

Tj g Hqo gt le Qwgnkqp or Tj g Ezr gt lo gpvcnMgyj qf qmji {

From the obscure beginnings to our foggy days among the Philologists days among the Philologists olds out vivacious debate about the nature and around the structure of the ir Discipline, about the immediate aims and the ultimate goal of their beloved Philology.

Great, large confusion in the philological field and no light shines to guide in the labyrinth and chaos of ideas, suggestions, ypotheses and convictions, everybody and everyone at the best of his means fiercely trying to condemn the new ideas: fruit of a sinful sinner's mind!

Woe to the apostates!

The roman priest sermonizing deplore and condemn the sinners in viting them to repent going the way of virtue and leaving the way of vice; the Universities 'Professors: laical priests of the new religion of Philology, from the high podiums of their minds superciliously pick up the heresies and scornfully condemn the apostates and the heretics blaming them fortheir: «folle audacia e temerario ardire» in opening new ways or damning the bold innovators to absolute «silence» worse than death.

For apostates and heretics no piety; apostates and heretics don't enjoy good time: «Mala tempora currunt!», not inside and outside of the Church but inside and outside of the Universities giving credit to the saying «Freelancer: great provoker!».

We suggest a point: among the ancient and the contemporary Philologists lacks unanimity; if questioned: «What's Philology?», they would differently answer to the proposed question.

Not all but many of the modern and contemporary Philologists, leading the questioner by the nose, would shun the question leaving stunned the reader at such conclusion: To the question: «What's today Philology?», are possible two classes of answers: 1) «the philological field is open»; 2) «the philological field is closed», so giving no answer to the proposed question.

To the reader stupefied, feeling to fall from an absurd to other absurds, the reader tossed by the breaking wawes of doubt loses the hope of the shore of salvation.

From the Philologists we find no answer to the proposed question from the days of ancient Greece to our days which have witnessed the formidable succes of Physics and the persistent ineffectiveness of Philology.

The Philologists are still trying to find a valid definition universally accepted of their discipline: their effort inefficacious. There being as many definitions as there are Philologists, we find justified the ancient maxim: «*Quot capitum vivunt, totidem studiorum milia*», so obliged to believe: «The Philology is not a Science!».

In this chorus of «etemenankian» discordance, not having the thread to disentangle our selves from the skein of so different voices, not knowing what to believe but still hoping to find a correct answer to the unanswered question we shall spend brain and time to demonstrate: «The Philology: a Science» and «The Philologist: a Scientist of highest degree».

The Greeks of ancient times were used to begin by Jove: not believing to the pagan deity we'll begin from the beginnings of Philology. Philology is old as old the man who took abode upon the mother earth. Philology and Humanity contemporary: the Man making Philology: Philology making Man!

There, in the Mesopotamian land, between two large rivers, peoples lived their lives and left ruins of cities and amounts of tablets with cuneiform writing: leaving records and making history, they made Philology respecting the double-faced meaning of the greek compound name: «Philology»: 1) «The love of the parole: *lógos*»: 2) «The love of history: *lógoi*».

There, along its sandy banks flowed the sacred river Nile and from its rich and inundating waters the «fellahim» sucked their nutriment and gave their lives to the reigning Pharaoh erecting monuments and building tombs for the eternal peace of the Pharaoh's «*Kâ*», for the merriment of the thieves and for the glory of the present day Archaeologists.

In the egyptian tombs and monuments engraving jeroglyphs the Egyptians made History and

made Philology respecting the double-faced meaning of the greek compound name: «Philology».

There, in the land of Egypt lived the Izraelites. Guided by Moses, the Izraelites left the Egypt's soil and crossed the Red sea waters, went wandering in the Sinai's desert solitudes eating «mana» and adoring the serpent: the egyptian «*aspis nigricolla*» or «*naje aje*»: the theriomorphic symbol of Ammon-Rà. God by means of Moses gave to His People the Sacred Law: «Thoràh»; died Moses and Joshua brought the Elected People in the Promised Land. The Izraelites made History, made Philology respecting the double-faced meaning of the greek compound name.

There, in the sea-shores of Phoenicia lived and traded Phoenicians who preferring the seas's ways to the land's routes, went by sea trading and establishing far away colonies and settlements. The Phoenicians invented the «*alphabet*» and passing it to other peoples they made History, made Philology respecting the double-faced meaning of the greek compound name.

There, in the mountainous land of Greece and in the luminous islands of the Mediterranean sea lived a people of dark eyes, dark hair and dark complexion: the mediterranean stock of humanity who enjoyed peace and loved music and dancing and left memories of its existence and of its social organization and activity in the ample ruins of Haghia Triada, of Knossos, of Festos and of Thera and in the «*murales*» of their palaces they represented men and women with dark hair, dark eyes and dark complexion while in the gigantic remains of Mykenae and Tyrinth they left marks of their power so making History, making Philology respecting the double-faced meaning of the greek compound name. The Odyssey: the epic poem of Odysseus the navigator hero fixed the great saga of this sea-farer people.

There, in the land of Greece reflected in the sparkling waters of the Ionian and Aegean sea penetrated bringing war and destruction the Achean warriors who had blond hair, blue eyes and white complexion.

