



DICCIONARIO  
GRIEGO-ESPAÑOL



I/II d.C. **Alexander Cotiaeus** rhetor (Alex.Cot.)  
Dyck, A.R.,«The fragments of Alexander of Cotiaeu», *ICS* 16, 1991, pp.307-335.

Dyck 1991.pdf

---

The Fragments of Alexander of Cotiaenum<sup>1</sup>

ANDREW R. DYCK

## I. Introduction

Thanks to the survival of the twelfth speech (really a letter of consolation to the people of Cotiaenum) of Aelius Aristides, the life of Alexander of Cotiaenum is better attested than that of any other scholar of Greek antiquity; for no other do we possess such extensive contemporary documentation. That is not to say that we know everything we would like to know about the man; for Aristides too often contents himself with vague encomiastic generalities where we would prefer specific information. Nevertheless we must be grateful to know as much as we do. In contrast, however, to the amount of biographical information, the work itself is pathetically underdocumented.

Having died around the middle of the second century A.D.<sup>2</sup> at a ripe old age (§§ 35–36), Alexander will have been born ca. A.D. 70–80.<sup>3</sup> We are not told who his own teachers were, the panegyrist being content to note merely that Alexander had surpassed them (§ 6); nor does Aristides identify any students of Alexander besides (unnamed) members of the imperial family and himself—Aristides has never been accused of a lack of interest in self-promotion (cf. also § 40: Alexander's judgment on Aristides' speeches)—though we are assured that they are legion (§ 10).

<sup>1</sup> On the spelling, cf. Keil ad Ael. Aristid. 2. 217. 9; H. Erbse, *Beiträge zur Überlieferung der Iliasscholien* (Munich 1960) 36 n. 2 (I have not, however, regularized the spelling in the documents that follow). I cite the speech hereafter in the text by paragraph number in Keil's edition.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. C. A. Behr, *Aelius Aristides and the Sacred Tales* (Amsterdam 1968) 51.

<sup>3</sup> M. Aurelius to Fronto *Ep.* 3. 9. 2. van den Hout probably should not be used to date the future emperor's tuition from Alexander later than 139, *pace* P. Aelius Aristides, *The Complete Works*, tr. C. A. Behr, II (Leiden 1981) 395 n. 14. The author indicates that, at the date of the letter (139 in view of the allusion to the "Caesaris oratio," probably a speech of thanks to Pius for the granting of the title of "caesar"), what he has learned about Greek composition is abandoning him, not that he had never learned the subject at all: *mihi vero nunc potissimum Graece scribendum est. 'quamobrem?' rogas. volo periculum facere, an id, quod non didici, facilius obsecundet mihi, quoniam quidem id, quod didici, deserit.*

While eschewing the problematical name of "sophist" (§ 8)—perhaps in deference to the Socrates of his beloved Plato (§ 25)—Alexander did not spurn payment for his art (§ 16). An interesting aspect of his teaching is the fact that slaves would attend along with their young masters and that manumission of the slaves would often ensue either as a spontaneous result of their admiration for their slaves' learning or on request from Alexander himself (§ 15).<sup>4</sup>

Aristides offers a pleasing portrait of Alexander's good relations with his colleagues (§ 11), tolerance of the non-professional (*ibid.*, an observation confirmed by Marcus Aurelius: *test.* 2) and generosity (§§ 15–17, including benefactions to Cotiaecum). When Aristides fell ill in Rome in spring of 144, Alexander enabled him to return home safely (§ 39). He died leaving a widow and a small son (§§ 37–38).

Besides a work on Aesop (no doubt inspired by local patriotism in view of the fact that Cotiaecum was sometimes given as that author's provenance: cf. §§ 26–27), the only other work which Aristides mentions is the Homeric *συγγραφή*, assumed to have been identical with the *Ἐξηγητικά* in at least two books cited by Porphyry (*test.* 6 = *fr.* 2). Only three fragments are assigned to a specific work, one to the *Ἐξηγητικά* (*fr.* 2), two to the *Παντοδαπά* (*fr.* 4 and 5). *Fr.* 2 makes it clear that, as the title suggests, the *Ἐξηγητικά* concerned the exegesis of specific Homeric passages. On this basis, I have assigned to the *Ἐξηγητικά* two other fragments which likewise deal with the exegesis of Homeric passages, rather than, e.g., the philological treatment of *voces Homericae*, which, *inter alia*, was dealt with in the *Παντοδαπά* (*fr.* 5).<sup>5</sup> On the other hand, one cannot exclude that comments on the spelling or etymology of *voces Homericae* appeared in the *Ἐξηγητικά*, if only as *obiter dicta*. Hence there remains a large category of glosses of uncertain provenance, which I have arranged alphabetically by word discussed (indicated in bold type). I have not ordinarily burdened the critical apparatus with itacistic errors or confusions of ε and οι, or indicated variants in the apparatus testimoniorum.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Similarly, slaves who were professional grammarians or philologists had very good chances of receiving their freedom; cf. J. Christes, *Sklaven und Freigelassene als Grammatiker und Philologen im antiken Rom*, *Forschungen zur antiken Sklaverei* 10 (Wiesbaden 1979) 181 ff.

<sup>5</sup> One might wish to contemplate, with M. W. Haslam, the possibility that the *Ἐξηγητικά* formed part of the *Παντοδαπά*.

<sup>6</sup> *Et. Gen.* is cited from my collation of photographs.—Note that the Alexander cited at sch. AT (*ex.*) ad Δ 109b is in all probability Alexander of Myndus, as M. Wellhausen, "Alexander von Myndos," *Hermes* 26 (1891) 565 n. 2, showed (= *FGH Hist* 25 F 6; Jacoby also prints it, however, among the dubious fragments of Alexander Polyhistor at 273 F 143). The following works are referred to by abbreviated title:

<i>AO</i>	<i>Anecdota Graeca e codd. manuscriptis bibliothecarum Oxoniensium</i> , ed. J. A. Cramer, 4 vols. (Oxford 1835–37)
<i>An. Orth.</i>	<i>Anekdota zur griechischen Orthographie</i> , ed. A. Ludwich (ind. lect. Königsberg 1905–12)

- Ap. Dysc. *Apollonii Dyscoli quae supersunt*, ed. R. Schneider-G. Uhlig, 3 vols. (Leipzig 1878-1910)
- Ap. S. *Apollonii Sophistae Lexicon Homericum*, ed. I. Bekker (Berlin 1833)
- Aristox. fr. *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, hrsg. v. F. Wehrli, II: Aristoxenos (2. Aufl., Basel and Stuttgart 1967)
- Choer. Orth. *Choerobosci Orthographia*, ed. in: *AO* II 167-281
- Choer. Th. *Theodosii Alexandrini Canones, Georgii Choerobosci Scholia, Sophronii Patriarchae Alexandrini Excerpta*, ed. A. Hilgard, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1889-94)
- EM *Etymologicum Magnum*, ed. Th. Gaisford (Oxford 1848)
- Epaphr. *Epaphroditii grammatici quae supersunt*, ed. E. Luenzer (diss. Bonn 1866)
- Ep. ad A *Epimerismi Homerici* I, ed. A. R. Dyck, *SGLG* 5/1 (Berlin and New York 1983)
- Et. Gud. . . . Stef. *Etymologicum Gudianum quod vocatur*, ed. A. De Stefani, 2 fasc. (Leipzig 1909-20)
- Et. Orion. G cod. Paris. 2653, s. XVI, ed. in: *Orionis Thebani Etymologicum*, ed. F. G. Sturz (Leipzig 1820)
- Et. Orion. H cod. Darmstad. 2773, s. XIV, ed. in: *Etymologicum Graecae linguae Gudianum*, ed. F. G. Sturz (Leipzig 1818) 610 ff.
- Eust. *Eustathii archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem*, ed. M. van der Valk, 4 vols. (Leiden 1971-88); *Eust. Commentarii in Odysseam*, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1825-26)
- Greg. Cor. *Gregorii Corinthii et aliorum grammaticorum libri de dialectis linguae Graecae*, ed. G. H. Schaefer (Leipzig 1811)
- Hdn. *Herodiani Technici Reliquiae*, ed. A. Lentz, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1867-70)
- Hsch. *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*, ed. K. Latte, 2 vols. [A-O] (Copenhagen 1953-66); rest in: *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*, ed. M. Schmidt, III-IV (Jena 1861-62)
- Moer. *Harpocration et Moeris*, ed. I. Bekker (Berlin 1833)
- Porph. *Porphyrü Quaestionum Homericarum reliquias collegit, disposuit, edidit* H. Schrader, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1880-90)
- Porph. . . . Sod. *Porphyrü Quaestionum Homericarum Liber I*, testo critico a cura di A. R. Sodano (Naples 1970)
- sch. Ap. Rh. *Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium vetera*, ed. C. Wendel (Berlin 1935)
- sch. D in *Il.* *Scholia Didymi quae vocantur in Iliadem*; ed. princ.: J. Lascaris (Rome 1517); here cited from: 'Ομήρου Ἰλιάς καὶ εἰς αὐτὴν σχόλια ψευδεπίγραφα Διδύμου, ἐκ θεάτρου ἐν Ὁξονίᾳ (1675)
- sch. D in *Od.* *Didymi antiquissimi auctoris interpretatio in Odysseam* (Venice 1528)
- sch. D.T. *Scholia in Dionysii Thracis Artem grammaticam*, ed. A. Hilgard (Leipzig 1901)
- sch. Eur. *Scholia in Euripidem*, ed. E. Schwartz, 2 vols. (Berlin 1887-91)
- sch. *Il.* *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (scholia vetera)*, ed. H. Erbse, 7 vols. (Berlin 1969-88)
- sch. Lyc. *Lycophronis Alexandra*, ed. E. Scheer, II: *Scholia* (Berlin 1908)
- sch. *Od.* *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Odysseam*, ed. G. Dindorf, 2 vols. (Oxford 1855)
- SGLG *Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker*

## II. Testimonia

## a. De vita

1. Ael. Arist. orat. XII tota

2. M. Aurel. Ant. Ad se ipsum 1. 10: παρὰ Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ γραμματικοῦ τὸ ἀνεπίπληκτον· καὶ τὸ μὴ ὄνειδιστικῶς ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι τῶν βάρβαρον ἢ σόλοικόν τι ἢ ἀπηγῆς προενεγκαμένων, ἀλλ' ἐπιδεξίως αὐτὸ μόνον ἐκείνο, ὃ ἔδει [5] εἰρῆσθαι, προφέρεσθαι ἐν τρόπῳ ἀποκρίσεως ἢ συνεπιμαρτυρήσεως ἢ συνδιαλήψεως περὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ πράγματος, οὐχὶ περὶ τοῦ ῥήματος, ἢ δι' ἑτέρας τινὸς τοιαύτης ἐμμελοῦς παρυπομνήσεως.

3. SHA IV Iul. Cap. M. Ant. phil. 2. 3: usus praeterea grammaticis Graeco Alexandro Cotiaensi (cotidianis: corr. Uhlig), Latinis Trosio Apro et Pol<I>ione et Eutychio Proculo Siccensi.

## b. De scriptis

4. Ael. Arist. 12. 36 = 2. 223. 17 Keil: καίτοι τὸ τῆς Ὀμηρικῆς συγγραφῆς ἀποχρῶν καὶ ταύτη κόσμος εἶναι πολλαχῆ.

5. Steph. Byz. 379. 3: Κοτιάειον· . . . ἔνθα ἦν Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Ἀσκληπιάδου γραμματικὸς πολυμαθέστατος χρηματίζων, ὃς περὶ παντοδαπῆς ὕλης κδ' ἔγραψε βιβλους.

6, 7, 8 = fr. 2, 4 et 5 infra laud.

## III. Fragmenta

## a. Ἐξηγητικά

1. Sch. A ad N 358–59: τοὶ δ' ἔριδος κρατερῆς <καὶ ὁμοίου πτολέμοιο / πείραρ ἐπαλλάξαντες ἐπ' ἀμφοτέροισι τάνυσσαν>: ὁ λόγος· οἱ δὲ τὸ πέρασ τοῦ πολέμου καὶ τῆς

---

Su.	<i>Suidae Lexicon</i> , ed. A. Adler, 5 vols. (Leipzig 1928–38)
Tyrann.	<i>Die Fragmente der Grammatiker Tyrannion und Diokles</i> , ed. W. Haas, SGLG 3 (Berlin and New York 1977) 79–184
Tz. Ex.	<i>Draconis Stratonicensis liber De metris poeticis, Ioannis Tzetzae Exegesis in Homeri Iliadem</i> , ed. G. Hermann (Leipzig 1812)
Zon.	<i>Iohannis Zonarae Lexicon</i> , ed. I. A. H. Titmann, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1808)

ἔριδος συνάψαντες ἐπέτειναν ἀμφοτέροις, οἶον ἀμφοτέρωθεν. [5] μετενήνεκται μὲν οὖν ἀπὸ τῶν δεσμῶν. τῷ δὲ ἐπαλλάξαι ἐπὶ τοῦ συνάψαι χρῶνται καὶ τῶν πεζολόγων τινές, πλεονάζει δὲ Ἀριστόξενος ὁ μουσικὸς ἐπηλλαγμένα λέγων (fr. 137 We.) τὰ συνημμένα. οὕτως ὁ Κοτσιαεὺς.

