THE AURAL *ILIAD:*
ALEXANDRIAN PERFORMANCES OF AN ARCHAIC TEXT

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS

AND THE COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE STUDIES

OF STANFORD UNIVERSITY

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Jack George Mitchell

June 2006

I certify that I have read this dissertation and that, in my opinion, it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

(Richard Martin) Principal Advisor

I certify that I have read this dissertation and that, in my opinion, it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

(Susan Stephens)

I certify that I have read this dissertation and that, in my opinion, it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

R. Netz

(Reviel Netz)

Abstract

This dissertation presents new evidence for the recitation of Homeric poetry in the Hellenistic and Imperial periods of classical antiquity, from roughly 150 BC to about 500 AD. Focusing on the key word *anágnōsis* ('reading' or 'reading aloud'), it attempts to establish the relationship between recitation and education, on the one hand, and the relationship between recitation and scholarship, on the other. The first chapter explores *anágnōsis* in the ancient classroom: it is shown that the literary evidence for expressive reading by young people is confirmed both by the papyrological record (in the practice of marking punctuation and accent in Homeric texts) and by the opinions of educational theorists in the scholia to the *Ars Grammatica* of Dionysius Thrax. It is suggested that the latter advocate an imaginative reënactment of original performance contexts by the young reader; comparison with the epigraphical record for competitive *anágnōsis* at festivals seems to confirm this. The second chapter turns to the Homer scholia, examining the regulation of discourse (chiefly in scholia deriving from the ancient Homerist Nicanor) and the regulation of the performance of character in the commentaries of ancient scholars; these are shown to be compatible with the educational *anágnōsis* described in Chapter 1. Chapter 3 investigates the depiction of audience in the scholia and focuses on one performer-audience relationship in particular, that between the *anagnōstes*

Posidonius and the Homerist Aristarchus; it is shown that *anágnōsis* of Homer by Posidonius was appreciated as a critical act by Aristarchus, who himself included a wider audience of 'beginners' as part of the intended readership for his commentaries on Homer. Ultimately, then, *anágnōsis* is described as a nexus of performer, audience, and text, in which Homeric performance by students reflects a broader understanding within ancient literary culture of the importance of expressive reading as the primary medium for Homeric poetry in this period.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank a number of people whose assistance and encouragement has helped me to complete this study. First, I would like to thank my advisor, Professor Richard P. Martin, whose work on the multiplicity of performance styles found in ancient Greek and other cultures was my main inspiration, and without whose help this dissertation would not have been possible. I would also like to thank the other members of my Reading Committee, Professor Susan Stephens and Professor Reviel Netz: seminars and courses taken with them contributed greatly to my understanding of the materiality of ancient texts, and their remarks on various drafts of the following chapters were most helpful and encouraging.

I would like to thank the Department of Classics at Stanford, which provided funds for my travel in the summer summer of 2003 to a number of the European libraries that conserve important Homer codices; I am grateful to the faculty and graduate students as a whole, for my whole experience at Stanford has been suffused with their warm intellectual fellowship. In particular, I wish I could repay debts owed to James Collins, Eirene Visvardi, Marcus Folch, Allen Romano, Don Lavigne, Corby Kelly, Chris Witmore, Trinity Jackman, Julia Nelson-Hawkins, Micah Myers, Bill Gladhill, Jason Aftosmis, Darian Totten, Natasha Peponi, Susanna Braund, and

Alessandro Barchiesi. I had the good fortune to be engaged in writing the present work while Mark Alonge was writing his own study of the Cretan Hymn to Zeus, and I benefited greatly from his enthusiasm, acumen, and solidarity.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my father, James R. Mitchell; my brother, David Mitchell; and especially my mother, Margaret Mitchell, herself an expert in education policy and avid listener to the contemporary ἀνάγνωσις of literature in digital form, whose faith in me as a scholar sustained me through countless hesitations: I dedicate this dissertation to her with the greatest filial affection.

Table of Contents

Abbreviations

CGL = G. Loewe, ed. 1888-1823. *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum.* Leipzig.

CIG = A. Boeckh, et al., eds. 1828-1877. *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum.* Berlin.

FGH = F. Jacoby, ed. 1923-1955. *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker.* Leiden.

GG = G. Uhlig, et al., eds. 1967-1910. *Grammatici Graeci.* Stuttgart.

GL = H. Keil, ed. 1855-1880. *Grammatici Latini.* Leipzig.

IG = O. Kern, et al., eds. 1913- . *Inscriptiones Graecae.* Bonn.

IMyl. = Wolfgang Blümel, ed. 1987. *Die Inschriften von Mylasa.* Bonn.

LSJ = H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, H. S. Jones, eds. 1990. *A Greek-English Lexicon.* 9th ed. Oxford.

P^2 = Roger A. Pack. 1965. *The Greek and Latin Literary Texts from Greco-Roman Egypt.* 2nd ed. Ann Arbor.

SEG = J. J. E. Hondius, et al., eds. 1923- . *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum.* Leiden.

SIG = W. Dittenberger, ed. 1960. *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum.* Hildesheim.

TLG = *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (www.tlg.uci.edu).

Introduction

This dissertation concerns the later (post-classical) recitation of Homeric poetry.[1] Specifically, we shall explore the ἀνάγνωσις (reading aloud) of Homer as a central aspect of Greek grammatical education and evaluate references to ἀνάγνωσις, along with ἀνάγνωσις-related material, in the abundant scholia to Homer; together, as I argue, these sources allow us to describe a cultural continuum in which schoolboys, teachers, contestants in artistic competitions, professional readers (ἀναγνώσται), and learnèd scholars were all engaged in a form of Homeric performance. Overall, I make the case that this reading aloud of Homer has more in common with earlier forms of performance than it does with modern understandings of the function of poetry; the period to which the evidence presented belongs, that is roughly the 2nd century BC to the 4th century AD, should therefore be regarded as constituting, from a typological point of view, an intermediary stage between the poetic performance of 'oral' cultures (featuring no written text) and the text-centered culture of the modern world: this was the era of the 'aural' *Iliad.*

[1] On the performance of Homer in classical Athens (from the Pisistratids through the fourth century), see Allen 1924, Davison 1955, Taplin 1992, Heiden 1996, Nagy 1996a, Nagy 1996b, Nagy 2002; for attempts to reconstruct pre-classical performance of Homer by bards (ἀοιδοί) on the basis of internal evidence and comparative research on living oral traditions, see Lord 1960, Lord 1962, Lord 1991: 72-104 (the most influential descriptions). On the later singing of Homeric verse, see West 1981.

As regards the sources of evidence for the investigation that follows, the first chapter (concerning the ἀνάγνωσις of poetry in Greek education) draws on a range of documentary material, including papyrological and epigraphical evidence, descriptions of educational *Realien* in the Late Antique *Hermeneumata*, and the scholia to the *Ars Grammatica* of Dionysius Thrax. The second and third chapters, however, focus on the ἀνάγνωσις of Homer above all and, as a result, depend principally on evidence supplied by the Homer scholia. Preserved in the margins of a handful of Homer codices dating from the 10th, 11th, and 12th centuries, these scholia represent the accumulation of centuries of criticism of Homer by ancient scholars. Nevertheless, the present study departs from the two approaches normally taken towards these scholia in modern classical scholarship: these approaches may be designated the '*Quellenforschung*' approach on the one hand and the 'theoretical' approach on the other. In order to situate the aims and method of this dissertation within the history of scholarship on the scholia, therefore, it will be useful to survey the aims and methods of these two standard approaches.

The '*Quellenforschung*' approach to the Homer scholia might be described as a side-effect of the Homeric Question. One of the two major turning-points in modern research on Homer (the other being the publication in 1928 of M. Parry's "L'épithète traditionnelle dans Homère"[2]) was the publication by Villoison in 1788 of a

[2] Collected in Parry 1971: 1-190.

manuscript discovered in the Marciana library in Venice.[3] This celebrated 'Venetus A' codex of the *Iliad*, preserving very many unique marginal scholia, greatly expanded scholars' knowledge of the Alexandrian criticism of Homer; in particular, it furnished detailed information on the views of Aristarchus, the preëminent Alexandrian critic. In his introduction, Villoison proudly wrote that the principal virtue of his discovery was to allow scholars' access to the authoritative editions of the Homeric text prepared by Aristarchus.

> For Villoison, the "original" oral composition of Homer had been eventually rescued from the "corruptions" of rhapsodic transmission, thanks largely to the research of scholars at the Library of Alexandria, especially Aristarchus. The text of the Venetus A codex of the *Iliad* was for Villoison the eventual result of this evolving rescue operation. Even if we could never recover an original *Iliad*, we could at least reconstruct the next best thing, that is, a prototype of the Venetus A text of the *Iliad*.[4]

Although, as was subsequently shown, Villoison was wrong in equating the 'Vulgate' text of the Venetus A with the text of Aristarchus (for there are numerous discrepancies), his equation of an Alexandrian text with a pre-rhapsodic text firmly situated the authority of Aristarchus at the center of the question of Homeric authenticity: after Villoison, any attempt to address the authenticity of a given line of Homer required an assessment of the authority of the Homer scholia.[5] Wolf's *Prolegomena* of 1795 challenged the authority of Aristarchus, arguing that any

---

[3] Villoison 1788.

[4] Nagy 2000a, ninth paragraph.

[5] For an account of the ups and downs of Aristarchus' reputation in the 19th century, see the first half of Nagy 2000a.

'original' text of Homer was lost in the mists of oral tradition[6]; by starting the 'Homeric Question,' however,[7] Wolf's book led to a 'Neo-Aristarchean' school of interpretation which (following Villoison) believed that, if the complex web of the Homer scholia could be disentangled, the authoritative judgments of Aristarchus could be used as the basis for reconstructing a 2nd century Alexandrian edition and thereby an earlier edition which would at least be less spurious than the medieval Vulgate[8]: the '*Quellenforschung*' was thus at once a search for the sources of the scholia, a search for the sources of the Alexandrian variants, and a search for the original text of Homer. In these projects, the Homer scholia naturally featured as the raw data from which the original sources of the Venetus A (and to a certain extent of the Townley

---

[6] Wolf 1795.

[7] Broadly defined, the Homeric Question asks after the origins and nature of the Homeric poems; in the 19th century and the first decades of the 20th, it was framed (by the 'Analytic' school of interpretation) as a quest for an 'original' text of the poems, the work of a historical Homer, which was envisioned as a core story hidden beneath layers of rhapsodic accretions.

[8] Apart from Wolf 1795, the catalyst and model for the Neo-Aristarchean school was Lehrs 1832, which classified the scholia deriving from Aristarchus; the classification of the works of Aristarchus' followers was pursued through the 19th century (particularly in the 1850's and 1860's), including those of Aristonicus (Friedländer 1853 with Carnuth 1869), Didymus (Schmidt 1851, Ludwich 1884), Nicanor (Friedländer 1857 with Carnuth 1875), Herodian (Lentz 1867), miscellaneous disciples (Blau 1883), or the Aristarchean school as a whole (Römer 1875). Simultaneously, the works of other ancient Homer scholars were collected, including Zenodotus (Duentzer 1848), Aristophanes (Gerhard 1850), Crates (Helck 1905), and Porphyry (Gildersleeve 1853). The attributions of particular scholia to ancient authors, as made by these 19th century scholars (and by Villoison), were generally followed in subsequent editions of the Homeric scholia (Dindorf 1875, Erbse 1969); the scholia themselves had previously been edited by Bekker (Bekker 1825) and by Villoison (Villoison 1788). The most extreme attempt to correlate evidence of the authenticity or spuriousness of lines and readings attested in the Homer scholia with the text of Homer is surely Bolling 1925; a more readable instance of his approach is Bolling 1940. Contemporary research on the philological problems posed by the Homer scholia includes Allen 1931, Erbse 1960, van der Valk 1963, Nickau 1977, van der Valk 1984, van Thiel 1992, van Thiel 1997, Schmidt 1997, Montanari 1998, West 2001b, and Nagy 2005. On Aristarchus and the development of Greek grammar, see Ax 1982, Matthaios 1999. For attempts to date the collections of Homer scholia more or less as we have them, see Allen 1931, Wilson 1967, McNamee 1995, McNamee 1998.

codex in London) could be reconstructed; scholia which could not be assigned to a particular ancient scholar on the basis of (most often) internal evidence were classed as 'exegetical,' thus establishing a firm line between those fragments which derived from Alexandrian scholarship (with which the 19th century philologists engaged in editing the scholia firmly identified) and those which were the result of the later, decadent, twilight time of the Imperial and Late Antique periods.[9] The question of the sources and authority of Aristarchus and the Aristarcheans continues to be important to contemporary scholarship,[10] while the Homer scholia themselves have been the subject of a monumental edition in the 20th century[11] and continue to be supplemented with material from other sources.[12]

It is with the 'exegetical' scholia that the second approach mentioned above, which we might term 'theoretical,' is primarily concerned. This approach involves the philological study of transmission only incidentally; indeed, it is rarely chronological,

---

[9] For a critique of this approach and a recollection that the term 'exegetical' when applied to Homer scholia is a generic as opposed to philological term, see below (p. 166ff.).

[10] Most prominently, G. Nagy and M. West disputed (1998-2005) the issue of whether it was Aristarchus or Didymus who collated the 'City Editions' and other important (long lost) manuscripts: see West 1999: i-lxii, Nagy 2000a, West 2001a, West 2001b, Nagy 2003b, West 2004, Nagy 2005. At stake is the authority of variants reported to Aristarchus, which West (following Wolf) describes as conjectures and Nagy takes as evidence for a pre-Vulgate diversity of Homeric texts.

[11] Erbse 1969. Impressive as it is, this edition is not without its flaws: it does not include the so-called 'D' scholia (which generally consist of glosses but also feature a good deal of interesting mythographic material) even where they appear in the Venetus A, and in comparing various passages in Erbse's edition with the manuscript facsimile of the Venetus A (Comparetti 1901), I have noticed the odd omission. Also, it is only in Erbse's apparatus that the *lemmata* of the manuscripts are to be found; his emendations of these are not always noted as such in the main text. In our own time, a new digital edition of the scholia is underway as part of the Homer Multitext Project. On the 'D' scholia see Heinrichs 1971a-c (on the papyri), Montanari 1979, Montanari 1995 (esp. pp. 69-151).

[12] Schironi 2004 is a particularly impressive example.

seeking rather to extract a literary and rhetorical (or 'aesthetic') critical system from the Homer scholia and to establish the relationship of such a system with other critical systems of antiquity, chiefly with that of Aristotle. It is generally found that, even if the scholia rarely define their terms, their use of literary and rhetorical terminology is fully compatible with Aristotle's usage, allowing us both to read Aristotle's larger definitions into the scholia's comments on particular passages and to clarify Aristotle's own system (as viewed by ancient scholars) with the examples featuring literary and rhetorical commentary in the scholia.[13] The object of these studies is to describe the way in which ancient scholars described the poem.

The present study follows neither of these dominant approaches, though it does depend upon (and sometimes debates *ad loc.*) the findings of the '*Quellenforschung*' approach and discovers a continuity of discourse across the centuries such as the 'theoretical' approach also finds with respect to ancient scholars and Aristotle. Nevertheless, instead of inquiring as to how ancient scholars decided what was or was not Homeric in Homer or how they analyzed the poems as literary art, this dissertation explores how ancient scholars presumed the poem would be experienced by their contemporaries and by themselves. In other words, the Homer scholia are treated as material for a chapter in the cultural history of epic poetry; the focus is not so much on the conscious use of rhetorical terminology in the scholia as it is on the unconscious

[13] Examples of this approach are Lehnert 1896, Bachmann 1902, Griesinger 1907, von Franz 1943, Richardson 1980, Meijering 1987, Snipes 1988, Papadopoulou 1999 (on the tragic scholia), and Lundon 2002.

assumptions of the scholiasts regarding what one was to do with a text of Homer once it had been fully authenticated and correctly analyzed. Though the evidence for this is necessarily limited both by nature (since no ancient scholar will have set out to describe culturally embedded assumptions the historically rooted character of which he would hardly be aware of) and by accident (since the Homer scholia reach us as abbreviated echoes of a once vast scholarly literature), the intention of the present study is likewise limited: the attempt at a cultural history of ἀνάγνωσις that follows will have succeeded if it correctly describes the nature, scope, and purpose of the practice of Homeric ἀνάγνωσις, as well as the relationship between that practice and the ancient scholarship that served to regulate it. We cannot hope to deduce a system adequate to every nuance of Homeric poetry or predict exactly how a given line of the *Iliad* would be read aloud by the ancients; indeed, as I hope to show, the very idea of ἀνάγνωσις calls for creative ability on the part of the reader or ἀναγνώστης, and to read Homer aloud was not only to engage in the performance of the *Iliad* but to become an interpreter of a dynamic text.

In the following three chapters, we shall observe how ἀνάγνωσις operated in the ancients' view of the uses to which Homeric poetry was to be put.[14] Chapter 1 ("Ἀνάγνωσις in Greek education") considers ἀνάγνωσις as a component of Greek literary education at the grammatical level (that is, when the student was under the

[14] For a thorough description of the semantics of the verb ἀναγιγνώσκω ('read' or 'read aloud'), together with an account of its historical development in the Greek language, see Chantraine 1950; on the semantics of ἀναγιγνώσκω in the 4th century BC (especially in Aristotle), see Allan 1980.

supervision of the teacher known as the γραμματικός); this chapter may be read both as a collection of the external evidence for one of the chief settings of ἀνάγνωσις and as a general description of how the Hellenistic and Imperial periods understood epic performance, since virtually all the men and women known to us from ancient literature would have passed through the phase of grammatical education. The chief challenge of this chapter is to determine the relationships among various sources of evidence and their various purposes: some are prescriptive (such as the statements of Quintilian and the definitions in the scholia to Dionysius Thrax), some attest to the actual practice of students (such as the Homer papyri featuring accentuation), some anticipate a specific act of ἀνάγνωσις (such as the inscription from Mylasa), some record acts of ἀνάγνωσις after the fact (such as the inscriptions from Chios, Cnidus, and Teos), and some do all these things at once (such as the *Hermeneumata*). Taken together, however, they form to a remarkably coherent portrait of ἀνάγνωσις by the young.

Chapter 2 ("Performance-oriented ἀνάγνωσις in the Homer scholia") turns to the corpus of the Homer scholia itself, presenting internal evidence that the scholiasts were aware of and engaged with the type of ἀνάγνωσις described in Chapter 1. The evidence here may be divided into two main types: on the one hand, evidence for an 'aural' punctuation of the spoken line; on the other, evidence for the performance of character by the reader, whether in the 1st person as a Homeric hero or in the 3rd person

as the narrator. Only one scholion considered here (XVI.131a) has been discussed by earlier scholars, and the great bulk of the material presented (of interest neither to the '*Quellenforschung*' nor to the 'theoretical' schools of scholarship on the Homer scholia) is discussed for the first time. The first half of the chapter concerns Nicanor, the presumed source for most of our information on punctuation in the Homer scholia, and makes the case that his efforts to clarify the Homeric text were not limited to the clarification of syntax but rather embraced also the emendation of performance of that text; the second half draws principally on the 'exegetical' scholia and their portrait of the blending of reader performing and character performed.

Chapter 3 ("Audiences and Scholars") shifts the discussion from the duty of the reader (the focus of the first two chapters) to the interaction between the reader and the audience. After a complete topology of references to an audience in the Homer scholia, in which it appears that the scholia imagine both relatively naïve and relatively knowledgeable audiences as participating in the performance of the poem (albeit in slightly different ways), we examine a particularly important instance of collaboration between performer and audience, namely the ἀνάγνωσις to Aristarchus of the Zenodotean text of the *Iliad* by the ἀναγνώστης Posidonius. Comparing this one particular historical act of ἀνάγνωσις at Alexandria to the relationships between ἀνάγνωσις and education (in Chapter 1) and between ἀνάγνωσις and commentary (in Chapter 2), I conclude that one of the aims of Alexandrian Homer scholarship —

paralleled in the very function of the Homer scholia itself — was to train readers for the proper ἀνάγνωσις of Homer.

Overall, then, this dissertation may be read in a number of ways. It may be taken as a collection of studies of ἀνάγνωσις in its various manifestations; it may be seen as an attempt to describe the medium in which the *Iliad* was experienced by the scholars responsible for our most detailed critiques of Homeric poetry, that is by the Alexandrians; or it may be understood as a contribution to 'Oral Theory,' the developing inquiry of modern scholarship into the multitudinous possibilities of poetry in performance. Most of all, however, I hope to show that Homeric poetry, as a performative act, did not die at the hands of Aristarchus, and that an aural *Iliad* continued to excite, to grieve, and to astound audiences long after the Museum was established, and perhaps for that very reason.

Chapter 1 : ἀνάγνωσις in Greek education

1.1 Introduction: the background of ancient education

This first chapter concerns the cultural context for the performance of the *Iliad* in Greek education. Our discussion will include analyses of literary, papyrological, epigraphical, and ancient theoretical evidence for the role of ἀνάγνωσις ('reading' or 'reading aloud') in the ancient classroom. After a brief survey of ancient education as a system (Section 1.1), we begin with the literary evidence, so termed because it reaches us *via* the main stream of manuscript transmission of canonical works, as it appears in Quintilian and Ausonius (Section 1.2); though less detailed than the material that follows, this literary evidence introduces a number of key concepts in the description of ἀνάγνωσις and may serve as a useful point of reference for the following sections. Since, however, the applicability of Quintilian and Ausonius to regular grammatical education has been challenged by R. Cribiore on the basis of papyrological evidence, we turn next to the papyri (Section 1.3); here we find tangible physical signs of the use of Homeric texts in the service of ἀνάγνωσις. Continuing with material deriving from the actual classroom experience of ἀνάγνωσις, we then consider (Section 1.4) the *Ars Grammatica* of Dionysius Thrax together with its extensive scholia; here we find ἀνάγνωσις embedded within the τέχνη γραμματική,

both in the sense of a physical manual of education (such as the *Ars* itself) and in the sense of a skill set (literary ability). In the last section (Section 1.5), we discover evidence in four inscriptions (from Mylasa, Cnidus, Chios, and Teos) for competitive ἀνάγνωσις in contests held at civic festivals; the scope of ἀνάγνωσις by the young is thus seen to reach beyond the classroom door. In conclusion (Section 1.6), we compare the ἀνάγνωσις of the foregoing sources with the role of reading in the classroom as portrayed in the Late Antique *Hermeneumata.* Overall, my chief concern is to establish that, at the level of 'secondary' education supervised by the γραμματικός, the ἀνάγνωσις of Homeric poetry was not merely concerned with the correct pronunciation and understanding of the text by the student but was, instead, intended to make Homer come alive in performance before an audience; my intention is not to describe the general character of Greek education or even the use of Homeric poetry in the curriculum[15] but rather to ascertain the nature of ἀνάγνωσις — and the ἀνάγνωσις of Homer in particular — as an element within that system.

1.1.1 The continuity of ancient education

Before entering into the debate on the structure of ancient education, we must note one crucial aspect of education in the Hellenistic and Imperial periods: its remarkable stability and continuity, both across time and across the Greek-Latin linguistic divide.

---

[15] For a survey of the use of Homer in Greek education, see Robb 1994: 159-82.

As Cribiore remarks in the introduction to her study of the papyrological remains of school exercises, though

> scholars have long recognized that Roman rule brought significant socioeconomic changes in Egypt and that the transition from the Ptolemaic to the Roman period could hardly be characterized by continuity [, e]ducational practices and contents . . . basically continued undisturbed throughout this period — another sign that Greek education in antiquity was virtually independent of societal changes and geography. An attempt at a more defined periodization would not capture the substantially "frozen" quality of education.[16]

Similarly, Morgan notes that "literate education developed as a system with remarkable speed. By the mid-third century BCE, on the evidence of the papyri, most of its elements were established in the order they would maintain for nearly a thousand years."[17] From the socioeconomic point of view, this was owing to the economic premium put on participation in Hellenic civilization.[18] On the material level, there

---

[16] Cribiore 2001: 8; also Cribiore 2001: 7: "not only did practices and attitudes toward education remain almost unchanged despite political and social changes in this long period, but the continuity of human experience helps to validate practices located far apart in time and geography." Cf. Cribiore 1996: 37: "The content of education remained unchanged for many centuries, and very little was left to the creativity of teachers. The school exercises of Graeco-Roman Egypt confirm that education consisted of a set of notions and concepts verified and proved by tradition and imparted according to gradual stages of difficulty." She notes that Beudel 1911: 5-6 "strongly believed that there had been no development in educational methods and thus did not make any distinction between the different periods: *optime intellegitur rationem docendi semper eandem fere fuisse*" (Cribiore 1996: 37 n.2).

[17] Morgan 1998: 24. For a striking instance of continuity between the 5th century BC and the Byzantine period, see Cribiore 2001: 30, where she provides an illustration (Figure 3) of a red-figure scene (*Met. Mus.* 17.230.10, c. 460 BC) in which an Athenian schoolboy carries a writing table which is identical to an early Byzantine writing tablet (*Brit. Mus.* Misc. 1906.10-20.2) preserved from Egypt (Figure 4).

[18] Morgan 1998: 23: "Literacy and literate education provided a means by which Greek culture could be identified and distributed and the Greek ruling class could be defined." We should pause, however, before attributing the efficacy of literary education to simple snobbery: given that socioeconomic power in antiquity was closely associated with persuasive speech, literary education was far from impractical. Cf. Cribiore 2001: 3: "Graduating from a secondary level of studies was often considered a sufficient mark of distinction even for privileged students: it was grammatical education that gave a youth the potential to become a person of culture. The few male students who reached the summit of rhetorical

was so little change that we find school writing tablets preserved from the early Byzantine period which are *identical* to those depicted on red-figure vases dating from a thousand years earlier[19]; indeed, as Cribiore shows, the methods, tools, and aims characteristic of ancient primary education were still to be seen in Egypt in the mid-19th century[20] and can still be found today in Niger.[21]

The ancient educational system displayed remarkable continuity not only across time, however, but also across space and across the linguistic divide. As Marrou writes,

> When we say "classical education" we really mean "Hellenistic education." This became the education of the whole Greek world, when the latter achieved some sort of stability after the exploits accompanying Alexander's conquests and the hazards of the wars of succession following his death. It remained in use throughout the Mediterranean world for as long as the latter could be termed "ancient," overlapping the strictly Hellenistic age and lasting into the Roman era. . . . Throughout the eastern half of the Mediterranean world, Hellenistic education continued unchanged and without a break for the whole of the Roman era, and even beyond. [22]

With regard to the Latin-speaking education, "Roman education . . . was only an adaptation of Hellenistic education to Latin circumstances. [While] it is true that a careful chronological grouping of the epigraphical and papyrological data shows that certain educational innovations appeared in the Imperial epoch, these concerned only

---

instruction were not necessarily the intellectuals, but those who craved certain positions in law and administration."

[19] Cribiore 2001: 30 (Figures 3 and 4).

[20] Cribiore 2001: 66 (Figure 10).

[21] Cribiore 2001: 136 (Figure 17).

[22] Marrou 1982: 95-96.

small details which, even taken all together, would not be sufficient to impart a specifically different character to Roman education."[23] In other words, "Nec refert," as Quintilian himself insists, "de Graeco an de Latino loquar, quanquam Graecum esse priorem placet. Utrique eadem via est" (It doesn't matter whether I am talking about [education in] Greek or Latin, though it is true enough that Greek [education] came first; the method is identical).[24] In light of this scholarly consensus, therefore, I will below essentially treat Greco-Roman education as a continuous whole, assuming a strong degree of chronological, geographical, and cross-cultural continuity unless there is evidence to the contrary.

1.1.2 The tripartite model of ancient education

In order to situate ἀνάγνωσις within Greek education of the Hellenistic and Imperial periods, we must first recall the basic framework of that education, along with various substantial critiques lately made of the validity of such a framework.

Typically, the ancient educational system is envisaged according to a tripartite model, the youngest students (in 'primary' school) being under the tutelage of a γραμματιστής or γραμματοδιδάσκαλος; older children (in 'grammar' school[25])

---

[23] Marrou 1982: 96.

[24] Quintilian 1.4.1.

[25] In order to highlight the importance of the concept of γραμματική at the 'secondary' level of Greek education, I consistently use the terms 'grammatical' education and 'grammar' school to refer to education under the γραμματικός. Though there is a danger of confusion with our modern concept of

studying with a γραμματικός; and advanced students (at the 'rhetorical' level) studying with a σοφιστής.[26] Nevertheless, though ancient sources can indeed be found to differentiate explicitly between education under a γραμματιστής and education under a γραμματικός,[27] these tend to describe education from the point of

---

grammar as correct language, the alternative term 'secondary' may be equally misleading; see below (p 15ff.).

[26] Kaster 1983: 323 describes this model, never provided as such by ancient authors, before embarking upon a detailed critique, faulting Marrou 1982 for a "presentation of the three stages [that] was especially rigid" (Kaster 1983: 324) in that Marrou's chapters proceed from the primary to the secondary to the rhetorical, explaining evidence of overlap by means of "a general law [that has] to be kept in mind: educational syllabuses tend to become increasingly top-heavy as the years go by, with the result that subjects gradually sink — they begin by being 'advanced' and end by being 'ordinary' or even elementary . . . The same thing can be seen happening today" (Marrou 1982: 160); Marrou cites Cicero *De Oratore* 3.108 ("sunt enim varia et ad vulgarem popularemque sensum accommodata omnia genera huius forensis nostrae dictionis" [all the aspects of our legal-rhetorical terminology are various and adapted to vulgar and popular understanding]), Suetonius *De Grammamticis* 4.1 ("Appellatio grammaticorum Graeca consuetudine invaluit sed initio litterati vocabantur. Cornelius quoque Nepos libello quo distinguit litteratum ab erudito, litteratos vulgo quidem appellari ait eos qui aliquid diligenter et acute scienterque possint aut dicere aut scribere, ceterum proprie sic appellandos poetarum interpretes, qui a Graecis grammatici nominentur" [The term (sc. *grammaticus*) has diminished in true Greek fashion, but originally the *litterati* were so designated. Cornelius Nepos, too, in the work in which he distinguishes the *litteratus* from the scholar (*eruditus*), says that the men now popularly designated *litterati* are those who can either speak or write diligently, acutely, and knowledgeably, but that those whom the Greeks call *grammatici* should be designated *interpreters of the poets*]), and Quintilian 1.1.1 ("Tenuit consuetudo, quae cotidie magis inualescit, ut praeceptoribus eloquentiae . . . discipuli serius quam ratio postulat traderentur. Eius rei duplex causa est, quod et rhetores utique nostri suas partis omiserunt et grammatici alienas occupauerunt" [Formerly it was the custom, nowadays greatly weakened, that pupils should be given over to the teachers of eloquence (*praeceptoribus eloquentiae*) later than is reasonable . . . The cause is twofold, namely that the *rhetores* like myself have lost part of their territory while the *grammatici* have taken on others' territory]). It will be seen that only the Quintilian passage supports Marrou's assertion. Against the idea of an evolution of teachers' responsibilities, Kaster rightly demurs in saying that "the sequential arrangement of 'primary' and 'secondary' schools — in the proper sense of those terms, with the former designed to feed into the latter, and both schools integrated in the same general system — is fully a development of the last three or four generations in the history of secular education in the West; and its existence in the highly stratified society of antiquity would anyway be surprising" (Kaster 1983: 338). Attempts to disentangle the overlap between the various teachers have since sought for a sociological as opposed to chronological explanation; see below (pp. 17-18, with notes).

[27] Kaster 1983: 325-329 adduces Diocletian's *Edict on Maximum Prices* (7.66, 70), Lactantius (*Institutiones* 3.25; see below), Augustine's progress from *primus magister* to *grammaticus* (*Confessions* 1.8.14ff., 1.13.20f.), Symeon of Mesopotamia (*Homilies* 15.42), Socrates Scholasticus (*Historia Ecclesiastica* 2.46.2 etc. vs. 7.13.7), Pompeius (*GL* 5.96.12ff.), Choricius of Gaza (*Oratio*

view of the *pupil*; from the point of view of the *teacher*, by contrast, the overlap and ambiguity in terminology are so widespread as to make schematization all but impossible.[28]

Rather than positing a fundamental tripartite model, then, whose rule so many exceptions would violate, modern scholars have attempted to construct a sociological model, in which 'primary' school is essentially a middle-class institution designed to propel to 'grammar' school those students who had not grown up in highly literate, aristocratic environments.[29] The fact that Quintilian, for example, includes no discussion of 'primary' education in his description of the ideal orator's early training — dismissing such studies as "litterarii paene ista ludi et trivililis scientiae" (1.4.27) — indicates that his "comments themselves do not concern two *successive* stages of schooling . . . but two *distinct types* of school, the 'school of letters,' providing a 'common' or 'vulgar' literacy, and the grammarian's school, including elements of 'common knowledge' in its instruction and in that respect overlapping with the

---

funeralis Procopii 5 F-R), and five others. Kaster notes, however, that "the fact that different teachers were identified with different functions," as in the above passages, "does not necessarily imply that they typically performed those functions in a regular scholastic sequence" (Kaster 1983: 328).

[28] See the extensive material for overlap between γραμματιστής and γραμματικός at Kaster 1983: 329-336, classified according to no less than 14 types of evidence; within these, the individual loci are very many. Kaster concludes that "the evidence suggests that the distinction between the 'primary' and 'secondary' teacher, in title or function, was far from iron-clad" (Kaster 1983: 336). See also Wolf 1952: 34ff. For overlap between *grammatici* and *rhetores*, see Clarke 1971: 11, who quotes Suetonius' list of Aurelius Opilius, Antonius Gnipho, and Ateius Philologus (*De Grammaticis* 6-7) and adds Ausonius' teacher Nepotianus (Ausonius 5.15) as examples of men who bore both titles.

[29] Booth 1979, followed by Kaster 1983: 337-346.

'school of letters,' but also providing more complete and exquisite knowledge,"[30] the details of which are the subject of Book 1 of the *Instituto Oratoria.*

The overall effect of the move to a non-evolutionary history of education is to highlight the problem of simultaneously designating various forms of education by the title of the teacher ('grammatistical,' 'grammatical') while also defining teachers' titles according to what they taught (the γραμματιστής as primary school teacher, γραμματικός as secondary school teacher, etc.): such an approach is doubly tautological. It would be more sensible to take teachers' titles as essentially independent of their activity and descriptive not of the education they supervised but of themselves as individuals. In this fashion, a γραμματιστής would have been a "letterer" not because he taught elementary knowledge of the alphabet, syllables, and so forth[31] but because he himself was not competent with the higher matter of literature.[32] The title γραμματικός, likewise, would retain its basic meaning of "man

---

[30] Kaster 1983: 339. As Booth writes, Quintilian's "child, destined to become the perfect orator, was neither to attend a *ludus litterarius* nor meet a *grammatistes*" (Booth 1979: 3); rather, "for the purposes of a liberal education, the *grammatistes* was frequently avoided. The elements could be taught quickly and informally at home perhaps by the *paedagogus*, or be subsumed into the institution of the *grammaticus*. But they did not regularly consume four or five years; indeed, they were so despised that they were often not recognized at all as a stage of learning" (Booth 1979: 10). Kaster's conclusions support Booth's view, while cautioning against a rejection of "one overly-generalized scheme only to replace it with another: this socially segmented arrangement of schools [whereby the γραμματιστής would teach lower-class children only], where it can be glimpsed at all, appears only in sources which derive from the greatest cities of the Empire"; ultimately, "there were throughout the Empire schools of all shapes and kinds, depending on local needs, expectations, and resources" (Kaster 1983: 346).

[31] For the province of the γραμματιστής in the ideal sense, see Cribiore 2001: 50-52 and (taking the γραμματιστής as responsible for 'primary' education, evidently always true) 160-184.

[32] On the lowly social standing of the γραμματιστής, whose title was also a form of verbal abuse, see Booth 1981, Cribiore 2001:59-62, Kaster 1988: 99-134. Aulus Gellius' ridicule of a *grammaticus* at the

of letters" in a manner consistent with its bearers' role as sometime poets and prose authors[33]: a γραμματικός would be someone capable, not merely in his capacity as teacher, in γράμματα[34] and (specifically) in the τέχνη γραμματική,[35] just as the ῥήτωρ who was a teacher in post-secondary education[36] was no less the "public speaker" which his title implied. In this essentialist view, the title of γραμματικός describes the bearer's own direct relationship with literature rather than with the students he may or may not have instructed in literature.[37] It is thus no surprise to find

---

end of Book 13, discussed below (note 35), highlights the victim's incompetence at literature and could be interpreted as reducing him to the status of a γραμματιστής.

[33] Cribiore 2001: 55, Wolf 1952: 39-41. Cribiore notes the example of "Kleobulos, who came to Antioch from Egypt: Libanius, who had been a student of his, called him a good poet, a *didaskalos*, and a *paideutes* ('teacher'), and offered him a post as grammarian in his school in a moment of need," citing Libanius *Epistulae* 361; she mentions four other γραμματικοί known to have been active poets.

[34] As Cribiore notes (Cribiore 1996: 20), the term γράμματα refers not only to elementary knowledge of writing but to the study of things written, at an elementary or at an advanced level.

[35] On the τέχνη as the comprehensive system (but not programme) of literary education, see below; on the τέχνη as specifically those attributes which allow for excellent ἀνάγνωσις (in a performative sense), see the section on Dionysius Thrax below (p. 54ff.). We may note in this context a scholion from the *Scholia Vaticana* to the *Ars Grammatica* (*GG* I.3.170), where the scholiast imagines that Dionysius' precepts on proper ἀνάγνωσις are directed towards a "γραμματικός," even though the object of instruction is clearly the student: "Τὸ δὲ δοκίμως ἀναγινώσκειν πάντως ἐκ τριβῆς καὶ ἐπιμονῆς πολλῆς γίνεται· ἐνδέχεται οὖν τὸν γραμματικὸν οὕτως ἀναγινώσκειν καὶ ὅσοις μὴ ἐντετύχηκε συγγράμμασιν, ὥσπερ ἐκεῖνα οἷς πολλάκις ἐντετύχηκεν· δεῖ γὰρ οὕτω προδιοικονομεῖν ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἐθίζειν ἐν οἷς ἐγχειρίζεται, ὡς ἐκ τούτων καὶ παρατυχόντα δοκεῖν πολλάκις ἀνεγνωσμένα" (Well-taught reading [aloud] is essentially the product of practice and much dedication; he [sc. Dionysius] therefore prescribes that the γραμματικός should read even writings he has not encountered before in the same manner as those he has met with several times; for he should prepare himself and get used to what he has at hand, so that from these even those things to be read which happen to be at hand shall appear to have often been read before).

[36] Cribiore 2001: 57 notes that ῥήτορες taught in the school of Libanius in a position subordinate to the master (who was designated a σοφιστής).

[37] Such an approach would serve to explain how, as Suetonius observed (see note 26 above), the term could encompass both the Alexandrian scholars (Aristophanes [*Suda* A.3933 Adler], Zenodotus [*Suda* Z.74 Adler], and Callimachus [*Suda* K.227 Adler] [to take some famous names] being γραμματικοί in the *Suda*, with Aristarchus as ὁ γραμματικώτατος [Athenaeus 15.671] supervising 40 γραμματικοί [*Suda* A.3892 Adler]) and the run-of-the-mill members of a "profession . . . characterized by mediocrity [which] engaged a student in mental acrobatics of limited value" (Cribiore 2001: 56).

that our sources define the qualification for entry into secondary studies as the ability to write, to speak, and to understand the written word[38]: only thus could the pupil hope to engage with the literature which his γραμματικός not only expounded but personally represented.

1.2 Literary evidence for ἀνάγνωσις in education

Having briefly noted the place of grammatical or literary education within the overall structure of Graeco-Roman education in the Hellenistic and Imperial periods, as well as debates regarding the merits of tripartite or socioeconomic models of the relationship between primary, secondary, and rhetorical educational stages, we may turn to descriptions of ἀνάγνωσις — or *lectio*, to give the Latin translation[39] — as they appear in two Roman sources, Quintilian and Ausonius. Since these writers are very much aristocratic — both featuring prominently in the Booth/Kaster case for a socioeconomic divide between literacy-oriented and literature-oriented education[40] — a discussion of their reports of ἀνάγνωσις cannot avoid the question of what sort of grammatical education they are describing. Rather than leaving the issue of the place

---

[38] Lactantius (*Institutiones* 3.25), quoted at Kaster 1983: 325: "discendae istae communes litterae [= "Basic Reading Skills"] propter usum legendi . . . grammaticis quoque non parum operae dandum est, ut rectam loquendi rationem scias"; Quintilian (*Institutio Oratoria* I.IV.1): "Primus in eo qui scribendi legendique adeptus erit facultatem grammaticis est locus."

[39] In the *Hermeneumata*, *lectio* glosses ἀνάγνωσις at *CGL* 637.4, 638.8 (*Leidense*); *CGL* 646 (*Monacensia*); Dionisotti 1972: 100 ln.32 (*Celtes*). On ἀνάγνωσις in the *Hermeneumata*, see below (p. 101ff.).

[40] Quintilian: Booth 1979: 3-5, Kaster 1983: 339-341; Ausonius: Booth 1979: 5-8, Kaster 1983: 331-332.

of grammatical education unresolved, the discussion of ἀνάγνωσις in the following sections of this chapter should, I hope, serve to clarify the relationship of grammatical education both with primary and with rhetorical education. I begin with Quintilian's and Ausonius' descriptions; compare these to the diminished role of ἀνάγνωσις proposed by Rafaella Cribiore on the basis of papyrological evidence (not without some disagreement); adduce the evidence of Dionysius Thrax' Τέχνη Γραμματική and its scholiasts; and include the evidence of inscriptions from Mylasa, Chios, Cnidus and Teos, as well as that of the Late Antique *Hermeneumata.*

The most normative description of the role of ἀνάγνωσις (*lectio*) in ancient education is to be found in the first book of Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria*, which specifies the ideal education of a future orator from birth until his entrance upon rhetorical training. As discussed above, Quintilian's programme essentially skips primary education, taking his schoolboy directly from the nursery to the literary education of the γραμματικός; certainly, by the time we reach Chapter 4 of the first book, we are in the province of the γραμματικός,[41] and it is in this context that we encounter his prescription for ἀνάγνωσις (*lectio*):

> Superest lectio, in qua puer ut scit ubi suspendere spiritum debeat, quo loco versum distinguere, ubi claudatur sensus, unde incipiat, quando attolenda vel summittenda sit vox, quo quidque flexu, quid lentius, celerius, concitatius, lenius dicendum, demonstari nisi in opere ipso non potest. Unum est igitur, quod in hac parte praecipiam: ut omnia ista facere possit, intelligat. Sit autem in primis lectio virilis et cum

[41] Cf. the passage from Quintilian noted above (note 38).

> suavitate quadam gravis et non quidem prosae similis, quia et carmen est et se poetae canere testantur; non tamen in canticum dissoluta nec plasmate (ut nunc a plerisque fit) effeminata; de quo genere optime C. Caesarem praetextatum adhuc accepimus dixisse: *Si cantas, male cantas; si legis, cantas.* Nec prosopopoeias, ut quibusdam placet, ad comicum morem pronuntiari velim; esse tamen flexum quendam, quo distinguantur ab iis in quibus poeta persona sua utetur.
> Reading [*lectio*] remains for consideration. In this connexion there is much that can only be taught in actual practice, as for instance where the boy should take breath, at what point he should introduce a pause into a line, where the sense ends or begins, when the voice should be raised or lowered, what modulation should be given to each phrase, and when he should increase or slacken speed, or speak with greater or less energy. In this portion of my work I will give but one golden rule: to do all these things, he must understand what he reads. But above all his reading must be manly, combining dignity and charm; it must be different from the reading of prose, for poetry is song and poets claim to be singers. But this fact does not justify degeneration into sing-song or the effeminate modulations now in vogue: there is an excellent saying on this point attributed to Gaius Caesar while he was still a boy: "If you are singing, you sing badly: if you are reading, you sing." Again I do not, like some teachers, wish character as revealed by speeches to be indicated as it is by the comic actor, though I think that there should be some modulation of the voice to distinguish passages from those where the poet is speaking in person.
>
> Quintilian 1.8.1-3[42]

This prescription includes — or rather aggregates and confounds — technical, ethical, and elocutionary aspects of reading. Technical aspects include punctuation (*ubi suspendere spiritum*; not necessarily with respect to physical marks on the page), enjambment (*quo loco versum distinguere*), and syntax (*ubi claudatur sensus*). Ethical aspects[43] include the articulation of fictional characters (*nec prosopopoeias . . . ad*

---

[42] The translation is that of Butler (Butler 1980).

[43] Here and below I use the word *ethical* in the sense of 'pertaining to ἦθος' or character, real or fictitious (more often the latter), rather than in the sense of 'moral' (as is often done in modern usage).

comicum morem pronuntiari velim) and of the speaker's own (*sit . . . lectio virilis et cum suavitate quadam gravis*). But the main emphasis is on elocution: the pitch of the voice, speed, energy, and the delicate question of musicality. All these, according to Quintilian, depend upon understanding (*ut omnia ista facere possit, intelligat*); it follows that good reading not only requires but also displays the student's understanding.[44] Finally, it goes without saying that Quintilian's definition of *lectio* / ἀνάγνωσις here presumes that the reading in question is to be reading aloud.

Following this passage, Quintilian goes on to specify (1.8.5-8) the poets to be read, namely Homer and Vergil, tragedy and lyric (despite this last genre's licentiousness), and Menander; elegiacs and hendecasyllabics are banished. This programme corresponds closely with the ancient curriculum as we know it from papyrological and other literary sources,[45] and also with the catalogue of authors and genres that Ausonius, writing to his grandson in his old age, imagined would soon be read aloud by that young man:

> perlege quodcumque est memorabile; prima monebo.
> conditor Iliados et amabilis orsa Menandri
> evolvenda tibi: tu flexu et acumine vocis
> innumeros numeros doctis accentibus effer
> adfectusque inpone legens. Distinctio sensum
> auget et ignavis dant intervalla vigorem.

---

[44] This concept is elaborated by Dionysius Thrax and his scholiasts; see below (pp. 64-66).

[45] For the Greek curriculum, see Marrou 1982: 162-164; Clarke 1971: 18-22; Cribiore 2001: 194-204. For the Latin curriculum, which included everything in the Greek curriculum with the addition of Latin authors, see Marrou 1982: 277-278. Writing in 1983, Nigel Wilson (Wilson 1983: 18-19) notes the following figures for papyrological remnants of the central school authors: Homer 590 (*Iliad* 454, *Odyssey* 136), Euripides 75, Menander 27, Demosthenes 83.

ecquando ista meae contingent dona senectae?
quando oblita mihi tot carmina totque per aevum
conexa historiae, soccos aulaeaque regum
et melicos lyricosque modos profando novabis?
Read through whatever is memorable; I will give you the basics.
The founder of the *Iliad* and the works of lovable Menander
Should be unrolled by you[46]: you by the modulation and pitch of the voice
Bring forth the endless lines with learned accents
And infuse forms of expression as you read; punctuation enhances the sense
And pauses give strength to the dull;
When indeed shall such gifts pertain to my old age?
When shall so many songs, now forgotten by me, and so many age-old
Joined histories, comedies, and tragedies of kings
And melic and lyric modes – when shall you renew them in speaking them forth?

Ausonius *Protrepticus ad nepotem* 45-54

Here the Late Antique poet, writing some three centuries after Quintilian, presumes that the poets he recommends will be read aloud and indeed touches on the same aspects of ἀνάγνωσις mentioned by the rhetorician: *flexus* and *acumen* of the voice, punctuation (*distinctio, intervalla*) resulting in *vigor* in the reader and *adfectus* in the performance; the reader will "renew" the works in question. Beyond the reading list, however, there is a larger reason to think that this reading aloud will be taking place at the level of grammatical education: his grandson is a young boy ("te puerum, mox in iuvenalibus annis") who stands in a love-hate relationship with his *magister* (who appears in lines 3, 13, and 25); the reading list is provided not for the boy in his time of leisure (the pleasures of which are admitted in lines 1-4) but for his *schola*, upon

[46] The referece of *evolvenda* is to the use of the bookroll, whose pages would be "unrolled" as in our modern codex-like books they are turned or flipped. For the aesthetic effects of the physical characteristics of the bookroll, see Johnson 2004: 85-86; on the transition from bookroll to codex and its effects on the physical use of texts, see Cavallo 1975, Roberts and Skeat 1983, Blanck 1992: 75-101.

whose original meaning the poet plays in lines 5-7.[47] The specifications of Quintilian and Ausonius thus overlap fully both in terms of content and in terms of context: the theorist's pupil and the consul's grandson will both read poetry aloud and do so in school. Before adding the evidence of Dionysius Thrax and his scholiasts so as to allow consideration of the purpose of such a practice, however, we must first adduce and, as it happens, reassess the papyrological evidence for ἀνάγνωσις in education.

1.2 Papyrological evidence for ἀνάγνωσις in education

In two important recent books on Graeco-Roman education in Egypt, Rafaella Cribiore has drawn attention to the importance of the papyrological remains of school writing exercises for our understanding of literacy and literary acculturation in the ancient world.[48] Cribiore engagingly emphasizes that our literary sources (of whom she mentions principally Plutarch, Libanius, and Quintilian) "focus primarily on the most prominent aspects of education and overlook the details . . . reflect[ing] a highly

---

[47] "Et latis est puero memori legisse libenter / et cessare licet; Graio schola nomine dicta est, / iusta laboriferis tribuantur ut otia musis. / quo magis alternum certus succedere ludum disce libens . . ." (It is permitted for a boy with a good memory to read widely and to stop reading; 'school' [*schola*] bears a Greek name so that time well-spent will be given in tribute to the laborious Muses; listen carefully so that you will be all the more sure as to why you should give up your playtime . . .). On the evolution of the meaning of σχολή (from 'leisure' to 'literary activity' to 'book clubs' to 'school') see Cribiore 2001: 20.

[48] Cribiore 1996 and Cribiore 2001. The latter work contextualizes the evidence collected in the former within a history of the ancient educational system; while no less exact in its presentation of documentary material, its readability makes it an excellent survey of education as an integral aspect of ancient society. Since the two texts work so closely together in presenting a unified view of ancient literacy, the critique below moves freely back and forth between the two.

idealized view that was less concerned with reality than with improving current standards"[49]; thus "it is essential to correlate the information transmitted by the literary sources and the anecdotal tradition with the wealth of educational material from Greco-Roman Egypt."[50] In what follows, I will first present Cribiore's view of the role of ἀνάγνωσις in grammatical education, and then undertake a reevaluation of the papyrological evidence she adduces to support it.

1.3.1 Cribiore's view: ἀνάγνωσις as a transitional activity

In both books, Cribiore emphasizes further that, while many people in the ancient world might enter into the stream of education, few would long continue and fewer still reach the highest levels of that education[51]; perhaps feeling that her readers will be apt to contrast this dynamic with modern schooling, the author is at pains to point out that the process of learning to read, write, and count was not always easy for the schoolchild in Greco-Roman Egypt.[52] Indeed her emphasis on the difficulty of reading

---

[49] Cribiore 2001: 7.

[50] Cribiore 2001: 7.

[51] E.g. Cribiore 2001: 1; Cribiore 2001: 187 of grammatical education, "At this point in the journey [of education], the hill of learning has already lost the majority of its climbers."

[52] Cribiore's insistence on this point appears most prominently in her analyses of primary education (the actual process of learning to read the alphabet, wield a pen, and copy model texts): see Cribiore 2001: 160-184. We may note that, whether it is the contemporary scholar or the author herself who is apt (with reference to the modern world) to assume a more widespread literacy in antiquity than may have been the case, a realistic assessment of our surroundings will quickly cure us of any disdain for ancient levels of literacy: although today all children in theory go to school, many have difficulty with reading and writing and a sizeable proportion of the population is illiterate or merely functionally literate; many (about 20% in North America) drop out without a highschool diploma (itself not always the best proof of familiarity with language and literature); few reach the level of 'rhetorical' education whose modern

and writing (particularly the former) recurs constantly, implicitly or explicitly suggesting that such difficulty was greater than that felt by the modern schoolchild.[53] This view of the difficulty of reading, which naturally has implications for our assessment of the nature and purpose of reading aloud, rests, as we shall see, on two arguments, both of which require some reappraisal: the first, which applies first and foremost to primary education, concerns the evidence of school exercises, while the second, which applies to grammatical education, concerns the nature of *scriptio continua* and pre-Byzantine punctuation.

With respect to primary education, Cribiore observes that "it is difficult to specify with precision the length, limits, and characteristics of elementary education"[54]; she focusses rather on "the most basic skills that an elementary student must have acquired from the course."[55] Following the anciently attested *ordo docendi* for this level,[56] which prescribed exposure first to the alphabet, then to syllables, then to strange combinations of letters called *chalinoi,*[57] and only subsequently to writing

---

equivalent is the B.A. in English or Classics; and none attain the eloquence of Libanius. As to handwriting, it is doubtful, in my estimation, whether ten thousand non-calligraphers on the continent could equal the penmanship demanded of the literate classes in the 19th century.

[53] "Reading was no doubt difficult for many ancient students to master" (Cribiore 1996: 9); more remarks of this sort will be noted below.

[54] Cribiore 2001: 162.

[55] Cribiore 2001: 162.

[56] Cribiore 2001: 169, citing Augustine *De ordine* 2.7, Ambrose *Ad Abraham* 1.30, Manilius 2.755-64, Jerome *Epistles* 107.4 and 128.1, Gregory of Nyssa *De beneficentia* 5-13.

[57] Cribiore 2001: 166. The *chalinus* "consisted of alphabets in scrambled order that joined together letters that were difficult to pronounce." Cribiore's discussion makes clear that syllables were indeed the building blocks of words in primary education, for which we have a substantial amount of evidence in the remains of primary school exercises.

full phrases and sentences, usually from models.[58] These last often display gross mistakes, leading Cribiore to conclude that their writers could not read what they were writing.

Nevertheless, to this reader there appears to be a basic methodological difficulty in Cribiore's approach. Disagreeing with "past historians of ancient education [who] have envisaged both reading and writing as following identical laws of rectilinear movement, with a progressive building upon the initial link — the letters of the alphabet," Cribiore instead posits that "teachers who valued handwriting made students copy sentences, maxims, and brief passages when they had not yet mastered syllables and could not read. These students, therefore, skipped the links of the individual syllables and single words: they learned according to an order that was based not on comprehension but on reinforcing writing skills."[59] In this interpretation, the primary students whose faulty texts display gross errors have not departed from the *ordo docendi* (letters to syllables to phrases) but have skipped the syllabic phase; their incompetence at copying phrases and moral maxims is not to be taken as evidence that phrases and maxims were used as material for teaching the alphabet at an early stage in the *ordo docendi* but rather that writing ability was privileged at the expense of reading ability. As these writing exercises from teachers' models are the only material confidently to be assigned to the level of primary education, it follows, in Cribiore's

---

[58] Cribiore 1996: 43-54 and Cribiore 2001: 132-137.
[59] Cribiore 2001: 162.

view, that texts belonging to the last phase of the *ordo docendi* which are incompetently copied constitute evidence that students graduating from primary education often could not read.[60] The reasoning here is somewhat tendentious: leaving aside the judgment that incompetent handwriting is a sign of an inability to read (a view one may excuse in a palaeographer), we may question some of the author's choice examples, as for example the following:

> A tablet from the second to third century C.E. discovered in the Roman cemetery of the village of Tebtunis was the prized possession of a boy or girl whose penmanship needed improvement. On top of the tablet, a teacher had written a model with a hexameter line: "Begin, good hand, beautiful letters, and a straight line," which was completed by the exhortation, "Now, you imitate it!" — one of the few times in which the voice of an ancient teacher rings loud. The student copied the hexameter five times, each time awkwardly writing down the final recommendation. The text deteriorated progressively as it proceeded down the tablet, as if this pupil followed in turn the previous attempt and listened to his or her own voice — "Imitate it!" instead of looking up at the model. Since this beginner was apparently unable to read and therefore to correct mistakes, errors of every kind proliferated.[61]

Rather than presume illiteracy on the part of the young copyist here, we might more gently suppose that he or she was intensely bored by the repetitive exercise and simply could not be bothered to glance up at the model hexameter. The inclusion of the exhortation "Now, you imitate it!" could as easily be explained as sardonic or bitter

---

[60] Cribiore 2001: 131: "With few exceptions, primary education enabled students to acquire only very limited reading and writing ability — not much more than the ability to copy a brief text and read a list of words or a short passage from an author previously rehearsed." As Cribiore admits, this assessment differs starkly from the specification of Quintilian (above, note 38): "Though Quintilian maintained that a boy was ready for the grammarian as soon as he had learned to read and write, his statement needs to be qualified. Not only was a student in primary education exposed only to copying and dictation, but his reading ability was also somewhat limited at the end of the course."

[61] Cribiore 2001: 133.

humor on the student's part: in assessing evidence for the work of young students, we cannot take for granted that they are trying their hardest at every point.

The privileging of writing as the fundamental goal of primary education is not only positivistic, however — positivistic in that it equates the principal source of evidence for primary education with the goal of such education, classifying it in strict conformity to the *ordo docendi*[62] — would be of less consequence if it did not affect Cribiore's subsequent judgment of the function of reading at the level of grammatical education. Having concluded, on somewhat shaky grounds as we have seen, that the ability to read was altogether limited at the end of primary education, she naturally concludes that

> when a student reached the next level, his initial efforts were dedicated to reinforcing his skills. Though the student's final goal was to be able to approach with confidence the works of the poets and to interpret them in all their nuances, initially he strove to acquire a stronger writing and reading ability and the capacity to manage larger quantities of texts.[63]

This emphasis on the difficulties of actually making sense of written letters — for we are not discussing the difficulty any child has in reading a text intended for adults, but rather the physical ability of reading — which applies in Cribiore's view even at the

---

[62] Cribiore's insistence on the *ordo docendi*, which positions flawed writing exercises at the end of the primary curriculum, reflects her desire to position the whole of the ancient evidence for education within a strict chronology, even if she rejects earlier scholars' notion of swift progression from one stage to the next: "The formidable burden of acquiring an education was tolerable only because it was divided into a series of steps. A student was made to progress with painstaking regularity. In climbing the hill of learning, the "athlete" [student] did not go straight up the slope [as some scholars have assumed] but proceeded in slow circles" (Cribiore 2001: 129).

[63] Cribiore 2001: 131.

grammatical level, has been observed above; its principal cause is not held to be the mindlessness and repetitiveness of ancient primary education, however, but rather the material characteristics of the written word. At the level of primary education, she points to "the limitations that the use of certain writing materials may have put on the acquisition and development of literacy,"[64] while at the grammatical level, when the student would be interacting with genuine literary texts, reading was inhibited principally, in Cribiore's account, by the ancient practice of not separating words with spaces, a style of writing known as *scriptio continua.* In her view, *scriptio continua* constituted a cognitive barrier not only at the elementary level[65] but at the grammatical level also.[66] Cribiore makes clear that, in her view, the problem was technological and applied to the whole of antiquity:

---

[64] Cribiore 2001: 130.

[65] Cribiore 1996: 47: "Even though the effort of children in antiquity to learn their syllables can easily be confused with the modern process of teaching syllabic combinations to children learning to read and write a language based on phonetic principles, one must recognize the tremendous effort required of a beginner in ancient times to distinguish words written in continuous blocks (*scriptio continua*). According to Quintilian, people usually advised the beginner to keep looking to the right when starting to read, to try and see what was coming after, but that was easier said than done, and a lot of practice was needed." This reference to Quintilian (1.1.34) and his advice on "looking to the right" does not necessarily refer to learning to read in and of itself, however; see below (pp. 64-65)with the notes of Gavrilov 1997: 60.

[66] Cribiore 2001: 134: "A pupil upon joining a grammarian's class still needed considerable assistance in decoding words written in continuous blocks — *scriptio continua.*" Cf. Cribiore 1996: 9: "Written Greek offered particular obstacles: elements of the text were seldom distinguished and individual words were not separated by spaces — *scriptio continua.* This feature of ancient writing must have presented a formidable challenge to the beginner, although with practice the mature reader learned to overcome the impredíments it presented." Noting that students would encounter *scholia minora* (wordlists) in grammatical education (assigned to that level because "at the level of *Scholia Minora* students wrote relatively well" [Cribiore 1996: 135]), she nevertheless makes the claim, difficult to believe, that "even after reaching the level of the *Scholia Minora*, a pupil could still see words not as existing by themselves but as essentially made up of syllables (Cribiore 1996: 51).

> Ancient manuscripts did not make many concessions to readers. A passage made of words written without separation in continuous blocks was only an ensemble of letters in need of interpretation. Reading at first sight was practically impossible: a text needed to be scrutinized beforehand to identify the relationship between the elements of a sentence and to understand their function in conveying meaning. It was only in the early Middle Ages that a thorough and consistent system of conventions was devised to help readers readily extract the information contained in a written text: word separation, features of layout, and a number of graphic symbols to help decode meaning."[67]

The historian's explanation for how students coped with this apparent technological hindrance is again, somewhat positivistically, the same material used as the evidence for the existence of such a hindrance: the appearance of punctuation in literary texts. As she writes,

> Lack of punctuation signs required [the reader] to examine the nature of each sentence and to recognize and identify words and linguistic markers. Grammatical and literary training were necessary to properly read aloud a text. Readers in antiquity who could not rely on word separation and punctuation had to interpret a text before reading it. Reading a text aloud with expression and appropriate punctuation was not a simple matter, and without careful practice a person could easily fall into an embarassing situation, as a well-known passage in Gellius shows. While Gellius refused to read aloud a passage he did not know, someone else made himself utterly ridiculous reading the passage with the clumsiness of a total novice. Lack of word separation and punctuation were formidable hurdles, especially for beginners.[68]

---

[67] Cribiore 2001: 189, citing Parkes 1993. For a reassessment of the view of Parkes (which is also that of Saenger 1982 and Saenger 1997), see the discussion below.

[68] Cribiore 1996: 148. The example of Aulus Gellius (13.31.5) is not well-chosen, as it is apparent from the context that the narrator there refuses to read the text beforehand because he is bent on humiliating the poor γραμματικός by forcing *him* to read it; it is the latter's general level of education (and corresponding pretention) that provokes the ridicule of the audience, not his ability to read as such — still less his inability to "sightread" a text. The choice of example is reminiscent of the decontextualization of the Ambrose-Augustine passage (*Confessions* 6.3) by Balogh (Balogh 1927) and debunked by Gavrilov (Gavrilov 1997: 61-66), on which see below (pp. 34-35).

The evidence of punctuated texts as classroom reading aids is adduced on pages 134-142 of *Gymnastics of the Mind*[69]; before proceeding to an analysis of some of these punctuated texts to determine if Cribiore's theory regarding punctuation holds up, however, we may briefly remark upon the intellectual antecedents of the view that *scriptio continua* presented grave obstacles to reading fluency — obstacles which punctuation supposedly allowed the reader to surmount.

1.3.2 The problem of *scriptio continua*

The view of *scriptio continua* that Cribiore presents is in fact widely held. Parkes' history of punctuation[70] opens with the statement that "ancient scribes presented the text on the page in a way which afforded the reader far less assistance than he would

---

[69] Cribiore 2001: 134-142. The examples adduced are the following: Cribiore 1996 no. 296 (= Figure 16 on page 135 of Cribiore 2001, a school tablet featuring II.147-160); **P^2 528** (= *P.Oxy.* XXIII.2355, featuring 21 fragmentary lines of Hesiod's *Catalogue*); **P^2 634** (= *P.Lond.Lit.* 5, featuring II.101-494, all of III, and IV.1-40); **P^2 643** (= *P.Lond.Lit.* 6, featuring II.251-875); **P^2 678** (= *P.Oxy.* III.541, featuring II.859-873); **P^2 708** (= *PSI* VII.747, featuring IV.33-65); **P^2 733** (= *P.Oxy.* II.233, featuring V.1-278 [with minus verses], 284-303, 329-374, 397-406, 420-42 [with minus verses], 544-548, and 701-705); ***Pap.Flor.* XIX pp. 111-115** (featuring material from *Iliad* VII); **P^2 915** (= *P.Mert.* I.3, featuring XIV.108-126, 162-177); **P^2 943&944** (= *P.Rain.Cent.* 20, featuring XVII.101-15, 142-151); **P^2 971** (= *MPER* n.s. III.3, *Iliad* XX.205-215, 234-243); **P^2 997** (= *P.Michael.* 2, featuring XXIII.1-25, 37-39, 63-68); **P^2 1013** (= *P.Lond.Lit.* 28, featuring XXIV.127-804); **P^2 1254** (= A. Schoene, *Mélanges Graux* pp. 481-504, an abridged version of Isocrates' *Ad Nicoclem*); **P^2 1539** (*P.Lond.Lit.* 182, featuring a grammatical handbook); and **P^2 1783** (= *P.Ryl.* III.486, a poem on Hero and Leander). Of these, I have been able to consult only **P^2 528**, **P^2 634**, **P^2 643**, **P^2 733**, **P^2 943&944**, **P^2 977**, **P^2 1013**, and **P^2 1783** for the purposes of the discussion below. It should be noted that, of the 12 papyri discussed by Cribiore as examples of schoolroom punctuating of Homer, only 3 (including the tablet) feature material from Books 1 and 2, the most popular in school exercises (Morgan 1998: 105; Cribiore 2001: 194). For evidence of students reading more than simply these first two books (whose popularity in the record of school exercises mirrors their popularity in the papyrological record as a whole), see Cribiore 2001: 195. *P.Oxy.* 930 preserves a letter from a teacher to a mother who had apparently asked about her son's progress and is told that he is studying Book 6, with the implication that he is progressing through the poem.

[70] Parkes 1992.

have needed to read it at sight . . . Reading at first sight was thus unusual and unexpected."[71] In a more extreme formulation, Saenger writes that

> Latin writing, which consisted of undivided rows of capital letters or their cursive equivalents, was entirely phonetic and had no ideographic value. Since in ancient books verbal concepts were not represented by recognizable images, the Romans developed no clear conception of the word as a unit of meaning . . . The Roman reader, reading aloud to others or softly to himself, approached the text syllable by syllable in order to recover the words and sentences conveying the meaning of the text.[72]

Both Parkes and Saenger here avail themselves of the view — first expressed by Norden, researched by Balogh, and disseminated among scholars by Hendrickson[73] — that silent reading was entirely abnormal in classical antiquity.[74] From Balogh/Hendrickson through the Marxist medievalist Istvan Hajnal,[75] the theory that the ancients were obliged to read out loud became part of the scholarly consensus[76]

---

[71] Parkes 1992: 10. The evidence adduced on pp. 10-11 is not convincing, however, consisting of a remark of Trimalchio's in praise of a boy who "librum ab oculis legit" (Petronius 75.4); the suggestion of Quintilian (already remarked and discussed below, p. 35) that one "look ahead" in reading; various scholarly debates from antiquity as to where to separate words given two possible readings (very common in the Homer scholia also, but hardly evidence of a general difficulty in situations of no ambiguity); scribal errors of the same type; the Latin language's 'built-in' punctuation (interrogatives and enclitics); and the example from Aulus Gellius debunked above (note 68). It is these pages that Cribiore cites (as registered above, note 67) to support her view of *scriptio continua.*

[72] Saenger 1982: 370-371.

[73] Norden 1923.1: 6 ("Eine vielleicht wenigen bekannte Tatsache ist es, dass man im Altertum laut zu lesen pflegte," quoted at Gavrilov 1997: 57 n.8; at n.9 Gavrilov suggests that Nietzsche in *Beyond Good and Evil* 247 may have had a hand in popularizing this view); Balogh 1927 (the *locus classicus*); Hendrickson 1929. For an entertaining history of the controversy, see Johnson 2000: 594-600.

[74] Both Parkes and Saenger refer to Balogh's article (which located the 'invention' of silent reading in silent monastic meditation) and pick out his example of Augustine's supposed amazement at his mentor Ambrose's ability to read with his lips closed (*Confessions* 6.3.3-4): Parkes 1992: 10, citing Balogh at n.4 and mentioning Augustine; Saenger 1982: 369.

[75] Hajnal 1954.

[76] Eg. Skeat 1956: 186-190.

and was particularly popular with media theorists.[77] Unfortunately, however, the theory has been successfully debunked, first by Bernard Knox and lately by A. K. Gavrilov.[78] Gavrilov showed that the Augustine passage (which Knox allowed to be "Exhibit A" in Balogh's discussion[79]) was proof not of the young ecclesiastic's amazement at *anyone* reading aloud but rather of his amazement that Ambrose, as Augustine's teacher and hitherto his idol, should spare himself a quiet, private literary moment[80]; moreover, in his general remarks on reading, Gavrilov adduces the evidence of modern psychology to show that while "one might have expected to find noticeable differences of reading speed in cultures which uses different writing systems . . . it turned out that what varies is rather the aims, circumstances, and habits

---

[77] See Saenger 1982: 367-368 for the influence of the theory on Marshall McLuhan. As Saenger writes, "In an age in which the telephone, radio, and television have supplanted reading as the most widely used forms of transmitting information, it is not surprising that scholars would find it reasonable to attribute equally dramatic results to earlier technical innovations such as the invention of printing" or, for a parallel Gutenberg revolution, the 'invention' of silent reading by St. Ambrose as forebear of scholarly monasticism. For the recurrence of the theory in contemporary scholarship, see Llamas Pombo 2002: 31, who candidly writes that "The study of the reading process by observing the nature of graphic signs implies a methodological assumption: the *certainty* [my emphasis] that research can be successfully concluded by means of deduction, since there exist direct connections between the traditions of writing and the ways of reading." In a nutshell, "In the culture of Late Antiquity [and by extension earlier], reading was characterized by two features: it was seen as expressive reading aloud, whilst it was based on a reduced graphic notation of alphabetical writing in which the words were separated by a dot or a blank space, or even run together, like the *scriptura continua* which the Greeks had practised throughout the ages" (Llamas Pombo 2002: 32).

[78] Knox 1968; Gavrilov 1997. See also the further evidence supporting Gavrilov's attack on the Balogh theory presented in Burnyeat 1997 in the same issue of *Classical Quarterly*.

[79] Knox 1968: 422.

[80] Gavrilov 1997: 61-66. He concludes from his analysis that "(i) reading to oneself does not interest Augustine in its own right, because it is an everyday phenomenon well known both to him and to his readers; and (ii) in his story about Ambrose, Augustine unintentionally reveals that he conceives of silent reading as more concentrated and, apparently, quicker. If this seems rather little, I happily admit that, once the standard view is rejected for the reasons given, the Augustine passage no longer says anything definite about techniques of reading in earlier centuries."

of readers."[81] Indeed, even when reading silently to ourselves today, we 'sub-vocalize' the words read; experimental evidence demonstrates that "the norm is that the two types of reading [silent reading and reading aloud] are always closely connected, even intertwined with each other; it is quite wrong to think of them as exclusive alternatives."[82] The prescription of Quintilian for "looking to the right" when reading (1.1.33-34), as well as a similar remark in Lucian's *Adversus indoctum*, are better explained as an anticipation of the Eye-Voice Span (EVS): "A well-developed EVS is essential if a reader is to be capable of reproducing the rhythmical and intonational pattern of the part of the sentence they are reading . . . In other words, the person reading aloud needs to be able to glance ahead and read inwardly selected portions of the following text; the more experienced the reader, the more easily and reliably they do this. That is why for virtuoso reading aloud one requires not merely the ability to read to oneself, but skill at it."[83] For the purpose of the present discussion, the salient point here is not simply that Quintilian's and Lucian's insistence on good EVS is proof of the anteriority of silent reading to reading aloud, but that their remarks specifically concern the technique of (virtuoso) reading aloud instead of describing a basic strategy for overcoming *scriptio continua.*

Gavrilov himself remains cautious and conservative on the psychological effects of *scriptio continua*, allowing that "it is quite likely that the ability to read to

---

[81] Gavrilov 1997: 60.
[82] Gavrilov 1997: 58-59.
[83] Gavrilov 1997: 59-60.

oneself and scan ahead may be all the more necessary for reading aloud from texts written in *scriptio continua.* In the absence of the modern and early Roman practice of dividing words, the process of reading would require eye and mind to determine the beginnings and endings of individual words as well as sentence pattern."[84] Even in this view, however, the eye's and mind's obligation to determine the beginnings and endings of words would constitute not a wholly new task *vis-à-vis* our modern reading habits but merely an additional challenge. Nevertheless, Gavrilov does not adduce any evidence for this view beyond the Quintilian and Lucian passages noted above, which by his own account apply to reading aloud specifically rather than to reading. Rather, in my view, the presumption that *scriptio continua* in and of itself is more difficult to read than is our own *scriptio discontinua* — once that view has been separated from the (faulty) external evidence for its association with — constitutes little more than a cultural prejudice on the part of modern readers for whom continuous script *is* difficult to read. In the absence of contemporary cultures employing *scriptio continua,*[85] we can of course only speculate; nevertheless,

---

[84] Gavrilov 1997: 60; cf. his note 28: "In my opinion, *scriptio continua* would be bound to affect the speed and accuracy of ancient reading to some degree."

[85] Contemporary Sanskrit texts, studied by thousands of students in India, continue to be printed in *scriptio continua* (even where *sandhi* would not require consonant combination or vowel combination), but modern Hindi, to which these students would be accustomed before beginning their Sanskrit studies, does not employ *scriptio continua*: thus their exposure to Sanskrit in this form does not parallel the exposure of Graeco-Roman schoolchildren to contemporary Greek and Latin texts in that modern Hindi-speakers will have to adjust their ideas of word-boundary in learning Sanskrit. Nevertheless, it would be interesting to discover how quickly a dedicated Hindu elementary school student, exposed to *scriptio continua* in an early grade, got the hang of reading Sanskrit. I imagine (though I do not know) that early textbooks for these students (like primers for Westerners) initially present texts not in *scriptio*

ambiguous readings aside, *scriptio continua* does not seem that much more difficult than, say, the hands of the High Gothic style, in which (to an outsider) every effort seems to have been made to make every letter resemble every other as much as possible. It is usual for handbooks, when first introducing *scriptio continua*, to astound the modern reader with an sample English sentence with all the spaces removed; yet it does not take more than a few minutes to accustom oneself to reading in this format. Thomas's warning, that "We should be very wary indeed of assuming that our own difficulties in reading ancient texts were shared by the Greeks and Romans,"[86] is well merited, particular in light of Gavrilov's refutation of the case for mandatory reading aloud and (consequently) any correlation between such mandatory reading aloud and the physical medium of *scriptio continua.*

1.3.3 The function of accentuation in the Homer papyri

This negative view of the psychological problems of *scriptio continua* does lead us, of course, to a more basic question: why is it that the ancients should have avoided spaces between words, either failing to adopt the Jewish usage (in the case of the Greeks) or indeed moving *away* from the system of spaces or interpuncts (in the case of both Greeks and Romans)? As William Johnson remarks, "Surprising as it may

---

continua; but again, given that these children would take the word-breaks of modern Hindi as their standard, this would by no means establish that *scriptio continua* is inherently more difficult than *scriptio discontinua.*

[86] Thomas 1992: 93.

seem, the conclusion is hard to avoid that there was something about the reading culture that felt no need for these things, that in terms of the total system of reading, habits like *scriptio continua* and lack of punctuation worked. For we cannot suppose the Greeks too naive or primitive or stupid to think of word spaces or punctuation or structural markers."[87] Interestingly, both Johnson and another scholar, Gregory Nagy, have come up with similar answers to this question (both, curiously, in the year 2000). Analysing the physical characteristics of the typical column of Greek prose text in the age of the papyrus roll, Johnson admits that "with its lack of word spaces and punctuation, the ancient bookroll is, to the modern perception, spectacularly, even bewilderingly, impractical and inefficient as a reading tool"[88]; nevertheless, rejecting Saenger's view that *scriptio continua* provided no points of "ocular fixation" with which to establish "Bouma shapes" with which to subconsciously decode a text,[89] Johnson instead argues that the division of *scriptio continua* into 15- to 25-character segments in the text column, always breaking the text at syllable boundary,[90] allowed "line beginnings themselves [to] provide natural points for the ocular fixation, and the 'decoding' of the letters could proceed on a line-by-line basis," since the 15- to 25-

---

[87] Johnson 2000: 608. Cf. Nagy 2000b: 9: "A major question is, why was *scriptio continua* a basic feature of ancient Greek literacy for a period that covers well over a thousand years?"

[88] Johnson 2000: 609.

[89] Johnson 2000: 610-611, quoting the arguments of Saenger 1997: 1-17, 32-40.

