



DICCIONARIO  
GRIEGO-ESPAÑOL



I d.C. **Heliodorus** grammaticus (Hld.Gr.)

Dyck, A.R., «The fragments of Heliodorus Homericus», HSPh 95, 1993, pp. 1-64.

Dyck 1993.pdf

---



## THE FRAGMENTS OF HELIODORUS HOMERICUS

ANDREW R. DYCK

### a. Introduction

IN light of H. Erbse's path-breaking edition of the Iliadic scholia and a number of studies of individual figures that have followed in its wake,<sup>1</sup> the history of early Homeric exegesis is gradually becoming clear. We still, however, need a modern edition of the fragments with commentary for so major a figure as Aristarchus; and the new edition of Aristophanes of Byzantium does not provide text and commentary for the Homeric exegesis, as it does for the other fragments.<sup>2</sup> Another, albeit lesser, desideratum is for such treatment of the fragments of Heliodorus, who is cited forty-six times in extant recensions of the *Lexicon Homericum* of Apollonius Sophista,<sup>3</sup> thrice with approbation,<sup>4</sup> four times with preference for an alternative explanation.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem* (scholia vetera), recensuit H. Erbse, 7 voll. (Berlin 1969–88); *Die Fragmente des Grammatikers Dionysios Thrax*, ed. K. Linke, *Die Fragmente der Grammatiker Tyrannion und Diokles*, ed. W. Haas, *Apions Γλωσσσαι Ὀμηρικαί*, ed. S. Neitzel, SGLG 3 (Berlin/New York 1977); *I frammenti dei grammatici Agathokles, Hellanikos, Ptolemaios Epithetes*, ed. F. Montanari, *Lesbonax Περὶ σχημάτων* (of uncertain date), ed. D. L. Blank, *The Fragments of Comanus of Naucratis*, ed. A. R. Dyck, SGLG 7 (Berlin/New York 1988); id., "The Glossographoi," this journal 91 (1987) 119–60.

<sup>2</sup> Aristophanis Byzantii *Fragmenta* post A. Nauck collegit, testimoniis ornavit, brevi commentario instruxit W. J. Slater, SGLG 6 (Berlin/New York 1986), pp. 175–210. Also, E. Duke's new edition of Seleucus announced by Erbse (previous note) 1, LXXXVII, is still awaited.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. A. Henrichs and W. Müller, "Apollonios Sophistes, Homerlexikon," *Collectanea Papyrologica: Texts Published in Honor of H.C. Youtie*, 1 (Bonn 1976) 34, n. 25.

<sup>4</sup> Frr. 34, 36 and 51; cf. fr. 7 ('Ἡλιόδωρος Ἀρισταρχείως μεταφράζων . . .). In fr. 50, too, he clearly prefers Heliodorus' view to Apion's; cf. fr. \*22, in the event that Heliodorus' name should be restored.

<sup>5</sup> Frr. 14, 17, 42 and 46. Cf. also fr. 44, where Apollonius prefers the explanation of

In marked contrast to Apion, with whom Apollonius Sophista juxtaposes his name thirteen times if one accepts the restoration of Heliodorus' name in fr. \*22 and counts fr. 30 from Cyril, almost certainly via Apollonius, nothing is known of Heliodorus' life.<sup>6</sup> His identification with Heliodorus the metrician has been mooted on grounds that Irenaeus, attested as the pupil of the metrician, had glossographic interests (Su. εἰ 190: Εἰρηναῖος . . . μαθητὴς Ἡλιοδώρου τοῦ μετρικοῦ . . .). But if the compilers of the Suda had merely found 'pupil of Heliodorus' in their source, might they not have inserted 'the metrician' (the Homerist's work being, apart from citations in Apollonius Sophista and the dependent tradition, hardly known in later times), to distinguish him from the novelist? The other argument adduced in favor of the identification is that the grammarian and metrician were contemporaries. But this argument, too, depends upon the veracity of the reference in the Suda, since the metrician's *terminus post quem* is inferred from the fact that he cites Seleucus and his *terminus ante quem* from the fact that his pupil (?) Irenaeus is cited by Erotian at the end of the century.<sup>7</sup> But if, as, in view of their similarity of interests, one would expect, Irenaeus was the pupil of the Homerist, rather than the metrician, the latter's first-century *terminus ante quem* collapses. Thus, though the identification cannot be ruled out, it has less in its favor than has sometimes been supposed. Though an interest in metre and in Homeric studies could both reside in a single individual (Aristophanes of Byzantium being a ready instance), one searches in vain for a fragment of the Homerist which betrays any interest in metre.

The one certain *terminus post quem* for Heliodorus is Aristarchus, in whose 'manner' (Ἀριστάρχῳ) he is said, in fr. 7, to proceed. How-

---

unnamed "others" to that of Aristarchus and leaves Heliodorus' and another, anonymous account without comment, and *ad* fr. 19.

<sup>6</sup> Frr. 16, \*22, 24, 28, 30, 34, 36, 37, 41, 42, 48, 49, 50: cf. Horst Schenck, *Die Quellen des Homerlexikons des Apollonios Sophistes* 1961 diss. (Hamburg 1974) 35; I exclude sch. D.T. 183.11 (ὥς δὲ Διόδωρος καὶ Ἀπίων ἐν τῷ περὶ τῶν στοιχείων . . .); but these two authors are also juxtaposed by Pamphilus (*apud* Ath. 11.501d and 14.642e); the transmitted text should therefore not be tampered with: cf. Cohn, *RE* 1.2 (1894), 2806.35 ff. and 5.1 (1903), 709.66 ff. On Apion's life cf. Cohn, *RE* 12 (1894), 2803.41 ff.; an *RE* article on our Heliodorus is lacking; Eustathius read a version of the four-man commentary attributed to Apion and Herodorus, the latter surely corrupted from our grammarian's name; cf. F. Ritschl, *Opuscula philologica* 1 (Lipsiae 1866) 117.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. J. H. Lipsius, *Neue Jahrb. f. Phil. u. Paed.* 81 (1860) 609–10, who cites Su. εἰ 190, and, on the metrician's date, Cohn, *RE* 5.2 (1905), 2120.49 ff.

ever, the fact that Apollonius so often — though not exclusively — cites him in juxtaposition with Apion suggests that the two Homerists were contemporaries who wrote immediately prior to Apollonius;<sup>8</sup> hence he had to read and take account of the views of both, rather than cite one via the other (as Ritschl had supposed<sup>9</sup>).

Since so large a proportion of Heliodorus' fragments is preserved in the *Lexicon Homericum* of Apollonius Sophista, it is worth noting that this text, dating from the second half of the first century A.D., is transmitted, in abridged form, in the tenth century codex Coislinianus graecus 345 (C); I have checked Bekker's edition of our glosses against a microfilm of the original. In addition, portions of the text, sometimes in fuller recension, have come to light on papyrus.<sup>10</sup> Of particular interest is the fact that P. Berol. inv. 16705 (s. V–VI), includes five fragments of Heliodorus (fr. 3, 5, 6, 13 and 14 below), none previously found in a version of Apollonius Sophista (though three of them — fr. 3, 13 and 14 below — were previously known from Hesychius). In view of the fact that we can trace no certain direct use of Heliodorus subsequent to Apollonius Sophista, the citations in the papyrus should not be ascribed to post-Apollonian augmentation.<sup>11</sup>

Heliodorus is likely to have written an Odyssean commentary used by Apollonius Sophista. The fact that Apollonius explicitly ties Heliodorus' comments to specific passages on a number of occasions<sup>12</sup> makes it clear that he has used a source keyed closely to a text, as a

<sup>8</sup> Schenck (n. 6 above) 36; cf. *ad* fr. 48 below on the possibility that Heliodorus responded to Apion's work.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Ritschl (n. 6 above), 117 (Apollonius knew Heliodorus only via Apion), exploded by Schenck (n. 6 above) 35, who points out the implausibility of assuming that in all passages where Heliodorus is cited either alone or in company with other grammarians a reference to Apion has fallen out.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. A. Henrichs and W. Müller (n. 3 above) 29, n. 5, where items published to that date are cited, and 30 ff. for publication of further fragments; cf. in the interim T. Renner, "Three New Homeric Papyri," this journal 83 (1979) 321–31; M. W. Haslam, "A New Papyrus Text of Apollonius Sophista," *ZPE* 49 (1982) 31–38.

<sup>11</sup> Though such augmentation did take place: cf. à propos Ap. S. 156.16–22 — a series of non-Homeric glosses possibly interpolated from Pamphilus — H. Erbse, *Beiträge zur Überlieferung der Iliasscholien*, *Zetemata* 24 (Munich 1960) 429 f., esp. 430, n. 1. The *editio princeps* of P. Berol. was by Henrichs and Müller (n. 3 above); supplements are theirs, unless otherwise indicated.

<sup>12</sup> Fr. 2, 3 (cf. test.), 4, 6, 7, 11, 12, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 37, 38, 39, 44, 45, 46, 47.

commentary, but not a lexicon, would be. Also, as M. W. Haslam observes, in spite of Apollonius' tendency to reduce his sources to glossographic form, such comments as fr. 7 (καθὸ οὐ κοινοῖς χρῶνται νόμοις à propos the Cyclopes' epithet ἄθεμίστων at ι 106) and fr. 34 (the hands to be understood as object of σχομένη in ζ 141) are ill adapted to the lexicon format.<sup>13</sup> These characteristics would, however, not rule out a monograph on Odyssean problems; and various fragments of Heliodorus deal with the Homeric ἄπαξ or δις εἰρημένα, well known ζητήματα and the like<sup>14</sup> that one would expect to be so treated. Yet such a format seems less likely than a commentary because of the admixture of a number of routine glosses on unremarkable *voces Homericae*;<sup>15</sup> though a commentator might feel constrained to offer definitions for such items, the author of a learned monograph could easily have eschewed them.

Occasionally, like Apollonius Sophista, other alphabetically arranged lexica of antiquity and the Byzantine period (Et. Orion. and to some extent Ep. Hom., Et. Gen.; the *Suda*, with its stricter alphabetization, is, of course, an exception), displays a method of composition based upon successive use of a fixed number of sources. In particular, the glosses sometimes tend to fall into series by the order of the occurrence of the lemmata in the *Odyssey*.<sup>16</sup> These patterns, together with the lemma-form, are often useful in determining the verse to which the gloss referred (see *ad* fr. 1, 5, 12 [a particularly striking instance], 29, 32, 40, 45). The reason is that Apollonius' basic source was a collection of glosses corresponding to our D-scholia arranged in commentary form.<sup>17</sup> Hence the commonest form of the Heliodorus glosses: an anonymous explanation (usually corresponding to a gloss preserved in the D-scholia) followed by one attributed to our gram-

<sup>13</sup> Any attempt to infer from our one testimonium (= Hsch. ep. ad Eulog. 31 ff. Latte) a work of Heliodorus with the word λέξεις in its title is doomed by both by this fact and the fact that Hesychius knew our grammarian only via Apollonius Sophista (see below).

<sup>14</sup> Cf. n. 109 and 110 below, as well as fr. 12 and 20.

<sup>15</sup> Fr. 1, 6, 8, 25, 26, 31, 33, 37, 38.

<sup>16</sup> For the similar arrangement of glosses in the alphabetical collections of Ep. Hom. see *Epimerismi Homerici*, ed. A. Dyck, SGLG 5/1 (Berlin-New York 1983) 8 ff.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. H. Gattiker, *Das Verhältnis des Homerlexikons des Apollonios Sophistes zu den Homerscholien*, diss. (Zurich 1945), as modified by H. Erbse (n. 11 above) 408 f. and Schenck (n. 6 above) 6 ff., as well as the latter's sample analysis of 10 pages of Bekker's edition 146 ff.

marian.<sup>18</sup> Apollonius does, of course, sometimes add Iliadic to Odyssean material or vice-versa; if so, this is ordinarily clearly signalled by a quotation.

In spite of the fact that lemma-forms, context and quotations can serve as a control, it is not always clear which of several possible Homeric passages prompted Heliodorus' comments. The Apollonian context is sometimes itself ambivalent, as in the case of fr. 8 (αἶθοπα οἶνον), 41 (τρητοῖσι), 42 (τρίγλῃνα), 43 (ὕγρον ἔλαιον);<sup>19</sup> in other cases, Ap. S. C gives us no aid, the glosses being extant only in other lexicographs (fr. 9, 23, 30). Therefore I have, for practical reasons, presented the fragments preserved in the lexicographical tradition alphabetically by gloss.

The degree to which these lexicographically attested fragments bear on the *Odyssey*, rather than the *Iliad*, is striking (see "Index of Passages discussed by Heliodorus"). In only one instance does Apollonius' gloss appear to refer unambiguously to the *Iliad*, namely fr. 46, where the lemma is followed immediately by ἐν τῇ Ω τῆς Ἰλιάδος and then by the citation of Heliodorus. Note, however, that this gloss is positioned between two Odyssean glosses (159.12 ὑπεροπλίσαιτο: ρ 268; 159.27 ὑποσταχούτο: υ 212), so that it is by no means impossible that Apollonius found Heliodorus' view under κ 279, rather than Ω 248, and added the Iliadic reference *suo Marte*. Even the Apollonian glosses show, however, that Heliodorus did not ignore the *Iliad*: in fr. 18 he cites E 880 à propos β 185; on the other hand, it is doubtful that fr. 19 includes his comments on Π 150 and T 400 or that in fr. 26 he commented on Γ 25–26 as well as ζ 89 (see *ad locc.*).

*Habent sua fata libelli.* Posterity was not kind to Heliodorus. In spite of Hesychius' reference to him in his letter to Eulogius (T 1 below), Apollonius is very likely to have been the last author to make direct use of his work. Hesychius' citations are agreed to be via Apollonius;<sup>20</sup> the same is doubtless true of the one fragment (30)

<sup>18</sup> Fr. 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 15, 25, 27, 29, 32, 39, 40; occasionally ὡς καὶ Ἡλιόδωρος or the like is appended at the end (cf. fr. 1 and 26).

<sup>19</sup> In this case the ambiguity results from the fact that there are only two preserved ΥΓ-glosses, the other being ὑγρὰ κέλευθα; however, since both are far commoner in the *Odyssey* (the latter by a ratio of 4:1, ὑγρὸν ἔλαιον by a ratio of 3:1), both glosses are likely to derive from an Odyssean commentary.

<sup>20</sup> Pace Ritschl (n. 6 above) 116; cf. Schenck (n. 6 above) 32.

known only from Cyril's lexicon;<sup>21</sup> and the version of the *Συναγωγή λέξεων χρησίων* used by both Photius and the Suda included some glosses from Apollonius Sophista in its earlier form and added still more in process of expansion;<sup>22</sup> hence the fragments thus attested.<sup>23</sup>

The non-lexicographical fragments, 52 and 53, pertain respectively to the accentuation of *ΑΝΔΡΙΑΣ* and *ΙΜΑΣ* and to the punctuation of E 297; the context of both being unclear and the authenticity of fr. \*\*54 being in considerable doubt, there is insufficient evidence to posit the existence of an Iliadic commentary as well. I have, however, again for practical reasons, arranged these fragments in the order of the passage of the *Iliad* referred to. I have marked fragments in which the name of Heliodorus has been conjecturally restored by an asterisk (\*) and a particularly doubtful restoration with double asterisk (\*\*). I have not ordinarily burdened the critical apparatus with itacistic errors or confusions of *ε* and *αι* or indicated variants in the apparatus testimoniorum. The parallels collected under each gloss are intended to illustrate only the doctrines of Heliodorus.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Schenck (n. 6 above) 32.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Henrichs and Müller (n. 3 above) n. 46, 38 f.; G. Wentzel, "Beiträge zur Geschichte der griechischen Lexikographen," *Sb. d. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Berlin*, 1895, 481–82 = LGM (n. 24 below) 5–6.

<sup>23</sup> Schenck (n. 6 above) 28 and 31 was prepared to include Heliodorus' name in Apollonius' text by conjecture for fr. 4, but not for fr. 9.

<sup>24</sup> The following works are cited by abbreviation:

|                   |                                                                                                                                                       |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| "Amm."            | Ammonii qui dicitur liber <i>De adfinium vocabulorum differentia</i> , ed. K. Nickau (Leipzig 1966)                                                   |
| Antisthenes . . . | <i>Socraticorum Reliquiae</i> , ed. G. Giannantoni 2 (Rome 1983)                                                                                      |
| Giannantoni       | 319–407                                                                                                                                               |
| AO                | <i>Anecdota Graeca e codd. manuscriptis bibliothecarum Oxoniensium</i> , ed. J.A. Cramer, 4 voll. (Oxford 1835–37)                                    |
| AP                | <i>Anecdota Graeca e codd. manuscriptis bibliothecae regiae Parisiensis</i> , ed. J.A. Cramer, 4 voll. (Oxford 1839–41)                               |
| "Apio" Gl. Hom.   | Apionis Glossae Homericae, ed. in: A. Ludwig, Über die Homerischen Glossen Apions, <i>Philol.</i> 74 (1917) 205–47 and 75 (1918) 95–127 = LGM 283–358 |
| Apio              | Apions Γλώσσαι Ὅμηρικαί, hrsg. v. S. Neitzel, SGLG 3 (Berlin-New York 1977)                                                                           |
| Ap. S.            | Apollonii Sophistae <i>Lexicon Homericum</i> , ed. I. Bekker (Berlin 1833)                                                                            |
| Ap. S. . . . St.  | Apollonii Sophistae <i>Lexicon Homericum</i> , ed. K. Steinicke [litt. α-δ tantum], diss. (Göttingen 1957)                                            |

- Ba. Synagoges recensio b, ed. in: *Anecdota Graeca ex codd. mss. bibl. reg. Paris.*, 1, ed. L. Bachmann (Leipzig 1828)
- Chantraine Pierre Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots*, 4 vols. (Paris 1968–80)
- Choer. Th. Theodosii Alexandrini *Canones*, Georgii Choerobosci *Scholia*, Sophronii Patriarchae Alexandrini *Excerpta*, ed. A. Hilgard, 2 voll. (Leipzig 1889–94)
- Crat. Mall. . . . Mette Cratetis Mallotae fragmenta selecta, ed. H.-J. Mette, *Sphairopoiia. Untersuchungen zur Kosmologie des Krates von Pergamon* (Munich 1936): fr. 1–51, pp. 103–298, and *Parateresis. Untersuchungen zur Sprachtheorie des Krates von Pergamon* (Halle [Saale] 1952): fr. 52–86, pp. 67–185
- Didym. Didymi Chalcenteri grammatici Alexandrini *Fragmenta*, ed. M. Schmidt (Leipzig 1854)
- Ecl. Ἑκλογαὶ διαφόρων λέξεων, ed. J.A. Cramer in: AO 2. 427–87
- EM *Etymologicum Magnum*, ed. Th. Gaisford (Oxford 1848)
- Ep. Hom. *Epimerismi Homerici*, 2, ed. A. Dyck (in press)
- Ep. alph. Ἑπιμερισμοὶ κατὰ στοιχείων, ed. J.A. Cramer in: AO 2. 331–426
- Epit. Cath. pr. Ἐπιτομή τῆς Καθολικῆς Προσφθίας Ἡρωδιανοῦ, rec. M. Schmidt (Jena 1860)
- Et. Gen. α —  
ἀμωσγέπως *Etymologicum Magnum Genuinum*, Symeonis *Etymologicum una cum Magna Grammatica*, *Etymologicum Magnum auctum*, ed. F. Lasserre-N. Livadaras, 1 (Rome 1976); other citations are from my collation of photographs of
- Et. Gen. A Vaticanus gr. 1818, X/XI cen.
- Et. Gen. B Laurentianus S. Marci 304, a. 994
- Et. Gud. . . . Stef. *Etymologicum Gudianum* quod vocatur, ed. A. De Stefani, 2 fasc. (Leipzig 1909–20); other citations are from my collation of photographs or microfilm of
- Et. Gud. c Vindobon. philos. gr. 23, XII. cen.
- Et. Gud. d Vatic. Barberin. gr. 70 (olim Barberin. I 70), XI. cen.
- Et. Gud. z Paris. suppl. gr. 172, XIII. cen.
- Et. Orion. G Orionis Thebani *Etymologicon*, ed. F.G. Sturz (Leipzig 1820: G = Paris. 2653, s. XVI)
- Et. Sym. α —  
ἀμωσγέπως see Et. Gen. α — ἀμωσγέπως
- Eust. Eustathii archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem*, ed. M. van der Valk, 4 voll. (Leiden 1971–88); Eustathii archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis *Commentarii in Odysseam*, 2 voll. (Leipzig 1825–26)
- FGrHist *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, ed. F. Jacoby, 3 Teile so far published (Berlin 1923–)
- Frisk H. Frisk, *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 3 voll. (Heidelberg 1960–72)

- Glossogr. Glossographorum fragmenta, ed. A. Dyck, "The Glossographoi," this journal 91 (1987) 119–60
- Hainsworth J.B. Hainsworth on ε-θ in: *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, 1 (Oxford 1988)
- Hdn. Herodiani Technici *Reliquiae*, ed. A. Lentz, 2 voll. (Leipzig 1867–70)
- Heubeck A. Heubeck on ι-μ and ψ-ω in: *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, 2–3 (Oxford 1989–92)
- Io. Al. ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΕΩΣ ΤΟΝΙΚΑ ΠΑΡΑΓΓΕΛΜΑΤΑ, ΑΙΛΙΟΥ ΗΡΩΔΙΑΝΟΥ ΠΕΡΙ ΣΧΗΜΑΤΩΝ, ed. G. Dindorf (Leipzig 1825)
- Lehrs, Ar.<sup>3</sup> K. Lehrs, *De Aristarchi studiis Homericis*, 3rd edn. (Leipzig 1883)
- Hsch. Hesychii Alexandrini *Lexicon*, ed. K. Latte, 2 voll. [-O] (Copenhagen 1953–66); the rest in: Hesychii Alexandrini *Lexicon*, ed. M. Schmidt, voll. 3–4 (Jena 1861–62)
- Lex. Αἶμ. Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν, quod vocatur, ed. A. Dyck (in press)
- Λέξ. Ὀμ. *Scholia Minora in Homeri Iliadem*, ed. V. de Marco, 1: ΛΕΞΕΙΣ ΟΜΗΡΙΚΑΙ codd. Urb. CLVII et Selestadiensis CVII, fasc. 1 (Vatican City 1946)
- LGM *Lexica Graeca Minora*, selegit K. Latte, disposuit et praefatus est H. Erbse (Hildesheim 1965)
- Meth. Methodius, lexicographer
- Nic. Nicanoris Περὶ Ἰλιακῆς στιγμῆς reliquiae emendatiores, ed. L. Friedländer (Königsberg 1850)
- Philox. *Die Fragmente des Grammatikers Philoxenos*, ed. Chr. Theodoridis, SGLG 2 (Berlin-New York 1976)
- Phot. Φωτίου τοῦ πατριάρχου λέξεων συναγωγή, descr. R. Porson, ed. P. Dobree, 2 voll. (Cambridge 1822)
- Phot. α-δ Photii Patriarchae *Lexicon*, 1 (A-Δ), ed. Chr. Theodoridis (Berlin-New York 1982)
- Poll. Pollucis *Onomasticon*, ed. E. Bethe, 3 voll. (Leipzig 1900–37)
- Porph. Q.H. Porphyrii Quaestionum Homericarum reliquias ed. H. Schrader, 2 voll. (Leipzig 1880–90)
- Ptol. Asc. Ptolemaei Ascalonitae fragmenta, ed. M. Baeye, *De Ptolemaeo Ascalonita* (Halle 1882)
- Reitzenstein, *Gesch.* R. Reitzenstein, *Geschichte der griechischen Etymologika* (Leipzig 1897)
- Russo J. Russo on ρ-υ in: *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, 3 (Oxford 1992)
- Σ<sup>a</sup> Lexici Segueriani Συναγωγή λέξεων χρησίμων inscripti pars prima e cod. Coisl. 347 [only α], ed. C. Boysen (Marburg 1891) = LGM 12–38
- Σ<sup>b</sup> Συναγωγῆς recensio aucta
- sch. Ap. Rh. *Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium vetera*, ed. C. Wendel (Berlin 1935)

- sch. Ar. *Scholia in Aristophanem*, ediderunt edendave curaverunt W.J.W. Koster et D. Holwerda (Groningen-Amsterdam 1960–); the rest in: *Scholia Graeca in Aristophanem*, ed. F. Dübner (Paris 1842)
- sch. Ar. Lys. *Scholia in Aristophanis Lysistratam* ed., Prolegomena de fontibus scholiorum scripsit G. Stein, diss. (Göttingen 1891)
- sch. D in Il. *Scholia Didymi quae vocantur in Iliadem*; ed. princ.: J. Lascaris (Rome 1517); here cited from: 'Ομήρου 'Ιλιάς καὶ εἰς αὐτὴν σχόλια ψευδεπίγραφα Διδύμου (ἐκ θεάτρου ἐν Ὁξονίᾳ 1675)
- sch. D in Od. *Didymi antiquissimi auctoris Interpretatio in Odysseam* (Venice 1528)
- sch. Il. *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem* (scholia vetera), ed. H. Erbse, 7 voll. (Berlin 1969–88)
- sch. Lyc. Lycophronis *Alexandra*, ed. E. Scheer, vol. 2 scholia continens (Berlin 1908)
- sch. Nic. Al. *Scholia in Nicandri Alexipharmaca*, post U.C. Bussemaker ed. M. Geymonat (Milan 1974)
- sch. Nic. Th. *Scholia in Nicandri Theriaca cum glossis*, ed. A. Crugnola (Milan-Varese 1971)
- sch. Od. *Scholia in Homeri Odyssea* α 1–309 auctiora et emendatiora, ed. A. Ludwich, ind. lect. (Königsberg 1888–90, rp. Hildesheim 1966); the rest in: *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Odysseam*, ed. G. Dindorf, 2 voll. (Oxford 1855)
- sch. Pi. *Scholia vetera in Pindari carmina*, ed. A.B. Drachmann, 3 voll. (Leipzig 1903–27)
- sch. Thuc. *Scholia in Thucydidem*, ed. C. Hude (Leipzig 1927)
- SGLG Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker
- Stanford *The Odyssey of Homer*, ed. with . . . Introduction, Commentary and Indexes by W.B. Stanford, 2 vols., 2nd edn. rp. with alterations and additions (London 1965)
- Su. *Suidae Lexicon*, ed. A. Adler, 5 voll. Leipzig 1928–38
- Tim. *Timaei Sophistae Lexicon vocum Platoniarum*, ed. David Ruhnken, ed. sec. (Leiden 1789)
- Tryph. *Tryphonis Grammatici Alexandrini Fragmenta*, ed. A. de Velsen (Berlin 1853)
- Tyrann. *Die Fragmente der Grammatiker Tyrannion und Diokles*, ed. W. Haas SGLG 3 (Berlin-New York 1977) 79–184
- Vill. *Apollonii Sophistae Lexicon Graecum Iliadis et Odysseae*, ed. J.B.C. d'Ansse de Villosion, 2 voll. (Paris 1773)
- West S.R. West on α-δ in: *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, 1 (Oxford 1988)
- Zon. *Iohannis Zonarae Lexicon*, ed. I.A.H. Tittmann, 2 voll. (Leipzig 1808).

## b. Testimonium

Hsch. ep. ad Eulogium 31 sq. Latte: οὐ γὰρ ὀκνήσω μετὰ παρρησίας εἰπεῖν ὅτι τῶν Ἀριστάρχου καὶ Ἀππίωνος καὶ Ἡλιοδώρου λέξεων εὐπορήσας, καὶ τὰ βιβλία προσθεὶς Διογενιανοῦ, ὃ πρῶτον καὶ μέγιστον ὑπάρχει πλεονέκτημα δαιτός, ἰδίᾳ χειρὶ γράφων ἐγώ, μετὰ πάσης ὀρθότητος καὶ ἀκριβεστάτης γραφῆς κατὰ τὸν γραμματικὸν Ἡρωδιανόν, λέξιν μὲν οὐδεμίαν παρέλιπον κειμένην ἐν αὐτοῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ πλείστας οὐχ εὐρὼν προστέθεικα.

## c. Fragmenta

## 1) Preserved in the Lexicographical Tradition

1 Ap.S. 8.4: ἀγακλυτά (γ 388): ἄγαν ὀνομαστά, ὡς καὶ Ἡλιοδωρος.

cf. sch. D ad γ 388: ἀγάκλυτα: ἄγαν ἔνδοξα; Hsch. α 289: ἀγάκλυτα: ἄγαν ἔνδοξα ἢ ἄγαν διαβεβοημένα; Ep. alph. (AO 2.343.12): ἀγακλυτός: ἐκ τοῦ ἄγαν καὶ τὸ κλυτός, ὁ ἔνδοξος· τοῦτο ἐκ τοῦ κλέω, τὸ δοξάζω, κατὰ μετὰθεσιν τοῦ εἰς υ κλύω καὶ κλυτός.

Used once each in the *Iliad* (Z 436 of Idomeneus) and *Theogony* (v. 945 of Hephaestus), ἀγακλυτός surpasses ἀγακλειτός in popularity with the poet of the *Odyssey*, who uses it of things as well as persons. Heliodorus' explanation, based upon a division into component parts, is quite routine and is similar to that attested in the D-scholium ad γ 388. It is this verse (though possibly γ 428) that our gloss evidently refers to; after a group of glosses of mixed provenance, ours appears to be the first of a brief series of Odyssean glosses, being followed by 8.5 ἀγροτέρας (ζ 133) and ἀγλαόκαρποι (η 113).

2 Ap. S. 5.4: †ἀγαπαζόμεθα: Ἡλιοδωρος ἄγαν προσεκέιμεθα· “ἀλλ’ ὅτε δὴ <μιν> πάντες †ἀγαπαζόμεθ’ ἐξερέοντες” (cf. κ 249).

2 μιν] suppl. Steinicke ex Hom.

cf. sch. T ad κ 249: ἀγαζόμεθα: ἄγαν προσεκέιμεθα καὶ ἐλιπαροῦμεν καὶ ἐξεπληττόμεθα.

