THE HOMER LEXICON OF APOLLONIUS SOPHISTA
I. COMPOSITION AND CONSTITUENTS*

MICHAEL W. HASLAM

THE LEXICON OF APOLLONIUS SOPHISTA, one of many first-century Homeric paraphernalia, is from many points of view our most important work of ancient Greek lexicography. It is valuable not only in that it transmits a lot of otherwise irretrievable ancient scholarship, especially Aristarchan, but also in its own right, as our one and only specimen of a comprehensive lexicon of The Poet; and in variously modified forms it quickly became a standard reference work for readers of the poems. Inasmuch as it helped control how Homer was read, it is a document of prime importance for the reception and interpretation of the Homeric texts throughout the Roman Empire.

What are its constituents, and how was it composed? The lexicon's own evidence on such questions has not, I think, been exploited as fully as it might. Various attempts have been made to identify the lexicon's sources. Hans Gattiker, reacting against Kaarlo Forsman's view of the lexicon's dependence on Aristarchus, took advantage of papyrus finds to demonstrate the importance of the scholia minora, or D-scholia, which proceed through the poems giving contemporary Greek translations of individual words as they occur. That (rather amorphous) body of material, whose origins can be traced back to classical times, is now widely accepted as the lexicon's main source, though van der Valk has proposed reversing the relationship. In any event, it is recognized that Apollonius must have used other sources too. The well-known Apion, his contemporary, is frequently cited, in such a way as to suggest first-hand acquaintance with his work, and the same is true of the otherwise unknown Heliodorus. Kurt Steinicke reasserted the importance of Aristarchan material and mooted

---

direct use of works by Aristonicus in addition to the D-scholia and Apion and Heliodorus. Hartmut Erbse and Horst Schenck, countering what they construed as Gattiker's attack on Apollonius *qua* scholar, have similarly sought to show that Apollonius made discriminating use of multitudinous sources. Schenck lists the D-scholia, exegetical commentaries, individual works of Aristonicus, Didymus, Apion, Heliodorus, Ptolemy of Ascalon, Apollodorus, Philoxenus, and more besides.[1]

Here, however, I wish to take a different approach, and start by investigating the lexicon's process of construction. Mostly, of course, this is hidden in the finished product. But not entirely. The lexicon itself provides much evidence as to how it was actually put together. Andrew Dyck, in his recent edition of the "fragments" of Heliodorus, has characterized Apollonius' method of composition as one based on successive use of a fixed number of sources, and has pointed out how determination of an entry's specific reference is often enabled by the fact that "the glosses tend to fall into series by the order of the occurrence of the lemmata in *Iliad* and *Odyssey*."[2] That observation, which gives Apollonius' work a certain affinity with more mechanically compiled and later lexica such as Orion's, is fundamental to the exploration I undertake here.

We have only one complete manuscript of the lexicon, the tenth-century codex Coislinianus gr. 345.[3] From the evidence of entries in later lexica, and a number of fragmentary papyrus manuscripts (these will be treated in Part II), it appears that the lexicon as given by the Coislinianus has been variously abridged. Loss of Homeric quotations, loss of names of authorities, loss of whole entries has to be reckoned with;[4] and there is internal evidence of some textual accretion too. Lexica are inherently unstable things, liable to mutate from copy to copy, and the question of definition

and identity is one to which we shall have to return; it applies no less acutely to the lexicon of Apion. But for the time being, I shall be speaking of the Coislinianus alone. And in at least one important respect the text of the Coislinianus proves to have been surprisingly resistant to change.

I. HELIODORUS

Here are the entries from the latter part of αγ-, as edited by their most recent editor.[5]

gl. 72 **ἀγρονόμοι:**[6] πρὸς διάφορον τόνον καὶ σημασίαν. καὶ ἅπαξ εἴρηται ἐν Ὀδυσσείαι "ἀγρονόμοι παίζουσι, γέγηθε δ' ἄρα φρένα Λητώ" (ζ 106) ἐπὶ τῶν Νυμφῶν. τῆς μὲν οὖν παρεσχάτης ὀξυτονουμένης ἀκούονται αἱ ἐν ἀγροῖς νέμουσαι, τῆς δὲ δευτέρας αἱ ἐν ἀγροῖς νεμόμεναι.

gl. 73 **ἀγρόται:** θηρευταί· "οἵ σί τε τέκνα ἀγρόται ἐξείλοντο" (π 217).

gl. 74 **ἀγανοῖς:** ἄγαν αἰνετοῖς, προσηνέσιν (Β 164).

gl. 75 **ἀγανοφροσύνη:** ἡ τῶν φρενῶν προσήνεια· "σή τ' ἀγανοφροσύνη μελιηδέα θυμὸν ἐπηύρα" (λ 203).

gl. 76 **ἀγέρωχοι:** ἡ μὲν καθ' ἡμᾶς συνήθεια τὴν λέξιν ἐπὶ τοῦ ψόγου ταύτην τάσσει· τοὺς γὰρ αὐθάδεις καὶ ἀπαιδεύτους ἀγερώχους λέγει. ὁ δὲ Ὅμηρος τοὺς ἄγαν ἐντίμους, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ γέρως ὀχεῖσθαι· "ὡς αὖτις καθ' ὅμιλον ἔδυ Τρώων ἀγερώχων" (Γ 36). ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ὅταν (ἐν τῆι Βοιωτίαι), "ἐκ Ῥόδου ἐννέα νῆας ἄγεν Ῥοδίων ἀγερώχων" (Β 654).

gl. 77 **ἀγακλυτά:** ἄγαν ὀνομαστά, ὡς καὶ Ἡλιόδωρος (γ 388).

gl. 78 **ἀγροτέρας:** οὐ συγκριτικῶς εἴρηκεν, ἀλλ' ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀγρίας· "ἠὲ μετ' ἀγροτέρας ἐλάφους· κέλεται δέ ἑ γαστήρ" (ζ 133).

gl. 79 **ἀγλαόκαρποι:** καλλίκαρποι· "ὄγχναι καὶ ῥοιαὶ καὶ μηλέαι ἀγλαόκαρποι" (η 115).

gl. 80 **ἀγαπήνορος:** τοῦ ἀγαπῶντος τὴν ἠνορέην, ὅ ἐστι τὴν ἀνδρείαν. ἔστι καὶ ὄνομα κύριον. ἢ τοῦ ἀγαπωμένου ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνδρῶν (Ο 392 . .).

gl. 81 **ἀγνυμενάων:** συντριβομένων· "νηῶν θ' ἅμα ἀγνυμενάων" (κ 123).

gl. 82 **ἄγρην:** θήραν· "καὶ δὴ ἄγρην ἐφέπεσκον ἀλητεύοντες ἀνάγκηι" (μ 330).

gl. 83 **ἀγνοιήσασα:** "ἄνδρ' ἀγνοιήσασ'" (υ 15), εἰς τὸ ἀγνοούμενον ἰδοῦσα.

gl. 84 **ἀγαιομένου:** καταπλησσομένου· "ὥς ῥα τοῦ ἔνδον ὑλάκτει ἀγαιομένου κακὰ ἔργα" (υ 16).

gl. 85 **ἀγκυλοχεῖλαι:** ἀγκύλα χείλη ἔχοντες· "φῆναι ἢ αἰγυπιοὶ γαμψώνυχες ἀγκυλοχεῖλαι" (Π 428 et π 217).

gl. 86 **ἀγνώσασκε:** ἐξηγνόει· "ἄλλοτε δ' ἀγνώσασκε κακὰ χροῒ εἵματ' ἔχοντα", ἐν τῆι Ψ τῆς Ὀδυσσείας ἐπὶ τῆς Πηνελόπης (ψ 95).

gl. 87 **ἀγνοίησι:** ἐν ἀγνοίαι τιθείη· "ἤέ κεν ἀγνοίησι πολὺν χρόνον ἐνθάδ' ἐόντα" (ω 218).

gl. 88 **ἀγέρθη:** συνελέγη· "ἡ δ' ἐπεί ῥ' ἄμπνυτο, καὶ ἐς φρένα θυμὸς ἀγέρθη" (Χ 475).

---

5. Steinicke, see n. 1 above; this section corresponds to 7.24–8.26 Bekker. This text incorporates a number of here unsignalled departures from the manuscript, but the only one of significance for present purposes is gl. 80 **ἀγαπήνορος,** on which see below.

6. The accent should obviously be removed, both in the lexis and in the quotation, so as to allow each of the interpretations offered. Accentuation is a matter of interpretation, not of text. The same is true of aspiration, and punctuation, and lexical articulation; in gl. 1 (1.11 Bekker), for instance, ἄρ' should obviously be ἄ ῥ', and an editor who so prints (none does, but all should) is not departing from the transmitted text. In antiquity the text was written with few if any diacritics. (Cf., e.g., *Od.* 3.391 ἐν/ἑν-δεκάτῳ ἐνιαυτῷ, with schol. ἀμφίβολον κἄντε δεκάτῳ κἄντε ἑνδεκάτῳ.) In gl. 83 below I would read εἰς τὸ(ν) (with Villoison), and in gl. 87, where ἐν ἀγνοίαι τιθείη is Villoison's emendation for the manuscript's ἀγνοία, I would suppose rather ἀγνοῇ or ἀγνοήσῃ (cf. D-schol. ad loc.).

gl. 89 **ἀδαήμονες**: ἄπειροι· "ὦ φίλοι, οὐ γάρ πώ τι κακῶν ἀδαήμονες εἶμεν" (μ 208).
καὶ **ἀδαημοσύνη** ἡ ἀπειρία· "ὦ γέρον, οὐκ ἀδαημοσύνη σ᾽ ἔχει ἀμφιπολεύειν ὄρχατον"
(ω 244).

From **ἀγακλυτά** (gl. 77) to **ἀγέρθη** (gl. 88)—which is the last of the ἀγ-
entries—we have an unbroken set of *Odyssey* entries, disposed according
to their order of occurrence in the poem. Recognition of this fact puts
us in a position immediately to make a number of particular secondary
observations.

   (1) The quotation given for gl. 88 ἀγέρθη should be referred not to
Il. 22.475, which has οὖν not ῥ᾽, but to *Od.* 24.349, which has αὐτὰρ ἐπεί
ῥ᾽ κτλ. The verse in the unmetrical form in which we find it in the Cois-
linianus is evidently due to conflation of the Odyssean verse with the
Iliadic.[7] That editors refer the quotation to the Iliadic verse rather than
to the Odyssean is symptomatic; but it may in fact find a counterpart in
a tendency within the lexicon itself to submerge Odyssean entries under
Iliadic, as we shall see.

   (2) The reference of gl. 85 ἀγκυλοχεῖλαι must be *Od.* 22.302 (= *Il.*
16.428), where however we find not φῆναι ἢ αἰγ. but οἱ δ᾽ ὥς τ᾽ αἰγ. Either
it is here conflated with *Od.* 16.217, φῆναι ἢ αἰγυπιοὶ γαμψώνυχες, οἷσί τε
τέκνα κτλ., a verse that does not contain the lexis, or the verse existed in
Od. 22 in the proffered form (one could postulate οἱ δ᾽ ὥς τ᾽ ⟨ . . . | φῆναι
ἢ⟩ αἰγυπιοὶ v. sim.).

