

ARISTARCHUS' WORK IN PROGRESS: WHAT DID ARISTONICUS AND DIDYMUS READ OF ARISTARCHUS?*

As is well known, the work of Aristarchus on Homer is not preserved by direct tradition. We have instead many fragments preserved mainly in the Homeric scholia, the Byzantine *Etymologica* and the Homeric commentaries by Eustathius of Thessalonica. These fragments go back to the so-called *Viermännerkommentar* (abbreviated VMK), the ‘commentary of the four men’, a commentary that is dated to the fifth-sixth century C.E. and collects the works of Aristonicus, Didymus, Nicanor and Herodian. In the first century B.C.E. Aristonicus explained the meaning of Aristarchus’ critical signs in a treatise called Περὶ τῶν σημείων τῶν τῆς Ἰλιάδος καὶ Ὁδυσσείας, while in the Περὶ τῆς Ἀρισταρχείου διορθώσεως Didymus studied Aristarchus’ Homeric recension. In the second century C.E. two more scholars, Herodian and Nicanor, dealt with Aristarchus while analysing questions of prosody in the Homeric language (Herodian) or the punctuation of the Homeric text (Nicanor).¹ Not all of these four ‘men’ are equally important, however, as sources for Aristarchus. In fact, Herodian and Nicanor had aims that were quite independent of Aristarchus’ enterprise: the former was concerned with problems of prosody, accentuation and aspiration in Homer, whereas the latter had developed a new system of punctuation to elucidate the Homeric text from a syntactic point of view. Although both Herodian and Nicanor did take an interest in Aristarchus, their focus was thus different from that of their Alexandrian predecessor. The goal of Aristonicus and Didymus, on the other hand, was specifically to reconstruct Aristarchus’ work on Homer; it is for this reason that they are considered the most trustworthy witnesses for Aristarchus’ fragments.²

* I would like to thank the anonymous referee for *CQ*, as well as Monica Negri, for reading this article and providing useful feedback. Casey Dué helped me with accessing the digital images of *Venetus A*.

¹ The existence of the VMK and the titles of the works it contained can be inferred from the *subscriptiones* at the end of each book (with some minor variants in the wording) in the *Venetus A* (*Marcianus Graecus Z.* 454=822), the main codex with scholia derived from the VMK: παράκειται τὰ Ἀριστονίκου σημεῖα, καὶ τὰ Διδύμου περὶ τῆς Ἀρισταρχείου διορθώσεως, τινὰ δὲ καὶ ἐκ τῆς Ἰλιακῆς προσωφίας Ἡρωδίνου καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Νικάνορος Περὶ στιγμῆς ([The work on] critical signs by Aristonicus and the work by Didymus on Aristarchus’ recension are here added; there are also some [excerpts] from the treatise on Iliadic accentuation by Herodian and from the one by Nicanor on punctuation). On the tradition of the VMK and Aristarchus’ sources, see H. Erbse, *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (Scholia Vetera)*, vol. 1 (Berlin, 1969), xlvi-lx; S. Matthaios, *Untersuchungen zur Grammatik Aristarchs: Texte und Interpretation zur Wortartenlehre (Hypommata 126)* (Göttingen, 1999), 38–43; F. Schironi, *I frammenti di Aristarco di Samotracia negli etimologici bizantini. Introduzione, edizione critica e commento (Hypommata 152)* (Göttingen, 2004), 11–25; F. Pontani, *Sguardi su Ulisse. La tradizione esegetica greca all’Odissea (Sussidi eruditivi 63)* (Rome, 2005), 96–100 and 148–50.

² In particular, Lehrs and Ludwich considered Didymus the best witness for Aristarchus. Cf. K. Lehrs, *De Aristarchi studiis Homericis* (Leipzig, 1882³), 16–28, esp. 27–8; A. Ludwich,

Even if there is a consensus on the importance of Aristonicus and Didymus as primary sources for the fragments of Aristarchus, the question is still open as to which of Aristarchus' original works they could have used to compile their treatises. Such a question becomes even more urgent because Aristonicus and Didymus often provide conflicting information about Aristarchus' readings—a discrepancy that cannot be explained solely by their different interests or focus. To clarify which works by Aristarchus these two scholars used is therefore of fundamental importance for reconstructing Aristarchus' work.

I would thus like to reconsider this question by analysing a particular set of sources: the scholia discussing the instances where Aristarchus changed his mind. In these cases, as we will see below, Didymus and Aristonicus indicate in some detail what material they had at their disposal. The goal of this paper is twofold in its contribution to Aristarchean studies. On the one hand, the analysis of the cases where Aristarchus changed his opinion will shed some light on the Hellenistic scholarship on Aristarchus himself. On the other hand, the proposed reconstruction of the evidence available to Didymus and to Aristonicus will be useful for assessing the information they give us, and will provide some guidelines on how to use their fragmentary evidence for scholars interested in working on Aristarchus.

1. ARISTARCHUS' WORKS ON HOMERIC SCHOLARSHIP

Before analysing the specific instances where Aristarchus changed his mind on certain Homeric lines, I would like to review briefly the evidence we have on Aristarchus' editions (*ekdoseis*) and commentaries (*hypomnēmata*) in the scholia to the *Iliad*.³ Aristonicus never refers to the 'edition(s)' of Aristarchus, and even if he sometimes notes that Aristarchus reconsidered and changed his opinions on a passage, he never says that they go back to different *ekdoseis* by Aristarchus. Didymus is much more informative: not only does he often mention two different readings by Aristarchus, but he even speaks of 'the editions of Aristarchus' (αἱ Ἀριστάρχου [έκδοσεις]) and of 'the second/other edition of Aristarchus' (ἡ δευτέρα/έτερα τῶν Ἀριστάρχου). From this evidence, one can conclude that Didymus saw two editions of Aristarchus, which were also most likely successive in time.⁴ Perhaps the last one was also called

Aristarchos Homerische Textkritik nach den Fragmenten des Didymos dargestellt und beurtheilt, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1884–5), 1.23, 41–3, 64–7. Recently, however, G. Nagy, *Homer the Classic* (Washington, DC, 2009), 35–7 has thrown Didymus' authority into question, claiming that Didymus might not have had access to the final stage of Aristarchus' work on Homer, as Aristarchus' 'definitive base text' and 'definitive *hypomnēmata*' were preserved not at Alexandria but at Rome; Aristonicus, who consulted them at Rome, is therefore considered in Nagy's view to be a more reliable source on Aristarchus. The most detailed analysis and assessment of Didymus' sources and method is carried out by M.L. West, *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad* (Munich and Leipzig, 2001), 46–85.

³ I will limit my analysis to the scholia to the *Iliad* because only for the *Iliad* does a manuscript close to the VMK—and so rich in Aristarchean fragments—exist: the *Venetus A*. On the other hand, the scholia to the *Odyssey* are much more heterogeneous and thus much more difficult to analyse; see Pontani (n. 1), 148–50. Moreover, it is only recently that a modern edition—one which clearly identifies the different origins of the scholia—is finally being prepared by Filippomaria Pontani; when writing this article, however, only the scholia to *Od.* 1–4 were available. The scholia to the *Iliad* are quoted according to Erbse's edition: *Scholia Graeca in Homeris Iliadem (Scholia Vetera) Recensuit Hartmut Erbse*, 7 vols. (Berlin, 1969–1988).

⁴ On Aristarchus' editions quoted by Didymus, see West (n. 2), 61–7.

a ‘revised’, ‘approved edition’, if we can trust Didymus, when in *Schol. Il.* 7.130a¹ he claims to have found a reading ἐν τοῖς ἔξητασμέναις Ἀριστάρχου.⁵ As for the commentaries, both Didymus and Aristonicus mention Aristarchus’ *hypomnēmata*—though Didymus also mentions *hypomnēmata* based on the edition of Aristophanes (*Schol. Il.* 2.133a: ἐν τοῖς κατ’ Ἀριστοφάνην ὑπομνήμασιν Ἀριστάρχου) and the ‘perfected’ commentaries (*Schol. Il.* 2.111b: ἐν τινὶ τῶν ἡκριβωμένων ὑπομνημάτων). Many scholars have used this evidence to reconstruct Aristarchus’ works on Homer and their relative order. Several different theories have been proposed,⁶ yet the most widely accepted—and the most convincing one, in my opinion—is the solution first proposed by Pfeiffer,⁷ according to whom Aristarchus’ work on Homer included two recensions/ editions and two sets of commentaries. In short, Aristarchus would have first written a set of commentaries on the basis of Aristophanes’ *ekdosis* before then preparing his own *ekdosis* (=Aristarchus’ first one). Using this new *ekdosis* Aristarchus would have proceeded to prepare a second ‘perfected’ commentary. This was not the end of the story, however. In his teaching Aristarchus would have been constantly engaged with Homer, discussing dubious passages with his pupils; he probably went back to the same passage many times, in fact, and thus might have changed his ideas about certain disputed variants. It was this process that led to a new recension, the second *ekdosis* mentioned by Didymus. This second ‘definitive’ edition could either be physically in another roll (perhaps published posthumously by Aristarchus’ pupils?) or in the same roll as the first *ekdosis*, if we imagine a series of successive notes.⁸

Aristarchus also composed monographs dealing with specific Homeric questions.⁹ Our main source is again Didymus, who mentions several of these Aristarchean treatises: *Against Comanus* (*Schol. Il.* 1.97-9; 2.798a; 24.110b¹), *Against Philitas* (*Schol. Il.* 1.524c; 2.111b), *Against the Paradox of Xenon* (*Schol. Il.* 12.435a¹) and *On the Iliad and on the Odyssey* (*Schol. Il.* 9.349-50). Aristonicus by contrast mentions only the monograph *On the Camp*, which is explicitly quoted twice (*Schol. Il.* 12.258a and 15.449-51a), even if it is probably referred to (with no explicit mention) in many other Aristonicus scholia dealing with the Achaean camp (for example, *Schol. Il.* 10.53b). While accepting this reconstruction, I would like to go a step further in this paper and try to see which of these works by Aristarchus were available to Didymus and Aristonicus. These two scholars were not working in the same conditions: Aristonicus was active in Rome while Didymus worked at Alexandria and had the

⁵ The plural ἐν τοῖς ἔξητασμέναις (ἐκδόσεσιν?) is problematic; already Lehrs (n. 2), 23 suggested to read a neuter ἐν τοῖς ἔξητασμένοις (ὑπομνήμασιν), which could be identifiable with the ἡκριβωμένα ὑπομνημάτα mentioned elsewhere (see below). Cf. also West (n. 2), 61 n. 46.

