



DICCIONARIO
GRIEGO-ESPAÑOL



heleníst.

Glossematum interpretes grammatici (Gloss.Int.)

Dyck, A.R., «The Glossography», HSPh 91, 1987, pp.119-160.

Dyck 1987.pdf



THE GLOSSOGRAPHOI

ANDREW R. DYCK

I. Introduction

THE earliest Homeric exegesis is shrouded in darkness. We may have a reflection of the treatment of the Homeric text in the Athenian schoolroom in Aristophanes fr. 233 K-A, evidently an *agon* in which a father cross-examines his son on the meaning of various Homeric glosses; the son, in turn, seeks to deflect criticism by asking his brother to explain some forensic glosses:

πρὸς ταύτας δ' αἶ λέξον Ὀμήρου γλώττας· τί καλοῦσι κόρυμβα
 UU-UU-UU-UU- τί καλοῦς' ἄμενηνὰ κάρηνα
 (B.) ὁ μὲν οὖν σός, ἐμὸς δ' οὗτος ἀδελφὸς φρασάτω· τί καλοῦσιν
 ἰδύους
 UU-UU-UU-UU-UU- τί ποτ' ἐστὶν ὀπύειν ¹

There are also the anonymous predecessors against whom Aristarchus polemicized and whom he designated the Γλωσσογράφοι. K. Lehrs, who gathered the Iliadic scholia which allude to these exegetes, assumed that their doctrines were relics of Athenian school instruction.² Adding some further passages, K. Latte suggested that anonymous citation was itself a form of polemic and that there might have been, not only pre-, but also post-Aristarchan Γλωσσογράφοι, since the older type of Homeric exegesis continued to be practiced.³

There, apart from some individual observations, the matter has rested to the present day. What is needed is not more impressions based on selective data but a systematic collection and evaluation of

¹ Cf. K. Lehrs, *De Aristarchi studiis Homericis*³ (Leipzig 1882) 37; K. Latte, "Glossographika," *Philologus* 80 (1924) 148 = *Kleine Schriften* (Munich 1968) 641, finds specimens also at Pl. *Crat.* 417c, 419c, and 426c, but this is much less certain.

² K. Lehrs (above, n. 1) 36-39.

³ K. Latte (above, n. 1) 148, n. 26 = *Kl. Schr.* 641-642, n. 26.

the available evidence. As is inevitable in an area where major texts such as Cyril's *Lexicon* or the *Etymologicum Genuinum* remain largely unedited, the present attempted reconstruction must be termed tentative. Nevertheless, H. Erbse's monumental edition of the Iliadic scholia now creates relatively favorable conditions for such an undertaking. A close look at the senses in which the term γλωσσογράφοι occurs is entailed, as well as an analysis of the paths of transmission and of the glossographic doctrines in relation to those of Alexandrian critics and later exegetes.

The term γλωσσογράφοι is subject to some variation in meaning, insofar as γλώσσα itself denotes a word in need of explanation because not in current use, whether because it is obsolete or foreign or dialectal.⁴ This study is concerned with the Γλωσσογράφοι of pre-Aristarchan Homeric exegesis. The following are therefore of no further interest here: i) the Γλωσσογράφοι mentioned in the *Lexicon* of Harpocration,⁵ who seem to be authors of collections of Ἀττικάι λέξεις;⁶ ii) *Suda* α 2674, where, I suspect, γλωσσογράφοι is used loosely to mean "lexicographers"; iii) several passages in which Eustathius, evidently on his own authority,⁷ employs the term of authors of

⁴ Arist. *Rhet.* 1410b12: αἱ μὲν οὖν γλῶτται ἀγνώτες, τὰ δὲ κύρια ἴσμεν; *id.*, *Poet.* 1457b3: λέγω δὲ κύριον μὲν ὃ χρῶνται ἕκαστοι, γλῶτταν δὲ ὃ ἕτεροι· ὥστε φανερόν ὅτι καὶ γλῶτταν καὶ κύριον εἶναι δυνατόν τὸ αὐτό, μὴ τοῖς αὐτοῖς δέ· τὸ γὰρ σίγνον Κυπρίοις μὲν κύριον, ἡμῖν δὲ γλῶττα; cf. also the title of the Ἀτακτοὶ γλώσσαι of Philetas (*Philetas Coi Reliquiae*, ed. Guil. Kuchenmüller [diss. Berlin 1928] fr. 29 ff.) or the Λακωνικαὶ γλώσσαι of Aristophanes of Byzantium (*Aristophanis Byzantii Fragmenta*, ed. W. J. Slater [Berlin and New York 1986] fr. 348–353 [but see n. 6 below]); γλῶττα as a designation for an antiquated word appears to be attested only at Galen, *Glossarium*, tom. 19, p. 66 Kühn: ἡ γλῶττα παλαιὸν ἐστὶν ὄνομα τῆς συνηθείας ἐκπεπωκός; cf. W. D. Lebek, "Zur rhetorischen Theorie des Archaismus," *Hermes* 97 (1969) 57–58, n. 3 and 64–65, n. 4; LSJ s.v. γλώσσα II.2. fails to mention the category "dialect glosses"; Eust. 918.29 even refers to Atticist lexicographers as οἱ τὰ τῶν γλωσσῶν ἱστορήσαντες (see n. 6 below). Cf. also A. Henrichs, "Scholia Minora zu Homer," *ZPE* 7 (1971) 232.

⁵ The passages in question are Harp. 117.8, 165.6, and 182.1 Bekker; a new edition of the lexicon is being prepared by Prof. J. J. Keaney. On the papyrus evidence for Harpocration's life cf. K. Alpers, *Das attizistische Lexikon des Oros* (Berlin and New York 1981) 116, n. 74, with literature.

⁶ Such as that of Ar. Byz. (above, n. 4) fr. 337–347; on the breakdown in the distinction between γλώσσα and λέξις cf. A. Henrichs (above, n. 4) 232.

⁷ Valk on Eust. 909.28 is surely right in assigning the words εἰ μὴ ῥητῶς ποιεῖν εὐρεθείη παρασημανθῆν ὑπὸ τινος γλωσσογράφου to Eustathius himself. Eust. 1024.38, 1090.48, and 1397.58 all depend on Athenaeus (especially 276c: Κλεῖταρχός φησιν ἐν ταῖς Γλώσσαις . . .). H. Erbse (*ad sch.* O 324c) and M. Schmidt, *Die Erklärungen zum Weltbild Homers und zur Kultur der Heroenzeit in den bT-Scholien zur*

studies of dialect glosses.⁸ The Γλωσσογράφοι under study here have in general one or both of these characteristics: i) they are opposed by Aristarchus;⁹ ii) they propound interpretations of difficult words tailored to specific Homeric passages.

Precious relics of Homeric criticism were saved from antiquity in a document which modern scholars have designated the “four-man commentary” (*Viermännerkommentar*) because it is based on the works of Aristonicus on critical signs, Didymus on textual criticism, Nicanor on punctuation, and Herodian on prosody. In the ninth century these remnants were then incorporated in the scholia to the famous Venetus A of the *Iliad*; a second tradition of Iliadic scholia, designated bT, likewise contains material of ancient origin. The glossographic fragments of the Iliadic scholia derive so regularly from Aristonicus’ work on critical signs that in several instances where they are attested only in the bT tradition Erbse suggested that the corresponding scholia in the Venetus

Ilias (Munich 1976) 201, have good reason to suspect that at Eust. 1018.21 the words κατὰ τοὺς Γλωσσογράφους are Eustathius’ own addition. Similarly, Erbse (*ad sch.* Ψ 29a) raises the possibility that Eust. 1285.44 derives from preserved scholia (*sch.* D *ad* Ψ 29, T *ad* Ψ 619).

⁸ *Sc.* 757.19, 909.27, 1018.21, 1024.36, 1090.47, and 1285.44. *Sch.* *B *ad* A 591 probably also illustrates this usage: . . . Παρμενίων δὲ ὁ γλωσσογράφος φησὶν Ἀχαιοὺς καὶ Δρύοπας καλεῖν τὸν οὐρανὸν (Ὀλύμπον Helck, *coll. sch.* AbT *ad loc.*) βηλόν. Κράτης δὲ (*fr.* 22b Mette) περισπῶν τὴν πρώτην συλλαβὴν Χαλδαικὴν εἶναι τὴν λέξιν ἀποδίδωσιν. . . . M. Haslam *ad* POxy 3710, col. ii (b), 24, has probability on his side in asserting Παρμενίων (as attested, not only on the papyrus, but also at Ath. 500b and *sch.* Ge *ad* Φ 259d and 260), not Παρμενίων (*sch.* *B *ad* A 591) to be the correct form. If that is so, he seems likely, as Haslam also suggests, to be identical with the iambographer and should thus probably take his place in the series of third-century scholar-poets (Philetas, Callimachus, Apollonius Rhodius, Eratosthenes). This impression is reinforced by Callimachean and Alexandrian allusions in his preserved poetic fragments: *fr.* 2: to the beginning of Callimachus’ Ἰαμβοί; *fr.* 3: Αἰγύπτιε Ζεὺ Νεῖλε; cf. P. Maas, *RE* 18.4 (1949) 42 ff. A further consequence would be that the chronological relationship which K. Latte (above, n. 1) 172 = *Kl. Schr.* 663 posited for Parmeno and Crates (*sch.* A 591) is reversed. Indeed, it makes sense to assume that the search for a meaning for βηλός should start closer to home, with the Achaeans and Dryopes, and later extend as far as the Chaldaeans; M. van der Valk, *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad* 1 (Leiden 1963) 283–284, reaches similar conclusions by a different process of reasoning. Finally, the papyrus testimony (Παρμενίων Βυζάντιος παρ’ Ἀθηναίοις τὸ καλλύνειν κορεῖν) makes the bracketing of Παρμενίων Βυζάντιος by Nicole, followed by Erbse, at *sch.* Ge *ad* Φ 260 appear very dubious: Attic most certainly was within the range of Parmeno’s dialect studies.

⁹ Cf. *frr.* 1, 4, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 23, 25, 31, and 32 below.

A had been curtailed.¹⁰ Aristonican reports on διπλαῖ of Aristarchus (cf. fr. 10) probably underlie the fragments attested in the Homeric scholia and Eustathius, as well as those attested in or derived from Apollonius Sophista (viz., 1, 4, 15, 20; cf. fr. 6b).¹¹ In general the scholia to minor hexameter poets depend heavily on the well-developed corpus of Homeric exegesis. Hence Erbse (*ad sch.* T 43) mooted the possibility that sch. Ap. Rh. 1.401a might derive from a lost Homeric exegetical note dealing with οἰήϊα. Likewise the connection of στρεῦγεσθαι with στράγξ, attributed to the Γλωσσογράφοι at sch. Nic. *Alex.* 291a (= fr. 30), has probably been transferred from a Homeric gloss: Ap. S. 146.2 might well have been shortened (cf. Hsch. σ 1987–1989, of which the last gloss also includes the connection with στράγξ, as do Eust. 1031.9 [*ad O* 512] and sch. μ 351). Tzetzes' scholium *ad Hes. Scut.* 216 (= fr. 12b) probably also derives from Homeric exegesis (cf. *ad loc.*).

What clues do we have as to the identity of the Γλωσσογράφοι? There is, in the first place, the evidence of the name itself. They were evidently compilers of collections of Homeric γλῶσσαι.¹² It seems plausible that the Alexandrians did not polemicize against these predecessors by name (as did Aristarchus in the case of Philetas and Comanus) because they did not know their names;¹³ in all probability, such *Gebrauchstexte* (intended primarily for schoolboys?) circulated anonymously. Some of the earlier Alexandrians, notably Callimachus and Zenodotus (frr. 31a and 6), were influenced by them. The

¹⁰ Erbse *ad sch.* I 570 (= fr. 29 below) and Ψ 454b (= fr. 32c below); cf. also his comment on sch. Ξ 117 (discussed on fr. 12 below); cf. also Cohn, *RE* 2.1 (1895) 866.19 ff.

¹¹ Erbse *ad sch.* Γ 36b posits a more complete gloss of Ap. S. than survives (7.33 Bekker = gl. 76 Steinicke) as the source of both Hsch. α 462 and Ep. Hom. α 163 (= fr. 1); L. Leyde, *De Apollonii Sophistae Lexico Homérico* (diss. Leipzig 1885) 21, already attributed Hsch. α 2503 (= fr. 4) to Ap. S.; on the other hand, the attempt to deny that Ap. S. depends on Aristonicus (*ibid.* 22) is unsuccessful (cf. Erbse *ad sch.* Λ 385 [line 45]).

¹² Cf. *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem* (scholia vetera) 6, ed. H. Erbse (Berlin 1983) 36: "Γλωσσογράφοι, οἱ qui explicationes verborum Homericorum composuerunt." The names of the compilers of some such collections are known (though they are not identical with the anonymous Γλωσσογράφοι whose fragments are edited below): cf. A. Henrichs (above, n. 4) 233. I leave open the question whether the glossographic collections consulted by the Alexandrians were exclusively Homeric; M. Naoumides, "The Fragments of Greek Lexicography in the Papyri," *Classical Studies Presented to Ben Edwin Perry* (Urbana 1969) 193–194, suggested on the basis of papyrus fragments of three lexica of Ptolemaic date that they were not.

¹³ So already Tolkiehn, *RE* 40.2 (1925) 2434.66–68; contrast Latte (above, n. 1) 148, n. 26 = *Kl. Schr.* 641–642, n. 26.

preserved fragments provide no firm dating criteria, apart from the fact that the Γλωσσογράφοι (in the sense of interest to us) were pre-Aristarchan.¹⁴

The basic flaw in the method of the Γλωσσογράφοι is their habit of tailoring their definitions of Homeric words to one passage or a handful of passages; they seldom¹⁵ undertook the laborious task of gathering the various Homeric passages in which the *glossandum* occurs and attempting to do justice to the totality of evidence.¹⁶ Thus the definition ἐλώρια = βρώματα (fr. 10) is evidently tailored to A 4; this definition presupposes and is parallel to δαῖτα in A 5 (αὐτοὺς δὲ ἐλώρια τεύχε κύνεσσιν | οἰωνοῖσί τε δαῖτα), but will not fit P 150–151 (ἐταῖρον | κάλλιπες Ἀργείοισιν ἔλωρ καὶ κύρμα γενέσθαι), as Aristarchus pointed out. Similarly, ποιπνύειν = διακονεῖν (fr. 27) was invented for A 600 (ὡς ἴδον Ἥφαιστον διὰ δώματα ποιπνύοντα) but will hardly suit Ξ 154–156 (αὐτίκα δ' ἔγνω [sc. Ἥρῃ] | τὸν μὲν ποιπνύοντα μάχην ἀνὰ κυδιάνειραν | αὐτοκασίγητον καὶ δαέρα). These two passages also illustrate another tendency of the Γλωσσογράφοι: to prefer a concrete, specific definition that yields immediate sense in context. The resulting definition is commonly too specific (cf. fr. 19: μάσταξ = βρῶμα, not specifically ἀκρίς; fr. 23 ὀνειάτα = good things in general [> ὀνίνημι], not just βρώματα) or too concrete (αἰών in T 27 = “vital force,” not “spinal marrow” [fr. 2]) or, in the absence of controls beyond the immediate context, simply misguided (fr. 6 ἀφήτωρ = socket in which the pivot of the door moved [if Aristonicus can be believed, Zenodotus thought this definition so well suited to I 404 that he was willing to rewrite the following line in order to accommodate it¹⁷]; fr. 18 λευγαλέον = ἐν ὕγρῳ, a definition tailored to

¹⁴ Pace K. Latte (above, n. 1) 148, n. 26 = *Kl. Schr.* 641–642, n. 26 (but see n. 44 below); R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship* 1 (Oxford 1968) 79, does not state his reasons for suggesting that they did not begin their work “before the later third century” (possibly because he connects them with dialect studies? See below, 125–126). Cf. also *HSCP* 85 (1981) 104, n. 6.

¹⁵ For possible exceptions see on fr. 11 and 24 below.

¹⁶ Cf. Valk (above, n. 8) 1.258, and 275–276; Cohn (above, n. 10) 869.2 ff.; however, etymology cannot be used as a criterion to divide pre- and post-Aristarchan interpretations, as Valk proposes (258 and 266, n. 322; modified somewhat 276, n. 362): cf. fr. 1, 4, 29, 30 and possibly 17 and 20 below.

¹⁷ To my mind νηοῦ for Φοῖβου in I 405 fulfills K. Nickau's criteria for proving that a reading of Zenodotus is a conjecture, namely that it is not original, that in Zenodotus' time it had the appearance of correctness, and that it cannot be accounted for as an accidental miswriting of the original: cf. *Untersuchungen zur textkritischen Methode des Zenodotos von Ephesos* (Berlin-New York 1977) 45, where, however, there is no discus-

Φ 281 and/or ε 312). They tend to focus on the immediate context¹⁸ and to sweep aside considerations of etymology or even the general meaning of a Greek word. Thus they posit πρόμος = βασιλεύς (fr. 28), ἔθω = βλάπτω (fr. 9), and καμμονίη = νίκη (fr. 14) on the “one for one” principle; it was left for Aristarchus to define these words as = πρόμαχος, ἐξ ἔθους ἐπιφοιτῶ, and ἡ ἐκ καταμονῆς (sc. νίκη) respectively. In general, their interpretations can be said to be trivializing and vulgar. Take the case of fr. 17, which shows that the Γλωσσογράφοι interpreted κῆλα as lightning and thunderbolts; in fact, in neither of its occurrences (sc. A 53 = A 383; M 280) should it be so interpreted; in A 53 the reference is to the bolts by which Apollo causes the plague among the Greek host (ἐννήμαρ μὲν ἀνὰ στρατὸν ὥχετο κῆλα θεοῖο); in M 280, as Aristarchus pointed out (sch. A *ad loc.*), to rain and snow (ἥματι χειμερίῳ, ὅτε τ’ ὤρετο μητίετα Ζεὺς | νιφέμεν, ἀνθρώποισι πιφασκόμενος τὰ ἄ κῆλα: M 279–280).

On the other hand, some, though not many, of their interpretations are seriously entertained down to the present day. Thus, LSJ *s.v.* πρόγνυ prefers the Glossographers’ interpretation of I 570 (= fr. 29), albeit the reading πρόγνυ is mooted,¹⁹ whereas Aristarchus’ definition is better adapted to Φ 460 and ξ 69. Likewise the Γλωσσογράφοι were right in connecting the ἄπαξ λεγόμενον βράσσων with βραχύς, in spite of Aristarchus’ objection that βραχύς is unattested in Homer (fr. 7), and in the meanings they posited for ἀκιδνότερος (fr. 3) and οἰήτια (fr. 22).