   (3) Most suggestive of all, gl. 80. **ἀγαπήνορος** is exclusively Iliadic
(15.392, 23.113, 124); but a vestige of the entry's Odyssean provenance
does remain. The transmitted lexis, long since editorially "corrected," is in
fact **ἀγαπήνορα**—which occurs at *Od.* 7.170 (and *Il.* 13.756). The lexicon
retains the lexis in the form in which it was found, but beyond that, Iliadic
substitution is total. The two alternative glosses ("loving manliness" or
"loved by men") belong to the Iliadic genitive, and the "also proper name"
that interrupts them is likewise Iliadic (2.609, nom.). And as it happens,
we are fortunate enough to have the immediate source of the substitution.
It is in the lexicon itself, towards the beginning of the αγ- entries—an en-
try in **ἀγαπήνορος** (4.4–6, gl. 30 St.), which runs: ὅταν ἐπίθετον, ἀγαπῶν-
τος τὴν ἠνορέην· "Μηριόνης θεράπων ἀγαπήνορος Ἰδομενῆος" (*Il.* 23.113
= 124). ἔστι δὲ καὶ κύριον ὄνομα· "τῶν ἦρχ᾽ Ἀγκαίοιο πάϊς κρείων
Ἀγ⟨απ⟩ήνωρ" (*Il.* 2.609). Evidently it is this entry that, shorn of the quo-
tations (the shearing post-Apollonian?), was attached to the later accusa-
tive entry. This also helps explain the incoherent organization of the latter
entry, where instead of "act. or pass.; + nom. prop." we find "act.; + nom.
prop.; or pass." The last item, ἢ τοῦ ἀγαπωμένου ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνδρῶν, is sim-
ply a later addition (but not, I would suppose, a post-Apollonian one), the
last stage of the process.

---

7. Conceivably by Apollonius himself; but more probably, I think, we should recognize transmissional
loss by *saut du même au même*: ἡ δ᾽ ἐπεί ⟨οὖν . . . αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ⟩. The Coislinianus is exceptionally prone to
this class of error, and many anomalies may be eliminated by recognition of it. Cf., e.g., the ἀμφίς entry
(gl. 369), p. 5 below.

Recognition of the *Odyssey* series, then, affords us a revealing glimpse of the sort of incoherence to which the lexicon was subject as it amalgamated material. But that is secondary. The main thing is that the same phenomenon—a series of *Odyssey* entries, in order of their occurrence within the poem, placed separately at the end of the relevant two-letter alphabetical section—is in fairly copious evidence elsewhere in the lexicon. The prime specimen, which has not escaped notice, comes at the end of αμ- (28.34–30.14 Bekker).[8] I adopt Steinicke's numeration for the entries ("glossae"), but give my own text.

gl. 368 **ἀμφιρύτη** περιρεομένη· "νήσῳ ἐν ἀμφιρύτῃ χαλεποὶ δέ μ⟨ιν ἄνδρες ἔχουσ⟩ιν"   *Od.* 1.198 cit.

gl. 369 **ἀμφίς**· ποτὲ μὲν ἀντὶ τῆς περί, οἷον "αἱ δ' οἷαι Διὸς ἀμφὶς Ἀθηναίη τε καὶ "Ηρη" (*Il.* 8.444), ὁτὲ δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ χωρίς, ὡς τὸ "οὐ γὰρ ἔτ' ἀμφὶς ⟨Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες" (*Il.* 2.13 = 30 = 67), ὁτὲ δὲ (. . .) ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐκτός, ὡς τὸ "ἀμφὶς⟩ ὁδοῦ δραμέτην" (*Il.* 23.393) (supplevi)[9]

gl. 370 **ἀμαλλοδετῆρες** οἱ τὰς ἀμά⟨λ⟩λας τῶν ἀσταχύων δεσμεύοντες   *Il.* 18.553

gl. 371 **ἀμύντορας** βοηθούς· "ἤ τινας ἐκ Πύλου ἄξει ἀμύντορας"   *Od.* 2.326 cit.

gl. 372 **ἄμφω** ἀμφότεροι ἢ ἀμφοτέρους[10]   *Od.* 3.344

gl. 373 **ἀμφεκάλυψεν** περιέσχεν   *Od.* 4.618

gl. 374 **ἀμφασίη** ἀφασία, ἀφωνία, ⟨ἀγρυξία⟩[11]   *Od.* 4.704

gl. 375 **ἄμμορον** ποτὲ μὲν κακόμορον (Tolle: κάμμορον), "ἄμμορον (κάμμορος cod.) ἢ τάχα χήρη σευ ἔσομαι" (*Il.* 6.408–9), ποτὲ δὲ ἄμοιρος, ἀμέτοχος, "οἴη δ' ἄμμορός ἐστι λοετρῶν Ὠκεανοῖο" (*Od.* 5.275 = *Il.* 18.489)· λέγει δὲ {καὶ} (Crönert) ἐπὶ τῆς ᾿Αρκτου.[12] τοῦτο δὲ εἴρηκεν μὴ γιγνώσκων ὅτι καὶ ἄλλα οὐ δύνει. ἢ πρὸς τὰ (Villoison: παρὰ τὸ) προειρημένα τὴν σύγκρισιν ποιεῖται. ὁ δὲ Ἡλιόδωρός φησι (Villoison: φασι) βέλτιον λέγειν ὅτι ἠγνόει. ὁ δὲ Κράτης οὕτως ἀναγινώσκει· "ἤ τ' αὐτοῦ στρέφεται καί τ' Ὠρίωνα δοκεύει (οἳ) (Helck)", μέχρι τούτου καταλέγων· "ἢ δ' ἄμμορός ἐστι λοετρῶν Ὠκεανοῖο" ἵνα τὸ συμβεβηκὸς αὐτῇ καὶ ⟨ἐφ'⟩ (Wachsmuth) ἑτέροις τῶν ἄστρων ἀκούηται.

gl. 376 **ἀμφήλυθε** περιῆλθεν· "ὥς τε με κουράων ἀμφήλυθε θῆλυς αὐτμή"   *Od.* 6.122 cit.

gl. 377 **ἀμφὶς ἔχοιεν** χωρὶς ἔχοιεν, περιέχοιεν· "δεσμοὶ μὲν τρὶς τόσσοι (τόσον cod.) ἀπείρονες ἀμφὶς ἔχοιεν (ἔχουσιν cod.)"   *Od.* 8.340 cit.

gl. 378 **ἀμφιφορεῦσιν** ἀμφορεῦσιν   *Od.* 9.204

gl. 379 **ἀμησάμενος** συναγαγών· ἐν τῇ ι Ὀδυσσείας   *Od.* 9.247 ref.

gl. 380	**ἀμηχανίη** ἀπορία· "ἀμηχανίη δ' ἔχε θυμόν"	*Od.* 9.295 cit.
gl. 381	**ἁμαρτήσεσθαι** διαμαρτεῖν· "ἁμαρτήσεσθαι ὀπωπῆς"	*Od.* 9.512 cit.
gl. 382	**ἀμφιμέμυκεν** περιήχει· "δάπεδον δ' ἅπαν ἀμφιμέμυκεν"	*Od.* 10.227 cit.
gl. 383	**ἀμφοτέρωθεν** ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων τῶν μερῶν	*Od.* 12.58
gl. 384	**ἀμφιτρίτη** ἡ θάλασσα· "ἀγάστονος ἀμφιτρίτη"	*Od.* 12.97 cit.
gl. 385	**ἀμφαγαπαζόμενος** περισσῶς ἀγαπῶν (-ώμενος cod.)	*Il.* 16.192
gl. 386	**ἀμοιβήν** ἔκτισιν· "εἰ δέ μοι οὐ τίσουσι βοῶν ἐπιεικέ' ἀμοιβήν"	*Od.* 12.382 cit.
gl. 387	**ἀμφουδίς** (ἀμφοῦδας cod.) περὶ τὸ οὖδας, τὸ ἔδαφος. ⟨ὁ δὲ Ἡλιόδωρος ἀμφοτέραις ταῖς χερσὶν εἰς τὸ οὖδας ῥίπτων⟩ (Steinicke ex Hesych.). "ἢ πρὸς γῆν ἐλάσειε κάρη ἀμφουδὶς ἐρείσας"	*Od.* 17.237 cit.
gl. 388	**Ἀμνισῷ·** Ἀμνισσὸς τόπος καὶ ποταμὸς τῆς Κρήτης	*Od.* 19.188
gl. 389	**ἀμήχανοι** μηχανὴν οὐκ ἔχοντες οὐδὲ βοήθειαν	*Od.* 19.560
gl. 390	**ἀμενηνῶν** ἀψύχων· "δοιαὶ γάρ τε πύλαι ἀμενηνῶν εἰσὶν ὀνείρων"	*Od.* 19.562 cit.
gl. 391	**ἀμμορίην** τὴν κακὴν μοῖραν· "⟨μοῖράν⟩ τ' ἀμμορίην τε"	*Od.* 20.76 cit.
gl. 392	**ἀμφιμάσασθε** καθάρατε, περιψήσατε· "τραπέζ⟨ας πάσ⟩ας ἀμφιμάσασθε, καθήρατε δὲ κρατῆρας (deb. κρη-)"	*Od.* 20.152 cit.
gl. 393	**ἁμαρτήσαντες** συντυχόντες, συναντήσαντες· "βουκόλος ἠδὲ συφορβὸς ἁμαρτήσαντες ἅμ' ἄμφω"	*Od.* 21.189/8 cit.[13]
gl. 394	**ἀμήσαντες** ἀποτεμόντες· "ῥῖνάς τ' ἀμήσαντες"	*Od.* 21.301 cit.
gl. 395	**ἀμέρδῃ** στερίσκει· ἐν τῇ φ τῆς Ὀδυσσείας	*Od.* 21.290 ref.
gl. 396	**ἀμφέθετο** περιέθετο· πρὸς τὴν μάχην παρεσκευάσθη ὁ Τηλέμαχος· "ἦ καὶ ἐπ' ὀφρύσι νεῦσεν, ὁ δ' ἀμφέθετο ξίφος ὀξύ"	*Od.* 21.431 cit.
gl. 397	**ἀμφέξεσα** περιέξεσα· "κορμὸν δὲ ῥίζης ποταμὸν (deb. προταμὼν) ἀμφέξεσα χαλκῷ"	*Od.* 23.196 cit.
gl. 398	**ἄμπνυτο** ἀνέπνευσεν· "αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ⟨ῥ'⟩ ἄμπνυτο"	*Od.* 24.349 cit.

As with the **αγ-** series, the entries typically take the form of a simple gloss, followed by quotation of the Homeric verse in question (sometimes curtailed or dropped). Entries not conforming to this pattern show clear evidence of what used to be called contamination—interaction with material from another source. The two which stand out are those on **ἀμφίς**, gl. 369, and **ἄμμορον**, gl. 375. The note on **ἀμφίς** is a typical polysemantic entry, or the remnant of one. I presume it has been attracted here by an entry such as **ἀμφίς** χωρίς on *Od.* 1.54, μακράς, αἵ γαῖάν τε καὶ οὐρανὸν ἀμφὶς ἔχουσι.[14] The Odyssean verse may have been added to the polysemantic entry's exemplification of this meaning (*Il.* 2.13 etc.), which is mostly swallowed up in lacuna in the Coislinianus; for such incorporation cf., e.g., **τάμνεν** (see below). One observes that the **ἀμφὶς ἔχοιεν** entry shortly below (gl. 377) remains untouched—a token of the rather hit-or-miss nature of the lexicon's methods of assimilation. The relatively long note on **ἄμμορον** also starts out as a polysemantic entry, but becomes interestingly more complex. We must recognize conflation with a note on *Od.* 5.275. Also to be noted is the intrusion of the Iliadic **ἀμφαγα-παζόμενος**, gl. 385. Evidently it has ousted an entry on **ἀμφαγάπαζον**

---

13. 188–89 as transmitted run τὼ δ' ἐξ οἴκου βῆσαν ὁμαρτήσαντες (vel ἁμ-) ἅμ' ἄμφω | βουκόλος ἠδὲ συφορβὸς Ὀδυσσῆος θείοιο. The lexicon implies inversion of the latter parts of the lines.

14. The **ἀμφιρύτη** entry that immediately precedes is attended by quotation of *Od.* 1.198, but may have pertained originally to *Od.* 1.50, also beginning νήσῳ ἐν ἀμφιρύτη.

(*Od.* 14.381), which would be in place one entry later.[15] Two of the entries have attendant book-reference in lieu of quotation—the incidence appears to be haphazard.

