Alberto Nodar

Ancient Homeric Scholarship and the Medieval Tradition: Evidence from the Diacritics in the Papyri*

The object of this paper is to present the provisional conclusions of the research project funded by the Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung that I am presently carrying out at the Institut für Papyrologie, in the University of Heidelberg. This project is an investigation into the *signs* preserved in papyri containing passages of *Iliad* book II. I have examined both the critical signs (i. e. those which, in principle, relate to the editing of the text) and the diacritical ones (i. e. those initially assisting the reader to solve possible ambiguities) in the belief that, especially in the case of the diacritics, their relationship with the grammatical and philological information preserved in the scholia and other ancient sources[1] can cast some light on the question of the transmission of the text.

For the purposes of this article I have selected four papyri which contain more or less overlapping passages of *Iliad* II[2]:

1. P.Hib. I 19; ca. 285–250 B.C.; ll. 174–179; 204–205; 621–623; 673–680; 715–724; 794–800; 813–817; 826–830; 855 a–b[3]. Several passages from book III.

2. P.Tebt. I 4; II B.C. (late); ll. 95–115; 121–157; 172–187; 197–210.

3. P.Col. VIII 195; III A.D.; ll. 188–203.

4. P.Mil. Vogl. I 2; II A.D.[4]; ll. 155–209.

Papyri from the Roman period without any diacritics are common; this is a fact mainly related to a lower production quality[5], and also determined by other factors such as the recipient and eventual use of the copy. However, I have chosen **1** and **2**, both coming from the Ptolemaic period, to exemplify how diacritics before the age of Alexandrian scholarship are absent from papyri[6].

---

* I should like to thank Dieter Hagedorn and John Lundon for their most valuable comments, suggestions and criticisms, which have been of great help in the preparation of this article.

[1] As F. Montanari, *The Fragments of Hellenistic Scholarship*, in: *Collecting Fragments*, G. W. Most (ed.), Göttingen 1997, 279, has pointed out, not only critical signs, but also "accents and breathings that appear sporadically in the papyri", other lectional signs and punctuation marks may reflect the work of ancient grammarians.

[2] It must be said that, although the numbers of the lines partially preserved in the papyri do overlap, it is very frequently the case that the portions of the lines themselves do not: for our papyri the real overlapping sections are as follows: **1** with **2** in all lines present in both papyri; with **4** in ll. 204–205, and **2** with **4** in ll. 197–202 and 204–209.

[3] I have used the editions of the papyri found in their corresponding volumes; for any divergences from the editors in matters of interpretation or edition I will state the source, as is the case here, where this last fragment was identified by S. West in her re-edition of the papyrus in *The Ptolemaic Papyri of Homer*, Köln and Opladen 1967.

[4] It is only for the sake of clarity in the exposition that I have listed **3** and **4** in chronologically inverted order.

[5] It does not follow, however, that all papyri showing lower production standards (e. g. nondescript — see E. G. Turner and P. J. Parsons (ed.), *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*, London [2]1987, 21 — or even half-cursive hands; narrow margins, writing across the fibres, etc.) present no diacritics; in fact, **3** is described by its editor as a "relatively inexpensive book". Conversely, we have a good number of very finely produced books which have not been provided with any diacritics — at least by the first hand. This is especially interesting in the case of those written in "Biblical Majuscule" hands (see ibid., 21–22), a question I will be dealing with shortly in the course of my research.

[6] At this point I should remind the reader that the present provisional conclusions have been drawn from the study of the papyri containing passages from *Iliad* book II only. Therefore, although I am not aware of any other Homer papyrus prior to the time of Alexandrian scholarship presenting diacritics, the possibility should remain open that it may eventually appear or that it escapes my knowledge. Let me also point out that B. Snell, the first editor of P.Hamb. II 136, from the first half of the third century B.C., containing ll. 101–109 of book II, seems to have seen a smooth breathing on ἀ̣π̣ο̣σ̣[in line 109, but S. West reads ἀ̣γ̣ό̣ρ̣ε̣υ̣[εν at this point, breathing and accent being only

This is certainly the case for **1**, which only presents a paragraphos under 815, marking the beginning of the Trojan catalogue[7]. **2**, already from the late second century[8], and abundant in critical signs, presents two instances of high stop at ll. 98 [βασιληω]ν· and 101 τευχων· In both cases they mark a strong pause, represented in our modern editions by a full or a high stop.

It is interesting to observe that, among the diacritics, stops, apostrophes and diaereses seem to occupy a special position: the number of papyri where only these signs appear, or where they, being due to the main hand, are accompanied by another type of diacritic (e. g. accents, breathings, marks of quantity, etc.) added by a second hand is much larger than that of the papyri which present accents, breathings or marks of quantity without presenting stops, apostrophes or diaereses[9]. Of course, it is also possible to find papyri with both groups of signs due to the same hand, but the trend is that, if there is a differentiation in terms of the hands responsible for the diacritics, stops, apostrophes and diaereses will be due to the main hand[10].

---

an editorial convention, after she has stated in the introduction to her book that "none of the papyri here reproduced have any accents or punctuation" (p. 10). Likewise, she suggests that the dots which appear at various places in fr. A of P. Lefort 1 (*Odyssey* φ 1–22; 431–χ 1; assigned to the second half of the third century B.C. by its editor princeps W. Lameere, *Aperçus de Paléographie Homérique*, 15ff.) are probably accidental (p. 277). Lameere had thought that their distribution was related to the metrical structure of the verses. In no case, however, can they be regarded as diacritical signs.

[7] cf. Schol. D B 815/Y^{s} Τρῶες: νῦν πάντες οἱ ἐν τῇι χώραι. When referring to D-Scholia I will cite them according to H. van Thiel's edition: http://www.uni-koeln.de/phil-fak/ifa/vanthiel/scholiaD.pdf

See also P.Oxy. VIII 1086, as edited in H. Erbse's *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem*, vol. 1, Berlin 1969, 164ff., col. iii, ll. 105–106, for the remains of a note to the line, of which, however, very little is preserved. For the significance of the D-Scholia and the Scholia Minora see below in this article.

[8] This is the date assigned by the editors, further specified in *GMAW*^{2}, 38 as not later than 140 B.C., which means it might have been written shortly after Aristarchus' death. See pp. 2–3 in H. van Thiel, *Zenodot, Aristarch und andere*, ZPE 90 (1992) 1–32.

[9] A preliminary study within the papyri from the second book of the *Iliad* shows the following results:

papyri with only diaeresis: P.Berol. inv. 21197 (F. B. A. M.: *Festschrift zum 150jährigen Bestehen des Berliner ägyptischen Museums*; Mitteilung aus der ägyptischen Sammlung VIII, Berlin 1974, 366–368) II A.D.; P.Ross. Georg. I 3, II A.D.; P.Mich. VI 390, II A.D.; P.Cair. JE 45614 (CdÉ 60 [1985] 17–29), III A.D.; P.Vindob. G 26737 (described in Archiv für Bibliographie, Buch- und Bibliothekswesen 1 [1926] 88, and examined by myself in the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek), III A.D.

papyri with only apostrophe: P.Col. VIII 196, I B.C.; P. Hal. inv. 33 (Archiv 37 [1991] 6), II A.D.

papyri with only stops: P.Lond. Lit. 6; P.Ryl. III 540; P.Lib. Cong. inv. 4082b (ZPE 63 [1986] 35–38); P.Morgan inv. M662B (6b) + (27k) (ZPE 110 [1996] 118–120); Bodl. Lib. MS Gr. class. d. 41 (partially published in W. Lameere, *Aperçus de Paléographie Homérique*, Paris 1960, 77–81), I A.D. (all belonging to the same roll).

papyri with only apostrophe and diaeresis: P.Mil. Vogl. II 31, III A.D.; P.Köln I 25, II A.D. (the editor mentions an accent in l. 4 of fr. l, but I cannot see anything at that point in the digitised image of the papyrus: http://www.uni-koeln.de/phil-fak/ifa/NRWakademie/papyrologie/PKoeln/PK34lr.jpg).

papyri with only stops, apostrophe and diaeresis: P.Ryl. III 541, I A.D.

papyri with any of these signs where accents, breathings or marks of quantity have been added by a second hand:

P.Ross. Georg. I 2, II–III A.D.: stops, apostrophe and diaeresis; accents and breathings added by a second hand.