[90] Johnson does not make this point, but in light of his arguments for the syllable boundary as the point of "ocular fixation" (and subsequent subconscious decoding) in ancient texts, the insistence upon learning by syllables (extensively documented by Cribiore [Cribiore 1996: XX, Cribiore 2001: 172-174] as the "tyranny of the syllables") could well be understood as the instillation in young children of the ancients' alternative method of decoding by syllabic "ocular fixation."

character segment corresponds to the natural 6-degree arc of parafoveal vision brought to bear by a reader upon any text, ancient or modern.[91] What Johnson thusly argues in the case of the segmentation of prose in columns of text, Nagy argues in the case of the segmentation of verse into rhythmical cola.[92] Objecting to the modern habit of printing the text of Bacchylides (and Pindar) by metrical period when the Pindar MSS. and Bacchylides papyrus present us rather with a sequence of metrical cola (each colon occupying one line), Nagy argues that "the formatting of the colon, as demarcated in the ancient colometry, constitutes a *functional* building block of the period" in that cola do not correspond with word-end either metrically or visually on the papyrus page, except when they coincide with period-end.[93] In progressing from one colon to the next, therefore, the reader is in fact *assisted* by *scriptio continua* in that the "hyphenation" of the text (across word-boundary from line to line on the papyrus page) highlights period-end when it does arise.[94]

It seems, then, that the presumption on the part of Parkes and Saenger (followed by Cribiore) that *scriptio continua* was in itself unsuited to the act of reading (and even, in the extreme formulation, necessitated reading aloud) does not correspond

---

[91] Johnson 2000: 611. Given that this scholar is the living expert on the physical characteristics of the ancient bookroll, his arguments, in themselves convincing in that they answer the question (unposed by earlier scholars) as to *why* the ancients should have continued with *scriptio continua*, must be decisive.
[92] Nagy 2000b, esp. pp. 13-14.
[93] Nagy 2000b: 13.
[94] Nagy 2000b: 13: "This mechanism of hyphenation is an aspect of the overall mentality of *scriptio continua*: it is easier to develop a 'feel' for a period-ending, which is followed by a pause, simply by developing a 'feel' for all the places where a word-ending must not be followed by a pause. In this context, I am using 'pause' in a performative rather than compositional terms."

with the reality of ancient manuscript formatting, which in fact (following Johnson and Nagy) both catered to the reading eye's area of parafoveal vision in restricting the text to tight columns and provided the decoding mind with adequate points of ocular fixation in the form of syllable- and colon-boundaries. This view challenges Cribiore's premise that *scriptio continua* by its very nature required the grammatical student, in his reading of poetic texts, to resort to a supplementary textual apparatus of decoding in the form of punctuation. Let us now turn to the examples of texts featuring punctuation which Cribiore adduces as evidence for the use of such a supplementary textual apparatus in the classroom.[95]

1.3.3.1 The evidence of P^2 634

As Cribiore writes, "since Homer was the subject of constant study at many levels, it is among Homeric papyri that books used in schools are most often found."[96] One of her examples is P^2 634 (3rd C AD), a lengthy document once containing the first six books of the *Iliad*, in which "there is some use of dots to separate words, and an unusual wealth of lectional signs, such as accents, breathings, apostrophes, and marks of quantity."[97] The editor of the papyrus does note, however, that "Accents, breathings, and marks of elision are written throughout, usually in the first hand, though not a few words remain unaccented and the accentuation does not always

[95] The texts adduced by Cribiore to this end have been listed above (note 69).
[96] Cribiore 2001: 140.
[97] Cribiore 2001: 140.

follow the received rules."[98] Here are some sample lines of the text (II.458-63, the famous pre-Catalogue simile of the birds)[99]:

> άιγληπαμφανοωσαδιαιθέροσουρανονίκεν
> τωνδ'ωσορνίθωνπετεηνῶνέθνεαπολλα
> χηνωνηγεράνωνηκυκνωνδουλιχοδίρων
> ᾱσιωενλιμῶνικαϋστριουαμφιρέεθρα
> ενθακαιενθαποτῶνταιαγαλλομέναιπτερυγεσ[σι
> κλαγγηδόνπροκαθιζοντων·σμαραγειδέτελιμω[ν[100]

These marks of accent and vowel length do not appear to assist in the "decoding" of the text by the reading eye; certainly, they are far from complete. The accents do not mark word division. There is only one example of punctuation, in the last line. There is only one apostrophe, though there are two cases of elision. Of the 23 words which should bear accents according to our rules, only 14 bear accents in the papyrus. The accent on κλαγγηδὸν is acute instead of grave. The accent on ἀγαλλόμενα is, according to our rules, misplaced. In short, it is not clear how the use of accents in

---

[98] Kenyon 1891: 82. Following standard practice, the editor restores the Theodosian accentual system in his apparatus of variants, however (Kenyon 1891: 82-92).

[99] The transcription is that of Turner 1971: 40.

[100] With the modern (Theodosian) accentuation, punctuation, capitalization, and word-breaks to which we are accustomed, these lines would appear thus:

> αἴγλη παμφανόωσα δι' αἰθέρος οὐρανὸν ἵκε·
> τῶν δ' ὥς ὀρνίθων πετεηνῶν ἔθνεα πολλὰ
> χηνῶν ἢ γεράνων ἢ κύκνων δουλιχοδείρων
> Ἀσίῳ ἐν λειμῶνι, Καϋστρίου ἀμφὶ ῥέεθρα,
> ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα ποτῶνται ἀγαλλόμενα πτερύγεσσι
> κλαγγηδὸν προκαθιζόντων, σμαραγεῖ δέ τε λειμών·
> Brilliant, resplendent, it reached the heavens through the bright air.
> Of them [sc. the Achaeans], as when the many tribes of winged birds,
> Of wild geese or of cranes or of long-necked swans,
> In a meadow of Asia, along the streams of the Caystrius,
> Fly hither and thither, glorying in their wings,
> Nosily settling onwards, and the meadow resounds . . .

this papyrus supports Cribiore's view that accentuation and punctuation served as a crutch to assist the beginner in decoding *scriptio continua.*

The accents of P^2 634 *do* conform, however, to an alternative theory of the role of ancient accentuation, one which emphasizes not the role of accents in clarifying the semantic value of the actual words of the text but rather their ability to encode the performance potential of the text's hexameters. This theory of accentuation was developed by Berhard Laum in *Die alexandrinische Akzentuationssystem* and has recently been revived by Nagy in his article on the colometry of the Bacchylides papyrus. As Nagy writes, "It is evident from the Bacchylides papyri that each colon, as marked by the colometric descriptions attributed to Aristophanes of Byzantium, has a *melodic contour*, which is generally marked by one or two accent-signs that indicate the peak or peaks of this melodic contour"[101]; such a

> *selective* placement of accent-signs (and other diacritics, such as breathings). This practice served a practical purpose: the readers of these papyri were concerned not with the accents of individual words *per se* . . . but with the correct pronunciation of the colon, which is the equivalent of the entire "verse" in the case of lyric poets like Bacchylides and of part of the verse in the case of Homer.[102]

In the case of Homer, "there is a tendency to signal an acute accent belonging to only one word within a given string of words, instead of signaling all the acutes belonging to all the words . . . To mark the one acute is to mark the highest point of the melodic

[101] Nagy 2000b: 14-15.
[102] Nagy 2000b: 17.

contour."[103] In other words, the Bacchylides papyrus and some Homer papyri not only mark accents selectively, according to word-group as opposed to by individual word, but their choice of which words to mark corresponds to the grouping of those words into metrical cola — the basic metrical cola being, in the case of the hexameter, the *hemiepes* before and after the medial caesura. Thus, to take a Homeric example of Nagy's,[104] at *Odyssey* xxii.183-184 we get a description of the goatherd Melanthius' *équipage*:

> τῇ ἑτέρῃ μὲν χειρὶ φέρων καλὴν τρυφάλειαν,
> τῇ δ' ἑτέρῃ σάκος εὐρὺ γέρον, πεπαλαγμένον ἄζῃ
> In the one hand bearing a fine helmet,
> In the other an shield, broad, old, flecked with rust.
>
> (xxii.183-184)

Line 184 here appears in *POxy.* III.448 as

> τηιδ'ετερηισακοσευρύγερον . . .

Here the accent on the oxytone "ευρύ" is acute, where we would require it to be grave; since it is followed by the medial caesura, however, the pause that follows it (and which its placement indicates) is an example of the melodic contour of the line being integrated into the metrical pattern of the hexameter, in which syntax cannot be separated from the structure of the hexameter: by placing an acute accent on ευρύ, the owner of the papyrus has indicated that εὐρύ is to be taken as directly associated with σάκος, since both appear before the medial caesura, whereas γέρον is part of the post-

[103] Nagy 2000b: 17.
[104] Nagy 2000b: 17.

medial metrical unit of "γέρον, πεπαλαγμένον ἄζῃ" paratactically modifying not σάκος merely but rather the whole phrase "σάκος εὐρύ" pre-caesura[105]; the absence of an accent on σακοσ is owing to its being grouped as a unit with ευρύ (σακοσευρύ), while there is no accent the preceding words (especially ετερη) because these words repeat from the previous line and are not in themselves semantically important to the performative meaning of "τηιδ'ετερησακοσευρυ." In short, accentuation here signifies not the lexical or syntactic meaning of the line but rather its significance as it is to be expressed in hexameter performance.

If we apply this alternative view of the function of accentuation to the example of Cribiore's already cited (P^2 634), we see that the accentuation does reflect the melodic (that is, the metrical and metrically-conditioned semantic) shapes of the verse. I have indicated caesurae (including one hephthemimeral) and (where applicable) the bucolic diaeresis:

ἀιγληπαμφανοωσα | διαιθέροσουρανονίκεν
τωνδ'ωσορνίθων | πετεηνῶν : ἑθνεαπολλα
χηνωνηγεράνων | ηκυκνωνδουλιχοδίρων
ᾱσιωενλιμῶνι | καϋστριουαμφιρέεθρα
ενθακαιενθαποτῶνται | αγαλλομέναιπτερυγεσ[σι
κλαγγηδόνπροκαθιζοντων· | σμαραγειδέτελιμω[ν

In the first line, then, the important word ἀιγλη receives an accent (not on the diphthong but on the first letter), whereas παμφανοωσα, less important than ἀιγλη, gets none; after the medial caesura, we get two accents, one for each essential idea

[105] On the conformity of Homeric discourse with metrical structure, see Bakker 1997.

("δι' αἰθέρος" and "οὔρανον ἵκεν"). In the second line, before the caesura we have only one important word ("ὀρνίθων") and consequently only one accent; after the caesura the paratactic πετεηνῶν receives an accent, while the formula filling the adonic slot receives an accent (on "ἔθνεα") so as to clearly mark the bucolic diaeresis. We might analyse the placement of the accents in the following lines in just the same fashion; significantly, the only mark of punctuation here (in the last line quoted) distinguishes the (rare) hepthemimeral caesura.

1.3.3.2 The evidence of P^2 1013

Given that this style of accentuation thus aims to express the performance-oriented "syntax of movement"[106] for any given line, it constitutes a form of basic close-reading on the part of the papyrus owner; as there might be many ways of expressing a given line and a corresponding variety of choices to be made in terms of emphasis, we should not expect to deduce a regular system from the papyri. Rather, we can only (as in the discussion just above) pursue close readings of the texts in question, following in the footsteps of the one who marked accents and punctuation in the first place. Though this process is somewhat labor-intensive, it remains necessary to demonstrate the applicability of the Laum-Nagy theory to Cribiore's examples, and we may proceed to another of these, P^2 1013 (the famous "Bankes" Homer), assigned by

[106] The phrase is that of Bakker 1997.

Thompson to the 2nd C AD.[107] Here, as is often the case, the accents are the work of a later hand.[108] I reproduce here lines 736-741 from Book 24 (Andromache's lament for Hector), adding caesura markers:

χωομενοσώτινιδηπου | αδελφὲονέκτανενεκτ[ωρ
ηπατέρηκαιυϊον | ηκαιμαλαπολλοιαχαιων
εκτοροσενπαλα[109] | οδαξελονάσπετονοῦδας
ουγαρμειλιχοσέσκε | πατηρτεοσενδὰϊλυγρηι
τωκαιμινλαοιμεν | οδυρονταιπεριαστυ
αρητὸνδετοκεῦσι | γοόνκαιπένθοσεθηκας[110]

Nowhere again do we find more than two accents in a single *hemiepes*; several half-lines (the second in line 2, the first in line 3, the first *and* second in line 5) feature no accent at all. With regard to the accents that do appear, χωομενοσώτινιδηπου in line 1 features an acute accent on "ῶ" presumably because it follows the enjambed χώμενος and begins a new clause; the accent on αδελφὲον signifies the importance

---

[107] Thompson 1912: 141; the papyrus is reproduced in facsimile at Thompson 1912: 140.

[108] Milne 1927: 27. Thompson notes that "the speeches of the different persons are indicated by their names, and the narrative portions by a contracted form of the word ποιητής" (Thompson 1912: 139); on the indication of speaker (and narrator) as a performance-oriented aid (and not, as Cribiore suggests, an aid to deciphering the text), see below (pp. 68-70, with note 146) on the evidence from Dionysius Thrax.

[109] A later hand has supplemented the faulty text here, adding <μησι> above the line.

[110] The Theodosian version would appear as follows:

χώμενος, ᾧ δή που ἀδελφεὸν ἔκτανεν Ἕκτωρ
ἢ πατέρ' ἠὲ καὶ υἱόν, ἐπεὶ μάλα πολλοὶ Ἀχαιῶν
Ἕκτορος ἐν παλάμῃσιν ὀδὰξ ἕλον ἄσπετον οὖδας.
οὐ γὰρ μείλιχος ἔσκε πατὴρ τεὸς ἐν δαΐ λυγρῇ:
τὼ καί μιν λαοὶ μὲν ὀδύρονται κατὰ ἄστυ,
ἀρητὸν δὲ τοκεῦσι γόον καὶ πένθος ἔθηκας
An angry man, because perhaps indeed Hector slew his brother,
Or his father or indeed his son, since very many of the Achaeans
At the hands of Hector have bitten the boundless earth.
For your father was not gentle in the woeful battlestrife.
Thus indeed the people mourn for him through the city,
And you [addressing the dead Hector] have set unspeakable lamentation and pain for your parents.

(anticipated by "δή που" before the caesura) of Hector's killing as close a relative as a brother, while the accent on ἑκτανεν corresponds to the importance of the verb of killing. Certainly, in none of these cases can we see how the accents could serve to clarify an ambiguity: the division between χωομενος and ωτινι is natural, since word-break must follow the middle-voice participle whose presence is unambiguous in the μενος sequence of letters, while in ὡτινι the dative of τινι is unmistakeable and naturally corresponds with the dative of "ᾧ." Indeed, I can see no case in this passage in which accentuation solves an ambiguity, whereas its dramatic force within metrical structures is everywhere apparent.

1.3.3.3 The evidence of P^2 997

A third papyrus adduced by Cribiore is P^2 997, which includes the following lines from Book 23; unfortunately the ends of the lines are lost (here restored, with caesurae indicated):

α]λλήτοινυνμεν | στυγερη[πειθωμεθαδαιτι
ηωθενδοτρυνοναν | αξαν[δρωναγαμεμνον
ύληντ'αξέμεναι | παράτεσ[χεινοσσ'επιεικες
νεκρονέχοντανέεσθαι | υ[ποζοφονηεροεντα
οφρ'ήτοιτουτονμεν | επιφ[λεγηακαματονπυρ
θασσοναποφθαλμων | λα[οιδ'επιεργατραπωνται[111]

[111] The Theodosian version would appear as follows:
ἀλλ' ἤτοι νῦν μὲν στυγερῇ πειθώμεθα δαιτί·
ἠῶθεν δ' ὄτρυνον ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγάμεμνον
ὕλην τ' ἀξέμεναι παρά τε σχεῖν ὅσσ' ἐπιεικὲς
νεκρὸν ἔχοντα νέεσθαι ὑπὸ ζόφον ἠερόεντα,
ὄφρ' ἤτοι τοῦτον μὲν ἐπιφλέγῃ ἀκάματον πῦρ

(XXIII.48-53)

Only five accents appear in the text preserved; again, there are never more than two *per* line, while two half-lines (in line 2 and line 6) feature no accent. While we might view the accent in "α]λλή" as disambiguating "ἀλλ' ἤτοι" from a reading of "ἄλλη τοι," in the other cases (ὑλην τ'αξέμεναι, νεκρονέχοντανέεσθαι, οφρ'ἤτοιτουτονμεν) there can be no ambiguity: ὑλην is line-initial, αξέμεναι is sufficently distinguished from "ταξεμεν + αι" by the apostrophe following τ', the sequence νεκρ requires that ον be followed by word-break, εχοντανέεσθαι cannot be "ἔχοντ' ἀνέεσθαι" (which in any case would require an apostrophe and not an accent), and οφρ'ἤτοι does not distinguish between "ὄφρ' ἤτοι" and "ὄφρ' ἢ τοι." The argument for accentuation as tool of disambiguation here failing, it is much more natural to regard the accentuation here as comforming to the Laum-Nagy theory of an esthetic punctuation expressed within melodic contours.[112]

θᾶσσον ἀπ' ὀφθαλμῶν, λαοὶ δ' ἐπὶ ἔργα τράπωνται.
Yet indeed for now let us yield to the woeful feast;
At dawn, rouse, o King of Men Agamemnon, [the folk]
To bring wood and provide as much as is fitting
For a dead man to have when he goes home beneath the misty dark,
So that indeed unwearying fire may burn this man
Quickly from our sight, and the people may turn to their tasks.

[112] The accents are still sparser on a fourth papyrus adduced by Cribiore, *P*[2] 943&944, which I will consequently not discuss in detail. Here are lines 144-149 from *Iliad* XVII as they appear on the papyrus page:

φραζεονυνοοππωσκε[π]ο[λινκαιαστυσαωσηις
ὀιοσσυνλαοῖσιτοιϊλιωεγ[γεγαασιν
ουγαρτισλυκιω[ν]γεμαχησ[ομενοσδαναοισιν
εῖσιπεριπτόλιο[σ]επειουκ[αρατισχαρισηεν
μαρνασθαιδηιοισιμετ'ανδ[ρασινωλεμεσαιει
πωσκεσυχειρο[ναφωτ]ασα[ωσειασμεθ'ομιλον.

1.3.3.4 The evidence of Cribiore 1996 no. 113

Lastly, however, we may examine Cribiore's principal example of accentuation as tool of decipherment, a school exercise reproduced in *Gymnastics of the Mind* as Figure 16.[113] Noting that in this case "the word groups (nouns together with articles, prepositions, etc.) were separated by oblique strokes, and sometimes by spaces," Cribiore concludes that "as in the case of most models, legibility was the foremost concern. Models such as this formed an indispensable transition to texts written by scribes without divisions of words."[114] The oblique strokes, to my eye, seem in no way different than those used in the Bankes Homer (reproduced in facsimile by Thompson); as to the question of word-groups, let us examine the text (which I have attempted to reproduce here faithfully, though where I have erred it is in placing the accent apart from the consonant it overlies, as in line 1 "ζεφυροσ΄" where the accent is above the sigma):

ωσδοτέκινησηί ζεφυροσ΄ βαθύληϊον ΄ηλθων
λαβρος΄επαιγιζων΄ επιτ΄΄ημυείας ταχυεσσιν
ωστων΄πασ[αγο]ρη΄κινηθη΄τοιδ΄αλαλητω
νηας΄επεσσευοντο΄ποδωνδ΄υπενερθέκονιη
ιστοτ΄΄αειρομενη΄τοιδ΄αλληλοισι΄κελευον
απτεσ θαι΄νηων΄ ηδ΄΄ελκεμεν΄εισαλα΄διαν[115]

A recent scholar is surely rather ambitious in stating that here "les signes prosodiques (accents, esprits, ponctuation, apostrophe, diérèse) ne manqueront pas de retenir l'attention" (Mertens 1983: 258).

[113] Cribiore 2001: 135 (= Cribiore 1996 no. 113).

[114] Cribiore 2001: 134.

[115] The Theodosian version would appear as follows:

ὡς δ' ὅτε κινήσῃ Ζέφυρος βαθὺ λήιον ἐλθών

(II.147-152)

Marking caesurae and the bucolic diaeresis, we get

ωσδοτέκινησηί | ζεφυροσ′ βαθύληϊον ′ ηλθων
λαβρος′επαιγιζων′ | επιτ′′ημυείας ταχυεσσιν
ωστων′πασ[αγο]ρη′| κινηθη′τοιδ′αλαλητω
νηας′επεσσευοντο′| ποδωνδ′υπενερθέκονιη
ιστοτ′′αειρομενη′ | τοιδ′αλληλοισι′κελευον
απτεσ θαι′νηων′ | ηδ′′ελκεμεν : ′εισαλα′διαν

Thus we find that, as in the papyrus examples above, it is usual here to mark two accents *per* half-line (the basic melodic shape of the hexameter). Twice we get three accents in one half-line (the second half of the first line and the second half of the sixth), but in the first case the line itself is of the type that straddles the two-part type (featuring medial caesura) and the "Rising Threefolder" (with caesurae after the second and fourth longa), so that the 'overlap' portion (corresponding to ζεφυροσ′) could naturally be perceived as an independent unit. Likewise, the second half of the sixth line features an emphatic bucolic diaeresis in which the adonic phrase "εἰς ἅλα δῖαν" paratactically modifies "ἠδ' ἑλκέμεν" and is thus effectively its own unit of meaning. It is true that the "accents" as such, if indeed such they are, are often

---

λάβρος ἐπαιγίζων, ἐπί τ' ἠμύει ἀσταχύεσσιν,
ὡς τῶν πᾶσ' ἀγορὴ κινήθη· τοὶ δ' ἀλαλητῷ
νῆας ἔπ' ἐσσεύοντο, ποδῶν δ' ὑπένερθε κονίη
ἵστατ' ἀειρομένη· τοὶ δ' ἀλλήλοισι κέλευον
ἅπτεσθαι νηῶν ἠδ' ἑλκέμεν εἰς ἅλα δῖαν
As when the west wind comes and stirs the deep crop,
Rushing boisterously, and its ears of corn sink,
So was their whole assembly stirred, and they with a loud cry
Rushed to the ships, and from beneath their feet the dust
Rose up and hung in the air; and they called out to one another
To seize hold of the ships and to drag them into the shining sea.

misplaced: thus ωσδοτέ for "ὡς δ' ὅτε," ηδ'ελκεμεν for "ἠδ' ἑλκέμεν," etc.; nevertheless, they do not always appear near a word-break: though in line 2 we get επιτ''ημυείας ταχυεσσιν for "ἐπί τ' ἠμύει ἀσταχύεσσιν," there is a visible space between –ας and ταχ- on the tablet, so that the accent on ημυείας does not appear, in the writer's mind, to mark word-break. In short, this tablet seems open equally to interpretation according to the Laum-Nagy theory of accentuation as to Cribiore's theory of accentuation as tool for decipherment; we might regard it less as a stepping-stone to the ability to read texts in *scriptio continua* than as a stepping-stone to the use of accents along the lines of the papyri discussed above, namely as aids to performance of the Homeric text.

1.3.4 Conclusions regarding the papyrological evidence

Reviewing our discussion of Cribiore's treatment of ἀνάγνωσις, we must begin by noting that it would be impossible to disagree with Cribiore's view that there must have been intermediate steps between the first decipherment of syllables in primary education and the reading of Homeric poetry. Her treatment of ἀνάγνωσις, however, locates those intermediate steps in the sphere of grammatical education and views references to ἀνάγνωσις at that level in those terms. This interpretation results, as we have seen, in a mistaken assumption (derived from the work of Parkes and Saenger and resting ultimately on the contribution of Balogh regarding silent reading) that the

physical medium of literature in antiquity was fundamentally more inscrutable than our own. Balogh's argument for the impossibility of silent reading has been refuted by Knox and Gavrilov, however, and the problem of *scriptio continua* itself has been solved by Johnson by virtue of his analysis of physical format of the papyrus roll. The texts adduced by Cribiore as evidence of grammatical students' difficulty with *scriptio continua*, whereby accentuation would be used as a tool for the decipherment of *scriptio continua*, have been shown to be more amenable to the theory of accentuation proposed by Laum and Nagy, whereby accentuation is not text- but performance-oriented.[116] Many of these texts might be relocated from grammatical education entirely since, if we discount their accents as signs of grammatical students' difficulty with *scriptio continua*, there is nothing left to tie them to the classroom; but even Cribiore's prime example of text-oriented accentuation, Figure 16 in *Gymnastics of the Mind*, has been shown to be compatible with (or a stepping-stone to) a system performance-oriented accentuation. Nevertheless, as I shall argue below, it would be a mistake to dissociate ἀνάγνωσις (however performance-oriented) in grammatical education from ἀνάγνωσις in the literate ancient world.

[116] It must be added that some of the texts adduced by Cribiore, for instance P^2 528 (a very fragmentary portion of Hesiod's *Catalogue*), *do* show an almost manic passion for accentuation: there, even consonants can bear more than one accent.

1.4 Ἀνάγνωσις in Dionysius Thrax and his scholia

In the sections above, we have observed that the literary evidence of Quintilian and Ausonius locates the practice of *lectio* (ἀνάγνωσις) at the level of grammatical education; Cribiore's challenge to this view has been shown to be overly pessimistic. Nevertheless, we are left to inquire just what the purpose, aims, and methods of ἀνάγνωσις at this level involved. As William Johnson, challenging the idea of reading as a "solely, or even mostly, neurophysiologically based act of cognition," has written, "anthropologists, ethnographers, and sociolinguists have increasingly come to recognize in reading a complex sociocultural construction that is tied, *essentially*, to particular contexts."[117] He proposes instead that we begin a history of "reading events," something "in part informed by the conceived reading community. Whether based on an actual group (such as a class) or an imaginary group (intellectuals, lovers of poetry), the reader's conception of 'who s/he is,' that is, to what reading community s/he thinks to belong, is an important, and determinative, part of the reading event."[118] The following discussion of ἀνάγνωσις in Dionysius Thrax and his scholia explores just this prescription, locating the act of ἀνάγνωσις in the community headed by the γραμματικός and paying special attention to the "reading event" of such ἀνάγνωσις as an act of imagination on the part of both performer and audience.

---

[117] Johnson 2000: 600.
[118] Johnson 2000: 602.

1.4.1 Grammatical handbooks and education

The Τέχνη Γραμματική of Dionysius Thrax (hereafter referred to as the *Ars Grammatica* or *Ars*) presents us with the opportunity to observe ἀνάγνωσις in the ancient classroom from the point of view of a canonical textbook. The *Ars* itself, or handbooks like it, were central to the school curriculum,[119] as the following passage from the Celtes *hermeneuma* demonstrates:

> Κελεύοντος κατηγητοῦ ἀνίστανται οἱ μικρότατοι πρὸς
> Iubente praeceptore surgunt minores ad syllabas
> καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀνεγορεύκαμεν ἄμιλλαν καὶ στοίχους
> et nos recitamus dictatum et versus ad subdoctorem
> ἀποδίδουσιν καὶ ἑρμινεύματα, γράφουσιν. Δευτέρα τάξης
> reddunt nomina et interpretamenta, scribunt. Secunda classis
> ἐπαναγενώσκει. καὶ ἐγὼ ἐν τῇ πρωτῇ, ὡς ἐκαθίσαμεν, διέρχομαι
> relegit. et ego in prima [sc. classe], ut sedimus, pertranseo
> (διέλθε, διῆλθον) τὸ ὑπόμνημα μου, καὶ λέξης καὶ τέχνην.
> pertransi, pertransivi commentarium meum et lexeis et artem
>
> When the teacher gives the word, the younger kids stand up for their syllables and we recite a *dictée* and verses to the teaching assistant. They present [ἀποδίδουσιν] the words and the *hermeneumata*, they write. The second class reads it again. And I, in the first class, when we have sat down, go through ('he went through, I went through') my commentary [ὑπόμνημα] and my word-book [λέξεις] and the grammatical handbook [τέχνη].[120]

---

[119] Cribiore 2001: 210 locates the rise of the use of grammatical handbooks in the 1st century AD, challenging (note 121) the view of Wouters 1999 that the absence of grammatical treatises prior to this date is an accident of the papyrological tradition. Grammatical treatises apart from Dionysius' have been edited by Alfons Wouters (Wouters 1979). Though, as Cribiore notes (Cribiore 2001: 211), there is no evidence that Dionysius' text in its present form became *the* authoritative text prior to the 5th century AD, there is no reason to think that the practices which the *Ars* and its scholia describe may not reflect earlier practice if not theory. On the wide influence of the *Ars*, see Uhlig 1883: vi.

[120] The two senses of the τέχνη appear in the Celtes *hermeneuma*: here the reference is clearly to a specific book, since it appears in a list with the ὑπόμνημα and the word-book (λέξεις); earlier, however, the narrator observes how "οἱ μείκροι ἐμινεύματα καὶ συλλάβας, τοῦ ῥήματος κλίσιν, τέχνην ἅπασιν, διάλεκτον διηγοῦνται παρὰ ὑποσοφιστῇ / Minores interpretamenta et syllabas, sermonis declinationem, artem omnem, sermonem exercent apud subdoctorem" (The young kids practice the *hermeneumata* and the syllables, the conjugation of the verb, the whole art, dialect with the

(*Celtes* [Dionisotti 1972: 100])

The date and authorship of the *Ars* is the subject of a long-standing scholarly debate. Dionysius Thrax himself is said to have been a disciple of Aristarchus and to have flourished in the first century BC[121]; it has been forcefully argued, however, that the treatment of the verb in the *Ars* as we have it does not correspond to the (Stoicizing) treatment we find in the testimonia, and that the *Ars* was therefore spuriously attributed to Dionysius Thrax in the Byzantine period so as to lend it greater authority.[122] Though it has been observed, in Di Bendetto's most recent remarks on the subject, that "in order to be able to interpret the *Techne* [i.e. the *Ars*], it is first necessary to determine its correct chronological position, that is to say, whether it should be dated to the second/first century BC [i.e. the lifetime of Dionysius Thrax] or to about the fourth century AD," opinion remains divided; in fact, however, the

---

teaching assistant). The reference in this second case is not to a particular book but to the τέχνη as a body of material to be learned (apparently such as the μείκροι could apprehend). Here and in the quotation above, I have supplied accents but not corrected the text as published (without correction) by Dionisotti (Dionisotti 1972: 100-101); on the difficulties of the text of the *hermeneumata*, see below (note 190).

[121] *Suda* Δ.1172: "Διονύσιος, Ἀλεξανδρεύς, Θρᾷξ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς Τήρου Τῆρος τοὔνομα κληθείς, Ἀριστάρχου μαθητής, γραμματικός, ὃς ἐσοφίστευσεν ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἐπὶ Πομπηΐου τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ ἐξηγήσατο Τυραννίωνι τῷ προτέρῳ. συνέταξε δὲ πλεῖστα γραμματικά τε καὶ συνταγματικὰ καὶ ὑπομνήματα" (Dionysius, from Alexandria, 'Thrax' because of his father Teres, called Terus. A disciple of Aristarchus; a grammarian [γραμματικός]. He was a teacher of rhetoric [ἐσοφίστευσεν] in Rome in the time of Pompey the Great, and he taught the younger Tyrannion. He put together a large number of grammatical works [γραμματικά] and works on syntax and commentaries). For a summary of the important testimonia regarding Dionysius (chiefly in Athenaeus and Apollonius Dyscolus), see Robins 1997: 15-16; for a detailed look at the linguistic evidence for Dionysius' linguistic theories *apart from* the *Ars*, see Schenkeveld 1997.

[122] The case for the spuriousness of the *Ars* was first made by Di Benedetto (Di Benedetto 1958 and 1959), though rejected by Pfeiffer (Pfeiffer 1968). Erbse 1980 upheld the traditional view; Di Benedetto replied to his arguments in Di Benedetto 1990. For a *précis* of the *status quaestionis*, see Robins 1997; for a typology of the views *pro* and *contra* authenticity, see Lallot 1997.

question of chronology is much more important for the history of the development of Greek grammatical theory than it is for the history of the cultural function of the *Ars* and its relationship to educational practice.

With respect to the latter, it of especial importance for the present study that the *Ars* reaches us together with copious scholia.[123] These texts reach us in the 'ἐρώτημα' form of frequent question-and-response,[124] as though themselves imitative

---

[123] On the MS. sources of these scholia, and on the question of their authorship, see Uhlig *GG* I.1.xxxiv-xl; Hilgard *GG* I.3.v-xlix. The commentaries are entitled the *Commentarius Melampodis seu Diomedis* (from Codex C), the *Commentarius Heliodori* (from Codex O), the *Scholia Vaticana* (from Codex C), the *Scholia Marciana* (MSS. VN), the *Scholia Londinensia* (MSS. AE), and the *Commentariolus Byzantinus* (MSS. LHF). The scholia to Dionysius Thrax are rarely treated synthetically; rather, given the abundant information they incidentally provide (particularly on the origins of the Homeric poems), it is usual to 'mine' them for evidence in support of an extraneous argument. For the purpose of the following discussion, I essentially treat the scholia as reflecting a single educational mentality (albeit one of *longue durée*), as there is little reason to assign them chronologically to one period or another (a few exceptions will be noted below). They are closely interwoven and often quote from one another, usually without attribution (though several comments are assigned in the MSS. to "Stephanus" or "Heliodorus"). In general, the *Commentarius Melampodis seu Diomedis* appears to be the oldest (with no Christian interjections such as σὺν θεῷ, for example), while the *Scholia Londinensia* appears to rank as the most recent on the *stemma* (featuring material not present in the *Commentarius Melampodis* but widely quoting or reworking material from that and other, earlier sources). In any case, it is essential to observe that the scholiasts never deviate from a historically conscious, essentially nostalgic attitude of scrupulous conservativism with regard to their intellectual heritage: thus even if they may reflect tendencies typical of the early Byzantine period (difficult or impossible as these might be to define), *in their own view* they represent the continuity of earlier tradition (from which they derive their authority). This mentality of continuity is undoubtedly itself the strongest point of continuity with antiquity: however much modern scholarship may find that the treatment of the verb in the *Ars* differs from its Stoicizing antecedents in the papyrological record, for example, there is no sign in the *Ars* or its scholia of any self-consciousness with regard to *its own* historicity (I have found only one instance in which the scholia disagree with the *Ars*: at one point the *Scholia Vaticana* disagree regarding the scope of the term ῥαψῳδία as defined in the *Ars* [*GG* I.3.179]).

[124] Eg. *Commentarius Melampodis seu Diomedis* §3 Περὶ τόνου (*GG* 1.I.22.18-23): "τί οὖν ἐστι τόνος; Φησὶν ἀπήχησις, τουτέστιν ἦχος. Τίνος; Φωνῆς. Οἱασδήποτε φωνῆς; Οὔ. Ἀλλὰ ποίας; Τῆς ἐναρμονίου. Τί δέ ἐστιν ἐναρμόνιος φωνή; Ἡ συγκειμένη ἐξ ὀξείας καὶ βαρείας καὶ περισπωμένες, οἷα ἐστὶν ἡ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου φωνὴ καὶ πᾶσα μιμουμένη τὴν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου φωνήν, οἷον κιθάρα, ὄρργανον, σύριγξ καὶ ὅσα τουαῦτα" (*So what is tone?* As he [sc. Dionysius Thrax] says, a 'resounding,' that is, an echo. *An echo of what?* An echo of the voice. *Of any kind of voice?* No. *So what kind of voice?* A voice with music. *What is a voice with music?* One that consists of acute, grave, and circumflex [tones], like the human voice and everything that imitates the

of the classroom environment in which the student would be exploring the *Ars* with his teacher; we can imagine them either as aids to the grammarian in his explanations of the *Ars* or as a sort of stand-in for the grammarian. Regardless of what we hold to be the origins and nature of the original *Ars Grammatica*, then, we can observe the role of the *Ars* in grammatical education by exploring the interpretations of its scholiasts; whether or not Dionysius Thrax himself intended his text to be used or read in this way is essentially moot.[125] Beyond the ongoing debate on the dating of the *Ars*, however, scholars have also been preoccupied almost exclusively with the *linguistic* contents of the *Ars*; the theory of ἀνάγνωσις, which fills the first five of the *Ars*' 20 chapters, has been all but ignored in this debate.[126] Nevertheless, an analysis of the structure of the *Ars* reveals that ἀνάγνωσις (or the practical application of γραμματική) is a central concept in the organization of the treatise.

---

human voice, such as the cithara, the organ, the pipes, and things of that sort). On the ἐρώτημα form of grammatical handbooks, see Wouters 1979: 87-89; Cribiore 2001: 212 notes that the ἐρώτημα form appears even with respect to simple subjects like noun declension in *PSI* inv. 505.

[125] The scholia to the *Ars* constitute a striking instance of what R. Netz has termed the 'deuteronomic' text (Netz 1998, Netz 2005); in Netz's formulation, a 'deuteronomic' text is a text predicated on the prior existence of a canonical text which develops its theme not by reworking and reinterpreting the prior text but by commenting upon it, The significance of such 'deuteronomy' here is that, just as the secondary text cannot be understood without reference to the primary text, so too the primary text comes under the influence of the secondary text (even if it is not itself reworked as a result): from the point of view of the scholiasts themselves, one can no more analyse the *Ars* without reference to the commentary upon it than one could analyse the commentary without reference to the *Ars*.

[126] In the volume *Dionysius Thrax and the Techne Grammatike* (Law and Sluiter 1997), which collects papers presented by eminent scholars on Dionysius, the first five chapters of the *Ars* merit a single, seven-line paragraph in Morgan's paper (Morgan 1997: 89).

1.4.2 The structure of the *Ars Grammatica*

It will be helpful at the outset to observe both where the *Ars* locates ἀνάγνωσις in its grammatical programme and how it describes it. To begin with the former, the *Ars* opens with a definition (§1 Περὶ γραμματικῆς):

> Γραμματική ἐστιν ἐμπειρία τῶν παρὰ ποιηταῖς τε καὶ συγγραφεῦσιν ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ λεγομένων.
>
> Μέρη δὲ αὐτῆς ἐστιν ἕξ· πρῶτον ἀνάγνωσις ἐντριβὴς κατὰ προσῳδίαν, δεύτερον ἐξήγησις κατὰ τοὺς ἐνυπάρχοντας ποιητικοὺς τρόπους, τρίτον γλωσσῶν τε καὶ ἱστοριῶν πρόχειρος ἀπόδοσις, τέταρτον ἐτυμολογίας εὕρεσις, πέμπτον ἀναλογίας ἐκλογισμός, ἕκτον κρίσις ποιημάτων, ὃ δὴ κάλλιστόν ἐστι πάντων τῶν ἐν τῇ τέχνῃ.
>
> Grammar is the experience [ἐμπειρία] if what has generally[127] been said by poets and writers.
>
> It has six parts: first, skillful reading according to prosody [προσῳδία]; second, explanation [ἐξήγησις] according to the dominant poetical styles; third, the ready explanation of strange words [γλῶσσαι] and background information [ἱστορίαι]; fourth, the discovery of etymologies; fifth, the setting out of analogies; sixth, the judgment [κρίσις] of poems, which indeed is the finest of all things in the art.
>
> (*GG* 1.I.5.2-5)

Though one might initially suppose that this preliminary definition of γραμματική in a treatise entitled the "Τέχνη Γραμματική" would function as a table of contents, this is not the case.[128] Of the six parts of grammar listed here (ἀνάγνωσις, ἐξήγησις,

---

[127] On the peculiar inclusion of the phrase ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολύ, see Uhlig's apparatus (*GG* I.1.5) for variants — which themselves appear to confirm that Dionysius' definition did include this phrase. The meaning must be "what has been said by poets and writers *as* poets and writers," that is, for example, what Apollonius said as poet of the *Argonautica* and not what he said as a Homeric commentator.

[128] *Pace* Robins 1997: 15, who mistakenly remarks that "after a paragraph defining and listing the subject and its content, the little book summarizes the orthographic phonetics and the morphology of

γλωσσῶν καὶ ἱστορίων ἀπόδοσις, ἀναλογία, κρίσις), only ἀνάγνωσις is discussed in the remainder of the treatise, a point that did not escape the scholiasts, who justify it by remarking that only ἀνάγνωσις is suited to the text's intended audience of beginners.[129] Even so, however, the structure of the *Ars* is far from self-evident. Its chapter headings in the *Ars* are as follows[130]:

§1. Περὶ γραμματικῆς (On grammar)
§2. Περὶ ἀναγνώσεως (On *anagnosis*)
§3. Περὶ τόνου (On tone [accent])

---

classical Greek." The failure to mention the existence of Chapters 2 to 5 here is, as mentioned, typical of contemporary approaches to the *Ars*.

[129] *Scholia Vaticana* (*GG* I.3.170): "Μόνης δὲ τῆς ἀναγνώσεως τὸν λόγον ποιησάμενος, οὐκέτι περὶ τῶν ἄλλων μερῶν διεξέρχεται τῆς γραμματικῆς, οἷον περὶ τῆς ἐξηγήσεως καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν μερῶν· σκοπὸς γὰρ αὐτῷ πρὸς εἰσαγομένους γράφειν, δεῖ δὲ τοὺς εἰσαγομένους δυσχερῶν ἀπέχεσθαι διδαγμάτων· ἐπεὶ οὖν ὁ τῆς ἐξηγήσεως καὶ τῶν ἄλλων μερῶν λόγος ποικίλος τις ἦν καὶ πολλῆς ἀκριβείας δεόμενος, ἀναγκαίως παρῆκεν ὁ τεχνικός, περὶ μόνης δὲ τῆς ἀναγνώσεως ποιεῖται τὸν λόγον" (Having provided an explanation only for ἀνάγνωσις, he does not go on to discuss the other parts of γραμματική, with for example a section on exegesis and the other parts; the reason being that his intention is to write for learners, and learners should avoid explanations of things which are not useful. Therefore, since the account of exegesis and the other parts is rather complicated and full of subtleties, the writer of the handbook [ὁ τεχνικός] let them be and rather restricts himself to an account of ἀνάγνωσις). This scholion is attributed to Stephanus by Hilgard. A similar view introduces §3 Περὶ τόνου in the *Scholia Vaticana*.

[130] The chapter titles are those preserved in the Greek MSS., where there is surprisingly little equivocation (usually singular for plural, eg. "Περὶ στοιχείων" for "Περὶ στοιχείου" in at least three MSS. [*GG* I.1.9 *app. crit. ad loc.*]; Uhlig's introduction does not discuss their origin. It is perhaps significant that the Armenian translation, the oldest datable source text (dated to the end of the 5th century AD by Merx 1883: lxxiii) and one which in general is scrupulously faithful to the wording of the Greek (Merx 1883: lxviii: "ut doceremus Armenium accuratissimum esse Graeci imitatorem, ita ut ad diiudicandum lectionum varietatem summa sit auctoritate"), appears to 'invent' its own titles for the chapters: thus for example the Armenian title corresponding to "Περὶ γραμματικῆς" would be translated "ὅρος καὶ μέρη (τῆς?) γραμματικῆς" (*GG* I.1.5), and "Περὶ στιγμῆς" would be "περὶ στιγμῶν καὶ τίνι διαφέρει στιγμὴ ὑποστιγμῆς" (*GG* I.1.7). In general these Armenian titles are more descriptive than the extant MS. titles; they may be taken as representing a period in which scribes or editors felt themselves to be at greater liberty in their adaptation of their source text. The Armenian version does, however, conform to the Greek MSS. in dividing the treatise into sections (the same in both cases). Consequently, though we should not regard the actual titles of the chapters as necessarily reflecting Dionsyius' own intentions in any way, we may employ them in the discussion that follows as descriptors of the contents of the sections they entitle; it is with the order of these sections, or rather with the order of their contents, that we are principally concerned.

§4. Περὶ στιγμῆς (On punctuation)
§5. Περὶ ῥαψῳδίας (On rhapsody)
§6. Περὶ στοιχεῖου (On the word)
§7. Περὶ συλλαβῆς (On the syllable)
§8. Περὶ μακρᾶς συλλαβῆς (On the long syllable)
§9. Περὶ βραχείας συλλαβῆς (On the short syllable)
§10. Περὶ κοινῆς συλλαβῆς (On the shared syllable)
§11. Περὶ λέξεως (On the parts of speech)
§12. Περὶ ὀνόματος (On the noun)
§13. Περὶ ῥήματος (On the verb)
§14. Περὶ συζυγίας (On the stem)
§15. Περὶ μετοχῆς (On the participle)
§16. Περὶ ἄρθρου (On the article)
§17. Περὶ ἀντωνυμίας (On the pronoun)
§18. Περὶ προθέσεως (On the preposition)
§19. Περὶ ἐπιρρήματος (On the adverb)
§20. Περὶ συνδέσμου (On the conjunction)

It will be apparent that, though the chapters are numbered sequentially, they in fact follow according to a scheme of nested subordination: §12-§20 constitute the ὀκτῶ μέρη τοῦ λόγου specified in the MSS. following §11 (*GG* I.1.24); §14 is evidently subordinate to §15, while §8-§10 are specific types of syllable and naturally subordinate to §7. Insofar as syllables are pieces of words, §7 is subordinate to §6. The whole is, in theory, subordinate to §1. It is with §2-§5 — the chapters which, as we have observed, contemporary scholarship tends to ignore — that we enter interesting territory. The subject of §2, ἀνάγνωσις, has been introduced as one part of γραμματική; one scholion (attributed to Heliodorus by Hilgard) explains its relationship to §3-5 (or potentially to §3-§20) as follows:

> Διὰ τί ἓξ μερῶν ὄντων τῆς γραμματικῆς περὶ τοῦ πρώτου μόνου διέλαβεν; Ἐπειδὴ ἠπίστατο, ὅτι ἐν τῇ ἀναγνώσει καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ

> μέρη περιέχονται· ἠρκέσθη οὖν ταύτῃ, ὡς καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν περιεχομένων ἐν αὐτῇ.
> Why, when there are six parts to γραμματική, did he only take up the first one? [He did so] because he knew that all the remaining parts are contained in ἀνάγνωσις; thus he contented himself with that part, seeing as all the remaining parts are contained in it.
>
> *Scholia Londinensia* [*GG* I.3.472]

While it is tempting to regard the whole of the *Ars* (including §6-§20) as subordinate to §2 Περὶ ἀναγνώσεως, in fact commentators explicitly relate only §3 and §4 to §2.[131] In doing so, they reveal that they regard accentuation and punctuation (the subjects of §3 and §4) not primarily as questions of the written page but as elements crucial to ὑπόκρισις ("acting out"); thus the *Commentarius Melampodis* introduces §3 Περὶ τόνου thus: "Τὴν ὑπόκρισιν ἡμῖν διασαφήσας ὁ τεχνικὸς περὶ τόνου διαλαμβάνει, ὅς ἐστιν ἀναγκαιότατος τῶν προσῳδιῶν" (The writer on grammar [ὁ τεχνικός], having thoroughly explained ὑπόκρισις to us, takes up τόνος, which is the most necessary of all the elements of προσῳδία).[132] This relates directly to the *Ars*' definition of ἀνάγνωσις in §2, to which we now turn.

---

[131] Eg. *Scholia Vaticana* (*GG* I.3.174), introducing *Περὶ τόνου*: "Ἐπεὶ οὖν οἱ εἰσαγόμενοι πρῶτον ἀναγνώσει ἐντυγχάνουσιν, καὶ ἀναγκαῖον ᾠήθη περὶ ταύτης διαλαβεῖν, περισπούδαστον δὲ ἡγήσατο καὶ περὶ τῶν παρεπομένων τῇ ἀναγνώσει ἀφηγήσασθαι· ἔστι δὲ ταῦτα τόνος καὶ στιγμὴ καὶ διαστολή" (Since learners encounter ἀνάγνωσις first, and of necessity it is thought they should begin with it, he [sc. Dionysius] thought it of prime importance to take them next through those things which go with ἀνάγνωσις, namely accent [τόνος], punctuation [στιγμή], and pausing [διαστολή]).

[132] *Commentarius Melampodis GG* I.3.22.

1.4.3 Dionysius *Περὶ ἀναγνώσεως*

The definition of ἀνάγνωσις in the *Ars Grammatica* is as follows:

> Ἀνάγνωσις ἐστι ποιημάτων ἢ συγγραμμάτων ἀδιάπτωτος προφορά.
>
> Ἀναγνωστέον δὲ καθ' ὑπόκρισιν, κατὰ προσῳδίαν, κατὰ διαστολήν. ἐκ μὲν γὰρ τῆς ὑποκρίσεως τὴν ἀρετήν, ἐκ δὲ τῆς προσῳδίας τὴν τέχνην, ἐκ δὲ τῆς διαστολῆς τὸν περιεχόμενον νοῦν ὁρῶμεν· ἵνα τὴν μὲν τραγῳδίαν ἡρωϊκῶς ἀναγνῶμεν, τὴν δὲ κωμωδίαν βιωτικῶς, τὰ δὲ ἐλεγεῖα λιγυρῶς, τὸ δὲ ἔπος εὐτόνως, τὴν δὲ λυρικὴν ποίησιν ἐμμελῶς, τοὺς δὲ οἴκτους ὑφειμένως καὶ γοερῶς. τὰ γὰρ μὴ παρὰ τὴν τούτων γινόμενα παρατήρησιν καὶ τὰς τῶν ποιητῶν ἀρετὰς καταρριπτεῖ καὶ τὰς ἕξεις τῶν ἀναγινωσκόντων καταγελάστους παρίστησιν.
>
> Ἀνάγνωσις is the faultless pronunciation [προφορά] of poems and prose works.
>
> One must read aloud according to ὑπόκρισις, according to prosody, according to pause. From the ὑπόκρισις we observe the excellence, from the prosody the art [τέχνη], from the pause the genre [τὸν περιεχόμενον νοῦν]: so that we should read tragedy heroically, comedy in a lifelike manner, elegy clearly, epic vigorously, lyric poetry melodically, songs of lamentation in a subdued or keening manner. If things are not done in accordance with this observation, it both destroys the excellences of the poets and makes the training [/ skills] of those doing the reading ridiculous.
>
> (*GG* I.1.6)

We may begin our analysis of this Chapter (given here in its entirety) by focusing in on the word ἀδιάπτωτος in the first sentence ("Ἀνάγνωσις ἐστι ποιημάτων ἢ συγγραμμάτων ἀδιάπτωτος προφορά"). This rather rare word immediately takes us into the realm of the stylistic criticism of poetry: it is used by Longinus to characterize the consistently polished manner of Bacchylides and Ion of Chios in

contrast with the supremely but unreliably incandescent Pindar and Sophocles.[133] Dionysius is thus calling for consistency and literary polish in his very definition of ἀνάγνωσις. The scholia relate the word to the classroom environment, insisting that correct ἀνάγνωσις is the product of hard work: "Τὸ δὲ δοκίμως ἀναγινώσκειν πάντως ἐκ τριβῆς καὶ ἐπιμονῆς πολλῆς γίνεται" (Genuine reading aloud is ultimately the result of practice and much diligence), as the *Scholia Vaticana* observe[134]; in this context the *Commentarius Melampodis* deploys that most teacherly verb, φιλοπονέω.[135] The ultimate goal is to be able to read any text aloud at sight with the same fluidity as one would have if one had read it many times before, just like a real γραμματικός.[136] The consequences of failure are dire, as Dionysius' definition (as we have seen) goes out of its way to point out; the scholiasts, with their

---

[133] *De sublimitate* 33.5: "τί δέ; ἐν μέλεσι μᾶλλον ἂν εἶναι Βακχυλίδης ἕλοιο ἢ Πίνδαρος, καὶ ἐν τραγῳδίᾳ Ἴων ὁ Χῖος ἢ νὴ Δία Σοφοκλῆς; ἐπειδὴ οἱ μὲν ἀδιάπτωτοι καὶ ἐν τῷ γλαφυρῷ πάντη κεκαλλιγραφημένοι, ὁ δὲ Πίνδαρος καὶ ὁ Σοφοκλῆς ὁτὲ μὲν οἷον πάντα ἐπιφλέγουσι τῇ φορᾷ, σβέννυνται δ' ἀλόγως πολλάκις καὶ πίπτουσιν ἀτυχέστατα" (Well then? In lyric, would you prefer to be Bacchylides instead of Pindar, and in tragedy Ion of Chios instead of Sophocles, by Zeus? For they [Bacchylides and Ion] are faultless [ἀδιάπτωτοι] and entirely elegant writers in the polished category, while Pindar and Sophocles, though they sometimes seem to set everything on fire in their rush, are also often unaccountably extinguished and fall down most unfortunately).

[134] *GG* I.3.170.

[135] "Ταῦτα τὰ τρία δεῖ καλῶς παραφυλάττεσθαι τὸν ἁρμονίως ἀναγινώσκειν φιλοπονοῦντα" (These are the three things which should be observed by the one who is studying hard [τὸν φιλοπονοῦντα] to read aloud harmoniously). On the teacherliness of φιλοπονέω, which recurs regularly in the papyrological record of actual classroom exercises (and also in the *Hermeneumata*), see Cribiore 2001.

[136] See note 35 above.

pedagogical focus,[137] enlarge on this, adding that the embarassment resulting from bad ἀνάγνωσις will not belong to the reader alone:

> ἐπιφέρει τοῦτο, ὅτι ἐὰν μὴ παραφυλάττωνται ταῦτα, ὡς προείρηται, *καὶ τὰς τῶν ποιημάτων ἀρετὰς καταρρίπτει*, τουτέστιν ἐξευτελίζει, ἀφανίζει, εἰς ἔδαφος καταβάλλει καὶ τὰ ἐνάρετα ποιήματα· ἢ οὕτως· καὶ τῶν σκεψαμένων ἀνδρῶν τὸν ἐνάρετον κάματον καταβάλλει εἰς ἔδαφος. *Καὶ τὰς ἕξεις τῶν ἀναγινωσκόντων. Ἕξεις*· τὰς σχέσεις, τὰς μαθήσεις, τὰς διδαχάς, τουτέστιν ὧν τινων μετέσχον καὶ ἀντελάβοντο τῆς μαθήσει· *καταγελάστους*· ἀξίας καταγέλωτος, ἀποβλήτους, ἀδοκίμους· *παρίστησι*· δείκνυσιν· ἤτοι τὰς μαθήσεις καὶ διδαχὰς τῶν ἀναγινωσκόντων ἀξίας καταγέλωτος δείκνυσιν. Ὅθεν δεῖ ἑκάστου ποιήματος τὴν ὑπόκρισιν παραφυλάττειν, ἵνα καὶ τῶν σκεψαμένων ἀνδρῶν ἡ ἀρετὴ διαφαίνηται καὶ ἡ τέχνη τοῦ ἀναγινώσκοντος.
>
> He [Dionysius] adds this, that if they [sc. the readers] do not observe all this as described, "he [sc. the reader] disgraces[138] the excellences of the poems," that is he disparages them, makes them disappear, and reduces to the lowest level [ἔδαφος] even poems which are themselves excellent; or perhaps it is that he reduces the virtuous toil of critics [σκεψαμένων ἀνδρῶν[139]] to the lowest level. *And the skills of the readers. Skills* [refers to] the preparations, the things learnt, the things taught, that is the things they [the (faulty) readers] had picked up in their learning. *Ridiculous* [means] worthy of ridicule, degraded,

---

[137] The pedagogical focus of the scholiasts is even projected by them onto Homer, the Poet (Sluiter 1999: 176-189 on this phenomenon in the 'exegetical' scholia to Homer; cf. the allegorical and pedagogical intention attributed to Homer in the *Essay on the Life and Poetry of Homer* attributed to Plutarch) and onto Dionyius Thrax (e.g. *Commentarius Melampodis*: "Μετὰ δὲ τὸν ὅρον τῆς ἀναγνώσεως λοιπὸν θέλει ἡμᾶς διδάξαι, τίνα παραφυλαττόμενοι ἢ πόσα τὴν ἀρίστην ἀνάγνωσιν ποιησόμεθα" [After the definition of ἀνάγνωσις he wishes furthermore to teach [διδάξαι] us what things we should observe, and to what extend, so as to produce the best ἀνάγνωσις] [*GG* I.3.16]).

[138] *LSJ* s.v. 2, citing Vettius Valens 238.31 (fl. 2nd C AD).

[139] "σκεψαμένων ἀνδρῶν" ("men who have engaged in σκέψις") must surely refer to scholars (and not to any teacher on-hand to observe the act of ἀνάγνωσις), since their activity of σκέψις ("judgment") is twice expressed here in the aorist (thus preceding the act of ἀνάγνωσις) and even, in the second instance, coupled contrastively with the τέχνη of the reader; moreover, terms such as ἀρετή and κάματον evoke the thoroughness of the writers of ὑπομνήματα. On this striking instance of the presence of scholarship in the very act of ἀνάγνωσις (and in the audience's judgment thereof), see the discussion below (p. 260).

> disreputable. *Establishes*: diplays; so they [sc. the readers] display how the things learnt by and the things taught to the readers are worthy of ridicule. Thus it is that one must observe the [proper] ὑπόκρισις of each poem, so that the virtue of the critics [σκεψαμένων ἀνδρῶν] made manifest, as also the skill [τέχνη] of the one reading aloud.
> (*Commentarius Melampodis, GG* I.3.22)

Reader, teacher, and hero of the poem being read thus all have a stake in successful ἀνάγνωσις: the teacher is implicity observable through the quality of the student's performance, for the audience can laugh at him too; contrawise, as we learn from the *Scholia Vaticana* on the subject of the ἀνάγνωσις of lamentations (οἴκτοι), the audience can be captivated and their emotions aligned with the performance:

> Λέγει οὖν τοὺς οἴκτους προφέρεσθαι *ὑφειμένως καὶ γοερῶς*, τουτέστι συνεσταλμένως, ταπεινῶς καὶ μετὰ πένθους, οἰκτρῶς, θρηνητικῶς· δεῖ γὰρ τὸν ἀναγινώσκοντα τὸν οἶκτον τοιοῦτον φαίνεσθαι, ὡς ἐλεεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκουόντων.
> He [Dionysius] thus says that we should pronounce [προφέρεσθαι] lamentations in a *subdued and tearful* [γοερῶς] *manner*, that is simply, softly and with grief, pitiably, keeningly; for the reader must make the grief manifest, so that he is pitied by the listeners [τῶν ἀκουόντων].
> (*GG* I.3.174)

These two passages highlight an essential point regarding the conception of ἀνάγνωσις in the *Ars*' scholia, one which fully justifies our terming such ἀνάγνωσις a form of *performance*: the assimilation of character *within* the poem being read aloud *by* the reader in the act of reading: it is the *reader himself* who is to be pitied by the listeners if he sucessfully imparts grief and piteousness to his reading, taking on the

character of the one mourning in the text in question (which, according to the scholiasts, may be lyric, elegiac, epic[140]).

Bearing in mind this *performative* melding of reader speaking and character spoken, we may turn to Dionysius' and his scholiasts' definitions and discussions of ὑπόκρισις and μίμησις. Dionysius had stated that one of the elements in ἀνάγνωσις is ὑπόκρισις (Ἀναγνωστέον δὲ καθ' ὑπόκρισιν) and that "ἐκ μὲν γὰρ τῆς ὑποκρίσεως τὴν ἀρετήν [ὁρῶμεν[141]]" (from the *hypocrisis* we see the excellence); the scholiast comments, "Τίνος δὲ τὴν ἀρετὴν ὁρῶμεν; Τῶν ἀναγινωσκομένων· ἐκ τῆς μιμήσεως γὰρ ἐνάρετα γίνεται καὶ δείκνυται τὰ ἀναγινωσκόμενα" (Whose excellence do we see? That of the ones being read aloud; for from *mimesis* the things read aloud become excellent and are shown as such).[142] Indeed, ὑπόκρισις and

---

[140] Cf. *Scholia Vaticana* (*GG* I.3.174): "Εἶδος μὲν ποιήσεως ὁ οἶκτος οὐκ ἔστιν, εὑρίσκεται δὲ ἐν παντὶ εἴδει ποιήσεως, παρὰ λυρικοῖς, παρ' ἐλεγειογράφοις, ὁμοίως καὶ παρὰ τοῖς τὰ ἔπη γράφουσιν, ὡς καὶ παρ' Ὁμήρῳ Ἀνδρομάχη λέγει ἐλεεινολογουμένη πρὸς Ἕκτορα" (Lament is not a type of poetry, rather it is found in every type of poetry, in lyric, in writers of elegy, and likewise also in the work of those who write epic, as even in Homer Andromache speaks in lamentation to [the corpse of] Hector).

[141] The *Commentarius Melampodis* is particularly insistent that ὁρῶμεν be supplied to (having been elided from) the first two clauses of Dionysius' third sentence, as only seems reasonable (*GG* I.3.16-17). This use of a verb of seeing in the first person plural, together with the vocabulary of ridicule in the second half of the chapter, surely confirms that Dionysius himself had an audience in mind in discussing the mechanics of ἀνάγνωσις, and that this audience was conceived of as *spectating* the act of ἀνάγνωσις.

[142] *GG* I.3.16 (*Commentarius Melampodis*). The fact that the scholiast nearly repeats himself in the second sentence surely indicates that the gender of "τῶν ἀναγινωσκομένων" differs from the (generalizing) neuter of the (generalizing) second sentence, and is thus personal and masculine — referring to the characters *within* τὰ ἀναγινωσκόμενα who are themselves ἀναγινωσκόμενοι. A slightly different view is taken by the *Scholia Marciana*, who regard the ἀρετή referred to as belonging to the poet whose work is being read (*GG* I.3.307).

μίμησις are equated.[143] Together they condition a *bodily* act, as we learn from the *Scholia Vaticana*:

> *Ἀναγνωστέον δὲ καθ' ὑπόκρισιν, κατὰ προσῳδίαν, κατὰ διαστολήν.* Ὑπόκρισίς ἐστι μίμησις ἁρμόζουσα τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις προσώποις ἔν τε λόγῳ καὶ σχήματι· οὐ μόνον γὰρ δεῖ μιμεῖσθαι τῷ λόγῳ τὰ πρόσωπα, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς τῶν σωμάτων κινήσεις κατὰ τὸ ἀπαιτοῦν, ὡς ἐν τῷ Ὀρέστῃ τοῦ Μενελάου μηδὲν εἰρηκότος αὐτῷ ἀποκρίνεται λέγων, *οὐ χρήματ' εἶπον*· δηλοῦται γὰρ ἐκ τούτου, ὡς οὐ λόγῳ γεγένηται ἡ ὑπόκρισις, ἀλλὰ μόνῳ τῷ σχήματι, τοῦ Μενελάου τὰς χεῖρας ἀνατείναντος καὶ τρόπον τινὰ μετασχηματιζομένου ὡς οὐδὲν εἰληφότος. *Καθ' ὑπόκρισιν* οὖν, τουτέστι κατὰ μίμησιν τῶν προσώπων.
> *One must read aloud according to ὑπόκρισις, according to prosody, according to pause.* ὑπόκρισις is μίμησις fitted to [ἁρμόζουσα] the designated characters [προσώποις] in the text [λόγος] and the presentation [σχήματι]; it is not only with respect to the text [τῷ λόγῳ] that one must enact the μίμησις of the characters but also in the movement of bodies in reaction [κατὰ τὸ ἀπαιτοῦν], as in the *Orestes* when Menelaus says nothing to him he [sc. Orestes] answers by saying, *I didn't say anything about money*; from this it is clear that the ὑπόκρισις [sc. in the case of Menelaus] did not consist in text [οὐ λόγῳ] but only in the presentation, as Menelaus stretches out his hands and by some change of posture indicates that he didn't take anything. So *according to ὑπόκρισις* means 'according to the *mimesis* of the characters.'
>
> (*GG* I.3.172)[144]

The observation here stems from a close reading of the text (and realization that Orestes must be responding to nonverbal behavior on the part of Menelaus), but the scholiast demands that the dramatic *action* here deduced, and presumably any dramatic action which would improve the presentation of the text, be included and

---

[143] *Commentarius Melampodis* (*GG* I.3.16): "*καθ' ὑπόκρισιν*· κατὰ μίμησιν" ('*according to* hypocrisis': according to *mimesis*).

[144] The example of Menelaus also appears in the *Scholia Londinensia* (*GG* I.3.473-474), with some rephrasing.

realized in the act of ἀνάγνωσις.[145] We may relate this to the practice, observable in a number of papyri, of indicating the speaker's or poet's name even in Homer, as in drama and dialogue[146]: the need to *change* the voice depending on who is speaking is essential to the act of ὑπόκρισις:

> Δεῖ γὰρ τὰ μὲν ἡρωϊκὰ συντόνῳ τῇ φωνῇ ἀναγινώσκειν καὶ μὴ ἐκλελυμένῃ, τὰ δὲ βιωτικά, τουτέστι τὰ κωμικά, ὡς ἐν τῷ βίῳ, τουτέστι μιμουμένους γυναῖκας νέας ἢ γραΐδας ἢ δεδοικότας ἢ

---

[145] In the later collections of scholia (*Scholia Marciana, Scholia Londinensia*) we find proposed two further definitions of ἀνάγνωσις, in addition to the explanation of ἀνάγνωσις as ὑπόκρισις and μίμησις: both are dependent on the idea of ἀνάγνωσις as a "second knowing." The first alternative definition is highly philosophical, suggesting that the γνῶσις in the result of reincarnation and subsequent "ἀναγνώρισις" (recognition; the usual word is ἀναγνωρισμός) of things known earlier in a former life (*Scholia Marciana* at *GG* I.3.305, *Scholia Londinensia* at *GG* I.3.473). A more pedestrian explanation of a "second γνῶσις" in these two collections suggests that the γνῶσις of ἀνάγνωσις comes second because the first γνῶσις had been that of syllables in elementary school (*Scholia Marciana* at *GG* I.3.305, *Scholia Londinensia* I.2.473). Both alternative explanations clearly stem from the same source. That the metempsychotic explanation is later than the regular (and universal) definition provided by, for example, the *Commentarius Melampodis* is apparent from one scholion in the *Marciana* ("Περὶ ἀναγνώσεως μὲν εἴρηται ἐν τοῖς προλαβοῦσιν. Ὁ δὲ ἢ παραδιαζευκτικὸς ἐν τῷ ἢ *συγγραμμάτων* ἀντὶ τοῦ *καί* παραλαμβάνεται, ὡς εἶναι καὶ συγγραμμάτων ἀδιάπτωτος καὶ ἄπταιστος προφορὰ ἤγουν προένεξις· ἀθάνατος γὰρ ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ πάντων ἔμπειρος" [Regarding ἀνάγνωσις, we have spoken earlier. The conjunction 'or' is used in the phrase '*or prose writers*' instead of 'and' because the faultless and unerring pronunciation or pronouncing is also of prose writers; for the soul is immortal and has experienced everything]) in which the text of anterior commentators has been garbled and the metempsychotic explanation tacked on in short form, apparently in an attempt at clarification. With regard to performance, it is interesting that scholiasts in two manuscripts (*Scholia Vaticana* at *GG* I.3.171 and *Scholia Londinensia* at I.2.473) cite (explicitly in the *Scholia Vaticana*) the observation of Stephanus regarding the (apparently genuine) Herodotean usage of ἀναγιγνώσκω to mean 'persuade,' which is here applied it to the act of ἀνάγνωσις *as* ὑπόκρισις: "Ἀναγνῶσαι δὲ τὸ ἀναπεῖσαι, ὡς παρ' Ἡροδότῳ, 'τίς σε ἀνθρώπων ἀνέγνω<σεν> ἐπὶ γῆν τὴν ἐμὴν στρατευσάμενον;' ἀνάγνωσις οὖν ἡ ἀνάπεισις, οἱ γὰρ καλῶς ἀναγινώσκοντες ἀναπείθουσιν·" (ἀνάγνωσις is [the act of] persuasion [ἀνάπεισις], and to read aloud [ἀναγνῶσαι] is to persuade [ἀναπεῖσαι], as in Herodotus [I.87], 'Who among men persuaded you [ἀνέγνω<σεν>] to invade my country?' So ἀνάγνωσις is persuasion, and those who read aloud well are persuasive [ἀναπείθουσιν]; *Vaticana*, *GG* I.3.171; *Londinensia* I.2.473).

[146] Haslam 1997: 57: "In some manuscripts of the Roman period speech-termini are marked by the paragraphos (an interlinear dash at line-beginning), and the speaker's name — or 'poet,' on reversion to narrative — may be added in the left margin; this matches the practice used in dramatic and pseudo-dramatic texts (e.g. Plato), only in Homer the narrator is on a par with his characters, in accordance with Aristotelian analysis of epic discourse."

> ὀργιζομένους ἄνδρας, ἢ ὅσα πρέπει τοῖς εἰσαγομένοις προσώποις παρὰ Μενάνδρῳ ἢ Ἀριστοφάνει ἢ τοῖς ἄλλοις κωμικοῖς.
> One must read heroic poems aloud with an earnest and eager voice [συντόνῳ τῇ φωνῇ] and not with a careless one; the 'poetry of life,' that is comedy, [should be read] as in life, that is they [sc. the readers] should imitate [μιμουμένους] young women or old women or fearful or angry men or whatever is suitable for the characters employed by Menander or Aristophanes or the other comic poets.
> (*Commentarius Melampodis*, *GG* I.3.16)

The dynamics of ἀνάγνωσις as ὑπόκρισις and μίμησις thus constitute a much more logical explanation for the habit of marking speaker in the papyri than Cribiore's assertion "that such an exercise [i.e. the marking of speaker] was needed [by students] is shown by the evident uncertainty in identifying the poet's voice."[147] The imitation of character simultaneously defines both genre and manner, which come together on the level of πράξις, which ἀνάγνωσις in turn unites with λόγος, as we saw above in the case of Menelaus' gesturing:

> Δεῖ γοῦν τὸν τόνον, ὅ ἐστιν ἔπος, εὐτόνως προφέρειν καὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῆς φωνῆς τοὺς λόγους καὶ τὰς πράξεις μιμεῖσθαι τῶν ἡρώων· ἡρωϊκὰς γὰρ πράξεις ἐν τῷ ἔπει ἐπῆλθεν ὁ ποιητής, ἃς οὐ χρὴ καταμαλάττειν τῇ μαλακίᾳ τῆς φωνῆς.
> Indeed one must pronounce the tone,[148] that is the [epic] verse, in a vigorous manner [εὐτόνως] and in so doing imitate [μιμεῖσθαι] with the voice the speeches [λόγους] and the deeds [πράξεις] of the heroes; for the Poet has recounted heroic deeds [ἡρωϊκὰς πράξεις] in his epic

---

[147] Cribiore 2001: 142.

[148] This word (τόνος) elsewhere refers either to (pitch) accent or to 'tone of voice' in our sense (cf. for instance Jerome the Philosopher [at Dionysius of Halicarnassus *De Isocrate* 13] on Isocrates lack of τόνος], but the *Scholia Marciana* here (*GG* I.3.307-308) takes it as a synonym for ἔπος: "Ἔπος κυρίως ὁ ἔμμετρος στίχος, καταχρηστικῶς δὲ καὶ πᾶς λόγος· ἔπος λέγεται καὶ τόνος παρὰ τισιν, 'ἑξαμέτροις τοῖς τόνοις κεχρῆσθαι.'" The usage, which seems peculiar (albeit dependent on the scholiast's unspecified source), is not important for the discussion at hand.

> verse, which one should not render weak and soft with a softness of the voice.
>
> (*Scholia Marciana*, *GG* I.3.308[149])

Indeed, it is the duty of the reader not only to imitate but to bring the characters to life once more with his own personality: "Ταύτην οὖν τὴν κωμῳδίαν δεῖ βιωτικῶς ἀναγινώσκειν, τουτέστιν ὡς ἐν τῷ βίῳ, μιμουμένους τὸ παρεισαγόμενον πρόσωπον καὶ τὴν ἐκείνου σχέσιν ἀναματτομένους" (Comedy being such, one must read it aloud in a lifelike manner, that is as one speaks in life, imitating the character in question and "refurbishing" [ἀναματτομένους] his personality [τὴν ἐκείνου σχέσιν]).[150] The verb describing the reader's action here, ἀναμάσσω, which I translate as "refurbish,"[151] can also describe the action of kneading bread,[152] and seems to me an excellent description of the process of learning to inhabit a character.

The adverbs applied by the scholiasts to the proper ἀνάγνωσις of each genre are by no means formulaic, rather indicating a sincere desire to specify the correct tone

---

[149] Cf. *Scholia Vaticana* (*GG* I.3.173, slightly rephrased at *Scholia Londinensia* (*GG* I.3.476); also *Commentarius Melampodis*, which appears to relate the performative manner (derived from content) to the very name of the epic genre: "Ἔπος λέγεται πᾶς στίχος ἰαμβικός τε καὶ τροχαϊκὸς καὶ ἀναπαιστικὸς καὶ δακτυλικὸς καὶ οἱῳδήποτε ποδὶ μετρούμενος, κατ' ἐξοχὴν δέ, τουτέστι κατὰ τιμὴν καὶ ὑπεροχήν, τὸ ἡρωϊκὸν μέτρον ἔπος ἐκάλεσαν. Ὅπερ διδάσκει ἡμᾶς *εὐτόνως* ἀναγινώσκειν, τουτέστι συντόνῳ τῇ φωνῇ καὶ μὴ ἐκλελυμένῃ, ὡς καὶ ἡρώων ἀνδρῶν περιέχον ἱστορίας" (The word ἔπος refers to any verse which is iambic, trochaic, anapaestic, dactyllic, or measured in any way, but principally (that is, from its venerableness and primacy) they called the heroic meter ἔπος. This is why he [Dionysius] instructs us to read it aloud 'vigorously,' that is with a vigorous tone of voice and not a dissipated tone of voice, since it contains the accounts of heroic men; *GG* I.3.21; cf. *Scholia Marciana* I.3.308, where these words are attributed to Diomedes in the MS. [though this most likely refers to the alternative authorship of the *Commentarius Melampodis seu Diomedis* and not to a treatise by Diomedes himself).

[150] *GG* I.3.19-20 (*Commentarius Melampodis*) (= *GG* I.3.306 [*Scholia Marciana*]).

[151] One of the definitions at *LSJ* s.v. A.II.4, citing Maximus of Tyre 8.2.

[152] Aristophanes *Clouds* 676 (*LSJ* s.v. A.II.1).

of voice for each form of poetry; the reading of tragedy, for example, which Dionysius had said should be read "ἡρωϊκῶς" (heroically), is thus developed by the scholiasts: "ἀξιοπίστως, μετὰ πολλῆς σεμνότητος καὶ ὄγκου· δεῖ γὰρ ἡμᾶς τραγικὰ προφερομένους κατὰ πάντα τρόπον μιμεῖσθαι τοὺς ἥρωας, καὶ μεγέθει σώματος καὶ λόγου ὑπερβολῇ" (In a manner worthy of trust, with great solemnity and grandeur; for in pronouncing tragedy we must in every way imitate the heroes, both in their greatness of body and in the perfection [ὑπερβολῇ] of speech)[153]; we have already observed a similar specificity with regard to comedy and to songs of lament. Elegy is to be read "λιγυρῶς" according to Dionysius; the scholiasts gloss this as "ὀξυφώνως· ἡ γὰρ λύπη τῇ παρατροπῇ τῆς φωνῆς ἐκ τοῦ κλαυθμοῦ ὀξύτερά τινα παρεισάγει" (In a piercing-voiced manner: for, as a result of a change in the voice from weeping, grief introduces a rather sharper note),[154] i.e. in the tone both of one actually bereft and of one reading a poem in the person of one bereft.[155]

---

[153] *GG* I.3.17-18 (*Commentarius Melampodis)* (= *GG* I.3.172 [*Scholia Vaticana*], *GG* I.3.306 [*Scholia Marciana*]).

[154] *GG* I.3.20-21 (*Commentarius Melampodis*).

[155] The scholiasts are not unaware that elegy, in spite of its apparent origins in songs of mourning (which they explain at, e.g., *GG* I.3.173 [*Commentarius Melampodis*]), also includes, as a genre, poems which are not mournful, as we find in the following scholion: "*Λιγυρῶς* δέ, οἷον ὀξέως ἀναγινώσκειν ἡμᾶς δεῖ τὰ ἐλεγεῖα, ὡς ἂν συμπεπνιγμένους καὶ ἐκπεπληγμένους τῷ πλήθει τῶν κακῶν· ἢ *λιγυρῶς* ἤγουν γλυκερῶς, λιγὺς γὰρ ὁ γλυκύς" (And [he says] *clearly* [λιγυρῶς], in such a sharp manner as we must read elegy aloud, as though completely pierced and wholly filled by the number of woes [experienced]; or [it might be that he means] *clearly* in the sense of *sweetly* [γλυκερῶς], for sweetness [γλυκύς] is clear [λιγύς]; *Scholia Vaticana* [*GG* I.3.173]). These contrasting and mutually incompatible definitions may reflect (or be derived from) an understanding of the genre of elegy as consisting of both sad and happy components.