Thus far the underlying assumption has been that our sources give an accurate picture of the Glossographers’ doctrines. In some instances, however, one wonders whether their intentions may have been distorted by the filter through which their views have reached us. The alternative is to assume that the Γλωσσογράφοι took leave of their senses, if, for instance, they defined νεκροί as = νέοι or τοῖτοι as = ἀγαθοί (see on fr. 21 and 31 below). However, the assumption is unavoidable that in some instances common Greek words received at their hands a radical redefinition: ἱερόν = μέγα (fr. 11) or τόσ(σ)ον = σῶμα (fr. 32).

It is easy enough to describe what the Γλωσσογράφοι did and why it proved, in most cases, inadequate; it is another matter to account for it. What emboldened them to put forward such radical redefinitions of

sion of this passage.

¹⁸ Cf. however, n. 15 above and fr. 2 and 15 below.

¹⁹ Cf. also Wyss *ad Antim.* fr. 5.

even common Greek words? In the case of one of our fragments there is evidence that the Glossographs' definition (fr. 19) also occurred in a dialect, that is, the doctrine μάσταξ = ἀκρίς, which Clitarchus attests for Ambraciote.²⁰ Now Valk states that this testimony is "not to be trusted" and classes it along with "mystifications" involving the dialects which he discovers in the bT-scholia.²¹ There are indeed dubious pieces of information about dialects transmitted among the bT-scholia;²² but this is as one would expect in a compilation dating from a period long after the ancient dialects had ceased to be spoken.²³ On the other hand, Clitarchus' dialect studies are well attested elsewhere, and he can be dated to 200–50 B.C., the heyday of Greek dialectography.²⁴ There is no good reason for impugning his testimony. It raises, however, the entire question of the relation of the Glossographs' work to dialectography. The matter is further complicated, however, by the fact that μάσταξ = ἀκρίς is attested not only for Ambraciote and the Γλωσσογράφοι but also for Sophocles (fr. 716 R). There is, in fact, another instance of a Sophoclean interpretation of a Homeric word in agreement with that of the Glossographs (fr. 18), as well as several other cases in which we must weigh the possibility of the Glossographs' having been influenced by dialect studies (frr. 4, 16, and 25). Yet another example, excluded from the fragments printed below since the Glossographs are not expressly mentioned,²⁵ is πόποι Dryopian = δαίμονες (Plut. *Mor.* 22c; sch. α 32)²⁶ and hence adopted in the sense θεοί at Lyc. *Alex.* 943 (cf. sch. *ad loc.*). Since the first systematic

²⁰ *Et. Gen.* β 277 Berger: . . . Κλείταρχος δέ φησι, ὅτι κατὰ Ἀμβρακιώτας μάσταξ καλεῖται ἡ ἀκρίς, *unde EM* 216.10; this note evidently derives from a more learned version of the scholium to Nicander *Ther.* 802 than now survives.

²¹ Valk (above, n. 8) 1.251, n. 256.

²² *Ibid.* 1.488–489; Valk is surely right in questioning the Arabian gloss δεῦνος = βασιλεύς in bT Ξ 325 or the Tyrrhenian meaning for βλωθρός attested at bT N 390; also he makes it appear likely that the dialect definition of βουγάιος attested at bT *ad* N 834 is based on σ 79 and ρ 225; on the other hand, the fact that ἀμυχθαλόεσσα was a poetic word does not exclude its occurrence in Cyprian.

²³ This statement holds true whether one dates the collection to late Antiquity or the early Middle Ages, the two possibilities left open by M. Schmidt (above, n. 7) 69, who cites the relevant literature.

²⁴ Cf. W. Kroll, *RE* 11.1 (1921) 655.9 ff.

²⁵ Note also that Valk (above, n. 8) 1.275–276 attributes to the Γλωσσογράφοι two doctrines anonymously transmitted in the Iliadic scholia (*sc.* ἀπούατος = κακός: sch. D *ad* Σ 272; πορφύρεος = μέλας: sch. A [Ariston.] *ad* E 83a¹; *sim.* bT *ad* E 83a²).

²⁶ For other testimonies cf. my forthcoming edition of the *Epimerismi Homerici*, *ad* ω 1.

investigations of the dialects seem not to have antedated the early third century B.C.,²⁷ any work of the Glossographers so influenced would have originated between this date and Aristarchus. But if in some cases they may have been aware of dialectal meanings of the words they glossed, in others the Γλωσσογράφοι may have used such an awareness of dialectal variations as license to posit wild semantic shifts. In addition to the fragments printed below, the following *cause célèbre* is attested, if not specifically for the Γλωσσογράφοι, at least for some unnamed Homeric exegetes: στήτη = γυνή in A 6 (διαστήτην ἐρίσαντε), the Doric equivalent of which was enshrined by Theocritus *Syrinx* 14 and Dositheus *Ara* 1.²⁸

What influence, if any, did the Γλωσσογράφοι exercise upon poets? Wilamowitz pioneered a risky method for finding influences of the Γλωσσογράφοι on Greek poetry.²⁹ His starting point was *Hymn. Hom. Merc.* 503–504: ἔνθα βόες μὲν ἔπειτα ποτὶ ζάθεον λειμῶνα | ἐτραπέτην (*sc. Apollo et Mercurius*). He surveyed the attested meanings for ζάθεος, concluded that only εὐώδης (*cf. Hsch. ζ 18; EM 407.4*) readily yields sense, and assumed that it was an interpretation of the Γλωσσογράφοι. However, this definition need go back no further than Diogenianus (2nd century A.D.), if he is the common source of Hesychius and the *EM*; it has reached us, in other words, by an altogether different path of transmission from the *bona fide* glossographic fragments; and it is likely that the definition was invented by someone who wanted to explain this or a similar passage. The doctrine ζάθεος = εὐώδης is in any case unnecessary; *LSJ s.v. ζάθεος* rightly refuses to recognize it; the widespread use of the epithet doubtless caused it to be felt in later epic as vaguely commendatory. Wilamowitz's other examples are no better. At Aesch. *Cho.* 185–186 Electra describes her reaction upon seeing Orestes' lock at their father's tomb: ἔξ ὁμμάτων δὲ δίψιοι πίπτουσί μοι | σταγόνες ἄφαρκτοι δυσχίμου πλημμυρίδος. The best clue to the meaning of δίψιοι is surely the explanation: πρῶην ἄρρευσται, ὥς δίψιον Ἄργος τὸ ποτὲ ἄνυδρον (*sch. ad loc.*); Aeschylus—and surely also Sophocles (*fr. 296 R*)—would thus have

²⁷ R. Pfeiffer (above, n. 14) 202, n. 2 (Sosibius Laco).

²⁸ The commentary on the *Techne* of Dionysius Thrax attributed to Melampus or Diomedes exempts the grammarian from having to know about such puzzles (*sch. D.T.* 11.24 ff.; *cf. Eust.* 21.44: ὁ δὲ τούτοις προσέχων εἴη ἄν φιλόκαινος).

²⁹ U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Isyllos von Epidauros* (Berlin 1886) 111 f., approved by J. Wackernagel, *KZ* 33 (1895) 49 = *Kleine Schriften* (Göttingen n.d.) 728 and K. Latte, *Glotta* 32 (1953) 200 = *Kl. Schr.* (above, n. 1) 698.

been following the Hesiodic interpretation δίψιον Ἄργος = Ἄργος ἄνυδρον (fr. 128 M–W); cf. also Garvie *ad loc.* There is surely no occasion for finding in our passage the meaning posited by Wilamowitz (δίψιον = ἄτησιν βεβολημένον); how, indeed, should ἄτη be involved in this situation? It is odd, too, that Wilamowitz found this meaning also in what he took to be the fragment of a hexameter verse quoted at sch. h *ad* Δ 171 in the version of cod. Paris. gr. 2556, s. XIV (= P): δίψιον ἄτησιν βεβολημένον.³⁰ Note, however, that cod. Angel. gr. 122, s. XII/XIV (= Ag), which is the source of P,³¹ presents, not βεβολημένον, but βεβλημένον. The sentence in question, then, should read: Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Ἰξίονι (Ag: Ἱερσίονι P: fr. 296 R) {δίψιον} (del. Papageorgiu) κατὰ πλεονασμὸν τοῦ δ δίψιον ἄτησι βεβλημ(μ)ένον (Ag, corr. Papageorgiu: βεβολημένον P). I suspect that the Sophoclean quotation is δίψιον ἄτησι, not δίψιον alone (as Radt prints it), with δίψιον then glossed as = βεβλημένον. Although Radt follows Papageorgiu³² in reading φησι τὸ βεβλημμένον for ἄτησι βεβλημμένον, the verb of saying can, of course, be understood; the Ionic form ἄτησι is definitely transmitted; one can account for its presence in a middle Byzantine grammatical text³³ much more plausibly as part of a poetic quotation than as a corruption of the much easier φησί. However that may be, there is no occasion for finding δίψιον = ἄτησι βεβολημένον in the text of this scholium. Nor is ἄπτερος = προσηνής required at Aesch. *Ag.* 276 (ἀλλ' ἦ σ' ἐπ' ἰάνεν τις ἄπτερος φάτις;), as Wilamowitz thought; E. Fraenkel, while stressing the uncertainty of the matter, prefers the explanation αἰφνίδιος or ταχύς (cf. Ap. S. 41.1 Bekker = gl. 583 Steinicke; Hsch. α 6867) in view of the fact that this question, addressed by the incredulous coryphaeus to Clytemnestra, who has just announced the capture of Troy, seems to require a pejorative sense.³⁴ Nor is λισσάς = “schroff” required in Aesch. *Suppl.* 794 (rather the λισσὰς . . . πέτρα of this passage has the same sense [*viz.*, “smooth”] as λισσὴ . . . πέτρῃ of Homer γ 293; its steepness is sufficiently indicated by its other epithets [*viz.*, αἰγίλιψ ἀπρόσδεικτος

³⁰ He found it printed in *Anecdota Graeca e codd. manuscriptis bibliothecae regiae Parisiensis*, ed. J. A. Cramer, 3 (Oxford 1841) 162.26; the gloss has since been reprinted by S. Radt *ad* Soph. fr. 296 with readings of Ag supplied by H. Erbse.

³¹ Cf. H. Erbse, *Beiträge zur Überlieferung der Iliasscholien* (Munich 1960) 193–195.

³² P. N. Papageorgiu, *Κριτικά καὶ ἐρμηνευτικά εἰς τὰ ἀποσπάσματα τῶν Ἑλλήνων τραγικῶν ποιητῶν* (Leipzig 1880).

³³ On the date of the h-scholia cf. K. Alpers (above, n. 5) 93, n. 36.

³⁴ Aeschylus, *Agamemnon*, ed. with a commentary by E. Fraenkel (Oxford 1950; corr. rp. 1962) *ad loc.*

οἰόφρων κρεμᾶς γυπιάς]) or Eur. *HF* 1148 (cf. Johansen and Whittle *ad Suppl.* 794, who, however, are wrong in regarding the sense “steep” as almost certain at A.R. 2.382 [λίσσῃ νήσῳ = “une île dénudée,” as Delage renders it]). The one case where Wilamowitz operates with a definition actually attested for the Γλωσσογράφοι is τοῖος = ἀγαθός (fr. 31); but this sense is not required at Aesch. *Suppl.* 400.³⁵ In general, nothing is gained by affixing ancient labels without evidence and on this basis positing strange semantic shifts.

This is not to say that the Γλωσσογράφοι were without influence on poets. We do find indubitable traces of their doctrines among the Hellenistic poets Apollonius Rhodius (2.56: fr. 5; 4.92 *et alibi*: fr. 13), Theocritus (22.167: fr. 13), Callimachus (fr. 55.2: fr. 9; fr. 627: fr. 31a), and Lycophron (574: fr. 13). The one classical poet who shares interpretations with the Glossographers is, as we have seen (above, 125), Sophocles. It is uncertain, however, whether it is they who have influenced him or vice versa. Their writings could have been produced over a long period of time, but insofar as they were influenced by dialectal studies a post-classical date appears to be indicated.

It is one measure of Aristarchus’ greatness that he succeeded in freeing himself from the tyranny of the Γλωσσογράφοι. We can see how on several occasions he took aim at the simplistic underlying assumption ἐν ἀνθ’ ἐνός, that is, that Homer’s text can be interpreted merely by mechanical substitution of one word for another (frr. 8 and 14).³⁶ The great Alexandrian seems to have taken some pleasure in singling out passages in which the Glossographers’ one-for-one substitutions result in absurdity (frr. 1, 5, 10, 23a, 27; sch. A *ad* Π 41a *et* Ξ 117) or oversimplification (frr. 8 and 14). Other faults which Aristarchus uncovered were their readiness to assume derivation of Homeric words from other words unattested in Homer (frr. 1 and 7) and their anachronism in failing to take account of the way of life of the heroic age (fr. 15).

The doctrines of the Γλωσσογράφοι, then, received (in general, deservedly) a rough reception at the hands of Aristarchus and in works dependent on him. Did they fare better elsewhere? A fragment of a Ptolemaic papyrus, if correctly restored, shares the glossographic

³⁵ So, rightly, Pfeiffer *ad* Call. fr. 627; cf. also Johansen and Whittle *ad loc.*

³⁶ He did, however, countenance the similar principle πρόθεσις ἀντὶ προθέσεως; cf. L. Cohn, *RE* 2.1 (1895) 871.35 ff.; cf. also D. L. Blank, “Remarks on Nicanor, the Stoics and the Ancient Theory of Punctuation,” *Glotta* 61 (1983) 64 f.

interpretation (fr. 23) ὀνειάτα = βρώματα.³⁷ Among published “scholia minora” four deal with words explained by the Γλωσσογράφοι; only one of the explanations coincides.³⁸ The D-scholia (so called because once thought to have been composed by Didymus), a Byzantine compilation which combines the ancient “scholia minora” with mythological, allegorical, and grammatical excerpts,³⁹ like the scholia of the Venetus A and the exegetical scholia, ordinarily present the view of the Γλωσσογράφοι, if at all, as one of several available interpretations.⁴⁰ Only once does their interpretation of a passage stand alone (sch. D *ad* Ψ 454: ἄλλο τόσον · τὸ ἄλλο ὅλον σῶμα), and this may be the result of shortening which a full recension of the D-scholia would correct.⁴¹ Thus, the glossographic explanations do not play a prominent role in the D-scholia, even though the Γλωσσογράφοι have been called schoolmasters⁴² and the D-scholia, or parts of them, are sometimes equated with the ancient scholastic tradition.⁴³ Yet their presence in the D-scholia, like the anonymous form of citation, suggests the antiquity of the Glossographs’ doctrines.

The method of the Γλωσσογράφοι did not die out after them, however.⁴⁴ The interpretative dialectic between the semantic field of a word and contextual exigencies continued, with some interpreters inclined to yield more to context than they should. Examples can be adduced, for

³⁷ Cf. M. Naoumides (above, n. 12) 193.

³⁸ Cf. *Scholia Minora in Homeri Iliadem*, ed. V. de Marco, 1: Λέξεις Ὀμηρικοί (Vatican City 1946) §§ 853 (fr. 6), 74 and 76 (fr. 7), 262 (fr. 14), and 1052 (fr. 17); only the last of these pairs coincides (cf. de Marco, p. xxiv); cf. also *ad* fr. 24 below. None of the glosses preserved on papyrus and published by A. Henrichs, *ZPE* 7 (1971) 97–149, 229–260; 8 (1971) 1–12; and 12 (1973) 17–43, happen to correspond to our fragments.

³⁹ H. Erbse (above, n. 12) 1.xi; *idem* in *Lexikon der alten Welt* (Zürich-Stuttgart 1965) s.v. Scholien C [2].1.

⁴⁰ Sch. D *ad* A 600 (fr. 27), Δ 315 (fr. 24), E 387 (fr. 16), Z 506 (fr. 4), I 43 (fr. 23), I 540 (fr. 9), K 56 (fr. 11), K 226 (fr. 7), A 385 (fr. 15), M 280 (cf. A 53; fr. 17), Ψ 661 (fr. 14), ε 312 (fr. 18), τ 203 (fr. 13).

⁴¹ It is reported that an edition of the Iliadic D-scholia is being prepared, after V. de Marco, by F. Montanari (cf. *Gnomon* 57 [1985] 763).

⁴² Cf. n. 2 above. A. Henrichs, *ZPE* 7 (1971) 100 n. 10, rightly points out that this assumption exceeds our evidence.

⁴³ Cf., e.g., H. Erbse, “Homerscholien und hellenistische Glossare bei Apollonios Rhodios,” *Hermes* 81 (1953) 170: “Auf solche explicationes magistrorum gehen letzten Endes auch unsere D-Scholien zurück”; *Die Fragmente des Grammatikers Dionysios Thrax*, ed. K. Linke (Berlin-New York 1977 [SGLG 3]) 55, on fr. *30: “Wenn das Fragment echt ist, übernimmt Dionysios lediglich die Schulerklärung” (cf. sch. D *ad* E 894).

⁴⁴ Cf. the remark of K. Latte (above, n. 1) 148, n. 26 = *Kl. Schr.* 642, n. 26: “die Tradition der älteren Homererklärung hatte auch nach Aristarch ihre Vertreter.”

instance, from the fragments of Comanus⁴⁵ and Apion;⁴⁶ the practice can doubtless be traced into modern times.

The work of the Γλωσσογράφοι consisted of a series of glosses. I suspect that they were arranged originally in the form of a lexicon, since the underlying assumption of Aristarchus' critique is that the Glossographers' definition should be applicable to all occurrences of the *glossandum*. Hence I have reconstructed their fragments in lexicon form; for convenience I have arranged them in alphabetical order, even though this is probably an anachronism.⁴⁷

In the following edition no account is taken of itacistic errors or confusion of αι and ε. Readings in the Iliadic scholia are reported according to the edition of H. Erbse (Berlin 1969–). In the text of Homeric scholia it is assumed that notes beginning with ὅτι stand for ἡ διπλῇ ὅτι and refer accordingly to a particular line beside which a διπλῇ will have been placed (sometimes referred to in abbreviated fashion merely by the first word or words in the line). Readings in the *Et. Gen.* are based on my collation of photographs of A and B. Testimonia are adduced only for the doctrines of the Γλωσσογράφοι.