The barbarian warriors looking for the first time at the sea called it «*Thálatta*» using the Aborigenes' language: they had no name for what they ignored. The blond Acheans made wars home and abroad and the «*Iliad*» celebrated their bellicose deeds and they made History and made Philology respecting the double-faced meaning of the greek compound name.

Odyssey and Iliad: two poems and two societies between them as distant as the moon from the earth; the first the saga of the dark people; the second the saga of the blond people: two different histories of two different peoples in the same land, in the same islands but in different times.

In time's process the greek People divided himself in: Ionians, Dorians and Attics; from them arised and proceeded the greek miracle: the miracle of literature, of philosophy, of science, of beauty, of culture and civilization.

There, in Halicarnassus lived his young years Herodotus: the father of History; to Him we owe the definition: «Philology: the love of the «parole»: «*lógos*»; «Philology: the love of history: «*lógoi*».

The greatest Wanderer of Antiquity wrote and passed to the future generations what the scribes translated to Him: the Wanderer wrote the History of the peoples He visited and His «parole» was and is a «parole» of Truth: He made Philology. He made History respecting the double-faced meaning of the greek compound name. There, in Athens lived Plato and Aristotle; the two celebrated philosophers did not neglect Philology or what they understood to be Philology.

There, in Athens happened something noteworthy: Plato and Aristotle marked the end of the double-faced meaning Philology burying it under studies of ample extensions and of diversified interests. The two philosophers studied and solved grammar's problems: Plato distinguished the name from the verbo of the verb enhancing numbers, genders and times; in the Cratylus He discussed etymologies and discussed about the nature and quality of poetry in the «*Politeia*», and «*Phaedrus*» and forcibly He rebuked the «rapsodes» burlesquely constraining Ion to reconoitre Homer as the greatest greek poet but not the master-expert in all the fields of Science.

For the first time and fighting the «*authoritative principle*»: the «*autos ephe*». Plato in His way and by His means opened the «Homeric Question» but He did not close what He had tentatively

opened.

Aristotle in His Grammar's studies, discovered the conjunctions and in His Poetics systematically studied the Poetry.

The two Philosophers: for his own part each of them made Philology but we call not philological their studies seeing in them grammatical studies, poetical studies but not philological studies if the greek compound name in its double-faced meaning still signifies: «Love of the «parole»: *lógos*; «love of history: *lógoi*». Plato and Aristotle amputated the Philology reducing it from Science to inclination, from the study of «parole» and «history» to the study of the sole «parole»: their fallacious distorsion and deceiving separation is still active with its nefastous and negative consequences. Philology is a very different matter! Plato and Aristotle had large number of followers. The Peripate and Academy's pupils had scarce interest in Philology: they were not able to close the «Homeric Question» they never claimed to have opened.

There, in Macedonia lived king Philip and went his way fighting the Greeks and his phalanxers' «*sarissae*» conquered Greece and the barbarous king cried his victory bawling: «*Demosthenes Demosthenous, Paianeus tade eipen!*» = «Demosthenes son of Demostenes from Pean, said all that!».

Philip of Macedonia made History, He did not make Philology! Alexander the Great, son of Philip, made History too but He left the Philology to the experts in the field.

There, in Alexandria city of Egypt, Ptolemy Philadelph founded the «Museum» and the «Serapeum» books deposits and boarding-house for all the scientists of the Oekumene: the «Museum» lasted for quite five centuries: in the «Museum» lived, taught and worked the best brains of Antiquity.

In those far away times and days, there, in Egypt, in Mesopotamia, Judea, Phoenicia and Greece worked geniuses who created marvelous monuments for the eternal glory of gods and goddesses, for the perpetual fame of the reigning sovereigns and rulers and for the continous joy of the people but they were not Scientists in the modern acception of the word.

The ancient Science, the modern Science have little in common: they have the same aims, they aim at same goals but they hav their way by different routes and means applying a diverse Methodology.

The difference separating the Ancient from the Modern Science is due principally to the different Methodology. The observation compell us to proclaim: «*There, no Science without Methodology!*» The alexandrinian men of culture catalogued the books of the «Museum» and filled the «Serapeum» with copies: they emended and corrected the text: they expounded and annotated the works of ancient masters: they sketched biographies and occupied themselves with grammar and critiques's problems.

The alexandrianian experts were all but Philologists: they made Philology but they did not make History so not respecting the double-faced meaning af the greek compound name. There, in the «Museum» among the «Pensioners» of the Ptolemies aroused a fierce strife: coiled up in two opposed factions: «Callimacheans» and «Anticallimacheans», the cultured Alexandrinians professed a very different idea about poetry: they disputed and their disputing saw no end: they wrote elaborate epigrams and fine epills but neglecting the people, their poetry being adressed to the men of culture and doctrine, they made Philology not History so neglecting the double-faced meaning of the greek compound name.

