Gertjan Verhasselt/Robert Mayhew*

Porphyry and ancient scholarship on *Iliad* 10.252–253: Edition, translation and discussion

Abstract: In *Iliad* 10, Odysseus claims that 'more night has passed | than two parts, but still a third part remains' (252–253). This gave rise to a Homeric problem, which received a great deal of attention from ancient scholars: If more than two parts of the night have passed, how can a third part remain? The main source for a variety of solutions to it is a lengthy discussion written along the perimeter of three pages of *Venetus* B, an important manuscript of the *Iliad*. The source of this text is almost certainly Porphyry's *Homeric Questions*. Porphyry presents six different solutions, including those of Apion, Chrysippus and Aristotle (this last a fragment from his lost *Homeric Problems*), as well as a discussion of Odysseus as astronomer. The present paper includes: a critical edition of this text based on a fresh inspection of the manuscript, yielding new readings; an English translation; notes to the text; and an interpretive essay. The paper demonstrates the limitations of earlier editors of the text, and the hope is that it will serve as an example of how properly to approach and present the fragments of Porphyry's *Homeric Questions*. It also turns out that, for quotations from the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, Porphyry often does not provide the text attributed to him in the recent Homer editions of West.

Keywords: Homer, Porphyry, Aristotle, scholia, Odysseus.

1 Introduction

In *Iliad* 10, Diomedes and Odysseus volunteer one night to spy on the Trojans. Odysseus urges them to make a start:

*Corresponding authors: Gertjan Verhasselt, LMU Munich and KU Leuven,
E-Mail: Gertjan.Verhasselt@klassphil.uni-muenchen.de
Robert Mayhew, Seton Hall University, South Orange, NJ, E-Mail: robert.mayhew@shu.edu

ἀλλ' ἴομεν· μάλα γὰρ νὺξ ἄνεται, ἐγγύθι δ' ἠώς,
ἄστρα δὲ δὴ προβέβηκε, παρῴχωκεν δὲ πλέων νὺξ
τῶν δύο μοιράων, τριτάτη δ' ἔτι μοῖρα λέλειπται. (*Il.* 10.251–253)[1]

But let us go, for night is quickly coming to an end, and dawn is near,
and the stars have advanced, and more night has passed
than two parts, but still a third part remains.[2]

This passage (and especially 252–253) received a great deal of attention from ancient Homeric scholars, and the extant evidence for what they said about it comes almost entirely from the Homeric scholia. There was discussion of possible variants of παρῴχωκεν ('have advanced'), none of which alter the meaning of the text.[3] But the bulk of the attention in antiquity was devoted to answering some version of the following 'much-discussed question' (in the words of one A scholion from the *Viermännerkommentar* (VMK)):[4] If *more* than two thirds (or two parts) of the night have passed, how can one third (or a third part) of the night remain?

There is no record of who first raised a question about these verses, but the text that is the focus of the present study tells us that this is one of the ancient questions; and the people who are cited take us back to the fourth or even the fifth century BC. The major Alexandrian scholars considered verse 10.253 to be an error. Zenodotus excised the verse, while Aristophanes of Byzantium athetised it (i. e. flagged it as spurious),[5] as did Aristarchus of Samothrace. Aristarchus seems to have athetised it for two reasons: First, it was sufficient to say, in summary fashion, 'the stars have advanced', whereas to go on about the remainder of the night, with a view to being accurate, is too elaborate, as if providing the account of some astronomer (ὥσπερ ἀστρονόμου τινός). Second, δύο in the genitive (τῶν δύο) is, he claims, not Homeric.[6] Further, according to a D scholion at least one

---

1 The text is that of West 1998–2000, I, 297.
2 Translations from the Greek are our own.
3 See the text-critical notes below (p. 458–459).
4 Schol. A *Il.* 10.252a (Erbse) (VMK): ἄστρα δὲ δὴ προβέβηκε, <παρῴχηκεν δὲ πλέων νύξ>· διὰ τὸ πολυθρύλλητον ζήτημα καὶ τὰς γεγονυίας ἀποδόσεις.
5 Schol. A *Il.* 10.253a1 (Erbse) (VMK) ends: Ζηνόδοτος <οὐ>δὲ ἔγραφεν, Ἀριστοφάνης ἠθέτει. This is the last line of the scholion, the rest of which is presented in the following note.
6 Schol. A *Il.* 10.253a1 (Erbse) (VMK): τῶν δύο μοιράων, <τριτάτη δ' ἔτι μοῖρα λέλειπται>· ἀθετεῖται, ὅτι αὔταρκες τὸ κεφαλαιωδῶς εἰπεῖν «ἄστρα δὲ δὴ προβέβηκε»· τὸ γὰρ τοῦ καιροῦ τοῦτο ἀπαιτεῖ, τὸ δὲ προσδιασαφεῖν κατὰ τὸ ἀκριβὲς τὸ παρεληλυθὸς καὶ τὸ περιλειπόμενον ὥσπερ ἀστρονόμου τινός. οὐχ Ὁμηρικὸν δὲ καὶ τὸ τῶν δύο· οἱ δύο μὲν γὰρ λέγει καὶ τοὺς δύο, <τῶν δύο δὲ> ἢ τοῖς δύο οὐκ ἔστιν εὑρεῖν παρ' Ὁμήρῳ. The source is generally taken to be Aristonicus' Περὶ τῶν σημείων τῆς Ἰλιάδος. While it is true that δύο is otherwise not attested in

scholar attempted to solve the problem with a hyperbaton, i. e. by reading τῶν δύο μοιράων together with ἄστρα δὲ δὴ προβέβηκε in the preceding line, so that the result is purportedly something like: 'the stars have advanced two parts, and most of the night has passed, but still a third part remains ...'[7]

Our main source for a variety of answers to this question – solutions to this problem – is an unusually lengthy text written along the perimeter of three pages

---

Homer as a genitive or dative, δύω is used as a dative in *Il*. 13.407 and as a genitive in *Od*. 10.515; these are also the only two passages in Homer where the number two is attested in the dative or genitive (so Homer does not use δυοῖν; he does, however, use the dative for the alternative δοιοί). See Römer 1912, 159 and Hainsworth 1993, 177–178. See also the discussion in Eust. *Il*. 10.251 vol. 3 p. 60–61 (van der Valk). Schironi 2018, 537 n. 159 is right to observe that 'τῶν δύο' and 'τοῖς δύο' are not attested in Homer, but this is not what the scholion intends to say, since 'οἱ δύο' and 'τοὺς δύο' are not attested either (the only forms attested with the article are τὼ δύω in *Il*. 5.554; 13.345; 19.47, οἱ δύω in *Od*. 12.73 and τὰς δύο in *Il*. 20.271). That is also why Erbse 1969–1988, III, 51 writes οἱ 'δύο' μὲν γὰρ λέγει (E 303 al.) καὶ τοὺς 'δύο' (B 346 al.). To express the number two, Homer also uses δοιοί/δοιώ. For the view that Aristarchus interpreted this passage despite athetising 10.253, see n. 135 below.

7 Schol. D *Il*. 10.252(1) p. 373.3–7 (van Thiel²): ἢ ἐν ὑπερβατῷ· «ἄστρα δὲ δὴ προβέβηκε τῶν δύο μοιράων, παρῴχηκεν δὲ πλέω νύξ. τρίτη δὲ μοῖρα λέλειπται», δηλονότι ὅλον τὸ τρίτον μέρος. ὡς γὰρ πρὸς τὸ ὑπολειπόμενον τῆς τρίτης μοίρας φησὶ τὸ «πλέω». ἔνιοι δὲ γράφουσιν «πλέη», ἀντὶ τοῦ «πλῆρες τῶν δύο μοιρῶν παρῴχηκεν»· τριφύλακτον γὰρ θέλει εἶναι τὴν νύκτα. See also schol. A *Il*. 10.252a (Erbse) (VMK): γράφεται καὶ οὕτως ἄστρα δὲ δὴ προβέβηκε τῶν δύο μοιράων, παροίχωκεν δὲ πλέω νύξ, τριτάτη δ᾽ ἔτι μοῖρα λέλειπται. τριφύλακος γὰρ ἦν καθ᾽ Ὅμηρον ἡ νύξ (so *Venetus* A fol. 131r). Like Dindorf 1875–1877, I, 352, Erbse 1969–1988, III, 48 adopted Cobet's correction of the Homeric line in this second scholion to ἄστρα δὲ δὴ προβέβηκε, παροίχωκεν δὲ πλέω‹ν› νύξ | τῶν δύο μοιράων, τριτάτη δ᾽ ἔτι μοῖρα λέλειπται. However, this might not be necessary. It is possible that this is the result of a misinterpretation of the D scholion as if it means that there was an actual reading that literally transposed the Homeric lines (which would obviously be unmetrical). Note also that the A scholion from the *Viermännerkommentar* shares the reading πλέω with most manuscripts of the D scholion. Moreover, like the D scholion, it refers to the night consisting of three parts. This would also explain why the two Homeric lines are quoted in full, which puzzled Ludwich 1884, 315, since the focus in the second part of the scholion is the Aristarchan reading παροίχωκεν. Van der Valk 1963–1964, I, 124–125, who also restored the text like Dindorf, tried to explain this by assuming that the scholion indicates that some critics did not athetise l. 253. However, the scholiast would not have simply used γράφεται to communicate this; for its counterpart οὐ γράφεται is not used to indicate athetesis but to show that the line in question was not written at all (athetised lines were still written but flagged with the *obelus* sign). See the *Glossary of Greek Terms* in Nünlist 2009, 368 *s. v.* ἀθετέω (ἀθέτησις): "*to consider spurious, to mark as spurious* (but without excising)" (see also Nünlist 2009, 16 n. 57), and 371 *s. v.* γράφω, οὐ: "*to excise* (i. e. athetise in the modern sense)". For the hyperbaton interpretation, see also Eust. *Il*. 10.252–253 vol. 3 p. 59.15–16 (van der Valk): ἢ καθ᾽ ὑπερβατόν, ὅτι ἄστρα τὰ πλέω τῶν ἀφ᾽ ἑσπέρας ὑπὲρ γῆν ὄντων τὰ τῶν δύο μοιράων ᾤχετο.

of *Venetus* B,[8] an important manuscript of the *Iliad* containing two levels of scholia (eleventh century, and twelfth or thirteenth). Although the text under discussion cites no author, it is generally taken to be an excerpt from Porphyry's *Homeric Questions*.[9] Modern scholars have rightly become sceptical with regard to the inclusion of anonymous texts under the fragments of Porphyry.[10] Indeed, in the case of the *Homeric Questions*, the standard edition by Schrader went much too far in including anonymous texts. Schrader included all scholia written in the form of a question in the Homeric scholia (spanning the A, bT and D scholia in the case of the *Iliad*) and even in Eustathius as fragments of Porphyry. This principle was rightly refuted by Erbse.[11] However, Porphyry is more likely to be the author of the excerpt than might appear at first sight. *B generally does not name Porphyry at the start of an excerpt, but the other main manuscripts containing the same excerpts – Scorialensis Ω.I.12 (E⁴) and Harleianus gr. 5693 (Bm⁸) – usually cite Porphyry at the start of the excerpt, thus confirming him as the author of the excerpt. Moreover, the attribution of the zetemata excerpts of *B to Porphyry is further confirmed by the numerous parallels with the *Zetemata Vaticana* (i. e. the first book of Porphyry's *Homeric Questions*). As we will show below, the text under discussion is not preserved in the other manuscripts. But the overwhelmingly large number of parallels for other excerpts suggests that Porphyry is most likely to be the author of the excerpt. Therefore, we posit that the excerpts in *B constitute an exception to the 'minimalist' rule, with which we otherwise wholeheartedly agree.

This text makes clear that most ancient literary scholars – or in any case, those whose views Porphyry thought were worth recording – sought to defend these verses as they stand. Here is an outline of the contents of this text (We have embedded these numbers and letters into our text and translation).

1. Introductory remarks on how to approach Homeric problems
2. A paradigm case: *Iliad* 10.252–253 and 'one of the ancient questions'

---

8 Digital copies of *Venetus* B, fols. 134v–135v, can be accessed here: http://beta.hpcc.uh.edu/hmt/archive-dl/VenetusB/.
9 We follow Erbse and others in using '*B' to refer to the later excerpts, which is the type that interests us here. On codex B and the difference between the B and *B scholia, see Erbse 1969–1988, I, XVII–XVIII. The scholiast responsible for the material labelled *B is credited with the addition of the excerpts from Porphyry and from Heraclitus the Allegorist in the spaces of the page that were empty. The scribe seems to have later added another set of excerpts from Porphyry (**B), which he introduces with a symbol in red ink. See Schrader 1880, VII–VIII; Erbse 1960, 17–29; MacPhail 2011, 8–9.
10 See especially Johnson 2017 on the 'minimalist' approach to the fragments of Porphyry.
11 Erbse 1960, 17–77.

3. Solutions: a.   The solution of 'some'
                 b.   The solution of Metrodorus (of Lampsacus the Elder?)
                 c.   The solution of Chrysippus
                 d.   The solution of 'others'
                 e.   The solution of Aristotle
                 f.   The solution of Autochthon
                 g.   The solution of Apion

4. What stars is Homer referring to, and what exactly does προβέβηκε denote?

In this paper, we first provide a critical edition and translation of the Porphyry excerpt (§ 2), followed by text-critical notes (§ 3).[12] We then provide an interpretive essay, in which we discuss the various views presented by Porphyry (§ 4).

2 Edition and translation

Porphyry's *Homeric Questions* are known to us partly in direct and partly in indirect transmission. The first book (which we have dubbed the *Zetemata Vaticana*[13]) is preserved in direct transmission. The rest of Porphyry's work is preserved only through excerpts in the manuscripts of the Homeric epics. For the excerpts on the *Iliad*, the most important manuscript is *Venetus* B. The text discussed in this article is one of those indirectly preserved excerpts. Before presenting our edition and translation of the excerpt, it is necessary to discuss briefly the previous editors of this text.[14]

    The *Iliad* scholia in *Venetus* B were first published by Villoison in 1788. However, Villoison often seems to have misread the text and to have misinterpreted the abbreviations used in the manuscript.[15] In 1825, Bekker made a new edition, in which he edited all B scholia together with the A and D scholia. Although he inspected *Venetus* B, he only partly collated it and often still relied on the text as edited by Villoison.[16] The Porphyry excerpts on the

---

12 These were composed by G. Verhasselt.

13 After Schrader's label "Ζητήματα codicis Vaticani". Sodano 1970 also dubs them zetemi vaticani.

14 On the editorial history of Porphyry's *Homeric Questions*, see also Sodano 1970, xxi–xxviii. On the early editions of the *Iliad* scholia, see also Pontani 2006.

15 On the importance of Villoison's edition, whatever its flaws, see Nagy 2004, ch. 1.

16 See Bekker 1825, iv: *Venetum alterum (B) [...] et ipse inspexi. quem cum viderem pulcherrime scriptum lectuque facillimum, nolui dubitare de Villoisonis in describendo eo aut fide aut peritia. nunc ne a vero identidem aberraverit vir eruditior quam prudentior, sero vereor.*

Iliad were re-edited in Kammer's 1863 dissertation. Although Kammer did not inspect *Venetus* B (or any manuscript for that matter), relying instead on Bekker's text, he provided numerous conjectures.[17] He also often suggested deleting sections, which – in his opinion – interrupted the flow of the text. While he often correctly identified interpolations, he went much too far in obelising the text.

The scholia in *Venetus* B received their first critical edition in the third volume of Dindorf's edition of the *Iliad* scholia in 1877, edited on the basis of a renewed inspection of the original manuscript. In 1888, Schrader published a new edition of the Porphyrian excerpts on the *Iliad*, which remains the standard edition to this day.[18] Schrader's main source is *Venetus* B, but he also used additional manuscripts, particularly the codex Lipsiensis gr. 32 (Li)[19] and the codex Leidensis Vossianus gr. 64 (Le). The former is now known to be an apograph of B, while the latter is an apograph of the codex Scorialensis Ω.I.12 (E^4). In his monumental edition of the *Iliad* scholia, which covers both the A and bT scholia, Erbse included only the first layer of B scholia, thus excluding all the excerpts from Porphyry. More recently, MacPhail has published a new edition and translation of the Porphyrian excerpts on the *Iliad* preserved in indirect transmission on the basis of *Venetus* B, E^4 and the codex Harleianus gr. 5693 (Bm^8) (in addition to Li and Le).[20]

The text edited here is not found in E^4/Le, Bm^8 or Li (the apograph of *Venetus* B). However, it is found in another copy of B not used by previous editors, viz. Vaticanus Palatinus gr. 12 (V^{20}) (thirteenth century)[21]. Since this is a *codex descriptus*, we do not systematically cite its readings, but we do cite it when it corrects

---

17 Kammer even chose to omit the excerpts in which he had no corrections to offer.

18 In this edition, Schrader also included the first book of Porphyry's *Homeric Questions*. Schrader 1890 later also published an edition of the Porphyrian excerpts on the *Odyssey*. Note, however, that Porphyry did not separate his discussion of the *Iliad* from that of the *Odyssey* and did not present the problems in the order of the Homeric songs. The first book of Porphyry's *Homeric Questions* shows that his discussion alternates between the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Therefore, the distinction of 'Homeric Question on the *Iliad*' and 'Homeric Questions on the *Odyssey*' is a purely modern construct.

19 The codex Lipsiensis gr. 32 (Li) was used already partly by Villoison and Bekker through a copy made by Stephanus Bergler (the *apographum Hamburgense*). See d'Ansse de Villoison 1788, XLV–XLVII; Bekker 1825, III. The scholia of Li were published by Bachmann 1835.

20 MacPhail's edition is also more restrictive in the inclusion of the texts than Schrader. Unfortunately, this has led him to exclude even some excerpts whose attribution to Porphyry is certain. He also omits the citations of Porphyry's *Homeric Questions* in the D scholia and Eustathius (F 384–402 Smith). See Dorandi 2011; Hillgruber 2014, 494.

21 On V^{20}, see Allen 1931, 48; Erbse 1960, 9; 1969–1988, I, XXXII–XXXIII.

a corrupt passage or resolves an abbreviation in B whose resolution is debated. When we cite deviating readings in V[20], these should thus be considered the equivalent of conjectures.

Despite the recent edition by MacPhail, the textual constitution is often still problematic, as will become clear from the notes and essay. Our renewed inspection of *Venetus* B also shows that MacPhail (like the editors before him) sometimes misread the text (though far less often than Villoison or Bekker). His translation, which aims to be literal, is also often difficult to understand.[22] Moreover, despite its title (*Porphyry's* Homeric Questions on the *Iliad: Text, Translation, Commentary*), MacPhail's book does not offer a commentary on the text (neither a philological nor an interpretive one) but merely offers sporadic footnotes. Furthermore, for our excerpt, MacPhail even omits the end of the text (virtually all of Item 4 in our outline) without any explanation.

---

22 See van der Horst 2011; Slater 2012, 328–329.

*B *Iliad* 10.252 (fols. 134v–135v)

Porphyry, *Homeric Questions on the* Iliad (p. 147.5–151.26 Schrader)

[fol. 134v] [1] ἡ συναγωγὴ τῶν ζητουμένων γέγονε μὲν ἤδη καὶ παρ' ἄλλοις· ἡμεῖς δὲ τὰ προβλήματα λαμβάνοντες παρὰ τῶν ἐζητηκότων, τὰς λύσεις ἐπικρίνομεν ἃς ἐκεῖνοι ὑπέταξαν τοῖς προβλήμασι, καί τινας μὲν τούτων ἐγκρίνομεν, τινὰς δὲ παραιτούμεθα, τὰς δ' αὐτοὶ ἐξευρίσκομεν, τὰς δὲ πειρώμεθα διορθοῦν καὶ
5 ἐξεργάζεσθαι, ὥσπερ τοῖς ἐντυγχάνουσιν ἔσται δῆλον.

    [2] αὐτίκα τῶν παλαιῶν ζητημάτων ὡμολόγηται εἶναι τὸ τοιοῦτο, ἐν οἷς φησιν· «ἄστρα δὲ δὴ προβέβηκε, παρῴχηκε δὲ πλέω νὺξ | τῶν δύο μοιράων, τριτάτη δ' ἔτι μοῖρα λέλειπται» (*Il.* 10.252–253)· πῶς γὰρ, εἰ αἱ δύο μοῖραι ἐξήκουσιν αὐταί τε καὶ ἔτι τούτων πλέον, ἡ τριτάτη μοῖρα λέλειπται, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ τῆς τρίτης μόριον;

10   [3a] ὅθεν καί τινες προστιθέντες τὸ σ̄ ἠξίουν «τριτάτης δ' ἔτι μοῖρα λέλειπται» γράφειν, ἵνα τῆς τρίτης μερίς τις ᾖ καταλελειμμένη, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὅλη ἡ τρίτη.

    [3b] Μητρόδωρος (61 *fr.* 5 DK) μὲν οὖν τὸ πλεῖον δύο σημαίνειν φησὶ παρ' Ὁμήρῳ. καὶ γὰρ τὸ σύνηθες, ὡς ὅταν λέγῃ «νώτου ἀποπροταμών, ἐπὶ δὲ πλεῖον ἐλέλειπτο» (*Od.* 8.475), καὶ «ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν πλεῖον πολυάϊκος πολέμοιο | χεῖρες
15 ἐμαὶ διέπουσι» (*Il.* 1.165–166), σημαίνει<ν> <δὲ> καὶ τὸ πλῆρες, ὡς ἐν τῷ «σὸν δὲ πλεῖον δέπας αἰεὶ | ἕστηκε» (*Il.* 4.262–263), καὶ ἐν τῷ «πλεῖαί τοι χαλκοῦ κλισίαι» (*Il.* 2.226). νῦν οὖν τὸ πλέον ἀντὶ τοῦ πλῆρες εἰρῆσθαι· πλήρης γὰρ ἡ νὺξ τῶν δύο μοιρῶν γεγονυῖα παρῴχηκε, τριτάτη δέ τι περι<λέ>λειπται. διεῖλε δ' εἰς γ΄, ὡς ἂν τριφυλάκου τῆς νυκτὸς οὔσης.

---

7 παρῴχηκε *B : παρῴχηκεν Kammer || πλέω *B : πλέον Villoison || δ' ἔτι Bekker (ex *Il.* 10.253) : δέ τι *B **8** αὖταί τε *B : αὐταί τε Bekker **9** ἔτι *B : ἐπὶ Villoison **10** προ°⁽ˢ⁾τιθέντες *B : προτιθέντες Villoison || δ' ἔτι Bekker : δέ τι *B || μοῖρα Bekker : μοίρας *B **12** μητρόδωρος *B : Ζηνόδωρος Horn 1883, 92 (thesis III) **15** σημαίνει<ν> <δὲ> Diels : σημαί^ν *B : σημαίνει V²⁰ : σημαίνει <δὲ> Schrader **17** πλέον *B : fortasse πλεῖον **18** τριτάτη *B : τριτάτης Villoison || δέ τι *B : δ' ἔτι Kammer || περι<λέ>λειπται Bekker : περίλειπται *B

[1] The collection of the inquiries has appeared already also in other writers; but we, taking the problems from those who have made the inquiries, are evaluating the solutions that they assigned to the problems, and some of them we approve of, whereas others we reject, and some solutions we find ourselves, whereas others we attempt to revise and work out, as will be clear to the reader.

[2] To begin with, the following is agreed to be one of the old questions, where [Homer] says: 'and the stars have advanced, and more night has passed | than two parts, and a third[23] still remains' [*Il*. 10.252–253]. For how, if these two parts have passed and even more than this, does the third part remain but not part of the third?

[3a] Hence, some in fact, adding a *sigma*[24], thought fit to write 'and some part of a third remains', so that some portion of the third is left, but not the whole third.

[3b] Now Metrodorus [61 *fr*. 5 DK] claims that πλεῖον means two things in Homer. For [it has] both the customary meaning [i. e. 'more' or 'most'], as when he says 'after he cut away from the back [of the boar], and *more* [or 'most'] was left' [*Od*. 8.475], and 'but it is my hands that conduct *more* [or 'the greatest part'] of furious war' [*Il*. 1.165–166]; <but> [he claims] that it also means 'full', as in 'your cup always stands full (πλεῖον)' [*Il*. 4.262–263], and in 'your huts are full (πλεῖαι) of bronze' [*Il*. 2.226]. So in the present case, [he claims that] πλέον is used instead of πλῆρες: for the night having become filled with two thirds has passed, and one third remains. And he divided it into three, since the night contained three watches.

---

23 The Homeric αἱ δύο μοῖραι is the equivalent of the Attic τὰ δύο μέρη here, which is the standard way of saying 'two thirds', with τὸ τρίτον μέρος ~ ἡ τριτάτη μοῖρα meaning 'one third'. However, the interpretations cited further on show that not all ancient writers interpreted it this way.
24 I.e. to τριτάτη, making it the genitive τριτάτης.

