

Scholia Graeca in Odysseam, edidit FILIPPOMARIA PONTANI, vol. I: *scholia ad libros α–β*, Roma, Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 2007, IX, 382 p. Pr. 58 Euros.

There has been no complete edition of the scholia to the *Odyssey* for more than 150 years (W. Dindorf, Oxford 1855, repr. Amsterdam 1962). The only edition that postdates it (A. Ludwich, Königsberg 1888–90, repr. Hildesheim 1966) breaks off at *Od.* 1.309. It is no surprise, then, that a new edition has long been recognised as an urgent *desideratum* of Classical scholarship, one so urgent, in fact, that almost any new edition might be welcome. So it is all the more pleasant to report that the first volume of what promises to be a solid basis for future research has now appeared. The edition under review supersedes Dindorf's in virtually every respect and, most importantly, it is based on many more manuscripts and a far better knowledge of them. As a result, there is much that is published here for the first time.¹ The main advantage over Ludwich's is that it reaches beyond *Od.* 1.309, presents the evidence in a more transparent way and provides the reader with a rich *Testimonienapparat*.

P.'s point of reference is, not surprisingly, the monumental edition of the scholia to the *Iliad* by H. Erbse (Berlin 1969–88). Regarding the selection of materials, the main differences are:

(1) P. does not endeavour to differentiate between *scholia vetera* and *recentiora*, whereas Erbse excluded the latter from his edition.

(2) P. includes the V-scholia (or *Vulgatscholien*), which contain the same type of material as the D-scholia on the *Iliad* (not in Erbse).

(3) P. includes the fragments of Porphyry (generally omitted by Erbse).

With a view to the actual presentation of the evidence, the main differences between the two editions are:

(4) P. does not print the papyri (*scholia minora* and commentaries) separately but combines them with the medieval scholia (on the specific line that is commented on).

(5) P. introduces two new marginal abbreviations for the identification of sources: 'v.l.' for *variae lectiones* that cannot be attributed to a particular source (usually Didymus or Aristonicus); 'alleg.' for allegorical explanations.

The five differences can be assessed as follows:

(1) There is a general trend in Classical scholarship to move away from the traditional preference for 'the old'. P.'s editorial decision will therefore raise few

¹ The details of the manuscript tradition have been set out in F. Pontani, *Sguardi su Ulisse: La tradizione esegetica greca all'Odisea*, Rome 2005, which is so to speak the *Prolegomena* to the present volume (see also my review in *BZ* 99.2, 2006, 680–4).

eyebrows. One wonders, however, whether it might not have been useful and practical to follow the principle of the ‘Dutch’ edition of the Aristophanes scholia, which identifies the *recentiora* in the margin.

(2) Erbse’s omission of the D-scholia has often been deplored, so P.’s inclusion of their Odyssean counterpart is bound to meet everyone’s approval. In this connection it is worth mentioning that there is also a recent *proekdosis* of the V-scholia by Nicola Ernst (http://www.ub.uni-koeln.de/digital/fachinfos/alertum/volltexte_ger.html), of which P. claims to have become aware only when the first volume of his edition had reached the stage of proofs (p. xi n. 4).

(3) *Mutatis mutandis* the same holds true as for (2). On the actual attributions see below.

(4) Given that the bulk of the relevant material on papyrus are *scholia minora*, P.’s decision makes sense. But one wonders whether, for reasons of chronology, the papyri should not have been printed before the mediievally transmitted scholia.

(5) The new abbreviations generally make use of the edition easier (on rare occasions, they cause a dilemma: e.g. schol. *Od.* 1.11a1 is both ‘exegetical’ and ‘allegorical’). Perhaps P. could have gone one step further. Since, as he argues (p. xi), the glossographic material that comes from sources other than V is no less important, he might have introduced the general abbreviation ‘gl.’, which in fact he employs in four cases (schol. *Od.* 1.73c, 1.157b, 1.229a, 1.234a). At the same time, P. does not exhaust the possibilities of his abbreviations. The following scholia could have been identified, for instance, as ‘exegetical’: 1.10g, 1.29e, 1.32a1, 1.47h, 1.58g, 1.64c, 1.115d, 1.128a1, etc.