P.Tebt. II 265, II A.D.: stops and diaereses by first hand, accents by second.

P.Köln I 24, I–II A.D.: diaeresis; accents seemingly by second hand.

By contrast, only three papyri present solely diacritics belonging to the "second group":

P.Mich. inv. 3694 (G. W. Schwendner, *Literary and Non-literary Papyri from the University of Michigan Collection,* Diss. Ann Arbor 1988, 2f.), IV A.D.: accents and rough breathing.

P. Ryl. I 45, II A.D.: smooth breathing.

P. Oxy. XI 1385, V A.D.: breathings, accents.

In these cases, their editors do not mention a different hand responsible for the signs, and I have not been able to see any photographic reproduction of the papyri.

[10] Of course there are some — partial — exceptions to this trend: P.Vindob. G 26767, II A.D., presents apostrophe and diaeresis by the main hand, and breathing and accents by a second hand, but some of the stops seem to be also due to the second hand, and the mark of long quantity is seemingly due to the main hand. According to its editors, in P.Oxy. I 21, I–II A.D., apostrophes are clearly by the first hand; possibly by the first hand, "but, more probably ... due to the person who has added some corrections in cursive" are accents, breathings, marks of quantity, but also the stops. Finally in the Ambrosianus gr. F 205 inf. (1019) the stops are due to a second hand.

This trend seems to suggest that stops, apostrophe and diaeresis might have entered the paradosis of the text at an earlier stage, as the very case of this papyrus illustrates[11].

As for the critical signs, the obelos and the diple periestigmene, and seemingly the asteriscus cum obelo, have their Aristarchean function, as known from Aristonicus; obeli in front of ll. 124, 130–133 (probably, in the case of ll. 130–132, according to editors) and 197, mark athetized lines, as sch. A B124a (Ariston.)[12], sch. A B130–133 (Ariston.) and sch. AT B193a[1] and b a[2] (Ariston.) respectively inform. Sch. A B156–169 (Ariston.) explains that Zenodotus presents an abbreviated text[13] that does not include Hera's speech, thus justifying the presence of the diple periestigmene as the Aristarchean sign to indicate disagreements with Zenodotus. Finally, the asteriscus cum obelo, if we follow the editors' very plausible suggestion that it refers to the corresponding line in the following column[14], would be pointing at the interpolation of l. 164 from another passage, just as made clear in sch. A B164 a[1] (Ariston.). Although the antisigma in front of l. 204 does not seem to follow the Aristarchean use[15], and although the oblique strokes to the left of ll. 147, 198 and 207 do not correspond to any grammatical or philological information found in the Scholia Maiora[16], it is certain that we are dealing with a papyrus reflecting the work of Alexandrian scholarship. This is shown by the scholia explaining the usage of the signs, and the "reading"[17] by Aristarchus at l. 133, [Ιλιο]ν, subsequently corrected into the "vulgate" Ιλιου very probably by a second hand. I will come back to this aspect later; for now, let it be remarked that the text is that of our "vulgate" (the only exception would be that of the unclear points in 132 and 137[18]).

This same text, presenting only very occasional and, for the most part, unimportant unique variants is the one we find in the papyri of the Roman period — and also in our medieval manuscripts. Although the

---

[11] According to R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, Oxford 1968, 179–180, "Aristophanes, far from 'inventing' punctuation, continued a long tradition", whereas in the case of accentuation he regards the scholar as the first to have provided texts with written accents. Even though, as he acknowledges, "so far no instance of a στιγμή in the earliest papyri is known", it is clear that the practice was well known before him from inscriptions. It is not surprising, therefore, that our papyrus presents stops, but not accents. It is also worth noticing the different nature of the two groups of signs: stops do not refer to any inherent phonetic or prosodic characteristics of the word they accompany; accents, breathings, and marks of long quantity do. Elision in a word, and therefore appearance of the corresponding apostrophe, is of a contingent nature, and something similar could be said of the use of diaeresis on an initial or final vowel when preceded or followed, respectively, by another vowel sound. This differentiation has some bearing on the way grammatical sources can attest the use of diacritics regarding particular words in our text: whereas words carrying accents, breathings and marks of quantity can be found as examples of abstract, grammatical rules, those accompanied by stops and apostrophes might only appear in commentaries to specific passages. It can also help to explain the chronological precedence of stops, apostrophes and diaereses, for these signs almost exclusively obey an immediate diacritical need. Nonetheless, these distinctions should not be taken too far: the use of diaeresis within a word to indicate that two consecutive vowels do not cluster together should be regarded in the same way as a mark of long quantity, and the grave accent on oxytones within the sentence, just as the enclisis accent, are of a contingent nature.

[12] When referring to the Scholia Maiora, I will cite according to Erbse's edition *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem*, 7 vols., Berlin 1969–1988.

[13] I will be discussing the nature of the Alexandrian texts below. For the moment, I will just follow the conventional way of referring to them.

[14] For the difficulties concerning the relative positions of ll. 141, to the right of which the sign stands, and 164, see the corresponding note in the editio princeps.

[15] See the comments of the editors in this respect; sch. AT B192a informs us that ll. 203–205 should be placed after l. 192, but it is against 192 that the antisigma should appear: τὸ ἀντίσιγμα, ὅτι ὑπὸ τοῦτον ἔδει τετάχθαι τοὺς ἐξῆς παρεστιγμένους τρεῖς στίχους ... Grenfell and Hunt conclude that "from the inconsistent explanations of the antisigma by ancient grammarians it is clear that scribes differed as to the use of it". K. McNamee, in *Sigla and Select Marginalia in Greek Literary Papyri*, Brussels 1992, 9, recognises this case as one of antisigma used in the context of line transposition, although not conforming exactly to Aristarchus' practice.

[16] They seem to be marking the beginning of sections; see Grenfell and Hunt in the editio princeps and Turner and Parsons (loc. cit., note 8), but whereas the strokes at 198 and 207 follow a speech, that against 147 seems to be introducing a simile. Similarly, K. McNamee, *op. cit.* table 2D, sees the strokes in our papyrus as markers of divisions in the text.

[17] I have enclosed the word *reading* in inverted commas, as I have done with *vulgate* below, for the reason stated in note 13; these concepts will be given further consideration later in this article.

[18] See notes of editors in commentary. In neither case, however, it is possible to ascertain what the new variant would be, nor is there any information in the scholia regarding any editorial disagreements at these points.

critical signs employed by the Alexandrian scholars are now only rarely to be found, the same corpus of philological information which accounted for the use of those signs in papyri such as **2** will, to a very large extent, account for the appearance of the diacritics in papyri from the Roman age.

In principle, we can think of two ways in which the appearance of a diacritic can be reasonably related to a scholion; one is the scholion's specific comment on the word which, in our text, carries the diacritic, the other is the reflection of the scholion's lemma in the text by means of the diacritics: if critical signs standing on their own in the papyrus, such as those seen in **2**, can be assumed to refer to pieces of philological information contained in a separate corpus, so could diacritics be thought to highlight those particular words which, in the separate corpus, might have been commented on. In suggesting this kind of relationship between diacritic and scholion lemma, I underline the function of the sign (clear in the case of the critical sign, but perhaps somehow ignored in the case of the diacritic) as a link to a comment, where it would presumably appear again[19].

Therefore, according to this double possibility, I have established the following criteria for a correspondence between scholion and diacritic to be safely suggested:

1. the word the diacritic accompanies should be specifically commented on in the text of the scholion (or a normal speech equivalent to that word should be given, particularly in the case of the D-Scholia), or

2. the word, when not being specifically commented on, should appear in the lemma. In this case, however, not only this word, but all the words appearing in the lemma should be marked in the papyrus (as far as they have been preserved) by means of a diacritic.

In principle, for stops and apostrophes (see above note 11), because it is sensible to assume that they always refer to a particular ἐν συντάξει phenomenon, the commentary in case 1. should refer specifically to, or imply, their appearance as markers of such ἐν συντάξει phenomena. In case 2. the stop or apostrophe should be present in the lemma.

A look at the diacritics in **3**, due to the same hand as that responsible for the main text[20], will illustrate some aspects of the relationship between diacritics and scholia: with the exception of the apostrophe in 202 ουτ' (and perhaps the accent in 191 ἄλλους, where we have the whole phrase explained, but not the pronoun in particular[21]), it is possible to find in the Scholia Maiora information relating to all the words presenting diacritics:

188 κιχεὶη[22]; sch. T B 188b (Did.) (ἔξοχον ἄνδρα) κιχείη: τινὲς "κιχοίη".