Verse κ 249 depicts the efforts of the remaining crewmen to elicit information from Eurylochus, who has returned thoroughly shaken after watching his companions turned to swine by Circe. The

*apparatus critici* of modern editions give ἀγαπαζόμεθ' as Heliodorus' reading in this verse; but surely what Heliodorus did was to propound the doctrine correctly reported in the T scholium *ad loc.*, namely to gloss ἀγαζόμεθ' (or, possibly, ἀγασσάμεθ', the other plausible ancient variant) as ἄγαν προσεκέιμεθα. The error will have arisen, as M. W. Haslam observes, under the influence of the preceding gloss ἀγαπαζόμεναι. The form of the quotation will then have been adjusted to agree with the new lemma. If all three of sch. T's definitions derive ultimately from Heliodorus, he was evidently again guided, as Haslam suggests, by an etymology (ἀγάζομαι < ἄγαν ἄζομαι [cf. ἐξεπληττόμεθα]).<sup>25</sup>

3a Ap. S. Berol. inv. 16705 fr. B recto, gl. 3:

[ἀδευ]κέι: ἀπειοικότι ἢ ἀδεχεῖ, ἀ-  
προσδοκῇτωι. Ἑλιδόωρος ἀνεικά[στωι].

3b Ap. S. 9.15: ἀδευκέι: ἦτοι τῷ ἀπειοικότι ἢ οἷον ἀδεχεῖ, ἀπροσδοκῇτω· “ἀδευκέι κεῖται ὀλέθρῳ” (v.l. α 46). ἐν δὲ τῇ Δ Ὀδυσσεΐας “ἀδευκέι” (δ 489) (Ἑλιδόωρος) ἀνεικάστω.

5 ἀδευκέι κεῖται ὀλέθρῳ secl. Steinicke, κεῖται ὀλέθρῳ ante alt. ἀδεύκει inserens 6 post Steinicke supplevi

hinc Hsch. α 1073: ἀδευκέι: ἀπειοικότι. οἶονεῖ ἀδοκεῖ, ἀπροσδοκεῖ. Ἑλιδόωρος δὲ φησιν ἀνεικάστω. οἱ δὲ ἀδευκῆς· αὐτάρκης; cf. sch. D ad δ 489: ἀδευκέι: ἀπροσδοκῇτω, χαλεπῷ; ibid. ζ 273: ἀδευκέα: σκληράν, χαλεπὴν; ibid. κ 245: ἀδευκέα: ἀνιστόρητον; sch. BE ad δ 489: ὀλέθρῳ ἀδευκέι: ἀδοκεῖ, ἀπροσδοκῇτω, ἀπὸ τοῦ δεύχω τὸ δέχομαι. ἡ πικρῷ, ἐκ τοῦ α στερητικοῦ μορίου καὶ τοῦ γλεῦκος; sch. B ad ζ 273: φῆμιν ἀδευκέα: ἀπὸ τοῦ γλεῦκος ἀγλευκέα καὶ ἀδευκέα. ἡ τὴν ἀπροσδόκητον, ἀπὸ τοῦ δέρκω, τὸ βλέπω. ἡ τὴν πικράν, ἡ τὴν ἀφανῆ; ibid. HQ: ἀπὸ τοῦ δεῦκος· ἀδευκέα οὖν τὴν πικράν καὶ δεῦκος μὴ ἔχουσιν; ibid. E: ἀπροσδόκητον· παρὰ τὸ δοκεῖν. καὶ ἀδευκῆς, ἀπευκέα τινὰ οὐσαν τὴν πολὺπικρον; Et. Orion. G 24.20 (>δεῖκω), unde Et. Gen. (B) α 63 (Et. Sym. α 129) et Et. Gud. 21.1 Stef.; sch. Ap. Rh. 1.1037–8b: ἀδευκέος ἔκτοθεν ἄτης: οὐ προσηνοῦς, ἀπειοικυῖας, πικρὰς· δεῦκος γὰρ τὸ γλυκύ ... ἡ ἀφανοῦς καὶ ἀπροοράτου, παρὰ τὸ δεῖκω; sim. ibid. 2.267b et 2.388–91b–c; EM 16.26 ex Et. Gen. et sch. Ap. Rh. 1.1037–8b; Eust 1506.3, 1563.33, 1657.25

Appearing as a description of the death which Menelaus darkly

<sup>25</sup> For Heliodorus' putative sponsorship of variant readings see also *ad* fr. 17, \*20 and \*\*54.

suspects may have befallen some of his comrades on the expedition to Troy during their voyage home and about which he asks Proteus (δ 489)<sup>26</sup> or as the kind of reputation which Nausicaa shuns (ζ 273) or of the fate of Eurylochus' unlucky companions, changed to swine by Circe (κ 245), ἀδευκής clearly had an unpleasant meaning. The ancient interpreters, agreeing on an alpha-privative formation, divided between (a) those who thought the basic meaning 'unexpected' (to δεύχω, a posited by-form of δέχομαι) and (b) those who derived it from γλεῦκος and hence found the sense 'harsh, unpleasant'. Heliodorus' interpretation 'unconjectured' arrives at a result not dissimilar to (a) but is probably based on a different etymology (might he have known a gloss corresponding to that preserved at Hsch. δ 722: δεύκει : φροντίζει or δεύκω = βλέπω at EM 260.54?). Heliodorus' definition was minted for δ 489 (cf. Ap. S. 9.15), where it is apt enough (though it would not fit ζ 273). Modern linguists despair of an etymology (cf. Frisk *ad loc.*).

4 Σ<sup>b</sup> (Ba. 31.10): ἀδινοῖο γόοιο (Σ 316 al.): τοῦ ἀθρόως ἐκχεομένου. | “Σειρήνων” δὲ “ἀδινάων” (ψ 326) τῶν συνεχῶς ἄδουσῶν, ὁ Ἥλιος δωροζῆρη.

1 ἀδινοῖο] ἀδινοῦ Hom.

cf. Ap. S. 9.4: καὶ ὅτε φησὶν “ἀδινοῖο γόοιο” τοῦ ἀθρόως ἐκχεομένου. ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς †T βραχυδίας Ὀδυσσεΐας “ἡδ’ ὡς Σειρήνων ἀδινάων φθόγγον ἄκουσεν” (ψ 326; ἡκ- C), συνεχῶς ἄδουσῶν, unde Hsch. α 1141; cf. sch. Tb (ex.) ad T 315b<sup>1-2</sup>; T (ex.) ad X 430a; sch. bT (ex.) ad Ψ 17; bT (ex.) ad Ω 123; sch. α 92, δ 320 et 721; Eust. 1394.32; de loco ψ 326 al. (sc. = ἡδέων) “Apio” Gl. Hom. 212.16; Eust. 178.27 et 1949.27 (cf. sch. D ad Π 481)

The ancients already distinguished as many as five different senses of ἀδινός in the Homeric poems.<sup>27</sup> The interpretation of the phrase Σειρήνων ἀδινάων at ψ 326 was disputed between those who, like Heliodorus, thought it bore something like its normal sense (he glossed it as συνεχῶς ἄδουσῶν) and those who, like the author of the collection of Homeric glosses circulated in antiquity under Apion's name,<sup>28</sup>

<sup>26</sup> Also Athena's characterization of the death suffered by Aegisthus, if M. W. Haslam, whom I have followed, is right in supposing Apollonius' ἀδευκέϊ κεῖται ὀλέθρῳ α (previously unattested) v.l. at α 46 (these words were bracketed by previous editors).

<sup>27</sup> “Apio” Gl. Hom. 212.14 ff.

<sup>28</sup> On authenticity cf. CP 77 (1982) 277, n. 38 (though it would be nice to find yet another opposition of Heliodorus and the real Apion).

thought to give it a special sense = ἡδέων. Like Apollonius Sophista, modern lexicographers group together Σ 316 and ψ 326, where the epithet is applied to sounds; and while they find reference to volume, rather than duration of sound ('vehement, loud' as in LSJ s.v., 2.), they rightly reject the *ad hoc* sense 'sweet'.

A note on the transmission: This is one of four lexicographical fragments not attested in an extant version of Apollonius Sophista (cf. fr. 9, 11 and 30); Apollonius does have the content but without Heliodorus' name attached. It can be regarded as a virtual certainty that the gloss entered the lexicographical tradition via a fuller version of Apollonius than that now extant.<sup>29</sup> The gloss does not yet occur in the earlier version of the Συναγωγή (Σ<sup>a</sup>), which is a slightly expanded version of the Lexicon Cyrilli, only in Σ<sup>b</sup>, which G. Wentzel showed to have been interpolated *inter alia* from Apollonius Sophista.<sup>30</sup> Valk (*ad* Eust. 178.26–29) thought that the problem of Σειρήνων ἀδινάων in ψ 326 would have been aired in a scholium no longer extant.

5 Ap. S. Berol. inv. 16705 fr. B recto, gl. 11:

ἀεικής: Ἡλι[όδωρ]ος [εὐκατα]-  
φρόνητο[ς ....] καζ....κ. [

cf. Ap. S. 11.5: †ἀείκαστος: εὐκαταφρόνητος, ἐν τῇ Τ ῥαψωδίᾳ; sch. D *ad* T 124: οὐ οἱ ἀεικές: οὐ δεινὸν καὶ ἀεικές καὶ ἀπεικός καὶ οὐ χαλεπὸν αὐτῷ; Hsch. α 1076: ἀεικές: κακόν, σκληρόν, ἀπρεπές, εὐκαταφρόνητον, ἀπεικός; sch. A (Did.) *ad* M 435a<sup>1</sup>: ... ἄμεινον δέ, φησίν, ἀεικέα, τὸν εὐτελῆ. ...; sch. D *ad* M 435: ἀεικέα: τὸν εὐτελῆ καὶ οἰκτρὸν et *ad* Ω 594: ἐπεὶ οὐ μοι ἀεικέα δῶκεν ἄποινα: ἐπεὶ οὐκ εὐτελῆ μοι παρέσχε λύτρα ...

Attempts to place the verse to which this gloss originally referred are complicated by the incompleteness and corruption of P.Berol. and C respectively and by the fact that the order of glosses in these two witnesses diverges sharply. It seems likely, however, that ἀεικής (P.Berol.), not ἀεικές (Hsch.), was the original form of the lemma, as the form of the gloss in C (εὐκαταφρόνητος) would indicate, in spite of the corruption of C's lemma.<sup>31</sup> As to the order of glosses, note that

<sup>29</sup> Cf. p. 5 above.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. n. 22 above.

<sup>31</sup> M. W. Haslam compares with †ἀείκαστος the following line of P.Berol., where he suggests with a query ἡ εἰ]καζ[εῖν or [εσθαί. On the other hand, D. Blank suspects that †ἀείκαστος may represent interference from ἀνείκαστῃ, the last word of the gloss on ἀδεύκει (= fr. 3 above).

divergences are to be explained by the more thoroughgoing alphabetization of P.Berol., whereby, however, η, ι and ει are treated as equivalent, as in the *Suda* (cf. gll. 11–13). Therefore the order in C is closer to the original and, in this case, suggests that the reference of our gloss is to υ 66:<sup>32</sup> the preceding gloss, ἀεικέλιον refers to υ 259, the following one, ἀεικίας, to υ 308. Therefore the reference to T (sc. 124) may be Apollonius' means of changing to another definition (not extant in C or P.Berol., but probably ἀπεικός, preserved following εὐκαταφρόνητον by Hsch.) from a different source (cf. sch. D *ad* T 124); the fuller form of Apollonius' gloss would then have been, e.g., ἀεικής: 'Ἡλίοδωρος εὐκαταφρόνητος· ἐν τῇ T ῥαψωδίᾳ ἀεικές, ἀπεικός. Alternatively, one might, with M. W. Haslam, regard T as a simple error for Y (sc. 'Ὀδυσσεΐας); cf. Ap. S. 9.5, cited *ad* fr. 4 above, and fr. 19 below. Thus Apollonius drew once again upon Heliodorus' *Odyssean* commentary.

Heliodorus' gloss would neatly fit the sense of υ 366 (from Theoclymenus' reply after his dire prophecy has been laughed at by the suitors and Eurymachus has questioned his sanity): εἰσί μοι ὀφθαλμοί τε καὶ οὐατα καὶ πόδες ἄμφω / καὶ νόος ἐν στήθεσσι τετυγμένος οὐδὲν ἀεικής.

6 Ap. S. Berol. inv. 16705 fr. B recto, gl. 17:

αἰράς: αἶρας, 'Ἡλίοδωρος [ἐν τῇ α]  
'Ὀδυσσεΐας προσενέγκας].

cf. sch. D *ad* Z 264 (sim. A<sup>im</sup> [Ariston.] *ad loc.*): αἶρε: πρόσφερε, unde Diogen. (Hsch. α 1303 [cf. 1304]; Su. α 636; EM 22.17; cf. Zon. 54); Ap. S. 10.21: αἰράς: ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ βασιτάζειν . . . ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ πρό(σ)φερε (corr. Bekker) "μή μοι οἶνον αἶρε" (Z 264) καὶ ἐν τῇ α 'Ὀδυσσεΐας (141) "αἰράς" προσενέγκας. εἴρηται δὲ οὕτως, ἐπεὶ ὁ προσφέρων αἶρει τὸ προσφερόμενον· καὶ αἶρειν τὸ προσφέρειν. ἀπὸ δὲ τούτου καὶ τὸν ἄρτον ὠνομάσθαι, ὥς φησιν 'Απολλόδωρος (FGrHist 244 F 237); sch. Ar. Pac. 1; Eust. 641.18

At Z 264–65 Hector, about to return to combat, instructs Hecuba: μή μοι οἶνον αἶρε μελίφρονα, πότνια μήτηρ, / μή μ' ἀπογυιώσης μένεος, ἀλκῆς τε λάθωμαι, where αἶρε was traditionally glossed as πρόσφερε (sch. D *ad loc.*)—the starting-point for Apollodorus' etymology of ἄρτος. Heliodorus applied this sense to αἰράς in its

<sup>32</sup> The other occurrences of the masculine nominative singular being at χ 308, ω 184, K 483 and Φ 20.

occurrence at α 141 as well (δαιτρός δὲ κρειῶν πίνακας παρέθηκεν αἰείρας / παντοίων . . .); sch. DE<sup>2</sup> *ad loc.* takes a similar line in glossing κομίσας.

7 Ap. S. 12.20: ἀθεμίστων (ι 106): ἐν τῇ I Ὀδυσσεΐας ἐπὶ τῶν Κυκλώπων ἐπιθέτου λεγομένου “Κυκλώπων δ’ ἐς γαῖαν ὑπερφιάλων ἀθεμίστων” (ι 106), ὁ γοῦν Ἡλίοδωρος Ἀρισταρχεῖως μεταφράζων φησί, καθὸ οὐ κοινοῖς χρῶνται νόμοις. ὁ γὰρ Ἀρίσταρχος λέγει δικαίους εἶναι τοὺς Κύκλωπας ἐκτὸς τοῦ Πολυφήμου· φησὶ γοῦν περὶ αὐτῶν “θεμιστεύει δὲ ἕκαστος / παίδων ἢ δ’ ἀλόχων, οὐδ’ ἀλλήλων ἀλέγουσιν” (ι 114–15). ὁ δὲ Κύκλωψ ἐκ τῆς ἰδίας ἀσεβείας περὶ αὐτῶν φησιν “οὐ γὰρ Κύκλωπες Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο ἀλέγουσιν” (ι 275), ὅπερ ψεῦδος· αὐτοὶ γὰρ εἰσιν οἱ λέγοντες “εἰ μὲν δὴ μή τις σε βιάζεται οἷον ἐόντα, / νοῦσον δ’ οὐ πῶς ἔστι Διὸς μεγάλου ἀλέασθαι” (ι 410–11). καὶ ἔστιν ὅλος ὁ τόπος οὗτος τῶν προβλημάτων.

8 αἰγιόχου Hom. 10 δ’] γ’ Hom.

cf. Ap. S. 158.32 (s.v. ὑπερφιάλοι): καὶ τοὺς Κύκλωπας χωρὶς τοῦ Πολυφήμου δικαίους συνέστησεν, καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ “Κυκλώπων δ’ ἐς γαῖαν ὑπερφιάλων ἀθεμίστων” τοὺς μὴ τοῖς κοινοῖς νόμοις χρωμένους; cf. sch. H *ad* ι 106: ὑπερφιάλων, ἀθεμίστων: ἡ τῶν μεγαλοφυῶν τῷ σώματι, τῶν δισημῶν γὰρ ἡ λέξις, ἀθεμίστων δὲ τῶν νόμοις μὴ χρωμένων· φησὶ γὰρ “θεμιστεύει δὲ ἕκαστος παίδων ἢ δ’ ἀλόχων.” εἰ γὰρ ἦν ἀθεμίστων ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀδίκου, πῶς λέγει “οἳ ῥα θεοῖσι πεποιθότες;” εἰ δ’ εἶπῃ τις, καὶ πῶς ὁ Πολύφημος φησὶ “οὐ Κύκλωπες Διὸς αἰγιόχου ἀλέγουσι” (ι 275), σκοπεῖται τὸ πρόσωπον, ὅτι Πολυφήμου ἐστὶ τοῦ ὠμοφάγου καὶ θηριώδους . . . ὥστε Πολύφημον μόνον λέγει ὑπερήφανον καὶ ἄδικον, τοὺς δὲ λοιποὺς πάντας Κύκλωπας εὐσεβεῖς καὶ δικαίους καὶ πεποιθότας τοῖς θεοῖς, ὅθεν καὶ ἀνῆκεν αὐτοῖς αὐτομάτως ἡ γῆ τοὺς καρπούς; *ibid.* sch. T: πῶς ὑπερφιάλους καὶ ἀθεμίστους καὶ παρανόμους εἰπὼν τοὺς Κύκλωπας ἄφθονα παρὰ θεῶν αὐτοῖς ὑπάρχειν λέγει τὰ ἀγαθὰ; ῥητέον οὖν ὅτι ὑπερφιάλους μὲν διὰ τὴν ὑπεροχὴν τοῦ σώματος, ἀθεμίστους δὲ τοὺς μὴ νόμῳ χρωμένους ἐγγράφῳ διὰ τὸ ἕκαστον ἴδιον ἄρχεσθαι· “θεμιστεύει δὲ ἕκαστος παίδων ἢ δ’ ἀλόχου” (ι 115), ὅπερ ἀνομίας σημεῖον. Ἀντισθένης δὲ φησιν (cf. fr. 189 Giannantonii) ὅτι μόνον τὸν Πολύφημον εἶναι ἄδικον· καὶ γὰρ οὗτος τοῦ Διὸς ὑπερόπτης ἐστίν. οὐκοῦν οἱ λοιποὶ δικαιοὶ· διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ τὴν γῆν αὐτοῖς τὰ πάντα ἀναδιδόναι αὐτόματον, καὶ τὸ μὴ ἐργάζεσθαι αὐτὴν δίκαιον ἔργον ἐστίν. ἀλλ’ ἐμπροσθεν βιαίων βιαίους, “οἳ σφεας σινέσκοντο” (ζ 6), ὥσπερ καὶ τοὺς Γίγαντας; “ὅσπερ ὑπερθύμοισι Γιγάντεσσι βασιλευν” (η 59), ὥσπερ καὶ τοὺς Φαίακας βλαπτομένους ὑπ’ αὐτῶν μετανασθῆναι; *sim.* VB *ad loc.* et Eust. 1617.44

The words narrating the approach of Odysseus and his crew to the land of the Cyclopes (Κυκλώπων δ’ ἐς γαῖαν ὑπερφιάλων ἀθεμίστων / ἰκόμεθ’: ι 106–7) constituted a πρόβλημα in antiquity (cf. the concluding words of the fragment), though we know of no attempt to solve

it by athetization or rewriting. The question was how to preserve a consistent narrative point-of-view in the face of apparent contradictions. Antisthenes (fr. 189 Giannantoni) already took the position that Polyphemus was the one wrong-doer among the Cyclopes, a view which Aristarchus seconded. Heliodorus' contribution was to bring this view into line with the epithet applied to the Cyclopes at ι 106, by the morally neutral explanation that ἄθέμιστοι should be taken to refer to a lack of common (and written, adds — after Heliodorus? — sch. T *ad loc.*) law. Apollonius goes on to support his statement that Heliodorus has glossed the word *modo Aristarcheo* by citing Aristarchus' argument that the Cyclopes know no social organization beyond the family unit (ι 115) and his refusal to take at face value Polyphemus' statement of ι 275 (οὐ Κύκλωπες Διὸς αἰγιόχοι ἀλέγουσιν) in light of their reference to Zeus at ι 410–11. No doubt the explanation of ὑπερφιάλων in a purely physical, not moral, sense, the citation of the fact that they obtain crops without labor (ι 107 ff.) as proof of their piety and the attempt to explain away their bad relations with the Phaeacians (ζ 6) all formed part of Aristarchus' (and already Antisthenes'?) argument, which differentiates between the poet's words and those of his characters. This interpretation is less than satisfying to the modern reader, who may well doubt that the facts of the poem allow for a simple moral characterization of the Cyclopes (cf. their treatment of the Phaeacians!). In any event, this fragment shows Heliodorus working along lines laid out by Aristarchus and thereby winning the (implicit) approval of Apollonius Sophista.

8 Ap. S. 13.30: αἶθοπα οἶνον (A 462 al.): ἦτοι τὸν φύσει θερμόν (αἶθειν γὰρ τὸ καίειν), ἢ τὸν μέλανα, ὡς Ἡλιδωρος, ἢ τὸν λαμπρόν κατὰ δύναμιν.

1 αἶθοπα C | τὸν Tolle: τῇ C

sim. "Ἀπιο" Gl. Hom. 292.4 (addito πυρρὸν interpretamento) 1 θερμόν] cf. Hsch. α 1876 (θερμαντικόν) 1–2 — μέλανα] cf. sch. D ad A 462; Et. Gen. α 197, unde EM 32.43 et Et. Sym. α 265, unde Zon. 68; Eust. 135.34 et 470.7 2 μέλανα] cf. Hsch. (Cyrill.) α 1877; Λέξ. Ὀμ. α 155

D. Blank suspects a πρόβλημα taking ι 346 (κισσύβιον μετὰ χερσὶν ἔχων μέλανος οἴνοιο) as its starting-point: how could the μέλας οἶνος also be αἶθος? It is probable that in Heliodorus' day two, if not more, interpretations of αἶθος were in competition: θερμός or μέλας, both

attested in the D-scholium to A 462, the former supported by an etymology from αἶθιν, the latter by a connection with the Αἰθίοπες. Heliodorus preferred the latter; we can only guess at his reasons (did he suppose it more likely that the Homeric epithet was based on the immediate appearance of wine, rather than its effect when ingested?).

9 Σ<sup>b</sup> (Phot. α 1043; Ba. 75.24): ἄλοσύνδης: τῆς ἐν ἀλὶ σευομένης. ὁ δὲ Ἡλίοδωρος τῆς θαλάσσης ἀπέδωκεν.

1 σευομένης Haslam : γενομένης Σ<sup>b</sup> 2 θαλάσσης Reitzenstein : θαλάω z θαλαω b, τὴν θάλασσαν Ba.

cf. sch. D ad δ 404: ἄλοσύνδης: τῆς θαλάσσης παρὰ τὸ ἐν ἀλὶ σεύεσθαι, unde Hsch. (Cyrill.) α 3248 et Su. α 1340; sch. PQ ad loc.: βοσκήματα τῆς θαλάσσης, ὡς καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ “ἡε τί μοι καὶ κῆτος ἐπισσεύη μέγα δαίμων / (ἐξ ἁλὸς) οἶά τε πολλὰ τρέφει κλυτὸς Ἀμφιτρίτη” (ε 421–22); Ap. S. 21.21: ἄλοσύνδην: τὴν ἐν ἀλὶ σευομένην, οἷον ἐνάλιον: “νεπόδες καλῆς ἄλοσύνδης” (δ 404). οἱ μὲν τῆς θαλάσσης, ἔνιοι δὲ τῆς Ἀμφιτρίτης; de testimoniis inferioris aetatis cf. ad Ep. Hom. α 327 editionis eius, quam praeparo

Like fr. 4 attested only in the Συναγωγή, this fragment, too, surely derives from a fuller version of Apollonius Sophista than C presents (note that οἱ μὲν has supplanted Heliodorus' name there).<sup>33</sup> Besides δ 404, quoted above, ἄλοσύνδη occurs only in Aeneas' speech to Achilles at Y 204–5: φασὶ σὲ μὲν Πηλῆος ἀμύμονος ἔκγονον εἶναι, / μητρὸς δ' ἐκ Θέτιδος καλλιπλοκάμου ἄλοσύνδης. It is possible that, as D. Blank suggests, a ζήτημα underlies this, like the previous fragment: how could both the νέποδες of δ 404 and Thetis in Y 205 be said to belong to ἄλοσύνδη? In antiquity there were two competing solutions: Heliodorus took it as a term for the sea in general; others saw in it specifically a designation for Amphitrite; both views were probably based on a comparison of ε 421–22 (quoted above); proponents of the second could also have cited μ 96–97: . . . δελφίνάς τε κύνας τε καὶ εἴ ποθι μεῖζον ἔλῃσι / κῆτος, ἃ μυρία βόσκει ἀγάστονος Ἀμφιτρίτη. The meaning of the *Odyssey*-poet's substantivized epithet may have been obscure even to him;<sup>34</sup> but the two ancient solutions amount to much the same thing, since, as Stoll observed, Amphitrite appears in the *Odyssey* essentially as an allegory of the sea.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>33</sup> Cf. also ad fr. 41.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. S. R. West ad δ 404.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Stoll in W. H. Roscher (ed.), *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* 1 (Leipzig 1884–86) 318.33 f.

**10** Ap. S. 23.31: ἀλφηστῆσι (α 349): ἐντίμοις· λέγει δὲ βασιλεῦσιν. οὕτως Ἡλιόδωρος.

cf. sch. D ad α 349: ἀλφηστῆσιν· ἐφευρετικοῖς, ἐπινοητικοῖς, ἐντίμοις; Hsch. α 3329: ἀλφηστής· ἰχθύος εἶδος καὶ ἔντιμος· ibid. 3332; Σ (Phot. α 1069; Ba. 78.18); EM 73.1: λέγονται καὶ οἱ ἔντιμοι καὶ τίμιοι βασιλεῖς ἢ ὀρχησταί; al. sch. BE ad α 349: ἀλφηστῆσιν· ἐπινοητικοῖς, ἐφευρετικοῖς, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀλφῶ, τὸ εὐρίσκω, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ τὸ ἄλφα; sim. sch. D ad loc. et sch. ad ζ 8 et v 261 et Eust. 1224.45 et 1422.34; Meth. (Ep. Hom. α 331 et Et. Gen. α 557 et ea opera, quae inde pendent)

In the passage in question Telemachus chides Penelope for reproving the minstrel for his choice of the return of the Achaeans from Troy as the subject of his song: οὐ νύ τ' αἰδοῖ / αἵτιοι, ἀλλὰ ποθι Ζεὺς αἴτιος, ὅς τε δίδωσιν / ἀνδράσιν ἀλφηστῆσιν ὅπως ἐθέλησιν ἐκάστω (α 347–49). Since ἐντίμοις is one of the glosses given here by the D-scholium, Heliodorus' contribution lay evidently in giving this sharper point as βασιλεῦσιν. Though suited to α 349, his explanation would not fit other occurrences (ζ 8, v 261); cf. *ad fr.* 3 above.

**11** Hsch. α 3582: ἀμενήνωσεν (N 562): ἀσθενῇ ἐποίησεν. Ἡλιόδωρος δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν “νεκῶν ἀμενήνᾳ κάρηνα” (κ 521, 536, λ 29, 49) τὰ ἀδιανόητα.

cf. Ap. S. 27.3: ἀμενήνωσεν· ἀσθενῇ ἐποίησεν, κατὰ στέρησιν τοῦ μένους, ὃ ἐστὶ τῆς ἰσχύος· “ἀμενήνωσεν δὲ οἱ αἰχμήν” (N 562). καὶ ἀμενήνός ὁ ἀσθενής· “ἦ κε ζῶς ἀμενήνός ἐα χαλκοῖο τυπῆσι” (E 887); al. sch. D ad κ 521: ἀμενήνᾳ· ἀσθενῇ, μένος οὐκ ἔχοντα ἢ σώματος δύναμιν· ἀπὸ τοῦ μόνην ἔχειν ἐκεῖ τὴν ψυχὴν; Eust. 1668.28: “Ὅτι τὸ “πολλὰ δὲ γουνοῦσθαι νεκῶν ἀμενήνᾳ κάρηνα” οἰκεῖον ῥηθῆναι ὅτε μεσίται τισὶν εἶεν χάνουσι καὶ ἀνωφελεῖς.

The epithet ἀμενήνᾳ used four times in the *Odyssey* in the phrase νεκῶν ἀμενήνᾳ κάρηνα was notoriously obscure even in antiquity; it is one of the *voces Homericæ* on which a father quizzes his son in Aristophanes' *Δαιταλῆς* (fr. 233 K.-A.). What we should probably assume to have been the standard ancient interpretation preserved in the D-scholium to κ 521 is based on an analysis as an α-privative formation to μένος (later revised, to accommodate the analogy of πέτω πετηνός, to a deverbative from μένω: cf. Et. Gen. α 629 and its derivatives). Similarly, Heliodorus, perhaps guided by a gloss μένος = νοῦς (cf. Hescl. μ 861), understands the word to mean ἀδιανόητος, evidently in the active sense ‘void of understanding’ (cf. LSJ s.v., II). This would fit well with the Homeric conception of the dead as attain-

ing consciousness only when they drink blood.<sup>36</sup> In view of the notorious obscurity of this epithet, Heliodorus' interpretation deserves perhaps more attention than it commonly receives these days.<sup>37</sup>

**12** Ap. S. 29.9: ἄμμορον (ε 275): ποτὲ μὲν κακόμορον “ἄμμορος ἦ τάχα χήρη / σεῦ ἔσομαι” (Z 408–9)· ποτὲ δὲ ἄμοιρος, ἀμέτοχος, “οἷ ἢ δ' ἄμμορός ἐστι λοετρῶν Ὠκεανοῖο” (Σ 489, ε 275)· λέγει δὲ {καὶ} ἐπὶ τῆς Ἄρκτου. τοῦτο δὲ εἶρηκεν μὴ γινώσκων ὅτι καὶ ἄλλα οὐ δύνει· ἢ πρὸς τὰ προειρημένα τὴν σύγκρισιν ποιεῖται. ὁ δὲ Ἡλιόδωρος φησιν βέλτιον λέγειν ὅτι ἡγνόει. ὁ δὲ Κράτης (F 25a Mette) οὕτως ἀναγινώσκει “ἢ τ' αὐτοῦ στρέφεται καὶ τ' Ὠρίωνα δοκεῖ / (οἷ)” (Σ 488, ε 274), μέχρι τούτου καταλέγων· “ἢ δ' ἄμμορός ἐστι λοετρῶν Ὠκεανοῖο,” ἵνα τὸ συμβεβηκὸς αὐτῇ καὶ (ἐφ') ἐτέροις τῶν ἄστρων ἀκούηται.

