris: Überlieferungsgeschichte und kritische Ausgabe*, Berlin-New York.
- Hammerstaedt, J. (1992), “Der Schlussteil von Philodems drittem Buch über Rhetorik”, in: *CErc* 22, 9–117.
- Hansen, P.A. (ed.) (2005), *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*. III, II-Σ, Berlin-New York.
- Hartung, J.A. (ed.) (1856), *Pindar's Werke: Griechisch mit metrischer Uebersetzung*. IV, *Die Isthmischen Oden und die Trümmer der verlorenen Werke*, Leipzig.
- Hartung, J.A. (ed.) (1857), *Die Skolien, Lohn- und Preisdichter oder die äolische Schule und die vollendete Kunstschule der griechischen Lyrik: Griechisch mit metrischer Uebersetzung und prüfenden und erklärenden Anmerkungen*, Leipzig.
- Heitz, E. (1865), *Die verlorenen Schriften des Aristoteles*, Leipzig.
- Heitz, E. (ed.) (1869), *Fragmenta Aristotelis*, Paris.

- Hilgard, A. (ed.) (1889), *Theodosii Alexandrini Canones. Georgii Choerobosci scholia. Sophronii patriarchae Alexandrini excerpta. I, Theodosii Canones et Choerobosci scholia in Canones nominales*, Leipzig.
- Hillgruber, M. (2014), Rev. of MacPhail 2011, in: *Gnomon* 86, 493–499.
- Hintenlang, H. (1961), *Untersuchungen zu den Homer-Aporien des Aristoteles*, PhD. Diss., University of Heidelberg.
- Horn, E. (1883), *De Aristarchi studiis Pindaricis*, Greifswald.
- Johnson, A.P. (2017), “The implications of a minimalist approach to Porphyry’s fragments”, in: I. Männlein-Robert (ed.), *Die Christen als Bedrohung? Text, Kontext und Wirkung von Porphyrios’ Contra Christianos*, Stuttgart, 41-58.
- Kammer, E. (ed.) (1863), *Porphyrii scholia Homerica emendatiora praefatione de scholiis Porphyrianis praemissa*, Königsberg.
- Kannicht, R. / Snell, B. (eds.) (1981), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta (TrGF). II, Fragmenta adespota. Testimonia volumini I addenda. Indices ad volumina I et 2*, Göttingen.
- Kassel, R. / Austin, C. (eds.) (1986), *Poetae comici Graeci (PCG). V, Damoxenus–Magnes*, Berlin-New York.
- Kleinlogel, A. / Alpers, K. (eds.) (2019), *Scholia Graeca in Thucydidem: Scholia vetustiora et Lexicon Thucydideum Patmense*, Berlin-Boston.
- Kock, T. (ed.) (1880), *Comicorum Atticorum fragmenta. I, Antiquae comoediae fragmenta*, Leipzig.
- Kortlandt, F. (1983), “Greek numerals and PIE glottalic consonants”, in: *MSS* 42, 97–104.
- Kühner, R. / Gerth, B. (1904), *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Zweiter Teil: Satzlehre, II*, 3rd ed., Hannover-Leipzig.

- Lanata, G. (ed.) (1963), *Poetica pre-platonica. Testimonianze e frammenti: testo, traduzione e commento*, Florence.
- Latte, K. / Cunningham, I.C. (eds.) (2018), *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*. I, A-Δ, 2nd ed., Berlin.
- Lehrs, K. (1837), *Quaestiones epicae*, Königsberg.
- Long, A.A. (1992), “Stoic readings of Homer”, in: R. Lamberton / J.J. Keaney (eds.), *Homer’s Ancient Readers: The Hermeneutics of Greek Epic’s Earliest Exegetes*, Princeton, 41–66.
- Ludwich, A. (1884), *Aristarchs homerische Textkritik nach den Fragmenten des Didymos dargestellt und beurtheilt*, I, Leipzig.
- Ludwich, A. (ed.) (1891), *Homeri Odyssea*, Leipzig.
- Luschnat, O. (ed.) (1960), *Thucydidis Historiae*. I, Libri I-II, 2nd ed., Leipzig.
- Lührs, D. (1992), *Untersuchungen zu den Athetesen Aristarchs in der Ilias und zu ihrer Behandlung im Corpus der exegetischen Scholien*, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York.
- Maass, E. (ed.) (1898), *Commentariorum in Aratum reliquiae*, Berlin.
- MacPhail Jr., J.A. (ed.) (2011), *Porphyry’s Homeric Questions on the Iliad: Text, Translation, Commentary*, Berlin-New York.
- Mayhew, R. (2019), *Aristotle’s Lost Homeric Problems: Textual Studies*, Oxford.
- McGuire, D.J. (1977), *Aristotle’s Attitude towards Homer*, PhD. Diss., Loyola University of Chicago.
- Meineke, A. (ed.) (1839), *Fragmenta comicorum Graecorum*. II, *Fragmenta poetarum comoediae antiquae. Pars I*, Berlin.
- Moggi, M. / Osanna, M. (eds.) (2003), Pausania, *Guida della Grecia. Libro VIII. L’Arcadia: testo e traduzione a cura di M.M. Commento a cura di M.M. e M.O.*, Milan.