## 1–3 le. suppl. Erbse

Cf. sch. A (Did. | Ariston.) ad N 359a: πείραρ ἐπαλλάξαντες <ἐπ' ἀμφοτέροισι τάνυσσαν> (suppl. Villoison): διχῶς Ἀρίσταρχος, καὶ "ἐπ' ἀλλήλοισιν." ἔν δὲ δι' ἀμφοτέρων τὸ λεγόμενον ὅτι ὁ Ποσειδῶν καὶ ὁ Ζεὺς τὸν πόλεμον τῇ ἔριδι συνέδησαν, τὸ πέρασ τῆς ἔριδος καὶ πάλιν τὸ τοῦ πολέμου λαβόντες καὶ ἐπαλλάξαντες ἐπ' ἀμφοτέροις, ὡσπερ οἱ τὰ ἄμματα ποιοῦντες, τόδε ἐπὶ τόδε. οὕτως Ἀρίσταρχος. | ἡ διπλῆ, ὅτι παραλληγορεῖ, δύο πέρατα ὑποτιθέμενος, ἕτερον μὲν ἔριδος, ἕτερον δὲ πολέμου, ἐξαπτόμενα κατ' ἀμφοτέρων τῶν στρατευμάτων; sch. D ad N 358–60: ὁ δὲ Ζεὺς καὶ ὁ Ποσειδῶν τὰ πέρατα τῆς μάχης καὶ τοῦ πολέμου τείναντες κατὰ ἀμφοτέρων τῶν στρατῶν, ἔδῃσαν ἰσχυρῶ δεσμῶ, ὅς {δεσμός} (ut gl. seclusi) πολλοῖς αἰτίοις ἀπωλείας ἐγένετο. 3 τὸ πέρασ] cf. sch. D ad N 359: πείραρ: πέρασ, τέλος. 5 τῷ δὲ ἐπαλλάξαι—] cf. sch. D ad N 359: ἐπαλλάξαντες: ἐπιπλέξαντες τὰς κῆρας καὶ οἰονεὶ δῆσαντες; Ap. S. 70. 26: ἐπαλλάξαντες: ἐπιπλέξαντες, ἐξαμματίσαντες, cui sim. Hsch. (Cyrill.) ε 4131: ἐπαλλάξαντες: ἐφαμματίσαντες, ἐπιπλέξαντες . . . ; Porph. 1. 184. 14: δυνατώτερα καὶ τολμηρότερα ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς πέρατα σχοινία συμβαλλόντων καὶ εἰς δεσμὸν ἐπαλλαττόντων τὰ πέρατα, ἔπειτα τεινόντων μετενήνοχεν, ἔριδος λέγων καὶ πολέμου τὰ πέρατα ἐναλλάξαντες καὶ δῆσαντες ἐτάνυσαν ἐπ' ἀλλήλους, οὕτως ἰσχυρῶς τὴν ἔριν τῷ πολέμῳ συνδήσαντες ὡς τὸν δεσμὸν τοῦτον "ἄρρηκτον" (360) μὲν εἶναι καὶ "ἄλυτον" (360) αὐτοῖς, "πολλῶν" δὲ "γούνατ' ἔλυσε" (360); Eust. 937. 5: ἡ δὲ μεταφορὰ γέγονεν εἰς τὴν μάχην ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν τοῖς σχοινίοις ἢ τοῖς ἰμάσι δεσμῶν, ἃ δῆσαντές τινες ἐξ ἄκρων, εἶτα διαστάντες τανύουσιν, ὡς ἂν ὁ δεσμός πυκνωθεῖς καὶ σφιγγθεῖς ἀσφαλισθῇ. παλαιὸς δὲ τίς φησιν οὕτω: "πείραρ ἐπαλλάξαντες ἀντὶ τοῦ μάχην παρατείναντες, ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπιπλεκομένων σχοινίων κατὰ τὰ πέρατα"; Eust. 937. 23.

I assume that this entire scholium, not just the final portion (τῷ δὲ ἐπαλλάξαι—), derives from Alexander.<sup>7</sup> It is all of one piece; the sentence beginning τῷ δὲ ἐπαλλάξαι gives grounds for the interpretation ἐπαλλάξαι = συνάψαι of the paraphrase. Alexander follows Aristarchus in interpreting πείραρ as = πέρασ ("end") and ἐπαλλάξαι as "join" (συνάψαι Alexander; ὡσπερ τὰ ἄμματα ποιοῦντες and ἐξαπτόμενα κατ' ἀμφοτέρων τῶν στρατευμάτων respectively in the Didymean and

<sup>7</sup> Subscriptions can be deceptive, however; see on fr. 3 below.

Aristonicean portions of sch. A ad N 359a; ἐπιπλέξαντες Ap. S. 70. 26); the D-scholium, too, present a similar doctrine. Alexander may have been the first to spell out that the underlying metaphor is from ropes, but this was certainly implicit in Aristarchus' position.<sup>8</sup>

Of greater interest for the student of Alexander are the following words (τῷ δὲ ἐπαλλάξαι—). "Certain prose authors" are cited—let us leave open the question whether citation of specific names and passages has been lost in the course of transmission—to establish an identity of meaning of ἐπαλλάξαι and συνάψαι. Possibly Alexander will have in mind the use of ἐπαλλάσσειν in the sense "overlap" or "become confused or intermixed," for which LSJ cites various Aristotelian passages (s.v. ἐπαλλάσσω II.2.a–b). The following citation of Aristoxenus has been misunderstood: it is not, as F. Wehrli supposed (ad Aristoxen. fr. 137), that Aristoxenus is alleging that Homer is guilty of redundancy, but rather that Alexander is accusing Aristoxenus of redundancy (cf. LSJ s.v. πλεονάζω III.6) in calling τὰ συντημένα ἐπηλλαγμένα. Though both terms occur in the *Elements of Harmony*,<sup>9</sup> the passage Alexander refers to does not. Besides the continuing influence of Aristarchus, this fragment discloses that Alexander read his prose authors with Homer in mind, in the hope that their usage would shed light on the poet's.

Lehrs suspected that this notice reached the A-scholium via Porphyry, *Quaestiones Homericae*, where a similar doctrine is found.<sup>10</sup> The fact that Porphyry elsewhere cites Alexander's Ἐξηγητικά (fr. 2) is a point in favor of this hypothesis. Note, however, that Porphyry's notice diverges from our scholium in content and phraseology. Furthermore the other citations of Alexander in the A-scholium (fr. 5 and 8) have no corresponding material in Porphyry and are not typical of his interests. I suspect that all three fragments derive from an exegetical commentary the author of which, like Porphyry, had access to the Ἐξηγητικά.

<sup>8</sup> M. van der Valk, *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad*, 2 vols. (Leiden 1963–64), at II 97–99, regards the interpretation of πείραψ as "end" rather than "rope" (cf. LSJ s.v., II.2) as Aristarchus' fatal mistake in this passage. He sees this as the replacement of "a concrete notion by an abstract idea" (p. 97); but note that πείραψ as used here by the ancient interpreters has the concrete sense of "the end of a rope." Furthermore fastening of a rope over two parties would not require two ropes to be joined "crosswise over one another" (pace van der Valk 98–99). If any part of Aristarchus' interpretation fails to satisfy, it is his gloss of ἐπαλλάξαντες, which fails to make clear "daß die Tätigkeit der Götter ihre verderbliche Wirkung auf beide Parteien gleichermaßen ausübt" (A. Heubeck, "Homeric," *Gymnasium* 56 [1949] 251 = *Kleine Schriften zur griechischen Sprache und Literatur* [Erlangen 1984] 124). For the interpretation of this passage, cf. also R. Janko, *The Iliad. A Commentary IV: Books 13–16* (Cambridge, forthcoming) ad loc.

<sup>9</sup> *Aristoxeni Elementa Harmonica*, ed. R. da Rios (Rome 1954) Index verborum s.v.

<sup>10</sup> K. Lehrs, *Quaestiones epicae* (Königsberg 1837) II n. 2; similarly Erbse (above, note 1) 96; in his edition of the scholia, however, Erbse adds a question mark after Porphyry's name.

2. Porph. 1. 227. 22 = 27. 29 Sod. = Erbse ad sch. Σ 509–33: ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ τῶν Ἐξηγητικῶν Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Κοτυαεὺς· δύο στρατοὶ περιεκάθητο τὴν πόλιν πολέμιοι, ἢ πορθεῖν ἀξιούντες αὐτὴν ἢ τὰ ἡμίση λαβόντες ἀπιέναι· οἱ δ' ἐνδόν ὄντες οὐκ [5] ἐδέχοντο τὴν πρόκλησιν. οἱ οὖν πολέμιοι, φησὶν, ἐνέδραν τινὰ ἐποίησαντο τῶν ποιμνίων καὶ τῶν βουκόλων, ἃ ἦν κτήματα τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει. εἶτα ἀξιοὶ τὸ μὲν “οἱ δ' οὐ πω πείθοντο” (513) ἀκούειν περὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει, τὸ δὲ “λόχῳ ὑπεθωρήσσαντο” (513) περὶ τῶν πολεμίων, καὶ τὸ “οἱ δ' ἴσαν” [10] (516) περὶ τῶν εἰς τὴν ἐνέδραν ἀπιόντων πολεμίων, οἱ δὲ σκοποὶ τῶν πολεμίων εἰσὶ. τὸ δὲ “οἱ δ' ὡς οὖν ἐπίθοντο πολὺν κέλαδον περὶ βουσίην” (530) ἐπὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει ἀκούει· ἐκαθέζοντο γὰρ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ βουλευόμενοι, τὰ τεῖχη φρουρεῖν παραδόντες τῇ ἀπολέμῳ ἡλικίᾳ· τὸ γὰρ “ἱράων [15] προπάροισθε καθήμενοι” (531) σημαίνει τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, ἐν αἷς εἴρουσι καὶ ἀγορεύουσιν. ὅτε δ' αὐτοῖς ἐμνηύθη τὰ κατὰ τὰ ποιμνία, ἐπιτρέχουσι καὶ ἐξεληθόντες συμβάλλουσι μάχην.

subsidia: magna ex parte codicem V (= Vat. gr. 305, anno 1314) secutus sum; ex recensione χ laudo \*B, h.e. codicis Venet. gr. 821 manum recentiore (s. XII/XIII) 1–2 — κοτ. \*B: ἀλέξανδρος μὲν ὁ κοτ. οὕτω φησιν V 2 post κοτ. hab. B ὅτι 3 περιεκάθητο] παρ- \*B 6 τῶν ποιμνίων καὶ τῶν βουκόλων V: τοῖς ποιμνίοις καὶ τοῖς βουκολίοις \*B 10 post περὶ hab. \*B τῶν πολεμίων | τὴν] om. V | πολεμίων V: hoc loco om. \*B 12 περὶ V: παρὰ \*B 13 ἐκκλησίᾳ \*B: ἐκκλησίαις V 14 ἱράων] εἰρ- propter etym. scribendum monuit Haslam 15 τῶν] om. \*B 16 ἀγορεύουσιν] ἐκκλησιάζουσιν \*B

14–16 ἱράων—ἀγορεύουσιν] cf. sch. D ad Σ 531: ἱράων: πρὸ τῶν ἀγορῶν, ὃ ἐστὶν ἐκκλησιῶν, ἀπὸ τοῦ εἴρειν ἐν αὐταῖς καὶ λέγειν, ὅθεν ὁ Ἴρος; Ap. S. 92. 22; Hsch. i 873; sch. A (Ariston.) et bT (ex.) ad Σ 531a–b; Et. Orion. G 59. 1; Et. Gud. 427. 23 (d<sup>2</sup>); EM 475. 11; Eust. 1160. 34.

Alexander's interpretation of the famous scene of siege and battle from the Shield of Achilles (Σ 509 ff.) is among three interpretations quoted by Porphyry, who (rightly) rejects both this one and the view that the two armies are divided, one friendly to the besieged, the other hostile.<sup>11</sup> Alexander's reading entails a number of difficulties, most notably, as Porphyry pointed out (1. 228. 27 = 29. 7 Sod.), the fact that he must assume a change of subject within v. 513 (οἱ δ' οὐ πω πείθοντο, λόχῳ δ' ὑπεθωρήσσαντο), since he thinks the ambush was conducted by the besiegers, not the besieged; as Porphyry rightly says of this interpretation,

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Erbse (above, note 1) 36 and 54.



ἔστι ἐλεγχόντων τὸν ποιητὴν μὴ δυνάμενον φράζειν ἀταράχως (1. 228. 15–16 = 29. 24–25 Sod.). Moreover, how is it that the besiegers have not already possessed themselves of the townsmen's herds of cattle and flocks of sheep, which Alexander supposes to be the goal of the ambush? Would the besieged risk leaving their walls in charge of women, children and aged men merely for a council? Porphyry's question is also pertinent: If the ambush was mounted only by a portion of the besiegers, how could the townsmen climb on their horses and ride to the scene openly and without opposition (1. 228. 16 = 29. 24 Sod.)?

