

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

HOMERIC READINGS LOST AND FOUND

From the Homeric lexicon of Apollonius Sophista may be recovered readings which evidently stood in texts of Homer in antiquity but do not do so today, having been lost in the interim. Here are two, not previously recognized so far as I am aware.¹

1. *Odyssey* 1.46

Ap. Soph. 9.15–17 (gl. 95 Steinicke): ἀδευκεῖ ἦτοι τῷ ἀπεικοῖτι, ἢ οἶον ἀδεχεῖ, ἀπροσδοκῆτω. “ἀδευκεῖ κεῖται ὀλέθρῳ.” | ἐν δὲ τῇ δ’ Ὀδυσσεΐας ἀδευκεῖ ἀνεικάστω.

Ap. Soph. P.Berol. fr.B recto 9–10 (gl. 3 Henrichs-Müller): [αδευ]κει απεικοτι η αδε-
χει απροσδοκῆτωι Ηλιοδωρος ανεικα[στωι

Hesych. α 1073: ἀδευκεῖ ἀπεικοῖτι. οἶονεῖ ἀδοκεῖ, ἀπροσδοκεῖ. Ἡλιοδωρος δὲ φησιν ἀνεικάστω.

The entry looks unproblematic enough. It falls into two parts, which I have separated by bar-line. First come two alternative interpretations of the lexis (“either ἀπεικοῖτι [unseemly?] or as it were ἀδεχεῖ, unexpected”),² followed by the relevant Homeric quotation. To this standard form of entry is then appended another suggested interpretation (“unimagined”), Heliodorus’, with *Odyssey* book reference.³

The problem is, ἀδευκεῖ κεῖται ὀλέθρῳ does not occur in our text(s) of Homer. The *Odyssey* 4 reference is to 489 ἦε τις ὅλετ’ ὀλέθρῳ ἀδευκεῖ ἥς ἐπὶ νηός, and this appears to be the only attested occurrence of ἀδευκεῖ in either epic. To bring either of the two occurrences of accusative ἀδευκέα into the question does not help (*Od.* 6.273 φῆμιν ἄδ., 10.245 ἄδ. πότμον). Accordingly editors have tampered with the wording of the entry in the lexicon in an attempt to make it fit the

1. The lexicon is cited from Bekker’s edition (Berlin, 1833) of the tenth century codex unicus, Coislinianus 345, which gives an abridged and somewhat corrupt version of the original product (compiled in the first century but drawing on earlier material). Two fragments of a fifth or sixth century papyrus codex of what is evidently the same work in slightly different form, P.Berol. inv. 16705, were published with very useful discussion by A. Henrichs and W. Müller in *Collectanea Papyrologica: Texts published in honor of H. C. Youtie*, vol. 1 (Bonn, 1976), pp. 27–51. “Steinicke” is K. Steinicke, *Apollonii Sophistae Lexicon Homericum* (diss., Göttingen, 1957), an edition of the entries in α-δ. “Schenck” is H. Schenck, *Die Quellen des Homerlexikons des Apollonios Sophistes* (diss., Hamburg, 1961; published as *Hamburger Philologische Studien* 34 [Hamburg, 1974]), effectively an expansion of c. 7 of H. Erbse, *Beiträge zur Überlieferung der Iliasscholien*, *Zetemata* 24 (Munich, 1960).

2. ἀδεχεῖ, confirmed by the papyrus (and I presume to be recognized in *Etym. Magn.* 17.5 ἀδευεῖ), is elucidated by the explicit etymology of schol.BE *Od.* 4.489 ἀδοκεῖ (*fort. leg. ἀδεχεῖ*) ἀπροσδοκῆτω, ἀπὸ τοῦ δεύχω τὸ δέχομαι.

3. On the basis of Hesychius’ entry Steinicke had already restored Heliodorus’ name to the Ap. Soph. entry before the Berlin papyrus brought confirmation. The original Ap. Soph. entry will have given both the book reference (om. pap.) and the name of the authority (om. Coislin.), and also, I would suppose, both Homer quotes. For the form of entry cf. e.g., Ap. Soph. 136.17–19.

Permission to reprint a note in this section may be obtained only from the author.