⁶ Cf. Lehrs (n. 2), 21-7, followed by Ludwich (n. 2), 1.22-7, and L. Cohn, s.v. ‘Aristarchos’ (22), RE 2.1 (Stuttgart, 1896), 862-73, at 863-5; H. Erbse, ‘Über Aristarchs Iliasausgaben’, *Hermes* 87 (1959), 275-303; H. van Thiel, ‘Zenodot, Aristarch und andere’, *ZPE* 90 (1992), 1-32; id., ‘Der Homertext in Alexandria’, *ZPE* 115 (1997), 13-36, criticized by M. Schmidt, ‘Variae lectiones oder Parallelstellen: Was notierten Zenodot und Aristarch zu Homer?’, *ZPE* 115 (1997), 1-12.

⁷ R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship. Vol. 1: From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford, 1968), 214-17. See also F. Montanari, ‘Zenodotus, Aristarchus and the *Ekdosis* of Homer’, in G.W. Most (ed.), *Editing Texts. Texte edieren (Aporematia 2)* (Göttingen, 1998), 1-21; F. Schironi, *The Best of the Grammarians. Aristarchus of Samothrace on the Iliad* (Ann Arbor, forthcoming), chapter 1.2.

⁸ So Montanari (n. 7), 18-19. See also F. Montanari, ‘Ripensamenti di Aristarco sul testo omerico e il problema della seconda *ekdosis*’, in M. Cannatà Fera and S. Grandolini (edd.), *Poesia e religione in Grecia. Studi in onore di G. Aurelio Privitera* (Naples, 2000), 479-86.

⁹ Cf. Pfeiffer (n. 7), 213.

Royal Library at his disposal. As I will demonstrate, the fact that Didymus could consult many more works by Aristarchus than by Aristonicus becomes evident for the cases in which Aristarchus changed his mind.

2. ARISTARCHUS' SECOND THOUGHTS ON *IL.* 2.130-3

While Didymus quotes Aristarchus' *hypomnēmata* quite often, Aristonicus mentions Aristarchus' *hypomnēmata* only twice (*Schol. Il.* 6.4a—analysed below—and 12.258a, where the commentaries are opposed to the monograph *On the Camp*¹⁰). Moreover, Aristonicus never specifies whether the Aristarchean *hypomnēma* he was using was the first one or the second one. An indirect indication can be found in a set of scholia debating an instance where Aristarchus changed his mind:

Schol. Il. 2.133a (Did.) Ἰλίου {έκπέρσαι}: ἐν τοῖς κατ' Ἀριστοφάνην ὑπομνήμασιν Ἀριστάρχου "Ιλιον" ἐγέγραπτο, οὐκ Ἰλίου· καὶ μήποτε ἄμεινον ἔχει. A

'To sack [the well-inhabited city] of Ilium ('Ιλίου'): in the commentaries of Aristarchus based on [the edition by] Aristophanes it was written "Ιλιον", not Ιλίου; and perhaps it is better.'

Schol. Il. 2.130-3 (Ariston.) Τρώων οἱ ναύιουσι: ἔως τοῦ Ἰλίου ἐκπέρσαι (line 133) ἀθετοῦνται στίχοι τέτταρες, ὅτι καθόλου πάντας τοὺς βαρβάρους σὺν τοῖς ἐπικούροις ἡσσονας τῶν Ἑλλήνων διὰ παντός φησι<ν> εἶναι. A

'Of the Trojans who live': up to 'to sack [the well-inhabited city] of Ilium ('Ιλίου)' (line 133) four lines are athetized because [the poet] always says that in total all the barbarians and their allies are less than the Greeks (cf. *Il.* 2.122, 8.56, 15.407).

Here the variant 'Ιλιον', mentioned by Aristonicus when discussing the athetesis of lines 130–3, corresponds to the later one according to Didymus, who says that in Aristarchus' *hypomnēmata* 'based on Aristophanes' edition'—that is, the first *hypomnēmata*—the reading was instead "Ιλιον". This evidence seems to suggest that Aristonicus worked with the second 'perfected' *hypomnēmata*.

3. ARISTARCHUS' SECOND THOUGHTS ON *IL.* 2.111

The *locus classicus* for Aristarchus' second thoughts is *Schol. Il.* 2.111, a long scholium by Didymus which has been discussed by many scholars in recent times—often with very different solutions.¹¹ I present my interpretation here.

¹⁰ *Schol. Il.* 12.258a (Ariston.) κρόσσας μὲν πύργων ἔρυνον: ὅτι 'κρόσσας' ἐν μὲν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασι κεφαλίδας, ἐν δὲ τοῖς Περὶ τὸν ναυστάθμον κλίμακας. [...]. A ('because in the commentaries [Aristarchus says that] κρόσσας [are] stepped copings, but in *On the Camp* [he says that they are] ladders').

¹¹ See, in particular, Lehrs (n. 2), 17–18, 27–8; Ludwig (n. 2), 1.66, 204–6; Erbse (n. 6), 282–4; M. van der Valk, *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad*, 2 vols. (Leiden, 1963–4), 2.223; F. Montanari, *I frammenti dei grammatici Agathokles, Hellanikos, Ptolemaios Epithetes: in appendice i grammatici Theophilos, Anaxagoras, Xenon* (SGLG 7) (Berlin and New York, 1988), 98–100; West (n. 2), 55–6, 175; Nagy (n. 2), 23–4. The scholia on *Il.* 2.111 have also been discussed for other reasons by K. Nickau, *Untersuchungen zur textkritischen Methode des Zenodotus von Ephesos* (Berlin and New York, 1977), 24, 64–6, 201 (Zenodotus had also athetized *Il.* 2.111–18) and by Matthaios (n. 1), 233–5 (on the meaning of ἐπίθετον).

Schol. Il. 2.111b (Did.) {Ζεύς με} μέγα {Κρονίδης}: σχολικὸν ἀγνόημα τὸ δοκεῖν Ζηνοδότειον εἶναι τὴν μετὰ τοῦ ζ γραφήν. καὶ δόξειεν ὃν ὑπὸ Διονυσίου τοῦ Θρακὸς ταῦτα δεδόσθαι· ἐν γὰρ τῷ Περὶ ποσοτήτων (fr. 6 Schmidt=14 Linke) καθάπτεται Ζηνοδότου ὡς ἡγνοηκότος ὅτι τῷ μέγα ἀντὶ τοῦ μεγάλως "Ομηρος ἀποχρῆται· παρ' ὁ δῆ καὶ κατά τινα τῶν ὑπομνημάτων μετειλῆφθαι τὸ μέγα ἀντὶ τοῦ μεγάλως. τὸ δὲ οὐκ ἔχει τὰκριβὲς οὗτως· εἰ γὰρ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν ὑπομνημάτων προτάτ<τ>οιμεν, ἔνεκα γοῦν τὰκριβοὺς γράφουμεν κατὰ Ἀρίσταρχον 'Ζεύς με μέγας'. ἐν γοῦν τῷ Πρὸς Φιλίταν συγγράμματι (fr. 55 Kuch.=fr. dub. 31 Dett.) τῇ γραφῇ κέχροται, δύο λέγων τὸ μέγας σημαίνειν, τοτὲ μὲν τὸ καθ' αὐτό, καθόπερ νῦν 'Ζεύς με μέγας<ζ> Κρονίδης' καὶ 'κείτο μέγας μεγαλωστί, λελασμένος ἵπποσυνάων' (*Il. 16.776*), τοτὲ δὲ αὖ τὸ πρὸς τὴν κατὰ τὸν Αἴαντα τὸν ἔτερον διάκρισιν 'Αἴας δ' ὁ μέγας' (*Il. 16.358*). [...] A

'Zeus son of Cronus [has] greatly (μέγα) [entangled] me': it is an error of the [Aristarchean] school to think that the reading with *ζ* [i.e. μέγας] is that of Zenodotus. And it would seem that this [mistake] was spread by Dionysius Thrax, for in his work *On the Quantities* (fr. 6 Schmidt=14 Linke) he rebukes Zenodotus, [arguing] that the latter does not know that Homer uses μέγα in the sense of μεγάλως. In addition to that, [it would seem that] in some of the commentaries μέγα is also interpreted in the sense of μεγάλως. But this is not accurate. And if we were to give preference to the monographs over the commentaries, for the sake of accuracy we would write Ζεύς με μέγας, following Aristarchus. In the monograph *Against Philitas* (fr. 55 Kuch.=fr. dub. 31 Dett.) he has used that reading arguing that μέγας has two meanings: sometimes [it is used] in its proper sense, as it is now, 'the great (μέγας) Zeus son of Cronus [has entangled] me' and 'he lay great (μέγας) in his greatness, having forgotten his horsemanship' (*Il. 16.776*); at other times, [it is used] to distinguish [one] from the other Ajax: 'Ajax the Great (μέγας)' (*Il. 16.358*) [...].

