

From Scholars to Scholia

Trends in Classics – Supplementary Volumes

Edited by

Franco Montanari and Antonios Rengakos

Scientific Committee

Alberto Bernabé · Margarethe Billerbeck · Claude Calame

Philip R. Hardie · Stephen J. Harrison · Stephen Hinds

Richard Hunter · Christina Kraus · Giuseppe Mastromarco

Gregory Nagy · Theodore D. Papanghelis · Giusto Picone

Kurt Raaflaub · Bernhard Zimmermann

Volume 9

De Gruyter

From Scholars to Scholia

Chapters in the History
of Ancient Greek Scholarship

Edited by
Franco Montanari
Lara Pagani

De Gruyter

ISBN 978-3-11-025162-3
e-ISBN 978-3-11-025163-0
ISSN 1868-4785

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data:

From scholars to scholia : chapters in the history of ancient Greek scholarship
/ edited by Franco Montanari and Lara Pagani.

p. cm. -- (Trends in classics. Supplementary volumes ; v. 9)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-3-11-025162-3 (acid-free paper)

1. Greek philology--History. 2. Scholia. 3. Greek literature--Criticism,
Textual. I. Montanari, Franco. II. Pagani, Lara.

PA53.F76 2011

480--dc22

2010050354

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche
Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet
at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

© 2011 Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, Berlin/New York

Typesetting: Michael Peschke, Berlin

Printing: Hubert & Co. GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen

∞ Printed on acid-free paper

Printed in Germany

www.degruyter.com

Contents

Preface	vii
Franco Montanari Correcting a Copy, Editing a Text. Alexandrian <i>Ekdosis</i> and Papyri	1
Lara Pagani Pioneers of Grammar. Hellenistic Scholarship and the Study of Language	17
Paola Ascheri The Greek Origins of the Romans and the Roman Origins of Homer in the Homeric Scholia and in <i>POxy.</i> 3710	65
Silvia Consonni Observations on Περὶ ἐπιρρημάτων by Apollonius Dyscolus	87
Fausto Montana The Making of Greek Scholiastic <i>Corpora</i>	105
Bibliography	163
General index	191
List of contributors	207

Preface

The field of research that encompasses philology, erudition and grammar in the ancient Greek world has, at least since the mid XXth century, aroused increasing interest. This vast sector covers a broad spectrum of disciplines that include the diversified production that goes by the label of “ancient scholarsip”, which flourished on account of the need to conserve, interpret and study the works of the great authors of the past: textual criticism and exegesis on the one hand (i.e. text conservation and interpretation in the strict sense) and the study of linguistic phenomena on the other (vocabulary, grammar, rhetoric). The chronological range involved is very extensive: for if this type of literature reached its *akme* between the IIIrd century B.C. and the Ist century A.D., the earlier stages have been shown to be far from inconsiderable – with examples of erudite activity in the classical age – while the later phases, right up to the Byzantine era, are equally noteworthy. Moreover, the themes now regarded as falling within the sphere of ancient scholarship represent a rather wide variety of subjects, extending to such areas as biography, rhetoric, “literary criticism”, philosophy, the history of the book¹. In the lively panorama of research in this sector, which over the decades has seen the flowering of in-depth studies, collections of materials, as well as works giving an overview of the main aspects, we will limit ourselves to mentioning only, among the innumerable possible examples, the important international conference held in Thessaloniki in December 2008 (*Language, Text, Literature. Archetypes, Concepts, and Contents of Ancient Scholarship and Grammar. 2nd Trends in Classics international conference*), in which a wealth of issues concerning ancient scholarship were addressed, and where the conviction of an indissoluble unity between «‘linguistic description’ and ‘interpretation of linguistic contents in literary contexts’»² played a major role.

The present work follows along the line of study outlined above. It springs in part from the colloquium entitled *La parola del poeta e la parola dell'interprete. Eruditi e grammatici nella cultura greca antica*, organized by

1 This type of perspective was inaugurated, explicitly, in a session of the Entretiens Hardt specifically devoted to the topic: Montanari 1994.