Odyssey 4 passage. The most recent version is Schenck's (p. 30): ἀδευκέϊ– (a) ἦτοι τῷ ἀπεικότῳ (b) ἢ οἷον ἀδεχεῖ, ἀπροσδοκῆτω. [ἀδευκέϊ κεῖται ὀλέθρῳ] (c) ἐν δὲ τῇ δ' Ὀδυσσεΐας (κεῖται “ὀλέθρῳ) ἀδευκέϊ.” (d) (Ἡλιδώρορ δὲ φησιν) ‘ἀνεικάστω’.⁴ But such maneuvers are unnecessary. The problem vanishes if we simply recognize ἀδευκέϊ κεῖται ὀλέθρῳ as being what it purports to be, a Homeric quotation.

Identification is not hard. ὀλέθρῳ is preceded by κεῖται in only one of its attested occurrences in the Homeric poems (*Od.* 1.46, 3.87 *v.l.*, 4.489, 15.268 *v.l.*, 23.79, all verse end except 4.489): *Odyssey* 1.46. Here is the passage (1.45–48), as transmitted (Athena picks up Zeus' reflections on the death of Aegisthus):

ὦ πάτερ ἡμέτερε Κρονίδη, ὕπατε κρειόντων,
καὶ λίην κείνός γε εἰκότι κεῖται ὀλέθρῳ,
ὥς⁵ ἀπόλοιτο καὶ ἄλλος ὅτις τοιαῦτά γε ῥέζοι.
ἀλλὰ μοι ἄμφ' Ὀδυσῆϊ δαΐφρονι δαίεται ἦτορ, κτλ.

Where the medieval manuscripts all give εἰκότι, in antiquity evidently ἀδευκέϊ was current. This is a reminder, if any is needed, of the paltriness of our textual evidence for the *Odyssey*. Many ancient readings—not all of them bad—have disappeared without leaving a trace.⁶ We are better off for the *Iliad*, more richly equipped with scholia, but even here there can be surprises, as my second instance demonstrates.

But first, what of the relative claims of εἰκότι and ἀδευκέϊ at *Odyssey* 1.46? Neither is obviously wrong. ἀδευκέϊ results in a hiatus without the justification of erstwhile digamma, but at caesura that is hardly an argument against it, and in any case we do not know that γε rather than μὲν preceded: cf. *Odyssey* 3.203 καὶ λίην κείνός μὲν ἐτίσατο κτλ. (where γε is in fact a variant). εἰκότι is glossed πρέποντι, ὁμοίῳ, by schol.H ad loc., a dual formulation that is hard to improve on: I take it as meaning “appropriate” inasmuch as Aegisthus met the same sort of death that he had dealt Agamemnon. The word is used in the same sort of way (as LSJ recognizes, εἰκα IV.2) at *Odyssey* 3.124–25, of Telemachus' μῦθοι, and at *Iliad* 9.399 of Achilles' prospective εἰκυῖαν ἄκοιτιν (with reference back to the equally sardonic 392 ὅς τις οἶ τ' ἐπέοικε); only here there is more than a touch of irony too, since the deaths could not be said to be “seemly.”

In the only other attestation of ἀδευκέϊ (*Od.* 4.489, quoted above) it comes in this same position (ἀδευκέα is found here too, 6.273), again in attendance on ὀλέθρῳ. ὀλεθρός has a highly developed formulaic system: αἰπὺς/ὄν/λοιγὸν/ῶ

4. For earlier like-minded attempts see Bekker (reporting Tolle) and Steinicke.

5. How should ὥς be taken? There seem to be four possibilities: (1) as “as”; (2) as “thus” (ὥς, so some codd.); (3) as εἴθε (so Nicanor); (4) as exclamatory “how”; all but the first requiring stronger punctuation preceding. Either (2) or (3) (or both at once?) seems validated by the formally and thematically parallel passage 3.202–7 (ὦ Νέστορ . . . / καὶ λίην κείνός μὲν ἐτίσατο . . . / αἶ γὰρ ἐμοὶ τοσσὴνδε θεοὶ δύναμιν περιθελίεν . . .). The same options are offered by 2.183 (αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεύς / ὤλετο τῇλ', ὥς καὶ σὺ καταφθίσθαι σὺν ἐκείνῳ / ὤφελες) and 15.359 (ἦ δ' . . . ἀπέφθιτο . . . / λευγαλέφ θανάτῳ, ὥς μὴ θάνοι . . .).