---

[19] Hence the philological value of the diacritic, very rightly claimed by Montanari (*loc. cit.,* note 1), which would have been transmitted *with* the text in a way similar to the critical sign (as suggested by M. Haslam; see note 75 below): take, for instance, the phrasing of sch. T B 201 (Hrd.) οἳ σέο: οὕτως ὀρθοτονητέον τὴν σέο· ἀντιδιασταλτικὴ γάρ ἐστιν, quoted below in this article, and compare it with, say, that of sch. A B164a[1] (Ariston.) ... ἀθετεῖται δὲ καὶ ἀστερίσκος παράκειται, ὅτι καὶ οὗτος πρὸς Ἀθηνᾶς οἰκείως πρὸς Ὀδυσσέα λέγεται ...: Both point to a corresponding sign in the main text before presenting us with the comment. Not all scholia, however, are provided with a lemma (the so-called *Textscholien* lack them), and many lemmata in the *Hauptscholien* do not necessarily correspond with the words actually commented on, but, being the repetition of the beginning of the verse where the commented on word(s) appear, act as mere indicators of the line the scholion belongs to (see H. van Thiel, *Die Lemmata der Iliasscholien zur Systematik und Geschichte*, ZPE 79 [1989] 9–26). Nonetheless, especially in the case of scholia attributed to Herodian and Didymus (that is, those more likely to refer to particular words), more specific, shorter lemmata appear (ibid. 17–19). It is this kind of lemmata I shall be looking at primarily.

[20] Only the accents in ll. 190 and 191, written in a fainter ink, might be thought to be due to a second hand.

[21] See sch. bT B 191b, of an exegetical nature and of which the lemma runs: καὶ ἄλλους ἵδρυε ⟨λαούς⟩.

[22] We would not expect a grave accent to appear on the accented syllable, which does not even agree with its more general meaning of "no high pitch here" (cf. J. Moore-Blunt, *Problems of Accentuation in Greek Papyri*, QUCC 29 [1978] 137–163, especially 140–141 and C. M. Mazzucchi, *Sul Sistema di Accentazione dei Testi Greci in Età Romana e Bizantina*, Aegyptus 59 [1979] 145–167, especially 146–147). Although nowhere else in our four papyri is an accent to be found in the "wrong" position (the editor princeps of this papyrus, C. W. Keyes, in AJP 50 [1929] 256–257, saw an acute accent on the second ε in ερητυσασκε, but that is more probably a hook to the right at the end of the long descender of ρ in the preceding line: see the digitised image at www.columbia.edu/cgi-bin/dlo?obj=columbia.apis.p230&size=300&face=f&tile=0), this case is not an isolated phenomenon at all in the context of all the papyri from book II; this matter will be the subject of more specific considerations in another place, but perhaps the diacritics' approximation to the function of a critical sign (see immediately below) might justify this non-specialised use of the accents; that is, they would be drawing the reader's attention to *any* particular point about the word in question (see also the end of this paper).

190 δ̣ειδίσσεσθ̣αι sch. bT B 190b (ex.) κακὸν ὣς δειδίσσεσθαι: εὐλαβεῖσθαι, θωπεύων δὲ δυσωπεῖ.

192 ὁ̣ιος νόος Ατρείδαω[23] sch. A B 192b[1] (Did.) οἷος νόος ᾽Ατρείδαο: “οἷος νόος ᾽Ατρείωνος” κἀν ταῖς διορθώσεσι καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασιν οὕτως ἐγέγραπτο “᾽Ατρείωνος”. καὶ αἱ πλείους δὲ τῶν χαριεστάτων οὕτως εἶχον, καὶ ἡ ᾽Αριστοφάνειος. καὶ ὁ Σιδώνιος δὲ καὶ ὁ ᾽Ιξίων οὕτως γράφουσιν. T b[2] οἷος νόος ᾽Ατρείδαο: αἱ χαριέστεραι “᾽Ατρείωνος”.

Moreover, as far as the papyrus has preserved this passage, it could be said that it seems to reflect almost all the comments made in the Scholia Maiora[24] to these lines (the exceptions would be διοτρεφέος βασιλῆος in 196 and βοόωντά τ᾽ ἐφεύροι in 198, although, in the cases of the first words of the two phrases the papyrus surface is quite badly damaged). It is remarkable, however, that the nature of these comments is never concerned with the prosody of the words affected, which situates the diacritics in a position similar to the critical signs seen in **2**[25]. Likewise, it is not infrequent in papyri provided with lectional signs to find an accent on forms peculiar to the Homeric language, which might not have been easily understood by the reader, such as compounds, uncontracted forms, second aorist forms or verbal forms without the augment. In these cases, the accent seems to be drawing the reader’s attention to the anomaly, rather than avoiding possible ambiguities or reflecting some grammatical doctrine on the accentuation of the word. On this basis, it could be argued that the presence of such diacritics should be better related to the explanatory nature of the D-Scholia, and not to the philological tradition of the Scholia Maiora[26].

For this reason I have thought it convenient to search also for cases in which we have D-Scholia which could account for the presence of the diacritics in our papyrus[27]:

	D-Sch.	Sch. Maiora		D-Sch.	Sch. Maiora
188 κιχεὶη	+	+	192 ὁ̣ιος	+	+
190 δ̣ειδίσσεσθ̣αι	+	+	νόος	+	+
191 ἀ̣λλους	–	–	Ατρείδαω	–	+
			202 ουτ᾽	+(?)[28]	–

[23] Note that, although the scholia are primarily concerned with the variant ᾽Ατρείωνος / ᾽Ατρείδαο, the three words appearing in the lemma present diacritics in the papyrus, which is not the case regarding ἄλλους in l. 191. On the confusion of o and ω, see F. T. Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and the Byzantine Periods*, 2 vols., Milan 1976–1981, i. 277.

[24] Schol. B189c A^{im} <ἐρητύσασκε:> ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐρήτυεν, although incorporated in the philological tradition represented by the Scholia Maiora, is identified by Erbse as a D-scholion; cf. the D-Scholion B 189/Z^{S} ἐρητύσασκε· κατεῖχεν, ἐκώλυεν ZYQXA^{ti}.

[25] An interesting fact might, perhaps, be commented on at this point: apart from the case in 188, for which the scholion quoted above provides a variant reading, we find a variant for δειδίσσεσθαι: M. West’s apparatus (*Homeri Ilias*, Stuttgart, Leipzig and Munich 1998–2000) informs us that an unpublished papyrus (no. 840 in West’s list) offers διδισσασθαι. Given the scantiness of its representation in the manuscripts and the absence of any notice regarding this variant in the scholia, it must, of course, remain purely hypothetical that the diacritic on δειδίσσεσθαι might refer to the existence of this variant (cf. the case of ουτ᾽ in l. 202 commented on below).

[26] P.Ash. inv. 103/90 (c) II A.D. (O 691–743, no. 1347 in West’s list), edited and commented on in my unpublished doctoral thesis, *Unpublished Literary Papyri from Oxyhynchus: an Edition with a Commentary*, Oxford 1998, provides a good number of accents on uncontracted forms; in P.Mich. inv. 6239 II A.D., which I will be dealing with in the course of my research, accents are found on anomalous or difficult forms. Despite the suggested similarity in scope between this use of the accent and the explanations of the D-Scholia, it should not be forgotten that Alexandrian scholars also remarked on peculiarities of the same kind as those clarified in the D-Scholia. And, in some cases, they did so in a way similar to that found in the word lists of the Scholia Minora; see H. van Thiel, *Der Homertext in Alexandria*, ZPE 115 (1997) 13–36, especially 22–24.

[27] Given the purely explanatory and succinct nature which characterises many of the D-Scholia, where the words in the lemmata are generally glossed with their equivalents in normal speech, I will not quote them unless they present further points of interest. Of course, they all can be found in van Thiel’s digital edition.

[28] The case for the apostrophe is not clear: sch. B 202/Z^{s} reads βουλῆι· οὔτε ἐν ἐκκλησίαι, but van Thiel informs us that it is Z only which offers οὔτε ἐν, whereas YQX all have τουτέστιν (A^{ti} has ἐν ἐκκλησίαι); nothing is said explicitly about the supposed rarity of ἐνί, but perhaps the appearance of οὐτε ἐν in Z and of ἐν in A^{ti} points to a possible difficulty in articulating the group negation + preposition. On the other hand, P.Lond. Lit. 5 presents ουδ at this point; that the apostrophe might be referring to the existence of this variant (and therefore have a philological value) must remain purely hypothetical.