2 See the forthcoming proceedings: Matthaios/Montanari/Rengakos 2010.

Franco Montanari (from the 2nd to the 5th of September 2008) at the Fondation Hardt pour l'Étude de l'Antiquité Classique, in Vandoeuvres (Geneva). Four of the papers read during the colloquium (namely the papers by Elena Esposito, Serena Perrone, Antonietta Porro and Marco Stroppa) dealt with papyrological topics, and were published in the volume *Fragments of the Past. Ancient Scholarship and Greek Papyri* (*Trends in Classics* 2009, 1.2), edited by Franco Montanari and Serena Perrone. Some of the others (specifically, those by Fausto Montana and Lara Pagani) will now appear in the present collection, which also includes a contribution by Franco Montanari dedicated to further enquiry into a specific portion of the vast theme he considered in the Geneva seminar (*La filologia alessandrina da Zenodoto a Didimo*), and two other studies contributed by “outsiders” not present at the Geneva seminar (those by Paola Ascheri and Silvia Consonni). In effect this collection, by its very nature and genesis, is the outcome of close collaboration and constant exchange of ideas among the different research groups to which the scholars who took part in the 2008 seminar belong. Not only was there intense and constructive debate during the colloquium itself (the main results of which enrich the two contributions from the 2008 event which are published here), but the common reflection and discussion continued during the subsequent period, leading to new studies (those by Ascheri and Consonni testify to this creative drive).

The article by Franco Montanari (*Correcting a Copy, Editing a Text. Alexandrian Ekdosis and Papyri*) focuses on the problem of the concrete form of the *ekdosis* of a literary work as carried out by the Alexandrian philologists, exploring what it meant to create an *ekdosis* and what procedures were materially involved in its execution. The question is discussed by starting out from an examination of papyri containing literary works and presenting interventions in the form of corrections of material errors; emphasis is placed above all on *POxy.* 2404 + *PLaur.* inv. III/278 (end IInd-beginning IIIrd century A.D.), which contains part of Aeschines' oration *Against Ctesiphon*. What is thereby highlighted is the central importance of the relation between the library artefact and the text as an object of editing, that is to say, between on the one hand the craftsman's practices, aimed at correcting, in a *copy*, that which was held to be wrong (often by means of a comparison with the antigraph or with other copies), and on the other hand, the rise of a philological practice seeking to emend the *text* of a work, in which case it was the text itself that was held to be unsatisfactory due to errors that had crept in over time and had been handed down through tradition. Finally, the framework thus reconstructed allows reflection on the nature of the readings attributed to the Alexandrian grammarians (conjectures *ope*

ingenii, variants from a documentary source or a mixture of both procedures).

The study by Lara Pagani (*Pioneers of Grammar. Hellenistic Scholarship and the Study of Language*) can be set in the context of the debate on the germinal stages of linguistic theory in the ancient Greek world. In particular, the paper offers a critical review of the research that developed, from the XIXth century onwards, around the role assumed to have been played by the first Hellenistic philologists in the birth of technical grammar. Antithetical positions have been taken in this regard, on the one hand minimizing the linguistic observations documented for the Alexandrian erudites and looking on these as the occasional by-product of their studies on poetry, or, on the contrary, emphasising their knowledge of a structured grammatical system. The approach that best seems to capture the philologists' first steps towards linguistics is one that interprets philology and grammar not as separate or conflicting fields, but rather as linked by a close-meshed interaction: such a viewpoint makes it possible to ensure due recognition of the value of the erudites' "grammatical" interventions, yet without refuting their original motivation, which was prompted by their concern for criticism and text exegesis.

The contribution by Paola Ascheri (*The Greek Origins of the Romans and the Roman Origins of Homer in the Homeric Scholia and in POxy. 3710*) focuses on the ancient theory that the Romans were of Greek descent, examining traces of such a belief found in two kinds of text that have received relatively little attention from this perspective: the Homeric scholia and a passage from an important commentary on book XX of the *Odyssey*, transmitted in *POxy. 3710* (IInd century A.D.). This evidence testifies partly to an attempt at identifying a Homeric antecedent for Roman customs, whereby it was sought to demonstrate that the Romans were actually of Greek origin and that their language, Latin, derived from Greek, but it also points to an attempt in the inverse direction: the commentary on *POxy. 3710* reveals the influence of theories that tried to show the Roman origins of Homer through the search for analogies between the Homeric and the Roman world. These opposing concepts are seen as the two faces of one and the same endeavour: namely the effort by Augustan propaganda to create a "global" and unitary vision of the Graeco-Roman world, as a means of bringing about a state of mind whereby the Greeks would accept the Roman conquerors and yet, at the same time, the Romans would feel proud to have ancient Greek origins.

The article by Silvia Consonni (*Observations on Περί ἐπιρρημάτων by Apollonius Dyscolus*) explores the etymology of the Greek term

ἐπίρρημα (“adverb”) in the monographic study of Apollonius Dyscolus dedicated to this part of speech. Its name, according to Apollonius, indicates the anteposition (ἐπί) of the adverb to the verb (ῥῆμα), and this was in fact the only syntactic relation he admitted as legitimate between two grammatical elements. Postposition of the adverb to the verb, which did exist in the general practice of language, was in his view an alteration of the grammatical structure. The same situation is found in the Apollonian explanation of the meaning of the adjective ἐπιταγματικός applied to the pronoun αὐτός, which is examined in parallel with the question of the adverb position. Consonni’s study allows some specific comments (in the *Appendix*) on ancient grammatical terminology in the principal modern dictionaries.