The definition of performative manner simultaneously in terms of genre and content is also notable for its emphasis on the historical character of genre, whereby the scholiasts relate the act of contemporary performance to the original setting and purpose of that performance. This is particularly evident in the case of lyric, which Dionysius had said should be read "ἐμμελῶς" (with melody); this raises the obvious difficulty of what melody should be used, and we read in the *Scholia Londinensia* that

> *Ἐμμελῶς* δὲ εἶπεν, ὅτι δεῖ μετὰ μέλους τοῦ προσήκοντος ᾄδειν τὰ λυρικά· ὅπερ νῦν ἡμῖν ἀδύνατον· εἰ μὲν γάρ τις ἐθελήσει κατὰ τὴν ἀρχαίαν μουσικήν, καθ' ἣν καὶ ἐγέγραπτο, ἀδύνατον, ἑτέρα γὰρ ἡ ἀρχαία πρὸς τὴν νῦν· ἡ μὲν γὰρ εἰς τρεῖς τρόπους διῄρητο, Δώριον, Φρύγιον, Λύδιον, ἡ δὲ νεωτέρα εἰς δεκαπέντε· πῶς ἂν οὖν τις δύναιτο κατὰ τὴν ἀρχαϊκὴν ἁρμονίαν γεγραμμένα μέλη κατὰ τὴν νῦν μελῳδίαν ᾄδειν; ὥστε ἀδύνατον τὸ τοιοῦτον ἐν γραμματικῇ διὰ τὸ γεγενῆσθαι μεταβολὴν τῆς ἁρμονικῆς· οὐ μὴν πάντως ἄδηλος ἔσται ὁ τρόπος τῆς ἀναγνώσεως, ἀλλὰ διαφορά τίς ἐστι περὶ τοῦτο τὸ ἀνάγνωσμα τῆς φωνῆς ὡς πρὸς τὰ μέλη ὑπαγομένοις.
>
> He [Dionysius] said [lyric should be read] *with melody*, because we must sing lyric poetry with the appropriate song [μέλος]; which is now impossible for us to do. For if one wished [to sing] in accordance with the old music [κατὰ τὴν ἀρχαίαν μουσκήν] according to which it was written, that is impossible, for the old music is something different from the one that now prevails; [the old music] was divided into three sorts, the Doric, the Phrygian, and the Lydian, while the newer type is divided into twelve. How then could songs written in accordance with the old harmony be sung in accordance to the current melody? This is indeed impossible in γραμματική because there has been a change in harmony. Nevertheless, let the type of ἀνάγνωσις not be completely unrecognizable: rather there is a difference of some sort with respect to this act of ἀνάγνωσις [τοῦτο τὸ ἀνάγνωσμα] in the voice, reflecting the fact that these [texts] are set to music.
>
> (*Scholia Londinensia*, *GG* I.3.476-477)

Another scholion is more blunt: "Ταύτην οὖν τὴν λυρικὴν ποίησιν δεῖ μετὰ μέλους ἀναγινώσκειν, εἰ καὶ μὴ παρελάβομεν μηδὲ ἀπομεμνήμεθα τὰ ἐκείνων μέλη" (We must read this lyric poetry, then, with melody [μετὰ μέλους], even if we do not have and do not remember the songs that go with them).[156] Presumably these scholiasts would have preferred to be able to sing in the original fashion if they had been able; what is more important even than the remarkable awareness that a fundamental change in music had taken place, however, is the fact that the scholiasts are conveying this information to the student (or the student's instructor) so as to condition the manner in which lyric poetry will be read aloud. Furthermore, I believe this historical sensitivity, explicitly brought to bear here on lyric, helps us to appreciate why so much historical information is presented in the case of the explanation of ἀνάγνωσις in the case of other genres, even if it is not explicitly related to performative manner.[157] We have already observed how both songs of mourning (οἴκτροι) and elegiac poems both call, in the scholiasts' opinion, for a reperformance of the grief of the original speaker by the reader-aloud, and that in the case of elegy this specification is preceded by an account of the historical origins of elegy in funeral song. In this case, the historical explanation of genre may be taken not merely as a lengthy and essentially off-topic gloss on the the word "ἐλεγεῖα" as

---

[156] *GG* I.3.21 (*Commentarius Melampodis*).

[157] It could, of course, be argued that the historical information provided in this and similar comments (some noted below) is simply an instance of the scholiast's prolixity; nevertheless, I believe the actual wording of the scholia supports a reading in which the information conveyed is conceived by the scholiast as relevant to the discussion of ἀνάγωνσις.

used by Dionysius in his Περὶ ἀναγνωσέως but as a lengthy introduction to the specification of performative manner — which, as we have seen, is certainly the case with respect to lyric. If we thus take the scholiasts' comments on genre as a continuous dissertation, as opposed to a historical explanation coupled with a prescription for ἀνάγνωσις, we must read the lengthy explanations of the origins and development of tragedy, for example (which occupy 15 lines of Hilgard's text in the case of the *Commentarius Melampodis*[158]) as in some sense informing the student (as reader-aloud) of the historical background of the texts he will be reading aloud *so as to affect the manner in which he himself understands his act of* ἀνάγνωσις, namely *as a historical act.* The student would thus be engaged in *reenacting* the original performance context of tragedy. We find support for this in the wording of the text; I provide the conclusion of the 'historical' part of the *Commentarius Melampodis*' treatment of tragedy:

> Ἐπιδεικνύμενοι δὲ τῶν ἡρώων ὡσανεὶ τὰ αὐτῶν πρόσωπα πρῶτον μὲν ἐπελέγοντο ἄνδρας τοὺς μείζονα φωνὴν ἔχοντας καὶ τῷ ὄγκῳ τῆς φωνῆς μιμεῖσθαι δυναμένους τοὺς ἥρωας· δεύτερον δὲ βουλόμενοι καὶ τὰ σώματα δεικνύειν ἡρωϊκά, ἐμβάδας ἐφόρουν καὶ ἱμάτια ποδήρη. Ταύτην οὖν τὴν τραγῳδίαν φησὶν ὁ τεχνικὸς δεῖν ἡρωϊκῶς ἀναγινώσκειν, τουτέστι μεγάλῃ τῇ φωνῇ μετὰ πολλῆς σεμνότητος καὶ ὄγκου δεῖ γὰρ ἡμᾶς τὰ τραγικὰ προφερομένους μιμεῖσθαι πάντα τρόπον τοὺς ἥρωας, καὶ μεγέθει σώματος καὶ λόγων ὑπερβολῇ.
> They [the tragic poets, mentioned above], in publicly presenting [ἐπιδεινύμενοι[159]] the heroes as it were through their characters, first

[158] *GG* I.3.17.

[159] This is the word used for Homeric performance by rhapsodes in the *Scholia Vaticana* on Dionysius' *Περὶ ῥαψῳδίας* (on which see below), regarding the collection of Homeric poetry by Pisistratus:

> picked men with strong voices who were able by the grandeur of their voices to imitate the heroes; next, wishing to exhibit [δεικνύειν] heroic bodies they wore slippers and clothes reaching down to their feet. Tragedy being such, the writer on grammar [ὁ τεχνικός, i.e. Dionysius] says that we must read it aloud in a heroic manner, that is, in pronouncing tragedy we must, with a loud voice with great solemnity and grandeur, imitate in every way the heroes, both in their greatness of body and in the perfection [ὑπερβολῇ] of speech.
>
> (*GG* I.3.17)

Here the tragedians clothe their actors to make them look like heroes and choose their actors on the basis of their ability to enact the μίμησις of heroes with voices (φωναί) remarkable for ὄγκος (grandeur), while the student is to enact the μίμησις of heroes with a voice (φωνή) likewise oriented towards σεμνότης (solemnity) and ὄγκος; while costume is not prescribed for the student engaged in ἀνάγνωσις, we do learn that part of the μίμησις will involve imitating the μέγεθος σώματος of the characters. There is thus a neat parallel between the historical description of the origins of tragedy and prescription for its ἀνάγνωσις; moreover, the two parts are joined by the connecting particle οὖν (therefore) and the ἀνάγνωσις of tragedy takes as its object the very tragedy just described (ταυτὴν τὴν τραγῳδίαν). The history of tragedy thus forms not only a backdrop to the ἀνάγνωσις of tragedy but one of its essential performative characteristics: here ἀνάγνωσις is not only performance but (across the centuries) self-conscious *reperformance*. Indeed, if we take the whole of

---

"Προθεὶς δὲ ἀγῶνα δημοτελῆ καὶ κηρύξας καὶ δοὺς ἄδειαν τοῖς εἰδόσι καὶ βουλομένοις τὰ Ὁμήρου ἐπιδείκνυσθαι . . ." (Establishing a contest at the public expense and announcing it and giving safe-conduct to those who were knowledgable [sc. regarding Homeric poetry] and who wished to publicly perform Homer's poems . . .; *GG* I.3.179); it appears in the same context and with the same meaning in the other commentaries.

the chapter §5 Περὶ ῥαψῳδίας, whose amplitude corresponds to the slimness of the sections on epic in §2 Περὶ ἀναγνωσέως and to which all the background historical information on the nature of epic is shifted,[160] as likewise functioning as a guide to ἀνάγνωσις as a historical act, then the abundant information on rhapsodic performance it contains would be in some sense present in the act of reading the Homeric poems also: and it is with such a purpose in mind that the *Commentarius Melampodis* introduces the chapter:

> Ἐπειδὴ οἱ ἀρχόμενοι ἀναγινώσκειν παῖδες πρὸ πάντων τῶν βιβλίων ἅπτονται τῶν Ὁμηρικῶν, τὰ δὲ Ὁμηρικὰ ποιήματα τέμνεται εἰς ῥαψῳδίας, βούλεται διδάξαι καὶ τοὺς παῖδας αὐτὸ τοῦτο, τί ἐστι ῥαψῳδία, καί φησι τὸν ὅρον τοῦτον.
> Since boys who are beginning to read aloud take up the poems of Homer before any other book, and the Homeric poems are divided into 'rhapsodies,' he [Dionysius] wishes to instruct these boys regarding this, what a 'rhapsody' is, and he gives this definition.
>
> (*GG* I.3.28)

The first phrase here, "οἱ ἀρχόμενοι ἀναγινώσκειν," seems to support both this idea of the chapter's orientation towards ἀνάγνωσις and (incidentally) our general

---

[160] See the scholion, attributed to Heliodorus by Hilgard, at *GG* I.3.314 (*Scholia Marciana*) for a criticism of the placement of the information in *Περὶ ῥαψῳδίας*, which the scholiast feels should have been part of *Περὶ ἀναγνωσέως*: "Οὐ προσηκόντως ἐνταῦθα κεῖται ὁ περὶ ῥαψῳδίας λόγος· εἰ δ' ἄρα ἔδει περὶ αὐτῆς διαλαμβάνειν, ἐν τῷ περὶ ποιητικῆς ἐχρῆν λόγῳ διαλήψεσθαι. Εἰ γὰρ ἡ ῥαψῳδία μέρος ἐστὶ ποιήματος, ἤγουν ποιήσεως, ὁ δὲ περὶ ποιήματος λόγος προσήκει τῷ περὶ ποιητικῆς λέγοντι, ἐν ἐκείνῳ ἔδει περὶ ῥαψῳδίας λέγειν· ἐνταῦθα δὲ οὐκ εὔκαιρον" (The account of rhapsody [ὁ περὶ ῥαψῳδίας λόγος] does not fit in appropriately here; if indeed he had to take up the subject, he should have taken it up in the account of poetry [ἐν τῷ περὶ ποιητικῆς λόγῳ; this can only refer to the treatment of genres in *Περὶ ἀναγνωσέως*, as the subject does not appear elsewhere in the *Ars*]. For if a 'rhapsody' is a part of a poem, or indeed of a work of poetry, and an account of a poem should appear when someone talks about poetry, then he should have addressed 'rhapsody' there; here it is out of place. For the following part of the handbook concerns the parts of speech, and the parts of speech are not the same as 'rhapsody').

hypothesis thusfar, that ἀνάγνωσις referred to reading out loud and that such reading out loud was the province of the grammatical education, having nothing to do with the mechanical process of learning to recognize the meaning of the written word. In terms of the contents of the scholia to *Περὶ ῥαψῳδίας*, the focus there on the origins of the poems in the contest of γραμματικοί (*GG* I.3.29-30), though mistaken from our point of view,[161] constitute an ideal myth for blending the performance context of the student under the supervision of the γραμματικός with the performance context of the Panathenaic festival at Athens. Otherwise this myth would constitute one of the most egregious lapses from verifiable truth (and perspicuity) to be found in the scholia to the *Ars Grammatica.*

1.4.4 Conclusions regarding ἀνάγνωσις in Dionysius Thrax

Reviewing our findings from the foregoing analyses of the *Ars Grammatica* and its scholia, we may note the most important aspects of the ἀνάγνωσις they define, while also comparing these findings with our conclusions from the discussion of classroom ἀνάγνωσις in the papyrological record.

Ἀνάγνωσις includes, on the theoretical level, both τόνος (accentuation) and διαστολή / στιγμή (punctuation); this relationship structures the first five chapters of

[161] As also from the point of view of a marginal note to the *Commentarius Melampodis*, which, commenting on the participation of Aristarchus and Zenodotus in Pisistratus' competition, reads, "οὐκ οἶδας τί λέγεις· πολλῷ γὰρ μεταγενέστεροι Ἀρίσταρχος καὶ Ζηνόδοτος Πεισιστράτου" (You don't know what you are saying: Aristarchus and Zenodotus lived much later than Pisistratus).

the *Ars.* Besides these two elements, we find the element of ὑπόκρισις / μίμησις, which conditions both tone of voice and gesture in the act of ἀνάγνωσις, and varies according to genre. Genre is understood both historically, requiring the reader to simulate or embody an original (or essential) performance context; it is also defined by the contents of the text being read aloud, and particularly by the personalities of the characters who speak inside the texts. In representing these characters, the reader is to embody their moods, voices, and gestures, merging his own personality with theirs. All of this takes place in a school environment, in which the reader's mastery of the τέχνη (in both the abstract and concrete senses of the word) allows for successful ἀνάγνωσις in the terms described above; the pupil's aim is to achieve the versatility and fluidity of ἀνάγνωσις characteristic of a true γραμματικός. The quality of the performance will reflect both on student and on his trainer, the γραμματικός, since the act of ἀνάγνωσις takes place before an audience capable of being emotionally stirred by the performance, either to laughter or (in the case of οἴκτροι) to pity both for performer and for the pitiable character he is representing; characters within poetry are made visibly present before the audience The stakes, in short, are reasonably high.

In sum, ἀνάγνωσις of text thus corresponds to ὑπόκρισις of character, while μίμησις is simultaneously μίμησις of action *internal* to a poem *and* μίμησις of historical performance context; we are reminded forcefully of the phrase used by Ausonius to describe his grandson's career as a reader: "*et melicos lyricosque modos*

profando novabis" (You shall *renew* melic and lyric modes in speaking them forth). Indeed, just as the 'literary' definitions of ἀνάγνωσις (*lectio*) provided by Quintilian and Ausonius and reviewed at the outset of this chapter had insisted on the importance of *distinctio* (στιγμή) and *intervalla* (διαστολή) as key elements to the *lectio*, they also touched on the *flexus et acumen vocis* and *quando attolenda vel summittenda sit vox*, aiming for *vigor* and a *lectio virilis et cum suavitate quadam gravis*, and the distinction between characters (*flexus quo distinguantur prosopopoeiae*). Thus the evidence of the *Ars* and its scholiasts, transmitted directly but nonetheless eminently 'documentary,' serves to confirm the authenticity of the Roman poet's and rhetoratician's prescriptions; above all, it disabuses us of a notion of ἀνάγνωσις as an element of grammatical education oriented towards understanding the meaning of the physical written word, and points us insistently in the direction of *performance*. As we have demonstrated above that the material adduced by Cribiore as material evidence of schoolroom ἀνάγνωσις was, at least, open to either interpretation, we may, I believe, conclude that the papyrological record should be interpreted in accordance with the meaning of ἀνάγνωσις presented in the literary sources as in the *Ars*.

Nevertheless, a critical question remains for our picture of the history of ἀνάγνωσις: can such classroom ἀνάγνωσις really be compared to the professional acts of poetic performance we are familiar with in the classical period, or is the

curriculum of ἀνάγνωσις essentially a fanciful exercise? Seeking to answer this question, we turn to the epigraphical record.

1.5 Ἀνάγνωσις in the epigraphical record

We are fortunate that the evidence for ἀνάγνωσις of poetic texts is not limited exclusively to literary descriptions, grammatical handbooks, and the papyri, but also includes four inscriptions (from Mylasa, Chios, Cnidus, and Teos) attesting to competitions in ἀνάγνωσις by young people.[162] The last three (from Chios, Cnidus, and Teos) are lists of victors in artistic and/or athletic competitions; the first (from Mylasa) is the record (and proclamation) of a decree by a philanthropic magistrate for the establishing of such competitions. Taken together, they provide an invaluable means of testing (and, as it happens, validating) the theory advanced above on the basis of Dionysius Thrax and his scholiasts, namely that ἀνάγνωσις was first and foremost an act of performance. In what follows, I will be particularly concerned to note indications of the precise age of the young readers, as this point has thus far remained undecided in our analyses of papyrological and literary evidence.

[162] The texts will be discussed below. They are *CIG* 3088 (Teos), *CIG* 2214 (Chios; = *SIG* 959), *SEG* 44.902 (Cnidus), and *IMyl.* 16 (Mylasa).

1.5.1 The inscription from Mylasa (*IMyl.* 16)

As the Mylasian inscription (which, unfortunately, bears no date) provides useful background information on the purpose and context of these competitions, we may begin our examination of competitive ἀνάγνωσις by quoting it in full:

> [—] ομενος. ἐπὶ στεφανηφόρου θεοῦ τρίτ[ου]
> [τ]οῦ μετὰ Ἀρίστωνα· τὴν πλείστην σπουδὴν κα[ὶ πρό]-
> [ν]οιαν ἐποιήσατο τῆς τῶν παίδων ἐπιμελείας [δια]-
> [φ]υλάξας ἐν τῆι ἀναστροφῆι τὸ ἐπιβάλλον καὶ πρέπ[ον]
> [τ]ῆι ἀρχῆι ὥστε τοὺς παῖδας προθυμοτέρους γεγ[ο]-
> [νέ]ναι καὶ πρὸς τὰ μαθήματα καὶ πρὸς τὸ τῆς εὐταξία[ς]
> [ἆθ]λον καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἐν ταῖς γυμνασίαις ἄσκησιν· ἐξ ὧν
> [π]άντων προκοπὴ καὶ μείζον περὶ τοὺ<ς> παῖδας γίνε-
> [ται] ἐπὶ τῶι τῆς πατρίδος συμφέροντι· ὅθεν καὶ θυσία[ς]
> [συν]ετέλεσεν καὶ πλείονας τοῖς θεοῖς ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν
> [παί]δων ὑγιείας τε καὶ σωτηρίας· ἐπετέλεσεν δὲ αὐ-
> [τοῖ]ς τε τοῖς παισὶν καὶ τοῖς παιδευταῖς αὐτῶν πλεο-
> [νάκ]ις καὶ γλυκεισμοὺς καὶ ἄριστα φιλανθρώπως βουλό-
> [με]νος προσφέρεσθαι· ἐπετέλεσεν δὲ αὐτοῖς κρεαδ[ο]-
> [σί]αν· ἔθηκεν δὲ τοῖς παισὶν πλεονάκις κ[αὶ ἆ]θλα τὰ καθ[ή]-
> [κον]τα τοῖς ἀγῶσιν τοῖς τε ἐν παλαίστρα τετελεσμέ-
> [νοι]ς διαδρομῆς καὶ πάλης καὶ πυγμῆς καὶ πακκρατίου·
> [ὁμοί]ως δὲ ἔθηκεν ἆθλα καὶ τῆς ἐν γράμμασιν ἀμ[ί]λλη[ς]
> [καὶ ἀ]ναγνώσεώς τε καὶ καλλιγραφίας καὶ φιλομαθίας·
> [ὧν κα]ὶ περὶ πάντων τὰ κατὰ μέρος δηλοῦται διὰ τῶν προ[γε]-
> [γρα]μμένων ἐγγράφως· θεωρῶν τε τὸν δῆμον καὶ π[ερὶ]
> [τῶ]ν κατασκευασμάτων τὴ<ν> καθήκουσαν πρόνοιαν [πεποι]-
> [ημ]ένον, ὑφεσταμένον δὲ καὶ τὸ γυμνάσιον [—]ΑΛ[—]
> [παρ]ασκευάζειν ἐπαγγελίαν πεποί[ηται — διὰ]
> [μη]νῶν πέντε ἐν τῶι διὰ τοῦ ψηφίσμα[τος —]
>
> . . . on the occasion of the third crowning of the god after Ariston's time. He showed great concern and foresight in his undertakings for the boys, observing always what in his mode of life was appropriate and fitting to his charge, so that the the boys become more eager for learning and for the contest of manners and for training in the *gymnasion;* it being from these things together that there is progress [προκοπή] and a greater benefit from the boys for the homeland. Thus

> he established also a good number of sacrifices to the gods for the sake of the boys' health and welfare, and in a philanthropic spirit he saw to it that the boys and their teachers should be provided with candy and with lunch more often; and he saw to it that they should get a ration of meat; and he established that the boys should more often have appropriate contests [ἆθλα] in the gatherings held in the exercise-ground, in running and wrestling and boxing and the *pankration*; and correspondingly he established contests in dictation and in ἀνάγνωσις and calligraphy and in encyclopedic learning [φιλομαθίας], all of which should be meticulously displayed through an inscribed list of victors. Observing that the people had taken appropriate thought to the preparations, and that the *gymnasium* had been made fit, [. . .] he has announced that everyone should make ready [. . .] five months after the decree . . .
>
> (*IMyl* 16)

This civic (and civic-sprited) decree makes clear that the contests to be held are not part of the regular educational curriculum: the benefactor is philanthropic *both* to the schoolchildren in their regular work (providing 'school lunches') *and* in funding competitions. Nevertheless, the competitions are based on the artistic and atheltic activities which form the basis of παιδεία, and their purpose is to stimulate enthusiasm for that curriculum ("ὥστε τοὺς παῖδας προθυμοτέρους γεγ[ο | νέ]ναι καὶ πρὸς τὰ μαθήματα καὶ πρὸς τὸ τῆς εὐταξία[ς | ἆθ]λον καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἐν ταῖς γυμνασίαις ἄσκησιν" [so that the the boys would become more eager for learning and for the contest of manners and for training in the *gymnasion*]); this is expressly described as a civic aim, since the younger generation is crucial to the well-being of the body politic, and the contestants are presumably citizen children of Mylasa. The list of events provided suits this agenda, as the eight contests are divided between

sports (running, wrestling, boxing, *pankration*) and γράμματα ("competition in letters," ἀνάγνωσις, calligraphy, and encyclopedic learning [φιλομαθία]); apparently the object of increasing εὐταξία ('mannerliness') is a general one, as none of the events showcases exactly this quality. As one would expect, ἀνάγνωσις appears among the contests in γράμματα. The contests are not, in the decree, organized or subdivided by age-category; rather, one assumes that it is the παῖδες (boys), mentioned three times before the list of contests, who will be entering into competition. Finally, we note that the benefactor's good deeds include the institution of sacrifices to the gods on behalf of the children; though no religious activities are expressly prescribed in connection with the contests themselves, the importance of preparations on the part of the citizen-body (δῆμος) in the last lines before the inscription breaks off, together with the "announcement to get ready" ([παρ]ασκευάζειν ἐπαγγελία), does suggest that the contests are to be associated with some city-wide event such as a (religious) festival.

1.5.2 The inscription from Chios (*CIG* 2214)

Overall, then, what the Mylasian inscription lacks in concrete details regarding its contests (including the contest in ἀνάγνωσις), it makes up for in its description of the cultural context and purpose for those contests. In the case of inscriptions containing lists of victors in such contests, however, the situation is reversed, and we discover a

good deal of differentiation among the contests and participants, even as the background information is more scanty. After the Mylasian inscription, the inscription featuring the fullest background information is that of Chios, dating from the 1st century BC[163]:

> [ἐ]πὶ πρυ[τά]νεως Ἀθη[νοδ]ώρ[ου, γυμνασι
> αρχούντων Ἑρμησίλεω τοῦ Ξούθο[υ, Δί
> νυος τοῦ Ἑλίξου, Νικίου τοῦ Μήτρωνο[ς, οἵδε
> ἐνίκων τῶν τε παίδων καὶ τῶν ἐφήβω[ν καὶ τῶν
> νέων τοὺς τιθεμένους ἀγῶνας καὶ [ἔθυσαν
> ταῖς τε Μούσαις καὶ τῶι Ἡρακλεῖ ἀπο τῆς π[ροσό
> δου τῆς δεδομένης κατὰ τὸ ψύφισμα τὸ Υ__
> τευς τοῦ Λυσίου. ἀναγνώσεως· Ἀγαθοκλῆ[ς]
> Αγαθοκλεῦς. ῥαψωδίας· Μιλτιάδης Διονυσίου.
> ψαλμοῦ· Ξένως Τιμοκλεῦς. κιθαρισμοῦ· Κλε[οκύ
> δης Διονυσίου. παίδων δόλιχον· Ασκληπιάδης
> Πρ]ωτογένου. ἐφήβων νεωτέρων δόλιχ[ον· Δι
> ο]νύσιος Καλλιστράτου. μέσων δόλιχον· Π[ρωτο
> κλῆς Τιμοκλεῦς. πρεσβυτέρων δόλιχο[ν·
> Μοσχίων Μοσχίωνος. ἀνδρῶν δόλιχον· Αἰσχρ[ί
> ων Αἰσχρίωνος. παίδων στάδιον· Ἀθηνικῶν Θ[ε
> οφάνου. ἐφήβων νεωτέρων στάδιον . . .
>
> In the year of Athenodorus' presidency, when Hermesileus son of Xouthos, Dinys son of Helixus, Nicias son of Metro were in charge of the *gymnasium*, the following boys [παίδων], ephebes, and young men [νέων] were victorious in the games that were held and sacrificed to the Muses and to Heracles when the procession was held in accordance with the decree of Hy---tes son of Lysias. In ἀνάγνωσις, Agathocles son of Agathocles. In rhapsodizing [ῥαψῳδίας], Miltiades son of Dionysius. In playing the cithara (strumming), Xenos son of Timocles. In playing the cithara (plucked), Cleocydes son of Dionysius. In long-distance running (boys), Asclepiades son of Protogenes. In long-distance running (ephebes), Dionysius son of Callistratus. In long-distance running (middle age-category [μέσων]), Protocles son of Timocles. In long-distance running (older age-category), Moschion

[163] Boeckh 1843: 202: "Aetas tituli Augusto Imp[eratori] haud dubie superior est, fortasse etiam Mithradate et Sulla: hinc etiam aliquid vetustae resedit dialecti, ut Ἀγαθοκλεῦς, Τιμοκλεῦς."

> son of Moschion. In long-distance running (grown men), Aeschrion son of Aeschrion. In the sprint (boys), Athenicon son of Theophanes. In the sprint (younger ephebes) . . .
>
> (*CIG* II.2214 [= *SIL* 959])

Here the integration of religious ritual with contest is much more explicit; though Boeckh felt that here the "sumptus vero sacrorum praebebantur expublico ex his victoribus, iique ex *reditibus* (ἀπὸ τῆς προσόδου),"[164] comparison with other evidence for processions and sacrifice associated with musical competition indicates that procession *precedes* competition[165]; it would thus have included the victors-to-be. Howbeit, these sacrifices (to the Muses and to Heracles) follow the same division between the artistic and athletic spheres as the competitions, which here include (in the order of the inscription) ἀνάγνωσις, rhapsodizing (ῥαψῳδία), ψαλμός, κιθαρισμός for the 'artistic' side, and long-distance running and sprinting for the athletic before the inscription breaks off. In terms of the place of ἀνάγνωσις here, we note that it appears among the 'artistic' contests and just before ῥαψῳδία. Not only is ἀνάγνωσις here competitive, then, but it is also a performance art on par with playing a musical instrument or performing the poems of Homer; that ῥαψῳδία refers to the performance of canonical epic (presumably that of Homer) may be inferred not only from Dionysius' treatment of the subject in exclusively Homeric terms but also from

---

[164] Boeckh 1843: 202.

[165] E.g. *IG* XII.ix (from Euboea, mid-4th C BC), "τοὺς δὲ τὴν μουσικὴν ἀγωνιζομένους πάντα[ς] ἀγωνίζεσθαι προσόδιον τεῖ θυσίει ἐν τεῖ αὐλεῖ ἔ[χο]ντας τὴν σκευὴν ἥνπερ ἐν τοῖ ἀγῶνι ἔχουσ[ι]" (those competing in the musical contests should all compete in a procession [προσόδιον] to the sacrifice in the hall, arranged in the same way as they are in the contest). Cf. Nagy 1996: 111 n.24.

the regular contrast of the "ῥαψῳδός" with the "ἐπῶν ποητής" both in a series of Boeotian inscriptions from the first to third centuries AD and in an Delphic inscription from 97 BC.[166] Just as the default contents for unspecified ῥαψῳδία are the Homeric poems, so to we may imagine ἀνάγνωσις as consisting (at least on the educational level, and especially when immediately preceding a contest in ῥαψῳδία) of the reading of poetry; perhaps the difference between the two lies in the presence of a written text in the case of ἀνάγνωσις, or in a restriction of ῥαψῳδία to Homeric poetry; in any case, the two are coupled, both here and in the Tean inscription discussed below. Boeckh, for his part, presumes that both ἀνάγνωσις and ῥαψῳδία involve Homeric poetry and suggests that an emphasis on Homer in this Chian inscription may reflect the long-standing attachment of that city to Homer; observing that no victor's name is unChian,[167] he relates the contests in ἀνάγνωσις and ῥαψῳδια specifically to the "gymnasium *Homereum* Chii, in quo praeter gymnica poesis et musicae disciplina institutos pueros esse crediderim"[168]: if so, the contestants in these contests would certainly, in their own view, be continuing and renewing a tradition as old as the 5th century Homeridae.

---

[166] Boeotian inscriptions (all featuring this contrast): *IG* VII.418 (Oropus, 80-50 BC); *IG* VII.419 (Oropus, 80-50 BC); *IG* VII.420 (Oropus, 80-50 BC); *IG* VII.541 (Tanagra, 100-70 BC; giving only "ποιητής"); *IG* VII.3195 (Orchomenus, c. 0 BC); *IG* VII.4147 (Acraephia, turn of the 2nd C AD); Delphic inscription: *SIG* III.711.L (Delphi, 97 BC).

[167] Boeckh 1842: 202: "Nomina propria, quae insunt, prope omnia aliunde constat Chiis usitata fuisse." He goes on to observe that either the victor in ἀνάγνωσις, Agathocles son of Agathocles, or his father may be the very Agathocles mentioned as a "Chius Georgicorum scriptor [qui] memoratur Varroni, Columellae, Plinio"; if true, this would be a remarkable example of skill in ἀνάγνωσις corresponding to poetical ability and eventual fame.

[168] Boeckh 1843: 202.

As to how old the contestants are — an important point for our history of ἀνάγνωσις — we note that whereas the contestants (in ἀνάγνωσις as in the other contests) at Mylasa were (apparently) παῖδες (boys), here the division of age-categories is stringent in the case of the athletic competitions (of which we have only those for long-distance running [δόλιχον]) but undifferentiated in the case of the artistic competitions.[169] There is no reason to suppose, then, that young people (παῖδες or ἔφηβοι) were barred from the artistic competitions; nor should we suppose that the act of ἀνάγνωσις is unsuited to fully grown men (νέοι ἄνδρες), since we find ἀνάγνωσις used elsewhere for artistic performance at a religious festival without respect to age, as in the following inscription from Delos (3rd C AD):

[Ἡ]ρακλείτου Καλχ[ηδονίου.
ἔδοξεν τῆι βουλῆι κα[ὶ
τῶι δήμωι· Ἀναξιμένη[ς
Ἡγησαγόρου εἶπεν· ἐπε[ι-
[δὴ Ἡράκλει]τος [ἀγα]θὸς [ὢν
ἀνὴρ διατελεῖ περὶ τὸ ἱε-
ρὸν καὶ τὴν πόλιν τὴν Δηλ[ί
ων, ἀναγνώσεις τε τῶι θε[ῶι
ποιούμενος καὶ ἰδίαι τοῖς [ἐν-
τυχάνουσι τῶν πολιτῶ[ν
χρείας παρεχόμενος· δε[δόχ-
θαι τῶι δήμηι· εἶναι Ἡράκ[λει-

[169] Boeckh 1843: 202 provides the following scheme: "Aetates in musicis ludis non distinctae sunt, sed in gymnicis singulis ex ordine recensentur παῖδες, ἔφηβοι νεώτεροι, μέσοι, πρεσβύτεροι (hoc est ἔφηβοι μέσοι, ἔφηβοι πρεσβύτεροι, repetenda ex prioribus voce ἔφηβοι . . . postremo ἄνδρες. At vs. 4.5. ludi hi dicuntur παίδων, ἐφήβων, νέων: patet igitur νέους ibi eosdem esse, qui infra ἄνδρες; nempe sunt ἄνδρες νέοι oppositi ἄνδρασι πρεσβυτέροις s. τῷ πρεσβυτικῷ . . . Παίδων, ut ἀνδρῶν, una tantum classis est; ephebi in tres divisi sunt: alias aut tantum ἄνδρες et παῖδες in ludis distinguuntur, παῖδες vero in tres dirimuntur classes, τῆς πρώτης, τῆς δευτέρας, τῆς τρίτης ἡλικίας; aut distinguuntur παῖδες, ἀγένειοι, ἄνδρες, et παῖδες vel unam classem constituunt vel dividuntur in νεωτέρους et πρεσβυτέρους."

τὸν . . .
Concerning Heracletus son of Calchedonius. It pleases the assembly and the people: Anaximenes son of Hegesagorus spoke: since Heracletus, being a worthy man, has shown his dedication regarding the precinct and the city of the Delians, giving readings [ἀναγνώσεις ποιούμενος] to the god and likewise to citizens on-hand (sc. as audience[170]), providing for the expenses; so it has pleased the people; Heracletus is . . .

(*IG* XI.4.418)[171]

We also note the evidence of *SIG* 960 (from Magnesia, 2nd C AD), in which contests are held in μελογραφία, κιθαρισμός, κιθαρῳδία, ζωγραφία, and ἀριθμητικά, but no age-categories are given, suggesting that the competition was not limited to schoolboys. In the case of our Chian inscription above, then, even if multiple competitions based on age-category were not held here in the case of the artistic contests, the Chians certainly felt that such performances, with ἀνάγνωσις heading the list, were worth privileging at the head of the inscription, in contrast to other competitions' list of victors in which poetry appears only at the end.[172] We may guess

[170] For "οἱ ἐντυγχανόντες" as a term for audiences, cf. pseudo-Plutarch *Essay on the Life and Poetry of Homer* 8: "Καὶ τὸ μὲν ὅλον <ἡ> παρ' αὐτῷ διήγησις τῶν πραγμάτων παράδοξος καὶ μυθώδης κατεσκεύασται ὑπὲρ τοῦ πληροῦν ἀγωνίας καὶ θαύματος τοὺς ἐντυγχάνοντας καὶ ἐκπληκτικὴν τὴν ἀκρόασιν καθιστάναι" (Overall, his [Homer's] narrative of events is constructed in a strange and fabulous manner so as to fill the audience (τοὺς ἐντυγχάνοντας) with suspense and wonder and so as to make the experience of listening astounding).

[171] Cf. *IG* II^2.204 (from Athens, undated), a long decree on oracles featuring the command "ἀνα[γ]νωσθ[ήτ]ω τῶι δήμηι ἡ . . . μαντεία" (let the prophecy be read to the people); on the act of reperformance of Delphic oracles before the assembly as the culmination and authorization of their validity, see Maurizio 1997.

[172] E.g. *SIG* 1059.II (from Thessaly), in which "ἐνκώμιον λογικόν," "ἐνκώμιον ἐπικόν," "καταλογὴ νέα," and "ἐπίγραμμα" follow after victories in the horse race, the foot race, the two-horse race, the horse torch relay race, etc. (to the number of 22).

that if younger competitors did enter into competition in ἀνάγνωσις with the fully grown, they would have lost, but there is no way to determine such a demographic.

1.5.3 The inscription from Cnidus (*SEG* 44.902)

The mixing of age-categories specifically for a contest in ἀνάγνωσις does appear, however, in the ἀνάγνωσις inscription from Cnidus, dated to the late Hellenistic period[173]:

[- - - - - - - - - - ἆθλ]α παισὶ καὶ [...] Κ [—]
[- - - - - - - - - - - -]Ε τόξωι, Φιλῖνος Φιλο-
[- - - - - - - - - - - -]ενευς· ἀκοντίωι, Δημη-
[- - - - - - - - - - - - -]ς Ζμυρναῖος· ἀναγνώ-
[σει - - - - νεωτέρους] καὶ μέσους· εὐταξίαι,
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - κ]ράτης Καλλιφάνευς
[- - - - - - - - καλ]λιγραφίαι, Θηροκράτης
[- - - - - - - - - -].στου· ζωγραφίαι, Εὐαν-
[- - - - - - - - - - -]ς· ψάλτας Σίμακος
[- - - - - - - - - - -]λοδώρου· νεωτέρους
[- - - - - - - - - δολίχ]ωι Ἀγησικλῆς Ἐρατι-
[- - - - - - - - - - στ]αδίωι, Νικάνωρ Ἁλικαρ-
[νασσεύς- - - - - - - ε]υς· διαύλωι, Φιλόφρων
[- - - - - - - - - - - -] πάλαι, Ἑρμογένης
[- - - - - - - - - - game]s for the boys and [-] K [-]
[- - - - - - - - - - - -] archery, Philinus son of Phil
[- - - - - - - - - - - - -]nes. In the javelin, Deme-
[- - - - - - - - - - - - -]s of Smyrna. In ἀνάγνωσις
[- - - - - - the younger] and middle. In mannerliness
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]crates son of Calliphanes
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - cal]ligraphy, Therocrates
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]stes. In painting, Evan-

[173] Pleket 1994.288. The translation that follows here expresses the line-boundaries because the inscription is so fragmentary that a text without line-breaks would appear still more unintelligible.

[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]s. In dancing, Simacus
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]lodorus. The younger
[- - - - lon]g-distance race, Hagesicles son of Erati-
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - sp]rint, Nicanor of Hallicar-
nassus - - - - -]es. In the two-lap race, Philophron
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -] wrestling, Hermogenes

(*SEG* 44.902)

The list of contests here blends the athletic and the artistic, consisting (in order) of archery, javelin, ἀνάγνωσις, mannerliness (εὐταξία), calligraphy, painting, dancing, long-distance running, sprinting, two-lap racing, and wrestling; it is likely enough that further events are lost, owing to the fragmentary state of the stone. Nonetheless, the artistic events (ἀνάγνωσις, mannerliness, calligraphy, painting, dancing) are grouped together, and once again ἀνάγνωσις heads the list; εὐταξία ('mannerliness'), a somewhat abstract goal of the whole competition at Mylasa, is here included in the list of contests.

With regard to the question of age-categories, the first line (featuring "παισὶ καὶ . . .") suggests that the contestests included both παῖδες (boys) and some other class. In line 5 we read (after the break in the stone) "καὶ μέσους," leading the editor to restore "νεωτέρους" beforehand; μέσους here and νεωτέρους in line 10 are both in the accusative, being both presumably objects of a verb such as ἐνίκων whose subjects are presumably the victors' names (here always in the nominative). This would suggest that those victors who "prevailed over" the "[νεωτέρους] καὶ μέσους" includes victors in the events either preceding or following "νεωτέρους" in line 10:

these events would thus include a mix of both younger and middle age-categories.[174] The event of ἀνάγνωσις appears in line 4, directly preceding mention of the "[νεωτέρους] καὶ μέσους"; whether we associate the age range of the contestants in ἀνάγνωσις with that of the contestants in archery and javelin or with that of the contestants in mannerliness, calligraphy, painting, and dancing therefore depends on where we restore ἐνίκων and whether we suppose it more naturally follows or precedes its object. We may be sure, from comparative evidence, that the event (here in the dative) precedes the victor (here in the nominative). As there is no space in line 5 for a verb between μέσους and εὐταξίᾳ, the two alternatives seem to be either OBJECT (acc.) + EVENT (dat.) + VICTOR (nom.) + ἐνίκων or ἐνίκων + EVENT (dat.) + VICTOR (nom.) + OBJECT (acc.). In the former case, we would restore an age-category (or more than one) in the accusative at the beginning of line 2 (before τόξῳ) and restore ἐνίκων before νεωτέρους in line 5; in the latter case, we would restore ἐνίκων in line 2 (with [νεωτέρους] καὶ μέσους in line 5 as its object) and take it as elided before the list of events resumes with εὐταξίᾳ in line 5. As there is not sufficient space in line 5 to restore both ἐνίκων *and* the victor's name associated with ἀναγνώ | [σει], the first alternative seems to me to be untenable: we must thus restore an ἐνίκων in line 2 and include among the objects its subjects' victory the νεωτέρους καὶ μέσους of line 5, with all the events between them defined by that age range.

---

[174] In the Mylasian inscription above these adjectives describe categories of ἔφηβοι.

This includes ἀνάγνωσις, and this inscription therefore testifies to a mixed-age competition of νεώτεροι ἔφηβοι and μέσοι ἔφηβοι in the competition of ἀνάγνωσις at Cnidus. The name of the victor in ἀνάγνωσις is lost in this case, but the inscription is a remarkable testimony to the presence at the competition of young people from neighboring cities (Smyrna and Halicarnassus); this contrasts, at least outwardly, with the expressly civic focus of the competition at Mylasa.

1.5.4 The inscription from Teos (*CIG* 3088)

Turning to our last inscription, from Teos, we may well welcome the clarity with which it delimits its age-categories:

— — — — —
[Πρεσβυτέρας ἡλικίας·]
— — — — —
— — — — —
Slab a.
ὑποβολῆς ἀνταποδόσεως
Ζωΐλος Ζωΐλου
ἀναγνώσεως
Ζωΐλος Ζωΐλου
Μέσης ἡλικίας
ὑποβολῆς
Μητρόδωρος Αττάλου
ἀναγνώσεως
Διονυσικλῆς Μητροδοώρου
πολυμαθίας
Ἀθήναιος Ἀπολλοδώρου
ζωγραφίας
Διονύσιος Διονυσίου τοῦ
Διονυσίου τοῦ Μενεκράτου

Slab b.
Νεωτέρας [ἡλικίας
[ὑποβολῆς?]
Ἡράκλεος Ἡρ[ακλε] — —
ἀναγνώσεως
— — — — — — — —
καλλιγραφίας
— — — — — — — —
λαμπάδος
Ἡ — — — — — — —
ψαλμοῦ
Ἰατρο[κλῆς ?] — — —
κιθαρισμοῦ
Μ[ητρόδωρος?] — — —
κιθαρῳδίας
Α — — — — — — — —
ῥυθμογραφία[ς]
— — — — — — — —
κωμῳδίας
Ἄτ[ταλος]
τραγῳδίας
— — — — — — — —
μελογραφίας
[Νίκανδ]ρος? Νικίου

[*Older age-category*]
Slab a.
In sequenced relay: Zoilus son of Zoilus. In ἀνάγνωσις, Zoilus son of Zoilus.

Middle age-category
In relay: Metrodorus son of Attalus. In ἀνάγνωσις, Dionysicles son of Metrodorus. In the contest of great knowlege [πολυμαθίας[175]], Athenaeus son of Apollodorus. In painting, Dionysius son of Dionysius son of Dionysius son of Menecrates.

Slab b.
Younger [*age-category*]

[175] This presumably corresponds to the φιλομαθία of the Mylasian inscription above, if indeed φιλομαθία is not there a mistake for πολυμαθία on the part of the inscriber.

> [In relay?], Heracles son of Heracl[---]. In ἀνάγνωσις, [----------]. In calligraphy, [----------]. In the torch race, [----------]. In playing the cithara (strumming), Iatro[cles?]. In playing the cithara (plucking), M[etrodorus?]. In singing to the cithara, A[----------]. In marking signs of rhythm, [----------]. In comedy, At[talus]. In tragedy, [----------]. In writing down music, [Nicand?]er son of Nicias.
>
> (*CIG* 3088)

With respect to the age-categories we find here (a supplied [Πρεσβυτέρας ἡλικίας], a Μέσης ἡλικίας, and a Νεωτέρας [ἡλικίας]; literally the "Older Age-category," the "Middle Age-category," and the "Younger Age-category"), Boeckh supposes that they correspond either to a division between νέοι, ἔφηβοι, and παῖδες, or to a division between ἔφηβοι πρεσβύτεροι, ἔφηβοι μέσοι, and ἔφηβοι νεώτεροι, as in the Chian inscription.[176] It might be supposed that, since the Πρεσβύτερας ἡλικία is restored, the first two competitions pertain, as in the Cnidian inscription, to a *mixed* competition featuring both μέσοι and νεώτεροι; as both those age-categories contain victors in the same events, however — and since no competition can have more than one victor in Greece — Boeckh's assigning of the first two events to an "Older Age-category" should stand. This leaves us with the remarkable pattern of an increasing range of events the younger the competitors become: where the oldest age-category features only the ἀνταπόδοσις ὑποβολῆς[177] and ἀνάγνωσις, the middle age-category features these and adds πολυμαθία and painting, while the youngest age-category

---

[176] Boeckh 1843: 675.

[177] "Ita enim genitivi . . . intelligendi sunt, ut ὑποβολῆς pendeat ex altero nomine: nam ὑποβολὴ ἀνταποδόσεως videtur formula sensu cassa esse" (Boeckh 1843: 675).

excludes πολυμαθία and painting (retaining the ἀνταπόδοσις ὑποβολῆς[178] and ἀνάγνωσις) and adds no less than nine events calligraphy, a torch race, two forms of cithara-playing, cithara-singing, ῥυθμογραφία, comedy, tragedy, and μελογραφία.[179] Besides suggesting that it is Boeckh's latter suggestion of a tripartite division among ἔφηβοι that here obtains (for it seems intuitively unlikely that παῖδες would be as accomplished as the list of events for the Νεώτερα ἡλικία would require, including as it does events in tragedy and comedy), this list highlights the events of the ἀνταπόδοσις ὑποβολῆς and of ἀνάγνωσις (shared by all three age-categories) as being both of importance and appropriate to all age groups. It is to these two events, therefore, that we direct our attention.

The meaning of ἀνάγνωσις in and of itself has perhaps been developed sufficiently above; what is interesting here is its coupling with the ἀνταπόδοσις ὑποβολῆς. Boeckh devotes six close columns of his treatment of this inscription to this phrase, and his conclusions are extremely interesting, particularly in light of modern theory regarding Homeric performance dynamics. Boeckh adduces two points

---

[178] If we accept Boeckh's tentative restoration of ὑποβολῆς here; this makes sense, however, as the young Heracles requires an event to be victorious in and ἀνάγνώσεως is preceded by ὑποβολῆς ἀνταποδόσεως twice above.

[179] On ῥυθμογραφία as "marking signs of rhythm," as also on μελογραφία, cf. Boeckh 1843: 678: "ῥυθμογραφία ad normam vocum καλλιγραφία (vs. 4) et μελογραφίας (vs. 11) interpretanda est. Μελογραφία vix potest aliud esse nisi *scriptura signorum melicorum,* quae satis nota sunt; de *modis melicis faciendis* non agitur: haec est enim μελοποιΐα, ut *modorum rhythmicorum confectio* est ῥυθμοποιΐα. Itaque, quamquam poesi nulla rhythmica sigla adhibita esse plus semel contendi, concedo habuisse Graecos etiam *sigla rhythmica,* quibus uterentur in saltatione non solum temporibus, sed etiam gestu et figuris (σημηείοις καὶ σχήμασι) describenda, item in musica instrumentali adornanda: horum scriptura est ῥυθμογραφία."

of comparanda, from the dialogue *Hipparchus* ascribed to Plato and from Diogenes Laertius:

> Ἱππάρχῳ . . . ἠνάγκασε τοὺς ῥαψῳδοὺς Παναθηναίοις ἐξ ὑπολήψεως ἐφεξῆς αὐτὰ διιέναι, ὥσπερ νῦν ἔτι οἵδε ποιοῦσιν.
> Hipparchus . . . required the rhapsodes at the Panathenaic Festival to go through them [the Homeric poems] in sequence [ἐφεξῆς], by relay [ἐξ ὑπολήψεως], as they still do even today.
>
> ([Plato] *Hipparchus* 228b-c)

> τά τε Ὁμήρου ἐξ ὑποβολῆς γέγραφε ῥαψῳδεῖσθαι, οἷον ὅπου ὁ πρῶτος ἔληξεν, ἐκεῖθεν ἄρχεσθαι τὸν ἐχόμενον.
> He [Solon] wrote a law [γέγραφε] that the Homeric poems should be rhapsodized by relay [ἐξ ὑποβολῆς], so that wherever the first [rhapsode] left off, from that point the next should begin.
>
> (Diogenes Laertius 1.57)

These texts, made famous in our day by the 'crystallization' theory of Panathenaic performance argued by Gregory Nagy,[180] are brought to bear by Boeckh upon the ἀνταπόδοσις ὑποβολῆς of the Tean inscription; refuting the skeptical arguments of Nitzsch ("[argumenta] quae refellere longius est quam difficilius"), Boeckh (whose dissertation we can only summarize[181]) begins by observing that ὑπολάβειν, when used in the context of speech, always means "to add on" to another person's discourse, sometimes by interrupting[182]; noting that the scholiast to *Odyssey* xix.79-80 ("ἑσταότος μὲν καλὸν ἀκούειν, οὐδὲ ἔοικεν / ὑββάλλειν· χαλεπὸν γὰρ ἐπισταμένῳ περ ἐόντι" [It is fine to hear one who stands (to speak), and it is not

---

[180] Eg. Nagy 1996a: 63-76; Nagy 1996b: 79-82.
[181] It appears at Boeckh 1843: 675-678.
[182] Boeckh 1843: 676, citing Isocrates *Panathenaicus* 91, *Odyssey* xix.80, and formulae featuring the adverb ὑποβλήδην.

fitting / to break in; it would be hard, however wise one were]) glosses ὑββάλλειν as "διακόπτειν ἐξ ὑποβολῆς τὸν λόγον," Boeckh concedes that "interruption" can be one meaning for ὑποβολή but notes that this meaning does not allow for the force of ἔληξεν in the Diogenes Laertius passage; likewise, the phrase "ἐφεξῆς διϊέναι" in pseudo-Plato surely indicates that the earlier speaker's discourse is not interrupted but rather continued. On the relation between ὑποβολή and ὑπόληψις, Boeckh points out that they are mirror images of one another, the former referring to the action of the one handing off the narrative and the latter reffering to the action of the one taking it up; naturally then, "utroque usu in unum conflato haec ὑποβολὴ ut ὑπόληψις nihil fere aliud fuisse Graecis videtur nisi ea plurimum qui dicerent vel recitarent successio, qua alter alteri suscepta oratione et quodammodo interpellans responderet."[183] The ἀνταπόδοσις is to be understood in this light: it constitutes a "handing over in turn"; that the first contestant would not be able to do so "in turn" (whence the αντ-) is beside the point. Given the parallels between pseudo-Plato's and Diogenes Laertius' descriptions of what Nagy has termed "relay poetics" in the context of Homeric performance at the Panathenaic Festival with the name of the contest at Teos, Boeckh concludes forcefully that

> ὑποβολὴν et ὑπόληψιν esse idem, et ὑποβολὴν apud Diogenem pertinere ad rhapsodiam, longe est certissimum; quo intellecto ubi Chiam inscriptionem cum Teia contuleris, sponte offertur ea, quam

[183] Boeckh 1843: 676.

> proposuimus, coniectura, in Teio titulo ὑποβολὴν nihil esse nisi ῥαψῳδίαν ipsam.
> That ὑποβολή and ὑπόληψις are the same thing, and that ὑποβολή in Diogenes refers to rhapsodizing [a point he has debated with Nitzsch], is entirely certain: when this is understood, and when you compare the Chian inscription with the one from Teos, the conclusion which we have proposed suggests itself, namely that the ὑποβολή of the Teian insciption is nothing less than ῥαψῳδία. [184]

The point that Boeckh does not develop, however, is that the Teian inscription thus furnishes extraordinary evidence of a scrupulous effort of historical reenactment of the dynamics of rhapsodic performance in classical rhapsodic competition, whether we regard this as evidence of continuity across the centuries or not[185]; given that knowledge of the performance conditions at the Panathenaea was evidently widely diffused in antiquity,[186] this seems a more likely scenario than one in which the essential nature of the Homeric poems requires relay poetics. Nevertheless, the degree to which ὑποβολή and ὑπόληψις were essential to the rhapsodic art-form cannot be overstated: the very name of the rhapsodes ("song-stitchers") refers to "the esthetic of

---

[184] Boeckh 1843: 677.

[185] It would be convenient if Boeckh provided a date for the inscription, which he does not; he notes (Boeckh 1843: 672) that the inscription had (by 1843) been moved to Oxford (it is reportedly now in Northern Ireland along with the bulk of the Tean inscriptions), but I have been unable to find a more recent treatment than his, which might provide the date. The inscription is shortly to be treated by John Ma in a forthcoming volume edited by Peter Wilson, *The Epigraphy of the Greek Theatre and Festivals* (Oxford University Press, 2007). Boeckh's edition is based on an apograph made in 1719.

[186] Cf. not only Diogenes Laertius' description above (p. 97), but also such details as are preserved for example in the *Scholia Marciana* (*GG* I.3.316): "Ἐπιστητέον δὲ ὅτι εἰ μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰλιάδος ᾖδον οἱ Ὁμηρίδαι, φοινικοῦν ἐφόρουν στέφανον διὰ τὸ περὶ ἐκχύσεως αἱμάτων λέγειν αὐτοὺς τὴν ὑπόθεσιν, εἰ δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς Ὀδυσσείας, κυάνεον, διὰ τὸ τοιοῦτον εἶναι τὸ θαλάττης χρῶμα, περὶ ἣν ἐγένετο τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως ἡ πλάνη" (One should know that if the Homeridae were singing from the *Iliad*, they wore a red crown, because they were telling a story of bloodletting, while if they were singing from the *Odyssey* they wore a blue one, since that is the color of the sea over which Odysseus wandered).

combining many different patterns into one new unified pattern" which "seems to be the basis of a foundation myth that explains the genesis of Homeric poetry"[187]: the rhapsodic ethic is one of competitive collaboration.

That these dynamics should resurface on Teos in a competition among young men competing (in all age-categories) collaboratively (as ἀνταπόδοσις clearly signifies) is nothing short of astonishing; the Teans are even able to designate rhapsodizing performance on their immortal inscription not with the term ῥαψῳδία but with a phrase descriptive of its relay poetics. What is more relevant for the present study, however, is the consistent coupling of a contest of ἀνταπόδοσις ὑποβολῆς with a contest in ἀνάγνωσις, which likewise appears in all three age-categories in the Teian inscription. On the one hand, we might take this as evidence that ἀνάγνωσις and (some form of) ῥαψῳδία were distinct activities, and so it appears; but since we find that, in the Oldest Age-category (which would surely have included the most experienced would-be rhapsodes and readers aloud), a single person, Zoilus son of Zoilus, took the prize in both contests (a unique achievement if we may judge from this and other lists of victors), it appears that, just as ἀνάγνωσις and ῥαψῳδια are (in the inscriptions above) distinct yet sufficiently akin as to be consistently coupled, so too the ἀνάγνωσις here is akin to the ἀνταπόδοσις ὑποβολῆς. Clearly the skills which brought Zoilus son of Zoilus victory in the ἀναπόδοσις ὑποβολῆς were also

[187] Nagy 1996a: 69.

applicable in the contest of ἀνάγνωσις, and vice versa; regardless of how we interpret this contrast, we can be sure that Zoilus son of Zoilus was able to bring poetry to life in front of the judges, whether *via* ἀνάγνωσις or *via* ἀνταπόδοσις; his double victory furnishes us with an extraordinary proof that ἀνάγνωσις was a medium closely akin to the art of rhapsodic performance itself.

1.6 Conclusion: ἀνάγνωσις in the *Hermeneumata*

By way of concluding our survey of the role of ἀνάγνωσις in Greek education, we may examine one last class of evidence for reading aloud in the ancient classroom, relating it to the treatment of literary, papyrological, theoretical, and epigraphical sources already undertaken. This evidence is the testimony of the Late Antique *Hermeneumata* (or *"Colloquies"*) preserved in eight manuscripts dating from the 9th to the 15th centuries AD.[188] Neither "interpretations" nor "dialogues" is, in fact, an appropriate label for these works, which essentially resemble the little stories found in modern language-learning textbooks and which indeed served a similar purpose. In large part they recount a day in the life of a schoolboy from dawn to dusk; for his text of the *Celtes* colloquium, Dionisotti provides the sections titles of "Getting up," "At School," "Lunch," "Preparations for Dinner," "At the Baths," "After the Party —

[188] For a review of the 'vital statistics' of these MSS. (which intermingle a good deal of material and preclude stemmatization), see Dionisotti 1972: 87. The texts of the *Hermeneumata* are published in the *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum* (CGL) Vol. III (= Goetz 1892), pp. 637-659. There are five versions, the *Leidense* (L), the *Harleianum* (H), the *Monacensia* (M), the *Montepessulanum* (MP), and the *Celtes* (C); this last was first published in Dionisotti 1972.

Bedtime," in sequence with the daily routine they describe.[189] These texts were, in fact, bilingual interlinear language texts designed by Greek-speaking pedagogues of Late Antiquity to assist Latin-speaking schoolchildren in learning Greek[190]; the narrative they contain thus pauses regularly to list (and gloss) vocabulary appropriate to whatever situation the first-person narrator finds himself in: the effect is reminiscent of a stream-of-consciousness technique. The world which the *Hermeneumata* depict is more typical than idealized, being designed presumably to suit as wide an audience as possible while remaining interesting to the young reader: though the narrator is a dutiful fellow, he has spirit.[191] He has a pedagogue, a nurse, and is well-dressed.[192]

---

[189] Three *Hermeneumata*, the *Colloquium Harleianum*, the *Colloquia Monacensia*, and the *Colloquium Montepessulanum*, include non-schoolboy material; the *Harleianum* in particular features a good deal of cursing, e.g. *CGL* III.641.16, "Duc te ergo. Quid stas? Quid tibi pertinet? Procurator meus es? Duc te. Recede (recedes), inpostor. Maledicis me, maligne et odiose? Ipse ista fac, expudorate. Tace. Bene tibi sit, nequissime homo. Ista audiet dominus tuus, si obviat mihi" (Well then, get lost. What are you waiting for? What's your problem? Are you my boss? Get lost. Take off (You will take off), wiseguy. You're cursing me, you jerk? Same to you, bozo. Shut up. That's right, you stupid idiot. Your master will hear that, if I run into him). All this is faithfully reproduced in the Greek.

[190] Dionisotti 1972: 91-92, who upholds the view of an Eastern, Greek-language origin (either of texts of or authors) on the grounds that the Greeks in general only learned Latin when their schooldays were long past, if at all. After showing that Goetz's presumption of a single original source for our various texts is untenable, Dionisotti further notes that neither the Latin nor the Greek text need necessarily be considered 'original' *in toto* and we may regard each text as contaminated by the other. It does appear that the texts were expressly designed to be compatible with one another and to permit one-to-one glosses: this is particularly clear in the case of the Greek, for which the interlinear translator "faithfully renders each part of speech with its equivalent, rarely letting fly with, e.g., τω διδασκοντι με for *doctori meo*" (Dionisotti 1972: 95). In considering the meaning of terms found in the *Hermeneumata*, then, we may presume that synonyms appearing therein were selected especially for their abililty to literally render one language's word with the other's.

[191] He always greets his teachers and fellow students cheerfully (eg. *CGL* III.646 [*Monacensia*], "processi de cubiculo cum paedagogo et cum nutrice salutare patrem et matrem; ambos salutavi et osculatus sum" [I leave my bedroom with my pedagogue and my nurse to greet my father and mother; I greeted them both and was kissed]; Dionisotti 1972: 98 [*Celtes*], "Si quis notus aut amicus occurit mihi, saluto eum nomine suo" [If I run into someone I know or a friend of mine, I greet him by his name]) and does well in school (e.g. *CGL* III.656.6 [*Montepessulanum*], "Laudem scripsi. Cuius? Iovis Capitolini. Lege. Magne dixisti. Tolle coronam. Nemo tibi contradicit" [I have written an *encomium.*

We may thus take the descriptions of ἀνάγνωσις in the *Hermeneumata* as typical enough of the ἀνάγνωσις that featured in the school day of a reasonably well-off schoolboy who is (as we observed in the passage already quoted above[193]) ahead of the "minores" who are still learning "syllabae" in primary school; he thus finds himself at the level of grammatical education, albeit in the same classroom with younger students.[194]

Examining the act of reading in these texts, we discover that it is indeed associated with the act of writing, but nevertheless distinct from it. Let us consider, for instance, the following passage:

> Ἔλαβον καὶ ἀπέδωκα πάλιν. Στίχους ὕστερον ἠρξάμην ἀναγινώσκειν.
> Accepi et reddidi iterum. Versus postea coepi legere.
> Παραγράφειν οὐκ οἶδα. Σὺ ἐμοὶ παράγραψον, ὡς οἶδας.
> Praeducere nescio. Tu mihi praeduc, quomodo scis.
> Κηρίον σκληρόν ἐστιν. Ἁπαλον ὤφειλεν εἶναι. Δέλτον. Λειαίνω.
> Cera dura est. Mollis debuit esse. Tabula. Deleo.
> Γράφω. Σὺ ἐμοί. Σελίς. Σελίδες πολλαί. Ἱμάντες. Γραφεῖον.
> Scribo. Tu mihi. Pagina. Paginae multae. Corrigiae. Graphium.
> I took it and I gave it back again. I began to read the verses afterwards.
> I do not know how to copy. Copy for me, then, as you know how. The

---

Of whom? Of Capitoline Jove. Read it. You have spoken wonderfully. Take the prize. No one disagrees with you]) but sometimes quarrels with his schoolfellows (e.g. *CGL* III.646 [*Monacensia*], "Sed statim dictavit mihi condiscipulus. Et tu, inquit, dicta mihi. Dixi ei: Redde primo. Et dixit mihi: Non vidisti, cum redderem prior te? Et dixi: Mentiris, non reddidisti. Non mentior. Si verum dicis, dicto" [But right away my schoolfellow recited. 'And you,' he said, 'recite to me.' I said to him, 'Give it back first.' And he said to me, 'Didn't you see that I gave it back to you already?' And I said, 'You liar, you didn't give it back' 'I'm not lying.' 'If you tell the truth, I'll recite']).

[192] E.g. Dionisotti 1972: 97-98 (*Celtes*), "Vestio me (vestivi me) ut decet (ut decuit) filium familias hominem ingenuum" (I get dressed [I got dressed] as is appropriate [as was appropriate] for the son of the family and a well-born man).

[193] Above, p. 55.

[194] On the "one-room schoolhouse" in antiquity, see Cribiore 2001: 21-34 on the physical situation and scope of the classroom; she makes it clear that the one-room model depicted here is one among many possibilities.

> wax is hard. It should be soft. The tablet. I erase. I write. You to me. The page. Many pages. Corrections. The pencil.
>
> (*Colloquium Leidense* [CGL III.638.6])

Here the student is engaged in copying a text; his assertion that he does not know how to copy ("praeducere nescio") being canceled by the teacher who tells him to copy as he knows how to do ("praeduc quomodo scis"); and indeed the student proceeds to copy the text onto his wax tablet. The exchange reverses the scenario described by Cribiore, noted above, in which students learned to copy before learning to read: here the student is able to read perfectly well but refuses to copy. Most importantly, he reads after he has given the text back to the teacher ("Reddidi iterum. Versus *postea* coepi legere") and before he begins to copy; as the student would thus not have the text in front of him, he must have committed it to memory before reading it — that is, reading it aloud. We might suppose that mention of "corrigiae" (corrections) at the end of this passage refers to the student's own corrections, but the abbreviated (and surely formulaic) classroom command "Tu mihi" must be the teacher speaking to the student.

A further passage confirms that the teacher is indeed the one who corrects the student's written work, while again showing that *lectio* was an activity that went beyond the written text.

> Παραγράφω πρὸς τὸν ὑπογραμμόν· γράψας δὲ δεινύω τῷ διδασκάλῳ·
> Praeduco ad praescriptum; ut scripsi, ostendo magistro;
> ἐδιώρθωσεν, ἐχάραξεν· κελεύει με ἀναγινώσκειν. Κελευσθεὶς ἄλλῳ δέδωκα.
> emendavit, induxit; iubet me legere. Iussus alio dedi.

> I copy in accordance with the model. Having copied it, I show it to teacher; he corrected it, he fixed it; he orders me to read (ἀναγινώσκειν). I am told to give it to someone else and I do so.
>
> (*Colloquia Monacensia* [*CGL* III.646.2])

Here the act of copying, followed the correction of copied text by the teacher, is a prelude to the act of *lectio* by the student: the teacher's corrections thus serve not only to improve the written text but (most of all) to improve or enable the student's *lectio.* We find a close parallel in a passage from the scholia to Dionysius Thrax not yet discussed:

> πρὸ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ ἄρξασθαι τὸν νέον ἀναγινώσκειν, ὁ διορθωτὴς λαμβάνων τὸ βιβλίον διωρθοῦτο αὐτό, ἵνα μὴ ἐπταισμένον αὐτὸ ἀναγνοὺς ὁ νέος εἰς κακὴν ἕξιν ἐμπέσῃ· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα λαβὼν ὁ νέος τὸ βιβλίον διορθωθέν, ἀπῄει πρὸς τὸν ἀναγνωστικὸν τὸν ὀφείλοντα αὐτὸν διδάσκειν ἀναγινώσκειν κατὰ τὴν διόρθωσιν τοῦ διορθωτοῦ.
>
> Before the young man [νέος] would begin to read [ἀναγινώσκειν], the corrector [διορθητής] would take the book and correct it, so that the young man would not read it in an imperfect state [ἵνα μὴ ἐπαισμένον αὐτὸ ἀναγνοὺ ὁ νέος] and thus fall into a bad habit. After that, the young man would take the corrected book and go off to the reading teacher [ἀναγνωστικός] who would help teach him to read in accordance with the correction of the corrector.
>
> (*Commentarius Melampodis* [*GG* I.3.12])

Leaving aside the question of an instructor whose duties are devoted especially to teaching the art of reading (the ἀναγνωστικός, for whom there is little evidence apart from this passage), the scholiast is here describing a scenario parallel to that described in the *Colloquia Monacensia* in that the activities of writing and copying are likewise distinguished by the intervention of the teacher's act of correction, the difference

being that the tasks of correction and teaching the art of reading aloud, assigned in the scholiast's scenario to different preceptors, are collapsed in the *Colloquia Monacensia.*

What did such instruction in the art of reading amount to? Apparently, this depended on who was doing the reading. In the following scenario, it is the teacher himself who reads:

> Φωνηθεὶς πρὸς ἀνάγνωσιν ἀκούω ἐξηγήσεις, διανοίας, πρόσωπα.
> Clamatus ad lectionem audio expositiones, sensus, personas.
> Ἐπερωτηθεὶς τέχνην ἀπεκρίθην. Πρὸς τίνα, λεγει. Τί μέρος λόγου;
> Interrogatus artificia respondi. Ad quem, dixit. Quae pars orationis?
> Ἔκλινα γένη ὀνομάτων, ἐμέρισα στίχον. Ὡς δὲ ταῦτ' ἐπράξαμεν,
> Declinavi genera nominum, partivi versum. Ut haec egimus,
> ἀπέλυσεν εἰς ἄριστον. . . . Ἠριστηκὼς ἐπανέρχομαι πάλιν εἰς
> dimisit ad prandium. . . . Pransus revertor iterum in
> τὴν σχολήν. Εὑρίσκω καθηγητὴν ἐπαναγινώσκοντα, καὶ εἶπεν· Ἄρξασθε
> scholam. Invenio magistrum perlegentem, et dixit: Incipite
> ἀπ' ἀρχῆς.
> ab initio.
>
> Summoned to the reading I hear about the interpretations, the meanings, the characters. When he called on me, I answered with my τέχνη. To whom? he says. What part of speech? I decline the cases of the nouns, I scan the verse. When we have done that, school stops for lunch. After lunch, I come back to school. I find the teacher reading it out, and he said, Start from the beginning.
>
> (*Colloquia Monacensia* [CGL III.647.2])

Here the student is not said to be himself reading, and "clamatus ad lectionem" apparently refers to a reading by the teacher, who also provides interpretation, glosses, and descriptions of the characters; the student, for his part, is grilled on grammar (his τέχνη in its abstract sense). When he returns from lunch, however, the student apparently gets his turn to read, rereading what the teacher had already read to him. The teacher's interpretation, glosses, and descriptions of the characters were all

preliminary to this act of *lectio* on the part of the student, as appears more clearly in the following passage[195]:

> Απιουσι προτοσχολοι προς διδα<σκαλον>, αναγενοσκουσιν αναγνωσιν
> Eunt priores ad magistrum, legunt lectionem
> περι Ελιαδος, αλλην περι Οδισσειας. Λαμβανουσι τοπιν, παρενεσιν,
> de Iliade, aliam de Odysseia. Accipiunt locum, suasoriam,
> αμφισβητησιν, ιστοριαν, κωμηδιαν, δραγματα, απασιν φιλοπονιαν/ρηθωριας,
> controversiam, historiam, comoediam, narrationes, omnem industriam /orationis,
> προφασιν του Ελλιακου πολεμου, προφασιν της αναγορευσις, αναδοσιν.
> causas Troici belli, materiam recitationis, redictationes.
> The older students go up to the teacher, they read a reading from the *Iliad*, another from the *Odyssey*. They are given the passage [*locum*], the scenario [*suasoria*], the background [*historia*], the comedy, the stories, the whole workload [*industria*], of the speech, the causes of the Trojan war, the material for the recital, the *dictées*.
>
> (*Celtes* [Dionisotti 1972: 100])

All this material is to contribute to the quality of the student's ἀνάγνωσις: after a long list of literary works such as might figure as the objects of *lectio* in this classroom ("Actiones Tullianas, Maronem, Persium, Lucanum, Statium, duo bella, Terentium, Sallustium, tres comoedias, Theocritum, Thucydidem, Demosthene, Hippocratem, Xenophontem et Cynicos") we immediately get the following passage:

> Τοτε επανερχετε εκαστος, εν τω ιδιω τοπω καθεσουσιν. Εκαστος
> Tunc revertitur quisque, in suo loco considunt. Quisque
> αναγινωσκη ανα<νωσιν> αυτω δεδειγμενην· αλλος γραφει, εθοποιει·
> legit lectionem sibi subtraditam; alter scribit, alter meditatur.
> εις ταξην αναγορευουσιν εκαστος κατα την δυναμιν· η της καλως ανεγορευσεν,
> In ordinem recitant quisque pro posse; si quis bene recitavit,
> επενειτε, ει της κακως, δερετε.
> laudatur, si quis male, coercetur.
> Then everyone goes back, they sit down in their places. Each of them reads the reading assigned to him; one writes, another thinks / gets

[195] The Greek text of the *Celtes* colloquium is particularly corrupt (and the Latin glosses particularly inept), but for symmetry I quote the Greek first and Latin beneath when giving the *Celtes* text, following Dionisotti 1972 (who likewise preserves an accent- and breathing-free diplomatic text).

> himself ready [*meditatur* / ἠθοποιεῖ]. Each student recites in order as best he can; if a student has recited well, he is praised; if he has recited badly, he is corrected.
>
> (*Celtes* [Dionisotti 1972: 100-101])

It is thus just after a conference with the teacher, who provides the historical context and general material for the *lectio*, that each student returns to his seat to prepare his *lectio* privately: this can include writing ("alter scribit") but also includes ἠθοποιΐα on the part of one student (glossed as *meditatur* but denoting more fully the development of character). The act of ἀνάγνωσις here, then, is both grounded in the literary and historical tradition *and* dependent upon the representation of character — as the reference to the students "receiving the characters" (*accipiunt . . . personas*) in the *Colloquia Monacensia* passage above has already suggested. Most significantly for our appreciation of the relationship between these colloquies and the epigraphical record, the *lectio* is a group activity: the students here recite according to the "ordo" of the text ("εἰς τάξιν ἀναγορεύουσιν") the portion they have been assigned from the body of material picked for the group's collective *lectio* (ἀναγινώσκει ἀνάγνωσιν αὐτῷ δεδειγμένην / *legit lectionem sibi subtraditam*, where δεδειγμένην and *subtraditum* denote a portion of a larger whole). As to "relay poetics," we twice find that the student reads first and then gives the text he is reading from to some other person.[196]

---

[196] *Colloquia Monacensia* (*CGL* III.642.2): "Iubet me legere. Iussus alio dedi" (He tells me to read. When he tells me, I give it to somebody else); *Celtes* (Dionisotti 1972: 99): "Dat mihi manuale et iubet me legere apud se paginas quinque; et legi certe et nobiliter. Tunc alio dedi. Postea redeo ad

It will be apparent that the *Hermeneumata* furnish us with an invaluable link between the practice of ἀνάγνωσις as it is prescribed in the *Ars Grammatica* and its scholia and the competitions in ἀνάγνωσις that figure in the epigraphical record. As we have seen, the *Ars* and its scholiasts carefully explain the historical background to the genres that supply the material for ἀνάγνωσις, relating this background directly to performance style, and insist that the reader is to attempt to realize vividly the characters which his texts contain; similarly, the teachers who appear in the *Hermeneumata* train the young readers in the classroom for their act of ἀνάγνωσις by informing them of the historical context of the texts they will read, as well as the nature of the characters in those texts, prompting ἠθοποΐα on the part of the student. The teacher himself can read the text before the student, a point that reminds us of the scholiast's view that the aim of thorough training in ἀνάγνωσις is to be able to read as well as a real γραμματικός.[197] With respect to the epigraphical record, the "relay poetics" evident from the competition in rhapsodizing at Teos here appear in the classroom itself, as students are assigned portions of a text to perform in sequence ("in ordinem"). Nor is the element of competition, fundamental to the contests in ἀνάγνωσις in Ionia, lacking: students are praised or corrected, or given (probably imaginary) crowns on the basis of the quality of their ἀνάγνωσις; this ἀνάγνωσις is

---

subdoctorem" (He gives me the handbook and tells me to read five pages in front of him; and I read with sureness and nobility. Then I gave it to someone else. Afterwards I go back to the teaching assistant).

[197] See note 35 above.

thus, like the contest ἀνάγνωσις of the inscriptions though on a smaller scale, manifestly not a solitary or silent activity but rather one which requires a critical audience such as the *Ars* and its scholia also depict. With respect to the papyrological evidence, we have seen that the διορθῶσις of the teacher is an important prelude to the act of ἀνάγνωσις, while students in the classroom of the *Hermeneumata* read "κατὰ διαστολήν"[198]; the overall *perfomance-oriented environment* that the *Hermeneumata* describe thus confirms our hypothesis that διαστολή is indeed, just as Dionysius Thrax had pronounced, geared towards reading aloud. This brings us at last to the literary evidence of Quintilian and Ausonius with which we began: can we say that the following lines of Ausonius, quoted at the outset of this chapter, reflect an educational culture which aimed at the poetic performance of texts?

> conditor Iliados et amabilis orsa Menandri
> evolvenda tibi: tu flexu et acumine vocis
> innumeros numeros doctis accentibus effer
> adfectusque inpone legens. Distinctio sensum
> auget et ignavis dant intervalla vigorem.
> The founder of the *Iliad* and the works of lovable Menander
> Should be unrolled by you: you by the modulation and pitch of the voice
> Bring forth the endless lines with learned accents
> And infuse forms of expression as you read; punctuation enhances the sense
> And pauses give strength to the dull;
>
> Ausonius *Protrepticus ad nepotem* 46-50

---

[198] *Colloquium Leidense* (*CGL* III.638.8):

> ὁ παῖς ἐμοῦ, δὸς ἐμοὶ δέλτον, καὶ ἄλλοι ἐν τάξει ἀποδιδοῦσιν
> Puer meus, da mihi tabulam, et alii in ordine reddunt
> κατὰ διαστολήν, καὶ ἐγὼ διέρχομαι ἀνάγνωσιν.
> ad distinctum, et ego transeo lectionem.