These *Odyssey* series in αγ- and αμ- are far from being freaks within the lexicon. They are just exceptionally conspicuous representatives of a body of material that was evidently distributed throughout the whole work.

φ, with some 76 entries (as against around ten times that number in α), will conveniently illustrate.

First φα-, 12 entries. There is an initial set, alphabetized to three places: φαεσίμβροτος, φαίδιμος, φαληριόωντα, φαλός, φᾶρος, φαρμάσσων, φάσγανον. Some of these are exclusively Iliadic, some are common to both poems, one is exclusively Odyssean. Then comes an entry on φαεινή of above average length and scholarly interest, giving Aristarchus' classic solution for the zetema posed by *Il.* 8.555 φαεινὴν ἀμφὶ σελήνην (how can the moon have been shining bright when the stars were?—the Parry-anticipating answer, it doesn't mean that it was bright at the time but that it's bright by nature, φύσει), in the course of which is adduced *Od.* 6.74, Nausicaa's pre-laundry ἐσθῆτα φαεινήν. Then comes the following series:

φάτις δόξα· "φάτις ἀνθρώπους ἀναβαίνει"	*Od.* 6.29 cit.
φαέθων λάμπων. ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἵππου ὄνομα.	*Od.* 11.16 (et alibi quater); nom. prop. *Od.* 23.246 (acc.)
φαείνω φανῶ· "δύσομαι."	*Od.* 12.383 cit.[16]
φάε ἐπέτελλε· "φάε δὲ χρυσόθρονος Ἡώς."	*Od.* 14.502 cit.

Now that we know what to look for, it is clear enough that as with the αγ- and αμ- sections, the original φα- section has had a set of *Odyssey* items appended to it, in order of their occurrence within the poem. The Aristarchan entry on φαεινή may have been pulled down by the *Od.* 6 connection, or it may be a separate, prior addition.

The entries in φε- (8 in number), φη- (4), and φθ- (5) have little to contribute, being alphabetized to three places.[17] φι-, with 12 entries, is more helpful. First, the initial set, alphabetized to three places, both Iliadic and Odyssean:[18] φιλέειν (polysemantic), φιλότης, φιλοκτεανώτατε, φιάλη

---

15. I take it that the Iliadic ἀμαλλοδετῆρες, gl. 370, is similarly a slight displacement.

16. δύσομαι εἰς Ἀΐδου καὶ ἐν νεκύεσσι φαείνω. In the Coislinianus the quote is severely curtailed but not altogether eliminated as elsewhere. Originally, if the Bodleian papyrus is anything to go by (my Π², see Part II), *every* lexis was accompanied by full quotation of the verse containing it.

17. The only exception is the Odyssean Φείδων (14.316, 19.287; glossed merely ὄνομα κύριον), which comes after five φερ- entries and is the penultimate entry in the φε- section. It looks as if this and the immediately preceding φέροντο (*Od.* 10.124 cit., with attendant book-reference) represent the *Odyssey*-section, but the final φε- entry, φέρτρῳ, is Iliadic (18.236 cit.)—slightly displaced in transmission? (Nothing could be better calculated to induce scribal omissions than an alphabetical list of lexeis; some were caught as the scribe proceeded; hence minor displacements downwards—upwards more rarely.)

18. A notion that the lexicon was entirely Iliadic before the accession of the *Odyssey* entries must confront entries such as that given for φιλέειν, ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ ξενίζειν "μῆνα δὲ πάντα φίλει με" (*Od.* 10.14), ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ ἀγαπᾶν "ἢ μοῦνοι φιλέουσ' ἀλόχους" (*Il.* 9.340), and is hardly tenable. Such "polysemantic" entries form a distinct type, and are scattered throughout the lexicon (though not normally in its *Odyssey*-sections): more on them below.

(evidently misread as φιλλη, and alphabetized accordingly!),[19] **φιλομειδής,**
φίν, φιτρῶν. Then the appended *Odyssey* set:

φιληρέτμοισι ἀπὸ μέρους, φιλοναύταις.	*Od.* 1.181 (also 419, 11.349)
φίλος ἀντὶ τῆς κλητικῆς εἴωθε λέγειν· "δὸς φίλος".	*Od.* 17.415 cit. (but cf. 1.301)
Φιλομηλείδης. τοῦ σχήματος ὄντος πατρωνυμικοῦ, ἐν τῇ δ᾽ Ὀδυσσείας "Φιλομηλείδῃ ἐπάλαισεν ἀναστάς" . . .	*Od.* 4.343 cit. + ref.
(long entry upholding patronymic against matronymic=Patroclus and approving nom. prop.)	
φιλίων ἀντὶ τοῦ φίλτερος· "οὐδέ τις ἄλλος ξείνων τηλεδαπῶν φιλίων ἐμὸν (ἐμῶν cod.) ἵκετο δῶμα." ἐσχηματισμένον τῷ τρόπῳ τοῦ καλλίων (κάλλιον cod.).	*Od.* 24.268 (vel 19.351) cit.[20]
φιλεόντων φιλείτωσαν, ὡς ἔστων (*Od.* 1.273, *Il.* 1.338) ἔστωσαν.	*Od.* 24.485

Here the **φίλος** entry appears to be slightly out of sequence, but I would
suppose that it originally pertained to the earliest *Odyssey* occurrence of
vocative φίλος, 1.301 (καὶ σὺ φίλος); the book 17 citation may have been
part of the original comment on that, or the lexicon may have amalgam-
ated a separate book 17 entry with the earlier one.

In **φλ-**, ostensibly just two entries, **φλέγμα** and **φλίψεται**, but the first in-
corporates material that is clearly the latter part of an erstwhile entry on
φλοίσβου (or -οιο). This will have closed the three-place alphabetical series,
leaving the **φλίψεται** entry (*Od.* 17.221) as an *Odyssey* appendage.

Then **φο-**, fifteen entries. First, the alphabetical collection, mixed *Iliad*
and *Odyssey:* **φόβος, φοῖβος, φοινόν** (*Il.* hapax), **φολκός** (*Il.* hapax), **φοξός**
(*Il.* hapax), **φόρμιγξ, φορύξας** (*Od.* hapax), **φόως.** Then these additional
entries:

φοῖνιξ. τῶν πολλὰ δηλουσῶν ἡ λέξις·	
τὸ μὲν γὰρ δένδρον, "φοίνικος νέον (ἔην cod.) ἔρνος" (*Od.* 6.163)·	
δηλοῖ καὶ τὸ κύριον ὄνομα, τὸν τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως τροφέα, "Φοῖνιξ ἄττα γεραιέ" (*Il.* 9.607)·	
σημαίνει καὶ τὸν πυρρὸν τῷ χρώματι, "τὸ μὲν ἄλλο δέμας φοῖνιξ ἦν, ἐν δὲ μετώπῳ	λευκὸν σῆμ᾽ ἐτέτυκτο" (*Il.* 23.454–55)·	
καὶ τὸ φοινικὸν ἄνθος, "ὡς δ᾽ ὅτε τίς τ᾽ ἐλέφαντα γυνὴ φοίνικι μιήνει" (*Il.* 4.141)·	
καὶ τὸ ἐθνικόν, "δὴ τότε Φοῖνιξ ἦλθεν ἀνὴρ ἀπατήλια εἰδώς" (*Od.* 14.288).	
φορτίδος φορτηγοῦ νεώς· "φορτίδος εὐρείης"	*Od.* 5.250 cit.
φορέῃσι διαφέρει· "φορέῃσιν ἀκάνθας"	*Od.* 5.328 cit.
φόρτου τῶν φορτίων· "φόρτου τε μνήμων"	*Od.* 8.163 cit.
Φόρκυνος ὄνομα κύριον· "Φόρκυνος δέ τις ἔστι λιμήν"	*Od.* 13.96 cit.

---

19. There is no lack of other misreadings revealed by position in the lexicon, e.g., 40.16 ἀπτοεπές among
ἀπο-. These apparently occurred in the course of the lexicon's original compilation and were faithfully
transmitted. Usually, of course, the corruption is subsequent, likewise revealed by alphabetical position:
thus, e.g., at 2.13 read α⟨α⟩δειν, at 38.11 απε- for απο-, at 74.7 επιc⟨c⟩ευαc, at 116.14 ν⟨η⟩ησας.

20. οὐδέ τις ἄλλος does not match our text either of 24.267 (καὶ οὔ πώ τις βροτὸς ἄλλος) or of 19.350
(οὐ γάρ τώ τις ἀνὴρ πεπνυμένος ὧδε), but I suppose it to be a misquotation subsequent to extracting rather
than a variant in the text of the *Odyssey.* It may be post-Apollonian corruption (as I assume for the two
places in the entry that I have altered), but I think it more likely that the lexicon had it in this form from
the start.

φοινικόεσσαν πυρράν τῷ χρώματι.   *Od.* 14.500 (& 21.118)
φορήμεναι ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ φορεῖν, "Ἥφαιστος Διὶ δῶκε φορήμεναι" (*Il.* 15.310),
        ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ προσφέρειν, "θαλλόν τ' (ἄλλον δ' cod.) ἐρίφοισι φορῆναι" (*Od.*
        17.224).

The last of these entries is of typical polysemantic type, different from the
simple gloss that characterizes the *Odyssey* accessions; I presume a recur-
rence of the *Od.* 17 citation pulled it down here. The first of them, on the
other hand, the polysemantic φοῖνιξ entry, does not have any clear con-
nection with the *Odyssey* list; it may possibly have been attracted by the
Od. 6 citation, but it may be a discrete accession. There is evidently rela-
tionship with the "Apion" lexicon's entry, φοῖνιξ τὸ δένδρον καὶ ὁ καρπός
καὶ ὄνομα κύριον καὶ τὸ πυρρὸν χρῶμα. The relation between the two
lexica is controversial, and will be discussed below.[21]

    φρ-, with five or six entries,[22] shows three-letter alphabetization
throughout, except that the first of the φυ- entries intervenes before the
last of the φρ- ones, a one-line displacement, obviously not original. The
φρ- entry in question is φρόντιν τὴν καταφρόνησιν, obviously corrupt, but
rather than simply φρόν{τ}ιν I suggest:

Φρόντιν ⟨ὄνομα κύριον.   *Od.* 3.282
φρόνιν⟩ τὴν καταφρόνησιν.   *Od.* 4.258 (& 3.244)[23]

These may (since they come at the end) or may not (since they are in
place in the 3-place alphabetization) represent *Odyssey* accessions.

    In φυ-, with nine entries, the alphabetical set is φῦκος, φυλάσσειν (poly-
semantic), φύλοπις, φυλίης, φύξιν, φυσιόωντας, φυσίζωος (leg. -ζοος),
φυταλίη. Then a single *Odyssey* accession:

φῦλον ἀντὶ τοῦ γένος · "ὡς ὤφελλ' (ὄφελ' cod.) Ἑλένης ἀπὸ φῦλον (φύλων
    cod.) ὀλέσθαι."   *Od.* 14.68

Two entries in φω- (φωριαμοῖς, φῶτες) close the φ- listings.

    Clearly, we must recognize these *Odyssey* accessions as one of the lex-
icon's discrete components—its incomplete integration enabling our iso-
lation of it. It evidently represents a relatively late phase of composition.
Though not fully integrated, however, the *Odyssey* accessions are no inor-
ganic appendage. We have already observed a fair amount of interaction
between the incoming *Odyssey* items and the lexicon's already existent
material (which evidently covered both epics), and doubtless there was
more than we can hope to trace. Incoming items for whose lexis an entry
already existed would presumably be incorporated with that entry (if it

    21. By the "Apion" lexicon I mean the variously transmitted Ἀπίωνος γλῶσσαι Ὁμηρικαί edited by
A. Ludwich, *Philologus* 74 (1917): 205–45 and *Philologus* 75 (1918): 95–127; reprinted in H. Erbse, ed.,
Lexica Graeca Minora (Hildesheim, 1965), pp. 283–358 (hereafter cited as *Lex. Gr. Min.*).
    22. Six if we count πέφραδέ τε Τρώεσσι καὶ εὐχόμενος (*Il.* 14.500), which appears as an independent
entry, unglossed—clearly a relic of a longer entry, and presumably to be connected with the entry on
φράδμων that directly precedes.
    23. The gloss καταφρόνησιν makes it independently clear that (as Heinsius pointed out) the reference
is to 4.258 (rather than to 3.244), where the Homeric text is κατὰ δὲ φρόνιν ἤγαγε.

offered something new: otherwise, it would simply be passed over). Probably most of them were assimilated in this way: the concluding blocks of *Odyssey* entries will tend to be residues, consisting mostly of words that do not recur in the *Iliad*.