While in the «Museum» they fervently disputed, in Athen the Academic Philosophers studied Mathematics and Astronomy and the Peripatetic Philosophers studied Nature and Biology. In Alexandria lived, studied and worked Physicists of first degree who were not disturbed by the dispute raging in the halls of the «Museum». The alexandrianian Physicists had no time to quarrel: penetrating the marvelous word of Exact Science they scorned to lose time while pursuing the truth being pursued by it incessantly. In Alexandria, Euclides wrote his famous: «*Stoicheia=Elements*» and in 13 books He expounded the Elementar Geometry.

In Alexandria, Aristarchus from Samos, precursor of Copernic, Galileo and Newton, to the geocentric opposed his helio-centric system: Aristarchus was accused of impiety; his condemnation did not alert Galileo. Conon from Samos was a famous astronomer in Alexandria and environs: Conon wrote 7 books of Astronomy and having detected in the sky a new constellation called it: «The Coma Berenices» honouring queen Berenice, daughter of Magas king of Cyrene and wife of Ptolemy III, to whom Conon had dedicated his works about Astronomy.

There, in Alexandria, Archimedes frequented the disciples of Euclides: He was a great mathematician, a great physicist, the greatest of all, inventor of the «hydraulic windlass» and of the «coclea» by Galileo defined: «not marvelous but miraculous».

Claudius Marcellus, roman «*imperator*», unchaining his legionaries for the final assault against the walls of Syracuse with the geste of the «*pollex versus*», ordered to save Archimedes and that was very roman indeed: to save the bitterest foe who against the assaulting Combined Roman Forces had invented and manned catapults, missile throwers and grappling hooks.

Archimedes died killed by a roman soldier, hero of His city and martyr of the beloved Physics. In 1906, Johan Ludwig Heiberg, a danish Scholar, found the text of «Method»: book containing the ways followed by Archimedes in His research-work.

Apollonius from pamphylian Perge surnamed the «Geometer» considered the most eminent mathematician of all times, studied in Alexandria following the classes of the Euclides' disciples; He wrote the «Conical Elements»: He defined more accurately the relation between the circumference and the circle's diameter; He invented the «epicycles» which supported the geocentric theory of Ptolemy. Eratosthenes from Cyrene, called «*Beta*» and «*Pentathlete*» by His defamers, called himself: «*Philosophos*» so declaring the vastness of His literary and scientific acquirements.

Chief of the alexandrian bibliotheca and tutor of Ptolemy Philopator, He wrote about literature and poetry; He tried to determine the dates of important historical and literary events from the traditional fall of Troy (1184 B.C.) to his days; his «*Geographica*» elevated geography to the rank of Science, delving systematically into ethnographical, mathematical, physical and political geography; He corrected the earlier measurements of the obliquity of the ecliptic; He measured the earth circumference and his Calculation only slightly exceeded the magnitude now accepted therefore.

Eratosthenes had two sticks fixed in two wells: one in Alexandria, the other in Syene; from the angular difference of the shade and the measured distance between the two cities He calculated the earth's circumference: a very great deed for that time! He wrote about literary and scientific matters and if He was «*Beta*»: a second in His literary works, He was certainly «*Alfa*»: the first in the scientific field; if what He wrote about Homer and the epic poetry did not close the «Homeric Question», what He wrote in the Geographical and Chronological field is still valid.

Erophilus, disciple of Praagoras from Cos, was the founder of Anatomy. The Anatomy made considerable progress when in the «*Museum*» was practised the vivisection of criminals.

In Alexandria, Pergamon, Antiocheia and Athens the Science made progress in its different fields; no progress registered the Literature in its diversified fields; of this formidable contrast we must uncover the causes.

There, in the alexandrian «*Museum*» and surroundings lived, worked and operated a bunch and bundle of Philologists seriously occupied in studying the greek literature, the greek poets and writers; they were particularly addicted to enlighten the Homer's life and the two poems: the «*Iliad*», the «*Odyssey*». In the alexandrian «*Museum*» they opened rightly the «*Homeric Question*» but they were not rightly able to close it because they lacked the right methodology and «*where is not Methodology, there is no Science*».

The alexandrian Philologists of the III century B.C. spoiled Homer: the blind Poet of all the poems of the Epic Cycle; «*apertis verbis*» they declared not homeric the «*Margites*», the

«*Batrachomiomachy*» and several «*Epigrams*» but «*ore rotundo*» declared homeric the «*Iliad*» and the «*Odyssey*».

The alexandrinian Philologists were not unanimous; in the «*Homeric Question*», they reflected all their culture and doctrine, all their sentiments. Xenon and Hellanicus declared Homer's the «*Iliad*», not the «*Odyssey*»; for the accomplished great deed the fellows adversaries adorned the two with the felicious but scornful surname: «*Chorizontes*'» repeated nowadays by the so called Philologists of our times afraid to appear inferior to the past and present stock yielding to the bandmaster of the moment.

In the «*Chorizontes*'» critique the true foundation of the «*Homeric Question*» which holds out in our days and there is no hope that may be closed someday the infinite series of books, treatises, essays, articles and papers which flowing from the authors' hands don't stop filling the bibliothecas' long and bent shelves in all the countries.

The «*Chorizontes*'» voice was strangled by the Aristarchus' authority who believed and forced all to believe: Homer author of the two poems: the «*Iliad*», the «*Odyssey*». The «*Homeric Question*» involved all the problems concerning the Poet's life, homeland, deeds and death.