[3c] Χρύσιππος (*SVF* III *fr.* 772) δὲ, ὥσπερ εἴ τις, φησὶ, περὶ τριῶν ἡμερῶν διαλεγόμενος ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ λέγει μίαν ἀπολείπεσθαι ἔτι ἡμέραν, κἂν μὴ περὶ ὄρθρον ποιῆται τοὺς λόγους· οὕτως καὶ τὸν Ὀδυσσέα, εἰ καὶ πλέον ἦν παρῳχηκὸς τῶν δύο μοιρῶν, τὴν τρίτην φάναι καταλείπεσθαι, ἐπειδὴ τριμεροῦς οὔσης τῆς νυκτὸς
5 ἕκαστον μέρος ὡς ἕν τι λαμβάνεται, ὥστε κἂν ἐλλιπὲς ᾖ τοῦτο καὶ μὴ ὁλόκληρον, ἀλλ᾽ ἀριθμεῖσθαί γε τρίτον τῷ τάξιν τῶν μερῶν ἔχειν τὴν τρίτην. οὕτω γὰρ καὶ ἄνθρωπον †παρὰ πόδα† γενόμενον, ἔτι τυγχάνειν τῆς ὅλης προσηγορίας ∵

[3d] ἄλλοι δέ φασιν ἔθος ἔχειν τοὺς ποιητὰς τῷ ἀπηρτισμένῳ χρῆσθαι ἀριθμῷ, ὁτὲ μὲν τὰ ἐπιτρέχοντα τοῖς ἀριθμοῖς περιγράφοντας ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὁλοσχερεῖ καὶ
10 ἀπηρτισμένῳ χρῆσθαι, οἷον «χιλιόναυν στρατὸν» φήσειέ <τις ἂν> τῶν Ἑλλήνων – ἦσαν δὲ αἱ νῆες χίλιαι ἑκατὸν ὀγδοήκοντα ἕξ – καὶ ἔτι «πύργους εἴκοσι μιᾷ στολῇ, πεζοῖς μὲν ἕνδεκα, ναυσὶ δὲ δυώδεκα» (*TGF* II Adesp. *fr.* 432a) ἀντὶ τοῦ κγ´. ὁτὲ δὲ τὸν προκείμενον περιγράφουσι, τῷ ἐπιτρέχοντι ἀρκούμενοι, οἷον «κατὰ μὲν φίλα τέκν᾽ ἔπεφνε<ν> θάλλοντα<ς> ἥβᾳ | δυώδεκ᾽, αὐτὸν δὲ τρίτον» (Pind. *fr.* 171 Snell/
15 Maehler), ἀντὶ τοῦ τρίτον καὶ δέκατον· καὶ «τετράτῳ δ᾽ αὐτὸς πεδάθη», φησὶν ὁ Πίνδαρος (*fr.* 135 Snell/Maehler), ἀντὶ τοῦ τετάρτῳ καὶ δεκάτῳ· «ἡ δὲ γυνὴ τέτορ᾽ [ἤθ᾽] ἡβώοι, πέμπτῳ δὲ γαμοῖτο» (Hes. *Op.* 698), ἀντὶ τοῦ τεσσαρεσκαίδεκα καὶ πεντεκαιδεκάτῳ· Εὔπολίς τε Χρυσῷ γένει (*fr.* 298 Kassel/Austin)·

2–6 ὥστε κἂν μὴ περὶ ὄρθρον ποιῆται τοὺς λόγους, ἀλλ᾽ ἀριθμεῖσθαί γε τρίτην, τῷ τάξιν τῶν ἡμερῶν ἔχειν τὴν τρίτην, οὕτως καὶ τὸν Ὀδυσσέα, εἰ καὶ πλέον ἦν παρῳχηκὸς τῶν δύο μοιρῶν, τὴν τρίτην φάναι καταλείπεσθαι, ἐπειδὴ τριμεροῦς οὔσης τῆς νυκτὸς ἕκαστον μέρος ἕν τι λαμβάνεται, κἂν ἐλλιπὲς ᾖ τοῦτο καὶ μὴ ὁλόκληρον Kammer   **5** ὡς om. Villoison   **6** τρίτον *B : τρίτην Villoison ‖ μερῶν Schrader : ἡμερῶν *B   **7** παρὰ πόδα *B : cruces posuimus : παρὰ <μικρὸν ἐξά>ποδα Schrader : πηρὸν τὸν πόδα Diels ap. MacPhail : καίπερ ἄποδα Kammer   **7** ὅλης *B : ὅλου Janko ap. MacPhail   **10** οἷον coniecimus : ὅταν *B : fortasse οἷον ἂν ‖ τις ἂν supplevimus : τις suppl. Schrader   **11** εἴκοσι *B : εἴκοσιν Kannicht in Kannicht/Snell 1981, 126   **12** ἕνδεκα *B : ἕνδεκ᾽ <ἀλλὰ> Kannicht in Kannicht/Snell 1981, 126 ‖ δυώδεκα *B : δώδεκα Kannicht in Kannicht/Snell 1981, 126   **13** κατὰ *B : κὰμ Maehler in Snell/Maehler 1989, 137   **14** τέκν᾽ Boeckh 1821, 644 : τέκνα *B ‖ ἔπεφνε<ν> Boeckh 1821, 644 : ἔπεφνε *B : πέφνε Thiersch 1820, 300 ‖ θάλλοντα<ς> Boeckh 1821, 644 : θάλλοντα *B : θάλλοντ᾽ ἐν Thiersch 1820, 300 ‖ δυώδεκ᾽ Boeckh 1821, 644 : δυώδεκα *B : δώδεκ᾽ Hartung 1856, 246   **16–17** τέτορ᾽ [ἤθ᾽] correximus : τέταρτ ᾽ ἤ θ᾽ *B : τέταρτον ἔτος Schrader : τετάρτῳ ἔτει Villoison : τέτορ᾽ [ἔτει] Kammer : τέτορ᾽ Dindorf   **17–18** τεσσαρεσκαίδεκα καὶ πεντεκαιδεκάτῳ coniecimus : τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτ καὶ πεντεκαιδεκάτ *B : ιδ´ψ καὶ πεντεκαιδεκάτῳ V[20] : τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτῳ καὶ πεντεκαιδεκάτῳ Villoison   **18** χρυσῷ γένει Bekker : χρυσογένειαν *B

[3c] But Chrysippus [*SVF* III *fr*. 772] claims that it is just as if someone, speaking about three days, says on the third that one day still remains, even if he does not make this statement around dawn; so too, although more than two thirds have passed, Odysseus claims that one third is left, since each portion of the night, which is tripartite, is taken as a unit, so that even if this is lacking and not complete, still it is counted as a third because it has the third position among the parts. For so too [he claims] a human being †having just been born† still obtains the whole title [of human].

[3d] Others claim that poets have a custom of using a round number, sometimes by cancelling the remainders in the numbers for the sake of using a whole and rounded one. For instance, <one> might say 'a thousand-shipped army' of the Greeks – though the ships were 1186 – and further, 'twenty columns to a single expedition, eleven to infantry, twelve to ships' [*TGF* II Adesp. *fr*. 432a], instead of twenty-three. Sometimes they omit the initial [digit], satisfied with the remainder; for instance, 'he slew his twelve dear children in the prime of their youth, and him third' [Pind. *fr*. 171 Snell/Maehler] instead of 'thirteenth'. And 'he was himself brought down by the fourth' [Pind. *fr*. 135 Snell/Maehler], says Pindar, instead of 'by the fourteenth'. 'Let your wife grow up for four years and let her be married in the fifth' [Hes. *Op*. 698] instead of 'fourteen' and 'in the fifteenth'. Eupolis in the *Golden Race* [*fr*. 298 Kassel/Austin]:

[A]. <δω>δέκατος ὁ τυφλός, τρίτος ὁ τὴν κάλην ἔχων,
ὁ στιγματίας τέταρτός ἐστιν ἐπὶ δέκα,
πέμπτος δ' ὁ πυρρός, ἕκτος ὁ διεστραμμένος·
χοῦτοι μέν εἰσ' ἑκκαίδεκ' εἰς Ἀρχέστρατον,
ἐς τὸν δὲ φαλακρὸν ἑπτακαίδεκ'. [Β]. ἴσχε δή.
[A]. ὄγδοος ὁ τὸν τρίβων' ἔχων.

5

ὁτὲ δὲ ἔξω προστιθέασιν, ἵνα τὸν πλήρη ἀριθμὸν εἴπωσιν, οἷον Ὁμήρου εἰπόντος «ἐννεακαίδεκα μέν μοι ἰῆς ἐκ νηδύος ἦσαν» (Il. 24.496), Σιμωνίδης (fr. 272 Poltera = fr. 54 Page, *PMG* 559) φησὶ «καὶ σὺ μὲν εἴκοσι παίδων | μᾶτερ ἔλλαθι». καὶ δεκάτῳ μηνὶ τοῦ τοκετοῦ ταῖς γυναιξὶ γιγνομένου φησὶν Ὅμηρος· «χαῖρε, γύναι, φιλότητι, περιπλομένου δ' ἐνιαυτοῦ | τέξῃ ἀγλαὰ τέκνα» (Od. 11.248–249). καὶ «ἄλλοι θ' οἳ Κρήτην ἑκατόμπολιν ἀμφενέμοντο» (Il. 2.649) καὶ «πολλοὶ ἀπειρέσιοι καὶ ἐνενήκοντα πόλεες» (Od. 19.174)· ἢ γὰρ κατὰ τὸ ἕτερον προστίθησιν ἢ κατὰ τὸ ἕτερον ἀφαιρεῖ. ὁμοίως καὶ «πρόπαν ἦμαρ ἐς ἠέλιον καταδύντα | δαίνυντο» (Il. 1.601–602), οὐχ ἅμα τῇ ἕῳ ἀρξαμένων πίνειν, καὶ «πᾶν δ' ἦμαρ μάρναντο περὶ Σκαιῇσι πύλῃσι» (Il. 18.453), καίπερ βραχέος γινομένου χρόνου **[fol. 135r]** ὑπὲρ τὴν μάχην. καὶ τῶν Ὀλυμπίων δὲ ἐναλλὰξ ἀγομένων διὰ πεντήκοντα μηνῶν καὶ τεσσαράκοντα ἐννέα, οἱ ποιηταὶ «πεντηκοντάμηνόν» φασι τὴν πανήγυριν

10

15

1–6 [A] δωδέκατος ... ἑπτακαίδεκ'. [Β] ἴσχε δή. [A] ὄγδοος ... personas ita distinxit Runkel 1829, 164 : [A] δωδέκατος ... Ἀρχέστρατον. [Β] ἐς τὸν δὲ φαλακρὸν ἑπτακαίδεκ'. [A] ἴσχε δή. ὄγδοος ... Kaibel ap. Kassel/Austin 1986, 472 : [A] δωδέκατος ... διεστραμμένος. [Β] χοῦτοι ... Ἀρχέστρατον. [A] ἐς τὸν δὲ φαλακρὸν ἑπτακαίδεκ'. [Β] ἴσχε δή. [A] ὄγδοος ... Storey 2003, 271　**1** <δω>δέκατος Runkel 1829, 164 : δέκατος *B　|| ὁ τρίτος δὲ δέκατος, τυφλός, ὁ καλὴν ἔχων Bothe 1855, 192　|| κάλην Schneider 1846, 647 et Emperius 1847, 309 : καλὴν *B : κωλῆν Meineke 1839, 537 : κυλλὴν Bergk : τρίτος ἐπὶ δέχ' ὁ τὴν καλήν Blaydes 1890, 39 : ὁ καλὴν ἔχων Bothe 1855, 192　**2** ὁ στιγματίας <οὗτος> τέταρτος ἐπὶ δέκα Blaydes 1896, 46　**3** πυρρὸς Runkel 1829, 164 : πύργος *B : πηρός Cobet 1876, 416 : γρυπός Tammaro 1988　**4** χοῦτοι Runkel 1829, 164 : καὶ οὗτοι *B　|| μέν εἰσ' Meineke 1839, 537 : μὲν εἰς *B : μὲν εἶσ' Runkel 1829, 164　|| ἑκκαίδεκ' Runkel 1829, 164 : ἑκκαίδεκα *B　|| εἰς Runkel 1829, 164 : ἐς *B　**4–5** εἰς δ' Ἀρχέστρατον | τὸν φαλακρὸν <εἰσιν> ἑπτακαίδεκ' Kaibel ap. Kassel/Austin 1986, 472　**5** ἐς τὸν δὲ φαλακρὸν Meineke 1839, 537 : ἐς δὲ τὸν φαλακρὸν *B : εἰς τὸν δὲ φαλακρὸν Runkel 1829, 164 : ἐς δὲ φαλακρὸν τόνδ' Bothe 1855, 192　|| ἑπτακαίδεκ' Runkel 1829, 164 : ἑπτακαίδεκα *B　**6** ὁ δ' ὄγδοος τίς; ὁ Porson 1812, 286　|| τὸν τρίβων' Bothe 1855, 192 : τὸν τρίβων *B : τὸν τρίβων'α V[20] : τὸ τριβώνιον Villoison　|| ἔχων *B : φορῶν Porson 1812, 286　|| ὄγδοος ὁ τὸν τρίβωνα < – × – > ἔχων Olson 2016, 465　**7** εἴπωσιν V[20] Bekker : εἴπω(σιν) *B : εἴπω Villoison　**8** Σιμωνίδης δὲ Villoison　**9** ἔλλαθι *B : ἵλαθι vel Ἑκάβη Gaisford 1823, 203　**10** γύναι *B : γυνὴ Villoison　**13** ἐνενήκοντα V[20] : ἐνενήκοντα *B : ἐνηνεκόντα Villoison : ἐννήκοντα Bekker　**15** πᾶν δ' ἦμαρ Villoison : πανδῆμαρ *B

[A] Twelfth is the blind man, third the man with a hump,
fourteenth the branded man,
fifth the redhead, sixth the squint-eye.
And these men are sixteen up to Archestratus,
but up to the bald-head seventeen. [B] Hold on!
[A] Eighth is the man wearing the threadbare cloak.

Sometimes they add from without, in order to express a full number; for instance, although Homer says 'I [*sc.* Priam] had nineteen [sons] from a single womb' [*Il.* 24.496], Simonides says: 'you, mother of twenty children, be gracious' [*fr.* 272 Poltera = *fr.* 54 Page, *PMG* 559]. And although women have childbirth in the tenth month, Homer says: 'take pleasure in love, woman, | and when a year has gone around, you will bear splendid children' [*Od.* 11.248–249]. And: 'others who were dwelling in Crete with a hundred cities' [*Il.* 2.649] and 'many countless men and ninety cities' [*Od.* 19.174]. For he either adds with regard to the one or subtracts with regard to the other. Similarly [he also says] 'all day long until sunset | they feasted' [*Il.* 1.601–602], though they did not begin to drink at dawn. And: 'all day long they fought around the Scaean Gates' [*Il.* 18.453], although a short time passed over the battle. And although the Olympic Games are held alternately after fifty or forty-nine months, the poets call the festival 'fifty-monthly'. In this

εἶναι. οὕτως οὖν οὐδὲν κωλύει, καὶ τῆς τρίτης μοίρας ἐλλιποῦς οὔσης, <μὴ> οὐχ ὁλόκληρον τρίτην αὐτὴν ὀνομάσαι μοῖραν ∵

[3e] Ἀριστοτέλης (*fr.* 161 Rose³ = *fr.* 385 Gigon) δὲ οὕτως ἀξιοῖ λύειν, ἐν οἷς φησιν· ἡ εἰς δύο διαίρεσις εἰς ἴσας δύναται γενέσθαι ἐν τούτοις· ἐπεὶ δὲ τὸ πλέον τοῦ 5 ἡμίσεος ἀόριστόν ἐστιν, ὅταν τοσοῦτον αὐξηθῇ ὡς τοῦ ὅλου τρίτον ἀπολείπεσθαι, ἀκριβοῦς ἂν εἴη τὸ ἀφορίσαι τοῦτο καὶ δηλῶσαι ὅσον ἐστὶ τὸ καταλειφθέν, ἵνα ὅσον ηὐξήθη τοῦ ὅλου τὸ ἥμισυ δῆλον γένηται. οἷον τῶν ϛʹ ἥμισυ τὰ γʹ. εἴπερ διαιρεθείη τὰ ϛʹ εἰς βʹ ἴσα, ἔσται γʹ. ἐὰν τὸ ἕτερον μέρος αὐξηθῇ, ἄδηλον πότερον μορίῳ ἀριθμοῦ ἢ ὅλῃ μονάδι. ἐὰν οὖν ὅλῃ μονάδι πλέον γένηται, τὸ μέρος τὸ 10 ὑπολειπόμενον τρίτον ἔσται τοῦ ὅλου, ὥστε καὶ ὁ εἰπὼν τῶν δύο μερῶν θάτερον πλέον γινόμενον καταλελοιπέ<ναι> τριτάτην μοῖραν δεδήλωκεν ὅτι ἐν αὐξήσει τὸ πλέον μονάδι γέγονε, τεσσάρων γεγονότων τῶν τριῶν καὶ δύο ὑπολειπομένων, ὅπερ ἦν τῶν ἓξ τὸ τρίτον. ἐπεὶ οὖν καὶ τῆς νυκτὸς αἱ δώδεκα μοῖραι εἰς δύο ἴσας μερίδας μερίζεσθαι δύνανται εἰς ἕξ, ηὐξήθη δὲ καὶ πλέον γέγονε θάτερον μέρος, 15 ἄδηλον δὲ τὸ πόσαις ὥραις – καὶ γὰρ μιᾷ καὶ δύο καὶ τρισὶ καὶ πλείοσιν ἡ αὔξησις δύναται γίνεσθαι – ἀφορίζων ὁ ποιητὴς τὸ ἀόριστον τοῦ πλείονος πόσον ἦν, καὶ ὅτι βʹ ὥραις ηὐξήθη, ἐπήγαγεν ὅτι τριτάτη μοῖρα λέλειπται, ὡς ὀκτὼ μὲν γενέσθαι τὰς παρῳχηκυίας ὥρας, καταλείπεσθαι δὲ τέσσαρας, αἵπερ εἰσὶ τοῦ ὅλου τρίτον. οὕτω καὶ εἰ δέκα ὀκτὼ εἴη μοιρῶν, ὅτι δίχα διαιρεῖται εἰς ἐννέα, εἴποις δ' 20 ὅτι πλέον τῶν εἰς δύο μοίρας <νεμομένων ὡρῶν> παρῴχηκεν, ἡ δὲ τρίτη μοῖρα περιλείπεται, δῆλον ποιήσεις ἐκ τοῦ τὸ τρίτον φάναι περιλείπεσθαι, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ϛʹ, ὅτι δώδεκα φῂς εἰλῆφθαι. ἔστω δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ νυχθημέρου τῶν ὡρῶν τὸ αὐτὸ ζητούμενον, καὶ λεγέτω τις ὅτι πλέον τι τῶν εἰς δύο μοίρας νεμομένων ὡρῶν παρῴχηκέ τι, μὴ ἀφορίσας τὸ πόσον, ἐπαγέτω δὲ ὅτι ἡ τρίτη μοῖρα τοῦ παντὸς

1 καὶ τῆς τρίτης μοίρας ἐλλιποῦς οὔσης del. Kammer   ‖ <μὴ> οὐχ vel [οὐχ] coniecimus **2** ὁλόκληρον Villoison : ὁλοκλήρου *B   **4** ἴσας Rose 1870, 1504 : ἴσην *B : fortasse ἴσα   ‖ ἐπεὶ δὲ Rose 1863, 165 : ἐπειδὴ *B : ἐπειδὴ <δὲ> Sodano 1974, 42 : ἐπεὶ δὴ Barnes/Lawrence 1984, 2432 n. 1   **5** ὅταν δὲ Kammer   **6** ἀκριβοῦς *B : ἀκριβῶς Villoison   **7** τῶν ϛʹ ἥμισυ τὰ γʹ del. Kammer   **8** ἴσα Bekker : ἴσα *B   **8** ἐὰν <δὲ> MacPhail   **11** γινόμενον *B : γενόμενον Rose 1863, 165   ‖ καταλελοιπέ<ναι> MacPhail : καταλέλοιϖ *B : fortasse ὁ εἰπὼν <ὡς> (vel <ὅτι>) ... καταλέλοιπε   **12** τῶν τριῶν *B : ἐκ τῶν τριῶν Kammer   **13** τῶν *B : τὴν Villoison   **14** εἰς ἕξ del. MacPhail   ‖ καὶ πλέον γεγονὸς del. Kammer   ‖ γέγονᵉ V²⁰ : γέγον *B : γεγονὸς Villoison **16** ἀφορίζων *B : ἀφορίζει Villoison : ἀφορίσας Rose 1863, 165   **19–22** οὕτω καὶ εἰ ... εἰλῆφθαι del. Kammer   **19** μοιρῶν Schrader : μέτρων *B : μερῶν Villoison   **20** πλέον τῶν εἰς δύο μοίρας <νεμομένων ὡρῶν> supplevimus : πλέον τῆς εἰς δύο μοίρας <νεμομένης> Janko ap. MacPhail : fortasse πλέον <θατέρου vel θατέρας> τῆς εἰς δύο μοίρας <διαιρέσεως>   ‖ τῶν *B : τῆς Villoison   **22** φῂς vel φησ(ὶ) *B : φῂς V²⁰ : φησιν Villoison : φῂς Schrader : φῂς Dindorf **22–p. 452.5** ἔστω δὲ καὶ ... ἡ αὔξησις γέγονε del. Kammer   **22** ἐπὶ τῶν τοῦ νυχθημέρου ὡρῶν Kammer   **23** λεγέτω V²⁰ : λεγετὼ *B   **24** παρῴχηκέ τι *B : παρῴχηκε ἔτι Villoison : παρῴχηκεν ἔτι Bekker : παρῴχηκε [τι] MacPhail

way, therefore, nothing prevents [Homer], even though the third part is defective [i. e. incomplete], from calling it a complete one third.

[3e] Aristotle [*fr*. 161 Rose[3] = *fr*. 385 Gigon] thinks to solve it as follows, when he says: Division into two can in this case be into equal [*sc*. parts]. Since 'more than half' is indeterminate, when it is increased so much that a third of the whole is left, it would be characteristic of an accurate person to determine this and indicate how much the remainder is, in order to make clear by how much half of the whole has increased. For instance, half of 6 is 3. If 6 were divided into 2 equal parts, [half] will be 3. If either part is increased, it is unclear whether this is by a part of a number or by a whole unit. Now if it becomes greater by a whole unit, the remaining part will be a third of the whole. So too someone saying that, when either of the two parts becomes more, it has left one third, has shown that 'more' in growth is by a unit, since three has become four and two remains, which was one third of six. So, since the twelve parts of the night can also be divided into two equal divisions – into six [each] – and one part increased and has become more, but it is unclear by how many hours – for the increase could be by one or two or three or more – the poet, determining what the indeterminate quantity of the 'more' was and that it increased by 2 hours, concluded that one third remains, so that the hours that have gone by were eight, and four are left, which is a third of the whole. So too if it consisted of eighteen parts, since it divides by two into nine, and [if] you said that a majority of the <hours which are divided> into two parts has passed, and one third remains, you will make clear from the fact that you say that one third is left, which is six, that you mean that twelve have been taken away. Let the same investigation be made in the case of the hours of a night-day cycle. Let someone say that of the hours, which are divided into two parts, a small majority has passed, without determining how much, and let him conclude that one third of the whole remains. It becomes clear that with the division into two

λέλειπται· δῆλον γίνεται ὅτι τῆς εἰς β΄ διαιρέσεως εἰς ιβ΄ καὶ ιβ΄ γενομένης, τοῦ
τρίτου καταλειφθέντος τοῦ παντός, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ὀκτώ, θάτερον μέρος τὸ πλέον ἐν
τέτρασιν ἔσχεν, ὥστε ἐκκαίδεκα ὥρας τὰς πάσας παρεληλυθέναι, ὑπολείπεσθαι
δὲ ὀκτώ. ἐν οἷς οὖν εἰς δύο ἴσα καὶ εἰς τρία ἔστι διαίρεσις, ἐάν τις †εἰς δύο
5 πλεονάσαντα† τὸ γ΄ τῆς εἰς γ΄ καταλίπῃ, ἀφορίζει ὅσῳ πλέον ἡ αὔξησις γέγονε.
σοφῶς οὖν ὁ ποιητὴς τὸ ἀόριστον [τρίτον] τῆς αὐξήσεως τοῦ ἡμίσεος δεδήλωκεν
ὅσον ἦν, ὅτι ὥραις δύο, καὶ ὀγδόη παρελήλυθε ὥρα, διὰ τὸ φάναι «τριτάτη δ᾽ ἔτι
μοῖρα λέλειπται» (*Il.* 10.253). εἰδὼς γάρ τις ὅτι ιβ΄ μὲν αἱ ὧραι πᾶσαι τῆς νυκτός,
ὧν ἡ εἰς δύο μὲν μοίρας διαίρεσις ϛ΄ καὶ ϛ΄ ποιεῖ, ἡ δὲ εἰς γ΄ δ΄ καὶ δ΄ <καὶ δ΄>, καὶ
10 ἀκούσας <ὅτι> τῆς εἰς δύο μοίρας διαιρέσεως πλέον τι παρῴχηκεν, εἶτα γνοὺς ὅτι
τῆς εἰς τρία τὸ τρίτον ἐπιμένει, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ὧραι τέσσαρες, εὐθὺς γινώσκει ὅτι ἀπὸ
τοῦ μεσονυκτίου μεταβάντος β΄ ὧραι ἦσαν παραλλάξασαι.

　　[3f] Αὐτόχθων δέ φησιν ὅτι τετελεσμένων τῶν β΄ μοιρῶν, λειπομένης δὲ τῆς
τρίτης, εἰκότως φησὶν ὡς παρῆλθε τὸ πλέον ἡ νὺξ οὖσα μοιρῶν β΄· πλέον γὰρ
15 μέρος εἰσὶ τῆς νυκτὸς αἱ δύο, εἴ γε τὰ δύο τοῦ ἑνὸς πλείονα. τὸ οὖν «παρῴχηκεν»,
ὅτι παροιχομένων τῶν δύο μοιρῶν τῷ πλείονι ἡ νὺξ παρῴχηκεν. οὕτω γὰρ οὐδ᾽
ἁμάρτημα ἔσται ἐν τῷ «πλέω», ὅπερ θηλυκῶς ἀκούοντές τινες ἡμαρτῆσθαι
λέγουσιν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἡ πλείων· ἔστι γὰρ τῷ «πλέω» ἡ νὺξ παρῳχηκυῖα μέρει, τουτέστι
τῷ πλείονι καὶ μείζονι μέρει παρήλλαχε, τῶν δύο μερῶν παρῳχημένων.

20 　　[3g] Ἀπίων δὲ αὐτῶν τῶν β΄ τὸ πλέον μέρος ἀνηλῶσθαι λέγει, ὥστε καὶ τῆς
δευτέρας εἶναι λείψανον, καὶ <τούτ>ων μὲν οὖν τὸ πλέον παρῴχηκε, τὸ <δὲ> τρίτον
καταλείπεται· περὶ γὰρ νύκτας μέσας ἀναστὰς Ἀγαμέμνων ἐγείρει τὸν Νέστορα καὶ

---

3 ἐκκαίδεκα Villoison : ἐκκαίδεκα *B   **4** ἴσα Bekker : ἶσα *B   ‖ ἔστι *B : ἐστὶ Bekker   ‖ τις
<τοῦ β΄ τῆς> MacPhail   **4–5** τις εἰς δύο πλεονάσαντα *B : τις εἰς δύο πλεονάσαν Kammer : τις
<τοῦ β΄ τῆς> εἰς δύο πλεονάσαντα MacPhail : fortasse τις <τῆς> εἰς δύο <θατέρου> πλεονάσαντος
vel τις <τῆς> εἰς δύο <θάτερον> πλεονάσας   **5** γ̂΄¹ *B : τρίτον Schrader   ‖ καταλίπῃ
MacPhail : καταλίποι *B   **6** τρίτον del. Kammer   **7** δύο <ηὐξήθη> Kammer   ‖ ὀγδόη Vil-
loison   ‖ τὸ *B : τοῦ Bekker   ‖ δ΄ ἔτι Schrader : δέ τι *B : δ᾽ ἔτι γὰρ Villoison   **8–12** εἰδὼς …
μεταβάντος del. Kammer   **9** δ᾽΄¹ Bekker : ἐς δ̂ *B : εἰς δ΄ Villoison   **9** καὶ δ΄ suppl. Kam-
mer   **10** ὅτι¹ suppl. Schrader   ‖ πλέον τι <τοῦ ἡμίσεος> Kammer   ‖ παρῴχηκεν *B :
παρῳχηκέναι Bekker   **12** μεταβάντος post μεσονυκτίου traiecimus : post παραλλάξασαι
habet *B   **14** post φησὶν rasura fere 20 litt.   ‖ β̂΄ *B : fortasse γ΄   **15** εἴ γε *B : εἶς τε Vil-
loison   ‖ παρῴχηκεν <δὲ πλέον νὺξ κτέ.> Kammer   **16–19** οὕτω γὰρ … παρῳχημένων del.
Kammer   **17** πλέω dubit. Kammer   **18** πλέω *B : fortasse πλέῳ   ‖ fortasse [τῷ] πλέω ἡ
νὺξ παρῳχηκυῖα [μέρει]   **19** παρήλλαχε Villoison : παρήλλᵃ *B : παρήλλαξε V²⁰   **20** Ἀπίων
Villoison : ἀππίων *B   **20–21** τῆς δευτέρας V²⁰ : τῆς δευᵗʳ΄ *B : τοῦ δευτέρου Kammer : τῆς
δεκάτης Villoison   **21** <τούτ>ων μὲν Schrader : ὧν μὲν *B   ‖ ὧν οὖν τὸ πλέον παρῴχηκεν
del. Kammer   ‖ δὲ supplevit Schrader   ‖ <ὅλον> τὸ τρίτον Kammer   **22** καταλείπεται *B :
καταλείπεσθαι Kammer

resulting in twelve and twelve, and with a third of the whole left, which is eight, the one part became greater by four, so that sixteen hours in total have gone by and eight remain. So where there is a division into two equal parts and into three [equal parts], if someone leaves behind a third of the [division] into three †increasing to two†, he defines by how much more there has been an increase. So, the poet wisely has indicated how much the undefined part of the increase of the half was – that [it was] by two hours, and the eighth hour had gone by – by saying 'and yet one third remains' [*Il.* 10.253]. For if someone knows that the total number of hours of the night are 12, of which the division into two parts makes 6 and 6, but into 3 [makes] 4 and 4 <and 4>, and if he has heard that of the division into two parts a small majority has passed, then upon learning that a third of the [division] into three remains, which is four hours, he straightaway realises that from the turning of midnight two hours had gone by.

