INTRODUCTION

Bill Beck (Indiana), Adrian Kelly (Oxford), Tom Phillips (Manchester)

The ancient scholia to the *Iliad* — excerpts of ancient scholarship and commentary on the *Iliad* that have been preserved as marginal and interlinear notes in major medieval manuscripts — constitute a uniquely rich and challenging source for anyone interested in Greco-Roman antiquity. A mass of material that includes textual criticism, lexical debate, and literary interpretation, the scholia range in quality from the tralaticious to the dazzlingly insightful, and they reflect multiple critical and exegetical approaches employed over many centuries. These responses to one of antiquity's most important texts provide vital information about ancient literary exegesis, textual criticism and education, and contain valuable evidence for the state of the Homeric texts in antiquity. But despite a recent surge of interest in Greek literary scholarship and scholiography,[1] the *Iliad* scholia remain relatively underexploited by all but a limited group of specialists. Philological analyses have traditionally characterised handling of this material, and these methods remain invaluable for unpacking the challenging language and sometimes unusual premises and presuppositions of these texts. Nonetheless, this volume seeks to combine that heritage with readings that position the scholia in the *longue durée* of both ancient and modern intellectual history, in an attempt to open up multiple trajectories for future scholarship.

The papers collected here derive from a conference held at Oxford University on July 5–6, 2018, organised to examine and illuminate the *Iliad*'s scholia by putting Homer's ancient critics in dialogue with other trends in ancient, Byzantine, and modern responses to Homeric poetry. As a whole, the volume considers ancient Iliadic scholarship both in its own contexts and through its refractions in intellectual history, and so it falls naturally into two parts — simply put, what is in the scholia, and how later readers have received them.

[1] The past fifteen years alone have seen the publication of several new critical editions of scholiastic corpora (Cufalo 2007; Pontani 2007–20; Regtuit 2007; Merro 2008; Xenis 2010a; Xenis 2010b; van Thiel 2014; Xenis 2018), translations of scholiastic corpora (Cassanmagnago 2009; Chantry 2009; Ramelli 2009; Lachenaud 2010), translations with commentary (Harding 2006; Daude, David, Fartzoff and Muckensturm-Poulle 2013), and monographs and companion volumes on the tradition of ancient Greek literary scholarship and scholiography (Sciarra 2005; Dickey 2007; Nünlist 2009; David-Guignard, Daude, Geny and Muckensturm-Poulle 2009–15; Matthaios, Montanari and Rengakos 2011; Montanari and Pagani 2011; Montana and Porro 2014; Montanari, Matthaios and Rengakos 2015; Phillips 2016; Mastronarde 2017; Ercoles, Pagani, Pontani and Ucciardello 2018; Schironi 2018; Boodts, De Leemans and Schorn 2019; Mayhew 2019; Prodi and Coward 2020).

The first section, in five chapters, explores several different aspects of this critical discourse in antiquity, revising and revisiting previously settled questions and received opinions. We begin, in the first chapter ('Exegetical Dialogue Through Compilation: Examples from the *h*-family of the *Iliad* Scholia'), with Fausto Montana addressing some of the most fundamental questions of all — what do our manuscripts actually contain, and how should we present or understand that material? Montana turns his attention to the way in which the greatest modern editor of the *scholia vetera*, Hartmut Erbse, classified and shaped its conception. He discusses advances made in our understanding of the manuscript tradition of the *Iliad* scholia, in light of careful examination of the relatively neglected *h*-family manuscripts. Given the fluid relationships between the different classes of scholia, one cannot entirely disentangle one class from the others without investigating their manuscript traditions. Though Erbse generally consulted *h*-manuscripts only where the text of the VMK-scholia was defective or lacunose in Venetus A, Montana demonstrates that the *h*-family is indispensable for constituting the text of the VMK-, exegetical, and D-scholia, and may well constitute a major scholiastic class in its own right.

In the second chapter ('Aristarchus in his own words?'), Francesca Schironi examines our most direct access to Aristarchus' commentaries on the *Iliad* — direct quotations of Aristarchus in the scholia attributed to Didymus (first century BCE) and Herodian (second century CE) — in order both to determine the exact content and wording of Aristarchus' commentaries on the *Iliad* and to assess the reliability of Aristonicus (late first century BCE) as a source for Aristarchus. Through the comparative analysis of these sources, Schironi sketches a portrait of Aristarchus' scholarly interests and methods and confirms the widespread impression that Aristonicus is a reliable witness to the content (though not necessarily the wording) of Aristarchus' *hypomnemata*.