The format of the present review does not allow for an extensive analysis of P.’s text. Suffice it to say that the text itself and the reporting of variant readings and conjectures in the *app. crit.* are generally reliable. Readers who are accustomed to Ludwich’s very full but potentially confusing *app. crit.* will welcome P.’s decision in favour of a negative *app. crit.* As to the treatment of textual corruption, P. is more inclined than Erbse to print emendations that can safely be deduced from the parallel transmission. Erbse often prints the corrupt text between *crucis* and reports the correction in the *app. crit.*

Arguably the most difficult and therefore controversial task is the identification of sources. As is well known, the scholia to the *Odyssey* have nothing that is remotely comparable to the famous Venetus A manuscript of the *Iliad* (Ven. Graec. 822, 10th cent.). With the exception of V⁰ (≈ D on the *Iliad*, see above), the Odyssean manuscripts are considerably more recent than Venetus A: 13th cent. and later (mss. F and G are older

too, but contain very few scholia: p. xi). Moreover, they do not provide the *subscriptions* that in the case of Venetus A identify the main sources: the four scholars of the so-called *Viermännerkommentar*. An already difficult question thus becomes particularly thorny with the scholia to the *Odyssey*. Readers will discover that P. tends to be on the optimistic side when it comes to identifying such sources. This is not the place for a systematic examination of P.'s attributions. A selection of relevant passages must do (for the purpose of comparison all dealing with attributions to Aristonicus, where P. often tacitly follows O. Carnuth, *Aristonici Perì σημείων Ὀδυσσεΐας reliquiae emendatiores*, Leipzig 1869; see p. xvii).

1.23b1: identifies the repetition of Αἰθίοπας as an instance of the rhetorical trope ἐπανάληψις (Carnuth 1869: 5). Unlike the many parallels from the Iliadic scholia (schol. A *Il.* 6.154 *Ariston.* etc.), the present note does not mention the fundamental point that this is the only instance of the trope in the entire *Odyssey*, as opposed to several Iliadic examples, which is part of Aristarchus' argument with the *chorizontes*. At the same time, the Odyssean passage is adduced as an instance of ἐπανάληψις in several rhetorical handbooks from Trypho onwards (listed in the *Testimonienapp.*).

1.29d1: V on the meaning of Aegisthus' epithet ἀμύμων. P. follows Carnuth (1869: 6), who, however, expressed reservations ('*fortasse*').

1.58a: reports that the grammarian Chairis (fr. 8 Berndt) explains the passage as an instance of the rhetorical trope ἀντίστροφος (also –στροφή), with parallels. P. does not offer a reason for his attribution to Aristonicus, which goes back neither to Carnuth nor Ludwig.

1.134h1: V on the meaning of ὑπερφιάλοισιν (Carnuth 1869: 9, with reference to schol. A *Il.* 15.94b *Ariston.*). The only connection seems to be one of the two glosses, ὑπερσπόνδοις, which can also be found in schol. g (ex.) on the Odyssean passage. Conversely, the present scholion does not mention Aristonicus' main point in the Iliadic scholion that the adjective ὑπερφιάλος can be used both negatively (ἐπὶ ψόγου) and positively (ἐν τάξει ἐγκωμίου). This point recurs in the *Suda* (v 487).

1.152a1: V glosses the meaning of μολπή with ἡ μετ' ᾧδῆς παιδιὰ VY, ἡ ᾧδή BHMαNVY (Carnuth 1869: 9–10). Parallels such as schol. BEHP *Od.* 6.101 show that Aristarchus expressly denied that μολπή means ᾧδή in Homer, which seems hard to reconcile with the present scholion. Neither Lehrs (*De Aristarchi studiis Homericis*, Leipzig³ 1888: 138) nor Friedländer (*Aristonici Perì σημείων Ἰλιάδος reliquiae emendatiores*, Königsberg 1853: 53) adduce the present scholion in their discussion. Erbse alone (ad *Il.* 1.472) mentions it, but does not comment on the difference with schol. BEHP *Od.* 6.101.

1.172c1: V on the meaning of εὐχετόωνται (Carnuth 1869: 10). The marginal note simply gives Aristonicus as the source, whereas P. expresses reservations in the *app.* ('*fortasse*').

1.259a1: V on the three cities that are called Ἐφύρη: one in Thesprotia (as in the passage under discussion), Corinth and one in Elis. Carnuth (1869: 11–12) correctly observed that Aristarchus knew of *two* cities of this name, the one in Thesprotia and Corinth. The one in Elis is traced back by P. to Crates (fr. 14 Broggiato) and Demetrius of Scepsis (fr. 55 Gaede). How does this justify an attribution to Aristonicus, especially in light of schol. T *Il.* 15.531c *ex.* (on Ἐφύρη in Elis), which is diametrically opposed to Aristonicus' note on the same passage (schol. A *Il.* 15.531a: the passage is said to refer to Ἐφύρη in Thesprotia, not Corinth)?