[3 f] Autochthon claims that as two thirds had been completed, and one third remained, reasonably [Homer] says that the night, which consists of two parts, had gone by for the most part; for the two [parts] are a greater portion of the night, since two is greater than one. So [Homer says] 'has passed by', because when the two parts have passed by, the night has passed by to the greater extent. Indeed, in this way there will not be an error in 'more' (πλέω), which some who interpret it as a feminine say is an error for 'the majority' (ἡ πλείων) [*sc.* of the night]. For it is by the greater portion that the night has passed by, that is by the greater and larger portion it has been surpassed, since two parts have passed by.

[3g] Apion says that the greater portion of the 2 [parts] themselves has been used up, so that there is also a remnant of the second, and of these the majority has passed by, <but> the third part remains. For Agamemnon, having arisen

μετ' αὐτοῦ τινὰς τῶν ἀριστέων, καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν τάφρον προελθόντες πέμπουσι τοὺς
κατασκόπους. τὸν δὲ καιρὸν τῆς νυκτὸς ὑποβάλλει καὶ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν πράξεων.
ὁπλισάμενοι γὰρ οἱ κατάσκοποι, ὀφθέντος αὐτοῖς τοῦ ὀρνέου, εὐξάμενοί τε τῇ
Ἀθηνᾷ χωροῦσι πρόσω, καὶ ἐντυχόντες τῷ Δόλωνι οὐκ ὀλίγον χρόνον περὶ τὰς
5　ἐρωτήσεις διέτριψαν· καὶ κτείναντες αὐτὸν μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπὶ τοὺς Θρᾷκας ἔρχονται·
[fol. 135v] καὶ βραδύνουσιν αὐτοῖς περὶ τὸν τούτων φόνον ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ ἐπὶ τὰς ναῦς
ἀπαλλάττεσθαι παραινεῖ· καὶ ἐπανελθόντες λούονταί τε καὶ ἀριστοποιοῦνται, καὶ
τότε ἡμέρα γίνεται. Ὀδυσσεὺς δὲ λέγει «ἐγγύθι δ' ἠώς» (*Il*. 10.251), τὴν διέξοδον
ἐπείγων· οὐδὲ γὰρ εὔλογον πλησιαζούσης τῆς ἕω κατασκόπους πέμπεσθαι, ἀλλὰ
10　καὶ πάνυ ἐπισφαλές. τὸ δὲ πλέω δύναται μὲν καὶ ὡς πληθυντικὸν οὐδέτερον
παρειλῆφθαι· τὰ πλείονα ἐκ τῶν δύο μοιρῶν παρῆλθεν· ἢ πλείονα παρὰ μοίρας
τὰς δύο, ὥς που καὶ ὁ Θουκυδίδης λέγει «ἀλλὰ καὶ ταύτην τὴν στρατίαν θαλάσσῃ
ἤδη πλείω χρώμενοι συνῆλθον» (Thuc. 1.3.5). δύναται δὲ καὶ θηλυκὸν ἑνικὸν
εἶναι, πτῶσιν αἰτιατικὴν προβάλλον· ἡ νὺξ παρῆλθε τὴν πλείονα μοῖραν τῶν δύο
15　μοιρῶν.

　　　[4] πιθανῶς δὲ οὐδένα ἄλλον τὴν τῶν ἄστρων πορείαν ἐποίησε φυλάττοντα ἢ
τὸν Ὀδυσσέα, προοικονομῶν εἰς τὴν Ὀδύσσειαν· ἐκεῖ γὰρ αὐτῷ ὁ πλοῦς ἀνύεται
«Πληϊάδας ἐσορῶντι καὶ ὀψὲ δύοντα Βοώτην» (*Od*. 5.272). λέγοντος τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως
«ἄστρα δὲ δὴ προβέβηκε», ζητήσειεν ἄν τις, τί δηλοῖ τὸ «προβέβηκε» καὶ ποῖά
20　εἰσιν ἄστρα ἐξ ὧν στοχάζεται τὴν ὥραν. τὸ γὰρ ἐκ τῆς ἄρκτου λέγειν οὐχ ὑγιές·
οὐ γὰρ ἐκ τῶν ἀεὶ φανερῶν, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν ἀνατελλόντων καὶ δυομένων τὰς ὥρας
τεκμήρασθαι ἔστιν. οἱ δὲ οὐδ' ἐπ' ἄλλου φασὶν οἷόν τε ἢ ἐπὶ τῆς ἄρκτου εἰρῆσθαι
διὰ τὸ προκεῖσθαι τὸ προβεβηκέναι [εἰρῆσθαι]· σημειωσάμενον γὰρ τοὺς τόπους
καθ' ὥραν, ὡς ἐπιλαμβάνουσι στρεφόμενοι τῆς ἄρκτου οἱ ἀστέρες, προβεβηκέναι
25　φάναι ἐπὶ πλέον κατὰ τὴν στροφὴν χωρήσαντας· οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν Πληϊάδων καὶ
Ὑάδων καὶ Ὠρίωνος, ἤτοι τὴν ἀνατολὴν ἑῴαν ποιουμένων καὶ προβεβηκότων

---

3 ὀρνέου Schrader : ὀρνˇ *B : ὀρ V²⁰ : ἐχθροῦ Villoison : ἐρωδιοῦ Bekker **7** λούονταί τε καὶ
ἀριστοποιοῦνται Bekker : λούοντˇ τε καὶ ἀριστοποιοῦντˇ *B : λούονταί τε καὶ ἀριστοποιοῦντ V²⁰ :
λούοντό τε καὶ ἀριστοποιοῦντο Villoison　**9** κατασκόπους Schrader : κατασκόπˇ *B : κατάσκοπον
Villoison　**10** ἐπισφαλές V²⁰ : ἐπισφαλˇ *B : ἐπισφαλῶς Villoison　**11** παρειλῆφθαι ⟨ἵν' ἦ⟩
MacPhail　**12** ὁ om. Bekker ‖ στρατίαν legimus : στρατˇ *B : στρατιὰν Bekker : στρατὸν Vil-
loison　**13** συνῆλθον *B : συνεξῆλθον MacPhail　**14** †προβάλλον† ⟨ἵν' ἦ⟩ MacPhail　**18** πληάδας
ἐσορῶντι *Bᵖᶜ (πλϊάδας *Bᵃᶜ) : Πληϊάδας εἰσορόωντι Villoison : Πληϊάδας ⟨τ⟩ ἐσορῶντι
Kammer : Πληϊάδας ἐσορῶντι Schrader ‖ fortasse λέγοντος ⟨δὲ⟩　**18–p. 456.16** λέγοντος
τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως ... νυκτὸς ἔην om. Kammer et MacPhail　**20** ⟨τὰ⟩ ἄστρα Bekker, *cf.* schol. D
Il. 10.252(2) p. 373.1 (van Thiel²)　**21** ἀεὶ φανερῶν *B : ἀεὶ φαίνεται Villoison : ἀειφανῶν Bek-
ker　**22** τεκμήρασθαι *B : τεκμαίρεσθαι Villoison ‖ φασὶν Bekker : φησὶν *B　**23** τὸ¹ Schrader :
τοῦ *B ‖ προβεβηκέναι *B : fortasse προβέβηκε ‖ εἰρῆσθαι del. Villoison　**25** ἀπὸ *B :
fortasse ἐπὶ　**26** Ὑάδων Villoison : ὑιάδων *B ‖ ἤτοι τὴν ἀνατολὴν Schrader : ἤτοι δὲ ἀνατολὴ
*B : ἤτοι δὲ ἀνατολὴν V²⁰

around midnight, wakes Nestor and with him some of the champions; they advance to the ditch and dispatch the spies. [Homer] inserts the time of night and the multitude of their actions. For after the spies have armed themselves, once the omen is seen by them, they pray to Athena and go onward. Encountering Dolon they spent no little time on questions; and having killed him, thereafter they go to the Thracians, and as they are detained by killing these men, Athena exhorts them to get away to the ships. After they return, they bathe and have breakfast, and then daybreak arrives. Now Odysseus says 'Dawn is near' [*Il.* 10.251], urging on the expedition; for it is not reasonable to have spies sent out as dawn approaches, but in fact very risky. The word πλέω ['more'] can also be taken as neuter plural, 'the majority of the two parts has passed by', or 'more beyond the two parts', as Thucydides also says somewhere: 'but already using the sea more, they also came together in this campaign' [Thuc. 1.3.5]. But it can also be an accusative feminine singular, 'the night went past the larger part of two thirds'.

[4] Plausibly [Homer] portrayed no one other than Odysseus watching the passage of the stars, as a preparation for the *Odyssey*. For there his voyage is accomplished 'as he gazes at the Pleiades and late setting Boötes' [*Od.* 5.272]. When Odysseus says 'and the stars have advanced', someone might ask what 'advanced' means, and what kinds of stars they are by which he calculates the time. To say this on the basis of Ursa Major is not sound. For it is not possible to indicate the time on the basis of the stars that are always visible but only on the basis of those that rise and set. But some people claim that it cannot have been said about anything other than Ursa Major, because 'have advanced' is set forth. Having interpreted the positions according to the hour, as the stars of Ursa Major occupy them while they rotate, [they claim that] he says that they have advanced, since they moved further in their rotation. Other people [claim that he says this] on the basis of the Pleiades, Hyades and Orion, which are either rising at dawn and have advanced from the east, †the Pleiades† are setting and

ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνατολῆς, †Πληϊάδων† δύσιν ποιουμένων καὶ ἤδη προβαινόντων εἰς τὴν δύσιν· τὸ αὐτὸ γὰρ καὶ ἐν τῷ «ἀλλ᾽ ὅτε δὴ τρίχα νυκτὸς ἔην, μετὰ δ᾽ ἄστρα βεβήκει» (*Od.* 12.312), ἢ ὡς πρὸς ἀνατολὴν ἢ πρὸς δύσιν, τὸ μέντοι τρίχα ἀντὶ τοῦ τρίτον. διχῶς δὲ τὸ τρίτον <...> τό τε κατὰ σχέσιν τὴν πρὸς τὸ πρῶτον. μή ποτε ἐκ τοῦ
5 ζῳδιακοῦ κύκλου τὴν ὥραν καταμεμαθηκέναι φησί· τούτου γὰρ εἰς ιβ΄ διῃρημένου, ϛ΄ μὲν εὐθέως καταδύνοντος ἡλίου βλέπεται, νυκτὸς δὲ προβαινούσης τὰ λοιπά, οὐ τὰ αὐτὰ μὲν ὁρώμενα, τὸν δὲ ἀριθμὸν τὸν ἓξ φυλάττοντα. ἐκ τῶν ζῳδίων οὖν τῶν ἐπιφερομένων τῷ δωδεκατημορίῳ τούτῳ, ἐν ᾧ ὁ ἥλιος ἔδυ, τὴν ὥραν στοχάζεται Ὀδυσσεύς. ἢ ἁπλῶς πάντα φησὶ τὰ ἄστρα προβέβηκε, τουτέστι
10 προκεχώρηκεν εἰς δύσιν τὰ ἀφ᾽ ἑσπέρας ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ φανέντα, ὡς καὶ νῦν φαμεν πολὺ προῆλθε τῆς ἡμέρας, εἰς δύσιν λέγοντες προελθεῖν· ἐφ᾽ ὧν γὰρ ἀπὸ πέρατος εἰς πέρας ἔστι τις δρόμος, ὅταν ἤδη πρὸς τῷ ἑτέρῳ πέρατι ὁρώμενα φαίνηται, προβεβηκέναι λέγοιτ᾽ ἂν ἀφ᾽ οὗ πρῶτον ὁρμώμενα ὤφθη. ὅτι δὲ καὶ τὴν ἡμέραν καὶ τὴν νύκτα εἰς τρία διαιρεῖ δῆλον· ἐπὶ μὲν γὰρ τῆς ἡμέρας· «ἔσσεται <ἢ> ἠὼς
15 ἢ δείλης ἢ μέσον ἦμαρ» (*Il.* 21.111), ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς νυκτός· «ἀλλ᾽ ὅτε δὴ τρίχα νυκτὸς ἔην» (*Od.* 12.312).

---

1 πληϊάδων *B : cruces posuimus : del. Schrader : ἢ τῶν ἑῴαν Schrader app. : fortasse ἢ(τοι) ἑῴαν τὴν **4** lacunam indicavit Schrader : fortasse addendum ἕτεροι δὲ τὸν ἕσπερον καὶ τὸν κύνα καὶ τὸ προβεβηκέναι ἑῴαν ποιεῖται τὴν δύσιν, *cf.* schol. D *Il.* 10.252(2) p. 373.5–6 (van Thiel²) **7** οὐ τὰ αὐτὰ Bekker, *cf.* schol. D *Il.* 10.252(2) p. 373.8–9 (van Thiel²) : οὐκ αὐτὰ *B **10** προκεχώρηκεν ἡ Villoison ‖ ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ *B : εἰς ἀνατολὴν Villoison **12** ἔστι (vel ἐστί) τίς *B : ἐστί τις Bekker **14** ἢ supplevimus, *cf.* schol. D *Il.* 10.252(3) p. 373.3 (van Thiel²)

are already advancing towards the west. For the same is also said in the verse 'but when it was the third watch of the night and the stars had turned their course' [*Od*. 12.312], referring either to rising or to setting; the 'third watch' is used in the meaning of 'the third part'. 'The third part' [can be interpreted?] in two ways <...> in relation to the first. Perhaps he means that he has learnt the time from the zodiac cycle. For since this is divided into 12, 6 are immediately visible at sunset, while the others are visible as the night progresses. They are not the same ones that are seen, but they remain six in number. On the basis of the zodiac signs that follow, Odysseus calculates the time by that sign in which the sun set. Or he simply means that all the stars have advanced, i. e. those that have appeared in the east since the evening have proceeded towards the west, as now too we say that much of the day progressed, meaning that it progressed towards sunset. For, in the case where there is a certain course from one end to the other, when they already appear to be seen at one end, they could be said to have advanced as soon as they have been seen to start [their course]. And it is clear that he divides both the day and the night into three parts. With regard to the day [he says]: 'a morning, evening or midday will come' [*Il*. 21.111]; with regard to the night [he says]: 'but when it was the third watch of the night' [*Od*. 12.312].

3 Notes to the Text

A note on orthography

In our edition, we have standardised a number of orthographic variations. Thus, the manuscript sometimes follows other rules for the accents, particularly for cases like οἷς φησιν (which the scribe writes as οἷς φησὶν). Another case is the negation οὐχ before an aspirated vowel; in such cases, the scribe always writes an apostrophe (e. g. οὐχ᾽ ὅλη), which we have not printed. He also always writes the word ὁτέ as ὀτέ with smooth breathing, which we have tacitly corrected. Further, he always writes compound numbers as one word (e. g. ὀγδοηκονταέξ), which we have always printed as separate words (so ὀγδοήκοντα ἕξ). Finally, for numbers, the scribe sometimes writes the word out in full (e. g. δώδεκα) and sometimes uses numerals (e. g. ιβ′). Unlike Bekker, Kammer and Dindorf, we have not converted every word into the corresponding numeral.[25]

---

25 Also, unlike Sodano 1974, we have not mentioned all these interventions by Bekker, Kammer and Dindorf in our apparatus.

Text-critical notes

These notes will treat text-critical issues, new readings and problems of interpretation in the Porphyrian excerpt. They will also discuss Porphyry as a witness for the Homeric text by comparing his quotations from Homer with other testimonies and with the transmitted Homer text (in mediaeval manuscripts and papyri).[26] As it turns out, Porphyry and other testimonia often do not provide the readings attributed to them in the recent Homer editions by West. This may be of particular interest to Homer scholars.

[2] **«ἄστρα δὲ δὴ προβέβηκε, παρῴχηκε δὲ πλέω νὺξ | τῶν δύο μοιράων, τριτάτη δ' ἔτι μοῖρα λέλειπται».** These Homeric lines (*Il.* 10.252–253) are transmitted with the following variants.

For παρῴχηκε[27]:

(1)   παρῴχηκε BTDEG, Hsch. α 7890 (Latte),[28] Choeroboscus, *Scholia in Theodosii Canones* p. 398 (Hilgard),[29] schol. A *Il.* 9.71 (Erbse) (VMK)[30], schol. D *Il.* 10.252(1) (FPal²XZAgBdBm¹²M¹¹V¹³) (lemma) p. 373.1 (van Thiel²)[31], schol. D *Il.* 10.252(3) (lemma) p. 373.1 (FPal²Xh) (van Thiel²), schol. D *Il.* 10.252(4) p. 374.1–2 (van Thiel²), Eust. *Il.* 10.252s. vol. 3 p. 58.19 (van der Valk)
(2)   παρῴχηκεν AFC, Arist. *Poet.* 25, 1461a26, [Hdn.] *De figuris* 58, schol. *Od.* 1.58a (Pontani), schol. D *Il.* 10.252(1) (Q) (lemma) p. 373.1 (van Thiel²), schol. D *Il.* 10.252(3) (lemma) (Q) p. 373.1 (van Thiel²), Anonymus I in Aratum 1 p. 89 (Maass)
(3)   παροίχωκεν Dorotheus ap. schol. A *Il.* 10.252a.18–20 (Erbse) (VMK), Apollonius Dyscolus ap. schol. A *Il.* 10.252a.22–23 (Erbse) (VMK), schol. A *Il.* 10.252a.15 (Erbse) (VMK)

---

26 The quotations from Hesiod and Thucydides will also be discussed.
27 The quotation in Achilles Tatius, *Introductio in Aratum* 1.9 p. 8 Di Maria = p. 30 Maass has either παρῴχηκε (codex Vaticanus gr. 191 (V)) or παρῴχηκεν (codex Laurentianus 28.44 (M)). The codex Vaticanus gr. 381 (T), which forms one family together with V, has παρῴγχηκε. Both Maass 1898, 30 and Di Maria 1996, 8 have accepted παρῴχηκεν in their editions of Achilles Tatius.
28 The manuscript of Hesychius reads παρῴχηκε, but Latte/Cunningham 2018, 360 corrected this to παρῴχηκεν.
29 The transmitted text of Choeroboscus reads παρῴχηκε, which Hilgard 1889, 398 corrected to παρῴχηκεν.
30 Erbse 1969–1988, I, 414 corrected this to παρῴχηκεν.
31 In the codex Parisinus gr. 2556 (P) fol. 74v, the lemma abbreviates the verb as παρῴχηκ.

(4) παρώχωκεν W, *P.Berol.* inv. 11911+17038+17048+21155, *PSI* I 13 ↓
(παρωχωϙ[εν]), Aristarchus ap. schol. A *Il.* 10.252e1 (Erbse) (VMK), schol.
T *Il.* 10.252e2.34 (Erbse) (οὕτω διὰ τοῦ ω̄ κατὰ τροπὴν τοῦ η̄ εἰς ω̄) (]χωϙ[
P.Oxy. inv. 100/15(a))

For πλέω:[32]

(1) πλέω ABTFCE, *P.Oxy.* VI 948 *fr.* a,[33] Arist. *Poet.* 25, 1461a26, Hsch. α 7890
(Latte)[34]; π 2536 (Latte)[35], schol. A Hom. *Il.* 9.71 (Erbse) (VMK), schol. A
Hom. *Il.* 10.252a.15 (Erbse) (VMK)[36], schol. T *Il.* 10.252–253a (lemma) (Erbse)
(exeg.), schol. T *Il.* 10.252–253a.38 (Erbse) (exeg.), schol. T Hom. *Il.* 10.252–
253b1 (lemma) (Erbse) (exeg.), schol. D *Il.* 10.252(1) (Fᵖᶜ XZV¹³) (lemma)
p. 373.1 (van Thiel²), schol. D *Il.* 10.252(1) (Fh) p. 373.6 (van Thiel²), schol.
D *Il.* 10.252(3) (AgBdPBm¹²M¹¹) p. 374.18 (van Thiel²)[37], schol. *Od.* 1.58a (Mᵃ)
(Pontani), Eust. *Il.* 10.252s. vol. 3 p. 58.19 (van der Valk)

(2) πλέων DO, schol. T *Il.* 10.252e2 (lemma) (Erbse), schol. *Od.* 1.58a (HJO)
(Pontani), schol. D *Il.* 10.252(1) (Q) (lemma) p. 373.1 (van Thiel²), schol. D
Il. 10.252(1) p. 373.6 (Q) (van Thiel²), Eust. *Il.* 10.252s. vol. 3 p. 59.16–17 (van
der Valk) (εἰ δὲ μετὰ τοῦ ν̄ γράφεται, λέγοι ἄν, ὅτι παρῴχετο πλέων νὺξ τῶν
δύο μοιρῶν)[38]

---

32 The quotation in [Hdn.] *De figuris* 58 shows several variants. The α family has πλέων (Mar-
cianus gr. 512 (M) and the corrector of Ambrosianus C 69 sup. (gr. 246) (A²)) or πλέω (Hauniensis
GKS 1965 (H) and Laurentianus conv. soppr. 98 (F)), whereas the β family has πλείω (Barocci-
anus 216 (B) and Vindobonensis phil. gr. 263 (U)) or πλείων (Laurentianus 56.16 (L) and Parisinus
gr. 2551 (P)). See Hajdú 1998, 135. The codex Ambrosianus C 69 sup. (gr. 246) (A), which is copied
from U, has πλέον. For quotations, however, A has often corrected the text (sometimes on the
basis of a lost manuscript of the α family): see Hajdú 1998, 78–81. The quotation in Achilles
Tatius, *Introductio in Aratum* 1.9 p. 8 Di Maria = p. 30 Maass has two variants. The manuscripts
of the α family (Vaticanus gr. 191 (V) and Vaticanus gr. 381 (T)) have πλέω, but the codex Lauren-
tianus 28.44 (M) has πλέα (a round *alpha* can be easily mistaken for *omega*). Both Maass 1898, 30
and Di Maria 1996, 8 have accepted πλέω in their editions of Achilles Tatius.
33 *Pace* West 1998–2000, I, 297, the papyrus fragment reads πλέω, not πλέων. Since πλεων is
followed by a trace of a letter that is compatible with *upsilon* but not *nu* (an oblique with a hook
in the left-top corner), the correct reading is πλεω νυ[ξ].
34 The manuscript of Hesychius actually reads τῶ πλέω: see Latte/Cunningham 2018, 360.
35 The manuscript of Hesychius actually reads πλεώννυξ: see Hansen 2005, 125.
36 Erbse 1969–1988, III, 48 corrected it to πλέων.
37 Van Thiel 2011, 374 tacitly adopted Lascaris' correction πλείων.
38 Eustathius has also recorded πλέων as a *varia lectio* by adding γρ(άφεται) πλέων above πλέω
in his quotation of the Homeric line in Eust. *Il.* 10.252s. vol. 3 p. 58.19 (van der Valk) (codex Lau-
rentianus 59.3 fol. 8r).

(3) πλέον W, Choeroboscus, *Scholia in Theodosii Canones* p. 398 Hilgard,[39] Ano-
nymus I in Aratum 1 p. 89 (Maass), schol. D *Il.* 10.252(1) (F^{ac}AgBdPBm^{12}M^{11})
(lemma) p. 373.1 (van Thiel^2)[40], schol. D *Il.* 10.252(1) (Pal^2) p. 373.6 (van
Thiel^2)

(4) πλέη schol. D *Il.* 10.252(1) p. 373.6 (van Thiel^2) (ἔνιοι δὲ γράφουσιν πλέη)[41]

(5) πλείω schol. D *Il.* 10.252(1) (Pal^2) (lemma) p. 373.1 (van Thiel^2), schol. D
Il. 10.252(1) (XZ) (p. 373.6 van Thiel^2), schol. D *Il.* 10.252(3) (dV^{13}) p. 374.18
(van Thiel^2), schol. D *Il.* 10.252(4) p. 374.2 (van Thiel^2)

(6) πλείων G

The Porphyry excerpt implies that the quoted authorities read the following:

Metrodorus: πλεῖον
Chrysippus: uncertain
Aristotle: probably πλέον
Autochthon: πλέω
Apion: uncertain

For δ᾽ ἔτι:[42]

(1) δ᾽ ἔτι ABCDEFGTW, Hsch. α 7890 (Latte), schol. D *Il.* 10.252(3) (P) (lemma)
p. 373.1 (van Thiel^2), schol. A *Il.* 10.252a.16 (Erbse) (VMK), schol. Ge *Il.* 10.252
(Nicole), Eust. *Il.* 10.252s. vol. 3 p. 58.19 (van der Valk); Eust. *Od.* 12.312 vol. 2
p. 26.26 (Stallbaum), Anonymus I in Aratum 1 p. 89 (Maass)

(2) δέ τι schol. D *Il.* 10.252(3) (dAgBdBm^{12}M^{11}) (lemma) p. 373.1 (van Thiel^2)

(3) δέ τοι schol. D *Il.* 10.252(3) (V^{13}) (lemma) p. 373.1 (van Thiel^2)

We have followed previous editors of the excerpt in adopting Bekker's conjecture
δ᾽ ἔτι.[43] Note, however, that the scribe systematically writes δέ τι when he quotes
this Homeric line further on, viz. twice in [3a].

---

39 The transmitted text of Choeroboscus reads πλεόνυξ, which Hilgard 1889, 398 corrected to
πλέων νὺξ.
40 In the codex Angelicus gr. 122 (Ag) fol. 86r, Bodmer 85 (Bd) fol. 91v and Parisinus gr. 2556 (P)
fol. 74v, the lemma actually has πλέον ἡ νὺξ.
41 Note that one manuscript of Achilles Tatius (*Introductio in Aratum* 1.9 p. 8 Di Maria = p. 30
Maass) has πλέα (see n. 32).
42 The quotation in Achilles Tatius, *Introductio in Aratum* 1.9 p. 8 Di Maria = p. 30 Maass has
either δ᾽ ἔτι (codex Vaticanus gr. 381 (T)), or δέ τι (codex Laurentianus 28.44 (M)). The codex
Vaticanus gr. 191 (V), which forms one family together with T, has δ᾽ ἔστι.
43 Bekker 1825, 284; Kammer 1863, 65; Dindorf 1875–1877, III, 434; Schrader 1880, 147; Sodano
1974, 42; MacPhail 2011, 170.

The sigla cited above refer to the following Homer manuscripts:

A   Marcianus gr. 822 (olim 454) = *Venetus* A
B   Marcianus gr. 821 (olim 453) = *Venetus* B
C   Laurentianus 32.3
D   Laurentianus 32.15
E   Scorialensis Y.I.1
F   Scorialensis Ω.I.12
G   Genavensis 44
O   Oxoniensis, New College 298
T   Londinensis, Burneianus 86 = *Townleyanus*
W   Vaticanus gr. 1319

The sigla of the D scholia correspond with the following manuscripts:

E[4]   Scorialensis gr. Ω.I.12
Pal[2]   Heidelbergensis, Palatinus gr. 222
Q   Vaticanus gr. 33
X   Vaticanus gr. 32
Ag   Angelicus gr. 122
Bd   Bodmer 85
P   Parisinus gr. 2556
Bm[12]   Londinensis, Harleianus 5727
M[11]   Ambrosianus L 116 sup. (gr. 502)
V[13]   Vaticanus gr. 1316

These manuscripts fall into two families: d (which comprises E[4], Pal, Q and X) and h (which comprises Ag, Bd, P, Bm[12], M[11] and V[13]). Within the h family, Ag, Bd and P form their own subgroup.[44] The readings of the D scholia reported here are based on images of the original manuscripts.