Alexander remains isolated in this interpretation, accepted neither by Porphyry nor the author of the exegetical scholia (T and b ad Σ 513c<sup>1-2</sup>). Only Eustathius, perplexed by the repeated use of οἱ δέ to shift the subject (vv. 513, 516, 525), accuses the poet of ἀσάφεια and leaves Alexander's interpretation on an equal footing with the other two cited by Porphyry (1159. 33 ff.). Porphyry himself, like modern commentators, prefers the interpretation whereby the besieged undertake the ambush, the women, children and old men guard the walls because the warriors have left for that purpose, the scouts are sent out by the townsmen, not the besiegers, and it is the besiegers whose council is interrupted by the commotion which follows upon the ambush (1. 228. 19 ff. = 29. 29 ff. Sod.). In one detail Alexander was in good company, however, namely his interpretation of ἰράων (v. 531), where he followed a well-established tradition.<sup>12</sup>

3a. Porph. 1. 234. 10 = 112. 7 Sod. = Erbse ad sch. T 79–80a: Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ ὁ Κοτιαεὺς φησι λέγων· καλῶς ἔχει τὸ ἐστῶτος τοῦ δημηγοροῦντος ἀκούειν καὶ μὴ ὑποκρούειν αὐτὸν καὶ ἐμποδίζειν (τοῦτο γὰρ σημαίνει τὸ “ὑββάλλειν” [T 80])· [5] χαλεπὸν γὰρ καὶ τῷ πάννυ δεινῷ ἐν ταραχῇ εἰπεῖν. τὸ γὰρ “χαλεπὸν ἐπιστάμενόν περ ἐόντα” (ibid.) κατὰ Ἀττικὴν συνήθειαν πλεονάζει τὸ “ἐόντα”· ἐκείνοις γὰρ ἦν σύνηθες λέγειν “μὴ προδοῦς ἡμᾶς γένη” ἀντὶ τοῦ μὴ προδῶς, καὶ “παίζεις ἔχων” ἀντὶ τοῦ διαπαίζεις, καὶ ἐνταῦθα “χαλεπὸν [10] γὰρ ἐπιστάμενόν περ ἐόντα” (ibid.) ἀντὶ τοῦ τὸν ἐπιστάμενον θορυβεῖσθαι χαλεπὸν, ὡς καὶ τοῦ ἐπιστήμονος ῥήτορος ἐν θορύβῳ χαλεπῶς δημηγοροῦντος. | ἐμοὶ δὲ δοκεῖ . . .

3b. Sch. A ad T 79–80a: ἐσταότος μὲν καλὸν ἀκούειν <— [15] ἐόντα>· καλῶς ἔχει τοῦ ἐστῶτος καὶ δημηγοροῦντος ἀκούειν καὶ μὴ ὑποκρούειν μηδ' ἐμποδίζειν· τοῦτο γὰρ δηλοῖ τὸ “ὑβ<β>άλλειν” (T 80)· χαλεπὸν γὰρ καὶ τῷ πάννυ δεινῷ ἐν ταραχῇ εἰπεῖν. τοῦτο ἀγνοήσας Ἀρίσταρχος καὶ οἰηθεὶς

<sup>12</sup> Probably the interpretation of Aristarchus (cf. sch. A [Ariston.] ad Σ 531a), it entered the scholastic tradition (cf. D).

παραίτησίν τινα ἐκ τοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος γίνεσθαι παρενέθηκε [20] τὸ “αὐτόθι ἐξ ἔδρης” (T 77). πρῶτον μὲν οὖν τί ἂν καθέζοιτο τὸν ἀγκῶνα τετρωμένος; ἔπειτα οὕτως ἔρρωται ὥστε ὀλίγον ὕστερον (cf. T 252–66) κάπρον ἀποσφάττει. οὕτως ὁ Κοτσιαεὺς.

recensionem χ ut pleniorē hic magna ex parte secutus sum

2 λέγων χ: om. V | ἔχει χ: om. V 4 σημαίνει] συμβαίνει V | ὑββάλλειν] ὑβάλλειν \*B: ὑββάλειν V 5 τῷ ... δεινῷ χ: τὸ (corr. τῷ) ... δεινὸν V | τὸ] τῷ Haslam, fort. recte 5–12 τὸ γὰρ χαλεπὸν—] om. V 10 γὰρ Villoison: περ \*B 17 ὑβάλλειν A: suppl. Villoison

3–4 μὴ ὑποκρούειν—ὑββάλλειν] cf. sch. D ad T 80: ὑββάλλειν: ὑποκρούειν, ἐμποδίζειν τὸν λέγοντα ...; Ap. S. 156. 27 et 33: ... οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Σιδώνιον ἐστῶτα μὲν λέγουσι τὸν Ἀγαμέμνονα παρὰ τῇ καθέδρᾳ, οὐδ' ἐν μέσοις ἐστῶτα. ... οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Σιδώνιον ἐκ τοῦ ὑββάλλειν τὸ ὑποκρούειν ἀκούουσιν; Hsch. v 567: ὑποβάλλει: ὑποκρούει; sch. bT ad T 80b: ὑββάλλειν: ὑποκρούεσθαι θορύβῳ τὸν λέγοντα; Eust. 1172. 34: οἱ καὶ αὐτοὶ (sc. οἱ ἀκριβέστεροι) ὑποβάλλειν φασὶ τὸ κωλύειν καὶ ὑποκρούειν διὰ κραυγῆς καὶ ποιεῖν θόρυβον ... 8–9 καὶ “παίζεις ἔχων” ἀντὶ τοῦ διαπαίζεις] cf. Moer. 212. 8 (φλυαρεῖς ἔχων); Greg. Cor. 146–47.

At issue is a passage from the Assembly scene in T (74–80) where Achilles announces his return to battle; the immediate reaction is as follows:

ὣς ἔφαθ', οἱ δ' ἐχάρησαν ἐϋκνήμιδες Ἀχαιοὶ  
 μῆνιν ἀπειπόντος μεγαθύμου Πηλεΐωνος.  
 τοῖσι δὲ καὶ μετέειπεν ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων  
 αὐτόθεν ἐξ ἔδρης, οὐδ' ἐν μέσσοισιν ἀναστάς·  
 “ὦ φίλοι ἦρωες Δαναοί, θεράποντες Ἄρης,  
 ἐσταότος μὲν καλὸν ἀκούειν, οὐδὲ ἔοικεν  
 ὑββάλλειν· χαλεπὸν γὰρ ἐπισταμένῳ περ ἔοντι ...”

In light of sch. A ad T 79–80a (= fr. 3b) Alexander has been thought guilty of the grave error of supposing that Aristarchus interpolated (παρανέθηκε) v. 77, on the assumption that αὐτόθεν ἐξ ἔδρης means that Agamemnon spoke from his seat because of a wound;<sup>13</sup> yet Agamemnon's wound was at the elbow (Λ 252). Now T 77 was already read by Aristophanes of Byzantium (and therefore could not have been interpolated by Aristarchus),

<sup>13</sup> This, by the way, was the interpretation of Epaphroditus fr. 43 L. = sch. bT ad T 77b and Eust. 1172. 21.

as we know from sch. AT (Did.) ad T 76–77. Therefore Ludwich thought that Alexander must be burdened with a surprising piece of negligence.<sup>14</sup>

Alexander has, however, been sufficiently exculpated on this score by Erbse, who makes it very likely that the compiler of the A-scholia combined at sch. T 79–80a two passages from Porphyry (1. 233. 3 ff. = 110. 3 Sod. + the first part of our fr. 3a) and carelessly added to the conglomerate the subscription οὕτως ὁ Κοριαεύς, which applied only to the first part (—ἐν παραρχῇ εἰπεῖν ~ first part of fr. 3a). Moreover, the A-compiler evidently misunderstood Porphyry's words (1. 233. 5 = 110. 7 So.) καὶ φησι (sc. ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος) διὰ τοῦτο ἐνέθηκε (sc. ὁ Ὀμηρος) τὸ “αὐτόθεν ἐξ ἔδρης οὐδ' ἐν μέσσοισι ἀναστάς” to mean that Aristarchus interpolated (παρενέθηκε) the verse in question. Finally, the words αὐτόθεν ἐξ ἔδρης can merely mean that Agamemnon spoke from where he was, i.e., did not go to the usual speaker's position in the middle of the assembly, but did stand up (as is implied by v. 79: ἐσταότος μὲν καλὸν ἀκούειν).<sup>15</sup>

If, then, Alexander can be cleared of responsibility for the misinformation laid to his charge in fr. 3b, what was his contribution to the understanding of T 80? Like others, he passed on the interpretation of ὑββάλλειν as equivalent to ὑποκροῦειν, ἐμποδίζειν, doubtless known to him from the scholastic tradition (cf. sch. D ad loc.). Whether he did more than that depends upon the status of the latter part of fr. 3a (τὸ γὰρ “χαλεπὸν ἐπιστάμενόν περ ἔόντα” κατὰ Ἀττικὴν συνήθειαν—). E. Kammer, following Barnes, athetized this material, which is absent from V;<sup>16</sup> Sodano agrees that it does not belong to Alexander but believes it to have been added by the redactor of the χ-recension. In putting forward this view Sodano cites sch. A ad T 79–80a (= our fr. 3b), Ap. S. s.v. ὑββάλλειν and Eust. 1172. 20; but none of these passages excludes the possibility that Alexander explained ἔόντι of T 80 as a pleonasm according to Attic usage.

Now Alexander was interested in matters of dialect (cf. frr. 5 and 13); and one sentence which he cites, “μὴ προδοὺς ἡμᾶς γένη,” is not a bad parallel. He should not, however, have mixed this up with such expressions as παίζεις ἔχων and tried to subsume both types under the rubric “pleonastic participle;” also the phenomenon is, of course, by no means

<sup>14</sup> A. Ludwich, *Aristarchs homerische Textkritik*, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1884–85) at I 74–75 (the error posited would be especially surprising since fr. 7 below shows Alexander familiar with, and influenced by, Didymus' work).

<sup>15</sup> Erbse (above, note 1) 54–57; for the last point he compares Demetrius Sidonius *apud* Ap. S. 156. 27 (quoted above; cf. also Eust. 1172. 30); he is likewise able to show that Schader's assumption that a citation of Demetrius has fallen out at 1. 233. 3 of his edition of Porphyry is unfounded and therefore that the Apollonius cited at 1. 233. 11 was the teacher of Porphyry, not of Demetrius.

<sup>16</sup> *Scholia Homerica emendatiora praefatione de scholiis Porphyrianis praemissa*, ed. E. Kammer (diss. Königsberg 1863); Joshua Barnes published Porphyry among other works of Homeric exegesis in the introduction to his edition of Homer (Cambridge 1711); both of these works, cited by Sodano, are inaccessible to me.

confined to Attic;<sup>17</sup> possibly Alexander was here influenced by Aristarchus' view that Homer was an Athenian.<sup>18</sup>

It is worth remembering that in Alexander's day the study of syntax was in its infancy, his contemporary, Apollonius Dyscolus, being the author of the first book on the subject, a book, however, which was not the kind of systematic exposition of Greek syntax a modern reader would expect but rather a paradigmatic discussion of select problems<sup>19</sup> and which offers no guidance on the problem at hand. Perhaps, then, Alexander's attempt to grapple with the conjoined participles of T 80 should not be judged too harshly.

#### b. Παντοδαπά

4. Et. Gen. (A) s.v. δίκρον καὶ δίκροον, unde EM 276. 26 = Hdn. 2. 385. 21: Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ ὁ τοῦ Ἀσκληπιάδου ἐν τῷ ἰ' τῶν Παντοδαπῶν παρὰ τὸ κόρος, ὃ σημαίνει τὸν κλάδον (ἔνθεν καὶ κοριθαλίς ἢ δάφνη λέγεται) καὶ κορεῖν, τὸ τοῖς [5] κλάδοις σαροῦν. Ἰ ἐγὼ δὲ νομίζω μᾶλλον παρὰ τὸ κέρασ

. . .

5 σαροῦν] σαρρ- A

Ex Et. Gen. etiam Zon. 1238: κοριθαλίς (sic): ἡ δάφνη, καὶ κόρος, ὁ κλάδος, καὶ κορεῖν, τὸ τοῖς κλάδοις σαροῦν. 3 κόρος = κλάδος] cf. Hsch. κ 3655: κόρος: πληθὸς ἀνθρώπων (πλησμονή dubitanter Haslam). καὶ τὰ νέα βλαστήματα. καὶ μέτρον.

The adjective δίκροος or, later by hyphaeresis, δίκρος (= "cloven, bifurcated") is attested as early as the *Little Iliad* (fr. 5 Bernabé and Davies: ἀμφὶ δὲ πόρκης / χρύσεος ἀστράπτει καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῷ δίκροος αἰχμῆ = sch. T ad Π 142b = sch. Pi. N. 6. 85b) and continued in use by poets (Ar. *Pax* 637: τήνδε μὲν δικροῖς ἐώθουσαν τὴν θεὸν κεκράγαμασιν; Call. fr. 177. 2 Pf.: δίκρον φειτρὸν ἀειραμένη; conjectured by Hermann at Aesch. fr. 152 R.); it also proved useful to medical and scientific authors (see LSJ, *Theat. Ling. Gr.*, s.v.). If Lentz has correctly assigned our passage to Herodian, whose work on pathology often served as a source for the etymologica,<sup>20</sup> it

<sup>17</sup> Cf. examples cited at R. Kühner and B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache* I (4. Aufl., Hannover 1955) 39 (§ 353.4, Anm. 3).

<sup>18</sup> Cf. sch. A (Ariston.) ad N 197; Vita V (p. 247. 8 Allen = *Vitae Homeri et Hesiodi*, ed. Wilamowitz [Berlin 1916; tp. 1929] 29. 9); R. Pfeiffer, *A History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford 1968) 228. Herodian, too, regarded the Homeric dialect as equivalent to Old Attic: cf. J. Wackemagel, *Kleine Schriften* (Göttingen n.d.) II 1107.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Cohn, *RE* II.1 (1895) s.v. Apollonios no. 81, 139. 16; D. L. Blank, *Ancient Philosophy and Grammar: The Syntax of Apollonius Dyscolus* (Chico, CA 1982).