Didymus' accusation against the Aristarchean School attributing the reading μέγας to Zenodotus is confirmed by Aristonicus, who does in fact say that Zenodotus read μέγας (*Schol. Il. 2.111a*: ὅτι Ζηνόδοτος γράφει 'Ζεύς με μέγας Κρονίδης'). Didymus objects to this reconstruction because, if the monographs are to be preferred over the commentaries, Aristarchus chose the reading Ζεύς με μέγας, as shown in the monograph *Against Philitas*, where Aristarchus explained that Homer can use μέγας either alone, as in this case to mean 'great', or to distinguish one character from the other, as in the case of Ajax the Great (Αἴας ὁ μέγας) in *Il. 16.358*. The phrasing used by Didymus to introduce the quotation from *Against Philitas* is revealing. In fact, by saying 'if we were to give preference to the monographs over the commentaries' (εἰ γὰρ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν ὑπομνημάτων προτάτ<τ>οιμεν), Didymus implies that Aristarchus' commentaries did not agree with the choice of Ζεύς με μέγας, as was made in the monograph *Against Philitas*. We are not told which commentaries they were (the ones according to Aristophanes' edition or the 'perfected' ones?), but in the same scholium Didymus quotes Aristarchus verbatim from the 'perfected commentaries' just after mentioning the monograph in the lines reported above:

Schol. Il. 2.111b (Did.): ... κάν ταῖς Λιταῖς ἔξηγούμενος 'αὐτὰρ ἔπειτ' Αἴας τε μέγας' (*Il. 9.169*) ἐν τινὶ τῶν ἡκριβωμένων ὑπομνημάτων γράφει ταῦτα κατὰ λέξιν· 'οὐ κατ' ἐπίθετον λέγει μέγας, ἀλλὰ πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολὴν τοῦ ἔτερου Αἴαντος. ὅταν δὲ λέγῃ 'Ζεύς με μέγας Κρονίδης' (*Il. 2.111*), οὐκέτι ὅτι καὶ ἔτερος μικρός ἔστιν.' καὶ τοὺς ἀτ' αὐτοῦ δὲ χρωμένους ἔστιν εὑρεῖν τῇ γραφῇ Διονυσόδωρον καὶ Ἀμμώνιον τὸν 'Αλεξανδρέα. ἐπιλέγουσι δὲ οὐδέν· ... ταῦτα ὁ Δίδυμος. (p. 112 Schm.) A

And also in explaining 'and then great (μέγας) Ajax' (*Il. 9.169*) in the Embassy, he writes this verbatim in some of the perfected commentaries: '[Homer] does not use μέγας as an epithet [i.e. in the absolute sense], but to differentiate [him] from the other Ajax. When he says 'the great (μέγας) Zeus son of Cronus [has entangled] me' (*Il. 2.111*), however, it is not because there is also another small [Zeus]'. And it is possible to find his pupils—Dionysodorus and Ammonius of Alexandria—using this reading. But they do not say anything more. ... So Didymus.

First of all, the quotation is taken from the explanation of *Il.* 9.169 (Αἴος τε μέγας) rather than from an explanation of *Il.* 2.111.¹² We can thus imagine that, while commenting on ‘great Ajax’, where μέγας was used in a comparative sense to differentiate (πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολὴν) Ajax son of Telamon from the lesser Ajax, Aristarchus recalled the other debated line in *Il.* 2.111 with Ζεύς με μέγας Κρονίδης and noted that in that case μέγας had no comparative meaning since there was no ‘lesser’ Zeus. Didymus could quote from the ‘perfected’ *hypomnēmata*, because it showed that the reading Ζεύς με μέγας Κρονίδης was known and discussed by Aristarchus. Yet this quotation *per se* does not necessarily imply that this was Aristarchus’ choice for *Il.* 2.111; it simply states that Aristarchus quoted *Il.* 2.111 according to that reading as an example. Aristarchus’ comment that μέγας in *Il.* 2.111 was not used to differentiate this Zeus from another smaller one could in theory come from two completely different scenarios: either Aristarchus could accept the reading μέγας in *Il.* 2.111 with an alternative explanation (i.e. μέγας in *Il.* 2.111 is used absolutely); otherwise, he could simply reject this reading in *Il.* 2.111 (i.e. μέγας is not the best choice here *exactly because* it cannot be used in a comparative sense, as is typical of Homer; it is better then to read μέγα). Some scholia by Aristonicus, which analyse variants that Aristarchus probably did not accept but which he still wanted to discuss in his commentaries, demonstrate that the latter possibility is also feasible.¹³

Alternatively we can imagine that Aristarchus had changed his mind while working on his ‘perfected’ *hypomnēmata*: when he commented on *Il.* 2.211 he decided for μέγος; then, when discussing *Il.* 9.169, he recalled the debated line in Book 2 and started wondering whether Zenodotus’ reading might have been acceptable. Yet this remained a point of discussion within an entry referring to a different lemma, so that the only ‘hard evidence’ Didymus had for the reading μέγας by Aristarchus in *Il.* 2.111 remained the monograph *Against Philitas*, which he duly quotes.

Therefore, if this quotation from the ‘perfected’ commentaries does not specify Aristarchus’ reading in *Il.* 2.111, the statement of the disagreement between monographs and commentaries mentioned above makes it clear that the choice was different in the commentaries. The hypothesis that Aristarchus’ reading in the ‘perfected’ *hypomnēmata* was different and that he opted for μέγα in fact matches the scholia of Aristonicus to another passage where the expression Ζεύς με μέγα(ς) Κρονίδης occurs again:

Schol. Il. 9.16b (Ariston.) {Ζεύς με} μέγα: ὅτι ‘μέγα’ δεῖ γράφειν ἀντὶ τοῦ μεγάλως ὡς ‘σάφα’ (*Il.* 2.192 al.). ἀδόκιμος δὲ πάνυ ή μετὰ τοῦ ζ, ‘μέγας’. A

‘Zeus [son of Cronus has] greatly (μέγα) [entangled] me’: because we must write μέγα instead of μεγάλως, like σάφα (*Il.* 2.192 al.). The reading with -ζ, μέγας, is completely unconvincing.

¹² The Aristonicus scholium ad loc. (*Schol. Il.* 9.169a) does not touch on this question but discusses another problem. However, the quotation from the ‘perfected commentaries’ recalls another note by Aristarchus discussing the similar Αἴος δ’ ὁ μέγας at *Il.* 16.358: *Schol. Il.* 16.358a¹ (Ariston.) Αἴος δ’ ὁ μέγας: ή διπλῆ, ὅτι συγκριτικῶς λέγεται πρὸς τὸν ἔτερον Αἴαντα ὁ μέγας, ὁ Τελαμώνιος, ἐπεὶ ἐκείνος μείον. A (‘the *diplop* because Ajax son of Telamon is called ‘the great’ [ὁ μέγος] in comparison to the other Ajax since that one is lesser’).

¹³ E.g. *Schol. Il.* 4.456a (Ariston.) <ιαχή τε φόβος τε>; ὅτι τὴν μετὰ δέους φυγὴν φόβον εἴρηκεν (‘because he calls the flight with fear φόβος’); and *Schol. Il.* 4.456b (Did.) <ιαχή τε φόβος τε>; ‘Αρισταρχος ‘ιαχή τε πόνος τε’· οὐ γάρ γέγονέ πω φυγή (‘Aristarchus writes ιαχή τε πόνος [instead of ιαχή τε φόβος]; for the flight has not happened yet’).

Here too Didymus attributes to Aristarchus the reading with a sigma (*Schol. Il.* 9.18a¹: 'Αρίσταρχος σὺν τῷ ζ., μέγας')—probably again on the basis of the monograph *Against Philitas*.

To conclude, in *Schol. Il.* 2.111a and *Schol. Il.* 9.18b Aristonicus attributes μέγα to Aristarchus and μέγας to Zenodotus, a solution which Didymus rejects, saying that this is a mistake of the Aristarchean School; rather, according to Didymus, μέγας is the final reading of Aristarchus. To reconcile this conflicting evidence I suggest a possible reconstruction: in his first *diorthōsis* and in his 'perfected' *hypomnēmata* Aristarchus might have initially read μέγα (against Zenodotus' μέγας) to differentiate the adverbial value of Ζεύς με μέγα Κρονίδης ('greatly Zeus the son of Cronus') from the 'comparative' value of the epithet in Αἴτιος ὁ μέγας. Then Aristarchus might have changed his mind; he might have come to the conclusion that even Zenodotus' reading (μέγας) was fine, provided that one interpreted it correctly, that is, not as a 'comparative' designed to oppose a 'great(er)' Zeus to a 'lesser' Zeus, but in an absolute sense, 'the great Zeus'. The reading Ζεύς με μέγας was certainly present in the monograph *Against Philitas* but not in the 'perfected' *hypomnēmata*, at least under the specific lemmata in which the reading was at stake (*Il.* 2.111 and 9.18) and whose entries Aristonicus reported. We cannot, however, dismiss the possibility that such a solution might have been entertained by Aristarchus when discussing *Il.* 9.169—an entry quoted by Didymus to prove his point but probably overlooked by Aristonicus.