An analysis of the situation of **4** will reveal further interesting facts[29]:

	D-Sch.	Sch. Maiora		D-Sch.	Sch. Maiora
164 δ᾽ αγα[νοις	–	+	192 ου γάρ πω	–	–
165 έα	+	–	193 νῦν	–	–
166 εφατ᾽	–	–	195 μή τι	–	+
167 β]ῆ	–	–	196 μέγ[ας	–	+
169 έπ[ειτα	+	–	197 δ᾽ εκ	–	–
170 εσταότ᾽	+	–	198 ὀν δ	+	+
	–	–	αῦ+	–	
171 ἀπτετ[	+	–	δήμο[υ	+	–
172 δ᾽ [ισταμενη	–	–	199 σκήπτρ[ωι	–	–
175 φε]ύξε[σθ	–	+	200 δαιμόνι᾽	+	–
179 αλλ᾽ ιθι	–	–	–	–	
180 σοῖς	–	–	ατρέ[μας	+	+
δ᾽ α[γανοις	–	+	201 ὀι	+	+
183 βῆ	+	+	σέο	+	+
184 κῆρυξ	–	+	202 οὐτέ	–	–
185 δ᾽ Ατρ[ειδεω	–	–	–	–	
186 δέξατό	–	+	ποτ᾽ εν	–	–
	–	+	203 ου μέν πως	+	–
ὀι	–	+	205 ἑῖς	–	–
187 τῶι	+	+	–	–	
έβη	–	+	ὦ ε[δωκε	–	–
188 όντινα	–	–	–	–	
189 δ᾽ αγανο[ις	–	+(?)	207 ὅ	+	–
190 δαιμόνι᾽	+[30]	–	+	–	
	–	–	209 ἠχῆι·	+	+
ό[υ	+(?)[31]	+	+	+	
191 αλλ᾽	–	–	–	+(?)	
αυτός [τε	+	–	ως ότε	–	–

Again we have Scholia Maiora to the lines in question informing us of different aspects concerning the words carrying the diacritics:

175 φε]ύξε[σθ bT B 175a (ex.) φεύξεσθε: εὖ τὸ καὶ τὸν Ὀδυσσέα συμπεριλαβεῖν τῇι φυγῆι· παρώξυνε γὰρ αὐτὸν πρὸς τὸ τοὺς ἄλλους ἐπέχειν, ἐπαγαγοῦσα τῶι ἥρωϊ δειλίας ἔγκλημα.

183 βῆ AbT B 183a (ex. | ex.) βῆ δὲ θέειν: ὥστε θέειν. T| ἀφείλετο τὴν ἀπόκρισιν ἡ ἔπειξις τοῦ καιροῦ, ἔστι δέ, ὥρμησεν ἐπὶ τὸ θέειν, ἢ Ἀττικῶς λείπει τὸ ὥστε, ἢ τὸ ἀπαρέμφατον ἀντὶ μετοχῆς.

184 κῆρυξ A[im] B 184a (Ariston.) <κῆρυξ Εὐρυβάτης:> ὅτι καὶ ἕτερος Εὐρυβάτης ὁμώνυμος.

T B 184b (ex.) κῆρυξ Εὐρυβάτης <Ἰθακήσιος>: ἕτερός ἐστιν οὗτος παρὰ τὸν Ἀγαμέμνονος, ὡς Πορφύριος· διὸ καὶ τὸ Ἰθακήσιος προσέθηκεν[32].

---

[29] For this analysis I have taken into account the corrections to the editio princeps made by Arturo Francesco Moretti in *Revisioni di alcuni papiri Omerici editi tra i P.Mil. Vogl.*, Tyche 8 (1993) 88.

[30] This scholion also appears in A. Since the comment on the word refers to its semantic characteristics as a λέξις τῶν μέσων (cf. V. Bécares Botas, *Diccionario de Terminología Gramatical Griega*, Salamanca 1985, s. v. μέσος), the scholion could be regarded as belonging to the group described by van Thiel as "gelehrte philologische und exegetische Scholien"; see H. van Thiel, *Die D-Scholien der Ilias in den Handschriften*, ZPE 132 (2000) 2.

[31] The D-scholion B 190/Z[s] runs: οὔ σε ἔοικε· οὔ σε πρέπει, ὦ βέλτιστε (ὦ βέλτιστε being also present in A[ti]) ZYQX. It does not actually provide any explanation or equivalent to οὔ, but we do not know whether the rest of the words in the lemma were also marked in our papyrus, and, on the other hand, there seems to have been some awareness of the accentuation of the negative; namely, Z presents οὐ σὲ in the lemma (cf. in the Scholia Maiora bT B190a, quoted below). These facts incline me to regard the case at least as dubious.

[32] I have included this case in the group of scholia for which there is philological evidence because, although in truth the scholia are only explaining the presence of Ἰθακήσιος, κῆρυξ Εὐρυβάτης can be easily identified as the object of the explanation, insofar as the expression is modified by the epithet. In fact, the lemma in 184b T has not originally included Ἰθακήσιος (unfortunately, damage in the papyrus prevents us from knowing whether Εὐρυβάτης was also marked, which would have made this point clearer).

186 δέξατό ὀι A B 186a (Ariston.) δέξατό ὀι σκῆπτρον: ὅτι ἀρχαϊκώτερον δέξατο αὐτῶι τὸ σκῆπτρον ἀντὶ παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ. (cf. also bT B 186b, of an exegetic nature)

187 τῶι ἔβη A^{im} B 187 (Ariston.) <σὺν τῶι ἔβη κατὰ νῆας:> ὅτι Ζηνόδοτος γράφει “σὺν τῶι βὰς κατὰ νῆας”.

195 μή τι bT^{il} B 195b (ex.) <μή τι:> τὸ μή τι διστακτικόν.

196 μέγ[ας bT B 196a (ex.) μέγας: ἐπηρμένος καὶ φοβερός, καὶ “μεγαλήτορας” γοῦν αὐτούς φησιν.

198 ὀν δ A^{im} B 198a (Nic.) <ὃν δ᾽ αὖ δήμου τ᾽ ἄνδρα ἴδοι βοόωντά τ᾽ ἐφεύροι:> ἐπὶ τὸ ἐφεύροι ὑποστικτέον διὰ τὸ ὅν ἄρθρον ὑποτακτικόν.

200 ατρέ[μας bT B 200 ἀτρέμας ἧσο (ex.) <καὶ ἄλλων μῦθον ἄκουε:> ἐν ἡσυχίαι κάθησο καὶ ἄκουε τῶν βασιλέων, τοῦτο δέ φησιν ἵνα ἔκδηλος τοῖς πολλοῖς ἡ βουλὴ γένηται.

209 ἠχῆι: T B 209a^{1} (D) {ἠχῆι ὡς ὅτε} κῦμα: τὸ †ἠχῆι† πρὸς τὴν κίνησιν, τὸν δὲ βρόμον πρὸς τὴν ἀντήχησιν[33].

But, more importantly, for some cases we do have the Scholia Maiora explaining the presence of the diacritic on grounds similar to those which determine our modern usage (i. e. with reference to the prosodic characteristics of the word):

164 δ᾽ αγα[νοις A B 164 a^{1} (Did.) σοῖς δ᾽ ἀγανοῖς: χωρὶς τοῦ δ̄ εἶχον αἱ χαριέσταται, “σοῖς ἀγανοῖς” καὶ ἡ ᾽Αριστοφάνους οὕτως εἶχεν. (The scholion also has an exegetical part, and some information about the line, attributed to Aristonicus. See also 164a^{2}, of exegetical character, partly identified as a D scholion, in bT)

180 σοῖς δ᾽ αγα[νοις A^{il} B 180b (Did.) <σοῖς δ᾽ αγανοῖς:> καθὰ καὶ ἄνω (sc. B 164) χωρὶς τοῦ δὲ συνδέσμου[34].

190 ό[υ bT B 190a (Hrd.) οὔ σε ἔοικε: ἡ μὲν ἀκρίβεια ὀρθοτονεῖ, ἐγκλίνει δὲ ἡ συνήθεια.