Alphabetization to the first two places is strict throughout the entire lexicon; on the rare occasions when an entry strays out of its assigned set, transmissional error will be the cause. But in φ- we have seen a consistent inconsistency. The *Odyssey* accessions are not alphabetized beyond two places, but the regular entries that precede are unmistakably alphabetized to three. This pattern of differentiation, while not peculiar to φ-, is unfortunately not in evidence throughout the whole lexicon. Three-place alphabetization is only spasmodic in α-, where more than anywhere else such organization would have been useful; it is as if the benefits of more thoroughgoing sorting were only belatedly recognized.[24] And elsewhere we find post-Apollonian levelling. Through most of ε- (the most populous letter after α-), for instance, the manuscript's alphabetization is total, and in parts of the lexicon where it is not total the basic three-place alphabetization has often been comprehensively carried through.[25] If it had been carried through everywhere, our clues to the lexicon's construction would have been obliterated. This is precisely what has happened in the case of a fifth or sixth century copy of the lexicon, P.Coll.Youtie I 2 (my Π[7], see Part 2), where alphabetization has ruined the integrity of the *Odyssey* αμ-series. But often enough in the Coislinianus, especially in the latter part of the lexicon, what must be the original organization survives more or less intact, revealing the two distinct phases we have identified: (1) lexeis sorted to three places, these constituting the bulk of the lexicon, with (2) sequential *Odyssey* accessions, sorted only to two places, intervening at the end of the relevant sections.

The same profile is presented by τ, for example. The basic alphabetization is to three places, but at the end of the listings in τα-, τε-, etc., we are liable to find a smaller set of sequential *Odyssey* entries. Not that all is perfectly neat and tidy: it is precisely where the tidiness fails (as with the anomalies we have already noted in αγ-, αμ-, and φ-) that we may hope to make further progress in discerning how the lexicon was put together.

In τα-, with 31 entries in all, we have first the regular alphabetical series, 23 entries running from τά to τάων, the three-place alphabetization intact except for the displacement of ταμεσίχροας, between τάχα and τάων. Then comes an entry for ταχεῖα, which I assume belongs one entry earlier, ahead

---

24. One might be tempted to attribute the chaotic organization of the α- entries to transmissional disruption, were it not for the fact that the *Odyssey* sets, or some of them, remain pretty well intact at the end of their respective two-place sections. Some parts of α-, e.g., απ-, have three-place alphabetization, and here this extends to the *Odyssey* accessions, as is clear from the set of *Odyssey* entries found at the end of απο- (40.18–26, after 35 regular απο- entries [counting the out-of-order ἀπριάτην, ἀπηλοίησεν, and ἀπτοεπές, the last and perhaps the first of these evidently misread as απο-]): ἀποτμότατος *Od.* 1.219, ἀπορραίσει *Od.* 1.404, ἀποστίλβοντες *Od.* 3.408, ἀπολείβεται *Od.* 7.107, ἀπόπροθεν *Od.* 7.244 alibi, ἀπορρώξ *Od.* 9.359, 10.514 (but *Il.* 2.755 quoted), ἀπομηνίσει *Od.* 16.378. But elsewhere the sorting of the *Odyssey* accessions is only to two places.

25. E.g., μ- (where μυών should be μυιών). Traces of the lexicon's original organization of the ε-entries are preserved in the Bodleian papyrus, treated in Part II.

of τάων. Then we expect the separate *Odyssey* accessions, if any. And here they are:

ταν⟨α⟩ύποδα ὁ μὲν Ἀπίων ταναόποδα, ὁ δὲ Ἡλιόδωρος προσεχέ-
στερον τανύποδα, τεταμένως (-μένα cod.) τῇ πορείᾳ χρώμενα τῶν
ποδῶν.²⁶   *Od.* 9.464

τάμνεν ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ διατέμνειν "τάμνε νέους ὄρπηκας" (*Il.* 21.38),
        ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ ἐλαύνειν "τάμνοντ᾽ ἀμφὶ βοῶν ἀγέλας καὶ πώεα
        μήλων" (*Il.* 18.528)
        καὶ πάλιν "βοῦς περιταμνόμενον ἠδ᾽ οἰῶν πώεα καλά" (*Od.*
        11.402),
        ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ θῦσαι "ἦ καὶ ἀπὸ στομάχους ἀρνῶν τάμ{ν}ε
        ⟨νηλέι χαλκῷ⟩" (*Il.* 3.292),
        ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ τοὺς ὅρκους δι᾽ ἐντόμων "ὄφρ᾽ ὅρκια τάμνοι (deb.
        -η) | αὐτός" (*Il.* 3.105–6).

τάς χωρὶς τοῦ ἄρθρου καὶ ἀναφορικῶς τίθησιν ἀντὶ τοῦ ταύτας. τὰς
        μὲν ἄρθρα (leg. -ον?).

τάρπησαν· Ἡλιόδωρος ἐν τῇ γ ῥαψῳδίᾳ Ὀδυσσείας, τὴν τέρψιν
        ἀπηνέγκαντο.   *Od.* 3.70 ref.

ταλαεργοί ὑπομένοντες τὰ ἔργα.   *Od.* 4.636, 21.23

τανύοντο ἐξετείνοντο διὰ τὴν προθυμίαν τοῦ τρέχειν.   *Od.* 6.83 (also *Il.*)

τάνυσσα ἐνέτεινα   *Od.* 23.201²⁷

τέγεοι κτλ.

There are a number of complications here. None of the first three entries takes the normal simple form of the *Odyssey* accessions. Each, I propose, represents a conflation of an incoming *Odyssey* entry with an existent one, and has been pulled out of sequence in the process. The entry for **ταναύποδα** mentions not only Heliodorus (as does the **τάρπησαν** entry) but also Apion, and prefers the one's interpretation to the other's. We shall be in a better position to assess this when other instances have been marshalled. The entry for **τάμνεν** is a typical polysemantic one—these too will be discussed later—and presumably owes its present position to its inclusion of the *Od.* 11 citation, which I take to be an accession originating here: it adds a second exemplification of an already defined and exemplified meaning. The entry for **τάς** will owe at least something of its incoherence to the casual butchery of transmission, but its position among the *Odyssey* accessions, rather than in its alphabetical position or accompanying **τά** at the head of the **τα-** entries (cf., e.g., **τῇ τῆς τήν** heading the **τη-** entries, or **τόν τοῦ τούς τό** heading the **το-**), is presumably due to a pertinent *Odyssey* item—perhaps *Od.* 3.291 ἔνθα διατμήξας τὰς μὲν Κρήτῃ ἐπέλασσεν.²⁸

---

26. Apion frag. 135 Neitzel (Apions Γλῶσσαι Ὁμηρικαί, ed. S. Neitzel, Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker 3 [Berlin–New York, 1977], pp. 185–328), Heliodorus frag. 36 Dyck (n. 2 above). Both Neitzel and Dyck adopt Villoison's more drastic emendation, τεταμένοις ἐν τῇ πορείᾳ χρώμενα τοῖς ποσίν, perhaps rightly, but cf. Eust. 1639.46 τεταμένως τοῖς ποσὶ βαδίζοντα.

27. ἐν (v.l. ἐκ) δ᾽ ἐτάνυσσ᾽ ἱμάντα κτλ., the only first-person occurrence in Homer; evidently articulated δὲ τάνυσσ᾽ (Aristarchan), cf. *Od.* 9.327 (δὲ/δ᾽ἐ-θόωσα) s.v. **θόωσα** 88.6.

28. Confirmed by τὰς μέν, a relic of the quote?

τε- is more straightforward. First the regular set of entries, 27 in number, τέγεοι to τέων, with undisrupted three-place alphabetization. Then an unusually lengthy *Odyssey* series. Only the beginning is a little shaky.

τετεύξεται κατασκευασθήσεται	*Il.* 12.345, 358, 21.322, 585
Τένεδος νῆσος σύμμαχος Τρώων	*Od.* 3.159 (-ον: -οιο *Il.*)
τετάνυστο ἐξετέτατο	*Od.* 4.135, 5.68 (& *Il.* 10.156)
τετραμμέναι ἀπεστραμμέναι· ἐν τῇ ε (ι cod.) 'Οδυσσείας	*Od.* 5.71 ref.
τετελεσμένον τὸ οἱόντε πρᾶγμα τελεσθῆναι	*Od.* 5.90 (& elsewhere, *Il.* & *Od.*)
τετράγυος τεσσάρων γυῶν. γύης δὲ μέτρον γῆς	*Od.* 7.113
τεκμαίρομαι ἀποτελέσω	*Od.* 7.317
τέρματα σημεῖα· ἐν τῇ θ 'Οδυσσείας	*Od.* 8.193 ref.
τετράκυκλοι τετράτροχοι	*Od.* 9.242
τετι{η}μένον[29] τετιμημένον	*Od.* 8.472
τέρψομαι τερφθῶ	*Od.* 16.26
τελέθοντες γινόμενοι· ἐν τῇ ρ 'Οδυσσείας	*Od.* 17.486 ref.
τέως τό⟨τε,⟩ τηνικαῦτα· "ὄφρα τέως αὐτὸς μενέω"[30]	*Il.* 24.658 cit.
τέγεος τῆς στέγους	*Od.* 18.209 (& elsewhere, *Od.* only)
τετευχῆσθαι καθωπλίσθαι	*Od.* 22.104
τετράοροι τέθριπποι	*Od.* 13.81
Τερπιάδης πατρωνυμικῶς, Τερπίου υἱός	*Od.* 22.330

There is not much that is anomalous here. The exclusively Iliadic τετεύξεται (glossed merely κατασκευασθήσεται, cf. τέτυκται glossed κατεσκεύασται in the alphabetical set) has been slightly displaced from the preceding τετ- entries (only τεύχεα and τέων intervene)—by attraction to an ousted entry on *Od.* 2.63 τετεύχαται, we may suspect. τετράοροι, the penultimate entry, is out of *Odyssey* sequence, whether by casual transmissional disruption or pulled down by an erstwhile entry in *Od.* 22.122 τετραθέλυμνον. More telling is τέως. The entry will owe its presence here to *Od.* 18.190 (τέως δ᾽ ἄρα δῖα θεάων | ἄμβροτα δῶρα δίδου), for which the given meaning is more appropriate than for the *Iliad* passage that has supplanted it.

The sporadic provision of book-references, in attendance on three of the entries, is another notable feature. There is little discernible reason for the three lexeis in question to be singled out in this way; they are (in the given forms) Odyssean hapaxes, but so are most of the others. The particularity of the assigned meaning could be a factor, but the lexicon's definitions are habitually context-specific. (With the signal exception of the polysemantic entries, which are clearly of separate origin, the lexicon conspicuously fails to address the semantic range of a word in its various forms.) The incidence of book-reference seems to be random. The possibility is not to be discounted that originally *all* the *Odyssey* entries were attended by book-reference.

In τη-, the three-place alphabetical listings conclude with **Τηΰγετον**, then come two *Odyssey* accessions:

---

29. Conflation of τετίμενον and τετιήμενος (*Od.* 8.303 et alibi). A single-line displacement.
30. I venture the emendation despite the marginal gloss on τέως at *Od.* 18.190 in P.Oxy.XV 1820, reported as το [τ]ηνικα[υ]τα. Cf., e.g., *Suda* s.v. (τηνικαῦτα. ἢ τότε), Hsch. s.v.