I believe that, in light of our survey of ἀνάγνωσις in Greek education, we can imagine Ausonius' grandson here not only reading the *Iliad* expressively, but doing so before an audience, inhabiting its characters, renewing its rhapsodic tradition, and sharing that activity with his fellows.

Chapter 2: Performance-oriented ἀνάγνωσις in the Homer scholia

2.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter, we observed that the discussion of ἀνάγνωσις at the level of grammatical education, from the literary evidence furnished by Quintilian and Ausonius to the pedagogical evidence of the papyri and the scholia to Dionysius Thrax, proceeded principally on two levels: on the one hand, punctuation (regulating poetry as discourse in realtime), and, on the other, tone of voice (for the appropriate expression of character and genre, or rather character *in* or *as* genre). In this second chapter, we turn to ἀνάγνωσις as it appears in ancient Homeric scholarship as evidenced in the scholia to a handful of 10th-, 11th-, and 12th-century *Iliad* codices; these appear most extensively in the celebrated Venetus A manuscript and in the Townley codex now preserved in the British Museum.[199] In these scholia, we similarly find ἀνάγνωσις discussed both on the level of punctuation and on the level of tone of voice; thus the first half of the present chapter concerns the punctuational

[199] On the manuscript stemma of the Homer scholia, see Erbse 1969.1: xi-lix (substantially based on evidence adduced in Erbse 1960), with some alternative suggestions in van der Valk 1963; the principal source for Nicanor's work, as for that of the other three scholars in the "Viermännerkommentar" (VMK) group, is the Venetus A codex. There is no more philologically intricate problem than that of the transmission of the VMK scholia; unfortunately no general introduction to the problems in this field exists. For a brief overview, see Nagy 1997; the chief contributions are those of Villoison 1788, Lehrs

system of Nicanor as a vehicle for the minute regulation of Homeric discourse in the reader's mouth, while the second half turns to the so-called 'exegetical' scholia and their specifications for the performance of character (ἦθος). Together these aspects of ἀνάγνωσις serve to clarify the degree to which the scholarly tradition in antiquity conceived of the reader of Homeric poetry as a performer; as will appear in the following pages, that conception is entirely consonant with the function of ἀνάγνωσις in the educational system as described in Chapter 1. With the help of some further aspects of ἀνάγνωσις as explored in Chapter 3, the relationship between scholia and young reader will be discussed in the Conclusion of this dissertation.

The task before us is complicated by the fact that the Homer scholia, in contrast to Dionysius Thrax and his scholiasts, are not engaged in questions of definition: instead, the modern student is obliged to reconstruct the assumptions governing their commentary inductively. From the point of view of methodology, it must constantly be borne in mind that ancient scholarly commentary on Homer reaches us, *via* the scholia, selectively and in a highly abbreviated form.[200]

1882 (= Lehrs 1833), Pierron 1869, Ludwich 1884, Allen 1931, Erbse 1960, van der Valk 1963, Wilson 1967, Lührs 1992, McNamee 1998, and Nagy (forthcoming: *Homer the Classic*).

[200] Comparing the level of detail found in papyrus fragments of *Iliad* ὑπομνήματα to the level of detail preserved in the codices, we can appreciate how much is lost. For example, Erbse 1969 Papyrus 5 consists of three fragmentary columns: the first features (part of) VI.240 in a lemma preceded by at least seven lines of commentary and followed by at least four; the second features VI.257 in a lemma preceded by at least eight lines of commentary and followed by at least twelve; the third takes its lemmata from VI.277, 278, 280, 281-282, and 284-285, preceded by at least two and a half lines of commentary and featuring one line after 277, two after 278, two after 280, eight after 281-282, and an indeterminable number of lines after 284-285. This thirteen definite lines of commentary for lines 277-282; if we use the average of 33 characters per line to fill in for incomplete lines, this yields roughly

Consequently, the present study can only hope to define the *nature* and *scope* of ancient scholars' idea of the role of the ἀνάγνωσις of Homer: though the number of individual scholia which definitely imply a performative valence for the ἀνάγνωσις of Homer is relatively small, the vast majority of scholia are neutral on the question, suiting a performance-based role for the Homeric poems as well as they would suit a purely textual role; thus the scholia which do point to performance may be taken as indicative of a more general view of how the text is to be used. In attempting to describe an overarching concept such as ἀνάγνωσις, then, we should not expect to arrive at a discreet system: rather, if we imagine ἀνάγνωσις as a spectrum featuring, at one end, the small-scale detail of the briefest of pauses (a βραχυτάτη διαστολή) and, at the other end, the grandest mode of heroic utterance, we will find the material of ἀνάγνωσις — punctuation, discourse, intonation, and characterization — interacting and interlocking at various points between the two extremes. So it appears from the examination of the evidence below, owing, I believe, to the fact that ἀνάγνωσις is not conceived by the scholia as an activity distinct from the ordinary use of the poem.

---

433 characters of commentary. For the lines corresponding to this third column as they appear in the all the scholia sources taken together (representing the distillation of material from multiple ancient ὑπομνήματα: Aristonicus, Didymus, and the 'exegetical' sources; the first two representing the ὑπομνήματα of at minimum Zenodotus, Aristophanes, and Aristarchus), we find 864 characters' worth of commentary. We must allow, too, that the priorities of the compiler of Aristonicus, Didymus, the

2.2 Performative ἔμφασις in Nicanor

We may begin with Nicanor and the scholia's observations regarding punctuation of the Homeric text. Nicanor has not received a great deal of attention from modern scholars.[201] The glamor of the Homeric Question, for which the lexical and stichic variants in the Homeric text attested by his fellow VMK scholars Didymus and Aristonicus are vital, has eclipsed him[202]; apart from the purely philological challenge of identifying Nicanor scholia as such,[203] scholarship has focused on Nicanor's relationship with ancient grammatical theory[204] or lately on what he can add to our knowledge of ancient colometry.[205] In contrast, the present discussion does not focus on Nicanor's place in the history of ancient grammar or metrics but rather on his commentary on Homer as an event in the cultural and literary history of ἀνάγνωσις.

Before proceeding to a study of performance-related indicators in the Nicanor scholia, however, it will be helpful to review the nature of our primary sources regarding Nicanor's punctuational theory and practice and to assess the

---

compiler of the VMK, and the excerptor of the VMK surely privilege variant readings, questions of accentuation, and questions of punctuation.

[201] The bibliography is effectively limited to Friedländer 1857, Wackernagel 1876, Wendel 1936, Baar 1956 (somewhat obliquely), Erbse 1960 (insofar as Nicanor scholia help clarify transmission), Blank 1983, and Cantilena 1995. The last addresses the colometric implications of Nicanor's punctuation. Nicanor's works were collected from Villoison's edition and edited by L. Friedländer in 1850, and have since been incorporated into the editions of Bekker (1875) and Erbse (1969); we shall cite Nicanor scholia in accordance with the numbering system of the latter, which is now canonical.

[202] As Blank observes (Blank 1983: 48), Nicanor's ìpunctiliousness earned [him] little more than ridicule. H. Usener . . . called Nicanor a *Grillenfänger* . . . Even L. Friedländer . . . often ridiculed Nicanor without trying to see why he made certain decisions.

[203] As in Friedländer 1857, Erbse 1960, van der Valk 1963.

[204] As with Baar 1956, Blank 1983.

methodological approach of the only contemporary treatment of Nicanor's system (that of David Blank). Both preliminary tasks are complicated, as we shall see, by the survival (in one section of the scholia to Dionysius Thrax' *Ars Grammatica*) of a highly theoretical description of Nicanor's eight marks of punctuation from late antiquity; this description has limited modern engagement with Nicanor to the study of the syntactical implications of his punctuation. I argue, by contrast, that Nicanor's principal aim was the clarification of ἀνάγνωσις: this included, but was not limited to, syntactical clarification, and served to enable the display (ἔμφασις) of extra-textual meaning in the *Iliad* by the reader.

2.2.1 Sources on Nicanor

Four sources provide us with what knowledge we have of Nicanor's work on punctuation. In order of increasing amplitude, they are, firstly, the famous subscription appearing at the close of the books of the *Iliad* in the Venetus A codex; secondly, the Suda entry on Nicanor; thirdly a passage in the scholia to Dionysius Thrax (*GG* I.3.26.4-28.8); lastly, some 848 marginal scholia and *Textscholien* in medieval manuscripts of the *Iliad*, chiefly the Venetus A codex.[206] The first two sources concern the titles (and scope) of Nicanor's punctuational criticism; the last

---

[205] Cantilena 1995.

two concern the theory and the specifics (respectively) of that work. Accordingly, it is convenient to consider the first two together and the last two together.

2.2.1.1 The Suda entry and the Venetus A subscription

The subscription following each book of the *Iliad* (save XXIV) in the Venetus A is as follows:

> Παράκειται τὰ Ἀριστονίκου σημεῖα καὶ τὰ Διδύμου περὶ τῆς Ἀρισταρχείου διορθώσεως, τινὰ καὶ ἐκ τῆς προσῳδίας Ἡρωδιανοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῶν Νικάνορος περὶ στιγμῆς.
> Alongside lie the *Signs* of Aristonicus and Didymus' work *On the Edition of Aristarchus*, as well as some things from the *Prosody* of Herodian and Nicanor's *On Punctuation.*

In two instances of the subscription, however, namely following Books 3 and 4, the title of the Nicanor source is given as *περὶ Ὁμηρικῆς στιγμῆς*.[207] The Suda entry on Nicanor is as follows (N 375):

> Νικάνωρ, ὁ Ἑρμείου, Ἀλεξανδρεὺς, γραμματικός, γεγονὼς ἐπὶ Ἀδριανοῦ τοῦ Καίσαρος, ὅτε καὶ Ἕρμιππος ὁ Βηρύτιος. *Περὶ στιγμῆς τῆς παρ' Ὁμήρῳ καὶ τῆς ἐξ αὐτῶν* [αὐτῆ Daub.] *διαφορᾶς ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ, Περὶ στιγμῆς τῆς καθόλου* βιβλία β', *Ἐπιτομὴν τούτων βιβλίον α', Περὶ στιγμῆς τῆς παρὰ Καλλιμάχῳ, Κωμῳδούμενα, Περὶ ναυστάθμου, Περὶ τοῦ ὦναξ, Περὶ στιγμῆς*: καὶ ἄλλα. ἐφ' ᾗ πραγματείᾳ σκωπτόμενος πρὸς τινων Στιγματίας ἐκαλεῖτο: οὐ γὰρ δήπου ὡς δοῦλος οὕτως ἐσκώπτετο.
> Nicanor son of Hermeius, of Alexandria, a grammarian, flourished in the time of the Emperor Hadrian, contemporary with Hermippus of Beiruit. *On the punctuation in Homer and the resultant differences for*

---

[206] There are also four reports of his explanations of toponyms, apparently from a work entitled *Περὶ Ἀλεξανδρείας πρὸς Ἀδριανόν* (perhaps separate works), found in Stephanus Byzantinus (s.v. Ἀλεξάνδρεια; Ἀθλίβις; Τίβυρις; Ἀλάβαστρα) and collected at *FGH* 628; see Wendel 1936: 275.
[207] Lehrs 1882: 2.

> *the meaning* [διάνοια[208]]; *On punctuation in general* (2 books); *Epitome* of the previous (1 book); *On the punctuation in Callimachus*; *Comedic Themes*; *On the stations of the ships*; *On* ὦναξ [i.e. on *crasis*]; *On punctuation*; and other works. He was mocked by the name of 'The Prick' by some, in accordance with the material he treated; it was not indeed because he was a slave that he was thus mocked.[209]

What interests us are the titles of those of Nicanor's works regarding Homeric punctuation, on the one hand, and regarding punctuation in general on the other. According to the Venetus A subscription, the source of the Homer-specific Nicanor material found in the Homer scholia was either Nicanor's *Περὶ στιγμῆς* or a *Περὶ Ὁμηρικῆς στιγμῆς*; according to the Suda, the source could have been either *Περὶ στιγμῆς τῆς παρ' Ὁμήρῳ καὶ τῆς ἐξ αὐτῶν* [αὐτῆ Daub.] *διαφορᾶς ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ*, the Homer-specific work mentioned by the Suda; or general works, *Περὶ στιγμῆς τῆς καθόλου*, the *Ἐπιτομή*, or *Περὶ στιγμῆς*. It seems, however, that the final *Περὶ στιγμῆς* mentioned in the Suda must have been added to the 'Nicanor' entry as an afterthought, since the descriptive phrase *τῆς καθόλου* in the title of Nicanor's general work on punctuation, *Περὶ στιγμῆς τῆς καθόλου*, surely differentiates that general work not from an earlier *Περὶ στιγμῆς* but from his author-specific works on the punctuation of Callimachus and Homer[210]; unless the

---

[208] On the meaning of διάνοια with respect to the interpretation of the Homeric poems (in both Alexandrian and rhapsodic phases), see Nagy 2003: x-xi.

[209] Runaway slaves would be branded with στιγμαί, and a runaway would be called a στιγματίας; whence the joke regarding on punctuation.

[210] Cf. the distinction, in the works of Nicanor's near-contemporary Herodian, between the latter's Καθολικὴ προσῳδία and his Ἰλιακὴ προσῳδία and Ὀδυσσειακὴ προσῳδία. The Καθολικὴ προσῳδία "was built on the foundation of his [Herodian's] more specialized studies . . . just as Nicanor's general treatment of punctuation had followed his studies of Homeric punctuation" (Dyck

Ἐπιτομή bore the title *Περὶ στιγμῆς*, which would mean that it is mentioned twice in the Suda entry. Given, however, that the punctuation-related observations appearing in the Homer scholia are not discussions of general principle but rather, one and all, specific to the text of the *Iliad*, it is reasonable to suppose that, insofar as they derive from Nicanor,[211] these observations have their source in Nicanor's Homer-specific work, whether that work was entitled *Περὶ Ὁμηρικῆς στιγμῆς* or *Περὶ στιγμῆς τῆς παρ' Ὁμήρῳ καὶ τῆς ἐξ αὐτῶν* [αὐτῆ Daub.] *διαφορᾶς ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ*: given the ability of ancient bibliographers either to expand a title by including descriptive information or to compress it, both these titles surely refer to a single, Homer-specific work of Nicanor's, to be contrasted with the *Περὶ στιγμῆς τῆς καθόλου*.[212] This distinction between general and Homer-specific works of

---

1993: 774). As noted below, though Nicanor clearly wrote a Homer-specific work, the titles here (Ἰλιακὴ προσῳδία, Ὀδυσσειακὴ προσῳδία) are modern speculation. For a survey of Herodian's works and the problems of dating them, see Dyck 1993; on the relationship between Herodian and Nicanor, see Wackernagel 1876, with the objections of Dyck 1993: 774 n.5.

[211] See note 213 below.

[212] See for instance the discussion at Lehrs 1886: 2 of the phrase in the Venetus A subscription "παράκειται τὰ Ἀριστονίκου σημεῖα," where he adduces a number of instances of this bibliographical flexibility in general and even in the Homer scholia themselves; thus we find τὰ Ἀριστονίκου σημεῖα in most instances of the subscription, τὰ Ἀριστονίκου σημεῖα μετὰ ὑπομνηματίου in the Book 12 subscription, allusion to Ἀριστόνικος ἐν τοῖς σημείοις at **Σ IV.22**, and *Περὶ σημείων τῶν ἐν τῇ Θεογονίᾳ Ἡσιόδου καὶ τῶν τῆς Ἰλιάδος καὶ Ὀδυσσείας* in the Suda (which Lehrs presumes refers to two or three separate works, one for the *Theogony* and one or two for Homer), and both *Περὶ σημείων τοῦ Ὁμήρου* and *Περὶ σημείων Ὀδυσσείας* in Orion. It is certainly the case that the remnants of Nicanor's work preserved in the Venetus A scholia do treat of punctuation with respect to its διαφορή ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ. But note too that, if we are right in supposing the Homer-specific work as the source for the Venetus A scholia, the 21 (of 23) instances of the subscription which cite a *Περὶ στιγμῆς* would be referring not to a work simply entitled *Περὶ στιγμῆς* (if any such existed) or (what certainly existed) *Περὶ στιγμῆς τῆς καθόλου*, but rather, in short-hand, to what is named in the subscriptions to Books 3 and 4, *Περὶ Ὁμηρικῆς στιγμῆς*. Friedländer titles the source of his *reliquiae emendatiores* "*Περὶ Ἰλιακῆς στιγμῆς*" (Friedländer 1857; followed by Carnuth 1875 for the *Odyssey*), not to my knowledge on any ancient grounds (his usage is followed by Dyck 1993).

Nicanor's on punctuation is vital, for it expresses the distinction between theory and application, each of which could well have a separate source and distinct purpose.

2.2.1.2 The DT scholia description and the scholia maiora

There are 848 scholia to the *Iliad* attributed, for their source, to Nicanor[213]; there is also a description of his punctuational system in one source of scholia to Dionysius Thrax. The *Iliad* scholia are *applied* punctuation, in that the punctuation they specify is geared to the particulars of the *Iliad* passages they address; the description in the scholia to Dionysius Thrax[214] concerns punctuational *theory*, appearing as it does as an aside within scholastic notes on Dionysius' definition-driven *Ars Grammatica*.[215]

On the Suda's manner of quoting authors' titles, see Baldwin 1983, who notes that (for example) in the case of εἰς vs. πρός in the titling of invectives, the Suda was apt to retitle in accordance with contemporary usage.

[213] Collected in Friedländer 1857: 141-278, searchable via TLG, and shortly to be made easy of access online *via* the Homer Multitext Project. Nearly all appear in the Venetus A. I am unable to find a clear statement, even in Friedländer and Carnuth, as to the rationale for attributing all punctuation-related scholia to Nicanor's work. The presumption (and it appears to be no more than that) is that any remark on punctuation, even if it is not Nicanor's own, derives from his own discussions of his predecessors' views. It must be observed, however, that Nicanor himself is cited by name on 25 occasions (viz. **I.62-3a**, **II.212-6**, **III.46-52**, **III.239-40**, **III.318a**[1], **III.428a**, **IV.82-3a**[1] [twice], **IV.147b**, **V.245c**, **V.297d**[1], **VI.445b**, **VII.171-4a**[1], **VIII.18a**, **VIII.213e**, **VIII.307b**, **IX.46-7a**[2], **IX.153d**[1], **IX.538**, **XI.100b**, **XI.186a**, **XI.413d**[2] [very similar to **XI.413e**[2]], **XII.295b**, and **XVII.41-2c**). It seems not unreasonable to suggest that the compiler of the VMK (to whom we must attribute these citations of Nicanor by name), having access to Aristarchus' opinions *via* Aristonicus' σημεῖα, might also, in providing punctuation-related observations, be citing Aristarchus or others without attribution in the same terms (because describing the same material) as he uses when compiling Nicanor's comments. On the relationship between Nicanor and his predecessors, see Friedländer 1857: 104-119 (*Epimetrum* II). Here and below I print scholia numbers in **bold**, hoping to offset the difficulty of distinguishing such references in footnotes.

[214] In order to avoid confusion between the Homer scholia and the scholia to Dionysius Thrax, I refer in the remainder of the present study to the scholia to Dionysius Thrax with the abbreviation "Σ DT."

[215] *GG* I.3.26-27 (*Commentarius Melampodis*). In brief, Nicanor's eight-mark system *as described by the Σ DT* is as follows; the full text, with translation, has been provided in the Appendix.

Since both the Nicanor-attributed scholia and the Σ DT description are presumably derived (at however many removes[216]) from Nicanor's works, sustained treatments of Nicanor's system[217] have employed the Σ DT description as a key to interpretation of the *Iliad* scholia. As Friedländer notes, "qui illum commentarium in Dionysii grammaticam composuit, breviuscule quidem rem ennaravit, sed ita ut omnia ab eo

---

1. τελεία στιγμή. Used between sentences which follow via *asyndeton*; requires a pause of 4 χρόνοι.

2. ὑποτελεία στιγμή. Used between sentences connected by δέ; requires a pause of 3 χρόνοι.

3. πρώτη ἄνω. Used between sentences correlated *via* μὲν — δέ, ἤ — ἤ, or οὐκ — ἀλλά; requires a pause of 2 χρόνοι.

4. δευτέρα ἄνω. Used between sentences joined by καί; requires a pause of 1 χρόνος.

5. τρίτη ἄνω. Used between sentences joined by τε; requires a pause of 1 χρόνος.

6. ὑποστιγμὴ ἐνυπόκριτος. Used with correlative clauses (ὀρθαὶ περιόδοι) in which the protasis precedes the apodosis and the two are related with ὄφρα — τόφρα, ἦμος — τῆμος, ὅτε — τότε, ἕως — τέως, ὅπου — ἐκεῖ; requires a pause of 1 χρόνος.

7. ὑποστιγμὴ ἀνυπόκριτος. Used with correlative clauses between protasis and apodosis when parenthetical elements come between them (the ἐνυπόκριτος may be used only directly before the apodosis); requires a pause of 1 χρόνος (the duration is inferred by Friedländer 1857: 119).

8. ὑποδιαστολή. Used when the apodosis *precedes* the protasis (i.e. in which the περίοδος is "ἀντεστραμμένη"). No χρόνος value assigned.

In addition to this use of the ὑποδιαστολή (seemingly equivalent to Nicanor's βραχεῖα διαστολή), Friedländer (Friedländer 1857: 81-101) describes other uses of the βραχεῖα διαστολή in the Homer scholia themselves, summarized by Blank (Blank 1983: 50-51) as the following (numerals added):

"i) grouping words which out to be understood together and separating those which ought not, as in Quintilian's *statuam auream hastam tenentem* (πρὸς τὸ σαφέστερον);

ii) separating words which, if understood together, would be in solecistic disagreement;

iii) separating relative pronouns from their antecedents, particularly where these are in different cases, a phenomenon which tended to appear to some ancient grammarians as a *schema*;

iv) 'separating' clauses of which one is incomplete until a verb is supplied from the other and 'joining' complete clauses which may nonetheless be said to have some element κατὰ κοινόν:

v) dividing the apodosis from the protasis of an ἀν(τ)εστραμμένη or 'turned-around' period [the use of the ὑποδιαστολή actually given in the scholia to Dionysius Thrax]" (Blank 1983: 50-51). As we shall observe below (p. 130ff.), this list of syntactical functions does not account for the full range of uses for the βραχεῖα διαστολή.

[216] As mentioned, the Venetus A scholia are excerpts from a "Viermännerkommentar," itself a "best of" collection; Blank (Blank 1983: 63 n.62) notes the difficulty of deciding the source of some of the Σ DT description's terminology given that the DT scholiast was evidently well-versed in both Nicanor and Apollonius.

[217] Friedländer 1857; Wendel 1932; Blank 1983.

relata egregie confirmentur ipsius Nicanoris fragmentis."[218] Rarely is the editor obliged to emend the text of the *Iliad* fragments so as to have them conform to the Σ DT description of the system[219]; and if the specific technical terminology of the Σ DT description is employed less often in the *Iliad* scholia than a more general terminology (for example, ὑποστίζειν where we would expect specification of either a ὑποστιγμὴ ἐνυπόκριτος or a ὑποστιγμὴ ἀνυπόκριτος), this is doubtless because either Nicanor or his excerptor presumes that the reader is sufficiently aware of the details of Nicanor's system as to be able, in any given context, to fill out such shorthand. There are, however, some differences in terminology between the *Iliad* fragments and the Σ DT description: the former calls the eighth mark a βραχεῖα διαστολή whereas the latter calls it a ὑποδιαστολή, and the former sometimes refers to the ὑποστιγμὴ ἐνυπόκριτος as a ὑποστιγμὴ μεθ' ὑποκρίσεως.[220]

2.2.2 Interpreting the Σ DT description

For the moment, to further illustrate the centrality of the Σ DT description in discussions of the *Iliad* fragments, let us pass on to the other sustained treatment of

---

[218] Friedländer 1857: 2.

[219] As he does, for example, at **XI.54b**, where "Cod[icis] στικτέον . . . mutandum erat in διασταλτέον . . . quoniam ante οὕνεκα propter inversam periodum διαστολὴ requiritur non στιγμή. Sed fortasse Nicanoris textu hic locus conformatus erat ut post αἰθέρος novae periodi esset initum, v. c. ἦ γὰρ ἔμελλεν —; tum στικτέον recte habebat" (Friedländer 1857: 208-209).

[220] It is perhaps significant that the Σ DT's term ὑποδιαστολή refers to a physical characteristic of the mark (its position *beneath* the last letter of the word it governs) whereas term of the *Iliad* fragments is equally valid with respect to the act of ἀνάγνωσις; on this, as also on the striking preponderence of *verbal* forms of Nicanor's punctuational terms in the *Iliad* fragments, see below (p. 130ff.).

Nicanor's punctuation theory and practice, that of David Blank.[221] In "Remarks on Nicanor, the Stoics, and the Ancient Theory of Punctuation," Blank argues that the eight-mark system of Nicanor's presented in the Σ DT description was "neither as strange as it has often seemed, nor wholly divorced from theoretical justification."[222] And indeed it is principally with the theoretical context of Nicanor's system that Blank's article is concerned.

In brief, Blank argues that three systems of punctuation — the one found in the main text of the *Ars Grammatica* (using 3 points); Nicanor's (using 8 points); and the actual system in general use in the ancient world, both papyrologically and theoretically (using 2 points)[223] — do not necessarily conflict from a historical point of view. First, of the "three στιγμαί" mentioned in Dionysius Thrax' *Ars Grammatica* (*GG* I.1.7), which are the τελεία, the μέση, and the ὑποστιγμή, only the first and third had any real application, while the μέση (which Dionysius calls a "σημεῖον πνεύματος ἕνεκεν παραλαμβανόμενον") is perhaps an interpolation[224] and certainly (Blank argues) a theoretical construct[225]; the resulting difference between the τελεία στιγμή and the ὑποτελεία στιγμή corresponds to a fundamental distinction between

---

[221] Blank 1983.

[222] Blank 1983: 49.

[223] There was apparently also a four-mark system, identified by Usener (Usener 1892) in the Vergilian commentator Diomedes; but Blank notes that Diomedes' "account is so confused . . . that little can be inferred from his precise wording" while the four-mark system found elsewhere in the scholia to Dionysius Thrax (*GG* I.3.177.19-32) "is clearly of rhetorical, not grammatical origin" (Blank 1983: 58 n.44).

[224] Blank 1983: 51, citing (note 22) Schmidt 1859: 515f. and Laum 1928: 412f.

[225] Blank 1983: 52-55.

complete (αὐτοτελῆ) and incomplete (ἐλλιπῆ) clauses, a distinction characteristic of Stoic linguistics.[226] Further, "in no piece of ancient commentary is a μέση or *media* ever called for,"[227] as Blank shows with reference to the Vergilian commentators.[228] Any difference between the 3-point *Ars Grammatica* system and the applied and applicable 2-point system results from "the grammarians' source, [which,] faced with exemplifying both *subdistinctio* and *media distinctio*, divided up the examples and excogitated the rationales"[229]; the *media* "fills the space in the line between the high dot of the *finalis* and the low *subdistinctio*, and it supplies the mean between the long and short pauses."[230] It is with this Stoic distinction between αὐτοτελεῖα and ἐλλεῖπον that Blank compares Nicanor's eight-mark system, concluding that "Nicanor seems to operate with the same basic interpretive aims and the same basic system of punctuation as his predecessors. His innovation consists in making further distinctions in the marks used for incomplete phrases,"[231] in that his first five marks (τελεία, ὑποτελεία, πρώτη ἄνω, δευτέρα ἄνω, and τρίτη ἄνω) follow clauses complete in themselves, while the last three (ὑποστιγμὴ ἐνυπόκριτος, ὑποστιγμὴ ἀνυπόκριτος, and ὑποδιαστολή) indicate that the clause remains incomplete.

---

[226] Blank 1983: 59-61.
[227] Blank 1983: 52.
[228] Blank 1983: 52-56. He concludes that references to *subdistinctiones* and *mediae distinctiones* better correspond to marks in Nicanor's 8-point system than to the theoretical μέση or *media* known from Dionysius Thrax.
[229] Blank 1983: 55.
[230] Blank 1983: 52.
[231] Blank 1983: 58.

It is not clear, however, that Blank's argument holds up with respect to the αὐτοτελεῖα of the five στιγμαί. His authority for the idea that a στιγμή always signals completeness is simply a statement of Apollonius Dyscolus' (on whom Blank is the leading expert, citing him as "Nicanor's great contemporary"[232]) that "στιγμὴ γὰρ πσα σημεῖον αὐτοτελείας."[233] As the Σ DT description itself specifies, Nicanor's πρώτη ἄνω can follow a clause containing μέν (expecting a δέ) or an ἤ (expecting another ἤ),[234] while the τρίτη ἄνω follows τε so as to indicate that another τε is to be expected.[235] It is not clear then how these marks signal a degree of completeness lacking in, for example, the case of the the Ὑποστιγμὴ ἐνυπόκριτος,

---

[232] Blank 1983: 60. Blank's authoritative work on Apollonius is Blank 1982.

[233] Blank 1983: 51 n.17, quoting Apollonius Dyscolus *Adversus mathematicos* 182.15.

[234] "Ἡ δὲ πρώτη ἄνω τίθεται ἐπνάω τῆς τελευταίας γραμμῆς τοῦ τελευταίου στοιχείου, ὅτε πρκόειται ὁ

μέν ἢ ὁ ἤ ἢ τὸ οὔ, **[27]** ἐπιφέρεται δὲ ὁ *δέ ἢ ὁ ἤ ἢ ὁ ἀλλά*, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ

αἴδεσθεν μὲν ἀνήνασθαι <δεῖσαν δ' ὑποδέχθαι> [VII.93]

εἰς τὸ τελευταῖον ι τοῦ ἀνήνασθαι ἡ πρώτη ἄνω τίθεται διὰ τὸ ἐπιφέρεσθαι τὸν δέ, τοῦ μέν προκειμένου" (*GG* I.3.26-27). In the scholiast's example, "αἴδεσθεν μὲν ἀνήσασθαι" *requires* "δεῖσαν δ' ὑποδέχθαι" (or equivalent); it is for this reason that this passage in fact *omits* the latter phrase.

[235] "Ἡ δὲ τρίτη ἄνω τίθεται καὶ αὐτὴ ἐπάνω μὲν τῆς τελευταίας γραμμῆς τοῦ τελευταίου στοιχείου, περιέχεται δὲ ὑπὸ διπλῆς ἔσωθεν, ὅτε ἐπιφέρεται ὁ τέ, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ

Κίλλαν τε ζαθέην Τενέδοιό τε ἴφι ἀνάσσεις [I.38]

εἰς τὸ ν τοῦ ζαθέην τίθεται ἡ τρίτη ἄνω, ἐπιφερομένου τοῦ τέ συνδέσμου" (*GG* I.3.27). The example chosen here by the scholiast is somewhat misleading with regard to the Homeric use of τε (what Denniston terms the "epic τε"; see Denniston 1959: 520ff.). If we add the preceding line (I.37),

κλῦθι μευ ἀργυρότοξ', ὃς Χρύσην ἀμφιβέβηκας

Κίλλαν τε ζαθέην Τενέδοιο τε ἴφι ἀνάσσεις

we see that the function of the τε following Κίλλαν is indicate the coordination of Κίλλαν and Χρύσην as objects of ἀμφιβέβηκας, while the scholiast apparently has in mind the coordination of the clauses ἀμφιβέβηκας Κίλλαν and ἀνάσσεις Τενέδοιο. Accordingly, it remains the scholiast's assumption that the first τε expects the second, even if from our point of view this is not necessarily the function of τε in Homer in general or in this case in particular.

which expects an immediate *apodosis*[236]: in terms of syntax, one could no more leave a clause featuring μέν unanswered than one could leave a protasis unanswered by an apodosis — the criterion for αὐτοτελεία according to Stoic theory, apparently echoed by the Σ DT source which includes the description of Nicanor's system.[237]

The question of the inherent completeness of phrases marked with a στιγμή is not, however, the only point at which Blank aligns Nicanor's punctuation with the theoretical assumptions of Apollonius Dyscolus. As Blank observes, "it is not always a simple matter to determine when a phrase is complete, particularly in Homer"[238]; but it is only by the criteria of completeness or incompleteness that Blank considers Nicanor's system, assuming therein "methodological presuppositions which Nicanor will [*sic*] share with other grammatical theorists," namely Apollonius. The chief methodological presupposition of Apollonius which Blank also ascribes, in somewhat opaque terms, to Nicanor is the view that "the coherence of the linguistic system" — the λόγος — defines proper punctuation because it "results from the necessary reflection of the signified by the expression. The signified, being intelligible, is itself always in rational order. The decision, then, whether or not an expression is complete at any point comes down to a consideration of what is supposed to be expressed."[239]

---

[236] *GG* I.3.27.29-30: an ἐνυπόκριτος is placed because "εὐθέως γὰρ ἐπιφέρεται ἡ ἀνταπόδοσις."
[237] See the excellent discussion at Blank 1983.59-61; the passages are Diogenes Laertius 7.63 (quoting Diocles of Magnesia) and *GG* I.3.24.19-27.
[238] Blank 1983: 60.
[239] Blank 1983: 60, citing Blank 1982: 12-19, 51, 35ff., and 45.

In other words, the text itself is grammatically autonomous: its meaning either becomes clear through grammatical analysis (including punctuational analysis) or is in some way corrupt (having suffered some πάθος).[240] The meaning of the text resides *in* the text; the reader plays no part in the construction of its meaning.

This is a fundamentally syntax-oriented view of grammar in general and punctuation in particular. While it may be the case that the Σ DT description of Nicanor's system agrees with Apollonius in defining the eight marks of punctuation in terms of their various syntactic functions, thus presuming that their role is simply to clarify self-evident or deductible syntactic relationships, and while it is conceivable that Nicanor's own theoretical treatise *Περὶ στιγμῆς τῆς καθόλου* was both the source of the syntax-oriented Σ DT description and itself syntax-oriented in being a work of punctuational *theory*, the fact is that in many cases Nicanor's applied *Iliad* punctuation is not, as I shall demonstrate, syntax-oriented but rather *discourse*-oriented. This is not to imply that discourse does not embrace syntax, but merely to assert that it is with the study of Homeric poetry *as discourse* that we should align Nicanor's *Iliad*-specific punctuation.

Before adducing a number of instances in which we find Nicanor punctuating according to discourse (προφορά) and not according to syntax (λόγος), we may illustrate the difference between a syntax-oriented punctuation and a discourse-

---

[240] Blank 1983: 60.

oriented punctuation with an example from Homeric poetry. In order not to prejudice discussion of Nicanor's own method, I take the example from the *Odyssey*, for which relatively little of Nicanor's commentary survives.[241] In a famous couplet in Book ix, Odysseus reveals himself to the Phaeacian court, saying

> εἶμ' Ὀδυσεὺς Λαερτιάδης ὃς πᾶσι δόλοισιν
> ἀνθρώποισι μέλω καί μευ κλέος οὐρανον ἵκει[242]
> I am Odysseus the son of Laertes who with my tricks
> Am on the mind of all men and my fame reaches heaven[243]
> (ix.19-20)

The question is this: how, in the case of line 20, should one punctuate between μέλω and καί?

From the point of view of *syntax*, the καί in line 20 joins the phrase μευ κλέος οὐρανον ἵκει with the phrase εἶμ' Ὀδυσεύς in the preceding line; it does *not* join μευ κλέος οὐρανον ἵκει with ἀνθρώποισι μέλω, since the latter belongs to the subordinate clause begun with ὅς. This being the case, the subordinate clause ὃς πᾶσι δόλοισιν / ἀνθρώποισι μέλω would be termed by Nicanor a διὰ μέσου

---

[241] The fragments, preseved not in the scholia but in Eustathius, are collected in Carnuth 1875. On their elusive character, see Carnuth 1875: 6-7. To my mind, the same caveats apply to the attribution of *Odyssey* punctuation-related scholia to Nicanor as are mentioned above (note 213) with respect to the more numerous *Iliad* fragments.

[242] In quoting from Homer in this section of the present chapter, I deliberately leave out the punctuation of modern editions, both for the Greek and in my translations, so as not to prejudice the reader's first sight of these texts, the punctuation of which is under review.

[243] This assumes that πᾶσι modifies ἀνθρώποισι; it could of course modify δόλοισιν, yielding "with all my tricks / am on the mind of men." It is difficult to choose between ἀνθρώποισι and δόλοισιν; one can remark that "πᾶσι . . . ἀνθρώποισι" makes more sense in itself, but it involves an uncharacteristic hyperbaton. The question is not strictly relevant to the discussion at hand.

construction[244] to be opened and closed by ὑποστιγμαί ἀνυπόκριτοι[245]: the second would follow καί, indicating that we are resuming the sentence from Λαερτιάδης after the parenthetical relative clause.

From the point of view of *discourse*, however, the phrase μευ κλέος οὔρανον ἵκει effectively contrasts not with εἴμ' Ὀδυσεύς but with ἀνθρώποισι μέλω: the first hemistich in line 20 indicates that the speaker is famous on earth, while the second indicates that he is famous in heaven also. Moreover, as with nearly all instances of necessary enjambment in the last third of the line (from the hephthemimeral caesura or the bucolic dieresis) provoked by a relative pronoun, the hemistich immediately following not only completes the relative clause but can, in itself, stand by itself as a semantically complete unit: ἀνθρώποισι μέλω is a perfectly complete thought, since Greek verbs do not require expressed subjects. (It is impossible to capture this double valence, whereby μέλω is endowed both with an expressed and with an unexpressed subject, in English.) Since ἀνθρώποισι μέλω, as a unit of discourse in and of itself, is independent, it *can* contrast with μευ κλέος οὔρανον ἵκει, as the human/divine contrast of ἀνθρώποισι and οὔρανον suggests by way of the sense. Thus, from the point of view of discourse, καί could join μέλω and ἵκει even though the former is a subordinate verb and the latter is not; we would in

---

[244] On διὰ μέσου as a term for parenthesis, and the Homer scholia's treatment of it, see Baar 1952. This text has never been published, but is circulating digitally as scans of a mimeographed copy of the typescript; readers are welcome to contact the author of the present study at *jackmitchell(at)gmail.com* if they would like to see Baar's interesting book.

this case use a στιγμὴ δευτέρα ἄνω before καί, indicating that the sentence is merely continuing the flow of thought within the line without signalling the resumption of previously interrupted discourse.

In this example from *Odyssey* ix.19-20, then, we have seen that a syntax-oriented grammar, which regards (with Apollonius) the meaning of Homeric verse as rigidly determined by syntactical relationships, will (if we follow the Σ DT description's remarks) punctuate with quite a different mark than will a discourse-oriented grammar, which regards meaning as conditioned by prosodic context. Most importantly, a syntax-oriented punctuation is relatively closed, whereas a discourse-oriented punctuation is relatively open: even to pose the question of whether, in our *Odyssey* example, a ὑποστιγμὴ ἀνυπόκριτος or a στιγμὴ δευτέρα ἄνω should precede καί μευ κλέος οὔρανον ἵκει is in some measure to adopt a discourse-oriented view of punctuation as a whole. For if punctuation were simply a matter of syntax, there can be no debate as to whether or not to punctuate syntactically.

2.2.3 Ἔμφασις and discourse in Nicanor

2.2.3.1 The flexibility of the βραχεῖα διαστολή

The tendency towards a discourse-oriented conception of punctuation in Nicanor is particularly noticeable in the deployment of the βραχεῖα διαστολή, which

---

[245] See note 215 above, #7.

Friedländer, in his extensive topology, observed to be the most flexible, in terms of syntactic function, of the eight marks appearing in the Σ DT description.[246] It is worth observing that the βραχεῖα διαστολή is the only one of Nicanor's marks whose name does not necessarily refer to its physical or spatial appearance[247]: whereas the other marks contain the word στιγμή in some form or other (τελεῖα στιγμή, ὑποτελεῖα [στιγμή], the three [στιγμαὶ] ἄνω, the two ὑποστιγαί), the literal meaning of βραχεῖα διαστολή ("brief pause") does not reference its acoustic valence *via* its physical form but rather appeals equally to its acoustic and physical valences. This is particularly noticeable in the case of the verbal forms: whereas στικτέον ("one must place a στιγμή") or στίζωμεν ("let us place a στιγμή") refer to the actual act of placing a στιγμή beside or beneath or above a letter, διασταλτέον ("one must pause") references the act of ἀνάγνωσις.[248] It is thus usually impossible to say whether, in suggesting a βραχεῖα διαστολή, Nicanor is telling us to pause or to place a comma-like mark on our page; they are indistinguishable.[249]

---

[246] Friedländer 1857: 81-101. Note that, just as the Σ DT description calls Nicanor's eigth mark a ὑποδιαστολή as opposed to a βραχεῖα διαστολή, so too its definition in the Σ DT encompasses only a few of the many uses of the διαστηολή identified by Friedländer. See the latter part of note 215 above regarding the Σ DT description for Blank's summary of these.

[247] In contrast to the equivalent term in the Σ DT description (ὑποδιαστολή); see note 215.

[248] We find 280 instances of βραχὺ διασταλτέον / διασταλτέον βραχύ; 7 instances of βραχὺ διαστέλλειν / διαστέλλειν βραχύ; and 2 instances of βραχὺ διαστελλῶμεν (**II.642a**, **III.434-5a**). There are 62 instances of διασταλτέον appearing *without* βραχύ, 15 of διαστέλλειν without βραχύ, and 3 instances of διαστελλῶμεν without βραχύ (**I.204a**, **III.323a**[1], **VI.87-9**).

[249] At **II.496-7** (οἳ ϑ' Ὑρίην ἐνέμοντο καὶ Αὐλίδα πετρήεσσαν / Σχοῖόν τε Σκῶλόν τε πολύκνημόν τ' Ἐτεωνόν "And they lived in Hyrine and rocky Aulis, / Schoios and Scolos and

2.2.3.2 Defining Homeric ἔμφασις

That the βραχεῖα διαστολή is the most ἀνάγνωσις-oriented of the marks perhaps best explains the fact that it fulfils so many functions. It is in the addition or prohibition of the βραχεῖα διαστολή that the ambiguity of physical and ἀνάγνωσις-oriented valences of punctuation are most prominent. In what follows, we will observe that discourse-oriented punctuation is implied most concretely in scholia featuring the critical term ἔμφασις / ἐμφαίνειν: as descriptors of the effect which certain deployments of the διαστολή can have, ἔμφασις / ἐμφαίνειν are employed by Nicanor in contexts in which punctuation is said to express the inherent emotional context of the narrative and to articulate character. In both cases the effect of such

---

Eteonos of the many mountain spurs") we remark the following exceptional, but provocative comment on the latter line (**II.497a**): καθ' ἕκαστον ὄνομα ἐκ φύσεως καὶ λόγου διαστολή ἐστι βραχυτάτη διὰ τὴν ἐπανάληψιν τῶν ὀνοματικῶν [ὑποτακτικῶν Fr.], ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις τιθέναι οὐκ ἐπείγει, κατὰ δὲ τὴν προφορὰν σώζειν "At each noun there is, in accordance with nature and reason, the briefest of pauses, owing to the leaving out of the nominals [articles Fr.], which there is no need to insert in the manuscripts (ἀντίγραφοι), but one should respect the pronunciation (προφορά)." Friedländer remarks that the ἀνάληψις here is that of the οἳ from the preceding line, "hoc autem pronomine ad quodque urbis nomen repetito totidem effici sensiculos, quot sint urbium nomina . . . unde post quodque nomen intermissionem vocis quidem faciendam esse, sed ita brevem ut distinctione in manuscriptis posita notari non opus sit" (Friedländer 1857: 162). This comment reinforces the double valence of the βραχεῖα διαστολή, in that here we find the unwriteable διαστολή is βραχυτάτη because a διαστολή which was merely βραχεῖα would signify, both on the page and in the reader's mouth, that it was the *verb* ("ἐνέμοντο") which was repeated implicitly in the second line (such that the Boeotians as a whole dwelt in these various cities) as opposed to the article ("οἳ"); a βραχεῖα would imply the elision of the verb, whereas Nicanor wishes to indicate the elision of the article with a βραχυτάτη. By contrast, the leaving off of the βραχεῖα διαστολή at **III.242**, owing to *synaloepha* on a τε (= τ'), is not the result of the letter ε being left off the physical manuscript: at **XI.119a**[1] a βραχεῖα διαστολή is called for after σπεύδουσ', whose final vowel is affected by *synaloepha*. Compare the διαστολή-related terminology from the **bT** scholia discussed by Friedländer at Friedländer 1857: 14: in **bT** we find ὀλίγον διαστέλλειν, βραχέως διαστέλλειν, and διαστολὴ μικρά, among other variants.

expression is designated with the key term ἔμφασις.

On the subject Homeric ἔμφασις, we find that Plutarch and the pseudo-Plutarch appear at first sight to be in disagreement as to the scope of the term. In the course of arguing that every rhetorical figure is to be found in Homer, the pseudo-Plutarch in his *Essay on the Life and Poetry of Homer* writes:

> Ἔστι καὶ ἡ ἔμφασις, ἥπερ δι' ὑπονοίας ἐπίτασιν τοῦ λεγομένου παρίστησιν, οἷον
>
> *αὐτὰρ ὅτ' εἰς ἵππον κατεβαίνομεν, ὃν κάμ' Ἐπειός.* [xi.523]
>
> ἐν γὰρ τῷ 'κατεβαίνομεν' τὸ μέγεθος τοῦ ἵππου ἐμφαίνει. ὅμοιον δὲ κἀκεῖνο·
>
> *πᾶν δ' ὑπεθερμάνθη ξίφος αἵματι·* [XVI.333, XX.476]
>
> καὶ γὰρ ἐν τούτῳ παρέχει μείζονα ἔννοιαν, ὡς βαπτισθέντος οὕτως τοῦ ξίφους, ὥστε θερμανθῆναι.
>
> There is also ἔμφασις, which by things implied [δι' ὑπονοίας] adds tension [ἐπίτασιν] to what is being said, as
>
> *When we were climbing down into the horse that Epeios made* (xi.523)
>
> adds ἔμφασις (ἐμφαίνει) the large size of the horse with "climbing down." Likewise the following:
>
> *Every sword was made hot with blood* (XVI.333, XX.476)
>
> For in this there is a greater sense, namely that the sword was so soaked ("ὑπεθερμάνθη") as to become hot.
>
> ([Plutarch], *Essay on the Life and Poetry of Homer* 54B.26 Keaney-Lamberton)

By contast, the actual Plutarch, in the course of praising Homer's moral as opposed to rhetorical excellence, writes in *On How a Young Man Should Hear (ἀκούειν) Poems*:

> Τοῦτο δ' ἡμᾶς εὐθὺς ὑπομιμνήσκει τὸ παράδειγμα τὸ τοὺς ψόγους ἀποθεωρεῖν καὶ τοὺς ἐπαίνους ἐν τοῖς Ὁμήρου μάλιστα ποιήμασιν· ἔμφασις γὰρ γίγνεται μεγάλη τοῦ τὰ σωματικὰ καὶ τυχηρὰ μὴ μεγάλης ἄξια σπουδῆς νομίζειν.
>
> This illustration [from Homer on the vanity of physical beauty] reminds us at once that we should consider the language of blame and praise in Homer's poetry most of all: for there is great ἔμφασις of how we

> should not consider bodily and accidental matters to be worth caring for.
>
> (Plutarch *On How a Young Man Should Hear Poems* 35A)

These two uses of the word ἔμφασις seem at first glance to present us with a stark contrast. For the pseudo-Plutarch, ἔμφασις appears on the lexical level, the large size of the Trojan Horse being implicit in the word κατεβαίνομεν ("We were climbing down") and the quantity of blood spilled being implicit in the idea behind the word ὑπεθερμάνθη ("Was soaked"). The actual Plutarch, however, declares that the ἔμφασις of despising bodily and accidental things is a characteristic of Homeric poetry as a whole (ἐν τοῖς Ὁμήρου μάλιστα ποιήμασιν), though of course he goes on to cite numerous illustrations of that view.[250] Unfortunately no definition of ἔμφασις survives in Greek to help us clarify its scope and meaning. Lausberg defines it as follows: "Emphasis is the use of a word of lesser semantic context in customary use (with a broader semantic range) to designate a greater (more precise) semantic content (with a narrower semantic range)"[251]; or again, "Emphasis as a word-trope expresses the more precise meaning of something by means of a less precise semantic content."[252] But these definitions essentially describe lexical *implication* (suiting the Pseudo-Plutarch passage quoted above) and not the larger scope of ἔμφασις we find in the actual Plutarch's comment on Homeric poetry as a whole.

---

[250] Plutarch *On How a Young Man Should Hear Poems* 35A-C.

[251] Lausberg 1990: 262-3 (ch. 578). For another discussion of the meaning of ἔμφασις, see Rutherford 1905: 264-266 (cited at Lamberton and Keaney 1996).

[252] Lausberg 1990: 407 (ch. 905). He goes on to quote from the passage in Quintilian (8.3.83) discussed below.

In fact, there is a good reason why Lausberg's definitions fit the Pseudo-Plutarchean passage: it is based on the definition of the term by Quintilian, which in turn shares much with the Pseudo-Plutarchean treatise. The full passage is as follows:

> Vicina praedictae sed amplior virtus est ἔμφασις, altiorem praebens intellectum quam quem verba per se ipsa declarant. Eius duae sunt species, altera quae plus significat quam dicit altera quae etiam id quod non dicit [significat]. Prior est et apud Homerum, cum Menelaus Graios in equum "descendisse" ait (nam verbo uno magnitudinem eius ostendit), et apud Vergilium, "Demissum lapsi per funem" [*Aeneid* 2.262]; nam sic quoque altitudo demonstrata est . . . Sequens positum in voce aut omnino supressa aut etiam abscisa. Supprimitur vox, ut fecit pro Ligario Cicero: "Quodsi in hac tanta fortuna bonitas tanta non esset, quam tu per te, per te inquam, obtines: intelligo quod loquar." Tacuit enim illud, quod nihilominus accipimus, non deesse homines qui ad crudelitatem eum impellant. Absciditur per ἀποσιώπησιν, quae (quoniam est figura) reddetur suo loco. Est in vulgaribus quoque verbis *emphasis*: "Virum esse oportet," et "Homo est ille," et "Vivendum est." A more ample virtue (related to the abovementioned) is ἔμφασις, which deepens the meaning beyond what the words express in themselves. There are two types: the first signifies more than it says, and the second signifies what it does not say. The first type appears in Homer, when Menelaus says that the Greeks "went down" [*κατεβαίνομεν*, xi.523] into the Horse (showing its large size in a single word), and in Vergil, "descending by a lowered rope" [*Aeneid* 2.262], thus similarly showing its height. The second type has to do with something entirely unvoiced or cut out. Something can be unvoiced, as Cicero does it in his speech for Ligarius [*Pro Ligario* 5.15], "Yet if in the midst of your good fortune your benevolence were not such as you display all by yourself — all by yourself, I say — I understand very well what I am saying." Here he left out what we nevertheless are able to grasp, namely that there was no lack of people who are inducing him to be cruel. It is cut out by means of ἀποσιώπησις [silencing], which (since it is a figure of speech) will be dealt with below. We also find *emphasis* in proverbs: "Be a man" and "He's a human being" and "You gotta live."
>
> (Quintilian 8.3.83-86)

It follows from this definition that ἔμφασις, as a rhetorical term, is an effect of speech but is not verbal. Quintilian's examples are not exhaustive, however: as he notes, ἔμφασις describes a level of meaning beyond the lexical: it can be the implication inherent in words, as with the examples from Homer and Vergil, or what is literally unspoken, as in the *Pro Ligurio* quotation. In the latter case, however, it is the very fact that Cicero interrupts himself that lends ἔμφασις to his discourse: the unspoken is here literally unspoken and verbally marked as such. It could not be otherwise, for Quintilian not only takes his example from a work of Cicero's which was already 150 years old and thus fully textual, but is also obliged to employ an illustration which would itself be suitable for transmission in the written medium.

In fact, Nicanor's own use of the term shows that ἔμφασις, even as a term of rhetoric, retained much of the semantic scope found in its non-rhetorical usage. The literal meaning has nothing to do with speech, deriving not from φημί ("say") but from φαίνω ("show"); the prefix εν-indicates either interiority or immediacy or both. Thus for instance Aristotle can say that a rainbow is an ἔμφασις of color in a cloud.[253] In what follows, it is important to resist the temptation to render the Greek term with

---

[253] Aristotle *Meteorologica* III.iv (373b): ὅταν ἄρχηται ὕειν καὶ ἤδη μὲν συνιστῆται εἰς ψακάδας ὁ ἐν τοῖς νέφεσιν ἀήρ, μήπω δὲ ὑῇ, ἐὰν ἐξ ἐναντίας ᾖ ὁ ἥλιος ἢ ἄλλο τι οὕτω λαμπρὸν ὥστε γίγνεσθαι ἔνοπτρον τὸ νέφος, καὶ τὴν ἀνάκλασιν γίγνεσθαι πρὸς τὸ λαμπρὸν ἐξ ἐναντίας, γίγνεσθαι ἔμφασιν χρώματος, οὐ σχήματος "When it is starting to rain and the air in the clouds has already condensed into droplets, but it is not yet raining, if the sun or some other thing bright enough to be mirrored in the cloud is opposite, then there is a reflection from the brightness opposite and an ἔμφασις (display) of color rather than form."

our English word "emphasis"; for far from deriving its "implications" exclusively from the innate properties of lexical items, the broader definition of ἔμφασις, even as a critical term, includes implication (imparted by the voice of the reader) which, like a rainbow, 'displays' a meaning which has no lexical form. It is with this type of ἀνάγνωσις-driven ἔμφασις that Nicanor is most concerned.

2.2.3.3 Ἔμφασις in the ἀνάγνωσις of narrative

It must be admitted at the outset of our study of Nicanor's use of the βραχεῖα διαστολή to produce ἔμφασις that what is revealed by the ἔμφασις in any given passage is not always entirely clear. Sometimes, to be sure, the non-lexical meaning to be displayed is specified, as at XXII.146a,

> *τείχεος αἰὲν <ὑπὲκ κατ' ἀμαξιτὸν ἐσσεύοντο>*: βραχὺ διασταλτέον μετὰ τὸ *ὑπέκ*· τὸ γὰρ ἑξῆς, ὑπὲκ τείχεος κατὰ τὴν ἅμαξιτόν, οἷον ὑπὸ τὸ τεῖχος· ἡ δὲ *ἔκ* πρόθεσις προ<σ>κειμένη ἐμφαίνει ὡς καὶ μικρὸν ἔξω τοῦ τείχους ἔτρεχον.
> *Always <away> from the wall <they rushed along the waggon track>*: A βραχεῖα διαστολή after ὑπέκ [away], for the order of thought [τὸ ἑξῆς[254]] is 'away from the wall and along the waggon track,' that is 'under the wall; the preposition ἐκ lends an ἔμφασις to the effect that they [Achilles and Hector] were running only slightly apart from the wall.

Far more often, however, the Nicanor scholion leaves it to the reader of his comments to infer what the ἔμφασις may be in context, as in the scholion on XIII.365-367,

> ἤτεε δὲ Πριάμοιο θυγατρῶν εἶδος ἀρίστην

[254] On the meaning of the term τὸ ἑξῆς, see Levy 1969.

> Κασσάνδρην ἀνάεδνον ὑπέσχετο δὲ μέγα ἔργον
> ἐκ Τροίης ἀέκοντας ἀπωσέμεν υἷας Ἀχαιῶν
> He [Othryoneus] asked for the hand of the best looking of Priam's daughters
> Cassandra without bridal gifts and he undertook a great task
> To drive the sons of the Achaeans from the land of Troy against their will
> (XIII.365-367)

Here the short scholion reads (XIII.366c),

> Βραχὺ διασταλτέον ἐπὶ τὸ *ἔργον*· ἐμφαίνει <γὰρ>.
> One must put a βραχεῖα διαστηολή after *ἔργον* (task); <for> this lends ἔμφασις.

What does a pause after ἔργον (task) ἐμφαίνει (display)? On the one hand, it avoids any ambiguity with respect to "ἐκ Τροίης," for the pause firmly assigns that phrase to "ἀπωσέμεν" rather than to "μέγα ἔργον"; more importantly, however, in the context of a young man's undertaking something impossible (namely to drive the Achaeans back single-hande), the boldness of Othryoneus' promise will be enhanced if the voice of the narrator pauses before providing (in line 367) the substance of that promise. Likewise at XVIII.376-377 as Hephaestus' wondrous golden tripods are described, equipped with wheels by the god

> ὄφρα οἱ αὐτόματοι θεῖον δυσαίατ' ἀγῶνα
> ἠδ' αὖτις πρὸς δῶμα νεοίατο θαῦμα ἰδέσθαι
> So that they [the tripods] should enter the divine gathering by themselves
> And again to his house return a wonder to behold
> (XVIII.376-377)

Here Nicanor comments,

> Βραχὺ διασταλτέον ἐπὶ το νεοίατο· μᾶλλον γὰρ ἐμφαίνει.
> One must observe a βραχεῖα διαστηολή after 'return' (νεοίατο); for

this lends greater ἔμφασις.

The object of ἔμφασις here is clearly the wondrousness of the tripods, which again is displayed if the narrator's voice pauses before adding the exclamation θαῦμα ἰδέσθαι.

Nicanor calls for ἔμφασις *via* the βραχεῖα διαστολή most often when the text features two adjectives which stand in apposition with a noun across line-break and which are themselves joined asyndetically. There are eight instances,[255] but we may cite two. In Book 11, the inability of the Trojans to resist Agamenon's prowess in battle is compared to a doe which, unable to save her young, takes to flight:

> καρπαλίμως δ' ἤϊξε διὰ δρυμὰ πυκὰ καὶ ὕλην
> σπεύδουσ' ἱδρώουσα κραταιοῦ θηρὸς ὑφ' ὁρμῆς
> Swiftly she [the doe] dashed through the thick brush and the wood
> Rushing sweating beneath the onset of the mighty beast
>
> (XI.118-119)

---

[255] **II.542-3** (*τῷ δ' ἅμ' Ἅβαντες <ἕποντο θοοί ὄπιθεν κομόωντες / αἰχμηταί>*: βραχὺ διασταλτέον *θοοί, κομόωντες, αἰχμηταί·* μᾶλλον γὰρ ἐμφαίνει ἕκαστον συμβεβηκὸς ἰδίᾳ λεγόμενον "*The Abantes followed him swift behind with flowing locks / spearmen* — One must put a βραχεῖα διαστολή after *swift, with flowing locks,* and *spearmen*; for this lends greater ἔμφασις that each of them is said in sequence with the same thing"), **VIII.152a** (*<ὤ μοι Τυδέος υἱὲ δαΐφρονος:>* ἐπὶ τὸ *δαΐφρονος* στικτέον· μᾶλλον γὰρ ἐμφαίνει "*Alas, son of Tydeus the battle-minded* — One must put a στιγμή after 'battle-minded'; for this lends greater ἔμφασις"; note that Nicanor's regular method is to place a στιγμή after vocatives), **IX.350a**[1] (<εὐρεῖαν, μεγάλην:> βραχὺ διασταλτέον ἐπὶ τὸ *εὐρεῖα<ν>* πρὸς ἔμφασιν "*Broad big* — one must put a βραχεῖα διαστολή after 'broad' for the sake of ἔμφασις"), **XI.119a**[1] (discussed below), **XI.689c** (*<ὡς ἡμεῖς παῦροι κεκακωμένοι ἐν Πύλῳ ἦμεν:>* βραχὺ διασταλτέον ἐπὶ τὸ παῦροι πρὸς ἔμφασιν "*Thus we fewer done wrong were in Pylos* — One must put a βραχεῖα διαστολή after 'fewer' for the sake of ἔμφασις"), **XIII.95d** (*<κοῦροι νέοι:>* ἔμφασιν ἔχει πλείονα τὸ *κοῦροι* χωριζόμενον τοῦ *νέοι* "*Lads young men* — Separating 'lads' from 'young men' lends greater ἔμφασις"), **XV.308-309** (discussed below), and **XVI.549a** (*<ἄσχετον οὐκ ἐπιεικτόν:>* βραχὺ διασταλτέον μετὰ τὸ ἄσχετον διὰ τὴν ἔμφασιν "*Unbearable no longer to be born* — One must put a βραχεῖα διαστολή after 'unbearable' because of the ἔμφασις"). Note that **IX.350a**[1], **XI.689c**, and **XIII.95d** occur in speeches, but in the case of

Nicanor comments, in familiar fashion (XI.119a[1]),

> *σπεύδουσ' ἱδρώουσα· ἐπὶ τὸ σπεύδουσα βραχὺ διασταλτέον· μᾶλλον γὰρ ἐμφαίνει.*
> *Rushing sweating* — One must place a βραχεῖα διαστολή after 'rushing'; for this lends greater ἔμφασις.

Here, as with the examples cited in note [XX] above, the ἔμφασις is called for at an emotional moment: the doe is running for her life, and what is to be displayed is not only her haste and sweat but the coupling of those two indications of her terror asyndetically. At XV.306-310, by contrast, the terror is produced by the epiphany of Apollo as he takes the Trojans against the ships:

> Τρῶες δὲ προΰτυψαν ἀολλέες ἦρχε δ' ἄρ' Ἕκτωρ
> μακρὰ βιβάς πρόσθεν δὲ κί' αὐτοῦ Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων
> εἱμένος ὤμοιιν νεφέλην ἔχε δ' αἰγίδα θοῦριν
> δεινὴν ἀμφιδάσειαν ἀριπρεπέ' ἣν ἄρα χαλκεύς
> Ἥφαιστος Διὶ δῶκε φορήμεναι ἐς φόβον ἀνδρῶν
> And the Trojans pressed forward tightly packed and, behold, Hector led
> Walking proudly and ahead of him went Phoebus Apollo
> Clothed on his shoulders in cloud and he had his raging aegis
> Terrible shaggy on both sides easily distinguished which, behold, the
> bronzesmith Hephaestus gave to Zeus to carry so as to rout men
> (XV.305-310)

Thankfully, Nicanor comes to our aid on the subject of Apollo's aegis, saying (XV.308-309),

> Διασταλτέον καθ' ἕν· ἔμφασις γὰρ μᾶλλον.
> One must put a διαστολή after each; for thus the ἔμφασις is greater.

Thus the description of Apollo's weapon, which occupies the rhetorical center of the

---

IX.350a[1] and **XI.689c** comment on lines from speeches by Achilles and Nestor (respectively), the two characters most aligned with the narrator in the *Iliad* in terms of rhetorical ability.

description of the Trojans' culminating assault on the ships, is to receive no less than four διαστολαί (presumably after θοῦριν, δεινὴν, ἀμφιδάσειαν, and ἀριπρεπέα). The ἔμφασις in question is clearly the terribleness of the god in this context.

At this point it might be objected that, in instances such as these, Nicanor is advising βραχείαι διαστολαί not so as to enable the ἔμφασις of the emotional situation in the narrative but in order to clarify the relationship between adjectives in serial asyndeton and the nouns they modify. It can be shown, however, that while ἔμφασις can collaborate with clarification, it is by no means restricted to such clarification. Ancient grammarians had a term for clarificatory punctuation, used extensively in the scholia attributed to Nicanor: such punctuation is said to be used πρὸς τὸ σαφέστερον ("for clarity's sake").[256] Yet we find Nicanor distinguishing between such clarification by punctuation on the one hand and the bestowal of ἔμφασις on the other. Regarding line XI.227 (part of a biography of a dying Greek),

> γήμας δ' ἐκ θαλάμοιο μετὰ κλέος ἵκετ' Ἀχαιῶν
> And having married he arrived from the bridal chamber with glory among the Achaeans
>
> (XI.227)

---

[256] On punctuation πρὸς τὸ σαφέστερον see Blank 1983: 50, the discussion at Quintilian 7.9.8, and especially (for Nicanor) Friedländer 1857: 91-94. For an example of punctuation πρὸς τὸ σαφέστερον (though the term itself is not used) in collaboration with ἔμφασις, see **XVIII.283a[1]**: *οὐδέ ποτ' ἐκπέρσει <πρίν μιν κύνες ἀργοὶ ἔδονται>· στικτέον δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ ἐκπέρσει· μᾶλλον γὰρ οὕτως ἐμφαίνει. ἐὰν δὲ συνάπτηται, ἀδιανόητον γίνεται "Nor shall he lay it [Troy] waste <ere that the swift dogs shall eat him>* — One must put a στιγμή after "lay it waste"; for thus the ἔμφασις is greater. If it [ie. the whole line] is joined together, it becomes senseless." That is to say, Polydamas is not here saying that Achilles will not sack Troy *until* the swift dogs eat him, but he will not sack Troy at all and the swift dogs will eat him first.

Nicanor's comment not only distinguishes between punctuation πρὸς τὸ σαφέστερον and that of ἔμφασις but goes so far as to spell out in what that ἔμφασις displays:

> *γήμας δ' ἐκ θαλάμοιο <μετὰ κλέος ἵκετ' Ἀχαιῶν>·* βραχὺ διασταλτέον μετὰ τὸν σύνδεσμον πρὸς τὸ σαφέστερον. καὶ ὅτι καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ἐμφαίνει τὸ ὑπόγυιον τοῦ γάμου καὶ τὴν περὶ τὸν πόλεμον σπουδὴν καὶ τὸ οἰκτρὸν τῆς ἀναιρεσέως.
> *And having married <he arrived> from the bridal chamber <with glory among the Achaeans>* — One must put a βραχεῖα διαστολή after the conjunction [ie. δ'] for clarity's sake. And [one should do so] also because it [ie. the βραχεῖα διαστολή] exceedingly displays [ἐμφαίνει] the suddenness of the marriage and the rush to war and the pitiable character of his being slain.

The fact that πρὸς τὸ σαφέστερον is divided here from the verb ἐμφαίνει by "καὶ ὅτι" suffices to show that these are different reasons for Nicanor's use of the βραχεῖα διαστολή. Similarly, at X.436-437 (Dolon's description of the horses of Rhesus),

> τοῦ δὴ καλλίστους ἵππους ἴδον ἠδὲ μεγίστους
> λευκότεροι χιόνος θείειν δ' ἀνέμοισιν ὁμοῖοι
> His [ie. Rhesus'] horses are the fairest and largest I [ever] saw
> [They are] whiter than snow and in speed similar to the winds
>
> (X.436-437)

Nicanor observes (X.437c),

> Χωριστέον τοῦ ἐπάνω στίχου, ἵνα μὴ σόλοικον γένηται. καὶ ἄλλως καθ' ἑαυτὸ λεγόμενον πλείονα ἔμφασιν παρίστησιν. λείπει δὲ τὸ *εἰσί* ῥῆμα, λευκότεροί εἰσιν.
> This line [437] should be separated from the line that precedes it, so that there is no grammatical mistake. Furthermore, if it is said all by itself [καθ' ἑαυτό] it adds greater ἔμφασις. And it leaves out the verb "are": "They are whiter."

Here the syntactical observation is distinguished from the observation regarding ἔμφασις by the definitively distinguishing term ἄλλως, standard in ancient criticism

when adducing a different comment or a different reason for a comment. While the phrase πρὸς τὸ σαφέστερον does not appear, the aim of the grammatical portion of the scholion is to avoid a grammatical mistake (ἵνα μὴ σόλοικον γένηται), equivalent to the purpose of a comment πρὸς τὸ σαφέστερον. In short, we here again find the reader being instructed on how to deliver the line (καθ' ἑαυτό) in an important context (the introduction of the horses which will be the subject of the latter half of Book 10). Ἔμφασις is thus once again directly related to the emotional context of the narrative.

2.2.3.4 Characterization through punctuation: the ἔμφασις of πάθος

In choosing when to pause in the ἀνάγνωσις of narration, then, the reader is able to display (ἐμφαίνειν) the unspoken and the non-textual, and Nicanor aims to help him do so; thus far our discussion has concerned punctuation at the lexical level, whereby meaning is added by the reader to particular words. We turn now to punctuation in the service of characterization, where it is chiefly used to bring out the emotion of characters in particular situations — the πάθος of rage, contempt, reproach, entreaty.[257] These comments on character-oriented ἔμφασις are more detailed than earlier examples, perhaps as a result of the greater variety and greater range of

[257] On the terms πάθος and ἦθος in ancient literary criticism, see Gill 1984. Von Franz 1940 (Diss. Zurich 1940) might offer interesting observations on these terms in the Homer scholia, since her first section of Part II is entitled "Ethos und Pthos im allgemeinen," but the first and second parts of her thesis were not published in von Franz 1943.

characters' emotions compared with the narrator's, or of the need to differentiate one character from another; they are more liberal in their use of the terminology of ἀνάγνωσις (often employing the verbs προφέρειν and ἀναγιγνώσκειν, for instance) and often incorporate 1st person plural verbs and pronouns.

Let us begin in Book 1 with a basic example. In disdaining Chryses, Agamemnon rather gratuitously throws in a description of the future in store for the priest's daughter:

> τὴν δ' ἐγὼ οὐ λύσω πρίν μιν καὶ γῆρας ἔπεισιν
> ἡμετέρῳ ἐνὶ οἴκῳ ἐν Ἄργεϊ τηλόθι πάτρης
> ἱστὸν ἐποιχομένην καὶ ἐμὸν λέχος ἀντιόωσαν
> I shall not free the girl before(hand) old age shall fall upon her
> In my house in Argos far from fatherland
> Walking at the loom and sharing my bed
>
> (I.29-31)

Regarding line 30, Nicanor comments (I.30a),

> καθ' ἑαυτὸ τοῦτο προφερόμεθα, καὶ γὰρ ἐμφατικώτερον
> We pronounce [προφερόμεθα] this all by itself, and it displays greater ἔμφασις [sc. if we do pronounce it that way].

Assuming this scholion refers to the entire line,[258] the ἔμφασις here results from the expression of the line as a whole (καθ' ἑαυτὸ τοῦτο) and consequent running together of three separately insulting ideas (servitude, alienness, distance); it is worth

---

[258] No lemma appears in the Venetus A (Erbse 1969.1: 17 n.23). It is of course often important to know what portion of the line is under discussion (especially if the scholion requests καθ' αυτὸ τοῦτο "All by itself," as here), and the lack of a lemma makes it difficult to judge the scope of commentary; admittedly, however, there is never any guarantee that any of the lemmata of the Venetus A reflect Nicanor's or other commentators' original lemmata; papyrus fragments of ancient ὑπομνήματα (commentaries) appear to employ longer (often full-line or two-line)

noting the 1st person plural form of προφέρειν, here simply in the indicative and indicating usual practice.

Moving on in Book 1, we find that the phrase καθ' αυτὸ τοῦτο need not refer to the pronunciation (προφορά) of a single line as a complete unity (that is, without διαστολαί) but can equally specify the isolation of a single phrase within the line for independent pronunciation. By I.231, Achilles is bitterly attacking Agamemnon, insulting not only the king personally but also his followers:

> δημοβόρος βασιλεὺς ἐπεὶ οὐτιδανοῖσιν ἀνάσσεις
> King eater-of-the-people since you rule over nobodies

On this line Nicanor comments (I.231a),

> *Δημοβόρος βασιλεύς·* καθ' ἑαυτὸ τοῦτο ἀναγνωστέον, ὡς καὶ Φιλοξένῳ ἐν τῷ *Περὶ προσῳδιῶν* δοκεῖ, ἵνα τὸ κομματικὸν τῆς προφορᾶς τὴν ὀργὴν μᾶλλον ἐμφαίνῃ. δύναται δὲ καὶ τὸ *εἶ* ῥῆμα λείπειν, ὑφ' ἓν ἡμῶν ὅλον προφερομένων τὸν στίχον, ἵν' ᾖ *δημοβόρος εἶ βασιλεύς ἐπεί οὐτιδανοῖσιν ἀνάσσεις.* ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐπείγει.
> *King eater-of-the-people* — It is necessary to read-aloud [ἀναγιγνώσκειν] all by itself [καθ' ἑαυτό], as Philoxenus in his *On Prosodies* remarks,[259] so that the choppy manner [τὸ κομματικόν] of

---

lemmata, as for instance in the ὑπόμνημα printed at Erbse 1969.2: 127 (Pap. Graec. Journal. 66.566 [= P^2 1184]).

[259] This Philoxenus (of Alexandria) is distinct from the famous dithyrambic poet Philoxenus of Cythera, and was apparently the quintessential Alexandrian scholar: according to the Suda entry (Φ 394) he "ἐσοφίστευσεν ἐν Ῥώμῃ. *Περὶ μονοσυλλάβων ῥημάτων, Περὶ σημείων τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰλιάδι, Περὶ τῶν εἰς μι λῃγόντων ῥημάτων, Περὶ διπλασιασμοῦ, Περὶ μέτρων, Περὶ τῆς τῶν Συρακουσίων διαλέκτου, Περὶ ἑλληνισμοῦ, Περὶ συζυγιῶν, Περὶ γλωσσῶν ε΄, Περὶ τῶν παρ' Ὁμήρῳ γλωσσῶν, Περὶ τῆς Λακώνων διαλέκτου, Περὶ τῆς Ἰάδος διαλέκτου,* καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν" (taught rhetoric at Rome [and wrote] *On monosyllabic verbs, On the critical signs in the* Iliad, *On –μι verbs, On reduplication, On meter, On the Syracusan dialect, On Hellenism, On conjucations, On rare words* (γλῶσσαι) (5 books), *On rare words* (γλῶσσαι) *in Homer, On the Laconian dialect, On the Ionian dialect,* and so on). It is curious that this catalogue does not mention *Περὶ προσῳδίων*, which is perhaps subsumed under τὰ λοίπα.

> the pronunciation better displays [ἐμφαίνειν] his rage. Alternatively [καὶ] the verb *are* [εἶ] can be left out, with ourselves pronouncing the whole line as a single item [ὑφ' ἕν], so that it becomes *You are an eater-of-the-people king because you rule over nobodies.* But this is not required.

There are a number of remarkable points in this passage. First, we do not in fact encounter the word διαστολή, though by implication the points turns on whether it is the whole line (Philoxenus' view) or merely δημοβόρος βασιλεύς (Nicanor's view) that should be pronounced καθ' ἑαυτό; if the latter, a βραχεῖα διαστολή is implied after βασιλεύς. Of these two alternatives, the first (Philoxenus') results in a "choppy" pronunciation suitable to displaying the character's heightened emotion (τὴν ὀργήν); but the second (perhaps Nicanor's) would presumably do so even more markedly. Both are articulated in terms of προφορά, the first also in terms of ἀνάγνωσις; as we observed in Chapter 2, these can, on a conceptual level, be equivalent terms. Finally, of the two options, we are free to choose whichever we think best ("ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐπείγει"). We may note, too, that Nicanor's suggestion does not consider δημοβόρος βασιλεύς to be an exclamation, but rather as having an elided verb "to be."

We find an example of such an exclamation, furnishing further definition of τὸ κομματικόν ("choppiness")[260] at II.337a when Nestor (foreseeing and lamenting the

---

[260] The word derives from κόμμα, a "cutting"; which in turn derives from κόπτω, "to cut." Aristarchus' views (as reported by Aristonicus) on the subject of τὸ κομματικόν are less clearly concerned with ἀνάγνωσις: "Ὅμηρος διακόπτει τὰς φράσεις, ἵνα μὴ μακροπερίοδος γένηται" (Homer chops up the phrasing so that as not to be long-winded) we read at **XIII.172a**; at **XIV.169a**,

Greeks' plight after the withdrawal of Achilles) begins his speech in the assembly with the famously untranslatable phrase "ὦ πόποι." Here we find not the adverbial form κομματικῶς (characterizing the ἀνάγνωσις) but the adjective κομματικόν, characterizing the exclamation itself. Nicanor comments (II.337a),

> Στικτέον ἐπὶ τὸ *ὦ πόποι*· κομματικὸν γάρ, καὶ μᾶλλον ἐμφαίνει καθ' ἑαυτὸ λεγόμενον.
> One must place a στιγμή after "ὦ πόποι"; for it lends greater ἔμφασις if it is said all by itself.

The ἔμφασις here is clearly one of the old man's grief and foreboding. By contrast, when Achilles' discourse is characterized in Book 9, it is again his rage (as he recalls the events of Book 1) which prompts Nicanor to recommend τὸ κοματτικόν as a means of ἔμφασις.