Moving from one of the most celebrated scholars of antiquity, René Nünlist's contribution ('Nicanor: more than a punctuator') focuses on a grammarian who has received significantly less attention: Nicanor Stigmatias 'the Punctuator'. Nünlist demonstrates that the reputational epithet fails to capture his wide array of interests in the Homeric text. By giving an overview of Nicanor's interests beyond punctuation, and by demonstrating the interrelations between punctuation and other aspects of exegesis, including semasiology, performance, narratology, and the history of the Greek language, Nünlist shows that Nicanor deserves the attention even of those who are not interested in the punctuation of the Homeric poems.

Bill Beck's contribution ('Reading for Achilles in the bT-scholia to the *Iliad*') focuses on the exegetical scholia, and argues that the bT-scholia read the *Iliad* with an eye to Achilles, taking it for granted that he was at the forefront of the narrator's mind. Beck demonstrates that the bT-scholia magnify Achilles' role when he is featured in the narrative and introject him into the narrative when he is absent, justifying an Achillocentric bias by projecting it onto others. By demonstrating the extent of this bias and its extensive interpretative consequences, Beck reminds us of the crucially important role played by metatextual materials in shaping reading practices.

Finally, Richard Hunter examines 'Some problems in the "Deception of Zeus"', specifically ancient critical responses to two questions raised by the Διὸς ἀπάτη in *Iliad* books 14 and 15: namely, why the narrator represents Lemnos as the location of Sleep, and why the narrator has Zeus, upon waking up, forecast the events that will be narrated in much greater detail shortly thereafter. In elucidating the scholia to these passages, Hunter explores the meanings, applications, and origins of ancient literary critical categories by which Homeric poetry was evaluated: 'necessity' (ἀνάγκη), 'banality' (εὐτέλεια), and 'chance' (τύχη). The conception of 'necessity' in particular seems to bear the stamp of Aristotelian influence, even if later critics employ it in broader ways than did Aristotle himself. Elsewhere, the process of posing and answering the question 'why Lemnos?' reflects more critically specific assumptions about Homeric authorship, in this case that Homer's writing is the outcome of a flawlessly purposive intelligence and creates a world in which every detail has its place.

Read in conjunction with each other, these five contributions make clear the extent to which ancient critical practices both anticipate and differ from those of later intellectual cultures, and indeed our own. Nünlist's Nicanor, whose microtextual modifications are bound up with and dependent on larger interpretative stances, looks a lot like the modern textual critic, while Schironi's Aristarchus emerges even more clearly as a figure of ultimate authority in this tradition, respected enough to be quoted directly well after his lifetime and to shape the responses of Homeric scholars and readers from antiquity onwards. Similarly expressive of this continuity, Beck's Achillocentric bT-scholiast articulates ethical and pedagogic preoccupations in a manner frequently paralleled in the writings of Renaissance and early modern critics, even though bT's interpretative procedures necessarily reflect a particular educational environment and cultural tradition. Many modern readers are likely to be unsympathetic to the charges of 'banality' that Hunter documents, and may be baffled by the length at which questions such as 'why Lemnos'?

are pursued in the scholia that he examines. But this is a useful reminder that the scholiasts, like many critics of later generations, are concerned to use grounds such as stylistic consistency to give an account of the quality of Homer's poetry and to justify Homer's place at the zenith of Greek literature with detailed evaluative judgements. Finally, Montana's chapter is an important reminder of the fact that fundamental questions about the composition of the scholia themselves remain open to be interrogated, addressed, and to allow new doctrines and orthodoxies to be established.

The four contributions of the next section turn to the reception of this kind of ancient Homeric criticism among Byzantine, Renaissance, and modern scholars, asking us to reflect not so much on the ancient scholia themselves as the uses to which they were put and the effects they had on contemporary scholarly and intellectual discourse. In 'The scholiast as poet: John Tzetzes and his *Allegories of the Iliad*', Johannes Haubold explores the way in which this unique reader and interpreter of the Homeric tradition fashioned himself as a scholiast-poet reading and being read by contemporary audiences. As their guide to Homer's poetry, Tzetzes sought to draw himself within and encapsulate the learned tradition, even mirroring the way that scholia appeared in manuscripts, and so he sought to create a poetically unified monument from that tradition, a body of work whose significance in intellectual history is only now starting to be appreciated.