τηλεφανής τηλόθεν φαινόμενος   *Od.* 24.83
Τηλεφίδην τὸν Τηλέφου υἱόν· "ἀλλ' οἷον τὸν Τηλεφίδην κατενήρατο"   *Od.* 11.519 cit.

The inversion of their *Odyssey* sequence reflects a tendency strongly in
evidence elsewhere in the lexicon to put proper names at the end of the
relevant section.

In τι- the alphabetical listings run from τιθαιβώσσουσιν (τη- cod.) to
τιτύσκετο (a polysemantic entry), then we have:

τιταινομένω ἐκτετακότες   *Od.* 2.149
τιμήεντος ἐντίμου   *Od.* 8.393
τίμιος ἔντιμος   *Od.* 10.38

Just one entry in τλ-, and three in τμ-; six in το- (not counting the
polysemantic-type notes on τόν τοῦ τούς τό at the outset, exempt from the
three-place alphabetization), with no Odyssean appendage. In τρ-, 26 al-
phabetical entries (only the polysemantic τρόχος out of position, between
τρυ- and τρω-), then after the τρω- entries comes:

τρίζουσαι τῶν πεποιημένων ἡ λέξις.   *Od.* 24.5, 7

But the form of entry, assigning the word to the category of onomato-
poeic formations (cf. τρύζηται· πεποίηται ἡ λέξις κατὰ μίμησιν)[31] is ab-
normal for an *Odyssey*-accession, and I wonder whether τρίζουσαι may
have started out as τρώζουσαι, and been brought into line with the re-
ceived form of the Homeric word.[32] In that case this entry belongs to the
regular alphabetical listings, not to the *Odyssey* accessions.

τυ- (5 entries) and τω- (2 entries) conclude the τ listings, except that a
patently alien trio of ταυρ- entries has been inserted at the end.[33]

It is time to ask, Where do these *Odyssey* accessions come from? They
clearly have a single origin: what is it? At one extreme we could envisage
Apollonius reading through the *Odyssey* and offering his own interpreta-
tions for words he chose to include, on the basis of his own scholarship. At
the other extreme we could envisage him appropriating the contents of an
existent *Odyssey* glossary. More plausibly, perhaps, we could envisage
him utilizing an *Odyssey* commentary. Further than that, we cannot hope
to go—or could not, had not Apollonius been considerate enough (and
honest enough) to provide a name. We have already encountered it, more
than once, but in στ-, it stares us in the face. After the alphabetical entries
(25 in number, σταυροί to στυγέη) comes the *Odyssey* appendage:[34]

---

31. See p. 34–35 below, with n. 116.

32. τρίζειν and τρύζειν are often confused (as are τρύζειν and γρύζειν), and τρώζειν is brought into the
same nexus by, e.g., Hesychius' proffering ψιθυρίζειν as a gloss for it. Are the Τρωγοδύται responsible
(Hdt. 4.183.4, where they τετρίγασι v.1. τετρύγασι like bats—just as at *Od.* 24.5–7)?

33. Blatantly unhomeric, and clearly not belonging to the original lexicon. See Steinicke (n. 1 above)
p. xxix, and M. W. Haslam, "A New Papyrus Text of Apollonius Sophista," *ZPE* 49 (1982): 33, n. 12.

34. Additionally, a trio of strays has wandered into συ-: στέφει (*Od.* 8.170), στεινωπόν (*Od.* 12.234,
with *Il.* 23.427 appended), στελέω (*Od.* 2.287).

στιβαρῇσι (-αῖς cod.) ἰσχυραῖς	*Od.* 4.506 (& later, & *Il.*)
στειλιόν στελεόν	*Od.* 5.236
στῆ δ᾽ ἀντασχομένη Ἡλιόδωρος τὰς χεῖρας ὑπὸ τὸ πρόσωπον ἀνατείνασα	*Od.* 6.141
στίλβων Ἡλιόδωρος εἰς τὸ περιλάμπων· ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἡμῖν συνήθης ἡ λέξις.	*Od.* 6.237 (& *Il.*)
στύξαιμι Ἡλιόδωρος εἰς κατάπληξιν ⟨ἀγ⟩άγοιμι (supplevi)	*Od.* 11.502
στρεύεσθαι καταπονεῖσθαι. ὁ δὲ Ἡλιόδωρος εἰς τὸ στρα- γεύεσθαι (scripsi: στρατ- cod.) μετείληφε τὴν λέξιν. "ἢ δηθὰ στρεύεσθαι ἐν αἰνῇ δηιοτῆτι"	*Il.* 15.512 cit.
στροφαλίζετε (-ται cod.) στρέφετε (-ται cod.)	*Od.* 18.315
στρόφος ἦεν ἀορτήρ ὁ συνεστραμμένος ἀναφορεύς, ἐξ οὗ ἤρτηται ἡ πήρα	*Od.* 13.438=17.198=18.109

In four successive entries, Heliodorus.[35] I see no reason to resist the simple hypothesis that he is the source from which the *Odyssey* accessions are drawn. The interpretations expressly identified as Heliodorus', or at any rate the first three of them, are not offered as *alternatives* to the source's interpretations: they evidently *are* the source's interpretations. The entry on στρεύεσθαι (στρεύ⟨γ⟩, or *stet*?) is self-evidently a composite: a preexistent entry with the interpretation καταπονεῖσθαι, to which is added the Heliodoran interpretation of the Odyssean occurrence, 12.351, ἢ δηθὰ στρευ-(γ)εσθαι ἐὼν ἐν νήσῳ ἐρήμη. It is clear from the lexicon's other citations of Heliodorus that he devoted his comments to the *Odyssey* rather than to the *Iliad*.[36] That his name is only intermittently attached is only what we would expect. We have seen that the Coislinianus is similarly fitful in its provision of the book-references and the Homeric quotations. Moreover the evidence of a fifth- or sixth-century copy of the lexicon (P.Coll.Youtie I 2) makes it clear that the lexicon in its original form named Heliodorus far more often than does the Coislinianus: of that papyrus copy's five explicit citations of him, not one is found in the Coislinianus.[37] More complicated hypotheses could no doubt be devised, e.g., that Apollonius took over the references to Heliodorus from his source,[38] or occasionally substituted Heliodoran interpretations for those offered by his source, but it seems to me that the only plausible view is that Apollonius drew the

35. Frags. 35, 31, 33, 32 Dyck.

36. Schenck, *Quellen*, p. 36: "Die Mehrzahl der von Heliodor behandelten Homerwörter und Wortformen ist einzig und allein in der Odyssee zu belegen. Wo aber Iliasstellen in Frage kommen könnten, stehen gleichberechtigt Odysseestellen zu Gebote."

37. It is therefore liable to be as futile as it is unnecessary to seek to explain why Heliodorus is named in some cases and not in others, but the incidence is not totally haphazard. Retention of the name is only natural in the στρεύ(γ)εσθαι entry, where Heliodorus' interpretation (apropos the Odyssean occurrence) is combined with a preexisting one (apropos *Il.* 15.512), and also in the στίλβων one, where Apollonius adds his own comment to Heliodorus' gloss. (For εἰς τὸ, cf. εἰς τὸ ὑπαύξοιτο μετέφρασεν in the ὑποσταχύοιτο entry at 159.33, quoted on p. 16 below; cf. also 67.19.) It may be that the lexicon originally recorded alternative interpretations of (στῆ δ᾽) ἀντασχομένη and στύξαιμι too, lost to the Coislinianus.

38. Ritschl's view was that the Heliodorus references came via Apion (*Kleine philologische Schriften*, vol. 1 [Leipzig, 1866], pp. 116–17). This was never plausible (cf. Schenck, *Quellen*, p. 35) and is now untenable.

material we have isolated from an *Odyssey* commentary that went under the name of Heliodorus.[39]

The proposed identification gains further cogency from the lexicon's other citations of Heliodorus. The name of Heliodorus is not confined to the discrete *Odyssey* sections. But when Heliodoran interpretations are cited elsewhere, it is usually clear that the Heliodoran component is secondary, not primary. Here are examples from the Coislinianus.

13.30 **αἴθοπα οἶνον** ἤτοι τὸν φύσει θερμόν (αἴθειν γὰρ τὸ καίειν), ἢ τὸν μέλανα, ὡς Ἡλιόδωρος, ἢ τὸν λαμπρὸν κατὰ δύναμιν.

35.17 **ἀνάπυστα** (*Od.* 11.274) ἔκδηλα, ἐξάκουστα. ὁ δὲ Ἡλιόδωρος ἀνάγγελτα.

72.20 **ἐπιβώτορι μήλων** ἤτοι βοσκήτορι ⟨ἢ ἐπιβήτορι⟩ (supplevi) οἷον ἐφιππαστῆρι· οἱ γὰρ (scripsi: τῶν) βασιλέων υἱοὶ πρῶτον ἐπὶ κριῶν εἰώθασιν ἐπιβαίνειν, ὡς καὶ Ἡλιόδωρός (Ritschl: Ἡρόδοτός) φησιν. "ἐπιβώτορι (-βότωρι cod.) μήλων παναπάλῳ, οἷοί τε ἀνάκτων παῖδες ἔασιν" (*Od.* 13.222f.).

73.5 **ἐπιειμένε** (*Il.* 1.149) ἐπημφιεσμένε. ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς ι Ὀδυσσείας "μεγάλην ἐπιειμένον (-ος cod.) ἀλκήν" (*Od.* 9.214) Ἡλιόδωρος ἀποδίδωσι πεποιημένον(?).

136.17 **πρότυψαν** (deb. πρού-) προενέσεισαν, "Τρῶες δὲ προ(ύ)τυψαν" (*Il.* ter). ὅταν δὲ ἐν τῇ ω τῆς Ὀδυσσείας ὁ Ἡλιόδωρος λέγῃ ἐπὶ τοῦ Λαέρτου "μένος προύτυψεν" (*Od.* 24.319), προ{σ}έπεσεν, προ{σ}έσεισεν (?).

141.3 **σεύας** (*Il.* 15.681) παρορμήσας. ὅταν δὲ φῇ "καὶ τὰς μὲν σεῦαν ποταμὸν πάρα δινήεντα" (*Od.* 6.89), ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀπεσόβησαν. καὶ τὸ "εἴ περ ἂν αὐτὸν σεύωνται" (*Il.* 3.25f.) σοβῶσι μεθ' ὁρμῆς. οὕτως καὶ Ἡλιόδωρος.

142.22. **σκίδναται** σκεδάννυται, ὅ ἐστι (Bekker: οἷον) σκορπίζεται. ὁ δὲ Ἡλιόδωρος χωρίζεσθαι (sc. ad σκίδνασθαι *Od.* 1.274)· καὶ "σκέδασον (δ') ἀπὸ κήδεα θυμοῦ" (*Od.* 8.149, cf. 142.20 **σκέδασον** χώρισον).

144.13 **σταυροί** καταπῆγες καὶ σκόλοπες καὶ πάντα τὰ διανιστάμενα ξύλα· ἀφ' ἧς ἐννοίας καὶ οἱ καθ' ἡμᾶς ὀνομάζονται. ὁ δὲ Ἡλιόδωρος **σταυροὺς** (*Od.* 14.11) ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑστάναι, οἱ λεγόμενοι σκόλοπες (Villoison: σκοπίοι).

152.35 **τιμήν** ἐπὶ μὲν τῆς δόσεως καὶ τῆς συνήθους ἡμῖν τιμῆς, "⟨τιμῆς⟩ ἧς τέ μ' ἔοικε τετιμῆσθαι μετ' Ἀχαιούς" (*Il.* 23.649), ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς τιμωρίας, "τιμὴν ἀρνύμενοι" (*Il.* 1.159), ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ προστίμου, "τιμὴν δ' Ἀργείοις{ιν} ἀποτινέμεν" (*Il.* 3.286), ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς ὠνῆς, "τιμὴν ἀμφὶς ἄγοντες ἐεικοσ{σ}άβοιον" (*Od.* 22.57)· μήποτε δὲ καὶ τοῦτο ἐπὶ προστίμου λέγεται (Bekker: λέγεσθαι). ὁ δὲ Ἡλιόδωρος καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν οὕτως φησὶν εἰρῆσθαι· "ἦ ἔτ' ἔχει τιμὴν πολέεσσι (πολέσιν deb.) μετὰ Μυρμιδόνεσσι" (*Od.* 11.495).