201 ὀι σέο A^{int}T B 201 (Hrd.) οἵ σέο: οὕτως ὀρθοτονητέον τὴν σέο· ἀντιδιασταλτικὴ γάρ ἐστιν[35].

---

[33] Although the scholion is of difficult interpretation, the allusion to the word is certain. Likewise, the awareness of the simile, present here and also in sch. b B 209a^{2} (D) τοῦτο μὲν πρὸς τὴν κίνησιν ἔλαβε τὸ εἰκόνισμα, πρὸς δὲ τὴν ἀπήχησιν τὸν βρόμον, might imply the presence of a pause, and thus justify the use of the stop. However, in the absence of more specific information, I have preferred to regard this case as dubious: +(?).

[34] The particle δέ is commented on specifically in both scholia; although there is no explicit reference to the elision of final ε (and, therefore, no reference to the prosody of the word), I have regarded these occurrences of apostrophe as reflected in the scholia because that would be the only sign possible on the word. Besides, since both scholia are obviously interrelated (cf. καθὰ καὶ ἄνω in A^{il} B 180b), it is possible to look at these cases in terms of reflection of a lemma: σοῖς included in the lemma together with δ᾽ (notice the elided form and the apostrophe) and ἀγανοῖς, as shown in B 164 a^{1}, is marked in the papyrus in l. 180 (the surface is too damaged at the corresponding point in l. 164 to exclude the possibility that the possessive would also be accented there; as for ἀγανοῖς, it has only been very partially preserved in both lines).

The case of the apostrophe in l. 189 δ᾽ αγανο[ις is somehow different; sch. 189a, 189b^{1} and 189b^{2}, all comment on the particle:

sch. bT B 189a (Hrd.) τὸν δ᾽: δύο μέρη λόγου εἰσίν. ὁ δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ δή.

sch. AT B 189b^{1} (Ariston.) τὸν δ᾽: ὅτι ἐγκλιτέον τὸν δὲ σύνδεσμον, ὡς ἄν τις εἴποι ὑφ᾽ ἓν τόνδε· χρῆται γὰρ συνήθως αὐτῶι περισσῶι.

sch. b B 189b^{2} (Ariston.) οὐκ ἐγκλιτέον δὲ αὐτόν· χρῆται γὰρ αὐτῶι συνήθως ὁ ποιητὴς περιττῶι.

But, either as part of the demonstrative or of the particle, δ would be there. It is nonetheless true that the apostrophe would be the only means to draw the reader’s attention to the particle, for the scribe does not seem to use the grave accent (with which he could have signified the barytonesis of the separated pronoun).

The question of the lemmata in these scholia is also complicated; according to Erbse, in sch. 189a, b presents no lemma, whereas T has τὸν δ᾽ ἀγανοῖς, and adds sch. 189b^{1} to this scholion (189b^{1} presenting, therefore, the same lemma in T). A offers τὸν δ᾽ ἀγανοῖς ἐπέεσιν as the lemma of 189b^{1}, and there is no lemma for 189b^{2}, which is joined to 189a in b, lacking, as previously said, any lemma. In any case, the demonstrative, present in the different lemmata to the scholia, has not been marked in the papyrus, nor has, apparently, αγανο[ις. Again, it could be argued here that the scribe does not use the grave accent elsewhere in the text, and that αγανο[ις, although present in the text, has not been preserved entirely. All these factors lead me to consider the case as dubious: +(?)

[35] This scholion also justifies the inclusion of the rough breathing on ὀι in the group of diacritics accounted for by the Scholia Maiora, on the grounds that, although οἵ is not specifically commented on, it appears together with σέο in the lemma, and both words are marked in the papyrus.

However, in spite of the volume of philological evidence for the use of the diacritics, a comparison between the two columns of each chart shows that, in fact, there are roughly the same cases of diacritics accounted for in the D-Scholia as there are in the Scholia Maiora. This might mean, it could be argued, that the appearance of the diacritics in the papyri is not necessarily related to the scholarly activity in Alexandria, but reflects, as the D-Scholia do especially in the explanation of words[36], the same need to facilitate the correct understanding of very particular points in the text which might have been deemed obscure for the reader. In other words, that diacritics always keep their original "diacritical" or differentiating value, either to help the reader articulate the text or clarify possible ambiguities, or to draw the reader's attention to words of which the meaning or form are unclear. No doubt this may be the case in some instances (cf. e. g. ἑῖς in **4** 205, to differentiate it from εἰς, or εσταότ in **4** 170, where the accent is very probably referring to the oddity of the uncontracted form), but, at any rate, what seems undeniable is that, for instance, the systematic appearance of the enclisis accent in **4** has little or no functionality in terms of the articulation of the text, nor does it help to clarify possible ambiguities. This use, on the other hand, could not have been supported by the D-Scholia. Now, we would not expect a philological scholion for each enclitic in the text, either. What we have instead is a whole grammatical doctrine on accentuation which is partially present in the Scholia Maiora, and which was, among other things, concerned with the enclisis accent[37].

Likewise, here and there in the Scholia Maiora we do find references to the accentuation of a particular word, just as in the extracts of Herodian's works, closely connected with Alexandrian Scholarship[38], we find a word as an example, or exception, to a particular rule. If we consider this kind of information, that is, grammatical or philological information on prosodic matters, which does not appear in the scholia to the particular line where we find the word carrying the corresponding diacritic in the papyri, but which, nonetheless, concerns and mentions that word or phenomenon, then the general overview of matters changes perceptibly:

	D-Scholia	Philological Information		
		S. M. to the line[39]		not to the line (also Hrd.)
		non-prosody	prosody	prosody
3				
188 κιχεὶη	+	+	–	–
190 δειδίσσεσθαι	+	+	–	–
191 ἂλλους	–	–	–	+[40]
192 ὃιος	+	+	–	+[41]
νόος	+	+	–	+[42]

[36] In this respect, let it be remembered that these explanations go back far beyond the age of Hellenistic scholarship, since they are already attested as early as the fifth century B.C.; see most recently H. van Thiel (2000), 2, with bibliography on the question.

[37] Cf., for instance, the above quoted scholia B 190a and B 201, reflecting the doctrine in Herodian's ἐκ τοῦ βιβλίου τοῦ περὶ προσωιδίας τῆς κατὰ σύνταξιν τῶν λέξεων (A. Lentz [ed.], *Herodiani Techniqui Reliquiae*, 2 vols., Leipzig 1867–1870, i. 555. 11–19). When citing Herodian, I will follow Lentz's edition stating volume, page and line number.

[38] See R. Pfeiffer (*op. cit.*) 218–219.

[39] Within the scholia to the line, I have separated those which refer to the prosodic characteristics of the word in question (none in the case of **3**) from the rest, so as to show, together with the affirmative cases in the fourth column, all the philological evidence supporting the use of the diacritics as prosodic indicators, not as more neutral markers of diverse phenomena in the line.

[40] Hrd. καθ. προσ. i. 158. 5: the word appears as an exception to the rule by which common nouns in λλ not preceded by ι and all the τριγενῆ in λλ are oxytones: τὸ δὲ ἄλλος ὡς ἐπιμεριζόμενον βαρύνεται.

[41] Sch. A Σ 591–2a (Nic.) and sch. T Σ 591–2b (ex.) deal with the difference between οἷος and οἶος, with the smooth breathing, in that particular case. In Hrd. καθ. προσ. i. 546. 16, the aspiration of the word is explained as an exception: τὸ οἶος ἀναφορικὸν δασύνεται, for it has been stated immediately before that the diphthong οι is not aspirated in polysyllabic words, when it is not followed by μ.