This disagreement between Aristonicus and Didymus might indeed confirm the reconstruction of the chronology of Aristarchus' works on Homer. In this case, at least, the latest reading μέγας would have been in the monograph but not in the 'perfected' *hypomnēmata*, which (as mentioned above) were not the latest stage of Aristarchus' work on Homer, since they were based on the first *ekdosis* (which thus must have had μέγα).¹⁴ In addition, Didymus' words in *Schol. Il.* 2.111b seem to suggest that the monograph *Against Philitas* (reporting this later reading) was written after the 'perfected' commentaries.¹⁵ Rather than being wrong,¹⁶ then, Aristonicus was reporting Aristarchus' view up to a certain point, because he did not have sources that reported Aristarchus' latest thoughts on the matter. Aristonicus had only the 'perfected' *hypomnēmata* and not the monograph *Against Philitas* (nor probably the Homeric text with Aristarchus' second *diorthōsis*). Therefore, he could not access Aristarchus' final opinion on certain difficult lines.¹⁷

¹⁴ It is uncertain whether or not μέγας was present in the second 'revised' *ekdosis*. The fact that Aristarchus' pupils, such as Dionysodorus and Ammonius, knew this reading (cf. *Schol. Il.* 2.111b) may suggest that the variant μέγας was present in the second edition; yet, if so, why did Didymus omit to mention this *ekdosis* in his analysis of *Il.* 2.111?

¹⁵ If so, it is difficult to accept the suggestion by A.R. Dyck, *The Fragments of Comanus of Naucratis* (SGLG 7) (Berlin and New York, 1988), 224 n. 13 that *sygrammata* such as Πρὸς Κομανόν, Πρὸς Φιλίτων and Πρὸς Ξένωνος παράδοξον were a sort of preliminary work, composed by Aristarchus at the beginning of his career. Indeed, all the evidence (see also below) seems to suggest that the Homeric monographs represent a later stage in Aristarchus' career, probably after the 'perfected' *hypomnēmata*.

¹⁶ As suggested by Lehrs (n. 2), 28; Ludwich (n. 2), 1.206 and 297; Erbse, ad *Schol. Il.* 9.18.

¹⁷ According to the reconstruction proposed here, if indeed Aristarchus considered μέγας as a reading for *Il.* 2.111 and 9.18 when discussing *Il.* 9.169, Aristonicus' fault resulted in failing to notice such a development in Aristarchus' analysis within the 'perfected' commentaries, even if it pertained to a different entry. However, Aristonicus did a good job overall in 'summarizing' Aristarchus' 'perfected' *hypomnēmata*. On the other hand, Didymus confirms both his own fame as a bibliophile and his own nickname χολκέντερος ('brazen-guts') by being able to quote all the available evidence where Aristarchus mentioned this variant.

4. ARISTARCHUS' SECOND THOUGHTS ON IL. 6.4

Even if in the case of Il. 2.111 Aristonicus does not seem aware of Aristarchus' second thoughts on the lines, sometimes he does indeed report that Aristarchus changed his mind on a specific issue. In two cases (*Schol. Il.* 12.258a, quoted in n. 10 above, and *Schol. Il.* 15.449-51a) the source for the alternative choice was the monograph *On the Camp*. From the wording of one of the scholia (*Schol. Il.* 15.449-51a: ἀθετοῦνται στίχοι τρεῖς ... ὑστερὸν δὲ ἐν τοῖς Περὶ τοῦ ναυστάθμου ἀπολογεῖται), it is clear that the monograph was composed after the 'perfected' *hypomnēmata*. Another scholium is worth analysing in full:

Schol. Il. 6.4a (Ariston.) μεσσηγὸς Σιμόεντος <ἰδὲ Ξάνθοιο ροάων>: ὅτι ἐν τοῖς ἀρχαίοις ἐγέγραπτο ‘μεσσηγὸς ποταμοῖο Σκαμάνδρου καὶ στομαλίμνης’. διὸ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασι φέρεται. καὶ ὑστερὸν δὲ περιπεσῶν ἔγραψε: ‘μεσσηγὸς Σιμόεντος ιδὲ Ξάνθοιο ροάων’ τοῖς γὰρ τῷ ναυστάθμου τόποις ἡ γράφη συμφέρει, πρὸς οὓς μάχονται. A

'Between the Simoeis and the streams of Xanthus' (μεσσηγὸς Σιμόεντος ιδὲ Ξάνθοιο ροάων): because in the old [copies?] it was written 'between the river Scamander and the lagoon' (μεσσηγὸς ποταμοῖο Σκαμάνδρου καὶ στομαλίμνης): so too this is [the reading] present in the commentaries. And then he changed his opinion and wrote 'between the Simoeis and the streams of Xanthus' (μεσσηγὸς Σιμόεντος ιδὲ Ξάνθοιο ροάων), for this reading fits the geography of the camp where they fight.

Here Aristonicus mentions an early reading present in Aristarchus' commentaries and ἐν τοῖς ἀρχαίοις [ἀντιγράφους?], which might indicate an 'old' edition by Aristarchus (the first edition?), or simply—and more likely in my view—'older copies' of Homer.¹⁸ Then Aristarchus changed his mind and wrote μεσσηγὸς Σιμόεντος ιδὲ Ξάνθοιο ροάων ('between the Simoeis and the streams of Xanthus'). The work carrying the last reading is not explicitly quoted by Aristonicus. However, the fact that Aristonicus says that Aristarchus changed his reading because having 'Simoeis and Xanthus' instead of 'Scamander and the lagoon' fit more closely with the geography of the camp suggests that the change of reading occurred when Aristarchus was working on the monograph Περὶ τοῦ ναυστάθμου, and that Aristonicus, who knew of such a monograph, got the information from there. Didymus too records this change of mind by Aristarchus:

Schol. Il. 6.4b (Did.) μεσσηγὸς Σιμόεντος <ἰδὲ Ξάνθοιο ροάων>: πρότερον ἐγέγραπτο ‘μεσσηγὸς ποταμοῖο Σκαμάνδρου καὶ στομαλίμνης’. ὑστερὸν δὲ Ἀρίσταρχος ταύτην εύρὼν ἐπέκρινεν. Χαῖρις (fr. 2 B.) δὲ γράφει ‘μεσσηγὸς ποταμοῖο Σκαμάνδρου καὶ Σιμόεντος’. b(BC E3E4)

'Between the Simoeis and the streams of Xanthus' (μεσσηγὸς Σιμόεντος ιδὲ Ξάνθοιο ροάων): first it was written 'between the river Scamander and the lagoon' (μεσσηγὸς ποταμοῖο Σκαμάνδρου καὶ στομαλίμνης); then Aristarchus found this reading [i.e. μεσσηγὸς Σιμόεντος ιδὲ Ξάνθοιο ροάων] and chose it. Chaeris writes 'between the river Scamader and Simoeis' (μεσσηγὸς ποταμοῖο Σκαμάνδρου καὶ Σιμόεντος).

Didymus simply says that Aristarchus first chose the reading μεσσηγὸς ποταμοῖο Σκαμάνδρου καὶ στομαλίμνης before then finding—and ultimately preferring—the variant μεσσηγὸς Σιμόεντος ιδὲ Ξάνθοιο ροάων.¹⁹ While he does not specify where

¹⁸ So also West (n. 2), 52.

¹⁹ This is evidence that Aristarchus consulted manuscripts in preparing his Homeric edition(s). Yet the extent to which Aristarchus used manuscript evidence to determine his Homeric text is another

Aristarchus found the new reading, Didymus' wording seems to imply that he read both variants in the *ekdoseis* of Aristarchus, and that they represented the two stages of his *diorthōsis*. As is typical of him, Didymus adds a further piece of information: Aristarchus' pupil Chaeris proposed a different variant.

This time Aristonicus knows about the fact that Aristarchus changed his mind, but the source from which he gets this information is most likely not the *ekdosis* but rather the monograph *On the Camp*. On the other hand, Didymus, who never mentions such a monograph, probably knew the later reading from the second *ekdosis* (which Aristarchus might have prepared shortly after or around the same time as *On the Camp*).

5. ARISTARCHUS' SECOND THOUGHTS ON *IL.* 10.397-9

The other two important cases where Aristarchus changed his mind are discussed in the scholia mentioning Ammonius' work on Aristarchus' *ekdosis* (*Schol. Il.* 10.397-9a.b and 19.365-8a²⁰).²⁰ Ammonius is a fundamental source for reconstructing Aristarchus' work on Homer. He is often quoted by Didymus, who explicitly says that he was the successor of Aristarchus at the school (*Schol. Il.* 10.397-9a ... Ἀμμονίῳ τῷ διαδεξαμένῳ τὴν σχολήν).²¹ In particular, Didymus—who often consulted Ammonius when in doubt about Aristarchus' decision on some lines—quotes two works by him: *On the Fact That There Were No Multiple Editions of Aristarchus' Recension* (Περὶ τοῦ μὴ γεγονέναι πλείονας ἐκδόσεις τῆς Ἀριστάρχειου διορθώσεως in *Schol. Il.* 10.397-9a) and *On the Re-edited Recension* (Περὶ τῆς ἐπεκδοθείσης διορθώσεως in *Schol. Il.* 19.365-8a¹). These references led scholars to suggest that Aristarchus worked on two different recensions of Homer, even if the latter one might have been 'edited' by the school. Without discussing the questions and the implications of these two works by Ammonius,²² I would like instead to focus on how these two scholia provide further evidence of instances where Aristarchus changed his mind. The first case concerns a set of repeated lines in Book 10. During the assembly of the Trojans in Book 10, Hector asks for a volunteer to go to the Greeks' ships and be a spy for the Trojans (*Il.* 10.309-12):

hotly debated issue. See in particular Ludwich (n. 2), 1.3-8; Erbse (n. 6), 280; Pfeiffer (n. 7), 94; R. Janko, *The Iliad: A Commentary Volume 4: Books 13-16* (Cambridge, 1992), 26; id., 'Seduta di chiusura', in F. Montanari and P. Ascheri (edd.), *Omero tremila anni dopo. Atti del congresso di Genova, 6-8 luglio 2000* (Rome, 2002), 653-66, at 659; A. Rengakos, 'Review of M.L. West, *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad* (Munich and Leipzig, 2001)', *BMCR* 2002.11.15; G. Nagy, *Homer's Text and Language* (Urbana, IL, and Chicago, 2004), 87-109, and id. (n. 2), 9-21; West (n. 2), 36-7, 46-85 (in particular 69-71), and id., 'West on Rengakos (*BMCR* 2002.11.15) and Nagy (*Gnomon* 75 [2003], 481-501)', *BMCR* 2004.04.17; Schironi (n. 7), chapter 2.2.