**1** κακόμορον Tolle: κάμμορον C | ἄμμορος Villosion, ut Hom.: κάμμορος C 3 καὶ] del. Crönert 5 πρὸς τὰ Vill.: παρὰ τὸ C 6 φησιν Vill.: φα(σιν) C 8 οἷ· suppl. Helck 9 ἐφ'] suppl. Wachsmuth

cf. Arist. Poet 1461a 20: καὶ τὸ “οἷ ἢ δ' ἄμμορος” κατὰ μεταφορὰν· τὸ γὰρ γνωριμώτατον μόνον; Strab. 1.1.6 (p. 3): . . . οὐδὲ Κράτης (F 25c Mette) οὖν ὀρθῶς γράφει “οἷ ἢ δὲ (E. Maass, οἶος δ' codd.) ἄμμορός ἐστι λοετρῶν”, φεύγων τὰ μὴ φευκτά. βελτίων δ' Ἡράκλειτος καὶ Ὀμηρικώτερος, ὁμοίως ἀντὶ ἀρκτικοῦ τὴν Ἄρκτον ὀνομάζων (sq. Vs. 22 B 120 = fr. 62 M.); “Ari.” Gl. Hom. 218.4 (= LGM 296.4): ἄμμορον: τὸ κακόμορον ἢ τὴν ἄμοιρον; Porphy. 1.225.25: ἀνιστόρητόν ἐστι τοῦτο· κατηγοροῦσι μὲν γὰρ κατὰ τὸν περὶ τῆς Ἀρκτου λόγον φάσκοντος “οἷ ἢ δ' ἄμμορός ἐστι λοετρῶν Ὠκεανοῖο”· καθόλου γὰρ πάντα τὰ ἐν τῷ ἀρκτικῷ μὴ δύνειν. λύοιτο δ' ἂν ἐκ τῆς ἀναφορᾶς τῶν πρὸς ἃ εἶρηται διὰ τῆς λέξεως· εἰρημένου γὰρ “Πηλιάδας θ' Ὑάδας τε τό τε σθένος Ὠρίωνος / Ἄρκτον θ', ἦν καὶ Ἄμαξαν ἐπὶ κλισίῃν καλέουσιν, / ἢ τ' αὐτοῦ στρέφεται καὶ τ' Ὠρίωνα δοκεῖ” (Σ 486–88), τὸ “οἷ ἢ δ' ἄμμορός ἐστι λοετρῶν” (489) πρὸς ταῦτα τὰ ῥηθέντα ἄστρα καὶ τὰ συγκαταλεχθέντα ἔχει τὴν ἀναφορὰν. κἂν διαιρηται δὲ “οἷ,” εἴτα “ἢ δ' ἄμμορός ἐστι λοετρῶν Ὠκεανοῖο” (= Crat. F 25b M.), κατὰ λέξιν ἢ λύσει ὑπάρχει; ex Ap. S. (brevius) Hsch. α 3707; sch. (ex.) Σ 489a: οἷ ἢ δ' ἄμμορός (ἐστι λοετρῶν Ὠκεανοῖο): τὸ οἷ οὐκ ἔχει τὴν σύγκρισιν πρὸς ἅπαντα τὰ ζῷδια, ἀλλὰ πρὸς μόνα τὰ ἐντετυπωμένα τῇ ἀσπίδι· b T εἰσὶ γὰρ καὶ ἄλλα μὴ δύνοντα. b 1 κακόμορον] cf. sch. D ad Z 408; Su. α 1630; Et. Gen. α 658, unde EM 84.26 2 ἄμοιρος, ἀμέτοχος] cf. sch. D ad Σ 489

Among the ancient ζητήματα in the Homeric poems was the fact that

<sup>36</sup> Cf. E. Rohde, *Psyche. Seelencult und Unsterblichkeitsglaube der Griechen* 9. u. 10. Aufl., 1 (Tübingen 1925) 55 ff. = Engl. transl. 1, 36 ff.

<sup>37</sup> It is not mentioned, e.g., by A. Heubeck, in: *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, 2 (Oxford 1989) ad κ 521 or by Frisk s.v. ἀμενηνός.—Note that Steinicke has added Ἡλιόδωρος—ἀδιανόητα ἀπέδωκεν at Ap. S. 27.5.

the Bear “alone” is said not to set (Σ 489, ε 275). Aristotle included this as one of the examples of προβλήματα in chapter 25 of the *Poetics*. Some, like Crates of Mallos (fr. 25 M.), were prepared to resort to a very tortured interpretation of the transmitted text (whereby the Bear is said to watch Orion ‘for herself’ [οἶ]), in order to save the poet’s reputation for scientific accuracy.<sup>38</sup> Others wanted to restrict the “alone” to the other constellations mentioned in context (Ap. S., sch. [ex.] Σ 489a<sup>1</sup>). Heliodorus, however, untroubled by the thought of the poet’s scientific ignorance, readily conceded the point.<sup>39</sup>

That our lemma (ἄμμορον) pertains to ε 275 (not Σ 489) is clear from its position within the group of λέξεις arranged in order of their appearance within the *Odyssey* appended at the end of the AM-series;<sup>40</sup> the sole anomaly is 29.28 ἀμφαγαπαζόμενος, which may, as M. W. Haslam suggests, have ousted a gloss on ἀμφαγάπαζον (ξ 381) and should therefore be one entry later:

- 29.5 ἀμύντορας : β 326
- 29.6 ἀμφο : γ 344
- 29.7 ἀμφοκάλυπεν : δ 618
- 29.8 ἀμφασίη : δ 704
- 29.9 ἄμμορον : ε 275
- 29.18 ἀμφήλυθε : ζ 122
- 29.19 ἀμφίς ἔχοιεν : θ 340
- 29.21 ἀμφιφορεῖσιν : ι 164
- 29.22 ἀμησάμενος : ι 247
- 29.23 ἀμηχανίη : ι 295

<sup>38</sup> Cf. the apt comment of Strabo (1.1.6 = Crates fr. 25c [p. 205, 4] M.): οὐδὲ Κράτης οὖν ὁρθῶς γράφει “οἶ· ἢ δ’ ἄμμορός ἐστι λοετρῶν”, φεύγων τὰ μὴ φευκτά. On the text of Crates’ interpretation cf. E. Maass, *Aratea*, Philologische Untersuchungen 12 (Berlin 1892), pp. 189–90.

<sup>39</sup> In this regard, too, Heliodorus’ view contrasts with that of Apion, for whom the opinion is attested ὅτι ἀστρονόμος Ὀμηρος (FGrHist 616 F 35a).

<sup>40</sup> This appears to be the regular procedure; Haslam compares the *Odyssey* glosses at the end of the ΑΓ- series: 8.4 ἀγακλυτά γ 388; 8.5 ἀγροτέρως ζ 133; 8.7 ἀγλαόκαρποι η 115; 8.9 ἀγαπήνορα (η 170; this is the reading of C; rather than emend to -ος, perhaps posit a lacuna following the lemma); 8.11 ἀγνυμένων κ 123; 8.12 ἄγρην μ 330; 8.13 ἀγνοήσασα υ 15; 8.14 ἀγαιομένου υ 16; 8.16 ἀγκυλοχεῖλαι χ 302; 8.18 ἀγνώσασκε ψ 95; 8.20 ἀγνοίησεν (a surrogate for ἀγνοίῃσι) ω 218; 8.22 ἀγέρθη ω 349. Note that several of these attributions (8.16, 8.22) differ from Steinicke’s. It need hardly be said that the implications of this compositional principle for the emendation of the text are considerable.

- 29.24 ἀμαρτήσεσθαι : ι 512
- 29.25 ἀμφιμέμυκεν : κ 227
- 29.26 ἀμφοτέρωθεν : μ 58
- 29.27 Ἀμφιτρίτη : μ 97
- 29.28 ἀμφογαπαζόμενος : Π 192; cf. ξ 381
- 29.29 ἀμοιβήν : μ 382
- 29.30 ἀμφοῦδας (sic) : ρ 237
- 29.32 Ἀμνισῶ : τ 188
- 29.33 ἀμήχανοι : τ 560
- 30.1 ἀμενηνῶν : τ 562
- 30.3 ἀμμορίην : υ 76
- 30.4 ἀμφιμάσασθε : υ 152
- 30.6 ἀμαρτήσαντες : φ 188
- 30.8 ἀμήσαντες : φ 301
- 30.9 ἀμέρδῃ : φ 290
- 30.10 ἀμφέθετο : φ 431
- 30.12 ἀμφέξεσα : ψ 196
- 30.14 ἄμπνυτο : ω 349.

**13a** Ap. S. Berol. inv. 16705 fr. A verso, gl. 58:

ἀμφοιδίς (ρ 237): περ[ι] τὸ ἔδαφος, [ὁ δ]ὲ Ἡλ[ι]ό[δ]ωρος]  
ἀμφοτέραις ταῖς χερσίν.

**13b** Hsch. α 4153: ἀμφοιδίς (ρ 237): περὶ τὸ ἔδαφος. ὁ δὲ Ἡλιόδωρος ἀμφοτέραις ταῖς χερσίν εἰς τὸ οὐδας ρίπτων.

cf. sch. D ad ρ 237 (sim. sch. H): ἀμφοιδίς: περὶ τὸ ἔδαφος; Orio laud. in Et. Gen. α 751 (= Reitzenstein, Gesch., p. 42.18), unde Et. Sym. α 839 et EM 93.17; Eust. 1818.60: λέγει δὲ ἀμφοιδίς ἐρεῖσαι τὸ πρὸς τῇ γῇ ρῖψαι, καὶ ἔστι ταὐτὸν τῷ πρὸς γῆν ἐλάσαι.

At this point in the narrative Melanthius has just insulted beggar Odysseus and kicked him in the hip; Odysseus is considering the appropriate response: ὁ δὲ μερμήριξεν Ὀδυσσεὺς / ἡὲ μεταΐξας ροπάλῳ ἐκ θυμὸν ἔλοιτο, / ἧ πρὸς γῆν ἐλάσειε κάρη ἀμφοιδίς ἀείρας (ρ 235–37). M. W. Haslam is surely right in thinking the P.Berol. entry defective and in need of supplementation at the end with Hesychius' εἰς τὸ οὐδας ρίπτων.<sup>41</sup> Heliodorus, while accepting οὐδῖς > οὐδας, was dissatisfied with ἀμφί = περί; he evidently felt the need for an

<sup>41</sup> Cf. fr. 35 below, where Heliodorus likewise supplies the hands as object.

instrument in parallel with ῥοπάλῳ in the preceding line. A different instrument is provided by Fick's ἀμφωδίς from \*ἀμφωφαδίς 'with both ears', which, based on an assumed error in μεταγραμματισμός from Old Attic to Ionic script, has won acceptance, e.g., from Bechtel, *Lexilogus*, and Frisk s.v. ἀμφουδίς. J. Russo (*ad loc.*) objects that the result is a comic image inappropriate to the anger of Odysseus, whose alternative is to murder Melanthius; but might he, in his anger, have equally well thought such scurrilous treatment exactly what Melanthius deserved? On the other hand, LSJ, followed by Stanford (*ad loc.*), sees the form as an adverbial extension of ἀμφί on the analogy of ἄμυδις to ἄμα; Stanford translates 'gripping him round (sc. the middle)', LSJ 'lifting by the middle'; though possible, this interpretation seems less plausible both semantically (the instrument — the middle — needs to be supplied) and morphologically (there is no parallel for an extension in -ουδης). One should, in any case, avoid taking refuge, with A. G. Tsopanakis, in the *lectio facilior* ἀμφ' οὐδας ἐρείσας.<sup>42</sup> Though his own solution has failed to carry conviction, Heliodorus did put his finger on a real difficulty, as the continuing controversy illustrates.

14a Ap. S. Berol. inv. 16705 fr. A verso:

ἀνακτορίησι (ο 397): τ[αῖς] δεσποτι[κ]αῖς.  
 'Ηλιόδωρος ἐ[.]α[.]... ]ειαις, ἔνιοι ταῖς  
 ἡγ[ε]μονίαις, 'Αρίσ[τ]αρχ[ος] καὶ βασι-  
 λικαῖς, ὅπ[ερ] βέλ[ι]ον.

14b Hsch. α 4380: ἀνακτορίησι: ταῖς δεσποτικαῖς ἢ βασιλικάις {ὕπηρεσίαις}. ὁ δὲ 'Ηλιόδωρος ταῖς ἀπὸ λεία{ι}ς· "δειπνήσας ἄμ' ὕεσσιν ἀνακτορίησιν ἐπέσθω" (ο 397).

7 ὕπηρεσίαις] clausi | λείαις C: corr. Schmidt

cf. Ap. S. 34.21: ἀνακτορίησι: ταῖς τοῦ ἀνακτος, οἷον τοῦ δεσπότου· "δειπνήσας ἄμ' ὕ{ι}εσσιν ἀνακτορίησιν ἐπέσθω" (ο 397). ἔνιοι δὲ ταῖς ἡγεμονίαις συνεπακολουθεῖτω. ὁ δὲ 'Αρίσταρχος τοῖς τῶν ἀνακτόρων νύασι, ὅπερ ἐστὶ βέλτιον; sch. B Vind. 133 ad ο 397 (brevius Q): ἀνακτορίησιν: ὁ μὲν 'Αρίσταρχος ταῖς δεσποτικαῖς, ὁ δὲ 'Αριστοφάνης, ὃν ἑκαστος ἄρχει, ὅθεν καὶ ὁ χειρῶνας, cui sim. Eust. 1785.38: ἀνακτορίας δὲ ὕας 'Αρίσταρχος μὲν τὰς δεσποτικάς φησιν, 'Αριστοφάνης δὲ ὃν ἑκαστος βόσκων ἀνάσσει, ὃ ἐστὶν ἄρχει. ἀπὸ τοιούτου δὲ ἀνάσσειν γίνεται καὶ χειρῶνας

<sup>42</sup> 'Αμφουδίς, *Hellenika* 12 (1951) 79–93.

ὁ τῆς χειρὸς ἢ τῶν ἐν χερσὶν ἀνάσσω. 2 ταῖς δεσποτικαῖς] cf. Hsch. α 4379; Σ (Phot. α 1528; Ba. 83.14; Su. α 1924)

Eumaeus, about to respond to beggar Odysseus' query about his origins, contrasts their behavior with that of a hypothetical 'other': τῶν δ' ἄλλων ὅτινα κραδίη καὶ θυμὸς ἀνώγει, / εὐδέτω ἐξελθόν· ἅμα δ' ἡοῖ φαινομένῃφι / δειπνήσας ἅμ' ὕεσιν ἀνακτορίησιν ἐπέσθω. / νῶϊ δ' ἐνὶ κλισίῃ πίνοντέ τε δαινυμένω τε / κήδεσιν ἀλλήλων τερπώμεθα λευγαλέοισι, μνωμένω· . . . (ο 395–400). 'Ανακτόριος as an epithet occurs only in this passage; it derives from ἀνάκτωρ, the agent noun to ἀνάσσω.<sup>43</sup> Therefore Aristarchus' explanation of ἀνακτορίησι as the swine 'belonging to the master or king' is very likely to be correct (it is, in fact, accepted by modern scholarship [cf. LSJ s.v.]). In spite of the reading reported by the first editors, it is hard to imagine that the papyrus contained anything except Hesychius' ταῖς ἀπὸ λεία{ι}ς. M. W. Haslam suggests that Heliodorus could have arrived at this definition by an etymology from ἀνάγω, if he equated this with ἄγω in the sense 'carry off as captives or booty' (LSJ s.v. ἄγω I.3.). See addendum.

**15a** Ap. S. 35.17: ἀνάπυστα (λ 274): ἔκδηλα, ἐξάκουστα. ὁ δὲ 'Ηλιόδωρος ἀνάγγελτα.

**15b** Phot. α 1625: ἀνάπυστα: ἀνεκλάλητα, ἀνεξάκουστα. ὁ δὲ 'Ηλιόδωρος ἀνάγγελτα καὶ ἄρρητα. ἡ ἐξάγγελτα καὶ ἔκδηλα καὶ ἐξάκουστα.

3 ἀνεξάκουστα] -αι z

sch. BV ad λ 274: ἀνάπυστα: ἀνὰ στόμα πᾶσι λέγεσθαι καὶ πυνθάνεσθαι· ἡ διάδῃλα; Hsch. α 4533: ἀνάπυστα: φανερά, ἀνήκοα, ἀναφανδὰ; Σ (Ba. 84.27; Su. α 2041): ἀνάπυστα: ἔκπυστα, δηλά; Et. Orion. G (31.3) s.v. ἀναλογία: ἔστιν οὖν ὁ λόγος, ἄλογος, ἀλογία καὶ μετὰ τῆς α στερήσεως, καὶ ἄλλη στέρησις, ἀναλογία. τοιοῦτον δέ ἐστι καὶ τὸ ἀνάπυστα, τὰ περιβόητα· ἐπλεόνασε δὲ τὸ ν ἐν τῇ λέξει τῇ ἀναλογία, ὡς ἐν τῷ ἀναίσχυντος, ἀναιδής, unde EM 97.39; Eust. 1684.36: ἀνάπυστα δὲ τὰ ἀκουστὰ ἢ φανερά, καὶ κατὰ τοὺς παλαιοὺς εἰπεῖν, ἀνὰ στόμα πᾶσι κείμενα πυνθάνεσθαι. γίνεται δὲ ἡ λέξις ἀπὸ τοῦ πεύθω πεύσω, ἐξ οὗ πύστις, ἡ δι' ἐρωτήσεως μάθησις, ὡς ἐκ τοῦ κεύσω ἢ κύστις. ἐκ δὲ τοῦ πύστις ἄπυστον καὶ ἀνάπυστον, καὶ ἄλλως δὲ εἰπεῖν, ἐκ τοῦ πέπυσμαί πέπυσται πυστόν τὸ ἀκουστόν καὶ πλεονασμῷ τοῦ ν δι' εὐφωνίαν ἀνάπυστον.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. Ernst Fraenkel, *Geschichte der griechischen Nomina agentis auf -τήρ, -τωρ, -της (-τ-)*, 2 voll. (Straßburg 1910–12) at 1.18 and 2.22 f.; Ernst Risch, *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*, 2. Aufl. (Berlin-New York 1974) § 40e.

The Odyssean catalogue of women includes the earliest account of the Oedipus saga: μητέρα τ' Οἰδιπόδαο ἴδον, καλὴν Ἐπικάστην, / ἥ μέγα ἔργον ἔρεξεν αἰδρεῖσσι νόοιο, / γημαμένη ᾧ νύϊ· ὁ δ' ὄν πατέρ' ἐξεναρξας / γήμεν· ἄφαρ δ' ἀνάπυστα θεοὶ θέσαν ἀνθρώποισιν. / ἄλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐν Θήβῃ πολυηράτῳ ἄλγεα πάσχων / Καδμείων ἦνασσε θεῶν ὀλοὰς διὰ βουλάς (λ 271–76). Though, like ἀμφοδῖς (fr. 13) and ἀνακτόριος (fr. 14), a Homeric ἄπαξ, ἀνάπυστος continued in use in Ionic; thus Hdt. 6.64 and 6.66.3 clearly confirm the vulgate explanation and refute Heliodorus, who wrongly interpreted the prefix as privative<sup>44</sup> and evidently referred this line (274) to the state of affairs during Oedipus' rule in Thebes (described in vv. 275–76), rather than to the sequel.

16 Ap. S. 33.24: ἀνδραχθέσι (κ 121): οὗς καὶ ἀνὴρ βαστάζων βαρυνθείη{ν} ἂν ὑπερμεγέθεις ὄντας λίθους· “οἱ ῥ' ἀπὸ πετράων ἀνδραχθέσι χερμαδίοισι βάλλον” (ibid.). ὁ Ἡλιόδωρος μέγα βάρος παρεχομένοις τοῖς ἀνδράσιν, ὁ δὲ Ἀπίων (fr. 18 N.) τοῖς ἀνδρὸς βάρος ἔχουσιν. ἡ οἶον ἀνδραχέσιν, κατὰ παρένθεσιν τοῦ θ, ἴν' ἡ τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἄχος ποιοῦσιν.

1 τοὺς C : corr. Bk. 2 βαρυνθείην C : corr. Bk. | ῥ' Steinicke, ut Hom. : δ' C 4 παρεχομένοις Steinicke ex sch. κ 121 : παρεχόμενα C

sch. B ad κ 121: ἀνδραχθέσι χερμαδίοισι: ἥτοι τοῖς δυναμένοις ἄνδρα καταβαρύνειν. ἡ ἄπερ αὐτοῖς μὲν ἦν χερμάδια, ἄλλων δὲ ἄχθοφορήματα· ἡ μέγα βάρος παρέχουσι τοῖς βαστάζουσι; sim. sch. Q ad loc.: μέγα βάρος παρέχουσι τοῖς βαστάζουσιν ἀνδράσι· ἡ εὐγενέσι, τοῖς δυναμένοις ἄνδρα καταβαρύνειν· ἡ μεγάλοις; Hsch. α 4733: ἀνδραχθέσι: τοῖς δυναμένοις καὶ ἀνδράσιν ἄχος ποιῆσαι; EM 102.41: ἀνδραχθέσι: τοῖς καὶ ἄνδρας δυναμένοις βαρύναι διὰ μέγεθος; Eust. 1651.9: λίθοι δὲ ἀνδραχθεῖς οἱ ἀνδροβαρεῖς, οἱ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀνδράσιν ἐπαχθῇ ἂν γένοντο φορήματα.

In the baleful encounter with the Laestrygonians, Antiphates follows his cannibalism with a shout to his compatriots, which meets with this response: οἱ δ' αἰόντες / φοίτων ἴφθιμοι Λαιστρυγόνες ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος, / μυριοί, οὐκ ἄνδρεσσιν εἰκότες, ἀλλὰ Γίγασιν. / οἱ ῥ' ἀπὸ πετράων ἀνδραχθέσι χερμαδίοισι / βάλλον... (κ 118–22). Another Homeric ἄπαξ, ἀνδραχθέσι is clearly compounded from ἀνδρ- and ἄχος; on this point both Apion and Heliodorus are agreed. The debate is over the precise relation of the two terms, whether the bould-

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Heubeck *ad loc.*, who sees the form as a contrary to ἄπυστος.

ers are ‘of a man’s weight’ (Apion) or are a ‘burden for a man’ (sc. to carry; Heliodorus). On Heliodorus’ interpretation ἀνδραχθής would be a verbal rection compound with the object as prior member based on a verb \*ἄχθεω (cf. Hsch. α 8869); on Apion’s view, a determinative *Bahuvrihi* compound with the prior member in genitival relation to the following substantive;<sup>45</sup> the accent would be the same in either case.<sup>46</sup> Both explanations have evidently been developed from the context. Neitzel (*ad* Apion fr. 18) thought Heliodorus’ interpretation preferable because it emphasized, *a fortiori*, the gigantic size of the Laestrygonians (“... die Laistrygonen mit Steinen werfen, die gewöhnliche Männer kaum tragen können”); but the same point emerges from Apion’s explanation, since a burden of a man’s weight can hardly be carried by a normal man, let alone thrown. Possibly Apion was influenced, like Chantraine,<sup>47</sup> by the analogy of μολιβαχθής ‘heavy with lead, leaded’; the analogy is imperfect, however, since in our gloss the prior member is not an added substance; note, too, that μολιβαχθής is attested no earlier than Philip, *AP* 6.103 (like Apion, 1st cen. A.D.). Heliodorus’ interpretation seems closer to the epic thought-world; cf. the description of a boulder’s weight at T 285–87: ὁ δὲ χερμάδιον λάβε χειρὶ / Αἰνείας, μέγα ἔργον, ὃ οὐ δύο γ’ ἄνδρε φέροιεν, / οἶοι νῦν βροτοὶ εἶσ’· ὁ δέ μιν ῥέα πάλλε καὶ οἶος.

17 Ap. S. 34.4: ἀνέξομαι (τ 27): ἐν ἑμαυτοῦ ἔξω· “ξεῖνος ὄδ’· οὐ γὰρ ἀ(ε)ργὸν ἀνέξομαι ὅς κεν ἐμῆς γε / χοίνικος ἄπτηται” (τ 27–28)· οὕτως φησὶν ὁ Ἡλινόδωρος. μήποτε δὲ κοινότερον εἶρηκεν ὡς ἡμεῖς, ὅτι οὐκ ἀργὸν τὸν ξένον ἀνέξομαι ἔχειν.

1 ἑμαυτῷ C : corr. Bekker | post ξεῖνος verba δ’ οὐ γὰρ habuit C<sup>ac</sup>, del. C<sup>1</sup> 2 ἀργὸν] ex Hom. corr. Steinicke

cf. Hsch α 4906: ἀνέξομαι : ὑπομενῶ; Eust. 1853.54: “ξεῖνος ὄδ’· οὐ γὰρ ἀεργὸν ἀνέξομαι ὅς κεν ἐμῆς γε / χοίνικος ἄπτηται καὶ τήλοθεν εἰληλουθῶς” (τ 27–28) ἤγουν οὐδεὶς ἀργὸς τραφήσεται παρ’ ἐμοί. λείπει δέ τι καὶ ἐνταῦθα ἐν τῷ “οὐ γὰρ ἀεργὸν ἀνέξομαι” (τ 27). λέγει γάρ, ὡς οὐκ ἂν ἀνασχοίην ἀργὸν ὄντα ἢ διάγοντα.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. A. Debrunner, *Griechische Wortbildungslehre* (Heidelberg 1917) §§ 99 and 95 respectively; I apply this terminology to bring out the similarity in the practice of both grammarians here to fr. 36 below; I assume that these differences were instinctively felt even though a corresponding terminology was evidently lacking.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Hdn. 2.2.13 and 2.37.16, etc.

<sup>47</sup> S.v. ἄχθομαι; he explains ἀνδραχθής ‘qui fait la charge d’un homme’.

Heliodorus is sometimes fairly scrupulous in respecting the force of prefixes (cf. fr. 1, 25, 42, 48–49); however, he fudges a bit in fr. 18 (see *ad loc.*) and offers a false analysis of the prefix at fr. 15 (in taking ἀνα- as an ἀ-privative). In this instance it is difficult to believe, however, *pace* T. W. Allen (app. crit. *ad* τ 27), that Heliodorus' paraphrase implies a variant reading ἐνέξομαι, since, as D. Blank points out, there surely was no possibility of a μετάφρασις involving ἀνα-. Alternatively, Heliodorus may have thought it necessary to posit a special meaning for ἀνέξομαι in this passage because it lacks the participial or infinitival complement common with it in later Greek (note that Apollonius' paraphrase inserts such an infinitive). 'Ανέχεσθαι with accusative of person is, however, amply paralleled in the sense 'suffer, bear with' (LSJ s.v. ἀνέχω C.II.2.); hence Apollonius was right to resist a special meaning here.

**18** Ap. S. 32.13: ἀνέσαιμι : ἀναπείσαιμι, ἐποτρύναιμι, προτρεψαί-  
μην· “εἰς εὐνὴν ἀνέσαιμι ὁμοῖοι ὠθηῖναι φιλότῃ” (Ξ 209). τοιοῦ-  
τόν ἐστι καὶ τὸ “οὐδὲ κε Τηλέμαχον κεχολωμένον ὦδ' ἀνιεί(ης)” (β  
185). οὐκ ἀναγκαῖόν φησιν (ὁ 'Αρίσταρχος) ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνίας ἀκούειν,  
ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνιέναι. διὸ καὶ δασυντέον, ἴν' ἢ ἀνιείης.  
διὸ καὶ ἐπιφέρει “σὺ οἴκῳ δῶρον ποτιδέγμενος” (β 186)· οἱ γὰρ  
λυποῦντές τινας οὐ λαμβάνουσι δῶρα. εἰ μὲν οὖν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνίας, ἦν  
ἂν τὸ ῥῆμα ἀνιῶης. ἔστι γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆς δευτέρας συζυγίας τῶν περι-  
σπωμένων, ἀνιῶ ἀνιῶς ἀνιῶ ὡς τιμῶ τιμῶς τιμᾶ καὶ ἀπατῶ ἀπατῶς  
ἀπατᾶ· καθὰ οὖν τὸ εὐκτικὸν τοῦ <τιμῶ> τιμῶν <τιμῶς τιμῶ> καὶ  
ἔτι τοῦ <ἀπατῶ> ἀπατῶν ἀπατῶς ἀπατῶ, οὕτως ἀνιῶν ἀνιῶς  
ἀνιῶ. Ἰένιοι δὲ φασὶ δασέως δεῖ(ν) ἀναγινώσκειν καὶ μὴ ψιλῶς. ἐκ  
μὲν τῆς δασυνομένης ἔσται ἐποτρύνοις καὶ ἐπιτρίβοις καὶ παρορ-  
μῶς, εἰ δὲ ψιλῶς, εἰς ἀνίαν ἄγοις. πῶς δ' ἂν ὁ εἰς ἀνίαν ἄγων  
τινὰ(ς) δύναιτ' ἂν παρ' ἐκείνων λαμβάνειν δῶρα; κατὰ δὲ τὴν  
'Ηλιοδώρου ἀπόδοσιν ἀρμόζει {ἐπανείης} κάκεινο οὕτως εἰρησθαι,  
“ἀλλ' ἀνιῆς, ἐπεὶ αὐτὸς ἐγείναιο παῖδ' αἰδῆλον” (Ε 880), τῆς μετα-  
φορᾶς οὔσης ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνιεμένων τῶν κυνῶν κατὰ τὰς θήρας ἀφέ-  
σεως. καὶ τοῦτο τῆς ἀποδόσεως διήκει καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ Τηλεμάχου λέγε-  
σθαι καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀθήνης.