[42] νόος is given as the first example of the rule τὰ διὰ τοῦ ο͞ο͞ς καὶ ε͞ο͞ς δισύλλαβα ἀπὸ συμφώνου ἀρχόμενα καὶ μὴ μόνου τοῦ θ̄ βαρύνεται, νόος … καθ. προσ. i. 111. 22–3. The rule is also to be found in περὶ ὀνομ. ii. 623. 28 ss. and περὶ τοῦ ζώς ii. 778. 7. ss., where the word occurs again as an example.

		non-prosody	prosody	prosody
Ατρείδαω	–	+	–	+[43]
202 ουτ’	–	–	–	[44]
4				
164 δ’ αγα[νοις	–	–	+	
165 έα	+	–	–	+[45]
166 εφατ’	–	–	–	
167 β]ῆ	–	–	–	+[46]
169 έπ[ειτα	+	–	–	–
170 εσταότ’	+	–	–	+[47]
	–	–	–	
171 ά̣π̣τ̣ε̣τ̣[	+	–	–	+(?)[48]
172 δ̣’[ίσταμενη	–	–	–	–
175 φε]ύξε[σθ	+	–	–	–
179 αλλ’ ιθι	–	–	–	
180 σοῖς	–	+	–	–
δ’ α[γανοις	–	–	+	
183 βῆ	+	+	–	+[49]
184 κῆρυξ	–	+	–	+[50]
185 δ’ Ατρ[ειδεω	–	–	–	
186 δέξατό	–	+	–	+
	–	+	–	+
ὁι	–	+	–	+[51]
187 τῶι	+	+	–	+[52]

[43] Ατρείδαο is specifically mentioned as an example of the accentuation of the Boeotian -αο genitives: καθ. προσ. i. 408. 21.

[44] The fourth column will always remain blank in the case of the stops and apostrophes, for the contingent nature of pause and elision in the text makes it impossible for the word after which a pause is marked or the elided word to appear in a rule of general character concerning pause or elision. It could be argued that another contingent phenomenon, namely that represented by the enclisis accent, has been regarded as a case represented in the philological tradition on the grounds that there is a grammatical doctrine concerning enclisis, whereas, in fact, elison (and pause, too) is likewise acknowledged in the scholia and other ancient grammatical sources. However, a difference is still to be noted with the case of the enclisis accent: here the doctrine defines *particular words* as enclitics, causing τὴν προκειμένην βαρεῖαν εἰς ὀξεῖαν μεθίστησιν, which effect is represented in the writing. On the other hand, it is obvious how the apostrophe and the stop are more likely to have been meant as an aid to the reader in articulating the text than the enclisis accent might have been, especially when used almost systematically.

[45] Sch. A E 256b[1] (Her.) and sch. bT E 256b[2] (Her.) discuss the accentuation of this particular form.

[46] Herodian, in περὶ Ἰλιακ. ii. 37. 34, to B 808, cites the two forms ἔβη/βῆ to exemplify the morphological variation concerning the augment in Homer, and the difference in the accentuation that it entails.

[47] Especially in the discussion of the declension of the nouns in -ης, Herodian several times cites the pair ἑσταώς ἑστώς (περὶ ὀνομ. ii. 620. 2, 8, 22), with reference to the rule that ἡ δὲ βαρεῖα καὶ ὀξεῖα εἰς ὀξεῖαν συνέρχονται (περὶ ὀνομ. ii. 620. 7), although he says that this does not happen in the case of common nouns and adjectives. See also, for further occurrences, περὶ παθ. ii. 329. 13, and περὶ κλίσεως ὀνομ. i. 712. 19.

[48] The augmented form ἵπτετο appears in περὶ Ἰλιακ. ii. 97. 23, to O 698, as an example to illustrate the accentuation of ἵντετο. But I believe the accent in the papyrus responds rather to the fact that the form lacks the augment.

[49] See note 46.

[50] κῆρυξ is given as an example of the rule of accentuation governing the words ending in -υξ (καθ. προσ. i. 44. 15).

[51] καθ. προσ. περὶ πνευμάτων i. 537. 1–2: πᾶσα ἀντωνυμία ἀποβαλλομένη τὸ ͞ι δασύνεται, σός ὅς, σοῦ οὗ, σέθεν ἔθεν.

[52] καθ. προσ. i. 473. 29 ss.: πᾶν ἄρθρον ὀξύνεται, χωρὶς τῶν γενικῶν καὶ δοτικῶν· αὗται γὰρ περισπῶνται, τοῦ τῶι, τῆς τῆι, τοῖν ταῖν, τῶν, τοῖς ταῖς. καὶ τὰ τούτων δὲ ὑποτακτικά, ἀποβολῆι τοῦ ͞τ γινόμενα, περισπῶνται. ὁμοίως καὶ τὸ κλητικὸν ὦ ἄρθρον μὲν οὐκ ἔστιν, ἀλλ’ ἐπίρρημα, περισπᾶται δὲ ὅμως καὶ ψιλοῦται τῶν ἀπὸ φωνηέντων ἀρχομένων ἄρθρων δασυνομένων “ὦ ἐχαρισάμην”. τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ πάντα ὀξύνονται, ὅ, τόν, οἵ, τούς, οὓς, ἥ, ἥν, τήν, τά, ἅ. Cf. sch. A[im] B 373a (Hrd.), where it is implied how the kind of accent and the absence or presence of iota adscript determine the meaning of the sequence τω, and, for further evidence of grammatical discussion on the word, περὶ προσωιδίας τῆς κατὰ σύνταξιν τῶν λέξεων i. 552. 24 and περὶ Ὀδυσσ. ii. 162. 16, where the indefinite pronoun is identified as the form deprived of accent.

		non-prosody	prosody	prosody
ἔβη	–	+	–	+[53]
188 ὀντινα	–	–	–	+
189 δ᾽ αγανο[ις	–	–	+(?)	
190 δαιμόνι᾽	+	–	–	+[54]
	–	–	–	
ὁ[υ	+(?)	–	+	+[55]
191 αλλ᾽	–	–	–	
αυτός [τε	+	–	–	+
192 ου γάρ πω	–	–	–	+
193 νῦν	–	–	–	+[56]
195 μή τι	–	+	–	+
196 μέγ[ας	–	+	–	+[57]
197 δ᾽ εκ	–	–	–	
198 ὀν δ	+	+	–	+[58]
αὖ	+	–	–	+[59]
δήμο[υ	+	–	–	+[60]
199 σκήπτρ[ωι	-	–	–	–
200 δαιμόνι᾽	+	–	–	+[61]
	–	–	–	
ατρέ̣[μας	+	+	–	+[62]
201 ὀι	+	+	–	+[63]
σέο	+	–	+	+[64]

[53] See note 46.

[54] δαιμόνιος is chosen as an example for the rule of accentuation of the nouns in -νιος: καθ. προσ. i. 117. 23.

[55] Discussion of the accentuation of the negative is also attested: see sch. Ψ 328 (test.). More specifically, in καθ. προσ. i. 417. 26, the word is mentioned as an exception to the general rule: καθόλου γὰρ ἡ διὰ τοῦ ῡ δίφθογγος καταλήγουσα ἀπέστραπται τὴν ὀξεῖαν τάσιν· ἔνθεν σημειούμεθα τὴν οὔ ἀπόφασιν ... Cf. also i. 474. 15, and, applied to adverbs, i. 494. 20. i. 504. 6 also mentions the exceptional characteristic of the word and adds an interesting comment: ... πλὴν τοῦ ἰδοῦ τὸ δεικτικόν, ἰού τὸ σχετλιαστικὸν καὶ οὔ τὸ ἀρνητικόν. τοῦτο δὲ καὶ ἐν τῇι συνεπείαι ὀξύνεται.

[56] Sch. A Φ 428a (Hrd.) is very explicit: εἴρηται ὅτι τὸ νῦν ἀεὶ παρὰ τῶι ποιητῆι περισπᾶται, κἂν παρέλκηι, χωρὶς εἰ μὴ μέτρον κωλύοι, ... Cf. sch. bT Φ 428b (ex. from Hrd.), sch. AbT A 421–422 (Hrd.); A Γ 97 (Hrd.); περὶ Ὀδυσσ. to ε 146 (ii. 142. 34–35). Also καθ. προσ. i. 492. 8, cited as an example of a rule of accentuation of monosyllabic adverbs: τὰ ἔχοντα δίχρονον ἐκτεταμένον περισπᾶται, ... νῦν χρονικόν.

[57] The word is given as example of an accentuation rule concerning polysyllabic nouns ending in -ας: τὰ εἰς γας πάντα βαρύνεται, εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ σκώμματος εἴη, ὡς ἔχει τὸ φαγᾶς, γίγας, μέγας … (καθ. προσ. ... i. 53. 18–19), but the accentuation of the word is also discussed at length in other passages, for it contradicts another rule according to which masculine and feminine nouns (i. e. ὀνόματα, which refers both to substantives and adjectives) in -ας with short α are oxytones: καθ. προσ. i. 59. 9ss.; cf. περὶ ὀνόμ. ii. 616. 15ss., where the rule is formulated somewhat differently: τὰ εἰς ας βαρύτονα ἀρσενικὰ μακρὸν ἔχει τὸ α.