[3b] **νῦν οὖν τὸ πλέον**. If the text were fully consistent, πλέον should be πλεῖον, since this appears to be what Metrodorus read.

[3c] **†παρὰ πόδα† γενόμενον**. As the text is transmitted, the sentence would mean 'a human having just been born still obtains the whole[45] title' (with παρὰ

---

44 See Montanari/Montana/Muratore/Pagani 2017, 5.
45 Janko ap. MacPhail 2011, 170 corrected ὅλης to ὅλου, in which case τῆς ὅλου προσηγορίας means 'the title of a whole human'.

πόδα = εὐθέως⁴⁶), but it is doubtful whether that is what Porphyry wrote. He (or Chrysippus) is unlikely to have claimed that newborn babies are normally not called full humans. Thus, the passage has been corrected in several ways. Schrader conjectured reading παρὰ <μικρὸν ἐξά>ποδα γενόμενον, 'having become just six foot tall',⁴⁷ but this does not explain why such people would not be called full humans either. If it is meant to indicate dwarfs being called humans even if they do not have the full size of regular humans, for instance, a more appropriate size would probably be <τρί>ποδα, <τετρά>ποδα or at the most <πεντά>ποδα.⁴⁸ Yet one does not really 'become' a dwarf. MacPhail adopted Diels' conjecture πηρὸν τὸν πόδα γενόμενον, 'having become maimed in his foot'.⁴⁹ Kammer constructed a similar sense with the correction καίπερ ἄποδα γενόμενον 'although he has become lame'.⁵⁰ Indeed, a reference to humans missing some body part would make sense in Chrysippus' analogy.⁵¹

[3d] **οἶον «χιλιόναυν στρατὸν» φήσειέ <τις ἂν> τῶν Ἑλλήνων**. The manuscript reads ὅταν χιλιόναυν στρατὸν φήσειε τῶν Ἑλλήνων. Schrader was the first to see that <τις> should be supplemented after φήσειε.⁵² All editors have kept ὅταν ... φήσειε,⁵³ but ὅταν + optative is impossible. The palaeographically most likely solution is to correct ὅταν (where -αν is abbreviated) to οἶον (in the sense of 'for instance') and supplement ἂν after φήσειέ <τις>. Alternatively, ὅταν might be a corruption of οἶον ἂν, in which case we only need to supplement τις after φήσειε. Theoretically, one could also correct the text to ὅταν χιλιόναυν στρατὸν φήση <τις> τῶν Ἑλλήνων, but φήση τις is an uncommon collocation.

«ἡ δὲ γυνὴ τέτορ᾽ [ἤθ᾽] ἡβώοι, πέμπτῳ δὲ γαμοῖτο», ἀντὶ τοῦ τεσσαρεσ-καίδεκα καὶ πεντεκαιδεκάτῳ. The exact reconstruction of the Hesiodic line (*Op*. 698) is problematic here. The manuscript reads τέταρᵗ · ἤθ᾽ ἡβώοι, which is both ungrammatical and unmetrical. Villoison and Bekker read τετάρτῳ ἔτει

---

46 See Hsch. π 639 (Latte), *s. v.* παρὰ πόδα. The plural παρὰ πόδας, however, is far more common: see *LSJ s. v.* πούς A 4b.
47 Schrader 1880, 148.
48 παρὰ πόδα might itself also be an error for πεντάποδα (so without Schrader's παρὰ μικρόν).
49 MacPhail 2011, 170.
50 Kammer 1863, 66.
51 Another solution would be to correct γενόμενον to something like τετρωμένον 'injured' or τετμημένον 'amputated'. However, this corruption (ΤΡΩ or ΤΜΗ to ΝΟ) is palaeographically less straightforward. Moreover, παρά + accusative is not the usual construction for these verbs.
52 Schrader 1880, 148.
53 D'Ansse de Villoison 1788, 251; Bekker 1825, 285; Kammer 1863, 66; Dindorf 1875–1877, III, 435; Schrader 1880, 148; MacPhail 2011, 172.

ἡβώοι,[54] which is not metrical either. Moreover, although the scribe has not written the case ending, the proparoxytone accent in τέταρτ implies the reading τέταρτον rather than τετάρτῳ. Kammer corrected the words to τέτορ' [ἔτει], deleting ἔτει as a gloss,[55] not realising that the manuscript does not read ἔτει to begin with. Note also that restoring ἤθ' to ἔτει only to then delete it is text-critically unsound. Dindorf also read τέτορ', which he considered to have been corrupted to τετάρτῳ ἔτει (so without the assumption of a gloss).[56] Indeed, the manuscripts and the other testimonies of Hesiod all have the West Greek form τέτορ'.[57] Schrader read Porphyry's text as τέταρτον ἔτος ἡβώοι (with ἔτος as a correction for ἤθ'),[58] which is again unmetrical. Schrader's use of letter spacing indicates that he considers all these words part of the quotation of Hesiod, but it is doubtful whether Porphyry would have written such an unmetrical line.[59] MacPhail tried to solve this by writing «ἡ δὲ γυνὴ» τέταρτον ἔτος «ἡβώοι, πέμπτῳ δὲ γαμοῖτο», thus separating τέταρτον ἔτος from the rest of the quotation as a paraphrase.[60] However, Porphyry normally does not interrupt poetic quotations with his own prose paraphrase of certain words. Moreover, an error ἤθ' for ἔτος or ἔτει is not palaeographically straightforward, neither in majuscule nor in minuscule script.

Another problem is that reading an accusative τέταρτον contradicts writing the dative τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτῳ in Porphyry's explanation of the word. We would expect Porphyry to use the same case in his exegesis of poetic words, as he does elsewhere. Indeed, the accent on the penultimate syllable in τεσσαρεσκαιδεκά^τ and πεντεκαιδεκά^τ implies a reading τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτῳ and πεντεκαιδεκάτῳ.[61] This is also the interpretation of the scribe of V²⁰, who copies *B and reads ιδ'ᵠ

---

54 D'Ansse de Villoison 1788, 251; Bekker 1825, 285.

55 Kammer 1863, 66.

56 Dindorf 1875–1877, III, 435. So also Gigon 1987, 533.

57 Plut. *Amat.* 8.753a; Poll. *Onom.* 1.58; Oribasius *Collectiones medicae* 18.3; Stob. *Flor.* 4.22e.114; *Etym. Magn. s.v.* τέτορε p. 754 (Kallierges); schol. vet. Hes. *Op.* 698a (Pertusi); Moschopulus, *Scholia in Hes. Op.* 698 (Grandolini); Arsenius, *Apophthegmata* 18.63b. See also the papyrus fragment *P.Oxy.* XL 3229 ([τ]ετορ').

58 Schrader 1880, 148.

59 *Cf.* Porphyry's attention to the meter in *Zetemata Vaticana* 17 p. 123.11–13 Sodano (συνεχώρει δὲ τὸ μέτρον εἰπεῖν «ἐς μισγάγκειαν συμμίσγετον ὄβριμον ὕδωρ» (*Il.* 4.453)) and *ad Il.* 9.378 p. 137.14–15 = p. 152 MacPhail (Νέσος δὲ ὁ Χῖος καὶ τὸ ᾱ μηκύνει οὐδὲν φροντίσας τοῦ μέτρου). See also Porph. *ad Od.* 9.60 p. 84.6–8 (Schrader) (πεζὸν μὲν τὸ φάναι ἀπώλοντο οἱ ἑβδομήκοντα δύο, καὶ σχεδὸν ἀδύνατον εἰπεῖν [εἶναι] ποιητικῶς διὰ τὸ μέτρον), although the attribution to Porphyry might be disputed.

60 MacPhail 2011, 172.

61 Note that the scribe of *B does not write the case endings for fourteen and fifteen either, so that the implied reading might equally be τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτου and πεντεκαιδεκάτου (because of the preceding ἀντὶ τοῦ).

καὶ πεντεκαιδεκάτῳ. In any case, τέταρτον (ἔτος) and τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτῳ are unlikely to *both* be correct. The only way to make the quotation from Hesiod metrical is to restore τέτορ' and delete ἤθ'. The latter might have originally been an otherwise unattested variant for ἡ δὲ (γυνὴ), which intruded into the main text. Restoring the cardinal number τέτορ', however, creates the problem that this contradicts the ordinal number τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτῳ. This can be solved by correcting the latter to τεσσαρεσκαίδεκα, which was later corrupted to τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτῳ on the basis of the subsequent πεντεκαιδεκάτῳ.

Finally, Porphyry agrees with the Hesiod codex Parisinus gr. 2771 (C) and Laurentianus 31.39 (D) in reading γαμοῖτο against the codex Messanensis F.A. 11 (E) and Vaticanus gr. 2383 (H), which read γαμείτω and γαμεῖτο, respectively.[62]

πέμπτος δ' ὁ πυρρός. Like Olson and other editors of Eupolis, we have adopted Runkel's conjecture πυρρός 'redhead'.[63] Kassel/Austin and the previous editors of the excerpt retained the transmitted πύργος 'tower',[64] which they probably interpreted as indicating a tall person. Olson has rightly pointed out, however, that πύργος is normally not used in this metaphorical sense; and even if that were the sense here, it would not match the other people in this catalogue, who all have some physical defect or slavish attribute.[65] If used metaphorically, πύργος denotes a hero acting as a stronghold to the army.[66] In other words, the word would have a positive connotation. Another possible conjecture is Cobet's πηρός 'disabled, cripple',[67] although the corruption ΠΥΡΡΟΣ to ΠΥΡΓΟΣ is palaeographically more likely than that of ΠΗΡΟΣ to ΠΥΡΓΟΣ. Tammaro conjectured γρυπός 'hook-nosed',[68] which is also possible and palaeographically intelligible. Olson considered this not "enough of a disfigurement to match the others in the catalogue", although the baldhead (φαλακρός) is equally 'disfigured' as someone with a hooked nose, and the speaker also mentions 'the man wearing the thread-

---

62 See Solmsen in Solmsen/Merkelbach/West 1990, 79.

63 Runkel 1829, 164; Olson 2016, 462; 464; 466. So also Meineke 1839, 537; Bothe 1855, 192; Kock 1880, 333; Edmonds 1957, 410; Storey 2011, 228.

64 D'Ansse de Villoison 1788, 251; Bekker 1825, 285; Kammer 1863, 66; Dindorf 1875–1877, III, 435; Schrader 1880, 148; Kassel/Austin 1986, 472. MacPhail 2011, 172 also printed πύργος in the main text but translated the word as 'redhead' (as if he adopted Runkel's πυρρός).

65 Olson 2016, 464. Red hair is a slavish attribute, indicating someone of Thracian origin. According to Edmonds 1957, 410 n. b, who assumed that the list describes people in the audience, however, the man with red hair may be the politician Hipponicus or the poet Timotheus.

66 So Hom. *Od*. 11.556 about Ajax. See Schiassi 1944, 62 n. 2 and Tammaro 1988.

67 Cobet 1876, 416. See also Blaydes 1896, 46.

68 Tammaro 1988.

bare cloak', i. e. a bum/hobo (the τρίβων was typically worn by poor men[69]). Note, however, that, although Eupolis probably wrote πυρρός, it is always possible that Porphyry did in fact read the incorrect πύργος.

«χαῖρε, γύναι, φιλότητι, περιπλομένου δ' ἐνιαυτοῦ | τέξῃ ἀγλαὰ τέκνα». Previous editors of the excerpt have printed γυνή.[70] However, the manuscript actually reads γύναι, which is the regular vocative of γυνή. This is also the reading of the manuscripts of Homer. Therefore, West was incorrect to claim that the testimonia of *Od*. 11.248 (which include Porphyry) all read γυνή.[71]

For the Homeric line 11.249, the first word is transmitted under several variants. Porphyry reads τέξῃ, a middle future indicative. Similarly, Zenodotus read τέξεαι. Aristarchus, however, read the active future indicative τέξεις,[72] which is the reading in the mediaeval manuscripts and the other testimonia.[73]

«πολλοὶ ἀπειρέσιοι καὶ ἐνενήκοντα πόληες». Most editors of the excerpt have corrected ἐνενήκοντα to ἐννήκοντα.[74] This is also how the editors of Homer traditionally read the text of *Od*. 19.174.[75] However, there is no solid textual basis for the form ἐννήκοντα. The main Homer manuscripts[76] and all the testimonia read

---

69 See Olson 2016, 467. The τρίβων was worn by Spartan men, who were famous for their simple and rugged lifestyle. In Athens, it was worn by poor people and by ascetic philosophers, like Socrates and the Cynics. See Brillant 1919 and Schuppe 1937. According to Edmonds 1957, 410, who considered the catalogue to refer to people in the audience, the man with the threadbare cloak is Socrates.

70 D'Ansse de Villoison 1788, 251; Bekker 1825, 285; Kammer 1863, 66; Dindorf 1875–1877, III, 436; Schrader 1880, 148; MacPhail 2011, 172. Kammer already suggested correcting it to γύναι.

71 West 2017, 235. *Pace* West, most other testimonia actually have γύναι as well: see Anon. *in Hermog. Inv.* vol. 7 p. 851 (Walz) and Eust. *Od*. 11.240 vol. 1 p. 410.13 (Stallbaum). Gell. *NA* 3.16.15, however, has γυνή.

72 See schol. *Od*. 11.249 (Dindorf): τέξεις] οὕτω Ἀρίσταρχος. Ζηνόδοτος δὲ κακῶς τέξεαι.

73 Gell. *NA* 3.16.15; schol. D *Il*. 10.252(3) p. 374.12 (van Thiel²); Anon. *in Hermog. Inv.* vol. 7 p. 851 (Walz); Eust. *Od*. 11.240 vol. 1 p. 410.14 (Stallbaum).

74 Bekker 1825, 285; Kammer 1863, 66; Schrader 1880, 148; MacPhail 2011, 172. Only Dindorf 1875–1877, III, 435 kept ἐνενήκοντα. D'Ansse de Villoison 1788, 251 wrote the non-existent ἐνηνεκοντα.

75 So Ludwich 1891, 105; Allen 1919; Bérard 1956, 75; Von der Mühll 1962, 355; Rutherford 1992, 104; Murray/Dimock 1998, 246; van Thiel 1991, 263.

76 West 2017, 401 reports that the corrector of the codex Ambrosianus gr. B 99 sup. (gr. 121) (B) has ἐνεννήκοντα, while the corrector of the codex Marcianus gr. 613 (olim 568) (M) has ἐννενήκοντα. He also claims that a second hand in the codex Monacensis gr. 519B (U) reads ἐννήκοντα. The word (found at the bottom of fol. 195v) indeed seems to have been corrected, but it is not entirely certain what correction it intended to make (ἐννήκοντα is possible if the scribe wrote an extremely wide *nu*). The corrector of this codex belongs to Allen's d family, which con-

ἐνενήκοντα.[77] In fact, the form ἐννήκοντα does not even seem to have existed, since it is not attested in any dialect. The only deviating forms are hενενηκοντα (attested in Heraclea), ἐνηκοντα (attested on Delos and in Phocis), which arose through haplology,[78] and ἐννενήκοντα (attested from Hippocrates onwards but mainly used in late antique writers), which probably duplicated *nu* on the basis of ἐννέα. The reason why the Homeric text is usually changed is that the line is seemingly unmetrical πο̄λλοῐ ἀπεῑρέ̄σῐοῑ καὶ ἔνε̆νή̄κο̄ντᾰ πό̆λη̄ε̄ς as opposed to πο̄λλοῑ ἀπεῑρέ̄σῐοῑ καῑ ἐ̄ννή̄κο̄ντᾰ πό̆λη̄ε̄ς (with hiatus after καί). However, the second syllable of ἐνενήκοντα can be scanned as long,[79] which is a remnant of an original *digamma* (ἐνενήκοντα < *ἐνεϝήκοντα < *$h_1neun\text{-}d\acute{k}omt$-[80]).[81] In his edition of the *Odyssey*, West therefore rightly printed ἐνενήκοντα.[82] However, he was wrong to cite Porphyry as a testimony for the form ἐννήκοντα.

καὶ «πρόπαν ἦμαρ ἐς ἠέλιον καταδύντα | δαίνυντο». MacPhail included the word καί as part of the quotation from *Il.* 1.601–602.[83] The other editors, however, have not considered it part of the quotation,[84] probably rightly so. The Homeric text is transmitted as ὣς τότε μὲν πρόπαν ἦμαρ, etc. Although καί could technically be a variant for μέν, it is not attested in any Homer manuscript nor in any of the testimonies. So it probably belongs to Porphyry, much like in the subsequent quotation from Homer (*Il.* 18.453) the word καί is not part of the quotation either (καὶ «πᾶν δ' ἦμαρ μάρναντο περὶ Σκαιῆσι πύλησι»).

---

sists only of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century manuscripts. See Allen 1910, 26. This family also includes the codex Harleianus 6325 (cited by van Thiel 1991, 263), which also reads ἐννήκοντα (fol. 168v). Allen 1910, 27–28 has shown, however, that this family hardly offers any old readings.
77 See [Pl.] *Min*os 319b; Eust. *Od.* 19.172 vol. 2 p. 196.22 (Stallbaum). Schol. D *Od.* 19.174b (Ernst) also reads ἐνενήκοντα, but Ernst 2006, 352 'corrected' this to ἐν{ε}νήκοντα. The manuscripts of Porph. *ad Il.* 2.649, too, have ἐνενήκοντα, but, as in our excerpt, Schrader 1880, 48 and MacPhail 2011, 68 have changed this to ἐννήκοντα; Bekker 1825, 87 and Dindorf 1875–1877, III, 144, in contrast, kept the transmitted form ἐνενήκοντα.
78 See Frisk 1960 *s. v.* ἐνενήκοντα; Beekes 2010 *s. v.* ἐνενήκοντα.
79 The correction ἐνεννήκοντα in the codex Ambrosianus gr. B 99 sup. (B) might be a later attempt to make the syllable long. Von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1927, 41 n. 1 conjectured reading ἐνηνήκοντα.
80 See Beekes 2010 *s. v.* ἐνενήκοντα. See also Kortlandt 1983, 98–99.
81 The number 90 is attested once more in Homer in *Il.* 2.602, where ἐνενήκοντα is metrically regular (τῷ̄ δ' ἔνε̆νή̄κο̄ντᾱ γλᾰφῠραῑ νέε̄ς ε̄στῐχό̄ω̄ντό).
82 West 2017, 401.
83 MacPhail 2011, 172.
84 So Bekker 1825, 285; Dindorf 1875–1877, III, 436; Schrader 1880, 148.

«πᾶν δ' ἦμαρ μάρναντο περὶ Σκαιῇσι πύλῃσι». Porphyry agrees with the transmitted text of Homer and with Eustathius[85] against most manuscripts of the D scholia, which read ἐπὶ Σκαιῇσι πύλῃσιν.[86]

πανήγυριν εἶναι. Every editor except Dindorf[87] has overlooked the abbreviation for εἶναι after πανήγυριν.[88]

οὐδὲν κωλύει, καὶ τῆς τρίτης μοίρας ἐλλιποῦς οὔσης, <μὴ> οὐχ ὁλόκληρον τρίτην αὐτὴν ὀνομάσαι μοῖραν. The previous editors of the excerpt have all written simply οὐχ ὁλόκληρον.[89] However, this is not the regular construction. The infinitive ruled by verbs of hindrance can have either a pleonastic μή or no negation. If the verb of hindrance is itself negated (as is the case in this sentence), the common construction is an infinitive with a pleonastic μὴ οὐ.[90] For this reason, we have conjectured <μὴ> οὐχ ὁλόκληρον. Alternatively, it is also possible to delete οὐχ, since κωλύω is often constructed with a simple infinitive, even if the verb is negated.[91]

[3e] **ἡ εἰς δύο διαίρεσις εἰς ἴσας δύναται γενέσθαι.** The manuscript reads εἰς ἴσην (with the case ending abbreviated), which previous editors of the excerpt have also printed.[92] We have followed Rose, however, who corrected ἴσην to ἴσας (*sc.* μερίδας or μοίρας), since Porphyry seems to refer to a division into two equal parts, which would require a plural. Alternatively, ἴσην could also be corrected to ἴσα (*cf.* εἴπερ διαιρεθείη τὰ ς' εἰς β' ἴσα further on). Indeed, Sodano (who printed ἴσην) translated "la divisione può in questo caso avvenire in due metà uguali"

---

85 Eust. *Il.* 18.444–456 vol. 4 p. 211.10 (van der Valk).
86 Schol. D *Il.* 10.252(3) p. 374.10 (van Thiel²). ἐπὶ is read in d, Bm¹², M¹¹ and V¹³, while Ag, Bd and P (which constitute one sub-family) read περὶ.
87 Dindorf 1875–1877, III, 436.
88 So d'Ansse de Villoison 1788, 252; Bekker 1825, 285; Kammer 1863, 67; Schrader 1880, 149; MacPhail 2011, 172.
89 So d'Ansse de Villoison 1788, 252; Bekker 1825, 285; Kammer 1863, 67; Dindorf 1875–1877, III, 436; Schrader 1880, 149; MacPhail 2011, 172.
90 See Goodwin 1896, 322–326; Kühner/Gerth 1904, 207–219; van Emde Boas/Rijksbaron/Huitink/de Bakker 2019, 599–600.
91 See Kühner/Gerth 1904, 215 n. b; van Emde Boas/Rijksbaron/Huitink/de Bakker 2019, 600 n. 1.
92 D'Ansse de Villoison 1788, 252; Bekker 1825, 285; Kammer 1863, 67; Dindorf 1875–1877, III, 436; Schrader 1880, 149; Sodano 1974, 42; MacPhail 2011,174.

("the division can in this case be done in two equal halves"),[93] which would require ἴσα or ἴσας. MacPhail (who also printed ἴσην), in contrast, translated "division into two can *result in* an equal [division] in these circumstances".

ἐπεὶ δὲ τὸ πλέον τοῦ ἡμίσεος ἀόριστόν ἐστιν. The manuscript reads ἐπειδὴ τὸ πλέον, etc. According to Schrader and MacPhail, a new sentence starts with ἐπειδή, which is why they adopted Rose's conjecture ἐπεὶ δὲ for ἐπειδὴ, as we have also done.[94] Similarly, Sodano corrected the text to ἐπειδὴ <δὲ>.[95] Barnes and Lawrence also punctuated before ἐπειδὴ but conjectured ἐπεὶ δή.[96] Earlier editors, however, kept the transmitted text, connected this phrase with the preceding sentence and punctuated after ἀόριστόν ἐστιν.[97] Breitenberger returned to this earlier interpretation.[98] However, logically, the phrase does not give an explanation for the preceding statement ('Division into two can in this case be into equal [*sc.* parts], since "more than half" is indeterminate') but explains what follows ('Since "more than half" is indeterminate, [...] it would be characteristic of an accurate person to determine this and indicate how much the remainder is').

καταλελοιπέ<ναι>. The transmitted text ὁ εἰπὼν τῶν δύο μερῶν θάτερον πλέον γινόμενον καταλέλοιπε τριτάτην μοῖραν is ungrammatical. Either we have to follow MacPhail in correcting καταλέλοιπε to καταλελοιπέ<ναι>,[99] which is an *accusativus cum infinitivo* ruled by εἰπών, or we have to supplement a conjunction ὅτι or ὡς after εἰπών to introduce indirect speech.[100] The former correction is palaeographically the most likely, since the verb is abbreviated in the

---

93 Sodano 1974, 44. So also Barnes/Lawrence 1984, 2432: "Division into two may in this case be division into equal parts" and Breitenberger 2006, 312–313: "Die Aufteilung in zwei Teile kann in diesem Fall in gleich große erfolgen" (although they do not specify whether they follow Rose in adopting ἴσας).
94 Schrader 1880, 149; MacPhail 2011, 174. See Rose 1863, 165; 1870, 1504; 1886, 129. So also Heitz 1869, 138.
95 Sodano 1974, 42.
96 Barnes/Lawrence 1984, 2432 n. 1.
97 Bekker 1825, 285; Kammer 1863, 67; Dindorf 1875–1877, III, 436. So also Gigon 1987, 534.
98 Breitenberger 2006, 313; 401.
99 MacPhail 2011, 174.
100 Kammer 1863, 67 tried to solve it by putting τῶν δύο μερῶν πλέον γινόμενον καταλέλοιπε τριτάτην μοῖραν between quotation marks, thus identifying it as direct speech. However, in that case, a parenthetic φησι would probably be expected.

manuscript (καταλέλοιπ), which may have originally been an abbreviation for καταλελοιπ(έναι).[101]

εἴποις δ' ὅτι πλέον τῶν εἰς δύο μοίρας <νεμομένων ὡρῶν> παρῴχηκεν. The manuscript reads πλέον τῶν εἰς δύο μοίρας παρῴχηκεν. Previous editors of the excerpt have corrected τῶν to τῆς,[102] presumably connecting it with μοίρας and identifying the latter as a genitive. This would then mean 'more of/than the part (divided?) into two has passed'.[103] However, ἡ εἰς δύο μοῖρα is an otherwise unattested collocation, and it is not straightforward to assume an implied 'divided'. For this reason, MacPhail supplemented the verb, correcting the text to πλέον τῆς εἰς δύο μοίρας <νεμομένης> (as suggested to him by Janko) and translating the phrase somewhat clumsily as "and [if] you said that more of the <divided> into two parts has passed".[104] However, this translation assumes that μοίρας is an accusative plural after εἰς, not a genitive singular. Maybe MacPhail assumed an implied διαιρέσεως. Indeed, further on in the text, Porphyry uses such elliptic phrases (τὸ γ' τῆς εἰς γ' (*sc.* διαιρέσεως) καταλίπη and γνοὺς ὅτι τῆς εἰς τρία (*sc.* διαιρέσεως) τὸ τρίτον ἐπιμένει). However, in those cases, the word διαίρεσις is found immediately before this in a similar construction (ἐν οἷς οὖν εἰς δύο ἴσα καὶ εἰς τρία ἔστι διαίρεσις and ἀκούσας <ὅτι> τῆς εἰς δύο μοίρας διαιρέσεως πλέον τι παρῴχηκεν, respectively) and can thus be easily understood. In order for the sentence to make sense, we would need πλέον τῆς εἰς δύο μοίρας <διαιρέσεως> παρῴχηκεν. Barnes and Lawrence thought in the same direction and translated: "and [if] you were to say that more than one part of the two-part division has gone",[105] which would probably require πλέον <θατέρου/θατέρας> τῆς εἰς δύο μοίρας <διαιρέσεως>. If μοίρας is no longer interpreted as a genitive, however, it may not be necessary to change τῶν to τῆς. A possible solution is to keep the transmitted τῶν and supplement the phrase, for instance, as πλέον τῶν εἰς δύο μοίρας <νεμομένων ὡρῶν> παρῴχηκεν, 'a majority of the <hours, which are divided> into two parts, has passed'. Our reason for supplementing this is that this construction is also used in the subsequent sentence (λεγέτω τις ὅτι πλέον τι τῶν εἰς δύο μοίρας νεμομένων ὡρῶν παρῴχηκέ τι). Heitz translated *et [si] dicas*

---

101 The infinitive ending -ναι is not written in προβεβηκέ(ναι) φάναι ἐπὶ πλέον (fol. 135v) and τὴν ὥραν καταμεμαθηκέ(ναι) φησί (fol. 135v) either.