2 ὁμοθηῖναι Hom. : ὁμοιωθηῖναι C 3 ἀνιείης Steinicke post Hom. : ἀνιεί C 4 ὁ  
ἀρίσταρχος suppl. Crönert 5 ἀνιείης Steinicke : ἀνιείσα C 6 σὺ οἴκῳ post Hom.  
Steinicke : ὦ οἴκα C 10–11 τιμῶ et ἀπατῶ suppl. Bekker 10 τιμῶς τιμῶ] suppl.  
Tolle 12 φησι C : corr. Vill. | δεῖ C : corr. R. Janko 13 ἐποτρύνοις C<sup>1</sup> : -εις C<sup>ac</sup> 13–14

παρ- ορμάς C : corr. Vill. 15 τινὰ C : corr. Vill. 16 ἐπαρείης] secl. Bekker 18 ἀνι-  
μένης C : corr. Haslam 19 διήκει] vox suspecta : διαρκεί R. Janko, fort. recte

1 ἀνέσαιμι = ἀπαπείσαιμι] cf. Hsch. (Cyrill.) α 4901; Σ (Ba. 95.19 et [loc. corrupt.] Su. α 2318); EM 109.49; Eust. 1441.1 3 de loco β 185 cf. sch. HMQRV ad loc. (= Hdn. Od. pr. 2.134.27): ἀνιείης: δασυντέον· ἔστι γὰρ ἀντί τοῦ ἀναπειθούς, ἀπὸ μεταφορᾶς τῶν κυνηγῶν τῶν ἐφιέντων τοὺς ἰμάντας τοῖς κυσί. ψιλοῖ δὲ Ἑλλάνικος (fr. 4 M.) παρὰ τὴν ἀνίαν ἐκδεχόμενος τὸ λυποίης. εἰ δὲ τοῦτο, ἐχρῆν γράφειν ἀνιόης· τοιαύτη γὰρ ἡ δευτέρα συζυγία; Lehrs, *Ar.*<sup>3</sup>, p. 308 5 διὸ καὶ δυσυντέον] cf. sch. A (Hdn.) ad Ω 235a 17–18 τῆς μεταφορᾶς οὐσης ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνιμένων τῶν κυνῶν κατὰ τὰς θήρας ἀφέσεως] cf. sch. D ad β 185: ὧδ' ἀνιείης: ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνίημι, ὡς τιθείης. κυνηγετική ἡ λέξις· ὅτε τις κύνα τοῦ δεσμοῦ †ἀμείξ ἀφήσῃ κατὰ θηρός. Ἰ δασυντέον· ἔστι γὰρ ἀντί τοῦ ἀναπειθούς, ἀπὸ μεταφορᾶς τῶν κυνηγ(ετ)ῶν τῶν ἐφιέντων ἰμάντας τοῖς κυσίν. ψιλοῖ δὲ Ἑλλάνικος...

Unimpressed by Halitherses' prophecy, Eurymachus offers a very different assessment of the position: αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεὺς / ὤλετο τῇλ' ὥς καὶ σὺ καταφθίσθαι σὺν ἐκείνῳ / ὦφελες. οὐκ ἂν τόσσα θεοπροπέων ἀγόρευες, / οὐδέ κε Τηλέμαχον κεχολωμένον ὧδ' ἀνιείης, / σῶ οἴκῳ δῶρον ποτιδέγμενος, αἶ κε πόρησιν (β 182–86). The sense of ἀνιείης was disputed in antiquity between those who, like Hellanicus (cf. sch. *ad loc.*, quoted above), connected the word with ἀνία 'pain' and another party who (rightly) saw a connection with ἀνίημι (and, accordingly, asserted interaspiration of the prior iota). As a teacher of Aristarchus' adversary Ptolemy Epithetes, Hellanicus, who, together with Xeno, was a leader of the Χωρίζοντες, is likely to be an elder contemporary of Aristophanes of Byzantium;<sup>48</sup> hence Aristarchus himself is likely to be, as Crönert conjectured, the critic whose name has fallen out; the comment on interaspiration is certainly in line with his doctrine.<sup>49</sup>

This was evidently the state of discussion when Heliodorus came on the scene. Our grammarian's contribution appears to have been to throw into play E 880 as a further parallel (in this passage the wounded Ares complains bitterly to Zeus that he has not restrained Athena: ταύτην δ' οὐτ' ἔπει προτιβάλλει οὔτε τι ἔργῳ, / ἀλλ' ἀνιείης, ἐπεὶ αὐτὸς ἐγείναιο παῖδ' αἰδήλον: E 879–80); also, accepting the connection with ἀνίημι, Heliodorus thinks that a metaphor from the release of dogs in hunting lies at the bottom of the use of this verb in both passages (sc. E 880 and β 185); in the latter passage he is evidently follow-

<sup>48</sup> Cf. Su π 3035; Gudeman, *RE* 8.1 (1912) 153.61 ff. and 154.16 ff.; F. Montanari (n. 1 above) 50–51 and 95.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. Lehrs, *Ar.*<sup>3</sup> 300 ff.; Montanari (n. 1 above) 71, n. 54.

ing an already established interpretation (cf. sch. D *ad loc.*).

Perhaps Heliodorus arrived at his view on the basis of the vulgate explanation of E 880 (sch. D *ad loc.* : ἀνίεις : ἀφίεις); but it is a weakness of his interpretation that he gives undue importance to the term ἄφεις,<sup>50</sup> with ἀνίημι itself added only in a subsidiary way (ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνιεμένων τῶν κυνῶν κατὰ τὰς θήρας ἀφέσεως). Our extant evidence may be deceptive, but on its basis no one would argue that the poet and his audience understood ἀνίημι in these two passages as a metaphor from hunting.

19 Ap. S. 43.29: ἄρπυιαι : ὁ Ἡλίοδωρος ἐν Υ' Ὀδυσσεΐας, “τόφρα καὶ τὰς κούρας Ἄρπυιαι” (υ 77), ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρπάζειν. ἰ ἐμφαίνει δὲ Ὅμηρος ἱπομόρφους αὐτάς. ἐν δὲ τῇ Ἰλιάδι, ἐπὶ <τοῦ> “τοὺς ἔτεκεν Ζεφύρῳ ἀνέμῳ Ἄρπυια Ποδάργη” (Π 150), ὁ μὲν Τιμογένης ἐν ταῖς Παραφράσεσιν ἔδειξεν ὅτι κύριον ὄνομα Ἄρπυια, τὸ δὲ Ποδάργη ἐπιθετον, πλανηθεῖς· τούναντίον γὰρ φαίνεται. ἐν γὰρ ἄλλοις τὸν Ξάνθον καὶ Βάλιον προσαγορεύον ὁ Ἀχιλλεύς φησι, “Ξάνθε τε καὶ {σύ} Βάλιε, τηλεκλυτὰ τέκνα Ποδάργης” (Τ 400)), ὥστε τὴν Ἄρπυιαν ἐπιθετικῶς εἰρήσθαι, οἷον τὴν ἀρπακτικὴν τοῦ δρόμου διὰ τάχους.

1 υ Bk. : σ C 2 καὶ] δὲ Hom. 3 τοῦ] suppl. Vill. 4 τιμογένης] exspectaveris τιμαγένης 8 σύ] post Hom. del. Steinicke

cf. sch. A (Aristonic.) ad Π 150a : “Ἄρπυια Ποδάργη : ἡ διπλῇ, ὅτι Ζηνόδοτος γράφει “Ἄρπυια πόδαργος” ὡς ἐπιθετικόν, ἵν’ ἡ ποδώκης. ἔστι δὲ τὸ κύριον ὄνομα Ποδάργη. σαφές δὲ καὶ ἐκ τούτων· “Ξάνθε τε καὶ Βάλιε, τηλεκλυτὰ τέκνα Ποδάργης” (Τ 400). 2 ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρπάζειν] cf. Et. Orion. G 28.17 : “Ἄρπυια : παρὰ τὸ ἄρπω, οὗ παράγωγον ἀπάζω. οὕτως Ἡρωδιανός (1.281.19; cf. 2.901.35); sim. Et. Gen. (AB) s.v. Ἄρπυια, unde EM 148.28; Λέξ. Ὅμ. α 743; sch. Lyc. Al. 167 : ἄρπυιαι δὲ λέγονται καὶ ὄρνεά τινα ἀρπακτικά . . . ; Eust. 1414.40 : δαιμόνιά τινα περτωτά, οἷα καὶ ἀνθρώπους ἀρπάζειν βιαίως.

The *exemplum* of the daughters of Pandareos, cited by Penelope in her prayer to Artemis, was the inspiration for Heliodorus’ etymology (accepted by Herodian and others) of Ἄρπυιαι from ἀρπάζω : τόφρα δὲ τὰς κούρας Ἄρπυιαι ἀνηρεΐψαντο . . . (υ 77). Penelope’s previous words give clear indication of how this is to be understood: . . . ἡ ἔπειτά μ’ ἀναρπάξασα θύελλα / οἷχοιτο προφέρουσα (υ 63–64).

<sup>50</sup> Its application to hunting is apparently in turn a metaphor from its use as a technical term in races: cf. Poll. 3.147.

Possibly, as D. Blank suggests, the words following Heliodorus' doctrine, ἐμφαίνει δὲ Ὅμηρος ἱππομόρφους αὐτάς, conceal a polemic against Heliodorus on grounds that horses cannot grab. In any case, in view of their different premise, there is no reason to connect these words or the following polemic against Timogenes (Timagenes?) on the respective parts of speech of Ἄρπυια and Ποδάργη in Π 150<sup>51</sup> with Heliodorus, rather than Apollonius himself or an unnamed source, in spite of the fact that, in the end, a similar etymology results (οἶον τὴν ἀρπακτικὴν τοῦ δρόμου διὰ τάχους).

\*20 Ap. S. 72.20: ἐπιβώτορι μήλων (ν 222): ἤτοι βοσκήτορι, (ἢ ἐπιβήτορι) οἶον ἐφιππαστήρι. οἱ τῶν βασιλέων υἱοὶ πρῶτον ἐπὶ κριῶν εἰώθασιν ἐπιβαίνειν, ὥς καὶ Ἡλιόδωρος φησιν. “ἐπιβώτορι μήλων / παναπάλω, οἱοί τε ἀνάκτων παῖδες ἔασιν” (ν 222–23).

1–2 ἢ ἐπιβήτορι Haslam 3 ἡλιόδωρος Ritschl : ἡρόδοτος C | ἐπιβώτορι C : correxī cf. sch. ad ν 223: οἱοί τε ἀνάκτων παῖδες ἔασιν· ὅτι καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς ἔνεμον δι’ ὧν φησιν Ἀνδρομάχη “πάντας γὰρ κατέπεφνε ποδάρκης διὸς Ἀχιλλεύς βουσὶν ἐπ’ εἰλιπόδεσσιν” (Z 423–24). HQ καὶ Αἰνείας περὶ Ἀχιλλέως· “ὅτε βουσὶν ἐπήλυθεν ἡμετέρησιν” (Y 91). H; sim. sch. D ad loc.

Athena appears to Odysseus in disguise after the Phaeacians have put him ashore on Ithaca, which at first he fails to recognize: σχεδόθεν δὲ οἱ ἦλθεν Ἀθήνη, / ἀνδρὶ δέμας εἵκνυα νέω, ἐπιβώτορι μήλων, / παναπάλω, οἱοί τε ἀνάκτων παῖδες ἔασιν, / δίπτυχον ἄμφ’ ὥμοισιν ἔχουσ’ εὐεργέα λωπὴν· / ποσσὶ δ’ ὑπὸ λιπαροῖσι πέδιλ’ ἔχε, χερσὶ δ’ ἄκοντα (ν 221–25).

Even in antiquity there was evidently a division of opinion between those who read ἐπιβήτορι (cod. Pal. 45, a. 1201 = Ludwich's P, as well as Allen's d family; it appears as a correction elsewhere) and the vulgate ἐπιβώτορι, since, in connecting the *nomen agentis* with ἐπιβαίνειν, Heliodorus (and he, rather than Herodotus, for whom no such notion is otherwise attested, is clearly the author in question) surely

<sup>51</sup> H. Erbse (ad sch. A ad Π 150b) moots with a question mark an identification with Τιμαγένης ἢ Τιμογένης, a Milesian historian and rhetorician discussed at Su. τ 590; but this is far from certain. A further problem is the relation of the Timogenes quoted by Apollonius to Zenodotus, who is quoted to the same effect in the scholium just cited. I suspect that this paraphrase had merely followed Zenodotus' interpretation and was cited by Apollonius for reasons of convenience.

presupposed the former reading.<sup>52</sup> Perhaps he was guided by a concern with τὸ πρέπον in preferring a reading which would, in his view, connect the disguised Athena with the sons of kings rather than mere shepherds, but his reading and quite fantastic interpretation have fallen into well deserved oblivion.

**21** Ap. S. 73.5: ἐπειμένε: ἐπημφιεσμένε. ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς I Ὀδυσσεΐας “μεγάλην ἐπειμένον ἄλκην” (vv. 214 et 514) Ἡλιοδόωρος ἀποδίδωσι †πεποιημένον.

2 ἐπειμένον Hom. : -ος C 3 πεποιημένον non intellego : περιβεβλημένον recte Haslam 1 ἐπημφιεσμένε] cf. sch. D ad A 149: ἐπειμένε: ἡμφιεσμένε, περιβεβλημένε (sim. sch. D ad ι 214 et 514)

Odysseus explains the all too justified foreboding that caused him to bring a skin of Maro's wine as he explored an unknown shore with twelve picked men: αὐτίκα γάρ μοι οἷσατο θυμὸς ἀγῆνωρ / ἄνδρ' ἐπελεύσεσθαι μεγάλην ἐπειμένον ἄλκην, / ἄγριον, οὔτε δίκας εἶδ' εἰδότα οὔτε θέμιστας (ι 212–14). On the other hand, the forebodings which Telemus' prophecy aroused in Polyphemus were wide of the mark: ἀλλ' αἰεὶ τινα φῶτα μέγαν καὶ καλὸν ἐδέγμην / ἐνθάδ' ἐλεύσεσθαι, μεγάλην ἐπειμένον ἄλκην (ι 513–14). Heliodorus' gloss as transmitted by C (πεποιημένον) is evidently corrupt; we will need Haslam's περιβεβλημένον to restore sense.

**\*22** Ap. S. 81.24: ζῶστρα (ζ 38): Ἀπίων (fr. 37 N.) τὰ ἐνδύματα τῶν ἀνδρῶν· “ζῶστρά τε καὶ πέπλους καὶ ῥήγεα σιγαλόεντα” (ζ 38). ὁ δὲ Ἡλιοδόωρος βέλτιον τὰ ζώματα, τὰς ζώνας.

3 Ἡλιοδόωρος Duentzer, De Zen. stud. Hom., p. 27, 8 : Ζηνόδορος (cf. Pusch, p. 19) C cf. sch. PQT ad β 38: ζῶστρα: τὰ πρὸς τὴν ζώνην ἐπιτήδεια, πάντα ἃ ἔστι ζώσασθαι, οἷον χιτῶνας καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα. πέπλους δὲ τὰ γυναικεῖα ἐνδύματα καὶ ἐμπερονήματα. ἅπαξ δὲ ἐνταῦθα ἡ ζῶστρα λέγεται; brevius sch. D ad loc.: ζῶστρα: τὰ πρὸς ζώνην ἐπιτήδεια ἐνδύματα· λέγει δὲ χιτῶνας ἢ ζώνας; Hsch. ζ 263: ζῶστρα: τὰ ζώματα, καὶ ζώνας. ἢ χιτῶνας ζωστούς, ἢ χλαῖνας ἀνδρείους. τινὲς δὲ τὰ ἐνδύματα; Σ (Phot. 56.21; Su. ζ 173; Ba. 247.25); Eust. 1550.18: ἔφη δὲ ζῶστρα ἐνταῦθα εἰσάπαζ τὰ πρὸς τὴν ζώνην ἐπιτήδεια οἷς ἔστι ζώσασθαι; Neitzel, pp. 199 et 206

The transmitted name of Zenodorus is the more difficult reading than

<sup>52</sup> This interpretation was first suggested to me by David Blank; for the formation of ἐπιβάτωρ cf. M. Leumann, *Homerische Wörter* (Basel 1950) 92.

Duentzer's conjectured Ἡλινόδωρος, since the former is not otherwise cited in the extant epitome of Apollonius, whereas Heliodorus is regularly contrasted with Apion. However, there is no necessity for Heliodorus always to be the grammarian juxtaposed with Apion, since it cannot be shown that Apollonius knew Apion via Heliodorus.<sup>53</sup> Though a treatment of ζῶστρα is missing from the extant epitome of Zenodorus' contrastive study of Homeric vocabulary with the συνήθεια,<sup>54</sup> the same is also true of Zenodorus' fragments transmitted in the scholia.<sup>55</sup> On the other hand, the ν of Zenodorus, as written in C, differs only slightly from λι, so that, apart from the initial ζ, there is a virtual palaeographic identity of the two names (with the transmitted text made, as M. W. Haslam notes, even more suspect by the ζ- context). Also, it has all the earmarks of a gloss of Heliodorus: it pertains to a passage of the *Odyssey*, is fairly conventional in content (see below) and corresponds to the commoner form for citation of both grammarians, viz. 1) Apion, 2) Heliodorus.<sup>56</sup>

This fragment offers a fairly obvious (and already traditional?) explanation of ζῶστρα by connecting it with the cognate word ζώματα (indeed, ζώνας is attested as a variant reading in this passage: sch. P). More imaginative was Apion's attempt to find in ζ 38 a contrast between men's and women's clothing and carpets,<sup>57</sup> an attempt rejected by Apollonius. If nothing else, this fragment shows that scholars of imperial date had to fall back on guesswork to explain Homeric ἄπαξ λεγόμενα, with some giving preference to context, others to etymology.

23 Ep. Hom. η 26: ἡλίβατος (O 273, 619; κ 88): ὑψηλή, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐκεῖ πρῶτον ἐπιβαίνειν τὸν ἥλιον. τινὲς δὲ ἡλίφατος ἀπὸ τοῦ φωτίζειν τῆς ἀχλὺος τὰ ὑψηλά. ἢ Ἡλινόδωρος δὲ ἀλίβατον, ἐφ' ἣν ἔστιν ἀλιτεῖν βαίνοντας ἢ διὰ τὸ ὕψος ἢ διὰ τραχύτητα. **O Et. Gud.**

1 ὑψηλή d Ecl. : ὁ ὑψηλός O | post ὑψηλή add. d<sup>1</sup> π(αράγ)εται s.l. 2 τινὲς O : τινὲς δὲ

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Schenck (n. 9 above), who, however, accepts Duentzer's conjecture (27, n. 1).

<sup>54</sup> Miller, *Mélanges de littérature grecque* (Paris 1868) 407 ff. = LGM 253 ff.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. H. Pusch, *Quaestiones Zenodoteae*, diss. (Halis Saxonum 1889) 21–22. This fact has roused suspicion that the alleged epitome may be inauthentic, a mere compilation from the Porphyry-scholia: cf. Schrader, *Porph. Q.H.* 1, 433; Erbse, LGM, XV; K. Nickau, *RE* 10A s.v. Zenodotos 2 (Munich 1972) 21.22.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. fr. 28, 30, 34, 36, 41, 48, 49.

<sup>57</sup> See Neitzel, ll.cc.

ἀντὶ τοῦ β τὸ φ γράφουσι d : ἡ Ecl. 3 ἡλιοδωρος δὲ O d : ἡ Ecl. 1 ἐφ' ἣν O : ἀφ' οὗ d Ecl. 3-4 ἔστιν ἀλιτεῖν d Ecl. : ἀλιτεῖν (pr. ι in loco alterius litt. inc.) ἔστιν O 4 βαίνοντα d Ecl. : βαίνοντα O | pr. ἡ O Ecl. : om. d | διὰ τὸ ὕψος d Ecl. : δι' ὕψος O

AO 1, 194.9-12 (192f); Et. Gud. d 78<sup>v</sup>-79<sup>r</sup> || brevius Ap. S. 83.25: ἡλίβατος: ὑψηλή, ἐφ' ἣ ὁ ἥλιος πρῶτον βάλλει; Ep. Hom. ex Ecl. (AO 2.445.25) 3-4 ἀλίβατον — ] cf. Hdn. II. pr. (2.96.34) = sch. A ad O 619a<sup>1</sup> = Hdn. παθ. (2.259.24): ἡλίβατος: ψιλῶς· ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀλιτεῖν ἐσχημάτιται . . . ; Et. Gen. (AB) s.v. ἡλίβατος: δύσβατος καὶ (καὶ om. B) ὑψηλὸς τόπος, μέγας, ἐφ' ᾧ ἂν τις βαίνων ἀλιτεῖ, ὃ ἐστὶν ἀμαρτάνει. ψιλοῦται· ἀπὸ γὰρ τοῦ ἀλιτεῖν ἀλιτῶ ἀλιτόβατος καὶ συγκοπῇ (κατὰ συγκοπὴν B) καὶ ἐκτάσει ἀλίβατος καὶ ἡλίβατος. δηλοῖ δὲ καὶ ἡ συναλιφῇ “τὸν μὲν τ' ἡλίβατος πέτρην” (O 273) . . . ; sch. Pi. O. 6.109c: πέτρην ἀλίβατον: καὶ ἥτοι ἐφ' ἣς βαίνοντα ἔστιν ἀλιτεῖν διὰ τὸ ὕψος . . . ; Eust. 1033.33: τὸ δὲ ἡλίβατος οὐ μόνον ἐψίλουν οἱ παλαιοί, καθὰ καὶ ἄλλοι ἐδηλώθη (loc. nondum repert.) ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀλιτεῖν, ὃ ἐστὶν ἀποτυχεῖν καὶ ἀμαρτεῖν τῆς ἐκεῖ βάσεως, ἀλλὰ τινες καὶ ἐδάσυνον . . .

The etymology of ἡλίβατος remains hardly less a puzzle today than it was in antiquity. Heliodorus' theory, unlike other ancient etymologies, does justice to the unaspirated initial vowel, unambiguously attested at O 273 (though dialectal variation could also be invoked to account for it); this fact no doubt explains the support of Herodian, who offers ἡλιτόμηρος (T 118) as a parallel for the lengthening. Though this parallel (and ἡλιτοεργός) were still cited by Buttmann,<sup>58</sup> these parallels are imperfect, because our epithet is not a verbal rection compound; Frisk (s.v. ἡλίβατος) still gives the etymology as “unerklärt”.

24 Ap. S. 100.19: κλίσιον (ω 208): τῶν ἅπαξ εἰρημένων, ἐν τῇ Ω τῆς Ὀδυσσεΐας, “περὶ δὲ κλίσιον θέε πάντη, / ἐν τῷ σίτεσκον(το)” (ω 208-9), ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ. ὁ μὲν Ἡλιόδωρος τὰς κύκλῳ καὶ ἔξω καταλύσεις εἴρηκεν, ὁ δὲ Ἀρίσταρχος (τὸ) κυκλόθεν τοῦ οἴκου οἶον ἐκ στιβάδων ᾠκοδομημένον, πρὸς οὗ καὶ οἱ θρόνοι ἔκειντο, ὥστε οὖν καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῶν καθιζομένους δειπνεῖν καὶ ἐγκοιμᾶσθαι. ὁ δὲ Ἀπίων (fr. 49 N.) φησὶν οὕτως· κλίσιον ἢ βάσις ἐφ' ἣς κεῖται ὁ θρόνος· “περὶ δὲ κλίσιον θέε πάντη” (ω 208), ὃ ἐστὶ δι' ὅλου τοῦ οἴκου.

#### 4 τὸ] supplevi

cf. sch. V = D ad ω 208: κλίσιον: ἅπαξ εἴρηται. σημαίνει δὲ ἐξέδραν τινὰ σιγμα-τοιειδῇ, ἐν ἣ ἔκειντο οἱ κλισμοί. ἡ κρηπίδωμα, ἐφ' οὗ ἐκαθέζοντο ἢ ἐκοιμῶντο; sch. Vind. 56 ad loc.: κλίσιον: ἄλλο τὸ παρὰ Ἀττικοῖς κλίσιον. κάκεινο μὲν γὰρ ἀμαξῶν καὶ ζευγῶν δεκτικόν, ὃ νῦν Ῥωμαῖοι παρὰ τὴν στάσιν σταυλὸν φασιν. τοῦτο δὲ παρὰ τὸ κλείειν, ὃ ἐστὶ περιέχειν, ἐν μέσῳ τοὺς οἴκους . . . ; Hsch. (Diogen.) κ 3017: κλισίον: πανδοχεῖον ἢ βάσις, ἐφ' ἣ τίθεται ὁ θρόνος; Eust. 1957.39: “ἐνθα οἶ,” φησὶν,

<sup>58</sup> *Lexilogus* 2 (Berlin 1825) 176 ff.

“οἶκος ἦν, περὶ δὲ κλίσιον θέε πάντη” (ω 208), ὁποῖά τι χαράκωμα τῶν ἐντὸς ἡ καὶ ἐρκίον ἐπαύλεως.

Homeric ἄπαξ λεγόμενα are especially difficult when later usage provides no guide (cf. sch. Vind. 56 *ad* ω 208, quoted above); as we have seen (*ad* fr. 22 above), the ancient interpreters were then forced to take refuge in context and/or etymology. Such a case is the κλίσιον of ω 208–9, which ran around the house of Laertes and where the slaves took their meals, sat and slept (ἐν τῷ σιτέσκοντο καὶ ἵζανον ἡδὲ ἵανον: ω 209). Heliodorus interpreted it as the slaves’ dwellings (καταλύσεις), located around the house; Aristarchus thought of it as built from straw or twigs (στιβάς) placed round about the house (R. Janko reports that bundles of twigs are still used as seats in the homes of the poorest Laconian peasants); Apion thought it was a platform on which chairs were placed. Dorotheus of Ascalon, who devoted an entire book to the word, came no further with its semantics than: τὸ οὖν χωροῦν κλίνας πολλὰς καὶ θρόνους κλίσιον ἐκάλουν.<sup>59</sup> Since we lack access to the arguments (which are likely to have been largely guesswork based on etymology and/or context anyway<sup>60</sup>), the meaning of κλίσιον in ω 208 cannot be finally settled, though Aristarchus’ explanation, with its apparent grasp of the primitiveness of life in the Homeric age, seems most plausible.

25 Ap. S. 136.17: προ(ῦ)τυψαν: προενέσεισαν· “Τρῶες δὲ προ(ῦ)τυψαν” (N 136, O 306, P 262). ὅταν δὲ ἐν τῇ Ω τῆς Ὀδυσσεΐας λέγῃ ἐπὶ τοῦ Λαέρτου “μένος προῦτυψεν” (v. 319), ὁ Ἡλίοδωρος, προ{σ}έπεισεν, προ{σ}έσεισεν.

1 πρότυψαν utrumque] correxī 2–3 ἐπὶ τοῦ Λαέρτου μένος προῦτυψεν] transpos. Vill.: post ἡλίοδωρος hab. C 3–4 προσέπεισεν C: corr. Haslam 4 προσέσεισεν C: corr. Haslam

1 προενέσεισαν] cf. sch. D *ad* N 136: προῦτυψαν: προέβαλον, προέκρουσαν; sch. D *ad* P 262: προῦτυψαν: πρώτων ἐνέβαλον; Hsch. π 4048: προῦτυψαν: προένευσαν, προῆλθον, προεχώρησαν (sim. Hsch. π 4049); Σ (Phot. 465.22; Ba. 353.8; Su. π 2915) 3–4 προέπεισεν] cf. sch. V = D *ad* ω 319: προῦτυψε προενέπεισεν; Eust. 1962.38: “δριμὺ μένος προῦτυψεν”, ἦγουν προενέπεισε ταῖς ῥίσιν. ὁ δὲ προπάσχει ὡς τὰ πολλὰ ὁ μέλλων δακρύειν. ἡ δὲ λέξις τοῦ προτύπτειν καὶ ἐν Ἰλιάδι, πλὴν πολεμικῇ, ὡς δηλοῖ

<sup>59</sup> *Apud* Porph. Q.H. 2.132.13.

<sup>60</sup> M. W. Haslam moots the possibility that not only Dorotheus’, but also Heliodorus’ gloss may have been motivated by etymology.

τὸ “Τρῶες δὲ προὔτυψαν”. καὶ ἄλλως δὲ νῦν προτύψαι τὸ μὴ ἐντός που τύψαι, ἀλλὰ πρὸ τοῦ ἀκρωτηρίου τοῦ ῥίνος.

Apollonius’ gloss occurs within a series of Iliadic entries: 136.13 προτραπέσθαι : Z 236; 136.14 προτιβάλλεαι : E 879; next our gloss; then 136.20 πρυμνόν : E 339; 136.22 πρυμνωρεῖν : Ξ 307; 136.23 πρόμολε : Σ 392 etc. The phrase Τρῶες δὲ προὔτυψαν ἀολλέες, which is used three times of the Trojan advance in the *Iliad*, was conventionally translated as προέβαλον, προέκρουσαν (sch. D ad N 136), of which Apollonius’ rendering προενέσεισαν is a slight variation (and a rare one at that; LSJ gives the word as transitive and cites only Plut. *Eum.* 6.4: . . . τοὺς μετ’ αὐτοῦ στρατευομένους . . . προενσεῖσαι τῷ Κρατερῷ . . .).

As was his wont, after recording this vulgate explanation, Apollonius cast about for further material and found Heliodorus’ comment à propos the scene in which, confronting Laertes for the first time upon his return, Odysseus cannot refrain from telling yet another made-up tale, at which the old man groans and pours dust on his head; Odysseus’ response is as follows: τοῦ δ’ ὠρίνετο θυμός, ἀνὰ ῥίνας δέ οἱ ἦδη / δριμύ μένος προὔτυψε φίλον πατέρ’ εἰσορόωντι (ω 318–19).

Apollonius’ report of Heliodorus’ interpretation of ω 319 is corrupt; προσέσεισεν is *vox nihili*, and his προσέπεσεν labors under the grave suspicion of likewise originating in the confusion of προ- and προσ- (the two being often written identically in minuscule script). If the restoration here adopted is correct, Heliodorus’ originality is in doubt since a very similar gloss (= προενέπεσεν) is found in the D-scholium *ad loc.* Apollonius’ procedures in excerpting doubtless account for the absence of the expected contrast between Heliodorus’ Odyssean gloss and the Iliadic one at the beginning of the entry.