An Alexandrian Epigrammatist in two verses confessed his incapacity to fix the Homer's natal city choosing among seven cities: «*Seven cities strife to be the Homer's famous home / Smyrna, Chios; Kolophon, Pylos, Sparta, Ithaca, Athens*». Among the ancient and the contemporary Philologists nobody knows the native city of the greek Poet and the relative doubts not yet solved are stille intriguing the cultured minds.

The roman Philologists, if we can consider them Philologists, following the greek erudite men, said nothing new about and around the «*Homeric Question*»: Horace wrote: «*Quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus*»; Properce exclaimed: «*Nescio quid maius nascitur Iliade*»; Juvenal versified admiringly: «*Conditor Iliados cantabitur atque Maronis*»; Alcimus meditated: «*Si potuit nasci quem sequeris, Homere / Nascetur qui Te possit, Homere, sequi*»; Quintilianus remarked: «*Qui mihi interroganti quem Homero crederet maxime accedere: Secundus, inquit, est Vergilius: proprior tamen primo quam tertio*»; Cicero informed about the Pisistratus' redaction: «*Qui (Pisistratus) primus Homeri libros confusos ante sic disposuisse dicitur ut nunc habemus*».

The Roman Philologist had notice of the «*Homeric Question*» but to it they did not give attention: a greek problem to be solved by greek minds if they were able of such arduous deed!

Passed centuries, passed years upon years and nothing new, nothing of interest was said or written about Homer and around the «*Homeric Question*». Nothing new from the Humanists and all of them they were very cultured fellows; nothing new, nothing of interest was said or written by the Renaissance men and all of them they were very cultured fellows.

Everybody kept strict silence because there was nothing to say, because the «*authoritative principle*»: «*autos ephē*», «*ipse dixit*» was too great to be ignored or to be transgressed. Finally and centuries after, François Hédelin abbé d'Aubignac, in the year of grace 1664, reopening the «*Homeric Question*» firmly believed to have put a brilliant stop to the problem. The french «*abbé*» put the question his way: 1) the two poems too large to be transmitted orally in the absence of writing; 2) to an attentive examiner the «*Iliad*» presents no unity; 3) in the epic poem many contradictions. «*L'abbé*» reopened the «*Homeric Question*» but did not close it because He had not at his disposal the right Methodology.

A few years after Giambattista Vico in his: «*Principi di Scienza Nuova intorno alla Comune Natura delle Nazioni*» in the third chapter: «*Scoperta del Vero Omero*» expressed lucidly what He thought about Homer, about the two Poems and about the epic poetry; what He thought, what He wrote is nowadays still valid because Vico looked at Homer not with the Philologist's eyes but with His philosophic mind.

Philology and philosophy are very different because they are about different matter treated with different Methodology. For Vico Homer was only a name: a fictitious name not a living person, not a living Poet.

For Vico understood in Homer all the greek people in its «*infancy*», seen and considered author of the two poems: the «*Iliad*» the «*Odyssey*». For Vico the «*Iliad*», the «*Odyssey*» were and are: «due gran tesori dei costumi dell'antichissima Grecia».

For Vico the Philosopher, the «*Iliad*», the «*Odyssey*» contain diverse uses, different manners, diverse ways of two different societies. For Vico the two poems represent the «*infancy*» and the «*maturity*» of the ancient greek people as of all the peoples upon the mother earth's surface.

We applaud to Vico and recognizing His greatness, we profoundly ~pplaud appreciate what He saw in Homer, what He wrote about the two epic poems but being no slaves of the «*authoritative principle*» we daresay that Vico did not close the opened «*Homeric Question*» for two principal arguments: 1) Vico could not close the «*Homeric Question*» which was extraneous to Him; 2) Vico could not close what He had not opened because He lacked the necessary information about the two societies He understood portrayed in the poems.

The ideas and work of Hédelin d'Aubignac and Giambattista Vico were not known to the large public who had no access to the secret halls of the contemporary Academies. There, from Hainrode went Friedrich August Wolf who moved the quiet waters of the «*Homeric Question*». Wolf was the second in the long arch of time to employ the name: «*Philologia*» in his registration's demand: «*Studiosus Philologiae*» in the Gottingen University.

Wolf in a second time, to the name: «*Philologia*» preferred the german compound name: «*Alterthumswissenschaft*» as omnicomprehensive and not restricted as the greek compound name. Wolf wasn't aware adopting the german compound name that He was betraying the double-faced meaning of the greek compound name. For Wolf who studied Homer, the epic poems and the «*Homeric Question*» moving from the «*Scholia*» of «*Venetus A*», published by Villoison, there was no writing in the Homer's supposed times.

For Wolf there only a possibility: the two poems: «*Iliad*» and «*Odyssey*» were redacted in Athens by a Commission appointed by Pisistratus in the VI century B.C. For Wolf the «*Iliad*» contains a central nucleus of 18 chants; the «*Odyssey*» believed Wolf, was due partly to Homer and partly to the «*Homeridae*». Wolf saw a strong analogy between the homeric poems and the ossianic poems: a fruit of the popular poetry!