> ἐκ γὰρ δή μ' ἀπάτησε καὶ ἤλιτεν οὐδ' ἂν ἔτ' αὖτις
> ἐξαπάφοι' ἐπέεσσιν ἅλις δέ οἱ ἀλλὰ ἔκηλος
> ἐρρέτω ἐκ γάρ εὑ φρένας εἵλετο μητίετα Ζεύς
> ἐχθρὰ δέ μοι τοῦ δῶρα τίω δέ μιν ἐν καρὸς αἴσῃ
> For indeed he completely tricked me and sinned against me never again
> Will he completely cheat me with words enough of him but at peace
> Let him dither for counseling Zeus completely robbed him of his mind
> And his gifts are hateful to me and I care nothing for him
>
> (IX.375-379)

Nicanor's comment (IX.375-379) is,

> Παρατηρητέον ὅτι ἐμφαντικώτεροι γίνονται οἱ λόγοι θᾶσσον

"Ὅμηρος ἄλλας ἀρχὰς λαμβάνει, ἵνα μὴ ἀσαφὴς ἡ περίοδος γένηται ἤτοι ὑστεροπερίοδος" (Homer take up new beginnings so that the sentence does not become unclear or subordinate). If we take "ἀσαφής" here as referencing clarity with respect to the audience's perception, the latter comment of Aristarchus' would be strikingly reminiscent of Bakker's work on the cognitive implications of the paratactic style (Bakker 1997, esp. pp. 86-122); but the comment does not unambiguously reference the act of ἀνάγνωσις.

> διακοπτόμενοι· ἡ γὰρ ὀργὴ μᾶλλον παρίσταται διὰ τοῦ τοιούτου. ἐν γοῦν τοῖς τέσσαρσι στίχοις ἐφεξῆς ἐκτώ εἰσιν αὐτοτελεῖς λόγοι καὶ τοσαῦται αἱ στιγμαί, ἕως τοῦ *ἐν καρὸς αἴσῃ*.
> One must take care to note that the statements gain greater *emphasis* in being cut up quickly; for the rage is better brought forth through this type of thing. For indeed in these four lines in sequence there are eight complete statements and as many στιγμαί, up to "care nothing for him."

If we had not observed above that ἔμφασις is a quality of ἀνάγνωσις, we could well read such a statement as simply syntactical[261]; as we have seen, however, the reader is free, in realizing any given passage, to apply whichever punctuational interpretation he prefers, as long as such punctuation is syntactically valid. The force behind the verb γίνονται in this passage draws attention to the *creation* of ἔμφασις by the reader; thus the phrase θᾶσσον διακοπτόμενοι implies a θᾶσσον διακόπτων; this may be taken to be either Achilles or the one being advised by means of the word "παρατηρητέον," or rather the latter in the process of presenting the former.

The ability of the reader to display (ἐμφαίνειν) not only a character's emotions but the character himself appears in a Nicanor scholion which again regards Achilles' reply to Odysseus. In rejecting Agamemnon's offer, Achilles bids his guests moreover

> Τῷ πάντ' ἀγορευέμεν ὡς ἐπιτέλλω
> ἀμφαδὸν ὄφρα καὶ ἄλλοι ἐπισκύζωνται Ἀχαιοί
> εἴ τινά που Δαναῶν τι ἔλπεται ἐξαπατήσειν
> αἰὲν ἀναιδείην ἐπιειμένος

[261] As Blank appears to do (Blank 1983: 60), who adduces this passage in refuting, on the syntactical grounds that "Nicanor chooses coordination over subordination," Friedländer's hostility to coordination.

> declare all these things to him just as I enjoin
> openly so that others of the Achaeans likewise may be angry
> if he still somehow imagines he will deceive another of the Danaans
> always clothed in shamelessness
>
> (IX-369-372)

Regarding line 372, Nicanor comments (IX.372a),

> *αἰὲν ἀναιδείην <ἐπιειμένος>*[262]: δύναται μὲν συνάπτεσθαι τῷ ἐπνάω στίχῳ, ὡς καὶ τέτριπται. βέλτιον δὲ καθ' ἑαυτὸ προφέρεσθαι· μᾶλλον γὰρ ἐμφαίνει τὸν ὀργιζόμενον.
> *Always clothed in shamelessness* : it can be joined to the preceding verse, so that it is enjambed, but it is better to pronounce it all by itself; for this better displays one who is angry.

Here again, following Nicanor's (or his excerptor's) shorthand, the actual punctuational terminology is left out; but if the first hemistich of line 372 is to be pronounced καθ' ἑαυτό, it is understood that this implies a στιγμή at the end of line 371, ensuring that αἰὲν ἀναιδείην ἐπιειμένος not be perceived as the subject of ἔλπεται. In contrast to the example of I.231a, however, the better pronunciation (which is once again explicitly presented as the better of two possibilities) this time allows the display (ἔμφασις) not only of the rage (τὴν ὀργήν) but of the actual raging character (τὸν ὀργιομένον). The fact that the stand-alone pronunciation is optional (and thus not inherent syntactically) is also conveyed by the adverb μᾶλλον, the combination of which with ἐμφαίνει is, as we have seen, nearly formulaic in

[262] The lemmata in the Venetus A being deficient from the point of view of including all words discussed in their respective scholia, modern editors have often supplied additional words in <pointed brackets>.

Nicanor.[263]

At XVI.125-129, Achilles commands Patroclus to rescue the hard-pressed Achaeans:

> ὄρσεο διογενὲς Πατρόκλεες ἱπποκέλευθε
> λεύσσω δὴ παρὰ νηυσὶ πυρὸς δηΐοιο ἰωήν
> μὴ δὴ νῆας ἕλωσι καὶ οὐκέτι φυκτὰ πέλωνται
> δύσεο τεύχεα θᾶσσον ἐγὼ δέ κε λαὸν ἀγείρω
> Rise up Zeus-born Patroclus driver-of-horses
> I see indeed by the ships the loud shout of blazing fire
> Let them not indeed take the ships and there is no longer any escape
> Put on your armor quickly and I will rouse the men
>
> (XVI.126-129)

This is a critical moment not only in the plot of the poem but in the Achilles' personal story: having put events in motion which have led to the present danger to the Greek fleet, and having roughly rejected not only the Embassy in Book 9 but Patroclus' own tearful pleas a mere hundred lines earlier, he is now moved to reverse the ruin he had held out for. Nicanor comments (XVI.128a),

> *μὴ δὴ νῆας ἕλωσι <καὶ οὐκέτι φυκτὰ πέλωνται>*: ταῦτα ὁμολογουμένως καθ' ἑαυτὸ λέγεται· ὑπερευλαβούμενος γὰρ λέγει. δύναιτο δ' ἂν καὶ τὸ ἑξῆς εἶναι "ὄρσεο," μὴ δὴ νῆας ἕλωσιν· ἀλλὰ βέλτιον τὸ πρότερον. παρατηρητον δὲ πρὸς τὰ ἀσύνδετα τὴν προσωποποιΐαν ὅτι ἐμφαντικωτάτη.
> By common consent[264] this part [ταῦτα] is spoken all by itself; for he is

[263] The example here drawn from **IX.372a** focuses on enjambment, but the phrase μᾶλλον γὰρ ἔμφαινει (usually with its words in this order, but also in various other configurations) occurs just as often with regard to βραχείαι διαστολαί which are to be *included*: **II.337a**, **III.151**, **VIII.152a**, **IX.239a** (ἵνα μείζων ἔμφασις γένηται "So that the ἔμφασις shall be greater"), **XI.119a[1]**, **XI.689c** (πρὸς ἔμφασιν "For the sake of ἔμφασις"), **XI.689c** (ἔμφασιν . . . πλείονα "Greater ἔμφασις"), **XIII.366c** (ἔμφαινει by itself; the text perhaps corrupt), **XIII.308-9**, **XVII.88**, **XVIII.82a**, **XVIII.262a**, **XVIII.283a[1]**, **XVIII.377a**, **XXII.247a**, and **XXIII.244-5**.

[264] For this meaning of ὁμολογουμένως, evidently the correct one here, see *LSJ* s.v. B.2. The usual term in Nicanor (as in Herodian) is, however, συνηθῶς.

> speaking with extreme caution [ὑπερευλαβούμενος]. The sequence of thought [τὸ ἑξῆς] could be "Rise up" [XVI.126], *so that they do not take the ships*; but the former way is better. One must take care to note, with respect to the *asyndeton*, the dramatization [sc. going on], that it is *most emphatic* [ἐμφατικωτάτη].

Again the choice between alternatives; again the punctuation of the line (the disjointed καθ' ἑαυτό manner of its phrases) is justified as furthering the display of emotion for the character being represented (whom we catch act of being cautious, ὑπερευλαβούμενος[265]). Indeed, we may perhaps read a nearly subconscious degree of correspondence between the verb describing how the lines are said (λέγεται) and the verb describing how Achilles speaks those lines (λέγει). But the main point is of course the nexus, in the last sentence, of the scholiast's advice to the prospective reader-aloud (παρατηρητέον [ὅτι]), (anti)punctuation (τὰ ἀσύνδετα), the process of characterization (προσωποποιΐα) and the resulting ἔμφασις, which the characterization of Achilles' emotion *via* punctuation has here displayed very prominently (ἐμφατικωτάτη[266]). So prominently, apparently, that it is the object of

---

[265] This rare word appears elsewhere only in Eunapius (*Vitae Sophistarum* 6.9.10) and Alexander of Nicaea (*Epistulae* 10.3). Here a better translation might be "with extreme anxiety," as manifest in line 128 ("μὴ δὴ νῆας ἕλωσι καὶ οὐκέτι φυκτὰ πέλωνται" which can be read as a an anticipatory negative purpose clause with δύσεο in the following line or (if pronounced καθ' ἑαυτό as Nicanor indicates) as a clause of fearing: the latter result in a disjointedness not only of thought but also of verbal mood (with the indicative λεύσσω followed in the next line by the subjunctives μὴ . . . ἕλωσι καὶ . . . πέλωνται followed in the next line by the imperative δύσεο).

[266] *LSJ* (s.v.) defines προσωποποιΐα as "A. the dramatization, the putting of speeches into the mouths of characters" or "III.change of grammatical person," citing Apollonius Dyscolus (*Adversus mathematicos* 131.16) for the latter. Since the dramatization of character (of Achilles as one ὑπερευλαβούμενος) is here expressed by, among other things, the switching between grammatical persons (2nd person singular in line 126, 1st person singular in line 127, two distinct 3rd persons plural in line 128, and 2nd person singular and 1st person singular in line 129) it is impossible to choose between the two meanings here.

common consent. Here we clearly see Nicanor framing the application of punctuation as a tool not for resolving difficult syntax but rather for *enhancing* its difficulty so as to aid the reader in displaying Achilles' state of mind.

The common consent of XVI.128a is lacking in another case of characterization through punctuation in Book 16. At XVI.684-687, Patroclus veers towards death:

> Πάτροκλος δ' ἵπποισι καὶ Αὐτομέδοντι κελεύσας
> Τρῶας καὶ Λυκίους μετεκίαθε καὶ μέγ' ἀάσθη
> νήπιος εἰ δὲ ἔπος Πηληϊάδαο φύλαξεν
> ἦ τ' ἂν ὑπέκφυγε κῆρα κακὴν μέλανος θανάτοιο
> And Patroclus having given orders to the horses and Automedon
> Went after the Trojans and Lycians and was greatly blinded
> Fool if he had heeded the advice of the son of Peleus
> Indeed he would have escaped the evil fate of black death
>
> (XVI.684-687)

Commenting on line 686, Nicanor remarks (XVI.686),

> τὸ *νήπιος* καθ' ἑαυτό· οὕτως γὰρ μᾶλλον ἐμφαίνει τὸν ἐπισχετλιάζοντα. ἁμαρτάνουσι δὲ οἱ συνάπτοντες.
> *Fool* [is to be pronounced] all by itself: for thus it better displays [ἐμφαίνει] one who is expressing grief [τὸν ἐπισχετλιάζοντα[267]]. Those who join it [sc. to the preceding line(s)] are mistaken.

Here we find, just as in the IX.372a scholion cited above, a phrase which Nicanor suggests is better pronounced καθ' ἑαυτό, the better to display emotion. The emotion

---

[267] ἐπισχετλιάζω occurs only here; *LSJ* (s.v.) glosses it as "lament over." The more common verb σχετλιάζω, however, is glossed (LSJ s.v.) as "complain of hardship, utter indignant complaints"; it usually appears intransitively, once (Demosthenes 34.19) with ἐπι-. The force of the prefix in the scholiast's ἐπισχετλιάζω surely directs the "complaint" onto a particular person; indeed, the verb (with its productive –ιζω suffix), which occurs first in classical Athenian authors (Aristophanes *Clouds* 477; Aeschines 3.146; Demosthenes 34.19; Theophrastus *Characters* 8.9), likely derives from the

here displayed is that of one who is ἐπισχετλιάζων, that is, the person responsible for terming Patroclus a "νήπιος." Particularly noteworthy here is the fact that the verb carries a *personal* force (guaranteed by its participial form; participles cannot be impersonal, especially when they are direct objects): thus it is *not* the emotion created by the verse itself which is displayed (ἐμφαίνει) here but rather *the emotion of the person who is describing Patroclus.* Whereas the scholion at IX.372a instructs the potential reader-aloud regarding the performance of Achilles, therefore, this scholion initially appears to provide instruction regarding the performance of the *narrator* — of Homer himself; it would thus be no exaggeration to say that this scholion implies a conception of ἀνάγνωσις in which the personality of the narrator and the personality of the reader can intermingle. Indeed, the speaker here and referent of ἐπισχετλιάζων may be Achilles himself, if we follow the suggestion of Richard Martin that the Book 16 narrative of Patroclus' ἀριστεῖα and death is focalized through the eyes of his friend.[268] Ἐπισχετλιάζων would particularly suit Achilles, since the exclamation of "νήπιος" at XVI.372a comes in the middle of the description of Patroclus' overstepping of Achilles' guidelines. There is therefore a possibility that

---

Homeric exclamation 'σχέτλιος,' and the mood evoked by ἐπισχετλιάζω is surely (especially in the hands of a Homeric scholar) that of any character who might call another σχέτλιος.

[268] Martin 1989: 234-235: "I suggest . . . that Homer uses an attested epic convention for both establishing contact and at the same time keeping distance between himself and the audience of the *Iliad.* By assuming the voice of Achilles, making the hero's performance as monumental as his own, and using turns of phrase in Achilles' voice that only Homer as narrator uses elsewhere, he turns Achilles into the 'focalizer of narration . . . In a way, this is to validate the notions one sees in both Hesiod and Plato regarding the relation between a narrator and narrated speech. Both assume that, to a large extent, the poet takes on the role of the speaker of his poem."

reader-aloud, narrator, and protagonist are all conceived of as overlapping by this Nicanor scholion: indeed, the case that Nicanor supposed such focalization is strengthened by his comment on 31 earlier in Book 16, during Patroclus' reproach to Achilles:

> μὴ ἐμέ γ' οὖν οὗτός γε λάβοι χόλος ὃν σὺ φυλάσσεις
> αἰναρέτη τί σευ ἄλλος ὀνήσεται ὀψίγονός περ
> αἴ κε μὴ Ἀργείοισιν ἀεικέα λοιγὸν ἀμύνῃς
> May indeed such rage as this never seize me, the rage you nurse
> Reckless in your bravery what other man will aid you though yet unborn
> If you do not ward off disgraceful ruin from the Argives
>
> (XVI.29-31)

Here it is Patroclus whose mood as one σχετλιάζων is to be displayed by the reader, according to Nicanor:

> <*αἰναρέτη*>· τοῦτο καθ ἑαυτὸ προενεκτέον· μᾶλλον γὰρ ἐμφαίνει τὸν σχετλιάζοντα.
> <*Reckless in your bravery*> — This should be pronounced [προενεκτέον] all by itself; for thus it better displays (ἐμφαίνει) one who is in the act of reproaching.

The object of ἔμφασις here is again a present middle participle, as with ὀργιζόμενον (Achilles at IX.372a) and ἐπισχετλιάζοντα (Narrator and/or Achilles at XVI.686).[269]

---

[269] In this context, we may adduce another Nicanor scholion from early in Book 16, **XVI.46a** (on lines XVI.46-47 ὡς φάτο λισσόμενος μέγα νήπιος ἦ γὰρ ἔμελλεν / οἱ αὐτῷ θάνατόν τε κακὸν καὶ κῆρα λιτέσθαι "Thus he spoke by way of entreaty great fool for indeed he was about / To beg the boon of evil death and shear destruction for himself"): ἡ μὲν συνήθεια ἀνεπιτηδεύτως συνάπτει ἄχρι τοῦ *μέγα νήπιος*. τάχα δ' ἂν μείζων γένοιτο ἡ ἔμφασις, εἰ καθ' ἑαυτὸ λέγοιτο τὸ *μέγα νήπιος* "Custom artlessly joins [sc. the words of the line] up to 'great fool.' But the ἔμφασις would immediately be greater if 'great fool' were spoken all by itself." Book 16 would thus feature, in sequence, first Patroclus (σχετλιάζων according to Nicanor) rebuking Achilles with σχέτλιε, the narrator rebuking Patroclus as a μέγα νήπιος (in the 3rd person), and the narrator and/or Achilles (ἐπισχετλιάζων) rebuking Patroclus as a μέγα νήπιος. We may compare Nicanor's comment at **II.112a** (on lines II.111-113, where Agamemnon begins the assembly of the Achaeans by pretending

Once again the object of punctuational ἔμφασις in these character-oriented scholia is framed not in terms of the character's emotion as such but in terms of the character himself; indeed, in the description of characters' πάθη within the poem, a participle in Nicanor's hands becomes virtually the equivalent of a stage direction.

2.2.3.5 Adverbs of interrogation

So far we have examined instances of the terms ἔμφασις / ἐμφαίνειν in the scholia attributed to Nicanor which deal with characterization in performance; all these instances addressed themselves to a particular type of discourse, namely exclamation. It will have struck the modern reader that none of Nicanor's eight marks correspond to our two modern symbols indicating intonation, the exclamation point and question mark, being instead confined to the regulation of pausing: this is precisely why the scholiasts justify their punctuation in terms of sense or (as we saw) character or mood. Since the ancients lacked such physical indicators of exclamation and interrogation, it is natural that intonation should be described explicitly in commentary. Having

---

to be downhearted regarding their expedition to Troy: Ζεύς με μέγας Κρονίδης ἄτῃ ἐνέδησε βαρείῃ / σχέτλιος ὃς πρὶν μέν μοι ὑπέσχετο καὶ κατένευσεν / Ἴλιον ἐκπέρσαντ' εὐτείχεον ἀπονέεσθαι "Zeus the great son of Crous bound me with a weighty blindness / The hard-heart who earlier had promised me and assented / That I would return home having completely sacked well-walled Troy"): *σχέτλιος*: τοῦτο καθ' ἑαυτὸ προενεκτέον, ὡς ἐν τοῖς ἄνω τὸ *νήπιος*· μᾶλλον γὰρ κομματικῶς λεγόμενον ἐμφαίνει "*The hard-heart*: this should be pronounced all by itself, as above [II.38] with *Fool*; for if it is said in a chopped-up manner it displays greater *emphasis* [or perhaps: what is said in a chopped-up manner displays greater *emphasis*]." Here we find the adjective κομματικῶς used of a single word; as it is not possible to "chop up" a single word (one can only chop up a larger unit, which would here be the larger λόγος), it can only refer to a general *manner* of speech, a manner here instantiated by means of the καθ' ἑαυτό phrasing of "σχέτλιος."

examined instances of exclamation, however, we now pass to examples of interrogation, which we find features two parallel terminologies: on the one hand the adverb πευστικῶς (also μετὰ πεύσεως and ἐν πεύσει), which we find associated with the specification of punctuation (and thus generally ascribed by modern editors to Nicanor); on the other hand, the phrase ἐν ἐρωτήσει (also κατ' ἐρώτησιν), associated rather with the 'exegetical' scholia. We shall first deal with ἀνάγνωσις specified as πευστικῶς and then turn to the phrase ἐν ἐρωτήσει.

We find that the adverb πευστικῶς and its phrasal variants is used twelve times in the *Iliad* scholia.[270] Of these, eight are assigned by modern editors to Nicanor on the basis of concomitant punctuational terminology.[271] The following is a typical example (X.545-546a[1]); Nestor welcomes Odysseus back from the Doloneia:

> Εἶπ' ἄγε μ' ὦ πολύαιν' Ὀδυσεῦ μέγα κῦδος Ἀχαιῶν
> ὅππως τούσδ' ἵππους λάβετον καταδύντε ὅμιλον
> Τρώων ἦ τίς σφωε πόρεν θεὸς ἀντιβολήσας
> Come now, tell me O praiseworthy Odysseus great boast of the Achaeans

---

[270] Πευστικῶς at **I.290-291**, **IV.82-83a[1]**, **VI.518c[2]**, **X.61a**, **X.545-546a[1-2]**, **XI.165b[1]**, and **XIV.299a**; κατὰ πεῦσιν **III.46(G)**; ἐν πεύσει **IV.643**; κατὰ πεῦσιν *and* μετὰ πεύσεως **III.46-52**; τὴν πεῦσιν γίνεσθαι **XXIV.381**. Here again I include only those references which relate explicitly or implicitly to ἀνάγνωσις: in the case of κατὰ πεῦσιν, for instance, I do not list instances in which the scholia refer to questions *within* the narrative, for instance the scholion at **iii.80** (Telemachus to Nestor: "εἴρεαι ὁππόθεν εἰμέν· ἐγὼ δέ κέ τοι καταλέξω"): *εἴρεαι·* εὐλαβῶς λίαν, ὡς αὐτὸς μὴ προκατάρξας λόγων, ἀλλὰ πρὸς πεῦσιν ἀποκρινόμενος ("*You ask* — [sc. Telemachus speaks] with great reverence, as one who did not instigate the conversation, but as one responding to a question"). Here all the verbs and adverbs of speaking (εὐλαβῶς, προκατάρξας λόγων, πρὸς πεῦσιν, ἀποκρινόμενος) concern events internal to the poem. This is not to say that what happens internally to the poem is irrelevant to ἀνάγνωσις; but it is critical to distinguish the scholia's observations regarding the actions of characters *per se* from their observations regarding the realization of those actions by the reader.

[271] Usually the phrases ἀπ' ἄλλης ἀρχης or ἀφ' ἑτέρας ἀρχης or a term like βραχὺ διασταλτέον; on which see above (pp. 130-131). Ἀπ' ἄλλης ἀρχης of course recurs in interrogatory contexts because the switch to interrogation marks a break with previous discourse.

> How -you[272] two took these horses here having entering the throng
> Of the Trojans or some god who met you gave you them
>
> (X.544-546)

Here the scholion comments (X.545-546a[1]),

> *ὅπως τούσδ' ἵππους λάβετον· χαριέντως διαστέλλουσι βραχὺ ἐπὶ τὸ λάβετον, ἵνα τὸ ἐξῆς πευστικῶς λέγηται· καταδύντες ὅμιλον Τρώων.* οὕτως καὶ Τήλεφος ἐν τῷ ὀγδόῳ τοῦ *Γραμματικοῦ* ἀξιοῖ· "εἰ γὰρ μὴ οὕτως," φησίν, "ἀναγνῶμεν, ἐπιταραχθήσεται ἡ διάνοια."
> *How - you two took these here horses* — Excellently,[273] they pause briefly after "these here horses" [λάβετον : i.e. the last word of the lemma], so that what follows is said questioningly: "having entered the throng of the Trojans." Thus Telephus also holds in the eighth book of his *On Grammar*[274]: "If we do not read it aloud [ἀναγνῶμεν] like that," he says, "the flow of thought [διάνοια] will get muddled."

Here the intention of clarifying διάνοια in ἀνάγνωσις through the punctuational regulation of discourse, familiar from Chapter 3, appears not only in Nicanor's comment (if it does derive from him) but in that of Telephus; the ἀνάγνωσις-related valence of such terms as βραχεῖα διαστολή recurs here in the verb διαστέλλουσι, which is unambiguously non-material; but the lack of an interrogatory mark of punctuation makes the adverb πευστικῶς, modifying λέγηται, particularly closely tied to the *Realien* of performance. Nevertheless, the scholion at X.545-546a[1] does little beyond illustrating this relationship. In another case, IV.82-83a[1], when the

---

[272] Given that I am describing the scholia's response to what could be ambiguities in the Greek, it seems best not to provide a definite translation of some lines so as not to prejudice my reader one way or the other before analysis of that ambiguity.

[273] On χάρις as an aesthetic principle in the editing of Homeric texts, see Nagy's 2002 Sather lectures (forthcoming as *Homer the Classic*). The word is difficult to translate; it denotes a reciprocity of interest between the possessor and the receiver of χάρις.

Achaeans look up man by man at Athena shooting down to the battlefield from Olympus,

> ὣδε δέ τις εἴπεσκεν ἰδὼν ἐς πλησίον ἄλλον,
> "ἦ ῥ αὖτις πόλεμός τε κακὸς καὶ φύλοπις αἰνή
> ἔσσεται ἢ φιλότητα μετ' ἀμφοτέροισι τίθησι
> Ζεύς ὅς τ' ἀνθρώπων ταμίης πολέμοιο τέτυκται."
> Thus then a man would speak, looking to the man next to him,
> "Indeed again evil war and dreadful battle-din
> There shall be, or friendship among both parties he shall set
> Zeus, who is the dispenser of war among men."
>
> (IV.81-84)

Here the Nicanor-attributed scholion reads (IV.82-83a[1]),

> *ἔσσεται·* ὁ λόγος στίζει ἐπὶ τὸ *ἔσσεται·* εἴρηται γὰρ καὶ ἐν τῇ πρὸ ταύτης ῥαψῳδίᾳ ὅτι οὐ πάντως ἐπὶ τῶν πευστικῶς λεγομένων ὑποστικτέον. οὕτως Νικάνωρ, "εἰ καὶ ἀπατᾷ," φησίν, "ἡ ὑπόκρισις."
> *There will be* — The sense places a στιγμή after "There will be"; for it has been mentioned in the Book before this one that it is not always necessary to place a ὑποστιγμή after things asked as questions. Such is Nicanor's view, "if," as he says, "the ὑπόκρισις is misleading."

The meaning is surely that what follows ἔσσεται in line 83 is indeed πευστικῶς λεγόμενον, taking "ἢ" not as a comparative ("or Zeus shall set friendship") but as a particle introducing a question ("shall Zeus set friendship . . . ?"). Since the two ἠ's are homonyms, the ὑπόκρισις could mislead the listener here, given that there is an earlier ἦ (the exclamatory) in line 82 which could be misheard as the first of two comparative ἤ's; to avoid this confusion, the reader is to pause longer before ἤ so as to disjoin it from the earlier. This is a neat example of the ἀνάγνωσις-dependent

---

[274] Telephus was a contemporary of Nicanor; see Wendel 1934: 369-371.

character both of interrogatory intonation and of Nicanor's punctuational criteria; the word ὑπόκρισις has already been encountered as once of the central elements of ἀνάγνωσις in the forumlation of the *Ars Grammatica.*

In the passages cited above, usually (as we have seen) accompanied by the terminology of punctuation, interrogatory ἀνάγνωσις has been specified for the sake of discursive clarity; the key word being the adverb πευστικῶς and its variants. When the purpose of commentary is not the correction of discourse but the creation of character, however, the key terms are the phrases ἐν ἐρωτήσει ("with a question"[275]) or κατ' ἐρώτησιν ("as a question"[276]); reference is sometimes made to an ἐρώτησις ("questioning"[277]). Here again these scholia often leave room for the reader-aloud to decide whether a given line is to be read with interrogative intonation or not. At XV.201ff., for example, Iris responds to Poseidon's rebuff to Zeus, his elder brother:

> οὕτω γὰρ δή τοι γαιήοχε κυανοχαῖτα
> τόνδε φέρω Διὶ μῦθον ἀπηνέα τε κρατερόν τε
> ἦ τι μεταστρέθεις στρεπταὶ μέν τε φρένες ἐσθλῶν
> οἶσθ' ὡς πρεσβυτέροισιν Ἐρινύες αἰὲν ἕπονται.
> Thus indeed truly, earthshaker darkhaired,
> I bear to Zeus this very μῦθος, unyielding and mighty,
> Or will you change your mind? For the minds of the good can be changed.
> You know how the Furies always follow the elder.
>
> (XV.201-204)

---

[275] ἐν ἐρωτήσει at **III.194b**, **VIII.448-449**, **XIII.727a**, **XV.204b**, and **XXI.89**.
[276] κατ' ἐρώτησιν at **I.291a**, **VIII.352-353a[1]**, **VIII.352-353a[2]**, **X.424c**, **XIV.364**, and **XIV.364(G)**.
[277] διὰ τῆς ἐρωτήσεως **X.82**; ἡ ἐρώτησις **X.84a**; τὰς ἐρωτήσεις **X.564-5**; τὴν ἐρώτησιν **XIII.219-329a**; ἐρώτησιν **XIV.265b**; ἐρωτήσεως (a genitive of characteristic) **XV.735a[1]**; τὰς

Here the scholia comment (XV.204b),

> *οἶσθ' ὡς πρεσβυτέροισι·* τοῦτο δυνατόν ἐστι καὶ ἐν ἐρωτήσει καὶ ἐν ἀποφάσει προάγειν. *ἔπονται* δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ *ἀκολουθοῦσι καὶ συμμαχοῦσι.* πιθανῶς δὲ πρὸς τὸν λέγοντα "μή τί με πάγχυ κακὸν ὣς δειδισσέσθω." οὐκέτι φησὶν ὅτι ἰσχυρότερός σού ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ πρεσββύτερος· τὸ γὰρ τοῦ γήρως πλεονέκτημα †ἐπιφθονον <ἀνεπίφθονον Bekker[278]>.
> *You know . . . the elder* — It is possible to present [προάγειν] this either as a question [ἐρώτησις] or as a denial [ἀπόφασις]. *Follow* in the sense of *attend upon and fight on behalf of.* It is convincing [sc. as spoken] to one who says "Let him in no way completely frighten me like a coward" [XV.196]. For he [sc. Zeus] does not go so far as to say that he is stronger than you, but elder. For the advantage of age is <not> a cause of jealousy.

The argument here is that XV.204 can either be spoken with interrogative intonation or not, depending on how the reader chooses to handle the emotional relationship between Zeus and Poseidon, and between Iris and Poseidon: if Iris is threatening Poseidon, she will speak line 204 as a (rhetorical) question, but if she is wheedling him she will frame οἶσθ' as a *reminder* to Poseidon, a denial (ἀπόφασις) that it is Zeus himself, as opposed to the principle of respect for one's elders, that should change the earthshaker's mind. This is a remarkably intricate piece of characterization on the part of the scholia, fully cognizant of the subtlety of Iris's whole speech (whose impact depends very much on the effect of the line in question); it proposes two possible ways of presenting (προάγειν) that subtlety; and the presentation is explicitly

---

ἐρωτήσεις **XVIII.188**; τῆς ἐρωτήσεως **XVIII.385a**; ἐρώτησις **XIX.56-58a**. These and the examples mentioned above will be discussed presently.

[278] See Erbse 1969.4: 57 n.87, citing Eustathius *ad loc.*, for convincing proof of Bekker's clarificatory emendation.

said to be dependent on the tone of voice not only of a character but of the reader (the implied subject of προάγειν).

In two other cases, the scholiast does not describe in detail the effects of two alternate intonations (likewise involving the presence or absence of interrogation) but rather notes that τινες take a given line as a question. At II.192-194 Odysseus rails at and rallies various important Achaeans man by man after they have been discouraged by Agamemnon's shame speech of defeat, the purpose of which had been expounded beforehand:

> οὐ γὰρ πω σάφα οἶσθ' οἷος νόος Ἀτρεΐωνος
> νῦν μὲν πειρᾶται τάχα δ' ἴψεται υἷας Ἀχαιῶν
> ἐν βουλῇ δ' οὐ πάντες ἀκούσαμεν οἷον ἔειπε
> By no means clearly do you know what is on the mind of the son of Atreus
> Now he is testing us, and swiftly he will strike the sons of the Achaeans
> In the council - not - all - we heard what he said
>
> (II.192-194)

Regarding the last line, the scholion reads (II.194b),

> *ἐν βουλῇ δ' οὐ πάντες ἀκούσαμεν·* μετρίως, ἵνα μὴ καταισχύνῃ τοὺς ἄλλους, εἶπε τὸ *ἀκούσαμεν*. τινὲς δὲ ἐν ἐρωτήσει· μὴ οὐκ ἠκούσαμεν πάντες οἱ βασιλεῖς, τί εἶπεν ἐν τῇ βουλῇ ὁ Ἀγαμέμνων;
> *In the council - not - all - we heard* — judiciously, so as not to shame the others, he says "we heard." Some [sc. intone it] as a question: "Didn't all of us kings hear what Agamemnon said in the council?"

Here either meaning is valid: if we take the οὐ as modifying πάντες ("not all of us heard") we get, as in the Iris example above, a reassuring declarative statement; if we take the οὐ as modifying ἀκούσαμεν ("didn't we all hear") we get a minatory

rhetorical question. The rhetorical strategy pursued by Odysseus in this speech thus depends on which intonation is selected by the reader. What is more, the adverb μετρίως, which in Erbse's text modifies ἀκούσαμεν and thus qualifies (in the scholiast's view) Odysseus' use of the inclusive first person plural, may well be taken as characterizing the non-interrogatory intonation of the line as such: only **T** provides the wording above, "τὸ *ἀκούσαμεν*" being omitted in the **b** family of MSS and initial phrase appearing as "μετρίως τοῦτό φησιν."[279] In this case μετρίως would characterize not Odysseus' *scheme* but his non-interrogatory, non-minatory, steadfast *manner.*

At VIII.447-449, with the battle turning against the Achaeans, Zeus mocks their divine partisans, Athena and Hera:

> τίφθ' οὕτω τετίησθον Ἀθηναίη τε καὶ Ἥρη;
> οὐ μέν θην κάμετόν γε μάχῃ ἔνι κυδιανείρῃ
> ὀλλῦσαι Τρῶας τοῖσιν κότον αἰνὸν ἔθεσθε.
> Why now are you two thus unhappy, Athena and Hera?
> Not - surely you two have tired in the glorious battle
> Of destroying the Trojans, against whom you have an amazing grudge.
> (VIII.447-449)

The scholia indicate that there are two ways to pronounce the last two lines (VIII.488-489):

> *οὐ μέν θην κάμετόν·* τινὲς ἐν ἐρωτήσει, καὶ περὶ τῆς προτέρας νοοῦσι μάχης, οἷον "οὐκ ἀπήρκεσεν ὑμῖν ἐκεῖνα"· οἱ δὲ ἐν ἀποφάσει καὶ περὶ τῆς νῦν κερτομικῶς.
> *Not - surely you two have tired* — Some [sc. pronounce it] with a

[279] Erbse 1969.1: 233 n.25.

> question, and think of the earlier battle, in other words "it wasn't enough for you"; others [sc. pronounce it] as a denial and jeeringly with respect the ongoing battle.

Since the terminology of ἀνάγνωσις is not explicit here, we might be tempted, were we to encounter this scholion detached from its cultural context, to view an adverb such as κερτομικῶς as qualifying the manner of Zeus's speech *inside* the poem merely; adducing other instances of the phrase ἐν ἐρωτήσει, however, we can be sure that the verb elided with ἐν ἐρωτήσει and ἐν ἀποφάσει must be either προφέρω or (more likely) ἀναγιγνώσκω[280]: thus κερτομικῶς would modify ἀναγινώσκουσιν and reference not only Zeus's poem-internal speech but also and equally the poem-external act of ἀνάγνωσις on the part of the performer. Interestingly, too, we may wonder if the verb νοοῦσι itself here likewise references the act of ἀνάγνωσις: though our first thought might be that "τινὲς [ἀναγινώσκουσιν] ἐν ἐρωτήσει" *because* they "περὶ τῆς προτέρας νοοῦσι μάχης," this is not in fact what we are told in the scholion, which correlates the act of posing the line as a question and the act of considering the previous battle; though Zeus is singular, νοοῦσι might well refer to the reader as such, pluralizing a necessarily singular voice because the individual action is blended with the critical formula τινες, referring to the school of thought which holds that VIII.488-489 should be pronounced as a question. If so, Zeus's thoughts and the

---

[280] **XIV.364** (parallel to **XIV.364(TM)** [κατ' ἐρώτησιν ἀναγνωστέον]) and **XIX.56(G)** [καθ' ὑπερώτησιν ἀναγνωστέον]. This last scholion is from the Geneva codex, but there is no reason to believe that **G**'s exegetical scholia postdate, in origin, those of **A** and **bT**; as the parallel at **XIV.364**

ἀναγνωστης' thoughts are here implicitly one and the same.[281]

2.2.4 Conclusions regarding Nicanor and ἀνάγνωσις

We may conclude our examination of Nicanor's interaction with ἀνάγνωσις by comparing and contrasting our findings with what was observed above in Chapter 1 regarding punctuation and accentuation in their physical form as markings on actual papyrus rolls of Homer. Here we may recall that at one point Nicanor appears to indicate that a διαστολὴ βραχυτάτη is *not* to be placed in the copies (ἀντίγραφοι):

> καθ' ἕκαστον ὄνομα ἐκ φύσεως καὶ λόγου διαστολή ἐστι βραχυτάτη διὰ τὴν ἐπανάληψιν τῶν ὀνοματικῶν [ὑποτακτικῶν Fr.], ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις τιθέναι οὐκ ἐπείγει, κατὰ δὲ τὴν προφορὰν σώζειν.
> At each noun there is, in accordance with nature and reason, the briefest of pauses, owing to the leaving out of the nominals [articles Fr.], which there is no need to insert in the manuscripts [ἀντίγραφοι], but one should respect [sc. the pause in] the pronunciation [προφορά] nonetheless.
>
> (Σ *Iliad* II.497a)

This appears to imply that Nicanor expected that the punctuational observations contained in his commentary on the *Iliad* (*Περὶ στιγμὴς τὴς παρ' Ὁμήρου*) were to be used in the physical marking of the text, as in the passage from the Σ DT already remarked in Chapter 1:

---

goes to show. In the *Odyssey* scholia we find ἐν ἐρωτήσει προενεκτέον and variants at **iv.665**, **v.23**, and **v.204**.

> πρὸ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ ἄρξασθαι τὸν νέον ἀναγινώσκειν, ὁ διορθωτὴς λαμβάνων τὸ βιβλίον διωρθοῦτο αὐτό, ἵνα μὴ ἐπταισμένον αὐτὸ ἀναγνοὺς ὁ νέος εἰς κακὴν ἕξιν ἐμπέσῃ· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα λαβὼν ὁ νέος τὸ βιβλίον διορθωθέν, ἀπήει πρὸς τὸν ἀναγνωστικὸν τὸν ὀφείλοντα αὐτὸν διδάσκειν ἀναγινώσκειν κατὰ τὴν διόρθωσιν τοῦ διορθωτοῦ.
>
> Before the young man [νέος] would begin to read [ἀναγινώσκειν], the corrector [διορθητής] would take the book and correct it, so that the young man would not read it in an imperfect state [ἵνα μὴ ἐπαισμένον αὐτὸ ἀναγνοὺ ὁ νέος] and thus fall into a bad habit. After that, the young man would take the corrected book and go off to the reading teacher [ἀναγνωστικός] who would help teach him to read in accordance with the correction of the corrector.
>
> (*Commentarius Melampodis* [*GG I.3.*12])

Nevertheless, the fact that Nicanor, at least at II.497a, remarks that physical placement is *not* necessary and that correct pronunciation can proceed without a physical mark ("κατὰ δὲ τὴν προφορὰν σώζειν" [but one should respect (sc. the pause in) pronunciation nonetheless]) indicates that his commentary was not merely a collection of off-the-shelf punctuational signs to be inserted methodically into a student's copied verses; rather, since using the commentary and marking the text are evidently two independent activities, the evidence collected above suggests that *Περὶ στιγμῆς τῆς παρ' Ὁμήρου* functioned as a "virtual" equivalent to consultation with an ἀναγνωστικός such as we find in the Σ DT passage here. This would explain why, for example, we find Nicanor's punctuational system evidenced in no published Homer papyrus: that system may have served to train students who had no access to an

---

[281] There is a third instance (**XXI.89**) in which τινες advocate pronunciation ἐν ἐρωτήσει, which again is said to heighten dramatic effect through the intensification of characterization: according to the τινες, Lycaon would first ask if Achilles would slay him and then (XXI.95) beg him not to.

ἀναγνωστικός, or perhaps to inform γραμματικοί of the proper training in ἀνάγνωσις which they should be imparting to their own students[282]; most likely, Nicanor's Homer-specific works served a range of such possible uses, corresponding to the varied ways in which ἀνάγνωσις governed the use of Homeric poetry. As with the punctuation and accentuation of Homer which does survive in the papyrological record, however, we may regard Nicanor's ἀνάγνωσις-oriented comments as a form of close reading of the text — a reading in which syntax plays an important, though by no means the only, part.

2.3 Specifications of performance in the 'exegetical' scholia

In this second part of Chapter 2, we turn our attention to the ἀνάγνωσις of intonation or 'delivery' in the Homer scholia, especially as these concern characterization on a larger scale. We have, indeed, observed above that punctuation is often employed in the service of characterization; nevertheless, with regard to characterization, the

---

[282] Cf. the manner in which the *Commentarius Melampodis* introduces its Σ DT description of Nicanor's system: "Ινα δὲ μὴ δόξῃ τις ἡμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν καὶ τὴν τοῦ λεχθέντος Νικάνορος διατύπωσιν τὴν περὶ τῶν στιγμῶν, ὧν τὰ ὀνόματα ἤδη ἡμῖν προείρηται, δεῖ ὡς ἐν συντόμῳ ἐνταῦθα μνησθῆναι τῆς τε θέσεως αὐτῶν καὶ τῆς διαφορᾶς τῆς τῷ Νικάνορι εἰρημένης· *ὧν δεῖ πρώτας ἀκοὰς τῶν παίδων ἀκοῦσαί τε καὶ μὴ παντελῶς ἀμυήτους εἶναι* (Lest anyone think we are unaware of the above-mentioned Nicanor's arrangement of στιγμαί, whose names we have already given, we must here briefly recollect the arrangement of them and the above-mentioned differences in Nicanor's system; *for boys' first ears should hear them and not be completely uninitated into them*). This appears to indicate that at least the Σ DT description of Nicanor's system should be used in classroom instruction and probably Nicanor's applied punctuation also — at least in the view of the *Commentarius Melampodis*.

effects of punctuation and of delivery differ in one important respect: where punctuation, being the regulation of discourse, is used chiefly to express a character's *mood* or emotion (as we saw at I.231a ["τὴν ὀργὴν . . . ἐμφαίνῃ"], IX.372a ["ἐμφαίνει τὸν ὀργιζόμενον"], XVI.686 ["ἐμφαίνει τὸν ἐπισχετλιάζοντα"], and IX.375-379 ["ἡ γὰρ ὀργὴ μᾶλλον παρρίσταται"]) or dramatization more generally (as at XVI.128a, where τὰ ἀσύνδετα result in a "προσωποποιΐα . . . ἐμφατικωτάτη"), delivery and intonation as tools of characterization are associated by the scholia with a character's essential personality. This difference between incidental emotion and essential personality coincides with the distinction in Greek poetics between πάθος and ἦθος; having noticed the punctuation of πάθος earlier in the chapter, we now turn to statements in the scholia which explicitly concern the ἀνάγνωσις of ἦθος, both in direct speech and in the narrative.[283]

Our evidence for such ἀνάγνωσις is to be found principally in the so-called 'exegetical' scholia, often equated with scholia deriving from the bT family of manuscripts (**T** in the British Museum, **B** in the Marciana, **C** in the Laurentiana, and

---

[283] For a survey of the uses of ἦθος in the *Iliad* scholia, see Richardson 1980: 272-275, who notes that the scholia "frequently comment on the way in which *speeches* reveal character, or observe that a particular thing is spoken or done ἠθικῶς," including Patroclus' gentleness, Menelaus' worthiness and moderation, Paris' cowardice, Agamemnon's nobility and arrogance, etc. See Richardson 1980: 272 for citations of these (not treating of ἀνάγνωσις explicitly). Besides the adverb ἠθικῶς, we also find the phrase ἐν ἤθει; for the equivalence of ἠθικῶς and ἐν ἤθει with respect to the meaning of "in character," see for instance XXIII.458, where Idomeneus boasts, "οἷος ἐγὼν ἵππους αὐγάζομαι ἦε καὶ ὑμεῖς; (Is it I alone who discern the horses or do you all [discern them] too?)," where the first scholion (**XXIII.458a**, from **T**) reads, employs ἐν ἤθει and the second (**XXIII.458b**, also from **T**) employs ἠθικῶς. With respect to the narrator, the fact that ἠθικῶς combines the meanings "in

$\mathbf{E}^3$ and $\mathbf{E}^4$ in the Escorial). The designation of 'exegetical' is sometimes carelessly regarded in modern scholarship on the Homer scholia as denoting a distinct group of sources whose material has flowed into the 'mainstream' of VMK material; it must be emphasized, however, that the term is a generic one, and moreover constitutes essentially a default category: if a given scholion cannot be assigned on the basis of external or (more often) internal evidence to any of the VMK scholars, it is classed as 'exegetical.' This does not mean, therefore, that such a scholion is the work of a specific exegete or group of exegetes, but only that its contents neither pertain to punctuation (Nicanor), the Alexandrian study of manuscript variants (Didymus), or prosody (Herodian), nor display the Aristonicus-signalling marker ὅτι (for ἡ διπλῆ ὅτι etc.). We find 'exegetical' scholia in the Venetus A and VMK scholia in the bT MSS. (on which see Erbse 1969.lii-lvi), and there is no reason, apart from our own inability to assign such scholia to a specific source, to suppose that Didymus and Aristonicus (for instance) could not be the source of the material they report. We may therefore decline to disdain these scholia as necessarily reporting a later tradition; rather, they may be taken as generally representative of the 'exegetical' aims of ancient scholarship.[284] Indeed, it is perhaps because the aims of the 'exegetical'

---

character" and "customarily" makes it somewhat difficult to tell when the scholia are referring to something as "proper to the Narrator's voice" or "typical of Homeric style."

[284] It is, I believe, a coincidence that one title for an ancient teacher (whose duties would involve the instruction of students in Homer *inter alia*) is ἐξηγητής; rather, the term 'exegetical' is applied by modern scholars in the sense of 'explanatory' as opposed to 'teacherly': though of course teachers do explain things.

scholia are to clarify the general character of particular passages (as opposed, for example, to providing manuscript variants) that they supply the most explicit evidence of ἀνάγνωσις as performance.

2.3.1 Expressing wonderment

In concluding our discussion of ἀνάγνωσις in Nicanor above, we dwelt at some length on the ἀνάγνωσις of interrogatory intonation, both because it affords many examples of the poem's dependence on the reader's *choice* (in that the decision to intone interrogatively is often left to the reader's discretion) and because it may serve to introduce other types of insistence by the scholia of the poem's dependence on the reader's *voice*. Before proceeding to an examination of the scholia's specifications for the ἀνάγνωσις of ἦθος, we may begin by considering briefly their views on the expression of wonderment (θαυμασμός), which serves as a convenient half-way point between the ἀνάγνωσις of πάθος and the ἀνάγνωσις of ἦθος.

As an intonational mode, wonder does not exclude interrogation: at Σ III.46-52 (where Hector reproaches Paris), we learn that III.46-47 ("ἦ τοιόσδε ἐὼν ἐν ποντοπόροισι νέεσσι / πόντον ἐπιπλώσας . . .") and following were pronounced by "τινὲς κατὰ πεῦσιν καὶ θαυμασμόν" — combining a question and an exclamation (what we might term a 'rhetorical question'); the same phrase is found at III.46(G). A punctuational scholion at v.183 reads, "ἀφ' ἑτέρας ἀρχῆς ἀναγινώσκειν βέλτιον,

ἵνα θαυμασμὸν μᾶλλον παραστήσωμεν (It is better to read aloud from a new starting point, so that we may better establish the wonderment [sc. of the speaker])." A more striking instance is found in the *Odyssey*, where at vii.212-215 Odysseus (still anonymous) remarks plaintively to Alcinous and his court,

> οὺς τινας ὑμεῖς ἴστε μάλιστ' ὀχέοντας ὀϊζύν
> ἀνθρώπων τοῖσίν κεν ἐν ἄλγεσιν ἰσωσαίμην
> καὶ δ' ἔτι κεν καὶ πλείον' ἐγὼ κακὰ μυθησαίμην
> ὅσσα γε δὴ ξύμπαντα θεῶν ἰότητι μόγησα
> Whichever you all know most weary in grief
> Among men, to them I would liken myself in my sufferings
> And I myself could speak forth regarding numerous woes
> Such [woes] one and all I have endured by the will of the gods
> (vii.212-215 with punctuation omitted)

Here the scholion, directed to line 215, reads,

> *ὅσσα γε δὴ ξύμπαντα·* τοῦτο ἀφ' ἑτέρας ἀρχῆς ἐν θαυμασμῷ ἀνεφωνησε.
> *Such [woes] one and all* — This he voiced with wonderment from a new starting point.

I quote this passage with its scholion as a remarkable instance of a speaker *within* the poem being granted the technical vocabulary of punctuation (ἀφ' ἑτέρας ἀρχῆς) and ἀνάγνωσις (ἐν θαυμασμῷ); almost uniquely, too, the verb describing action in the poem is in the past tense. Two points are relevant to our discussion, however: first, the scholia here expressly divide (*via* the significant pause of a ἕτερα ἀρχή), from the point of view of ἀνάγνωσις if not syntax, the relative pronoun from its noun for the sake of aural effect (here, θαυμασμός); second, the verb used (ἀναφώνειν) is itself chosen for its acoustic valence. The result of such a decision on the part of an reader

is significant in that Odysseus' already plaintive speech is rendered all the more emotional by means of a one-line interjection: rather than, "I could recount the woes, such as I have suffered" we are to make the hero say "I could recount the woes; such have I suffered!" Here the responsibility for characterization falls on the reader, and it is to be achieved aurally.

2.3.2 Characterization through tone of voice: ἦθος

All the specifications of interrogatory intonation cited above concerned speech by characters within the poem, since it is generally characters who ask each other questions[285]; by contrast, we find that ἦθος can be specified both for characters' speeches and for characters' actions. Let us begin with an example from the former, and moreover with a scholion which forms a bridge between the interrogatory intonation and the intonation of ἦθος, I.291. Here Agamemnon is quarreling with Achilles, but addresses himself to Nestor following the old man's attempts at reconciliation:

---

[285] When the narrator asks a question, it is posed to the Muses (τίς at I.8, II.761, V.703 [= VIII.273, XI.299, XVI.692 with minor variation], xxii.12-14; πῶς at XX.202. τίς occurs in the ἀπόλογοι at x.573-574 and xii.450 and at *Scutum* 72-73; πῶς in the *Hymn to Apollo* 19 (= 207). None presents us with ἀνάγνωσις-related scholia, though we may note a rather peculiar comment on **XI.299** (ἔνθα τίνα πρῶτον, τίνα δ' ὕστατον ἐξενάριξεν;): "ἐπὶ λύπῃ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν οὐκ ἔτι τὴν Μοῦσαν, ἀλλὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐρωτᾷ" (From grief for the Achaeans [who are being slaughtered by Hector] he no longer asks the Muses [to inform him] but rather asks [it of] himself]). Neither of the earlier instances of the line (V.703 and VIII.273) had addressed the Muse by name, however; XVI.692 is addressed to Patroclus by name. Here the narrator's self-questioning is ascribed to *his own grief* for the Achaeans (ἐπὶ λύπῃ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν), and the scholion may be indicating that the question is to be asked in a more pathetic tone of voice.

εἰ δέ μιν αἰχμητὴν ἔθεσαν θεοὶ αἰὲν ἐόντες,
τοὔνεκεν οἱ προθέουσιν ὀνείδεα μυθήσασθαι
If the gods that are forever made him a spearman
For this reason they prompt[286] him to speak forth shame

(I.290-291)

The scholia here comment (I.291a),

ἦθος ὑποφαίνει ὁ λόγος, εἰ κατ' ἐρώτησιν ἐκφέροιτο.
The sentence reveals character, if it is pronounced as a question.

Though we again note both the optional character of the interrogatory intonation (revealed by the optative προφέροιτο), they key word here is certainly ἦθος: the interrogatory intonation presents the opportunity to reveal (ὑποφαίνει) Agamemnon's character. Similarly, at XIX.56ff Achilles formally returns to the Greek cause, saying,

Ἀτρεΐδη, ἦ ἄρ τι τόδ' ἀμφοτέροισιν ἄρειον
ἔπλετο, σοὶ καὶ ἐμοί, ὅ τε νῶΐ περ ἀχνυμένω κῆρ
θυμοβόρῳ ἔριδι μενεήναμεν εἵνεκα κούρης;
Son of Atreides, was this then better for both of us,
For me and for you, that we two, though grieving at heart,
Contended in soul-devouring strife for the sake of a girl?

the scholia comment (XIX.56[G]),

τὸ δὲ *ἀμφοτέροισιν ἄρειον* ἐν ἤθει καθ' ὑπερώτησιν ἀναγνωστέον· θέλει γὰρ εἰπεῖν ὅτι παρ' ἀμφοτέροις ὁμονοεῖν ὑπάρχει.
This better for both of us — This is to be read aloud in character [ἐν ἤθει] as a question; for he wishes to say that it is fitting for both of them to be of the same mind.

Here we find the by now familiar injunction ἀναγνωστέον coupled with the phase ἐν ἤθει; this confirms that ἦθος is an element not only of poem-internal discourse but of

[286] The meaning of προθέουσιν and thus of the whole line is not entirely clear; see Kirk 1985: 82.

the external discourse of the reader-aloud. In the following example, regarding the disguised Poseidon's exhortation to the Argive chiefs at XIII.99-101

> ὦ πόποι, ἦ μέγα θαῦμα τόδ' ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὁρῶμαι,
> δεινόν, ὃ οὐ ποτ' ἔγωγε τελευτήσεσθαι ἔφασκον,
> Τρῶας ἐφ' ἡμετέρας ἰέναι νέας . . .
> Ah, indeed this is a great wonder here which I see with my eyes,
> A terrible one, such as I for one never thought would come to pass,
> The Trojans coming to our ships . . .
>
> (XIII.99-101)

the scholia read

> (*XIII.101a*) *Τρῶας ἐφ' ἡμετέρας·* ἐν τῷ *ἡμετέρας* μεγάλη ἔμφασις, καὶ ἔστι μυρία ὑπακοῦσαι, οἷον τοὺς βαρβάρους ἐπὶ τὰς Ἑλληνικάς, τοὺς δειλοὺς ἐπι τὰς τῶν γενναίων, τοὺς ὀλίγους ἐπὶ τὰς τῶν πλεόνων. (**bT**)
> (*XIII.101a*) *The Trojans to our ships* — Great ἔμφασις on "our," and there are many things implied, such as: 'barbarians to the Greek ships,' 'cowards to the ships of the nobly born,' 'few men to the ships of a greater number.' (**bT**)
>
> *(XIII.101b)* ἐν ἤθει τὰ θαύματα ταῦτα (**bT**^{il}) ὡς τὸ "Ἕκτωρ δὴ παρὰ νηυσί" [(XIII.123)]. (**T**^{il})
> (*XIII.101b*) These wonders [θαύματα] [verb elided] in character [ἐν ἤθει] (**bT**^{il}), just as with "Hector indeed by the ships" (XIII.123). (**T**^{il})

In XIII.101b the verb itself is elided but the concomitant terminology clearly implies ἀναγνωστέον or some such ἀνάγνωσις-related word, as we can tell from the "μεγάλη ἔμφασις" specified in XIII.101a for ἡμετέρας; ἔμφασις, as we have seen, being a term of ἀνάγνωσις. Taking the two scholia as essentially equivalent,[287] we may take θαύματα (101b) as equivalent to the μυρία ὑπακοῦσαι (101a) and ἐν ἤθει

[287] That is, taking **XIII.101b** as the interlinear abbreviation of **XIII.101a** (both in the Townley codex, **T**). Since both occur in the margins of **b**, either they had different sources or the full **b** scholion is a

as equivalent to ἔμφασις: for it is by means of ἔμφασις that we may Ὀπακοῦσαι, just as it is by means of discourse ἐν ἤθει that we perceive the θαύματα. It is thus by realizing the ἦθος of Poseidon as encourager of the Argive chiefs that the reader is to convey meaning not explicit in the text but explicable in performance.

The power of ἀνάγνωσις-dependent ἦθος to convey implicit meaning is still clearer in another passage, this time from Book 9. At IX.449ff., Phoenix tells the autobiographical tale of how his mother used him as an agent of revenge upon her rival, the concubine whom Phoenix' father was doting on:

> τὴν αὐτὸς φιλέεσκεν, ἀτιμάζεσκε δ' ἄκοιτιν,
> μητέρ' ἐμήν· ἡ δ' αἰὲν ἐμὲ λισσέσκετο γούνων
> παλλακίδι προμιγῆναι, ἵν' ἐχθήρειε γέροντα.
> τῇ πιθάμην καὶ ἔρεξα· πατὴρ δ' ἐμὸς αὐτίκ' ὀϊσθείς
> πολλὰ κατηρᾶτο, στυγερὰς δ' ἐπεκέκλετ' ὀρινῦς
> He himself [Phoenix' father] was loving her [the concubine] and dishonoring his spouse
> My mother; she [Phoenix' mother] would always entreat me holding my knees
> That I have sex with the concubine, so that she [the concubine] would be hateful to the old man.
> I obeyed her and did it; my father, immediately perceiving this,
> Mightily cursed me and called down the terrible Furies
> (IX.449-454)

Regarding line 453, the scholia comment (IX453a),

> *τῇ πιθάμην καὶ ἔρεξα·* ἐν ἤθει δεῖ [τὸν στιχον **b**] ἀναγινώσκειν ὡς μετανοοῦντος αὐτοῦ· διὰ καὶ ἐμπεπίστευται Ἀχιλλέα· "ὁ γὰρ πταίσας τι καὶ φυλάττεται." καὶ Σοφοκλῆς "ὃς μὴ πέπονθε τἀμά, μὴ †βουλεύεται."
> *I obeyed her and did it* — It is necessary to read this [line **b**] aloud [ἀναγινώσκειν] in character [ἐν ἤθει] as though he is changing his

---

complete whole from which the T^{il} scholion is extracted; given the lack of lemmata in the **b** MSS., it is impossible to decide whether **XIII.101b** was originally independent.

> mind. This is why Achilles has been entrusted to him: "He who has stumbled before will be on guard in the future" [Menander Asp. 28]. And Sophocles [says], "He who has not suffered as I have, let him not give counsel" [fr. 814 N^2].

Here we do find the phrase ἀναγνωστέον ἐν ἤθει, with what amounts to a stage direction in "ὡς μετανοοῦντος αὐτοῦ (as though he is changing his mind)" — perhaps with something like a pause, a shake of the head, and a sigh, or something more strictly intonational. Howbeit, not only does the ἦθος of Phoenix involve the blending of his voice with that of the reader, but the Phoenix of yesteryear is also blended with the Phoenix of the Book 9 scene: the scholia's further comments (from διὸ onward) concern the present moment in Achilles' tent, by which time Phoenix has "reformed"; yet the participle μετανοοῦντος, though present tense, does not refer to Phoenix' changing his mind in the tent but rather his change of mind in response to his mother *when he was young*: μετανοοῦντος refers not to the fact that Phoenix has reformed his laviscious and unfilial ways but that he was willing to be persuaded by his mother. What is at stake is thus not Phoenix' change of mind itself but rather his *rueful reflection* on his earlier change of mind in Book 9. Indeed, the thought is so subtle that it is only by resorting to quotation of Menander and Sophocles at their most psychological and emotive that the richness of Phoenix' adult ἦθος, explicitly to be realized through an ἀνάγνωσις ὡς τοῦ μετανοοῦντος, can be indicated to the scholiast's ideal reader and performer of the poem.

If indeed Phoenix' change of mind were to be rendered in a more than purely

intonational manner — with a shake of the head, for instance — it would find a parallel in the ἀνάγνωσις specified for two other passages in which personality is expressed through a character's action as described by the narrator. In the heat of the battle for the wall, Teucer sends the herald Thotes (his name means 'Swifty') to call the Ajaxes, saying (XII.343) "ἔρχεο, δῖε Θοῶτα, θέων Αἴαντα κάλεσσον (Go, bright Thotes, run and call Ajax)"; and the herald obeys him:

> ὣς ἔφατ', οὐδ' ἄρα οἱ κῆρυξ ἀπίθησεν ἀκούσας,
> βῆ δὲ θέειν παρὰ τεῖχος Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων,
> στῆ δὲ παρ' Αἰάντεσσι κιών, εἶθαρ δὲ προσηύδα·
> "Αἰαντ', Ἀργείων ἡγήτορε χαλκοχιτώνων . . ."
> So he [Teucer] spoke, and indeed the herald obeyed him when he had heard,
> And he went running along the wall of the bronze-shirted Achaeans,
> And he came to a halt when he came by the Ajaxes, and spoke forth straightaway:
> "Ajaxes, both of you leaders of the bronze-shirted Achaeans . . ."
>
> (XII.351-354)

Regarding line 352 (βῆ δὲ θέειν παρὰ τεῖχος Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων) the scholia comment (XII.352a),

> ταῦτα καὶ ταχέως προφέρεσθαι δεῖ· ἔφη γὰρ "εἶθαρ δὲ προσηύδα."
> This should all be pronounced quickly; for he [sc. the Poet] said "he spoke swiftly."

Here we find the scholia taking their cue as to how to present one portion of narrative from another part of that narrative; the haste of the reader reveals the πάθος of Thootes (his desire to deliver his urgent message quickly) but also his ἦθος, as a trusty messenger conscious of his duty. In another scholion, by contrast

— one also involving haste and duty — the ἀνάγνωσις of narrative is conditioned by another character's speech. At XVI.126-129, as the first flame touches the ships of the Achaeans, Achilles at last assents to Patroclus' oft-repeated request that he be allowed to aid the Greeks:

> ὄρσεο, διογενὲς Πατρόκλεες, ἱπποκέλευθε·
> λεύσσω δὴ παρὰ νηυσὶ πυρὸς δηΐοιο ἰωήν·
> μὴ δὴ νῆας ἕλωσι καὶ οὐκέτι φυκτὰ πέλωνται·
> δύσεο τεύχεα θᾶσσον, ἐγὼ δέ κε λαὸν ἀγείρω.
> Rise up, Zeus-born Patroclus, driver of horses;
> I see indeed by the ships the loud should of blazing fire;
> Let them not indeed take the ships; and there is no longer any escape.
> Put on your armor quickly, and I will rouse the men.[288]
>
> (XVI.126-129)

We may note especially the command δύσεο τεύχεα and its adverb θᾶσσον. The passage continues with Patroclus' arming:

> ὡς φάτο, Πάτροκλος δὲ κορύσσετο νήροπι χαλκῷ·
> κνημῖδας μὲν πρῶτα περὶ κνήμῃσιν ἔθηκε
> καλάς, ἀργυρέοισιν ἐπισφυρίοις ἀραρυίας·
> δεύτερον αὖ θώρηκα περὶ στήθεσσιν ἔδυνε
> ποικίλον ἀστερόεντα ποδώκεος Αἰακίδαο·
> ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' ὤμοισιν βάλετο ξίφος ἀργυρόηλον
> χάλκεον, αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα σάκος μέγα τε στιβαρόν τε·
> κρατὶ δ' ἐπ' ἰφθίμῳ κυνέην εὔτυκτον ἔθηκεν
> ἵππουριν· δεινὸν δὲ λόφος καθύπερθεν ἔνευεν.
> εἵλετο δ' ἄλκιμα δοῦρε, τά οἱ παλάμηφιν ἀρήρει . . .
> So he [Achilles] spoke, and Patroclus arrayed himself with the pitiless bronze;
> The greaves first he set about his shins
> The fine greaves, set with silver ankle-pieces;
> Secondly he put on the cuirass about his chest,
> The richly-wrought and star-spangled cuirass of the son of Aeacus;
> And, behold, about his shoulders he tossed the silver-studded sword,

[288] We had already encountered this passage above (p. 150), where the issue at hand was the ἀσύνδετα and their effecting a προσωποποιΐα ἐμφατικωτάτη.

> The bronze sword, and after that the great and sturdy shield;
> And upon his mighty head he set the well-made helmet,
> The horse-hair helmet; and terribly the crest nodded from above;
> And he took the two valorous spears, which fitted his grip . . .
>
> (XVI.130-139)

I include a longer quotation than usual because it is not clear if the pertinent scholion (XVI.131a) applies merely to line 131 ("κνημῖδας μὲν πρῶτα" etc.) or to the whole of this "arming scene"[289]:

> *Κνημῖδας μὲν πρῶτα·* σπεύδοντα δεῖ προφέρεσθαι ταῦτα, ἐπιπόθησιν τῆς ἐξόδου μιμούμενον.
> *The greaves first* — It is necessary to pronounce [προφέρεσθαι] all this hurriedly, imitating a desire for the conclusion.

In terms of vocabulary, the use of two participles (σπεύδοντα and μιμούμενον) as subjects of the infinitive προφέρεσθαι (and objects of δεῖ) reminds us of participles discussed above as objects of ἐμφαίνει (τὸν ὀργιζόμενον, IX.372a; τὸν ἐπισχετλιάζοντα, XVI.686); where (as was suggested) these participles with ἐμφαίνει describe primarily a character in the poem and secondarily the reader, however, here the primary focus is on the reader, the only possible subject of the technical verb προφέρεσθαι, while the secondary focus is on the character whose ἐπιπόθησις is being realized. Nevertheless, poem-internal and poem-external speakers are not here easily distinguished; the "performative" melding of the two

---

[289] The arming scene in fact continues to line 154 with an excursus on Achilles' spear (ll. 140-144) and chariot (145154). Cf. Erbse 1969.4: 193 n.2-3 (on **XVI.131a**): "sch[olion] fort[asse] ad versus Π 131-154 referendum est." On the basis of ταῦτα (in Σ **XVI.131a**) this is surely correct. On arming scenes, see Janko 1992.334 (on XVI.130-139), who compares Patroclus' arming scene with those of Ajax

could not be clearer.[290] With respect to the ἐπιπόθησις, Richard Martin has observed regarding this scholion that "the representation [of the ἐπιπόθησις] involved is actually triplicate: the performer's desire to bring about an effective *exodos*; the desire of Patroklos, the character he represents, to achieve an end in battle; and finally, the *audience*'s desire to see and feel the most satisfying conclusion."[291] Such universal ἐπιπόθησις for the end of Patroclus' arming scene of course corresponds to the scene's occurrence at one of the most dramatic turning points in the plot, involving three climaxes simultaneously (in lines 119-130): the first firing of the ships, Achilles' partial concession, and the gratification of Patroclus' desire to help his fellow

---

(VII.206ff) and Agamemnon (II.578 and XI.16), noting that "all four major arming-scenes share [XVI.]131-3 and 135f."

[290] This is perhaps why this scholion caught the attention of N. Richardson (Richardson 1980: 287) and R. Martin (Martin 1997: 141). The "overlap" between character and reader here corresponds to the narratological overlap between character and narrator studied by de Jong (de Jong 2004, esp. pp. 41-100). More specifically, René Nünlist has described ancient scholars' sensitivity to what we would now term 'embedded focalization' or the articulation of narrative events (Nünlist 2003); as he shows, this is the basis of the λύσις ἐκ τοῦ προσώπου, a type of argument used by ancient scholars for resolving superficial contradictions in the poem; on the λύσις ἐκ τοῦ προσώπου, see Dachs 1913 and Römer 1924. For example, at **VI.377** Hector (running through Troy looking for Andromache) describes his wife as λευκώλενος; the scholia comment, τοῦ ποιητοῦ τὸ ἐπίθετον, οὐ τοῦ προσώπου "The epithet belongs to the poet, not to the character." Note that the term προσώπος refers not only to characters' but also to the poet's perspective, as Porphyry (*ad* VI.265, pp. 99-100 Schrader; cited by Nünlist 2003.63) makes clear: "ὅσα μὲν γὰρ ἔφη αὐτὸς ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ ἐξ ἰδίου προσώπου, ταῦτα δεῖ ἀκόλουθα εἶναι (Whatever he himself [i.e. the poet] said from his own personal perspective [προσώπου] should be non-contradictory)." Nünlist shows that the scholia are more than willing to allow some leakage from diegetic to mimetic (paralepsis) or from mimetic to diegetic (embedded focalization), confirming by their comments on such leakage that such a distinction existed: he cites **XVII.588a** (that Menelaus is μαλθακός in Apollo's view but ἀρηΐφιλος for the narrator), **XVI.278** (that the Trojans do not themselves perceive Patroclus as "Menoetius' son"), **I.23** (that Homer's description of Chryses as a ἱερεύς reflects the Achaeans' own respectful attitude), **XVIII.247-248** (a Nicanor scholion, specifying a coordinate clause with οὕνεκα as focalized), **VI.377** (quoted above), three scholia describing epithets as Ὁμηρικόν or ποιητικόν (**X.220b**, **I.355**, **IX.651**), two regarding diegetic perspective in characters' speeches (**XXI.218**, **XXIII.471**), and two relating differences in characters' and the narrator's geographical perspectives to focalization (**VI.152** on names for Corinth, **VII.422** on the course of the sun).

Achaeans. This last is the most affecting, since in hastening to arm he is hastening to death, as we know from XVI.45-46 (where he plead "μέγα νήπιος· ἦ γὰρ ἔμελλεν / οἱ αὐτῷ θάνατόν τε κακὸν καὶ κῆρα λιτέσθαι"). Ajax' personal survival is also in doubt. In this context, the swift utterance of the arming scene intensifies the ἀγωνία (suspense).[292] This is perhaps a more plausible rationale for the scholia's injunction than Richardson's technical point that "as these lines are largely formulaic, this could presumably be done without fear that the audience would lose track of the sense."[293] It is not necessary, after all, *literally* to rush through the lines in order to give an impression of haste: σπεύδοντα may simply mean "making haste" (as Patroclus is doing).

We may adduce one more example of the interdependence of ἦθος and ἀνάγνωσις. Early in Book 22, Achilles has been chasing the disguised Apollo across the plain in lieu of killing more Trojans; Apollo reveals his deception, bragging of his immortality. Achilles responds (XXII.14-20):

> τὸν δὲ μέγ'ὀχθήσας προσέφη πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς·
> "ἔβλαψάς μ', ἑκάεργε, θεῶν ὀλοώτατε πάντων,

---

[291] Martin 1997: 141.

[292] On ἀγωνία, see Richardson 1980: 270. Another term is πρόληψις, on which see Duckworth 1931: 322-323 (quoting the definition at **XV.610b**1, "πρόληψις δὲ σχῆμα ποιητικόν· προσεκτικὸν δὲ ταῦτα τὸν ἀκροατὴν καὶ περιπαθέστερον ἀπεργάζεται," and a similar comment at **Σ ix.229** [Duckworth 1931.322]). Duckworth notes that "the use of πρόληψις in the sense of anticipation is distinct from the grammatical use of the term" (Duckworth 1931: 322); but there are "no other examples of πρόληψις used in this sense. The word to denote foreshadowing which appears with the greatest frequency in the scholia is προαναφώνησις," occuring 15 times (Duckworth 1931: 323 with note 12). On the same page he notes other terms referring to future action (προανάληψις, ἀναφώνημα, ἀναφώνησις; also προλέγω, προαπαγγέλλω, προαναφθέγγομαι, and προλαμβάνω).

[293] Richardson 1980: 287.

ἐνθάδε νῦν τρέψας ἀπὸ τείχεος· ἦ κ' ἔτι πολλοί
γαῖαν ὀδὰξ εἵλον πρὶν Ἴλιον εἰσαφικέσθαι.
νῦν δ' ἐμὲ μὲν μέγα κῦδος ἀφείλεο, τοὺς δε σάωσας·
ῥηϊδίως, ἐπεὶ οὐ τι τίσιν γ' ἔδεισας ὀπίσσω.
ἦ σ' ἂν τισαίμην, εἴ μοι δύναμίς γε παρείη."
Greatly angered, the swift-footed Achilles addressed him:
"You have tricked me, Far-worker, most destructive of gods,
Having here and now turned me from the wall; indeed many more
Would have bitten the ground before reaching Ilium.
Now you have taken great glory from me in saving them
Easily, since you had no fear of future revenge.
Indeed I would take vengeance on you, if I had the power."

(XXII.14-20)

Taking its lemma from the last line, though perhaps (in again referencing ταῦτα) referring to the whole of the passage quoted,[294] a scholion of **T** comments (XXII.20c[1]),

> *εἰ μοι δύναμίς γε παρείη·* δύναμις ἴση τῇ σῇ. προφέρεσθαι δὲ ταῦτα δεῖ οὐ τεθαρρηκυίᾳ φωνῇ, ἀλλ' ὡς ἄν εἴποι ἀνὴρ γενναῖος μεγαλόφρων ἀπειλῶν θεῷ.
> *If I had the power* — Power equal to your own. It is necessary to pronounce (προφέρεσθαι) all this not with a bold voice, but rather as a high-minded noble man would speak when threatening a god.

A more evocative and descriptive prescription for ἀνάγνωσις could scarcely be imagined, and we shall not attempt to improve on the scholiast's description. We may note, however, that such an injunction ("Pronounce it as a high-minded [μεγαλόφρων] noble man would speak when threatening a god") calls for a good deal of imagination on the part of the reader: correct pronunciation here is specifically described as *not* being a question merely of tone of voice but rather of the

[294] We may observe, too, that when this passage is quoted by Plato (*Republic* 3.391a) as an instance of Homeric impiety (in that Achilles here threatens a god), Plato quotes not merely the last line with its threat but the preceding line as well.

impersonation of character, and the reader (never having himself threatened a god) must place himself in the position of Achilles.

2.4 Conclusion: ἀνάγνωσις and rhetoric

By way of conclusion, I would like to focus in on the word describing what would be (according to the scholiast) the ideal ἦθος for the ἀνάγνωσις of the lines in our last example above. That word is μεγαλόφρων ("high-minded"). It is true that this word aply describes Achilles in every circumstance; in the example above, however, this characteristic of the hero is related to his speaking style in a particular situation. Elsewhere, however, Achilles is described as μεγαλόφρων with respect to his rhetorical style in general (IX.622b, introducing Ajax's Embassy speech):

> τοῖσιν δ' ἄρ' Αἴας· οἱ τέσσαρές εἰσι ῥήτορες· Ὀδυσσεὺς συνετός, πανοῦργος, θεραπευτικός· Ἀχιλλεὺς θυμικός, μεγαλόφρων· Φοῖνιξ ἠθικός, πρᾶος, παιδευτικός· Αἴας ἀνδρεῖος, σεμνός, μεγαλόφρων, ἁπλοῦς, δυσκίνητος, βαθύς.
> *Among them Ajax* — The four speakers are: Odysseus — sagacious, scoundrelish, obsequious; Achilles — irascible, high-minded; Phoenix — tactful, mild, pedagogical; Ajax — manly, solemn, high-minded, direct, fixed, profound.

As this scholion does not prescribe a particular manner of ἀνάγνωσις, it might be taken simply as a comment on the style of the characters as we can observe them preexistent in the text of the written and readable poem. Yet one may wonder, in view of the profound engagement with ἀνάγνωσις evident in such scholia as XXII.20c[1] above, how many scholia which do not (in the curtailed and compressed form in which

they survive) feature the explicit vocabulary we have discovered elsewhere in this chapter — including ἀναγνωστέον, προσενεκτέον, προφορά, ἔμφασις, τὸ κομματικόν, ἐν πεύσει, θαυμαστικῶς, adverbs and participles of manner, or even the βραχεῖα διαστολή itself — were intended by their authors to describe the written text as it could be activated and enhanced in the mouth of a reader. Is this scholion directing us to *perform* Ajax as "profound" (βαθύς) or Odysseus as "obsequious" (θεραπευτικός)? We cannot be certain, but readers of the scholia's criticism would do well to bear in mind how much aurality, and how much implicit advice to the reader, may be lurking in the beneath the surface of Erbse's text.