[58] καθ. προσ. i. 536. 35–36: πᾶν ἄρθρον ἀπὸ φωνήεντος ἀρχόμενον δασύνεται, ὅ, οὗ, ὧι. τὸ δὲ ᾧ ψιλοῦται, οὐ γὰρ ἄρθρον, ἀλλ᾽ ἐπίρρημα κλητικόν. If Herodian meant only the article in the way we understand it, he would not have given the forms οὗ, ὧι as examples. That he regarded the relative forms as ἄρθρα is, on the other hand, shown clearly in καθ. προσ. i. 473. 29ss., quoted above.

[59] Cf. sch. A^{int} Π 87b (Hrd.) <αὖ τοι:> τὸ αὖ περισπαστέον· δύο γάρ ἐστιν, αὖ καὶ τοί. More generally, there is also a rule concerning the accentuation of the word: καθ. προσ. i. 516. 4ss.: καὶ οἱ παραπληρωματικοὶ πάντες ὀξύνονται … ὁ δὲ αὖ καὶ ὁ οὖν περιεσπάσθησαν διὰ τὸ τὴν εἰς ῡ λήγουσαν δίφθογγον ἀποστρέφεσθαι τὴν ὀξεῖαν, ὡς πολλάκις εἴπομεν.

[60] The accentuation of δῆμος, as opposed to δημός is discussed in καθ. προσ. i. 168. 17–27.

[61] See note 54.

[62] The accentuation of ἀτρέμας is specifically discussed, with reference to this line, too, in the chapter on adverbs in καθ. προσ. i. 511. 6–9: τὰ εἰς ας μὴ παραληγόμενα τῶι ε σὺν ἀμεταβόλωι ὀξύνεται. … τὸ μέντοι πέλας βαρύνεται καὶ τὸ ἀτρέμας “ἀτρέμας ἦσο”, ὅπερ καὶ χωρὶς τοῦ ς λέγεται ἀτρέμα. Cf. also περὶ παθ. ii. 226. 4–5, where the word, likewise quoted from this line, is cited as a paroxytone adverb in -ας.

[63] See note 51.

[64] Mention of σέο as a paroxytone form (i. 475. 2) — apart from the fact that it might be enclitic or not — is made in the section of καθ. προσ. about the personal pronouns, just after it is stated that the uncontracted genitive singular forms “πρὸ μιᾶς ἔχουσι τὸν τόνον”.

		non-prosody	prosody	prosody
202 οὐτέ	–	–	–	+
	–	–	–	+
ποτ᾽ εν	–	–	–	
203 ου μέν πως	+	–	–	+
205 ἐΐς	–	–	–	+[65]
	–	–	–	+[66]
ὧ ε[δωκε	–	–	–	+[67]
	–	–	–	+[68]
207 ὅ γε	+	–	–	+[69]
	+	–	–	+
209 ἠχῆι·	+	+	–	–
	+	+	–	+[70]
	–	–	+(?)	
ως ότε	+	–	–	+

In **3**, more than half of the diacritics are supported by comments of a prosodical nature found in the ancient philological tradition, and so are 36 out of 56 cases in **4**. Of course, from this evidence it does not follow that in *all* these cases there has been a conscious intention on the part of the scribe or corrector to record this kind of learned scholarship. To start with, many of these signs might have already been in the text the scribe was copying. Others might have been inserted by the scribe himself, or by a corrector[71], according to their specific interests. But in any case, whether the signs were already part of the paradosis or not, the question remains as to why the need was felt to insert those diacritics, whenever they were inserted. We have already said that some of these cases may have well originated from a purely diacritical intention (the rough breathing and the circumflex accent on ἐΐς in **4** 205), or as a kind of "warning" of the presence of some oddity of the epic language not easily understood any more (the acute accent on ecταότ in **4** 170). None of these two cases, however, is in contradiction or excludes the possibility of a "philological" background. It is only natural that the grammatical and philological reflections on the Homeric text originated from the problematic passages, from the same problems that motivated the kind of explanations found in the D-Scholia[72]. Only the approach, and the attitude, is different: from the very particular explanation of a very particular word, now rules are sought which abstract general principles from those individual phenomena. Now, it is a fact that we do not have papyri with the markers of those phenomena (whether seen as particular ones or as expressions of general principles) until the time of this scientific approach, and this fact, together with the presence of the same signs, in the same papyri, in cases where the diacritical intention is impossible to see[73], seems to indicate that those markers were associated with the grammatical

[65] In καθ. προσ. i. 546. 9, εἶς appears as one of the — numerous — exceptions to the rule that ἡ ε͞ι δίφθογγος ψιλοῦται.

[66] καθ. προσ. i. 400. 6 ss. explains why the numeral presents the circumflex accent: τὸ μέντοι εἷς περισπᾶται ὡς τριγενές. τὰ γὰρ εἰς ε͞ις λήγοντα ὀνόματα κοινολεκτούμενα ἔχοντα οὐδετέρου παρασχηματισμὸν ἀποστρέφονται τὴν ὀξεῖαν τάσιν ...

[67] See note 58, where a special remark is made about the opposition ὦι/ὧ.

[68] For the accent, see note 52.

[69] For the aspiration, see note 58.

[70] ἠχή is the first example to the rule τὰ εἰς χ͞η δισύλλαβα παραληγόμενα φωνήεντι προσηγορικὰ ὀξύνεται, ἠχή, ... (καθ. προσ. i. 346. 10–11), although nothing is said there about the circumflex in the dative.

[71] Although this does not seem to have been the case for **3** and **4**.

[72] Cf. Erbse in the introduction to his edition of the Scholia Maiora on the explanations of words belonging to the D-Scholia: *Iam Aristarchus haud paucas (explanationes) emendavit vel supplevit* (op. cit. p. xi). Van Thiel (2000, pp. 5–8) shows how an early form of the D-Scholia (consisting of their oldest element, namely the explanation of words) is to be presumed to explain pieces of information belonging to Alexandrian scholarship, and how some elements in the D-Scholia must have originated from the contact between these early elements with the philological activity: "... es erscheint sicher, dass Aristarch eine Wörterliste wie die der D-Scholien kannte und benutzte und in der Hand seiner Hörer voraussetzte". Cf. also the D-Scholion to B 190, commented on above.

[73] Cf., for instance, the accents on νόος and Ατρείδαω in **3** 192, or those on κῆρυξ in **4** 184, νῦν 193, σκήπτρ[ωι 199, as well as the enclisis accents on, for example, γάρ 192, and μέν 203.

and philological activities of ancient scholars. The possibility that diacritics might occasionally approach the value of a critical sign, as suggested for **3**, points in the same direction: in Alexandrian scholarship, grammar came as an auxiliary of the philological task of interpreting, and establishing, the text. The same people who were marking certain lines of the text as worthy of comment were also marking words of it as worthy of comment. In other words, it was all the same activity, and the signs which later came to be highly specialised and whose function became entirely fixed, might not always have been so[74].

In short, it seems difficult to maintain the theory that the appearance of diacritics in the papyri is arbitrary and only dependant on what the scribe thought ambiguous for the reader. Rather, the distribution of diacritics in the papyri reflects to a very large extent the work and discussion of the Alexandrian scholars and their successors. This fact has some bearing on our considerations regarding the transmission of the text: not only then did Alexandrian Scholarship affect the Homeric text in the number of lines per book, as has long been accepted, but it also determined the appearance of signs which directly — if there was a separate commentary on the work to which they were referring[75] — or, in any case, indirectly, incorporated the work of those scholars into the tradition of the text.

If this is so, it is also difficult to accept that these scholars produced a text different from what we find in the papyri containing the signs they used (that is, the papyri after the second century B.C., or the "vulgate" papyri[76]). It is indeed difficult to imagine how a scribe might have ignored or changed back the alterations made by Alexandrian scholars to a supposedly previously existing tradition (i. e. the so-called "vulgate"), while incorporating at the same time their critical and diacritical signs[77].