<sup>20</sup> On the reconstruction of this work, cf. R. Reitzenstein, *Inedita poetarum Graecorum fragmenta* II (ind. lect. Rostock 1891) 18 ff.

is he, rather than Alexander, who has the honor of being the first to propose the etymology currently favored (< κέρας; the stem ending in -*φ* will account for the original δίκροον).<sup>21</sup>

Alexander's mistake was perhaps to attempt to build a word-family on, at best, a very tenuous foundation, the only other independent testimony for κόρος = κλάδος being Hsch. κ 3655; hence, for instance, LSJ does not recognize κόρος in this sense. The word for laurel (usually spelled κορυθαλῖς) is surely related to the cult titles of Apollo (Κόρυθος) and Artemis (Κορυθαλ(λ)ία), rather than a generic word for branch.

Alexander's connection of κορεῖν and κόρος with the same root<sup>22</sup> might seem *prima facie* more promising in light of φιλεῖν/φίλος. However, if the basic noun stands to the verb's direct object in the relation of an instrument with which it is treated, one expects a formation in -οῦν, not -εῖν.<sup>23</sup>

Together with fr. 9 and test. 5, our fragment preserves what I take to be the name of Alexander's father, Asclepiades;<sup>24</sup> and, like fr. 5, it tells us that Alexander wrote a *Miscellany* in at least ten books (cf. test. 5). If the contents were alphabetically arranged, this might account for δίκροον and ἐπίσχοιες being treated in the same book, but without further evidence we cannot be sure.

5. Sch. A ad Ξ 241c: ἐπίσχοιες: τῷ ἐπίσχοιμι ἀκόλουθόν ἐστι τὸ ἐπίσχοις, τῷ δὲ ἐπίσχοιῖν τὸ ἐπίσχοιός· καὶ ἴσως ἔδει οὕτως ἔχειν, παρεφθάρη δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν μεταχαρακτηρισάντων· τῷ δὲ χαρακτῆρι γινόμενον ὅμοιον τῷ "ἰοίῖν" καὶ "ἀγαγοίῖν" [5] παρὰ Σαπφοῦ (frg. 169 et 182 Voigt) καὶ τῷ "πεπαγοίῖν" παρ' Εὐπόλιδι (fr. 472 K.-A.) εἰκότως ἐβαρτυρονήθη τὸ ἐπίσχοιός γινόμενον ἐπίσχοιες, ὡς Αἰολικόν. οὕτω καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Κοτιαεὺς ἐν τῷ ι' τῶν Παντοδαπῶν.

2 ἐπίσχοιῖν τὸ ἐπίσχοιός Cobet: ἐπίσχοιός τὸ ἐπίσχοιῖν A 5 τῷ Bekker: τὸ A

1-2 τῷ ἐπίσχοιμι—ἐπίσχοιός] cf. Ap. Dysc. et Hdn. apud Choer. Th. 2. 260. 19-20, unde EM 664. 26 (s.v. περιπατοίῖν) et Eust. 983. 1: ἐκ τοῦ σχοῖμι δὲ τὸ σχοίῖν Ἀττικῶς, ὁμοίως τῷ περιπατοίῖμι περιπατοίῖν καὶ τοῖς ὁμοίοις; sch. A ad Ξ 241b': {τῷ κεν} (secl. Erbse) ἐπίσχοιες: οὕτως τὴν γραφὴν παρατίθεται ὁ Ἡρωδιανὸς ἐν τῷ ιζ' τῆς Καθόλου (Hdn. 1. 469. 14; cf. 2. 230. 20) καὶ λέγει ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐπίσχοις πλεονασμὸν εἶναι τοῦ ε ἢ συστολήν τοῦ

<sup>21</sup> Cf. H. Frisk, *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 3 vols. (Heidelberg 1960-72) at I 394, s.v. δίκροος.

<sup>22</sup> M. W. Haslam queries whether κόρος = κλάδος might have been inferred from κορεῖν.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. A. Debrunner, *Griechische Wortbildungslehre* (Heidelberg 1917) 93 f. and 99 f.

<sup>24</sup> Rather than of his teacher, as A. Meineke (*Analecta Alexandrina* [Berlin 1843] 16) supposed.

ἐπισχοίης; sch. A<sup>int</sup> ad Ξ 241b<sup>2</sup>: οὕτως Ἡρωδιανὸς ἐπίσχυες (debutit ἐπίσχοιες, ut vidit Erbse).

In the Διὸς ἀπάτη Hera offers Ὑπνος the prospect of fine gifts in return for collaboration in putting Zeus to sleep (Ξ 238–41):

δῶρα δέ τοι δώσω καλὸν θρόνον, ἄφθιτον αἰεὶ,  
 χρύσειον· Ἥφαιστος δέ κ' ἐμὸς παῖς, ἀμφιγυήεις  
 τεύξει ἀσκήσας, ὑπὸ δὲ θρήνυν ποσὶν ἦσει,  
 τῷ κεν ἐπίσχοιες λιπαροῦς πόδας εἰλαπινάζων.

At issue in our fragment is the word ἐπίσχοιες, attested here as early as the third century B.C. (π<sup>59</sup> = Pap. Ryl. 49) and assumed by Alexander and Herodian to be the transmitted text.

Alexander notes that one would expect ἐπίσχοις (το ἐπίσχοιμι) or ἐπισχοίης (to ἐπισχοίην). He therefore cautiously (ἴσως) moots the possibility that ἐπισχοίης ought to have been the reading (ἐπίσχοις, of course, being metrically excluded) but that it was corrupted in the process of transcription from Old Attic script, which failed to differentiate between ε and η.<sup>25</sup>

The modern editor must also face the additional query: Is the reading ἐπισχοίης plausibly Homeric in light of what we know about the history of Greek? Now σχοίς is original, σχοίης an innovation; but how early an innovation? In the *Odyssey* we meet φιλοίη (δ 692) and φοροίη (ι 320), which have been explained as Attic; the *Iliad* has σταίησαν (transmitted without a variant) at P 733.<sup>26</sup> Wackernagel has argued, however, that, since the *Iliad* otherwise has the -η- formation only for verbs in -μι, the true reading at Ξ 241 is ἐπίσχοιας.<sup>27</sup>

Admittedly the evidence is less extensive than one would like. However, editors including Ludwich, Allen and Mazon are probably right in preferring Alexander's ἐπισχοίης. Note that it is not a "conjecture of the second century A.D.," as Wackernagel states,<sup>28</sup> but an alternative interpretation of the oldest παράδοσις and that the parchment reading that he prefers is attested only in the sixth century A.D. (a fact which he does not mention).<sup>29</sup> Furthermore if ἐπισχοίης strains credibility in spite of σταίησαν, φιλοίη and φοροίη, how much less likely is Homer to have

<sup>25</sup> This mode of explanation is likely to have been used already by Aristarchus: cf. sch. A (Ariston.) ad Λ 104a<sup>1</sup>, with testimonies adduced by Erbse. I assume, however, that Alexander learned only the principle, not its application to this passage, from his great predecessor (via Didymus?).

<sup>26</sup> Cf. E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik* I (Munich 1953) 794 ff.; P. Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique* I (Paris 1958) 463 ff.

<sup>27</sup> J. Wackernagel, *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer* (Göttingen 1916) 14; and *Kleine Schriften* (above, note 18) I 806–07.

<sup>28</sup> Previous note.

<sup>29</sup> Cod. Brit. mus. add. 17210: ἐπίσχοιάς.

known an ἐπίσχοιαις formed on the analogy of the third plural weak aorist optative -ειαι (cf., e.g., πημήνειαι [Γ 299], ἀκούσειαι [B 98, 282])?<sup>30</sup>

The provenance of our scholium is a difficult problem. Erbse would assign it, together with the other A-scholia which mention Alexander, to Porphyry's *Quaestiones Homericae*; he points to the fact that in his eighth *quaestio* Porphyry deals with a problem of textual criticism, just as our scholium does (cf. fr. 15 below, which displays an interest in the processes by which the true reading is corrupted similar to that of our fragment).<sup>31</sup> Van der Valk, however, objects that (a) we have no evidence that Porphyry dealt with Ξ 241; (b) Porphyry's interest in a textual problem in the eighth *quaestio* is an exception; (c) our fragment deals specifically with a grammatical point, and we know that Porphyry despised grammar and grammarians; and (d) the citation by work and book number is more precise than Porphyry is wont to be (but cf. fr. 2).<sup>32</sup>

H. Schrader, on the other hand, assigned this scholium to Herodian.<sup>33</sup> However, if, as I am inclined to believe, at Hdn. 1. 468. 4 Lenz's reconstruction (based on *Ep. alph.* [AO 2. 334. 20] and EM 495. 1) is correct, the prosodical portion of our scholium conflicts with Herodian's doctrine that the strong aorist optative only of verbs with participles ending in -ς retains the accent of the primitive; hence, on Herodian's view, one would in any case expect ἐπίσχοιες, not the form ἐπισχοῖες implied by Alexander, so that the supposition of Aeolic barytonesis would be redundant. If this note had passed through Herodian's hands, one would thus have expected it to include a corrective along these lines.

In view of the deficiencies of the hypotheses of Porphyrian or Herodianic provenance, might we be best advised to assign this scholium to the exegetical commentary which seems the likely source of two other citations of Alexander in the A-scholia (sc. fr. 1 and 8)?<sup>34</sup>

### c. Ex opere incerto

6. EM 77. 7 (s.v. ἀμάμαξυς<sup>35</sup>): ἔστιν οὖν ἀμπέλου τι γένος. οἱ δὲ τὴν ἐσπέριον σταφυλὴν· Ἀλέξανδρος τὴν †ἀβούβαστον λέγει.

2 τὴν ἀβούβαστον] τὴν ἀβούμαστον PT: τὴν ἄμπελον βουβαστὸν vel βουβάστειον Sturz

<sup>30</sup> Cf. R. Janko (above, note 8) ad loc., who arrives at a similar conclusion.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Erbse (above, note 1) 97-98.

<sup>32</sup> Van der Valk (above, note 8) I 113-14.

<sup>33</sup> H. Schrader, *Porphyrii Quaestionum Homericarum ad Iliadem pertinentium reliquiae* (Leipzig 1880) 379.

<sup>34</sup> This is the alternate possibility mooted (with a query) in Erbse's edition. The citation of Eupolis, ill adapted to the argument, may be a later addition (so M. W. Haslam).

<sup>35</sup> On the accent, cf. Hdn. 2. 762. 6 = Choer. Th. 1. 331. 4.

Cf. Hsch. α 3425: ἀμάμαξος: ἄμπελος, ἡ γένος σταφυλῆς· εἴρηται δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ χωλοῦ τινος, δύο βακτηρίαις ὑπὸ τὰς μασχάλας ἐρειδομένου καὶ ἐκκρεμάμενον ἔχοντος τὸν πόδα ὡς βότρυον.

The compiler of the *EM* adds our fragment immediately after a Methodian gloss (s.v. ἀμάμαξος) which he copied from the *Et. Gen.*<sup>36</sup> Our material has been thought likely to derive from Diogenianus in view of the similar definitions presented by Hesychius and the *EM*;<sup>37</sup> if that is so, Diogenianus, who was his contemporary,<sup>38</sup> is the earliest author to cite Alexander. The word was used by Sappho (fr. 173 Voigt) and Epicharmus (Γᾶ καὶ Θάλασσα, fr. 24 Kaibel) and in a comic scene described at Hsch. α 3425; in addition, ψευδαμάμαξος appears at Ar. *Vesp.* 326 (cf. sch. ad loc.). What was meant by those who called the ἀμάμαξος ἡ ἐσπέριος σταφυλή is obscure enough;<sup>39</sup> but Alexander's remark is corrupt (ἀβούβαστον being *vox nihili*), with no remedy in sight (the connection with Βούβαστις, the Egyptian equivalent of Artemis [cf. Hdt. 2. 137. 5] implied by Sturz's conjectures is far from clear).

7. *Et. Gen.* (A), unde *EM* 145. 38 (s.v. ἀρμάτειον μέλος [Eur. Or. 1384]): ... ἄλλοι δὲ ὅτι ὁ ἦχος τοῦ ἄρματος ὄξυς καὶ λεπτός γίνεται· τὸν οὖν ὄξυν καὶ λεπτὸν φθόγγον ἀρμάτειον ἐκ τούτου ὁ Εὐριπίδης ἐκάλεσε· καὶ εὐνοῦχον [5] εἰσάγει λέγοντα· τοιαῦται δὲ τῶν εὐνοῦχων αἱ φωναί. οὕτω Δίδυμος (p. 245 Schm.) καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος. ἢ παρὰ τὸν ἀρμόν, ὃ σημαίνει τὸν πόλεμον τῆ τῶν Φρυγῶν διαλέκτῳ φησὶ Παλαμῆδης. ἢ ἱστορεῖ ὁ τὴν κωμικὴν λέξιν συναγαγῶν Μεθόδιος.