Chapter 3: Audiences and Scholars

3.1 Introduction

In the first two chapters, we have seen that ἀνάγνωσις, or the act of performing a poetic text, was central to literary education in the Greek and Roman classroom and that the principal elements of this ἀνάγνωσις, namely apt discourse and evocative characterization, are likewise to be found in the Homer scholia's running commentaries. Given the parallels in terminology and scope between the two, we are thus tempted to infer that Homeric scholarship was geared, insofar as it concerned ἀνάγνωσις, to the classroom setting. Such an inference would, however, privilege the student not only as the primary target of the scholiasts' comments but also as the primary agent of ἀνάγνωσις, and the hypothesis itself raises a number of methodological questions. First, to what extent are the observations of Nicanor (who flourished under Hadrian) and of the 'exegetical' scholia (representing long-term traditions of Homeric scholarship) applicable to ancient Homeric scholarship in the sense in which that scholarship is most often invoked, that is with reference to Alexandria? Second, what setting for the act of ἀνάγνωσις do the scholia themselves portray?

In order to prepare an answer to these questions, which appears in the Conclusion to this dissertation, the present chapter expands our investigation to

include, in addition to the performer and his performance as described in Chapter 2, the setting of that performance. We begin with a complete survey of references to an audience in the Homer scholia; these, as we discover, describe both non-scholarly and scholarly listeners. In the second part of the chapter, we go on to apply the notion of a 'scholarly' (expert) audience as described in the scholia to the relationship between Aristarchus as a listener and Poseidonius (his ἀναγνώστης) as a performer and indeed fellow interpreter of Homeric poetry. The methodological questions to which our earlier explorations of ἀνάγνωσις give rise, regarding chronological scope on the one hand and cultural scope on the other, are thus seen to be related: both scholars and students can be listeners, and both scholars and students can function as performers.

3.2 The audience

We may begin with a complete topology of the representation of audience in the Homer scholia. The subject has been studied cursorily by Richardson[295] and by George Duckworth,[296] though neither scholar focuses on the audience as such, Richardson citing the description of audience emotion as one aspect of literary criticism in the scholia and Duckworth limiting his discussion of audience to their role in προαναφώνησις (foreshadowing). Perhaps owing to the limited scope of his

[295] Richardson 1980, esp. pp. 268-269 and p. 278.
[296] Duckworth 1931, esp. pp. 330-338. Duckworth's and Richardson's articles rarely overlap in the scholia they cite.

analysis, Duckworth is sensibly cautious on the degree to which the scholia's widespread use of the term ἀκροατής (95 times in the *Iliad* scholia alone) refers to a contemporary audience: "When the scholiasts speak of ἀκροατής or ἀκούοντες," he remarks, "they may be thinking of the readers and students of Homer in their own day. The Homeric poems, however, were composed to be recited, or sung . . . and so I prefer to be consistent throughout and speak of the Homeric 'audience.'"[297] In light of the performative character of the ἀνάγνωσις described in Chapter 2, however, this distinction between a reading or studious audience contemporary with the commentators and a listening audience contemporary with archaic or classical recitation or song is perhaps more apparent than real, since text read aloud would be listened to; nevertheless, the distinction might be rephrased as one between listeners contemporary with the commentators and listeners in an 'original' performance context as imagined by those commentators. To which audience do the scholia refer? Our answer must be conditioned by the degree of vividness we discern in the scholia's references to an audience, to which we know turn.

3.2.1 The non-scholarly audience

We may begin our survey of audience emotion, as described principally in the 'exegetical' scholia, by remarking that the very abundance of expressions available to

[297] Duckworth 1931: 321 n.3. This note most likely appears so as to defend the author from any contemporary (c. 1931) accusation of anachronism.

the critic for describing audience emotion, and their non-formulaic character, convinces us we are not here dealing with the fossilized remnants of an Aristotelian critical system or a blind application of abstract rhetorical terms. In the following subsections, I consider evidence first for a non-scholarly audience, that is, one not well versed in the Homeric poems and consequently vulnerable to extremes of emotion resulting from their (relative) ignorance. These emotions may be classified as *suspense*, *anticipation* (ἐλπίς), *attentiveness* and its opposite *relaxation*, and lastly *patriotism* as manifest in Philhellenism.

3.2.1.1 Suspense

The variety of terms used to characterize audience emotion is is most apparent in the terms used for describing audience *suspense*, or rather the way in which such emotion is effected by the Poet (ὁ ποιητής).[298] In his study of προαναφώνησις (foreshadowing), a concept naturally related to suspense, Duckworth cites eight scholia as instances of such audience emotion; Richardson adds nineteen more.[299] For

---

[298] It must be remarked immediately that, in the case of verbs describing the effect of verses on the audience, the subject of such verbs is *never* "ὁ ἀναγνώστης"; sometimes the subject is a rhetorical term referring to a specific word in the lines discussed (eg. **XI.604**, ἀναπτεροῖ τὸν ἀρκοατήν ἡ ἀναφώνησις, "the exclamation puts the listener on the edge of his seat"); occasionally it is the listener himself (eg. **VII.171e** ἀγωνιᾷ ἐπὶ τῷ κλήρῳ ὁ ἀκροατής, "the listener is in suspense regarding the lottery"); but more usually the subject, implicit or explicit, is "the Poet" (ὁ ποιητής at **V.561, VII.479, X.43a, XIII.13, XV.64c, XVII.240-243, iii.184**;Ὅμηρος at **v.410, vi.148**. In all, "Ὅμηρος" appears 266 times in the Homer scholia [296 times if we include the D scholia], "ὁ ποιητής" 562 times [652 times if we include the D scholia]). Thus it is clear that, with respect to the audience, the speaker of the poem is imagined as the poet himself.

[299] Duckworth 1931: 330-338 cites **II.39b, II.419, XI.604** (noted by Richardson 1980: 270 n.11 and 277), **XV.64c, XVI.112-113, XVI.46b, XX.443**. Richardson 1980: 269-270 and 270 nn.11-12

Richardson, a key term is ἀγωνία, "related to the poet's tendency to bring the action to the point a crisis and then provide a resolution" and his "fondness for cliff-hanging situations.[300] These are usually noted briefly,[301] but can specify the object of suspense[302] and vividly indicate the relationship between the listener in suspense and the object.[303] The effect of suspense is particularly associated with rapid action in the poem, as at XIV.418-425:

---

cites **III.16b**, **VII.479**, **VIII.87a**[1], **VIII.217a**, **XI.218**, **XI.401**, **XI.507**, **XII.52-59**, **XII.297b**, **XII.330a**, **XIV.424c**, **XVI.431-461**, **XIV.508**, **XXIII.378b**, and **v.379**.(**XIV.508**, also cited by Richardson, does not appear to reference the audience.) The following may be added to this list: **II.649b**, **II.223a**, **VI.392**, **VII.29**, **VII.171e**, **IX.103**, **X.43a**, **XI.218**, **XII.179-180**, **XIII.665b**, **XIII.219-329**, **XV.390**, **XV.556-558**, **XVI.463-476b**, **XVII.240-243**, **XVII.453-455a**[2], **XVIII.145-148**, **XVIII.115-152**, **XX.375b**, **iii.184**, **ix.276**, and **ix.444**. Here and below I have altered Duckworth's and Richardson's numbering of scholia (which in their articles reference the edition of Dindorf 1875) to conform to the numbering of Erbse's edition, and I have added the words of the scholia themselves where appropriate (generally Duckworth and Richardson cite only).

[300] Richardson 1980: 270. In a scholion noted by Duckworth (Duckworth 1931: 332) and praised by Römer (Römer 1914: 32, cited by Duckworth 1931: 332), the ancients concur (**XV.64c**): *ὁ δ' ἀνστήσει Πάτροκλον·* Ζηνόδοτος ἐνθένδε ἕως τοῦ "λισσομένη" [(XV.77)] οὐδὲ ἔγραφεν· ἐοίκασι γὰρ Εὐριπιδείῳ προλόγῳ ταῦτα. ἐναγώνιος δέ ἐστιν ὁ ποιητὴς καὶ, ἐὰν ἄρα, σπέρμα μόνον τιθείς, "κακοῦ δ' ἄρα οἱ πέλεν ἀρχή" [(XI.604)]. Τάχα δὲ ὁ ταῦτα ποιήσας καὶ τὸ "ὠχόμεθ' ἐς Θήβην" [(I.336)] καὶ τὸ "ἤρξατο δ' ὡς πρῶτον Κίκονας δάμας" [(xxiii.310)]) "*He shall send out Patroclus* — Zenodotus did not write these lines, up to "beseeching" (XV.77); all this seems like a Euripidean prologue. The poet is fond of suspense and, using ἄρα ['behold'], puts in a hint merely, [as in] 'Behold, the beginning of woe was upon him' (XI.604). Swiftly the poet [creates] these things, as also 'We journeyed to Thebe" (I.336) and 'He began at where he overcame the Cicones' (xxiii.310)." The lines quoted are all highly abbreviated narratives, the second of course described in greater detail in Book 9 of the *Odyssey* (ix.39-61).

[301] As at **VI.392** (τοῦτο δέ φησιν ἵνα ἀγωνιώτερος ὁ ἀκροατὴς γένηται "He [sc. the Poet] says this so that the listener grows more suspenseful"), **XI.507** (ηὔξησεν οὖν τὴν ἀγωνίαν "Therefore he increased the suspense," noted at Richardson 1980: 270 n.12), **XVI.463-476b** (κατ' ἀρχὴν πολλάκις ἀποτυγχάνοντας ποιῶν τοὺς βάλλοντας ἐναγώνιον ποιεῖ τὸν ἀκροατήν "He often makes them miss [with their spears] at the beginning and thus makes the listener suspenseful"); at **ix.44** we find simply τοῦτο εἰς ἀγωνίαν τοῦ ἀκροατοῦ "This is for the suspense of the listener."

[302] **XII.171e** ἀγωνιᾷ ἐπι τῷ κλήρῳ ὁ ἀκροατής "The listener is in suspense as to the lottery."

[303] **VIII.87a**[1] ἐν αγωνίᾳ δὲ καθιστὰς τὸν ἀκροατὴν καὶ τὸν δεινὸν Ἕκτορα αὐτῷ ἐπάγει "Having put the listener in suspense he also brings up the terrible Hector before him" (noted at Richardson 1980. 269). The specification of αὐτῷ (i.e. the listener) is striking as a sign that the listener is conceived as a real person and not merely as a concept. We find αὐτῷ similarly at **XV.56b**: παραμυθεῖται τὸν ἀκροατήν, τὴν ἅλωσιν Τροίας σκιαγραφῶν αὐτῷ. Both ἐπάγει (VIII.87a[1]) and σκιαγραφῶν (XV.56b) could be used without an object, so the use of the pronoun is deliberate.

ὣς ἔπεσ' Ἕκτορος ὦκα χαμαί μένος ἐν κονίῃσι
χειρὸς δ' ἔκβαλεν ἔγχος, ἐπ' αὐτῷ δ' ἀσπὶς ἐάφθη
καὶ κόρυς, ἀμφὶ δέ οἱ βράχε τεύχεα ποικίλα χαλκῷ·
οἱ δὲ μέγα ἰάχοντες ἐπέδραμον υἷες Ἀχαιῶν
ἐλπόμενοι ἑρύεσθαι, ἀκόντιζον δὲ θαμειὰς
αἰχμάς· ἀλλ' οὔ τις ἐδυνήσατο ποιμένα λαῶν
οὐτάσαι οὐδὲ βαλεῖν· πρὶν γὰρ περίβησαν ἄριστοι,
Πουλυδάμας τε καὶ Αἰνείας καὶ δῖος Ἀγήνωρ . . .
Thus the might of Hector fell quickly down in the dust
And he dropped his spear, and his shield sank after it
And his helmet too, and around him his cunningly-wrought armor clanked;
And they ran up shouting loudly, the sons of the Achaeans,
Hoping to drag him away, and they cast thick
Their spears, but not one of them was able [to hit] the leader of the folk,
To would or strike him; for before [that could happen] the best men came up
Polydamas and Aeneas and bright Agenor . . .

(XIV.418-425)

Here the scholion (noted by Richardson[304]) is as follows (XIV.424c):

περίβησαν ἄριστοι · . . . ὅρα δέ, πῶς ἐπὶ τὸ ἀκρότατον ἐξάγει τὰς ἀγωνίας.
The best men came up — Look here, how he brings the suspenseful moments[305] to the highest point.

The listener himself can "be in suspense" verbally, as at VII.479:

προκινεῖ καὶ ἀγωνιᾶν ποιεῖ τὸν ἀκροτατὴν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐσομένοις ὁ ποιητής.
The Poet stirs the listener with respect to the future (προκινεῖ) and makes him be in suspense [ἀγωνιᾶν] concerning events to come [τοῖς ἐσομένοις].

Such a scholion might make us rethink a translation of ἀγωνία as "suspense": it is here necessary to specify that the ἀγωνία concerns events to come, whereas our

[304] Richardson 1980: 270 n.12.
[305] It is impossible to translate the plural in ἀγωνίας, though we may note that the plural excludes an abstract sense here: the scholiast is either referring to a series of suspenseful moments or, conceivably, to multiple feelings of suspense felt by multiple people.

English word implies expectation of the future; rather, ἀγωνία refers to the listener's emotion at the present time. With respect to the verb κινέω, it indicates a general heightening of listeners' emotion[306] which can be particularized.[307]

3.2.1.2 Ἐλπίς

Besides 'ἀγωνία," other terms used in the scholia to denote keen interest on the part of the audience is ἐλπίς. Duckworth was perhaps mistaken in classifying ἐλπίς as a condition of 'comfort' on the part of the audience, in keeping with their Philhellenism[308]; rather, it means "an expectation of the future." For example at VII.29, where ὁ μὲν ἀκροατὴς δεινὰ ἐλπίζει ἐπὶ τῇ παρόδῳ τῷ τῶν θεῶν "the listener expects awesome things upon the entrance of the gods," the scene in question is precisely one in which Athena and Apollo negotiate their pro-Greek and pro-Trojan stances. Thus we should not presume that the audience is described as having a partisan stake in such scholia as XVIII.151-152, "τοῖς μὲν ἀκροαταῖς ἐλπὶς ἦν ἐξειλκύσθαι Πάτροκλον, ὁ δὲ πάλιν ἐπιταράττει τὴν διάνοιαν, ἵνα ἐπὶ τὸ

---

[306] As at **ix.276**: διὰ τούτων κινεῖ τὸν ἀκροατὴν, ἵνα μισήσωμεν τὸν Κύκλωπα τῆς ἀσεβείας καὶ ἐφησθῶμεν αὐτῷ κολασθέντι "By means of these [remarks of Polyphemus'] he [sc. the Poet] stirs [κινεῖ] the listener, so that we may hate the Cyclops for his impiety and exult over him when he is brought to heel." On the coupling of ὁ ἀκροατής with verbs in the 1st person plural, see below (p. 212ff.). We may add **v.379**: πάλιν ἄλλων δεινῶν προσδοκίαν ὑποβάλλει ἀνακινῶν τῷ ἀκροατῇ "Again he [sc. the Poet] sets up the expectation (προσδοκία) of other terrible things for the listener so as to produce excitement [ἀνακινῶν]" (noted at Richardson 1980: 270 n.11), here by means of Poseidon's declaration that he will prolong Odysseus' seaborne suffering.

[307] As at **XXIII.378b**: φιλονεικίαν κινεῖ τοῖς ἀκούουσι τὸ ἐφάμιλ<λ>ον τῶν ἀγωνιστῶν "The coming together of the contestants stirs a love of strife in the hearers [τοῖς ἀκούουσι]."

[308] Cf. Duckworth 1931: 331, where he translates it as "a ray of hope" with respect to **Σ II.419**. On the presumption by the scholiasts of the audience's Philhellenism, which Duckworth rightly shows is a significant factor elsewhere and which he mistakenly brings to bear on ἐλπίς, see below (p. 195ff.).

ἀκμαιότατον προαγαγὼν τὴν ἀγωνίαν πιθανὴν ποιήσηται τὴν Ἀχιλλέως ἔξοδον" (The listeners had an expectation that Patroclus would be dragged out [of the fray], but he [sc. the Poet] disturbs the train of thought [ἐπιταράττει τὴν διάνοιαν] so that in bringing the suspense [ἀγωνία] to the highest point he can make the return of Achilles believable).[309]

3.2.1.3 Attentiveness

Both ἀγωνία and ἐλπίς thus manipulate the listener with respect to the future, the latter inherehently and the former by context or with additional adverbial phrases such as τοῖς ἐσομένοις; in the case of προσοχή and its agentive verb ἐξαιρέω, however, the reference is very much to the moment at hand.[310] We find it used especially for

---

[309] On the principle of πιθανότης in the scholia see Richardson 1980: 272, Meijering 1987: 201-203, and Feeney 1991: 50ff., as well as Spengel 1894.i.365.7 (*Anonymi de arte rhetorica*). Other examples of the audience's ἐλπίς include **II.419** (διὰ τοῦ "πώ" ἐλπίδα ὑπολείπει "Because of the 'hardly' there remains an expectation"; discussed at Duckworth 1931: 331), **XII.179-180** (ἐλπίδα ὑποβάλλει τοῖς ἀκροαταῖς ὅτι οὐκ ἦν ταῦτα ἀρεστὰ θεοῖς, ἀλλὰ διενοοῦντο μὲν καὶ αὐτοὶ βοηθεῖν, ᾐδοῦντο δὲ Δία "He [sc. the Poet] throws in an expectation for the audience that these things [sc. the Argives' problems] were not pleasing to the gods, but that they [the gods] were planning themselves to help yet were at the pleasure of Zeus"), and **II.694b** (ψυχαγωγεῖ ταῖς ἐλπίσι τοὺς ἀκροατάς "He [sc. the Poet] controls the emotions of the listeners by means of expectations for the future [ἐλπίσι]"). On ψυχαγωγία cf. Meijering 1987: 6-12; on the ψυχαγωγία of the audience elsewhere see **XXII.147-156** (δαιμονίως τὸν τῆς διώξεως καιρὸν οὐκ ἀργὸν κατέλιπεν, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ διατριβὴν ποριζόμενος τῇ ἀκοῇ τοὺς μὲν τρέχειν φησίν, αὐτὸς δὲ ψυχαγωγεῖ τὸν ἀκροατήν "Astonishingly, he has not left the moment of the pursuit unornamented, but rather as though to provide a pause to the ear he tells us they were running but himself controls the emotions of the listener") and (seemingly applied to the listener) at **XXIII.476** (δέδοκται γὰρ τῷ ποιητῇ πᾶν εἶδος κινεῖν πρὸς ψυχαγωγίαν "It pleased the Poet to bring every sort [of speech, here λοιδορία] to bear for the sake of ψυχαγωγία). As a rhetorical term applied to speeches by characters *within* the narrative, ψυχαγωγία appears in the scholia at **I.312-313**, **II.300c**, **II.323a**, **III.6**, **VI.202b**, **VIII.236**, **IX.447b**, **IX.528a**$^{1-2}$, **XI.741b**, **iii.115**, and **x.491** (this last applied to Odysseus in his ἀπόλογοι).

[310] For a poem-internal use of the word that clarifies its meaning in the scholia, see **XIII.545** on Antilochus: καὶ προσεκτικὸν τὸν νεανίαν εἰσάγει καὶ μετὰ ἐπιμελείας πάντα πράττοντα·

set-piece actions such as duels[311] and meta-textual moments like the invocation of the Muses[312] or address of the listener in the 2nd person singular[313]; the narrative is thus renewed by means of audience attentiveness, or sustained by the frustration of the attentive audience's expectations.[314] Likewise with ἐγείρω, describing the effect of

---

τοιοῦτν τι ἐνθάδε καὶ τὸ *δοκεύσας* "he brings in the young man as attentive and careful in all things; such is the meaning of 'thoughtful' here."

[311] As at **XVI.431-461** (προσοχὴν ἐργάζεται τῇ τοῦ μονομαχίου σκέψει "He [sc. the Poet] works up attention by means of the perspective [of Zeus] on the duel"; noted at Richardson 1980: 270 n.11), **XII.330a** (πάλιν ἄλλῃ παρασκευῇ χρῆται ὥστε νεώτερον τὸν ἀγῶνα φαίνεσθαι, προσεκτικοὺς ἡμᾶς ποιῶν "Again he [sc. the Poet] makes use of a different arrangement [sc. of words] so as to make the contest seem newer, making us attentive"; noted at Richardson 1980: 270 n.11), and **XII.297b** (προπαρασκευάζει δὲ ἀεὶ τοὺς ἀριστεύοντας, ἐξαίρων ἡμᾶς εἰς προσοχήν "He [sc. the Poet] always prepares heroes having their moment of glory in advance, pulling us to attention"; noted at Richardson 1980: 270 n.11). On the use of the 1st person plural to describe the objects of the poet's devices, see below (p. 212ff.). For the use of ἐξαιρέω with the audience, cf. **XVI.46b** on Patroclus' entreating Achilles as a μέγα νήπιος: αἱ δὲ προαναφωνήσεις αὗται τὸν ἀκροατὴν ἐπαίρουσιν, ἤδη προσδοκῶντα τὸ δεινόν "Foreshadowings such as these pull up the listener, expectant as he already is of something terrible"; discussed by Duckworth 1931: 336-337 and noted by Richardson 1980: 270 n.11).

[312] Richardson (Richardson 1980: 270) notes two such: **XVI.112-113** (*ἔσπετε νῦν μοι, Μοῦσαι·* ὡς παράδοξον μέλλων λέγειν τὴν ὑποχήρησιν Αἴαντος, τὸν ἀκροατὴν προσεκτικώτερον ποιεῖ τοῖς παρὰ Μουσῶν λόγοις "*Tell me now, Muses* — Being on the point of telling something incredible in the retreat of Ajax, he makes the listener more attentive by means of information taken from the Muses"; also noted at Duckworth 1931: 334-335) and **XI.218** (*ἔσπετε νῦν μοι, Μοῦσαι·* ἐπὶ τοῖς μεγίστοις τὰς Μούσας καλεῖ ὡς ἐρῶν τι καινότερον· αἱ γὰρ τοιαῦται προπαρασκευαὶ ἀκμαιοτέρας ποιοῦσι τὰς προσοχὰς τοῖς ἀκροαταῖς "*Tell me now, Muses* — He calls the Muses for the most important things as though saying something fresher: such introductory elements make for better attentiveness [ἀκμαιοτέρας . . . προσοχὰς] on the part of the listeners). As above with the plural of ἀγωνίας, it is quite likely that the plural προσοχαί corresponds to the plural ἀκροαταί and that neither is therefore used in an empty technical sense

[313] As at **IV.223a** (on ἔνθ' οὐκ ἂν βρίζοντα ἴδοις Ἀγαμέμνονα δῖον "Then you would not have seen bright Agamemnon dozing"): προσεκτικὸν δὲ λίαν εἰς Ἀγαμέμονα τὸν ἀκροατὴν ποιεῖ "He makes the listener altogether attentive to Agamemnon."

[314] There are three comments on the *exploitation* of suspense and manipulation of the listener's suspenseful expectations, **XX.375b** (ἔνθεν λανθάνει τὸν ἀκροατὴν προσέχοντα ταῖς αἰκίαις Ἕκτορος "Here he [sc. the Poet] slips past the listener, who is waiting for the sufferings of Hector"), **XIII.219-329a**[1] (ὁ μὲν ἀκροατὴς ἀκούσας 'καὶ τότε δὴ περὶ κῆρι Ποσειδάων ἐχολώθη' [(XIII.206)] προσδοκᾷ ἀφόρητον τινα συμβολὴν ἔσεσθαι, ὁ δὲ ἄλλας ἐπεισήγαγε "The listener, having heard 'And then indeed Poseidon was greatly angered at heart' (XIII.206) expects that there will be some inevitable confrontation, but he [sc. the Poet] brings in other material"; noted at Richardson 1980: 270 n.11), and **iii.184** (of Nestor's revelation that he knows nothing of Odysseus' homecoming: δαιμονίως ὁ ποιητὴς, ἐμβαλὼν εἰς ἐπιθυμίαν τῶν νόστων τὸν ἀκροατὴν, ἀναρτᾷ πάλιν "Astonishingly the poet, having inspired a desire in the listener to know of the homecomings, puts him

foreshadowing on the listener,[315] the appearance of a major character,[316] or (with ἀγωνία) the surprising despair of an otherwise ever-hopeful character.[317] Finally, we find three uses of ἀναρτάω (literally, 'to hang something on,' but an intensive verb of suspense) describing tension felt by the audience,[318] and one of the colorful verb ἀναπτερόω (literally 'to put wings on someone'; we might say 'to put someone on the edge of their seat').[319] Needless to say, the Poet does all this deliberately and self-

---

back in suspense"). On the concept of "Homeric misdirection," whereby the storyteller or his characters deliberately mislead us with respect to future events in the poem, see Morrison 1992.

[315] **II.39b** on the direct statement by the narrator that Zeus has pain and groaning in store for the Achaeans: ἡδὲ προαναφώνησις ἐγερτική "This instance of foreshadowing is arousing [sc. of the listener]" (mentioned at Duckworth 1931: 330).

[316] **III.16b** on the appearance of Paris: *Τρωσὶν προμάχιζεν Ἀλέξανδρος θεοειδής·* ἐγείρει δὲ τὸν ἀκροατὴν προκινδυνεύοντα εἰσάγων τὸν πλείστων κινδύνων ἑτέροις αἴτιον "*The godlike Alexander came out to fight for the Trojans* — 'In bringing in the cause of so many dangers for others as the champion, he [sc. the Poet] arouses (ἐγείρει) the listener" (noted by Richardson 1980: 270 n.11).

[317] At **XVII.240-243**, where Ajax remarks to Menelaus that they are both about to be killed: τάχα τὸν ἀκροατὴν ἐγείρων ὁ ποιητὴς καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν ἰσχυρότατον ἀγωνιῶντα παρίστησιν "Swiftly rousing the listener, the poet also makes him suspenseful in the highest degree."

[318] ἀναρτάω: **XX.443**, of Apollo snatching Hector from Achilles' clutches (πιθανῶς ἀναρτᾷ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν τῶν ἀκροατῶν "He [sc. the Poet] credibly puts the listener's yearning in suspense"; discussed by Duckworth 1931: 336-337, noted by Richardson 1980: 270 n.11); **X.43a**, of Agamemnon's need for counsel (ἀναρτᾷ τὸν ἀκροατήν "He [sc. the Poet] puts the listener in suspense"); **iii.184** (quoted above, with ἀναρτᾷ πάλιν "[the Poet] puts the listener back in suspense"). We may add **VIII.350**, a sudden change of scene to Olympus from the battlefield where Hector is triumphant (ἀναρτᾷ πάλιν ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τῶν παρόντων μὴ διηγούμενος τὴν δυστυχίαν τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὡς φιλέλλην "He [sc. the Poet] again puts us in suspense, away from the action, in not going on to describe the dire situation of the Greeks (being Philhellenic)." On the presumption of Philhellenism, see below (p. 195ff.).

[319] ἀναπτερόω: **XI.604**, of Patroclus that κακοῦ δ' ἄρα οἱ πέλεν ἀρχή "Behold, the beginning of woe was upon him," a scholion combining several of the terms encountered above (ἀναπτεροῖ τὸν ἀκροατὴν ἡ ἀναφώνησις ἐπειγόμενον μαθεῖν τί τὸ κακὸν ἦν. τὴν προσοχὴν δὲ ἐργάζεται διὰ βραχείας τῆς δείχεως· εἰ γὰρ πλέον ἐπεξειργάσατο, δίφθειρεν ἂν τὸν ἑξῆς λόγον καὶ ἀπήμβλυνε τὴν ποίησιν "The exclamation (ἀναφ νησις) puts the listener on the edge of his having been roused (ἐπειγόμενον) to [wish to] know what that woe was. He [sc. the Poet] works up the attentiveness through the brevity of the exposition; for if he had described it more fully, he would have destroyed the rest of the story and taken the edge off the poem" (discussed by Duckworth 1931: 332 and noted by Richardson 1980: 270 n.11 and 277) and **XV.594b[1]**, on the statement that Zeus θέλγε δὲ θυμὸν "bewitched the heart" of the Argives (ἀναπτεροῖ δὲ τὸν ἀκροατὴν προσδοκῶντα τὸν ἐμπρησμόν "He [sc. the Poet] puts the listener on the edge of his seat, expecting the burning [of the ships]). We find ἀναπτερόω used of Hermes' wand at **XXIV.343c**, and twice of speech by characters

consciously.[320]

3.2.1.4 Relaxing the audience

Having observed how, according to the scholia, Homer's audience is made suspenseful, full of anticipation, and attentive, we may briefly consider the reasons why that audience is said on occasion to relax. The key terms are the near-synonyms ἀνάπαυσις and διανάπαυσις, or rather their verbal forms. We find that this relaxation is structural, providing a pause in the middle of long battle, as at the end of Book IV,[321] during the interview of Glaucus and Diomedes in Book 6,[322] as an ecphrasis prior to Patroclus' death,[323] or on the occasion of Meriones' sudden trip in search of a new spear in Book 13.[324] As the scholiast observes at XIV.114b (on a speech of Diomedes'), "Ὁμηρικὸν δὲ ταῖς παρεκβάσεισιν διαναπαύειν τὸν

---

within the poem (**II.333a**, of Odysseus' suggestion to the Greeks that they flee; **X.160-161**, of Nestor's waking Diomedes with news of the imminence of the Trojans). The word may have positive connotations ("the thrill of suspense"?) if its application at Plato *Phaedrus* 249d to the ecstatic love of truth experienced by the philosophizing soul is in some way consonant with its usage here as a term of criticism.

[320] **v.410**: αὐτός ἐστιν ἑαυτοῦ συναισθανόμενος Ὅμηρος εἰς ὅσον ἀγωνίας προήγαγε τὸν λόγον "Homer himself is aware of what level of suspense he has brought the narrative."

[321] **IV.539b** on the long-range perspective of "ἔνθα κεν οὐκέτι ἔργον ἀνὴρ ὀνόσαιτο μετελθών: παντοδαπὰς δὲ πληγὰς καὶ πτώματα διελθὼν ἐπαναπαύει τὸν ἀκροατήν "Providing a summary of all sorts of blows and bodies, he [sc. the Poet] gives the listener a rest."

[322] **VI.119b** (=**VI.119[G]**; the comment applies, however, to the whole of VI.119-236): διαναπαύει τὸν ἀκροατὴν γενεαλογίας καὶ μύθους παρεμβάλλων "He [sc. the Poet] gives the listener a rest by inserting genealogies and stories."

[323] **XVI.793-804a**: διαναπαύων τὸν ἀκροατὴν ὁπλοποιΐαν παρεισάγει "Giving the listener a rest, he [sc. the Poet] puts in the ecphrasis on the armor."

[324] **XIII.168a**: τὸ λον διὰ τὸ ἀναπαῦσαι τοῦ ἀκροατὰς ἀπὸ μάχης τοῦτο πράττει ὁ ποιητής "The poet uses the whole [of this incident] in order to give the listener a rest from the battle." The rest is not a long one, as the battle resumes immediately at XIII.169. For an example of διανάπαυσις describing speech by a character *within* the poem, see **VII.328a** (Nestor speaking to Agamemnon in the assembly), likewise with ὁ ἀκροατής (not Agamemnon himself but the individuated Achaean).

ἀκροατήν" (It is Homer's way to make use of digressions in order to give the reader a rest). The return of Chryseis to her father at I.430-487 occasions a more extensive comment (I.430b):

> ὅπως μὴ τῇ τῆς Θέτιδος ἀπαλλαγῇ συνάψῃ τὴν ἐπάνοδον, διὰ μέσου βάλλει τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ὀδυσσέα, μόνον οὐχὶ λόγῳ καταμετρήσας τὸν ἐπὶ Χρύσην πλοῦν. ἑκατέροις δὲ μετρίως χρώμενος διαναπαύει τὸν ἀκροατήν, τῶν μὲν τὸν κόρον περιαιρῶν, τῶν δὲ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ἀποπληρῶν.
> So as not to join Thetis' arrival with her departure, he [sc. the Poet] parenthetically inserts the material concerning Odysseus, though he does not measure out the sailing to Chryse in full. Using both elements in due measure, he gives the listener a rest, taking away the sense of sateity from some and filling up others' eagerness.

This scholion is remarkable in allowing that some parts of the audience may desire one thing and other parts another; Homer, however, satisfies the audience's need both for arousal and for relaxation, and even for rest.[325]

3.2.1.5 Comforting and gratifying the Philhellenic audience

The Poet is 13 times described as φιλέλλην ("favoring the Greeks") in the scholia[326]; we may likewise cite at least twelve instances of emotion ascribed to the audience which takes its Philhellenism for granted.[327] It follows from the presumption of

---

[325] **XVI.666a**: μικρᾷ δὲ παρεκβάσει ἀναπαύει τὸν ἀκροατὴν καμόντα "With a short digression he [sc. the Poet] gives the tired listener a rest."

[326] ἀεὶ γὰρ φιλέλλην ὁ ποιητής at **X.14-16**; φιλέλλην ὁ ποιητής at **XVI.814-815**; ὡς φιλέλλην ὁ Ὅμηρος at **VIII.78(G)**; ὡς φιλέλλην ὁ ποιητής at **XI.0**; ὡς φιλέλλην at **VI.1a**, **VII.17-18**, **VIII.78**, **XI.1(G)**, **XIV.15a²**, and **XV.598b**; φιλέλλην ὤν at **II.673-674**, **VIII.274-276a¹**, and **XI.336a**.

[327] Duckworth 1931: 332-335 adduces the following scholia as exhibiting Philhellenism with explicit regard to the *audience*: **XI.192b**, **XI.194a**, **XI.413f**, **XII.13-15**, **XIII.348a**, **XV.56b**,

audience Philhellenism that the numerous woes of the Achaeans in the *Iliad* will fill the audience with dread and grief, while the προαναφώνησις of future Greek success will alleviate such feelings, comforting or gratifying the listener.[328] XV.56b, where we

---

XVII.205a, and **XVII.236a**. We may add **III.16b**, **V.519**, **VIII.217a**, and **XVI.339-418**. Cf. **IV.223a** (sympathy for Agamemnon) and **v.25** (sympathy for Telemachus; noted at Duckworth 1931: 335). As Duckworth notes (Duckworth 1931: 335) that it is possible for the audience (in the scholia's view) to feel sympathy for the barbarian (**XVII.207-208b** πάθος ἐργάζεται ταῖς ἀλλοτρίαις συμφοραῖς συναλγοῦν τὸ πρόσωπον "He [sc. the Poet] works up pity for the disasters of foreigners by sympathizing with this character"), but this is the 'marked' form of sympathy, it being taken for granted otherwise that the listener is quite simply cheering for the Greeks. On this "general view that Homer wishes to present the Greeks as favorably as possible, whereas the Trojans are barbarians, and so are shown in a bad light," see Richardson 1980: 273-274, who provides further examples of the scholia's Philhellenic tendencies (Richardson 1980: 274 with nn.25, 27, and 28, not necessarily with reference to the *audience* as in my list above). Richardson cites the debate between van der Valk (van der Valk 1963.1: 474ff.) and Kakridis (Kakridis 1971: 54ff.) as to whether the scholia's view is correct (van der Valk holding that it is; Richardson 1980: 274 n.26).

[328] Duckworth 1931.330-335 lists the following (associated with προαναφώνησις): **X.274b**[1] (προχαρίζεται . . . τῷ ἀκροατῇ "He [sc. the Poet] gratifies the listener"), **X.295** (παραμυθητικὸν τοῦτο "This [is said] by way of comfort"), **X. 332b** (προσαγώγιμος ἡ τῶν ἀναφωνήσεων τέρψις τῷ ἀκροατῇ. ἡδίστη δέ ἐστιν καὶ κερτομική "The listener's delight in the exclamations is anticipatory. It is most pleasurable and mocking"), **XI.192b** (ἵνα μὴ λυπώμεθα "Lest we grieve"), **XI.194a** (ἵνα εἰδότες τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἥττης μὴ βαρέως ἀκούοιμεν τῶν λεγομένων κακῶν περὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων "So that, aware of the time of his diminishment, we will not take it badly as we hear harsh things said about the Greeks"), **XI.413f** (διὰ τς ἀναφωνήσεως ἀνακτᾶται τὸν ἀκροατήν· λίαν γὰρ αὐτὸν ἐξεφόβησεν "By means of the exclamation he [sc. the Poet] refreshes the listener; for he had exceedingly terrified him"; also noted at Richardson 1980: 270), **XII.13-15** (ἵνα μὴ λυπώμεθα "Lest we grieve"), **XII.174a[1](T)** (θεραπεύων τὸν ἀκροατὴν "comforting the listener"; very similar to **XXII.174a[2][b]**), **XIII.348a** (*κυδαίνων Ἀχιλῆα*· τουτέστι τὸ "Διὸς δ' ἐτελείετο βουλή" [(I.5)]. ὑπὲρ παραμυθίας δὲ ταῦτα τῶν ἀκροατῶν διὰ μέσου φησίν· σχεδὸν γὰρ ἀποδείκνυσιν ἀμφοτέρους τοῖς Ἕλλησι βοηθοῦντας, τὸν μὲν ἑνί, τὸν δὲ τῷ πλήθει "*Giving glory to Achilles* — This is the 'And so the will of Zeus was being accomplished' [I.5]. He [sc. the Poet] says these things parenthetically by way of comforting the listeners; for he soon shows both of them [sc. Zeus and Poseidon] helping the Greeks, Zeus helping the one [sc. Achilles] and Poseidon helping the mass of them"), **XV.56b** (quoted above), **XVII.205a** (τὴν ἀγανάκτησιν τῶν ἀκροατῶν ὅρα "Look at the refreshment of the listeners"), **XVII.236a** (ἐπὶ εὐθυμίαν τῶν ἀκουόντων "For the good feeling of the listeners"), and **v.25** (ἀπαλλάττει ἀγωνίας τὸν ἀκροατὴν "He sets the listener free from suspense"). All these scholia relate to προαναφώνησις; for analysis, see Duckworth 1931. With respect to the comforting or gratification of the audience, we may add **XVII.800a** (τὴν ἀγανάκτησιν δὲ τῶν ἀκουόντων ἰᾶται, οὐκ ἐπὶ πολὺ φάσκων ἀπολαύειν τῶν ὅπλων τὸν Ἕκτορα "He [sc. the Poet] heals the distress of the [poem-external] hearers in saying that Hector will not long be enjoying the [use of Achilles'] armor). Contrawise, the listeners' satisfaction at the near-success of Agamemnon's ἀριστεία is frustrated at **XI.181-182** by the intervention of Zeus (δι' ὀλίγων εὐφράνας τὸν ἀκροατὴν ἐπὶ τὰ συνεκτικὰ ἔρχεται· δεῖ γὰρ συνωθεῖσθαι τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς εἰς τὴν ἔξοδον Πατρόκλου "Having gratified the listener for a short space he moves on to essential matters

find Zeus assuaging the disraught and highly Philhellenic Hera, provides a particularly graphic example:

> ῥητέον οὖν ὅτι τὸ σχῆμά ἐστι προανακεφαλαίωσις, ὡς Ὀδυσσεὺς προαναφωνεῖ Τηλεμάχῳ τὴν μνηστηροκτονίαν . . . πρὸς δὲ τούτοις παραμυθεῖται τὸν ἀκροατήν, τὴν ἅλωσιν Τροίας σκιαγραφῶν αὐτῷ· τίς γὰρ ἂν ἠνέσχετο ἐμπιπραμένων τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν νεῶν καὶ Αἴαντος φεύγοντος, εἰ μὴ ἀπίκειτο ταῖς ψυχαῖς τῶν ἐντυγχανόντων, ὅτι οἱ ταῦτα πράξαντες κρατηθήσονταί ποτε;
> It must be said, therefore, that the rhetorical device is one of anticipatory summary, in the same manner as Odysseus foretells the slaughter of the Suitors to Telemachus . . . In addition, he comforts the listener by outlining the sack of Troy to him; for who could keep calm with the Greek ships being burned and Ajax in retreat, if it were not explained to the spirits of those on hand that those who have done such things will soon be vanquished?

The exact reference of "τῶν ἐντυγχανόντων," not to mention "τὸν ἀκροατήν," is not entirely clear; as we shall see below, the more regular term for a listener inside the poem is ὁ ἀκούων (or ἡ ἀκούσα as it would be here). Whether we take Zeus as the subject of παραμυθεῖται and Hera as τὸν ἀκροατήν or whether we presume they have their ordinary scholial meanings (of "the Poet" and "the [poem-external] listener"), the Philhellenism of this scholion and its rhetorical question is remarkable: the prospect of the Greek ships being burnt is presumed to fill the listener (internal, external, or both) with uncontrollable fear. Yet we must also note that the scholia are far from imagining their audience as without pity for Hector: εἰ καὶ ἔμελλε τις τῶν

[i.e. the main plot]; for it is necessary that the Achaeans be put in dire straits [as we head] towards the *sortie* of Patroclus"). See also **VII.182** and **X.546c** (discussed below).

ἀκουόντων, we read at XVII.207-208a,[329] "ἀγανακτήσειν ἐπι τῷ τὸν Ἕκτορα χρῆσθαι τοῖς Ἀχιλλέως ὅπλοις, μαθὼν ὅτι οὐκ ἐπὶ πολύ, κἂν ἠλέησε τὸν Ἕκτορα" (Even if someone in the audience were distressed at Hector's using Achilles' armor, learning [here] that it will not be for long he would pity Hector).[330]

Twice we find the scholia aligning the gratification of the audience with the gratification of characters inside the poem. At VII.176-182, prior to the duel of Hector and Ajax, the chief Achaeans draw lots to see who will fight the Trojan:

> ἐν δ' ἔβαλον κυνέῃ Ἀγαμέμνονος Ἀτρεδαο·
> λαοὶ δ' ἠρήσαντο, θεοῖσι δὲ χεῖρας ἀνέσχον·
> ὧδε δέ τις εἶπεσκεν ἰδὼν εἰς οὐρανὸν εὐρύν·
> "Ζεῦ πάτερ, ἢ Αἴαντα λαχεῖν, ἢ Τυδέος υἱόν,
> ἢ αὐτὸν βασιλῆα πολυχρύσοιο Μυκήνης."
> ὣς ἄρ' ἔφαν, πάλλεν δὲ Γερήνιος ἱππότα Νέστωρ,
> ἐκ δ' ἔθορε κλῆρος κυνέης ὃν ἄρ' ἤθελεν αὐτοί,
> Αἴαντος·
> And they cast [the tokens] into the helmet of Atreus' son Agamemnon;
> And the folk prayed and held up their hands to the gods;
> And thus a man [among them] would speak, looking to broad heaven:
> "Father Zeus, let it be Ajax who is chosen, or the son of Tydeus,
> Or the king himself of Mycenae rich in gold."
> So, behold, they spoke, and the Geranian horseman Nestor shook [the helmet],
> And out of the helmet leapt the token which they themselves had wished for,
> That of Ajax—
>
> (XVII.176-183)

---

[329] Noted and discussed at Duckworth 1931: 335.

[330] For other instances of the audience pitying characters, cf. the slaying of the (Achaean) twins Crethon and Orsilochus by Aeneas at V.540-560, on which the scholia comment (**V.550a1[b]**), ηὔξησε τὸ πάθος καὶ ὅτι ἡβῶντες καὶ ὅτι δίδυμοι ἦσαν δηλώσας, καὶ εἰς οἶκτον κινεῖ τὸν ἀκροατήν "He boosts the pathos both in showing that they were young and in showing that they were twins, and moves the listener to pity" (similarly at **V.550a²[T]**: ἡμᾶς ὤτρυνε διὰ τοῦ παθητικοῦ, τῆς ἥβης, τῆς τιμῆς, ὅτι δίδυμοι "He rouses us with the pathetic, [namely] their youth, their renown, the fact that they were twins"); also **XXIII.184**, where sympathetic grief for Hector is comforted: διὰ δὲ τῆς ἀναφωνήσεως ἐθεράπευσε τὸν ἀκροατήν· ἤδη γὰρ συνέπασχε τῇ τοῦ Ἕκτορος αἰκίᾳ "By means of the exclamation he [sc. the Poet] comforted the listener; for he [the listener] was already suffering along [συνέπασχε] with Hector's agony."

Remarking on line 182, the scholiast comments (VII.182b),

> πιθανῶς εἴρηται τοῦτο, εὐχῆς γὰρ τὸ ἔργον ἦν, καὶ κεχαρισμένως τῷ ἀκροατῇ.
> This is said believably, for it was a question of prayer, and it delights the listener.

Here the delight of the audience (τῷ ἀκροατῇ) and the delight of the Achaeans (unstated, but implicit in ὃν ἄρ' ἤθελον αὐτοί) correspond; the scholiast comes close to saying that the listener had participated in the prayer of the anonymous average Achaean (πιθανῶς . . . εὐχῆς γὰρ τὸ ἔργον). Likewise at X.545-547, where Nestor congratulates Odysseus and Diomedes on the stolen horses post-*Doloneia*[331]:

> ὅππως τούσδ' ἵππους λάβετον, καταδύντες ὅμιλον
> Τρώων, ἦ τίς σφωε πόρεν θεὸς ἀντιβολήσας;
> αἰνῶς ἀκίνεσσιν ἐεικότες ἠελίοιο.
> However did you two get these horses here, having entered the throng
> Of the Trojans, or some god who met you gave you them?
> They wonderfully resemble the rays of the sun.
>
> (X.545-547)

Here the scholion comments (X.546c),

> *ἦ τίς σφωε πόρεν·* εὐφραντικὰ τοῦ ἀκροατοῦ, ἢ διὰ τὸ κάλλος, ἢ διὰ τὸ ἀμήχανον εἶναι δύο εἰς κατασκοπὴν ἀπελθόντας καὶ λάφυρα κομίσασθαι.
> *Or some god gave you them* — [This is said] as things meant to cheer the listener, whether because of the beauty [sc. of the horses] or because it is not feasible for two people coming back from a scouting trip to have also acquired booty.

Since Nestor is here addressing a fellow character, it could be that what he is saying is

---

[331] We have already encountered this passage above (p. 142), on the issue of how to read these lines aloud as a question. Here we consider a different scholion's comment, however (**X.546c** as opposed to **X.545-546a**[1] above).

εὐφραντικά to Odysseus as his ἀκροατής; but it is just as likely — even (in light of the overwhelming predominance of reference to poem-external listeners in the scholiasts' use of the word ἀκροατής, observed above) probable — that the scholiast is indicating that Nestor's amazement cheers the poem-external ἀκροατής, the audience of the ἀνάγνωστης. What is more, if the latter is referred to here, the emotion of poem-internal listener (Odysseus) and poem-external listener must overlap, since the εὐφροσύνη of the poem-external listener would be the warm welcome feeling of reaching the end of the suspenseful *Doloneia,*[332] just as Odysseus' εὐφροσύνη would result from reaching the end of his κατασκοπή and being congratulated on its success. As we shall see in the section below, such blurring of the line between internal and external audiences is by no means unparalleled.

3.2.2 The blurring of internal and external audiences

3.2.2.1 οἱ ἀκούοντες as the internal audience

Having surveyed the scholia's conception of the Poet's audience — for which, as we have seen, by far the most common term is οἱ ἀκροαταί (or ὁ ἀκροατής) —we naturally turn to the scholia's view of audiences *within* the poem. Discussion of these *internal* ἀκροαταί and ἀκούοντες is much more limited in the scholia; we note only

[332] We have already encountered, in scholia discussed above, many references to audience emotion in Book 10, viz. **X.43a**, **X.274b**[1] , **X.295**, and **X.332b**.

17 examples.[333] The meaning can be as simple as "those who heard," even if the speaker is not speaking but simply shouting loudly, as with Poseidon's shout in Book 14[334]; when Peisistratus addresses Menelaus, Menelaus is ὁ ἀκούων.[335] Usually, however, the scholia employ the phrase in order to make a subtle point about the relationship between speakers and multiple listeners. Noting that Achilles' boasting in the assembly in Book 1 of his city-sacking prowess is framed in terms of collective action[336] whereas he later claims to act alone, the scholiast comments (I.165-166 [**b(BC)T**]):

> τὰ ἑαυτοῦ ἀνδραγαθήματα ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀκούοντας φέρει, ὑποθωπεύων τοὺς παρόντας, ἐπεὶ ὅταν μόνος ᾖ δικαιολογούμενος πρὸς τοὺς πρέσβεις, ἀποτομώτερον φέρεται καί φησι· "δώδεκα δὴ σὺν νηυσὶ πόλεις [ἀλάπαξ' ἀνθρώπων / πεζὸς δ' ἔνδεκά φημι κατὰ Τροίην ἐρίβωλον]."
> He brings his great deeds up before the hearers [τοὺς ἀκούοντας], flattering those on hand, but then when he is defending himself in

---

[333] The seventeen examples (mostly with ὁ ἀκούων or οἱ ἀκούοντες; exceptions noted) are **I.165-166**, **I.165-167**, **III.222a**[1], **IV.164b**[1] [= **IV.164(G)**], **IV.241**, **XI.786-789**, **XIII.109**, **XIV.84-85**, **XIV.151-152**, **XVIII.18a**, **XVIII.286-287**, **iv.200**, **viii.0** (ἀκροατής), **viii.12** (ἀκροατής), **viii.45**, **ix.14** (ἀκροατής *and* ἀκούων), and **xii.42**.

[334] **XIV.151-152**: διὰ βοῆς δείξας ἑαυτὸν ὅτι θεὸς ἦν παρώρμησε τοὺς ἀκούοντες "By showing that he is a god with his shout, he rallied those listening [i.e. those who heard him]."

[335] **iv.200**: τὸν ἀκούοντα μάρτυρα ἐπαγόμενος "Citing his listener as a witness." Likewise Achilles when Antilochus brings him news of Patroclus' death, discussed at **XVIII.18a**: *ὤ μοι, Πηλέως υἱέ·* περιπαθῶς καὶ ἀξίως τῆς φιλίας ἀναφθέγγεται, οὐκ ἐπὶ τὸν τεθνεῶτα οὐδ' ἐπὶ τὸν ἀκούοντα, ἀλλ' ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν ἀνενεγκὼν τὴν ἀτυχίαν "*Alas, son of Peleus* — He [sc. Antilochus] utters this cry in a manner both very moving and worthy of their friendship, implying that the misfortune is not the dead man's nor his hearer's [τὸν ἀκούοντα, Achilles] but his own."

[336] . . . ὁππότ' Ἀχαιοί
Τρώων ἐκπέρσωσ' ἐὺ ναιόμενον πτολίεθρον
ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν πλεῖον πολυάϊκος πολέμοιο
χεῖρες ἐμαὶ διέπουσ'
whenever the Achaeans
Sack a well-peopled citadel of the Trojans';
But though most of the tumultuous war
Is done by my hands

> private to the Embassy, he is more precise, saying "Indeed by ship twelve cities [of men have I sacked / and, I declare, eleven by foot throughout the fertile land of Troy]" (IX.328-9).[337]

Thus a speech addressed notionally to Agamemnon, but delivered in the Achaean assembly, is said to take the feelings of a secondary audience into account. Such sensitivity to the audience context of internal speeches appears elsewhere in the scholia: at IV.164b Agamemnon addresses the wounded Menelaus, comforting him by saying that there will be a day when Troy falls ("ἔσσεται ἦμαρ τ' ἄν ποτ' ὀλώλῃ Ἴλιος ἰρή"), the scholia comment that his statement is meant to motivate "the hearers" (τοὺς ἀκούοντας) to renew the fighting.[338] At XIII.95-124, Poseidon gives a speech to a number of the principal Achaeans,[339] urging them to battle and attributing the Greeks' difficulties to the common soldiers' slackness:

> οἳ κείνῳ ἐρίσαντες ἀμυνέμεν οὐκ ἐθέλουσι
> They, bitter towards him [Agamemnon], do not want to defend
>
> (XIII.109)

The scholia remark that the god is rebuking his hearers (τοὺς ἀκούοντας) indirectly, so as not to offend kingly men.[340] In the assembly in Book 14, the scholia note that

---

[337] The following scholion (**I.165-167**, likewise appearing in **b**[**BC**]**T**) restates the thought: ἐξ ἐπιδρομῆς τῶν ἰδίων κατορθωμάτων μνησθεὶς εὔνοιαν, οὐκ ἀπέχθειαν παρὰ τῶν ἀκουόντων ἐπηγάγετο "Alluding to his personal successes obliquely [ἐξ ἐπιδρομῆς], he provokes good will [εὔνοιαν] and not hatred [ἀπέχθειαν] in the hearers."

[338] **IV.164b[1] [=IV.164(G)]**: *ἔσσεται ἦμαρ·* τούτοις προτρέπεται πολεμεῖν τοὺς ἀκούοντας "*There will be a day* — With these words he motivates the hearers to do battle."

[339] Teucer, Leitus, Peneleon, Thoas, Deipurus, Meriones, and Antilochus (enumerated at XIII.91-93).

[340] **XIII.109**: πρὸς βασιλικοὺς γὰρ ἄνδρας ὁ λόγος, οὓς ἐλέγχειν ἀντικρυς παρῃτήσατο. ἐπὶ δὲ τὸν ὑποτεταγμένον ὄχλον τὸν λόγον ἔτρεψε, καὶ δοκεῖ μὲν κατὰ τῶν ἄλλων λέγειν, ἡ δ' ἐπαναφορὰ πρὸς τοὺς ἀκούοντας γίνεται "The speech is directed towards kingly men, whom he declines to rebuke directly. He turns the thought towards the accompanying crowd and, though he seems to be talking about other people, the reference is to the hearers."

Odysseus *enlists* his hearers in a discourse directed to Agamemnon by the use of 1st person plural verbs; his speech is conceived of as fully contextualized with respect to his larger audience.[341] Similarly, at XVIII.286-287, Hector in the Trojan assembly counters Polydamas' defensive plan by rephrasing it as a cowardly retreat on the part of his hearers, shaming them (δυσωπῶν τοὺς ἀκούοντας).[342] If such detailed discussion of the multiple audiences of the poem were not enough to show the scholia's sensitivity to internal audiences, we even find what amounts to a discussion of poem-internal *narratology* at XI.786-789, regarding Nestor's quotation of Menoetius at the close of his lengthy tale to Patroclus:

> *τέκνον ἐμόν·* ὅσα ἐβούλετο τῷ Πατρόκλῳ παραινεῖν, ταῦτα ποιεῖ τὸν Μενοίτιον ὑποτιθέμενον, ὡς καὶ τῷ Ἀχιλλεῖ ὁ Ὀδυσσεὺς ἐκτίθεται τὸν τοῦ Πηλέως λόγον. καὶ ἀμφότεροι δεόντως ἵνα μὴ δόξωσιν οἱ ἀκούοντες μήτε Ὀδυσσέα μήτε Νέστορα τοὺς λέγοντας, ἀλλὰ τὸν πατέρα.
> *My lad* — He [Nestor] has the recommendations he wishes to make to Patroclus be laid down by Menoetius, in the same way that Odysseus sets forth Peleus' speech when speaking to Achilles. And both of them [Odysseus and Nestor] [do so] rightly, so that the hearers [οἱ ἀκούοντες, i.e. Achilles and Patroclus respectively] will not think that either Odysseus or Nestor are the ones speaking but rather [in either case] the father [i.e. Peleus or Menoetius].

This scholion does nothing less than describe a mimetic act internal to the poem in

---

[341] **XIV.84-85**: *<οὐλόμεν' αἴθ' ὤφελλες> ἀεικελίου στρατοῦ ἄλλου / σημαίνειν <μηδ' ἄμμιν ἀνασσέμεν>·* τὸ πρῶτον ἐπιχείρημα ἀπο τῶν ἀκουόντων λαμβάνει, ὅτι πρὸς τοιούτους οὐκ ἔδει συμβουλεύειν τοιαῦτα "*<Doomed man, would that you> for some other wretched army / were commander <and that you were not king over us>* — He [sc. Odysseus] takes his first avenue of attack from the hearers, [saying] that one should not have counseled such things [sc. as Agamemnon has done] to such men."

[342] *ἀλήμεναι·* ὁ μὲν τῆς ἀσφαλείας φροντίζων σεμνοῖς ὀνόμασιν ἐχρήσατο, ὁ δὲ μετατίθησι τὰ ὀνόματα δυσωπῶν τοὺς ἀκούοντας "*Scatter* — The first man [sc. Polydamas], in planning for safety, made use of dignified diction, but the second [sc. Hector] changes the diction so as to shame the hearers [τοὺς ἀκούοντας]," ie. the Trojan audience in the assembly who would be doing the scattering.

terms of its (poem-internal) audience's thoughts and sensibility. If we imagine the *Iliad* as being read out on the scholiast's terms, the reader would here, if he followed the scholiast's advice, express Nestor expressing Menoetius in such a way that the audience understood that Patroclus understood that it was Menoetius speaking. Adding the further level of ὁ ποιητής, we conclude that the scholiast is expressly aware that lines 786-789 of Book 11 (the quotation of Menoetius) would be spoken by the reader speaking as the ποιητής speaking as Nestor speaking as Menoetius and gives his advice on that basis. That this layering of speakers should be framed in terms of audience awareness is nothing short of remarkable.

3.2.2.2 οἱ ἀκούοντες as the external audience

In the example above, we observe that the scholiast employs the term "οἱ ἀκούοντες" in describing the audience for Nestor's and Odysseus' quotations and the speeches that contain them; if it were not the case that poem-internal audiences are mostly, as we have seen, described by the scholia as ἀκούοντες and not ἀκροαταί, and if the sentence in which the term appears here did not feature a plural such as ἀμφότεροι (thus enabling ἀκούοντες to refer to the collection of two individual hearers, Patroclus in Book 11 and Achilles in Book 9), we might be tempted to interpret ἀκούοντες at Σ XI.786-789 as referencing the poem-external audience as much as the poem-internal audience, perhaps blending the two together. (It would, after all, in real terms be as necessary for the reader to distinguish quotation from speech as it is for

Nestor.) There are, however, a number of cases in the Homer scholia in which poem-external and poem-internal audiences are equated. A scholion discussing the beginning of Nestor's Book 11 tale to Patroclus comments that the speech is rhetorically crafted to produce an ἀμβλυτέρα ἀκρόασις; the remark on rhetoric applies equally to Nestor's tale itself and to the Poet's creation of Nestor's tale, and the ἀκρόασις is consequently as much that of the poem-external ἀκροατής as of the poem-internal ἀκούων.[343] When Priam remarks, "Let Achilles kill me" prior to his departure in Book 24, the scholia remark that "τῆς τῶν ἀκουόντων διανοίας ἥψατο ταῦτα λέγων (XIV.226), apparently with equal reference to Hecuba (whom he addresses; she is not likely alone, though no attendants are mentioned) and to the poem-external audience: both are convinced he is going to his death. At iv.183-188, all the company at Sparta weeps to think Odysseus did not return from Troy:

> ὣς φάτω, τοῖσι δὲ πᾶσιν ὑφ' ἵμερον ὦρσε γόοιο.
> κλαῖε μὲν Ἀργείη Ἑλένη, Διὸς ἐκγεγαυῖα,
> κλαῖε δὲ Τηλέμαχός τε καὶ Ἀτρεΐδης Μενέλαος,
> οὐδ' ἄρα Νέστορος υἱὸς ἀδακρύτω ἔχεν ὄσσε·
> μνήσατο γὰρ κατὰ θυμὸν ἀμύμονος Ἀντιλόχοιο
> τόν ῥ' Ἠοῦς ἔκτεινε φαεινῆς ἀγλαὸς υἱός.
> So he [Menelaus] spoke, and he roused in them all the desire of mourning.
> Argive Helen wept, the offspring of Zeus,
> And Telemachus wept, as did Atreus' son Menelaus;

---

[343] The scholion at the outset of Nestor's long speech (**Σ XI.671-761**) is also interesting: *ὡς ὁπότ' Ἠλείοισι·* ἐξ ἀναστροφῆς τὸ διήγημα· ἐπι γὰρ τοῖς ἐπιμηκεστέροις τῶν διηγημάτων τὸ μὲν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἰέναι ἐπὶ τὴν ἀφήγησιν ἀμβλυτέραν τὴν ἀκρόασιν καθίστησιν, τὸ δὲ ἐκ τῶν πρακτικῶν ἄρχεσθαι ἡδύ "*As when for the Elians* — The narrative begins back to front; in longer narratives, starting on the story at the beginning can make the experience of listening [τὴν ἀκρόασιν] duller, while beginning with actual action is pleasant." It is of course impossible to say whether this remark concerns Nestor's tale itself or rather the Poet's rendition of Nestor's tale, if indeed such a distinction is applicable here.

> And neither, behold, did Nestor's son hold back the tears from his eyes:
> For in his heart he remembered the blameless Antilochus [his brother]
> Whom the glorious son of the bright Dawn [ie. Memnon] had slain.
> (XI.183-188)

Here the scholion reads (iv.184),

> δαιμονίως ἀντιλαμβανόμενος ὁ ποιητὴς, ὅπως κεκίνηκε τὸν οἶκτον τῶν ἀκροατῶν, φαντασίαν ἐπὶ τοὺς τότε ἀκούοντας μετήνεγκε.
> The Poet conceived an astonishing idea as to how to produce pity in the listeners, [namely] by providing a mental image (φαντασία) to the hearers then [i.e. in the poem].

The distinction between ἀκροατής and ἀκούων is here made explicit (though the scholiast has added τότε to the latter, perhaps in recognition of the possible ambiguity); and the correspondence between the poem-external audience's grief and the poem-internal audience's grief is complete. As to φαντασία, a common critical term in the Homer scholia,[344] it may be defined as "any especially vivid or striking image or visualisation."[345] As Richardson notes,[346] the most striking instance of the

---

[344] On φαντασία in the Homer scholia, see von Franz 1943.19ff., Richardson 1980.278-279, and Meijering 1987.18-21 (esp. 20-21); it is discussed by Quintilian 6.2.29ff., Longinus 15. A basic example is **XV.712b** (οἱ δὲ πληθύνειν αὐτὸν τὰς φωνὰς τῶν ὅπλων διὰ τὸ φαντάζειν τὸν ἀκροατήν "Some [say] that he [sc. the Poet] multiplies the sounds of the weapons so as to give the listener a mental image"). As Aristotle notes (*De Anima* 427b.17-20, quoted at Meijering 1987.19), "τοῦτο μὲν . . . τὸ πάθος (sc. φαντασία) ἐφ' ἡμῖν ἐστιν, ὅταν βουλώμεθα· πρὸ ὀμμάτων γὰρ ἐστι τι ποιήσασθα, ὥσπερ οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημονικοῖς τιθέμενοι καὶ εἰδωλοποιοῦντες" (This emotion [sc. φαντασία] depends on us, when we will it. For it consists in putting something before the eyes, as in things of memory, when we store and visualize them), and we may compare the Poet's ability to make the audience visualize things to his ability to "remind" them, as at **XI.399-395** (ἀναμιμνήσκων . . . τοὺς ἀκούοντας "He [sc. the Poet] in reminding . . . the hearers"); here ἀναμιμήσκω is the opposite of προφαντάζει, as at XI.45b (οὐ μόνον τῇ ὁπλίσει, ἀλλὰ καὶ ταῖς διοσημίαις προφαντάζει τὸν ἀκροατην "Not only by means of the arming [of Agamemnon] but also by means of sky omens [διοσημίαις] he [sc. the Poet] gives the listener an anticipatory mental image").

[345] Richardson 1980: 278-279, where he provides a selection of uses of the term in the Homer scholia.

[346] Richardson 1980: 279.

Poet inducing audience visualization of the scene in hand is found in the comment at XXIII.362-372 on the start of the chariot race:

> *οἱ δ' ἅμα πάντες·* πᾶσαν φαντασίαν ἐναργῶς προβέβληται ὡς μηδὲν ἧττον τῶν θεατῶν ἐσχηκέναι τοὺς ἀκροατάς.
> *All together then* — He [sc. the Poet] inserts every sort of mental image [φαντασία] with such vividness that the listeners [τοὺς ἀκροατάς] are gripped in no way less than the spectators [τῶν θεατῶν].

The skilful use of φαντασία can thus have the effect of collapsing the difference between poem-internal and poem-external audiences; here they are the spectators (θεαταί) of the race and visual nature of their role corresponds to the visual effect on the poem-external audience.[347]

---

[347] But note that mere diegetic description can achieve the same result, even if this is not termed φαντασία, as in Hera's journey at **XIV.225-230** ("Ηρη δ' ἀΐξασα λίπεν ῥίον Οὐλύμποιο,/ Πιερίην δ' ἐπιβᾶσα καὶ Ἡμαθίην ἐρατεινὴν / σεύατ' ἐφ' ἱπποπόλων Θρῃκῶν ὄρεα νιφόεντα,/ ἀκροτάτας κορυφάς· οὐδὲ χθόνα μάρπτε ποδοῖιν· / ἐξ Ἄθόω δ' ἐπὶ πόντον ἐβήσετο κυμαίνοντα / Λῆμνον δ' εἰσαφίκανε, πόλιν θείοιο Θόαντος "And Hera, leaping up, left the peak of Olympus, / And passing over Pieria and lovely Emathia / She rushed over the snowy mountains of the horse-rearing Thracians, / The highest crests of them; nor did she graze the ground with her feet; / From Athos she went over the billowing sea, / And she reached Lemnos, the city of godlike Thoas"). On the effect of this geography, the scholia remark (XIV.226-227), "*ἐφ' ἱπποπόλων·* ἄκρως κατονομάζει τοὺς τόπους, τὰς ὁμόρους χώρας διεξιών, ὡς καὶ ἐν Ὀδυσσείᾳ "ἡ δὲ ἐρὰς <ἐπ>έβαλλεν ἐπειγομένη Διὸς οὔρῳ / ἠδε παρ' Ἦλιδα δῖαν, ὅθι κρατέουσιν Ἐπειοί/ ἔνθεν δ' αὖ νήσοισιν" [(xv.297-299)]. τῇ γὰρ ὀνομασίᾳ τῶν τόπων συμπαραθέουσα ἡ διάνοια τῶν ἐντυγχανόντων ἐν φαντασίᾳ καὶ ὄψει τῶν τόπων γίνεται. ἅμα τὰ προκείμενα χωρία· μάρτυρας γοῦν ἐπαγόμενος τοὺς ἀκούοντας πιθανωτάτην καθίστησι τὴν διήγησιν (*The horse-rearing* — He [sc. the Poet] perfectly recounts the placenames, going through adjacent territories, as in the *Odyssey* [we get] "And it [the ship] went quickly to Pherae, driven by the breeze of Zeus / and past shining Elis, where the Epeians hold sway / And from there again to the islands." In the naming of places the train of thought of those on hand [τῶν ἐντυγχανόντων] runs along with it and turns to a mental image and vision of the places.) Here the ἐντυχανόντες are clearly the poem-external audience, since no one is traveling with Hera; and the διανοία συμπαραθεούσα is theirs. As the scholion at XI.532 notes, "ἡ γὰρ ἀκοὴ εἶδος ἐστι τῆς αἰσθήσεως" (Listening is one type of perception), here resulting in flight.

3.2.2.3 The audience of the ἀπόλογοι

Significantly, the heaviest blurring of audiences takes place (from the scholia's point of view) in the course of Odysseus' ἀπόλογοι in Books 9-12 of the *Odyssey*, when Odysseus takes on the role of a performing bard.[348] His tale-telling is of course preceded by Demodocus' Troy Tale (viii.499-520), a type of epic performance which Odysseus here instigates (viii.486-498). When he specifies the subject for Demodocus (ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ μετάβηθι καὶ μπου κόσμον ἄεισον "But come now, change your tune and sing of the making of the Horse," viii.492), the scholiast comments (viii.492),

> *ἀλλ' ἄγε δή·* πιθανὸν τὸ ἐπίταγμα, ἵνα παρ' ἄλλου μαθόντες τὰς ἐν Ἰλίῳ πράξεις ὑπομένοντες ἀκούωμεν, ἐπειδὴ πᾶς ἔπαινος φθόνον παρὰ τῶν ἀκουόντων ἐπάγεται, ἡ δε ἐπαινουμένῳ προσώπῳ ἀκρόασις μείζω τὴν ἔκπληξιν.
> *But come now* — The injunction [to Demodocus] is plausible, so that in learning from another what happened in Troy we will patiently listen, since all praise arouses jealousy in the hearers [τῶν ἀκουόντων], while the act of listening [ἡ . . . ἀκρόασις] increases the emotional turbulence [ἔκπληξις].

It is thus just at the moment at which Odysseus requests epic performance that the scholiast imagines himself and his fellow Homerists as joining (ἀκούωμεν) the Phaeacians in and straightaway deploys a critical vocabulary that combines terms for the poem-internal audience (ὑπομένοντες, ie. in Alcinous' hall; τὰς ἐν Ἰλίῳ πράξεις, ie. events elsewhere in the heroic world; τῶν ἀκουόντων; παρ' ἄλλου, i.e from another person in the room) with terms we have seen used elsewhere for poem-

[348] For a sketch of Odysseus' bardic qualities in Books 9-12, see Segal 1992, Most 1989.

external audiences (πιθανὸν, προσώπῳ, ἐπάγεται, ἔκπληξιν[349]); what unites the two is specifically the act of listening (ἡ ἀκρόασις). Indeed, following Demodocus' Troy Tale, Odysseus weeps as an ἀκροατής.[350] The scholia have by then already used this term in anticipating the Phaeacians role in the ἀπόλογοι as participants in an ἀκρόασις (Σ viii.12 on viii.12, Athena's summoning of the Phaeacians ὄφρα ξείνοιο πύθησθε "So that you may learn of the stranger"[351]). It is at the opening of Odysseus' performance, however, that two scholia most thoroughly apply the terms for describing a poem-external audience to the poem-internal audience of the Phaeacians, as Odysseus begins (ix.12) with "τί πρῶτόν τοι ἔπειτα, τί δ' ὑστάτιον καταλέξω;" (What then shall I describe first, what shall I describe last?):

> **ix.14 (H.Q.)**: *τί πρῶτον· . . . .* ἔτι δὲ καὶ προσοχὴν ἐργάζεται τοῖς ἀκροωμένοις.
> *What first — . . .* and also he provokes the interest [προσοχήν] of the listeners [τοῖς ἀκροωμένοις].
>
> **ix.14 (T)**: *τί πρῶτόν τοι ἔπειτα· ὅσα αὔξει τὴν προσοχὴν,*

---

[349] For ἔκπλησις of the poem-external audience, cf. **XXIV.630** (*ἤτοι Δαρδανίδης Πρίαμος θαύμαζ' Ἀχιλῆα / ὅσσος ἔην οἷός τε· θεοῖσι γὰρ ἄντα ἐῴκει· ὅσος ἐν μεγέθει, οἷος ἐν κάλλει.* ταῦτα δὲ πρὸς ἔκπληξιν τῶν ἀκροατῶν "*Then indeed Dardanian Priam stood amazed at Achilles, / At what and what sort he was; for he greatly resembled the gods* — 'What' with respect to his size, 'what sort' with respect to his handsomeness. All this [is said] so as to create emotional turbulence the listeners") and **I.242** (πρὸς δὲ κατάπληξιν τῶν ἀκουόντων καὶ τὸ ἐπίθετον αὐτοῦ δεδήλωκεν "He [the Poet or Agamemnon] deployed his [Hector's] epithet [i.e. "manslaying"] so as to create emotional turbulence in the listeners [i.e. the poem-external audience or the Achaeans]").

[350] **viii.0** (*summary*): ὧν καὶ ἀκροασάμενος Ὀδυσσεὺς ἐδάκρυσεν "Having listened [ἀκροασάμενος] to which [sc. Demodocus' tale] Odysseus wept." At **ix.12** Demodocus' performance is called "ἡ τοῦ κιθαρῳδοῦ ἀκρόασις" (The listening to the bard).

[351] **iii.12**: εἰκότως διὰ πάντων αὐτοὺς ἐπεγείρει, φήσασα αὐτὸν ξένον πλανήτην διαπρεπῆ τὴν ὄψιν, ἵνα οἱ μὲν φιλόξενοι πρὸς τὸν ξένον, οἱ δὲ φιλόκαλοι πρὸς τὸ κάλλος, οἱ δὲ φιλίστορες πρὸς τὴν ἀκρόασιν τοῦ πολυπλανοῦς κινηθῶσιν "Seemingly she rouses them in every manner, saying that he is a good-looking wandering stranger, so that hospitable people will welcome him because he is a stranger, the aesthetes because he has beauty, and the tale-hungry because they will be able to listen (πρὸς τὴν ἀκρόασιν) to his wanderings."

> προσδοκίαν ἐμποιῶν, περ ἐστὶ τεχνικὸν ὡς ἐν προοιμίῳ· δεῖ γὰρ παρὰ τῶν ἀκουόντων ἑαυτῷ μὲν εὔνοιαν ἐπισπᾶσθαι, τῷ δὲ λόγῳ προσοχήν, ἵνα τὸν μὲν λέγοντα ἀποδέξωνται, τῶν δὲ πραγμάτων ἐπιθυμήσωσι τὰ λεγόμενα καὶ μάθωσιν ὅπερ δι' ὅλου κατώρθωκεν Ὀδυσσεὺς ἑαυτὸν μὲν ἐπαινέσας, τὸ δε πλῆθος καὶ τὴν καινότητα τῶν πραγμάτων ἐνδειξάμενος δηλοῖ τὴν προαίρεσιν καὶ πόθεν παραγίνεται καὶ τί βούλεται, εἶθ' οὕτως καὶ τὰ μείζονος διηγήσεως ἄρξηται "Ἰλιόθεν με φέρων" [(ix.39)].
> *What first then indeed* — So greatly he increases the interest [προσοχήν] by putting in a sense of expectation [προσδοκίαν], which is a technical element such as [we would find in] a proem [προοιμίῳ]: he needs to establish the goodwill [εὔνοιαν] of the listeners [τῶν ἀκουόντων] towards him and interest [προσοχήν in his story, so that they will receive him as he tells his story and desire [ἐπιθυμήσωσι] the account of the material [τὰ λεγόμενα τῶν πραγμάτων] and learn [μάθωσιν] that which Odysseus established summarily in praising himself; while he, for his part, by showing the variety and novelty of the material, displays his structure [προαίρεσιν] and his starting-point and his plans, so that the main part of the narrative begins at 'Carrying me from Ilium' (ix.39).

Without reviewing all the terminology deployed here (by now familiar from our typology of representations of audience in the scholia), we may summarize by saying that this description of Odysseus' audience within the poem — at, moreover, the most bardlike moment in all of Homer — maps the Phaeacians fully and directly onto the poem-external audience which the scholiasts themselves identify with: the Phaeacians may not be scholiasts, but the environment of their ἀκρόασις is conceived of as essentially identical with that of the ἀκρόασις which the scholia presume to be the natural environment of ἀνάγνωσις, featuring (as on Scheria) ἀκροαταί whose emotions and interests, whose suspensefulness and relaxation are manipulated by ὁ ποιητής.

3.2.3 The scholarly audience

It will be evident that the audience's perspective as it appears in the scholia discussed above is generalized to the level of the typical audience member; it is distinct from that of the Poet, who is able to manipulate audience emotion by controlling how a scene will unfold, 'misdirecting' the narrative, evoking astonishment at uncharacteristic behavior on the part of his characters, and controlling the overall economy of emotional pitch in the poem; one important tool for the latter is the the audience's presumed wish for Greek victory. The audience is apt to identify with characters in the poem (with Hector, with the average Achaean), and the scholia identify points at which the Poet takes advantage of this so as to blur the distinction between internal and external audiences and between internal and external performance. In general these characteristics indicate that the audience is not conceived by the scholia as possessing detailed knowledge of the contents or mechanics of Homeric poetry: otherwise, audience members would not experience ἀγωνία at the prospect of what we know would be a premature death for Hector in Book 14, nor be in need of comfort at the possibility of Greek defeat in Book 15; for this reason we may refer to the generalized ἀκροατής as a non-scholarly listener. By contrast, the very fact that the scholiasts inform the readers of their commentary that these are mere poetic devices implies that the perspective of scholiasts and scholia-readers alike is quite different from that of the ordinary listener: aided by the knowledge not only that Hector will survive Book 14 but that the Poet is deliberately

provoking ἀγωνία in the depiction of the Trojan hero's near-death, the scholarly reader of the scholia is to some degree distanced from the emotional entanglement in the poem characteristic of the non-scholarly audience. Such is the implication of the act of criticism, particularly in a running commentary; yet it would be rash to allow a general principle such as this to define the perspective of ancient Homeric scholarship as a whole. In fact, the evidence below indicates that the authors and readers of Homeric scholarship were themselves presumed to experience Homeric poetry as members of an audience and were subject to many of the same emotions as the typical listener while nevertheless benefitting, as audience members, from their greater knowledge of the Homeric corpus.