II. The Fragments

1. Homeric Glosses

fr. 1: ὥς δ' ὅτε τίς τε δράκοντα ἰδὼν παλίνορσος ἀπέστη
οὔρεος ἐν βήσσης, ὑπὸ τε τρόμος ἔλλαβε γυῖα,
ἄψ δ' ἀνεχώρησεν, ὥχρος τέ μιν εἶλε παρειάς,
ὥς αὐτίς καθ' ὅμιλον ἔδου Τρώων ἀγερώχων
δείσας Ἀτρεὺς υἱὸν Ἀλέξανδρος θεοειδής. (Γ 33–37)

Ep. Hom. α 163 = AO 1.29.25, Et. Gud. 10.9 Stef. (unde EM 7.49):
ἀγερώχων (Γ 36): ἡ μὲν συνήθεια τὴν λέξιν ἐπὶ ψόγου τάσσει· τοὺς
γὰρ αὐθάδεις καὶ ἀπαιδεύτους ἀγερώχους λέγουσι. ὁ δὲ Ὅμηρος
τοὺς ἄγαν ἐντίμους ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄγαν ἐπὶ τοῦ γέρως ὀχεῖσθαι

5 ὥς αὐτίς καθ' ὅμιλον ἔδου Τρώων ἀγερώχων (Γ 36)·

⁴⁵ Fr. 10 (= Hsch. α 1990) tailors the meaning of αἰνίζομαι to suit N 374; fr. 11 (= sch. T [ex.] ad N 529; Eust. 945.19) invents a special meaning for ἡ βραχίων (= χεῖρ) to fit N 529; cf. my edition forthcoming in *SGLG* 7.

⁴⁶ Cf. Apion's Γλῶσσαι Ὀμηρικαί, ed. S. Neitzel (Berlin-New York 1977 [*SGLG* 3]) 203–204, 317.

⁴⁷ Cf. K. Alpers, *Gnomon* 47 (1975) 113.

P O Et. Gud. ὁμοίως καὶ ὅταν λέγῃ ἐν τῇ Βοιωτίᾳ

ἐννέα νῆας ἄγεν Ῥοδίων ἀγερῶχων (B 654).

ἐνιοι δὲ τῶν Γλωσσογράφων ἰδίως τούτους ἔδοξαν ἀγερῶχους λέγεσθαι, ἐπεὶ νησιῶται ἐπεισακτῶ τροφῇ χρῶνται· φασὶ γὰρ
 10 εἰρησθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀγείρειν ὀχὴν, τουτέστι τροφήν, Ὅμηρου μὲν οὐδέποτε τὴν τροφήν ὀχὴν εἰρηκότος, ἔπειτα καὶ τοὺς Τρῶας μηδαμῶς ὄντας νησιώτας ἀγερῶχους λέγοντος (sc. Γ 36 alibi). **P O**

3 λέγουσι (O : λέγει Gud. : λε (cd. ambig.) P 4 ἀπὸ τοῦ P Gud. : παρὰ τὸ O | alt. τοῦ O : τὸ P Gud. | γέρως P O : γέρας Gud. : γέρας EM 5 ὡς αὐτίς P : ὡς δ' αὐτίς O : om. Gud. | ἔδου] δυ evan. in c 6 ὁμοίως P : om. O 9 ἐπεὶ P : ἐπειδ(ή) O 10 post εἰρησθαι hab. P τουτέστι (cf. quae sequuntur; fort. lg. τοῦτο) | ἀγείρειν P : ἀγέρειν O | τουτέστι P : ἦτοι O 11–12 μηδαμῶς ὄντας νησιώτας P : ὄντας νησιώτας οὐδαμῶς O 12 λέγοντος scripsi : λέγεσθαι P O

ex Apollonii Sophistae glossa quam quae exstat (7.33 Bekker = gl. 76 Steinicke) pleniore Hsch. α 462 et noster (cf. Erbse ad sch. A ad Γ 36b); cf. etiam Et. Orion. (G [5.16]; H [611.25]; in sede scholiorum Hom.); ex nostro (sc. Et. Gud.: εἰς τὸ ἄλλο) EM 7.49 10 ἀπὸ τοῦ—τροφῇ] cf. Tz. Histt. IX, 112 | ὀχὴ = τροφή] cf. ad Ep. Hom. α 34

In their explanation of the epithet ἀγέρωχοι the Γλωσσογράφοι used a single passage (B 654) as the foundation without taking sufficient account of other usage. Their etymology of the word from “collecting food” (ἀγείρειν ὀχὴν) would fit the Rhodians to whom the term is applied in B 654 since they were islanders dependent on imports; however, this rationale is not possible for the other ἀγέρωχοι of the *Iliad*, the Trojans (Γ 36, E 623, H 343, Π 708, Φ 584) and Mysians (K 430). Aristarchus also has another reason for rejecting the Glossographs’ etymology: ὀχὴ = food is not attested in Homer. Here, as elsewhere, Aristarchus’ practice is in line with the principle Ὅμηρον ἐξ Ὅμηρου σαφηνίζειν, even if our evidence is insufficient to prove that he himself formulated it.⁴⁸

⁴⁸ Cf. R. Pfeiffer (above, n. 14) 227; his conclusions need to be modified insofar as C. Schäublin, “Homerum ex Homero,” *MH* 34 (1977) 221–227, has adduced Galen *CMG* 5.9.2.182.23 ff., a passage which makes it likely that the maxim antedates Porphyry; if this is so, its Aristarchan origin seems very likely (*pace* Schäublin, who would trace the maxim to legal-rhetorical literature); the attempt to show that the maxim antedates Agathon’s *bon mot* as recorded at Ael. *VH* 14.13 is unconvincing; cf. N. G. Wilson, *CR* 21 (1971) 172 and *PCPS* N.S. 22 (1976) 123, and G. Lee, *PCPS* N.S. 21 (1975) 63–64.

fr. 2: Achilles to Thetis:

ἀλλὰ μάλ' αἰνῶς
 δείδω μή μοι τόφρα Μενoitίου ἄλκιμον υἱὸν
 μυῖαι καδδῦσαι κατὰ χαλκοτύπους ὠτειλὰς
 εὐλὰς ἐγγείωνται, ἀεικίσσωσι δὲ νεκρόν —
 ἐκ δ' αἰὼν πέφαται—κατὰ δὲ χροά πάντα σαπήη. (T 23–27)

sch. D ad T 27: ἐκ δ' αἰὼν πέφαται: ἦτοι ἀνήρηται ὁ βίος, ὃ ἐστι ζωῆς ἐστέρηται. ἦ, ὥς οἱ Γλωσσογράφοι, αἰὼν ἔφθαρται, ὃ ἐστὶν ὁ νωτιαῖος μυελός.

cf. Erot. 20.18 αἰὼν: ὁ νωτιαῖος μυελός. φησὶ γάρ (sc. Hippocrates): “ἐσφακελίσθη τὸν αἰῶνα.” κὰν τῷ Περί βελῶν καὶ τραυμάτων φησί· “τὸν αἰῶνα νοσήσας τις ἐβδομαῖος ἀπέθανεν.” καὶ Πίνδαρος ἐν Ὑπορχήμασι λέγων· “... αἰὼν δὲ δι’ ὅστέων ἐραίσθη” (fr. 111); Diogen. = Hsch. α 2216: αἰὼν: ... τινες δὲ τῶν νεωτέρων τὸν νωτιαῖον (μυελὸν) ἀπέδωκαν, ὥς Ἱπποκράτης· “τὸν αἰῶνά τις νοσήσας ἐβδομαῖος ἀπέθανεν” ...; sch. min. ε 1052: αἰὼν: ὁ νωτιαῖος μυελός; Phot. α 677 (ubi vide test.): αἰὼν: μυελός, ὥς Ἱπποκράτης, ἢ βίος, ἢ ζωή. ...

A. A. Nikitas has subjected αἰὼν = “spinal marrow” to close scrutiny.⁴⁹ He has given a very plausible explanation for the origin of the Glossographers’ interpretation of T 27: the first wound which Patroclus received is described thus: ὅπιθεν δὲ μετὰφρενον ὀξεί δουρὶ | ὤμων μεσσηγὺς σχεδόθεν βάλε Δάρδανος ἀνὴρ, | Πανθοίδης Εὐφορβος (Π 806–808), that is, in the spot where the spinal marrow is located; thus, when they came to interpret T 27 and inquired what the subject of πέφαται might be, the spinal marrow seemed a likely candidate.⁵⁰ One might add that this is in accord with the tendency of the Γλωσσογράφοι to seek concrete meanings for the words they glossed (cf. above, 123); this example does, however, show them searching beyond the immediate context insofar as they took account of the wounding of Patroclus at Π 806 ff. The explanation of the Glossographers has not

⁴⁹ A. A. Nikitas, “Bemerkungen zum Lexikon von Liddell-Scott-Jones,” *Würzburger Jahrbücher* N.F. 4 (1978) 75 ff.

⁵⁰ Nikitas goes too far, however, in denying that αἰὼν *ever* has the sense “spinal marrow”: his treatment of the two Hippocratic fragments cited by Erotian is unconvincing; Erotian, who had the context of each passage in front of him, is unlikely to have been wrong about the meaning of αἰὼν; and the uniformity of usage within the corpus of medical writings of disparate origin transmitted under Hippocrates’ name should not be overestimated. If the Glossographers’ interpretation was early, the word might well have come into use in that sense.

won the favor of modern scholars, however; the anatomical sense of αἰών is, in fact, unnecessary in T 27; the sense “vital force” (“Lebenskraft”), attested elsewhere in epic, is altogether suitable.⁵¹

fr. 3: Odysseus to Calypso:

πόντα θεά, μή μοι τόδε χῶεο· οἶδα καὶ αὐτὸς
πάντα μάλ', οὔνεκα σεῖο περίφρων Πηνελόπεια
εἶδος ἀκιδνότερῃ μέγεθός τ' εἰσάντα ιδέσθαι·
ἥ μὲν γὰρ βροτός ἐστι, σὺ δ' ἀθάνατος καὶ ἀγήρω. (ε 215–218)

3a sch. MV ad ε 217 (spectat ad vocem ἀκιδνότερῃ): οἱ μὲν Γλωσσογράφοι ἀσθενεστέρα, οἱ δὲ εὐτελεστέρα. καὶ γὰρ ἐν ἄλλοις “οὐδὲν ἀκιδνότερον γαῖα τρέφει ἀνθρώποιον” (σ 130), ἀντὶ τοῦ εὐτελέστερον. νῦν δὲ οἱ Γλωσσογράφοι ἀπέδωσαν αὐτὸ ἀσθενεστέραν.

3b Eust. 1530.44: ἀκιδνότερα δὲ κατὰ τοὺς Γλωσσογράφους ἡ ἀσθενεστέρα ἢ εὐτελεστέρα, περὶ οὗ ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς που κρεῖττον ῥηθήσεται.

3c The speaker is Odysseus:

Ἀμφινόμ', ἡ μάλα μοι δοκεῖς πεπνυμένος εἶναι·
τοίου γὰρ καὶ πατρός, ἐπεὶ κλέος ἐσθλὸν ἄκουον,
Νῆσον Δουλιχιῇα εὖν τ' ἔμην ἀφνειὸν τε·
τοῦ σ' ἔκ φασι γενέσθαι, ἐπητῇ δ' ἀνδρὶ ἔοικας.
τοὔνεκά τοι ἐρέω, σὺ δὲ σύνθεο καὶ μευ ἄκουσον·
οὐδὲν ἀκιδνότερον γαῖα τρέφει ἀνθρώποιον
πάντων ὅσσα τε γαῖαν ἔπι πνεῖει τε καὶ ἔρπει. (σ 125–131)

Eust. 1841.24 (ad σ 130): ἀκιδνότερον δὲ ἢ τὸ ἀσθενέστερον καὶ εὐτελέστερον κατὰ τοὺς Γλωσσογράφους, καθ' οὓς καὶ ὑπερβολικῶς εἴρηται τὸ “μηδὲν ἀκιδνότερον εἶναι ἀνθρώπου” (σ 130) ἢ μᾶλλον ὑπομενετικώτερον, φερεπονώτερον, παρὰ τὸ μὴ κίδνασθαι ἥτοι χωρίζεσθαι καὶ πόρρω γίνεσθαι τοῦ ἐπισυμβαίνοντος.

cf. ea testim. quae ad Lex. Αἴμ. α 21 collegi

⁵¹ Cf., e.g., Hansjakob Seiler, *LdfrgE* (Göttingen 1955–) s.v. αἰών B 1.cb, with reference also to *Hymn. Hom. Merc.* 42 and 119, for which the sense “spinal marrow” is sometimes claimed.

Here modern interpreters have been receptive to the Glossographers' suggestion (cf., e.g., Passow-Crönert and LSJ s.v. ἀκιδνός; G. Meiwes, *LdfrgE* s.v. ἀκιδνότερος [with test.]); cf. above, 124.

fr. 4: ὡς δ' ὅτε τις στατὸς ἵππος, ἀκοστήσας ἐπὶ φάτνῃ,
 δεσμὸν ἀπορρήξας θεῖη πεδίοιο κροαίνων,
 εἰωθὼς λούεσθαι ἐϋρρεῖος ποταμοῖο,
 κυδιόων· ὕψου δὲ κάρη ἔχει, ἀμφὶ δὲ χαῖται
 ὤμοις αἰσσοῦνται· ὁ δ' ἀγλαΐῃφι πεποιθὼς,
 ῥίμφα ἐ γούνα φέρει μετὰ τ' ἥθεα καὶ νομὸν ἵππων.
 (Z 506–511 = O 263–268)

Hsch. α 2503 (ex Apollonii S. recensione quam quae exstat pleniore [cf. 20.14 Bekker = gl. 218 Steinicke]): ἀκοστήσας (Z 506): κριθιάσας, ἀδδηφαγήσας κατὰ τοὺς Γλωσσογράφους, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄκος λαμβάνειν. τίθησι δὲ τὸ ἄκος ἐπὶ τῆς ἀποπαύσεως τοῦ τε λιμοῦ καὶ τῆς δίψης· “πίον τ' ἀκέοντό τε δίψαν” (X 2). ὁ δὲ Ἀριστόνικος, ἐν ἄχει γενόμενος· διὸ ἐπιφέρει “δεσμὸν ἀπορρήξας θεῖη πεδίοιο κροαίνων” (Z 507), ὃ καὶ βέλτιον εἴρηται. τινὲς δὲ ἄδην πληρωθεῖς.

cf. sch. A (Ariston.) ad Z 506–511: . . . ἡ δὲ διπλὴ πρὸς τὸ ἀκοστήσας (506), ὅτι ἄλλοι ἄλλως ἀπέδωκαν. ἔστι δὲ ἥτοι ἐν ἄχει γενόμενος διὰ τὴν στάσιν ἢ ἄκος τι καὶ βοήθημα τῆς στάσεως ζητῶν; sch. A (D|ex. |D|ex.) ad Z 506b: ἀκοστήσας: ἄκος τῆς στάσεως λαβών, τουτέστιν ἴαμα, καὶ κριθιάσας. κυρίως δὲ {αἱ} (del. Ddf.) πᾶσαι αἱ τροφαὶ ἀκοσταὶ καλοῦνται |παρὰ Θεσσαλοῖς, ὡς καὶ Νικάνδρος (cf. Alex. 106), |παρὰ τὸ ἴστασθαι τὰ σώματα τρεφόμενα. ἐν ἄλλῃ· καιρῷ παραλαβών. βέλτιον δὲ δυσχεράνας ἐπὶ τῇ τῆς φάτνης στάσει. |οἱ δὲ “ἀγοστήσας”. ἀγοστὸς γὰρ ὁ ῥύπος. ἡ ἡσυχάσας παρὰ τὴν ἀκὴν; cf. etiam Meth. (Et. Gen. α 351; Ep. Hom. α 314); Eust. 658.45; de glossa Hesychiana ad Ap. S. attribuenda cf. Leyde (supra, n. 11) 21; de textu constituendo, Erbse, Beiträge zur Überlieferung der Iliasscholien (Monaci 1960) 413 adn. 2.

The word ἀκοστήσας is attested only in the horse simile which occurs at both Z 506 ff. and O 263 ff., applied in the former passage to Paris, in the latter to Hector. Hence the meaning had to be inferred from this single context. The Γλωσσογράφοι, etymologizing from ἄκος “remedy,” explained it as literally = ἄκος λαμβάνειν. In this particular context the “remedy” takes the form of food and drink (τίθησι δὲ τὸ ἄκος ἐπὶ τῆς ἀποπαύσεως τοῦ τε λιμοῦ καὶ τῆς δίψης), a metaphor for which Homeric precedent could be cited (X 2: πίον τ' ἀκέοντό τε δίψαν). One wonders whether it was the Γλωσσογράφοι or later commentators who adduced Thessalian ἀκοσταί = τροφαί and/or Nicander (*Alex.* 106–107: πολλάκι δ' ἐνθρύψειας ἐν ὀπταλέησιν ἀκοσταῖς | Γερραῖης λιβάνοιο χύσιν περιπηγέα θάμνοισ). If the

former is the case, this would be confirmation of the view that early Homeric exegesis tended to treat uncommon Homeric idioms as dialectal phenomena.⁵² The variety of explanations of ἀκοστήσας already in circulation in his time caused Aristarchus to mark his text with a διπλή. Aristonicus, presumably following Aristarchus, adopted a different solution from that of the Glossographs. He connects the word, not with ἄκος, but with ἄχος, and interprets as = ἐν ἄχει γενόμενος. By way of justification he points to the following words δεσμὸν ἀπορρήξας θείει πεδίῳ κροαίνων. In other words, Aristonicus interprets the situation differently: it is not a satisfied horse who has eaten his fill at the manger who breaks free of his tether and runs clattering through the plain, but a horse in distress; but why the horse should have felt distress precisely ἐν φάτῃ remains unexplained. The meaning that has prevailed approximates that of the Γλωσσογράφοι, though based on yet a different etymology (> ἀκοστή ‘barley’).⁵³

fr. 5: ὧς εἰπὼν (sc. Μενέλαος) ἵπποισιν ἐκέκλετο φώνησέν τε·
 “μή μοι ἐρύκεσθον μηδ’ ἔστατον ἀχνυμένω κῆρ.
 φθήσονται τούτοισι πόδες καὶ γούνα καμόντα
 ἢ ὑμῖν· ἄμφω γὰρ ἀτέμβονται νεότητος.” (Ψ 442–445)

sch. T (D|ex.) ad Ψ 445b: ἀτέμβονται: στέρονται. |οἱ δὲ Γλωσσογράφοι μέμφονται.

cf. sch. Ap. Rh. 2.55–56b: (ἴνα μή μοι) ἀτέμβῃαι (μετόπισθεν) (suppl. Haslam): ἴνα μή μοι μέμψῃ ὕστερον ὡς χείρονας εἰληφώς. τὸ γὰρ ἀτέμβεσθαι οἱ νεώτεροι οὐκ ἐπὶ τοῦ στερίσκεσθαι ἤκουσαν, ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τοῦ μέμφεσθαι; sim. sch. Ap. Rh. 2.1199 et 3.97–99c

“It is clear that this meaning cannot have been presented by the glossogr. on this passage, where it would be inappropriate. They, no doubt, offered this interpretation for the Homeric expression ἀτεμβόμενος κίοι ἴσης” (Λ 705, ι 42).⁵⁴ Here we have an instance where a poet has availed himself of a doctrine of the Γλωσσογράφοι (cf. above, 128).