**26** Ap. S. 141.3: σεύας (O 681): παρορμήσας. ὅταν δὲ φῇ “καὶ τὰς μὲν σεῖαν ποταμὸν δινήεντα” (ζ 89), ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀπεσόβησαν. καὶ τὸ “εἴ περ ἂν αὐτὸν / σεύωνται” (Γ 25–26) σοβῶσι μεθ’ ὀρμῆς. οὕτως καὶ Ἡλιόδωρος.

2 τὸ s.l. add. C<sup>1</sup>

1 σεύας = παρορμήσας] cf. Hsch. σ 461; ὀρμήσας vel sim.: sch. D ad O 681; Lex. Aἰμ. δ 10; Et. Gen. (AB) s.v. σεῖω: τὸ ὀρμῶ καὶ διώκω· ἀπὸ τοῦ σῶ σεῖω; EM 710.1; Eust. 658.14 2 ἀπεσόβησαν] cf. sch. D ad ζ 89 (ἐδίωξαν) 3 σοβῶσι μεθ’ ὀρμῆς] διώκωσι vel sim.: sch. D ad Γ 26; Hsch. σ 468

Perhaps σεύας, the last of the σε- glosses in Ap. S. C, should be taken, like the preceding entries (141.1 σέλας πυρός: T 366 and 141.2 Σελήεις for the sake of Σελλοί at Π 234), to refer to the *Iliad*; hence I have assigned it to O 681, from the traditional interpretation of which it hardly differs (cf. sch. D *ad loc.*). Heliodorus' material probably begins with the *Odyssey* verse (ζ 89); since Heliodorus' name has evidently been tacked onto a previously existing entry (note καί), he need not have offered anything more than (ἀπ)εσόβησαν μεθ' ὁρμῆς as a gloss on σεῦαν in that passage, as M. W. Haslam suggests.

**27** Ap. S. 142.22: σκίδναται (Λ 308, η 130): σκεδάννυται, ὅ ἐστι σκορπίζεται· ὁ δὲ Ἡλιόδωρος χωρίζεσθαι καὶ “σκεδάσον <δ>” ἀποκήδεα θυμοῦ” (θ 149).

1 ὅ ἐστι Bk.: οἶον C 2 post Ἡλιόδωρος suppl. Schenk σκίδνασθαι | δ'] Schenk ex Hom.

ex gl. nostra (iam corrupta?) Hsch. α 979: σκίδναται: διασκεδάννυται, σκορπίζεται, χωρίζεται. 1–2—σκορπίζεται] cf. sch. D ad A 487 2 σκορπίζεται] cf. sch. D ad α 274 et θ 149; Hsch. σ 980–81; Σ (Phot. 520.10; Ba. 366.8; Su. σ 603); sch. Nic. Th. 329a 2 χωρίζεσθαι] cf. Ap. S. 142.20: σκέδασον: χώρισον (Heliodoro attrib. Schenck)

As D. Blank points out, Heliodorus evidently arrived at his definition specifically for θ 149, where the presence of the genitive θυμοῦ suggests the idea of separation. Hence Schenck's σκίδνασθαι, which would make α 274 the focus of Heliodorus' interpretation (μνηστήρας μὲν ἐπὶ σκίδνασθαι ἄνωχθι), is not wanted.

**28** Ap. S. 144.7: σπιλάδες (ε 405): ὁ μὲν Ἀπίων (fr. 125 N.) αἱ ἐν ὕδατι κοῖλαι πέτραι, ὁ δὲ Ἡλιόδωρος αἱ παραθαλάσσιοι πέτραι καὶ πεπιλημένοι ὑπὸ τῶν κυμάτων.

hinc Σ (Phot. 531.6; Ba. 368.30; Su. σ 943): σπιλάδες: αἱ ἐν ὕδατι κοῖλαι πέτραι, ὡς Ἀπίων· Ἡλιόδωρος δὲ τὰς παραθαλασσίας πέτρας καὶ τεπιλημμένας ὑπὸ τῶν κυμάτων, et Lex. cod. Coislin. 347 asserv., typis impr. AP 4.175.18 2–3 αἱ παραθαλάσσιοι —] cf. sch. EQV ad γ 298: σπιλάδεσσι δὲ ταῖς παραλίαις πέτραις, παρὰ τὸ ἐσπιλῶσθαι· ἢ ταῖς κατὰ θάλασσαν περιειλημμέναις ἐν ὀλίγῳ ὕδατι, unde Eust. 1468.28: σπιλάδες δὲ ὡς οἱ παλαιοὶ φασιν, αἱ παράλαι (sic; lege -οι) πέτραι παρὰ τὸ σπιλοῦσθαι τῇ ἄχνη; Et. Gen. (AB) s.v. σπιλάδες, unde EM 724.2; Et. Gud. cz: σπιλάδεσιν (γ 298, ε 401): παραλίαις πέτραις, παρὰ τὸ ἐσπιλῶσθαι· ἢ ταῖς καταθαλασσίαις περιειλημμέναις ἐν ὀλίγῳ ὕδατι· καὶ ἄλλως σπιλάδες αἱ ὕφαλοι πέτραι. ἢ παρὰ τὸν σπῖλον, ὁ σημαίνει τὸν ῥύπον (ἢ παρὰ — z: om. c).

Heliodorus' interpretation of σπιλάδες seems to have been based

above all on the following narrative from Nestor's account of his homecoming: ἔστι δέ τις λισσὴ αἰπεῖά τε εἰς ἄλλα πέτρη / ἐσχατιῇ Γόρτυνος ἐν ἡρωεῖδεϊ πόντῳ· / ἔνθα νότος μέγα κύμα ποτὶ σκαιὸν ῥίον ὤθει, / ἐς Φαιστόν, μικρὸς δὲ λίθος μέγα κύμ' ἀποέργει. / αἱ μὲν ἄρ' ἐνθ' ἤλθον, σπουδῇ δ' ἤλυξαν ὄλεθρον / ἄνδρες, ἀτὰρ νῆας γε ποτὶ σπιλάδεσσιν ἔαξαν / κύματ'· (γ 293–99). Heliodorus' idea that the σπιλάδες are on the seacoast (παραθαλάσσιοι) is clearly in line with the description of the λισσὴ αἰπεῖά τε εἰς ἄλλα πέτρη and the headland (ῥίον; cf. ε 405: ἄλλ' ἀκταὶ προβλήτες ἔσαν σπιλάδες τε πάγοι τε). Heliodorus clearly has in mind an etymology from *πεπιλημένα* ὑπὸ τῶν κυμάτων ('having been compacted by the waves'); his etymology was later ousted, however, by a derivation from *σπιλοῦσθαι* ('to be stained', sc. by foam). On the other hand, Apion's conception that the σπιλάδες were *in* the sea probably derives from ε 401: καὶ δὴ δοῦπον ἄκουσε ποτὶ σπιλάδεσσι θαλάσσης; possibly he added the qualifier 'hollow' (κοῖλαι) for etymological reasons, as Neitzel has suggested (*ad* Apion fr. 125) with reference to the later attested etymology from σπέος (cf. sch. P *ad* ε 405; Et. Gen.). In any case, Heliodorus' etymology fits the Homeric contexts much better than Apion's or the explanation that the σπιλάδες were reefs beneath the sea (αἱ ὕφαλοι πέτραι: sch. E *ad* ε 405; Et. Gen., Et. Gud.).

**29** Ap. S. 144.13: σταυροί (Ω 453, ξ 11): καταπήγες καὶ σκόλοπες καὶ πάντα τὰ διανιστάμενα ξύλα· ἀφ' ἧς ἐννοίας καὶ οἱ καθ' ἡμᾶς ὀνομάζονται. Ἰό δὲ Ἡλίοδωρος σταυροὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐστάναι, οἱ λεγόμενοι ἴσκοπιοι.

3 σκοπιοί C : σκόλοπες aut σταυροί Villoison

hinc Hsch. σ 1664: σταυροί: οἱ καταπεπηγότες σκόλοπες, χάρακες καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐστῶτα ξύλα, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐστάναι; cf. sch. b (ex.) *ad* Ω 453a: (σταυροῖσι) (add. Bk.): σταυροί εἰσι ξύλα ἀπωξυσμένα (ἀπε- b: corr. Haslam, ut etiam sch. ξ 11 *infra* [bis]) ἀμφοτέρωθεν καὶ προσπεπηγμένα τῇ γῇ πρὸς τὸ εἶργειν τοὺς εἰσιέναι βουλομένους; sim. sch. A<sup>a</sup> (Dlx) *ad* Ω 453b: <σταυροῖσιν πυκνιοῖσι> (add. Duchesne): ὀξέσι ξύλοις, σκόλοψι | πυκνοῖς; sch. Q *ad* ξ 11: σταυρούς: ὠξυσμένα ξύλα καὶ ὀρθὰ ἔπηξε πρὸς τὸ ἀντιβαίνειν τῷ τοίχῳ; sim. sch. D = V *ad* loc.: σταυρούς: τὰ ὀρθὰ καὶ ἀπωξυσμένα ξύλα; Σ<sup>p</sup> (Phot. 535.1; Su. σ 1011; sch. Patm. Thuc. 2.75.1): σταυροί: τὰ ὀρθὰ πεπηγότα ξύλα; partim ex sch. Ep. alph. (AO 2.410.6): σταυρός: παρὰ τὸ στα καὶ τὸ εὖρος, ὃ σημαίνει τὸ πλάτος. | παρὰ δὲ τῷ ποιητῇ σταυροί (Gaisford: στροια Barocc.) λέγονται τὰ ἀπωξυσμένα (ἀπο-: corr. exi) ξύλα, ἅπερ καὶ σκόλοπας καλεῖ· “σταυροῖσι πυκνιοῖς” (Gaisford: ποικίλας Barocc.; Ω 453); ex Σ<sup>b</sup> + x + Ep. alph. fluxit Et. Gen. (AB) s.v. σταυρούς (-ός B<sup>im</sup>): σταυροὺς ἔλεγον (στ. ἔλ. A: om. B) οἱ παλαιοὶ ὀρθὰ ξύλα, παρὰ τὴν στάσιν, ἅπερ ἐξῶθεν περιτίθεται ταῖς αὐλαῖς πρὸς τὸ μὴ στενοχωρεῖ-

σθαι τὰ ζῶα ἐν τοῖς συφετοῖς. ἰεῖρηται δὲ καὶ ὁ παρ' ἡμῖν σταυρός παρὰ τὴν στάσιν καὶ τὸ εὖρος κτλ., unde EM 725.28; Eust. 1748.51: σταυροὶ δὲ ὀρθὰ καὶ ἀπωξυμένα ξύλα. τὰ καὶ σταύαρα παρὰ τοῖς μὴ λαλοῦσιν εὐγενῶς. γίνονται δὲ παρὰ τὴν εἰς ἀέρα στάσιν ἢ παρὰ τὸ εἰς εὖρος ἵστασθαι. οἱ δὲ αὐτοὶ καὶ σκόλοπες λέγονται . . .

Σκοπίοι is *vox nihili*; σκορπίοι would be an obvious correction but is possible only on the assumption that there is reference to some (technical?) sense of the term otherwise unattested. In any case, Heliodorus is the earliest author known to put forward an etymology from ἐστάναι or the like,<sup>61</sup> which later became standard (cf. Ep. alph., Et. Gen., Eust.).

The first of four alphabetized ΣΤ- glosses in C, σταυροὶ is followed immediately by two Iliadic glosses, στέρνον (B 479 al.) and στεροπηγερέτιο (ἄπαξ at Π 298). Apollonius could, of course, have found Heliodorus' comment under ξ 11 even if his initial source pertained to Ω 453.

**30** Cyrill. Lex. (asserv. cod. Bodl. auct. T. II.ii; typis impr. AP 4.191.17): στίβη (ε 467, ρ 25): δηλοῦται ὥς μὲν Ἀπίων (fr. 126) ψῦχος, ὥς δ' Ἡλιόδωρος πάχνη· Ἀπολλόδωρος (FGrHist 244 F 274) τὸ ἐξ αἰθρίας ψύχος.

**2** ἄπιος cod.

cf. Hsch. σ 1846 (emend. Mus.): στίβη: ψῦχος, πάχνη· “μή με δαμάσση(ς) / στίβη ὑπιο(ς>)” (ρ 24–25); Su. σ 1099: στίβη: πηγυλῖς, ἢ πάχνη. Ὅμηρος· “στίβη ὑπιοή” (ρ 25), τοῦτέστιν ὀρθρινή; sch. BT ad ε 467: στίβη τε: ἡ ἐωθινὴ νύχρα; sch. B ad loc.: ἡ πάχνη, ἀπὸ τοῦ στιβάζεσθαι; sch. E ad loc.: τὸ ἐξ αἰθρίας κρύος γενόμενον μάλιστα παρὰ τοὺς πόδας καὶ τὰς χεῖρας ἅμα ἡμέρα, ὅπερ ἔνιοι λέγουσι μάκην; sch. PQ ad loc.: ἡ ἐωθινὴ νύχρα, ἡ πάχνη. τῶν ἄπαξ δὲ εἰρημένων ἡ λέξις; sch. V = D ad loc.: ἡ πάχνη κατὰ ἀντίφρασιν, ἢ τὸ ἐωθινὸν ψῦχος; sch. V = D ad ρ 25: στίβη ὑπιοή: ὁ παγετὸς ὁ ὀρθρινός; Eust. 1546.45: στίβη δέ, ὥς που καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς, ἡ ἐωθινὴ πάχνη, παρὰ τὸ στεῖβω, τὸ καταπατῶ καὶ πυκνοποιῶ; ibid. 1810.60: “μή με δαμάσση / στίβη ὑπιοή” (ρ 24–25), ἤγουν ἡ ἐωθινὴ πάχνη, ὥς προγεγραπταί.

*Pace* sch. PQ ad ε 467, στίβη is not a ἄπαξ λεγόμενον. Though landed on Scheria, Odysseus' problems are by no means over; he contemplates grim alternatives: ὦ μοι ἐγὼ, τί πάθω; τί νύ μοι μήκιστα γένηται; / εἰ μὲν κ' ἐν ποταμῷ δυσκηδέα νύκτα φυλάσσω, / μὴ μ' ἄμυδις στίβη τε κακὴ καὶ θήλυς ἐέρση / ἐξ ὀλιγηπελῆς δαμάσση κεκαφηότα θυμόν· / αὖρη δ' ἐκ ποταμοῦ ψυχρὴ πνέει ἡῶθι πρό. / εἰ δέ κεν ἐς κλιτὺν ἀναβὰς καὶ δάσκιον ὕλην / θάμνοισι ἐν πυκνιοῖσι καταδράθω, . . . δεῖδω

<sup>61</sup> Might Philoxenus already have mooted a derivation from \*στῶ? Cf. fr. \*598 Theodoridis (στατήρ).

μὴ θήρεσσιν ἔλωρ καὶ κύρμα γένωμαι (ε 465 ff.). Arguing that the town is better for a mendicant's purposes, beggar-Odysseus proposes to Telemachus that he should be led there: ἐμὲ δ' ἄξει ἀνὴρ ὅδε, τὸν σὺ κελεύεις, / αὐτίκ' ἐπεὶ κε πυρὸς θερὴν ἀλέη τε γένηται. / αἰνῶς γὰρ τὰδε εἶματ' ἔχω κακά· μή με δαμάσση / στίβη ὑπιοίη· ἕκαθεν δέ τε ἄστρ' φάτ' εἶναι (ρ 22–25). In both passages στίβη is perceived as a danger to the traveler. Though στίβη is associated with cold in both passages (note the reference to the cold wind from the river at ε 469 and the compounding factor of εἶματα . . . κακά at ρ 24), there can be no doubt but that Heliodorus' interpretation of στίβη as 'hoar-frost' is correct against the interpretation of it as 'cold' in general (Apion) or 'the cold generated by the clear cold air (of night)' (Apollodorus); hence the contrast with the 'soft dew' at ε 467<sup>62</sup>; though if the word were ἄπαξ λεγόμενον at ρ 25, one would be hard pressed to choose between the definitions of Apollodorus and Heliodorus.

**31** Ap. S. 145.33: στίλβων (ζ 237): Ἡλιοδωρος {εἰς τὸ} περιλάμπων. ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἡμῖν συνήθης ἡ λέξις.

1 εἰς τὸ utpote dittogr. secl. Haslam; cf. fr. sq.

cf. sch. D ad Γ 392: στίλβων: λάμπων; Poll. 2.63 et 87, 3.71; Hsch. σ 1859: στίλβει: λάμπει; Et. Gen. (A; al. B): στίλβω: τὸ λάμπω· παρὰ τὸ στέλλω στίλβω, unde (ex recens. plenior) EM 728.2; Eust. 1842.26: . . . ὥσπερ τὸ “μάρναντο δέμας πυρός” (A 596, N 673, P 366, Σ 1) ἀντὶ τοῦ ὡς πῦρ, οὕτω καὶ “στίλβων κάλλει” (Γ 392) τὸ λάμπει· σθαι τὴν ὄψιν . . .

If not the most original of Heliodorus' interpretations (it merely adds an intensive περι- to the vulgate gloss: cf. sch. D<sup>63</sup>), his treatment of στίλβω at least shows that he did not deal exclusively with rare Homeric words and usages; he did not despise explaining even common words (cf. Apollonius' comment: συνήθης ἡ λέξις).

<sup>62</sup> Cf. LSJ s.v. στίβη and s.v. θήλυς Π.1. Hainsworth *ad* ε 467 finds θήλυς in this sense open to the same objection as τρόφιμος, i.e., that it would be purely ornamental and awkward in combination with στίβη κακή, and hence prefers the sense 'moist', 'soaking', 'chilly'; I fail to see that the objection applies to στίβη and find no parallel in early poetry for such a sense for θήλυς.

<sup>63</sup> D. Blank queries whether Heliodorus may have been influenced by περιχεύεται in the simile at ζ 232.

32 Ap. S. 146.2: στρεύ(γ)εσθαι (μ 351): καταπονεῖσθαι. ὁ δὲ Ἡλίο-  
δωρος εἰς τὸ στραγεύεσθαι μετέιληφε τὴν λέξιν· “ἢ δηθὰ στρεύ-  
(γ)εσθαι ἐν αἰνῇ δηϊοτήτι” (O 512).

1 et 2–3 στρεύεσθαι] στρεύεσθαι post Hom. praeter L<sup>4</sup> (μ 351) Alberti 2 στρατεύ-  
εσθαι C : corr. Haslam | post τὴν rasura ca. 5 litterar. capax 3 αἰνῇ] α in gutta vel in  
loco alterius litt. inc.

hinc Hsch. σ 1988: (στρεύεται:) στραγέυεται (στρατ- Marc., corr. Haslam), ταλαιπω-  
ρεῖται, καταπονεῖται, (σ)τρ[αγγέυεται], τριψημερεῖ (textum post Musurum restitui; cf.  
Ap. S., Hsch. τ 1474 et Eust. 1441.59); cf. Glossogr. fr. 30 = sch. Nic. Al. 291a; Didym.  
fr. 34, p. 69 Schm. = sch. Ap. Rh. 4.1058a: στρευγομένοις: φθειρομένοις καὶ κατα-  
πονουμένοις ἢ καὶ προσδιατριβουσιν· ὅθεν καὶ στράγξ ἡ κατὰ βραχὺ πρόεσις τοῦ  
ὔδατος· οὕτω Δίδυμος; sch. D ad O 512: στρεύεσθαι: ταλαιπωρεῖν, κακοπαθεῖν;  
sch. A (Nic.) ad O 511–12: (βέλτερον ἢ ἀπολέσθαι ἓνα χρόνον ἢ ἐ βιώναι, / ἢ δηθὰ  
στρεύεσθαι ἐν αἰνῇ δηϊοτήτι) (le. add. Friedländer): διαστολὴ ἐπὶ τὸ βῖωσαι, μέχρι  
δὲ αὐτοῦ συναπτεόν· ὁ γὰρ λόγος, ἢ ἀποθανεῖν ἢ ζῆσαι συντόμως βέλτιόν ἐστιν ἢ  
μετὰ παρολκῆς καταπονεῖσθαι; sch. H ad μ 351: στρεύεσθαι: κατὰ στράγγα φθείρε-  
σθαι, ἤγουν κατ’ ὀλίγον; sch. B ad loc.: κατὰ στράγγα ἐκρεῦσαι, ὅ ἐστι κατ’ ὀλίγον  
στραγγίσαι καὶ ἀποθανεῖν; sch. V = D ad loc.: κατὰ στράγγα, ὅ ἐστι κατ’ ὀλίγον,  
ὑπορρεῖν; Et. Gen. (AB): στρεύεσθαι: οἶον στραγγίζεσθαι, κατ’ ὀλίγον κινεῖσθαι  
καὶ ἐκλείπειν· οὕτως Ἀριστονίκος· | ταλαιπωρεῖν, κακοπαθεῖν (ταλ. κακ. A : ord. inv.  
B) . . . , unde EM 729.50; ex sch. O 512 Eust. 1030.8: στρεύεσθαι δὲ τὸ στραγγίζεσθαι  
καὶ οἶον κατὰ στράγγα καὶ κατ’ ὀλίγον ἐκλείπειν . . . ; ibid. 1725.12: λέγει δὲ στρεύε-  
σθαι τὸ τήκεσθαι λιμῶ καὶ οἶον κατὰ στράγγα ὑπορρεῖν . . .

With reference to Haslam’s conjecture *στραγεύεσθαι* restored in both  
texts above, note that forms of *στραγ(γ)εύομαι* are, in fact, commonly  
corrupted into forms of *στρατεύομαι*, as LSJ (s.v. the former) docu-  
ments. As Haslam observes, this gloss probably originally belonged to  
O 512, which is quoted (cf. the definition *καταπονεῖσθαι*, which also  
appears in the Nicanor scholium *ad loc.*), but once the Heliodoran  
material was added, it was displaced to the series of Odyssean glosses  
(indeed it is the fourth gloss in a row which cites Heliodorus): 145.31 =  
fr. 34 (ζ 141); 145.33 = fr. 30 (ζ 237); 146.1 = fr. 32 (λ 502); our gloss;  
146.4 *στροφαλίζεται* (σ 315); 146.5: *στροφος* ἦεν *ἀορτή* (σ 109; also  
v 438, p 198). Heliodorus was probably guided here, as so often else-  
where, by etymology. However, his definition as ‘to loiter’, rather than  
‘to perish slowly’ or the like had the consequence of lessening the  
severity of conditions on the Island of the Sun portrayed by Eurylochus  
at μ 350–51 (. . . βούλομ’ ἅπαξ πρὸς κύμα χανὼν ἀπὸ θυμὸν ὀλέσ-  
σαι / ἢ δηθὰ στρεύεσθαι ἐὼν ἐν νήσῳ ἐρήμῃ) and hence did not meet  
with much favor.

**33** Ap. S. 146.1: στύξαιμι (λ 502): Ἡλιόδωρος εἰς κατάπληξιν (ἀγ)άγοιμι.

ἄγοιμι C : corr. Haslam

cf. sch. V = D ad λ 502: στύξαιμι : εἰς κατάπληξιν ἀγάγοιμι (ἀνά- MS : corr. Haslam); Hsch. σ 2083: στύξαιμι : εἰς κατάπληξιν ἀγάγοιμι; Eust. 1695.22: καὶ ὅτι τὸ στύξαιμι οὐ μόνον αὐτοπαθῶς ἀντὶ τοῦ φρίζαιμι καὶ μισήσαιμι, ἀλλ' ἰδοὺ νῦν καὶ ἀλλοπαθῶς ἀντὶ τοῦ “εἰς μῖσος καὶ ἔκπληξιν ἀγάγοιμι”.

The shade of Achilles asks Odysseus for information *inter alia* about the fate of Peleus: εἰπέ δέ μοι Πηλῆος ἀμύμονος εἴ τι πέπυσσαι, / ἢ ἔτ' ἔχει τιμὴν πολέσιν μετὰ Μυρμιδόνεσσιν, / ἢ μιν ἀτιμάζουσιν ἄν' Ἑλλάδα τε Φθίην τε, / οὐνεκά μιν κατὰ γῆρας ἔχει χειράς τε πόδας τε. / οὐ γὰρ ἐγὼν ἐπαρωγὸς ὑπ' αὐγὰς ἡελίοιο, / τοίος ἐὼν οἶός ποτ' ἐνὶ Τροίῃ εὐρείῃ / πέφνον λαὸν ἄριστον, ἀμύμων Ἀργείοισιν. / εἰ τοιόσδ' ἔλθοιμι μίνυνθά περ ἐς πατέρος δῶ, / τῷ κέ τεφ στύξαιμι μένος καὶ χειράς ἀάπτους, / οἳ κείνον βιόωνται ἔεργουσὶν τ' ἀπὸ τιμῆς (λ 494 ff.). That στύξαιμι in λ 502 bears a special sense was recognized in antiquity and continues to be so to the present.<sup>64</sup> It appears that we must assume that, as in fr. 30 (and elsewhere: see p. 60 below), Heliodorus essentially repeated the vulgate interpretation (cf. sch. D).

**34** Ap. S. 147.28: σφαραγεῦντο (ι 390. 440): ὁ μὲν Ἀπίων (fr. 129 N.) ἐψόφουν, ὁ δὲ Ἡλιόδωρος βέλτιον κατεπονούντο. | . . .

hinc Hsch. σ 2856: σφαραγεῦντο : κατεπονούντο, ἐφλέγοντο, ἐψόφουν **1–2** — κατεπονούντο] cf. sch. BP ad ι 390: σφαραγεῦντο : διετείνοντο, ἐσπαράσσοντο μετὰ ἤχου, ἢ κατεπονούντο; sim. sch. D ad loc.: σφαραγεῦντο : διετείνοντο, περιετείνοντο, ἢ κατεπονούντο, ἢ ἐ(σ)παράσσοντο; sch. B ad ι 440: σφαραγεῦντο : ἐβαρούντο διὰ τὸ πρωΐας μὴ ἀμελῆσθαι; sch. HQ ad loc.: διετείνοντο, ἐκπεπλησμένα ἦσαν· οὐθαρ δὲ τὸ γάλα; sch. D ad loc.: σφαραγεῦντο : πεπλήρωντο; Eust. 1636.7: τὸ δὲ σφαραγεῦντο ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐτείνοντο κατὰ τοὺς παλαιούς, ἢ κατεπονούντο, ἢ ἐσπαράττοντο, νοεῖται δὲ κατὰ τινα ἤχον, ὅθεν καὶ Πίνδαρος ποιεῖ ἐπὶ πολυήχου τὸ ἐρισφάραγον (fr. 6a [d] M.) τίθησιν. δηλοῖ δὲ τοῦτο καὶ ἡ τοῦ χαλκῆως ἐνταῦθα παραβολὴ εἰς ταὐτὸν ἄγουσα τὸ σίζειν καὶ τὸ ἴσχειν καὶ τὸ σφαραγεῖν, πλὴν ὅσον τραχύτερον τὸ σφαραγεῖν ὡς δηλοῦν καὶ τινα βρασμόν; Eust. 1638.30: ἰστέον δὲ ὡς λυπεῖ τὰ ὡς ἐρρέθη ἀνήμελκτα ζῶα ὁ τοῦ γάλακτος πλεονασμὸς διατείνων τοὺς μαστούς; de Apionis sententia cf. etiam Et. Orion. G (143.1), unde Et. Gen. (AB) s.v. σφαραγεῦντο (-εὔτο B), unde EM 737.57

<sup>64</sup> Cf. Heubeck ad λ 502: “στύγῳ is used here . . . with an unusual meaning (‘to make something dreadful for someone’).”

The same verb is used of the effect of the stake upon the roots of the pupil of Polyphemus' eye at ι 389–90 (πάντα δέ οἱ βλέφαρ' ἀμφὶ καὶ ὀφρύας εὗσεν ἀϋτμή / γλήνης καιομένης· σφαραγεῦντο δέ οἱ πυρὶ ρίζαι) and of the udders of the victim's unmilked ewes at ι 439–40 (θήλειαι δ' ἐμέμηκον ἀνήμελκτοι περὶ σηκούς / οὐθατα γὰρ σφαραγεῦντο). It is clear that, as Neitzel pointed out (*ad* Apion fr. 129), Apion's definition was formulated with ι 390 in mind and very much under the influence of the following simile (ὥς δ' ὅτ' ἀνὴρ χαλκεὺς πέλεκυν μέγαν ἤε σκέπαρνον / εἶν ὕδατι ψυχρῷ βάπτῃ μέγала ἰάχοντα / φαρμάσσω· τὸ γὰρ αὐτε σιδήρου γε κράτος ἐστίν· / ὥς τοῦ σίζ' ὀφθαλμὸς ἐλαϊνέῳ περὶ μοχλῷ: ι 391–94), Heliodorus' rather for ι 440. Unless Apollonius was thinking only of the latter verse, the basis for his preference is unclear.

**35** Ap. S. 145.31: στή δ' ἄντα σχομένη (ζ 141): Ἡλιδόωρος τὰς χεῖρας ὑπὸ τὸ πρόσωπον ἀνατείνασα.

cf. sch. H ad ζ 141: στή δ' ἄντα σχομένη: ἐξ ἐναντίας ἐπισχεθεῖσα· οἱ δὲ λείπειν φασὶ τὰς χεῖρας, ἣ τὸ κρήδεμνον. τινὲς δὲ περικαλυψαμένη; sch. PQ ad loc.: ἀμφίβολος ἡ στιγμή καὶ ἡ διάνοια. ἡ γὰρ ἔσται ἐπισχοῦσα ἑαυτὴν τῆς φυγῆς· καθ' ἣν διάνοιαν χωριστέον ἐκάτερον· οἱ δὲ λείπειν φασὶ τὰς χεῖρας, ἵν' ἡ παραβαλλομένη τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τὸ κρήδεμνον. οἱ δὲ φασὶ τὸ κρήδεμνον λείπειν, τουτέστι περικαλυψαμένη ὑπ' αἰδοῦς; Eust. 1421.12: ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι τὸ “ἄντα παρειάων κρήδεμνα” (α 334) ταῦτόν ἐστι τῷ παρακαλυψαμένη ὑπὸ αἰδοῦς; *ibid.* 1555.28: “στή δ' ἄντα σχομένη,” ἥγουν κρατηθεῖσα, ἡ ἐπισχοῦσα ἑαυτὴν τῆς φυγῆς.