Cf. sch. TB Eur. Or. 1384 (1. 220. 21 Schwartz): Ἀπολλόδωρος ὁ Κυρηναιῖος (fr. 1 Dyck) παρεπιγραφὴν λέγει εἶναι τὸ τάρμοδιον ὃ Ἰλιον†. εἰ δὲ ἦν παρεπιγραφή, ἅπαξ ἂν ἐπεγράφετο (τὸ Ἰλιον ἀπώλετο). ἔνιοι δὲ τὸν ἐκπεπηδηκότα Φρύγα εὐνοῦχόν φασιν εἶναι, τοὺς δὲ εὐνοῦχους ἐπιεικῶς ὄξυφώνους ὑπάρχειν. τὸ οὖν ὄξυτονὸν ἀρμάτειον αὐτὸν φάναι διὰ τὸ τὸν ὑπαξόνιον τῶν ἀρμάτων ἦχον ἀνατεταμένον τε καὶ ὄξυν εἶναι. ὅτι δὲ εὐνοῦχος ἦν, φησὶ· “οὔτε <γὰρ> γυνὴ πέφυκας, οὔτ' ἐν ἀνδράσιν σύ γ' εἶ” (1528)· καὶ πάλιν· “ὄξυ γὰρ βοῆς ἀκούσαν Ἄργος ἐξεγείρεται” (1530). εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ ἄλλαι αἰτίαι ἃς ἐκτίθεται ὁ ὑπομνηματιστάμενος.

<sup>36</sup> Ed. at R. Reitzenstein, *Geschichte der griechischen Etymologika* (Leipzig 1897) 13. 20.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Erbse (above, note 1) 97.

<sup>38</sup> *Sm.* δ 1140: ... γεγωνῶς ... ἐπὶ Ἀδριανοῦ βασιλέως; cf. Cohn, *RE* V. 1 (1903) 778. 10 ff.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. L. Dindorf, *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* I.2 (Paris 1831–56) 20d.



Our fragment has reached the etymologica via the fifth-century lexicographer Methodius,<sup>40</sup> who is expressly cited. Methodius is likely to have used an Atticist source, which, in turn, found the comment in the Παντοδαπά (the Ἐξηγητικά not being known to have dealt with authors other than Homer). Sch. Eur. *Or.* 1384 preserves (via Didymus, who is expressly cited: τὸ ἀρμάτειον μέλος ὁ Δίδυμος φησιν ὠνομάσθαι . . . , 1. 220. 9 Schwartz) a more detailed version of the same doctrine (though the scholium's last sentence shows that it, too, is curtailed). Alexander has simply taken over from Didymus an interpretation of the use of ἀρμάτειον at *Or.* 1384; Didymus' own work is largely of value as a collection of the views of his predecessors; we have no way of gauging his originality in this matter, however.<sup>41</sup> Furthermore, Alexander shows no awareness of the possibility that Apollodorus of Cyrene had raised, namely that *Or.* 1384 might be a stage direction that crept from the margin into the text.<sup>42</sup>

8. Sch. A<sup>im</sup> ad A 1i: <Ἀχιλῆος> ὁ Κοτταεὺς “Ἀχιλῆος,” διὰ τὸ μέτρον ἐν λ γράφει· καὶ γὰρ τὸ Κάμανδρος ἀντὶ τοῦ Σκάμανδρος γράφεται.

1 le. add. Erbse 2 γὰρ Erbse: /// A 3 γρ(άφεται) Erbse, Beitr. 96: γρ(άφεσθαι) Erbse in ed.

1-2 Ἀχιλῆος—γράφει] cf. sch. DAT ad A 1h: Πηληιάδεω Ἀχιλῆος: οὕτως ἀναγνωστέον δι' ἐνός λ διὰ τὸ μέτρον καὶ διὰ τὸ ἄχος (ὅ ἐστι λύπην) ἐπενεγκεῖν τοῖς Ἰλιεῦσιν. οἱ δὲ παρὰ τὸ μὴ θιγεῖν χεῖλεσι τροφῆς (debuit χιλοῦ vel χιλῆς, ὅ ἐστι τροφῆς, ut vidit Erbse)· ὄλωσ γὰρ οὐ μετέσχε γάλακτος; Ep. ad A 1E (cum test.); Tz. Ex. 61. 3: Ἀχιλῆος: ἐν λ, οὐ διὰ τὸ μέτρον, καθὰ τινες φάσκουσιν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τε τὸ ἄχος ἐμποιεῖν Ἰλιεῦσι καὶ διὰ τὸ χιλῆς ἄμοιρον εἶναι . . . ; sim. Tz. laudatus sch. Lyc. 797; Eust. 14. 8: ὅτι ὡσπερ Ὀδυσσεὺς ποτὲ μὲν διὰ δύο σσ παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ, ποτὲ δὲ δι' ἐνός, ὡς μετὰ ταῦτα φανήσεται, οὕτω καὶ Ἀχιλλεύς, ἐνταῦθα μὲν ἐν τῷ “Πηληιάδεω Ἀχιλῆος” καὶ ἀλλαγῆ δὲ δι' ἐνός ἐκφωνεῖται λ, ἐν πλείοσι δὲ τόποις δύο λ<λ> (cogit. Haslam) ἔχει. ἐπαγωνίζονται δὲ ἄλλοι μὲν τῇ τοῦ ἐνός, ἕτεροι δὲ τῇ τῶν δύο λ γραφῇ, τὰ μὲν δύο τιθέντες ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄχος ἰάλλειν ἦγον λύπην ἐμβάλλειν, . . . ἢ κατὰ πλεονασμὸν τοῦ ἐτέρου λ διὰ τὸ εὐφωρότερον, . . . τῷ δὲ ἐνὶ λ συνηγοροῦντες πρῶτον μὲν ἐκ τῆς ἀναλογίας, ἵνα ἦ ὅμοιον τῷ Ὀϊλέως, βασιλεύς· εἶτα ἐξ ἐτυμολογίας, ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄχος τοῖς

<sup>40</sup> Cf. C. Wendel, *RE* XV.2 (1932) 1380. 22 ff., esp. 1381. 20 ff.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Pfeiffer (above, note 18) 274 ff.; on the Euripidean commentaries in particular, p. 277.

<sup>42</sup> For Apollodorus' date (prior to the first-century A.D. lexicographer Pamphilus, who quotes him), cf. A. Dyck, “On Apollodorus of Cyrene,” *HSCP* 85 (1981) 106; E. Hoffmann-Aleith, *RE* XVIII.3 (1949) 336. 44 (Pamphilus no. 25). The problem is still debated: cf. Euripides, *Orestes*, ed. C. W. Willink (Oxford 1986) ad loc., with literature there cited.

'Ιλιεῦσιν . . . γενέσθαι· ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ α στερητικοῦ καὶ τοῦ χιλός . . . 2-3 τὸ Κάμανδρος—γράφεται] cf. sch. h ad Φ 223 (laud. Erbse ad loc.); sch. D.T. 351. 8: "πῶς οὖν," ἐπάγουσι, "πάλιν τὸ σκ κοινὴν εἰργάσατο, ὡς ἐν τῷ 'οὐδὲ Σκάμανδρος ἔληγεν' (Φ 305) καὶ τὸ ζ διπλοῦν ὄν ἐν τῷ 'οἶ τε Ζάκυνθον ἔναιον' (B 634);" πρὸς οὓς φαμεν, ἐπειδὴ ἀνάγκη ἦν πάντως τὰ ὀνόματα ἐντεθῆναι τῇ ποιήσει, ἃ πάντως ἐντιθέμενα χωλὸν εἰργάζετο τὸν στίχον· καὶ διὰ τὸ χρειῶδες μέτρον κατεφρόνησεν ὁ ποιητής; ibid. 506. 4; Eust. 255. 29 (cum Valkii adn.): σημειῶσαι δὲ ὅτι ὁ Σκάμανδρος δυσχερῶς ἐν μέτρῳ ἔχων παρεισρέειν ἠρωϊκῶ ἐκαινοτομήθη ἐξ ἀνάγκης παρὰ τοῦ ποιητοῦ.

This fragment represents a stage in the efforts of ancient grammarians to bring the spelling and prosody of Homeric proper names under a common denominator. It is surprising that Alexander is singled out for the spelling 'Αχιλῆος in A 1, which is that both of the vulgate and the scholastic tradition (cf. sch. D ad loc.).<sup>43</sup> In any case, others (like sch. D, Tzetzes, Eustathius and others) sought an etymological, rather than a metrical, justification.

The name of the river Scamander could not have been used in hexameter verse if the initial σκ- caused a preceding short syllable to lengthen. Accordingly, in all twelve passages in which it occurs in the the *Iliad* the σ fails to make position and a variant spelling with κ- is attested.<sup>44</sup> The reading with σκ- is attested at P. Heid. 1262a (= π<sup>12</sup>, 3rd century B.C.) at Φ 305.<sup>45</sup> Alexander provides a terminus ante quem for the spelling Κάμανδρος in Homer.

The rule formulated at sch. h ad Φ 223 whereby only verbs beginning with σκ- or ζ-, but not nouns, lengthen the previous syllable is inadequate: it introduces an alien element (part of speech) into metrical calculations;<sup>46</sup> and what about σκεδάννυμι/κεδάννυμι?<sup>47</sup> More promising is the approach of K. Strunk, who argues that the prosody ξσκ- takes advantage of a reminiscence of a dialect in which σκ had been assimilated to

<sup>43</sup> On the spelling itself, cf. M. W. Haslam, "Homeric Words and Homeric Metre: Two Doublets Examined (λείβω/εἰβω, γαῖα/αἶα)," *Glotta* 54 (1976) 206 n. 12.

<sup>44</sup> E 36, 77, 774, H 329, Λ 499, M 21, Θ 74, Φ 124, 223, 305, 603, X 148; the same is true of the name Σκαμάνδριος derived from it (Z 402); M. W. Haslam compares the treatment of the form σκέπαρνον at ε 237 and ι 391, where the σ likewise fails to make position.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. S. West, *The Ptolemaic Papyri of Homer*, Papyrologica Coloniensia 3 (Cologne and Opladen 1967) 138.

<sup>46</sup> M. W. Haslam raises the interesting possibility that h's rule may have arisen from a misunderstanding of τὰ ὀνόματα at sch. D.T. 351. 8 (cited above).—For a similarly misguided introduction of part of speech into ancient prosodical doctrine, cf. J. Wackemagel (above, note 18) II 1105.

<sup>47</sup> Erbse (above, note 1) 96 n. 2, therefore rightly assumes this note to be a late invention.

κ and cites corresponding short forms and papyrus evidence for a personal name Κάμ(μ)ονδρος.<sup>48</sup>

Erbse assigned our scholium to Porphyry's *Quaestiones Homericae*,<sup>49</sup> more perhaps because of fr. 3b above than the nature of our fragment itself (it has no correspondence in Porphyry's extant work; nor is it clear what kind of ζήτημα could have accommodated it). It is argued above (ad fr. 1 and 5) that we should in any case assume that some of the citations of Alexander in the A-scholia derive from an exegetical commentary, a hypothesis which would also suit this fragment well.

9. Et. Gen. (AB) s.v. ἄχνη, unde Et. Gud. d<sup>2</sup> 251. 18 Stef. et EM 181. 55: ... Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ ὁ τοῦ Ἀσκληπιάδου λέγει αὐτὴν παρὰ τὸν αἰξῶ μέλλοντα εἶναι, ὡς τεύχω τέχνη, καὶ ἀποβολῇ τοῦ ι.

2 ὁ τοῦ ἀσκλ. A: om. B 2-3 λέγει αὐτὴν post μέλλοντα hab. B 3 τέχνη B: τεύχην καὶ A | καὶ A: om. B 4 ι A: υ B

3 παρὰ τὸν αἰξῶ] cf. Et. Orion. G (23. 12). | τεύχω τέχνη] cf. Et. Orion. H (616. 44); EM 755. 56, cui sim. Zon. 1720; Eust. 178. 5, 421. 36, 575. 33.

If, as LSJ contends, the basic meaning of ἄχνη is "anything that comes off the surface," then Alexander's etymology from the verb meaning "shoot, dart" has at least some semantic plausibility. However, the supporting analogy is inadequate; for, as M. W. Haslam observes, τέχνη is not formed from τεύξω, nor does αἰξῶ have a present \*αἶχω. Not surprisingly, then, Alexander's etymology failed to find favor either in Byzantine or modern times.

The Byzantines preferred the etymology from ἔχω (. . . ἀεχίνη τις οὔσα, ἢ μὴ δυναμένη ἔχεσθαι καὶ κρατεῖσθαι διὰ τὸ λεπτομερὲς καὶ ἄτομον: Et. Gen.; cf. test. cited by Erbse ad sch. bT ad A 307c). Modern etymologists allow a connection either with ἄχυρον, "chaff," or with the root in Latin *agna* ("ear of grain") and Gothic *ahana* ("chaff") plus the *-snā* suffix.<sup>50</sup>

Probably this fragment, like Alexander's other etymologies (fr. 4, 11, 12), belongs to the Παντοδαπά (fr. 4 above being expressly attested for that work). In Et. Orion. the gloss s.v. ἄχνη occurs within a group of glosses interpolated into the section from Philoxenus. I suspect that Orion's gloss on ἄχνη may derive from Herodian, as seems likely in the case of fr. 4. The Et. Gen. will have drawn on a more detailed Orion gloss

<sup>48</sup> K. Strunk, "Sprachliches und Prosodisches zur mykenischen Orthographie," *IF* 66 (1961) 164 f.

<sup>49</sup> Erbse (above, note 1) 96, and, with a question mark, ad sch. A 1i.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. H. Frisk (above, note 21) s.v. ἄχνη; P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: Histoire des mots*, 4 vols. (Paris 1968-80) s.v. ἄχνη.

than is now extant. Note that the mention of Alexander's father's name also binds fragments 4 and 9 together.