The collection closes with the investigation conducted by Fausto Montana into the origin of the scholiographic corpora to the ancient Greek authors (*The Making of Greek Scholiastic Corpora*), a highly important point and the subject of extensive debate in the history of studies in this field. The hypothesis of the late antique origin of scholiography has been widely embraced and has exerted considerable influence on scholars of classical antiquity, to the point of being hailed as a definite and certain acquisition. Montana’s research presents an overview and a discussion of the traditional arguments: the comparison with the biblical *catenae*, the parallel with Latin scholiography where the adverb *aliter* (ἄλλως in Greek) can be seen as a verbal alert signalling the application of the compilative procedure; a careful and wide-ranging examination of books with broad margins dating from late antiquity and the proto-Byzantine age, densely annotated in the margins (on this point, it is not possible to document that the annotators did resort to compilation from different exegetic sources, nor to confirm that this procedure was used with a methodical and systematic criterion); the palaeographic evidence, with the question of the small-sized handwriting as a prerequisite in order to have marginal annotation and the problem of the subscriptions; the persistence of separate commentaries on codex in late antiquity. The conclusion reached, which must necessarily be cautionary, is that in the absence of direct evidence, the existence of scholiography cannot be postulated as a need or an obvious historical fact for the era prior to the IXth century.

This collection thus presents several in-depth analyses on perspectives of ancient scholarship, starting out from an enquiry into disparate aspects of the work of philologists in the Hellenistic and imperial age, such as the *ekdosis* of literary texts, reflections on language and grammatical theorization, the re-utilization in the Roman world, for the purposes of propaganda, of the results of erudite activity. These

considerations then lead to reflection on the scholiographic *corpora* by means of which the greater part of ancient scholarship, through numerous stages of re-elaboration and abbreviation, has been handed down to us: *from scholars to scholia*.

Franco Montanari
Lara Pagani

Genoa, September 2010

Correcting a Copy, Editing a Text. Alexandrian *Ekdosis* and Papyri

Franco Montanari

In the period from Zenodotus to Aristarchus, *ekdosis* confirmed its place within ancient culture as a typical product of Alexandrian philologists along with *hypomnema*, *syngramma*, and the collection of *lexeis* and other exegetical-erudite products. How the *ekdosis* of a literary work was effectively carried out, what form it took and the way in which it was prepared in actual practice by the grammarian have for some time been the object of debate. As we shall see, the question also has effects on the reconstruction and assessment of the method and results of philological activity, of which *ekdosis* is a part. I have over the last few years analysed these questions¹, emphasising the importance of the relationship between the library artefact on one hand and the text as an object of editing, with its various paratextual elements such as annotations and *semeia*, on the other hand². We must take into account and give the right prominence to what we know regarding the creation of new copies of texts (in the *scriptoria* by professional scribes or privately by individuals) along with insights that can be gleaned from surviving examples.

Significant problems for instance have arisen as to understanding the method of work adopted by Zenodotus, the first of the major Alexandrian philologists. According to Rudolf Pfeiffer, «It is not improbable that Zenodotus, examining manuscripts in the library, selected *one* text of Homer, which seemed to him to be superior to any other one, as his main guide; its deficiencies he may have corrected from better readings in other manuscripts as well as by his own conjectures. Διόρθωσις can be the term for either kind of correction. It is hard to imagine any other way»³. K. Nickau, the author of important works on Zenodotus, states:

English translation by Justin Rainey.

1 Montanari 1998; 2002; 2004; 2009b and 2009c, with extensive bibliography.

2 The question is discussed by Jacob 1999, as part of a wider overview of the development of philology (see on the Alexandrians in particular p. 80).

3 Pfeiffer 1968, 110.

«Dann ist zu fragen, ob Z(enodotos) nicht einen durch Recensio ermittelten Homertext zugrundelegte (der jedoch nicht seinen Vorstellungen von der genuinen Form der Epen entsprach), diesen mit Obeloi versah und zu ihm Textvorschläge sowie deren Begründung mitteilte. Z(enodotos) selbst wie auch seine Hörer machten sich entsprechenden Notizen, die, wären sie von Z(enodotos) schriftlich veröffentlicht worden, ‘Hypomnemata’ hätten heißen können. Aber die Zeit der schriftlich publizierten Homer-Kommentare begann erst mit Aristarchos. So würden sich auch die späteren Unsicherheiten in der Berichterstattung über Z(enodotos)s Ausgabe erklären»⁴.