A problem which exercised the ancient interpreters was the use of σχομένη without an expressed object with reference to Nausicaa in the following passage: τῇ γὰρ Ἀθήνη / θάρσος ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θῆκε καὶ ἐκ δέος εἴλετο γούων· / στή δ' ἄντα σχομένη (ζ 139–41). The middle participle of ἔχω appears with an object as Sarpedon is about to penetrate the Greek wall (τὴν [sc. ἀσπίδα] ἄρ' ὅ γε πρόσθε σχόμενος, δύο δοῦρε τινάσσω, / βῆ ρ' ἵμεν ὥς τε λέων ὀρεσίτροφος κτλ.: M 298–99); the participle is clearly passive when used of Oedipus' mother Epicaste at Λ 279: ᾧ ἄχεϊ σχομένη (cf. λ 334, ν 2); and it appears four times with reference to Penelope's modest use of her veil when appearing before the suitors: ἄντα παρειάων σχομένη λιπαρὰ κρήδεμνα (α 334, π 416, σ 210, φ 65). Accordingly, one or more ancient critics were inclined to supply the veil as object in our passage by analogy with Penelope's scenes (cf. sch. *ad loc.*), but in doing so they took too little account of the circumstances in which Nausicaa finds herself, playing ball with

her maids. More plausible, if an object needs to be supplied, is Heliodorus' theory that Nausicaa uses her hands as a veil, or rather a screen, when confronted with the naked Odysseus.<sup>65</sup> But the subsequent action lends no support to this theory; and the use of the middle of ἔχω without an accusative object is not unparalleled in epic: cf. Γ 84: οἱ δ' ἔσχοντο μάχης ἄνεώ τ' ἐγένοντο; ω 57: ὡς ἔφαθ', οἱ δ' ἔσχοντο φόβου μεγάθυμοι Ἀχαιοί. Perhaps, then, Eustathius' interpretation is to be preferred: "στῇ δ' ἅντα σχομένη," ἡγουν κρατηθεῖσα, ἡ ἐπισχοῦσα ἑαυτὴν τῆς φυγῆς.

**36** Ap. S. 150.11: ταν(α)ύποδα (ι 464): ὁ μὲν Ἀπίων (fr. 135 N.) ταναύποδα, ὁ δὲ Ἡλίοδωρος προσεχέστερον τανύποδα, τεταμένως τῇ πορείᾳ χρώμενα τῶν ποδῶν.

1 τανύποδα C : corr. Neitzel 2–3 τεταμένα τῇ πορείᾳ χρώμενα τῶν ποδῶν C : corr. Haslam (Eust. ad loc. coll.) : τεταμένοις ἐν τῇ πορείᾳ χρώμενα τοῖς ποσὶν Vill.

hinc Hsch. τ 129: ταναύποδα: ὀρθόποδα, τεταμένοις τοῖς ποσὶ κατὰ τὴν ὁδοιπορίαν; cf. Tryph. fr. 96 Velsen = Hdn. Il. pr. (2.50.34) = sch. bT ad E 289b<sup>2</sup>: Τρύφων δὲ σύνθετον αὐτὸ ἐκδέχεται παρὰ τὸ ταλαόν καὶ τὴν ῥίνον ὁμοίως τῷ ταναύποδα ταναύποδα (cf. Et. Gen. [AB] s.v. ναῦφι, unde EM 598.21); sch. HQV ad ι 464: ταναύποδα: τὰ τεταμένοις τοῖς ποσὶ βαδίζοντα, ἢ ἰσχνόποδα, ἢ ταναόποδα (ταναό- Dindorf: τανύποδα HQ: τετανόποδα V)· ταναὸν γὰρ τὸ ἐπίμηκες . . .; sch. BQ ad loc.: ἰσχνόποδα, τεταμένους τοὺς πόδας ἔχοντα . . .; Eust. 1639.46: ταναύποδα δὲ λέγει οὐ τὰ μακρόποδα μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ τεταμένως τοῖς ποσὶ βαδίζοντα· ταῦτ' οὐ δ' εἰπεῖν, μακρὰ βιβάντα.

As in fr. 16 above, Apion finds the epithet a *Bahuvrihi* compound, Heliodorus a verbal rection compound; Neitzel should have noted that Apion was preceded in his interpretation by Trypho (fr. 96 Velsen). In spite of the fact that the posited sound-change and type of formation can be supported by parallels,<sup>66</sup> Apion's interpretation remains semantically unsatisfying (the *length* of a sheep's foot being in no way noteworthy). Heliodorus' interpretation, whereby the derivation is from τανύω (=τείνω) τὸν πόδα, with consequent emphasis on the intense gait of sheep (i.e., the fact that they walk with stiff legs<sup>67</sup>) has

<sup>65</sup> Cf. fr. 13 above, where Heliodorus likewise supplies 'the hands'.

<sup>66</sup> For the latter cf. τανυσίπτεροι (ε 65) and other examples at Frisk, s.v. τανυ-, as well as our next gloss.

<sup>67</sup> Eustathius has surely misunderstood this point in making ταναύποδα = μακρὰ βιβάντα; far better is Hesychius' paraphrase ὀρθόποδα; cf. also Stanford *ad* ι 464.

therefore won acceptance in both ancient<sup>68</sup> and modern times.<sup>69</sup>

37 Ap. S. 149.18: τανύγλωσσοι (ε 66): ἐπὶ μὲν τῶν κορωνῶν φησι “τανύγλωσσοί τε κορωνῶναι” (ibid.). κατὰ μέντοι τὸ †προφαινόμενον†, τεταμένας εἰς μέγεθος ἔχουσαι τὰς γλώσσας. ὁ δὲ Ἀπίων (fr. 134 N.) τεταμένην ἔχουσαι τὴν φωνήν. ὁ δὲ Ἡλιόδωρος τὸ πρότερον.

1 μὲν] secl. Haslam, fort. recte 2 μέντοι] μὲν vel μὲν δὴ praefert Bk.

hinc Hsch. τ 142: τανύγλωσσοι· μακρόφωνοι· ἢ τεταμένην ἔχουσαι τὴν γλῶτταν; cf. sch. BPQ ad ε 66: τανύγλωσσοι δὲ μεγαλόγλωσσοι· τὰς αἰθυίας δὲ φησι; sch. D ad loc.: τανύγλωσσοι· πλατύγλωσσοι.

Unlike fr. 16 and 36 above, here Apion and Heliodorus are both agreed on a *Bahuvrihi* compound; the difference lies in the sense each assigns to the second element. As in fr. 42 below, Apion goes astray by deviating too far from the literal meaning, since, unlike φωνή, γλῶττα cannot be used to designate the sounds of animals as well as the speech of humans.<sup>70</sup> Hence Heliodorus' interpretation is the one implicitly followed in the scholia. Derivations from both τανύω and \*τανύς are under current consideration.<sup>71</sup>

38 Ap. S. 150.20: τάρπησαν: Ἡλιόδωρος ἐν τῇ Γ ῥαψωδίᾳ Ὀδυσσεΐας (v. 70), τὴν τέρψιν ἀπηνέγκαντο.

cf. sch. D ad γ 70: τάρπησαν: ἐκορέσθησαν (sim. sch. D ad Λ 779 et Ω 633; Et. Gen. [AB] s.v. τάρπημεν, unde EM 746.52); Hsch. τ 201: τάρπησαν: τέρψιν ἔλαβον; Eust. 1457.16: τὸ δὲ τάρπησαν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐκορέσθησαν ἢ μᾶλλον ἐτέρφθησαν δι' ἐδωδῆς.

Following a feast, Nestor thinks the time has come to question his guests Telemachus and Athena/Mentor: νῦν δὴ κάλλιον ἐστὶ μεταλλῆσαι καὶ ἐρέσθαι / ξείνους, οἳ τινές εἰσιν, ἐπεὶ τάρπησαν ἐδωδῆς (γ 69–70). Heliodorus differs (slightly) from the vulgate explanation in emphasizing the enjoyment, rather than the satiety induced by the meal

<sup>68</sup> Note Apollonius' approving προσεχέστερον.

<sup>69</sup> Cf., e.g., LSJ s.v. ταναόπους, where, however, Eustathius' mistaken interpretation is repeated.

<sup>70</sup> However, his instinct that the epithet for crows should be founded on a salient, readily observable characteristic is in principle sound.

<sup>71</sup> Cf. Neitzel 201, and *ad* Apion fr. 134.

(was he perhaps influenced by considerations of what was *πρέπον* for a king?).

39 Ap. S. 152.35: τιμὴν : ἐπὶ μὲν τῆς δόσεως καὶ τῆς συνήθους ἡμῖν “τιμῆς ἧς τέ μ’ ἔοικε τετιμῆσθαι μετ’ Ἀχαιοὺς” (Ψ 649), ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς τιμωρίας “τιμὴν ἀρνύμενοι” (A 159), ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ προστίμου “τιμὴν δ’ Ἀργείοις{ιν} ἀποτινέμεν” (Γ 286) ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς ὥνῆς “τιμὴν ἀμφὶς ἄγοντες ἔεικοσ{σ}άβοιον” (χ 57). μήποτε δὲ καὶ τοῦτο ἐπὶ προστίμου λέγεται. ἰό δὲ Ἡλίοδωρος καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν οὕτως φησὶν εἰρήσθαι· “ἦ ἔτ’ ἔχει τιμὴν πολέ{εσ}σι{ν} μετὰ Μυρμιδόνεσσι” (λ 495).

4, 5, 7 post Hom. correxi 6 λέγεσθαι C : corr. Bk.

hinc EM 758.48: ὁ δὲ † Ἡρωδιανὸς καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν οὕτως φησὶν εἰρήσθαι, “ἦ ἔτ’ ἔχει τιμὴν πολέσι{ν} μετὰ Μυρμιδόνεσσι” (λ 495); al. Eust. 1695.39: διὸ καὶ Ὀδυσσεὺς εὐρὺ κλέος ἔχεν ἐρρέθη που καθ’ Ἑλλάδα καὶ μέσον Ἄργος.

The shade of Achilles is concerned to discover from Odysseus his father’s current status: εἰπὲ δέ μοι Πηλῆος ἀμύμονος εἴ τι πέπυσσαι, / ἦ ἔτ’ ἔχει τιμὴν πολέσιν μετὰ Μυρμιδόνεσσιν, / ἦ μιν ἀτιμάζουσιν ἄν’ Ἑλλάδα τε Φθίην τε, / οὐνεκά μιν κατὰ γῆρας ἔχει χεῖράς τε πόδας τε (λ 494–97). In spite of Eustathius’ dissent, Heliodorus put his finger on a nuance of the Greek in this context which appears otherwise to have gone unnoticed in antiquity.<sup>72</sup>

40 Ap. S. 153.32: τολύπευσεν : κατειργάσατο· ὅθεν καὶ ἡ τῶν ἐρίων τολύπη λέγεται. ὁ δὲ Ἡλίοδωρος διείλησεν.

cf. Hsch. τ 1102: τολύπευσεν : ἐξειργάσατο; sch. bT (ex.) ad Ω 7a: τολύπευσε : εἰς τέλος ἦγαγεν, ἀπὸ τῶν ἐρίων· τολύπη γὰρ ἡ σφαῖρα τῶν ἐρίων. ἔνθεν τὸ ἐκ πολλῶν πραγμάτων εἰς ἓν τι κεφαλαιοῦν τολυπεύειν λέγεται; sch. EV ad α 238: ἐπεὶ πόλεμον τολύπευσε : κατειργάσατο, μεταφορικῶς. τολύπη γὰρ εἶδος βοτάνης θανασίμου· καὶ τὴν τῶν ἐρίων ἥδη κατειργασμένην εἴλησιν τολύπη λέγομεν; sch. V = D ad δ 490: τολύπευσεν : ἐμχανήσατο. μετὰ κακοπαθείας ποιηθέν. τολυπεύειν ἐργάζεσθαι, τολύπη ἡ ἐργασία, τολυπευτὸν κατασκευαστὸν καὶ πεφιλοκαλημένον ἐρίον; sch. E ad loc.: τολύπη, εἶδος βοτάνης. μεταφορικῶς δὲ καὶ τὴν ἐρίων τῶν ἥδη κατειργασμένων εἴλησιν τολύπην λέγομεν. τολύπευσε γοῦν ἦτοι κατειργάσατο, ὑπέμεινε, ἦ ἐξέφυγεν; sch. Q ad ξ 368: τολύπευσεν : μετὰ κακοπαθείας ἦνυσεν; sch. Ar. Lys. 587: καὶ τολυπεύειν : ὥς ἐπὶ τῶν ἐρίων ἐπέμεινε τῇ τροπῇ; ad Lex. Aίμ. τ 5

The position of this gloss within an alphabetized series of Iliadic glosses suggests a reference to Ω 7: 153.21 τοκῆας; perhaps Ψ 223;

<sup>72</sup> Cf. A. Heubeck *ad* λ 494–97.

our gloss; 154.1 τοξότα λωβητήρ: Λ 385; 154.2 τορνύσατο: Ψ 255. However, as elsewhere, Apollonius probably added Heliodorus' definition from the Odyssean commentary, τολύπευσε(v) being attested thrice in the *Odyssey* (α 238, δ 490, ξ 368; cf. also ω 95) but only once in the *Iliad*. Heliodorus' gloss of τολυπεύειν as 'to wind through' (i.e., to the end) does not differ markedly from the conventional view.

**41** Ap. S. 154.16: τρητοῖσιν (Γ 448, α 440, κ 12): 'Απίων (fr. 137 N.) κυρίως· ἰμάσιν γὰρ ἐνετείνοντο αἱ κλῖναι. ὁ δὲ Ἡλιδόωρος εἰς ταυτὸν τείνειν τοῖς εὐ τετρημένοις.

hinc et Hsch. τ 1324: τρητοῖς ἐν λεχέεσσι (cf. Γ 448): τοῖς κατὰ τὰς ἀρμογάς τετρημένοις, ἢ ἱμαντωτοῖς. ἰμάσι γὰρ ἐνετείνοντο αἱ κλῖναι, ὡς καὶ τὰ βάθρα, et sch. A<sup>im</sup> ad Γ 448a: ἐν τρητοῖσι: ὁ μὲν Ἀπίων κυρίως· ἰμάσι γὰρ ἐνετείνοντο αἱ κλῖναι. ὁ δὲ Ἡλιδόωρος τοῖς εὐ τετραμμένοις. Ἀπολλώνιος δὲ ὁ τοῦ Χαίριδος (fr. 2 Berndt) διὰ τὸ κατὰ τὴν ἀρμογὴν τετρηθῆναι; sch. D ad loc.: τρητοῖσι: τετρυπημένοις πρὸς τὴν τῶν σχοινίων δέσιν; sch. D ad Ω 720: τρητοῖς: καλῶς κατεσκευασμένοις (κατα-: corpexi), τετρημένοις; sch. Q ad α 440: τρητοῖσι: τορνεντοῖς, ἱμαντοδέτοις; sch. H ad κ 12: τρητοῖσι δὲ τοῖς καλῶς κατεσκευασμένοις ἢ τετορνενμένοις; Et. Gen. (AB): τρητὸν λέχος: ἢ παρὰ τὸ τετρηθῆναι κατὰ τὰ ἐνήλατα εἰς ἃ ἐμβάλλεται (B: βάλεται A) ἢ σπάρτη· ἢ παρὰ τὸ τετρηθῆναι τοὺς πόδας εἰς οὓς ἐμβάλλεται (B: ἐμβάλε- A) τὰ ἐνήλατα, unde EM 765.3; Eust. 1428.63: τρητὰ δὲ λέχη πρὸς διαστολὴν τῶν στιβάδων, τὰ τεκτονηθέντα. αἱ γὰρ στιβάδες εἰκαίως πεποιημένα, οὐδὲν τι τοιοῦτον πάσχουσι; Eust. 1582.47: τὰ δὲ δέμνια τρητὰ λέχη προῖων λέγει, ἔτι δὲ καὶ πυκινὸν λέχος. εἰ δὲ τὸ τρητὸν οὐκ ἔστι πυκινὸν καθὼ τέτρηται, ἀλλ' ἐν τούτοις ἤρμονται ἄμφω τοῖς δέμνιοις, τὸ μὲν διὰ τὰς ἐν τῇ κλίνῃ κατατρήσεις, τὸ δὲ διὰ τὴν τοῦ στρώματος πυκνότητα...

C presents in general an abridgement of Apollonius' lexicon; but this gloss is particularly compressed as compared with its derivatives at Hsch. τ 1324 and sch. A<sup>im</sup> ad Γ 448a. The view of Apollonius, the son of Chaeris, has fallen out altogether, as R. Berndt saw.<sup>73</sup> Furthermore Apion's view is curiously expressed; one cannot but wonder whether something has fallen out before ἰμάσιν γὰρ κτλ.<sup>74</sup> Neitzel is surely right in assuming that for Apion the bedframe contained holes where the straps were inserted and fastened, even though the perforation of the bedframe is attested in our sources only in connection with a support of rope, rather than straps (cf. sch. D ad Γ 448; Et. Gen.). Apion's

<sup>73</sup> R. Berndt, *De Chaerete, Chaeride, Alexione grammaticis eorumque reliquiis, pars prior*, diss. (Königsberg, 1902), p. 51, 5; cf. Erbse (n. 11 above) 83, 3.

<sup>74</sup> M. W. Haslam suggests the original gloss as, e.g., ὁ μὲν Ἀπίων κυρίως, τοῖς τετρημένοις καὶ ἱμαντωτοῖς (or ἱμαντοδέτοις)· ἰμάσι γὰρ κτλ.

interpretation was, it should be emphasized, evidently a piece of guess-work based on an analogy to chairs in existence in his day (note Hesychius' phrase ὡς καὶ τὰ βάθρα); his view was, however, allowed as a possibility by sch. Q *ad* α 440.

Whereas Apollonius, the son of Chaeris,<sup>75</sup> thought that τρητόν ('perforated') referred to holes enabling the pieces to be fitted together, Heliodorus took a line similar to the vulgate explanation (cf. sch. D *ad* Ω 720). Others saw these beds as luxury items turned on the lathe: cf. τορνευτοῖς (sch. Q *ad* α 440) and τετορνευμένοις (sch. H *ad* κ 12).<sup>76</sup> Τρητόν may well, as S. Laser suggests, refer to some technical innovation; its precise character remains in doubt, however.<sup>77</sup>

42 Ap. S. 154.24: τρίγληνα (Ξ 183, σ 298): ὁ μὲν Ἡλινόδωρος τρίκορα εἶπε· γλήνη γὰρ ἡ κόρη τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ. οὕτως δὲ εἴρηται ἐπὶ τῶν ἐνωτίων τῶν ἐν τῇ Ὀδυσσεΐα διδομένων τῇ Πηνελόπῃ. ὁ δὲ Ἀπίων (fr. 138 N.) βέλτιον πολύγληνα· γλήνη γὰρ ἡ κόρη, ὥστε εἶναι πολυθέατα, πολλῆς θεάς ἄξια. τοῦτοις ἂν τις προσθεῖη ὅτι καὶ γλήνεα λέγεται τὰ θεάς ἄξια, ὅτε φησὶ “κέδρινον ὑπόροφον, ὃς γλήνεα πολλὰ κεχάνδει” (Ω 192).

5-6 γλήνια C : corr. Vill. 6 ὅτι C : corr. Vill. ἰὺψίροφον C : corr. Vill.

hinc et Hsch. τ 1361: τρίγληνα: πολυθέατα· γλήνη γὰρ οἱ ὀφθαλμοί· τρίκοκκα, τριόφθαλμα, πολυειδῆ et Σ (Phot. 601.1; Su. τ 961; Ba. 389.31; Et. Gen. [AB] s.v. τρίγληνα [pars prior]): τρίγληνα: ὁ μὲν Ἡλινόδωρος τρίκορα· γλήνη γὰρ ἡ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ κόρη. ὁ δὲ Ἀπίων πολύγληνα, τὰ θεάς ἄξια, et Lex. cod. Coislin. 347 asserv., AP 4.176.2 typis impr.; sch. A (Ariston.) ad Ξ 183a: τρίγληνα, μορόντα: ἡ διπλῇ, ὅτι τρίγληνα τρίκορα, ὡς τριῶν ζωδίων ἐφ' ἐκάτερον δεδημιουργημένων. ...; sch. D ad loc.: τρίγληνα: πολλῆς θεάς ἄξια, τρίκοκκα ἢ τριπρόσωπα. γλήνη γὰρ ἡ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ κόρη. ἡ πολλῶν κοσμίων ἄξια· γλήνεα γὰρ τὰ κόσμια, ὡς καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ φησιν· “ὃς

<sup>75</sup> Evidently the Chaeris who studied with Aristarchus: cf. Cohn, *RE* 2.1 (1895) 135.43 f., with literature.

<sup>76</sup> Might this have been suggested by a recension of the beds so described, namely Telemachus' bed (α 440), the bed assigned to Telemachus in Nestor's palace (γ 399), the bed assigned to Odysseus in Alcinous' palace (η 345), the appointments in the house of Aeolus Hippotades (κ 12), the bed of Paris (Γ 448) and the bed on which the corpse of Hector, brought back by Priam, is laid out (Ω 720)?

<sup>77</sup> S. Laser, *Hausrat*, *Archaeologia Homerica* IIP (Göttingen 1968) 31; he prefers the interpretation of the etymologica whereby holes were bored in the bedstead to receive the cords (*viz.*, which held the mattress); *pace* Neitzel, this is not quite the same as Apion's interpretation (see above). The wooden bedframe discovered in room Δ2 at Thera is different, however; it still bears evidence of leather lashings tied around it: cf. Spyridon Marinatos, *Excavations at Thera (1970 Season)* (Athens 1971) 41-42 with Pl. 104-5.

γλήνεα πολλὰ κεχάνδει" (Ω 192); sch. BQV ad σ 298: τρίγληνα: τρίκορα κόσμια, ἐνώτια τριόφθαλμα. τὸ δὲ μορόντα ἀντὶ τοῦ μετὰ πολλοῦ μόρου καὶ κακοπαθείας κατεσκευασμένα; EM 766.9 ex Et. Gen. et sch. A ad Ξ 183a; Eust. 976.34: τρίγληνα δὲ ἢ τὰ ἀξιοθέατα καὶ πολλῆς γλήνης ἄξια, ἡγουν θέας, ὅθεν καὶ τὸ "γλήνεα πολλὰ κεχάνδει" (Ω 192) . . . ἢ τὰ ἐκ τριῶν τινων ζώων σύνθετα. οἱ δὲ φασι τριόφθαλμα [cf. Et. Gud. cz s.v. τρίγληνα], ἃ οἱ Ἀττικοὶ τριόττια καὶ τριοττίδας καλοῦσιν, οἱ δὲ τινες τριῶν ἔχοντα Χαρίτων ἐκτυπώματα. τοῦτο δὲ οὐ καλῶς· οὐ γὰρ οἶδε Χαρίτων ἀριθμὸν οὐ ποιητὴς κατὰ τοὺς ὕστερον.

The basic difference between Apion and Heliodorus on the sense of the epithet τρίγληνα, applied to the earrings that Hera puts on in the *toilette* scene of the Διὸς ἀπάτη (Ξ 183) and the earrings presented to Penelope by Eurydamas at σ 298, is that Heliodorus, but not Apion, takes the prefix literally; thus those who explain τρίκοκκα (sch. D, Hsch.) or compare the Attic τριόττια or τριοττίδες (Eust.) are in the same camp with Heliodorus. The three-armed earring is, in fact, well attested from early times.<sup>78</sup> Therefore, and in view of the fact that the accompanying epithet in both passages is μορόντα, evidently derived from μόρον and meaning 'clustering like mulberries', surely, in spite of Apollonius' unusual preference for Apion's metaphorical interpretation, Heliodorus was nearer the mark.<sup>79</sup>

**43** Ap. S. 157.9: ὕγρον ἔλαιον (ζ 49, 215; η 107; Ψ 281): ὁ Ἡλίοδωρος ἦτοι διὰ τὸ εἰς ἄνεσιν ἄγειν καὶ ἀνιέναι τὸ σῶμα, ἢ διὰ τὸ πλείονα χρόνον ὕγρον διαμένειν ἐκχεόμενον.

2 καὶ ἀνιέναι] ut glossema secl. Haslam (Hsch. coll.), recte

<sup>78</sup> Cf. Chr. Kardara, "Ἐρματα τρίγληνα μορόντα," *AJA* 65 (1961) 62–64, who notes that the three-armed earring points to an Assyrian or North Syrian origin.

<sup>79</sup> On μοροίς cf. LSJ s.v. and E. Bielefeld, *Schmuck*, *Archaeologia Homerica* IC (Göttingen 1968) 4; note also the pair of gold earrings with three clusters descending from the hoop, each cluster shaped like a mulberry by means of a technique of gold-granulation, discovered in an EG II grave at Lefkandi; R. A. Higgins in M. R. Popham, L. H. Sackett and P. G. Themelis, *Lefkandi* 1 (London 1980) 221, describes this find as "the first identified revival by Greeks of the Mycenaean technique of granulation, which was kept alive in Phoenicia through the Dark Ages"; *ibid.* Pl. 231d (I owe this reference to the kindness of R. Janko). Cf. also R. Janko, *The Iliad. A Commentary. IV: Books 13–16* (Cambridge 1992) 177–78 (on Ξ 182 f.), who agrees with Heliodorus.—On Apollonius' verdict cf. Schenck (n. 6 above) 18, who thinks that confirmation for Apion's interpretation in the D-scholium ad Ξ 183 may have been decisive (but cf., with M. W. Haslam, Ap. S. 154.35); he notes that Apollonius expresses approval for Apion's definitions on only three other occasions: 122.21, 148.15, 159.29 (= our fr. 49).

hinc Hsch. υ 500: ὑγρὸν ἔλαιον: {ὁ καταφερῆς} (secl. Mus.) διὰ τὸ εἰς ἄνεσιν ἄγειν τὸ σῶμα. ἡ ὅτι πάντων τῶν ὑγρῶν ὑγρότατόν ἐστι τὸ ἔλαιον· πᾶσι γὰρ τοῖς ὑγροῖς ἐπιπλεῖ βαλλόμενον τὸ ἔλαιον; cf. sch. D ad ζ 79: ὑγρὸν ἔλαιον: οὐ τῇ φύσει ὑγρόν, ἀλλὰ τὸ ὑγοποιόν; sch. E ad loc.: ὑγρὸν ἔλαιον: τὸ ὑγοποιόν, ὡς τὸ “χλωρὸν δέος” (H 479, λ 43 al.). ἡ διὰ τὸ μὴ ἀποκρυσταλλοῦσθαι τοῦτο φησιν ἡ διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔων ξηρανθῆναι, ἃ καὶ ἀμφοτέρω θεωροῦνται ἐπὶ τοῦ ὕδατος; sch. P ad loc.: οὐ τὸ φύσει ὑγρόν, ἀλλὰ τὸ ὑγοποιόν, τὸ μὴ ἔων σκληρύνεσθαι, ἡ τὸ χαλαστικὸν τῶν σωμάτων; Eust. 1300.58: “ἔλαιον” δὲ “ὑγρόν,” ὡς καὶ ἐν Ὀδυσσεΐᾳ, τὸ μὴ ταχὺ ἰκμαζόμενον, ἀλλὰ παραμένον τοῖς ἀλειφομένοις καὶ ἀποκωλύον τὴν κραύρωσιν; Eust. 1552.26: “ἔλαιον” δὲ “ὑγρόν” οὐ μόνον ὡς χαλαστικὸν καὶ ὑγοποιόν καὶ διατηροῦν τὸ ἀλιφέν σῶμα ἐν ὑγρότητι, ὡς μὴ σκελετεῦεσθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅτι οὐκ ἀποκρυσταλ(λ)οῦται (suppl. Blank) τῷ ψύχει διὰ τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ ποιότητα οὐ μὴν ἀπλῶς ὑγρότητα.

Both of Heliodorus' alternative interpretations of the epithet for olive oil, ὑγρόν, take their cue from the vulgate explanation (τὸ ὑγοποιόν: sch. D ad ζ 79). The first interprets ὑγρόν in the sense ‘languid’ (cf. LSJ s.v. ὑγρός II.2.). The second interpretation was correctly elaborated by Eustathius (surely on the basis of a scholium similar to the extant sch. E ad ζ 79) as τὸ μὴ ταχὺ ἰκμαζόμενον, ἀλλὰ παραμένον τοῖς ἀλειφομένοις καὶ ἀποκωλύον τὴν κραύρωσιν. One can, however, question the premise of the D-scholium and see the epithet as designating olive oil as opposed to fat or tallow (so LSJ s.v. ὑγρός I.1.). If Heliodorus allowed himself to be influenced too much by the received interpretation in this instance, the tradition of ancient Homeric exegesis as a whole seems to have had nothing better to offer, since other hypotheses based on the physical properties of olive oil, such as those preserved by Hesychius (πάντων ὑγρῶν ὑγρότατόν ἐστι τὸ ἔλαιον κτλ.) or Eustathius (ὅτι οὐκ ἀποκρυσταλ(λ)οῦται τῷ ψύχει κτλ.: cf. sch. E ad ζ 79), are even less plausible as explanations for the Homeric epithet.

44 Ap. S. 158.8: ὑπερικταίνοντο: τῶν ἄπαξ εἰρημένων, ἐν τῇ Ψ τῆς Ὀδυσσεΐας “πόδες δ' ὑπερικταίνοντο” (ψ 3). ὁ γὰρ Ἀρίσταρχος φησιν ἄγαν ἐπάλλοντο, προθυμουμένης αὐτῆς βαδίζειν μὲν ταχέως, μὴ δυναμένης δέ, ἀλλὰ κατὰ βραχὺ διὰ τὸ γήρωσ. φαίνεται τοίνυν τὸ πληρὲς κατὰ Ἀρίσταρχον ἐρικταίνοντο, καὶ δηλὰ τὰ τῆς ἀναγνώσεως. ἔνιοι δὲ ἐνυμώτερον ὑπ[ε]ρ[ε]σχίζοντο κατὰ τὴν πορείαν· οἱ γὰρ σπονδαστικῶς ἔχοντες κατὰ διάβασιν ὀρώνται ὥσπερ ἐσχισμὸν τινα ποιούμενοι τῶν ποδῶν ἓνα παρ' ἓνα, ἐρ(ε)ῖζαι δὲ κυρίως τὸ διασχίσαι, “ἦρικε δ' ἵπποδάσεια κόρυς” καὶ ἡμεῖς ἔτι ἐρεγμὸν λέγομεν τὸν ἐσχισμένον κύαμον. ὁ δὲ Ἡλιόδωρος ὑποκατεκλῶντο οὐκ εὐτονοῦντες. ἄλλοι δὲ ὑπερικνοῦντο διὰ τὴν προθυμίαν.