In 'Homeric scholarship in the pulpit: The case of Eustathios' sermons', Maroula Perisanidi and Oliver Thomas turn our attention to the role played by Homeric scholarship in the famous commentator's Sermons, highly wrought and learned works designed for an educated elite, but relatively underexploited in this connection. For the community of readers imagined in these works, it was as important to know the Homeric poems, and what had been said about them, as it was to know what was in the sacred text. Here the intellectual heritage of the Homeric tradition comes headlong into contact with a specifically Christian form in a specifically Christian context, each side of the equation contributing to a dialogue about what could — and what could not — be recreated and deployed from the old texts in that new world.

Though the publication of systematic translations of entire exegetical *corpora* is a relatively recent phenomenon,[2] the translation and even publication of the fragments of ancient exegesis to Greek poetry is by no means new. In 'Translating Homeric scholia: Five case-studies from the 14th through the 18th centuries', Filippomaria Pontani surveys partial and complete translations of Homeric scholia in late medieval and early modern Europe. Pontani highlights the

[2] See n. 1 above for the recent explosion in such publications.

work of Leontius Pilatus (†1366), who adapted and translated material from several scholiastic corpora, including the commentaries of John Tzetzes (1110–80) and the D-scholia; Angelo Poliziano (1454–94), whose notes on the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* quoted, paraphrased, and translated extracts from ancient scholia and the commentaries of Eustathius; Guillaume Budé (1467–1540), whose marginal notes reflect his familiarity with the D-scholia and *scholia maiora*; Vicente Mariner (†1642), who translated into Latin the entirety of Eustathius' *Parekbolai* and all of the D-scholia (or V-scholia for the *Odyssey*), and Antonio Bongiovanni (1712–62), whose translation of the scholia to *Iliad* book 1 in Venetus B is the first systematic translation of a scholiastic corpus to reach the printing press. For these scholars and the intellectual world they sought to create, these repositories of ancient learning represented a powerful stimulus to their own analytical and creative thinking, and had to be brought to the attention of a wider audience.

Constanze Güthenke brings the volume to a close in the modern world ('"The Alexandrian scholar poets are our ancestors": Ancient scholarship and modern self-perception'), interrogating the processes by which philologists imagined their relationships with their Hellenistic forebears, and deconstructing the ways in which Classics as a discipline has sought to shape its intellectual heritage. Beginning with Rudolf Pfeiffer's characterization of the ancient scholars as the 'noble ancestors' of the contemporary classicist, Güthenke traces the antecedents of this genealogy in the work of Friedrich Wolf and Augustus Boeckh. For both of these crucial progenitors of *Altertumswissenschaft*, the turn to Alexandrian predecessors is a means of projecting a disciplinary community with a distinct identity, while also acknowledging that community's belatedness. Examining these manoeuvres in the light of Friedrich Nietzsche's attack on philological practice as both a source and symptom of cultural exhaustion, Güthenke is critically attuned to the often contestable assumptions about intellectual continuity that underpin philological labour. Simultaneously, by showing how philologists have conceptualized the awkward amalgam of 'creativity and agency' that defines their practice, her arguments impel us to reflect on how we might understand our own reading practices in the light of these categories.

What the chapters of this section show is that ancient Homeric scholarship was not a dead-end or a repository of useless, pedantic knowledge, but an essential stimulus, in several periods of European history, in activating and recomposing the Homeric inheritance for eager audiences. From Byzantium to Renaissance Italy and nineteenth-century Germany, the sacred texts were shepherded to audiences through the intense reading and reflection of the scholars who turned from

the ancient scholia to their own response, and reflected on that body of knowledge as they sought to configure their own position in intellectual history.

The articles collected in this volume demonstrate the considerable advances that recent scholarship has achieved in our understanding of the Homeric scholia, and the numerous scholarly cultures from which they emerged and which they have influenced. But they also show that scholiographic studies are, in some respects, still in their infancy. Notwithstanding the numerous analyses that have emerged in recent decades, the chapters of the first section demonstrate that many elements in our understanding of ancient scholarly practice can still be sharpened, and that the material repays revisiting and serious investigation on its own terms. The second section shows that the project of connecting the scholia to other scholarly traditions and practices has much to tell us about 'Classics' as an historical and cultural phenomenon, and about the role of antiquity and its intellectual heritage in shaping those of subsequent ages. Reading the scholia, these articles make clear, is an opportunity for reflection on the antecedents and values of our own scholarly practices as much as for inquiry into the past.