²⁰ These two sets of scholia have been analysed by, among others, Erbse (n. 6), 276-7, 296-8; Montanari (n. 7), 11-18; id. (n. 8), 479-83; Nagy (n. 2), 21-33. I agree with most of Montanari's solution, even if, as will become clear, my final conclusions are slightly different from his.

²¹ Cf. also *Suda α* 1641: Ἀμμόνιος: Ἀμμονίου, Ἀλεξανδρεύς, Ἀλεξάνδρου γνώριμος, ὃς καὶ διεδέξατο τὴν σχολὴν Ἀριστάρχου πρὸ τοῦ μοναρχῆσαι τὸν Αὐγούστον ('Ammonius: [son of] Ammonius, of Alexandria, acquainted with Alexander, who also took over the school of Aristarchus before the reign of Augustus'). On the meaning of Ἀλεξάνδρου γνώριμος (was Ammonius a friend of Alexander Polyhistor? Or was Alexander the predecessor of Ammonius at the head of the School of Aristarchus? Or is Ἀλεξάνδρου γνώριμος a mistake for Ἀριστάρχου γνώριμος?), see A. Blau, *De Aristarchi discipulis* (Diss., Iena, 1883), 6 with n. 2.

²² For the reconstruction of Aristarchus' editions on the basis of these titles by Ammonius, see the bibliography cited in nn. 6 and 7 above.

ἢ ἐ φυλάσσονται νῆες θοαὶ ὡς τὸ πάρος περ,
 ἢ ἥδη χείρεσσιν ὑφ' ἡμετέρησι δαιμέντες
 φύξιν βουλεύουσι μετὰ σφίσιν, οὐδὲ ἐθέλουσι
 νύκτα φυλασσέμεναι, καμάτω ἀδηκότες αἰνῶ.

whether the swift ships are guarded as before
 or whether destroyed at our hands
 they are planning an escape among themselves, and they do not want
 to be on watch during the night, oppressed by terrible toil.

As the story goes, Dolon volunteers, but he is intercepted by Odysseus and Diomedes. To Odysseus, who asks him where he is going, Dolon replies (*Il.* 10.391-5) that Hector promised him many gifts and commanded him to go and find out ‘whether the swift ships are guarded as before | or whether destroyed at our hands | they are planning (βουλεύονται) an escape among themselves (μετὰ σφίσιν), and they do not want (ἐθέλουσι) | to be on watch during the night, oppressed by terrible toil’ (*Il.* 10.396-9 = *Il.* 10.309-12). Several scholia show that the verbatim repetition of these lines had caused some problems for Aristarchus. Didymus comments on lines 397-9 as follows:

Schol. Il. 10.397-9a (Did.) ἢ ἥδη χείρεσσιν <—ἀδηκότες αἰνῶ>: καὶ γραπτέον οὕτως, καὶ ἀθετητέον τοὺς τρεῖς στίχους, εἴ τι χρὴ πιστεύειν Ἀμμώνιον τῷ διαδεξαμένῳ τὴν σχολήν, ἐν τῷ Περὶ τοῦ μὴ γεγονένας πλείονας ἐκδόσεις τῆς Ἀρισταρχείου διορθώσεως τούτο φάσκοντι ... ταῦτα ὁ Δίδυμος (p. 115 Schm.) περὶ τῶν στίχων τούτων. A

‘Or whether [destroyed] at our hands—oppressed by terrible [toil]’: it must be written in this way and the three lines must be athetized, if we must follow Ammonius, who succeeded [Aristarchus] at the school and says this in the work *On the Fact That There Were No Multiple Editions of Aristarchus’ Recension*. ... So Didymus about these lines.

Didymus thinks that Aristarchus athetized lines 397–9,²³ and in this respect he follows the authority of Ammonius, whose words are preserved by another scholium:

Schol. Il. 10.397-9b (x) <ἢ ἥδη χείρεσσιν—ἀδηκότες αἰνῶ> ... ἐν μέντοι τῇ τετραλογίᾳ Νεμεσίωνος οὕτως εύρον περὶ τῶν στίχων τούτων: ‘τῶν παρακεψένων ὀβελῶν οὐκ ἔστιν αἰτίαν εὑρεῖν διὰ τῶν Ἀρισταρχείων ὑπομνημάτων. Ἀμμώνιος δὲ ὁ Ἀριστάρχειος πρώτων μὲν στιγμᾶς φροντὶ τὸν Ἀρισταρχὸν παρασημεώσασθαι αὐτούς, είτα δὲ καὶ τελέως ἔξελειν, τάχα διὰ τὸ ἐπὶ δευτέρου προσώπου τὸ σφίσι (line 398) τετάχθαι, καὶ ἄνωθεν [sc. *Il.* 10.310-12] μετενηγέθαι.’ A

‘Or whether, [destroyed] at our hands—oppressed by terrible [toil]’: ... In the tetralogy of Nemesion I found this [note] about these lines: ‘of the *obeloi* put next [to lines 397-9] it is not possible to find any motivation in the Aristarchean commentaries. Ammonius, the pupil of Aristarchus, says that first Aristarchus marked them with *stigmai*, then he completely eliminated them, probably because *σφίσι* was used for the second person and because they were transposed here from above [lines 310-12].’

The scholium is not attributed to a specific scholar by Erbse; whether the tetralogy of Nemesion is the VMK or another commentary that was used by the compiler of the VMK,²⁴ the direct quotation which mentions Ammonius again could go back to

²³ If so, Aristarchus kept the first repeated line (line 396) because it was necessary after *Il.* 10.395: ἀνδρῶν δυσμενέων σχεδὸν ἐλθέμεν, ἔκ τε πυθέσθαι | ἡὲ φυλάσσονται νῆες θοαὶ ὡς τὸ πάρος περ ([Hector commanded me] to go close to the enemies and find out | whether the swift ships are guarded as before').

²⁴ On Nemesion's tetralogy, see Lehrs (n. 2), 31 n. 15; Erbse, ad *Schol. Il.* 10.397-9b (with bibliography); van der Valk (n. 11), 1.107-9; Nickau (n. 11), 260-3 (both van der Valk and Nickau also discuss this scholium and Aristarchus' solutions).

Didymus.²⁵ Didymus (if it is him) found *obeloi* (preserved also in the *Venetus A*) in the *ekdosis* but no motivation for them in the *hypomnēmata*. However, he consulted Ammonius, who said that first Aristarchus marked the lines with *stigmāi*, and then he completely removed them from his text because there was a grammatical mistake. The *stigmē* is not a common Aristarchean sign; from the very few instances of it the *stigmē* seems to have been used alone to highlight ‘problematic’ lines, which seemed questionable to Aristarchus but which he did not feel comfortable rejecting completely without further reasons.²⁶ However, at a certain point Aristarchus decided to eliminate (ἐξελεῖν) / to athetize (ἀθετεῖν)²⁷ *Il.* 10.397-9, because they were repeated from *Il.* 10.310-12 and there was a grammatical mistake: the pronoun σφίσι at *Il.* 10.398 was used for the second person.

The athetesis, owing to the mistake of σφίσι in the words of Dolon to Odysseus, is tenable only if at line 398 one reads φύξιν βουλεύοιτε μετὰ σφίσιν οὐδ' ἐθέλοιτε, that is, ‘[if] you are planning an escape among themselves (σφίσι), and you do not want | to ...’. In this case, there is indeed a problem of agreement, since there is a reflexive pronoun of the third person (σφίσι) in agreement with a verb of the second person. This was probably the text of the ‘revised’ recension to which Ammonius is referring. Such a reading was certainly in circulation, according to Didymus:

Schol. Il. 10.398 (Did.) <φύξιν βουλεύοιτε μετὰ σφίσιν οὐδ' ἐθέλοιτε:> ἐν ἄλλῳ ‘φύξιν βουλεύονται μετὰ σφίσιν οὐδ' ἐθέλονται’.

[Whether] you are planning (βουλεύονται) an escape among themselves (μετὰ σφίσιν), and they do not want (ἐθέλοιτε): in another copy: [whether] they are planning (βουλεύονται) an escape among themselves (μετὰ σφίσιν), and they do not want (ἐθέλονται).

Didymus’ reference text (the lemma of the scholium as well as the modern vulgate) at line 398 had the verbs in the second person plural, but he says that in another copy there was a reading with verbs in the third person plural. With the latter reading there is no grammatical inconsistency because now both the verbs and the pronoun are in the third person plural. It comes as a bit of a surprise to learn that this one was Aristarchus’ emendation, according to Aristonicus:

Schol. Il. 10.397-9b ... ὅτι οὕτως γραπτέον, ‘βουλεύονται’ καὶ <ἐ>θέλονται’ (line 398). τὸ γάρ ‘σφίσιν’ (line 398) ἐν τῷ περὶ τινῶν ἔστι λόγῳ ἀντὶ τοῦ αὐτοῖς, φὸ ὁκόλουθα δεῖ εἶναι τὰ ρήματα. ταῦτα ὁ Ἀριστονίκος (p. 180 Friedl.) περὶ τῆς γραφῆς ταύτης φησί, διπλῆν <προσ>βάλλων τῷ στίχῳ. A

²⁵ This hypothesis seems to be suggested also by Montanari (n. 7), 16.