3 expectaveris προθυμουμένης μὲν αὐτῆς βαδίζειν ταχέως 6 ἐτοιμότερον C : corr. Bk. | ὑπερσχιζόντο C : corr. Lehrs 7 ὡς περὶ C : corr. Bk. 8 ἐρίξαι C : corr. Ludwig 9 post ἔτι rasura ca. 14 litterar. capax

cf. Hsch. v 411: ὑ(ε)ρικταίνοντο (corr. Schmidt): ἔνιοι ὑπὲρ δύναμιν ἵκνουν, ὑπερικνούντο διὰ τὴν χαρὰν, ὃ ἐστὶν ἐξετείνοντο; sch. MS Barnes ad ψ 3: ὑπερικταίνοντο: Ἀρίσταρχος μὲν ἄγαν ἐπάλλοντο (μὲν ἄγ. ἐπ. M [= Marcian. 613]: ἐπάλλοντο O : ἐπάλλοντο [sic] V<sup>m</sup> [= Monac. 233], teste Ludwig [n. 83] 4: ἀνεπάλλοντο MS Barnes) καὶ ἐκινούντο προθυμουμένης αὐτῆς βαδίζειν ταχέως, μὴ δυναμένης δέ, ἀλλὰ κατὰ βραχὺ διὰ τὸ γῆρας. οἱ δὲ ὑπερεξετείνοντο. ἄμεινον δὴθεν ἐκινούντο, παρὰ τὸ ἵκταρ, ὃ ἐστὶν ἐγγύς· καὶ γὰρ προείρηκε, “γούνατα δ’ ἐρρώσαντο”. ταχέως (-ων cod.) οὖν ὑπερικνούντο, ὃ ἐστὶ παραινέοντο; sch. HQ ad loc.: ὑπερικταίνοντο δὲ ὑπερικνούντο καὶ ὑπερεπιδῶν, ὑπὲρ τὸ δέον ἐβάδιζον. οἱ δὲ ἄγαν ἵκνούνται; Et. Gen. (B): ὑπερικταίνοντο: “πόδες δ’ ὑπερικταίνοντο” (ψ 3)· Κράτης (fr. 62a M.) ἄγαν ἐπάλλοντο· Λυσανίας ἐπὶ τοῦ τρέμειν φησὶ τετάχθαι. ὁ δὲ Σιδώνιος καὶ ὁ Πινδαρίων (πινδαρίος B) δασέως ἀνέγνωσαν, ὥστε εἶναι ὑπερικνούντο· ὁ δὲ Ἀσκαλωνίτης (p. 63 Baege) ψιλῶς φησι. οἱ δὲ πόδες διῴκνούνται διὰ τὴν χαρὰν ὑπὲρ τὸ μέτρον τῆς δυνάμεως, unde (brevius) EM 778.9; Eust. 1936.10: τὸ δὲ ὑπερικταίνοντο ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀνεπάλλοντο κατὰ Ἀρίσταρχον, ἢ ὑπερεξετείνοντο, ἄγαν ἵκνούνται· παρὰ τὸ ἵκταρ, ὃ ἐστὶν ἐγγύς...

The ἄπαξ εἰρημένον ὑπερικταίνοντο, used of Eurycleia’s legs as she goes to convey to Penelope the good news that Odysseus has returned and killed the suitors (γούνατα δ’ ἐρρώσαντο, πόδες δ’ ὑπερικταίνοντο: ψ 3), was much discussed in antiquity. Lysanias, the teacher of Eratosthenes,<sup>80</sup> thought it referred to a trembling of the old woman’s legs.<sup>81</sup> Aristarchus, followed by Crates,<sup>82</sup> paraphrased the verb as ἄγαν ἐπάλλοντο. As Ludwig showed, Aristarchus probably wrote ὑπ’ ἐρικταίνοντο, since Apollonius gives the full form as \*ἐρικταίνω, which he evidently analyzed into the intensive particle ἐρι- (cf. the paraphrase ἄγαν) and the verb ἀκταίνω.<sup>83</sup> Dissatisfied with this, Aristarchus’ pupils Ptolemy Pindarion<sup>84</sup> and Dionysius Sidonius<sup>85</sup> sought to derive

<sup>80</sup> Cf. Gudeman, *RE* 13.2 (1927) 2508.55 f.

<sup>81</sup> Possibly he actually read ὑποακταίνοντο (cf. Hsch. v 563: ὑποακταίνοντο: ἔτρεμον), as Ruhnken (*ad Tim.*, p. 21) once conjectured.

<sup>82</sup> M. W. Haslam queries whether it is not more likely that Crates’ interpretation has fallen out of Et. Gen.

<sup>83</sup> A. Ludwig, “Homericus”, *Jahrbh. für cl. Philol.* 41 = 151 (1895) 2–5, who compares *inter alia* sch. Aesch. *Eum.* 36: ἀκταίνειν: κουφίζειν· σημαίνει δὲ καὶ τὸ γαυριᾶν καὶ ἀτάκτως πηδᾶν; Lehrs, *Ar.* 3 307, aptly compared Virgil’s description of Sychaeus’ aged nurse Barce carrying out Dido’s instructions at *Aen.* 4.641: *illa gradum studio celebrabat anili*.

<sup>84</sup> On him cf. A. Blau, *De Aristarchi discipulis*, diss. (Jena 1883) 17 f.; F. Susemihl, *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur in der Alexandrinerzeit*, 2 (Leipzig 1892) 155 f.; A. Dihle, *RE* Suppl. 9 (1962) 1306.2 ff.; F. Montanari, “Il grammatico Tolomeo Pin-

the verb from ὑπερ- and an otherwise unattested by-form of ἰκνέομαι, but met with opposition from Ptolemy Ascalonita,<sup>86</sup> who asserted the absence of interaspiration (likewise presupposed by Aristarchus). Apollonius preferred to Aristarchus' interpretation the view of certain unnamed 'others' who connected the verb with ἐρεῖζαι = διασχίσαι on the grounds that those who move eagerly across a surface "are seen to effect a kind of division of the legs one by one" (ὁρῶνται ὥσπερ εἰ σχισμόν τινα ποιούμενοι τῶν ποδῶν ἓνα παρ' ἓνα). Heliodorus, on the other hand, saw Eurycleia's legs as "beginning to 'break down' (in strength and vitality), i.e., getting weak" (M. W. Haslam); more original than usual, he evidently finds, as Haslam observes, ὑπο-, not ὑπερ-, the augment, then ρικτ-/ρηκτ-. Still others appear to have connected the verb with τανύω (= τείνω) or with ἵκταρ (= ἐγγύς). Even the most recent commentary on this passage observes: "The exact sense is unclear ..."<sup>87</sup> In any case, the basic sense was laid out by Aristarchus, who was the first to detect a semi-comic tension between the aged woman's desire for speed and actual locomotive powers, although his successors tried to arrive at a similar goal by various other routes.

45 Ap. S. 160.18: ΥΠΕΡΜΟΡΟΝ (α 35): ὁ μὲν Ἀρίσταρχος τὴν δευτέραν ὀξυτονῶν ὑπερμόρως ἀκούει, "ὥς καὶ νῦν Αἰγισθος ὑπέρμορον Ἀτρεΐδαο" (α 35)· ὁ δὲ [Ἡ]λιόδωρος ὡς δύο μέρη λόγου ὄντα προφέρεται, καὶ φησὶν ὑπὲρ τὸ καθήκον.

cf. Hsch. v 433–34: ὑπέρμορα: ὑπὲρ τὸ δέον, ὑπὲρ τὸ καθήκον; ὑπὲρ μόρον: ὁμοίως; sch. A (Hdn.) ad Y 30b.<sup>1</sup>: ὑπὲρ μόρον {ἐξαλλαπάξει} (del. Dindorf): Ἀριστοφάνης ὡς "ὑπέρβιον" (P 19 al.) ἔν. μέρος λόγου ποιῶν· καὶ ὁ Ἀσκαλωνίτης (p. 58 Baeye), ἐπεὶ ἀντὶ ἐπιρρήματος τοῦ ὑπερμόρως παρὲλθεται, ὁμοίως πληθυντικῶ "ἔνθα κεν Ἀργεῖοισιν ὑπέρμορα νόστος" (B 155). καὶ ὃν τρόπον "οὐ μὲν καλὸν ἀτέμβειν" (φ 312) ἀντὶ τοῦ καλῶς ἐστὶ καὶ τὸ πληθυντικὸν "οὐ μὲν καλὰ χόλον τόνδε ἔνθεο" (Z 326), οὕτως καὶ τὸ προκείμενον ἐνικῶς καὶ πληθυντικῶς εἰς σύνταξιν παρελεύσεται ἐπιρρήματος· "δεῖδω μὴ καὶ τεῖχος ὑπέρμορον ἐξαλλαπάξει" (Y 30) καὶ "ἔνθα κεν Ἀργεῖοισιν(ν) ὑπέρμορα νόστος" (B 155). . . . δύναται καὶ τοῦτο καὶ τὸ ἐν τῇ Ὀδυσσεΐα (sc. α 35), λέγω δὲ τὸ "ὥς καὶ νῦν Αἰγισθος ὑπέρμορον", κατὰ διάλυσιν ἀναγινώσκεσθαι, ὁμοίως τῷ "μὴ καὶ ὑπὲρ μοῖραν δόμον Αἶδος" (Y 336), ὥσπερ ἤδη ἀπεφηνάμεν (cf. Hdn.

darione, i poemi omerici e la scrittura," *Studi di letteratura greca*, Ricerche di filologia classica 1 (Pisa 1981) 97–114.

<sup>85</sup> Cf. Cohn, *RE* 5.1 (1903) 983.51 ff.; Blau (previous note) 45–48.

<sup>86</sup> On him cf. Susemihl (n. 84 above) 2, 156–58; A. Dihle, *RE* 23.2 (1959), 1863.20 ff. with literature.

<sup>87</sup> Cf. Heubeck *ad* ψ 3, as well as Frisk s.v. ἵκταρ.

1.488.7); brevius sch. bT ad Y 30b.<sup>2</sup> et Eust. 1193.57; sch. A (Hdn.) ad B 155a.: ὑπέρμορα: οὕτως ὕφ' ἐν τὸ ὑπέρμορα· οὐ γὰρ (ὡς τινες) κατὰ διάστασιν. . . .; sch. MQ ad α 34: ὑπὲρ μόρον: οὐ σύνθετον τὸ ὑπὲρ μόρον. μόρον δὲ τὴν μοῖραν· “ἡ ῥα καὶ σὺ κακὸν μόρον ἠγηλάσεις” (λ 618). καὶ πῶς ἀλλαχοῦ φησι “μοῖραν δ' οὐτινὰ φημι” (Z 488); ῥητέον ὅτι τῆς μοῖρας τὸ μὲν ἐστὶ μονότροπον, τὸ δὲ ἀμφίβολον, ὡς ἐν Ἰλιάδι ἀπεδείξαμεν· ὡς ἐν τῷ “μήτηρ γὰρ τέ μέ φησι . . . / διχθαδίας κῆρας φερέμεν” (I 410–11); sch. Q ad loc.: ἀντὶ τοῦ ὑπὲρ τὸ πεπωμένον; Ep. Hom. υ 1 et 41 (cum test.)

The interpretation of ΥΠΕΡΜΟΡΟΝ was controversial in antiquity, with Aristophanes of Byzantium, followed by Aristarchus and Ptolemy Ascalonita, in favor of the interpretation as a single word, adverbial in sense, while Heliodorus, like the MQ scholium ad α 34, thought it two words.<sup>88</sup> While allowing both possibilities, at least in Y 30 and α 35, Herodian was decidedly in favor of Aristarchus' interpretation for B 155, if sch. A ad B 155a can be trusted. Those who interpreted as two words pointed to μόρον as a separate word in λ 618 and to the phrase ὑπὲρ μοῖραν at Y 336, though whether Heliodorus himself cited either passage is unknown; their adversaries, on the other hand, invoked the analogy of ὑπέρβιον.

If, as J. Wackernagel argued, the great Alexandrians had access to an oral tradition on Homeric prosody, their interpretation carries weight in spite of Heliodorus' opposition.<sup>89</sup> Heliodorus is on firmer ground here, as elsewhere, however, in the area of semantics, especially since the context in which the gloss occurs suggests that his paraphrase ὑπὲρ τὸ καθῆκον may have been minted with α 35–36 in mind (ὡς καὶ νῦν Αἰγισθος ὑπὲρ μόρον Ἀτρεΐδαο / γῆμ' ἄλοχον μνηστήν, τὸν δ' ἔκτανε νοστήσαντα);<sup>90</sup> similarly Ep. Hom. υ 1 renders ὑπέρμορα at B 155 as ὑπὲρ τὸ προσῆκον, where the return of the Greeks without capturing Troy is at issue. At Y 30 and Φ 517, however, where the reference is to an untimely Greek seizure of the wall of Troy, the vulgate

<sup>88</sup> Whether Heliodorus took the same line on ΥΠΕΡΜΟΡΑ is uncertain; certainly the other party did.

<sup>89</sup> J. Wackernagel, *Kleine Schriften*, 2 (Göttingen n.d.) 1103–4 and 1152.—Or did Heliodorus have only α 34–35 in mind, where he appears to have the scholium on his side?

<sup>90</sup> Ap. S. 160.16 ὑπωρεΐας (Y 218), the last of a short series of alphabetical glosses; our gloss; 160.22 ὑπάτε κρειόντων (α 45 or 81); 160.23 ὑπίσχεται (β 91 or γ 380); 160.24 ὑποστάς (γ 99 or δ 329); 160.26 ὑποδμῶς (δ 386), etc.; it seems on internal and external grounds less likely to refer to Φ 517.—Note that he thus brings to bear a term familiar from Stoic ethics; cf. Damianos Tsekourakis, *Studies in the Terminology of Stoic Ethics*, Hermes Einzelschriften 32 (Wiesbaden 1974) esp. pp. 42 ff.

gloss παρὰ τὸ εἰμαρμένον seems apposite (cf. sch. D *ad* Y 30), as also in α 34 (the suffering of mortals ὑπὲρ τὸ πεπρωμένον, as rendered by sch. D *ad loc.*).

46 Ap. S. 159.22: ὑπηνήτη: ἐν τῇ Ω τῆς Ἰλιάδος (sc. v. 348; cf. κ 279). ὁ Ἡλιόδωρος ἀποδίδωσιν ἀρτίως τὴν ἥβην ἔχοντι. ὑπήνη δὲ ἐστὶν ὁ ὑπὸ τὴν ρίνα τόπος· καὶ οἱ μὲν τὸν μύστακα ἀποδιδόασιν, οἱ δὲ τὸ γένειον. ἀκούειν δὲ ἄμεινον τῷ ἀρτίως γενειῶντι· διόπερ ἐπήνεγκε “τοῦ περ χαριεστάτη ἥβη.”

cf. sch. D *ad* Ω 348 (partim sim. A): πρῶτον ὑπηνήτη: ἀρχομένῳ γενειάζειν· ὑπῆναι δὲ καλοῦνται αἱ περὶ τὰ χεῖλη τρίχες, ὁ μύσταξ ἄρτι φυόμενος. οἱ δὲ κοινῶς εἶπον τὸ γένειον; sch. HQV *ad* κ 279: ὑπηνήτη: ὑπήνη λέγεται ὁ μύσταξ. πρῶτον ὑπηνήτη, ἄρτι γενειῶντι, πρώτης ἥβης καὶ ἡλικίας ὄντι, ἄρτιγενεῖω γενειότη. ὑπήνη δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ ἐπάνω χεῖλος, ἐφ’ οὗ πρῶτον γεννᾶται ὁ χνοῦς, ὁ ἐστὶν ἡ πρώτη τοῦ γενείου ἔκφυσις; sch. Q *ad loc.*: ὑπηνήτης ὁ τὸ χεῖλος πρῶτον χνοάζων γενεῖω; Σ (Phot. 625.12; Ba. 397.3; Su. v 429): ὑπηνήτη: ἀκμαίῳ, ἄρτι γενειῶντι, unde Lex. Aἰμ. app. 3, gl. 2 3–4 οἱ μὲν — γένειον] cf. Poll. 2.80: αἱ δ’ ὑπὸ ρίνι τρίχες μύσταξ καὶ ὑπορρίνιον, καὶ προπαγώνιον ἢ πρώτη βλάστη· αἱ δὲ πρὸς τῷ κάτω χεῖλει πάππος, τὸ δ’ ἐξ ἁμφοῖν ὑπήνη; sch. AbT (ex.) *ad* Ω 348a: καὶ μύσταξ μὲν αἱ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄνω χείλους τρίχες, τὸ δὲ κάτω πάππος, τὸ δὲ ἐξ ἁμφοῖν ὑπήνη; sim. Eust. 1353.56 2–3 ὑπήνη — τόπος] cf. Hsch. v 539: ὑπήνη: τὸ γένειον, ἥτοι πάγων· ἄλλοι μύσταξ, ἄλλοι ὑπήνη, ὅς ἐστι <ὁ> ὑπὸ τὴν ρίνα τόπος. 4 τῷ ἀρτίως γενειῶντι] cf. Dem. Thr. (fr. om. Gehrmann) ap. Eust. 1658.61: Ἑρμῆς τῷ Ὀδυσσεῖ ἐπιτυχάνει, νεανίσκῳ προσεοικώς, ἄρτι ὑποπιπλαμένῳ γενείου.

The epithet ὑπηνήτης is applied to Hermes on his mission to Priam in the Ἑκτορος λύτρα (Ω 348) and when he appears to provide Odysseus with the magical drug μῶλυ (κ 279) prior to the meeting with Circe. Ὑπήνη being the term for the beard and moustache (cf. Poll. 2.80, sch. AbT *ad* Ω 348a), the conventional explanation of πρῶτον ὑπηνήτη in antiquity was ἀρχομένῳ γενειάζειν or the like (sch. D *ad* Ω 348; cf. sch. HQV *ad* κ 279; Σ, Dem. Thr.).<sup>91</sup> This is also the explanation favored by Apollonius Sophista over Heliodorus’ less literal ἀρτίως τὴν ἥβην ἔχοντι. Apollonius believed that the following phrase, τοῦ περ χαριεστάτη ἥβη, tells against Heliodorus (evidently on grounds of redundancy); Heliodorus doubtless thought that it supported his posi-

<sup>91</sup> Cf. Risch (n. 43 above) § 14d, who recognizes the connection with ὑπήνη and suggests with a question mark that ὑπηνήτης may belong to the group around πολίτης; on the paraphrast Demosthenes Thrax cf. B. Gehrmann, *Demosthenis Thracis Μεταβολῶν Ὀδυσσεΐας Fragmenta*, diss. (Königsberg 1890); he leaves the question of date open (12–13).

tion.<sup>92</sup> This case illustrates Heliodorus' willingness to take a fresh look at the context and challenge the vulgate explanation on this basis, if he thought it necessary. However, the more literal rendering has tended to prevail in both ancient and modern times.<sup>93</sup>

47 Ap. S. 160.26: ὑποδμῶς: “Ποσειδ(ά)ων(ος) ὑποδμῶς” (δ 386)· ὁ μὲν Ἡλιόδωρος δμῶς ὑποτεταγμένος, ἔνιοι δὲ ὡς περισσευούσης ἀκούουσι τῆς προθέσεως.

1 ποσειδῶν C : corpexi 2 περισσευούσης Bekker : περισσὸν οὔσης C

cf. Hsch. v 611: ὑποδμῶς: ὑποτεταγμένος δοῦλος, θεράπων; sch. D ad δ 386: ὑποδμῶς: θεράπων, ὑπηρετής; sch. EQ ad loc.: ὑποδμῶς: ὁ ὑποτεταγμένος θεράπων τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος. ἐμφασιν γὰρ ἔχει ἡ ὑπό· θεράπων ὁ ὑποεῖκων τῷ οἰκείῳ δεσπότη καὶ δαμαζόμενος. παρέλκει ἡ ὑπό, διαφυλάττει δὲ τὴν ὀξεῖαν (παρέλκει — = Hdn. 2.140.19); Σ (Phot. 627.13; Ba. 398.2; Su. v 484): ὑποδμῶς: δοῦλος; Eust. 1501.37: ἐν δὲ τῷ ὑποδμῶς περιττὴ ἡ πρόθεσις, ὡς καὶ ἐπ' ἄλλων πολλῶν γίνεται.

There was an ancient controversy as to whether the prefix in ὑποδμῶς had force and the word should be rendered as δμῶς ὑποτεταγμένος, as Heliodorus did (cf. sch. EQ *ad* δ 386), or whether, in fact, compound and simplex were indistinguishable in sense and the ὑπο- redundant (cf. sch. D *ad loc.*). Insistence on literalism occasionally stood Heliodorus in good stead (cf. *ad fr.* 42); here it seems a dubious blessing.

48 Ap. S. 160.11: ΥΠΙΟΝΗΩΙ (α 186): ὁ μὲν Ἀπίων (fr. 143 N.) ὡς ἐν τῇ Ἰθάκῃ λιμένος οὕτως καλουμένου. ὁ δὲ Ἡλιόδωρος ὡς δύο μέρη λόγου ὄντα μετελίφεν, ἵν' ἢ ὑπὸ τῷ νηίῳ· φησὶ γὰρ “νήϊος τόπος ἔχων ξύλα ἢ δένδρα, ἐξ ὧν δεσμοῦσι τὰς ναῦς καθορμίζοντες.”

hinc Hsch. v 705: ὑπὸ νηίῳ: τόπος δένδρα (-ον M) ἔχων, ἐν οἷς ἐδέσμευον τὰς ναῦς et sch. D.T. 444.29 = AO 4.310.10: ὁ γὰρ Ἀπίων ὡς τοῦ ἐν Ἰθάκῃ λιμένος ὑποννήϊον καλουμένου συνθέτως ἀνέγνω· ὁ δὲ Ἡλιόδωρος διαιρεῖ, ἵν' ἢ ὑπὸ τῷ νηίῳ; Eust. 1409.39: τὸ δὲ ὑπὸ νηίῳ οἱ μὲν ὑφ' ἐν ἀναγινώσκουσι, λέγοντες ὑποννήϊον τὸν λιμένα. οἱ δὲ ἐν δυσὶ μέρεσιν “ὑπὸ τῷ Νηίῳ ὅρει τῷ ὑλήεντι”, ἡγουν τῷ δασεῖ, ὅπερ καὶ κρεῖττον· εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἐν μέρος λόγου τὸ ὑποννήϊον ὡς ἐπίθετον τοῦ λιμένος, εἴη ἂν καὶ τὸ ὑλήεντι ἐπίθετον τοῦ λιμένος, ὅπερ ἐστὶ φορτικόν· οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἂν ὑλήεντα εἴπη λιμένα. εἰ δὲ δύο μέρη λόγου εἶεν τὸ “ὑπὸ νηίῳ”, πολλὰ ἀκριβεστέρα ἡ γραφή, ἵνα λέγῃ τὸν λιμένα κεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῷ Νηίῳ, ὅρει ὑλήεντι.

<sup>92</sup> Cf. fr. 49 and 31 (?) for possible examples of Heliodorus basing his paraphrase closely on another word in context.

<sup>93</sup> Cf., e.g., LSJ s.v. ὑπνητής.

As Neitzel remarks, it was doubtless the analogy of γ 81 (ἡμεῖς δ' ἐξ Ἰθάκης Ὑπονήϊου εἰλήλουθμεν) that led Apion to think ΥΠΟΝΗΙΩΙ a single word in α 186 (ἐν λιμένι Πείθρῳ ΥΠΟΝΗΙΩΙ ὕληνεντι). But if Ὑπονήϊος was the name of the harbor, what did Apion make of Πείθρῳ? Eustathius presents a fuller version of Heliodorus' argument, doubtless from a scholium no longer extant, with emphasis on the absurdity of applying the epithet ὕληεις to a harbor, a consequence of Apion's interpretation.<sup>94</sup> Might this argument go back ultimately to Heliodorus and indicate that he wrote after Apion? Heliodorus has, in any case, developed his gloss for νήϊον (our one verbatim quotation of the grammarian, by the way) on the basis of etymology (> ναῦς) and context (epithet ὕληνεντι). One wonders how he dealt with γ 81.

**49** Ap. S. 159.27: ὑποσταχύοιτο (ν 212): τῶν ἀπαξ εἰρημένων. ὁ μὲν οὖν Ἀπίων (fr. 144 N.) ἀποδίδωσιν ὑπαύξοιτο, ὁ δὲ Ἡλίοδωρος ὑπογεννώτο· “ὑποσταχύοιτο βοῶν γένος εὐρυμετώπων” (ibid.). ὑγιῶς μὲν οὖν ἐκάτερος. εἴρηται γὰρ ἀπὸ τῶν σταχύων μεταφορικῶς. ὥσπερ οὖν ἐξ ἐνὸς σπέρματος εἰς πυθμὴν γίνεται, ἀφ' οὗ πολλοὶ στάχυες, οὕτως ἀπὸ μιᾶς βοδὸς πολλοὶ γίνονται. διόπερ ὁ μὲν εἰς τὸ ὑπαύξοιτο μετέφρασεν, ὁ δὲ ὑπογεννώτο.

cf. sch. D ad ν 212: ὑποσταχύοιτο: ἐπαύξοιτο; Hsch. ν 751: ὑποσταχύοιτο: ὑπαύξοιτο ἀπὸ τοῦ στάχυος; sch. Ap. Rh. 1.972a: γράφεται δὲ “ἄρμοι που κάκεινα ὑποσταχέσκον” ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀρτίως, νεωστὶ ὑπηύξανον, ὑπήνθουν; Eust. 1890.3: τὸ δὲ ὑποσταχύοιτο (-ωτο cod.) ἀντὶ τοῦ αὐξοιτο δίκην σταχύων· ὧν ἕκαστος ἐξ ἐνὸς κόκκου πολύχους γίνεται τὸν καρπὸν· ἐκ τοῦ στάχυος γὰρ τὸ ὑποσταχέσθαι.

The cowheard Philoetius is moved by the appearance of a beggar of the same age as his master to these reflections about Odysseus: εἰ δ' ἤδη τέθνηκε καὶ εἰν Ἀΐδαο δόμοισιν, / ὧ μοι ἔπειτ' Ὀδυσῆος ἀμύμονος, ὅς μ' ἐπὶ βουσὶν / εἶς' ἔτι τυτθὸν ἐόντα Κεφαλλήνων ἐνὶ δήμῳ. / νῦν δ' αἱ μὲν γίνονται ἀθέσφατοι, οὐδέ κεν ἄλλως / ἀνδρὶ γ' ὑποσταχύοιτο βοῶν γένος εὐρυμετώπων· / τὰς δ' ἄλλοι με κέλονται ἀγνέμεναι σφισιν αὐτοῖς / ἔδμεναι (ν 208–14). The ἀπαξ ὑποσταχύοιτο is, as Apollonius notes, a metaphor from ears of grain (στάχυες). Apion's interpretation (*sc.* ὑπαύξοιτο) hardly differs from the conventional ἐπαύξοιτο. Heliodorus' rendering ὑπογεννώτο ('be begotten') is no improvement.<sup>95</sup> Neither of the ancient glosses brings out the force

<sup>94</sup> Neitzel *ad* Apion fr. 143 presents the same argument without citing Eustathius.

<sup>95</sup> Schenck (n. 6 above) 19 suggests that Apion is following etymology, Heliodorus context (cf. γίνονται in ν 211).

of the metaphor, however; cf. T. E. Shaw's translation: "Yes, and these have so increased as to be beyond number, like ears of standing corn for multitude. Never did any man's broad-fronted cattled breed better."<sup>96</sup>

50 Ap. S. 165.24: φυλῖης (ε 477): ὁ μὲν Ἡλιόδωρος γένος ἐλαίας, ὁ δὲ Ἀπίων (fr. 152 N.) ψιλῶς γένος δένδρου. λέγεται γὰρ {ὅτι} ἡ ἀνήμερος ἐλαία λεγομένη φυλία {λέγεται}.

2–3 ὅτι et alt. λέγεται del. R. Janko

cf. Paus. 2.32.10: ῥάκους μὲν δὴ καλοῦσιν Τροϊζήνιοι πᾶν ὅσον ἄκαρπον ἐλαίας, κότινον καὶ φυλλίαν καὶ ἔλαιον; sch. D ad ε 477: φυλῖης: εἶδος ἐλαίας τῆς καλουμένης φυλίας; sch. BPQT ad loc.: φυλῖης: φυλία εἶδος ἐλαίας, μυρρίνης ὅμοια φύλλα ἐχούσης. οἱ δὲ τὸ ἀγριελαίον λέγουσιν; Hsch. φ 985: φυλ(ε)ίης: φυλία ἐστὶν εἶδος ἀγριελαίας, ἄλλοι συκῆς, οἱ δὲ εἶδος δένδρου ὅμοιον πρίνω; Eust. 1547.6: ἡ δὲ φυλία εἶδος καὶ αὐτὴ ἀγρίας ἐλαίας ἐχούσης φύλλα ὅμοια μυρρίνης, φυλάττουσα μέχρι καὶ νῦν παρὰ πολλοῖς τοῦνομα; al. "Amm." gl. 490: φαυλία καὶ φυλία διαφέρει. φαυλία μὲν γὰρ εἶδος ἐλαίας, φυλία δὲ ἡ σχῖνος, vix recte.