*

Scholarly discourse about the Homeric scholia is facilitated by a set of commonly applied symbols and abbreviations which, however necessary for those who use them, may be unintelligible to those who are unfamiliar. The matter is further complicated by the fact that scholars do not all cite scholia in the same way; they differ in their abbreviations, the information they include, and the order in which relevant information is organized in a citation. For simplicity, we have selected one system of citation, which we explain here.

To illustrate with an example: we cite the first scholion to *Il.* 4.1 (in Erbse's edition) as Σ bT *Il.* 4.1a *ex*. In this citation 'Σ' stands for 'scholion'. The letter(s) that follow indicate the manuscript or manuscript family that transmit the scholion in question—in this case, the bT-family, which is comprised of the manuscripts B, C, E^3, E^4 and T.[3] In addition to bT, commonly cited manuscript sources for the *Iliad*'s scholia include 'A' (=Venetus A) and 'h', the important family of manuscripts discussed in chapter 1. In sequence after the manuscript tradition appear the line(s) to which a scholion corresponds—here, *Il.* 4.1; if several scholia correspond to the same line(s), they are differentiated by lower-case letters ('a', 'b', and so on). The citation ends

[3] On these and other manuscripts of the *Iliad* containing *scholia maiora*, and the relationship between them, see Erbse 1969–88 I xiii–lix.

with the scholion's attribution—in this case, '*ex.*', that is, the so-called 'exegetical scholia', which derive from 'exegetical' commentaries of the Imperial Age. These scholia are 'exegetical' in that they deal primarily with matters of interpretation and literary criticism, as opposed to the VMK-scholia,[4] which typically focus on more technical matters (*e.g.* punctuation, pronunciation, orthography, and the correct constitution of the Homeric text). In addition to '*ex.*', other common attributions include '*Ariston.*', the scholia that derive from Aristonicus' *On the Critical Signs of Aristarchus* (1st c. BCE–1st c. CE); '*Did.*', the scholia that derive from Didymus' *On the Aristarchean Recension* (1st c. BCE–1st c. CE); '*Hrd.*', the scholia that derive from Herodian's *On Homeric Prosody* (2nd c. CE); '*Nic.*', the scholia that derive from Nicanor's *On Homeric Punctuation* (2nd c. CE); '*Porph.*', the scholia that derive from Porphyry's *Homeric Questions* (3rd c. CE); and 'D',[5] *i.e.* the D-scholia, which constitute a heterogeneous compilation containing paraphrases (= *scholia minora*), mythographical explanations derived from the *Mythographus Homericus* (1st c. CE), and plot summaries of the individual books of the *Iliad*. Named originally but erroneously for Didymus, with whom they are in fact unconnected, the D-scholia are transmitted in many and diverse manuscripts, and so their citations conventionally specify the attribution in place of the manuscripts that transmit them, a convention which we follow in this volume. Thus, the D scholion to *Il.* 1.1 (transmitted by the manuscripts Z, Y, Q, A, T, U, I, G, and M) is cited as 'Σ D *Il.* 1.1h' rather than 'Σ ZYQATUIGM *Il.* 1.1h *D.*'[6]

Unless otherwise indicated, texts and citations of the *scholia maiora* to the *Iliad* follow Erbse 1969–88; those of the D-scholia follow van Thiel 2014; those of the scholia to *Odyssey* 1–8 follow Pontani 2007–20; and those of the scholia to the remaining books of the *Odyssey* follow Dindorf 1855. Texts and citations of Eustathius' commentary on *Odyssey* 1–2 follow Cullhed 2014; those of the remaining books follow Stallbaum 1825–26.[7]

[4] 'VMK' stands for Viermännerkommentar, *i.e.*, the 'Four-Man Commentary' (5th/6th c. CE), which compiled extracts of Aristonicus' *On the Critical Signs of Aristarchus*, Didymus' *On the Aristarchean Recension*, Herodian's *On Homeric Prosody*, and Nicanor's *On Homeric Punctuation*.

[5] The Odyssean equivalent of 'D' is designated by 'V', which represents the 'V-scholia'. See Pontani 2007–20 I x–xi, xvi–xvii.

[6] See Dickey 2007: 19 n. 1 "identification as a D scholion takes precedence over identification as an A scholion, so material found in the main D-scholia manuscripts is considered to be D-scholia material even if it also occurs in A. Thus the different groups of scholia are grouped hierarchically in the order D, A, bT, other, and material is assigned to the first of these groups in which it is found. It is not accidental that this hierarchy matches the chronological order of creation of the earliest elements of each group."

[7] All references to ancient works follow the conventions of the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*.