The fundamental position, supported by the two eminent scholars⁵, excludes the possibility that the *ekdosis* of Zenodotus consisted in a new copy bearing the continuous text wanted by the grammarian i.e. the whole text completely re-written by him (or for him), with his readings incorporated, with the *obeloi* in the margins indicating the athetesis, without the verses which in his opinion had to be omitted. As Pfeiffer says, it is hard to imagine another way of working that did not consist in carrying out corrections on an already existing copy, appropriately chosen from those available and used as the basic text on which the grammarian would over time make changes and add annotations as part of his studies and the work of *diorthosis*. I share this position and regard it as the one on which to base further discussions. Owing to the size of the documentation and knowledge available, these discussions will focus specifically on the Homeric text. However, we can assume a substantially similar approach also for other authors subject to philological analysis by the Alexandrian grammarians.

A similar method of producing the *ekdosis* was utilised by Zenodotus and continued to be used by later grammarians. A philologist chose, according to his own preferences, an exemplar that he considered suitable as a basis for his work. When he rejected the text, he noted in the place in question the preferred reading in the free spaces or between the lines. His own text resulted from the original text chosen together with the changes suggested and contained in the paratext created. Next to the verses were placed the appropriate *semeia*: Zenodotus began just with an *obelos* for his proposal of athetesis, with the system subsequently becoming considerably richer and more differentiated. Doubts remain as to what extent the working copy may have contained also explanatory annotations. Such annotations, however, must have been present⁶ and,

4 Nickau 1972, 30–31.

5 See also *infra*, n. 38 for the position of H. van Thiel in this regard.

6 For a discussion of papyrus *marginalia*, see McNamee 2007.

in this respect, a development may have taken place (as proposed by Nickau), leading eventually to the separate *hypomnema*. We can imagine this as a product of years of study that led to over time a series of interventions to the same copy. This copy, bearing the traces of the work of *diorthosis*, resulted materially in the philologist's own *ekdosis* of Homer. This was his own personal copy, it bore his name for purposes of identification and contained the fruit of his work and insights; *ekdosis* in that it was *ekdotheisa*, i.e. available for consultation by scholars, poets and intellectuals.

Until the writing of commentaries became standard practice, with larger spaces available for illustrating the arguments proposed and the materials used, the working copy containing in the margins the *semeia*, the divergent readings along with any brief notes was the key source for knowing the philologist's opinion of the text he had worked on. This copy could also be accompanied by other types of works, such as essays on a particular subject, lexicographic collections or even notes from scholar/school *milieu*, transmitted orally or by memory. This was probably the case for Zenodotus, Aristophanes and the pre-Aristarchean grammarians in general, with the inevitable degrees of uncertainty well-known to those working in this field. With Aristarchus, the practice certainly remained of producing an *ekdosis* made up by the working copy and its paratextual surrounds. However, this *ekdosis* often came with the *hypomnema*, which became the ideal means with which the philologist was able to develop his arguments on a quantity and variety of philological-exegetical themes.

I find it difficult to raise objections to the view that the production of a philological *ekdosis* was based on working methods and practices that were certainly by no means new or unusual in an intellectual environment that had been used to be a "book civilisation" for at least two centuries. There is little doubt (and I have supported this position for some time) that the philological work of the Alexandrian grammarians, starting from the first generation, represented something new in cultural history and marked significant intellectual progress. The reality of this revolution, I believe, becomes more evident and tangible if we highlight the precedents and foundations that initiated and nurtured developments as well as uses that were new in methodology and above all in scope.

It is an accepted fact that examples of literary works were normally re-read and corrected thanks to additional further comparison with the antigraph, at times even on the basis of a collation with other copies. Naturally, we are interested in the most ancient evidence. However, we are to an extent conditioned by the fact that the most ancient Greek papyri that we are aware of, from the second half of the IVth century

B.C., are extremely limited in number. One of these, possibly the oldest, is the well-known fragment of the *Persians* of Timotheus, *PBerol.* inv. 9875. At col. IV, l. 133, after having written βορειαιραισον|ται, the scribe inserted a δ *supra lineam* in order to restore the correct reading βορέα διαραίσον|ται. At col. V, l. 196, after having written πλουτουοδε, the scribe inserted an ι *supra lineam* to restore the correct reading πλούτου οί δέ. These two corrections (διορθώσεις) were made either *in scribendo* or following a rereading of the text. In the renowned *Derveni Papyrus*, dated around the end of the IVth century B.C., at col. XXI, l. 11 a first hand corrects]ρμοναδε by inserting an ι *supra lineam* to restore the correct A]ρμονία δέ, whilst at col. VI, l. 5 the omission of a letter in τοιδε (instead of τοῖς δέ) at the end of the line is not corrected. Such examples suggest that the corrections were not the product of a systematic analysis, but were made by the scribe, probably *in scribendo*, if he should notice a mistake⁷. These corrections of material errors, though not classifiable as a significantly evident phenomenon, certainly represent the most ancient, tangible and visible evidence of a concern for the creation of a correct text and can be placed just before or at the same time as Zenodotus (330 ca.-260 ca.).

