

This paper stems from a new edition which I am preparing of Porphyry's *Homeric Questions* (*HQ*). Shortcomings in the standard editions by H. Schrader, *Porphyrii quaestionum Homericarum ad Iliadem pertinentium reliquias* (Leipzig 1880) and *Porphyrii quaestionum Homericarum ad Odysseam pertinentium reliquias* (Leipzig 1890) have perpetuated misconceptions about the nature of this work. By paying due heed to the transmission of the *HQ*, one can deduce editorial principles that bring us closer to the original. This revised text allows us to assess more accurately the place of the *QH* in the commentary tradition.

The first step in restoring the original is to give careful consideration to the peculiarities in the transmission of the *HQ*. The work survives through two divergent paths. One is MS *Vaticanus* 305, which preserves the first book of the *HQ* in more or less pristine form. The other is by way of excerpts in the margins of the medieval scholia., sometimes signaled by the heading "of Porphyry," sometimes left anonymous, depending on which MS one consults. Comparison of the continuous text of the Vatican MS with the excerpts shows that the latter have been subjected to considerable redaction. Of the two sides of the transmission, *Vat.* 305 is the more faithful. This MS must serve as the basis for one's understanding of Porphyry's style and methods in the *QH*.

Inverting the relative value of the two sides of the transmission, Schrader privileged the authority of the extracts over that of the Vatican MS. Schrader relied chiefly on *B, a MS which has with two major disadvantages for the purpose of editing Porphyry's *HQ*: it never indicates the source of extracts and freely interpolates new material into extracts from Book One. It is quite likely that the same tendencies persist in extracts from the later books of the *HQ*. Nevertheless, Schrader's text consists of any *B scholium introduced by a question, usually διὰ τί, or a stock phrase such as ἐναντίον δοκεῖ or ζητεῖται. Stock solution types, such as "on the basis of diction," "on the basis of character" and "on the basis of time," follow the stock introductions. When these stylistic markers do not appear in *B, but an identical extract is identified 'of Porphyry' in another MS in the bT family, Schrader is at a loss.

The Vatican MS, however, makes clear that Porphyry never introduces *zetemata* with such introductions, nor does he avail himself of such solutions. Extracts that Schrader regarded as anomalous actually bear the distinguishing characteristics of *zetemata* in Book One. Whereas Schrader believed that Porphyry's style and methods changed in the later books, I argue that there is a tight consistency of style and method through the work as a whole. Once it is purged of contamination from the scholia, one can recognize more easily the *QH*'s affinities with works such as Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae*.