Friedrich August Wolf, teuton from Hainrode and german «*Philologist*» or, so He preferred, «*Alterthumswissenschaftler*» acquired great fame with His «*Prolegomena ad Homerum*», reopening the «*Homeric Question*» but He was not able to close what He had reopened because He lacked Methodology and He was a german Philologist! There, from Leipzig came Gottfried Hermann with a new theory of His own about Homer and about the two epic poems. Hermann followed Wilh. Mueller in structuring the «*Erweiterung-oder Entwicklungshypothese*».

Hermann believed the «*Iliad*» composed around a central «*Kern*» of successive adjoints, ampliations and rielaborations elaborated to improve the «*nucleus*». Herman believed the «*Odyssey*» resulting by successive adjoints, ampliations and successive rielaborations around the central «*nucleus*» of the original poem.

Gottfried Hermann from Leipzig enjoyed great fame home and abroad but fame and name did not help Him to close the «*Homeric Question*» He had not opened ad because He too lacked the right Methodology and He was a Philologist, a german Philologist!

W. Leaf, RC. Jebb, E. Petersen, E. Rohde, M. Valenton, G. Murray. P. Cauer and, last but not least, G. Finsler, each for his own part, tried to buttress the «*Hermannsche Ypothesis*». There, from Braunschweig came Karl Lachmann and taught at the «*Berliner Universitaet*».

Lachman was an eminent classical and german Philologist who distinguished in the philological field the «*recensio*» and the «*emendatio*», exhorting to establish the archetype by collating the manuscripts, the testimonies, the «*Scholia*» before ascending by conjectures to the original archetype. Lachmann founded the «*Liedertheorie*»: the «*Iliad*» resulted from 18 distinct laies originally independent but mechanically assembled and only in the sixth century recorded by writing, by the commission «*ad hoc*» appointed by Pisistratus. Lachmann was not able to close the

«*Omeric Question*» He had not opened.

Karl Lachmann classical and german Philologist left open what open He did find because He too lacked a right and sound Methodology! There, from Berlin came Adolf Kirchhoff and He acquired great fame and vaste resonance in the philological circles by His homeric studies. Kirchhoff proposed His «*Kompilationstheorie*» extrapolating it from the «*Odyssey*». Kirchhoff believed and tried to demonstrate the «*Odyssey*» composed by three distinct «*Gedichte*»: 1) «*Nostoi*», 2) «*Telemachy*», 3) «*Ithakesia*». The «*Kompilationstheorie*» was followed and corroborated by the works and studies of B. Miese, Ch. Reimreichs, U.v. Wilamowitz, O. Seeck, J. van Leeuwen and D. Muelder.

Kirchhoff and His followers did not close the «*Homeric Question*» because all of them had doctrine and culture but they all lacked the right and sound Methodology!

The contemporary Philologists are assembled in two opposite groups: 1) «*The Unitarians*», 2) «*The Antiunitarians*» and between them have their good space the «*Neo unitarians*» who believed: a Poet for the «*Iliad*», a Poet for the «*Odyssey*»: poets who at their times had rielaborated preesistent poems or epic laies. They all: «*Unitarians*», the «*Antiunitarians*» and the «*Neounitarians*» believe to be able to close the «*Homeric Question*» but all of them failed because they too lacked the right and sound Methodology!

Nowadays, the «*Homeric Questions*» is losing if it has not lost its attraction b'ut nobody recognizes this loss of interest because nobody has the courage to denounce the total and final bankruptcy of all the ancient and contemporary attempts to close the still open «*Homeric Question*». The failure was and is due principally to the lack of a right and sound Methodology to which we recognize the capacity of closing once and for all the «*Homeric Question*» and the other classical questions and problems still open because not solved.

The contemporary Philology is slowly making its way toward a better understarding of Homer, of His poems, of His poetry, His times and the two societies described in the two poems because the modern Philologists are ready to accept the help of the other Sciences while trying to solve problems exclusively philological.

This is the first and necessary step toward the scientific foundation of the Experimental Philology: give space, give importance to the Sciences before called «*Subsidiary*» because underestimated.

While the «*Homeric Question*» was raging among the cultured circles, the Archaeologists gave news to the cultured world of their brilliant discoveries in the land of Turkey, Crete and Greece. Well, the archaeological discoveries proved the existence of writing (Linear A, Linear B) in the royal palaces of

Crete; if the writing was in use in Crete of the Minoan Age (3000 B.C. to 1100 B.C.) all were concord to admit: the writing, *a fortiori*, in use in the homeric times. The discovery of writing crashed and smashed the Hédelinian and Wolfian theory, both built upon anthistorical premise.

Heinrich Schliemann, german from Neubukow, in the hill of Hissarlik in Turkey discovered a city and in the sixth couch He saw the burned ruines of the homeric city of Troy devoured by fire; excavating at Tirinth, Mycenae and Orchomenos Schliemann found precious ornaments, jewels and utensils

testimonies of a dead but rich society. There, in the island of Crete worked Arctur Evans, Federico Halbherr and Luigi Pernier at Knossos, Festos and Haghia Triada and everybody knows what They found but nobody as it seems, was aware of the importance of their discoveries related to the «*Homeric Question*».