²⁶ The *stigmē* is the second sign of the couple *antisigma + stigmē*; in that combination the *stigmē* can be conceived as having the function of ‘highlighting’ the problematic part in a passage because it signals lines which are transposed (as in *Il.* 10.397-9 ‘transposed from’ *Il.* 10.310-12) or tautological.

²⁷ ‘To eliminate (ἐξελεῖν) a line’ technically is different from ‘athetizing (ἀθετεῖν) it’, as the first operation involves either the complete omission of the line from the text or its physical cancellation (with a horizontal stroke?) in the manuscript. Athetizing, on the other hand, means to mark the line with an *obelos* without deleting it from the manuscript, and thus represents a lighter intervention by the scholar on the text. See Schironi (n. 7), chapter 4.1, § 1.6. The only way to reconcile these two pieces of evidence is to assume that by τελέος ἐξελεῖν Ammonius meant ‘to athetize’, as often happens; see Montanari (n. 7), 16–17; in this way, Ammonius would be referring to the *obeloi* in the ‘revised’ *ekdosis* for which the scholar speaking in *Schol. Il.* 10.397-9b (Didymus?) does not find any reason in the *hypomnēmata*.

Because it must be written in this way, βουλεύοντι (line 398) and ἐθέλοντι (line 398), for σφίσιν is used instead of αὐτοῖς in a speech about some people and verbs must be in agreement with it. Thus Aristonicus says about this reading, placing a *diploē* next to the line.

How can we explain this apparent contradiction between Didymus, Ammonius and Aristonicus about Aristarchus' reading?²⁸ Considering our sources, I propose the following sequence of 'events'. First Aristarchus had in front of him a text with the reading βουλεύοιτε, ἐθέλοιτε and μετὰ σφίσιν.²⁹ Since such a text was grammatically wrong, in the 'perfected' commentary (and probably also in his first *ekdosis*) Aristarchus proposed a solution by altering the text. He might have found the readings βουλεύοντι and ἐθέλοντι in one of the manuscripts of the library, or he could have changed the text himself.³⁰ According to the new reading (φύξιν βουλεύοντι μετὰ σφίσιν, οὐδ' ἐθέλοντι), line 398 had a sound syntax. The new text also made sense because at this point Dolon is verbatim reporting the orders of Hector, who used the third person to refer to 'their enemies' (in *Il.* 10.311).³¹ Aristonicus might have found a *diploē* at this line because with it Aristarchus signalled his emendation discussed in the 'perfected' *hypomnēma*. This was not, however, his final decision: Aristarchus was not convinced by it—perhaps because of the alteration of the text. In his second *diorthōsis* he might have first marked the lines with *stigmai* because he was uncertain about what to do; then he eventually decided to go back to the 'original' text with βουλεύοιτε and ἐθέλοιτε in incorrect agreement with μετὰ σφίσιν and athetize all three lines. This is the stage of the *diorthōsis* that Ammonius reports. However, since Aristarchus did not have a chance to write his reasons anywhere, the *obeloi* in the second *ekdosis* were left unexplained, as noted in *Schol. Il.* 10.397–9b.

Didymus was aware of both variants: a 'corrected' text with βουλεύοντι and ἐθέλοντι, which he might have found either in some manuscripts or even in Aristarchus' first *ekdosis* and/or in the 'perfected' commentaries (cf. *Schol. Il.* 10.398), as well as a problematic text with βουλεύοιτε and ἐθέλοιτε marked (in the second edition) first by *stigmai* and then *obeloi* at lines 397–9 (cf. *Schol. Il.* 10.397–9a.b). Ammonius confirmed that the lines were rejected because there was a grammatical problem. If Didymus is the person behind the anonymous note in *Schol. Il.* 10.397–9b, he was also puzzled because he did not find any explanations for the *obeloi* in the *hypomnēmata*. The same 'perfected' *hypomnēmata* were the source of the

²⁸ Montanari (n. 7), 17–18, on the other hand, thinks that the scholium of Aristonicus can be reconciled with the notes of Didymus and Ammonius as describing the same state of the text; to do so, however, we must suppose that a great part of Aristonicus' note (discussing the athetesis and a possible solution by emending the verbs in the text) was lost.

²⁹ That this was the original version seems to be confirmed by the fact that those lines had been athetized previously by Aristophanes (see Didymus in *Schol. Il.* 10.397–9a), and the only reason for this must have been grammatical, since repetition alone is not *per se* enough of a reason for an athetesis in the practice of the Alexandrian grammarians. Indeed, βουλεύοιτε, ἐθέλοιτε and μετὰ σφίσιν are still the readings of the vulgate.

³⁰ Didymus' note in *Schol. Il.* 10.398 (ἐν ὅλῳ 'φύξιν βουλεύοντι μετὰ σφίσιν οὐδ' ἐθέλοντι') seems to suggest that the reading was indeed present 'in another manuscript' (ἐν ὅλῳ). Perhaps Didymus saw the reading in a text going back to Aristarchus but did not think it was Aristarchus' choice in the first *diorthōsis*. Alternatively, we could speculate that ἐν ὅλῳ is the result of bad epitomizing for 'in the other edition of Aristarchus' (ἐν τῇ ἔτερᾳ τῶν Ἀριστάρχου).

³¹ Aristarchus certainly accepted the use of the third person instead of the second or the first in 'reported orders', as is shown by *Schol. Il.* 16.496a (Ariston.); see R. Nünlist, *The Ancient Critic at Work. Terms and Concepts of Literary Criticism in Greek Scholia* (Cambridge, 2009), 324–5.

comments by Aristonicus, who indeed is not aware of any athetesis but knows a reading that solves the grammatical problem. This inconsistency between Aristonicus and Didymus can only be explained by assuming that Aristonicus did not have the latest edition of Aristarchus, nor the works by Ammonius (which instead Didymus had)—all of which reported the athetesis embraced by Aristarchus at a later stage, that is, after the emended text with βουλεύουσι and ἔθέλουσι (as known by Aristonicus) did not satisfy him any longer.

6. ARISTARCHUS' SECOND THOUGHTS ON *Il.* 19.365-8

The most difficult case to deal with is when Aristarchus changes his mind on *Il.* 19.365-8. In those lines taken from his arming scene Achilles is described as grinding his teeth—an image considered unworthy of a ‘serious’ hero like him. If we follow Erbse’s attributions, Didymus notes:

Schol. Il. 19.365-8a¹ (Did.) τοῦ καὶ ὁδόντων μὲν <καναχῇ πέλε—τεύχων>: ἀθετοῦνται στίχοι τέσσαρες· γελοῖον γὰρ τὸ βρυχᾶσθαι τὸν Ἀχιλλέα· ἢ τε συνέπεια οὐδὲν ζητεῖ διαγραφέντων αὐτῶν. ὁ δὲ Σιδώνιος ἡθετηκέναι μὲν τὸ πρώτον φησιν αὐτοὺς τὸν Ἀριστορχον, ὕστερον δὲ περιελεῖν τοὺς ὄβελούς, ποιητικὸν νομίσαντα τὸ τοιοῦτο. ὁ μέντοι Ἄμμανιος ἐν τῷ Περὶ τῆς ἐπεκδοθείσης διορθώσεως οὐδὲν τοιοῦτο λέγει. A

‘There was a clang of his teeth—[the gifts of the gods which Hephaestus toiled] to make’: four lines are athetized; for it is ridiculous to have Achilles grinding his teeth. And the syntactic connection does not require anything else if these lines are cancelled. [Dionysius] from Sidon says that first Aristarchus athetized them, then he cancelled the *obeloi* thinking that this was poetical. But in the *On the Re-edited Recension* Ammonius does not say anything like that.

Didymus reports that Dionysius from Sidon, a pupil of Aristarchus, thought that Aristarchus first athetized these three lines before then changing his opinion because he attributed them to poetic licence. According to Ammonius, on the other hand, Aristarchus never altered his original judgement. Therefore, Didymus (who again follows Ammonius in this case) is in favour of the athetesis. Indeed, another scholium in T, attributed to Didymus, seems to suggest that Didymus noticed that in this regard the second edition was in agreement with the first (*Schol. Il.* 19.365-8a²): αὕτη τῇ προτέρᾳ ἐκδόσει συμφωνεῖ.³² If so, it means that the *obeloi* were present in both ‘stages’ of Aristarchus’ *diorthōsis*.

It is very difficult to decide what to do with this evidence. As Montanari outlined,³³ Dionysius could be wrong or could have invented Aristarchus’ second thoughts about these lines; it is also possible, however, that Ammonius might have willingly ignored that Aristarchus eventually changed his mind; or, if we trust the honesty of both of them, we might conclude that this issue was controversial: Aristarchus might have discussed the possibility of not athetizing the lines with his pupils, among whom were Dionysius and perhaps also Ammonius, but in the ‘final’ *ekdosis* he never actually got rid of the *obeloi*. The *Venetus A* also preserves a note attributed to Aristonicus on the same passage:

³² Cf. Erbse, ad *Schol. Il.* 19.365-8a²; for a completely different (and unconvincing) interpretation of this scholium, see van der Valk (n. 11), 1.424-5.

³³ Montanari (n. 7), 12.

Schol. Il. 19.365-8a¹ (Ariston.) διπλῆν δὲ προσθετέον τῷ ‘δῦν’ ἄχος ἀτλητον, οὐ δ’ ἄρα Τρωσὶ μενεαίνων’ (line 367) ὅτι τὸ ‘μενεαίνων’ νῦν θυμούμενος σημαίνει. A

We must add the *diplopē* to ‘unbearable pain entered [his heart]; thus eager (μενεαίνων) [to kill] Trojans, he ...’ (line 367), because μενεαίνων now means ‘desiring’.