⁵² Cf. K. Latte (above, n. 1) 147 ff. = *Kl. Schr.* 641 ff.; W. D. Lebek (above, n. 4) 63.

⁵³ Cf. V. Pisani, *LdfrgE* (Göttingen 1955–) s.v. ἀκοστήσας; H. Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* 1 (Heidelberg 1973) s.v. ἀκοστή; LSJ s.v. ἀκοστάω or -έω.

⁵⁴ Valk (above, n. 8) 1.276.

fr. 6: Achilles to Odysseus:

ἐνθα δέ μοι μάλα πολλὸν ἐπέσσυτο θυμὸς ἀγῆνωρ
 γήμαντα μνηστὴν ἄλοχον, εἰκυῖαν ἄκοιτιν,
 κτήμασι τέρπεσθαι τὰ γέρων ἐκτήσατο Πηλεΰς·
 οὐ γὰρ ἐμοὶ ψυχῆς ἀντάξιον οὐδ' ὅσα φασὶν
 Ἴλιον ἐκτήσθαι, εὖ ναιόμενον πτολίεθρον,
 τὸ πρὶν ἐπ' εἰρήνης, πρὶν ἐλθεῖν υἷας Ἀχαιῶν,
 οὐδ' ὅσα λαΐνος οὐδὸς ἀφήτορος ἐντὸς ἐέργει,
 Φοῖβου Ἀπόλλωνος, Πυθοῖ ἐνὶ πετρῆεσσι. (I 398–405)

- 6a** sch. A (Ariston.) ad I 404a: οὐδ' ὅσα λαΐνος (οὐδὸς ἀφήτορος ἐντὸς ἐέργει): πρὸς τοὺς Γλωσσογράφους ἀφήτορος τοῦ στροφέως ἀποδιδόντας. καὶ Ζηνόδοτος δὲ οὕτως ἐκδέδεκται· τὸν γὰρ ἐξῆς μετέγραφε· “νηοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος.” ἀφήτορα δὲ τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα ἐπιθε-
 5 τικῶς, οὐ κοινότερον, ἀλλὰ τὸν Πύθιον, οἷον ὁμοφήτορα, διὰ τὸ εἰς λόγους ἔρχεσθαι τοῖς χρησιμωδουμένοις.

6b Ap. S. 49.17 (s.v. ἀφήτορος = gl. 759 St.): οἱ δὲ Γλωσσογράφοι ἀφήτορα ἔδοξαν λέγεσθαι τὸν στροφέα τῆς θύρας.

1 le. suppl. Villoison **8** ἀφήτορας C : corr. Villoison

cf. sch. h (An. Par. 3.173.6 s.v. ἀφήτορος): . . . ἢ τοῦ τῆς πυλίδος στροφέως (Ge : τροφέως Ag).

H. Pusch warns that the reference to Zenodotus in 6a need not imply that that author's Γλῶσσαι contained an entry ἀφήτωρ: στροφεύς.⁵⁵ Cf. above, 123 and n. 17.

fr. 7: The speaker is Diomedes, who volunteers to spy on the Trojan camp by night but asks to be joined by a partner:

Νέστορ, ἔμ' ὀτρύνει κραδίη καὶ θυμὸς ἀγῆνωρ
 ἀνδρῶν δυσμενέων δῦναι στρατὸν ἐγγὺς ἐόντων,
 Τρώων· ἀλλ' εἴ τίς μοι ἀνὴρ ἅμ' ἔποιτο καὶ ἄλλος,
 μᾶλλον θαλπωρὴ καὶ θαρσαλεώτερον ἔσται.
 σύν τε δύ' ἐρχομένω, καί τε πρὸ δ τοῦ ἐνόησεν
 ὅπως κέρδος ἔη· μῶνος δ' εἴ πέρ τε νοήσῃ,
 ἀλλὰ τέ οἱ βράσσων τε νόος, λεπτὴ δέ τε μῆτις. (K 220–226)

⁵⁵ Cf. H. Pusch, *Quaestiones Zenodoteae* (Halle 1890 [*Dissertationes philologicae Halenses* 10]) 189.

7a sch. A (Ariston.) ad K 226: ἀλλά τέ οἱ βράσσων: ὅτι οἱ Γλωσσογράφοι βράσσων ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐλάσσων (ἀπὸ τοῦ βραχύς· ἀλλ') οὐδαμῶν κέχρηται τούτῳ Ὅμηρος. ἀποδοτέον οὖν βρασσόμενος, ταρασσόμενος διὰ τὸ δέος, οὐχ ἐστηκώς διὰ τὴν ἀγωνίαν. ἅπαξ δὲ ἐνταῦθα κέχρηται τῇ λέξει.

7b Eust. 800.10: τὸ δὲ “βράσσων” ἅπαξ μὲν ἐνταῦθα εἴρηται τῷ ποιητῇ, δηλοῖ δὲ κατὰ τοὺς Γλωσσογράφους τὸν βραδὺν ἢ τὸν βραχύν, ἀπὸ τοῦ βραδύς βραδίων βράσσων, ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ βραχύς βραχίων βράσσων, ὡς ἐλαχὺς ἐλαχίων ἐλάσσων, παχὺς παχίων πάσσων.

2 suppl. Friedländer 3 τοῦτο A : corr. Bekker

cf. sch. D ad K 226: βράσσων: βραδύτερος (βραχύτερος Haslam), ἐλάσσων; Ap. S. 53.7 Bekker = gl. 845 Steinicke: βράσσων: οἱ μὲν ἐλάσσων, οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ βρασμοῦ ἄτακτος καὶ μὴ σταθερός; Hdn. Mon. (2.942.17): θάσσων. τὰ εἰς ὧν λήγοντα συγκριτικὰ δισύλλαβα, εἰ ἔχει πρὸ τέλους τὸ α, συννεσταλμένον αὐτὸ ἔχει. βράσσων

ἀλλά τέ οἱ βράσσων τε νόος (K 226) . . .

The issue is the sense of the ἅπαξ λεγόμενον βράσσων in K 226. The corruption of the A-scholium makes assessment difficult; but given the definition βράσσων = ἐλάσσων, there is no reason to assume that the Γλωσσογράφοι derived the word from any other source than βραχύς. Hence Eustathius' indication that they offered alternative definitions τὸν βραδὺν ἢ τὸν βραχύν and corresponding alternative etymologies seems to result from contamination with another source, probably either *Et. Gen.* β 243 or *EM* 211.33. Here, as in fr. 1, Aristarchus takes aim at the Glossographs' practice of assuming derivation from a word (in this case βραχύς) unattested in Homer. (Did he also object to the tautology of βράσσων τε νόος, λεπτή δέ τε μήτις?) His own solution, βράσσων = βρασσόμενος = ταρασσόμενος διὰ τὸ δέος, cannot be supported with extant parallels and has, accordingly, not found favor.⁵⁶ On the other hand, the solution of the Γλωσσογράφοι is backed by good analogy, as Herodian knew. This example may serve to illustrate the fallibility of Aristarchus himself, particularly in cases where a solution cannot be found by appealing to a passage or passages elsewhere in the Homeric corpus.

⁵⁶ Cf. C. G. Cobet, *Miscellanea Critica* (Leiden 1876) 388; N. Wecklein, *Über Zenodot und Aristarch* (Munich 1919 [Sb. d. Bayerischen Akademie d. Wissenschaften, philosoph.-philol. u. hist. Kl.]) 70; F. Martinazzoli, *Hapax legomenon* 1 (Rome 1953) 44.

fr. 8: Ἴδομενεὺς δ' οὐ λήγε μένος μέγα, ἴετο δ' αἰεὶ
 ἢ τίνα Τρώων ἐρεβεννῇ νυκτὶ καλύψαι,
 ἢ αὐτὸς δουπῆσαι ἀμύνων λοιγὸν Ἀχαιοῖς. (N 424–426)

8a sch. A (Ariston.) ad N 426a: ἡ αὐτὸς δουπῆσαι: ὅτι ἐκ παρεπομέ-
 νου τὸ ἀπολέσθαι· οἱ γὰρ ἐν πολέμῳ πίπτοντες ψόφον ἀποτελοῦσι
 τοῖς ὅπλοις. ἡ δὲ ἀναφορὰ πρὸς τοὺς Γλωσσογράφους· οὗτοι γὰρ
 (ἐν) ἀνθ' ἐνὸς ἐδέξαντο “δεδουπότος” (Ψ 679) ἀντὶ τοῦ τεθηγκότος.

4 ἐν ins. Bekker

8b Ἐκτωρ δ' ὥς εἶδεν Πατροκλῆα μεγάλθυμον
 ἄψ ἀναχαζόμενον, βεβλημένον ὀξείῃ χαλκῷ,
 ἀγχίμολόν ρά οἱ ἦλθε κατὰ στίχας, οὐτα δὲ δουρὶ
 νεΐατον ἐς κενεῶνα, διαπρὸ δὲ χαλκὸν ἔλασσε·
 δούπησεν δὲ πεσών, μέγα δ' ἤκαχε λαὸν Ἀχαιῶν . . . (Π 818–822)

sch. A (Ariston.) ad Π 822a: δούπησεν δὲ πεσών: ὅτι ἐκ τῶν τοιούτων
 ἀπεξεδέξαντο οἱ Γλωσσογράφοι τὸ δουπῆσαι ἐν ἀνθ' ἐνὸς ἀντὶ τοῦ
 ἀποθανεῖν. ἀγνοοῦσι δὲ ὅτι οὐκ ἐπὶ παντὸς θανάτου τάσσει τὴν
 λέξιν, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῶν ἐν πολέμῳ πιπτόντων διὰ τὸν παρακολουθοῦντα
 5 ψόφον ἐκ τῶν ὅπλων.

2 ἀπεξεδέξαντο Erbse (cl. sch. A ad Π 41a [laud. ad fr. 13 infra]): ἀπεκδέξαντο A
 4 πιπτόντων Bekker: πυκτευόντων A 5 ψόφον Bekker: φόβον A

8c ὥς ἔφαθ' (sc. Erius), οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἀκὴν ἐγένοντο σιωπῇ.
 Εὐρύαλος δέ οἱ οἶος ἀνίστατο, ἰσόθεος φῶς,
 Μηκιστῆος υἱὸς Ταλαϊονίδαο ἄνακτος,
 ὅς ποτε Θήβασδ' ἦλθε δεδουπότος Οἰδιπόδαο
 ἐς τάφον· ἐνθα δὲ πάντας ἐνίκαι Καδμείωνας. (Ψ 676–680)

sch. A (Ariston.) ad Ψ 679a: ὅς ποτε Θήβας δ' ἦλθε (δεδουπότος
 Οἰδιπόδαο): ὅτι ἐπὶ τοῦ Μηκιστέως ἀκουστέον (τὸ) “ὅς ποτε Θήβας
 (δ') ἦλθεν,” οὐκ ἐπὶ τοῦ Εὐρύαλου, ὥς ὁ Κράτης (p. 46 W.). καὶ ὅτι
 οἱ νεώτεροι παρὰ τὸν Ὅμηρον τὸν Οἰδίπουν φασὶν ἑαυτὸν τυφλώ-
 (5) σαντα ποδηγούμενον εἰς Ἀθήνας ἐλθεῖν καὶ ἐκεῖ τελευτῆσαι·
 νῦν δὲ ὁμόλογον ὅτι ἐν Θήβαις ἐτελεύτησεν. καὶ πρὸς τὸ
 δεδουπότος: οἱ Γλωσσογράφοι γὰρ ἐν ἀνθ' ἐνὸς τεθηγκότος ἐξε-
 δέξαντο. ἐκ παρεπομένου δὲ νοητέον ὅτι ἦτοι ἐν πολέμῳ τετελεύ-
 τηκε—ψοφοῦσι γὰρ οἱ πίπτοντες: “δούπησεν δὲ πεσών” (Δ 504

al.)—ἡ κατεκρήμνισεν ἑαυτόν· καὶ γὰρ οὗτος ὁ θάνατος μετὰ ψόφου.

1–2 le. suppl. Villoison 2–3 τὸ et δ' suppl. Erbse

The Γλωσσογράφοι may have based their “one for one” interpretation δουπῆσαι = ἀποθανεῖν on this last passage. If so, they probably assumed that Homer, like the authors of the cyclic *Thebaid* and *Oedipodia* as well as Sophocles and Euripides, knew a version of the legend in which Oedipus, upon discovery of his crimes, either blinded himself or was blinded by others and went into exile or retirement. It would then have been left to Aristarchus, putting into practice—whether or not he invented it—the precept “Ὅμηρον ἐξ Ὀμήρου σαφηνίζειν,”⁵⁷ to sort out the stages of the tradition. According to the poet of the *Odyssey*, he continued to rule over Thebes:

ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐν Θήβῃ πολυηράτῳ ἄλγεα πάσχων
Καδμείων ἦνασσε θεῶν ὀλοᾶς διὰ βουλάς. (λ 275–276)

Perhaps Aristarchus had this in mind in suggesting that Oedipus might have died in war.⁵⁸ In any case, he is firm in insisting on the literal sense of δουπῆσαι and the fact that this excludes certain forms of death (cf. 8b), including the non-violent death he dies in Sophocles' *Oedipus Coloneus*.⁵⁹

fr. 9: Phoenix to Achilles (exemplum of Meleager):

⁵⁷ Cf. n. 48 above.

⁵⁸ Cf. E. R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1951) 36.

⁵⁹ The usage δουπῆσαι = ἀποθανεῖν once claimed for Quintus of Smyrna (cf. *Quinti Smyrnaei Posthomericonum Libri XIV*, ed. Thom. Christ. Tychsen [Strasbourg 1807] lvi: “δουπεῖν simpliciter pro interimi, mori, I.768, II.9 [hodie II.12], III.192 [hodie III.193] & alibi;”) will not bear scrutiny (the three passages cited refer respectively to the deaths of Thersites, Hector, and Achilles); cf. now F. Vian and E. Battegay, *Lexique de Quintus de Smyrne* (Paris 1984) s.v. δεδοπῶς (= “qui a péri de mort violente”). The same is true for the passages adduced by E. Livrea *ad* Ap. Rhod. 4.557, viz., Ap. Rhod. 1.1304 (Pelias), 4.557 (Apsyrtus), Euphor. fr. 40.2 Powell (Achilles), Lyc. *Alex.* 285 (Hector), 492 (the Calydonian boar), 919 (Philoctetes), Quint. Smyrn. 2.555 (Memnon), Nonnus 11.327 (Ampelus). For other versions of Oedipus' death cf. L. R. Farnell, *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality* (Oxford 1921) 332 ff.

καὶ γὰρ τοῖσι κακὸν χρυσόθρονος Ἄρτεμις ὥρσε,
 χωσαμένη ὅ οἱ οὐ τι θαλύσια γουνῶ ἀλωῆς
 Οἰνεὺς ρέξ'· ἄλλοι δὲ θεοὶ δαίνυνθ' ἑκατόμβας,
 οἷη δ' οὐκ ἔρρεξε Διὸς κούρη μέγαλοιο.
 ἢ λάθεται ἢ οὐκ ἐνόησεν· ἀάσατο δὲ μέγα θυμῷ.
 ἢ δὲ χολωσαμένη διὸν γένος ἰοχέαιρα
 ὥρσεν ἔπι χλοῦνην σὺν ἄγριον ἀργιόδοντα,
 ὃς κακὰ πόλλ' ἔρδεσκεν ἔθων Οἰνήος ἀλωήν·
 πολλὰ δ' ὅ γε προθέλυμα χαμαὶ βάλε δένδρεα μακρὰ
 αὐτῇσιν ρίζησι καὶ αὐτοῖς ἀνθεσι μήλων. (I 533–542)

sch. A^{int} (Ariston.) ad I 540b: (ὃς κακὰ πόλλ' ἔρδεσκεν ἔθων Οἰνήος ἀλωήν): ὅτι οἱ Γλωσσογράφοι τὸ ἔθων ἀποδιδόασιν βλάπτων. ἔστι δὲ ἐξ ἔθους ἐπιφοιτῶν.

1 le. supplevi : ἔθων suppl. Erbse

cf. sch. D ad I 540: ἔθων: ἐξ ἔθους κατατρέχων, καὶ βλάπτων; Eust. 773.25: τὸ δὲ “ἔθων Οἰνήος ἀλωήν” ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐξ ἔθους βλάπτων τὰ περὶ Καλυδῶνα.