10a. Choer. Th. 2. 108. 31: 'Ο δὲ Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Κοτυναεὺς θαυμασιῶς αὐτὸ σχηματίζει· λέγει γὰρ ὅτι πολλὰ ῥήματα ἀπὸ τοῦ μέλλοντος παράγονται εἰς τὸν ἐνεστῶτα, καὶ τρέπουσι τὸ σ εἰς τὸ χ ἢ εἰς τὸ κ, οἷον σμῶ σμήσω σμήχω (ἐξ οὗ [5] τὸ σμήξω), ὀλῶ ὀλέσω ὀλέκω· οὕτως οὖν ἐκ τοῦ δεῖσω μέλλοντος ἐγένετο ὁ ἐνεστῶς δείκω κατὰ τροπὴν τοῦ σ εἰς τὸ κ, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ δείκω λοιπὸν ἀκολουθῶς ὁ μέσος παρακείμενος **δέδοικα**, ὡσπερ λείπω λέλοιπα, λείβω λέλοιβα, πείθω πέποιθα.

10b. Et. Gen. (AB), unde EM 253. 9: δέδοικα: ἔστι δεῖδω, οἷον [11] “δεῖδω μὴ τι πάθω”· τούτου ὁ μέσος παρακείμενος δέδοικα καὶ διὰ τὴν ἐπαλληλίαν τῶν δ ἐτρόπη τὸ ἔσχατον δ εἰς κ καὶ γέγονε δέδοικα. | ὁ δὲ Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Κοτυναεὺς θαυμασιῶς ἀπολογεῖται λέγων ὅτι πολλὰ ῥήματά εἰσιν ἀπὸ [15] μελλόντων εἰς ἐνεστῶτας μεταγόμενα καὶ τρέποντα τὸ σ ἢ εἰς τὸ χ ἢ εἰς τὸ κ, οἷον σμῶ σμήσω σμήχω σμήξω, ὀλῶ ὀλέσω ὀλέκω· οὕτως οὖν καὶ ἐκ τοῦ δεῖσω μέλλοντος ἐγένετο ὁ ἐνεστῶς δείκω καὶ ἐκ τούτου ὁ μέσος παρακείμενος δέδοικα. | διὰ τί γὰρ δείκω ἐγένετο καὶ οὐ [20] δεῖχω; ἐπειδὴ οὐδέποτε τὰ εἰς χω ῥήματα θέλουσι τῆ εἰ διφθόγγῳ παραλήγεσθαι, πλὴν τοῦ στείχω λείχω. οὕτως Ζηνόβιος.

1 κοτυναεὺς O 6 ἐγένετο] ἐγίνετο C 11 πάθω] fort. πάθησι ut A 470 (cf. anon. ad EM 253. 11) 12 δέδοικα B: δέδοικα A | τῶν B: τοῦ A 13 ante κ hab. A τὸ | γέγονε A: γίνεται B 15 μελλόντων] μέλλοντος A | μεταγόμενα] παρα- B 16 prior ἢ om. B 19 τί A: τοῦτο B | post δείκω hab. A ῥῆμα

Cf. ad Ep. ad A 555.

At issue is the form δέδοικα. For the first question about it, viz. its classification as to tense and voice, Choeroboscus has found an answer to his satisfaction in Apollonius: It is perfect middle, changed from δέδοικα because of the juxtaposition of the three *d* sounds (Choer. Th. 2. 108. 20 = Ap. Dysc. 3. 107. 42). Choeroboscus then goes on to explain that the third *δ* was changed because, owing to the nature of the perfect reduplication, a change of either of the first two deltas would have entailed change of the other and thereby a total change in the appearance and sound of the word. He then goes on to cite the “remarkable” analysis of Alexander, who sees δέδοικα as a regular perfect middle to δείκω, formed on future δεῖσω, like ὀλῶ ὀλέσω ὀλέκω. By the way, the πάθος by which a present form was

derived from the future was not uncommonly used by the ancients; cf., e.g., *Ep.* ad A 490.

I have focussed on Choeroboscus' presentation, since it gives a clearer notion of the grammatical context in which Alexander's remark was quoted than does the excerpt in the *Et. Gen.* Both Choeroboscus and *Et. Gen. s.v.* δέδουκα are likely, however, to derive from the same source, namely Zenobius' commentary on Apollonius' Ῥηματικόν.<sup>51</sup> Choeroboscus' dependence on Zenobius was made likely by Reitzenstein, who compared Choeroboscus' discussion of ἰμάσσω (*Th.* 2. 154. 17) with *Et. Gen. s.vv.* ἰνάσσω and ἰμάσσω.<sup>52</sup> I suspect that Alexander's "remarkable" opinion was already cited (and rejected) by his contemporary, Apollonius Dyscolus; it seems much less likely to have been dredged up by Zenobius centuries later.<sup>53</sup>

11. *Et. Gen.* (AB), unde EM 277. 8: δινωτοῖσιν (Γ 391): ἀπό τοῦ δινῶ τοῦ συστρέφω. τορνευτοῖς ἢ στοργγύλοις ἀπό τῆς τῶν κλινοπόδων περιφερείας. Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Κοτυαεῦς.

2 alt. τοῦ Erbse: τὸ AB 3 ἀλέξανδρος — A: om. B

Cf. sch. D ad Γ 391: δινωτοῖσι: ἦτοι πεποικιλμένοις ἢ κατὰ συστροφήν τετορνευμένοις; Ap. S. 59. 5: δινωτοῖσι λεχέεσσι: στοργγύλοις, ἀπό τῆς τῶν κλινοπόδων περιφερείας; *Et. Orion.* G (44. 1; in sede scholiorum Hom.): δινωτή (δινωτή G: corr. Larcher): περιφερής, ἔοικυῖα δίνω (ἀδίνω G, corr. Larcher), ὃ ἔστι τόνρω. δίνος δὲ ὁ τόνρος παρὰ τὸ δινεῖσθαι καὶ κυκλοῦσθαι (δονεῖσθαι καὶ κολοῦσθαι G, corr. Larcher); sch. bT ad N 407a; ad *Ep. Hom.* δ 48 (= AO 1. 114. 10) eius editionis quam praefero.

The form δινωτοῖσι occurs in the Homeric poems only at this place (but cf. δινωτήν at N 407 and τ 56), where Aphrodite seeks to lure Helen back to Paris' chamber in spite of his debacle in the μονομαχία with Menelaus (Γ 390 ff.):

“δεῦρ' ἴθ'· Ἀλέξανδρός σε καλεῖ οἴκονδε νέεσθαι.

<sup>51</sup> H. Duentzer, *De Zenodoti studiis Homericis* (Göttingen 1848) 14–16, had the merit of observing that, apart from four passages dealing with *voces Homericæ* where Zenodotus was clearly meant, the ζη compendium in the *EM* should be resolved as Ζηνόβιος. The fragments of this work were assembled by G. Schoemann, *De Zenobii commentario Rhematiici Apolloniani* (progr. Danzig 1881); our fragment is no. 12 at pp. 11–12.

<sup>52</sup> Reitzenstein (above, note 36) 361–62.

<sup>53</sup> On Apollonius' date, cf. Cohn, *RE* II.1 (1895) 136. 32 ff. Unlike the younger grammarian Choeroboscus, our Zenobius does not enjoy his own *RE* article; H. Gärtner, *RE* X A (1972) 12. 10 ff., suggests that our Zenobius may be the author of *AP* 9. 711 in honor of a rhetorician named Victor, if Sulpicius Victor (4th century) is the honoree in question; note, however, that, as Reitzenstein (above, note 36) 362 showed by reference to *Et. Gen. s.v.* οὐδεῖς = *EM* 639. 16, Zenobius was contemporary with or younger than John Philoponus (6th century), whom he criticized.

κείνος ὃ γ' ἐν θαλάμῳ καὶ δινωτοῖσι λέχεσσι,  
κάλλει τε στίλβων καὶ εὔμασιν· . . .”

Alexander's interpretation of δινωτός as a verbal adjective to δινω is implicit in the D-scholium to Γ 391; and the agreement in wording of Alexander's explanation with that of Apollonius Sophista is striking. As terminus ante quem for the latter we have only the fact that he is cited by Herodian.<sup>54</sup> However, it is more likely that Alexander has copied from Apollonius (whose *Lexicon* survives in a shortened version only) than vice versa, since, although Apollonius names a good many sources,<sup>55</sup> Alexander is not among them, Apion being the latest source that Apollonius does cite. Apollonius will have been influenced here, as elsewhere, by the D-scholia (or rather their ancient predecessor, the scholia minora).<sup>56</sup>

It is tempting to believe, with Erbse,<sup>57</sup> that Alexander's comment was taken from the Ἐξηγητικά, but since the Παντοδοπαία, too, dealt with a Homeric ἄπαξ λεγόμενον (cf. fr. 5), certainty is unobtainable. Nor is it possible to determine the source from which the *Et. Gen.* gleaned this information.<sup>58</sup>

12. EM 294. 7 (s.v. δωτήνη [I 155, 297, ι 268]): Ἀλέξανδρος  
δὲ σύνθετον εἶναι τὴν λέξιν παρὰ τὸ τὴν δόσιν τίνειν, ἴν' ἧ ἡ  
ἀποτινομένη δόσις.

2 δόσιν] -ις D

Cf. sch. D ad I 155: δωτήνησι: δωραίς.

We may assume that Alexander was familiar with the explanation of δωτήνη given in the D-scholium to I 155. His etymology both accounts for the -τιν- element and at the same time adds the idea of “paying what one owes”<sup>59</sup> appropriate to the earliest occurrence of the word in the passage where Agamemnon promises Achilles his choice of one of his three daughters in marriage and seven fortified towns (πτολίεθρα) as a dowry if he will return to battle (I 154–56 ~ 296–98):

ἐν δ' ἄνδρες ναίουσι πολύρρηγες, πολυβοῦται,  
οἳ κέ ἐ δωτήνησι θεὸν ὡς τιμήσουσι  
καὶ οἱ ὑπὸ σκήπτρῳ λιπαρὰς τελέουσι θέμιστας.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. Cohn, *RE* II.1 (1895) 135. 60 ff.

<sup>55</sup> Fifteen to be exact; cf. the detailed discussion by H. Schenck, *Die Quellen des Homerlexikons des Apollonios Sophistes* (Hamburg 1961) 13 ff.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. H. Gauker, *Das Verhältnis des Homerlexikons des Apollonios Sophistes zu den Homerscholien* (diss. Zürich 1945) 50–65; K. Steinicke, *Apollonii Sophistae Lexicon Homericum* (diss. Göttingen 1957) xvii–xxi; Schenck (previous note) 146 ff. gives a paradigmatic source-analysis of glosses on ten pages of Bekker's edition.

<sup>57</sup> Erbse (above, note 1) 98 n. 1.

<sup>58</sup> Erbse ad sch. Γ 391a mentions Orus with a question mark (because of fr. 147).

<sup>59</sup> Cf. LSJ s.v. τίνω I, s.v. ἀπό D.4, s.v. ἀποτίνω I.1–2.

These δωτῖναι are clearly, as Leumann remarks, "am Grundstück haftende Abgaben."<sup>60</sup> In the *Odyssey* δωτίνη twice appears as a gift to be given by host to guest (ι 268, λ 352).

This etymology, like Alexander's derivation for δίκρο(ο)ν (fr. 4), has found favor in neither medieval nor modern times. More influential in Byzantium were the two alternative etymologies recorded at Choer. *Orth.* (191. 12): (a) δώσω, δωσίνη, δωτίνη; (b) δέδοται, δοτός, δοτίνη, δωτίνη, both repeated (without mention of Alexander's hypothesis) at *Et. Gen.* (AB) s.v. δωτίνη (~ Zon. 588) and *Et. Gud.* 387. 18 Stef.;<sup>61</sup> the *EM* has sandwiched Alexander's view between these two. One wonders whether it might have been, again, Herodian who saved the doctrine of his elder contemporary for posterity; Herodian himself was, after all, not averse to bold compounds.<sup>62</sup>

Modern comparative linguists see δωτίνη as an old formation from the word for gift, δῶς or \*δῶτ-ς, and the suffix (τ)ιν-, possibly a backformation from a genitive \*δωτίνος.<sup>63</sup>

13. Eust. 859. 50: ἰστέον δὲ καὶ ὅτι τὸν ἰητῆρα οἱ μεθ' Ὀμηρον ἰητρὸν τε λέγουσι καὶ ἰατρὸν, καὶ ὅτι οὐ μόνον κατὰ γένος ἄρρηνικὸν ἰατρός, ἀλλὰ καὶ θηλυκῶς. φησὶ γοῦν Αἴλιος Διονύσιος (ι 1) ἰατρὸν γυναῖκα, "Ἀλεξίς δὲ (fr. 318 K.) [5] ἰατρίαν. ἡ δὲ ἰατρίνη οὐχ Ἑλληνικόν, φησί. παρὰ δὲ τοῖς Τεχνικοῖς κείται καὶ ὅτι ὁ μὲν Ὀρος (p. 42 Ritschl) οὐχ Ἑλληνικὴν λέξιν τὴν ἰατρίνην εἶναι φησιν, Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ ὁ Κοτταεὺς, πρὸς ἀκριβείαν λαλῶν, μὴ Ἀττικὴν εἶναι αὐτὴν λέγει.

Cf. Choer. *Orth.* (170. 33 ~ Hdn. 2. 456. 26): Ἀδρησίνη, Αἰητίνη: ... τὸ τι ι· τὰ γὰρ διὰ τοῦ ἰνη μονογενῆ, μὴ γενόμενα ἀπὸ ἐπιθέτων κύρια, ἀποστρέφονται τὴν διὰ τῆς εἰ διφθόγγου γραφὴν, οἷον Ὠκεανίνη, Εὐηνίνη, ἰατρίνη καὶ τὰ ὅμοια; An. *Orth.* 163. 23–24: τὰ δὲ [sc. διὰ τοῦ ἰνη] ὑπὲρ γ' συλλαβᾶς διὰ τοῦ ι· Αἰητίνη, Ἀδρησίνη, Ὠκεανίνη, Εὐηνίνη, Κυρηκίνη, ἰατρίνη ...