3.2.3.1 The use of 1st person plural verbs

The self-identification of Homeric scholarship with the Homeric audience is most marked in the scholia's repeated use of 1st person plural verb-forms in the context of ἀκρόασις. The verb ἀκούω appears twice thus, in two scholia already noted (XI.194a, ἵνα εἰδότες τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἥττης μὴ βαρέως ἀκούοιμεν [So that, aware of the time of his diminishment, we will not take it badly as we hear], and viii.492, ὑπομένοντες ἀκούωμεν [We listen patiently]); we note also Σ vi.148, regarding the line that introduces Odysseus' speech to Nausicaa:

> αὐτίκα μειλίχιον καὶ κερδαλέον φάτο μῦθον
> Straightaway he spoke a *muthos* that was soothing and crafty
>
> (vi.148)

Here the comment is,

> προστίθησι δὲ τῷ ἀκροατῇ κανόνα τῶν εἰρησομένων λόγων· εἰσόμεθα δὲ εἰ κεκράτηκε τῆς ἐπαγγελίας
> He [sc. the Poet] provides the listener [τῷ ἀκροατῇ] with a *précis* [κανών] of the speech that follows; we will thus know if he [sc. Odysseus] succeeded in his presentation.

The ἀκροατής mentioned is plainly not Nausicaa, since the κανών line belongs to the narrator; the 'we' of "εἰσόμεθα" is the scholiast and his reader, apparently instantiations of the generalized ἀκροατής, who participate in the performance as audience members in that they will be critically assessing Odysseus' attempt to deliver a soothing and crafty speech *as that speech unfolds*, reserving judgment until the narrator describes Nausicaa's reaction; the scholiast and his reader are thus enfolded in performance time, hanging (as it were) on Odysseus' words, while nevertheless remaining aware that the narrator controls the framework into which they are enfolded.

Besides these overt examples of participation by the scholar as an audience member, however, we find ἡμεῖς subject to the same range of emotions described above for the generalized ἀκροατής. V.550a[1] and V.550a[2], for instance, are parallel scholia from the **bT** line of transmission, the former appearing in the **B**, **C**, and **E**[3] manuscripts and the latter in the **T**, and may thus be read as equivalent; the occasion is the death in battle of young Trojan twin brothers:

> *(V.550a[1])* ηὔξησε τὸ πάθος καὶ ὅτι ἡβῶντες καὶ ὅτι δίδυμοι ἦσαν δηλώσας, καὶ εἰς οἶκτον κινεῖ τὸν ἀκροατήν. (**b**[**BCE**[3]])
> *(V.550a[1])* He [sc. the Poet] raised the emotion in showing both that

> they were young and that they were twins, and he moves the listener [τὸν ἀκροατήν] to pity. (**b**[**BCE3**])
>
> *(V.550a²)* ἡμᾶς ὤτρυνε διὰ τοῦ παθητικοῦ, τῆς ἥβης, τῆς τιμῆς, ὅτι δίδυμοι. (**T**)
> *(V.550a²)* He stirs us [ἡμᾶς] by means of the emotional element [τοῦ παθητικοῦ], of their youth, of their glory, [by the fact] that they were twins. (**T**)

Here the listener and the scholar are equated *via* the manuscript transmission, experiencing pity (οἶκτον), just as the listener above (XVII.207-208a) pities (ἠλέησε) Hector[352]; likewise, 'we' can be made attentive by the Poet, as at XII.297b (ἐξαίρων ἡμᾶς εἰς προσοχήν "[The Poet] pulling us up to attention") and XII.330a (προσεκτικοὺς ἡμᾶς ποιῶν "[The Poet] making us attentive"), and our Philhellenism is taken for granted, as at XI.192b (ἵνα μὴ λυπώμεθα "So that we not grieve"), XII.13-15 (ἵνα μὴ λυπώμεθα ἀκούοντες "So that we not grieve to hear"), and XVII.453-5a¹(**T**) (ἀνεξόμεθα οὖν μαθόντες τὴν προθεσμίαν τῆς εὐημερίας "We will thus be sustained with knowledge of the appointed time of happiness"); this last, formulated otherwise in the **b** sources, may again be taken as equating the scholar with the listener (cf. XVII.453-455a²[**b**], ἵνα μὴ λυπῇ τὸν ἀκροατὴν . . . τὴν προθεσμίαν διδάξας τῆς εὐημερίας "So that he [sc. the Poet] does not grieve the listener . . . having explained the appointed time of happiness"). In a further equation

---

[352] This emotion happens to be the one most fully developed in the discussion of generic ἀνάγνωσις in the scholia to Dionysius Thrax; as discussed in Chapter 1, the performance of lamentations (οἶκτοι) is said by the *Scholia Vaticana* to require a self-identification by the performer with the lamenting persona: "δεῖ γὰρ τὸν ἀναγινώσκοντα τὸν οἶκτον τοιοῦτον φαίνεσθαι, ὡς ἐλεεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκουόντων" (The reader must make the grief manifest, so that he is pitied by the listeners) (*GG* I.3.174).

of the two, 'we' experience the Cyclops' ὕβρις as though we were actually hearing his speech, for the scholia note that the Poet (and/or Odysseus) makes Polyphemus boast that he is much stronger than the gods and so "κινεῖ τὸν ἀκροατήν, ἵνα μισήσωμεν . . . καὶ ἐφησθῶμεν (He moves the listener, so that we hate . . . and so that we exult").[353]

Beyond these elements of emotional susceptibility, openness to προσοχή, and Philhellenism, however, we find that 'we' resemble the generalized listener in another important way, in that 'we' can also identify with internal audiences. In the last example above, it was not clear whether the subject of "κινεῖ" was the Poet or Odysseus; the latter possibility would involve a self-identification of the 1st person plural of scholarship with Odysseus' Phaeacian audience. The possibility is strengthened by a curious scholion at ix.12, appearing at the outset of the bardic ἀπόλογοι:

> σοὶ δ' ἐμὰ κήδεα θυμὸς ἐπετράπετο στονόεντα
> εἴρεσθ' ὄφρ' ἔτι μᾶλλον ὀδυρόμενος στεναχίζω
> To you [Alcinous] my heart is turned [to tell] my grievous hardships
> To tell [them so that I may, weeping, groan all the more
>
> (ix.12-13)

Here the scholion reads (ix.12),

---

[353] We may also note the immediacy of comments referencing the audience by means of the imperative ὅρα, as at **XIV.424c** (ὅρα δέ, πῶς ἐπι τὸ ἀκρότατον ἐξάγει τὰς ἀγωνίας "Look here, how he brings the suspenseful moments to the highest point"; noted at Richardsion 1980: 270 n.12) and **XVII.205a** (τὴν ἀγανάκτησιν τῶν ἀκροατῶν ὅρα, πῶς συνελὼν τῷ Διὶ περιέθηκεν "Look at the distress of the listeners, how picking it up he gives it [i.e. the distress] to Zeus"; noted at Duckworth 1931.335 and discussed above). Even if we must admit that ὅρα is a very common turn of phrase in the *Iliad* scholia (appearing 90 times), the latter scholion here is remarkable in that it imagines the Poet as taking his cue from the emotions of his audience.

> *σοι δ' ἔμὰ κήδεα·* ἐπειδὴ μέλλει περὶ πραγμάτων διηγεῖσθαι, ἠθικῶς προκατασκευάζει ὅτι μᾶλλον τῷ ἡμετέρῳ συμποσίῳ ἁρμόζει καὶ ἡ τοῦ κιθαρῳδοῦ ἀκρόασις, ἵνα ἐὰν ὀχληρὸς φαίνηται, τοῖς βιασαμένοις ἀναφέρωσι τὴν αἰτίαν. ἅμα δὲ καὶ προσοχὴν ἐργάζεται, ὅτι πολλὰ ἀπαγγελεῖ παράδοξα
> *To you . . . my hardships* — Now that he is on the point of making a narrative of things, he as usual [ἠθικῶς] sets it up [προκατασκευάζει] to the effect that a listening [ἀκρόασις] to the bard [Demodocus] is more fitting for our symposium, so that if he [Odysseus] proves to be offensive [ὀχληρός] [to them], they will blame his oppressors. Also, he provokes attention [προσοχή] to the fact that he will be reporting many marvels [παράδοξα].

As with other scholia on the ἀπόλογοι (discussed above, section 4.4.3), these remarks of the scholiast exhibit a striking sensitivity to performance-related criteria: Odysseus as storyteller (διηγεῖσθαι) seizes the attention of his audience (προσοχὴν ἐργάζεται), conditions his audience's expectations by positioning himself against a rival performer (ἡ τοῦ κιθαρῳδοῦ ἀκρόασις) and even protects himself against a negative reception of his performance by that audience on the very terms of his material and his self-presentation in his narrative. We have trouble translating the word ἠθικῶς, which could refer to Odysseus' knack for *captatio benevolentiae* before identifying himself (as for instance with Nausicaa, whom he flatters at vi.149-161) or potentially to the ἦθος of epic performers in their proems (cf. ix.14[**T**] above). But in terms of the self-identification of the scholiast with the audience (here the Phaeacians, who are a poem-internal audience with respect to the ἀνάγνωσις of the *Odyssey* and a poem-external audience with respect to the "poem" of Odysseus' ἀπόλογοι) what is most striking in this scholion is its description of Alcinous' feast as τὸ ἡμέτερον

συμπόσιον ("our symposium"). The scholiast's interpretation of Odysseus' intention is thus focalized through Odysseus himself, even if the verbs which take Odysseus as subject are in the 3rd person and bracket ἡμετέρῳ before and after (προκατασκευάζει and φαίνηται); but we also sense that the scholia here imagine themselves as participating in the feast, not least because they use the contemporary noun συμπόσιον in lieu of the epic δαίς.

3.2.3.2 The ἀκροατής as Homeric scholar

Having noticed above instances in which ancient scholars appear to identify with the generalized audience or audience-member and to experience the epic, as listeners, in a manner similar to that of the ordinary listener, we now turn to evidence for how 'expert' listeners might experience Homer differently. As Ineke Sluiter has observed,[354] the Homer scholia favor the verb διδάσκει; she infers that "the process of identification [of Homer with the διδάσκαλος] tends to be made symmetrical, in the sense that the concerns of the interpreter are projected back into the source text"[355]; nevertheless, this "teaching" is not necessarily filtered through the figure of the διδάσκαλος but can be directly presented to the listener by the poet himself. For instance, when Zeus in Book 17 sends Automedon and Achilles' horses back to the

---

[354] Sluiter 1999, esp. pp. 176-179. She perhaps exaggerates in saying that "the assumption of Homer's didactic intentions on the part of the scholiasts is all-pervasive," but the list of examples she produces (Sluiter 1999: 176-177 nn.8-21) is remarkable, including for its curriculum generalship, spear-fighting, weapon maintenance, strategy, dealing with friends, filial respect, "not to answer immediately," etc.
[355] Sluiter 1999: 178.

ships from the battle, he remarks that he is doing so because he is still (temporarily) favoring the Trojans:

> σφῶϊν δ' ἐν γούνεσσι βαλῶ μένος ἠδ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ
> ὄφρα καὶ Αὐτομέδοντα σαώσετον ἐκ πολέμοιο
> νῆνας ἔπι γλαφυράς· ἔτι γάρ σφισι κῦδος ὀρέξω
> κτείνειν, εἰς ὅ κε νῆας ἐσσέλμους ἀφίκωνται
> As to you two [horses], I shall cast strength in your knees and hearts
> So that you two may bring Automedon safe from the battle
> To the hollow ships; for still I shall bestow glory on them [the Trojans]
> [The glory of] killing, until they reach the well-benched ships
>
> (XVII.451-455)

Here the scholia, ever sensitive to the emotional state of the listener, comment (XVII.453-455a^{2}[b]),

> ἔτι *γάρ σφισι* — προλέγει δέ, ἵνα μὴ λυπῇ τὸν ἀκροατὴν ἐπὶ πλέον, τὴν προθεσμίαν διδάξας τῆς εὐημερίας
> *Still . . . . on them* — He [sc. the Poet, though also Zeus] is foretelling, so that he should not grieve the listener [τὸν ἀκροατὴν] excessively, explaining [διδάξας] the appointed hour of [the Greeks' and thus the listeners'] happiness.

The listener is thus also a learner; as we see from a rephrasing of the above scholion in the **T** MS. (XVII.453-5a^{1}[**T**]):

> ἀνεξόμεθα οὖν μαθόντες τὴν προθεσμίαν τῆς εὐημερίας
> We will thus be sustained with knowledge of the appointed time of happiness

The listener, who is taught (διδάξας XVII.453-455a^{1}), and ἡμεῖς, who learn (μαθόντες), are thus one and the same; while this confirms Sluiter's point that the scholia imagine the Poet as a teacher, we must add that the process of teaching is fundamentally not that of διδασκαλία in the classroom sense but rather one of

ἀκρόασις. The 'curriculum' imparted to such ἀκροαταί by the Poet can amount to the material of epic poetry itself, as when Aeneas remarks to Achilles in Book 20,

> εἰ δ' ἐθέλεις καὶ ταῦτα δαήμεναι, ὄφρ' ἐῢ εἰδῇς
> ἡμετέρην γενεήν, πολλοὶ δέ μιν ἄνδρες ἴσασι·
> If you wish to learn these things also, so that you will know well
> My descent; many are the men that know it.
>
> (XX.214-215)

Here the scholia comment (XX.213b),

> παρῆκται ἡ ὁμιλία κατὰ ποιητικὴν αἵρεσιν πρὸς ὠφέλειαν τῶν ἀκροατῶν, ἵνα τὴν Τρωϊκὴν γενεαλογίαν μάθωμεν.
> The encounter [sc. between Aeneas and Achilles] has been introduced, in poetic fashion, so as to aid the listeners, so that we may learn the Trojan genealogy.

The ὠφέλεια thus provided is not one that would help the listeners (ἡμεῖς again) better understand Book 20, however; rather it constitutes 'deep background' information pertinent to the study of the Trojan War as a whole and thus helpful principally to students of literature: the listeners here are hardly ordinary Greeks. We may compare a scholion on II.382 (Agamemnon's injuction to the rallied Greeks that εὖ μέν τις δόρυ θηξάσθω, εὖ δ' ἀσπίδα θέσθω "Let a man now well sharpen his spear and well arrange his shield"), the scholiast again notes that the object of διδασκαλία is the ἀκροατής who is either the ordinary (τις) Achaean or the real-life listener or perhaps both (II.382a):

> *τις δόρυ*· κινητικὰ τοῦ μέλλοντος ἔσεσθαι πολέμου ταῦτα, καὶ τὴν πολεμικὴν παρασκευὴν διδάσκοντα τὸν ἀκροατήν· οἶδε γὰρ καὶ ταῦτα αἴτια εἶναι τῆς ἥττης· "οὐδὲ διαπρὸ δυνήσατο," "τῇ ὅ γ' ἐνὶ βλαφθεὶς πέσεν ὕπτιος." δεῖ οὖν μὴ τὴν αἰτίαν ἐξ ἡμῶν εἶναι τοῦ κακοῦ.

> These [thoughts/words] are an impulse [κινητικά] to the coming battle and explain [διδάσκοντα] battle preparation to the listener [ἀκροατήν]; for he [the listener, not Agamemnon] knows that the causes of defeat are such as these "He could not [push the spear] through" [XIII.607], "He tripped over it [his shield] and fell backward" [XV.647]. Thus it is necessary that the cause of disaster not come from ourselves [ie. we should prepare well and not be the cause of our own defeat].

Here the blending of internal and external audiences is virtually total, as the teacher is both the Poet and Agamemnon and the learner is both the real-life listener and the average Achaean; the final thought (δεῖ οὖν μὴ τὴν αἰτίαν ἐξ ἡμῶν) is either focalized through the average Achaean or the result of the listener's identification with that Achaean. What is particularly striking, however, is that the listener is presumed to be sufficiently familiar with Homeric poetry as to be able to interpret Agamemnon's line here in Book 2 in terms of two widely separated lines from Books 13 and 15 (quoted moreover in the most familiar style by the scholiast); not only is it thus presumed that this 1st-person listener is able to reference later books before they happen, but the thoroughness of his acquaintance with Homer surely classes him as a scholarly listener. Most astonishingly, we learn elsewhere that this familiarity on the part of the listener extends to *both* epics, in apparent violation of Monro's Law against inter-reference between *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. When Proteus prophecies to Menelaus in Book 4 of the *Odyssey*, he makes the following answer to the hero's question regarding other heroes' deaths:

> ἀρχοὶ δ' αὖ δύο μοῦνοι Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων
> ἐν νόστῳ ἀπόλοντο· μάχῃ δέ τε καὶ σὺ παρῆσθα

> Yet only two of the leaders of the bronze-shirted Achaeans
> Perished on their homecoming; as for the war, you were there yourself
> (iv.496-497)

Here we read in the scholia (iv.497),

> *μάχῃ*· τὸ *μάχῃ δέ τε καὶ σὺ παρῆσθα τάχα* ὁ Πρωτεύς φησι πρὸς τὸν Μενέλαον, ὁ δ' Ὅμηρος πρὸς τὸν ἀκροατήν, ἐδιδάχθης, φησίν, ἐν τῇ Ἰλιάδι τίνες ἀπώλοντο, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οὐδὲ θέλει αὐτοὺς πάλιν ἀπαριθμεῖν.
> *As to the war* — The phrase "as for the war, you were there yourself," perhaps Proteus says this to Menelaus while Homer says it to the listener, having already explained (ἐδιδάχθης), they say, in the *Iliad* who the men were who perished, and this is why he does not want to count them up again.

With some amazement we note here that the many levels of speaker/listener interaction here — Proteus to Menelaus, Menelaus to Telemachus, and the Poet to the listener — are here (in the scholiast's view) collapsed; this would be remarkable in itself, but the most significant point here is that such a collapsing of internal and external audiences is itself predicated upon the prior familiarity of the listener with the whole of Homeric poetry. In other words, the listener is able to identify with Menelaus — to immerse himself in the performance completely — *because* he is able to detach himself from the *Odyssey* by means of Homeric scholarship.

The scholion just discussed appears thus to encapsulate what might appear to modern scholars, who are accustomed to experiencing poetry in its physical form, as a contradiction: on the one hand, the Homer scholia provide an immense amount of detailed information about every aspect of the poems, while on the other they presume that the poem is principally directed towards people who do not possess enough

familiarity with the *Iliad* to know that Hector does not die in Book 14. Moreover, the scholarly audience — the ἡμεῖς who author and study ancient Homeric scholarship — behaves substantially like the ordinary audience in being subjected to suspense, roused to attention, tensed, relaxed, moved to pity, and comforted. How is it that detailed commentary should result in kinship with the ordinary audience? We could, I suggest, easily attribute this kinship to a shared experience of ἀνάγνωσις: if the ὑπόκρισις of the reader is sufficiently authentic, even the most knowledgeable audience would be swept up by mimetic illusion and subject to suspense. Perhaps there is something to this. Nevertheless, we should be wary of reducing the 'ordinary' listener to an entirely passive role, as the following scholion of Porphyry's regarding the question of why Homeric heroes wash *before* a meal but never afterwards.[356] Noting other omissions of this type, Porphyry concludes (I.449a),

> οὐκέτι ἐπεσημήνατο, διδοὺς τοῖς ἀκροαταῖς καθ' ἑαυτοὺς λογίζεσθαι τὰ ἀκόλουθα. καὶ πολλὰ τοιαῦτα ἔστι γνῶναι παρ' αὐτῷ· οὐ γὰρ μόνον, τί εἴπῃ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τί μὴ εἴπῃ, ἐφρόντισεν.
> He [sc. the Poet] provides no further indication of it [the bow given by Meriones to Odysseus in Book 10], leaving it to the listeners [τοῖς ἀκροαταῖς] to figure out the attendant circumstances [τὰ ἀκόλουθα] on their own [καθ' ἑαυτοὺς λογίζεσθαι]. And there are a lot of things like this in him [Homer], for he did not merely take thought as to what he would state but as to what he would not state.[357]

---

[356] The scholion is evidently an excerpt from Porphyry's *Homeric Questions*, preserved in the **bT** MSS., and not from his allegorical interpretations (which would raise other questions of readership); see Erbse 1969.1: 125-6 *test.*449a for the sourcing. The scholion is also discussed by Richardson (Richardson 1980: 278) who references "the Aristotelian principle that its [something ἀπίθανον's] dramatic effectiveness is such that the hearer does not stop to reflect on its probability" (citing *Poetica* 1460a11ff., esp. 26f. and 35ff.).

[357] This scholion is mentioned by Richardson (Richardson 1980: 271 and 271 n.19), citing Demetrius *De elocutione* 4.222: Ἐν τούτοις τε οὖν τὸ πιθανόν, καὶ ἐν ᾧ Θεόφραστός φησιν, ὅτι οὐ πάντα ἐπ' ἀκριβείας δεῖ μακρηγορεῖν, ἀλλ' ἔνια καταλιπεῖν καὶ τῷ ἀκροατῇ συνιέναι καὶ

The Poet is here praised for his negotiation of the spoken and the unspoken, while the the listeners are presumed to possess an independent exegetical ability (λογίζεσθαι) sufficient to interpret and assimilate the unspoken element.[358] We might thus view the whole of Homeric exegesis as an extension of the ordinary listener's need to "figure out attendant circumstances on their own," thus enhancing his ability to enter into the

---

λογίζεσθαι ἐξ αὐτοῦ· συνεὶς γὰρ τὸ ἐλλειφθὲν ὑπὸ σοῦ οὐκ ἀκροατὴς μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ μάρτυς σου γίνεται, καὶ ἅμα εὐμενέστερος. συνετὸς γὰρ ἑαυτῷ δοκεῖ διὰ σὲ τὸν ἀφορμὴν παρεσχηκότα αὐτῷ τοῦ συνιέναι, τὸ δὲ πάντα ὡς ἀνοήτῳ λέγειν καταγινώσκοντι ἔοικεν τοῦ ἀκροατοῦ "Such are the main points regarding believability [τὸ πιθανόν], regarding which Theophrastus says that not everything should be precisely declared at full length, but that one should leave some things to the listener [τῷ ἀκροατῇ] to grasp and figure out [συνιέναι καὶ λογίζεσθαι] on his own. For when he grasps what you have left out he becomes not only your listener [ἀκροατής] but your witness [μάρτυς] and more amenable to boot. For he considers himself intelligent because you furnish him with a way of grasping something, while to state everything to the listener as though he were a fool seems slanderous." Cf. **Σ XIV.226-227** (discussed above). We may also note **XV.414b** (δαιμονίως παρακελεύεται τῷ ἀκροατῇ μείζω τὰ ἔργα ἡγεῖσθαι τῶν λόγων, ὡς ἔνια δὲ καὶ ὑπερβαίνων αὐτὰ ὑπονοεῖν ἡμῖν δίδωσιν "He [sc. the Poet] astonishingly bids the listener consider the deeds to be greater than the account, so that in picking a few of them he gives it to us to imagine the rest"); On ὑπονοέω and the audience, cf. **XXIV.3-4** (ἐπειδὴ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνέσεως τοῦ ἀγῶνος ἐν ἄλλῃ καταστάσει πεποίηκε τὸν ἀκροατὴν ὥσθ' ὑπονοεῖν, μὴ καὶ ἀφῆκεν ἐκ τῆς ψυχῆς τὴν ἀνίαν ὁ Ἀχιλλεύς, πάλιν ἐπὶ τὸ συνεκτικὸν μεταβαίνει πρόσωπον· μονωθεὶς γὰρ πάλιν ὑπὸ τῆς λύπης κρατεῖται "Once, after the end of the contest [i.e. Book 23], he [sc. the Poet] has put the listener in a different state of mind so as to imagine [ὑπονοεῖν] that Achilles has not put the sorrow out of his spirit, he switches to the summarizing perspective; for in private he [Achilles] is overwhelmed by grief again"). On κατάστασις as a rhetorical term in ancient Homeric criticism, see Heath 1993.

[358] Though this Porphyry scholion appears to view such exegetical ability on the part of the audience as a virtue, we do find that the ability to λογίζεσθαι is elsewhere viewed as something to be avoided, as at **XXI.269a** (regarding Achilles battle in Book 21 with the river Scamander, who at one point [XXI.269] strikes him on the shoulders: "*πλάζ' ὤμους καθύπερθεν*· ὅλον τὸ πεδίον πέλαγος γεγενημένον ὑπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ἔδειξεν ὥστε καὶ τοὺς ὤμους ἐπικλύζειν τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως. καὶ πρὸς μὲν ἀλήθειαν ταῦτα οὐ πιθανά· τί γὰρ ἐπράττετο περὶ τοὺς ἄλλους στρατιώτας; ἀπίθανον γὰρ μόνον τὸν Ἀχιλλέα ὑπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ταῦτα πάσχειν. ὡς δὲ ἐν ποιήσει παραδεκτά. καὶ οὕτω τῇ ἀπαγγελίᾳ κατώρθωται, ὥστ' οὐδ' ἀνίησι τὸν ἀκροατὴν ἐπιλογίσασθαί τι τῶν λεγομένων, εἰ ἀληθὲς ἦν ἢ μή" (*He struck his shoulders from above* — He [sc. the Poet] showed that the whole plain [of Troy] had been turned into a sea by the river so that Achilles was immersed up to his shoulders. And this is not believable [οὐ πιθανά] with regard to truth [πρὸς ἀλήθειαν]: for what happened to the other people in the army [who had been following Achilles]? It is not believable [ἀπίθανον] that the only one to experience this effect of the river was Achilles. This is the sort of thing one must accept in poetry. And thus it has been fixed in the [subsequent] narrative [ἀπαγγελία], so that the listener is not left free to ponder [ἐπιλογίσασθαι] anything that has been said with respect to its truth; noted at Richardson 1980: 278).

heroic world and allowing for a richer ἀκρόασις (as in the examples of Agamemnon at II.382a and Menelaus at iv.497 above). This is no doubt a valid conclusion also, eminently compatible with the idea of the inclusivity of ἀνάγνωσις. There is, however, a still more vital dimension to the portrayal of audience in ancient Homeric scholarship and the idea of the ancient scholar as a listener: just as the young performer (as depicted in Dionysius Thrax and his scholiasts) was, as we have argued in Chapter 1, engaged in an act of historical imagination in his act of ἀνάγνωσις, seeking to recreate (if only fictively) the original performance context of his text, and just as the line between a contemporary audience and an imagined 'original' audience is (as Duckworth observed) blurred in the scholia to the point of irrelevance, so too we may regard the observations provided to ancient students and scholars of Homer regarding the general ἀκροατής as serving to enable an act of imagination on their part regarding how best they themselves would affect that ἀκροατής in their own act of ἀνάγνωσις. Even for a scholar in the audience, therefore, the generalized audience member — one lacking in Homeric scholarship — would serve as an imaginary double for the real audience member — however well versed he might be in the scholia; the scholar would thus assume both the naïve perspective of the eager ordinary listener and the knowledgable perspective of the Poet keen to cater to that eagerness.

3.3 Ἀνάγνωσις at Alexandria

Our exploration of ἀνάγνωσις having taken us, above, into a discussion of reader and audience as both in some measure theoretical constructs in the Homer scholia, we may now return, in the latter portion of this chapter, to the evidence for a particular moment in the history of Homeric performance, namely the 2nd century BC at Alexandria, and to that most celebrated figure in the history of ancient scholarship, Aristarchus of Samothace. Understandably given his reputation and influence as a critic, modern scholarship has tended to depict Aristarchus as a proto-philologist; nevertheless, pursuing our study of the audience of ἀνάγνωσις in its scholarly dimension, we will rather restrict ourselves to a new assessment of Aristarchus as a member of the audience of ἀνάγνωσις. Three Homer scholia attest to the activity of "Posidonius, the ἀναγνώστης of Aristarchus."[359] As we shall see, the phrase "ὁ ἀνανγνώστης Ἀριστάρχου" does not indicate that Posidonius was a reader of the *works* of

---

[359] On the literary role of Posidonius, see Blau 1883, Wendel 1953: 826; for an attempt, on the basis of epigraphical evidence, to locate Posidonius in Athens after the flight of the Aristarcheans from Alexandria in 145 BC, which has unfortunately (as Wendel notes) been undercut by later epigraphical finds, see Cichorius 1908. Wendel gives credence to the idea that the Posidonius cited by Apollonius Dyscolus as the author of a treatise *Περὶ συνδέσμων* (*De coniunctionibus* 214.4-20) is the ἀναγνώστης, though the insistence with which Posidonius the ἀναγνώστης is designated as such in the scholia might rather suggest that the scholiasts are differentiating him from a γραμματικός of the same (very common) name, who might be a more appropriate author for a treatise *Περὶ συνδέσμων*. None of the four Poseidoniuses listed in the Suda (Π 2107-2110) is a described as a γραμματικός: the first is the famous Rhodian Stoic, the second a Stoic historian, the third a geographer (often cited by Eustathius), and the fourth the author of an obscure work on "παλμικὸν οἰώνισμα" (twitch augury). Besides the three Homer scholia, Wendel adduces also a scholion to Apollonius of Rhodes (Σ *Argonautica* II.105-106) on the meaning of "λάξ"; as this has nothing to with ἀνάγνωσις, however, and since Posidonius of Rhodes is a much more likely candidate as a writer on physiognomy, there seems to be no reason to dispute the view of Bake 1810: 234 that the Posidonius of Σ *Argonautica* II.105-106 is Posidonius of Rhodes and not our ἀναγνώστης.

Aristarchus but rather that he read texts *to* Aristarchus himself; before proceeding to a detailed analysis of the evidence for his relationship with Aristarchus, however, we may usefully survey the profession of ἀναγνώστης (*lector* in Latin) as it appears in Greek and Roman sources.

3.3.1 The profession of ἀναγνώστης[360]

Perhaps surprisingly, the word ἀναγνώστης (the agentive noun of ἀναγιγνώσκω) is relatively uncommon in the Greek corpus before the Christian period.[361] *LSJ* defines it as either "A. a reader, slave trained to read" or more particularly as "II. a secretary." The latter sense appears in two inscriptions (ἀναγνώστης τῆς πόλεως at *Inscr. Prien.* 111.194; ἀναγνώστης γερουσίας at *Inscr. Cos* 238), and surely corresponds to the use of a *lector* in courtroom cases as described by Cicero.[362] The larger sense of "reader, slave trained to read" situates the ἀναγνώστης in settings beyond the courtroom and corresponds to the great variety of material which he might be called

---

[360] The role of the *lector* (more so than of the ἀναγνώστης, though the two words are synonymous) has been explored by Balsdon 1969: 44-45 and (in more detail) by Starr 1990; their examples are included in the discussion below (and noted as such), with the addition of material from Epictetus, Fronto, and (on Agatharchides) Photius.

[361] In Christian communities, the role of ἀναγνώστης was a Church office, deriving from Jewish practice: Ezra is the "Reader of the Law" (ἀναγνώστης τοῦ νόμου) in the Septuagint (Ezra I 8.8-9, 9.19, 9.39, 9.42, 9.49; Josephus 11.123). There are thus innumerable references to this office in Ecclesiastical writers, and the term appears in Christian funereal inscriptions. On the ἀναγνώστης in early Christianity, see Quacquarelli 1959.

[362] Cicero *De oratore* 2.55.223 As Starr notes (Starr 1990: 338), it was evidently usual to use one *lector* in the presentation of one's case — perhaps reading from a document in court was inconsistent with a Roman lawyer's dignity — and Brutus' use of two *lectores* on one occasion was humorously countered with three *lectores* by his opponent Crassus.

upon to read, including classic texts,[363] contemporary literature,[364] works of scholarship,[365] and (not always to the audience's delectation) a host's own poems.[366] Since, as Starr supposes, slaves skilled in reading aloud would be comparatively expensive,[367] ἀναγνώσται may have been associated with élite,[368] but they were not associated with luxury,[369] and the remark of Juvenal's narrator in Satire 11 (at whose

---

[363] Juvenal 11.179-182 speaks of Homer and Vergil as typical, as Starr 1990: 342 and Balsdon 1969: 44 n.170. Petronius 68.4-5 is a satire on the reading of classics at dinner parties.

[364] Martial claims (7.97.11) that his addressee Aulus Pudens will have the Martial's poems presented at a dinner party; Cicero (*Ad Atticum* 16.2) sends Atticus his essay *On Glory* with specific instructions: "notentur eclogae duae quas Salvius bonos auditores nactus in convivio dumtaxat legat" (Note that there are two eclogues which Salvius can [have] read [aloud], at least at the dinner party, if he can get his hands on good listeners); Atticus (*Ad Atticum* 13.12.2) appparently had Cicero's *Pro Ligario* read out, though perhaps not at a dinner party. These instances are noted by Starr 1990: 341.

[365] Pliny reports (*Epistulae* 3.19.1) that "Apud cenam Favorini philosophi cum discubitum fuerat coeptusque erat apponi cibus, servus assistens mensae eius legere inceptabat aut Graecarum quid litteratum aut nostratium; velut eo die, quo ego affui, legebatur Gavii Bassi, eruditi viri, liber de origine verborum et vocabulorum" (At Favorinus the philosopher's dinner, when we had lain down to supper and the food was being served, a slave standing by his table began to read something either from Greek literature or from our own; so it was that, on the day I was present, that learnèd man Gavius Bassus' book on the origins of words and terms was read out). This instanced is noted by Starr 1990: 341.

[366] As Balsdon notes (Balsdon 1969: 44-45), Martial 3.50 is a satire on one Ligurinus, who insisted on reading his own poems;

[367] Starr 1990: 338-339.

[368] Thus Starr 1990: 337: "*Lectores,* specialists in oral reading, played a vital role in aristocratic Romans' experience of literature." Certainly they are first in the long list of Crassus' slaves provided by Plutarch (*Crassus* 2), and their plurality perhaps indicative of wealth: "τοσούτους ἐκέκτητο καὶ τοιούτους, ἀναγνώστας, ὑπογραφεῖς, ἀργυρογνώμονας, διοικητάς, τραπεζοκόμους, αὐτὸς ἐπιστατῶν μανθάνουσι καὶ προσέχων καὶ διδάσκων, καὶ ὅλως νομίζων τῷ δεσπότῃ προσήκειν μάλιστα τὴν περὶ τοὺς οἰκέτας ἐπιμέλειαν, ὡς ὄργανα ἔμψυχα τῆς οἰκονομικῆς" (He had so many and such extraordinary slaves, ἀναγνώσται, secretaries [ὑπογραφεῖς], silversmiths, stewards, waiters; and he himself directed their training and taught them, and generally held that it was the master's duty first and foremost to take an interest in his household slaves, as animated instruments of the household).

[369] Nepos mentions (*Atticus* 14.1) in one breath that Atticus both cultivated ἀνάγνωσις and changed nothing of his routine after his inheritance: "Nemo in conuiuio eius aliud acroama audiuit quam anagnosten, quod nos quidem iucundissimum arbitramur; neque umquam sine aliqua lectione apud eum cenatum est, ut non minus animo quam uentre conuiuae delectarentur: namque eos uocabat, quorum mores a suis non abhorrerent. cum tanta pecuniae facta esset accessio, nihil de cotidiano cultu mutauit, nihil de uitae consuetudine, tantaque usus est moderatione . . ." (No one at a dinner party of his heard any other aural entertainment [*acroama*] but the ἀναγνώστης, which in my own view is a most agreeable thing: nor did he ever dine without some reading [*lectio*], so that his guests would be as much

modest dinner party "conditor Iliados cantabitur atque Maronis / altisoni dubiam facientia carmina palmam. / quid refert tales versus qua voce legantur?), which does not appear to be ironic, appears to testify to ἀνάγνωσις at non-aristocratic parties.[370] In company, readings by a *lector* / ἀναγνώστης were an element of the *acroama*[371]; the Roman dependence on the Greek word testifies to this as a distinct cross-cultural phenomenon.

The profession of *lector* / ἀναγνώστης was apparently sufficiently specialized that a *notarius* could read aloud to the Elder Pliny but a *lector* could not take dictation.[372] When Pliny is advised by his friends that he is unfit to be the *lector* of his own poems,[373] he drafts a household freedman into the role,[374] "tam novus lector quam ego poeta" and consequently "perturbatus"; the fact that Pliny then remarks that "Ipse nescio, quid illo legente interim faciam, sedeam defixus et mutus et similis otioso an, ut quidam, quae pronuntiabit, murmure oculis manu prosequar. Sed puto me non

---

pleased in spirit as in stomach; for he used to invite those [guests] whose preferences were not dissimilar to his own. When he inherited so much money, he changed nothing of his normal routine, nothing of his way of life, and he made such great use of moderation . . .). This example is noted by Balsdon 1969: 44 n.168.

[370] Cf. Starr 1990: 341, who notes that when Pliny withdrew from Rome to his estate in Tuscany in the summer or in Laurentum in the winter, a book was typically read during the evening meal if he was dining with only his wife or a few people, i.e. in private (summer: 9.36.4; winter: 9.40.2). As Starr writes (Starr 1990: 341 n. 31), "Both these letters purport to describe Pliny's routine, not just isolated instances."

[371] Cf. Nepos 14.1 (note 369); Pliny 6.31.13 pictures the *acroamata* that Trajan will provide to his guests at Centumcellae; Plutarch *Moralia* 711-B-713F (*Quaestonies Conviviales* 7.8) is a discussion of which *acroamata* are most suitable. Gellius 1.22.5 quotes Varro's view that these should be literary works both educational and entertaining. These instances are noted by Balsdon 1969: 44-45.

[372] Thus Starr 1990: 339-340, to my mind convincingly, on Pliny *Epistulae* 3.5.15, which describes how the *ad hoc* role of *lector* was thrust on the author's uncle by the fact that a carriage could only hold two people. Starr cites Bradley 1987: 16 for evidence of the extreme specialization of servile occupations.

[373] Pliny *Epistulae* 5.3; 8.21. Noted by Starr 1990: 340.

[374] Pliny *Epistulae* 9.34.

minus male saltare quam legere" is interpreted by Starr as referring (albeit ironically) to the use of *cantores* for the declamation of poetic texts[375]: the *lector* would thus incorporate gesture into his performance.[376] *Recitatio* and dinner party were by no means the only settings for ἀνάγνωσις by *lectores*, however: Pliny lists among the pleasures of solitude his time with his *lector*.[377] This was, according to Dio Chrysostom,[378] the ideal way of experiencing the classics:

> τῶν μὲν δὴ ποιητῶν συμβουλεύσαιμ' ἄν σοι Μενάνδρῳ τε τῶν κωμικῶν μὴ παρέργως ἐντυγχάνειν καὶ Εὐριπίδῃ τῶν τραγικῶν, καὶ τούτοις μὴ οὕτως, αὐτὸν ἀναγιγνώσκοντα, <ἀλλὰ δι'> ἑτέρων ἐπισταμένων μάλιστα μὲν καὶ ἡδέως, εἰ δ' οὖν, ἀλύπως ὑποκρίνασθαι· πλείων γὰρ ἡ αἴσθησις ἀπαλλαγέντι τῆς περὶ τὸ ἀναγιγνώσκειν ἀσχολίας.
>
> Regarding the poets, I would suggest that you would not be wrong to start with Menander for the comic poets and Euripides for the tragedians, but that you should not encounter them by reading them yourself; you will get more pleasure and less pain if instead you have them acted out [ὑποκρίνασθαι] by people who are knowledgeable; for one perceives more if one does not undertake the business of reading.
>
> (Dio Chrysostom 18.6)[379]

---

[375] On *cantores* in Pliny's day, see Quinn 1982: 156-158, though the lack of documentation in Quinn's discussion does lend an aura of intuition to his findings.

[376] Starr notes that Pliny doesn't use *lectores* for his speeches; this draws attention to the fact that rhetoric, as the projection of the Roman self, differed fundamentally from poetry, which did not require authorization by the *orator*'s own performance.

[377] Starr 1990: 338 notes that Pliny (*Epistulae* 9.20.2), writing from one of his country estates, says that the slaves he brought from Rome are supervising the harvest "meque notariis et lectoribus reliquerunt."

[378] Dio Chrysostom 18.6 (cited by Starr 1990: 343); the 'oration' is addressed to an elderly friend who wishes to know about literature.

[379] For an opposing view, in which the ability of the ἀναγνώστης is discredited on just the same terms, see Jerome the Philosopher's harsh criticism of Isocrates (as reported by Dionysius of Halicarnassus *De Isocrate* 13): "Ἱερώνυμος δὲ ὁ φιλόσοφός φησιν ἀναγνῶναι μὲν ἄν τινα δυνηθῆναι τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ καλῶς, δημηγορῆσαι δὲ τήν τε φωνὴν καὶ τὸν τόνον ἐπάραντα καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ κατασκευῇ μετὰ τῆς ἁρμοττούσης ὑποκρίσεως εἰπεῖν οὐ παντελῶς. τὸ γὰρ μέγιστον καὶ κινητικώτατον τῶν ὄχλων παραιτεῖσθαι τὸ παθητικὸν καὶ ἔμψυχον. δουλεύειν γὰρ αὐτὸν τῇ λειότητι διὰ παντός, τὸ δὲ κεκραμένον καὶ παντοδαπὸν ἐπιτάσει τε καὶ ἀνέσει καὶ τὸ ταῖς παθητικαῖς ὑπερθέσεσι διειλημμένον ὑπερβεβηκέναι. καθόλου δέ φησιν αὐτὸν εἰς

The ὑπόκρισις that accompanies this ἀνάγνωσις is not necessarily to be taken as a result of the dramatic character of Menander and Euripides (since the plural of "ἑτέρων ἐπισταμένων" may be generalizing) as is suggested by a passage in Fronto. Writing to Marcus Aurelius, he imagines the emperior's use of his *lector*, Niger[380]:

> Nec dubito quin te ad ferias in secessu maritimo fruendas ita compararis: in sole meridiano ut somno oboedires cubans, deinde Nigrum vocares, libros intro ferre iuberes; mox, ut te studium legendi incessisset, aut te Plauto expolires aut Accio expleres aut Lucretio delenires aut Ennio incenderes, in horam ist<ic> Musarum propriam quintam; re<dires> inde libris . . .
> I do not doubt that in enjoying your holiday at the seaside resort you will conduct yourself thus: lying down in the noonday sun, you will pay heed to sleep, then you will call Niger, you will order him to bring in the books; then, taken with the desire to read, you will polish yourself with Plautus or fill yourself up with Accius or soothe yourself with Lucretius or burn yourself with Ennius, until the fifth hour (so appropriate to the Muses); you will then return to your books . . .
>
> (Fronto *De Feriis Alsiensibus* 3.1)

We note here that the use of books by the emperor himself is contrasted with his experience of Plautus, Accius, Lucretius, and Ennius; the latter is effected by means of Niger, the *lector*. As to Niger's own activity as *lector*, Fronto's catalogue of the four

---

ἀναγνώστου παιδὸς φωνὴν καταδύντα μήτε τόνον μήτε πάθος μήτε ὑπόκρισιν δύνασθαι φέρειν" (Jerome the philosopher says that a man can read aloud [ἀναγνῶναι] his [sc. Isocrates'] speeches well, but that turning one's voice into that of a speaker to the assembly [δημηγορῆσαι δὲ τήν τε φωνήν] and uplifting one's tone and speaking in this manner [ταύτῃ τῇ κατασκευῇ] with the appropriate gestures [μετὰ τῆς ἁρμοττούσης ὑποκρίσεως] is quite impossible [οὐ παντελῶς]; for he [sc. Jerome] advises us that what is most important and most impressive with the mob is the emotional and inspired element [τὸ παθητικὸν καὶ ἔμψυχον], and that he [sc. Isocrates] was above all the slave of smoothness and did away with [ὑπερβεβηκέναι] the variation and variegation that come with the increase and relaxation of tension, and he has not divided [his speeches] with emotional climaxes [ταῖς παθητικαῖς ὑπερθέσεσι]. Overall, he [sc. Jerome] says that he [sc. Isocrates] descends to the level of the voice of a slave ἀναγνώστης and can bear neither tone [τόνον], nor emotion [πάθος], nor acting out [ὑπόκρισιν]). Again, however, it is perhaps the fact that the genre rhetoric was situated, in the imagination of the upper classes, too far above the capacity of a slave that here provokes Jerome's scornful equation of Isocrates with an insensible ἀναγνώστης.

[380] The passage is cited by Starr 1990: 340-341.

authors whom he imagines the emperor will have read to him is in fact a generic one: elsewhere he gives essentially the same list of poets when picturing a canon.[381] The same figures appear in the following passage:

> Mitte mihi aliquid, quod tibi disertissimum videatur, quod legam, vel tuum aut Catonis aut Ciceronis aut Sallustii aut Gracchi aut poetae alicuius, χρήζω γὰρ ἀναπαύλης, et maxime hoc genus, quae me lectio extollat et diffundat ἐκ τῶν κατειληφυιῶν φροντίδων; etiam si qua Lucretii aut Enni excerpta habes εὔφωνα ἁδρά et sic ubi ἤθους ἐμφάσεις.
> Send me something to read that seems most learnèd to you, something of yours or Cato's or Cicero's or Sallust's or Gracchus' or of some poet, for *j'ai besoin de séjour*, and especially of this sort, something to read [*lectio*] to boost me and spread me out *de ces penseés ténébreuses*; even if you have some selections from Lucretius or Ennius which are *utiles-doux* [εὔφρονα ἁδρά] and especially thus where [they feature] displays of character [ἤθους ἐμφάσεις].
>
> (Fronto *Ad M. Antonium Epistulae* 4.1.3)

Aligning this request for Lucretius or Ennius with Fronto's imagined portrait of the emperor's relaxation in the company of his *lector*, we may interpret the last phrases here (excerpta . . εὔφωνα ἁδρά et sic ubi ἤθους ἐμφάσεις) with the activity of the ἀναγνώστης, for euphony, character, and ἔμφασις are all (as we have seen in our first two chapters) characterstic of ἀνάγνωσις at its most performative.

---

[381] Fronto *Ad M. Caesarem Epistulae* 4.3.2: (Oratorum post homines natos unus omnium M. Porcius eiusque frequens sectator C. Sallustius; poetarum maxime *Plautus,* multo maxime Q. Ennius eumque studiose aemulatus L. Coelius nec non Naevius, *Lucretius, Accius* etiam, Caecilius, Laberius quoque [As to orators sprung since the dawn of man (I most esteem) M. Porcius (Cato) and the one who often follows him, Sallust; as to poets, (I esteem) *Plautus* very greatly, and most greatly of all Q. *Ennius* and the one who diligently imitated him, L. Coelius, as well as Naevius, *Lucretius*, even *Accius*, Caecilius, and Laberius too]; emphasis mine); Fronto *Ad Antoninum Imperatorem De Eloquentia* 1.2 (In poetis <aut>em quis ignorat ut gracilis sit Lucilius, Albucius aridus, sublimis *Lucretius,* mediocris Pacuvius, inaequalis *Accius, Ennius* multiformis? [Among the poets, however, who does know that Lucilius is graceful, Albucius dry, *Lucretius* sublime, Pacuvius mediocre, *Accius* uneven, *Ennius* multiplicitious?]; emphasis mine).

Such then are the skills of the ἀναγνώστης as a performer, quite in keeping with the portrait of ἀνάγνωσις as evinced from Greek education and the Homer scholia. In the examples above, however, we have observed them here from the aristocratic Roman point of view, that is primarily as conduits for the authors whose works they read[382]; but they were also, of course, human personalities, as the affection felt by Cicero and Pliny for their ἀναγνώσται clearly shows.[383] They could also be

---

[382] Their lowly station appears from a passage in Epictetus (*Discourses* 1.26.14), where an ἀναγνώστης reads philosophical maxims while the disciples listen; when one of the disciples interrupts the reader and laughs at him, Epictetus rebukes him, saying that he is laughing at himself; the incident acquires its sharpness from the contrast between the slave reader and the rude disciple, while nonetheless testifying to the subordination of ἀναγνώσται even in Epictetus' school.

[383] Cicero *Ad Atticum* 1.12.4: "Quid praeterea ad te scribam non habeo, et mehercule eram in scribendo conturbatior; nam puer festivus anagnostes noster Sositheus decesserat meque plus quam servi mors debere videbatur commoverat" (I don't have anything else to write to you about, and by Hercules I was thrown into disorder in writing; for my agreeable slave ἀναγνώστης Sositheus had died and had affected me more than you would think a slave's death would do; noted by Starr 1990: 342, Balsdon 1969: 44 n.169); Pliny *Epistulae* 5.19: "Quod si essem natura asperior et durior, frangeret me tamen infirmitas liberti mei Zosimi, cui tanto maior humanitas exhibenda est, quanto nunc illa magis eget. Homo probus officiosus litteratus; et ars quidem eius et quasi inscriptio comoedus, in qua plurimum facit. Nam pronuntiat acriter sapienter apte decenter etiam; utitur et cithara perite, ultra quam comoedo necesse est. Idem tam commode orationes et historias et carmina legit, ut hoc solum didicisse uideatur. Haec tibi sedulo exposui, quo magis scires, quam multa unus mihi et quam iucunda ministeria praestaret . . . ante aliquot annos, dum intente instanterque pronuntiat, sanguinem reiecit atque ob hoc in Aegyptum missus a me post longam peregrinationem confirmatus redît nuper" (Even if I were harsher and tougher by nature, still the sickness of my freedman Zosimus would break me down; for one should be that much more kind to him now that he needs it. He is an upright, dutiful, literate man; and then there is his skill and his talent (he is practically branded for it) as an actor [comoedus], which counts for a lot. For he recites [pronuntiat] precisely, sagaciously, fittingly, even decently; he both plays the cithara skillfully (better than an actor needs to do); and again he reads [legit] orations and histories and poetry in such good taste [tam commode] that you would think he had devoted himself to such study only. I've described all this to you in detail, so that you will fully appreciate how much this one man has provided to me, and what excellent service he has done. There is also the great gentleness of the man, which his ill health itself has increased. For he is so endowed by nature that the love he stirs and rouses is no greater than the fear of being without him; which fear I am now suffering not for the first time. For a few years ago, while he was attentively and earnestly reciting [dum intente instanterque pronuntiat], he coughed up blood and therefore was sent by me to Egypt and only returned recently, healthy again, after a long stay there; noted by Balson 1969: 44 n.169); Pliny *Epistulae* 8.1.2: "Encolpius quidem lector, ille seria nostra ille deliciae, exasperatis faucibus puluere sanguinem reiecit. Quam triste hoc ipsi, quam acerbum mihi, si is cui omnis ex studiis gratia inhabilis studiis fuerit! Quis deinde libellos meos sic leget, sic amabit? Quem aures meae sic sequentur?" (Encolupius, my lector,

profoundly learned, as the case of ἀναγνώστης Agatharchides makes plain. A contemporary of Aristarchus,[384] his works are known to us only in fragments, and he is know to us chiefly from Photius' description:

> ἀνεγνώσθη Ἀγαθαρχίδου *Ἱστορικόν*· ἔνιοι δὲ αὐτὸν Ἀγάθαρχον ὀνομάζουσι. τούτωι πατρὶς μὲν ἡ Κνίδος ἦν, ἡ δὲ τέχνη γραμματικὸν ἐπεδείκνυτο· ὑπογραφέα δὲ καὶ ἀναγνώστην ὁ τοῦ Λέμβου Ἡρακλείδης, δι' ὧν αὐτῶι ἐξυπηρετεῖτο, παρέσχε γνωρίζεσθαι. ἦν δὲ καὶ θρεπτὸς[385] Κινέου. γράψαι δὲ τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον τὰ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐγνωσμένα ἐν βιβλίοις ι΄. καὶ τῶν κατὰ τὴν Εὐρώπην δὲ εἰς ϑ΄ καὶ μ΄ παρατείνεται αὐτῶι ἡ ἱστορία· ἀλλὰ καὶ ε΄ βιβλία τὴν Ἐρυθρὰν αὐτῷ πᾶσαν καὶ τὰ περὶ ταύτην ἐξιστοροῦσι. τὴν οὖν εἰρημένην ἅπασαν συγγραφὴν καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπὶ τέλει τοῦ <ε΄> λόγου εἰς μνήμην ἀνάγει, ἐν ᾧ καὶ πεπαῦσθαι τοῦ γράφειν . . . πλήν γε εἰσὶν οἵ φασιν αὐτὸν καὶ ἑτέρας συγγεγραφέναι πραγματείας, ὧν ἡμεῖς οὐδὲν οὐδέπω ἴσμεν. *Ἐπιτομὴν* δὲ αὐτόν φασι τῶν περὶ τῆς Ἐρυθρᾶς ϑαλάσσης ἀναγεγραμμένων ἐν ἑνὶ συντάξαι βιβλίῳ· καὶ μὴν καὶ *Περὶ Τρωγλοδυτῶν* βιβλία <ε΄>· ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἐπιτομὴν τῆς Ἀντιμάχου *Λύδης*· καὶ πάλιν ἄλλην *Ἐπιτομὴν* τῶν συγγεγραφότων *Περὶ συναγωγῆς ϑαυμασίων ἀνέμων*· *Ἐκλογάς* τε ἱστοριῶν αὐτὸν συντάξαι· καὶ *Περὶ τῆς πρὸς φίλους ὁμιλίας*.
> The *History* of Agatharchides was read; some name him Agatharchos. His homeland was Cnidus, and his knowledge of language [τέχνη] shows him to have been a γραμματικός. Heracleides of Lembus, questioned on the subject, gives us to know that he was a secretary and

---

my serious hours and my hours of relaxation, has a terrible sore throat and has coughed up blood from his lung. How awful this is for him, and how bitter for me, if the very one to whom I owe all my profitable study should find himself unfit for study himself! Who then will read my books in the same way, who will love them so? Whom shall my ears follow in the same way?; noted by Starr 1990: 342, Balson 1969: 44 n.169). One ἀναγνώστης of Cicero's did, however, run away (though the writer apparently made no effort to pursue him), as we learn from Cicero *Ad Familiares* 5.9.2 [Vatinus to Cicero]: "Dicitur mihi servus anagnostes fugitivus cum Vardaeis esse, de quo tu mihi nihil mandasti, ego tamen terra mariue ut conquireretur praemandavi et profecto tibi illum reperiam, nisi si in Dalmatiam aufugerit" (I am told that your fugitive slave ἀναγνώστης is among the Vardans, and though you haven't asked me about it I have nonetheless given orders that he be apprehended 'by land or sea' and I will send him straight back to you, unless he has taken refuge in Dalmatia; noted by Balson 1969: 44 n.169).

[384] Sacks 2003: 36.

[385] I have written θρεπτός; the MSS. give τρεπτός.

> ἀναγνώστης. He was raised as a slave by Cineas. They say that this man [τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον] wrote an *Observations on Affairs in Asia* in 10 books, and his history of affairs in Europe reaches to 49 books; also, he has 5 books which describe the Red Sea and the region around it. He committed the whole of this latter work, up to Book 5, to memory, at which point he stopped writing . . . There are, furthermore, some who say that he wrote on other subjects, but we know nothing of them [directly]. They say that he wrote an epitome of his work on the Red Sea in one book; and indeed also 5 books *On Burrowing Animals* [*Περὶ Τρωγλοδυτῶν*]; and also an epitome of Antimachus' *Lyde*; and again another epitome of works *On the Gathering of Fantastic Winds* [sc. *On Tornadoes*], and that he assembled *Selections from the Historians*; and *On Associating with Friends.*
>
> (Photius 213 [= *FGH* IIA 86T])

I include this long description because it is the only biography of an ἀναγνώστης to survive from antiquity. Like the *pueri doctissimi* of Atticus, Agatharchides was a slave (θρεπτός), born in Cnidus but apparently reared in Alexandria and educated for his profession; the ambiguity regarding his name is perhaps another indication of his servile status. Nevertheless, Photius accords him the title of γραμματικός on the basis of his τέχνη; employed as a secretary (ὑπογραφής, a writer who takes dictation) and also (or simultaneously) as an ἀναγνώστης, we may guess from his voluminous output and from the positively Borgesian variety of his work that his master was an Alexandrian scholar. Again in keeping with his lowly social status, his biography is unknown to Photius, who must extrapolate his character from his writings:

> ἔστι δέ, ἐξ ὧν τὸν ἄνδρα τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ διελθόντες ἐπέγνωμεν, μεγαλοπρεπής τε καὶ γνωμολογικός, καὶ τῷ μὲν τοῦ λόγου μεγέθει καὶ ἀξιώματι τῶν ἄλλων μᾶλλον χαίρων . . . εἰ δὲ καὶ τὸ τῆς ῥητορικῆς ἐπώνυμον αὐτῷ ἡ μὴ νήφουσα ψῆφος οὐκ

> ἐπέθετο, ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἔμοιγε δοκεῖ οὐδὲν ἔλαττον τῶν γραμματικῶν οὐ δεύτερος ἢ τῶν ῥητόρων, δι' ὧν καὶ γράφει καὶ διδάσκει, καταφαίνεσθαι.
> Insofar as we can come to know the man by going through his writings, he was a magnificent and thoughtful person, both in the greatness of his writing and in that he much rejoiced in the worthiness of others . . . Though the unsober vote [sc. of posterity] has not provided him with the title of rhetoric[ian], still he seems to me nonetheless to appear second to none of the γραμματικοί or ῥήτορες, according to his writings and instructiveness.
>
> (Photius 213 [= *FGH* IIA 86T])

The career of Agatharchides thus testifies to, and even incarnates in his own person, the close relationship between scholars and their ἀναγνώσται: the pride and intellectual greatness of this ἀναγνώστης (if not his freedom from pettiness) are very much typical of the pride and intellectual greatness of scholarly Alexandria. If the line between γραμματικός and ἀναγνώστης was never officially crossed by Agatharchides, posterity at least, in the form of Photius, acknowledged the close convergence of his work with that of officially sanctioned scholars.

3.3.2 Sources for Posidonius

Having reviewed the cultural role of the ἀναγνώστης as performers and (in some cases) accomplished intellectuals, we turn now to one ἀναγνώστης in particular, namely Posidonius, with whom we began this part of the present chapter. As mentioned, three scholia testify to his activity, and we may begin by quoting them in full. The first and second concern the simile of a horse at the close of Book 6, appearing in Allen's text thus:

ὑψοῦ δὲ κάρη ἔχει, ἀμφὶ δὲ χαῖται
ὤμοις ἀΐσσονται· ὁ δ' ἀγλαΐηφι πεποιθώς,
ῥίμφα ἑ γοῦνα φέρει μετά τ' ἤθεα καὶ νομὸν ἵππων·
Aloft he [the horse] holds his head, and his mane
Round his shoulders flies; and he, having gloried in his splendor,
Nimbly his knees bear him to the haunts and pasture of horses.
(VI.509-511)

Here the first scholion, assigned by modern editors to Aristonicus' reports in *Περὶ σημείων* on the ὑπομνήματα of Aristarchus and appearing in the **A** manuscript, reads (VI.511a):

> *ῥίμφα·* Ζηνόδοτος "ῥίμφ' ἑὰ γοῦνα φέρει." Ποσειδώνιος δὲ ὁ ἀναγνώστης Ἀριστάρχου <ἄνευ> διαιρέσεως τὸ ε ψιλῶς προφέρεται, παρέλκειν αὐτὸ λέγων ὡς ἐν τῷ "ἦὲ σὺ τόνδε δέδεξο," καὶ λύεται τὸ σολοικοφανές. ὁ δὲ Ὅμηρος ὑπὸ τῶν γονάτων καὶ ποδῶν φέρεσθαι λέγει· "τὸν μὲν ἄρ' ὡς εἰπόντα πόδες φέρον."
> *Nimbly* — Zenodotus [says] "He carries his [ἑά] nimble [ῥίμφ'] knees." But Posidonius the ἀναγνώστης of Aristarchus pronounces the ε with a smooth breathing and without wordbreak, saying that is a question of *diectasis* as in "Or else [ἦέ] await yourself the onset of this man" [V.228], and he solves the seeming awkwardness. Homer says that people are carried along by their knees and feet: "So he spoke and his feet carried him" [XV.405].

We may compare the second scholion, preserved in the **T** manuscript (VI.510-511a):

> *ὁ δ' ἀγλαΐηφι·* ἀντὶ τοῦ τοῦτον. | καὶ τὸ ἕ ἀντὶ τοῦ αὐτόν, φημὶ τὸ *ῥίμφα* †ι. | Ποσειδώνιος δὲ ψιλῶς τὸ ἕ προφέρεται καί φησιν αὐτὸ πλεονάζειν ὡς ἐν τῷ "ἦὲ σύ."
> *He . . . in his splendor* — In lieu of "such a one." | And the "him" in lieu of "that one," I mean the *Nimbly* †*o.* | Poseidonius pronounces the ἕ with a smooth breathing and says that it is a case of pleonasm as in "Or else . . . yourself" [V.228].[386]

[386] Here modern editors assign the first third (up to the first '|' mark) to Aristonicus, the second third (up to the second '|' mark) to an 'exegetical' source, and the third third (on Posidonius) to Aristonicus again; this is of course rather speculative, especially as all three appear in **T** (which contains mostly 'exegetical' scholia) and the syntax points at integration of all three comments (though the first and

Saving our analysis of this passage for the overall discussion of Posidonius' activity below, we turn to a second passage and the third scholion; here Apollo disguised as Mentes speaks to Hector:

> Ἕκτορ, νῦν σὺ μὲν ὧδε θέεις ἀκίχητα διώκων
> ἵππους Αἰακίδαο δαΐφρονος· οἳ δ' ἀλεγεινοὶ
> ἀνδράσι γε θνητοῖσι δαμήμεναι ἠδ' ὀχέεσθαι
> Hector, now you are thus hurrying in vain pursuing
> The horses of the war-minded descendent of Aeacus [Achilles]; they are hard
> For mortal men to master and to steer
>
> (XVII.75-77)

Here the scholion, preserved in **A** and attributed by modern editors to Nicanor, reads (XVII.75a),

> *Ἕκτορ, νῦν μὲν ὧδε·* μετὰ τὸ ὄνομα στικτέον· προσαγορευτικὴ γάρ ἐστι. τὸ δὲ *ἀκίχητα* φασὶ Ποσειδώνιον τὸν Ἀριστάρχου ἀναγνώστην τοῖς ἑξῆς προσνέμειν καὶ τὸν Ἀρίσταρχον ἀποδέχεσθαι.
> *Hector, now you are thus* — One should place a στιγμή after the proper noun, for it is a vocative. They say that Posidonius the ἀναγνώστης of Aristarchus attached the "in vain" [ἀκίχητα] to the phrase that follows and that Aristarchus took up the idea [ἀποδέχεσθαι].

Together these three scholia furnish our sole evidence for the activity of Posidonius. Nevertheless, comparing them to our understanding of the requirements of ἀνάγνωσις and the role of the ἀναγνώστης, we can extract more from them than might initially

---

second appear to repeat themselves); in the absence of an Aristonicus-signalling 'ὅτι' for the third third, it would be safer to assume that all three elements of VI.510-511a (including the report on Posidonius) have passed through an 'exegetical' source, which may have had independent access to Aristonicus source (namely Aristarchus' ὑπόμνημα); certainly, if both the third third of VI.510-511a and VI.511a derived from Aristonicus, it would be curious that the wording has been altered in the two (παρέλκειν in VI.511a vs. πλεονάζειν in VI.510-511a). Could the source of the third third of VI.510-511a be Didymus?

be supposed.

As regards sourcing, we note that, in terms of the later transmission, VI.511a appears in manuscript **A**, VI.510-511a in **T**, XVII.75a in **A** again. These passages are likewise the only ones at which Eustathius mentions Posidonius[387]; since the Byzantine commentator is apparently sufficiently interested in Posidonius to mention him at just the same points where he appears in the Homer scholia, we may suppose that Eustathius' source for Alexandrian material (the famous 'Ap.H.' authority[388]), whether or not this is synonymous with the direct source for the **A** scholia, contained these anecdotes of Posidonius and no others. Further, we note that the Posidonius material appears not only in **A** but also in **T**; and it can be shown that Eustathius had access to the shared sources *both* of VI.511a (in our **A**) *and* of VI.510-511a (in our **T**). Here is how Eustathius discusses VI.511 (at 2.377)

> τινὲς δέ φασι τὸν τοῦ Ἀριστάρχου ἀναγνώστην Ποσειδώνιον *ῥίμφαε* λέγειν ἐν ἑνὶ τρισυλλάβῳ μέρει λόγου, πλεονάσαντος, φησίν, ἐν παρολκῇ τοῦ ε, ὡς ἐν τῷ "ἠὲ σὺ τόνδε δέδεξο." καὶ ἄλλοι[389] μὲν τοιαῦτα. ὁ δὲ Ὁμηρικὸς ἀνὴρ ἥδιον ἀκούοι ἂν καὶ νῦν καινοφωνοῦντος ἐλλόγως τοῦ ποιητοῦ τὰ ἀστεῖα ταῦτα σολοικοφανῆ ἥπερ ἀνέχοιτο Ἀττικῶς φθεγγομένων ἀκροᾶσθαι τῶν ἐπιδιορθουμένων αὐτόν.
>
> Some say that Posidonius the ἀναγνώστης of Aristarchus said "Nimble" [ῥίμφαε], [i.e.] as a single trisyllable, using pleonasm, they say, in his distention of the ε, as in "Or else [ἠέ] yourself await the onset of this man" [V.228]. And others say the same thing. A Homeric man would be happy to hear a man systematically [ἐλλόγως] neologize the Poet's elegant expressions in this manner [in saying] that they seem

[387] Eustathius 2.277 and 4.17.

[388] On the nature of the 'Ap.H.' authority, see Erbse 1969.1.

[389] I have written ἄλλοι; the MS. Gives αὐτοί.

> awkward [as they stood before] and would indeed keep quiet as he listened [ἀκροᾶσθαι] to how Attic-speakers corrected [ἐπιδιορθουμένων] him.
>
> (Eustathius II.377)

Here the words "πολεονάσαντος" and "φησίν" correspond to the "πλεονάζειν" and "φησιν" of VI.510-511a (in **T**), where VI.511a (in **A**) uses the phrase "<ἄνευ> διαιρέσεως" and describes Posidonius' view without intermediary reports; yet Eustathius' ridicule of those who seek to solve a σολοικοφανής clearly aligns him also with VI.511a (in **T**), which claims that Posidonius' view "λύεται τὸ σολοικοφανές," as does his use of "παρολκῇ" where VI.511a likewise uses παρέλκειν to describe *diectasis*. It appears, then, that, even if Eustathius had access to other sources which likewise reported on Posidonius ("καὶ ἄλλοι μὲν τοιαῦτα," with my emendation), his wording suggests that a single source (probably Ap.H.) provided the bishop with his Posidonius material on VI.511, and that that source was subsequently split between **A** and **T**. This source is probably the VMK or even (since the attribution of the third third of VI.510-511a [**T**] to Aristonicus is somewhat problematic) its consitutent commentaries; either way, all the VMK scholars had access to the ὑπομνήματα of Aristarchus; and indeed it is significant that both Aristonicus and Nicanor are credited (for VI.511a / VI.510-511a and XVII.75a respectively) by modern editors as the sources for these scholia. The ultimate source for the material on Posidonius is therefore to be found in the actual writings of Aristarchus.

3.3.3 Posidonius and Aristarchus

Turning to the actual scholia, we may begin with Posidonius' ἀνάγνωσις of XVII.75-6. As we see from the pertinent scholion, Posidonius interpreted the word "ἀκίχητα" (in vain) as modifying the phrase "διώκων / ἵππους Αἰακίδαο" (pursuing the horses of the descendent of Aeacus) and not the phrase "ὧδε θέεις" (thus you hurry); the phrase "Ἕκτορ, νῦν σὺ μὲν ὧδε θέεις" thus becomes independent ("while you are thus hurrying"), its "μὲν" contrastive with the "δ'" of "οἱ δ' ἀλεγεινοί," while the phrase "ἀκίχητα διώκων / ἵππους Αἰακίδαο" fits well with the description of those horses in line 177 as not being worth the pursuit. To προσνέμειν the word ἀκίχητα is evidently an activity of the voice as opposed to an effect of any physical punctuation (Nicanor mentions none such); moreover, though the text *qua* text is evidently open (in the scholion's view) to either interpretation, a break after θέεις and before ἀκίχητα fits naturally with a basic metrical shape of the hexameter, namely the hephthemimeral caesura. Thus on grounds both of sense and of sound Posidonius' decision to associate ἀκίχητα with the material that follows is hardly surprising; if anything, it is any association of ἀκίχητα with ὧδε θέεις that would strike us as idiosyncratic. Nevertheless, the scholion is quite clear that Aristarchus based his view of the best ἀνάγνωσις of the line on Posidonius' aural interpretation; since Aristarchus' views on ἀνάγνωσις (among other things) were passed down in a

ὑπόμνημα,[390] however, this further implies that the great scholar both endorsed Posidonius' interpretation in his own work and (since, as we have seen, the ultimate source for our accounts of Posidonius is Aristarchus himself) described Posidonius' ἀνάγνωσις in that work. In other words, in the case of a question which could only be decided on the basis of ἀνάγνωσις, Aristarchus not only felt obliged to express a view but in fact had enough confidence in the authority of Posidonius' ἀνάγνωσις as to make it the basis for his own opinion on the subject of ἀκίχητα.

In the above example, the interpretation of the text is necessarily a question of ἀνάγνωσις, but the scope of that ἀνάγνωσις extends only to the performance of the poem; thus Aristarchus first and Nicanor in turn must call attention to (and endorse) Posidonius' ἀνάγνωσις in commentaries independent of the physical text of the poem. In our second example of Posidonius' activity, however, we find the ἀναγνώστης having a lasting impact on the actual wording of the poem and thus collaborating in the very act of διόρθωσις which made Aristarchus' reputation. Regarding lines 510-511 in Book 6 and the problematic word ῥίμφ-, we learn from VI.511a that Zenodotus' text read "ριμφεα"; as Zenodotus did not write a ὑπόμνημα but only offered a text,[391] the scholiast's report that Zenodotus had "ῥίμφ' ἐὰ γοῦνα φέρει" (Nimbly [ῥίμφ'] he carries his own [ἐά] knees) depends upon the interpretation by an

---

[390] Many of Aristarchus' comments (as reported by the VMK scholars) of course involve ἀνάγνωσις; they are not dealt with in the present study because they may all be read as referencing the act of reading in and of itself as opposed to the act of reading aloud; they mostly involve the disambiguation of potentially ambiguous wordbreak.

[391] Pfeiffer 1968: 115.

ἀναγνώστης of "ριμφεα" as "ῥίμφ' ἑά." By contrast, the Vulgate text reads "ῥίμφα ἑ γοῦνα φέρει," which would earlier have appeared as "ριμφαεγουναφερει," that is with αε following ριμφ where Zenodotus' text had εα. Thus it appears that Posidonius interpretation of "ῥίμφαε γοῦνα φέρει" (He carries his nimble knees) is based on the Vulgate text, as the analogy with "ἠέ" (where the *ε* follows the first vowel) makes clear.

How, then, does Posidonius' reading "solve the σολοικοφανές"? Indeed, what text is characterized by a "σολοικοφανές"? The two candidates are the text of Zenodotus, whose "ριμφεαγουναφερει" (= ῥίμφ' ἑὰ γοῦνα φέρει) places a rather strange emphasis on the horse's "own" [ἑὰ] knees, and the text of the Vulgate, whose "ὁ δ' ἀγλαΐῃφι πεποιθώς / ῥίμφα ἑ γοῦνα φέρει" leaves the first phrase ("ὁ δ' ἀγλαΐῃφι πεποιθώς) without a verb and features a sudden *acolouthon* and change of subject (to γοῦνα from ὁ [the horse]). With regard to the latter text, however, it is not unparalleled for Homeric noun-phrases to stand independently with a change of subject, while (as VI.511a itself notes just after mentioning Posidonius' solution of the σολοικοφανές) it is usual for Homeric heroes to *be carried* by their limbs. Thus there is no clear σολοικοφανές in the case of the Vulgate's "ῥίμφα ἑ"; it follows that the σολοικοφανές is that of the text of Zenodotus. Posidonius' λύσις is thus a λύσις of the text of Zenodotus, resulting in a change of the text from ριμφεα to ριμφαε; though the Vulgate word-division of ριμφαε as ῥίμφα ἑ goes beyond Posidonius' ῥίμφαε, it appears to depend on this prior change. Aristarchus was apparently

familiar with a pronunciation of ῥίμφα ἑ, for in both VI.511a and VI.510-511a (which presumably stem from Aristarchus) specifically say that Posidonius pronounced the ε without aspiration; still, though we get no specific phrase such as "Ἀρίσταρχον ἀποδέχεσθαι" here as in XVII.75a, the great scholar here appears to be giving credit to Posidonius, in his act of ἀνάγνωσις, for noticing and emending a σολοικοφανές on the part of a scholar. Such a finding also indicates, incidentally, that the shapshot, as it were, of the relationship between ἀναγνώστης and scholar provided here by VI.511a and VI.510-511a actually situates them in a specific historical moment, and an important one at that, namely during the ἀνάγνωσις of Zenodotus' text of the *Iliad*, with Posidonius engaged in his ἀνάγνωσις and Aristarchus as his critically engaged audience. Finally, we may note that the wording of VI.511a appears to attribute a degree of scholarly familiarity with Homer to Posidonius himself: "τὸ ε ψιλῶς προφέρεται," it says, "παρέλκειν αὐτὸ λέγων ὡς ἐν τῷ "ἠὲ σὺ τόνδε δέδεξο," followed by the evidence for heroes' being carried by limbs. The subject of λέγων is the subject of προφέρεται, namely Posidonius, and complements (participially) his act of προφορά; the phrase "παρέλκειν αὐτο λέγων" appears to mean "saying that it should be the object of *diectasis*." Bearing in mind that there is no independent evidence that Posidonius wrote a treatise on Homer, and that this scholion derives from the ὑπόμνημα of Aristarchus, we are not out of place in suggesting that Aristarchus here not only describes what Posidonius did but even reports the rationale Posidonius provided for his alteration of Zenodotus' text, complete with supporting

example of *diectasis* in the form of the "ἠὲ σὺ τόνδε δέδεξο" taken from Book 5. That Aristarchus is willing to report not only the critical judgment of his ἀναγνώστης but also his rationale points, I suggest, to a profound degree of engagement with the Homeric text on the part this Alexandrian ἀναγνώστης, the result (presumably) of a thorough and to some degree authoritative experience with the task of Homeric ἀνάγνωσις.

3.4 Conclusion: ὅτι ϑηλυκῶς τὴν Ἴλιον

In this chapter, we have explored both the imagined audience of the Homer scholia and a particularly important instance of a real performer-audience relationship in the collaboration between Posidonius the ἀναγνώστης and his master, Aristarchus the γραμματικώτατος. By comparing these two audiences, we may hope to arrive a better understanding of the purpose behind the Homer scholia's specifications for ἀνάγνωσις as detailed in Chapter 2.

First, we observed that the Homer scholia imagine two types of audience, consisting on the one hand of ordinary listeners without specialized knowledge of the plot of the *Iliad* or of the epic background to the Homeric universe. The first type is subject to all the emotions of an audience rapt up in a vivid and exciting story; the second is able to perceive a deeper frame of reference underlying particular scenes (such as Agamemnon's prophecy of Troy's fall or Proteus' reference to battles at

Troy). While simultaneously advising their readership of the effects of the poem on the ordinary audience, then, the Homer scholia both acknowledge that a second type of listener exists and, by the very nature of their exegesis, serve to renew that scholarly audience. In terms of our real-life audience at Alexandria, represented by Aristarchus but surely to be generalized to the larger community of ancient scholars, we observed an ἀναγνώστης whose performance of the *Iliad* was sufficiently authoritative, and perhaps sufficiently knowledgable, as to impress the supreme critic; on questions not only of ordinary ἀνάγνωσις (where to punctuate, for example, as in the case of ἀκίχητα above) but of the correct wording of the poem, the success or failure of a given ἀνάγνωσις was evidently a criterion of authenticity for Aristarchus. What, however, was the relationship of Aristarchus' own work to ἀνάγνωσις in the educational context described in Chapter 1?

Modern scholars have traditionally regarded the methodology and purpose of Aristarchus' ὑπομνήματα as foreshadowing the methodologies and purposes of modern textual criticism[392]; consequently, in this view,

> Aristarchus' commentaries (on Homer as well as Plato) were not meant to reach a wide audience, and were used only in the library by other scholars. Their circulation was thus inevitably limited. However, . . . Aristarchean Homeric exegesis was saved for future generations, thanks to the work of Didymus and Aristonicus, and later Herodian and Nicanor (via the *Viermännerkommentar*) . . .[393]

According to this school of thought, any engagement on the part of Aristarchus with

---

[392] Eg. Schironi 2005: 423, who refers to an "Aristarchus [who was] a 'scientific' scholar with wide interests who employed a clear and constant methodology."
[393] Schironi 2005: 434.