Callimachus appears to have been influenced by this doctrine of the Γλωσσογράφοι (cf. also ad fr. 31a below): Call. fr. 55.1–2 Pf = *SH* 267.1–2: τὸν μὲν ἀρiscυδῆς εὖνις ἀνήκε Διός | Ἄργος ἔθειν . . . (*spectat ad leonem Nemeaeum*). (Cf. also above, 128)

fr. 10: Glaucus to Hector:

πῶς κε σὺ χεῖρονα φῶτα σαώσεις μεθ' ὅμιλον,
 σχέτλι', ἐπεὶ Σαρπηδὸν' ἅμα ξεῖνον καὶ ἐταῖρον
 κάλλιπες Ἀργείοισιν ἔλωρ καὶ κύρμα γενέσθαι,
 ὃς τοι πόλλ' ὄφελος γένετο, πτόλει τε καὶ αὐτῷ,
 ζῶδες ἑών· νῦν δ' οὐ οἱ ἀλαλκόμεναι κύνας ἔτλης. (P 149–153)

sch. A (Ariston.) ad P 151b: κάλλιπες: ἢ διπλῇ, ὅτι τὰ ἐλώρια οὐκ ἔστι βρώματα, ὡς οἱ Γλωσσογράφοι, ἀλλ' ἐλκύσματα.

sim. sch. A (Ariston.) ad Σ 93b

The Glossographs' definition, if invoked in this passage, would impute cannibalism to the Greek host! This passage is an evident part of Aristarchus' *reductio ad absurdum* of the glossographic doctrines. (Cf. above, 128.)

fr. 11: Agamemnon to Menelaus:

ἀλλ' ἴθι νῦν Αἴαντα καὶ Ἰδομενῆα κάλεσσον
 ῥίμφα θέων παρὰ νῆας· ἐγὼ δ' ἐπὶ Νέστορα δῖον
 εἶμι, καὶ ὄτρυνέω ἀνστήμεναι, αἶ κ' ἐθέλησιν
 ἐλθεῖν ἐς φυλάκων ἱερὸν τέλος ἡδ' ἐπιτεῖλαι. (K 53–56)

11a. sch. A (Ariston.) ad K 56b (spectat ad le. ἐλθεῖν ἐς φυλάκων): ὅτι οἱ Γλωσσογράφοι ἱερὸν τέλος τὸ μέγα τάγμα. . . . ἱερὸν τέλος ὡς “ἱερὸν ἰχθύν” (Π 407) τὸν μέγαν. ἱερὸν μὲν οὖν τέλος λέγει τὸ θεῖον τάγμα, “ἱερὸν” δὲ “ἰχθύν” τὸν ἄνετον καὶ ἱερὸν βοῦν (cf. A 5 99 alibi), ἀπὸ τοῦ ἴεσθαι.

11b Et. Gen. (AB): ἱερὸν τέλος: τὸ μέγα τάγμα λέγουσιν οἱ Γλωσσογράφοι, ὡς “ἱερὸν ἰχθύν” τὸν μέγαν. ἱερὸν μὲν οὖν τέλος λέγουσι τὸ θεῖον τάγμα, “ἱερὸν δὲ ἰχθύν” τὸν ἄνετον καὶ ἱερὸν βοῦν (cf. A 99 alibi), ἀπὸ τοῦ ἴεσθαι.

10 11c Eust. 789.11: οἱ μέντοι Γλωσσογράφοι ἱερὸν τὸ μέγα φασί, ὡς καὶ ἱερός, φασίν, ἰχθὺς ὁ μέγας.

7 λέγουσι A : λέγε B 8 καὶ A : ὡς B

cf. sch. D ad K 56: ἱερὸν (τέλος: ἱερόν) ἦτοι μέγα ἢ ἀπληλαγμένον τῶν λοιπῶν ἔργων. τέλος δὲ καὶ τὸ τάγμα. . . . sch. Eur. Hipp. 1206: ἱερὸν: ἀντὶ τοῦ μέγα; sch. Ael. Arist. 77, 6; Ba. 260, 24: ἱερω: θεῖω, ἦτοι μεγάλω; τέλος = τάγμα: cf. sch. Thuc. 2.22.2; sch. A (Ariston.) ad Π 407d: ἱερὸν ἰχθύν: ὅτι οὐκ ἐπὶ τι εἶδος ἰχθύος φερόμενος εἶρηκε ἱερὸν ἰχθύν, καθάπερ τινὲς ἀποδεδώκασιν τὸν πομπίλον, οἱ δὲ τὸν κάλλιχθιν, ἀλλὰ κοινότερον τὸν ἄνετον καὶ εὐτραφή, ὡς ἱερὸν βοῦν (cf. A 99 alibi) λέγομεν τὸν ἀντιμενον; Et. Gud. 273.16, unde EM 468.25; Erbse, Beitr. (cf. ad fr. 4 supra) 143, adn. 2.

Valk (*ad* Eust. 789.11) suspected Eustathius' attribution to the Γλωσσογράφοι of an interpretation of ἱερός ἰχθὺς. Though Eustathius sometimes uses the term with great latitude (see above, 120–121), in this case Valk's suspicion is baseless, since the attribution occurs already in the *Et. Gen.*, so that any reconstruction of the common source, which Eustathius refers to as Apion and Herodorus, should include it.⁶⁰ Note also that in this case the Glossographs' explanation is

⁶⁰ So already K. Nickau, *Gnomon* 56 (1984) 688. One wonders whether the Constantinian poet(s) might still have been influenced *inter alia* by this doctrine of the Glossographoi in rendering *magnus* as ἱερός in Virgil *Ecl.* 4.5; cf. also E. Fisher, “Greek translations of Latin literature in the fourth century A.D.,” *YCS* 27 (1982) 181.

based on a comparison of passages, not just one (cf. fr. 24 below).

fr. 12: οἱ δ' ἐκ Δουλιχίου Ἐχινάων θ' ἱεράων
νῆσων, αἱ ναίουσι πέρην ἁλὸς Ἥλιδος ἄντα,
τῶν αὖθ' ἡγεμόνευε Μέγης ἀτάλαντος Ἄρηι
Φυλείδης, ὃν τίκτε Διὶ φίλος ἵπποτα Φυλεύς,
ὅς ποτε Δουλίχιόνδ' ἀπενάσσατο πατρὶ χολωθεῖς.
(B 625–629)

12a Eust. 305.5 (spectat ad B 628): διὸ καὶ ἵπποτης νῦν εἰρῆσθαι
δοκεῖ καὶ αὐτὸς ἀντὶ τοῦ φυγᾶς· κεῖται γὰρ ποτε τὸ ἵπποτης ὄνομα
κατὰ τοὺς Γλωσσογράφους καὶ ἐπὶ τοιούτου σημαινομένου.

12b ἐν δ' ἦν ἡυκόμου Δανάης τέκος, ἵπποτα Περσεύς,
οὗτ' ἄρ' ἐπιψαύων σάκεος ποσὶν οὗθ' ἐκάς αὐτοῦ,
θαῦμα μέγα φράσσασθ', ἐπεὶ οὐδαμῇ ἐστήρικτο.
(Hes. Scut. 216–218)

sch. Tzetzae ad Hes. Scut. 216: ἵπποτα Πέρσευς· κατὰ τοὺς Γλωσσο-
γράφους (ἔστιν) ἵπποτην ἀκούειν τὸν φυγάδα. ἐπεὶ ὁ πάππος
Ἀκρίσιος ἐξέβαλεν αὐτόν, οὐ γὰρ εἰσάγεται ἵππῳ χρώμενος ὁ
Περσεύς.

2 ins. Lehrs

cf. sch. D ad B 336: ἵπποτα· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἱππικός, νῦν δὲ φυγᾶς. ὁ γὰρ ποιητὴς νῦν ἀντὶ
τοῦ φυγάδος κέχρηται· sch. A (Ariston.) ad Ξ 117: ἵπποτα Οἰνεύς· ὅτι ἐλέγχονται οἱ
τὸν ἵπποτην ἀποδιδόντες φυγάδα· ὁ γὰρ Οἰνεύς κατέμεινε ἐπὶ τῆς πατρίδος· Ap. S.
92.4 Bekker: ἵπποται· οἱ μὲν νεώτεροι ἵπποτην τὸν φυγάδα {ἵπποτην} λέγουσιν·
“ἵπποτα Φοῖνιξ,” ὅτι φυγᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς πατρίδος πρὸς Πηλέα ἦλθεν. ὁ δὲ Ὅμηρος οὐκ
ἔοικεν ἐπὶ τούτου τάσσειν. ἔστιν οὖν ὁ ἵπποτης ἱππικός κατὰ πόλεμον, ὡς Νέστωρ καὶ
Οἰνεύς· Hsch. ι 854: ἵπποτα· ἵπποτης, ἱππικός. οἱ δὲ νεώτεροι φυγᾶς, οὐκ εὖ. κάλλιον
γὰρ ἐπιστήμων ἱππικῆς, ἱππικώτατος, ἄλλοι ἱππηλάτης.

Eustathius' reference to the Γλωσσογράφοι caused Erbse (*ad sch. Ξ*
117) to suspect loss of an Aristonican note (presumably to B 628).
Such a note would be in line with tendencies observable elsewhere: a
meaning developed to fit a single Homeric context (in this case, B 628),
to which Aristarchus objected (if Apollonius Sophista can be taken as
representing his views) on the grounds that it did not suit other
occurrences of the word in question. One can, however, question
whether their critics have correctly interpreted the Glossographers' inten-
tions: Eustathius merely states that they sometimes (ποτε) assigned the

meaning φυγάς to ἱππότης. Our fragment is unique, however, among the attestations in Iliadic exegesis in that Eustathius is the sole witness. This fact may have led Valk (*ad loc.*) to suggest that Eustathius copied his reference to the Γλωσσογράφοι from Tzetzes *ad Hes. Scut.* 216 (12b). Yet even if this is so, if the citation of the Γλωσσογράφοι rests upon a tradition, it is likely that ἱππότης = φυγάς entered Hesiodic exegesis from Homeric criticism (cf. above, 122 on the dependence of scholia on minor hexameter poets on Homeric exegesis), though the question whether the borrower was Tzetzes himself or a predecessor must remain open. It is, of course, possible that Tzetzes added the reference to the Γλωσσογράφοι and used the term in the loose sense of *Suda* α 2674 (see above, 120); in that case the testimony has no evidential value for the doctrines of the Γλωσσογράφοι under study here. However, since ἱππότης = φυγάς is attested for ancient Homeric exegesis (sch. D *ad B* 628; Ap S. 92.4 Bekker) and there is no inherent reason to deny this doctrine to the Γλωσσογράφοι, the prior explanation (*viz.*, loss of an Aristonican scholium) seems preferable.

fr. 13: Of Odysseus:

ἴσκε ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγων ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα (τ 203).

Eust. 1861.52 (*ad* τ 203): τὸ δὲ ἴσκειν οἱ μὲν Γλωσσογράφοι ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔλεγεν ἐκδέχονται, οἱ δὲ ἀκριβέστεροι ἀντὶ τοῦ ἦϊσκειν, ὃ ἐστὶν εἰκάζεν ἀπεικονίζων πρὸς ἀλήθειαν.

cf. sch. V (= D) *ad* τ 203: ἴσκε ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγων ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα: τινὲς βούλονται τὸ “ἔλεγε” σημαίνειν. ἄλλοι δὲ τὸ “ἦϊσκε,” τὸ “εἰκάζεν, ὁμοίου.” τὸ γὰρ ὅλον “πολλὰ ψευδῆ λέγων εἰκάζεν, ὥστε ὅμοια εἶναι ἀληθῆσιν.” ἀπὸ τοῦ εἶδω ὁ μέλλων εἶσω; sch. χ 31: ἴσκε: ἄλλοι μὲν τὸ ἔλεγεν σημαίνειν βούλονται. **MS Barnes.** οὐδέποτε Ὅμηρος ἐπὶ τοῦ ἔλεγε τὸ ἴσκε, ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὁμοίου. ἡπάτῃται οὖν ὁ διασκευαστὴς ἐκ τοῦ “ἴσκε ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγων ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα” (τ 203). **Vind. 31;** sch. A (Ariston.) *ad* Π 41a: αἱ κέ με σοὶ ἴσκοντες: ὅτι τὸ ἴσκοντες ἀνάλογόν ἐστι τῷ κατὰ διαίρεσιν εἴσκοντες, ὁμοιοῦντες: “εἵκτο δὲ θέσκελον αὐτῷ” (Ψ 107). ἡ δὲ ἀναφορά πρὸς τοὺς ἀπεκδεξαμένους τὸ “ἴσκειν ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγων ἐτύμοισιν” (τ 203): τὸ γὰρ “ἴσκειν” ὑπολαμβάνουσι κεῖσθαι ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔλεγεν, οὐκ ὀρθῶς; sch. Ap. Rh. 1.834: . . . τὸ δὲ ἴσκειν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔλεγεν, κακῶς. Ὅμηρος γὰρ ἀντὶ τοῦ ὁμοίου; sch. Lyc. Alex. 574: τὸ ἴσκων Ὅμηρος μὲν ἐπὶ τοῦ ὁμοιοῦν, Λυκόφρων δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ λέγειν φησίν.

This is another instance (cf. above, 128) in which one can with some probability claim that poets (Ap. Rhod. 4.92 *et alibi* [cf. Livrea *ad loc.*]; Theoc. 22.167; Lycophron Alex. 574) were influenced by a doctrine of the Γλωσσογράφοι, if Eustathius’ attribution to them of ἴσκειν

= ἔλεγεν is correct. Moreover, the attribution is likely to be right, since the gloss bears the expected characteristics: it is evidently based on a single passage, namely τ 203 (as the author of the Vienna scholium to χ 31 suspected); it yields a superficial sense but on closer inspection causes difficulty (it is odd to have the participle λέγων depending on ἴσκειν if ἴσκειν itself = ἔλεγεν); finally, the Glossographs' *ad hoc* definition fails, as usual, to place ἴσκειν within the larger framework of Greek vocabulary, whereas others (Aristarchus?) were left to suggest a connection with ἤϊσκε. Finally, the antithesis between οἱ Γλωσσογράφοι and οἱ ἀκριβέστεροι, whether Eustathius found it in a source or formulated it himself, is faithful to the tenor of Aristarchus' critique of their methods.

fr. 14: Achilles announces the boxing match and the prizes at stake:

“Ἀτρεΐδῃ τε καὶ ἄλλοι ἐϋκνήμιδες Ἀχαιοί,
 ἄνδρε δύω περὶ τῶνδε κελεύομεν, ὥ περ ἀρίστω,
 πῦξ μάλ' ἀνασχομένῳ πεπληγέμεν· ᾧ δέ κ' Ἀπόλλων
 δῶῃ καμμονίην, γνώωσι δὲ πάντες Ἀχαιοί,
 ἡμίονον ταλαεργὸν ἄγων κλισίηνδε νεέσθω·
 αὐτὰρ ὁ νικηθεὶς δέπας οἷσεται ἀμφικύπελλον.” (Ψ 658–663)

sch. A (Ariston.) ad Ψ 661a¹: δῶῃ καμμονίην: ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἀνθ' ἐνὸς καμμονίῃ νίκη, ὥς οἱ Γλωσσογράφοι, ἀλλ' ἡ ἐκ καταμονῆς· διὸ ἐπὶ δρομέων οὐ τάσσει, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῶν πυκτευόντων καὶ μονομαχούντων (cf. X 257)· διὰ γὰρ καταμονῆς.

2 καταμονῆς (olim per cd. scriptum) Lehrs : πολλ(ῶν) A 4 διὰ Erbse : μία A

cf. Plut. aud. poet. 22c: ἄλλος τοίνυν τρόπος ἐστὶ τὰς ἐν τοῖς ποιήμασιν ὑποψίας πρὸς τὸ βέλτιον ἐκ τοῦ χειρόνος μεθιστάς ὁ διὰ τῶν ὀνομάτων τῆς συνηθείας, περὶ ὃν δεῖ τὸν νέον γεγυμνάσθαι μάλλον ἢ περὶ τὰς λεγομένας γλώττας. ἐκεῖνο μὲν γὰρ φιλόλογον, καὶ οὐκ ἀήδης ὅτι ... καμμονίην δὲ νίκην Αἰολεῖς τὴν ἐξ ἐπιμονῆς καὶ καρτερίας...

The Glossographs' "one for one" interpretation καμμονίη = νίκη neglects to do justice to etymology (cf. above, 124); they presumably failed to recognize the connection with καταμονή, probably because they lacked as yet a clear conception of the πάθη, or regular changes, involved in Greek word formation.⁶¹

⁶¹ Cf. n. 67 below; on καμμονίη in particular cf. E. Risch, *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*² (Berlin-New York 1974) § 41b; on the πάθος in question (sc. ἀποκοπή

fr. 15: Diomedes to Paris:

τοξότα, λωβητήρ, κέρα ἀγλαέ, παρθενοπίνα,
 εἰ μὲν δὴ ἀντίβιον σὺν τεύχεσι πειρηθείης,
 οὐκ ἄν τοι χραΐσμησι βιὸς καὶ ταρφέες ιοί· . . . (Λ 385–387)

Ap. S. 98.11 Bekker: κέρ(α) ἀγλαέ (Λ 385): οἱ μὲν Γλωσσογράφοι ταῖς θριξὶν ἀγαλλόμενε· κέρα γὰρ τὴν τρίχα λέγεσθαι. ὁ δὲ Ἀρίσταρχος κυρίως ἀκούει τὸ τοῦ βοὸς κέρας, οἷον τὸ κεράτι(ν)ον συρίγγιον· τὸ γὰρ παλαιόν, πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἀποτρῶξαι τὸν ἰχθύν, τῷ ἀγκίστρῳ περιτίθεσθαι τοῦτο, τὸν δὲ Ὀμηρον μηδέποτε εἰρηκέναι κέρας τὴν τρίχα. ὅθεν ἐπὶ τοῦ κέρ(α) ἀγλαέ, τόξῳ ἀγαλλόμενε.

3 κεράτιον C : corr. Bekker

cf. sch. A (Ariston.) ad Λ 385d: κέρα ἀγλαέ: . . . ἔνιοι δέ, τῷ τόξῳ ἀγαλλόμενε· προ-
 εῖρηκε δὲ “τοξότα λωβητήρ”; sch. A (Hdn. 2.75.18) ad Λ 385e¹: κέρα ἀγλαέ: . . . οἱ δὲ
 ἐξέτειναν τὸ αὖ πάλιν πληθυντικὸν ἐκδεχόμενοι, τιθέντες δὲ τὴν λέξιν ἐπὶ τοῦ τόξου,
 ὥστε εἶναι κατὰ κέρας, συναλιφὴν ἐκδεχόμενοι τοῦ κέραα. περὶ δὲ τῆς τοιαύτης
 ἀναγνώσεως δεδήλωται ἡμῖν, ὅποτε διελάβομεν περὶ τοῦ “κέρα ἐκ κεφαλῆς” (Δ 109;
 locus non iam exstat; sed cf. infra). τοσοῦτον δὲ ἔχω νῦν παραφυλάξαι ἐπὶ τοῦ νοητοῦ
 ὡς ὅτι σπάνιόν ἐστιν ἐπ’ ἀνθρωπίνης φύσεως παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ τὸ κέρας ἐπὶ τριχὸς
 τάσσεσθαι. “κόμην” (Σ 27 al.) δὲ λέγει καὶ “τρίχας” (X 77 al.) καὶ “πλοκάμους” (Ξ
 176) καὶ “ἐθειράς” (cf. Π 795 al.); sch. D ad Λ 385: κέρα (ἀγλαέ): καλλωπιζόμενε τῇ
 τοξικῇ ἢ τῇ τριχῶσει. κέρας γὰρ οἱ παλαιοὶ καὶ τὴν τριχῶσιν ἐκάλουν; sch. Q ad μ
 253: βοὸς κέρας: κέρας Ἀρίσταρχος τὸ κεράτινον συρίγγιον, ὃ ἐπιτιθέασι πρὸς τὸ μὴ
 ἐσθίεσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἰχθύος τὴν ὀρμὴν.