From the IIIrd century B.C. comes the Milan papyrus with epigrams by Posidippus, *PUniv.Milan.* 309, which represents important evidence not only because of the ancient epoch to which it belongs, but also in view of the quantity of corrections and annotations the text presents. The majority of the corrections were made by the same scribe, but subsequently two other hands intervened with further emendations and the differences in approach should be recognised. «Il medesimo scriba è responsabile della maggioranza delle correzioni ... Gli interventi sono tutti assai limitati (in genere coinvolgono una sola lettera e mai più di tre) e sono tutti diretti ad emendare banali errori di stesura, cioè fraintendimenti, sostituzioni accidentali ed omissioni. La maggior parte di essi è stata manifestamente eseguita *in scribendo*; e tutti quanti sono stati compiuti con studiata accuratezza ... infatti, se gli errori emendati fossero apparsi evidenti, avrebbero dato immediatamente l'impressione che il testo fosse scritto senza la necessaria precisione ed avrebbero svilito il lavoro di chi lo aveva scritto. Dopo quella del copista, altre due mani hanno inserito emendamenti nel rotolo, operando entrambe in pochi punti e senza avere la precauzione di occultare i loro interventi, come invece cercava di fare il copista ... Si potrebbe pensare che questa [*scil.* la seconda mano, m. 2] sia la mano di un revisore del centro di copia in

7 Turner/Parsons 1987, 92; text in Kouremenos/Parássoglou/Tsantsanoglou 2006.

cui fu realizzato il rotolo. L'ipotesi non è del tutto esclusa; ma non è nemmeno sostenuta da indicazioni certe. Anzi, il fatto che le correzioni di m. 2 siano tutte concentrate in due sole colonne consecutive, induce a ritenere che chi le apportò fosse un lettore particolarmente interessato a quella sezione dello scritto, più che un revisore obbligato a controllare tutto il rotolo. Fu sicuramente un lettore la terza persona che intervenne sul testo [*scil.* m. 3] ... i suoi interventi sono concentrati tutti nella col. XI. Lì egli segnalò una variante di lettura per la l. 30, annotandola nel margine superiore»⁸. Let us take one example. At col. XI, l. 30 we can read κεντρῶκαίεξω[; in the upper margin, one of the two hands working on the text after the original scribe has written καίκεντρῶ (the last three letters are not visible in the photograph but can be seen in the original document)⁹. It is extremely likely that this is a correction or a variant, probably for the κέντρῶ καί of the text, an inversion – καὶ κέντρῶ – is proposed, but it is not clear owing also to the fact that the rest of the verse has not been preserved¹⁰.

The papyrus findings of the IInd and IIIrd centuries of our era are sizeable and the evidence of the period provides us with valuable and abundant documentation. The following significant examples will suffice for our purposes, although these could be easily added to.

POxy. 2161, of the IInd century A.D., contains Aeschylus' *Diktyoulkoi*. The scribe has occasionally corrected some of his own errors. For

8 Bastianini/Gallazzi 2001, 15: «The same scribe is responsible for most of the corrections ... Interventions are extremely limited (in general amounting to one and never more than three letters) and are all aimed at correcting minor slips in the drafting stage i.e. misunderstandings, accidental substitutions and omissions. Most of these are clearly made *in scribendo*; and all of these were carried out with considerable accuracy ... in fact, if the errors corrected had appeared visible, they would have given the impression that the text had been written without due precision so devaluing the importance of the work of its writer. After the copyist's corrections, two further hands inserted revisions in the roll, both operating in only a few places and without any attempt to hide their corrections, unlike the copyist ... It is possible that this [*scil.* the second hand, m. 2] is the hand of a proof reader of the workshop where the roll was created. This hypothesis is not completely to be rejected; however, it lacks reliable evidence. Indeed, the fact that the corrections of m. 2 are concentrated in only two consecutive columns leads one to believe that who made these corrections was a reader with particular interest in that section of the script rather than a proof reader having to check the entire roll. A reader was certainly the third person to make changes to the text [*scil.* m. 3] ... his amendments are concentrated all in col. XI. There he recorded a variant on the reading of l. 30, noting it in the upper margin».