102 D'Ansse de Villoison 1788, 252; Bekker 1825, 285; Kammer 1863, 67; Dindorf 1875–1877, III, 437; Schrader 1880, 149; MacPhail 2011, 174.

103 So also Sodano 1974, 45: "e se tu dicessi che è trascorso 'piu' della parte divisa in due".

104 MacPhail 2011, 174–175.

105 Barnes/Lawrence 1984, 2432.

duarum partium majorem praeteriisse,[106] which would probably require πλέον τῶν δύο μοιρῶν.

ἐάν τις †εἰς δύο πλεονάσαντα† τὸ γ′ τῆς εἰς γ′ καταλίπῃ. The text seems to be corrupt. The sense appears to be: 'if one part of a division into two increases and if someone leaves behind one third of a division into three, he determines by how much the increase has been'. That would require ἐάν τις <τῆς> εἰς δύο <θατέρου> πλεονάσαντος τὸ γ′ τῆς εἰς γ′ καταλίπῃ (if πλεονάζω is intransitive) or perhaps ἐάν τις <τῆς> εἰς δύο <θάτερον> πλεονάσας τὸ γ′ τῆς εἰς γ′ καταλίπῃ (if πλεονάζω is transitive). At any rate, πλεονάσαντα seems impossible, since there is neither a masculine accusative nor a neuter plural[107] with which it could be connected as a circumstantial participle. Kammer changed the participle to πλεονάσαν,[108] probably connecting it with τὸ γ′, but that does not give the required meaning. The translation would be 'if one leaves behind one third of the (division) into three, after it has increased to two'. MacPhail corrected the text to ἐάν τις <τοῦ β′ τῆς> εἰς δύο πλεονάσαντα τὸ γ′ τῆς εἰς γ′ καταλίπῃ, translating this as "if someone leaves behind a third of the division into three exceeding [a half of the division] into two".[109] However, his dangling participle 'exceeding' does not solve the problematic case of πλεονάσαντα. It is also doubtful whether τοῦ β′ can mean 'half'. Sodano translated "se si facesse la somma di due terze parti" or "if one were to make the sum of two thirds".[110] In a footnote, he gave a more literal translation: "se si portasse il terzo della divisione in tre parti (una cioè delle tre parti in cui è stato diviso il tutto) a due ripetentisi (cioè al raddoppio)" or "if one were to bring the third of the division into three parts (i. e. one of the three parts into which the whole has been divided) to two which repeat themselves (i. e. to duplication)".[111] But here, too, the case of the participle is ignored (his translation "se si portasse [...] a due" requires εἰς δύο πλεονάσας), and "ripetentisi" ("repeating themselves") comes a bit out of nowhere.

---

106 Heitz 1969, 138.
107 The only possible neuter plural is δύο, but connecting πλεονάσαντα with δύο would make no sense and would leave εἰς unconnected with anything.
108 Kammer 1863, 68.
109 MacPhail 2011, 174–175.
110 Sodano 1974, 46.
111 Sodano 1974, 46 n. 95.

καταλίπη. Most editors have kept the transmitted form καταλίποι,[112] but ἐάν + optative is impossible. Either ἐάν τις has to be corrected to εἴ τις, or καταλίποι has to be changed with MacPhail to καταλίπη.[113] Palaeographically, the latter is more plausible (-οι being an iotacistic error for -η).

σοφῶς οὖν ὁ ποιητὴς τὸ ἀόριστον [τρίτον] τῆς αὐξήσεως τοῦ ἡμίσεος δεδήλωκεν ὅσον ἦν τρίτον. Like Villoison, Bekker and Dindorf, MacPhail has kept the first τρίτον.[114] However, this word should be deleted with Kammer, Schrader and Sodano.[115] Porphyry is talking about the number by which one half has increased. It is the increase which is unspecific, not the 'one third'.

ἀπὸ τοῦ μεσονυκτίου μεταβάντος β′ ὧραι ἦσαν παραλλάξασαι. The manuscript puts μεταβάντος after παραλλάξασαι, which previous editors have left unchanged.[116] It can only be connected with μεσονυκτίου, but this creates an extreme hyperbaton. For this reason, we have moved it after μεσονυκτίου.[117]

[3f] **παρῆλθε τὸ πλέον ἡ νὺξ οὖσα μοιρῶν β′**. Autochthon's explanation is a bit confusing. He first paraphrases Homer, stating that the two parts (or two thirds) have been completed and the third part (or one third) remains (τετελεσμένων τῶν β′ μοιρῶν, λειπομένης δὲ τῆς τρίτης). However, he then states that the night has passed for the majority (παρῆλθε τὸ πλέον ἡ νὺξ) and adds that the night consists of two parts (ἡ νὺξ οὖσα μοιρῶν δύο). This could be taken to mean that he interprets τῶν δύο μοιράων, like Aristotle, as indicating two halves of the night. However, that is not how he goes on to explain the text. In the interpretation that follows, he contrasts the two parts with one (stating 'two is greater than one') and argues that two thirds is the majority of the night (πλέον γὰρ μέρος εἰσὶ τῆς νυκτὸς αἱ δύο), indicating that he is now speaking of two thirds of the night rather than two halves. He then again repeats his point that, if two thirds have passed, the night has passed for the majority (παροιχομένων τῶν δύο μοιρῶν τῷ πλείονι ἡ νὺξ παρῴχηκεν; *cf.* also τῷ πλείονι καὶ μείζονι μέρει παρήλλαχε (*sc.* ἡ νὺξ), τῶν

---

112 D'Ansse de Villoison 1788, 252; Bekker 1825, 285; Kammer 1863, 68; Dindorf 1875–1877, III, 437; Schrader 1880, 149.

113 MacPhail 2011, 174.

114 D'Ansse de Villoison 1788, 252; Bekker 1825, 285; MacPhail 2011, 174.

115 Kammer 1863, 68; Schrader 1880, 149; Sodano 1974, 44.

116 D'Ansse de Villoison 1788, 252; Bekker 1825, 285; Kammer 1863, 68; Dindorf 1875–1877, III, 437; Schrader 1880, 150; Sodano 1974, 44; MacPhail 2011, 176.

117 Alternatively, μεταβάντος might have originally been a gloss to παραλλάξασαι (so μεταβάσασαι), which was later corrupted to μεταβάντος. However, this speculative theory requires a double correction.

δύο μερῶν παρῳχημένων at the end). This raises the question whether β΄ in ἡ νὺξ οὖσα μοιρῶν β΄ might be an error (for γ΄?), perhaps introduced from the Aristotelian argument. Alternatively, we could translate παρῆλθε τὸ πλέον ἡ νὺξ οὖσα μοιρῶν β΄ as 'the night has gone by for the most part, if (we were to assume that) it consists of two parts'.

ἔστι γὰρ τῷ «πλέω» ἡ νὺξ παρῳχηκυῖα μέρει. The word πλέω is a bit problematic. In this sentence, Porphyry seems to want to connect this with μέρει in the sense of 'for the most part', as he goes on to explain (*cf.* τουτέστι τῷ πλείονι καὶ μείζονι μέρει). However, πλέω/πλέῳ is no regular dative form of the comparative πλείων (neither in Attic prose nor in Homer). Of course, it is nevertheless possible that Porphyry/Autochthon believes that πλέω/πλέῳ is somehow a Homeric form of the dative comparative, similar to the more familiar πλέω = πλέονα and πλείους = πλέονες/πλέονας. One way to solve the problem is to assume that we should actually read τῷ «πλέω» ἡ νὺξ παρῳχηκυῖα μέρει, τουτέστι τῷ πλείονι καὶ μείζονι μέρει. Or perhaps more drastically: [τῷ] πλέω ἡ νὺξ παρῳχηκυῖα [μέρει], τουτέστι τῷ πλείονι καὶ μείζονι μέρει (in which case πλέω would be a regular adverbial accusative). In any case, Porphyry's/Autochthon's point seems to be that πλέω is not an error and should not be corrected to πλείων but is used in an adverbial sense (πλέω = τῷ πλέονι μέρει).

[3g] **Ἀπίων δὲ αὐτῶν τῶν β΄ τὸ πλέον μέρος ἀνηλῶσθαι λέγει, ὥστε καὶ τῆς δευτέρας εἶναι λείψανον**. The manuscript reads τῆς δευτέρας, presumably with an implied μοίρας. However, since τὸ πλέον μέρος precedes, the switch to a feminine form in somewhat unexpected. Kammer's conjecture τοῦ δευτέρου is what would probably be expected.[118] Note, however, that the parallel in the D scholia has τῆς δευτέρας as well.[119] An alternative solution would be to supplement αὐτῶν τῶν β΄ <μοιρῶν> or at the very least to assume that τῶν β΄ is a feminine plural and thus short for τῶν β΄ (μοιρῶν).

«ἀλλὰ καὶ ταύτην τὴν στρατίαν θαλάσσῃ ἤδη πλείω χρώμενοι συνῆλθον». Most editors of the excerpt have read τὴν στρατιάν.[120] In the manuscript, the word is abbreviated as στρατ΄. The acute accent shows that the reading is actually

---

118 D'Ansse de Villoison 1788, 252 and Bekker 1825, 286 misread the abbreviation δευ^tr΄ as δεκάτης (presumably interpreting this as referring to the tenth hour).
119 Schol. D *Il*. 10.252(3) p. 374.17 (van Thiel²).
120 Bekker 1825, 286; Kammer 1863, 69; Dindorf 1875–1877, III, 438; Schrader 1880, 150; MacPhail 2011, 176. D'Ansse de Villoison 1788, 252 read τὴν στρατόν, which is impossible, since στρατός is masculine.

στρατίαν or (without iotacism) στρατείαν. Thus, Porphyry seems to have agreed with the text of Thucydides (1.3.5) as transmitted by the codex Laurentianus 69,2 (C⁴)[121] and Monacensis gr. 430 (F) (στρατείαν) / the codex Monacensis gr. 228 (G) (στρατίαν) against the codex Parisinus suppl. gr. 255 (A), Vaticanus gr. 126 (B), Heidelbergensis, Palatinus gr. 252 (E) and Londinensis Add. 11,727 (M), which read στρατιὰν (ABEM form one family, to which F normally belongs as well).[122] Note, however, that the parallel quotation in the D scholia has στρατιὰν.[123]

The excerpt also agrees with most manuscripts of Thucydides in reading πλείω against the codex Monacensis gr. 228 (G) and the corrector of the codex Londinensis Add. 11,727 (M¹), which read τὰ πλείω.[124] Finally, it deviates from the *codices veteres* in reading συνῆλθον[125] (instead of ξυνῆλθον) but nevertheless agrees with them in so far as it has the prefix συν-/ξυν- against the codex Parisinus gr. 1733 (Pe)[126] (ἐξῆλθον) and Lorenzo Valla's translation (*exierunt*).[127] Cobet corrected the text of Thucydides to ξυνεξῆλθον,[128] which MacPhail adopted in his edition of the excerpt as συνεξῆλθον,[129] but this correction by MacPhail is unnecessary.

πτῶσιν αἰτιατικὴν προβάλλον. MacPhail puts προβάλλον between *cruces*.[130] Indeed, a construction προβάλλω πτῶσιν in the sense of 'show a grammatical case' is otherwise unattested. Note, however, that the parallel in the D scholia has προβάλλον as well.[131]

[4] «**Πληϊάδας ἐσορῶντι**». The text of *Od.* 5.272 is transmitted by the mediaeval Homer manuscripts as Πληϊάδας τ' ἐσορῶντι.[132] This is also how the text is read

---

121 The initial part of codex C (Thuc. 1.1.1–1.15.1) is written in a later hand; hence the siglum C⁴. For the stemmatological position of C⁴, see Alberti 1972, CLXVIII–CLXXI.

122 See Luschnat 1960, 21; Alberti 1972, 29. For the transmission of Thucydides, especially the stemma of the *codices veteres*, see Luschnat 1960, 11*-16*; Alberti 1972, XL–LIII. The reading στρατιὰν is also found in schol. Thuc. 1.3.5b (Kleinlogel/Alpers).

123 Schol. D *Il.* 10.252(3) p. 374.20 (van Thiel²).

124 The lemma of schol. Thuc. 1.3.5b (Kleinlogel/Alpers) also has τὰ πλείω according to A and B; in F, the lemma has καὶ πλείω. See Kleinlogel/Alpers 2019, 270.

125 Schol. Thuc. 1.3.5b (Kleinlogel/Alpers) also has συνῆλθον.

126 For the relevance of codex Pe, see Alberti 1972, LXXIII–LXXV.

127 Valla's translation was based on a now lost codex. For its text-critical importance, see Alberti 1972, CXIX–CXXXII.

128 Cobet 1873, 428.

129 MacPhail 2011, 176.

130 MacPhail 2011, 176.

131 Schol. D *Il.* 10.252(3) p. 374.22 (van Thiel²).

132 See West 2017, 110.

by Eustathius.[133] Similarly, the geographer Pausanias quotes the line as Πληϊάδας τ᾽ ἐσορῶντα (with an accusative instead of a dative participle).[134] In an *Odyssey* scholion, however, the participle appears in a 'distended' form as εἰσορόωντα.[135] It also appears in a 'distended' form in the quotation of this line in Achilles Tatius and the Anonymus I in Aratum, viz. as Πληάδας εἰσορόωντι (with a dative participle).[136] Similarly, an exegetic *Iliad* scholion quotes the line as Πληϊάδας θ᾽ ὁρόωντι.[137] The codex Harleianus 5674 fol. 33r may have initially read something similar. In its current form, it reads πληϊάδας [[˛]] ὁρῶντι (with an erasure between the two words). Originally, the text probably read πληϊάδας θ᾽ ὁρῶντι, but the corrector erased θ᾽ and wrote τ᾽ ἐσ over it, thus producing the standard reading πληϊάδας τ᾽ ἐσορῶντι, found in the other mediaeval Homer manuscripts.

In the manuscript of the Porphyry excerpt, the line is quoted as πλη(ι)άδας[138] ἐσορῶντι. Many editors of the excerpt have corrected this and aligned it with one of the previously discussed readings. Their reason for doing so is that the line in its current form seems to be unmetrical (Πληῐ̆ᾱ̆δᾰς ἐ̆σŏρ̄ῶντῐ / Πληᾱ̆δᾰς ἐ̆σŏρ̄ῶντῐ). Villoison, Bekker and Dindorf corrected the text to Πληᾱ̆δᾰς εῑσŏρŏῶντῐ (the reading of Achilles Tatius and the Anonymus I in Aratum);[139] Kammer corrected

---

133 Eust. *Od*. 5.271 vol. 1 p. 215.24 (Stallbaum).

134 Paus. 8.3.7. Rocha-Pereira 1990, 226, Casevitz/Jost/Marcadé 2002, 20 and Moggi/Osanna 2003, 22 have corrected ἐσορῶντα to ἐσορῶντι.

135 Schol. *Od*. 5.272d (Pontani): γρ(άφεται) καὶ «εἰσορόωντα». διχῶς αἱ Ἀριστάρχου. Aristarchus' two editions differed with regard to the reading of the participle. This is what the word διχῶς indicates, which means 'in two ways' and is often used in the Homeric scholia to indicate discrepancies between Aristarchus' first and second edition. According to West 2017, 110, τ᾽ ἐσορῶντι was the reading of Aristarchus' first edition (Ar^a), and τ᾽ ἐσορῶντα the reading of Aristarchus' second edition (Ar^b). Unlike other scholia (e. g. schol. A *Il*. 8.213a1 (Erbse) (VMK): διχῶς αἱ Ἀριστάρχου «ἔεργε» καὶ «ἔρυκε»; schol. *Od*. 1.188a (Pontani): διχῶς αἱ Ἀριστάρχου, «εἴ πέρ τε» καὶ «εἴ πέρ τι»), the present scholion does not go on to spell out the two readings. Therefore, reconstructing Aristarchus' readings remains hypothetical. The phrasing of the scholion implies, however, that Πλήαδας εἰσορόωντα was the reading of one edition of Aristarchus, while his other edition presumably read the vulgate Πλήϊάδας τ᾽ ἐσορῶντι.

136 Achilles Tatius, *Introductio in Aratum* 1 p. 30 (Maass); Anonymus I in Aratum 1 p. 89 (Maass). Note that the manuscripts of Achilles Tatius have πληϊάδας τ᾽ εἰσορόωντι (Vaticanus gr. 191 (V); the Vaticanus gr. 381 (T), which belongs to the same family as V, has πλησϊάδας τ᾽ εἰσορόωντι) and πλειάδας εἰσορόοντι (Laurentianus 28,44 (M)); Maass 1898, 30 corrected this to Πληϊάδας εἰσορόωντι, probably rightly so, since a distended form is found in all three manuscripts. Di Maria 1996, 8, in contrast, corrected the text to Πληϊάδας τ᾽ ἐσορῶντι.

137 Schol. AT *Il*. 8.93a1 (Erbse) (exeg.).

138 The scribe seems to have initially written πλϊάδας, as is indicated by the diaeresis, which is normally only used for ι and υ, and then corrected ι to η. It is possible that his exemplar originally had πληϊάδας.

139 D'Ansse de Villoison 1788, 252; Bekker 1825, 286; Dindorf 1875–1877, III, 438.

it to Πληῐᾰ́δᾱς <τ᾿> ἔσŏρῶντῐ, i. e. the text as it is transmitted in the mediaeval Homer manuscripts.[140] Arguably, Kammer's intervention is less drastic than that of the other editors. However, it is possible that Porphyry actually quoted the line as Πληῐᾰ́δᾱς ἔσŏρῶντῐ, presumably with metrical lengthening *in arsi*.[141]

τεκμήρασθαι. Previous editors of the excerpt have all printed τεκμαίρεσθαι.[142] However, what follows *mu* is written quite narrowly and seems to be *eta* rather than *alpha iota*. Moreover, *rho* is followed by *alpha*, not *epsilon*. So the verb is τεκμήρασθαι, the aorist infinitive. This is also what is read in the codex Vaticanus Palatinus gr. 12 (V[20]), which copies B.

τὸ προβεβηκέναι. This might be an error for τὸ «προβέβηκε», since Porphyry generally quotes the Homeric words in their original conjugations and declensions.

οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν Πληϊάδων καὶ Ὑάδων καὶ Ὠρίωνος. The sentence is elliptic: οἱ δὲ (*sc.* φάναι Ὅμηρον/Ὀδυσσέα) ἀπὸ τῶν Πληϊάδων καὶ Ὑάδων καὶ Ὠρίωνος, 'other people claim that [Homer/Odysseus says this] on the basis of the Pleiades, Hyades and Orion'. However, it is possible that ἀπὸ is an error for ἐπὶ, since this is the preposition used before (οἱ δὲ οὐδ᾿ ἐπ᾿ ἄλλου φασὶν οἷόν τε ἢ ἐπὶ τῆς ἄρκτου εἰρῆσθαι), so that the meaning would be 'other people claim that [Homer/Odysseus says this] about the Pleiades, Hyades and Orion'.

†Πληϊάδων† δύσιν ποιουμένων καὶ ἤδη προβαινόντων εἰς τὴν δύσιν. The transmitted text is obviously corrupt here. The phrase is preceded by οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν Πληϊάδων καὶ Ὑάδων καὶ Ὠρίωνος, ἤτοι τὴν ἀνατολὴν (corrected from ἤτοι δὲ ἀνατολὴ) ἑῴαν ποιουμένων καὶ προβεβηκότων ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνατολῆς 'Other people [claim that he says this] on the basis of the Pleiades, Hyades and Orion, which are either rising at dawn and have advanced from the east'. The required text would therefore probably be ἤ(τοι) ἑῴαν τὴν δύσιν ποιουμένων καὶ ἤδη προβαινόντων εἰς τὴν δύσιν 'or are setting at dawn and are already advancing towards the west'.[143] Alternatively, it is possible that Porphyry is no longer talking about the Pleiades, Hyades and Orion here. This might be suggested by the parallel in the D

---

140 Kammer 1863, 69.

141 Schrader 1880, 150 and MacPhail 2011, 178 printed Πληϊάδας ἐσορῶντι.

142 D'Ansse de Villoison 1788, 252; Bekker 1825, 286; Dindorf 1875–1877, III, 438; Schrader 1880, 151.

143 Schrader 1880, 151 simply deleted Πληϊάδων, but in his apparatus he suggested correcting this to ἢ τῶν ἑῴαν, although he added that more may have fallen out.

scholia, which read ἔνιοι μὲν οὖν Πληϊάδας φασὶ καὶ Ὑάδας καὶ τὸν Ὠρίωνα καὶ τὸ προβεβηκέναι τὴν ἀνατολὴν ἑῴαν ποιεῖσθαι, ἕτεροι δὲ τὸν ἕσπερον καὶ τὸν κύνα, καὶ τὸ προβεβηκέναι ἑῴαν ποιεῖσθαι τὴν δύσιν.[144] So it is possible that Porphyry has moved on to another interpretation and is now talking about the Evening Star and Sirius as stars that set at dawn.

διχῶς δὲ τὸ τρίτον <...> τό τε κατὰ σχέσιν τὴν πρὸς τὸ πρῶτον. As Schrader indicated, some text appears to have fallen out after τρίτον.[145] Porphyry seems to have talked about two ways of interpreting 'the third part' (or 'one third'). If we do not supplement a reference to the Evening Star and Sirius in the aforementioned corrupt passage, it is possible that such a note was originally found in the lacuna here.

«ἔσσεται <ἢ> ἠὼς ἢ δείλης ἢ μέσον ἦμαρ». The manuscript quotes *Il*. 21.111 as ἔσσεται ἠὼς ἢ δείλης ἢ μέσον ἦμαρ. Previous editors of the excerpt have kept this text,[146] but the line is unmetrical as such, and Porphyry is unlikely to have written that. For this reason, we have supplemented <ἢ> ἠὼς on the basis of the transmitted Homer text (with ἢ lost through haplography).[147] The conjecture is further supported by the parallel D scholion, which also reads ἢ ἠὼς.[148] Moreover, this is also how Porphyry reads the line in the first book of the *Homeric Questions*.[149]

 Porphyry (as presented by *B) also reads δείλης with the Homer manuscripts AFTG (alongside Apollonius Sophista, the *Suda*, the *Etymologicum Genuinum* and the *Etymologicum magnum*)[150] and against the rest of the Homer manuscripts

---

144 Schol. D *Il*. 10.252(2) p. 373.4–6 (van Thiel²).

145 Schrader 1880, 151.

146 D'Ansse de Villoison 1788, 253; Bekker 1825, 286; Dindorf 1875–1877, III, 439; Schrader 1880, 151.

147 This error is also found in schol. A *Il*. 10.252a (Erbse) (VMK) (Erbse 1969–1988, III, 49 supplemented <ἢ> ἠὼς with Ludwich), schol. T *Il*. 21.110c1 (Erbse) (exeg.), Eust. *Il*. 10.252s. vol. 3 p. 59.2 (van der Valk).

148 Schol. D *Il*. 10.252(3) p. 373.2–3 (van Thiel²).

149 Porph. *Zetemata Vaticana* 11 p. 63 (Sodano) = *ad Il*. 6.201 p. 96 (Schrader). The Vaticanus gr. 305 (V), the only manuscript that preserved book 1 of Porphyry's *Homeric Questions*, reads ἔσσεται ἠώς, but the excerpts of this passage in *B, the codex Scorialensis gr. Ω.I.12 (E⁴) and the Harleianus gr. 5693 (Bm⁸) all have ἔσσεται ἢ ἠώς. See Sodano 1970, 62–63.

150 Apollonius Sophista *Lexicon s.v.* ἠώς p. 85 (Bekker); *Suda* η 417, *s.v.* ἠώς; *Etymologicum Genuinum s.v.* δείλη (Vaticanus gr. 1818 fol. 98v); *Etym. Magn. s.v.* δείλη p. 261 (Kallierges). One manuscript of the *Suda* (Parisinus gr. 2625 (A)) has δείλη: see Adler (1931) 576. The *Suda* also incorrectly quotes the line as ἔσσεται ἦμαρ ἢ ἠώς, etc. Note further that the transmitted text of Apollonius actually reads ἔσσετε for ἔσσεται. Eust. *Il*. 21.106–113 vol. 4 p. 464.22 (van der Valk) records δείλης as a variant (κατὰ δέ τινας δείλης).

and the other testimonia, which have δείλη.[151] Note, however, that in the first book of his *Homeric Questions*, Porphyry seems to have read δείλη instead.[152] The nominative δείλη also seems to have been the reading of Aristarchus and Didymus.[153] In his Homer edition, however, West adopted Fick's conjectures ἠ᾿ for ἢ and δείελη for δείλη(ς).[154]

4 Discussion

4.1 Porphyry's introduction [1–3a]

The text seems to reproduce the introduction to some section of Porphyry's *Homeric Questions*, explaining his approach to answering such questions[155]. It is unlikely to be the beginning of the work itself, however, as the first book is extant in the manuscript tradition, and this is not how it begins.[156]

Porphyry mentions that 'the collection of the inquiries has appeared already also in other writers' (ἡ συναγωγὴ τῶν ζητουμένων γέγονε μὲν ἤδη καὶ παρ᾿ ἄλλοις). Schrader claimed that Porphyry's work was based on three collections: a Peripatetic collection (also containing all pre-Aristotelian material), a Stoic col-

---

151 *Etymologicum Symeonis* δ 90 (Baldi), *s. v.* δείλη; Lexicon αἰμωδεῖν ε 198 (Dyck), *s. v.* ἔσται; schol. bT *Il.* 8.66b (Erbse) (exeg.); schol. A *Il.* 10.252a (Erbse) (VMK); schol. T *Il.* 21.110c1 (Erbse) (exeg.); schol. b *Il.* 21.110b2/c2 (Erbse) (exeg.); schol. T *Il.* 21.111c1 (Erbse) (exeg.) (δίχα οὖν τοῦ σ̄ ἡ δείλη); schol. Procl. Hes. *Op.* 578–581 (Pertusi); Phot. *Lexicon* η 314 (Theodoridis), *s. v.* ἠώς; Eust. *Il.* 10.252s. vol. 3 p. 59.2; 11.84 vol. 3 p. 157.22; 21.106–113 vol. 4 p. 464.22 (van der Valk). Note that one manuscript (Parisinus gr. 2708 (B)) of Proclus' scholion on Hesiod has δείλης: see Pertusi 1955, 163. Also, like the *Suda*, Photius reads the Homeric line as ἔσσεται ἦμαρ ἢ ἠώς (although he does not repeat ἦμαρ at the end).
152 Porph. *Zetemata Vaticana* 11 p. 63 (Sodano) = *ad Il.* 6.201 p. 96 (Schrader). Note, however, that excerpt in the codex Scorialensis gr. Ω.I.12 (E⁴) reads δείλης.
153 See schol. A *Il.* 21.111d (Erbse) (VMK) (Ἀρίσταρχος χωρὶς τοῦ σ̄, «δείλη»); schol. A *Il.* 21.110a (Erbse) (VMK) (οὕτως δὲ χωρὶς τοῦ σ̄ γραπτέον, ὡς καὶ Διδύμῳ δοκεῖ ἐν τῇ διορθώσει); schol. T *Il.* 21.110c1 (Erbse) (exeg.) (καὶ χωρὶς τοῦ σ̄ τὸ «δείλη», ὡς καὶ Δίδυμός φησιν); schol. b *Il.* 21.110b2/c2 (Erbse) (exeg.) (τὸ δὲ «δείλη» χωρὶς τοῦ σ̄, ὥς φησι Δίδυμος).
154 West 1998–2000, II, 245.
155 See Kammer 1863, 5; Rose 1863, 165; Dindorf 1875–1877, III, xii–xiii; 434; Schrader 1880, 367–68; 370; 421; 1890, 169; Erbse 1960, 64.
156 See Sodano 1970. But note van der Valk 1963–1964, I, 104 n. 75: "this question formed the beginning of Porphyry's book"; Pontani 2019, 48 n. 3: "on a l'impression d'avoir ici l'ouverture d'un livre [...] ou de l'œuvre entière" (we find the former much more likely).

lection (providing allegorical explanations) and an Alexandrian collection.[157] According to Schrader, the reference to a συναγωγὴ τῶν ζητουμένων proves his use of such collections.[158] Although the three-source hypothesis was not adopted by subsequent scholars, Gudeman did accept the existence of an Alexandrian collection, which he considered to be attested in the current excerpt[159]. According to Erbse, however, this is not what the text says at all. In his view, Porphyry instead *contrasts* his work with such collections and stresses that, unlike such compilations, he consulted the original works.[160]

Porphyry announces in this programmatic statement that he draws on the inquiries of others and evaluates their solutions. He states that he agrees with some but rejects others and adds that some solutions are his own, while others are based on a revision and expansion of solutions proposed by other writers. Indeed, his discussions in the *Homeric Questions* often take the form of a catalogue of solutions proposed by previous writers.[161]

To illustrate his approach, Porphyry begins with one of the old questions. He quotes *Il.* 10.252–253, and then presents the Homeric question (in the following form): 'For how, if these two parts have passed and even more than this, does the third part remain but not part of the third?' Indeed, Porphyry goes on to give a list of possible solutions that have been proposed by other writers. However, despite what he announces at the start of the excerpt, he does not critically evaluate the solutions here, nor does he explicitly reject any of these. In other excerpts, in contrast, Porphyry engages more actively with the discussed solutions.