Forsman is right in finding Apollonius' gloss incoherent.⁶² The intrusive material comprises the words οἷον τὸ κεράτινον συρίγγιον· τὸ γὰρ παλαιόν, πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἀποτρῶξαι τὸν ἰχθύν, τῷ ἀγκίστρῳ περι-
 τίθεσθαι τοῦτο, which evidently pertain to another passage, such as μ
 253 (where cf. sch.). Whether the confusion was caused by Apollonius
 himself or arose in the process of excerpting his lexicon must remain
 open.⁶³ The tenor of Aristarchus' rejoinder to the Γλωσσογράφοι is
 nonetheless clear: he objects that the postulated sense is without

of a preposition) in the Homeric dialect cf. K. Strunk, *Die sogenannten Äolismen der homerischen Sprache* (diss. Cologne 1957) 113 ff.

⁶² C. Forsman, *De Aristarcho lexicis Apolloniani fonte* (Berlin 1883) 37–38. His proposed restoration of the text is, however, to be treated with reserve.

⁶³ Fragments of this gloss discovered on a third-century papyrus and published by W. E. H. Cockle, “A New Greek Glossary on Papyrus from Oxyrhynchus,” *BICS* 28 (1981) 123 ff. (fr. 1, col. i, 24 ff.) fail to shed light on this problem.

Homeric parallel. He proposes instead a usage attested elsewhere in Homer (and plausible in context: cf. sch. A [Ariston.] *ad* Λ 385d *sub fin.*). Herodian seems, as so often, to be in agreement with Aristarchus (cf. sch. AbT [ex.] *ad* Δ 109a: κέρα: . . . Ἡρωδιανὸς συναλιφὴν τοῦ κέραα). Others attempted to achieve a sort of compromise between the two views (cf. sch. A [Ariston.] *ad* Λ 385d: κέρα ἀγλαέ: ὅτι κέρα οὐ τῇ τριχὶ ψιλῶς, ἀλλ' ἐμπλοκῆς τι γένος· εἰς κέρατος τρόπον ἀνεπλέκοντο οἱ ἀρχαῖοι κτλ.). Still others found an obscene reference.⁶⁴ In their interpretation the Γλωσσογράφοι seem to have been guided by the general ἥθος of Paris rather than any explicit hints in this context.

fr. 16: πολλοὶ γὰρ δὴ τλήμεν Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες
 ἐξ ἀνδρῶν, χαλέπ' ἄλγε' ἐπ' ἀλλήλοισι τιθέντες.
 τλή μὲν Ἄρης, ὅτε μιν Ὠτος κρατερός τ' Ἐφιάλτης,
 παῖδες Ἀλωῆος, δῆσαν κρατερῶ ἐνὶ δεσμῶ·
 χαλκέω δ' ἐν κεράμῳ δέδετο τρισκαίδεκα μῆνας· . . .
 (E 383–387)

Cyrelli Lex. (cod. Voss. 63): κέραμος: τὸ δεσμοτήριον παρὰ τοῖς Γλωσσογράφοις, παρὰ δὲ Κυπρίοις τὸ ἀγγεῖον, παρὰ δὲ Ἀριστάρχῳ ὁ πίθος.

cf. Ap. S. 98.4 Bekker: κεράμω: οὐχ ὡς κατὰ Κυπρίους τῷ δεσμοτηρίῳ· καὶ γὰρ ἐν ἄλλοις “πολλῶν δ' ἐκ κεράμων μέθρ πίνετο τοῖο γέροντος” (I 469); sch. D *ad* E 387: χαλκέω (κεράμω): χαλκῷ καὶ σκληρῷ ἀγγεῖω, πίθῳ ἢ δεσμοτηρίῳ· οἱ γὰρ Κύπριοι τὸ δεσμοτήριον κέραμον καλοῦσι; Eust. 560.2 (*ad* E 387): ἔδησαν δὲ τὸν Ἄρην ἐν χαλκέῳ κεράμῳ, ἥγουν ἀγγεῖω, οἷον πίθῳ. χρῆσις δὲ τῆς λέξεως ταύτης καὶ ἐν τῇ I ῥαψωδίᾳ (sc. v. 469). ἄλλοι δὲ φασὶ δεσμοτηρίῳ στερεῶ, λέγοντες Κυπρίους κέραμον καλεῖν τὸ δεσμοτήριον.

The nature of Ares' place of confinement exercised ancient critics a good deal. Some posited for κέραμος in this passage the Cyprian sense “prison”; Aristarchus objected that elsewhere in Homer (I 469) the word means “storage jar.” The Γλωσσογράφοι enter the picture in the confused gloss of Cyril's *Lexicon* which K. Latte brought to light.⁶⁵ The original form of the gloss might have been something like this:

⁶⁴ *Aristoteles pseudepigraphus*, ed. V. Rose (Leipzig 1863) 166, fr. 20a (= 145) = Eust. 851.52: Ἀριστοτέλης (Ἀριστοφάνης Rose) δέ, φασί, κέρα ἀγλαὸν εἶπεν ἀντί τοῦ αἰδοῖω σεμνυνόμενον . . .; this interpretation may well have been triggered, as A. Henrichs suggests, by the neighboring παρθενοπίτα.

⁶⁵ *Glotta* 34 (1955) 200 = *Kl. Schr.* 698.

κέραμος· ἀγγεῖον· κατὰ δὲ Γλωσσογράφους δεσμωτήριον, ὥς παρὰ Κυπρίοις· κατὰ δὲ Ἀρίσταρχον πίθος. Latte sought Cyril's source in a fuller version of the D-scholium (*ad* E 387) than that now extant; but one expects to find Aristarchus' views reported, if anywhere, in the Aristonican scholium *ad loc.*; hence it is more likely that Cyril's source was either a lost Aristonican scholium *ad* E 387 (so Erbse *ad loc.*) or a fuller gloss of Apollonius Sophista than that now extant.⁶⁶

fr. 17: ἐννήμαρ μὲν ἀνὰ στρατὸν ὄχετο κῆλα θεοῖο,
τῇ δεκάτῃ δ' ἀγορήνδε καλέσσατο λαὸν Ἀχιλλεύς· . . .
(A 53–54)

Et. Gen. (AB): κῆλον· τὸ ξύλινον βέλος· παρὰ τὸ κᾶλον τὸ δηλοῦν τὸ ξύλον. κατὰ δὲ Γλωσσογράφους βέλη θεῖα, τουτέστιν ἀστραπὰς καὶ βροντάς· “ὄχετο κῆλα θεοῖο” (A 53)· παρὰ τὸν κῆσω μέλλοντα τὸν δηλοῦντα τὸ καύσω, ὅθεν καὶ “πυρὶ κηλέω” (Θ 217), τουτέστι καυστικῶ, γέγονε πλεονασμῶ τοῦ ε· . . .

3 καὶ] om. B | τὸν B : τὸ A

cf. Ap. S. 99.2: κῆλα· ποτὲ μὲν τὰ ξύλινα βέλη, “τάχ' ἐπόχετο κῆλα θεοῖο” (A 383)· ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ Διός, “πιφασκόμενος τὰ ἅ κῆλα” (M 280), οἱ μὲν τὰ σημεία, τὰς βροντάς καὶ τὰς ἀστραπὰς, ὁ δὲ Ἀρίσταρχος φησι καὶ ταῦτα βέλη εἶναι ποῖα τοῦ Διός. . . .; sch. A (Ariston.) *ad* M 280: νιφέμεν, ἀνθρώποισι· ὅτι κῆλα τὰ βέλη Διός, χιῶν καὶ υέτός. . . .; Et. Gen. fons Etymologici Gud. 319.18; cf. EM 510.21

The Γλωσσογράφοι might already have been guided by such an etymology as παρὰ τὸν κῆσω μέλλοντα, though, of course, the fully developed doctrine of pathology came only much later.⁶⁷ Cf. above, 124.

fr. 18: Monologue of the storm-tossed Odysseus:

⁶⁶ D. L. Blank moots the possibility that the Γλωσσογράφοι merely wanted to point out that κεραμῶ in E 387 refers to the δεσμῶ of the preceding line and doubts that κεραμός = δεσμωτήριον in Cyprus.

⁶⁷ Cf. J. Wackernagel, *De pathologiae veterum initiis* (diss. Basel 1876) 26 = *Kleine Schriften* 3 (Göttingen 1979) 1452; D. Blank, *Ancient Philosophy and Grammar: The Syntax of Apollonius Dyscolus* (Chico 1982) 83, n. 1; *ad* fr. 6 of Comanus of Naucratis (to appear in *SGLG* 7). The entry *s.v.* κῆλα in the papyrus text of Apollonius Sophista published by W. E. H. Cockle (above, n. 63), l.ii.1–2, is too damaged to admit of certain restoration; for one attempt cf. M. W. Haslam, “A New Papyrus Text of Apollonius Sophista,” *ZPE* 49 (1982) 35, n. 21.

τρισμακάρες Δαναοὶ καὶ τετράκις οἱ τότε ὄλοντο
 Τροίῃ ἐν εὐρείῃ, χάριν Ἀτρείδῃσι φέροντες.
 ὥς δὴ ἐγὼ γ' ὄφελον θανέειν καὶ πότμον ἐπισπεῖν
 ἥματι τῷ ὅτε μοι πλεῖστοι χαλκήρεα δοῦρα
 Τρῶες ἐπέρριψαν περὶ Πηλείωνι θανόντι.
 τῷ κ' ἔλαχον κτερέων, καὶ μευ κλέος ἦγον Ἀχαιοί·
 νῦν δέ με λευγαλέῳ θανάτῳ εἵμαρτο ἀλῶναι. (ε 306–312)

sch. Q ad ε 312: λευγαλέῳ θανάτῳ: ὅτι λευγαλέον θάνατον οἱ
 Γλωσσογράφοι ἀποδεδώκασι τὸν ἐν ὑγρῷ, ἕκ τε τούτων καὶ ἐκ τῶν
 ὑπ' Ἀχιλλέως ἐν τῇ πρὸς τὸν ποταμὸν μάχῃ λεγομένων. ἄμεινον δὲ
 ὀλέθριον, παρὰ τὸ {ν} λοιγός.

4 τὸν λοιγόν Q : corr. Haslam

cf. sch. D ad ε 312: λευγαλέῳ: ἀδόξῳ ἢ ἀδυνάτῳ, ἢ τῷ δι' ὕδατος.

Valk points out that λευγαλέος appears at Φ 281 and ε 312 in contexts in which a man (Achilles and Odysseus respectively) fears imminent death by drowning.⁶⁸ Might the Γλωσσογράφοι have been guided as well by a derivation of λευγαλέος from ὑγρός? In any case, the interpretation is an early one as can be seen from Sophocles fr. 785 (μύρῳ λευγαλέῳ) and 1062a Radt (Phot. 216.16: λευγαλέα: διάβροχος. οὕτω Σοφοκλῆς); cf. above, 123–124 and 125.

fr. 19: ὥς δ' ὄρνις ἀπτῇσι νεοσσοῖσι προφέρῃσι
 μάστακ', ἐπεὶ κε λάβῃσι, κακῶς δ' ἄρα οἱ πέλει αὐτῇ,
 ὥς καὶ ἐγὼ πολλὰς μὲν ἀύπνους νύκτας ἵαυον,
 ἥματα δ' αἱματόεντα διέπρησσον πολεμίζων,
 ἀνδράσι μαρνάμενος ὁάρων ἔνεκα σφετεράων. (I 323–327)

sch. A (Ariston.) ad I 324a: (μάστακ':) ὅτι οἱ Γλωσσογράφοι μάστακα
 τὴν ἀκρίδα, δέον μάσημα καὶ βρῶμα. ἐνίοτε δὲ καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ στόμα
 ὁμωνύμως, καθάπερ {τὸ} χοίνικα τὸ μετρο(ῦ)ν καὶ τὸ μετρούμενον·
 “ἀλλ' Ὀδυσ{σ}εὺς ἐπὶ μάστακα χερσὶ πίεζεν” (δ 287).

1 le. add. Erbse 3 pr. τὸ] secl. L. Friedländer | μέτρον A : corr. Friedländer 4 ὀδυσσεὺς
 A : corr. West

cf. sch. Nic. Ther. 802: τοί θ' ὑπὲρ ἄκρων: αἵτινες, φησὶν, ἡγουν αἱ ἀκρίδες, ἐπὶ τῶν

⁶⁸ Valk (above, n. 8) 1.253.

ἄκρων ἀθέρων τοῦ σίτου ἱπτάμεναι τὸν λέπυρον, ἥτοι λεπυριζόμενον, στάχυν βόσκονται.

Valk suggests that in Theoc. 14.39–40 (μάστακα δοῖσα τέκνοισιν ὑπωροφίοισι χελιδῶν | ἄψορρον ταχινὰ πέτεται βίον ἄλλον ἀγείρειν) the word μάστακα may “possibly” bear the Glossographs’ sense (= ἀκρίδα).⁶⁹ However, the definition τροφήν ... ἀπαλὸν καὶ τροφερόν offered by the scholium *ad* 39–42b is surely adequate. Moreover, since this passage is patterned after I 323–324 (ὥς δ’ ὄρνις ἀπτῆσι νεοσσοῖσι προφέρῃσι | μάστακ’), where the word is agreed to mean μᾶσημα καὶ βρῶμα, it seems gratuitous to assume that Theocritus misunderstood his model. Cf. above, 123.

fr. 20: ὥς ἄρα φωνήσας πόρε φάρμακον ἀργειφόντης
ἐκ γαίης ἐρύσας, καὶ μοι φύσιν αὐτοῦ ἔδειξε.
ρίζη μὲν μέλαν ἔσκε, γάλακτι δὲ εἴκελον ἄνθος·
μῶλυ δέ μιν καλέουσι θεοὶ· χαλεπὸν δέ τ’ ὀρύσσειν
ἀνδράσι γε θνητοῖσι· θεοὶ δέ τε πάντα δύνανται.
(κ 302–306)

Ap. S. 114.23 Bekker: μῶλυ (κ 305): φυτὸν ἀλεξιφάρμακον. οἱ μὲν γὰρ Γλωσσογράφοι τὸ ἄκεσμα καὶ οἶον τὸ ἔλकुσμα τῶν φαρμάκων· Κλεάνθης δὲ ὁ φιλόσοφος (SVF 1, fr. 526) ἀλληγορικῶς φησὶ δηλοῦσθαι τὸν λόγον, δι’ οὗ μωλύονται αἱ ὁρμαὶ καὶ τὰ πάθη.

2 post ἄκεσμα καὶ vocem novam ἔρυσμα inserere voluit Haslam (coll. ἐρύσας κ 303) 4 αἱ Tollius : καὶ C

cf. sch. D ad κ 305: μῶλυ: βοτάνης εἶδος παρὰ τὸ μωλύειν, ὃ ἐστὶν ἀφανίζειν, τὰ φάρμακα· φασὶ δὲ αὐτὸ ἐλκόμενον τῆς ρίζης τῷ τέλει θάνατον ἐπιφέρειν τῷ ἀποσπῶντι, unde Et. Gud. 401.27, unde Tzetzes ad Lyc. Alex. 679; Hsch. μ 2036: μῶλυ: φυτοῦ εἶδος ἀλεξιφάρμακον, ἡ βοτάνης ἀντιπάθιον. οἱ δὲ τὸν λόγον, δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα μωλύεται, ὃ ἐστὶ πράνεται; Σ (Phot. 283.22; Ba. 305.19; Suda v 1326): μῶλυ: ἀντιπάθιον ἢ βοτάνη (ἀντιπαθεῖ ἢ βοτάνη Ba.) ἀλεξιφάρμακος, ἥτοι πῆγανον ἄγριον; Et. Gen. (AB) s.v. μῶλυ, unde EM 592.39.

What did the Glossographs mean when they called μῶλυ “τὸ ἄκεσμα καὶ οἶον τὸ ἔλकुσμα τῶν φαρμάκων”? In his *editio princeps* of Apollonius Sophista, Villoison offered the following explanation: “Lexicographi enim intelligunt remedium, et quasi id quod ad se attrahit vim veneni.” To be sure, LSJ recognizes ἔλकुσμα only as the

⁶⁹ Valk (above, n. 8) 1.251.

result of the action ἐλκύειν, that is, something that is drawn; however, the oldest formations in -μα comprise the most varied types of *nomen actionis*.⁷⁰ The choice of ἔλκυσμα may well have been influenced by the preceding ἄκεσμα; the οἶον indicates that the usage is not normal. If Villoison is right, the words limiting τὸ ἔλκυσμα, namely τῶν φαρμάκων, will refer to Circe's φάρμακα λύγρα (κ 236; cf. 290; LSJ s.v. ἔλκω II.8). In fact, the lexicographic tradition generally defines μῶλυ in opposition to Circe's drug as an ἀντιφάρμακον (*Et. Gen.*, *EM*) or an ἀλεξιφάρμακον (Ap. S., Hsch., Σ); similarly, some exegetes define μωλύνειν as = ἀφανίζειν τὰ φάρμακα (sch. D and derived texts cited above). A. Henrichs is probably right in suspecting that the Γλωσσογράφοι understood μωλύνειν = ἔλκειν.

fr. 21: From the description of Achilles' shield:

ἐν δ' Ἑρις ἐν δὲ Κυδοιμὸς ὁμίλειον, ἐν δ' ὅλοη Κήρ,
 ἄλλον ζῶν ἔχουσα νεούτατον, ἄλλον ἄουτον,
 ἄλλον τεθνηῶτα κατὰ μόθον ἔλκε ποδοῖν·
 εἶμα δ' ἔχ' ἄμφ' ὥμοισι δαφοινεὸν αἵματι φωτῶν.
 ὠμίλειν δ' ὥς τε ζωοὶ βροτοὶ ἢ δ' ἐμάχοντο,
 νεκρούς τ' ἀλλήλων ἔρυον κατατεθνηῶτας. (Σ 535–540)

sch. A (Ariston.) ad Σ 540a: νεκρούς τ' ἀλλήλων (ἔρυον κατατεθνηῶτας): ὅτι ἐπὶ τῶν τοιούτων τόπων οἱ Γλωσσογράφοι νεκρούς τοὺς νέους ὑπέλαβον λέγεσθαι.