9 Bastianini/Gallazzi 2001, 76–77.

10 Bastianini/Gallazzi 2001, *ad loc.*

instance, at l. 831 he wrote ηδη, but then crossed this out with an oblique line through each letter, writing *supra lineam* the correct reading ο]iov.

PBerol. inv. 9872 (BKT II), of the IInd century A.D., is a long papyrus roll (75 columns plus various fragments) that contains a commentary on Plato's *Theaetetus* with a substantial number of corrections. The most recent editors of the roll, Bastianini and Sedley, write: «Il *volumen* è stato sottoposto a revisione e corretto in più punti: parole o lettere omesse nella stesura originaria sono state reintrodotte, lettere o parole superflue sono state cancellate, lettere ritenute errate sono state sostituite con quelle giudicate esatte. Tutti questi interventi non sembrano presupporre *necessariamente* una collazione con un esemplare diverso da quello di copia (l'affermazione contraria di McNamee 1981, 90 non appare sufficientemente fondata) ... La varietà del modo con cui le emendazioni sono state attuate può indurre il sospetto che il rotolo sia stato corretto a più riprese: una prima mano (quella di un *diorthotès* dello *scriptorium*) ha aggiunto le parole saltate, che sono riportate nel margine superiore ... o inferiore ... oppure sono poste a proseguire il rigo direttamente nell'intercolumnio ... Una mano successiva, o forse più mani, sembrano poi avere ripercorso tutto il testo, cancellando da capo con un tratto d'inchio tutto le lettere ritenute errate»¹¹.

For example, at col. LXIII, l. 6 the scribe had written προσάλλουτεσχη, omitting some words. In the *intercolumnium* to the left, the corrector has put the sign of an upwards-pointing *ancora* and in the space between ἀλλὰ and οὐτε has written ἄνω; in the upper margin, one can read the words θεωρεῖται οὐτε γὰρ χρῶμα κα(τω), which were probably preceded by an *ancora* now lost in *lacuna*. The corrected text is therefore πρὸς ἄλλα θεωρεῖται οὐτε γὰρ χρῶμα οὐτε σχῆμα.

11 Bastianini/Sedley 1995, 243-244: «The *volumen* has been proof read and corrected in many places: letters or words omitted in the original drafting stage have been restored, superfluous letters or words have been cancelled, letters judged to be mistakes have been replaced by those considered correct. All these changes do not appear *necessarily* to presuppose a collation with an exemplar different from that of the copy (the contrary view held by McNamee 1981, 90 does not seem sufficiently well-grounded) ... The variety of ways the corrections have been made may lead one to suspect that the roll had been corrected on various occasions: the first hand (a *diorthotès* in the *scriptorium*) added the missing words, which are marked in the upper margin ... or lower ... or are placed after the line directly in the *intercolumnium* ... A later hand or perhaps hands, appears to have gone through the whole text, cancelling with a line in ink all the letters judged to be wrong».

POxy. 2256, of the IInd-IIIrd centuries A.D., contains *hypotheses* of various tragedies by Aeschylus. The fragmentary *hypothesis* of fr. 3 recalls the victory, with the trilogy of which the *Danaids* was a part, against Sophocles and another author, probably Mesatos (l. 5). After the name of the latter and at the beginning of the following l. 6, round brackets can be clearly seen, which are generally used as a sign to indicate expunction in literary texts and non-literary documents. It is clear here that the round brackets were placed *in scribendo*, which can be explained solely by imagining that the scribe copied from an exemplar where the expunctions were already present to indicate that the plays placed between brackets had been mistakenly placed after the name of Mesatos¹². The copy of the Gospel according to St. John contained in *PBodmer* 2 dates to the IIIrd century A.D. The scribe has corrected the text in a variety of ways. There are *supra lineam* additions (ll. 2 and 12) and words rewritten above parts of the text cancelled with a sponge: at ll. 9-10 εταραχθη has been written over a word that has been scrubbed out and which continued in the following line, where the letters σαρτο can be made out in the remaining space; the second part of l. 10 has been rewritten; at the beginning of l. 11 τον is the remains of an eliminated reading, subsequently punctuated with dots as well as small round brackets *supra lineam*.