1.260d1: the preposition ἐπί is said to stand for μετά. P. comments '*doctrinam Aristarchi* (frr. 186–94 Matthaios) *redolent*'. True, but is this enough for a straight attribution, especially in the absence of a parallel for exactly these two prepositions?

1.398b1: V deduces λήισσατο from λεία and explains the meaning of the latter. Erbse's note on P.'s main parallel (schol. A *Il.* 18.28a) and the other parallels (esp. schol. A *Il.* 9.406 *ex.* ?) show that the attribution to Aristonicus is by no means certain.

More examples could be adduced, but the general point will be clear. While no instance can positively be proven to be wrongly attributed to Aristonicus, the reader is left wondering whether a more generous use of the question mark would not have represented the state of affairs more accurately. A similar observation can be made, for example, with respect to Porphyry. The principle that is set out in the preface (pp. xvii–xviii: attribution to Porphyry either when his name is expressly mentioned or when the same point occurs more or less verbatim in the *Quaestiones Vaticanae*) is more than once abandoned in favour of a more generous inclusion. Consequently, P. follows Schrader (*Porphyrii Quaestionum Homericarum ad Odysseam pertinentes reliquiae*, Leipzig 1890) more often than is, perhaps, justified. An illuminating example is schol. *Od.* 1.284a, where P. duly mentions Erbse's doubts (*Beiträge zur Überlieferung der Iliasscholien*, Munich 1960: 29 n. 3), but nevertheless accepts Schrader's attribution. All in all, readers should take P.'s attributions very seriously, but not accept them unreservedly.

P. deserves particular praise for providing the reader with a rich *Testimonienapparat* that presents the individual scholion against the wider background of ancient scholarship. The collection of *testimonia* and *loci similes* is particularly full in the case of scholia that deal with semantics. In a way this reflects the fact that in this area the ancient sources are especially rich (*scholia minora*, D-scholia, *Etymologica*, lexicæ and the like). But methodological factors play an important role too. It is comparatively easy

to identify parallels that discuss the meaning of the same lexeme (or its morphology). The same cannot be said about areas that are less clear-cut than semantics such as literary criticism and rhetoric. The problem is particularly urgent when the relevant scholia do not make use of standard terminology, which is often the case. The question is then: what makes a parallel a parallel? Needless to say, these are questions that P. could not have dealt with in an edition. The relative scarcity of his references to relevant secondary literature may well be indicative of the fact that scholia – the ones to the *Odyssey*, in particular – have not received the scholarly attention they deserve. However, P., who modestly declares his *Testimonienapparat* an ‘*initium investigationis ... potius quam finem*’ (p. xvi), appears to focus particularly on ancient and Byzantine parallels (the references to, for example, R. Meijering, *Literary and Rhetorical Theories in Greek Scholia*, Groningen 1987, could easily have been multiplied: 1.8a, 1.32c, 1.128h, 1.154b1, etc.). Here is hoping that the field will respond to his implicit appeal and he himself eventually complete his edition with thematic indices in the same way as his model Erbse.

Readers will notice with satisfaction that typographical errors are comparatively rare. The general clarity of the printed text might have gained from printing the *sigla* of the manuscripts in bold (as in Erbse’s edition) and from a better separation of the individual entries in the *Testimonienapparat*. An odd typographical feature is the recurrent omission of a separating space after elided Greek words. Omission of Greek text (in supplemented lemmata or quotations in the *app.*) is indicated either by three dots or a short dash, apparently with no difference in meaning between the two. Given that this book will be a point of reference for many years to come, the publisher might have considered the option of a hardback.

To sum up: Classical scholars have long been waiting for a new edition of the scholia to the *Odyssey*. At least it has been worth waiting. The one or two questions that have been raised above should in no way detract from the great merit of this first volume of an edition that will hopefully be published in reasonably short intervals. The scholia to the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* display such fundamental differences in quantity and quality, with the gap growing in the later books, that this new edition will unlikely be a real match for its older sibling. Of course this is not the fault of P., who is making an enormous effort to force this corpus out of its state of seemingly eternal hibernation. It only remains for us at this point to express our gratitude and wish him well for the continuation of this very important project.

Rene_Nuenlist@Brown.edu