This fragment is unique in dealing, not with a textual problem, definition or etymology but exclusively with a question of usage. Here, as elsewhere, Eustathius displays familiarity with the Atticist lexicon of

<sup>60</sup> M. Leumann, *Homerische Wörter* (Basel 1950) 280; he goes on to suggest that δωτῖνα as "rent in kind" at *IG IV* 841. 18, 21 (Calauria, 3rd cent. B.C.) may be a semantic development from this passage.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. also Eust. 743. 44, who merely notes the lengthening of the first vowel of δωτίνη.

<sup>62</sup> Cf., e.g., P. Egenolff, "Zu Lentz' Herodian III," *Philol.* 62 (1903) 57–59; Dyck, *Glotta* 55 (1977) 225–27 (ἴφθιμος < ἴφι + θυμός).

<sup>63</sup> Cf. H. Frisk (above, note 21) s.v. δίδωμι; E. Schwyzer (above, note 26) I 465 n. 5.

Alexander's contemporary, Aelius Dionysius,<sup>64</sup> who made the point that *ιάτρός* can be common to both genders,<sup>65</sup> cited Alexis for the form *ιάτρία* but denied that *ιάτρίνη* was Greek. Eustathius also used, however, another source which quoted Orus and Alexander and which, it is agreed, he refers to by the periphrasis *οἱ Τεχνικοί*. While Reitzenstein argued that Eustathius thus refers to an otherwise unknown collection of Atticist excerpts,<sup>66</sup> it is generally agreed today that *παρὰ τοῖς Τεχνικοῖς* is rather an allusion to Choeroboscus, who (among others) is elsewhere so referred to<sup>67</sup> and is the source of Eustathius' other two citations of Orus.<sup>68</sup> Presumably the remark will have stood in a more nearly complete version of Choeroboscus' *Orthography* than is now extant. Orus, in turn, will have cited Alexander,<sup>69</sup> as in fr. 14.

Atticism was certainly in the air in Alexander's lifetime, as the activity of Aelius Dionysius and Herodian<sup>70</sup> attests; it therefore seems likely that his remark on *ιάτρίνη* was prompted by Atticist interests (a reply to Aelius Dionysius?).<sup>71</sup> We do not know whether he cited evidence in support of his position, though he certainly could have (cf. LSI s.v. *ιάτρίνη*).

14. Et. Gen. (AB), unde EM 664. 39: *περιρρηδής: οἶον*  
*“περιρρηδης δὲ τραπέζην”* (χ 84). AB *περιρραγεῖς, περιρρυεῖς.*  
*οὕτως Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Κοτιαεὺς. Πίος δὲ* (fr. 14 Hiller)  
*περιφερής, περιρρυής. Ὠρος* (om. Ritschl). A EM

4 ὦρος EM: om. A

Cf. sch. D ad χ 84: *περιρρηδής: περικλασθεῖς ἢ περιρραγεῖς· ἢ*  
*περιρρεόμενος ἢ περιρρυεῖς ἢ περιφερής; Ap. S. 130. 7:*  
*περιρρηδής: περιρρησόμενος, περικεκλασμένος. βέλτιον δὲ*

<sup>64</sup> Cf. H. Erbse, *Untersuchungen zu den attizistischen Lexika*, Abh. der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Philos.-hist. Kl., Jg. 1949, 2 (Berlin 1950) 1 ff.

<sup>65</sup> For *ιάτρός* as feminine, cf. Plut. *mor.* 143d, Ath. 636a.

<sup>66</sup> Reitzenstein (above, note 36) 389.

<sup>67</sup> Cf. K. Alpers, *Das attizistische Lexikon des Oros: Untersuchung und kritische Ausgabe der Fragmente*, SGLG 4 (Berlin and New York 1981) 82–83, who finds that in all other passages which refer to *οἱ Τεχνικοί* Reitzenstein's interpretation is excluded.

<sup>68</sup> Namely 837. 44 (*ζήτρειον*) from Choer. *Orth.* 215. 27 (possibly via *Et. Gen.* [AB] s.v. *ζήτρειον*) and 857. 42 (*λέων*) from Choer. *Orth.* 235. 32; cf. L. Cohn, *De Aristophane Byzantio et Suetonio Tranquillo Eustathi auctoribus*, Jahrb. f. cl. Philol., ed. A. Fleckeisen, 12. Supplbd. (Leipzig 1881) 295 n. 23, and *RE* VI.1 (1907) 1474. 2 ff.; Alpers (previous note) 81 n. 12. Cf. in general also Erbse (above, note 1) 97 n. 2, and van der Valk ad Eust. 859. 52.

<sup>69</sup> *Κατὰ Φρυνίχου, κατὰ στοχείου* has been seen as the work of Orus in question: cf. F. Ritschl, *De Oro et Orione commentatio* (Bratislava 1834) 42; R. Reitzenstein, *Der Anfang des Lexikons des Photios* (Leipzig and Berlin 1907) xlix; C. Wendel, *RE* XVIII.1 (1942) 1178. 49 ff.; perhaps, however, this should be modified slightly to Orus' Atticist work later used by himself in his *Orthography*; cf. Alpers (above, note 67) 80–83.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. Reitzenstein (above, note 36) 371 ff.

<sup>71</sup> Cf. L. Cohn, "Der Atticist Philemon," *Philol.* 57 (1898) 365.



μεταφορικῶς περιρρεόμενος· βάλλεται γὰρ καὶ τὸ ποτήριον κρατῶν, ὡς ἅμα τῇ πόσει περιρρεῖσθαι πεσόντα. ὁ δὲ Ἀρίσταρχος στροβηθεὶς περιφερῆς ἔπεσε τῇ τραπέζῃ, ὡς περικλασθῆναι περὶ αὐτήν· “περιρρηδῆς δὲ τραπέζῃ / κάππεσεν” (χ 84–85); sch. Ap. Rh. 1. 431a: περιρρηδῆς κερ(άεσσιν): ἐπὶ πρόσωπον μεθ’ ὀρμῆς κατενεχθεὶς, ἐπιρραγεὶς εἰς τοῦμπροσθεν, ἢ ἐπενεχθεὶς <ῆ> (suppl. Haslam) ἀντὶ τοῦ περιφερόμενος, ὡς καὶ παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ· “περιρρηδῆς δὲ τραπέζῃ / κάππεσεν” (χ 84–85). Ἀντίμαχος δὲ (fr. 190 Wyss) τὸ κατὰ κύκλον πεσεῖν οὕτω λέγει. νῦν δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπενεχθεὶς εἰς τὸ ἔμπροσθεν; Eust. 1920. 30: περιρρηδῆς δὲ ὁ ἔρραντισμένους αἵματι, ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ ῥάζω, περὶ οὗ προεῖρηται (sc. 912. 22, 1469. 3), οὐ δευτέρως ἀόριστος ἔρραδον, ὅθεν ὁ περιρρηδῆς.

The first question that this fragment raises is that of the relation of the two grammarians cited, Alexander and Pius. Now Hiller dates Pius to the end of the second or beginning of the third century, with the *terminus post quem* derived from the fact that Pius is not cited by Herodian.<sup>72</sup> In order for that argument to have force, however, it would have to be shown that Pius offered material relevant to Herodian’s interests. But, in fact, none of Pius’ fragments bears upon prosody, which was the focus of Herodian’s preserved work on the Homeric text.<sup>73</sup> More telling perhaps is the fact that Pius’ work was not cited by Nicanor, who lived under Hadrian and might well have been interested in Pius’ punctuation of Φ 55 (fr. 6 Hiller).<sup>74</sup> Furthermore Hiller’s *terminus ante quem* is given by Orus’ citation; but Orus is nowadays dated to the fifth, not to the first half of the third, century.<sup>75</sup>

It is worth considering whether the grammarian’s name may provide a clue to his date. Like, for instance, the Thucydidean biographer Marcellinus, Pius bears, in Greek fashion, a single name, even though the name itself is Roman. I suspect that the grammarian takes his name from the emperor Antoninus Pius, who adopted the *agnomen* upon ascending the throne in 138.<sup>76</sup> Pius’ case is evidently not parallel with that of Aelius

<sup>72</sup> E. Hiller, “Der Grammatiker Pius und die ἀπολογίαι πρὸς τὰς ἀθετήσεις Ἀριστάρχου,” *Philol.* 28 (1869) 93–94; the question of Pius’ date is left open by D. Strout and R. French, *RE* XX.2 (1950) 1891. 26 ff., s.v. Pius no. 2.

<sup>73</sup> Namely the Ἰλιάκη and Ὀδυσσειακὴ Προσφῶδια, preserved in extensive excerpts in the scholia on the respective poems; some of the content of these works was doubtless repeated—and not merely in Lentz’s reconstruction—in the Καθολικὴ Προσφῶδια. The one doctrine of Pius that might have interested Herodian is that preserved in fr. 1 Hiller (= sch. T ad E 638d<sup>1</sup>), since Herodian, too, dealt with the problem of ἀλλ’ οἶον (sch. A ad E 638c = Hdn. 2. 52. 9 Lentz; cf. also Haas ad Tyrann. fr. 18); however, Pius’ view (i.e., that the words ἦσαν οὐχ οἶος σύ need to be understood) is so eccentric that Herodian may well have thought it unworthy of serious attention.

<sup>74</sup> A point already made by Hiller (above, note 72) 93 and n. 11; for Nicanor’s date, cf. C. Wendel, *RE* XVII.1 (1936) 274. 50–52.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. C. Wendel, *RE* XVIII.1 (1942) 1178. 34 ff., with literature.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. P. v. Rohden, *RE* II.2 (1896) 2497. 60 ff. and 2498. 24 ff.

Herodian and others who, upon receiving Roman citizenship, adopted the gentile name of the emperor responsible,<sup>77</sup> since then we would have expected him also to adopt Aelius (the *nomen gentile* of Imp. Caes. T. Aelius Hadrianus Antoninus Aug. Pius) and to have retained his original Greek name. He is likely rather to have been named after the emperor, who was often simply called Pius to distinguish him from the later Antonini.<sup>78</sup> One would expect a child so named to have been born after the death of Antoninus Pius on March 7, 161, and within ca. one generation of that date, while the memory of the emperor was still potent. We thus arrive by a different route at a date not dissimilar to Hiller's.

It would have been welcome for Alexander to have been contemporary with, or later than, Pius, so that we could assume the same chain of transmission for both frs. 13 and 14 (viz. Alexander > Orus). However, our fragment may have come from Alexander's 'Εξηγητικά, fr. 13 from the Παντοδαπά. Orus is not otherwise known to have used Pius; possibly he found both scholars cited in a commentary of later imperial date. One wishes the citation of Orus were by both name and title. Possibly it derives from the Λύσεις προτάσεων τῶν Ἡρωδιανοῦ, which dealt with controverted *voes Homericae*.<sup>79</sup>

Hiller's comment on our fragment, that Alexander derived περιρρηδής from περιρρήγνυμι, whereas Pius saw περιρρεῖν as its etymon, and his suggestion that περιρρυεῖς should be deleted, is an attempt to construct a dichotomy at the expense of the transmitted text. Both scholars are, in any case, dependent on the D-scholia or their ancient forerunners.

Modern etymologies of περιρρηδής have not made much progress because of the uncertainty about its meaning. It is evidently formed from περι- and a stem \*ῥήδος, possibly related to ῥαδινός "slender."<sup>80</sup>

15. Porph. 1. 286. 19 Schr. = 35. 9 Sod.: 'Εν τοῖς Φιλήμονος Συμμίκτοις περὶ Ἡροδοτείου διορθώματος ὁ γραμματικὸς διαλεγόμενος πειράται καὶ Ὀμηρικὰ τινα σαφηνίζειν, οὐδὲν δὲ χεῖρον καὶ τὸν Ἡρόδοτον φιλοῦντί σοι τὴν πᾶσαν τοῦ [5] ἀνδρὸς ἀναγράφω ζήτησιν. φησὶ γὰρ ὅτι ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ Ἡρόδοτος τῶν Ἱστοριῶν περὶ Κροίσου τοῦ Λυδοῦ πολλά τε ἄλλα διείλεκται καὶ μὴν ὅτι . . . ἀνέθηκε δέ τινα (sc. ἀναθήματα) καὶ "ἐν Βραγχίδησι τῆσι Μιλησίων" (1. 92. 2). καὶ γέγραπται ἤδη κατὰ πάντα ἀπλῶς τὰ ἀντίγραφα τὸ

<sup>77</sup> Cf., in general, Ernst Fraenkel, *RE* XVI.2 (1935) 1662. 55 (s.v. *Namenwesen*) and the case of a Spartan named Eurycles who, upon receiving citizenship from Augustus, was called C. Iulius Eurycles (*PIR* IV 208, no. 301); cf. B. Doer, *Die römische Namengebung* (Stuttgart 1937) 126. On Aelius Herodian, cf. E. Hiller, *Quaestiones Herodianeae* (diss. Bonn 1866) 3, and Lentz, *Hdn.* I xi.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. v. Rohden (above, note 76) 2498. 63 ff.

<sup>79</sup> Cf. Wendel (above, note 75) 1179. 1 ff.

<sup>80</sup> Cf. Frisk (above, note 21) and Chantraine (above, note 50) s.v. περιρρηδής.