Aristonicus is simply noting that there is a *diplopē* at line 367 because of the specific meaning of μενεαίνων, which in this passage means ‘desiring’ (and does not mean ‘being angry’); he does not seem to know of any athetesis. If we accept Erbse’s attributions, Didymus speaks of an athetesis, and Aristonicus ignores it. Certainly it could be a mistake in the tradition: the specific note by Aristonicus might simply have been lost. If this is not the case, however, then we need to conclude that Aristonicus got the latest version of Aristarchus’ *diorthōsis* (according to Dionysius), while Didymus and Ammonius got it wrong. This is quite problematic to reconcile with the rest of the evidence because in all the other cases it is Didymus—and never Aristonicus—who has access to Aristarchus’ final decision as reported in the second *ekdosis*.

There is a way to solve this discrepancy, though, if we change Erbse’s attribution of the first scholium analysed.³⁴ The first part of the scholium indeed sounds much more like it was derived from Aristonicus than from Didymus—not so much because it mentions an athetesis,³⁵ but because it ‘explains’ the reason for the athetesis using a criterion that is typical of the scholia by Aristonicus: the ‘ridiculous’ (*γελοῖον*).³⁶ I thus suggest that we divide *Schol. Il. 19.365-8a¹* in a different way:

Aristonicus	Didymus
<p>ἀθετοῦνται στίχοι τέσσαρες· γελοῖον γὰρ τὸ βρυχάσθαι τὸν Ἀχιλλέα· ἢ τε συνέπεια οὐδὲν ζητεῖ διαγραφέντων αὐτῶν.</p> <p>Four lines are athetized: for it is ridiculous to have Achilles grinding his teeth. And the syntactic connection does not require anything else if these lines are cancelled.</p>	

³⁴ The attribution of scholiastic notes, presumably derived from the VMK, to any one of the four scholars is mostly based on the content of those notes: thus scholia discussing a reading are attributed to Didymus, those treating the reasons for critical signs or for an athetesis to Aristonicus; notes focussed on prosody and accentuation of specific words most probably derive from Herodian; and those concerned with punctuation from Nicanor. Even though in the majority of the cases the content provides reliable attributions, sometimes (such as in this case) the origin of a comment in a scholium is not so easy to identify. In the present case I suggest that the content of these notes indicates a different attribution, which in addition solves the problems concerning the contradiction about Didymus’ and Aristonicus’ relative knowledge of Aristarchus’ opinions on *Il. 19.365-8*.

³⁵ Even if Aristonicus is our main source for Aristarchus’ atheteseis, Didymus also mentions them occasionally; see Didymus in *Schol. Il. 5.906b¹; 7.443-64b^{1,2}; 8.235b^{1,2}; 9.694a²; 11.179-80b; 11.356b²; 13.658-9b; 17.404-25; 21.130-5a¹; 24.30a*.

³⁶ On this criterion, see F. Schironi, ‘Theory into practice: Aristotelian principles in Aristarchean philology’, *CPh* 104 (2009), 279–316, at 297–300.

ο δὲ Σιδώνιος ἡθετηκέναι μὲν τὸ πρῶτὸν φησιν αὐτοὺς τὸν Ἀρίσταρχον, ὕστερον δὲ περιελεῖν τοὺς ὄβελους, ποιητικὸν νομίσαντα τὸ τοιοῦτο. ὁ μέντοι Ἀμμώνιος ἐν τῷ Περὶ τῆς ἐπεκδοθείσης διορθώσεως οὐδὲν τοιοῦτο λέγει.

[Dionysius] from Sidon says that first Aristarchus athetized them, then he cancelled the *obeloi* thinking that this was poetical. But in the *On the Re-edited Recension* Ammonius does not say anything like that.

διπλῆν δὲ προσθετέον τῷ ‘δῦν’ ἄχος
ἄτλητον, ὁ δὲ ὅρα Τρωσὶ μενεάίνων'
(line 367) ὅτι τὸ ‘μενεάίνων’ νῦν
θυμούμενος σημαίνει.

We must add the *diplopis* to ‘unbearable pain entered [his heart]; thus eager (μενεάίνων)
[to kill] Trojans, he ...’ (line 367), because
μενεάίνων now means ‘desiring’.

If we accept this reattribution, we would have a ‘composite’ scholium in which a comment by Didymus has been inserted within a note by Aristonicus;³⁷ more than that, many of the difficulties of this scholium become much easier to explain with such a solution. Looking at the ‘perfected’ *hypomnēmata* Aristonicus noted that *Il.* 19.365-8 were athetized because they were deemed ‘ridiculous’; the athetesis was not a problem because the syntax linking line 364 to line 369 was still respected even without those four lines. Both the criterion of the γελοῖον and the concept of συνέπεια—namely, the syntactic connection of a passage which should remain sound after an athetesis—are typical of Aristonicus.³⁸ Aristonicus also noted that there was the *diplopis* at line 367 because of a semantic peculiarity.³⁹

³⁷ This would not be a unique case, as there are other scholia apportioned in this way by Erbse himself: e.g. *Schol. Il.* 5.700a (Did. | Ariston. | Did.); *Schol. Il.* 6.510-11a¹ (Ariston. | ex. | Ariston.); *Schol. Il.* 10.306b (Did. | ex. | Did.); *Schol. Il.* 13.191d (ex. | Did. | Hrd. | Did. | Hrd.).

³⁸ In particular, the term συνέπεια is always used by Aristonicus in the scholia to the *Iliad* (*Schol. Il.* 3.395, 3.423a, 9.26-31, 16.89) with only two exceptions: it is used once by Herodian (*Schol. Il.* 11.51b) and once in a scholium partly attributed to Didymus (*Schol. Il.* 7.256-7), in which, however, Aristonicus is also quoted: (Did. | Ap. H.) τοὺς στίχους τούτους οὐ προσίενται ἔνιοι, ὥσπερ οὐδὲ Ζηνόδοτος, ἀλλὰ τὸ τῆς συνέπειας οὗτος ἔχει παρ’ αὐτῷ, | ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ Ἀριστόνικος (p. 132 Friedl.) ἐκτίθησιν, ἵνα περιττὸν ἐνοιτίσπεν γράψαι (‘some do not accept these lines, as Zenodotus does not either, but in his text the syntactic connection reads in this way, | as Aristonicus also explains, which we considered superfluous to write down’). It is obviously very difficult to decide what to attribute to Didymus and what instead is the scholiast’s rephrasing of Aristonicus’ original note (Didymus’ words could actually end at ὥσπερ οὐδὲ Ζηνόδοτος and the section on the συνέπεια could be part of Aristonicus’ note excerpted by the scholiast). This is another case of a ‘composite’ VMK scholium with a difficult attribution, like *Schol. Il.* 19.365-8a¹.

³⁹ Indeed, an athetesis certainly did not prevent Aristarchus from commenting upon interesting features of a ‘rejected’ line, as we can see elsewhere (e.g. Aristonicus in *Schol. Il.* 11.767a¹).

Didymus instead was puzzled because, although he had both *ekdoseis* by Aristarchus and both agreed on the athetesis of those lines, he also found that Dionysius from Sidon claimed that Aristarchus had changed his mind and eventually kept those lines. At the same time, however, Didymus did check his authority, Ammonius, who did not confirm Dionysius' information but agreed upon the idea that Aristarchus never changed his mind and rejected those ridiculous lines. This is of course a hypothetical reconstruction but it has two advantages:

1. In attributing the first part of *Schol. Il. 19.365-8a*¹ to Aristonicus, it is consistent with the usual style of Aristonicus (as opposed to Didymus) because both of the terms γελοῖον and συνέπεια are typical of the Aristonicus scholia when discussing an athetesis.
2. This reconstruction fits within the picture outlined on the basis of other scholia with regard to both of the following aspects: a) the relative chronology of Aristarchus' Homeric works and b) the specific works by Aristarchus that Aristonicus and Didymus used as sources.

7. CONCLUSIONS

The proposed solutions for the above cases where Aristarchus changed his mind reconcile some of the conflicting and difficult evidence from the scholia with the most widely accepted reconstruction of Aristarchus' works on Homer. Therefore, this analysis helps to confirm that the relative chronology of Aristarchus' works as suggested by other scholars is most likely correct. Most of my arguments consist only of a different interpretation of the scholia, but in one case (for *Schol. Il. 19.365-8a*¹) I have suggested different attributions within the VMK scholium than the ones proposed by Erbse. When discussing Aristarchus' fragments, everything depends on how we classify each scholium: whether it is exegetical (and so, in principle, non-Aristarchean) or derived from the VMK—and for a VMK scholium, which of the four scholars is the author of the specific note. Even if most of Erbse's attributions are correct, caution is necessary when dealing with more problematic cases, especially with what I called 'composite scholia'. The case of *Schol. Il. 19.365-8a*¹ is an excellent example of how these notes can be difficult to assess, whether my new attribution is accepted or not.

Even if these are problematic scholia, the solutions I have suggested point to an overall picture which is self-consistent and, above all, in agreement with the most commonly accepted reconstruction of Aristarchus' Homeric production: a first commentary on the basis of Aristophanes' *ekdosis*, Aristarchus' own first *ekdosis*, a second 'perfected' commentary on the basis of his first *ekdosis*, and finally the second and final *ekdosis* (without any commentary).⁴⁰

If my reconstruction is correct, it is also possible to conclude that at Alexandria Didymus had at his disposal both sets of commentaries and both sets of editions, as well as Aristarchus' monographs. Yet he sometimes had problems ascertaining the final reading of Aristarchus. It is impossible now to determine the reasons for

⁴⁰ It is impossible, on the other hand, to suggest a relative chronology for Aristarchus' monographs, except for one, *On the Camp*, which was written certainly later than the second 'perfected' *hypomnēmata*. However, I am tempted to suggest that all the monographs were composed later, after the second commentary, as if they were a sort of 'summary' of Aristarchus' past exegetical activity now focussed on specific topics (but see above, n. 15).