For the first solution, Porphyry reports that 'some in fact, adding a *sigma* [i. e. to τριτάτη, making it the genitive τριτάτης], thought fit to write "and a part of a third remains", so that a portion of the third is left, but not the whole third'.[162] Porphyry seems to raise this sort of solution only to set it aside as a representative of attempted solutions through emendation generally. That is, it is probably not meant to be part of the main discussion of serious solutions.[163]

---

157 Schrader 1880, 368–427; 1890, 172–200.
158 Schrader 1880, 421.
159 Gudeman 1927, 2513.
160 Erbse 1960, 64–65.
161 For Porphyry's method in the *Homeric Questions*, see Pontani 2019, especially pp. 48–53.
162 Eustathius may be alluding to this interpretation in Eust. *Il.* 10.252–253 vol. 3 p. 59.10–12 (van der Valk): ἢ αἱ δύο ὅλαι μοῖραι παρῴχοντο καὶ σὺν αὐταῖς μέρος τι καὶ τῆς τρίτης, ὡς μὴ ὅλην αὐτὴν περιλείπεσθαι (although he does not go so far as to state that τρίτη should become τρίτης). Alternatively, he might also be referring to Chrysippus' interpretation (see § 4.3 below).
163 See also Porph. *ad Od.* 5.334–337 p. 56–57 (Schrader) = schol. *Od.* 5.334e (Pontani), where he states that Aristotle's emendation of the word αὐδήεσσα to αὐλήεσσα or οὐδήεσσα (*fr.* 171

4.2 Metrodorus [3b]

The first real solution cited by Porphyry is that of Metrodorus. This is probably Metrodorus of Lampsacus the Elder, a student of Anaxagoras who is mentioned in Plato's *Ion* (530c = 61 *fr.* 1 DK).[164] Other scholars have identified him as Metrodorus of Chios (a student of Democritus and author of a work entitled Τρωϊκά[165]) or Metrodorus of Lampsacus the Younger (a friend of Epicurus and author of a work Περὶ ποιημάτων[166]).[167] Metrodorus of Lampsacus the Younger seems especially unlikely, since, according to Plutarch, Metrodorus did not consider knowledge of Homer necessary.[168] Horn even conjectured changing Μητρόδωρος to Ζηνόδωρος, thus identifying him as Zenodorus, author of a work Περὶ τῆς

Rose[3] = *fr.* 394.1 Gigon) is not a solution (λῦσαι μὲν οὖν οὐ βεβούληται, *sc.* Ἀριστοτέλης). See the discussion in Hintenlang 1961, 89–93, Breitenberger 2006, 417–418 and Verhasselt 2020, 246–248.

164 See Schrader 1880, 384; Lanata 1963, 246–247 with n. 4; Freeman 1949, 277–278; Pfeiffer 1968, 35; Sodano 1974, 47 n. 98; Richardson 1975, 68; Cassio 2002, 123; Pontani 2005, 28; Pagani 2006; Novokhatko 2015, 37–38. The fragment is included in Diels/Kranz 1952, 49–50 as 61 *fr.* 5 with a question mark.

165 The title is attested in Ath. 4.184a (= Metrodorus Chius 70 B 3 DK = *FGrH* 43 F1: Μητρόδωρος δ' ὁ Χῖος ἐν Τρωϊκοῖς) and schol. Ge *Il.* 21.444c (Erbse) (exeg.) (= Metrodorus Chius 70 B 4 DK = *FGrH* 43 F2: Μητρόδωρος ἐν Τρωϊκοῖς).

166 See Phld. *De rhetorica* 2, *PHerc.* 1674 col. 49.27 – col. 51.29 p. 145–149 Longo Auricchio = vol. 1 p. 85–89 Sudhaus (~ Metrodorus *fr.* 20–21 Koerte); *PHerc.* 1672 col. 20.28 – col. 21.17 p. 213–215 Longo Auricchio = vol. 1 p. 119–20 Sudhaus (not in Koerte); *De rhetorica* 3, *PHerc.* 1506 col. 40.17–29 – col. 41.21 p. 17 Hammerstaedt 1992 = vol. 2 p. 241–242 Sudhaus (not in Koerte); col. 44.18–31 p. 20 Hammerstaedt 1992 = vol. 2 p. 247–248 Sudhaus (~ Metrodorus *fr.* 23 Koerte). Plut. *Non posse suaviter vivi secundum Epicurum* 12.1094e quotes the work as Περὶ ποιητῶν (= Metrodorus *fr.* 24 Koerte).

167 See Sengebusch 1855, 133–134. The text is included in the fragments of Metrodorus of Chios by Alfieri 1936, 336 and F. Jacoby, *FGrH* 43 F4. See also Erbse 1960, 45–46. Diels/Kranz 1952, 234 do not print the text but give it its own fragment number (70 B 5) with a cross-reference to Metrodorus of Lampsacus the Elder. This attribution is rejected, however, by F. Jenkins, *BNJ* 43 F4.

168 Plut. *Non posse suaviter vivi secundum Epicurum* 12.1094e = Metrodorus *fr.* 24 Koerte: ὅθεν μηδ' εἰδέναι φάσκων, μεθ' ὁποτέρων ἦν ὁ Ἕκτωρ, ἢ τοὺς πρώτους στίχους τῆς Ὁμήρου ποιήσεως ἢ πάλιν τὰ ἐν μέσῳ, μὴ ταρβήσῃς, 'Therefore, you do not have to be disturbed if you admit that you do not even know which side Hector was on, or the first lines of Homer's poetry or those in the middle'. According to Erler 1994, 219, Metrodorus' work discussed 'poetological' problems. However, according to Plutarch (*Non posse suaviter vivi secundum Epicurum* 2.1087a), Metrodorus calumniated Homer in many works. So if Metrodorus discussed Homeric problems, it was probably not to solve them but to criticise Homer (much like the work of Zoilus of Amphipoli). According to Plutarch, Epicurus (*fr.* 228 Usener) and Metrodorus spoke of 'poetic confusion' (ποιητικὴ τύρβη) and 'Homer's buffoonery' (Ὁμήρου μωρολογήματα).

Ὁμηρικῆς συνηθείας.[169] However, this correction seems unnecessary. The main reason for rejecting the identification of Metrodorus as the pupil of Anaxagoras is that the fragment offers no allegorical interpretation of Homer, which Metrodorus was known for.[170] However, this does not mean that Metrodorus was unable to offer more 'grammatical' interpretations. In fact, the Stoics were known for allegorical interpretations, too, but in the current excerpt, Chrysippus is cited for a 'grammatical' interpretation as well (see § 4.3 below).

In any case, Metrodorus reads πλεῖον and claims that it can mean two things in Homer – that is, it is a homonym.[171] One meaning is the customary one: 'more'. But he claims that it can also mean 'full' (τὸ πλῆρες), as it does for instance in *Il.* 2.226, 'your huts are full of bronze' (πλεῖαί τοι χαλκοῦ κλισίαι) and *Il.* 4.262–263, 'your cup always stands full' (σὸν δὲ πλεῖον δέπας αἰεὶ | ἕστηκε). And this less common meaning is the one that solves our problem. In the Homeric epics, Metrodorus says, the night is divided into three watches (τριφυλάκου τῆς νυκτὸς οὔσης), and so what Homer is in fact saying here is that a full two parts of the night have passed – not more than two part – and a third part remains. Richardson calls this a "very strained reading".[172] Breitenberger is more specific: the problem is that only the neuter singular πλεῖον is homonymous in this way. For instance, the feminine nominative singular of the comparative of πολύς is πλείων or πλέων, but the feminine nominative singular of πλέως/πλεῖος ('full') is πλέα/πλεία. So, if one tried to defend πλεῖον in verse 252, it cannot modify νύξ (which is feminine) to mean 'full night' or 'night is full'. Yet in his paraphrase, this is precisely what Metrodorus is claiming: 'for the night (νύξ), having become filled (πλήρης, fem.) with two parts, has passed, but a third remains', etc.[173] This is probably why the D scholia report the variant πλέη, an Ionic form of πλέα.[174] Met-

---

169 Horn 1883, 92 (thesis III). On Zenodorus, see Pusch 1890, 135–147. The title is attested in schol. bT *Il.* 18.356b (Erbse) (exeg.) (Ζηνοδώρῳ τῷ συγγράμματι Περὶ τῆς Ὁμήρου συνηθείας). *Suda* ζ 78, *s. v.* Ζηνόδοτος erroneously lists it under the works of Zenodotus of Alexandria. Zenodorus is cited by Porphyry in *Zetemata Vaticana* 18 p. 129 Sodano (= Porph. *ad Il.* 16.174 p. 214 (Schrader) = Porph. *ad Od.* 4.477 p. 48 (Schrader) = schol. *Od.* 4.477h1 (Pontani)) and *ad Il.* 18.22 p. 220 (Schrader) = p. 230 (MacPhail).
170 See Diog. Laert. 2.11 = Metrodorus 61 *fr.* 2 DK, Tatianus, *Ad Gr.* 21 = Metrodorus 61 *fr.* 3 DK and Hsch. α 299 (Latte), *s. v.* Ἀγαμέμνονα = Metrodorus 61 *fr.* 4 DK.
171 The interpretation of Lanata 1963, 246–247 is incorrect. In her edition of the fragment of Metrodorus, she only printed Μητρόδωρος μὲν οὖν τὸ «πλεῖον» δύο σημαίνειν φησὶ παρ' Ὁμήρῳ, which she incorrectly translated as "Metrodoro afferma che in Omero πλεῖον significa «due»".
172 Richardson 1975, 68.
173 See Breitenberger 2006, 402.
174 Schol. D *Il.* 10.252.1(1) p. 373.6–7 (van Thiel²): ἔνιοι δὲ γράφουσιν «πλέη» ἀντὶ τοῦ πλῆρες τῶν δύο μοιρῶν παρῴχηκεν· τριφύλακτον γὰρ θέλει εἶναι τὴν νύκτα.

rodorus probably interpreted πλεῖον as an adverbial accusative: 'the night has passed in a manner that is full of two thirds'. Note that the scribe is inconsistent with regard to Metrodorus' reading. At the beginning, he says that it is πλεῖον, but at the end he writes πλέον (unless the latter is merely a scribal error).

The interpretation that the word means 'full' also recurs in an A scholion on *Il.* 9.71,[175] an exegetic bT scholion on *Il.* 10.252–253[176] and in Hesychius' lexicon.[177] Interestingly, these texts circumvent the problem by reading πλέω instead of πλεῖον. This suggests that they interpret it as a nominative feminine singular, since they explain it not as πλῆρες but as πλήρης.[178] However, this creates the problem that πλέω is not a regular feminine form either. Perhaps the critics who defended this interpretation erroneously thought of the paradigm as (m.) πλέως, (f.) πλέω, (n.) πλέων (instead of πλέως, πλέα, πλέων), a paradigm that is otherwise unattested.

---

175 Schol. A *Il.* 9.71 (Erbse) (VMK): πλεῖαι {τοι οἴνου κλισίαι}: ὅτι πλεῖαι ἀντὶ τοῦ πλήρεις. πρὸς τὸ «παρῴχηκε δὲ <u>πλέω</u> νύξ» ἀντὶ τοῦ <u>πλήρης</u>. Van der Valk 1963–1964, II, 232 concluded, on the basis of this scholion, that Aristarchus interpreted this passage, similarly explaining πλέω as πλήρης. So also Lührs 1992, 14 n. 49; 60–61 with n. 145. Although Aristarchus athetising l. 253 (as discussed above) does not preclude his having offered an interpretation of πλέω(ν) in l. 252, the interpretation πλέω = πλήρης probably presupposes reading it together with l. 253 ('filled with the two parts'). Moreover, the argument in schol. A *Il.* 10.253a1 (Erbse) (VMK) that l. 253 is superfluous seems to imply that it interprets πλέω(ν) as 'for the most part', which would contradict the interpretation πλέω = πλήρης. We are therefore sceptical that schol. A *Il.* 9.71 (Erbse) (VMK) preserves Aristarchus' interpretation. According to Friedländer 1853, 155–156, it is a heavily condensed rendition of Aristonicus' argument, who supposedly originally said that the word πλέων in *Il.* 10.252 was *misinterpreted* by some as a synonym of πλήρης. However, such an interpretation cannot be reconstructed on the basis of the actual text. So also Lührs 1992, 61 n. 144.

176 Schol. bT *Il.* 10.252–253a (Erbse) (exeg.): <παρῴχηκεν δὲ> <u>πλέω</u> νύξ | τῶν δύο μοιράων, <τριτάτη δ' ἔτι μοῖρα λέλειπται>· παρῆλθον τῆς νυκτὸς αἱ δύο πλήρεις μοῖραι, ὡς τὸ «μέλαινά τ' ἄστρων ἐκλέλοιπεν εὐφρόνη» (Soph. *El.* 19), ἵν' ᾖ τὸ «πλέω» ἀντὶ τοῦ <u>πλήρης.</u>

177 Hsch. α 7890 (Latte): ἄστρα δὲ δὴ προβέβηκε· παρῴχηκεν δὲ πλέω νύξ τῶν δύο μοιράων, τριτάτη δ' ἔτι μοῖρα λέλειπται. ἤτοι εἰς τρεῖς μοίρας διαιρετέον, καὶ τὸ <u>πλέω</u> ἀντὶ τοῦ πλήρης ἀκουστέον, ἵνα ᾖ, ὅτι <u>πλήρης</u> τῶν δύω μοιρῶν ἡ νὺξ παρελήλυθεν.

178 The meaning 'full' also recurs in a prose paraphrase in the codex Scorialensis Ω.I.12 (E⁴) fol. 38r, which shows that it interprets πλέω as an adverbial accusative: τ' ἄστρα δὲ προέβη· παρῆλθε δὲ ἡ νὺξ, τὸ πλῆρες τῶν δύο μοιρῶν· ἡ τρίτη δὲ μοῖρα ἔτι ὑπολέλειπται.

4.3 Chrysippus [3c]

The next solution (after a raised dot and gap of three letters) comes from the Stoic Chrysippus.[179] There are several fragments in which Chrysippus offers solutions for Homeric problems.[180] Although no title is attested, he may have written a separate work on this,[181] like the Stoic Zeno of Citium[182]. Usually the Stoics are associated with allegorical interpretations of Homer. However, unlike his teacher, Cleanthes, Chrysippus does not seem to have interpreted Homer allegorically.[183]

Chrysippus starts by making the comparison with a group of three days. If two days have passed, on the third day, we can say that a third day remains, even if we do not make this statement at the start of the day. So, we call a day a day even past dawn (i. e. even when only part of a day remains); and in the same way, Homer is here calling one part of the tripartite night one full part of the night, even though only a portion of that part remains (like Metrodorus, Chrysippus divides the night into three parts). So there are three parts of the night, more than two parts have past, and Homer (or Odysseus) is informally calling what remains of the third part 'the third part'. Chrysippus then seems to draw a comparison with 'incomplete' humans. His argument seems to be that we call people full humans, even if they are missing certain body parts.[184]

4.4 'Others' [3d]

The fourth solution (after a special three-dot punctuation and a gap of three letters) is like the third: 'Others claim that poets have a custom of using a number that has been made uniform' – i. e. they tend to round numbers up or down in some

---

179 According to Erbse 1960, 46, Porphyry knew Chrysippus' solution (together with that of Metrodorus) through a commentary of the Roman period, which was also used in the Geneva scholia.
180 Chrysippus, *SVF* III *fr*. 769–777.
181 See Pontani 2005, 41.
182 The list of Zeno's works in Diog. Laer. 7.4 attests a work of *Homeric Problems* in five books (Προβλημάτων Ὁμηρικῶν πέντε). See also Zeno, *SVF* I *fr*. 274–275. Zeno does not apply allegory to Homer; he does, however, offer an allegorical interpretation of Hesiod's *Theogony* (*SVF* I *fr*. 103–105; *fr*. 118; *fr*. 121; *fr*. 167; *fr*. 169; *fr*. 276). See Steinmetz 1986, 19–23; 1994, 523–524 and Long 1992, 48; 50–51; 59–64.
183 For Chrysippus' Homeric studies, see Buffière 1973, 150–152, Steinmetz 1986, 26–28 and Long 1992, 48–50; 58–59. For Cleanthes, see Buffière 1973, 137–154, Pépin 1976, 125–131 and Steinmetz 1986, 23–25.
184 See the text-critical note above (p. 461–462) on the problematic words παρὰ πόδα.

way. In the lengthy passage that follows (the second longest), many examples from various poets are provided. Porphyry starts by giving examples of numbers that are rounded down. First, he quotes a line mentioning an army of 1000 ships (χιλιόναυν στρατόν), perhaps a quotation from Euripides' *Orestes*.[185] This refers to the Achaean fleet sent to Troy, which in fact consisted of 1186 ships.[186] This is followed by a quotation from an anonymous tragedy, which mentions 20 columns for one expedition but then specifies that there are 11 for the infantry and 12 for the ships, thus showing that they are in fact 23 in total.[187] These are examples which omit the 'subsequent digit(s)' (τὰ ἐπιτρέχοντα τοῖς ἀριθμοῖς), i. e. the remainder (in our examples, ͵αρπϛ′ becomes ͵α, and κγ′ becomes κ′). Porphyry then adds that the opposite, viz. omission of the first digit (τὸν προκείμενον), is also found. He first quotes two passages of Pindar. The first quotation mentions an unnamed person (presumably Heracles) killing twelve children and 'him' (i. e. the father) third, i. e. thirteenth (so with γ′ for ιγ′).[188] The second quotation from Pindar states that another unnamed man (here Oenomaus) was brought down by the fourth suitor (Pelops), i. e. the fourteenth (so with δ′ for ιδ′).[189]

Porphyry then quotes a line from Hesiod's *Works and Days*, which states that a woman should grow up for four year and be married in her fifth year,[190] which Porphyry interprets as being short for 'fourteen' and 'fifteenth' (so with δ′ and ε′ for ιδ′ and ιε′, respectively).[191] This is then followed by an extensive quotation

---

185 Eur. *Or.* 351–352 (ὦ χιλιόναυν | στρατὸν ὁρμήσας). So Schrader 1880, 148 and Sodano 1974, 48 n. 100. MacPhail 2011, 173 n. 110 cited Euripides' line *exempli gratia*. The Greek fleet is also called χιλιόναυς in Eur. *Andr.* 106, *IA* 174 and *Rhes.* 262.

186 This explanation also recurs in schol. Eur. *Or.* 353.02 (Mastronarde) (τῷ δὲ ἀπηρτισμένῳ ἀριθμῷ ἐχρήσατο· τοσαῦται γὰρ ἦσαν αἱ νῆες τῶν Ἑλλήνων, ͵αρπϛ′), schol. Eur. *Andr.* 106 (Schwartz) (τῷ ἀπηρτισμένῳ ἀριθμῷ ἐχρήσατο· εἰσὶν γὰρ αἱ νῆες ͵αρπϛ′), schol. Lycoph. *Alex.* 210 (Leone) (ὁ χιλιόναυς· τῷ τελείῳ δὲ ἀριθμῷ ἐχρήσατο) and Tzetz. *Scholia in Lycoph. Alex.* 207 (Scheer) (τὰς δὲ ρπϛ′ ναῦς παρέλιπε τῷ ἀπηρτισμένῳ μόνῳ χρησάμενος ἀριθμῷ· ἦσαν γὰρ αἱ πᾶσαι νῆες τῶν Ἑλλήνων ͵αρπϛ′). The number of ships is 1196 in schol. Eur. *Andr.* 106 (Schwartz) (τῷ ἀπηρτισμένῳ ἀριθμῷ ἐχρήσατο· εἰσὶ γὰρ αἱ νῆες χίλιαι ρϛ′).

187 *TGF* II Adesp. *fr.* 432a.

188 Pind. *fr.* 171 Snell/Maehler. Pindar probably recounts the story of Heracles killing Neleus together with all his sons (except Nestor). So Boeckh 1821, 644.

189 Pind. *fr.* 135 Snell/Maehler. A longer version of this fragment (with the preceding number, from which the first digit can be derived) is found in schol. vet. Pind. *Ol.* 1.127a (Drachmann) (πέφνε δὲ τρεῖς καὶ δεκ' ἄνδρας | τετάρτῳ (Porphyry has τετράτῳ) δ' αὐτὸς πεδάθη). The scholiast explicitly states that the fragment (taken from Pindar's *Thrēnoi*) is speaking of Oenomaus and the suitors of Hippodameia.

190 Hes. *Op.* 698.

191 So also Poll. *Onom.* 1.58 (ὅταν δὲ εἴπῃ ὁ Ἡσίοδος «ἡ δὲ γυνὴ τέτορ' ἡβώοι» τετταρακαίδεκα ἔτη λέγει, προσαριθμουμένων τῶν δέκα) and Moschopulus, *Scholia in Hes. Op.* 698 (Grandolini)

from Eupolis' *Golden Race*, which gives a catalogue of deformed or otherwise ugly men.[192] In this list, Eupolis uses 'third', 'fifth', 'sixth' and 'eighth' in the sense of thirteenth, fifteenth, sixteenth and eighteenth (so γ΄, ε΄, ϛ΄ and η΄ for ιγ΄, ιε΄, ιϛ΄ and ιη΄, respectively).[193]

Porphyry next quotes examples of numbers that are rounded up. This is the category that is relevant for our Homeric problem. He first contrasts Homer with Simonides. In Homer, Priam is said to have had 19 sons 'from a single womb' (i. e. from Hecabe),[194] while Simonides, according to Porphyry, has rounded this number up to 20.[195] This is followed by a number of examples where Homer himself has rounded up a number. Thus, in Homer, after having slept with Tyro, Poseidon says that she will bear splendid children 'when a year has gone around' (περιπλομένου δ' ἐνιαυτοῦ),[196] although pregnancy lasts nine months, not a full year.[197] This is followed by a reference to the contradiction between *Il.* 2.649 and

---

(«ἡ δὲ γυνὴ τέτορ' ἡβῴοι», ἀντὶ τοῦ τέτταρα ἐπὶ δέκα· τουτέστιν, ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἐπὶ τέσσαρα καὶ δέκα ἔτη ἀκμαζέτω, τῷ πέμπτῳ δέ, ἀντὶ τοῦ τῷ πεντεκαιδεκάτῳ, γαμοῖτο, ἀντὶ τοῦ γαμείσθω, τουτέστιν εἰς γάμον ἐρχέσθω). However, Hesiod probably means the fourth and fifth year *since the start of puberty*. So Spohn 1819, 66, van Lennep 1847, 155–156, Goettling/Flach 1878, 267, Paley 1883, 96–97 and West 1978, 327. See also *LSJ s. v.* ἡβάω A1.

192 According to Cobet 1876, 416, this is a description of the chorus. According to Crusius 1892, and Edmonds 1957, 410 n. b, however, the speaker is describing people in the audience. Kaibel ap. Kassel/Austin 1986, 472, in turn, claimed that this is a list of potential candidates for the office of *stratēgos*. See also the discussion in Olson 2016, 465.

193 In these cases, ἐπὶ δέκα is implied, which Eupolis writes out in full for the fourteenth man (ὁ στιγματίας τέταρτός ἐστιν ἐπὶ δέκα). For the fragment of Eupolis, see especially Storey 2003, 271–273 and Olson 2016, 462–468.

194 Hom. *Il.* 24.596.

195 Simon. *fr.* 272 Poltera = *fr.* 54 Page, *PMG* 559. Homer and Simonides are also contrasted in schol. Theoc. *Id.* 15.139 (Wendel) (εἴκατι· εἴκοσι παίδων. τῷ ἀρτίῳ ἀριθμῷ ἀποκέχρηται ὡς καὶ Σιμωνίδης. Ὅμηρος ἐννεακαίδεκα λέγει). The person addressed in Simonides is Hecabe. According to Schneidewin 1839, 396 and Hartung 1857, 164, the person speaking is the ghost of Achilles. This is based on [Longinus], *Subl.* 15.7, which mentions a poem of Simonides (*fr.* 277 Poltera = *fr.* 52 Page, *PMG* 557), where the ghost of Achilles appears above his tomb to the Greeks as they depart to return home (καὶ κατὰ τὸν ἀπόπλουν τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐπὶ τἀχιλλέως προφαινομένου τοῖς ἀναγομένοις ὑπὲρ τοῦ τάφου, ἣν οὐκ οἶδ' εἴ τις ὄψιν ἐναργέστερον εἰδωλοποίησε Σιμωνίδου). Blass 1874, 157, in contrast, connected the fragment with an anonymous fragment (Adesp. *fr.* 47 Page, *PMG* 965 = Dio Chrys. *Or.* 33.59) and assumed that the poem told the story of Hecabe, who ended up transforming into a dog. In this case, the person speaking would be the poet himself. Blass' interpretation is extremely speculative, however. See also Poltera 2008, 511–512.

196 Hom. *Od.* 11.248–249.

197 The D scholiast comments with greater specificity (schol. D *Il.* 10.252(3) p. 374.12–13 (van Thiel²)): 'For to reach birth not a whole year is completed, but 273 days' (εἰς γὰρ ἀποκύησιν οὐ πληροῦται ὅλον ἔτος, ἀλλὰ διακόσιαι καὶ ἑβδομήκοντα καὶ τρεῖς ἡμέραι).