ἀνάγνωσις would be incidental to his specialized criticism of the Homeric text, either in his διορθώσεις (editions) or in the ὑπομνήματα. Nevertheless, there is evidence (not, as it happens, concerned with ἀνάγνωσις) that Aristarchus had in mind a much broader readership for his ὑπομνήματα, one that extended to ordinary readers of the *Iliad.* The gender of the noun Ἴλιον appears to have been of particular interest to him: at no less than 33 points in the Homer scholia we read a note introduced by "ὅτι" which notes that the gender of Ἴλιον in the poem is (rather counterintuitively) feminine[394]; of these, all but seven[395] are literally identical, consisting of "ὅτι θηλυκῶς τὴν Ἴλιον" (The Poet [treats] Ilium as feminine); all appear in manuscript **A** except for XV.71c, which appears in **T**. In addition, the phrase appears in no less than two surviving papyri of ancient ὑπομνήματα.[396]

The conclusion seems in inescapable that these notes derive from Aristarchus and are aimed at non-specialist readers. It might be objected that nearly all of them appear in **A**, and moreover in its interlinear scholia ($\mathbf{A}^{im}$) or its scholia on the interior-marginal or intermarginal areas ($\mathbf{A}^{m}$ or $\mathbf{A}^{int}$), and that their frequency might be the result of over-zealousness on the part of the 10th century arrangers of the Venetus A codex; but the appearance of the same phrase in **T** (at XV.71c, which features both an

---

[394] The scholia in question are **III.305b**, **IV.46b**[1], **IV.46b**[2], **IV.416**, **V.210**, **V.648**, **VI.96b**, **VI.277**, **VI.448c**, **VII.20**, **VII.82**, **VII.413**, **VII.429**, **VIII.499**, **IX.419a**, **IX.686**, **XI.196**, **XII.115**, **XIII.657c**, **XIII.724**, **XV.56a**, **XV.71a**, **XV.71b**, **XV.71c**, **XV.558**, **XV.193**, **XX.216**, **XXI.128**, **XXI.515**, **XXIII.64b**, **XXIII.297c**, **XXIV.143**, and **XXIV.383**.

[395] **III.305b**, **IV.46b**[2], **XV.56a**, **XV.71a**, **XV.71b**, **XV.71c**, and **XVII.193**.

[396] Erbse 1969.2 Papyrus 2a (ln. 7) and Erbse 1969.2 Papyrus 5 (on ln. 277). The former reads "(ἡ διπλῆ) δὲ παράκειτα[ι | . . . τὴν] Ἴλιον θηλυκῶς ὡς (ἐστιν) α[," while the latter only slightly expands the codices' formula: "*αἴ κεν Τυδέο[ς υἱ-* | *ὸν ἀπόσχηι Ἰλίου ἱ]ρῆς·* τὸ σημεῖο(ν) ὅ(τι) θηλυκῶ[ς τὴν Ἰ- | λιον . . .]."

$\mathbf{A}^{m}$ and $\mathbf{A}^{im}$ scholion to similar effect in **A**) and (most of all) in two papyri, together with the fact that they are introduced by a ὅτι such as served to point Aristonicus' readers to a critical sign in their texts of the poem, negates this objection. It might be objected that, since Aristarchus' ὑπομνήματα may have been subdivided by book, it was necessary to indicate the gender of Ἴλιον in each book; but the presence of three such scholia in Book 4, three in Book 6, four in Book 7, two in Book 9, and so on, indicates that Aristarchus was pointing out the gender of Ἴλιον more than once *per* ὑπόμνημα — indeed, their frequency suggests that *every* instance of a feminine Ἴλιον resulted in a comment by Aristarchus. Finally, it might be objected (rather desperately) that the frequency of these scholia derives from Aristonicus; but if we allow that a ὅτι in the Homer scholia does not necessarily indicate the deriviation of the subsequent scholion from Aristarchus then we dislodge the single most important philological plank of modern interpretation of Alexandrian scholarship.

In fact, if we examine the scholia on the gender of Ἴλιον which do not literally follow the pattern of "ὅτι θηλυκῶς τὴν Ἴλιον," we find that Σ XVII.193 includes the verb εἶπε ("ὅτι θηλυκῶς εἶπε τὴν Ἴλιον"), adding little to our knowledge; but III.305b and XV.71b read (respectively) "ὅτι θηλυκῶς ἀεὶ τὴν Ἴλιον" and "ἀεὶ θηλυκῶς λέγει ὁ ποιητής." This is not the case in our texts: at XV.71 the line reads,

> Ἴλιον αἰπὺ ἕλοιεν Ἀθηναίης διὰ βουλάς
> They [the Achaeans] should take lofty Ilium through the counsels of Athena
> (XV.71)

From the point of view of formulaic composition, of course, this appears to us the

mixing together of formulae such as "αἰπὺς ὄλεθρος" or "αἰπὺς Ὄλυμπος" (both of these usually close the line but each appear once at the opening of the second foot [at XIV.99 and XV.84 respectively], as αἰπὺ does here) with formulae featuring ἕλοιεν or ἕλοιτο (which *always* close the line except in this case): in other words, the composer has here substituted ἕλοιεν for the ὄλεθρος in αἰπὺς ὄλεθρος and reapplied this cadence in a manner analogous with the αἰπὺς ὄλεθαρος of XIV.99 or the αἰπὺς Ὄλυμπος of XV.84. What could be more natural than to combine this with a line-initial Ἴλιος, which appears in that slot 31 times elsewhere?[397] Except that here creative exuberance has neglected the usual gender of Ilium: Ἴλιον αἰπεῖαν ἕλοιεν would not scan.

What appears to us as a soluble riddle of formulaic composition, however, was naturally a subject for debate among ancient scholars. The scholia at IV.46b^2 (on "Ἴλιος ἱρή") notes the exceptional character of this line, saying,

> *Ἴλιος ἱρή·* διὰ παντὸς θηλυκῶς, ἅπαξ δὲ οὐδετέρως "Ἴλιον αἰπὺ ἕλοιεν Ἀθηναίης διὰ βουλάς."
> *Holy Ilium* — Almost always [the Poet treats Ilium] as feminine, once in the neuter [with] "They should take lofty Ilium through the counsels of Athena."

The scholion is not attributed to a particular source in this case; IV.46b^2 appears in the main marginal scholia of **A**, while there is another (formulaic) scholion on this topic in the **A**^{im} scholia (IV.46b^1) whose ὅτι marks it as stemming from Aristonicus; more than likely, therefore, this is a case of separate transmission of **A** and **A**^{im} scholia

---

[397] For the *loci,* see Prendergast 1962: 206-207.

deriving from the same source. In any case, the exceptional character of the neuter at XV.71 is noted *ad loc.* by XV.71a, which *does* feature a ὅτι:

> ὅτι νῦν μόνως οὐδετέρως εἴρηται *Ἴλιον.*
> [The critical sign appears] because here [νῦν] uniquely he [sc. the Poet] says *Ilium* is neuter.

So when Ilium does appear in the neuter here, Aristarchus comments upon it; there is another scholion at this passage, however, which suggests that that comment included an alternative reading or suggestion for "Ἴλιον αἰπὺ ἔλοιεν," the phrase which caused the trouble (XV.71b [$\mathbf{A}^{im}$]):

> †ἀρίσταρχος† "Ἴλιον ἐκπέρσωσιν."
> †Aristarchus† [read / suggested] "They [the Achaeans] should sack Ilium"

The modern editor has daggered the proper name not because the sense is unclear, of course, but because we have already seen Aristarchus saying that this is the only place where the Poet treats Ilium as feminine (IV.46b[2] and XV.71a) and (what appears to be a contradiction) that the Poet *always* treats Ilium as feminine (III.305b and XV.71b). In fact, there are three different scholia, all on XV.71 and all in **A**, which offer three different views on the problem. We may add a fourth view: according to XV.56a (assigned to Aristonicus by modern editors), the whole of XV.56-77 (the bulk of Zeus's speech to Hera) was doubted by Aristarchus and athetized[398]: among the

---

[398] **XV.56a**: "ἀπὸ τούτου ἕως τοῦ "λισσομένη τιμῆσαι" [XV.77] ἀθετοῦνται στίχοι εἴκοσι δύο, ὅτι οὐκ ἀναγκαίως παλιλλογεῖται περὶ τῶν ἑξῆς ἐπεισαχθησομένων καὶ κατὰ τὴν σύνθεσίν εἰσιν εὐτελεῖς. καὶ ὅτι ὡς ἐπίπαν πρὸς τὸ δεύτερον πρότερον ἀπαντᾷ, νῦν δὲ πρὸς τὸ πρότερον ἀπήντηκεν, <ὅφρ' ἡ μὲν μετὰ λαὸν Ἀχαιῶν.> ψεῦδος δὲ καὶ τὸ "φεύγοντες δ' ἐν νηυσὶ πολυκλήϊσι πέσωσι / Πηλείδεω Ἀχιλῆος" [XV.63-64]· οὔτε γὰρ παραγεγόνασιν ἕως τῶν

reasons for this large-scale athetesis is that at XV.71 "ἀσύνηθες δὲ καὶ οὐδετέρως τὸ Ἴλιον νῦν ῥηθέν, "Ἴλιον αἰπὺ ἔλοιεν'· πάντοτε γὰρ θηλυκῶς λέγει" (Contrary to normal usage Ilium is here treated as a neuter, 'They should take lofty Ilium'; always he treats it as a feminine). Thus, to sum up, we have strong evidence that Aristarchus a) viewed the neuter at XV.71 as an exception; b) did not acknowledge it; c) suggested that the phrase containing it should be replaced; and d) considered the neuter to be one reason to doubt the episode in which is contained.

Returning to the issue of the frequency of the formulaic "ὅτι θηλυκῶς τὴν Ἴλιον," we are tempted to regard the 27 instances of this comment which are simply declarative (29 if we include the papyri) as effects of the debate on the neuter at XV.71. Nevertheless, such a view would involve a number of rather strange suppositions. First, we should not discount the idea that all four of Aristarchus' views on the neuter (as sketched above) were in fact mutually compatible: Aristarchus could have viewed the neuter as an exception, suggested that it should (if retained) be replaced, and still cast doubt on the passage — all in his ὑπόμνημα. But why then would he go to the trouble of noting instances that conformed to the rule? His reasons

---

Ἀχιλλέως νεῶν οὔτε τὸν Πάτροκλον ἀνέστησεν ἐπὶ τὸν πόλεμον ὁ Ἀχιλλεύς. καὶ τὸ "πέσωσιν" [XV.63] οὐχ Ὁμηρικόν· μᾶλλον γὰρ ἐκεῖνος τὸ ἐμπεσεῖν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐνσεῖσαι τίθησιν· "ἔφαντο γὰρ οὐκέτ' Ἀχαιούς / σχήσεσθ', ἀλλ' ἐν νηυσὶ μελαίνῃσι<ν> πεσέεσθαι" [XII.125-126]; ἡ δὲ παλίωξις οὐχ Ὁμηρικῶς παρείληπται· οὐ γὰρ λέγεται οὕτως ψιλῶς παρ' αὐτῷ ἡ φυγή, ἀλλ' ὅταν ἐκ μεταβολῆς οἱ πρότερον φεύγοντες διώκωσι· σαφῶς γὰρ ἐν ἄλλοις φησὶν "εἰ δέ χ' ὑποστρέψωσι, παλίωξις δὲ γένηται" [XII.71]. ἀσύνηθες δὲ καὶ οὐδετέρως τὸ Ἴλιον νῦν ῥηθέν, "Ἴλιον αἰπὺ ἔλοιεν" [XV.71] · πάντοτε γὰρ θηλυκῶς λέγει. ἐν δὲ τῷ "λισσομένη τιμῆσαι" [XV.77] φησὶν ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος ὅτι οὐδαμῆ τὸν Ἀχιλλέα "πτολίπορθον" εἴρηκεν, ἀλλὰ "ποδάρκη" καὶ "ποδώκη." "

for suspecting the neuter at XV.71 are specific to that passage; nor would a specialist in Homeric poetry, who (according to Schironi and the general view of Aristarchus) constituted the principal reader of Aristarchus' commentary, need to be reminded so unremittingly of the gender of a common (and important) noun: a single comment such as we find at IV.46b[2] and XV.71a, to the effect that Ilium is always feminine, would suffice.

I believe that, in these circumstances, it makes more sense to think there are two distinct issues at hand in Aristarchus' discussion of the gender of Ilium: on the one hand, the debate surrounding the neuter at XV.71; on the other, a more consistent advertisement of the authentic gender of Ilium whenever it appears. This latter procedure would be senseless and somewhat patronizing if addressed to Aristarchus' fellow Homeric scholars; rather, these notes ὅτι θηλυκῶς τὴν Ἴλιον should be regarded as addressed by Aristarchus to readers apt to mistake the gender of a feminine noun in –ιον, that is to say, the general reader or the student at the grammatical level of education busily being initiated into Homer. If this is the case, it would mean that the whole of Aristarchus' task of commenting on the Homeric poems was addressed to a much wider audience. In this light, the distance between scholarly practice and classroom procedure greatly diminishes; having observed Aristarchus as an audience-member listening to his ἀναγνώστης, we may also imagine him writing for those students engaged in learning to practice ἀνάγνωσις themselves. Given Aristarchus' importance in the scholarly tradition represented by the scholia whose

comments are (as we know) often addressed to the task of ἀνάγνωσις, we may situate the great Alexandrian himself in an educative and ἀνάγνωσις-oriented cultural environment — as, in his own conception, one ἀκροατής among many ἀκούοντες.

Conclusion

In a word, this dissertation has explored the relationship between a culture and a text. The culture is that of literary antiquity on a broad scale, from the 2nd century BC into the Late Antique period; in particular, we have focused on the educational aspect of that literary culture, in which students were initiated into literature by the γραμματικός. The text is the scholia to Homer, representing the distillation by medieval copyists of many layers of commentary on the Homeric poets by ancient scholars. Both ancient literary culture and ancient scholarship demonstrate, as we have seen, a sustained engagement with ἀνάγνωισις (reading aloud); but it remains to clarify the degree to which ἀνάγνωσις in the Homer scholia is dependent on ἀνάγνωσις in the ancient classroom, or the degree to which ἀνάγνωσις in the ancient classroom is dependent on the commentary of Homeric scholars. In concluding the present study, we may usefully review the findings of the foregoing chapters as they relate both to culture and to text and thus attempt a synthetic portrait of Homeric ἀνάγνωσις; with the help of comparative evidence from Anglo-Saxon England, we may hope to situate the Homer scholia within the broader framework of ἀνάγνωσις in antiquity.

The first chapter, "Ἀνάγνωσις in Greek education," studied the training of young people in the reading aloud of poetic texts. Noting that, in both Quintilian and Ausonius, technical aspects such as proper pacing (including the regulation of pauses), the distinction of one verse from another, and the expression of syntactical relationships were joined with dramatic aspects such as the bringing to life of fictional characters and the overall self-presentation of the reader as an energetic and manly renewer of the classics, we compared these literary (and perhaps idealized) portraits of the young reader with the reader as he appears in documentary evidence. Rejecting the view of R. Cribiore that reading aloud functioned as a means of assisting the beginner with the difficulties of *scriptio continua*, we instead interpreted marks of accentuation and punctuation in the papyrological remains as evidence of engagement by readers (including, in the example of Cribiore no. 113, young readers) with the articulation of the Homeric hexameter as an 'aural' entity, one with a metrical and melodic contour that must be respected and thus with a potential for the expression of nuance that must be exploited. The papyrological evidence for ἀνάγνωσις was thus seen to correspond closely with Quintilian's and Ausonius' insistence on proper pacing and the expression of syntactical relationships. The bringing to life of fictional characters, however, together with the challenge of self-representation, was most to the fore in the scholia to the *Ars Grammatica* of Dionysius Thrax, where the first five chapters (and particularly §2 Περὶ ἀναγνώσεως) portrayed ἀνάγνωσις both as a skill

and as an activity. Of the three aspects of ἀνάγνωσις mentioned in Dionysius' injunction "Ἀναγνωστέον δὲ καθ' ὑπόκρισιν, κατὰ προσῳδίαν, κατὰ διαστολήν," we found that the scholia dwelt particularly on ὑπόκρισις (acting out), and moreover appeared to relate the generous amount of background information they provide on various genres to how those genres should be expressed in performance: in thus recreating, if only through his and his audience's imagination, the original performance context of, say, an Attic tragedy, the young reader was also to assimilate the personality of the speaker(s) in his text, provoking the pity of the audience, for example, when reading a pitiable lament. This aspect of ἀνάγνωσις in the DT scholia corresponds strikingly to Ausonius' idea that his grandson will be "renewing" the classics he reads. Finally, the first chapter turned to epigraphical evidence for competitive ἀνάγνωσις by school-aged young people, whereby it was deduced that ἀνάγνωσις was akin to, while remaining distinct from, rhapsodic performance (if the ἀνταπόδοσις ὑποβολῆς of the inscription from Teos is to be equated with the latter); it thus appeared that ἀνάγνωσις was not confined simply to the classroom but was part of a larger phenomenon of competitive performance of poetry at festivals; furthermore, competition on Chios (probably held at the 'Homeric gymnasium') could be seen as a real example of imaginative connection with original performance contexts by the reader as performer, such as we appear to find in the scholia to Dionysius Thrax. In concluding the first chapter, we observed that the Late Antique

Hermeneumata exhibit classroom situations that feature many of these aspects of ἀνάγνωσις, including the assimilation of background information prior to the act of reading, the 'oral' instruction of the student in how to read by means of a model reading by the teacher, and a simple form of 'relay poetics' among students.

The second chapter, "Performance-oriented ἀνάγνωσις in the Homer scholia," turned from the literary culture of antiquity as reflected in Greek education to a particular text, looking for those references to ἀνάγνωσις (explicit or implicit) in the Homer scholia which unambiguously reference a *viva voce* presentation of the poem. As in the literary culture described in Chapter 1, the regulation of ἀνάγνωσις apparent in the Homer scholia can again be divided into those elements concerned with small-scale regulation of pacing and those concerned with larger-scale regulation of ἦθος; though the former is more concerned with narrative and the latter with character, we found many instances of overlap, in which punctuation (or rather the ἔμφασις it could effect) brought out aspects of character, or in which tone of voice and delivery applied to the narrative. Some of the latter examples were particularly evocative, as the scholia told us to read Achilles' speech to Apollo "like a proud man threatening a god" would do, or the narrative of Patroclus' arming scene in such a manner as to express the hero's desire to do battle. The bulk of the ἦθος-oriented remarks appeared in the 'exegetical' scholia, that is in those scholia untraceable to the VMK scholars; those

regulating ἀνάγωνσις so as to achieve various effects of ἔμφασις (the 'display' of the unspoken) belonged (as comments on punctuation) to Nicanor.

The third chapter, "Audiences and Scholars," turned to the portrayal of the generalized ἀκροατής (audience-member) and to one audience-member in particular, the great Homerist Aristarchus of Samothrace; the chapter thus addressed both the culture of ἀνάγνωσις (in assessing Aristarchus' relationship with his ἀναγνώστης, Posidonius) and with the text of the Homer scholia. With regard to the ἀκροατής, we found that the Homer scholia do not describe an interaction between ἀκροατής (or the ἀκούοντες) and the reader aloud but rather imagine the audience as listening to 'the Poet,' Homer himself; nevertheless, though the audience is generally imagined as relatively naïve and thus subject to suspense, anticipation (sometimes frustrated), and the effects of attentiveness and relaxation, there are indeed instances in which the audience demonstrates a remarkable knowledge of Homeric poetry and an ability to understand widely separated lines (separated even across epics) in relation to one another. For this reason, it was proposed that the scholia depict two types of audience, a general public on the one hand and a scholarly public on the other; the fact that the scholia can reference the latter appeared to confirm that the audiences imagined by the scholia represent a projection of a generalized and (doubtless) idealized audience onto actual, contemporary audiences for the ἀνάγνωσις of the *Iliad.* Turning to one actual audience-performer interaction in the recitation of Zenodotus' text of Homer by

Posidonius, we observed that the professionalism of the ἀναγνώστης in this case resulted in Aristarchus' changing his text of Homer. The great Alexandrian was thus seen to be respectful of the authority of ἀνάγνωσις as an interpretive act; nevertheless, through an analysis of the common Aristarchean comment "ὅτι ϑηλυκῶς τὴν Ἴλιον," we concluded the chapter by arguing that Aristarchus' own commentaries were not oriented solely towards an intellectual readership and that he will consequently not have viewed the correct ἀνάγνωσις of Homer purely as the province of professional ἀναγνώσται but as an act of interest and importance for beginners also.

We may attempt a synthesis of this diverse material by asking after the relationship between the culture and the text with which this dissertation is concerned. Is it the case, we wonder, that the Homer scholia themselves (or the commentaries on which they are based) were oriented towards Greek education? Is the regulation of ἀνάγνωσις in those scholia intended as the regulation of classroom ἀνάγνωσις, and is the audience imagined in fact the audience of schoolboys and teachers?

On the one hand, there are several reasons why we might answer this question in the affirmative. The first is the fact that, according to the *Hermeneumata*, the information contained in the Homer scholia corresponds to the information studied in the classroom prior to the act of ἀνάγωνσις (and doubtless also as part of general literary education): the *Colloquia Monacensia* speak of "expositiones (ἐξηγήσεις),

sensus (διανοίας), personas (πρόσωπα)" (*CGL* III.647.2) as the subjects of a teacher's discourse to his students, and the *Celtes* mentions "locum, suasoriam, controversiam, historiam, comoediam, narrationes, omnem industriam orationis, causas Troiici belli" (*Celtes* [Dionisotti 1972: 100]), just as the Homer scholia contain mythographic material, summaries of the action in the poem, and λύσεις ἐκ τοῦ προσώπου; the teacher's activity in correcting the text prior to ἀνάγνωσις (as in the *Commentarius Melampodis* [*GG* I.3.12]) corresponds to the abundant comments in the Homer scholia on accentuation and punctuation; and the student himself (in the *Celtes* colloquy [Dionyisotti: 1972: 100] employs a ὑπόμνημα together with his λέξεις and τέχνη. Regardless of whether we regard the ancient Homeric commentary as a "teacher's tool" or as a textbook, therefore, there does seem to be a correspondence between the raw material of the commentary and the subject of the lessons of the ancient classroom. Of particular interest to us is the fact that, in addressing ἀνάγνωσις in a sizeable number of passages, the Homer scholia may be presumed to assume that ἀνάγνωσις is the medium in which the Homeric poems will be heard, while in providing advice as to how to punctuate or deliver particular lines, they address a reader interested in improving his ἀνάγνωσις of Homer: correspondingly, as we observed in Chapter 1, the scholia to Dionysius Thrax insist that the ἀρετή and

κάματον of σκεψάμενοι ἄνδρες (surely a reference to ancient scholarship[398]) is staked anew in every act of ἀνάγνωσις:

> ἐπιφέρει τοῦτο, ὅτι ἐὰν μὴ παραφυλάττωνται ταῦτα, ὡς προείρηται, *καὶ τὰς τῶν ποιημάτων ἀρετὰς καταρρίπτει*, τουτέστιν . . . καὶ τῶν σκεψαμένων ἀνδρῶν τὸν ἐνάρετον κάματον καταβάλλει εἰς ἔδαφος. *Καὶ τὰς ἕξεις τῶν ἀναγινωσκόντων. Ἕξεις*· τὰς σχέσεις, τὰς μαθήσεις, τὰς διδαχάς, τουτέστιν ὧν τινων μετέσχον καὶ ἀντελάβοντο τῆς μαθήσει· *καταγελάστους*· ἀξίας καταγέλωτος, ἀποβλήτους, ἀδοκίμους· *παρίστησι*· δείκνυσιν· ἤτοι τὰς μαθήσεις καὶ διδαχὰς τῶν ἀναγινωσκόντων ἀξίας καταγέλωτος δείκνυσιν. Ὅθεν δεῖ ἑκάστου ποιήματος τὴν ὑπόκρισιν παραφυλάττειν, ἵνα καὶ τῶν σκεψαμένων ἀνδρῶν ἡ ἀρετὴ διαφαίνηται καὶ ἡ τέχνη τοῦ ἀναγινώσκοντος.
>
> He [Dionysius] adds this, that if they [sc. the readers] do not observe all this as described, "he [sc. the reader] disgraces the excellences of the poems," that is . . . he reduces the virtuous toil of critics [σκεψαμένων ἀνδρῶν] to the lowest level. *And the skills of the readers. Skills* [refers to] the preparations, the things learnt, the things taught, that is the things they [the (faulty) readers] had picked up in their learning. *Ridiculous* [means] worthy of ridicule, degraded, disreputable. *Establishes*: diplays; so they [sc. the readers] display how the things learnt by and the things taught to the readers are worthy of ridicule. Thus it is that one must observe the [proper] ὑπόκρισις of each poem, so that the virtue of the critics [σκεψαμένων ἀνδρῶν] made manifest, as also the skill [τέχνη] of the one reading aloud.
>
> (*Commentarius Melampodis, GG* I.3.22)

Finally, we have seen that Aristarchus himself offered comments (in our example, comments on the gender of Ilium) which were oriented towards beginners; and Aristarchus is the principal god of the scholiasts. Taken together, these correspondences might suggest that Greek education and the Homer scholia together form a closed circle: students and teachers would look to the authority of scholars in

---

[398] See note 139 above.

their ἀνάγνωσις of the Homeric text, while scholars would compete for authority among a readership of students and teachers. The Alexandrians would thus be imagined as γραμματικοί by students accustomed to emulating their own instructors, while teachers could see themselves as engaged in the same activity — the exposition of Homer, including the inculcation of proper ἀνάγνωσις — as were the Alexandrians themselves.

Nevertheless, the hypothesis of a closed circle does not account for the full importance of ἀνάγνωσις in ancient literary culture as a whole. As we have seen from the epigraphical evidence of Mylasa, Teos, Chios, and Cnidus, students could take their ἀνάγνωσις outside the classroom and compete with other young readers at festivals; those festivals were not limited to the subjects of education, however, and were thus not 'educational' festivals: they included (on the 'artistic' side) cithara-playing, painting, dancing, and song-singing, and (on the 'athletic' side) running, javelin, and wrestling. Moreover, these festivals featured events in which the participants did not belong to the age categories of grammatical education: though one might learn effective ἀνάγνωσις with the γραμματικός, there was apparently a larger public for such performance by young people, presumably the same public as the one interested in performance by ῥαψῳδοί in Boeotia in the 2nd century AD. Moreover, if ἀνάγνωσις by the young was thus not limited to the classroom, neither was ἀνάγνωσις itself limited to the young: in fact, a whole profession of ἀναγνώσται

(consisting usually of slaves) was responsible for much of aristocratic antiquity's experience of literature; indeed, according to Dio Chrysostom if not Jerome the Philosopher, ἀνάγνωσις by such a professional was the ideal way to experience a classic text. Aristarchus himself, as we have seen, employed Posidonius in this manner, and if his commentaries were indeed composed for use by students *inter alios*, there is no reason to think that the very ἀναγνώστης whose observations on Homer he incorporated would be excluded from the list of people to whom he addressed his remarks on ἀνάγνωσις.

It seems, then, that we must add a significant qualification to the hypothesis of a closed circle as between ἀνάγνωσις in the Homer scholia and ἀνάγνωσις in the ancient classroom. The commentary passed down by the scholiasts (reflecting the works of earlier scholars), and particularly their remarks on ἀνάγνωσις, may have been of interest and use to more than one set of readers aloud. Certainly, the literate young were not being trained *as* ἀναγνώσται, over whom, as we have seen in Epictetus, they were socially elevated; nevertheless, given that ἀναγνώσται were primary vehicles for classic texts in antiquity, ancient education in ἀνάγνωσις may be taken as reflective of an overall opinion of the medium in which Homer best functioned, with the result that the student was initiated into literature as a performer even if his later career would see him as an audience-member. Educational ἀνάγνωσις would thus reflect, theoretically speaking, antiquity's view of what

ἀνάγνωσις should be, while it would remain, historically speaking, merely one manifestation of that ideal; correspondingly, while the Homer scholia's views of ἀνάγνωσις could be used *by* students they would not be exclusive *to* students: their observations on ἀνάγνωσις will have been intended as observations on ἀνάγνωσις in general, which could be applied by students or teachers to ἀνάγνωσις in the particular setting of the classroom. Though there is no evidence of ἀναγνώσται using works by Homeric commentators to improve their ἀνάγνωσις, the subject would surely have been of interest to them, and we may suppose that the ἀναγνώστης profited as much from the comment on Achilles' speech to Apollo as did his master's son at school.

Such a model, in which educational ἀνάγνωσις reflects but does not encompass ἀνάγνωσις in a culture as a whole, finds an interesting parallel in the literary culture of the Benedictine monastary in Anglo-Saxon England, as explicated by Patricia Hampton.[399] As Hampton writes, Benedictine monastaries were important educational centers for their localities; of the students who were instructed in schools adjunct to them, some would be destined for religious life but others destined for the secular.[400] The curriculum followed the *trivium* and *quadrivium* pattern, the former containing grammar, logic, and rhetoric; these subjects were not much changed from antiquity, since "the Church's recognized form of secular instruction was simply the

[399] Hampton 1972.
[400] Hampton 1972: 239, citing Heinrich 1924: 168.

rhetorical education of Imperial Rome as described by Quintilian."[401] Similarly, the literary culture of 9th century England would not appear unfamiliar to a Roman: though King Alfred was initially illiterate, he had (like Dio Chrysostom's elderly correspondent) a zeal for literature and access to good readers who would read to him regularly,[402] while books of the period mention *auditores* as often as they do *lectores*.[403] It is not surprising, therefore, that grammatical instruction in this period was predominantly oral, just as in antiquity[404]; students would further be called upon to display their learning orally (by as formidable a person as the Abbot),[405] reprimanded for ignorance and beaten for mispronunciation in the reading aloud of a text.[406] All this is familiar from Cribiore's portrait of education in antiquity, down to the survival of *grammaticus* Aelfric's *Colloquy* (more aptly named than in the case of the *Hermeneumata*), in which the students sensibly (in light of the penalties for mispronunciation) "ask to be taught to speak Latin *recte*."[407] As Wright notes,

> It is probable that the teacher, or *magister*, in the first instance, explained and translated [elementary treatises] orally, whilst the chief task of the scholars [i.e. students] was to commit them to memory, and

---

[401] Adamson 1946: 64 (quoted by Hampton 1972: 241).
[402] Alfred's enthusiasm nearly compares to that of Pliny the Elder: "Whenever he had the leisure, he commanded such men as these to read books to him; for he never suffered himself to be without one of them, wherefore he possessed a knowledge of every book, though of himself he could not yet understand anything of books for he had not yet learned to read any thing" (from Asser's *Life of Alfred*, quoted at Benham 1916: 123-124 and thence by Hampton 1972: 247).
[403] Crosby 1936: 90 "Since it was true that most people heard rather than read, it became customary for writers to address their works to the hearers as well as to the readers" (quoted at Hampton 1972: 245).
[404] Hampton 1972: 243.
[405] Hampton 1972: 244.
[406] Hampton 1972: 233-234.
[407] Garmonsway 1939: 13 (quoted at Hampton 1972: 244).

> to repeat the teacher's comments. . . . At the same time they were continually exercised in reading and chanting Latin.[408]

The subject-matter in these monastic schools being predominantly ecclesiastical,[409] it is reasonable to take Hildemar's contemporary commentary on the Benedictine *Rule* as applying as much to the mixed class of pre-novitiate students as to the actual novices; he notes that

> since the *Rule* (Chapter 38) orders only those to read . . . who will edify their hearers, it is necessary that we subjoin here the instruction of the various holy Fathers who teach how one should read – instructions gathered from the sayings of Augustine and Ambrose, of Bede and Isidore, or even of Victorinus and Servius and other grammarians who teach how to distinguish accurately the obscure meanings and to read properly according to the accents.[410]

Hildemar thus relates general education of the mass of students in expressive and edifying reading to a particular element of monastic practice: the reading aloud of sacred or theological texts at various points in the monk's day.[411] Though all students would be educated with this purpose in mind, few would be qualified to undertake these readings aloud in the real as opposed to imagined setting,[412] and, as we have seen from Hildemar, St. Benedict had specified that only those capable of edifying their

---

[408] Wright 1842: 71-72 (quoted at Hampton 1972: 243).
[409] Hampton 1972: 239.
[410] Schroll 1941: 128 (quoted at Hampton 1972: 243). The passage is taken from Hildemar's commentary on the *Rule*; his feeling for the importance of this particular subject led him to composed a separate treatise on artistic reading (Hampton 1972: 243).
[411] Specifically (according to the *Rule*), following Prime, at Matins, at Chapter, and before Compline; see Hampton 1972: 231-232.
[412] Hampton 1972: 230, who quotes Schroll 1941: 118: "Several remarks of our commentators indicate that not all could do this [read aloud] equally well, not even sufficiently well to fulfill the service of public reader in the Office of Matins or in the refectory."

hearers should be entrusted with the task. Particularly important was the reading in the refectory, while the monks ate: here one monk would serve as reader for the duration of a week's meals, and

> the reading had to be carefully prepared . . . One common and useful direction given to the refectory reader is, that he was not to hurry. The quantity he got through was immaterial compared with distinct pronunciation and careful rendering. Any specially noteworthy passage should be repeated so as to impress its meaning upon the hearers.[413]

Here mispronunciation or solecism was not, as among the grammar school students, occasion for corporal punishment, but it was cause for penance[414]; no wonder that

> the commentators tell us . . . that it would be preferable for one brother who reads in an edifying manner to read three or four or even six lessons than that many read who do not edify. Provision is also made that a brother be appointed before whom the prospective lector may read his portion of the lessons, and who will correct the book if necessary.[415]

This corrector and dry-run audience was often the *cantor*, the monk in charge of all literary and musical performances at the monastary who also served as librarian and archivist[416]:

> It was part of the cantor's duty to move about the choir when it was necessary to regulate the singing . . . Above all things he had to guard against mistakes . . . He was instructed to select music that was known to all, and to see that it was sung in the traditional manner. To guard against faults in reading and singing he was obliged by his office to go over the Lessons for Matins with the younger monks, and to hear the reader in the refectory before the meals, in order to point out defects of

---

[413] Gasquet 1919: 139 (quoted at Hampton 1972: 231).
[414] Hampton 1972: 233-234.
[415] Schroll 1941: 119-120 (quoted at Hampton 1972: 232).
[416] Hampton 1972: 235-236.

> pronunciation and quantity, as well as to regulate the tone of the voice and the rate of reading.[417]

In some monastaries, this *cantor* also served as the teacher at the monastary school.[418]

Overall, then, this comparative evidence from Anglo-Saxon England offers an example of reading aloud which is remarkably parallel to the situation described above for Homeric ἀνάγνωσις. In both cases, students are trained in reading aloud who will not undertake such reading in the future; in the ancient case, this is owing to class roles, while in the monastic case it results from varying levels of ability among the humble brethren; for everyone involved, however, the controlling imaginary setting for performance is the ideal presentation of the text as it was meant to be performed (in front of the assembled monks in the Anglo-Saxon case, at the Panathenaea in the Homeric case). In both cultures, a supervisory 'expert' reader (the γραμματικός or the *cantor*) controls and regulates ἀνάγνωσις on the part of less expert readers, conducting a διόρθωσις of the physical text prior to its public presentation. In both cases, technique includes both pacing and ἦθος; in both cases, the demands of the audience are of central importance.[419] Though it is true that much of the practice of Anglo-Saxon monastic literary culture is to be directly traced to pagan antiquity, the

---

[417] Gasquet 1919: 59-60 (quoted at Hampton 1972: 235-236). Cf. Gasquet 1919: 61-63 (quoted at Hampton 1972: 236): "To prevent mistakes, as far as it was possible so to do, the cantor was supposed to go over the book to be read carefully, and to put a point at the places where the pauses in public reading should be made."

[418] Hampton 1972: 236.

[419] Cf. McCann 1945: 109 (quoted at Hampton 1972: 233), from Chapter 47 of the *Rule*: "But let no one presume to sing or read, unless he can fulfill the office to the edification of his hearers. Let it be done with humility, gravity, and reverence, and by him whom the abbot has appointed."

comparison is all the more fruitful as a result: we observe here how the overarching cultural idea of how a text should ideally function serves to condition literary education. Students at the monastary school will have been trained to read *as though* they were soon to be performing in the refectory; the general conception of how best to read aloud *tout court* will therefore have governed education in reading aloud, though it was not exclusive to such education and applied more generally. This is precisely the scenario I have sketched above for the ἀνάγνωσις of Homer in Greek education: the Homer scholia's prescriptions may be taken as applicable on a general level to the ἀνάγνωσις of Homer *and therefore* applicable to ἀνάγνωσις performed in front of the γραμματικός. As Hampton concludes, however,

> for positive evidence as to how literature was orally interpreted in the Anglo-Saxon period, we should have to call upon the ghosts of scops, monks, and other appointed to recite or to read aloud. There were no textbooks designed to instruct the reader in the techniques of delivery or gesture.[420]

We are fortunate indeed, in the case of the ἀνάγνωσις of Homer, that we still retain such witnesses to instruction in the persons of the Homer scholiasts, those still-extant surrogates for many generations of teachers and scholars and ἀναγνώσται. In educating ourselves in Homeric poetry today, whether we wish to read aloud or not, we would do well to imprint, like the ancient students of the γραμματικοί, their observations on our memory; the more closely one reads their remarks, the more

---

[420] Hampton 1972: 248.

ἔμφασις we discover in them and in the works of Homer they explain, and the more 'aural' our own *Iliad* becomes.

Appendix: the DT Scholia description of Nicanor's punctuation system

Commentarius Melampodis vel Diomedis in Artem Grammaticam *Dionysii Thracis (GG I.3.26.4-28.7)*

[28.4] Ἵνα δὲ μὴ δόξῃ τις ἡμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν καὶ τὴν τοῦ λεχθέντος Νικάνορος διατύπωσιν τὴν περὶ τῶν στιγμῶν, ὧν τὰ ὀνόματα ἤδη ἡμῖν προείρηται, δεῖ ὡς ἐν συντόμῳ ἐνταῦθα μνησθῆναι τῆς τε θέσεως αὐτῶν καὶ τῆς διαφορᾶς τῆς τῷ Νικάνορι εἰρημένης· ὧν δεῖ πρώτας ἀκοὰς τῶν παίδων ἀκοῦσαί τε καὶ μὴ παντελῶς ἀμυήτους εἶναι. —Ἡ μὲν οὖν τελεία στιγμὴ τίθεται ἐν τῷ μέσῳ τόπῳ τῆς τελευταίας γραμμῆς τοῦ στοιχείου τοῦ τελευταίου ἐν τοῖς ἀσυνδέτοις λόγοις, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ

μάντι κακῶν, οὔ πώ ποτέ μοι τὸ κρήγυον εἶπας

[I.106]

εἰς τὸ εἶπας, τουτέστιν εἰς τὸ τελευταῖον αὐτοῦ γράμμα ἡ τελεία τίθεται, τοῦ ἐφεξῆς λόγου ἀσυνδέτου ὄντος. —Ἡ δὲ ὑποτελεία ὀλίγον ὑποκάτω τοῦ μέσου τόπου τοῦ στοιχείου τοῦ ἐσχάτου, ὅτε ἐπιφέρεται ὁ δέ ἢ ἄλλος τις σύνδεσμος τῶν ἰσοδυναμούντων τῷ δέ, λέγω δὲ τὸν γάρ, τὸν ἀλλά, τὸν ἀτάρ, τὸν αὐτάρ, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ

ἡρώων, αὐτοὺς δὲ ἑλώρια [I.4]

εἰς τὸ ν τοῦ ἡρώων ἡ ὑποτελεία τίθεται διὰ τὸ ἐπιφέρεσθαι τὸν δέ. Οὕτω γὰρ δοκεῖ τῷ ἡμετέρῳ γραμματικῷ, φημὶ δὲ τῷ Ἀπολλωνίῳ, καὶ μάλα εὖ, ὥς γέ μοι δοκεῖ· ἔφη δὲ ἐν τούτῳ παρεωρακέναι τὸν Νικάνορα, τὴν μὲν ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ τῆς σιωπῆς διαφορὰν ὁρισάμενον τῶν πρώτων δύο στιγμῶν, φημὶ δὲ τῆς τελείας καὶ τῆς ὑποτελείας, τὴν δὲ θέσιν καὶ τὸν τόπον τὸν αὐτὸν ταῖς δύο ἀπονέμοντα· οὐ δεῖ οὖν τὴν τελείαν καὶ τὴν ὑποτελείαν ἐν τῷ μέσῳ τοῦ στοιχείου τιθέναι, ὥς γέ φησι Νικάνωρ, ἐπεὶ ποία διαφορὰ ἔσται αὐτῶν; ἀλλὰ τὴν μὲν τελείαν ἐν τῷ μέσῳ, τὴν δὲ ὑποτελείαν ὑποκάτω ὀλίγον τοῦ μέσου τόπου τοῦ τελευταίου στοιχείου. —Ἡ δὲ πρώτη ἄνω τίθεται ἐπάνω τῆς τελευταίας γραμμῆς τοῦ τελευταίου στοιχείου, ὅτε πρόκειται ὁ μέν ἢ ὅ ἤ ἢ τὸ οὔ, **[27]** ἐπιφέρεται δὲ ὁ δέ ἢ ὅ ἤ ἢ ὁ ἀλλά, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ

αἴδεσθεν μὲν ἀνήνασθαι <δεῖσαν δ' ὑποδέχθαι>

[VII.93]

εἰς τὸ τελευταῖον ι τοῦ ἀνήνασθαι ἡ πρώτη ἄνω τίθεται διὰ τὸ ἐπιφέρεσθαι τὸν δέ, τοῦ μέν προκειμένου. —Ἡ δὲ δευτέρα ἄνω τίθεται καὶ αὐτὴ ἐπάνω τῆς τελευταίας γραμμῆς τοῦ ἐσχάτου στοιχείου, περιέχεται δὲ ὑπὸ διπλῆς ἔξωθεν, ὅτε ἐπιφέρεται ὁ καί, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ

καί ῥα πάροιθ' αὐτοῖο καθέζετο καὶ λάβε γούνων [I.500]

[28.4] Lest anyone think we are unaware of the above-mentioned Nicanor's arrangement of στιγμαί, whose names we have already given, we must here briefly recollect the arrangement of them and the above-mentioned differences in Nicanor's system; for boys' first ears should hear them and not be completely uninitated into them. —The τελεία στιγμή is placed in the middle position of the final letter of the final syllable in unconjoined phrases, as in

Prophet of evil, never yet anything useful have you to me declared [I.106]

after "declared," that is to say that the τελεία is placed after the final letter of that word, since the phrase that follows is not introduced with a conjunction. —The ὑποτελεία [is placed] somewhat below the middle position of the final syllable, when it is followed by δέ or another conjunction of similar force to δέ, namely ἀλλά, ἀτάρ, αὐτάρ, as in

Heroes, and [δέ] them as prey [I.4]

following the ν in "ἡρώων" [heroes] we get the ὑποτελεία, since it is followed by a δέ. Such is the the view of our Professor, i.e. Apollonius [Dyscolus], and he is quite right, in my view; he said that Nicanor erred in this, both in differentiating the duration of silence involved in the two first στιγμαί, that is in the τελεία and the ὑποτελεία, and in assigning the different placements to these two. For we should not place both the τελεία and the ὑποτελεία in the middle of the final syllable, as Nicanor says, for what difference would there be between them? Rather, the τελεία [should be placed] in the middle [of the final syllable] and the ὑποτελεία somewhat below the mid level of the final syllable. —The πρώτη ἄνω is placed above the final letter of the final syllable, when preceded by μέν, or ἤ or οὔ **[27]** and followed by δέ or ἤ or ἀλλά, as in

They did [μέν] dread to deny him, yet feared to meet him [VII.93]

following the final ι of ἀνήσασθαι we get the πρώτη ἄνω, since it is followed by δέ and preceded by μέν. —The δευτέρα ἄνω is also placed above the final letter of the final syllable, but is surrounded by a διπλή (>) open to the left, [and is used] with a following καί, as in

And behold he sat down in front of him and took hold of his knees [I.500]

following the ο we get the δευτέρα ἄνω, since it is followed by a καί. —The τρίτη ἄνω is also placed above the final letter of the final syllable, but is surrounded by a διπλή (<) open to the right, [and is

εἰς τὸ ο τοῦ καθέζετο τίθεται ἡ δευτέρα ἄνω, τοῦ καί ἐπιφερομένου. —Ἡ δὲ τρίτη ἄνω τίθεται καὶ αὐτὴ ἐπάνω μὲν τῆς τελευταίας γραμμῆς τοῦ τελευταίου στοιχείου, περιέχεται δὲ ὑπὸ διπλῆς ἔσωθεν, ὅτε ἐπιφέρεται ὁ τέ, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ

Κίλλαν τε ζαθέην Τενέδοιό τε ἶφι ἀνάσσεις [I.38]

εἰς τὸ ν τοῦ ζαθέην τίθεται ἡ τρίτη ἄνω, ἐπιφερομένου τοῦ τέ συνδέσμου. —Ἡ δὲ ὑποστιγμὴ ἡ ἐνυπόκριτος τίθεται ὑποκάτω μὲν τῆς τελευταίας γραμμῆς τοῦ τελευταίου στοιχείου, ὀλίγον δὲ ἐξωτέρω ἐκ πλαγίου νεύουσα, ἐν ταῖς ὀρθαῖς περιόδοις, τουτέστιν ὅτε πρόκειται τὸ ὅφρα ἢ τὸ ἦμος ἢ τὸ ὅτε ἢ τὸ ἕως ἢ τὸ ὅπου, ἐπιφέρεται δὲ τὸ τόφρα, τὸ τῆμος, τὸ τότε, τὸ τότε, τὸ τέως, τὸ ἐκεῖ καὶ τὰ ὅμοια, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ

ἦμος δ' ἠριγένεια φάνη ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἠώς

εἰς τὸ ς τοῦ Ἠώς τίθεται ἡ ἐνυπόκριτος, ἐπιφερομένου τοῦ τότε. —Ἡ δὲ ὑποστιγμὴ ἡ ἀνυπόκριτος τίθεται καὶ αὐτὴ ὑποκάτω τοῦ τελευταίου γράμματος ὑπὸ τὴν ἐσχάτην καὶ κατωτάτην γραμμὴν τοῦ στοιχείου, ἐν δὲ ταῖς μεταξὺ πρὸ τῆς ἀνταποδόσεως τῶν ὀρθῶν περιόδων ἀναφωνουμέναις ἑτέραις περιόδοις, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ

ὡς δ' ὅτε τίς τε δράκοντα ἰδὼν παλίνορσος ἀπέστη
οὔρεος ἐν βήσσῃς, <ὑπό τε τρόμος ἔλλαβε γυῖα,
ἄψ τ' ἀνεχώρησεν, ὠχρός τέ μιν εἷλε παρειάς> [III.33-35]

ἐνταῦθα τίθεται ἡ ἀνυπόκριτος, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἰς τὸ «γυῖα» καὶ εἰς τὸ «ἀνεχώρησεν»· μεταξὺ γὰρ <πρὸ> τῆς ἀνταποδόσεως ἕτεραι περίοδοι ἐνετέθησαν· εἰς δὲ τὸ «παρειάς» ἡ ἐνυπόκριτος· εὐθέως γὰρ ἐπιφέρεται ἡ ἀνταπόδοσις. —Ἡ δὲ ὑποδιαστολὴ κατὰ πάντα τῶν προλαβουσῶν στιγμῶν ἐνήλλακται, ὡς καὶ αὐτῷ τῷ σχήματι μὴ εἶναι νυγμή τις, ὡς αἱ ἄλλαι, ἀλλὰ τὸν τύπον ἔχειν τοῦ ὀξέος τόνου· τίθεται δὲ καὶ αὐτὴ ὑποκάτω τῆς ἐσχάτης γραμμῆς τοῦ τελευταίου γράμματος, ὡς ὀξεῖα δέ **[28]** τις, ὡς προείρηται, ἐν ταῖς ἀντεστραμμέναις περιόδοις, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ

ἦ κεν γηθήσαι Πρίαμος <Πριάμοιό τε παῖδες>,
ἄλλοι τε Τρῶες μέγα κεν κεχαροίατο θυμῷ,
εἰ σφῶϊν τάδε πάντα πυθοίατο μαρναμένοιιν [I.255-257]

ἐν τῷ «θυμῷ» τίθεται ἡ ὑποδιαστολή· ἐπιφέρεται γὰρ τὸ «εἰ σφῶϊν» καὶ ποιεῖ ἀντεστραμμένην τὴν περίοδον· ἡ γὰρ ὀρθὴ περίοδος ἦν «εἰ σφῶϊν τάδε πάντα πυθοίατο, ἦ κεν γηθήσαι Πρίαμος».

used] with a following τέ, as in

'N' [τέ] holy Cilla, 'n' [τέ] you rule mightily over Tenedos [I.38]

following the ν of ζαθέαν we get the τρίτη ἄνω, since the conjunction τέ follows. —The ὑποστιγμὴ which is ἐνυπόκριτος is placed below the final letter of the final syllable, but slightly to the right and bending at a slant, [and is used] in correlative clauses [ὀρθαὶ περιόδοι], that is when preceded by ὅφρα or ἦμος or ὅτε or ἕως or ὅπου, and followed by τόφρα, τῆμος, τότε, τότε, τέως, ἐκεῖ, and suchlike, as in

As soon as rosy-fingered Dawn, the early born, appeared

following the ς of Ἠώς [we get the] ἐνυπόκριτος, since it is followed by τότε. —The ὑποστιγμή which is ἀνυπόκριτος is also placed below the final letter of the final syllable, under the furthest and lowest of the syllable, [and is used] in other periods which include parenthetical material [ἀναφωνουμέναις μεταξύ] before the apodosis of the correlative clauses, as in

As when a man, seeing a snake, jumps backwards
In the mountain glades <and trembling seizes his limbs
And straightaway he goes back the way he came and pallor takes hold of his cheeks> [III.33-35]

Here we get the ἀνυπόκριτος, both following "limbs" [γυῖα] and following "he goes back" [ἀνεχώρησεν]; for other parenthetical periods have been inserted before the apodosis. The ἐνυπόκριτος [is put] after "cheeks" [παρειάς], for the apodosis immediately follows. —The ὑποδιαστολή is used in the place of any of the aforementioned marks, as it is not in this system a pricking like the others are, but rather resembles an acute accent; it too is placed beneath the last letter of the final word, like an acute accent **[28]** as mentioned, [and is used] in turned-around periods, as in

Indeed Priam would rejoice <and the sons of Priam too
and the other Trojans would greatly rejoice
if the way you two are struggling were made known> [I.255-257]

following "heart" [θυμῷ] we get the ὑποδιαστολή, for it is followed by "if the way you two" [εἰ σφῶϊν] and turns the period around; the right-side-up correlative would be "if the way you two are struggling were made known, indeed Priam would rejoice."

Bibliography

Adamson, J. W. 1946. *"The Illiterate Anglo-Saxon" and Other Essays on Education, Medieval and Modern.* Cambridge.

Allan, D. J. 1980. "Ἀναγιγνώσκω and Some Cognate Words." *CQ* n.s. 30.1: 244-251.

Allen, T. W. 1924. *Homer: the Origins and Transmission.* Oxford.

Allen, T. W. 1931. *The Homeric Scholia.* Proceedings of the British Academy 17. London.

Ax, Wolfram. 1982. "Aristarch und die 'Grammatik.'" *Glotta* 60: 96-109.

Baar, Johannes. 1956. *Untersuchungen zur Terminologie der Iliasscholien.* Diss. Hamburg.

Bachmann, Wilhelm. 1902. *Die ästhetischen Anschauungen Aristarchs in der Exegese und Kritik der homerischen Gedichte.* Nurnberg.

Basset, L. and F. Biville, eds. 1999. *Actes du XXXIe Congrès International de l'APLAES.* Lyon.

Bakker, E. 1997. *Poetry in Speech Orality and Homeric Discourse.* Ithaca.

Bakker, E. and A. Kahane, eds. 1997. *Written Voices, Spoken Signs: Tradition, Performance, and the Epic Text.* Cambridge, MA.

Balogh, Josef. 1927. "'Voces Paginarum': Beiträge zur Geschichte des lauten Lesens und Schribens." *Philologus* 82: 202-240.

Balsdon, J. P. V. D. 1969. *Life and Leisure in Ancient Rome.* London.

Beck, Frederick A. G. 1964. *Greek Education, 450-350 BC.* New York.

———. 1975. *Album of Greek Education.* Sydney.

———. 1986. *Bibliography of Greek Education and Related Topics.* Sydney.

Bekker, A. I. 1825. *Scholia in Homeri Iliadem.* Berlin.

Benham, Allen R. 1916. *English Literature from Widsith to the Death of Chaucer.* New Haven.

Beudel, P. 1911. *Qua ratione Graeci liberos docuerint papyris, ostracis, tabulis in Aegypto inventis illustratur.* Münster.

Blanck, Horst. 1992. *Das Buch in der Antike.* Munich.

Blank, David L. 1982. *Ancient Philosophy and Grammar: the Syntax of Apollonius Dyscolus.* Ancient Classical Studies 10. Chico.

———. 1983. "Remarks on Nicanor, the Stoics, and the Ancient Theory of Punctuation." *Glotta* 61: 48-67.

Blau, August. 1883. *De Aristarchi discipulis.* Diss. Jena.

Boeckh, A., ed. 1843. *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum (CIG).* Berlin.

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

———. 1940. "Zenodotus' Dehorning of the Hornèd Hind and the Text of Homer." *TAPA* 71: 40-44.

Booth, Alan D. 1979. "Elementary and Secondary Education in the Roman Empire." *Florilegium* 1: 1-14.

Bradley, K. R. 1987. *Slaves and Masters in the Roman Empire: A Study in Social Control.* New York.

Burnyeat, M. F. 1997. "Postscript on Silent Reading." *CQ* n.s. 47.1: 74-76.

Butler, H. E., transl. 1980. *Quintilian: Institutio Oratoria.* 4 Vols. Cambridge, MA.

Cantilena, M. 1995. "Il ponte di Nicanore." In Fantuzzi and Pretagostini 1995: 9-67.

Calderini, Aristide. 1921. "Commenti 'minori' al testi di Omero in documenti egizianti." *Aegyptus* 2: 302-326.

Carnuth, Otto, ed. 1869. *Aristonici* Περὶ σημείων Ὀδυσσείας reliquiae emendatiores. Leipzig.

———, ed. 1875. *Nicanoris* Περὶ Ὀδυσσειακῆς στιγμῆς reliquiae emendatiores.

Berlin.

Cavallo, Guglielmo. 1975. *Libri, editori e pubblico nel mundo antico: guida storica e critica.* Bari.

Chantraine, Pierre. 1950. "Les verbes grecs signifiant 'lire' (ἀναγιγνώσκω, ἐπιλέγομαι, ἐντυγχάνω, ἀναλέγομαι)." *Annuaire de l'Institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales et slaves* 10: 115-126.

———. 1953. *Grammaire Homérique.* Paris.

———. 2000. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: histoire des mots.* Paris.

Cichorius, Conrad. 1908. "Panaitios und die Attische Stoikerinschrift." *RhM* 63: 197-223.

Clark, Donald L. 1957. *Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education.* New York.

Clark, W. P. 1931. "Ancient Reading." *CJ* 26: 698-700.

Clarke, M. L. 1971. *Higher Education in the Ancient World.* Albuquerque.

Collart, Paul. 1932. "Les papyrus de l'*Iliade.*" *Revue de philologie* Ser. III 6: 315-349.

Comparetti, D. 1901. *Homeri* Ilias *cum scholiis: Codex venetus A, Marcianus 454 phototypice editus.* Leiden.

Cribiore, Raffaella. 1996. *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt.* Atlanta.

———. 2001. *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt.* Princeton.

Crosby, Ruth. 1936. "Oral Delivery in the Middle Ages." *Speculum* 11: 88-110.

Dachs, H. 1913. *Die λύσις ἐκ τοῦ προσώπου: Ein exegetischer und kritischer Grundsatz Aristarchs und seien Neuanwendung auf Ilias und Odyssee.* Diss. Erlangen.

Daitz, Stephen G. 1991. "On Reading Homer Aloud: To Pause or Not to Pause."

AJP 112.2: 149-160.

———. 2003. "Response: Daitz on Wyatt on Daitz." *BMCR* 2003.01.14.

Davison, J. A. 1995. "Peisistratous and Homer." *TAPA* 86: 1-21.

de Jong, I. 2004. *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad.* 2nd ed. New York.

———. 2005. "Aristotle on the Homeric Narrator." *CQ* 55.2: 616-621.

Di Benedetto, Vincenzo. 1958. "Dionisio Trace e la Techne a lui attribuita." *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* n.s. 27: 169-210.

———. 1959. "Dionisio Trace e la Techne a lui attribuita (*continuazione e fine*)." *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* n.s. 38: 87-118.

———. "Afterword." In Law and Sluiter 1997: 151-152.

Dindorf, G. and E. Maass. 1875. *Scholia graeca in Homeri Iliadem ex codicibus aucta et emendata.* Oxford.

Dionisotti, A. C. 1972. "From Ausonius' Schooldays? A Schoolbook and its Relatives." *JRS* 72: 83-125.

Doyle, Esther M. and V. H. Floyd. *Studies in Interpretation.* Amsterdam.

Duckworth, George E. 1931. "Προαναφώνησις in the Scholia to Homer." *AJP* 52.4: 320-338.

Duentzer, H. 1848. *De Zenodoti studiis Homericis.* Göttingen.

Dyck, Andrew R. 1981. "Notes on Greek Grammarians." *RhM* 124.1: 50-54.

———. 1993. "Aelius Herodian: Recent Studies and Prospects for Future Research." *ANRW* 34.1 Vol. II: 772-794.

Erbse, Hartmut. 1960. *Beiträge zur Überlieferung der Iliasscholien.* Zetemata 24. Munich.

———, ed. 1969.1-7. *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (scholia vetera).* Berlin.

Fantuzzi, Marco and Roberto Pretagostini, eds. *Struttura e storia dell'esametro greco.* Rome.

Feeney, D. C. 1991. *The Gods in Epic: Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition.* New York.

von Franz, Maria. 1940. *Die aesthetischen Anschauungen der Iliasscholien* (Diss. Zurich).

———. 1943. *Die aesthetischen Anschauungen der Iliasscholien.* Zurich.

Friedländer, L., ed. 1857. *Nicanoris* Περὶ Ἰλιακῆς στιγμῆς *reliquiae emendatiores.* Berlin.

———, ed. 1853. *Aristonici* Περὶ σημείων Ἰλιάδος *reliquiae emendatiores.* Göttingen.

Garmonsway, G. N., ed. 1939. *Aelfric's Colloquy.* London.

Gasquet, H. E. C. 1919. *Englig Monastic Life.* London.

Gavrilov, A. K. 1997. "Reading Techniques in Classical Antiquity." *CQ* 47: 56-73.

Gerhard, O. 1850, *De Aristarchi Aristophanis interprete.* Diss. Bonn.

Gildersleeve, B. 1853. *De Porphyrii studiis Homericis.* Diss. Göttingen.

Gill, Christopher. 1984. "The Ethos/Pathos Distinction in Rhetorical and Literary Criticism." *CQ* n.s. 34.1: 149-166.

R. Griesinger. 1907. *Die Ästhetischen Anschauungen der alten Homererklärer dargestellt nach den Homerscholien.* Tübingen.

Hajnal, I. 1954. "Universities and the development of writing in the XIIth-XIIIth centuries." *Scriptorum* 6.2: 177-195

Hampton, Patricia E. 1972. "Oral Interpretation as a Means of Instruction in Anglo-Saxon England." In Doyle and Floyd 1972: 229-253.

Haslam, M. 1997. "Homeric Papyri and Transmission of the Text." In Morris and Powell 1997: 55-100.

Harmon, A. M. 1923. "The Poet κατ' ἐξοχήν." *CA* 18): 35-47.

Harrauer, H., ed. 1983. *Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer: Festschrift zum 100-Jährigen*

Bestehen der Papyrussammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek. Vienna.

Heath, Malcolm. 1993. "Στάσις-theory in Homeric commentary." *Mnemosyne* 46: 356-363.

Heiden, Bruce. 1996. "The Three Mouvements of the Iliad." *GRBS* 37: 5-22.

Heinrich, M. P. 1924. *The Canonesses and Education in the Early Middle Ages.* Washington.

Heinrichs 1971a. "Scholia Minora zu Homer I." *ZPE* 7.2: 97-149.

———. 1971b. "Scholia Minora zu Homer II." *ZPE* 7.3: 229-260.

———. 1971c. "Scholia Minora zu Homer III." *ZPE* 8.1: 1-12.

Helck, Iohannes. 1905. *De Cratetis Mallotae studiis criticis quae ad Iliadem spectant.* Diss. Leipzig.

Hendrickson, G. L. 1929. "Ancient Reading." *CJ* 25: 192-196.

Hilgard, A., ed. 1901. *Scholia in Dionysii Thracis Artem Grammaticam* (*Grammatici Graeci* I.3). Leipzig.

Hornblower, Simon and Anthony Spawforth, eds. *The Oxford Classical Dictionary.* 3rd ed. Oxford.

Johnson, William A. 2000. "Toward a Sociology of Reading in Classical Antiquity." *AJP* 121: 593-627.

———. 2004. *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus.* Toronto.

Kakridis, Johannes T. 1971. *Homer Revisited.* Lund.

Kaster, Robert A. 1983. "Notes on 'Primary' and 'Secondary' Schools in Late Antiquity." *TAPA* 113: 323-346.

Kenyon, F. G. 1891. *Classical Texts from Papyri in the British Museum.* London.

Kindstrand, J. 1973. *Homer in der zweiten Sophistik.* Uppsala.

Kirk, G. S. 1985. *The Iliad: A Commentary.* Vol. 1. Cambridge.

Knox, Bernard M. W. 1968. "Silent Reading in Antiquity." *GRBS* 9: 421-435.

Lallot, Jean. 1997. "*Grammatici certant:* vers une typologie de l'argumentation *pro et contra* dans la question de l'authenticité de la *Technè*." In Law and Sluiter 1997: 27-39.

Lamberton, Robert and John J. Keaney, eds. 1996. *Homer's Ancient Readers.*

Laum, B. 1928. *Das Alexandrinische Akzentuationssystem unter Zugrundelegung der theoretischen Lehren der Grammatiker und mit Heranziehung der praktischen Verwendung in den Papyri.* Paderborn.

Laurie, S. S. 1900. *Historical Survey of Pre-Christian Education.* 2nd ed. London.

Lausberg, Heinrich. 1998. *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study.* M. T. Bliss, A. Jansen, D. E. Orton, transls. Boston.

Law, Vivien and Sluiter, Ineke, eds. 1997. *Dionysius Thrax and the* Techne Grammatike. Münster.

Lefkowitz, M. R. 1985. "The Pindar Scholia." *AJP* 106: 269-282.

Lehnert, G. H. 1896. *De scholiis ad Homerum rhetoricis.* Diss. Leipzig.

Lehrs, K. 1832. *De Aristarchi studiis Homericis.* Diss. Göttingen.

———. 1882. *De Aristarchi studiis Homericis.* 3rd ed. A. Ludwich, ed. Leipzig.

Lenz, A. 1867. *Herodiani Technici reliquiae* (*Grammatici Graeci* III.1). Leipzig.

Levy, Harry L. 1969. "*To Hexês* In Homeric Scholia and Servius' *Ordo.*" *TAPA* 100: 237-254.

Llamas Pombo, Elena. 2002. "Visual Construction of Writing in the Medieval Book." *Diogenes* 196: 31-40.

Lord, Albert B. 1960. *The Singer of Tales.* Cambridge.

———. 1962. "Homer and Other Epic Poetry." In Wace and Stubbings 1962: 179-214.

———. 1991. *Epic Singers and Oral Tradition.* Ithaca.

Ludwich, A. 1884. *Aristarchs Homerische Textkritik nach den Fragmenten des Didymos.* Leipzig.

Lührs, D. 1992. *Untersuchungen zu den Athetesen Aristarchs in der Ilias und zu ihrer Behandlung im Corpus der exegetischen Scholien.* Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 11. Hildesheim.

Lundon, J. 2002. "Aristotle, Aristarchus and Zielinski on the Narration of Simultaneous Events in Homeric Epos." In Manafis 2002: 581-591.

Manafis, K. A, ed. *Proceedings of the XIth International Congress of Classical Studies.* Athens.

Manfredi, M. 2000. *Papiri dell'* Iliade. Florence.

Marrou, H. I. 1982. *A History of Education in Antiquity.* G. Lamb, transl. Madison.

Martin, Richard. 1989. *The Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the* Iliad. Ithaca.

———. 1997. "Similes and Performance." In Bakker and Kahane 1997: 138-166.

Matthaios, S. 1999. *Untersuchungen zur Grammatik Aristarchs: Texte und Interpretatione zur Wortartenlehre.* Göttingen.

Maurizio, L. 1997. "Delphic Oracles As Oral Performances: Authenticity and Historical Evidence." *CA* 16.2: 308-334.

McCann, J, ed. 1952. *The Rule of Saint Benedict.* London.

McNamee, K. 1995. "Missing Links in the Development of Scholia." *GRBS* 36.4: 399-414.

———. 1998. "Another Chapter in the History of Scholia." *CQ* 48.1: 269-88.

Meijering, Roos. 1987. *Literary and Rhetorical Theories in Greek Scholia.* Groningen.

Mertens, Paul. 1983. "A propos d'un papyrus de l'*Iliade,* chant XVII." In Harrauer 1983: 257-259.

Merx, Adalbertus. 1883. "De Artis Dionysianae interpretatione Armeniaca." In Uhlig 1883: lvii-lxxiii.

Milne, H. J. M. 1927. *Catalogue of the Literary Papyri in the British Museum.*

London.

Montanari, Franco. 1979. *Studi di filologia omerica antica* I. Pisa.

———. 1995. *Studi di filologia omerica antica* II. Pisa.

———. 1998. "Hypomnema." *DNP* 5: 813-815.

Moore-Blunt, J. 1978. "Problems of Accentuation in Greek Papyri." *QUCC* 29: 137-163.

Morgan, Teresa. 1997. "Dionysius Thrax and the Educational Uses of Grammar." In Law and Sluiter 1997: 73-94.

———. 1998. *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds.* Cambridge.

———. 1999. "Literate Education in Classical Athens." *CQ* n.s. 49.1: 46-61.

Morris, Ian and Barry Powell, eds. 1997. *A New Companion to Homer.* Leiden.

Morrison, James V. 1992. *Homeric Misdirection: False Predictions in the* Iliad. Ann Arbor.

Most, Glenn W., ed. 1999. *Commentaries – Kommentare.* Aporemata Vol. 4. Göttingen.

Nagy, G. 1996a. *Poetry as Performance: Homer and Beyond.* Cambridge.

———. 1996b. *Homeric Questions.* Austin.

———. 1997. "Homeric Scholia." In Morris and Powell 1997: 101-122.

———. 2000a. Review of West 1999. *BMCR* 2000.09.12.

———. 2000b. "Reading Greek Poetry Aloud: Evidence from the Bacchylides Papyri." *QUCC* n.s. 64.1: 7-28.

———. 2002. *Plato's Rhapsody and Homer's Music: The Poetics of the Panathenaic Festival in Classical Athens.* Hellenic Studies 1. Washington.

———. 2003a. *Homeric Responses.* Austin.

———. 2003b. Review of West 2001b. *Gnomon* 75.6: 481-501.

———. 2005. *Homer's Text and Language.* Champaign.

———. Forthcoming: *Homer the Classic* (2002 Sather Lectures).

Netz, Reviel. 1998. "Deuteronomic Texts: Late Antiquity and the History of Mathematics." *Revue d'histoire des mathématiques* 4.2: 261-288.

———. 2005. "A Programmatic Note: On Two Types of Intertextuality." *Revue d'histoire des mathématiques* 11.1: 143-155.

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

Nietzsche, F. 1989. *Beyond Good and Evil.* W. Kaufmann, transl. New York.

Norden, Eduard. 1923. *Die antike Kunstprosa.* 4th ed. Leipzig.

Nünlist, R. 2003. "The Homeric Scholia on Focalization." *Mnemosyne* 56.1: 61-71.

Ong, Walter J. 1982. *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word.* New York.

Pack, Roger A. 1965. *The Greek and Latin Literary Texts from Greco-Roman Egypt.* 2nd ed. Ann Arbor.

Papadopoulou, Thalia. 1999. "Literary Theory and Terminology in the Greek Tragic Scholia: the Case of πλάσμα." *BICS* 43: 203-210.

Parkes, M. B. 1993. *Pause and Effect: An Introduction to the History of Punctuation in the West.* Berkeley.

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

Pierron, P. A., ed. 1869. *L'Iliade d'Homère : texte grec, revu et corrigé d'après les documents authentiques de la recension d'Aristarque.* Paris.

Prendergast, G. L. 1962. *A Complete Concordance to the* Iliad *of Homer.* B. Marzullo, ed. Darmstadt.

Quacquarelli, A. 1959. "Alle origini del lector." In Rapisarda 1959: 381-406.

Quinn, K. 1982. "The Poet and his Audience in the Augustan Age." *ANRW* II.30.1: 75-180.

Rabel, Robert J. 1997. *Plot and Point of View in the* Iliad. Ann Arbor.

Rapisarda, E., ed. *Convivium Dominicum: Studi sull'eucarestia nei Padri della Chiesa Antica e Miscellanea Patristica.* Catania.

Richardson, N. J. "Homeric Professors in the Age of the Sophists." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* n.s. 21: 65-81.

———. 1980. "Literary Criticism in the Exegetical Scholia to the *Iliad*: A Sketch." *CQ* 30: 265-287.

Richardson, Scott. 1990. *The Homeric Narrator.* Nashville.

Robb, Kevin. 1994. *Literacy and Paideia in Ancient Greece.* Oxford.

Roberts, Colin H. and T. C. Skeat. 1983. *The Birth of the Codex.* Oxford.

Robins, Robert H. 1997. "The Authenticity of the *Techne*: the *status quaestionis.*" In Law and Sluiter 1997: 13-26.

Römer, Adolf. 1875. *Über die Werke der Aristarcheer im Codex Venetus A.* Munich.

———. 1912. *Aristarchs Athetesen in der Homerkritik.* Leipzig.

———. 1924. *Die Homerexegese Aristarchs in ihren Grundzügen.* Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums 13. Paderborn.

Rutherford, W. G. 1905, ed. *Scholia Aristophanica: being such comments adscript to the text of Aristophanes as have been preserved in the Codex Ravennas 3.* London.

Sacks, Kenneth S. 2003. "Agatharchides." In Hornblower and Spawforth 2003: 36.

Saenger, Paul. 1982. "Silent Reading: Its Impact on Late Medieval Script and Society." *Viator* 13: 367-414.

Salomons, R. P. 1984. "The Use and Meaning of the Middle Point in the *Hawara Homer.*" *Atti XVII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia* II. Pp. 249-253. Naples.

———. 1997. *Space Between Words: The Origins of Silent Reading.* Stanford.

Schenkeveld, Dirk. 1997. "The Linguistic Contents of Dionysius' *Παραγγέλματα.*"

In Law and Sluiter 1997: 41-53.

Schironi, Francesca. 2004. *I frammenti di Aristarco di Samotracia negli etimologici bizantini.* Göttingen.

———. 2005. "Plato at Alexandria: Aristophanes, Aristarchus, and the 'Philological Tradition' of a Philosopher." *CQ* 55.2: 423-434.

Schlunk, Robin R. 1974. *The Homeric Scholia and the* Aeneid*: A Study of the Influence of Ancient Homeric Literary Criticism on Vergil.* Ann Arbor.

Schmidt, Moritz. 1851. De Didymo Chalcentero vocabulorum interprete. Oels.

Schmidt, M. 1997. "Variae lectiones oder Parallelstellen: Was notierten Zenodot und Aristarch zu Homer?" *ZPE* 115: 1-12.

Scholz, M. G. 1984. "On Presentation and Reception Guidelines in the German Strophic Epic of the Late Middle Ages." *New Literary History* 16: 137-151.

Schroll, M. A. 1941. *Benedictine Monasticism as Reflected in the Warnefrid-Hildemar Commentaries on the Rule.* New York.

Segal, Charles. "Bard and Audience in Homer." In Lamberton and Keaney 1992: 3-29.

Skeat, T. C. 1956. "The Use of Dictation in Ancient Book Production." *PBA* 42: 179-208.

Sluiter, Ineke. 1999. "Commentaries and the Didactic Tradition." In Most 1999: 173-205.

Snipes, Kenneth. 1988. "Literary Interpretation in the Homeric Scholia: the Similes of the *Iliad.*" *AJP* 109: 196-222.

Starr, Raymond J. 1990. "Reading Aloud: *Lectores* and Roman Reading." *CJ* 8: 337-343.

Svenbro, Jesper. 1993. *Phrasikleia: An Anthropology of Reading in Ancient Greece.* J. Lloyd, transl. Ithaca.

Taplin, O. 1992. *Homeric Soundings: the Shaping of the* Iliad. Oxford.

Thomas, Rosalind. 1992. *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece.* Cambridge.

Thompson, E. M. 1912. *Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography.* Oxford.

Turner, E. G. 1968. *Greek Papyri: An Introduction.* Princeton.

———. 1971. *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World.* Oxford.

———. 1987. *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World.* 2nd ed. London.

Uhlig, G., ed. 1883. *Dionysii Thracis Ars Grammatica* (*Grammatici Graeci* I.1). Leipzig.

Usener, H. 1892. "Ein altes Lehrgebäude der Philologie." *Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Berlin* 4: 582-648.

van der Valk, M. 1963. *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad.* Leiden.

———. 1984. "Manuscripts and Scholia: Some Textual Problems." *GRBS* 25.1: 39-49.

van Thiel, H. 1992. "Zenodot, Aristarch und andere." *ZPE* 90: 1-32.

———. 1997. "Der Homertext in Alexandria." *ZPE* 115: 13-36.

Villoison, J. B. G. d'Ansse de, ed. 1788. *Homeri Ilias ad veteris codicis Veneti fidem recensita.* Venice.

Wace, Alan J. B. and Frank. H. Stubbings, eds. *A Companion to Homer.* London.

Wackernagel, J. 1876. "Nicanor und Herodian." *RhM* 31: 432-439.

Wecklein, Nicklaus. 1919. *Über Zenodot und Aristarch.* Munich.

Wendel, C. 1934. "Telephus." *RE* 5A.1 369-371.

———. 1936. "Nicanor." *RE* 17: 274-277.

———. 1953. "Poseidonios." *RE* 22.1: 826.

West, M. L. 1981. "The Singing of Homer and the Modes of Early Greek Music." *JHS* 101: 113-129.

———, ed. 1999. *Homeri Ilias: Volumen prius, rhapsodias I-XII continens.* Stuttgart.

———. 2001a. "West on Nagy and Nardelli on West." *BMCR* 2001.09.06.

———. 2001b. Studies in the Text and Transmission of the *Iliad.* Munich.

———. 2004. "West on Rengakos (BMCR 2002.11.15) and Nagy (Gnomon 75, 2003, 481-501) on West." *BMCR* 2004.04.17.

Wilson, N. G. 1967. "A Chapter in the History of Scholia." *CQ* 17: 7-29

———. 1983. *Scholars of Byzantium.* Baltimore.

Wolf, F. A. 1795. *Prolegomena ad Homerum, sive de operum Homericorum prisca et genuina forma variisque mutationibus et probabili ratione emendandi.* Halle.

Wolf, Peter. 1952. *Von Schulwesen der Spätantike: Studien zu Libanius.* Baden-Baden.

Wouters, Alfons. 1979. *The Grammatical Papyri from Graeco-Roman Egypt: Contributions to the Study of the 'Ars Grammatica' in Antiquity.* Brussels.

———. 1997. "The Grammatical Papyri and the *Techne Grammatike* of Dionysius Thrax." In Law and Sluiters 1997: 95-109.

———. 1999. "La grammaire grecque dans l'école antique, d'après les papyrus." In Basset and Biville 1999: 41-68.

Wright, Thomas. 1842. *Biographia Britannica Literaria.* London.

Wyatt, W. F. "Response: Daitz on Reading Homeric Verse (*AJP* 112 [1991] 149-160)." *BMCR* 2002.07.09.