I turn now to a manuscript that, I believe, provides us with what can be termed an anthology of the techniques and methods available for correcting and improving a text: *POxy.* 2404 + *PLaur.* inv. III/278, a fragment of a papyrus roll (late IInd century-early IIIrd century A.D.) containing a part of §§ 51-53 (*POxy.* 2404) and of §§ 162-163 (*PLaur.* III/278) of Aeschines' oration *Against Ctesiphon*¹³. We can see that the work of proof reading was not limited solely to correcting minor errors as discretely as possible in order to reduce the possibly negative impact of emendations on the appearance of the text (see above the case of the papyrus of Posidippus); in fact, more evident corrections, albeit written with care and precision, have been made, with the apparent aim of improving the text and enabling it to be read according to the intention of the corrector or correctors. As regards punctuation, the scribe provided the text only with *paragraphoi*, whilst copious punctuation was added (at

12 Arata/Bastianini/Montanari 2004, 39, 47-48.

13 *Editio princeps* of *POxy.* 2404: Turner 1957; see also Turner 1980², Pl. VIII and p. 212; *editio princeps* of *PLaur.* inv. III/278: Messeri Savorelli/Pintaudi 1997, 172-174; see also Neri 2003, 511-514; Esposito 2004, 3-4; Colomo 2008 *passim*.

least it is thought) by a later hand¹⁴. Most of these are dots, placed slightly higher than the letters, which had already been written, making sure that they were not above a letter but in the narrow space between the end of the preceding word and the beginning of the next. A lower dot can also be seen at col. I, l. 17. The system can be described as follows: the upper dot combined with the *paragraphos* marks the end of a sentence; the upper dot on its own distinguishes the *cola* of the sentence; the lower dot indicates a weaker pause¹⁵. If we examine the second column (preserved almost in its entirety)¹⁶, which includes the portion of the text (relatively small as the columns are narrow and not high) which goes from § 52.7 τριάκοντα to § 53.7 ὥστε (Dilts 1997 edition, 212–213), we find six upper dots that correctly mark out all the *cola* of the passage (ll. II 5, 8, 12, 15, 16, 22 = ll. 33, 36, 40, 43, 44, 50 in the numbering of the *editio princeps*); two of these dots are also combined with the *paragraphos* (ll. 8 = 36 and 22 = 50) and mark precisely the end of the two sentences that occur in these lines (i.e. they correspond with the two full stops of the modern edition). In the first column, where the beginnings of the lines are lost and the absence of the left margin does not allow us to know whether there were *paragraphoi*, one can note two upper dots at ll. 14 and 22 in addition to the already mentioned lower dot at l. 17. Proof therefore of a serious attempt to highlight the syntactic and rhetorical structure of the text that leads us to consider the role of punctuation in Alexandrian philological exegesis (rather than the complex and idiosyncratic system created by Nicanor, one can mention the simpler and more widely-used system of the three *stigmai* of Dionysius Thrax)¹⁷. Starting from the *editio princeps* of *POxy.* 2404, all corrections have been attributed to a single second hand, although D. Colomo in a recent work states that three subsequent hands can be identified following that of the scribe's¹⁸. As I feel insufficiently competent on this point, believing that further autopsy on the original is required, I will not go into the question, focusing my attention on the changes made in particular in col. II of *POxy.* 2404.

14 See Turner 1957, 130; 1980², 212; Colomo 2008, 15–16. On punctuation marks in papyri, see Turner 1980², 92–93; Turner/Parsons 1987, 9–10.

15 Colomo 2008, 15–16.

16 Only one line is missing at the beginning while the other lines are complete, thereby allowing for a well-founded evaluation. The upper and lower margins remain in the first column so guaranteeing 28 lines per column. The column is however mutilated both on the right and on the left (approximately half the line remains).

17 See Colomo 2008, 15–22; Montana 2009a; D.T., in GG I/I 7.3–8.2.

18 Colomo 2008, 24–27; see also Neri 2003, 511–514.

At l. 6 (= 34 of the continuous numbering) the first hand wrote ἐν τοῖς διονυσίοις and the proof reader makes the appropriate correction ἐν διονύσου by putting four dots above the letters of the τοις to be eliminated and writing simply ου above ιοις, without cancelling out these letters, but paying attention to place ου exactly above ιο, so as to avoid possible misinterpretations (e.g., σίου), and to clearly mark the correct reading σου, obviously counting on the fact that the residual ις did not create problems. At l. 21 (= 49) λείαν has been corrected to λίαν by cancelling ε with two oblique lines through the letter; at l. 26 (= 54), the first hand wrote ὅπως which the corrector revises with οὕτως by deleting the incorrect π with an oblique line through and writing υτ exactly above π¹⁹.

More interesting and considerably more intriguing is the situation at ll. II 16–20 (44–48 in the numbering of the *editio princeps*). This is the text of the passage in the codices and in modern editions (Blass 1908²⁰, Adams 1919, Leone 1977, Dilts 1997):

ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνο φοβούμενος, μή μοι παρ' ὑμῶν ἀπαντήσῃ τὸ δοκεῖν ἀληθῆ μὲν λέγειν, ἀρχαῖα δὲ καὶ λίαν ὁμολογούμενα.