1 le. suppl. Friedländer

Perhaps the tautology of νεκρούς . . . κατατεθνηῶτας caused the Glossographers to posit νεκροὶ = νεοί.

fr. 22: αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τὰ ἕκαστα περιφραδέως ἀλέγνυναν,
 κληῖδας μὲν πρῶτα πάλῳ διεμοιρήσαντο,
 ἄνδρ' ἐντυναμένῳ δοιῶ μίαν· ἐκ δ' ἄρα μέσσην
 ἦρεον Ἡρακλεῖ καὶ ἡρώων ἄτερ ἄλλων
 Ἀγκαίῳ, Τεγέης ὅς ῥα πτολίεθρον ἔναιε·
 τοῖς μέσσην οἴοισιν ἀπὸ κληῖδα λίποντο

⁷⁰ Cf. A. Debrunner, *Griechische Wortbildungslehre* (Heidelberg 1917) § 311; A. Henrichs compares ἔρεισμα, φῶμα, παιδεύμα (LSJ s.v., II.2), σκλήρυσμα. My treatment of this fragment is in general much indebted to Professor Henrichs.

αὐτως, οὗ τι πάλω· ἐπὶ δ' ἔτρεπον αἰνήσαντες
Τίφυν ἐϋστείρης οἰήϊα νηὸς ἔρυσθαι. (Ap. Rh. 1.394–401)

sch. Ap. Rh. 1.401a: . . . οἰήϊα δὲ τὰ πηδάλια οἶον οἰήσια, ἐπειδὴ οἰήσεως χρεῖα τῷ κυβερνήτῃ. οἱ δὲ Γλωσσογράφοι τοὺς οἴακας.

Here is another case where the Glossographs' definition is still accepted (cf. LSJ s.v. οἰήϊον; above, 124). As A. Henrichs notes, the etymology presented in this scholium is intelligible if οἴησις can mean something like "informed opinion."

fr. 23: Hermes, disguised as a prince, to Priam:

πῆ, πάτερ, ᾧδ' ἵππους τε καὶ ἡμιόνους ἰθύνεις
νύκτα δι' ἀμβροσίην, ὅτε θ' εὐδοῦσι βροτοὶ ἄλλοι;
οὐδὲ σύ γ' ἔδεισας μένεα πνείοντας Ἀχαιοῦς,
οἷ τοι δυσμενέες καὶ ἀνάρσιοι ἐγγὺς ἔασι;
τῶν εἴ τίς σε ἴδοιτο θοῆν διὰ νύκτα μέλαιναν
τοσσάδ' ὀνειάτ' ἄγοντα, τίς ἂν δῆ τοι νόος εἴη. (Ω 362–367)

23a¹ sch. A (Ariston.) ad Ω 367a: τόσσαςδ' ὀνειάτ' ἄγοντα: ὅτι οὐ πάντως βρώματα τὰ ὀνειάτα, ὥς οἱ Γλωσσογράφοι, ἀλλὰ πάντα τὰ ὄνησιν τινα περιποιοῦντα, ὥς νῦν τὰ δῶρα. . . .

23a² sch. bT (ex. [Ariston.]) ad Ω 367b: ὀνειάτα: χρήματα, παρὰ τὴν
5 ὄνησιν. οἱ δὲ Γλωσσογράφοι βρώματα· **bT** ὥς "ἐπ' ὀνειάθ' ἐτοῖμα προκείμενα" (I 91. 221 al.). **T**

23a³ *Suda* ο 334: ὀνειάτα: οὐ πάντως βρώματα, ὥς οἱ Γλωσσογράφοι, ἀλλὰ πάντα τὰ εἰς ὄνησιν ἐπιτήδεια. . . .

5 οἱ δὲ γλωσσογράφοι **T**: δηλοῖ δὲ ἀλλαχόθι καὶ τὰ BCE³: ἀλλαχόθι δὲ δηλοῖ καὶ τὰ E⁴|ὡς Erbse: καὶ **T**

23b Penelope to Odysseus in the guise of a beggar:

δοιαὶ γάρ τε πύλαι ἀμενηνῶν εἰσὶν ὀνειρῶν·
αἱ μὲν γὰρ κεράεσσι τετεύχαται, αἱ δ' ἐλέφαντι·
τῶν οἱ μὲν κ' ἔλθωσι διὰ πριστοῦ ἐλέφαντος,
οἷ ῥ' ἐλεφαίρονται, ἔπε' ἀκράαντα φέροντες·
οἱ δὲ διὰ ξεστῶν κεράων ἔλθωσι θύραζε,

οἱ ῥ' ἔτυμα κραίνουσι, βροτῶν ὅτε κέν τις ἴδῃται.

(τ 562–567)

Eust. 1877.61 (ad τ 562): ἐν τούτοις δὲ σημειῶσαι καὶ ὅτι τοῦ ἀληθοῦς ὄνειρου ἐτυμολογουμένου ἀπὸ τε τοῦ αὐτὸ τὸ ὄν εἶρειν, ἔτι δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄνέω, τὸ ὠφελῶ, ἐξ οὗ καὶ τὸ ὄνειαρ πλεονασμῷ τοῦ ἰῶτα, ὠνόμασέ τις ὄνειαρ καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ ὄνειρον, οἶον “ὄνειαρ 5 κεράτων οὐδ' ἐλέφαντος ὄν” (cf. τ 562–563). ἐξ οὗ δῆλον ὅτι οὐκ ἐπὶ βρωμάτων μόνον λέγεται τὸ ὄνειαρ, ἀλλὰ πᾶν εἰς ὄνησιν ἐπιτήδειον οὕτω καλεῖται, ὅποῖόν τι καὶ ὁ ἀληθὴς ὄνειρος. οἱ Γλωσσογράφοι μέντοι ἐπὶ βρώματος τὴν λέξιν ἰδι(ά)ζεσθαι φασιν.

8 ἰδιάζεσθαι φασιν Henrichs (coll. Valk ad Eust. 800.42; Eust. 867.53) : ἰδίασαν cod.

The Glossographs evidently liked to find words for edibles in the Homeric poems (cf. fr. 10), whereas the parodist Matro of Pitane liked to insert new ones;⁷¹ cf. above, 123.

fr. 24: Agamemnon to Nestor:

ὦ γέρον, εἴθ', ὥς θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι φίλοισιν,
ὥς τοι γούναθ' ἔποιτο, βίη δέ τοι ἔμπεδος εἴη·
ἀλλὰ σε γῆρας τεῖρει ὁμοῖον· . . . (Δ 313–315)

24a sch. A^{im} (Ariston.) ad Δ 315a: (ἀλλὰ σε γῆρας τεῖρει ὁμοῖον:) ὅτι οἱ Γλωσσογράφοι ὁμοῖον τὸ κακόν.

24b Eust. 476.44: σημειοῦνται γὰρ οἱ παλαιοὶ τὸ ὁμοῖον τὸν ποιητὴν ἐπὶ φαύλου λαμβάνειν. Ἀπίων γοῦν καὶ Ἡρόδωρος φασιν, ὅτι οἱ Γλωσσογράφοι ὁμοῖον κατὰ διαίρεσίν φασιν τὸ κακόν, οἶον “γῆρας τεῖρει ὁμοῖον” (Γ 315) καὶ “νεῖκος ὁμοῖον ἔμβαλε μέσον” (cf. Δ 444) καὶ “θάνατον μὲν ὁμοῖον” (γ 236) καὶ “τέλος ὁμοῖον πολέμου” (cf. I 440–441), ἵνα εἴη ὁμοῖον περὶ ὃ πάντες ὁμοίως διάκεινται ὥς χαλεπόν. τὸ μέντοι εἰπεῖν γῆρας ὁμοῖον τὸ ὁμοίως πᾶσιν ἐπικείμενον τοῖς ἐπιτεινομένοις εἰς τὸ ζῆν εὐνόητον μὲν, οὐκ ἀρέσκει δὲ τοῖς παλαιοῖς.

⁷¹ The text is now reprinted at *Supplementum Hellenisticum*, ed. H. Lloyd-Jones and P. Parsons (Berlin-New York 1983) 259 ff., including the celebrated δεῖπνά μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, πολύτροφα καὶ μάλα πολλὰ . . . (fr. 534.1).

1 ἄλλά—τείρει supplēvi, ὁμοίον suppl. Erbse

cf. sch. min. ad Δ 315 (P. Dura 3, v. 11 [ii A.D.; cf. M. Gronewald, ZPE 44 [1981] 178]):
ὁμοίον κακόν.

The fact that ὁμοίος/-ον appears as the epithet of various evils (γῆρας, νεῖκος, θάνατος, τέλος πολέμου) evidently led the Γλωσσογράφοι simply to equate it with evil. This is, of course, an oversimplification and fails to do justice to the word's relation to ὁμοίω. In this case, however, the Glossographs seem to have based their definition on a comparison of various passages (cf. above, fr. 11).

fr. 25: ἔνθα δὴ νύκτας δύο τ' ἤματα κύματι πηγῷ
πλάζετο (sc. Ὀδυσσεύς), πολλὰ δέ οἱ κραδίη προτιόσσετ'
ὄλεθρον.
(ε 388–389)

sch. EPQV ad ε 388: κύματι πηγῷ: οἱ μὲν Γλωσσογράφοι μέλανι καὶ ἰσχυρῷ, ψυχρῷ ἀδιαλύτῳ. τινὲς δὲ γαλιναίῳ. κρεῖσσον δὲ εὐπαγεῖ, εὐτραφεῖ καὶ εὐμεγέθει.

1 οἱ μὲν γλωσσογράφοι] om. EPQ 2 ψυχρῷ ἀδιαλύτῳ] om. PV 3 ante εὐτραφεῖ hab. D καὶ

cf. sch. D ad Γ 197: πηγεσιμάλλω: . . . ἔριον πηγὸν ἔχοντι, ὃ ἐστὶ πηκτόν, εἴτε μέλαν, εἴτε λευκόν; Hsch. π 2150: πηγεσιμάλλω: . . . πηγὸν γὰρ τὸ εὐτραφές· τινὲς δὲ λευκὸν τὸ πηγόν, οἱ δὲ μέλαν; sch. T (ex.) ad I 124a: πηγούς: μέλανας . . .; sim. sch. Call. Aet. 2a, 52 (II, p. 104 Pf.); Et. Gen. (AB): πηγός (-ὦς B): . . . σημαίνει δὲ καὶ τὸ μέλαν κατὰ διάλεκτον; Et. Gud. 465.1; EM 669.20; Eust. 403.42: τὸ δὲ πηγεσιμάλλω ἀντὶ τοῦ μελανομάλλω; eund. 740.50: πηγούς δὲ ἵππους τοὺς εὐπαγεῖς λέγει καὶ στερεούς· οἱ δὲ παλαιοὶ θέλουσι νοεῖν μέλανας . . .; eund. 1539.42: ἡ καὶ ἄλλως κύμα πηγὸν τὸ μέλαν κατὰ τινα γλῶσσαν, ὅθεν καὶ κριὸς ἐν Ἰλιάδι πηγεσίμαλλος (Γ 197).

Did the Glossographs have dialectal evidence to support their definition πηγός = μέλας (cf. *Et. Gen.* s.v.)? Or is their definition likely rather to have been inferred from Γ 197–198 (ἀρνειῷ μιν ἔγωγε εἴσκω πηγεσιμάλλω, | ὅς τ' οἴων μέγα πῶν διέρχεται ἀργεννάων)? In any case, it seems that underlying sch. ε 388 is a critique (of Aristarchan provenance?) of their view on the grounds that it ignores etymology (cf. κρεῖττον δὲ εὐπαγεῖ . . .). Aristarchus is likely also to have pointed out that their definition is ill adapted to ε 388.

fr. 26: Having noticed his guest's weeping during Demodocus' song of Troy, Alcinous asks for an explanation:

εἰπὲ δ' ὅ τι κλαίεις καὶ ὀδύρεαι ἔνδοθι θυμῷ
 Ἀργείων Δαναῶν ἰδὲ Ἰλίου οἶτον ἀκούων.
 τὸν δὲ θεοὶ μὲν τεύξαν, ἐπεκλώσαντο δ' ὄλεθρον
 ἀνθρώποις, ἵνα ᾗσι καὶ ἐσσομένοισιν ἀοιδῇ.
 ἦ τίς τοι καὶ πηδὸς ἀπέφθιτο Ἰλιόθι πρὸ
 ἐσθλὸς ἑὼν, γαμβρὸς ἦ πενθερός, οἷ τε μάλιστα
 κῆδιστοι τελέθουσι μεθ' αἱμά τε καὶ γένος αὐτῶν;
 ἦ τίς που καὶ ἐταῖρος ἀνὴρ κεχαρισμένα εἰδώς,
 ἐσθλός; ἐπεὶ οὐ μὲν τι κασιγνήτοιο χερεῖων
 γίγνεται ὅς κεν ἐταῖρος ἑὼν πεπνυμένα εἰδῇ. (θ 577–586)

sch. T ad θ 581: ἦ τίς τοι καὶ πηδός: σαφῶς ἐκ τούτου δηλοῦται ὅτι πηδὸς ὁ[ὗ] κατ' ἐπιγαμίαν οἰκείος ἦ φίλος, ἀλλ' (οὐχ) ἐταῖρος, ὡς οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν Γλωσσογράφων ἐπιφέρει γοῦν ἀντιδιαστέλλων “ἦ πού τις καὶ ἐταῖρος ἀνὴρ” (θ 584), ὀρισμὸν ποιῶν. ἡ φιλία γὰρ ὅταν τις 5 τῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων ζηλωτὴς τύχῃ, ὅπερ δηλοῖ διὰ τοῦ “κεχαρισμένα” πρᾶττειν· (ὁ δὲ πηδὸς καὶ οἰκείος ἄλλα μὲν κεχαρισμένα πρᾶττει) οὐκ ἄλλα δέ, διὸ προσέθηκε τὸ “ἐσθλός” (θ 582).

2 ὁ West: οὐ cod. [ἐπιγαμίαν Henrichs, coll. Ap. S. 131.22 Bekker, sch. D ad θ 581 et Γ 163, Hsch. π 2219, Ep. Hom. π 121 : ἐπωνυμίαν cod. | οὐχ suppl. West 6–7 ὁ δὲ—πρᾶττει] suppl. West.

cf. Eust. 1611.21: σημειῶσαι δὲ ὅτι περὶ πηοῦ καὶ ἐταίρου ἐρωτήσας ὁ βασιλεὺς οὐκ ἐσίγησεν οὐδὲ τοὺς καθ' αἱμά, εἰπὼν “μεθ' αἱμά τε καὶ γένος αὐτῶν,” οἷονεὶ λέγων ὡς εἴπερ πηοῦ μέμνηται καὶ ἐταίρου, πολλῷ πρότερον περὶ συγγενεὺς ἐρωτῶ. τούτου δὲ ἐνδεικτικὸν καὶ τὸ “ἦ τίς τοι καὶ πηδὸς ἀπέφθιτο”· ὁ γὰρ ΚΑΙ σύνδεσμος δευτερεύειν δηλοῖ τὸν πηδὸν τοῦ ἐξ αἵματος γένους. τῶν δὲ ῥηθειῶν οἰκειοτήτων τοιαύτη τις κατὰ τὸν ποιητὴν ἢ διαίρεσις. τῶν δι' οὓς λυπούμεθα, οἱ μὲν πηοὶ εἰσι, τουτέστιν ἀγχισταὶ καὶ κλητοὶ συγγενεῖς παρὰ τὸ πῶ, τὸ κτῶμαι, ὧν κῆδιστοι γαμβρὸς καὶ πενθερός, οἱ δὲ φύσει συγγενεῖς. καὶ τούτων οἱ μὲν αἱμά, ὡς οἱ παῖδες, οἱ δὲ ἀπλῶς γένος, ὡς ἀδελφοὶ αὐτανέμιοι ἀνεμιοί. εἰσὶ δὲ τινες καὶ οὐδέτερον τούτων, τουτέστιν οὔτε πηοὶ οὔτε συγγενεῖς, ἀλλ' ἐταῖροι.

The argument adduced tells against the Glossographs' πηδός = ἐταῖρος; also, one expects the interpretation of the Γλωσσογράφοι to meet with rejection rather than approval; hence West's supplements.

fr. 27: Ἥρῃ δ' εἰσεῖδε χρυσόθρονος ὀφθαλμοῖσι
 στᾶσ' ἐξ Οὐλύμπιοιο ἀπὸ ρίου· αὐτίκα δ' ἔγνω
 τὸν μὲν ποιπνύοντα μάχην ἀνὰ κυδιάνειραν

αὐτοκασίγητον καὶ δαέρα, χαῖρε δὲ θυμῷ . . . (Ξ 153–156)

sch. A (Ariston.) ad Ξ 155: τὸν μὲν ποιπνύοντα: ὅτι τὸ ποιπνύοντα ἐνεργοῦντά ἐστιν, οὐχ ὡς οἱ Γλωσσογράφοι ποιοῦσι τὸ ποιπνύειν διακοπεῖν ἐκ τοῦ “ὡς ἴδον Ἥφαιστον διὰ δώματα ποιπνύοντα” (A 600).

cf. sch. D ad A 600: ποιπνύοντα: ἐνεργοῦντα, διακοποῦντα; Theogn. Orth. 129 (AO 2.23.16): ποιπνύει, διακοπεῖ.