Every Homer's word was studied, weighed and referred to the minoan society, to the minoan culture but no one was intrigued by the «*murales*» discovered in the royal palaces of Crete, nobody was intrigued by the «*murale*» discovered in the island of Thera. In the studied but somewhat ignored «*murales*» the Experimental Philology grasps the new idea and establishes a new Methodology in the philological studies.

Well, if there we may doubt of the «*paroles*» of the two poems for the ambiguity carried by the

«*parole*», it is not possible to doubt of the «*parole*» if and when confirmed by the «*murales*» which represent the society of Crete and of the greek island, described by Homer in His *Odyssey*. In the royal

palaces' «*murales*» we contemplate men and women with dark hair, dark eyes in their features of a dark complexion; in Thera's «*murale*» we contemplate men and a navy of merchant vessels going by oars and by sails or mooring at anchor in the sheltered harbor of the island.

Dark hair, dark eyes and mediterranean features in the dark complexion Homer attributes to Odysseus the seafarer hero of the «*Odyssey*» and dark hair, dark eyes and features of dark complexion have the Pheacians in their island and they were of the same mediterranean racial stock and like Odysseus they were great navigators putting their defense and all their hopes in the vessels, in the navigation's skill and in the absence of dangers and in the presence of peace. This mediterranean people of navigators

enjoyed a society which had reached the highest degree of culture and civilization: the Cretan-Minoan civilization from 3000 B.C. to 1400 B.C.

The archaeological discoveries, the existence at that time of writing, the glorious ruins of the cities of Crete and Greece; the surprising «*murales*» bring to our attention the existence in the mediterranean land and sea area of an industrious people of dark complexion, dark eyes and dark hair who went around the mediterranean waters for commercial purposes not for war; who lived in cities defended by the navy not by wall or fortified ramparts; who loved peace refusing war and a lively life because around they had no foe to be afraid of; whose women could love whom they loved nobody enforcing them to matrimony.

Upon this solid archeological premises conformed and supported by the «*Odyssey's*» verses, the Experimental Philology dares say the «*Odyssey*» poem and saga of the people of navigators of mediterranean racial stock: dark hair, dark eyes, dark features in dark complexion living in the greek island and in the greek inland, who enjoyed peace and lived a life free of fears because in the navy they put their defence and in the commerce their riches.

The Experimental Philology proclaims the «*Odyssey*» the lay of the mediterranean people, in the «*Odyssey*» seeing the navigation book of the men who dominated in the long run the Mediterranean, Ionian and Aegean waters before the coming of the Arian warriors who brought with them the barbarian idea of war and introduced in the dark mediterranean racial stock the blond hair, blue eyes and white features in the candid complexion. The Arian warriors knew the art of war but they ignored the winds, ignored the stars, they ignored the navigability of the sea waters: of the sea they ignored the name and «*Thalatta*» they called with a mediterranean word the brilliant waters of the greek sea they saw for the first time and they had non name for wat they did not know. The blond warriors destroyed the society and the civilization they found in Greece but they were not able to destroy the culture as they were not able to destroy the mediterranean people who racially survived and in the long run of time absorbed the intruding blond warriors who slowly but incessantly absorbed the superior culture of the conquered enemy and rightly we understand the Horace's verse: «*Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit*».

The blond warriors by fire and by sword destroyed the mediterranean people: of these ancient wars we have memories in the «*Iliad*»: the poem of warriors, the saga of the fighting blond men, the lay of the bloody and furious madness of Achilles the hero of the «*Iliad*» who knew the use of the arms but ignored the laws of the sea and of the sky, because as did his fellows, he ignored the winds, the marine currents and the navigating art.

The Experimental Philology making the right use of the archaeological discoveries, of the anthropological discoveries, of the philological conclusions and extrapolating from those Sciences what is to be extrapolated, readily acknowledges: The «*Homeric Question*» may finally and decisively be closed by the Experimental Philologist who humbly considers all the subsidiary sciences as necessary and valid instruments of research in the philological field: who applies to the philological realm the «*Experimental Methodology*».

Having indicated the possibility of closing in a scientific way the still unsolved «Homeric Question», we are ready to confess as not having yet demonstrated the Philology Science, not having proposed answer to the question: «Philology is a Science?».

The answer to the question was given three centuries ago by the founder of the «Experimental Physics»: Galileo Galilei who for his misfortune and our fortune was a dedicated Physicist and not a Philologist. The contemporary Philologist saw the «Experimental Physics» as a blasphemy and cried anathema and stoutly refused to put their eyes to the «cannocchiale» and believing to condemn Galileo and His discoveries they condemned themselves and their discipline to complete inefficacy.

This refusal was not a trifle of a bagatelle if it costed to Galileo His imprisonment at Arcetri and to the Philologists the misery of their «Static Philology» and to the Philology the loss of the primacy it enjoyed over all the other Sciences.