- Montanari, F. / Montana, F. / Muratore, D. / Pagani, L. (2017), “Towards a new critical edition of the scholia to the *Iliad*: A specimen”, in: *TiC* 9, 1–21.
- Murray, A.T. / Dimock, G.E. (eds.) (1998), Homer, *Odyssey*. II, *Books 13-24. With an English Translation*, Cambridge, MA.
- Nagy, G. (2004), *Homer's Text and Language*, Champaign, IL (available online here: <https://chs.harvard.edu/book/nagy-gregory-homers-text-and-language/>).
- Nickau, K. (1977), *Untersuchungen zur textkritischen Methode des Zenodotos von Ephesos*, Berlin.
- Novokhatko, A. (2015), “Greek scholarship from its beginnings to Alexandria”, in: F. Montanari / S. Matthaios / A. Rengakos (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship*. I, *History. Disciplinary Profile*, Leiden-Boston, 3–59.
- Nünlist, R. (2009), *The Ancient Critic at Work: Terms and Concepts of Literary Criticism in Greek Scholia*, Cambridge.
- Olson, S.D. (ed.) (2016), Eupolis, *Heilotes – Chrysoun genos (frr. 147-325): Translation and Commentary*, Heidelberg.
- Pagani, L. (2005), “Autochthon”, in: F. Montanari / F. Montana / L. Pagani (eds.), *Lexicon of Greek Grammarians of Antiquity*, Brill Online.
- Pagani, L. (2006), “Metrodorus”, in: F. Montanari / F. Montana / L. Pagani (eds.), *Lexicon of Greek Grammarians of Antiquity*, Brill Online.
- Paley, F.A. (ed.) (1883), *The Epics of Hesiod*, 2nd ed., London.
- Pépin, J. (1976), *Mythe et allégorie: les origines grecques et les contestations judéo-chrétiennes*, 2nd ed., Paris.
- Pertusi, A. (ed.) (1955), *Scholia vetera in Hesiodi Opera et dies*, Milan.

- Pfeiffer, R. (1968), *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginning to the End of the Hellenistic Age*, Oxford.
- Poltera, O. (ed.) (2008), *Simonides lyricus. Testimonia und Fragmente: Einleitung, kritische Ausgabe, Übersetzung und Kommentar*, Basel.
- Pontani, F. (2005), *Sguardi su Ulisse: la tradizione esegetica greca all'Odissea*, Rome.
- Pontani, F. (2006), “Gli scoli omerici e il senso del mondo. Storie e progetti da Faesch a Valckenaer, da Tychsen ai giorni nostri”, in: G. Avezzi / P. Scattolin (eds.), *I classici greci e i loro commentatori. Dai papiri ai marginalia rinascimentali*, Rovereto, 201–233.
- Pontani, F. (2019), “Les *Questions homériques* de Porphyre”, in: T. Dorandi (ed.), *Porphyre. L'Antre des Nymphes dans l'Odyssée: introduction, édition du texte grec, traduction et notes*, Paris, 41–58.
- Porson, R. (1812), *Adversaria: Notae et emendationes in poetas Graecos*, Cambridge.
- Pusch, H. (1890), “Quaestiones Zenodoteae”, in: *Dissertationes philologicae Halenses* 9, Halle, 119–216.
- Richardson, N.J. (1975), “Homeric professors in the age of the sophists”, in: *PCPhS* n.s. 21, 65–81.
- Rocha-Pereira, M.H. (ed.) (1990), *Pausaniae Graeciae descriptio. II, Libri V-VIII*, Leipzig.
- Römer, A. (1912), *Aristarchs Athetesen in der Homerkritik (wirkliche und angebliche): Eine kritische Untersuchung*, Leipzig-Berlin.
- Rose, V. (ed.) (1863), *Aristoteles pseudepigraphus*, Leipzig.
- Rose, V. (ed.) (1870), *Aristotelis opera. V, Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta. Scholiorum in Aristotelem supplementum. Index Aristotelicus*, Berlin.
- Rose, V. (ed.) (1886), *Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta*, Leipzig.