153.32 **τολύπευσεν** κατειργάσατο, ὅθεν καὶ ἡ τῶν ἐρίων τολύπη λέγεται. ὁ δὲ Ἡλιόδωρος διείλησεν.

___

In instances such as these, it is clear that the Heliodoran interpretation has simply been tacked on to an existent entry, which it has otherwise left unaffected. Sometimes the Heliodoran contribution relates to just the same lexis as the entry to which it is added (e.g., ἀνάπυστα), but more often, and more revealingly, its reference is different. To the existing entry on the Iliadic occurrence of ἐπιειμένε is added Heliodorus' gloss for the Odyssean occurrence of ἐπιειμένον; to the existing entry on the Iliadic προύτυψαν are added Heliodorus' glosses for the Odyssean προύτυψεν.[40] To the multiple entry on σεύας, etc., including the Odyssean σεῦαν, is added a coda attesting Heliodorus' identical interpretation.[41] To the poly-semantic entry on τιμήν, listing four distinct meanings (Apollonius ex-pressing reserve about the fourth), is added yet another from Heliodorus. And so on.

Elsewhere the incorporation is effected a little more organically, but never in such a way as to give any reason to doubt that the Heliodoran component is secondary.

In ὑπ-, for example, in addition to the set of sequential *Odyssey* entries at the end (on which see below), we find a scattering of Heliodoran con-tributions to the regular collection of entries that precedes (39 entries, υπαρ to υπωρειας, three-place alphabetization). The entries concerned, in order of their occurrence within the lexicon, are these:[42]

158.8–21 ὑπερικταίνοντο τῶν ἅπαξ εἰρημένων, ἐν τῇ ψ τῆς Ὀδυσσείας, "πόδες δ' ὑπερικταίνοντο." ὁ γὰρ Ἀρίσταρχός φησιν ἄγαν ἐπάλλοντο, ... ἔνιοι δὲ ἐτυμώτερον (ἐτοιμό- cod.) ὑπ{ερ}εσχίζοντο (Lehrs) κατὰ τὴν πορείαν· . . . . ὁ δὲ Ἡλιόδωρος *ὑποκατεκλῶντο οὐκ εὐτονοῦντες.* ἄλλοι δὲ ὑπερίκνοῦντο διὰ τὴν προθυμίαν.

159.22–26 ὑπηνήτῃ ἐν τῇ ω τῆς Ἰλιάδος. ὁ Ἡλιόδωρος *ἀποδίδωσιν ἀρτίως τὴν ἥβην ἔχοντι.* ὑπήνη δέ ἐστιν ὁ ὑπὸ τὴν ῥῖνα τόπος· καὶ οἱ μὲν τὸν μύστακα ἀποδιδόασιν, οἱ δὲ τὸ γένειον. ἀκούειν δὲ ἄμεινον τῷ ἀρτίως γενειῶντι· διόπερ ἐπήνεγκε "τοῦπερ χαρι-εστάτη ἥβη."

27–33 ὑποσταχύοιτο τῶν ἅπαξ εἰρημένων. ὁ μὲν {οὖν} (seclusi) Ἀπίων ἀποδίδωσιν ὑπαύξοιτο, ὁ δὲ Ἡλιόδωρος *ὑπογεννῷτο.* "ὑποσταχύοιτο βοῶν γένος εὐρυμετώπων." ὑγιῶς μὲν οὖν ἑκάτερος· εἴρηται γὰρ ἀπὸ τῶν σταχύων μεταφορικῶς· ὥσπερουν ἐξ ἑνὸς σπέρματος εἰς πυθμὴν γίνεται, ἀφ' οὗ πολλοὶ στάχυες, οὕτως ἀπὸ μιᾶς βοὸς πολλοὶ γίνονται· διόπερ ὁ μὲν εἰς τὸ ὑπαύξοιτο μετέφρασεν, ὁ δὲ ὑπογεννῷτο.

160.11–14 ὑπο-νηίῳ ὁ μὲν Ἀπίων ὡς ἐν τῇ Ἰθάκῃ λιμένος οὕτως καλουμένου. ὁ δὲ Ἡλιόδωρος *ὡς δύο μέρη λόγου ὄντα μετείληφεν, ἵν' ᾖ ὑπὸ τῷ νηίῳ· φησὶ γὰρ νήιος τόπος ἔχων ξύλα ἢ δένδρα, ἐξ ὧν δεσμοῦσι τὰς ναῦς καθορμίζοντες.*

---

40. The entries show surface corruption that cannot all be securely mended, but that does not matter for present purposes. (πεποιημένον is perhaps for περιβεβλημένον, cf. D-schol. on *Il.* 1.149. More remark-able is προενέσεισαν and προ{σ}έσεισεν. I cannot parallel the intransitive usage, but they seem to protect one another.) The oddly stranded position of ὁ Ἡλιόδωρος in the latter entry (the subject of λέγη being of course Homer) is perhaps indicative of addition in draft; as a post-Apollonian corruption (Villoison pro-posed shifting it to follow the quotation) it is not too easy to explain.

41. It will apply to the *Odyssey* passage, which Heliodorus evidently glossed (ἀπ)εσόβησαν (μεθ' ὁρμ-ῆς) v.sim.; we should not expect precision in such matters. Cf. the ἐπιβήτορι entry (to which *Od.* 18.263 ἐπιβήτορι ἵππων must be relevant).

42. Heliod. frags. 44, 46, 49, 48 Dyck.

All four are composites. The Odyssean hapax ὑπερικταίνοντο (23.3) is a word whose etymology and (therefore) meaning was a scholarly problem of long standing; Apollonius adds Heliodorus' interpretation to an already complex note (nearly but not quite at the end: the final interpretation— ἄλλοι δέ—may be a still later addition, or may be drawn from Heliodorus himself).[43] ὑποσταχύοιτο (Od. 20.212), also expressly hapax (suggesting Aristarchan comment via Aristonicus), gave less scope for variety, but here as elsewhere Apollonius opposes Heliodorus' translation to Apion's, and makes comparative judgment. Similarly with ὑπο-νηίῳ, Od. 1.186: ὁ μὲν Ἀπίων . . . , ὁ δὲ Ἡλιοδ., this time left without Apollonian resolution. For ὑπηνήτη the reference given is to Il. 24.348, but the Heliodoran interpretation will have been made apropos of the word's other occurrence, at Od. 10.279. Within the separate Odyssey block, among its Heliodoran fellows, the entry would have appeared simply as ὑπηνήτη ἀρτίως τὴν ἥβην ἔχοντι, but once lifted from its Heliodoran context it needs to be labelled, ὁ Ἡλιοδ. ἀποδίδωσι κτλ.

If we look now at the separate Odyssey set, we see a certain amount of infiltration in that direction too. It runs as follows (160.18–161.7):

ὑπερ-μορον. ὁ μὲν Ἀρίσταρχος τὴν δευτέραν ὀξυτονῶν ὑπερμόρως ἀκούει· "ὡς καὶ νῦν Αἴγισθος ὑπέρμορον Ἀτρείδαο." ὁ δὲ ['Η]λιόδωρος ὡς δύο μέρη λόγου ὄντα προφέρεται, καὶ φησὶν ὑπὲρ τὸ καθῆκον.	Od. 1.(34,) 35 cit. (& 5.436)
ὕπατε κρειόντων ἡγούμενε θεῶν	Od. 1.45, 81 (& 24.473)
ὑπίσχεται ἀναδέχεται καὶ ὑπισχνεῖται	Od. 2.91 (& 13.380)
ὑποστάς ἀναδεξάμενος. ὅταν δὲ λέγῃ "καί μοι ὑποστήτω ὅσσον βασιλεύτερός εἰμι," ἴσον τῷ ὑπειξάτω.	Od. 3.99 = 4.329; + Il. 9.160 cit.
ὑποδμώς "Ποσειδῶν (deb. Ποσειδάωνος) ὑποδμώς." ὁ μὲν Ἡλιόδωρος δμὼς ὑποτεταγμένος, ἔνιοι δὲ ὡς περισσευούσης (Bekker: περισσὸν οὔσης) ἀκούουσι τῆς προθέσεως.	Od. 4.386 cit.
ὑπιωγῇ ὑπαγωγῇ (-ή cod. bis)· "εὗδον Βορέω ὑπιωγῇ"	Od. 14.533 cit.
ὑποπερκάζουσι μεταβάλλουσιν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄμφακος	Od. 7.126
ὑπεκπροθέων ὑπεκτρέχων	Od. 8.125
ὑπὲρ τοκήων κατὰ τῶν γονέων· †"λίσσομ' ὑπὲρ τοκήων"†	Il. 22.338? (olim Od. 15.261?)
ὑποσσείουσιν ὑφέλκουσιν	Od. 9.385
ὑποκυσσαμένη ἔγκυος γενομένη	Od. 11.254
ὑπαλευόμενος φυλασσόμενος	Od. 15.275
ὑποδέγμενος ἀναδεχόμενος· "βίας ὑποδέγμενος ἀνδρῶν"	Od. (13.310 =) 16.189 cit.
ὑπό κυρίως μὲν "δύο δ' ὑπὸ πυθμένες ἦσαν" (Il. 11.635), καὶ πάλιν "ὡς ὑπὸ Τυδείδῃ πυκιναὶ κλονέοντο φάλαγγες" (Il. 5.93). ἀντὶ ⟨δὲ⟩ τῆς μετά ⟨"?Il. 18.492" . . . ⟩	

43. This last interpretation is elsewhere attributed to Dionysius of Sidon and Pindarion (cf. Schenck, Quellen, p. 115, Crates frag. 62b Mette).

ὕπνος ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ εἰδωλοποιουμένου θεοῦ,
        "Ὕπνε ἄναξ" (*Il.* 14.233)
    ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ πάθους, "ὕπνῳ καὶ φιλότητι"
        (*Il.* 14.353)
    ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ θανάτου, "ὡς ὁ μὲν αὖθι πεσὼν
        κοιμήσατο χάλκεον ὕπνον" (*Il.* 11.241)
ὕπνου δῶρον περιφραστικῶς ὁ ὕπνος.   *Od.* 16.481 (and *Il.* 7.482, 9.709)
ὑπέρπτατο μεταφορικῶς ἀντὶ τοῦ ὑπερέπεσεν   *Od.* 22.280 (and 8.192)

An obvious intruder here is the polysemantic ὕπνος entry.[44] This was
evidently sucked in by the Heliodoran note on ὕπνου δῶρον. The two en-
tries that include Heliodorus' name, ὑπέρ-μορον and ὑποδμώς, incorporate
alternative interpretations of the lexis, credited to Aristarchus and ἔνιοι
respectively. I would guess, though there is no knowing for certain, that
these come from Heliodorus' commentary itself, from notes such as ὁ
Ἀρίσταρχος . . . , ἄμεινον δὲ . . . , and οὐ περισσεύει ἡ πρόθεσις, ὥς τινες,
ἀλλὰ. . . . In taking over both the rejected and the preferred interpreta-
tions Apollonius naturally names Heliodorus, as he does not need to do
when there is no competing interpretation. The ὑποστάς entry is different,
contrasting the meaning of ὑποστάς (in its Odyssean occurrence) with the
meaning of another form in another place. The conjunction is probably
Apollonius', importing a preexistent ὑποστήτω entry, but the possibility
cannot be excluded that it is Heliodorus'; we know from the ἀνέσαιμι
entry (frag. 18 Dyck) that he adduced Iliadic passages on occasion. The
ὑπιωγή entry is out of sequence, and given in the nominative: probably
insignificant—if it reflects a reading ὑπιωγή somewhere earlier I cannot
imagine where. The remaining anomalies are a couple of garbled entries.
The ὑπό entry is obviously defective. I take it that a Heliodoran note on
some *Odyssey* instance of ὑπό—perhaps 16.215 ὑφ' ἵμερος ὦρτο γόοιο—
has drawn down the lexicon's prior entry on ὑπό, listing and exemplifying
a variety of meanings (cf., e.g., ἐπί, 72.7–10, κατά, 96.14–17). The ὑπὲρ
τοκήων entry is more seriously incoherent. Bekker refers this to *Il.* 15.660
λίσσεθ' ὑπὲρ τοκέων, but then not only is τοκήων mistaken for τοκέων but
λίσσομ' is mistaken for λίσσεθ'—an unlikely error, and the entry's pres-
ence within the *Odyssey* list would remain unexplained. The original ref-
erence, I think, must be to *Od.* 15.261 λίσσομ' ὑπὲρ θυέων. It looks as if
a note on ὑπὲρ θυέων was combined with a reference to *Il.* 15.660—or
more probably to *Il.* 22.338, λίσσομ' ὑπὲρ ψυχῆς καὶ γούνων σῶν τε
τοκήων. I expect the mangling occurred at the stage of original compila-
tion, though it may of course be due to transmissional corruption.