6. E.g., P.Oxy. LIII 3710, from a commentary on *Od.* 20, in its twenty-odd surviving *lemmata* presents four readings that were previously quite unknown to us (πλησίαι and τοι in 106, οἱ in 174, θεῶν in 276 *p.c.*), as well as recording hitherto unknown variants in its notes. Against the possibility that the lexicon's quotation comes not from *Od.* 1.46 but from some otherwise unknown line, nowhere in the lexicon do I find reference to a verse not transmitted in the vulgate, nor would one expect to: from the time of Aristarchus the number and sequence of verses were much more successfully stabilized than those verses' precise textual form.

ὄλεθρος/ον/φ are invariable for that metrical shape (mostly at line-end), across both epics; the pattern ~ ~ ~ ὄλεθρον does not happen to occur (there is Hermann's bridge to consider), but we meet ἀδευκέα in the phrase καὶ ἀδευκέα πότμον at *Odyssey* 10.245, which is exceptional on two counts, as being line-final instead of one foot earlier and as having ἀδευκέα instead of αἰκέα. Thus ἀδευκέι κείται ὀλέθρῳ can claim formulaic normalcy; and it cannot be said that the adjective (whatever it means, i.e., however it was understood)⁷ is any less appropriate in 1.46 than in 4.489.

Anyone with prejudice against it is free to say that ἀδευκέι was introduced into the former place from the latter, just as anyone with prejudice against εἰκότι is free to say that that originates in ἀδευκέι having been glossed ἀπεικότη, but I think we would do better to acknowledge that *utrum in alterum* is hardly determinable in the circumstances, and is perhaps not even an appropriate question. Both variants will have been current from very early days.

Before leaving this I would make one further point, on the intertextuality of 4.489 and 1.46 that is lexically cemented with ἀδευκέι. As is well known, the *Odyssey*-launching conversation between Zeus and Athena initiates the Orestes paradigm that is made explicit later in Book 1 (298–300) and is further developed in Telemachus' successive meetings with Nestor and Menelaus. In his flashback, Menelaus recounts that he had asked Proteus (4.487–90), Did all the Greeks get back safely, or did anyone die ὀλέθρῳ ἀδευκέι ἥς ἐπὶ νηὸς / ἡὲ φίλων ἐν χερσὶν after the war?—the cue for Proteus' telling him (and Menelaus' telling Telemachus) of the respective deaths of Locrian Ajax and of Agamemnon, whom Aegisthus slew οὐκ εἰδὼτ' ὄλεθρον, like an ox at the manger (534–35). Maybe Aegisthus is still alive, or maybe Orestes has killed him (546–47). Whereupon the conversation turns to Odysseus. It would be unwise to press this, but clearly it would be fitting if the phrase used in prospective allusion to the death of Agamemnon in Book 4 echoes that used of the death of Aegisthus in Book 1. That powerfully oblique opening, which already reverberates in Telemachus' meeting with Nestor (especially in the rhetorical parallelism of 3.202–6 with 1.45–47), resonates in his meeting with Menelaus too.

2. *Iliad* 9.539

Ap. Soph. 167.3–5 (Apion frag. 155 Neitzel) χαυλιόδοντα τὸν ἐπικεχλασμένους ἔχοντα τοὺς δόδοντας. | ὁ δὲ Ἀπίων γελοῖως καυλιόδοντα, ἐκκεκαυληκὸτας ἔχοντα τοὺς δόδοντας· | ὅθεν καὶ αὐλός.

χαυλιόδοντα is not in our Homer. At [Hesiod] *Scutum* 387 we have ἰκάπρος χαυλιόδων, but accusative χαυλιόδοντα cannot be referred to that.⁸ Once again,

7. The only worthwhile evidence for its contemporary meaning is that of the Homeric poems themselves; I doubt it meant anything very precise. Hellenistic usage, viz. Apollonius Rhodius', is self-consciously archaistic and reflects the same etymological interpretations that we find in the lexicographical tradition (cf. E.-M. Hamm [Voigt] in *Lfgre* s.v.).