First, a small point of interest. The medieval codices agreed on δοκεῖν μὲν ἀληθῆ λέγειν, whilst C. G. Cobet had suggested the transposition δοκεῖν ἀληθῆ μὲν λέγειν, rightly accepted by Blass 1908²¹ and later editions²². Our papyrus confirms this transposition: the correct reading ἀληθῆ μὲν is in the primary text and is left unchanged by the corrector.

Apart from this, the textual situation of the passage is complex in that neither the primary text nor the text the corrector produced from it correspond to medieval tradition. The primary text appears to have been:

ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνο φοβούμενος, μή μοι παρ' ὑμῶν ἀπαντήσῃ τι τοιοῦτον καὶ τὸ δοκεῖν ἀληθῆ μὲν λέγειν κτλ.

Turner observes that «This first reading appears to mean ‘lest I be greeted on your part by some such thing as the impression of telling the

19 According to Neri 2003, 512, the two deletions at ll. 21 and 26 are assignable to the first hand i.e. the scribe, whilst the corrector later added the correct letters at l. 26; furthermore, at col. I, l. 28 Neri suggests that the scribe tried to correct an erroneous ε, but with imprecise results, which led the corrector to add the correct ο *supra lineam*. See Colomo 2008, 26.

20 Unchanged in Blass/Schindel 1978.

21 Confirmed in Blass/Schindel 1978, XXIX.

22 μὲν ἀληθῆ remains solely in the Martin/de Budé 1928 edition.

truth but...’, as if $\tau\iota\ \tau\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu\ \omicron\iota\omicron\nu$ or $\tilde{\omega}\ \kappa\alpha\iota$ stood in the Greek»²³. Later $\tau\iota\varsigma$ has been added *supra lineam*, positioned carefully between $\mu\eta$ and $\mu\omicron\iota$ (l. 16 = 44); $\tau\iota\ \tau\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu$ (l. 18 = 46) has been eliminated with two horizontal lines (one drawn through the two words, now faded, the other clearly visible *supra lineam*) and next to that on the right (in the *intercolumnium*) in its place has been written $\theta\omicron\rho$], which is generally integrated as $\theta\omicron\rho\upsilon\beta\omicron\varsigma$. In the next line (l. 19 = 47) $\kappa\alpha\iota$ has been left, whilst $\tau\omicron\ \delta\omicron\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$ has been eliminated with a horizontal line through the letters (double lines through $\omicron\delta\omicron$, probably a first, shorter line which was later gone over by a longer line through the whole segment) and $\delta\omicron\varsigma\omega$ added in smaller writing not in the margin (as was the case for $\theta\omicron\rho\upsilon\beta\omicron\varsigma$) but in an empty space in the final part of the line in which the four letters of smaller size fit into the space with only a minimal part extending outside the space on the right (see below). The resulting text is as follows:

ἀλλ’ ἐκεῖνο φοβούμενος, μή τις μοι παρ’ ὑμῶν ἀπαντήσῃ [τῖ τοιοῦτον]
 θόρυβος καὶ [τὸ δοκεῖν] δόξω ἀληθῆ μὲν λέγειν κτλ.

The most straightforward scenario is to imagine that the first was the text written by the copyist²⁴ and the second, resulting from the sum of corrections, was the one wanted by the corrector or correctors. A doubt remains regarding the correction at l. 19 (= 47): why did the copyist leave an empty space after $\tau\omicron\ \delta\omicron\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$ at the end of l. 19 = 47, a space which was used for adding $\delta\omicron\varsigma\omega$? There are certainly some irregularities in right side justification, but the space left empty here is perhaps too big (corresponding to around three letters of the normal size). Neri suggests that the scribe himself may have left the space, making the correction later (if however this occurred *in scribendo*, why should the scribe write in a smaller and more compact size?) or he may have deliberately left the space for the corrector, who would fill the space afterwards²⁵. Colomo, on the other hand, thinks that $\delta\omicron\varsigma\omega$ is attributable to a fourth hand, different from the one who wrote $\tau\iota\varsigma$ between the lines and $\theta\omicron\rho\upsilon\beta\omicron\varsigma$ in the margin²⁶.

23 See Turner 1957, 132, *ad loc.*; according to Colomo 2008, 24, here «è stato operato un intervento di correzione attraverso la collazione di un altro esemplare diverso dall’antigrafo, ad opera di due mani diverse, la terza e la quarta» («a correction was made by the collation of another exemplar different from the antigraph carried out by two different hands, i.e. a third and fourth hand»).

24 With an error/omission after $\tau\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu$, as suggested by Turner 1957, 132. However, see Merkelbach 1959.

25 Neri 2003, 512.

26 Colomo 2008, 25.