Despite uncertainties in individual cases, then, a fairly clear picture is
emerging. The Heliodoran accessions to the lexicon are not kept strictly
segregated, and it is when they are combined with existing entries that
their Heliodoran provenance is especially liable to be marked.[45] The in-
terpenetration is two-way. Existent entries may be drawn down into the

---

44. For such metonymic entries see p. 34 below.
45. Or when Apollonius ventures to add comment of his own: witness στίλβων (above, p. 14 with n. 37),
and ἀνέξομαι (*Od.* 19.27), where Apollonius' identification of the interpretation as Heliodorus' is preliminary

appended Heliodoran section (often with some resulting incoherence), or items from that section may be pulled out to join existent entries. We are in a position to identify Heliodoran items pulled out and fused with already existent entries only when the name of Heliodorus is attached. When the movement is in the other direction, into the Heliodoran section, identification is easier, so long as alphabetization has not destroyed the section's integrity by redistribution of its serial constituents. As well as the instances in ὑπ- just viewed we have seen the same phenomenon with ἀγαπήνορα, ἀγκυλοχεῖλαι, ἀγέρθη, ἀμφίς, ἄμμορον, ἀμφαγαπαζόμε-νος, φαεινή, φορήμεναι, ταν⟨α⟩ύποδα-τάμνεν-τάς, τέως, and στρεύ-(γ)εσθαι, nearly all of which patently occur within *Odyssey* series, though only ἄμμορον, ταν⟨α⟩ύποδα, and στρεύ(γ)εσθαι actually have the name of Heliodorus attached. It is hardly necessary to demonstrate this at greater length, but it is worth giving one more example, brief but neat, from πλ-. First the three-place alphabetical set, πλαζεται πλατυν πλειαι πλημνη πληξαι πλημυρις πλησσοντο πλωτη πλωεν, then two further entries:

πλείου πλήρους. καὶ "πλεῖος δόμος."
πλῆντο προσεπέλασαν. σημαίνει καὶ τὸ ἐπληροῦντο.

πλείου and πλῆντο = προσεπέλασαν are both Iliadic (10.579, 14.468): but πλεῖος δόμος is *Od.* 4.319, and πλῆντο = ἐπληροῦντο is *Od.* 8.57 (ἐπλη-ρώθησαν D-schol., cf. Hsch.). Diagnosis is now simple. The entries on πλείου and πλῆντο have been attracted out of alphabetical sequence by the Heliodoran accessions with which they are combined.

Not everything in the lexicon becomes this perspicuous, once we recognize the *Odyssey* sections and make the identification with Heliodorus, but it is fair to say that much becomes more intelligible than it was before. If there is a large residue of phenomena that defy rational explanation (e.g., why should Heliodorus' πλεῖος entry attract πλείου πλήρους but not πλεῖαι πλήρεις, which stays discrete within the alphabetical set?), that is only to be expected, for the lexicon was clearly put together in what at least by modern standards seems a rather slap-dash and happy-go-lucky way.[46] But it is I hope clear that much of the lexicon does yield to analysis.

Even the most jumbled parts of the lexicon have patches of compara-tive clarity. No part of it has a less intelligible composition than the eight or so Bekker pages of αv- (30.15–37.5). Here we find neither an intact Heliodoran section nor wholesale redistribution and amalgamation, but a number of Heliodoran clusters, variously interfered with. There are four

---

to his distancing himself from it: ... οὕτως φησὶν ὁ Ἡλιόδορος· μήποτε δὲ κοινότερον εἴρηκεν ὡς ἡμεῖς, ὅτι οὐκ ἀργὸν τὸν ξένον ἀνέξομαι ἔχειν. This entry occurs in what seems to be a predominantly He-liodoran environment (ἀνέγναμψαν *Od.* 14.348, ἀνέξομαι *Od.* 19.27, ἀναΐξαντες + ἀναΐξας *Od.* 21.119, ἀνειρήψαντο *Il.* 20.234 but *Od.* quater, ἀνέβραχε *Od.* 21.48, ἀντιάσειεν *Od.* 21.402).

46. Not wholly an anachronistic judgment. It is true that lexicography was still very much undevel-oped, but the lexicon would have emerged with incomparably fewer defects if it had been put together by a scholar of Aristarchus' calibre, or (since scholarship was not uniformly degenerate) of Herodian's. The significant thing is that after Zenodotus no scholar worthy of the name concerned himself with lexicogra-phy (and those who came closest were mired in atticism).

or five explicit mentions of Heliodorus (in ἀνέσαιμι, ἀνδραχθέσι, ἀνέξο-
μαι, ἀνακτορίησι [name not in Coisl.],[47] ἀνάπυστα), the naming in each
case evidently motivated by the fact that the Heliodoran interpretation is
in attendance on a competing interpretation of the lexis in question. The
entry for ἀνδραχθέσι, *Od.* 10.121, is followed by one on ἀνέρριψαν
Od. 10.130 (33.24–29 Bekker), the entry for ἀνακτορίησι *Od.* 15.379 is
followed by one on ἀντίθυρον *Od.* 16.159 (34.21–26 Bekker); the Odys-
sean environment of the entry for ἀνέξομαι has already been noted (n. 45
above). As for ἀνάπυστα (35.17 Bekker):

ἀνάπυστα ἔκδηλα, ἐξάκουστα, ὁ δὲ Ἡλιόδωρος ἀνάγγελτα.[48]	*Od.* 11.274
ἀνεμώλια μάταια, ἀνεμώδη, ἀπὸ τοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀνέμων μολίσκειν, οἷον ἀνεμοφόρητα. "ἀνεμώ- λια γάρ μοι ὀπηδεῖ"	*Il.* 5.216 cit. (but cf. *Od.* 11.464)
ἀναμορμύρεσκεν (ἀνε- cod.). τῶν πεποιημένων ἡ λέξις κατὰ μίμησιν, οἷον ἀνέζει, ἀνετάραττεν. "πᾶσ' ἀναμορμύρεσκε κυκωμένη" (πᾶσαν ἀμ-, μυκ- cod.)	*Od.* 12.238 cit.
ἀνεροίβδησεν ἀνέπιεν. "τρὶς δ' ἀναροιβδεῖ"[49]	*Od.* 12.236, 431; *Od.* 12.105 cit.
ἀναιδής μεταφορικῶς ὁ βίαιος καὶ σκληρός. "λᾶας (καὶ cod.) ἀναιδής"	*Od.* 11.598 cit.[50]
ἀναμετρήσαιμι διέλθοιμι. "ὄφρ' ἔτι τὴν ὀλοὴν ἀναμετρήσαιμι θάλασσαν"	*Od.* 12.428 cit.
ἀνασχόμενος ἀνατείνας. "κόψεν ἀνασχόμενος σχίζῃ δρυός"	*Od.* 14.425 cit.
ἀντιφερίζειν ἐξισοῦσθαι	*Il.* 21.357 (but cf. *Od.* 16.238)
ἄναλτον ἀπλήρωτον. "βούλεται αἰτίζων βόσκειν ἣν γαστέρ' ἄναλτον"	*Od.* 17.228 cit.
ἀναγνούσῃ οἷον ἀναγνωρισάσῃ. "εἵματ' ἀναγ- νούσῃ"	*Od.* 19.250 cit.[51]

47. The name is supplied by the Berlin papyrus P.Coll.Youtie I.2 (Ἡλιόδωρος ε[. .]α[. . .]ειαις; I
would have expected ταις απολειαις) and by Hesychius (ὁ δὲ Ἡλιόδωρος ταῖς ἀπολείαις). Incidentally, I
see no need to change Hesychius' ἀπολείαις to ἀπὸ λείας (so Schmidt, approved by Latte); the word is
perfectly unexceptionable, and I take it as implying an etymology νάκος μὴ ἐχούσαις v.sim. (i.e., alpha
privative). At the beginning of the Coislinianus' entry, ταῖς τοῦ ἀνάκτου οἷον τοῦ δεσπότου, I presume
ἀνάκτου is to be amended not to ἄνακτος (Villoison, approved by all since) but to ἀνάκτορος.
48. Perhaps ἀνάγγελτα καὶ ἄρρητα, as Photius s.v.
49. Textual loss is clear from the discrepancy between lexis and quotation. We should restore some-
thing like: ἀνεροίβδησεν ἀνέπιεν· "*Od.* 12.236" καὶ ἀναροιβδεῖ ἀναπίνει· "*Od.* 12.(104/)105."
50. Given the manuscript's καὶ, I suspect that the original entry was more complex, and adduced *Od.*
17.449, ὥς τις θαρσαλεὸς καὶ ἀναιδής ἐσσι προίκτης, in addition to the "metaphorical" application to λᾶς
in Book 11. Cf. (1) the abridged entry in the fifth- or sixth-century copy of the lexicon P.Coll.Youtie I.2,
ἀναιδής βίαιος καὶ σκλ[ηρός,] ἀνένδοτος, and (2) Hesychius, ἀναιδής σκληρός, ἀναίσχυντος· μεταφορικῶς
γὰρ τὸν λίθον ἀναιδῆ λέγει "Ομηρος, "λᾶας ἀναιδής." We could reconstruct something on the lines of
μεταφορικῶς ἐπὶ λίθου βίαιος καὶ σκληρὸς καὶ ἀνένδοτος· "(*Od.* 11.598)"· ὅταν δὲ λέγῃ "(*Od.* 17.449),"
κυρίως ἀναίσχυντος. (Steinicke's supplements, both here and in ἀνεμώλια above, where he adds ⟨καὶ φέρ-
εσθαι τὰ τοιαῦτα⟩ after the etymological μολίσκειν, too slavishly follow Hesychius, I think.)
51. εἵματ' is a reading lost to the direct tradition, which gives σῆμα'. Among these few entries we
also have θάλασσαν not χάρυβδιν at *Od.* 12.428 (in ἀναμετρήσαιμι), and κόψεν not κόψε δ' at *Od.* 14.425
(in ἀνασχόμενος). This last may represent transmissional corruption in the lexicon, but εἵματα and θάλασ-
σαν clearly originate in their Homeric context and came into the lexicon in this form. Cf. ἀντιφερίζειν (see
main text). A reminder of the paltriness of our textual evidence for the *Odyssey* (cf. P.Oxy.LIII 3710).