Guided by the success of the «Experimental Physics» we openly acknowledge: «There, every Science is Experimental». Well, now there is the problem: «demonstrate the Philology subjected to the 'Experimental Methodology' is equivalent to proclaim the Philology a Science» and not a «forma mentis» reserved for few men elected to enter the Philology's reserved domain.

The «Experimental Methodology» opened the way to Physics to enter in the scientific field and realm: the «Experimental Methodology» shall introduce once and for all the Philology into the scientific realm, field and domain. To the physical force is subjected everything, everybody born and living upon the earth's surface, in the air of the sky and in the profound and dark waters of oceans and seas.

The «parole»: creature of man, as such is of material matter and therefore subjected as all other bodies, objects and particles to the «attrition's law» which operating in the philological field we call: «catatropy», in order to shun the blame of the Physicists jealous of their Science, of their definitions, of their terminology.

All the bodies, all the objects, all the particles being material and therefore subjected to the «attrition's law», pass from a superior to an inferior status, finally disappearing at the end of their short or long way. The same happens to the «parole» which lives its life and after the transformations undergone in its diachronic process, finally disappears in the mute heap of all the «fossilized» words.

The life and death of a body, object and particle is not different from the life and death of a «parole»: the life and death of a galaxy, of a solar system, of a star is not different from the life and death of a «parole»: the mikrokosmos, the makrokosmos!

The astronomers following the stars photograph them and to study them fix what they cannot see in the stellar «spectrogram»: in the fixed «spectrogram» the astronomers read the pulsating life of the star and they follow the stars all along the way of their decaying till to their death in a gigantic fire explosion: «expyrosis».

What do the Astronomers, that must do the Philologists if they will make Science not Rhetoric: imitating the Astronomers, they must follow the «parole» from its appearance all along the path of its life to its disappearance when left to decay and die in the neglected heap of all the dead «paroles». Who follows the «parole» all along the path of its short or long life, must fix all its mutations, diversifications, changements of form and meaning in the baconian: 1) «tabula praesentiae» 2) «tabula absentiae» 3) «tabula graduum», in order to shape the history of the «parole» in a graduate stripe we call: «rhematogram». The «rhematogram» when and if finished carries the history of the «parole»: the objective not the subjective history.

The «parole» being the loyal mirror of the society which invented, used and transformed the «parole», the «rhematogram» of the «parole» carries and contains the history of the society: the objective history not the subjective history. There, we see unified the study of the double-faced greek compound name: Philology: 1) «study of the parole=lógos» 2) «study of the history:lógoi»

The «Experimental Methodology» resulting in the objective study of the «parole» and of «history», the objectivity the true fruit of Science compels us to proclaim Philology a Science not a subjective

«forma mentis». If in the «paroles» the Philologist unveils the history, then Philology is on the way to regain its primacy!

The astronomer to fix the star «spectrogram» has the plate or the star's film: the Philologist has the sources: literary, archaeological, anthropological, religious, artistic, antiquarian sources to rebuild the «rhematogram» of the «parole»; when the sources are absent or silent, the Philologist must have the heart to use «phantasy», which is not the propriety of the sole Physicists!

Studying the diachronic evolution of the «parole in its external form and in its internal meaning, there are two ways to register and fix the «rhematogram»: 1) «Anabatic way»: moving down-up from the known meaning of the «parole» to the aboriginal and unknown meaning of the same «parole»: 2) «Katabatic way»: moving up-down from the known aboriginal meaning to the unknown ultimate meaning of the «parole».

When to the brave Philologist shines no hope of finding sources, then He must formulate «hypothesis» that sort of «Arbeitsypothese» which is very familiar with the Physicists having guided them in their researches, to have a channel to let flow the ideas, not constraining them to be stanchied; carrier of truth the «ypothesis» which shall be corroborated by valid proofs.

The prudent Philologist, who feels the gravity of his work, speaks not by the support of the «ipse dixit» or the comfort of the literary sources because of their ambiguity but with the help of the improperly called: «subsidiary sciences»: graffiti, pictures, mosaics, numismatic, sculptures, antiquarian, history, geography, mathematics, astronomy, philosophy, sociology, anthropology, mathematics, and last but not least, medicine.

Using correctly the «Experimental Philology» and correctly applying its «Decalogue when shaping the «rhematogram» of the «parole» in order to know the history of the «parole», in order to know the history of the society, the Philologist shall register success as never before in the long life of Philology.

When the Philologist will scientifically interpret the «rhematogram», then and only then Philologist will regain his place, will be the master of his Science to indicate to all the right way to follow in their studies.

Here the renewable «Decalogue» of the «Experimental Philology»:

- 1) «Eternal and perpetual refusal of the Autoritative principle»;
- 2) «Eternal and perpetual adherence to the Bengelian imperative»; «Applica Te totum ad textum; rem totam applica ad Te!»;
- 3) «Eternal and perpetual searching of the "parole" reversing the De Saussureian theory»;
- 4) «Eternal and perpetual inquiry of the "parole" in order to fix its aboriginal meaning; employ of "phantasy" and "ypothesis "when necessary»;
- 5) «Eternal and perpetual registering of the meanings of the "parole" all along its short or long diachronic process; employ of "phantasy" and "ypothesis" when necessary»;
- 6) «Eternal and perpetual registering of the "parole" by "Anabasis." when is known the last meaning of the "parole"; by "Katabasis" when is know the aboriginal meaning of the "parole"»;
- 7) «Eternal and perpetual registering of the "rhematogram" of the "parole"»
- 8) «Eternally and perpetually the Philologist will adhere to the "rhematogram" of the "parole"»;
- 9) «Eternally and perpetually adhering to the "rhematogram "the Philologist shall rebuild the society and its history»;
- 10) The «rhematogram» carries the objective history of man and the sole possibility of its remaking.