Didymus' uncertainties about Aristarchus' readings. We might speculate that the rolls containing Aristarchus' *ekdoseis* which he consulted had lacunae and were not well preserved—if originals, they would have been quite old manuscripts.⁴¹ On the other hand, if it is true that the second edition was published by his pupils⁴² and not by Aristarchus himself, then Didymus might have found contradictory evidence or might not have fully trusted it. Indeed, Aristarchus' pupils themselves were sometimes not certain about the final decision of their master, as is suggested by the case of *Il.* 19.365–8 with the different opinions of Ammonius and Dionysius from Sidon.

At Rome, however, Aristonicus had only a copy of the second ‘perfected’ set of commentaries and the monograph *On the Camp* (which could be useful for supplying some of Aristarchus’ later ideas on the topography of the camp and on the Trojan plain) but probably no editions. The unavailability of part of Aristarchus’ work did not bother Aristonicus because for what he had planned to do—explaining the meaning of Aristarchus’ critical signs—the (‘perfected’) *hypomnēmata* were enough. He did not need the first *ekdosis*, since the σημεῖα were also present before the lemmata in the *hypomnēmata* and all the explanations for the σημεῖα were included in the latter.⁴³ Even more importantly, Aristonicus had no need at all either for Aristarchus’ second and final *ekdosis* or for Ammonius’ work on the number of Aristarchus’ editions, since he was not interested in the editorial choices of Aristarchus but rather in his exegesis and explanations.

As West has pointed out, it is significant to note that, aside from Aristonicus, two other Alexandrian grammarians who worked in Rome between the first century B.C.E. and the first century C.E. also discussed Aristarchus’ critical signs: Philoxenus wrote a Περὶ σημείων τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰλιάδι (*Suda* φ 394) and Seleucus a Κατὰ τῶν Ἀριστάρχου σημείων (*P.Oxy.* 2.221, xv 16–17).⁴⁴ Such a focussed interest seems to suggest that the ‘perfected’ *hypomnēma* by Aristarchus—or a copy of it—was present at Rome in that period.⁴⁵ Aristarchus’ commentaries with critical signs followed by his explanations and exegetical notes had probably aroused the interest of these grammarians, who decided to write treatises either to disseminate Aristarchus’ ideas (Aristonicus and Philoxenus) or to argue against them (Seleucus).

⁴¹ In principle, both Aristonicus and Didymus could have consulted the autograph works of Aristarchus, since bookrolls could last over two hundred years; see G.W. Houston, ‘Papyrological evidence for book collections and libraries in the Roman Empire’, in W.A. Johnson and H.N. Parker (edd.), *Ancient Literacies: The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome* (Oxford and New York, 2009), 233–67, at 248–51.

⁴² This seems to be suggested by Ammonius’ works *On the Fact That There Were No Multiple Editions of Aristarchus’ Recension* and *On the Re-edited Recension*. Cf. Erbse (n. 6), 277; Pfeiffer (n. 7), 216–17.

⁴³ For a discussion on the relationship of critical signs, *ekdosis* and *hypomnēma*, see F. Schironi, ‘The ambiguity of signs: critical σημεῖοι from Zenodotus to Origen’, in M.R. Niehoff (ed.), *Homer and the Bible in the Eyes of Ancient Interpreters (Jerusalem Studies in Religion and Culture 16)* (Leiden and Boston, 2012), 87–112, at 88–100.

⁴⁴ See West (n. 2), 47–8 and, in particular, 48 n. 8. Cf. also Nagy (n. 2), 35 (though he thinks that at Rome there was also ‘the definitive base text of Aristarchus, marked with the master’s marginal signs’, namely, Aristarchus’ final *ekdosis*).

⁴⁵ Other works by Aristarchus reached Rome at a later point. According to Galen (*PA* 13), the Palatine Library had ‘the Aristarchea, which include the two Homers’ (Ἀριστάρχειον οὕτωνές εἰσιν ‘Ομηροι δύο); the latter could be either the commentaries on the *Iliad* and on the *Odyssey*, or the two *ekdoseis* of Homer. M.C. Nicholls, ‘Galen and libraries in the *Peri Alupias*’, *JRS* 101 (2011), 123–42, at 130–1 suggests that Aristarchus’ books might have come to Rome either after Octavian took Alexandria in 30 B.C.E. or (more likely in my view) around 80 C.E., when Domitian sent copyists to Alexandria to copy books in order to refurbish Roman libraries (Suet. *Dom.* 20.1).

This reconstruction begs one more question: were Didymus and Aristonicus aware of each other's work? We can confidently conclude that Aristonicus was not aware of Didymus' writings, as he never refers to him, nor do any of his notes suggest any acquaintance with his younger colleague's analysis. This is also proven by the case of *Il.* 2.111, analysed above, where Didymus seems to know more about the latest stage of Aristarchus' *diorthōsis* and corrects what he calls a mistake of the School of Aristarchus. The question of Didymus' knowledge of Aristonicus' work is more difficult to settle. Yet West's suggestion that Didymus used Aristonicus' work⁴⁶ does not seem to me so self-evident. West's conclusions are mainly based on three sets of scholia (*Schol. Il.* 7.256-7; 8.535-7; 15.86a and 15.86c), which report that Didymus and Aristonicus said exactly the same things on Aristarchus' choices: twice (*Schol. Il.* 8.535-7, 15.86a and 15.86c)⁴⁷ the excerptor reports Aristonicus' note, and once (*Schol. Il.* 7.256-7)⁴⁸ Didymus'. Even if Aristonicus was active some time earlier than Didymus, these scholia do not necessarily prove that Didymus read Aristonicus' work. This is not because it would be impossible for Aristonicus' work on Aristarchus' signs to have been available at Alexandria shortly after its 'publication'—rapid book circulation in the first century B.C.E. was certainly possible. It is rather that we can more economically explain the fact that both Didymus and Aristonicus said the same things on Aristarchus' decision regarding three passages in the *Iliad* by assuming that both of them looked at the same source—namely, Aristarchus' 'perfected' *hypomnēma*—and recopied it in an almost identical way. The same explanation may be valid for the scholia in which Didymus and Aristonicus report similar information about Aristarchus' choices.

Moreover, Didymus never quotes Aristonicus. This strongly suggests that he did not use his work, since Didymus is always very keen on quoting his scholarly authorities.⁴⁹ Didymus might have known about Aristonicus' treatise on the Aristarchean σημεῖο, just as he knew about the work of Ammonius as well as about the opinions of Aristarchus' pupils like Dionysius of Sidon, Dionysius Thrax or Chaeris. Yet, whereas he uses Ammonius and quotes other pupils of Aristarchus, he never mentions Aristonicus. The reasons for this silence cannot but be speculative. He might have willingly ignored Aristonicus' work because he did not consider it authoritative—based as it was on an earlier Homeric recension by Aristarchus and not the definitive one; in this case, Didymus might have claimed that his own reconstruction of Aristarchus' work was better because he had taken into account Aristarchus' final decisions. Even so, it does seem odd that, if Didymus had such a polemical intent, he never quoted Aristonicus to show that he was wrong. Another possibility is that, even if Didymus knew about Aristonicus' work, he did not use it since it was not useful to him, not only because it did not include the latest stage of Aristarchus' recension, but also because Aristonicus' focus was Aristarchus' exegesis rather than his readings. A third possibility is that Didymus might have known about Aristonicus' work but did not have it available for use. The

⁴⁶ West (n. 2), 49–50.

⁴⁷ *Schol. Il.* 8.535-7: ... τὰ αὐτὰ δὲ λέγει περὶ τῶν στίχων τούτων ὁ Διδύμος (p. 115 Schm.), ἀκαὶ ὁ Ἀριστόνικος: διὸ οὐκ ἐγράψαμεν τὰ Διδύμου ('about these lines Didymus says the same things as Aristonicus; therefore, we did not write down Didymus' words'); and *Schol. Il.* 15.86c: ταῦτα ὁ Διδύμος (p. 116 Schm.) τῷ Ἀριστονίκῳ λέγει περὶ τῆς γραφῆς τῆς δέποστι ('regarding the orthography of δέποστι Didymus says the same things as Aristonicus').

⁴⁸ On this scholium, see above, n. 38.

⁴⁹ See West (n. 2), 46–85.

evidence we have does not allow us to determine which of these three scenarios is the correct one.

The scholia thus provide instances of disagreement between Didymus and Aristonicus. The cases in which Aristarchus changed his mind and which I analysed above suggest that Didymus and Aristonicus used different evidence and therefore represent different sources for Aristarchus. Within such a scenario the question arises of how the different sets of data provided by Didymus and by Aristonicus can be used by modern scholars interested in Aristarchus' work on Homer. The choice depends on what one is looking for when reading the Homeric scholia. If the interest lies in Aristarchus' readings and in the final text of Homer that he 'produced', Didymus should be the preferred source; in fact, despite his uncertainties, Didymus probably connects us to the latest stage of Aristarchus' recension in terms of variants. On the other hand, Aristonicus is a most precious witness for Aristarchus' exegesis in the broadest sense because he collected Aristarchus' work as systematized in his second 'perfected' *hypomnēmata*. Therefore, if one is interested in Aristarchus' exegesis or, more broadly, in Aristarchus' motivations (also for specific, even though not final, readings), Aristonicus is the best source. In conclusion, even though both Didymus and Aristonicus are valuable sources for Aristarchus, it is important to acknowledge that they give different and 'chronologically sensitive' answers; it is up to us to choose which ancient scholar to interrogate and to ask him the right questions if we are to receive the best answers.

University of Michigan

FRANCESCA SCHIRONI

schironi@umich.edu