8. An oblique-case lexis implies a textual occurrence in that case. S. Neitzel (*Apions Γλώσσα Ὀμηρικαί*, Sammlung gr. u. lat. Grammatiker 3 [Berlin–New York, 1977], p. 299) with incurious sangfroid is content to remark that the entry belongs "zu jenen nichthomer. Lemmata, die Ap.S. in sein Homerlexikon aufnahm," referring to Erbse's *Beiträge* (n. 1, above), pp. 429–30. But what Erbse there discussed was the set of blatantly alien ταυρ-entries that is appended to the Coislinianus' τ-section (156.16–22), which even

evidently, the lexicographical tradition transmits a reading that was extruded from the more volatile direct tradition. This time, unfortunately, no citation is provided. But I see only one place where χαυλιόδοντα can have stood, and that is *Iliad* 9.539, of the Calydonian boar, where the paradosis is ὥρσεν ἐπὶ (better ἐπι) χλοῦνην σὺν ἄγριον ἀργιόδοντα. I take the lexicon's entry as implying σὺν κάπρον χαυλιόδοντα there.

Boars, like dogs, are ἀργιόδοντες (dogs then become ἀργοί at need, e.g., when ἔποντο or ἔδονται will end the line), but just as epic dogs become καρχαρόδοντες when an initial consonant is convenient,⁹ so will epic boars have become χαυλιόδοντες in the same circumstances. So we have πολλοὶ δ' ἀργιόδοντες ὕες at *Iliad* 23.32 (cf. *Od.* 8.60, 14.416, 532, *Hymn. Hom. Merc.* 569), κάπρος χαυλιόδων at *Scutum* 387. When there is no metrical constraint it is ἀργι- that is used (line-initial ἀργιόδοντος ὕος at *Il.* 10.264, *Od.* 8.476, 14.423, 438), but it is noteworthy that the *Shield* has κάπρος χαυλι- not κάπριος ἀργι-.

For χαυλιόδοντα Apion read the *vox nihili* καυλιόδοντα, κ- for χ-. It is not clear whether he found it or conjectured it, though I imagine the latter, for the sake of the rather neat etymology that it yields.¹⁰ Apion's editor loyally takes exception to Apollonius' calling καυλι- ridiculous (γελοῖως: the harshest comment in the entire lexicon, if I am not mistaken), but extra-epic usage, especially Herodotus and Aristotle, is surely decisive in favor of χαυλι-.¹¹

For the postulated σὺν κάπρον cf. *Iliad* 17.21 σὺς κάπρου, 5.783=7.257 συσι κάπροις, and especially 11.293, *hac sede*, συὶ καπρίῳ ἢ ἑ λένοντι, with *v.l.* κάπρῳ. If beside these we set 8.338 σὺς ἀγρίου ἢ ἑ λένοντος, it is easy to see how σὺν κάπρον and σὺν ἄγριον could have arisen as competing variants, respectively entailing χαυλιόδοντα and ἀργιόδοντα to follow.¹² σὺν κάπρον χαυλιόδοντα would have jarred on the metrical sensibilities of later times, so that its eventual displacement is intelligible. But as with ἀδευκέι/ἔοικότι at *Odyssey* 1.46, both variants have the ring of antiquity, of having been generated under oral conditions, and I am glad I do not have to say which one is Homer's.¹³

MICHAEL W. HASLAM
University of California,
Los Angeles

Erbse, notoriously averse to recognizing textual interpolation, was prepared to regard as interpolated (cf. *ZPE* 49 [1982]: 33, n. 12). The χαυλιόδοντα entry is not remotely comparable: it is thoroughly Apollonian in form and content, it comes in its alphabetically proper place in the lexicon (the last of the regular χα-entries [there follows a separate *Odyssey* list, 167.6–13]), and it clearly *is* Homeric, at least as far as Apollonius and his sources are concerned.

9. 11.292 κύνας ἀργιόδοντας vs. 13.198 κυνῶν ὑπο καρχαρόδόντων, cf. 10.360.

10. As Andrew Dyck points out to me, it is possible (indeed, likely) that Apion did not so much "read" καυλ. as interpret χαυλ. as if it were καυλ.; in that case the lexicon's entry is elliptical (or corrupt) for χαυλ. οἷον καυλ. *v. sim.*

11. At least, for historic times. It does not seem to me out of the question that the word did in fact originate as καυλι- (καυλός has suitable etymology and usage, whereas χαυλι- cannot be traced), if the accession of the aspirate can be explained.

12. The contemporary aesthetics of the alliteration of ἄγριον ἀργιό- (and to a lesser extent of κάπρον χαυλιό-) are hard to gauge, but I am not sure they would have had any effect either on generation or on retention.

13. Thanks go to my colleague Andrew Dyck for a preview of his edition of Heliodorus, which provided the impetus for this note, and to him and also to two anonymous referees and the Editor and his colleagues for comments.