To the «Experimental Philology» and to its simple «Decalogue» we recognize as due the objective successes obtained in our work still vivacious in the field left unvaried by the Static Philology. The «Experimental Philology» helped us to prove false the «maneloquium» attributed to the Romans and the «saluto fascista» the Romans civilians and soldiers never did (I); to prove false the gest of the

and of the «pollex versus» (inexistent) (2), so reconstructing the roman gesture of the «maneloquium circense», «maneloquium castrenese», «maneloquium cottidianum», «maneloquium sub-uranum» or «sucusanum»; the right interpretation of the roman «manelo-quium» was of great help in reading the «Columna Ulpiatraiana», the «Columna Marcaurelia» and all the mosaics and pictures and the pompeian graffiti(3).

The employ of the same «Decalogue» facilitated our work in penetrating the «nominatura» of the «Divus Julius»(4); the same «Decalogue» correctly applied was helpful in solving the difficult problem connected with the «nominatura» of Publius Vergilius «Maro Parthenias» and in making light in the obscure «Vergaiusge burtsortsjrage», declaring «Andes» not a vicus' or pagus' name but name of the celtic tribe to which belonged «Vergiliomarus»: father of the mantuan Poet, which had occupied the territory of the Ultrahighpadania of Mantua(5).

The «Decalogue» helped us to solve the problem of the meaning of the name: «Roma», «Romus», «Romulus», «Romina» and «Ruminalis»(6); helped us to nullify the absurd legend of the Capitol's geese(7); to solve the legend of the serpent: «aspis nigricolla» or «naje aje» suggested as the cause of the death of Cleopatra, of Iras and Charmion(8); helped us also in clearing the difficulties and the problems of the two battles of Philippi and of the military career of the tribune Q. Horatius Flaccus(9); helped us also in restituting to Q. Fabius Maximus Ovicula Verrucosus Cunctator the glory of his surname and the merits of his strategy against Hannibal and the fame of his War-school (10). The «Experimental Philology» helped us to formulate the «imperiu's» theory, which opened new fields of study in the Roman history (11).

The results give credit to the «Experimental Philology» and to its «Decalogue» and we recommend it to all concerned and to all the unconcerned inviting all to leave the old way to enter new ways for new kind of grazing in the new pasturage having left the withered and arid old pasturage.

Davide Nardoni

¹ D. Nardoni, «Utroque...pollice», Nuova Scienza, XVII, maggio 1976, n.5, pp.39-45.

² D. Nardoni, «Pollice presso, pollice verso», Nuova Scienza, XVIII, aprile 1977 n.4, pp.7-9.

³ D. Nardoni, La Colonna Ulpia Traiana, Roma, Eiles, 1986.

D. Nardoni, La Colonna Marcaurelia, in pubblicazione per i tipi della Eiles, Roma.

⁴ D. Nardoni, «Caius Julius Caesar Dictator Perpetuus», Nuova Scienza, XVII, agosto-settembre 1976, n.8-9, pp.8-10.

⁵ D. Nardoni, «Vico Andico», Il Tartarello, dicembre 1983, n.4, pp.3-13.

D. Nardoni, «Vico Andico», Il Tartarello, marzo 1984, n. 1, pp.3-18.

⁶ D. Nardoni, Romus, Romulus, Rominalis, Romina, Roma, in «Spiragli», I, dicembre 1989, n.3 pp.8-10.

⁷ Delle «oche capitoline» in una prossima «taratalla» sulla rivista «Spiragli».

⁸ D. Nardoni, «Fatale monstrum», Nuova Scienza, XVIII, luglio 1977, n.7, pp. 7-9.

⁹ D. Nardoni, «Me dimisere Philippi», Novantiqua, Tip. Artig. Latina, 1979, pp.97-100; Accad. Ital. Scienz. Biolog. Moral.

D. Nardoni, «Relicta non bene parmula», Novantiqua, Tip. Artig. Latina, 1979, pp.101-107; Accad. Ital. Scienz. Biolog. Moral.

D. Nardoni, «O navis referent...» Novantiqua, Tip. Artig. Latina, 1979, pp.109-116; Accad. Ital. Scienz. Biolog. Moral.

¹⁰ D. Nardoni, «Quintus Fabius Maximus Verrucosus, Ovicula, Cunctator», Caicachanna, Tip. Artig. Latina. Accad. Ital. Scienz. Biolog. Moral., 1979, pp.11-13.

¹¹ D. Nardoni, «Imperium sine fine dedit», Caiachanna, Accad. Ital. Scienz. Biolog. Moral., Tip. Artig. Latina, 197, pp.50-64.