Od. 19.174 regarding the number of cities in Crete. In the Catalogue of Ships in the *Iliad*, Crete is said to have 100 cities (ἑκατόμπολιν), whereas according to Odysseus' fictitious tale in the *Odyssey*, it has 90 cities (ἐνενήκοντα πόληες). Porphyry states here that either the *Iliad* passage has added ten or the *Odyssey* passage has subtracted ten. This was a famous problem also treated by Aristotle.[198] Interestingly, the explanation in the current text differs from Porphyry's interpretation given elsewhere, viz. that either 100 in the *Iliad* is a metaphor for many, or that, in the *Odyssey*, Homer does not mean that Crete has *only* 90 cities, i. e. saying that there are 90 cities does not exclude the possibility of there being 100 cities.[199]

Similarly, Porphyry indicates that Homer says that 'all day long until sunset | they feasted' (*Il*. 1.601–602), although they did not begin to drink at dawn, and 'all day long they fought around the Scaean Gates' (*Il*. 18.453), although the actual battle was much shorter. The final example is a non-Homeric one. Porphyry points out that, although the Olympic Games take place after either 50 or 49 months, poets nevertheless systematically call the festival 'fifty-monthly' (πεντηκοντάμηνος).

'In this way, therefore', these 'others' conclude, 'nothing prevents [Homer], even though the third part is incomplete, from calling it a complete third part'[200].

---

198 Arist. *fr*. 146 Rose³ = *fr*. 370 Gigon = Porph. *ad Il*. 2.649 p. 48–49 (Schrader) = p. 68 (MacPhail). See Hintenlang 1961, 67–69, Breitenberger 2006, 383–385, Mayhew 2019, 96–98 and Verhasselt 2020, 232–236. The contradiction was one of the arguments for the Chorizontes or Separators to claim that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were written by two different poets. See schol. A *Il*. 2.649 (Erbse) (VMK): πρὸς τοὺς Χωρίζοντας, ὅτι νῦν μὲν ἑκατόμπολιν τὴν Κρήτην, ἐν Ὀδυσσείᾳ δὲ ἐνενηκοντάπολιν.

199 Porph. *ad Il*. 2.649 p. 49 (Schrader) = p. 68 (MacPhail). The metaphorical explanation was used by the Alexandrian grammarians to refute the Chorizontes. See schol. A *Il*. 2.649 (Erbse) (VMK): ἤτοι οὖν ἑκατόμπολιν ἀντὶ τοῦ πολύπολιν. This A scholion also gives the alternative explanation given by Porphyry in the current text, viz. that Homer has rounded up the number in the *Iliad* and offers the correct number in the *Odyssey* (ἢ ἐπὶ τὸν σύνεγγυς καὶ ἀπαρτίζοντα ἀριθμὸν κατενήνεκται νῦν, ἐν Ὀδυσσείᾳ δὲ τὸ ἀκριβὲς ἐξενήνοχεν, ὡς παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ). Aristotle (*fr*. 146 Rose³ = *fr*. 370 Gigon = Porph. *ad Il*. 2.649 p. 48–49 (Schrader) = p. 68 (MacPhail)) solved the problem by pointing out that the lines are spoken by two different people, viz. Homer in the *Iliad* and Odysseus in the *Odyssey*; as long as it is not the same person who is speaking, such contradictions are allowed. Other solutions were offered by Heraclides Ponticus (Aristotle's fellow student in the Academy, who also wrote a work of *Homeric Solutions*) and the historian Ephorus. They considered *both* numbers to be correct. According to Heraclides (*fr*. 99 Schütrumpf = Porph. *ad Il*. 2.649 p. 48–49 (Schrader) = p. 68 (MacPhail)), there were originally 100 cities, but after the Trojan War, Idomeneus and his men destroyed ten cities; so when Odysseus returned home, he heard of this and thus adjusted the number. According to Ephorus (*FGrH* 70 F146 = Strabo 10.4.15.479c), conversely, Crete originally had 90 cities, but after the Trojan War, Althaemenes founded ten new cities.

200 *Cf*. schol. D *Il*. 10.252(3) p. 374.7–18 (van Thiel²).

Ultimately, this sounds a lot like Chrysippus' solution, which may be why it follows right after his. The main difference is that Chrysippus considers the Homeric line/ calculation to be inexact, whereas the other explanation argues that poets often omit the first or second digit and often prefer round numbers.

4.5 Aristotle [3e]

The next and lengthiest solution to the problem (again, after three-dot punctuation and a gap of three letters) is Aristotle's, almost certainly from his lost *Homeric Problems*.[201] As no one is more important than Aristotle, he warranted a special indication in the left margin: his name, with an asterisk to the left and special punctuation (:–), usually reserved to mark the end of a scholion, to the right.

But before turning to Porphyry's presentation of Aristotle's solution, we need to say something about Aristotle's mention of this same problem in *Poet*. 25, a chapter devoted to answering objections to Homer and solving Homeric problems.[202] At one point, he presents a dozen ways of solving these problems. Some should be solved, he says, by assuming ambiguity (ἀμφιβολία).[203] Aristotle gives as an example half of *Il*. 10.252 ('and more night has passed', παρῴχηκεν δὲ πλέω νύξ), though he seems to have in mind the verse that follows as well and the Homeric problem that concerns us.[204] Here Aristotle merely adds: 'for πλείω in this passage is ambiguous' (τὸ γὰρ πλείω ἀμφίβολόν ἐστιν). Some scholars have assumed that this is a highly abbreviated reference to the lengthy discussion presented by Porphyry.[205] But it is also possible that in *Poet*. 25 he is referring to the solution of Metrodorus, who claimed that πλεῖον means two things in Homer.[206]

---

201 On the nature of this work, see Mayhew 2019, and Verhasselt 2020.
202 Halliwell 1998, 327–328 writes: "*Poetics* 25 has the look of being a compressed summary of an already worked out scheme of problems and their solutions. But I am not aware of any clear evidence for the date of the *Homeric Problems*". On the connection between *Poet*. 25 and the *Homeric Problems*, see Römer 1884; Carroll 1895; Hintenlang 1961, 106–141 and Verhasselt 2020.
203 Arist. *Poet*. 25, 1461a25–26.
204 Some scholars have inferred from Aristotle's quotation that his copy of the *Iliad* did not have line 253. So Bolling 1925, 126 and von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1916, 60 n. 1.
205 So Wachsmuth 1863, 33–34; Heitz 1865, 266; Schrader 1880, 419; Carroll 1895, 48; Hintenlang 1961, 79 n. 1; Sodano 1974, 51–53; Nickau 1977, 55; Schmitt 2011, 718; Mayhew 2019, 19–20. Wilamowitz even claimed that the fragment of Aristotle in Porphyry is spurious. However, Nickau has rightly pointed out that Metrodorus' interpretation presupposes reading τῶν δύο μοιράων of line 253 as well ('filled with two thirds').
206 See Bywater 1909, 340–341; Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1916, 60 n. 1; McGuire 1977, 74; Breitenberger 2006, 402. Aristotle makes clear in his *Sophistical Refutations* (4, 166a14–21) that there

This would not be the only case of Aristotle providing examples of a solution from someone else.[207]

In any case, Aristotle's solution, according to Porphyry, goes as follows. He interprets πλέον as meaning 'more than half' and argues that this is indeterminate. To say that 'more' is indeterminate (ἀόριστον) arguably qualifies this as a solution according to ambiguity, though that is not clear. Aristotle first gives an example unrelated to the scene in *Iliad* 10: Six can be divided into two equal parts or halves (of three each). When one says that a half is increased (αὐξηθῇ), it is unclear whether one means increased by a portion of a number or by a whole unit. If it is increased by a whole unit – by one here – then three becomes four, which leaves two of the original six, i.e. it leaves a third. Aristotle then applies this logic to our passage. The night consists of 12 parts, which can be divided into two equal halves of six hours each. One half has increased, but it is unclear by how much. It could be by one, two, three or more. Homer therefore specifies that one third is left and, in doing so, determines the unspecified increase. If half of the night (which is six hours) has increased by two hours, then eight hours have gone by, and four remain, which is one third of the night. So, in saying that one third of the night is left, Odysseus is neither getting the math wrong (the worry behind this Homeric problem) nor being informal and imprecise (as Chrysippus and others would have it). Rather, by saying that a third of the 12 hours is left (which is four), he indicates that half of the night (which is six) has increased by two, i.e. eight hours have gone by.[208] This would mean that dawn is approaching only in the sense that they are twice as close to dawn as they are to midnight, not that dawn is imminent.

---

are three modes of homonymy and ambiguity (τρεῖς τρόποι τῶν παρὰ τὴν ὁμωνυμίαν καὶ τὴν ἀμφιβολίαν), the first being when an account or word properly means more than one thing (ἢ ὁ λόγος ἢ τοὔνομα κυρίως σημαίνῃ πλείω). See Hintenlang 1961, 78. Aristotle's examples here are the word ἀετός and κύων. He does not explain precisely what he means, but ἀετός can mean *eagle*, *omen*, *eagle-ray* and *pediment*; and, κύων can mean *dog*, *dog-fish* (i.e. a shark), *the Dog-Star* (i.e. Sirius), a shameless person, a Cynic philosopher, etc.

207 For instance, in the *Poetics*, Aristotle cites a solution κατὰ προσῳδίαν of Hippias of Thasos (*Poet.* 25, 1461a21–23). What might speak against this interpretation is that Aristotle quotes the word as πλέω and then refers to it as πλείω («παρῴχηκεν δὲ πλέω νύξ»· τὸ γὰρ πλείω ἀμφίβολόν ἐστιν). Neither of these is a form of πλέως/πλεῖος, unless we were to interpret the word as a dative πλέῳ/πλείῳ (*sc.* μέρει?). The question is whether Aristotle overlooked this. He is certainly less careful in terms of linguistic accuracy than the Alexandrian grammarians.

208 This explanation also recurs as an anonymous tradition in schol. bT *Il.* 10.252–253a (Erbse) (exeg.): οἱ δέ, τὸ πλέον τῶν δύο μοιρῶν αὐτῆς παρῆλθεν ἡ νύξ, δύο δὲ μοῖραι ὀκτὼ ὧραι. τούτων τὸ πλέον, ὅ ἐστιν ἑπτά, παρῆλθεν, ἐσμὲν δὲ ἐν ὀγδόῃ ὥρᾳ, λείπονται δὲ τέσσαρες.

Porphyry goes on in the remainder of the passage to show how this same process applies to any number that can be divided evenly into two parts and into three parts. He gives as examples first the number 18, and then the 24 hours of the full day. By stating that one third remains, it is implied that 12 have passed and 6 remain in the case of the number 18, and 16 have passed and 4 remain in the case of the number 24. Porphyry then returns to the Homeric example and argues that Homer has wisely indicated how much the undefined part of the increase was. If you know that the hours of the night are 12, a number which can be divided both into two equal parts (of six each) and into three equal parts (of four each), then stating that one third remains is tantamount to saying that, from the turning of midnight, two hours have gone by.

The additional numerical examples with regard to 18 and the 24 hour day-night cycle and the conclusion are not included as part of the fragment of Aristotle by Rose.[209] The passage was included, however, by Heitz and Gigon,[210] although Heitz indicated that he was unsure whether the extra part, which was omitted by Rose, belonged to Porphyry or Aristotle. According to Sodano, Porphyry has elaborated on the Aristotelian solution, as he announces that he does in the introduction (τὰς δὲ πειρώμεθα διορθοῦν καὶ ἐξεργάζεσθαι).[211] Sodano argued that the fragment of Aristotle runs from Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ οὕτως ἀξιοῖ λύειν to αἵπερ εἰσὶ τοῦ ὅλου τρίτον. This is then interrupted by Porphyry's expansion, which runs from οὕτω καὶ εἰ δέκα ὀκτὼ εἴη μοιρῶν to ἀφορίζει ὅσῳ πλέω ἡ αὔξησις γέγονε. According to Sodano, these further numerical examples (regarding numbers 18 and 24) interrupt the logical coherence. He also claimed that the word νυχθήμερον is only attested from the first century AD onwards and is therefore an argument against attributing this part of the text to Aristotle.[212] His claim about νυχθήμερον is incorrect, however. The word is attested as early as Bolus of Mendes (third/second century BC) and the astronomer and mathematician Theodosius (second/first century BC).[213] Moreover, the argument itself has little value, since Porphyry probably paraphrases Aristotle anyway.

According to Sodano, Porphyry then reprises Aristotle's argument from σοφῶς οὖν ὁ ποιητὴς to διὰ τὸ φάναι τριτάτη δ᾽ ἔτι μοῖρα λέλειπται. Sodano then claimed (like Kammer) that the text from εἰδὼς γάρ τις ὅτι to μεταβάντος is an interpolation by a later scribe, which summarises the Aristotelian interpre-

209 Rose 1863, 165; 1870, 1504; 1886, 128–129.
210 Heitz 1869, 138–139; Gigon 1987, 533–534.
211 Sodano 1974, 46–51. See also Erbse 1960, 65.
212 Sodano 1974, 50 n. 103.
213 Bolus, *Physica et mystica* vol. 2 p. 41; p. 42; *Ad Leucippem* vol. 2 p. 55 (Berthelot-Ruelle); Theodosius, *De diebus et noctibus* p. 144 (Fecht).

tation. Kammer himself gave a similar interpretation, except that he attributed the additional numerical examples not to Porphyry but to a later interpolator.[214] However, it is perhaps exaggerated to claim that these examples interrupt the train of thought. In fact, Aristotle himself started the discussion with a non-Homeric example (about the number six).

There are a few oddities in Aristotle's interpretation. (1) He assumes that τῶν δύο μοιράων in our passage refers to the two equal halves of the night, and not two out of three parts. So he interprets τῶν δύο μοιράων as indicating two parts/ halves (and not the more logical 2/3) but then accepts τριτάτη μοῖρα as meaning 1/3. (2) He seems to assume that a whole unit in this context is or can be two hours, though perhaps this is not odd if his view is that a whole unit is any divisor, as opposed to a fragment or any non-divisor. (3) He takes παρῴχηκεν δὲ πλέω νύξ | τῶν δύο μοιράων ('more night has passed of/than the two parts') to mean that one of the two parts of night has increased. It is hard to imagine that this is what the author of the *Iliad* truly had in mind. (4) Aristotle may have read πλέον rather than πλέω, since Porphyry writes ὥστε καὶ ὁ εἰπὼν τῶν δύο μερῶν θάτερον πλέον γινόμενον καταλέλοιπε τριτάτην μοῖραν. Since he writes the Homeric τριτάτην, this implies that πλέον might also be the Homeric form read by Aristotle.

One point which Aristotle glosses over, however, is how he interprets the sentence grammatically. In his paraphrases, he uses θάτερον μέρος as a subject, which explains the form πλέον.[215] In Homer, however, the subject is νύξ. The only way he might have interpreted πλέον is as an adverbial accusative: 'the night has passed for the majority of its two parts'.

Finally, Breitenberger was right to point out that the division of the night into 12 hours/parts is un-Homeric.[216] Instead, Homer seems to have divided the day and the night into three parts each.[217]

---

214 Kammer 1863, 67–68.

215 *Cf.* ἐὰν τὸ ἕτερον μέρος αὐξηθῇ, [...] ἐὰν οὖν ὅλη μονάδι πλέον γένηται; τῶν δύο μερῶν θάτερον πλέον γινόμενον καταλέλοιπε τριτάτην μοῖραν; ἐπεὶ οὖν καὶ τῆς νυκτὸς αἱ δώδεκα μοῖραι εἰς δύο ἴσας μερίδας μερίζεσθαι δύνανται εἰς ἕξ , ηὐξήθη δὲ καὶ πλέον γέγονε θάτερον μέρος; δῆλον γίνεται ὅτι τῆς εἰς β΄ διαιρέσεως εἰς ιβ΄ καὶ ιβ΄ γενομένης, τοῦ τρίτου καταλειφθέντος τοῦ παντός, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ὀκτώ, θάτερον μέρος τὸ πλέον ἐν τέτρασιν ἔσχεν.

216 Breitenberger 2006, 401–402.

217 See *Il.* 21.111; *Od.* 12.312; 14.483. See also schol. A *Il.* 10.252a (Erbse) (VMK), schol. D *Il.* 10.252(3) p. 373.3–5 (van Thiel²), schol. A *Il.* 21.111a (Erbse) (VMK), Eust. *Il.* 10.252s. vol. 3 p. 58–59 (van der Valk). Porphyry also mentions this in his discussion of Metrodorus (διεῖλε δ᾽ εἰς γ΄, ὡς ἂν τριφυλάκου τῆς νυκτὸς οὔσης) and Chrysippus (τριμεροῦς οὔσης τῆς νυκτός) and at the end of the excerpt (ὅτι δὲ καὶ τὴν ἡμέραν καὶ τὴν νύκτα εἰς τρία διαιρεῖ δῆλον).

4.6 Autochthon [3 f]

Once again there follows three-dot punctuation and a gap of three letters. The next solution is from the grammarian Autochthon (second century AD).[218] He argues that, if two thirds of the night have been completed (and one third is left), Homer logically states that the night has passed for the majority. He also argues against certain unnamed people (who say that πλέω is or should be a nominative feminine singular) that it is not necessary to correct πλέω to πλείων. Autochthon thus seems to consider πλέω to be an adverbial accusative (being the equivalent of τῷ πλείονι μέρει) and τῶν δύο μοιράων to be an epexegetical/appositive genitive ruled by πλέω. The result is something like: 'The night has mostly passed, i. e. by two thirds, and one third remains'. This is in fact an approach that some modern scholars have taken in explaining these verses.[219]

4.7 Apion [3g]

The next solution is that of the Alexandrian scholar Apion (*ca*. 30 BC to AD 45). He is perhaps best known for heading an embassy to Caligula to complain about the Jews of Alexandria, and for being the titular character of Josephus' *Contra Apionem*. This part of Porphyry's text is rather cryptic, but so far as we can tell, his solution to the Homeric problem is decidedly odd: 'Apion says that the greater portion [τὸ πλέον μέρος] of the two [parts] themselves has been used up, so that there is also a remnant of the second, and of these the majority has passed by, but the third [part] remains'.[220] It might seem that he is claiming that the night

---

218 On Autochthon, see Pagani 2005; Filoni 2009. Autochthon was a teacher of the orator Alciphron: see Alciphron, *Epistulae* 3.42.2. His interpretations are transmitted mainly through the exegetic bT scholia.

219 See Grossmann 1866, 26; Düntzer 1877, 53; Ameis/Hentze 1888, 22; *LfgrE s. v.* πολύς II 4 (Nordheider); Breitenberger 2006, 400–401. Unlike Autochthon, however, these scholars read πλέων.

220 This interpretation also seems to recur in schol. T *Il*. 10.252–253b1 (Erbse) (exeg.): πλέω <νύξ> | τῶν δύο μοιράων· τὴν πλείονα μοῖραν τῶν δύο μοιρῶν, ἵνα λείπηται μέρος τι τῶν δύο καὶ ἡ τρίτη τελεία; schol. b *Il*. 10.252–253b2 (Erbse) (exeg.): τὸ δὲ ὅλον οὕτως· παρῆλθεν ἡ πλείων ἤδη μοῖρα τῶν δύο τῆς νυκτὸς μοιρῶν, ἵνα λείπηται μέρος τι τῶν δύο καὶ τρίτη τελεία. So also Eust. *Il*. 10.252–253 vol. 3 p. 59.8–10: ἄδηλον γὰρ εἴτε τῶν δύο μοιρῶν τὴν πλέω μοῖραν παρῴχηκεν ἡ νύξ, ὡς λείπεσθαί τι καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν δύο μοιρῶν καὶ τὸ ὅλον τριτημόριον. See also the paraphrase by Theodorus Gaza (p. 151 Theseus 1812): τὰ ἄστρα δὲ προκεχώρηκεν εἰς δύσιν, παρῆλθε δὲ ἡ νὺξ εἰς πλείονα τῶν δύο μοιρῶν, ἡ τρίτη δὲ μοῖρα ὑπολείπεται (παρήλλακται δὲ ἡ νὺξ τὰ πλείονα ἐκ τῶν δύο μοιρῶν, ὥστε λείπεται μέρος τι τῶν δύο, καὶ ἡ τρίτη τελεία).

consists of two parts, most of which has passed – i.e. all of one part and some of the second part, leaving a third portion that remains. But we think that the interpretation that best makes sense of Apion's text as presented by Porphyry is that (1) Apion implies that the night consists of three parts, (2) the majority of the first two parts has passed, (3) thus a remnant of the second part is left, (4) and in addition to this the third part too remains. Consider the following example: if each part is exactly 1/3 (= 4/12) of the night and if the majority of the first two parts is for instance equal to 6/12,[221] then we can say that the majority of the first two parts (which are 2/3 = 8/12 in total) has passed and a remnant of the second part (*sc.* 2/12) is left, in addition to the 1/3 (= 4/12) that constitutes the third part (in this example, 6/12). This would mean that Apion interprets παρῴχηκε δὲ πλέω/ πλέον νὺξ τῶν δύο μοιράων as 'the night has passed for the majority of the two parts (*sc.* of three)', with τῶν δύο μοιράων as a partitive genitive. This line of reasoning makes better sense of what Apion presents next, namely, an enumeration of events between the departure of the spies and the arrival of daybreak. In this case, Apion is arguing that Homer cannot be saying that 2/3 of the night has passed, because 1/3 is not enough to accommodate all the other things that happen afterwards, though he thinks that as much as half the night would be enough.

Apion then adds: 'Odysseus says "dawn is near" (*Il.* 10.251), urging on the expedition (τὴν διέξοδον ἐπείγων); for it is not reasonable to have spies sent out as dawn approaches, but in fact very risky'.[222] He may be responding to an additional Homeric problem here, viz. why does Odysseus say that dawn is near? For if dawn truly is near, it would be foolish to send out spies at such a time. Apion's sketch of the action of *Iliad* 10 in fact makes it clear that Odysseus' 'dawn is near' is false. But he has a solution to the problem: the clever, dissembling Odysseus merely *says* that dawn is near, so that his companions will hurry up.

One of the main questions is from which work Apion's comment on this Homeric passage was taken. His two main works were *Aegyptiaca* (in which he argued against the Jews) and *Glossae Homericae* (a Homeric lexicon). Some scholars have also assumed that he wrote commentaries on Homer.[223] Cohn and Erbse, in contrast, claimed that such fragments on Homer belong to other works,

---

221 This could in fact be any amount above one third (4/12) and less than two thirds (8/12).

222 *Cf.* schol. T *Il.* 10.252b1 (Erbse) (exeg.): ἄστρα δὲ δὴ προβέβηκε· ἄτοπον πρὸς ἠῶ κατασκόπους πέμπεσθαι. κατεπείγων οὖν φησιν; schol. b *Il.* 10.252a2/b2/c2 (Erbse) (exeg.): ἤδη πρὸ τῆς ἐξόδου περὶ τοῦ καιροῦ συμβουλεύει, κατεπείγων αὐτόν· ἄτοπον γὰρ πρὸς ἠῶ κατασκόπους πέμπεσθαι. δεόντως οὖν αὐτὸν εἵλετο.

223 So Lehrs 1837, 33, Volkmann 1864, 1243, Baumert 1886, 7; 47–52, esp. 48–49 and van der Valk 1963–1964, I, 301 with n. 464; 437 with n. 122.

especially the *Aegyptiaca*, although they did not explicitly connect the citation of Apion in our excerpt with this work.[224] Apion may have included the word πλέω in his Homeric lexicon. It is also possible that he commented on Homer in his lectures/speeches. Such speeches on Homer earned him the nickname of Ὁμηρικός and are attested in Seneca.[225]

This is followed, without any special punctuation or break, with a brief comment on the two ways of understanding the word πλέω. This might still be part of the fragment of Apion or perhaps Porphyry's comment on it. According to Erbse, Porphyry expanded Apion's interpretation with excerpts from *hypomnemata* which were also at the basis of the D scholia[226]. In any case, Porphyry or Apion argues that the word πλέω can be interpreted as either neuter plural or feminine singular. The comment on πλέω as a neuter plural shows that the genitive τῶν δύο μοιράων can be either a partitive genitive (τὰ πλείονα ἐκ τῶν δύο μοιρῶν) or a genitive of comparison (πλείονα παρὰ μοίρας τὰς δύο). To attest the use of πλέω as a neuter plural, Porphyry cites a passage from Thucydides.[227] In his comment on πλέω as an accusative feminine singular, he argues that μοῖραν is implied (τὴν πλείονα μοῖραν τῶν δύο μοιρῶν).

4.8 Astronomy in Homer [4]

The excerpt ends (after a raised dot and a gap of one letter) with a long discussion of Odysseus as an astronomer – and specifically, of which stars Odysseus used to calculate how many hours were left in the night, and what precise movement προβέβηκε denotes. Porphyry begins by stating that Homer has plausibly portrayed Odysseus alone as watching the passage of the stars as a prelude[228] to the *Odyssey*, where Odysseus' voyage concludes 'as he gazes at the Pleiades and late setting Boötes' (*Od*. 5.572).[229] MacPhail's edition ends his presentation of this Porphyry 'fragment' here, without mention, explanation, or justification,[230] even

---

224 Cohn 1894, 2806; Erbse 1960, 52 with n. 1. See also Pontani 2005, 63 and the discussion in Bacigalupo 2019.

225 Sen. *Ep*. 88.40.

226 Erbse 1960, 65 with n. 1.

227 Thuc. 1.3.5.

228 For the meaning of προοικονομῶν, see Nünlist 2009, 42: "(προ)οικονομεῖν (and cognates) always means 'to motivate in advance, to prepare for'. This may, at times, include the notion 'to adumbrate, to hint at', but never goes so far as to indicate explicit prolepsis".

229 This argument also recurs in schol. T *Il*. 10.252–253a (Erbse) (exeg.): ὅθεν καὶ τὸ «Πληϊάδας τ' ἐσορῶντι» φησὶ περὶ τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως. προοικονομεῖ οὖν, φασί, τὴν Ὀδύσσειαν.

230 MacPhail 2011, 178. So also already Kammer 1863, 69.

though nothing but a raised dot and a space of one letter separates this line from what follows. And what follows is 28 lines of Greek in Schrader's edition of Porphyry's *Homeric Questions*.[231] This material is quite similar to a long D scholion, which might have led MacPhail to consider it not part of our Porphyrian text.[232] While it is true that Porphyry moves to another, related Homeric problem, this does not prove that the excerpt ends right before this, much less that the last part is not derived from Porphyry. If the last part were truly a separate excerpt or scholion, it would probably have been introduced with its own sign[233]. The omission by MacPhail is all the stranger, since he does include the words πιθανῶς δὲ οὐδένα ἄλλον … ὀψὲ δύοντα Βοώτην, which already introduce the new argument.

Porphyry first discusses the view that the stars mentioned in Homer refer to Ursa Major. He rejects this view, since the time can only be calculated on the basis of stars that rise and set, which Ursa Major (as a circumpolar constellation) obviously does not do, since its stars are always visible. Critics who do consider the constellation to be Ursa Major appear to have argued that the hour can be calculated on the basis of its position in the rotation around the Pole Star. In this interpretation, προβέβηκε would mean 'move further in their rotation'.

The second interpretation cited by Porphyry considers the stars to refer to the Pleiades, Hyades and Orion, which do rise and set. In a passage that is partly corrupt,[234] Porphyry seems to have said that these either rise or set at dawn. So, in this interpretation, προβέβηκε refers to either rising (advancing from the east) or setting (advancing towards the west[235]). Indeed, the times when the Pleiades, Orion and the Hyades rise and set vary throughout the year. During the vernal equinox, for instance, Orion *sets* six hours after sunset, but during the autumnal equinox it *rises* six hours after sunset. Alternatively, it is possible that, in the corrupt text, Porphyry argued that, if the stars refer to the Pleiades, Hyades and

---

231 Schrader 1880, 150 comments: *λέγοντος κτλ. sine ullo intervallo neque ullo signo interposito in cod. (f. 135ᵇ) iis quae iam edidimus subiunguntur*.