[10] “τῆς” ἄρθρον σὺν τῷ ἰσοδυναμοῦν τῷ “ταίς,” οὐδένα γε μὴν Ἑλλήνων ὑπομείναι θηλυκῶς “τὰς Βραγχίδας” ἂν εἰπεῖν, Ἡρόδοτον δὲ μᾶλλον ἂν ἐτέρων φυλάξασθαι, ἀκριβῆ τε ὄντα περὶ τὰ ὀνόματα καὶ πάνυ ἐπιεικῶς φροντιστικόν. τοῦτο δὴ θεραπεύων τις (sc. Alexander Cot.; cf. quae sq.) οὐχ [15] Ἡροδότου φησὶν ἀμάρτημα γεγονέναι, μᾶλλον δὲ τὸν (συγ)γραφέα φησὶ διαμαρτεῖν παρεμβαλόντα τὸ {σ}ι, πολλὰ δὲ φέρεσθαι μέχρι νῦν ἀμαρτήματα κατὰ τὴν Ἡροδότου συγγραφὴν καὶ ἔτι τὴν Θουκυδίδου καὶ Φιλίστου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀξιολόγων συγγραφέων. τί δ’ οὐχὶ καὶ τὰ [20] ποιήματα σχεδὸν ἀνάπλεω πάντα τυγχάνει ἀμαρτημάτων γραφικῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων παραδιορθωμάτων πάνυ ἀγροίκων; . . . ἐπανάγωμεν δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἡρόδοτον καὶ τὸν διορθωτὴν τὸν Κοτυαέα Ἀλέξανδρον. ἡξίου γὰρ ὁ ἀνὴρ γράφειν “τῆσι Μιλησίων” χωρὶς τοῦ ἰ “τῆς [25] Μιλησίων,” ὑποκειμένης ἕξωθεν χώρας ἢ γῆς. “καὶ ἐγὼ δέ,” φησὶν (sc. Philemon), “ἐπειθόμην οὕτως ἔχειν τὰ τῆς γραφῆς, τὸν δὲ ἄνδρα τῆς ἀκριβοῦς συνέσεως ἐτεθναμάκειν. ἐντυχῶν <δὲ> τοῖς Ἡροδοτείοις αὐτοῖς ἔπεσι καὶ γενόμενος ἐπὶ τέλει τῆς Αἰγυπτιακῆς βίβλου, ἥτις ἐστὶ δευτέρα τῇ [30] τάξει, εὐρίσκω πάλιν κατὰ τὴν αἰτιατικὴν πῶσιν εἰπόντα τὸν Ἡρόδοτον· ἀνέθηκεν εἰς Βραγχίδας τὰς Μιλησίων” (2. 159. 3). οὐκέτι οὖν ᾧμην ἀμάρτημα εἶναι γραφικόν, Ἰωνικὸν δὲ μᾶλλον ἰδίωμα. πολλὰ γὰρ οὗτοι τῶν ὀνομάτων χαίρουσι θηλυκῶς ἐκφέροντες, οἷον τὴν τε λίθον [35] καὶ τὴν κίονα καὶ ἔτι τὴν Μαραθῶνα· Κρατίνος (fr. 506 K.-A.) ‘εὐιπποτάτη Μαραθῶν,’ Νικάνδρος (fr. 111 Schneider) ‘εὐκτιμένην Μαραθῶνα.’ ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἃ ἡμεῖς εὐρομεν καὶ ἐκρίναμεν ὑγιέα.” τοιαῦτα δὴ τοῦ Φιλήμονος λέγοντος, ἃ μὲν πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον περὶ τοῦ Ἡροδοτείου διορθώματος [40] εἶρηκεν, οὐκ οἰκεῖον κρίνω τῇ παρούσῃ ὑποθέσει ἐξετάζειν.

subsidia: cod. V tantum

5 ἀναγράψω Schrader: -ψαι V 8 βραγχίδησι ut Hdt. Schrader: βραγχίσι V 16 συγγραφέα V: corr. Schrader ἰσι V: corr. Rosén 28 δὲ suppl. Schrader 38 ὑγιέα Sodano: ὑγιῶς V

This, the most detailed of all discussions of Alexander’s doctrines, came to Porphyry via Philemon, rightly identified by L. Cohn with the Atticist lexicographer who lived ca. A.D. 200.<sup>81</sup>

<sup>81</sup> Cf. L. Cohn (above, note 71) 363–66; C. Wendel, *RE* XIX.2 (1938) 2152. 15 f. and 2151. 37.

Proper names form a difficult transmissional problem,<sup>82</sup> especially when, as in the case of Βραγχίδαι, they are anarthrous unless coupled with attributes. Here, as in fr. 13, the fundamental problem is that of determining the Ἑλληνισμός of a certain form, though in this case the decision on usage has textual consequences. While in fr. 13 Alexander admitted ἰατρῖνη as a Greek (albeit not Attic) form, here he denies that Βραγχίδαι as a feminine is Greek (lines 10–12: οὐδένα γε μὴν Ἑλλήνων ὑπομῆναι θηλυκῶς “τάς Βραγχίδας” ἄν εἰπεῖν). Note that, unlike Zoilus of Amphipolis and others, his reaction is not to blame the author, but the παράδοσις.<sup>83</sup> Hence he proposes to emend to ἐν Βραγχίδησι τῆς Μιλησίων with (Ionic) χῶρης or γῆς understood.<sup>84</sup> The formulation itself is perhaps a bit awkward; one might rather have expected ἐν Βραγχίδησι τῆς Μιλησίης (cf. Paus. 7. 5. 4). But the fatal objection is the one raised by Philemon, that ἐς Βραγχίδας τὰς Μιλησίων is, in fact, read at Hdt. 2. 159. 3. Alexander thus stands convicted of carelessness (though the lack of modern aids should be taken into account).

By the way, Philemon's defense of the παράδοσις on grounds that the Ionians had a predilection for feminine forms is also wide of the mark. Μαραθῶν appears as feminine at Pi. O. 13. 110; and, as Kassel and Austin truly remark ad Cratin. fr. 506, it is odd to see him cited for an allegedly Ionic feature. Presumably Alexander's error lay rather in confusing the ethnic οἱ Βραγχίδαι (cf. Hdt. 1. 158. 1: ἐς τοὺς Βραγχίδας) with the (feminine) toponym.<sup>85</sup>

#### IV. Alexander's Legacy

For Aristides, Alexander's writings were but a pale reflection (μικρὰ ἄττα εἴδωλα) of his lectures (§ 26). No doubt, in turn, the surviving fragments are but a pale reflection of the writings. It is thus doubly difficult for the modern student to do justice to the man who, in his time, held so high a reputation.

The surviving fragments indicate that Alexander was read largely by his contemporaries (Diogenianus [fr. 6], Apollonius Dyscolus [10], Herodian [4, 9, 12]) or those who wrote within about a generation of his death (Philemon [15]).<sup>86</sup> Within the same interval his views will have entered the

<sup>82</sup> Cf., e.g., Haas ad Tyrann. fr. 29 and CP 77 (1982) 273 (problems of accentuation of proper names in the Homeric text).

<sup>83</sup> Cf. Erbse (above, note 1) 98.

<sup>84</sup> The proposed emendation is therefore not τῆς (pace *Herodoti Historiae*, ed. H. B. Rosén, I [Leipzig 1987] app. crit. ad 1. 92. 2).

<sup>85</sup> Cf. H. B. Rosén, *Eine Laut- und Formenlehre der herodotischen Sprachform* (Heidelberg 1962) 99 n. 104.

<sup>86</sup> L. Cohn's idea (above, note 71) 366 that Philemon's politeness in disagreement with Alexander (fr. 15) is an indication that he was a younger contemporary personally acquainted with him is an attractive possibility (though not the only possible explanation).

exegetical commentaries from which most of the Homeric fragments derive (1, 5, 8 and possibly 11 and 14). On one occasion Porphyry's citation of Alexander is demonstrably at second hand (fr. 15) and, in all likelihood, in other cases as well, in spite of citation by book number (fr. 2). In the fifth century Methodius (fr. 7) and Orus (fr. 13 and 14 and possibly 11) probably knew his views via intermediary (Atticist?) works.

It is a pity that so large a percentage of the surviving fragments deals with Homeric problems,<sup>87</sup> since the possibility of reaping a new and true insight from that well-ploughed field was much reduced in Alexander's day. Thus his Homeric criticism makes, on the whole, a much less original impression than that of, say, Apion,<sup>88</sup> since Alexander so often follows the scholastic interpretation (preserved in the D-scholia: cf. fr. 1 and 14 and part of 3) or Apollonius Sophista (fr. 11). In some cases when he does venture out on his own, as in his interpretation of the siege depicted on the Shield of Achilles (fr. 2) or his explanation of the syntax of ἐπισταμένῳ εἶόντι (fr. 3), the results are unfortunate. It was perhaps premature, however, for G. Wentzel to deny Alexander any "wissenschaftliche Bedeutung."<sup>89</sup> For fr. 5 preserves an (evidently original) interpretation of the παράδοσις at Ξ 241 and an explanation of the corruption which have prevailed to this day.

Aristides praises Alexander for the sheer range of his interests (§ 24), but this is a merit that our fragments are least able to do justice to. We would not know, for instance, that Alexander had devoted attention to emending the text of Herodotus but for the fact that Porphyry, exceptionally in the *Quaestiones Homericæ*, quoted Philemon on the subject because he thought the comments on textual corruption of more general interest and because his dedicatee, Anatolius, happened to be interested in Herodotus (fr. 15). The only other author whose exegesis is represented in the fragments is Euripides (fr. 7). Only *en passant* in the Homeric fragments do we find examples of Alexander's wide reading: the citations of Aristoxenus (fr. 1), Sappho and Eupolis (fr. 5), though the latter may have been added later (see above, note 34).

It would be easy to measure Alexander against the standard of modern philology and find him wanting. Though his etymologies (cf. fr. 4, 9, 11, 12) have not found favor, taken as a whole, they are by no means the worst surviving from antiquity, an age when the etymologist's art, like rhetoric, took persuasiveness, rather than truth, as its goal.<sup>90</sup> If on occasion he

<sup>87</sup> 7 of 15 (1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 11, 14).

<sup>88</sup> Cf. S. Neitzel (ed.), *Apions Γλώσσαι Ὀμηρικαί*, SGLG 3 (Berlin and New York 1977) 204 ff.

<sup>89</sup> Wentzel, *RE* I.2 (1894) 1456. 30.

<sup>90</sup> Cf. the definition at *Et. Gen.* (A<sup>1</sup>B) s.v. ἐτυμολογία: ἔστι λέξεως ἀνάπτυξις συμφώνων τῶν σημαινομένων ἀρμόζουσα τῇ φωνῇ πρὸς τὴν τοῦ ὑποκειμένου πράγματος πιθανότητα . . . (known also in simplified form from sch. D.T. 14. 23, 169. 20, 303. 17 and 390. 12, as well as from Eustathius' paraphrase [1408. 13]); C.

seems less careful than he should have been, the difficulty of working without modern aids needs to be borne in mind (cf. ad fr. 15). It is a pity that more of his Atticist work has not survived, since the one fragment that we have (fr. 13) makes it clear that in this field he was an authority more accurate than some who made a name for themselves by writing on such questions.

Such is our picture of Alexander of Cotiaeum: a great teacher, a great personality, but as a scholar largely a *routinier*, though with an occasional flash of insight.<sup>91</sup>

## V. Indices

### a. Passages Discussed by Alexander of Cotiaeum

Eur. <i>Or.</i> 1384	fr. 7
Hdt. 1. 92. 2	fr. 15
Homer:	
A 1	fr. 8
Γ 391	fr. 11
I 155 al.	fr. 12
N 358–59	fr. 1
Ξ 241	fr. 5
Σ 509–33	fr. 2
Τ 79–80	fr. 3
χ 84	fr. 14

### b. Words Discussed by Alexander of Cotiaeum

ἀμάμαξυς	fr. 6
ἀρμάτειον μέλος	fr. 7
ἄχιλῆος	fr. 8
ἄχνη	fr. 9
βραγχίδαι	fr. 15
δέδοικα	fr. 10
δίκρον, δίκροον	fr. 4
δινωτοῖσιν	fr. 11
δωτίνη	fr. 12
έόντα	fr. 3
ἐπαλλάξαι	fr. 1
ἐπίσχοιες	fr. 5
ιατρίνη	fr. 13
περιωρηδής	fr. 14
ὕββάλλειν	fr. 3

### *University of California, Los Angeles*

Wendel, *RE* XVIII.2 (1942) 1448. 8–12 attributes *EM* 817. 4 (ἐτυμολογία δέ ἐστιν ἐπισημασία λέξεων ἐπὶ τὸ πλείστον τὸ πάθος ἔχουσα) to Choeroboscus' Προλεγόμενα τῆς Ὀρθογραφίας and notes that it corresponds to the *Prolegomena* of Charax derived from Herodian; the version at sch. D.T. 454. 22 (... ἐπισημασία ἐπὶ τῶν πλείστων τὸ πιθανὸν ἔχουσα) is, however, likely to be original as against *EM* (πάθη being a common, but not essential, characteristic of etymologies); cf. Aristotle's definition of the ἔργον of rhetoric: τὸ ἰδεῖν τὰ ὑπάρχοντα πιθανὰ περὶ ἕκαστον (*Rhet.* 1355b10–11).

<sup>91</sup> I would like to thank my colleagues David Blank, Richard Janko and especially M. W. Haslam for scrutinizing this study in draft and giving me the benefit of their expert advice.