- Runkel, M. (ed.) (1829), *Pherecratis et Eupolidis fragmenta*, Leipzig.
- Rutherford, R.B. (ed.) (1992), Homer, *Odyssey: Books XIX and XX*, Cambridge.
- Schiassi, G. (ed.) (1944), *De Eupolidis comici poetae fragmentis*, Bologna.
- Schmitt, A. (2011) Aristoteles, *Poetik: Übersetzt und erläutert*, 2nd ed., Berlin.
- Schneider, O. (1846), “In Anacreontem et poetas comicos”, in: *Philologus* 1, 645–647.
- Schneidewin, F.G. (ed.) (1839), *Delectus poesis Graecorum elegiacae, iambicae, melicae. Sectio I et III: Poetae iambici et melici*, Göttingen.
- Schrader, H. (ed.) (1880), *Porphyrri Quaestionum Homericarum ad Iliadem pertinentium reliquias collegit, disposuit, edidit H.S.*, Leipzig.
- Schrader, H. (ed.) (1890), *Porphyrri Quaestionum Homericarum ad Odysseam pertinentium reliquias collegit, disposuit, edidit H.S.*, Leipzig.
- Schuppe, E. (1937), “Tribon”, in: *RE* 6A2, 2415–2419.
- Sengebusch, M. (1855), *Homerica disseratio prior*, Leipzig.
- Slater, W. (2012), Rev. of MacPhail 2011, in: *ExClass* 16, 325–330.
- Snell, B. / Maehler, H. (eds.) (1989), Pindarus. II, *Fragmenta. Indices*, Munich-Leipzig.
- Sodano, A.R. (ed.) (1970), *Porphyrri Quaestionum Homericarum liber I: testo critico*, Naples.
- Sodano, A.R. (1974), “Aristotele, *Ἀπορήματα Ὀμηρικά*, fr. 143, 146, 151, 157, 161 Rose³”, in: *AFLM* 7, 11–54.
- Solmsen, F. / Merkelbach, R. / West, M.L. (eds.) (1990), *Hesiodi Theogonia, Opera et dies, Scutum. Edidit F.S. Fragmenta selecta ediderunt R.M. et M.L.W.*, 3rd ed., Oxford.
- Spohn, F.A.W. (ed.) (1819), *Hesiodi Opera et dies e veterum grammaticorum notationibus et optimis libris mss.*, Leipzig.

- Steinmetz, P. (1986), “Allegorische Deutung und allegorische Dichtung in der alten Stoa”, in: *RhM* n.s. 129, 18–30.
- Steinmetz, P. (1994), “Zenon aus Kiton”, in: H. Flashar (ed.), *Die Philosophie der Antike*. IV, *Die hellenistische Philosophie*, Basel, 518–554.
- Storey, I.C. (2003), *Eupolis: Poet of Old Comedy*, Oxford.
- Storey, I.C. (ed.) (2011), *Fragments of Old Comedy*. II, *Diopithes to Pherecrates*. Edited and Translated, Cambridge, MA-London.
- Tammaro, V. (1988), “Eupol. Fr. 298, 3 K.-A.”, in: *ZPE* 72, 34.
- Theseus, N. (ed.) (1812), *Ὅμηρου Ἰλιάς μετὰ παλαιᾶς παραφράσεως ἐξ ἰδιοχείρου τοῦ Θεοδώρου Γάζη* (*Homērou Ilias meta palaias parafraseōs ex idiocheirou tou Theodōrou Gazē*), II, Florence.
- Thiersch, F. (ed.) (1820), Pindarus, *Werke, Urschrift, Uebersetzung in den pindarischen Versmaassen und Erläuterungen*, II, Leipzig.
- van der Valk, M. (1963-1964), *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad*, I-II, Leiden.
- van der Horst, P.W. (2011), Rev. of MacPhail 2011, in: *BMCR* 2011.06.02.
<<https://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2011/2011.06.02>>
- van Emde Boas, E. / Rijksbaron, A. / Huitink, L. / de Bakker, M. (2019), *The Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek*, Cambridge.
- van Thiel, H. (ed.) (2014), *Scholia D in Iliadem: Proecdosis aucta et correctior secundum codices manu scriptos*, Cologne.
- van Lennep, D.J. (ed.) (1847), *Hesiodi Opera et dies: Librorum mss. et veterum editionum lectionibus commenarioque instruxit D.J.v.L.*, Amsterdam.

- Volkmann, R. (1864), “Apion 2”, in: W.S. Teuffel (ed.), *Pauly’s Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft in alphabetischer Ordnung*, 1.1: *A – Apollinopolis*, Stuttgart, 1243–1244.
- Von der Mühl, P. (ed.) (1962), *Homeri Odyssea*, 3rd. ed., Stuttgart-Leipzig.
- von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. (1916), *Die Ilias und Homer*, Berlin.
- von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. (1927), *Die Heimkehr des Odysseus: Neue homerische Untersuchungen*, Berlin.
- Verhasselt, G. (2020), “Did Homer nod off? Aristotle and Homeric problem-solving”, in: A.P. Mesquita / S. Noriega-Olmos / C. Shields (eds.), *Revisiting Aristotle’s Fragments: New Essays on the Fragments of Aristotle’s Lost Works*, Berlin, 221–261.
- Wachsmuth, R. (1863), *De Aristotelis studiis Homericis capita selecta*, Berlin.
- West, M.L. (ed.) (1978), Hesiod, *Works and Days: Edited with Prolegomena and Commentary*, Oxford.
- West, M.L. (ed.) (1998-2000), Homerus, *Ilias*, I-II, Berlin.
- West, M.L. (ed.) (2017), Homerus, *Odyssea*, Berlin.