232 In a follow-up article, G. Verhasselt will re-edit this scholion and discuss its relation to Porphyry. In all likelihood, the D scholion and Porphyry go back to a common source.

233 The only possible objection is that a connective δέ might be expected to introduce the new sentence. However, this can easily be supplemented after λέγοντος. Note also that in [3e] ἐὰν τὸ ἕτερον μέρος αὐξηθῇ is not introduced with δέ either.

234 See the text-critical notes above (p. 475–476).

235 The interpretation 'advancing towards the west' was adopted in the prose paraphrase of Homer in the codex Vaticanus gr. 1316 fol. 146v (V¹³) probably under the influence of the D scholia: τὰ δὲ ἄστρα προέβη πρὸς δύσιν· ἡ δὲ πλείων νὺξ προῆλθε καὶ διέβη τῶν δύο μοιρῶν. See also the paraphrase by Theodorus Gaza (p. 151 Theseus 1812): τὰ ἄστρα δὲ προκεχώρηκεν εἰς δύσιν, παρῆλθε δὲ ἡ νὺξ εἰς πλείονα τῶν δύο μοιρῶν, ἡ τρίτη δὲ μοῖρα ὑπολείπεται (παρήλλακται δὲ ἡ νὺξ τὰ πλείονα ἐκ τῶν δύο μοιρῶν, ὥστε λείπεται μέρος τι τῶν δύο, καὶ ἡ τρίτη τελεία).

Orion, προβέβηκε refers to rising; but the stars may also refer to the Evening Star and Sirius, in which case προβέβηκε refers to setting. However one chooses to correct the text, Porphyry then quotes another line of Homer (*Od*. 12.312), which mentions the progression of the stars (ἀλλ᾽ ὅτε δὴ τρίχα νυκτὸς ἔην, μετὰ δ᾽ ἄστρα βεβήκει). He then seems to have discussed two interpretations of τρίχα = τὸ τρίτον, but whatever he wrote about this appears to have fallen out.

Porphyry next discusses the possibility that the stars refer to the zodiac cycle. The signs of the zodiac are 12 in number. Six are visible at sunset, and the others become visible as the night progresses. Porphyry says that the zodiac signs visible at sunset are not always the same, but their number is always six. By observing in which sign the sun sets, Odysseus is thus able to calculate the time of night on the basis of whatever zodiac signs are visible then.

The last interpretation presented by Porphyry is the simplest. Homer simply means that *all the stars* have advanced, i. e. those stars that had already appeared have advanced towards the west. In other words, προβέβηκε does not have to refer to *either* rising *or* setting.

Porphyry closes his discussion (at least as it is presented in the excerpt) by stating that Homer divides the night as well as the day into three parts. As attestations of this, he quotes *Il*. 21.111 (three parts of the day) and *Od*. 12.312 (three parts of the night).[236]

The purpose of this material might be to answer the claim of Aristarchus (mentioned at the outset) that verse 253 is suspect, because it unnecessarily provides the kind of account an astronomer would give. On the view defended here, Odysseus is precisely the kind of man who *would* possess astronomical wisdom. This same view is found in Eustathius in a discussion of *Iliad* 10.252–253, likely relying on lost ancient sources. He writes: 'Observe also that the resourceful one [ὁ πολυμήχανος, i. e. Odysseus] is practising philosophy here (φιλοσοφεῖ) – the one who in the *Odyssey* observes the Pleiades and the Hyades and the next stars in the sequence – and from the nightly signs of the Zodiac above the earth he figures out the time', etc.[237]

<p style="text-align:center">***</p>

---

236 *Cf.* Eust. *Il*. 10.252–253 vol. 3 p. 58.26–p. 59.3 (van der Valk): ἰστέον δὲ καὶ ὅτι τριφύλακτον κατὰ τοὺς παλαιοὺς ὁ ποιητὴς βούλεται εἶναι τὴν νύκτα, ὅ ἐστι τριῶν φυλακῶν, τριμερῆ ποιῶν αὐτήν, καθὰ καὶ τὴν ἡμέραν, ὅτε εἴπῃ «ἔσσεται ἠὼς ἢ δείλη ἢ μέσον ἦμαρ».
237 Eust. *Il*. 10.252–253 vol. 3, p. 59.3–8 (van der Valk): ὅρα δὲ καὶ ὅτι φιλοσοφεῖ κἀνταῦθα ὁ πολυμήχανος, ὁ ἐν Ὀδυσσείᾳ Πλειάδας ὁρῶν καὶ Ὑάδας καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς ἄστρα, καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὑπὲρ γῆν νυκτερινῶν ζῳδίων τὴν ὥραν καταμανθάνει, κτλ. On Odysseus as πολυμήχανος, see e. g. *Od*. 1.205 and (as an epithet) 5.203 (πολυμήχαν᾽ Ὀδυσσεῦ).

Van der Valk, commenting on *Il.* 10.252–253, remarks: "As for the Homeric passage, we may observe that the ancient critics seem to have needlessly plagued themselves. Apparently, the night was divided into three parts"[238] – as if that settled the matter. Even more negative, Hainsworth calls our Homeric problem, and the discussion it engendered, 'silly' and 'of depressing pedantry'.[239] Yet the energy devoted to answering it, and the many different solutions offered, provide a fascinating look at the lengths to which ancient literary scholars would go to defend Homer. We hope that the foregoing has made this clear.

Our paper also aims to be a case study in or example of how to approach and present the fragments/excerpts of Porphyry's *Homeric Questions*. Already Erbse had outlined what a new edition of Porphyry's *Homeric Questions* should look like,[240] but such an edition still remains a *desideratum*. It is also important to avoid the limitations or flaws of earlier editors (see above p. 441–443). Indeed, a renewed inspection of the manuscripts often yields new readings. Text-critical issues are also often connected with interpretive problems. Ideally, these should be discussed in a commentary that accompanies a new edition. With our paper, we hope to have illustrated the kind of commentary one would expect from the subtitle of MacPhail's book – *Text, Translation, Commentary* – of which the third element is not to be found there.

Bibliography

Adler, A. (ed.) (1931), *Suidae lexicon.* II, *Δ-Θ*, Stuttgart.

Alberti, G.B. (ed.) (1972), *Thucydidis Historiae.* I, *Libri I–II*, Rome.

Alfieri, V.E. (1936), *Gli atomisti. Frammenti e testimonianze: traduzione e note*, Bari.

Allen, T.W. (1910), *The Text of the Odyssey*, London.

Allen, T.W. (ed.) (1919), *Homeri opera.* IV, *Odysseae libros XIII–XXIV continens*, 2nd ed., Oxford.

Allen, T.W. (1931), *Homeri Ilias.* I, *Prolegomena*, Oxford.

Ameis, K.F. / Hentze, C. (eds.) (1888), *Homers Ilias* 1.4: *Gesang X–XII*, 3rd ed., Leipzig.

Bacigalupo, V. (2019), "Apion", in: F. Montanari / F. Montana / L. Pagani (eds.), *Lexicon of Greek Grammarians of Antiquity*, Brill Online.

Bachmann, L. (ed.) (1835), *Scholia in Homeri Iliadem quae in codice Bibl. Paull. Acad. Lips. leguntur*, I, Leipzig.

---

238 Van der Valk 1963–1964, II, 232–233.

239 Hainsworth 1993, 178.

240 Erbse 1960, 72–73. For a summary in English of Erbse's proposal, see Slater 2012, 325–326.

Barnes, J. / Lawrence, G. (1984), "Fragments", in: J. Barnes (ed.), *The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation*, Princeton, 2384–2465.

Baumert, H. (ed.) (1886), *Apionis quae ad Homerum pertinent fragmenta*, Königsberg.

Beekes, R.S.P. (2010), *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*, Leiden-Boston.

Bekker, I. (ed.) (1825), *Scholia in Homeri Iliadem*, I, Berlin.

Bérard, V. (ed.) (1956), *L'Odyssée. "Poésie homérique"*. III, *Chants XVI–XXIV: texte établi et traduit*, 5th ed., Paris.

Blass, F. (1874), "Zu den griechischen Lyrikern", in: *RhM* n.s. 29, 149–158.

Blaydes, F.H.M. (1890–1896), *Adversaria in comicorum Graecorum fragmenta*, I–II, Halle.

Boeckh, A. (ed.) (1821), *Pindarou ta sōzomena. Πινδάρου τὰ σωζόμενα. Pindari opera quae supersunt*, II 2, Leipzig.

Bolling, G.M. (1925), *The External Evidence for Interpolation in Homer*, Oxford.

Bothe, F.H. (ed.) (1855), *Poetarum comicorum Graecorum fragmenta*, Paris.

Breitenberger, B. (2006), "Literaturwissenschaft, Sympotisches, Poesie", in: H. Flashar / U. Dubielzig / B. Breitenberger (eds.), Aristoteles, *Fragmente zu Philosophie, Rhetorik, Poetik, Dichtung: Übersetzt und erläutert*, Berlin, 291–437.

Brillant, M. (1919), "Tribôn", in: E. Saglio (ed.), *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines d'après les textes et les monuments* 5, 414–416.

Buffière, F. (1973), *Les mythes d'Homère et la pensée grecque*, 2nd ed., Paris.

Bywater, I. (ed.) (1909), Ἀριστοτέλους Περὶ ποιητικῆς *(Aristotelous Peri poiētikēs): A Revised Text with Critical Introduction, Translation and Commentary*, Oxford.

Casevitz, M. / Jost, M. / Marcadé, J. (eds.) (2002), Pausanias, *Description de la Grèce.* VIII, *Livre VIII. L'Arcadie: texte établi par M.C., traduit et commenté par M.J. avec la collaboration de J.M.*, 2nd ed., Paris.

Cassio, A.C. (2002), "Early editions of the Greek epics and Homeric textual criticism in the sixth and fifth centuries BC", in: F. Montanari / P. Ascheri (eds.), *Omero tremila anni dopo: atti del congresso di Genova 6–8 luglio 2000*, Rome, 105–136.

Cobet, C.G. (1873), *Variae lectiones quibus continentur observationes criticae in scriptores Graecos*, 2nd ed., Leiden.

Cobet, C.G. (1876), *Miscellanea critica quibus continentur observationes criticae in scriptores Graecos praesertim Homerum et Demosthenem*, Leiden.

Cohn, L. (1894), "Apion 3", in: *RE* 1.2, 2803–2806.

Crusius, O. (1892), "Eupolis fr. 276 K.", in: *Philologus* 51, 663.

d'Ansse de Villoison, J.-B.-G. (ed.) (1788), Ὁμήρου Ἰλιὰς σὺν τοῖς σχολίοις *(Homērou Ilias sun tois scholiois). Homeri Ilias ad veteris codicis Veneti fidem recensita: Scholia in eam antiquissima Ex eodem Codice aliisque nunc primum edidit cum Asteriscis, Obeliscis, aliisque Signis criticis, J.-B.-G.d'A.d.V.*, Venice.

Di Maria, G. (ed.) (1996), *Achillis quae feruntur astronomica et in Aratum opuscula: De universo. De Arati vita. De Phaenomenorum interpretatione*, Palermo.

Diels, H. / Kranz, W. (eds.) (1952), *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, I, 6th ed., Berlin.

Dindorf, W. (ed.) (1875–1877), *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem ex codicibus aucta et emendate*, I–IV, Oxford.

Dorandi, T. (2011), Rev. of MacPhail (2011), in: *Sehepunkte* 11, <http://www.sehepunkte. de/2011/10/20281.html>

Düntzer, H. (ed.) (1877), Ἰλιάς *(Ilias). Homers Ilias: Erklärende Schulausgabe*, II 1, 2nd ed., Paderborn.

Edmonds, J.M. (ed.) (1957), *The Fragments of Attic Comedy*, I, Leiden.

Emperius, A. (1847), "Adversaria", in: F.G. Schneidewin (ed.), *Adolphii Emperii Brunopolitani opuscula philologica et historica amicorum studio collecta*, Göttingen, 304–352.

Erbse, H. (1960), *Beiträge zur Ueberlieferung der Iliasscholien*, Munich.

Erbse, H. (ed.) (1969–1988), *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (scholia vetera)*, I–VII, Berlin.

Erler, M. (1994), "Die Schule Epikurs", in: H. Flashar (ed.), *Die Philosophie der Antike*. IV, *Die hellenistische Philosophie*, Basel, 203–490.

Ernst, N. (ed.) (2006), *Die D-Scholien zur Odyssee: Kritische Ausgabe*, PhD. Diss., University of Cologne.

Filoni, A. (2009), "Il grammatico Autottone, i Cari e i κανόνες degli scudi omerici", in: *ARF* 11, 25–36.

Freeman, K. (1949), *The Pre-Socratic Philosophers: A Companion to Diels, Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, 2nd ed., Oxford.

Friedländer, L. (ed.) (1853), *Aristonici Περὶ σημείων Ἰλιάδος reliquiae emendatiores*, Göttingen.

Frisk, H. (1960), *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg.

Gaisford, T. (ed.) (1823), *Poetae minores Graeci*, III, Leipzig.

Gigon, O. (ed.) (1987), *Aristotelis Opera*. III, *Librorum deperditorum fragmenta,* Berlin.

Goettling, C. / Flach, H. (eds.) (1878), *Hesiodi carmina*, 3rd ed., Leipzig.

Goodwin, W.W. (1896), *The Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb*, New York.

Grossmann, G. (1866), *Homerica*, Bayreuth.

Gudeman, A. (1927), "Λύσεις", in: *RE* 13.2, 2511–2529.

Hajdú, K. (ed.) (1998), Ps.-Herodian, *De figuris: Überlieferungsgeschichte und kritische Ausgabe*, Berlin-New York.

Hammerstaedt, J. (1992), "Der Schlussteil von Philodems drittem Buch über Rhetorik", in: *CErc* 22, 9–117.

Hansen, P.A. (ed.) (2005), *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*. III, *Π-Σ*, Berlin-New York.

Hartung, J.A. (ed.) (1856), *Pindar's Werke: Griechisch mit metrischer Uebersetzung*. IV, *Die Isthmischen Oden und die Trümmer der verlorenen Werke*, Leipzig.

Hartung, J.A. (ed.) (1857), *Die Skolien, Lohn- und Preisdichter oder die äolische Schule und die vollendete Kunstschule der griechischen Lyrik: Griechisch mit metrischer Uebersetzung und prüfenden und erklärenden Anmerkungen*, Leipzig.

Heitz, E. (1865), *Die verlorenen Schriften des Aristoteles*, Leipzig.

Heitz, E. (ed.) (1869), *Fragmenta Aristotelis*, Paris.

Hilgard, A. (ed.) (1889), *Theodosii Alexandrini Canones. Georgii Choerobosci scholia. Sophronii patriarchae Alexandrini excerpta*. I, *Theodosii Canones et Choerobosci scholia in Canones nominales*, Leipzig.

Hillgruber, M. (2014), Rev. of MacPhail 2011, in: *Gnomon* 86, 493–499.

Hintenlang, H. (1961), *Untersuchungen zu den Homer-Aporien des Aristoteles*, PhD. Diss., University of Heidelberg.

Horn, E. (1883), *De Aristarchi studiis Pindaricis*, Greifswald.

Johnson, A.P. (2017), "The implications of a minimalist approach to Porphyry's fragments", in: I. Männlein-Robert (ed.), *Die Christen als Bedrohung? Text, Kontext und Wirkung von Porphyrios' Contra Christianos*, Stuttgart, 41–58.

Kammer, E. (ed.) (1863), *Porphyrii scholia Homerica emendatiora praefatione de scholiis Porphyrianis praemissa*, Königsberg.

Kannicht, R. / Snell, B. (eds.) (1981), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta (TrGF)*. II, *Fragmenta adespota. Testimonia volumini 1 addenda. Indices ad volumina 1 et 2*, Göttingen.

Kassel, R. / Austin, C. (eds.) (1986), *Poetae comici Graeci (PCG)*. V, *Damoxenus–Magnes*, Berlin-New York.

Kleinlogel, A. / Alpers, K. (eds.) (2019), *Scholia Graeca in Thucydidem: Scholia vetustiora et Lexicon Thucydideum Patmense*, Berlin-Boston.

Kock, T. (ed.) (1880), *Comicorum Atticorum fragmenta*. I, *Antiquae comoediae fragmenta*, Leipzig.

Kortlandt, F. (1983), "Greek numerals and PIE glottalic consonants", in: *MSS* 42, 97–104.

Kühner, R. / Gerth, B. (1904), *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Zweiter Teil: Satzlehre,* II, 3rd ed., Hannover-Leipzig.

Lanata, G. (ed.) (1963), *Poetica pre-platonica. Testimonianze e frammenti: testo, traduzione e commento*, Florence.

Latte, K. / Cunningham, I.C. (eds.) (2018), *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*. I, *A-Δ*, 2nd ed., Berlin.

Lehrs, K. (1837), *Quaestiones epicae*, Königsberg.

Long, A.A. (1992), "Stoic readings of Homer", in: R. Lamberton / J.J. Keaney (eds.), *Homer's Ancient Readers: The Hermeneutics of Greek Epic's Earliest Exegetes*, Princeton, 41–66.

Ludwich, A. (1884), *Aristarchs homerische Textkritik nach den Fragmenten des Didymos dargestellt und beurtheilt*, I, Leipzig.

Ludwich, A. (ed.) (1891), *Homeri Odyssea*, Leipzig.

Luschnat, O. (ed.) (1960), *Thucydidis Historiae*. I, *Libri I–II*, 2nd ed., Leipzig.

Lührs, D. (1992), *Untersuchungen zu den Athetesen Aristarchs in der Ilias und zu ihrer Behandlung im Corpus der exegetischen Scholien*, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York.

Maass, E. (ed.) (1898), *Commentariorum in Aratum reliquiae*, Berlin.

MacPhail Jr., J.A. (ed.) (2011), *Porphyry's Homeric Questions on the Iliad: Text, Translation, Commentary*, Berlin-New York.

Mayhew, R. (2019), *Aristotle's Lost Homeric Problems: Textual Studies*, Oxford.

McGuire, D.J. (1977), *Aristotle's Attitude towards Homer*, PhD. Diss., Loyola University of Chicago.

Meineke, A. (ed.) (1839), *Fragmenta comicorum Graecorum*. II, *Fragmenta poetarum comoediae antiquae. Pars I*, Berlin.

Moggi, M. / Osanna, M. (eds.) (2003), Pausania, *Guida della Grecia. Libro VIII. L'Arcadia: testo e traduzione a cura di M.M. Commento a cura di M.M. e M.O.*, Milan.

Montanari, F. / Montana, F. / Muratore, D. / Pagani, L. (2017), "Towards a new critical edition of the scholia to the *Iliad*: A specimen", in: *TiC* 9, 1–21.

Murray, A.T. / Dimock, G.E. (eds.) (1998), Homer, *Odyssey*. II, *Books 13–24. With an English Translation*, Cambridge, MA.

Nagy, G. (2004), *Homer's Text and Language*, Champaign, IL (available online here: https://chs.harvard.edu/book/nagy-gregory-homers-text-and-language/)

Nickau, K. (1977), *Untersuchungen zur textkritischen Methode des Zenodotos von Ephesos*, Berlin.

Novokhatko, A. (2015), "Greek scholarship from its beginnings to Alexandria", in: F. Montanari / S. Matthaios / A. Rengakos (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship*. I, *History. Disciplinary Profile*, Leiden-Boston, 3–59.

Nünlist, R. (2009), *The Ancient Critic at Work: Terms and Concepts of Literary Criticism in Greek Scholia*, Cambridge.

Olson, S.D. (ed.) (2016), Eupolis, *Heilotes – Chrysoun genos (frr. 147–325): Translation and Commentary*, Heidelberg.

Pagani, L. (2005), "Autochthon", in: F. Montanari / F. Montana / L. Pagani (eds.), *Lexicon of Greek Grammarians of Antiquity*, Brill Online.

Pagani, L. (2006), "Metrodorus", in: F. Montanari / F. Montana / L. Pagani (eds.), *Lexicon of Greek Grammarians of Antiquity*, Brill Online.

Paley, F.A. (ed.) (1883), *The Epics of Hesiod*, 2nd ed., London.

Pépin, J. (1976), *Mythe et allégorie: les origines grecques et les contestations judéo-chrétiennes*, 2nd ed., Paris.

Pertusi, A. (ed.) (1955), *Scholia vetera in Hesiodi Opera et dies*, Milan.

Pfeiffer, R. (1968), *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginning to the End of the Hellenistic Age*, Oxford.

Poltera, O. (ed.) (2008), *Simonides lyricus. Testimonia und Fragmente: Einleitung, kritische Ausgabe, Übersetzung und Kommentar*, Basel.

Pontani, F. (2005), *Sguardi su Ulisse: la tradizione esegetica greca all'Odissea*, Rome.

Pontani, F. (2006), "Gli scoli omerici e il senso del mondo. Storie e progetti da Faesch a Valckenaer, da Tychsen ai giorni nostri", in: G. Avezzù / P. Scattolin (eds.), *I classici greci e i loro commentatori. Dai papiri ai marginalia rinascimentali*, Rovereto, 201–233.

Pontani, F. (2019), "Les *Questions homériques* de Porphyre", in: T. Dorandi (ed.), *Porphyre. L'Antre des Nymphes dans l'Odyssée: introduction, édition du texte grec, traduction et notes*, Paris, 41–58.

Porson, R. (1812), *Adversaria: Notae et emendationes in poetas Graecos*, Cambridge.

Pusch, H. (1890), "Quaestiones Zenodoteae", in: *Dissertationes philologicae Halenses* 9, Halle, 119–216.

Richardson, N.J. (1975), "Homeric professors in the age of the sophists", in: *PCPhS* n.s. 21, 65–81.

Rocha-Pereira, M.H. (ed.) (1990), *Pausaniae Graeciae descriptio*. II, *Libri V–VIII*, Leipzig.

Römer, A. (1912), *Aristarchs Athetesen in der Homerkritik (wirkliche und angebliche): Eine kritische Untersuchung*, Leipzig-Berlin.

Rose, V. (ed.) (1863), *Aristoteles pseudepigraphus*, Leipzig.

Rose, V. (ed.) (1870), *Aristotelis opera*. V, *Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta. Scholiorum in Aristotelem supplementum. Index Aristotelicus*, Berlin.

Rose, V. (ed.) (1886), *Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta*, Leipzig.

Runkel, M. (ed.) (1829), *Pherecratis et Eupolidis fragmenta*, Leipzig.

Rutherford, R.B. (ed.) (1992), Homer, *Odyssey: Books XIX and XX*, Cambridge.

Schiassi, G. (ed.) (1944), *De Eupolidis comici poetae fragmentis*, Bologna.

Schmitt, A. (2011) Aristoteles, *Poetik: Übersetzt und erläutert*, 2nd ed., Berlin.

Schneider, O. (1846), "In Anacreontem et poetas comicos", in: *Philologus* 1, 645–647.

Schneidewin, F.G. (ed.) (1839), *Delectus poesis Graecorum elegiacae, iambicae, melicae. Sectio I et III: Poetae iambici et melici*, Göttingen.

Schrader, H. (ed.) (1880), *Porphyrii Quaestionum Homericarum ad Iliadem pertinentium reliquias collegit, disposuit, edidit H.S.*, Leipzig.

Schrader, H. (ed.) (1890), *Porphyrii Quaestionum Homericarum ad Odysseam pertinentium reliquias collegit, disposuit, edidit H.S.*, Leipzig.

Schuppe, E. (1937), "Tribon", in: *RE* 6A2, 2415–2419.

Sengebusch, M. (1855), *Homerica disseratio prior*, Leipzig.

Slater, W. (2012), Rev. of MacPhail 2011, in: *ExClass* 16, 325–330.

Snell, B. / Maehler, H. (eds.) (1989), Pindarus. II, *Fragmenta. Indices*, Munich-Leipzig.

Sodano, A.R. (ed.) (1970), *Porphyrii Quaestionum Homericarum liber I: testo critico*, Naples.

Sodano, A.R. (1974), "Aristotele, Ἀπορήματα Ὁμηρικά, frr. 143, 146, 151, 157, 161 Rose³", in: *AFLM* 7, 11–54.

Solmsen, F. / Merkelbach, R. / West, M.L. (eds.) (1990), *Hesiodi Theogonia, Opera et dies, Scutum. Edidit F.S. Fragmenta selecta ediderunt R.M. et M.L.W*, 3rd ed., Oxford.

Spohn, F.A.W. (ed.) (1819), *Hesiodi Opera et dies e veterum grammaticorum notationibus et optimis libris mss.*, Leipzig.

Steinmetz, P. (1986), "Allegorische Deutung und allegorische Dichtung in der alten Stoa", in: *RhM* n.s. 129, 18–30.

Steinmetz, P. (1994), "Zenon aus Kition", in: H. Flashar (ed.), *Die Philosophie der Antike*. IV, *Die hellenistische Philosophie*, Basel, 518–554.

Storey, I.C. (2003), *Eupolis: Poet of Old Comedy*, Oxford.

Storey, I.C. (ed.) (2011), *Fragments of Old Comedy*. II, *Diopeithes to Pherecrates. Edited and Translated*, Cambridge, MA-London.

Tammaro, V. (1988), "Eupol. Fr. 298, 3 K.-A.", in: *ZPE* 72, 34.

Theseus, N. (ed.) (1812), *Ὁμήρου Ἰλιὰς μετὰ παλαιᾶς παραφράσεως ἐξ ἰδιοχείρου τοῦ Θεοδώρου Γάζη (Homērou Ilias meta palaias parafraseōs ex idiocheirou tou Theodōrou Gazē)*, II, Florence.

Thiersch, F. (ed.) (1820), Pindarus, *Werke, Urschrift, Uebersetzung in den pindarischen Versmaassen und Erläuterungen*, II, Leipzig.

van der Valk, M. (1963–1964), *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad*, I–II, Leiden.

van der Horst, P.W. (2011), Rev. of MacPhail (2011), in: *BMCR* 2011.06.02. <https://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2011/2011.06.02>

van Emde Boas, E. / Rijksbaron, A. / Huitink, L. / de Bakker, M. (2019), *The Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek*, Cambridge.

van Thiel, H. (ed.) (2014), *Scholia D in Iliadem: Proecdosis aucta et correctior secundum codices manu scriptos*, Cologne.

van Lennep, D.J. (ed.) (1847), *Hesiodi Opera et dies: Librorum mss. et veterum editionum lectionibus commenarioque instruxit D.J.v.L.*, Amsterdam.

Volkmann, R. (1864), "Apion 2", in: W.S. Teuffel (ed.), *Pauly's Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft in alphabetischer Ordnung*, 1.1: *A – Apollinopolis*, Stuttgart, 1243–1244.

Von der Mühll, P. (ed.) (1962), *Homeri Odyssea*, 3rd. ed., Stuttgart-Leipzig.

von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. (1916), *Die Ilias und Homer*, Berlin.

von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. (1927), *Die Heimkehr des Odysseus: Neue homerische Untersuchungen*, Berlin.

Verhasselt, G. (2020), "Did Homer nod off? Aristotle and Homeric problem-solving", in: A.P. Mesquita / S. Noriega-Olmos / C. Shields (eds.), *Revisiting Aristotle's Fragments: New Essays on the Fragments of Aristotle's Lost Works*, Berlin, 221–261.

Wachsmuth, R. (1863), *De Aristotelis studiis Homericis capita selecta*, Berlin.

West, M.L. (ed.) (1978), Hesiod, *Works and Days: Edited with Prolegomena and Commentary*, Oxford.

West, M.L. (ed.) (1998–2000), Homerus, *Ilias*, I–II, Berlin.

West, M.L. (ed.) (2017), Homerus, *Odyssea*, Berlin.