Landed on Scheria, Odysseus seeks shelter for the night: δοιοὺς δ' ἄρ' ὑπήλυθε θάμνους / ἐξ ὁμόθεν πεφυῶτας· ὁ μὲν φυλῖης, ὁ δ' ἐλαίης. / τοὺς μὲν ἄρ' οὐτ' ἀνέμων διάη μένος ὑγρὸν ἀέντων, / οὔτε ποτ' ἠέλιος φαέθων ἄκτισιν ἔβαλλεν, / οὐτ' ὄμβρος περάσσκε διαμπερές· ὧς ἄρα πυκνοὶ / ἀλλήλοισιν ἔφυν ἐπαμοιβαδῖς· οὐς ὑπ' Ὀδυσσεὺς / δύσσετ' (ε 476–82).<sup>97</sup> One suspects that Apion's fondness for dichotomy<sup>98</sup> led him to deny the conventional wisdom (cf. sch. D ad loc.), followed by Heliodorus, that the φυλίη was a type of olive. I suspect that Hesychius' alternative explanations are likewise philologists' guesses aimed at supplying a suitable shade-tree. Later Greek usage (cf. Pausanias, Eustathius), should be decisive in favor of the traditional interpretation.

51 Ap. S. 168.22: χοίνικος: "ὅς κεν ἐμῆς (γε) / χοίνικος ἄπτηται" (τ 27–28)· ὁ δὲ Ἡλιόδωρος θέλει δηλοῦν ἀπὸ μέρους τροφῆς, οὐκ ἀπιθάνως.

<sup>96</sup> *The Odyssey of Homer*, tr. T. E. Shaw (New York 1956, 1st publ. 1935) 276 (also cited by Stanford ad loc.).

<sup>97</sup> Cf. Nonnus' imitation (*Dion.* 5.474): θάμνους ἔην τανύφυλλος, ὁ μὲν φυλῖης, ὁ δ' ἐλαίης.

<sup>98</sup> Cf. fr. 37 Neitzel = our fr. \*22.

cf. sch. D ad τ 28: χοίνικος ἄπτεται : τροφᾶς λαμβάνει· τό τε μετροῦν καὶ τὸ μετρούμενον; sch. HQ ad loc.: ἀντὶ τοῦ δαπάνης, τροφῆς. ἅπαξ ἐνταῦθα ἡ φωνή. καὶ οὐ διὰ τοῦτο χωριστέον τῆς Ἰλιάδος τὴν Ὀδύσειαν· κάκει γὰρ εἰσι τοῦδε εὐτελέστερα ὀνόματα· “ἄλμον δ’ ὥς ἔσσευε βαλῶν” (Λ 147), “ἄμφ’ ἀστραγάλοισι χολωθεῖς” (Ψ 88), “πτύοντ(α)” (Ψ 697); Eust. 1853.59: χοῖνιξ δὲ νῦν ἡ τροφή· δίσημος γὰρ ἡ λέξις, ἐπὶ τε σκεύους τοῦ μετροῦντος καὶ τοῦ μετρούμενου πράγματος.

Here Heliodorus is not so much concerned with the meaning of a word in context (he assumes the vulgate explanation χοίνικος ἄπτεται = τροφᾶς λαμβάνει), but rather with the semantic development that led to this sense. Eustathius, i.e., was able to cite other examples of the homonymy of the measure and the object measured (*viz.*, μέδιμνος, τάλαντον). Heliodorus’ observation, however, that the Homeric usage is an example of *συνεκδοχή* or *pars pro toto* is a good one and rightly receives Apollonius’ approval.

## 2) Preserved outside the Lexicographical Tradition

52 Herodian, Περὶ μονήρους λέξεως 2.939.20: Ἀνδριάς: τὰ εἰς ας λήγοντα καθαρὸν, ἐκτεταμένον ἔχοντα τὸ α, εἰ ἔχοι πρὸ τέλους φωνήν ἢ φωνήεντα, βαρύνεσθαι θέλει, δρακοντίας, ὀνοματίας, κοππατίας, Λοξίας, Ἐρυξίας, Βορέας, Ἡρέας, Θαρσέας, Κρατέας, Μινύας, Φλεγύας, Ἀνδρέας· μυρίον ἐστὶ πλῆθος τοιούτων ὀνομάτων ἀδιάπτωτον. σημειῶδες ἄρα τὸ ἀνδριάς ὀξυνόμενον. οὐκ ἄγνοῶ δὲ ὅτι Ἡλιόδωρος ἐβούλετο αὐτὸ περισπᾶν· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὸ ἰμάς. τὸ δ’ αὐτὸ ἡξίου καὶ Δράκων ὁ Στρατονικεύς, ἔτι δὲ καὶ Τυραννίων (fr. 13 Haas). οὐκ ἔχει δὲ οὕτω τὰ τῆς ἀναγνώσεως, ὥς ἐν ἑτέροις (cf. 1.51.14) ἐδήλωσα.

4 καππατίας . . . εὐρυξίας cod. : corr. Lehrs 9 τυραννίκων cod. : corr. Bloch

cf. Io. Al. 8.22: σεσημειῖται τὸ ἰμάς καὶ ἀνδριάς ὀξυνθέντα· ἰμάντος γὰρ καὶ ἀνδριάντος ἅπερ παρ’ Ἀττικοῖς <προ>περισπᾶται; Erit. Cath. pr. 21.11: περισπᾶται δὲ Ἀρκᾶς πελεκᾶς· οὐδέποτε δὲ ὀξύνεται, χωρὶς εἰ μὴ ὦσιν ἀπὸ παθητικοῦ παρακειμένου σύνθετα, ὅθεν τὸ ἰμάς καὶ ἀνδριάς, ὥς ἐκτεταμένον ἔχοντα τὸ ας σημειούμεθα ὀξυνόμενα . . . ; ad Tyrann. fr. 13 Haas et ad Ep. Hom. i 57

Both ΙΜΑΣ and ΑΝΔΡΙΑΣ still belonged to the living language in the second century A.D. A grammarians’ dispute over their accentuation may therefore seem at first surprising. Furthermore Haas *ad* Tyrann. fr.

13 is only partially correct in saying that Heliodorus *et al.*<sup>99</sup> merely wanted, by violence, to reduce these two words to the general rule, since then we would have expected them to posit ἀνδρίας (even if the proper names or quasi-adjectival forms like δρακοντίας, ὀνοματίας, κοππατίας or ταραξίας are held to be inapposite parallels, surely κοχλίας provides the needed analogue: cf. Hdn. 1.52.1 ff.).

There was, however, some local variation, with Attic speakers pronouncing ἀνδριᾶντος, ἰμᾶντος etc. in the oblique cases.<sup>100</sup> Perhaps the circumflex of the oblique forms invaded the nominative in some people's speech and was seized upon by the grammarians named as the more analogous and therefore "correct" pronunciation. Herodian is, however, clearly right about the prosody of these words.<sup>101</sup> Heliodorus' remark may have been made à propos the form ΙΜΑΣ at Γ 391; the same is likely in the case of Tyrannio, as Haas has shown.<sup>102</sup>

**53a** sch. A (Hdn.) ad E 297c<sup>1</sup>: Αἰνείας δ' ἀπόρουσε{ε} (σὺν ἀσπίδι δουρί τε μακρῷ): Ἡλιδῶρος στίζει ἕως τοῦ ἀπόρουσεν, εἶτα ἄρχεται ἀπὸ τοῦ σὺν ἀσπίδι δουρί τε μακρῷ· ἃ γὰρ εἶχε, φησί, πρότερον, ταῦτα τῷ Πανδάρῳ μετέδωκεν. αἶρει γοῦν, φησί, τὴν ἀσπίδα ἀπὸ τοῦ νεκροῦ καὶ καθοπλίζεται καὶ τὸ βληθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ Διομήδους δόρῳ. | τοῦτο δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀληθὲς ὥς ὅτι ἀπὸ τοῦ Πανδάρου ὁ Αἰνείας αἶρει τὰ ὅπλα· οὐ γὰρ ἐδήλωσεν ὁ ποιητής, ἀπίθανόν τε

<sup>99</sup> Draco's chronological position is unclear; he was prior to the *Techne* attributed to Dionysius Thrax (on the date of which see most recently V. di Benedetto, "At the Origins of Greek Grammar," *Glotta* 68 [1990] 19–39, with literature) and to Apollonius Dyscolus: cf. L. Cohn, *RE* 5.2 (1905) 1662.27 ff. (in the list of his works at Su. δ 1496 we should surely read Περὶ σατυρ(ικ)ῶν).

<sup>100</sup> ἰμάντα· τὸ γὰρ ἐκτεταμένον νέας Ἀτθίδος, ὡς ἀλλᾶντα: sch. T ad Ξ 214b, as well as Io. Al. cited above.

<sup>101</sup> Cf. n. 89 above; the Herodianic cross-reference is likely to be to a passage of the Ἰλιακὴ προσφῶδια otherwise lost, since it is here that one would expect him to discuss the reading of the Homeric text, not in the Καθολικὴ προσφῶδια (al. Haas ad Tyrann. fr. 13). Might the other party have been influenced by Aristarchus' view that Homer was an Athenian? Cf. A. R. Dyck, "The Fragments of Alexander of Cotiaeum," *ICS* 16 (1991), 317, n. 18.

<sup>102</sup> Pace F. Ritschl (n. 6 above) 119, who denied that this material could derive from a work of Homeric exegesis and raised instead the possibility that the metrician is the Heliodorus in question in this fragment; however, the quantity of the vowel is not at issue here (the length of the α being presupposed), only the accent, which is, of course, not within a metrician's province; the problem is akin rather to that dealt with in fr. 45 (albeit in this case the meaning is unaffected).

αὐτὸν εἶναι τὸν Αἰνεΐαν γυμνὸν παραδεδωκέναι τοῖς πολεμίοις, ὑπόψυχρόν τε τὸ ἐκδέχεσθαι τὸν Διομήδη ἕως οὐ καθοπλίσσεται ὁ Αἰνεΐας καὶ μὴ εὐθέως αὐτὸν ἀνελεῖν· διὸ καὶ ὁ Ἀσκαλωνίτης (p. 46 B.) συνάπτει ὥστε ἐπὶ τοῦ Αἰνεΐου κεῖσθαι τὸ “σὺν ἀσπίδι δουρί τε μακρῷ”· καὶ δῆλον ὅτι ὁ Πάνδαρος ὑπ’ ἄλλου κατὰ τὸ σιωπώμενον καθώπλιστο, ὁ δὲ Αἰνεΐας εἰς τὸ μετάφρενον μετενηνόχει τὴν ἀσπίδα, εἶχε δὲ τὸ δόρυ παρακείμενον, ἧ ἔκειτο ἐν τῷ δίφρῳ, ὥσπερ καὶ Νέστωρ ἡνιοχῶν Διομήδει, ὡς σαφές ἐκ τοῦ Ἑκτορος προσώπου “αἶ κε λάβωμεν / ἀσπίδα Νεστωροῖον” (Θ 191–92). οὕτως δὲ καὶ Αὐτομέδων ἡνιοχεῖ τῷ Πατρόκλῳ· παραδοὺς οὖν τὰς ἡνίας Ἀλκιμέδοντι πολεμεῖ τοῖς ἰδίοις ὅπλοις (cf. P 481–83). ταῦτα Ἡρωδιανὸς ἐν τῇ Προσφδίᾳ (2.51.5). A

**53b** sch. bT ad E 297c<sup>2</sup>: Ἡλίοδωρος ἔστιξεν εἰς τὸ ἀπόρουσε· παρεδεδώκει γάρ, φησίν, ὁ Αἰνεΐας τὰ ἴδια ὅπλα τῷ Πανδάρῳ ὡς μέλλων ἡνιοχεῖν, εἶθ’ οὕτω κατελθὼν ἐκδιδύσκει τὸν νεκρὸν καὶ τούτοις ὀπλίζεται· ὅπερ ἄτοπον, τὸ ἐπιτηρεῖν Διομήδεα, ἄχρῃς οὐ ὀπλισθῇ Αἰνεΐας. ἀλλὰ μάλλον, ὡς καὶ Ἡρωδιανῷ (2.51.16) δοκεῖ, κατὰ μὲν τὸ σιωπώμενον Πάνδαρος ὀπλίζεται . . .

1 le. emend. et suppl. Villoison 2 ἕως τοῦ] εἰς τὸ Bekker, fort. recte 3 εἶλε φασί A : corr. Bekker 4 παρέδωκεν Bekker, fort. recte | γοῦν οὖν Lehrs, γ’ οὖν Erbse 7–8 τε αὐτὸν εἶναι] τε αὐτὸν αὐτὸν Bekker : τε τὸ αὐτὸν vel sim. Erbse : τε αὐτὸν εἶη ἂν Haslam, recte 20–21 παραδεδώκει b 21 φησίν—ὅπλα T : φησί τὰ ὅπλα b 22 ἐνδιδύσκει E<sup>3</sup>

cf. sch. T ad E 297d<sup>1</sup>: Αἰνεΐας δ’ ἀπόρουσε σὺν ἀσπίδι δουρί τε μακρῷ· ὅλον συναπτέον τὸν στίχον, ὡς Νικάνωρ (p. 183 Friedl.); sch. A<sup>int</sup> ad E 297d<sup>2</sup>: συναπτέον ὅλον τὸν στίχον.

This, Heliodorus’ one known foray into the field of Homeric punctuation, can hardly be accounted a success. He has, however, put his finger on a real problem in the text. Aeneas finds Pandarus on the field of battle (E 167–69); their conversation results in Pandarus’ decision to join Aeneas in his chariot; the reader assumes that down to this point Pandarus has been armed only with his bow (cf. esp. E 204–5: ὡς λίπον, αὐτὰρ πεζὸς ἐς Ἴλιον εἰλήλουθα / τόξοισιν πίσυνος). If, then, Pandarus uses Aeneas’ equipment in his fatal encounter with Diomedes, as the reader would naturally assume, how is this sequel to Pandarus’ death possible: Αἰνεΐας δ’ ἀπόρουσε σὺν ἀσπίδι δουρί τε μακρῷ / δέισας μὴ πῶς οἱ ἐρύσαιτο νεκρὸν Ἀχαιοί (E 297–98)?

Heliodorus’ solution, to make Aeneas leap from the chariot

unarmed, afraid lest shield and spear be taken along with the corpse, was rejected by Ptolemy Ascalonita on several grounds: the poet does not depict Aeneas putting on the arms of his fallen comrade; there are also problems of plausibility and taste: Aeneas would not have offered Pandarus to the enemy unarmed, nor would Diomedes have waited for Aeneas to arm himself. Although on one occasion Apollonius implicitly praised Heliodorus for his exegesis “in the manner of Aristarchus” (Ἀρισταρχεῖως),<sup>103</sup> in this instance it fell to Herodian (or already Ptolemy Ascalonita?) to invoke the Aristarchean principle κατὰ τὸ σιωπώμενον to solve the problem: καὶ δῆλον ὅτι ὁ Πάνδαρος ὑπ’ ἄλλου κατὰ τὸ σιωπώμενον καθώπλιστο κτλ.<sup>104</sup>

**\*\*54** sch. Ge (ex.?) ad Φ 259a.: (χερσὶ μάκελλαν ἔχων:) Ἡλιόδωρος γράφει· “χερσὶ δίκηλλαν ἔχων”.

1 le. add. Nicole 1–2 Ἡλιόδωρος γράφει· χερσὶ δίκηλλαν ἔχων Nicole : ἡδροδοῦρις γὰρ χερσὶν ἔχων δίκηλλαν Ge

cf. Ap. S. 109.33: μάκελλαν· δίκηλλαν, κακῶς· ἔστι γὰρ τὸ πλατὺ σκαφεῖον; Hsch. μ 114: μακέλλη· δίκηλλα, πλατὺ σκαφεῖον... δὲ τῆς μακέλλης ὁ στελεός; sch. bT (ex.) ad Φ 259b.: (μάκελλαν:) μάκελλα ἢ σκαλὶς ἢ †μακέλλουσα καὶ κινουσα· δίκηλλα γὰρ ἡ διχόθεν κέλλουσα (cum iis testimoniis, quae collegit Erbse); sch. D ad loc.: μάκελλαν· μακέλλην· ἔστι δὲ εἶδος ἐργαλείου.

If Heliodorus’ name is correctly restored here<sup>105</sup> and if, as Ludwig suggested,<sup>106</sup> Heliodorus’ δίκηλλα is a gloss rather than a variant reading,<sup>107</sup> then this would be Apollonius’ harshest criticism of Heliodorus.<sup>108</sup> But this fragment would be singular not only in that respect but also as the sole glossographic fragment transmitted outside the lexicographical tradition and bearing unambiguously on the *Iliad*; Nicole’s conjecture therefore remains subject to grave doubt.

<sup>103</sup> Fr. 7 above.

<sup>104</sup> Cf. R. Meinel, Κατὰ τὸ σιωπώμενον, *ein Grundsatz der Homererklärung Aristarchs*, Progr. (Ansbach 1915) 13.

<sup>105</sup> Cf. also Ludwig’s conjecture ὕδρο(ρρής) Δοῦρις γράφει (n. 83 above) 12, n. 66.

<sup>106</sup> *Ibid.*, n. 68; for γράφειν in the sense ‘explain’ he has collected parallels at *Aristarchs homerische Textkritik*, 2 (Leipzig 1885) 748; Erbse *ad loc.* likewise adopts this position in light of Ap. S. 109.33.

<sup>107</sup> As Allen assumes, after Nicole, in his app. crit. *ad* Φ 259.

<sup>108</sup> Cf. fr. 42 above, where he preferred Apion’s interpretation; I. Helck, *De Cratetis Mallotae studiis criticis quae ad Iliadem spectant*, diss. (Lipsiae 1915) 42, n. 1, had, on account of this harshness, assumed Apion to be the target.

## d. Conclusion

Of Heliodorus' extant glosses most give explanations for Homeric words, the exceptions being frr. 12, 35 and 51–53; 16 deal with ἄπαξ εἰρημένα,<sup>109</sup> another seven with words which occur only twice in Homer.<sup>110</sup> Seldom do we hear of his opinions about prosody and punctuation, above all in frr. 52 and 53 respectively,<sup>111</sup> two fragments which have bypassed the usual Apollonian filter; they do not, however, make one greatly regret the loss of other such material. We know of at most one case in which Heliodorus seems likely to have sponsored a variant reading.<sup>112</sup>

In trying to evaluate Heliodorus' work, we are hampered by the Apollonian filter through which almost all of it has passed, as well as the corruption of several fragments (21 and 29). Nevertheless we can form some estimate, if nothing else, of his glossographic activity. By the first century A.D. there was a substantial tradition of Homeric exegesis for the scholar to react to, and it was proportionately difficult to say something new and true. Both Apion and Heliodorus labored under this problem. Also, the hunt for προβλήματα, begun by the Peripatos and continued at Alexandria, was by no means dead in Heliodorus' day (cf. *ad* frr. 7, 8, 9, 12).<sup>113</sup> Much of the time Heliodorus appears as a conventional critic, hewing close to the received interpretation (albeit sometimes with refinements tailored to the given context: cf. *ad* frr. 1, 6, 9, 18 (for β 185), 21, \*22, 25 (?), 31, 33, 34, 38, 40, 41 and 50. Similarly, he takes the interpretation preserved in the D-scholia as his starting-point in frr. 18 and 43 (cf. also fr. 11); and he works along lines opened up by Aristarchus in fr. 7. He also, if I am not mistaken, evinces concern to protect the πρέπον in the depiction of royalty: cf. *ad* frr. 10, 35, 38 and, possibly, 41.<sup>114</sup>

In handling difficult ἄπαξ εἰρημένα, the scholar was sometimes reduced to guesswork (cf. *ad* frr. 22 and 41). For better results at

<sup>109</sup> Sc. frr. 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 20, 24, 36, 37, 44, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, \*\*54.

<sup>110</sup> Sc. fr. 9, 29, 30, 32, 34, 42, 46.

<sup>111</sup> For prosody cf. also fr. 45 and *ad* fr. 48; for punctuation cf. also fr. 12.

<sup>112</sup> Cf. *ad* frr. 2, 17, \*20 and \*\*54.

<sup>113</sup> Cf. *The Fragments of Comanus* (n. 1 above) 253, n. 47.

<sup>114</sup> This last fragment would be relevant if Heliodorus' inclusion of εὖ with τετρημένοις in his definition of τρητοῖσιν was intended to distinguish the royal beds so described (see n. 76 above) as deliberately 'pierced' (for aesthetic reasons), rather than through other causes.

explaining difficult words there were two methods available — both, however, subject to abuse: inference from etymology or from context. Heliodorus practiced both methods, especially etymology, which plays a rôle in 23 of the extant fragments.<sup>115</sup> Many of these interpretations are routine and unoriginal; and when he strikes out on his own there are sometimes problems: cf. *ad* fr. 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 23, 32 and 35. Sometimes, however, close attention to context paid off for Heliodorus: see *ad* fr. 3, 5, 26 (for Γ 26) and 39; and in fr. 33 he appears to have been the first to detect a nuance which modern scholars still recognize. On other occasions, even if one cannot agree with his solution, he at least put his finger on a real difficulty (cf. fr. 13 and the non-glossographic fr. 53).

We have the opportunity to compare Heliodorus' views with various predecessors, including Aristarchus. On occasion he follows in the footsteps of his great predecessor (fr. 7; cf. fr. 18, if Aristarchus' name is correctly restored). He parts company with him, however, four times: in fr. 14 and 45, where Aristarchus' view is accepted by modern scholars, and in fr. 23 and 44, which cannot, on our evidence, be adjudicated. The same *non liquet* applies to his difference with Apollonius, son of Chaeris, and Apion over the sense of the epithet for beds, *τηριτόν*. He has the merit, however, unlike Crates and Apion, of not insisting on Homer's scientific omniscience (cf. *ad* fr. 12). He may also have refuted one Timogenes (?) on the parts of speech of Ἄρπυια and Ποδάργη (fr. 19).

However, the thirteen citations which juxtapose our grammarian with Apion provide the best opportunity to compare Heliodorus with another scholar.<sup>116</sup> *Suda* α 3215 includes the information that Apion was a μαθητής Ἀπολλωνίου τοῦ Ἀρχιβίου. But Ruhnken already saw that this could not be right and that Apion must be the older man.<sup>117</sup> Hence Polak's emendation to μαθητής Ἀρχιβίου τοῦ Ἀπολλωνίου, whereby Apion would be the student of Apollonius' father, has won general acceptance.<sup>118</sup>

More citations of Apion appear in Apollonius' *Lexicon* than of any

<sup>115</sup> He employs etymology in fr. 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 11, 13, 14 (?), 15, 16, 19, 22, 23, \*24 (?), 29, 32, 36, 37, 41, 42, 44, 47, 48.

<sup>116</sup> Cf. n. 6 above.

<sup>117</sup> Preface to Alberti's Hesychius.

<sup>118</sup> Cf. Henrichs and Müller (n. 3 above) 27, n. 5, who also correct Schenck's surprising mistake (n. 6 above) 13 ff. in making Apion the teacher of Apollonius Sophista.

other scholar;<sup>119</sup> most include no value judgment, but almost 1/3 contain a negative assessment; and only four times does Apollonius express approval of Apion's position.<sup>120</sup> One sometimes has the impression that Heliodorus is being cited primarily as a counterweight to Apion; thus, in fr. \*22 and 50, Apollonius makes clear his preference for glosses of Heliodorus which merely repeat the doctrine of the D-scholia.<sup>121</sup>

In the circumstances one might expect to find Apollonius expressing preference for Heliodorus over Apion even where the latter is superior. This is not, in fact, the case. Only in fr. 34 is the lexicographer possibly less than fair to Apion; Apollonius' preference for Heliodorus' interpretation of σφαραγεῦντο is warranted only if ι 440 and not ι 390 is in question. Elsewhere when he prefers Heliodorus' gloss, it is, in fact, better (fr. \*22, 36, 50). It is possible that some editorial comments by Apollonius have fallen out in the course of transmission, but at other points one might have expected him to express preference for Heliodorus' view, when, according to the extant text, he does not (fr. 16, 28, 30, 37, 48); and on one occasion he wrongly prefers Apion's interpretation (fr. 42). Though one case cannot be decided on evidence available today (fr. 41), I find no instance where Apion's interpretation is definitely to be preferred. One could take refuge in the assumption that Apollonius has focussed on the less plausible of Apion's glosses, though he was not the only ancient Homerist to criticize Apion severely.<sup>122</sup> But surely there must have been cases in which Apion and Heliodorus agreed which it did not suit Apollonius' purposes to record.

Apion has received much criticism in modern times as well, some of it deserved. S. Neitzel has finally given us a more balanced assessment of Apion's achievement by keeping in mind that Apion was, like Heliodorus, ordinarily glossing a single passage. Heliodorus was less prone to risky interpretations (and less original) than the other scholar; and he paid the price by being cited less often than Apion.<sup>123</sup> Heliodorus, too, however, has his interpretational absurdities (see especially fr. \*20, if it is his). But, unlike Apion, he avoided the pitfall of asserting the poet's

<sup>119</sup> 132 according to Neitzel 207, n. 66.

<sup>120</sup> Cf. Schenck (n. 6 above) 25 and n. 79 above.

<sup>121</sup> Were the D-scholia, or rather their ancient forerunner, an important criterion for Apollonius, as Schenck suspected (see n. 79 above)?

<sup>122</sup> Cf. Porphyry's judgement at fr. 46 N.

<sup>123</sup> His fragments amount to only ca. 1/3 those of Apion.

expertise in astronomy.<sup>124</sup> Suffering many, though not all, of the limitations of Apion, Heliodorus, though not a great critic, was a guardian and defender of the tradition of Homeric exegesis and was still able to make a few modest gains.<sup>125</sup>

INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

Index of Passages Discussed by Heliodorus

| <i>Homeric<br/>verse</i> <sup>126</sup> | <i>fragment<br/>number</i> | <i>Homeric<br/>verse</i> | <i>fragment<br/>number</i> |
|-----------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| E 297                                   | 53                         | ζ 237                    | 31                         |
| E 880                                   | 18                         | ι 106                    | 7                          |
| Φ 259                                   | *54                        | ι 214                    | 21                         |
| Ω 348                                   | 46                         | ι 440                    | 34                         |
| α 35                                    | 45                         | ι 464                    | 36                         |
| α 141                                   | 6                          | κ 121                    | 16                         |
| α 186                                   | 48                         | κ 249                    | 2                          |
| α 238                                   | 40                         | κ 521                    | 11                         |
| α 274                                   | 27                         | λ 274                    | 15                         |
| α 349                                   | 10                         | λ 495                    | 39                         |
| β 185                                   | 18                         | λ 502                    | 33                         |
| γ 70                                    | 38                         | μ 351                    | 32                         |
| γ 388                                   | 1                          | ν 222                    | *20                        |
| δ 386                                   | 47                         | ο 397                    | 14                         |
| δ 489                                   | 3                          | ρ 237                    | 13                         |
| ε 66                                    | 37                         | τ 27                     | 17                         |
| ε 275                                   | 12                         | τ 28                     | 51                         |
| ε 405                                   | 28                         | υ 77                     | 19                         |
| ε 467                                   | 30                         | υ 212                    | 49                         |
| ε 477                                   | 50                         | υ 366                    | 5                          |
| ζ 38                                    | *22                        | ψ 3                      | 44                         |
| ζ 89                                    | 26                         | ψ 326                    | 4                          |
| ζ 141                                   | 35                         | ω 208                    | 24                         |
|                                         |                            | ω 319                    | 25                         |

<sup>124</sup> See n. 39 above.

<sup>125</sup> I would like to thank David Blank, Richard Janko and especially M. W. Haslam for a particularly thorough and beneficial reading of this paper.

<sup>126</sup> I assign to the earliest attestation within either poem in case of more than one.

*incertum utrum ad Iliadem an Odysseam spectent*

| <i>fr. no.</i> | <i>possible references</i> |
|----------------|----------------------------|
| 8              | A 462, β 257, al.          |
| 9              | Υ 205, δ 404               |
| 23             | Ο 273, κ 88, al.           |
| 29             | Ω 453, ξ 11                |
| 41             | Γ 448, α 440, al.          |
| 42             | Ξ 183, σ 298               |
| 43             | Ψ 281, ζ 49, al.           |

## Index of Glosses Here Edited

|                     |                   |
|---------------------|-------------------|
| ἀγάκλυτα 1          | προϋτυψαν 25      |
| †ἀγαπαζόμεθα 2      | σεύας 26          |
| ἀδευκέϊ 3           | σκίδναται 27      |
| ἀδινοῖο γόοιο 4     | σπιλάδες 28       |
| ἀεικής 5            | σταυροί 29        |
| ἀείρας 6            | στίβη 30          |
| ἀθεμίστων 7         | στίλβων 31        |
| αἶθοπα οἶνον 8      | στρεύεσθαι 32     |
| ἀλοσύδνης 9         | στύξαιμι 33       |
| ἀλφηστῆσι 10        | σφαραγεῦντο 34    |
| ἀμενῆνωσεν 11       | σχομένη 35        |
| ἄμμορον 12          | τανάυποδα 36      |
| ἄμφουδὶς 13         | τανύγλωσσοι 37    |
| ἀνακτορίησι 14      | τάρπησαν 38       |
| ἀνάπυστα 15         | τιμήν 39          |
| ἀνδραχθέσι 16       | τολύπευσεν 40     |
| ΑΝΔΡΙΑΣ 51          | τρητοῖσι 41       |
| ἀνέξομαι 17         | τρίγληνα 42       |
| ἀνέσαιμι 18         | ὕγρὸν ἔλαιον 43   |
| ἄρπυιαι 19          | ὑπερικταίνοντο 44 |
| ἐπιβώτορι μήλων *20 | ΥΠΕΡΜΟΡΟΝ 45      |
| ἐπειμένε 21         | ὕπηνήτη 46        |
| ζῶστρα *22          | ὕποδμῶς 47        |
| ἡλίβατος 23         | ΥΠΟΝΗΙΩΙ 48       |
| ΙΜΑΣ 52             | ὕποσταχύοιτο 49   |
| κλίσιον 24          | φυλῆς 50          |
| μάκελλαν *54        | χοίνικος 51       |

Addendum (p. 23 above): M. W. Haslam now suggests retaining ταῖς ἀπολεί-  
αις, which may be interpreted as ‘smooth’ (cf. LSJ s.vv. ἀπολεαίνω and λεῖος  
3; cf. such compounds as ἀωρόλειος, ἐπίλειος, κρᾶνιόλειος), and would, in  
turn, imply an analysis as ἀ-νακ- ‘without fleece’.