Cf. above, 123 and 129.

fr. 28: Hector to Paris:

Δύσπαρι, εἶδος ἄριστε, γυναιμανές, ἡπεροπευτά,
αἰθ' ὄφελος ἄγονός τ' ἔμεναι ἄγαμός τ' ἀπολέσθαι·
καὶ κε τὸ βουλοίμην, καὶ κεν πολὺ κέρδιον ἦεν
ἢ οὕτω λῶβην τ' ἔμεναι καὶ ὑπόψιον ἄλλων.
ἦ που καγχαλώωσι κάρη κομόωντες Ἀχαιοί,
φάντες ἀριστῆα πρόμον ἔμμεναι, οὖνεκα καλὸν
εἶδος ἔπ', ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔστι βίη φρεσὶν οὐδέ τις ἀλκή. . . . (Γ 39–45)

sch. A (Ariston.) ad Γ 44b: φάντες ἀριστῆα <πρόμον ἔμμεναι>: ὅτι κατὰ συγκοπὴν τὸν πρόμαχον εἴρηκεν, οὐχ ὡς οἱ Γλωσσογράφοι τὸν βασιλέα.

1 φάντες ἀριστῆα] πρόμον Bekker|πρόμον ἔμμεναι supplevi

cf. sch. A (Ariston.) ad X 85c: μὴ δὲ πρόμος ἴστασο τούτῳ: ὅτι σαφῶς πρόμος ὁ πρόμαχος, οὐχ ὁ βασιλεύς; Ap. S. 135.22: πρόμος: ὁ βασιλεύς, ὃ ἐστι πρόμαχος.

One can see how the Glossographs' interpretation πρόμος = βασιλεύς could have originated from Γ 44 or another such passage where the meaning “king” seems, at least at first glance, to fit. However, as a definition, πρόμαχος is a better semantic fit, whether or not one accepts it as the etymology as well.⁷²

fr. 29: Phoenix to Achilles (the subject is Meleager):

⁷² H. Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* 2 (Heidelberg 1970) s.v. πρόμος, is still prepared to entertain it as a possibility; cf. also P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* 3 (Paris 1968) 941, s.v. πρόμος.

τῇ (sc. Κλεοπάτρῃ) ὃ γε παρκατέλεκτο χόλον θυμαλγέα πέσσαν,
 ἐξ ἀρέων μητρὸς κεχολωμένος, ἥ ῥα θεοῖσι
 πόλλ' ἀχέουσ' ἤρ'ατο κασιγνήτοιο φόνιοι,
 πολλὰ δὲ καὶ γαῖαν πολυφόρβην χερσὶν ἀλοῖα
 κικλήσκουσ' Ἀΐδην καὶ ἐπαινὴν Περσεφόνειαν,
 πρόχυν καθεζομένη, δεύοντο δὲ δάκρυσι κόλποι,
 παιδί δόμεν θάνατον· τῆς δ' ἡεροφοῖτις Ἐρινὺς
 ἔκλυεν ἐξ Ἑρέβεσφιν, ἀμείλιχον ἦτορ ἔχουσα. (I 565–572)

sch. T (ex.) ad I 570: πρόχυν καθεζομένη: παντελῶς καθημένη, ὅλη
 παρειμένη, ἵνα πλέον ᾖ τὸ πάθος. οἱ δὲ Γλωσσογράφοι 'ἐπὶ γόνυ'.

cf. sch. D ad I 570: πρόχυν: εἰς γόνατα; Et. Orion. 126.10: πρόχυν: οἶον πρόγονο (Lar-
 cher: προύγη cod.) κατὰ συγκοπὴν, ὃ ἐστὶ ὀκλάσαι. καὶ ἡ πρό ἀντὶ τῆς ἐπὶ, ἐπὶ γόνυ,
 unde Et. Gen. (AB) s.v. πρόχυν, unde EM 691.50 (brevius Et. Gud. 483.37); Eust.
 775.12: τὸ δὲ "πρόχυν" ἐπίρρημά ἐστι ποιότητος καὶ δηλοῖ τὸ ἐπὶ γόνυ καὶ ὡς εἰπεῖν
 προγόνου, καὶ κατὰ συγκοπὴν καὶ τροπὴν πρόχυν.

Cf. above, 124.

fr. 30: ἰξιόεν δέ σε μή τι δόλῳ παρὰ χεῖλεσι πῶμα
 οὐλόμενον λήσειεν ὅ τ' ὠκιμοειδὲς ὄδωδε. . . .
 τῷ καὶ στρευγομένῳ περ ἀνήλυθεν ἐκ καμάτοιο
 πνεῦμα μόλις, πόσιες δὲ παραντίκα λύματ' ἔχευαν
 φαρμακοῖς φῶϊσιν ἀλίγκια τοῖά τε βοσκὰς
 ὀρταλὶς αἰχμητῆσιν ὑπευνασθεῖσα νεοσσοῖς
 ἄλλοτε μὲν πληγῇσι νέον θρομβήια γαστρὸς
 ἔκβαλεν ἐν μήνιγξιν ἀνόστρακα, πολλάκι νούσῳ
 δαμναμένη δύσποτμον ὑπὲκ γόνον ἔκχεε γαίῃ.
 (Nic. Alex. 279–280, 291–297).

sch. Nic. Alex. 291a: τῷ καὶ στρευγομένῳ: ἐλαυνομένῳ ἢ συνεχο-
 μένῳ· οἱ δὲ Γλωσσογράφοι κατὰ στράγγα ἀπολλυμένῳ.

cf. sch. H (sim. B et V) ad μ 351: στρεύεσθαι: κατὰ στράγγα φθεῖρεσθαι, ἡγουν κατ'
 ὀλίγον; sch. Ap. Rh. 4.1058a (= Didym. fr. 34, p. 69 Schm.): στρευγομένοις: φθειρο-
 μένοις καὶ καταπονουμένοις ἢ καὶ προσδιατρίβουσιν· ὅθεν καὶ στράγγῃ ἢ κατὰ βραχὺ
 πρόεσις τοῦ ὕδατος. οὕτω Δίδυμος; Hsch. σ 1989: στρεύομαι: διατρίβω, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ
 στράγγῃ, ἢ κατὰ βραχὺ πρόεσις.

The Glossographs' definition was based upon O 512 and μ 351, the two Homeric passages in which στρεύεσθαι occurs, in each of which, as Valk observed, it is used "by persons who prefer to die at once instead of δηθὰ στρεύεσθαι."⁷³ Their definition, based evidently both on etymology and (Homeric) context, is ill adapted to Nic. *Alex.* 291, where we need rather the prior definition of the scholium (ἐλαυνομένῳ ἢ συνεχομένῳ; "distressed" Gow-Scholfield). This case illustrates how Homeric exegesis infiltrates that of the minor hexameter poets (cf. above, 122). This doctrine of the Γλωσσογράφοι exercised some influence, since an etymological connection of στράγγξ and στρεύεσθαι was still accepted by Didymus and Hesychius.

fr. 31: Ajax to Hector:

ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐν νήεσσι κορωνίσι ποντοπόροις
κεῖτ' ἀπομηνίσας Ἀγαμέμνονι, ποιμένι λαῶν·
ἡμεῖς δ' εἰμὲν τοῖσι οἳ ἂν σέθεν ἀντιάσαιμεν
καὶ πολέες· ἀλλ' ἄρχε μάχης ἡδὲ πτολέμοιο. (H 229–232)

31a sch. b (ex.) ad H 231a¹: <τοῖσι> οἱ Γλωσσογράφοι τὸ τοῖσι ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ· ὅθεν καὶ Καλλίμαχος τῷ "τοίων †ἀεὶ" κέχρηται (fr. 627).

I le. add. Bekker | alt. τοῖσι Bekker: τοιοῦτοι b 2 τῷ | τὸ C | τοίων | τοῖον C | ἀεὶ cod. : δεῖ
Meineke, *Vind. Strab.* 211

If Pfeiffer is right in suspecting that the words τοίων ἀεὶ conceal a Callimachean fragment, we have here an instance of the influence of a doctrine of the Glossographoi on a poet (cf. above, 128).⁷⁴

⁷³ Valk (above, n. 8) 1.266; O 511–512 (Ajax to his companions): βέλτερον, ἢ ἀπολέσθαι ἓνα χρόνον ἢ ἐ βιώναι, | ἢ δηθὰ στρεύεσθαι ἐν αἰνῇ δημοτῇ; μ 350–351 (Eurylochus urges his companions to kill the cattle of the Sun): βούλομ' ἅπαξ πρὸς κύμα χανῶν ἀπὸ θυμὸν ὀλέσσαι | ἢ δηθὰ στρεύεσθαι ἑὸν ἐν νήσῳ ἐρήμῃ. Valk goes on to discuss the use of this verb by Apollonius Rhodius and Callimachus; it remains moot, however, whether they were influenced by the Glossographoi or by their own interpretations of the Homeric passages.

⁷⁴ Valk (above, n. 8) 1.183, n. 241, finds τοῖος = ἀγαθός at Ap. Rh. 2.468–470, where Paraeibius is the speaker: ὦ φίλοι, οὐκ ἄρα πάντες ὑπέρβιοι ἄνδρες ἔασιν, | οὐδ' εὐεργεσίας ἀμνήμονες· ὥς καὶ ὅδ' ἀνὴρ | τοῖος ἑὸν δεῦρ' ἦλθεν, ἐὸν μόνον ὄφρα δαεῖται. But surely the qualities understood under τοῖος are implied by the preceding statement (τοῖος = οὐχ ὑπέρβιος οὐδ' εὐεργεσίας ἀμνήμων).

31b The mourning for Patroclus:

ὥς ἔφαθ' (sc. Ἀχιλλεύς), οἱ δ' ὤμωξαν ἀολλέες, ἦρχε δ' Ἀχιλλεύς.
οἱ δὲ τρεῖς περὶ νεκρὸν εὐτρίχας ἤλασαν ἵππους
μυρόμενοι· μετὰ δέ σφι θέτις γόου ἵμερον ὤρσε.
δεύοντο ψάμαθοι, δεύοντο δὲ τεύχεα φωτῶν
δάκρυσι· τοῖον γὰρ πόθεον μήστωρα φόβοιο. (Ψ 12–16)

31b¹ sch. A (Ariston.) ad Ψ 16a¹: δάκρυσι τοῖον γάρ: ὅτι ἀνῆλτικῶς
τὸ τοῖον, οὐχ, ὥς οἱ Γλωσσογράφοι ἀξιούσιν, ἀγαθόν.

31b² sch. bT ad Ψ 16a²: τοῖον γὰρ πόθεον: τοῖον ἀνῆλτικῶς κατὰ
ἔμφασιν. οἱ δὲ Γλωσσογράφοι ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀγαθόν ἤκουσαν.

3 τοῖον—τοῖον T : om. b : τοῖον (ut le.) Erbse 3–4 | κατὰ ἔμφασιν T : καὶ θαυμαστικῶς
μετ' ἐμφάσεως, ἵν' ᾗ τὸν μέγαν καὶ περιβόητον b

cf. Hsch. τ 1068: τοῖοι: τοιοῦτοι, ἀγαθοί.

Failing to understand the adverbial use of τοῖον (= “so much”; cf. ad fr. 32a below), the Glossographoi resorted to the definition τοῖον = ἀγαθόν; however, D. Blank moots the possibility that the Glossographs merely meant “τοῖον, i.e., ἀγαθόν,” and that their intentions were misunderstood or misrepresented by our sources (cf. above, 124).

31c Priam and his children mourn the death of Hector:

παῖδες μὲν πατέρ' ἀμφὶ καθήμενοι ἔνδοθεν ἀνλῆς
δάκρυσιν εἶματ' ἔφυρον, ὁ δ' ἐν μέσσοισι γερατὸς
ἐντυπὰς ἐν χλαίνῃ κεκαλυμμένος· ἀμφὶ δὲ πολλὰ
κόπρος ἔην κεφαλῇ τε καὶ ἀνῆνι τοῖο γέροντος,
τήν ῥα κυλινδόμενος καταμήσατο χερσὶν ἑήσι. (Ω 161–165)

sch. A (Ariston.) ad Ω 164a: κόπρος ἔην κεφαλῇ τε (καὶ ἀνῆνι τοῖο
γέροντος): ὅτι τὸ τοῖο οὐκ ἔστιν ἀγαθοῦ, ὥς οἱ Γλωσσογράφοι, ἀλλὰ
θαυμαστικῶς τοιούτου. . . .

1–2 le. supp. Villoison

“Remarkable that τοῖο is interpreted by both parties as if it were
τοίου” (M. L. West).

31d Menelaus to Peisistratus, son of Nestor:

ὦ φίλ', ἐπεὶ τόσα εἶπες ὅς' ἄν πεπνυμένος ἀνὴρ
εἴποι καὶ ρέξειε, καὶ ὃς προγενέστερος εἴη·
τοίου γὰρ καὶ πατρός, ὃ καὶ πεπνυμένα βάζεις.

(δ 204–206)

31d¹ sch. H ad δ 206: τοίου: ἀντὶ τοῦ τοιούτου, οὐχ, ὡς οἱ Γλωσσογράφοι, πάντως ἀγαθοῦ.

31d² Eust. 1492.9: ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι τὸ “τοίου γὰρ πατρός” (δ 206) οἱ Γλωσσογράφοι ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ φασιν, ὡς τὰ παλαιὰ σχόλια λέγει.

fr. 32: Thetis' visit to Hephaestus:

τὸν δ' εὖρ' ἰδρῶντα ἐλίσσόμενον περὶ φύσας
σπεύδοντα· τρίποδας γὰρ ἐείκοσι πάντας ἔτευχεν
ἐστάμεναι περὶ τοίχον εὐσταθέος μεγάρου,
χρῦσα δέ σφ' ὑπὸ κύκλα ἐκάστω πυθμένι θῆκεν,
ὄφρα οἱ αὐτόματοι θεῖον δυσαΐατ' ἀγῶνα
ἦδ' αὖτις πρὸς δῶμα νεοΐατο, θαῦμα ἰδέσθαι.
οἱ δ' ἦτοι τόσσον μὲν ἔχον τέλος, οὐατα δ' οὐ πω
δαιδάλεα προσέκειτο· τὰ ῥ' ἥρτυε, κόπτε δὲ δεσμούς.

(Σ 372–379)

32a sch. bT (ex. [ex. + Ariston.]) ad Σ 378b: τόσ(σ)ον μὲν ἔχον τέλος, (οὐατα δ' οὐπω): τόσ(σ)ον **T** ἀντὶ τοῦ ὅλον **bT** “ὃς τὸ μὲν ἄλλο τόσον φοῖνιξ ἦν” (Ψ 454)· οὕτως γὰρ φησι πρὸς τὰ παρ' ὀλίγον τετελεσμένα. οἱ δὲ Γλωσσογράφοι τόσ(σ)ον ἀντὶ τοῦ τὸ σῶμα. **T** οἱ δέ, 5 ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἔσχον τὸ τέλος ὥστε τῶν ὥτων προσδεῖσθαι. τινὲς δὲ τόσσον τὸ λοιπόν. **bT**

1 τόσον **T** : corr. Maass **2** οὐατα δ' οὐπω suppl. Erbse | τόσον **T** : corr. Maass | ὃς Erbse : ὡς **T** **3** τόσον Maass : τοῖον **T** **4** τόσον **T** : corr. Maass **5** τὸ] om. **T** **6** τόσσον] τόσον **T**

The Glossographs posited a simple antithesis of the σῶμα and οὐατα of Hephaestus' tripods, the former of which is complete, the latter still needing to be added. They thus mistook the epic usage by which τόσ(σ)ον (adv.) = “to such an extent,” for which other interpreters aptly cited Ψ 454.

32b Confrontation of Achilles and Hector:

οἶος δ' ἀστὴρ εἷσι μετ' ἀστράσι νυκτὸς ἀμολγῶ
 ἔσπερος, ὃς κάλλιστος ἐν οὐρανῷ ἵσταται ἀστὴρ,
 ὥς αἰχμῆς ἀπέλαμπ' εὐήκεος, ἦν ἄρ' Ἀχιλλεύς
 πάλλεν δεξιτερῇ φρονέων κακὸν Ἑκτορι δίφ,
 εἰσορόων χροά καλόν, ὅπῃ εἴξειε μάλιστα.
 τοῦ δὲ καὶ ἄλλο τόσον μὲν ἔχε χροά χάλκεα τεύχεα,
 καλά, τὰ Πατρόκλοιο βίην ἐνάριξε κατακτάς·
 φαίνεται δ' ἢ κληῖδες ἀπ' ὤμων αὐχέν' ἔχουσι,
 λαυκανήν, ἵνα τε ψυχῆς ὠκιστος ὄλεθρος·
 τῇ ρ' ἐπὶ οἱ μεμαῶτ' ἔλασ' ἔγχει δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς. . . .

(X 317–326)

sch. T ad X 322a²: οἱ δὲ Γλωσσογράφοι τόσον ἀντὶ τοῦ σώμα.

32c Ἀργεῖοι δ' ἐν ἀγῶνι κατήμενοι εἰσορόωντο
 ἵππους· τοὶ δὲ πέτοντο κονίοντες πεδίοιο.
 πρῶτος δ' Ἰδομενεὺς Κρητῶν ἀγὸς ἐφράσαθ' ἵππους·
 ἦστο γὰρ ἐκτὸς ἀγῶνος ὑπέρτατος ἐν περιωπῇ·
 τοῖο δ' ἀνευθεν ἐόντος ὁμοκλητῆρος ἀκούσας
 ἔγνω, φράσσατο δ' ἵππον ἀριπρεπέα προὔχοντα,
 ὃς τὸ μὲν ἄλλο τόσον φοῖνιξ ἦν, ἐν δὲ μετώπῳ
 λευκὸν σῆμα τέτυκτο περίτροχον ἡύτε μήνη. (Ψ 448–455)

sch. bT (ex.) ad Ψ 454b: ὃς τὸ μὲν ἄλλο τόσον (φοῖνιξ ἦν): τόσον T
 ἀντὶ τοῦ ὅλον· οὕτω γάρ φησι πρὸς τὰ παρ' ὀλίγον τετελεσμένα. οἱ
 δὲ Γλωσσογράφοι τόσον ἀντὶ τοῦ τὸ σώμα. Χαμαιλέων (fr. 20 We.²)
 δέ φησι τοὺς τοιούτους ἵππους ἀρίστους εἶναι. **bT**⁷⁵

sch. (cum le. τόσσον ἐπιδραμέτην) primo loco ad Ψ 433 occurrit in T 1 le. codicis T
 suppl. Erbse : om. b 3 τόσσον b|τὸ om. b

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

⁷⁵ I would like to thank Professors D. L. Blank, M. W. Haslam, A. Henrichs, and M. L. West for reading a draft of this paper and giving me the benefit of their comments.