Already in 1906, when Grenfell and Hunt published **1**, they gave an answer to the question of the "vulgate", which, in my view, is still entirely valid[78]. Responding to Ludwich's thesis that the pre-Alexandrian text was basically the vulgate represented in our medieval manuscripts, they stated that from the evidence of the papyri, and without denying that the vulgate had existed prior to 150 B.C.[79], it had not risen into general acceptance until after that date. Perhaps the error is then to call the vulgate so before it became the generally accepted version, and to oppose it, as a well defined tradition, to several "eccentric" versions represented by the papyri before the Alexandrian period[80]. I entirely agree with van Thiel when he speaks of the work of the Alexandrians as not being editions as we now understand them, but commentaries

---

[74] Lack of a general agreement in the use of the antisigma has already been mentioned (for the non-specialised character of other critical signs, see K. MacNamee, *op. cit.*, esp. pp. 15–23), and the case of the grave accent is a good example of how, even in the same papyrus, it is not always possible to attribute a completely defined value to some signs. For instances of inconsistency in the use of accents in ancient manuscripts, see the already cited works of Blunt and Mazzucchi.

[75] In the way suggested by M. Haslam, *Homeric Papyri and the Transmission of the Text* in: *A New Companion to Homer*, Leiden, New York and Köln, 1997, p. 86: "... it does look as if there was towards the middle of the second century B.C. an actual copy of Aristarchus' recension of the transmitted Homeric text (possibly equipped with critical signs but not incorporating emendations), …".

[76] This text, it has already been said, is the text we find not only in **3** and **4**, but also in **2**, provided with critical signs.

[77] Cf. Haslam (art. cit., p. 84): "If we imagine an Aristarchan text available to proprietors of scriptoria, it has to be explained why they should not simply have reproduced it".

[78] Cf. R. Pfeiffer (op. cit.) p. 109 n. 7: "... these few outstanding pages are fundamental and not yet superseded".

[79] They also expressed their doubts about this fact: Ludwich's inferences being made from short quotations, and the additional lines being very unevenly distributed in the text, the chances of a true representation of the proportion of additional lines in the sources the pre-Alexandrian writers were following are reduced very considerably. Besides, it is also possible to find divergences from the vulgate in these authors; see recently Haslam, op. cit. pp. 74–79, with bibliography on this question, to which M. Sanz Morales, *El Homero de Aristóteles*, Amsterdam 1994, can be added.

[80] Haslam (op. cit. p. 63) questions the existence of the vulgate before the second century B.C., and insists on its abstract meaning: "... the 'vulgate' text may mean the collectivity not just of majority readings but of all readings in subsequent (after the stabilization of the text in the 2nd century B.C.) general circulation, as distinct from the different textual instantiations of the early Ptolemaic manuscripts".

or commented copies, where the marginal parallels or explanations *were not meant* to enter the text[81]. This is something that the corrector of **2** has very probably seen: the scribe (or the person to whom the paradosis of his copy was due) had included in the text at l. 133 the Aristarchean "reading" [Ιλιον[82], but this has been changed by the second hand into the actual reading of the text Aristarchus was working on, namely ᾽Ιλίου. Certainly, what later came to be the vulgate must have existed prior to the time of Alexandrian scholarship, and it must have been thought to be a good copy of the text, too, for among the exemplars available to the earlier generations of scholars, it was this particular one they decided to work on, which would be subsequently used by the following generations[83]. Only when the authority of these scholars and their work was widely and generally acknowledged did the text they had worked on become a vulgate text. In my opinion, before this time, we should rather think of it as a text as "eccentric" as the others. To conclude, van Thiel's sentence "The text that the Alexandrians knew is none other than ours"[84], would perfectly express my view, with just the nuance of inverting the order of its elements: "The text that we know is none other than the Alexandrians'".

---

[81] H. van Thiel (ed.), *Homeri Odyssea*, Hildesheim, Zürich, New York 1991, Introduction pp. xxvii ss.; also id. (1992), especially 1. Annotierte Homertexte pp. 1–4. These comments were nonetheless often misunderstood as variant readings: "Dass Parallelen und Kommentare als Varianten missverstanden sind, wird manchmal dadurch bewiesen, dass sie nicht in den Vers passen wollen, in den die Scholien oder deren Benutzer sie verzweifelt einzuordnen suchen ..., wenn sie es sich mit Aristonikos leicht machen und Zenodot einfach für einen Stümper halten" (ibid. p. 5). However, Aristarchus must have operated on the same basis as Zenodotus and understood rightly the nature of his predecessor's comments (ibid. pp. 6–7). In his article *Variae Lectiones oder Parallelstellen: Was notierten Zenodot und Aristarch zu Homer?* ZPE 115 (1997) 1–12, M. Schmidt contested van Thiel's views, but, as van Thiel rightly remarked in his response *Der Homertext in Alexandria*, where he clarifies his thesis and presents further evidence in support of it, "wenn Martin Schmidt jetzt im Titel schreibt 'Was notierten Zenodot und Aristarch zu Homer', hat er das Missverständnis sowohl anerkannt als überwunden; denn von 'notieren zu' war bei den 'dunklen Lesarten' der 'Ekdoseis' früher nicht die Rede" (op. cit., p. 16).

[82] From the content of the exegetic scholia at this point, Aristarchus' "reading" might well have been meant as a clarification itself, although later misunderstood as a variant reading:

A B 133a (Did.) ᾽Ιλίου {ἐκπέρσαι}: ἐν τοῖς κατ᾽ ᾽Αριστοφάνην ὑπομνήμασιν ᾽Αριστάρχου "῎Ιλιον" ἐγέγραπτο, οὐκ ᾽Ιλίου· καὶ μήποτε ἄμεινον ἔχει.

T B 133b[1] (Did. |ex.) ᾽Ιλίου {ἐκπέρσαι} ἄμεινον τὸ "῎Ιλιον" ἤπερ ᾽Ιλίου | ᾽Ιλίου πτολίεθρον ὡς "᾽Αργοῦς σκάφος".

b B 133b[2] (Did. |ex.) ᾽Ιλίου δὲ πτολίεθρον ἄμεινον ἦν εἰπεῖν τὸ "῎Ιλιον" ἤπερ ᾽Ιλίου. | ἀλλὰ συνωνυμικῶς εἶπεν ὡς "᾽Αργοῦς νηὸς σκάφος".

[83] Sharing van Thiel's above mentioned views (see also n. 81), it might be suggested that already Zenodotus was working on a copy of what later became the vulgate; for the omitted verses in the Zenodotean version as not having been excluded from the text, see van Thiel (1992) p. 5: "Auch die Notizen der Scholien über vermeintliche Versauslassungen Zenodots gehen wegen ihrer charakteristischen Formulierung sicher auf Zenodot zurück; diese Verse fehlten also eben nicht in seinem Text". However, in his most recent work M. West clearly distinguishes the texts of Aristophanes and Aristarchus from that of Zenodotus, which he identifies with that of an Ionian rhapsode "deformed by many oral variants, arbitrary abridgments, trivializations, modernizations, and so forth, yet drawing on a side-stream of tradition which, having branched off at an early date from the major (Attic) channel, uniquely preserved certain genuine elements of the archaic text" (M. West, *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad*, München, Leipzig 2001, 45). In any case, both authors agree that the ἐκδόσεις of Zenodotus, Aristophanes and Aristarchus were not editions in the modern sense; that is, based on a collation work, and, since it is clear that Aristophanes used Zenodotus' and that Aristarchus used both Aristophanes' and Zenodotus' texts, the idea of a textual continuity, at least between Aristophanes and Aristarchus, seems quite plausible to me.

[84] van Thiel (1991) p. xxiv. He continues: "... they merely appended their deliberations". In a footnote to this statement, he adds: "The pre-Alexandrian existence of our 'vulgata' is confirmed by early papyri such as Sorbonne 4 and London 10; cf. West, Papyri 286 and 64". About the latter S. West says, in the line of Grenfell and Hunt's argument: "But probably the absence of plus-verses is due to the fact that the context did not favour their insertion". In any case, this papyrus does present a plus verse, namely Δ 69a, and omits three lines: Γ 389, Δ 89 and E 527, all of which does not correspond to the vulgate. P.Sorbonne 4 "nowhere differs significantly from the Vulgate" in S. West's words; she also specifies that "as only a few words remain from M 260–5 we cannot absolutely exclude the possibility that the papyrus gave a more concise version of the passage, but it is scarcely probable". However, the existence of this papyrus alone, when confronted with the evidence from the rest of the papyri earlier than 150 B.C., would hardly authorise us to speak of a "vulgate" *tradition* before the Alexandrian times.