There is no mistaking the *Odyssey* series here, brought in train by the expressly Heliodoran addition to the ἀνάπυστα entry.[52] The most notable points are (1) the suppression of the original Odyssean reference of ἀνεμώλια (κακὸν δ' ἀνεμώλια βάζειν) by an Iliadic quotation,[53] and (2) the obscuration of the original Odyssean reference of the ἀντιφερίζειν entry.[54] Heliodoran entries tended to be submerged even as they entered. The rest of the Heliodoran accessions in αν- are less plainly in view, but are not wholly lost from sight.[55]

In about a third of the Coislinianus' explicit citations of Heliodorus his name is paired with that of Apion.[56] Heliodorus ("Herodorus") and Apion are names found in tandem in later tradition too, in Eustathius, but there they appear as an undifferentiated composite. In the lexicon, Heliodorus and Apion are always reported separately (the latter much more frequently than the former), and their interpretations never exactly coincide. When they appear in the same entry, the order is normally Apion-Heliodorus, consistently with the thesis that Apollonius incorporated Heliodorus at the last stage of composition. We have already seen instances in ταν⟨α⟩ύποδα, ὑποσταχύοιτο, and ὑπο-νηίῳ, and here are others:

81.24 (Ap. frag. 37 Neitzel, Hel. frag. 22 Dyck) ζῶστρα Ἀπίων τὰ ἐνδύματα τῶν ἀνδρῶν· "ζῶστρά τε καὶ πέπλους καὶ ῥήγεα σιγαλόεντα" (*Od.* 6.38). ὁ δὲ Ἡλιόδωρος (Duentzer: Ζηνόδωρος) βέλτιον τὰ ζώματα, τὰς ζώνας.

144.7 (Ap. frag. 125, Hel. frag. 28) σπιλάδες ὁ μὲν Ἀπίων αἱ ἐν ὕδατι κοῖλαι πέτραι, ὁ δὲ Ἡλιόδωρος αἱ παραθαλάσσιοι πέτραι καὶ πεπιλημέναι ὑπὸ τῶν κυμάτων.

147.28 (Ap. frag. 129, Hel. frag. 34) σφαραγεῦντο ὁ μὲν Ἀπίων ἐψόφουν, ὁ δὲ Ἡλιόδωρος βέλτιον κατεπονοῦντο. | καὶ τὸ "οὐδ' ἄρ ἀπὸ σφάραγον μελίη τάμε χαλκοβάρεια" (*Il.* 22. 328).—ἐν συναλοιφῇ εἴρηται ἀ σ φ ά ρ α γ ο ν, οὐ σφάραγον. καὶ ἔστιν ἀσφάραγος φάρυγξ, δι' οὗ τὸ φωνητικὸν ἀνέρχεται· ἐπιφέρει οὖν "ὄφρα τί μιν προτιείποι ἀμειβόμενος."[57]

---

52. The immediately preceding entry, ἀναβροχέν (corrupted in Coisl. to ἀναβροχθέντος, see n. 4 above), *Od.* 11.586, also seems to belong here. And the Berlin papyrus and other sources preserve an ἀνακλ(ε)ῖναι entry, *Od.* 11.525, omitted by Coisl., which may also come from this series.

53. It may be suspected that (as demonstrably with ἀγαπήνορα) the replacement extends over the entire entry. The interpretation is identical (mutato mutando) with the one identified as Apion's on μεταμώνια; that entry reads (112.3) μάταια, ἀπὸ τοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀνέμων ἰέναι, οἷον ἀνεμοφόρητα. οὕτως Ἀπίων· οἱ δὲ τὰ μεταμελείας ἄξια. There the alternative interpretation (Heliodorus'?) is preserved, here it is not.

54. Our texts of *Od.* 16.238 give ἀντιφέρεσθαι (glossed ἐξισοῦσθαι by D-schol.). Either -φερίζειν was an ancient reading in the *Odyssey* passage, or the Iliadic lexis has replaced the Odyssean.

55. What follows the entries just presented is curious. After an intervening Iliadic entry, ἀνάεδνον, we have what appears to be basically a *reversed Odyssey* sequence, back from Book 10; the entries pertain to Book 10, 10, 10, (*Il.* 4), 6, 7, 4, 4, 2, 2 (ἀνήνορα to ἀνάψαι). Then a formally discrete pair of entries intervenes (ἀνέχῃσι and ἀνέχεσθαι, each entry taking the form ἡ μὲν λέξις ἐν τῇ x τῆς Ὀδυσσείας, quotation, σημαίνει/δηλοῖ δὲ τὸ . . . ; the first interposes Aristarchus' interpretation after the quotation). Then two Book 1 entries, then interruption by two entries on Books 21–22 (also Heliodoran, I would suppose), then two further Book 1 entries. Then there are five further entries (the first on *Od.* 4, the rest Iliadic, of simple gloss type) before αν- is concluded.

56. The figures are 13:41 (Schenck, *Quellen*, p. 27 n. 1, p. 35).

57. Synagoge b (*Anecd. Gr.* 1 377.21 Bachmann, Photius, Suda) has a clearly related entry σφάραγον· ὁ Ἀπίων φάρυγγα ἀπὸ τοῦ περὶ αὐτὸν γινομένου ψόφου (Ap. frag. 130 Neitzel). This is no doubt drawn from Ap.Soph. (cf. G. Wentzel ap. *Lex. Gr. Min.* [n. 21 above], p. 6), in which case the Coislinianus' appended note on σφάραγον vs. ἀσφάραγον at *Il.* 22.328 is not just elliptical (ἐν συναλοιφῇ refers to the elision in ἀπ' ἀσφάραγον) but badly defective. Evidently σφαραγεῦντο (*Od.* 9.390, 440) was adduced in support of σφάραγον in the *Iliad* passage (and each adduced in semantic and etymological elucidation of the other), but both σφάραγος and ἀσφάραγος were held to mean φάρυγξ. There is a separate entry in ἀσφάραγον,

149.18 (Ap. frag. 134, Hel. frag. 37) **τανύγλωσσοι** ἐπὶ μὲν τῶν κορωνῶν φησὶ "τανύγλ-
ωσσοί τε κορῶναι" (*Od.* 5.66)· κατὰ μέντοι τὸ προφαινόμενον[58] τεταμένας εἰς μέγεθος
ἔχουσαι τὰς γλώσσας· ὁ δὲ Ἀπίων τεταμένην ἔχουσαι τὴν φωνήν. ὁ δὲ Ἡλιόδωρος τὸ
πρότερον.

154.16 (Ap. frag. 137, Hel. frag. 41) **τρητοῖσι{ν}** Ἀπίων κυρίως· ἱμᾶσιν γὰρ ἐνετείνοντο
αἱ κλῖναι. ὁ δὲ Ἡλιόδωρος εἰς ταὐτὸ τείνει{ν} (or -ων: -ειν cod.), τοῖς εὖ τετρημένοις.[59]

The posteriority of the Heliodoran citations is clear.

In just four cases there is more integration and Heliodorus precedes
Apion:

33.24 (Ap. frag. 18, Hel. frag. 16) **ἀνδραχθέσι** οὓς καὶ ἀνὴρ βαστάζων βαρυνθείη ἂν
ὑπερμεγέθεις ὄντας λίθους· "οἱ δ' ἀπὸ πετράων ἀνδραχθέσι χερμαδίοισι βάλλον" (*Od.*
10.121f.). ὁ Ἡλιόδωρος μέγα βάρος παρεχομένοις (Alberti: -α) τοῖς ἀνδράσιν, ὁ δὲ
Ἀπίων τοῖς ἀνδρὸς βάρος ἔχουσιν, ἢ οἷον ἀνδραχέσιν, κατὰ παρένθεσιν τοῦ θ, ἵν᾽ ἦ
τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἄχος ποιοῦσιν.

100.19 (Ap. frag. 49, Hel. frag. 24) **κλίσιον** τῶν ἅπαξ εἰρημένων, ἐν τῇ ω τῆς
Ὀδυσσείας, "περὶ δὲ κλίσιον θέε πάντη, ἐν τῷ σιτέσκον⟨το⟩" (*Od.* 24.208f.) (ἀντὶ τοῦ
ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ). ὁ μὲν Ἡλιόδωρος τὰς κύκλῳ καὶ ἔξω καταλύσεις εἴρηκεν, ὁ δὲ Ἀρίσταρ-
χος κυκλόθεν τοῦ οἴκου οἷον ἐκ στιβάδων ᾠκοδομημένον, πρὸς οὗ (1. ἐφ᾽ οὗ?, πρὸς ᾧ?)
καὶ οἱ θρόνοι ἔκειντο, ὥστε οὖν καὶ ἐπ᾽ αὐτῶν καθιζομένους δειπνεῖν καὶ ἐγκοιμᾶσθαι.
ὁ δὲ Ἀπίων φησὶν οὕτως· "κλίσιον ἡ βάσις ἐφ᾽ ἧς κεῖται ὁ θρόνος· περὶ δὲ κλίσιον θέε
πάντη᾽ (ὅ ἐστι δι᾽ ὅλου τοῦ οἴκου)."

154.24 (Ap. frag. 138, Hel. frag. 42) **τρίγληνα** ὁ μὲν Ἡλιόδωρος τρίκορα εἶπε· γλήνη γὰρ
ἡ κόρη τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ. οὕτως δὲ εἴρηται ἐπὶ τῶν ἐνωτίων τῶν ἐν τῇ Ὀδυσσείᾳ διδομένων
τῇ Πηνελόπῃ (*Od.* 18.298). ὁ δὲ Ἀπίων βέλτιον "πολύγληνα· γλήνη γὰρ ἡ κόρη, ὥστε
εἶναι πολυθέατα, πολλῆς θέας ἄξια." τούτοις ἄν τις προσθείη ὅτι καὶ γλήνεα λέγεται τὰ
θέας ἄξια, ὅτε φησὶ "κέδρινον ὑψίροφον, ὃς γλήνεα πολλὰ κεχάνδει" (*Il.* 24.192).

165.24 (Ap. frag. 152, Hel. frag. 50) **φυλίης** (*Od.* 5.477) ὁ μὲν Ἡλιόδωρος γένος ἐλαίας,
ὁ δὲ Ἀπίων ψιλῶς γένος δένδρου· λέγεται γὰρ ὅτι ἡ ἀνήμερος ἐλαία λεγομένη φυλία
λέγεται.

It is hard to say just why the normal Ap.-Hel. order is inverted in these four
cases, but it illustrates the degree of incorporation to which the Heliodoran
accessions were liable. With **ἀνδραχθέσι**, three additional interpretations
(Heliodorus' and Apion's; I assume the third is an alternative of Apion's)
are appended to an already complete entry. This entry occurs within pre-
dominantly Odyssean environment, largely Heliodoran I would suppose.
With **κλίσιον**, it is possible that the Aristarchan testimony (along with the

φάρυγγα + quote. The Heliodoran component of the present entry is confined to the gloss on σφαραγεῦντο
(*Od.* 9.390, 440), I would suppose.

58. Both τὸ προφαινόμενον and the particles initially gave me difficulty, but I take τὸ προφαινόμενον to
mean "the preceding entry," **τανυγλώχινας** τεταμένας τὰς γλωχῖνας ἔχοντας (this the only cross-reference in
the lexicon?), and the particles are not to be touched: μὲν of the application, μέντοι (= δέ) of the meaning.

59. The first part of this entry is exceptionally elliptical. Apion's (and Heliodorus') "proper," i.e., lit-
eral interpretation, according to which holes were bored in the bed-frame in order to accommodate straps
that supported the bedding, is implicitly opposed to a non-literal ("metaphorical") interpretation such as
καλῶς κατεσκευασμένοις ἢ τετορνευμένοις (schol.H on *Od.* 10.12); but no such interpretation is given.
See further Dyck ad loc.

hapax notation) is drawn from Heliodorus (ultimately from Aristonicus); the quote from Apion, repeating the Homeric quotation, is unintegrated at the end, suggesting that Apion too was incorporated at a relatively late stage of composition. With τρίγληνα, Apion's explanation is put after Heliodorus' (which is expressly tied to the Odyssean occurrence of the word, 14.183) probably because it enjoys Apollonius' explicit preference. Where Apollonius prefers Heliodorus' interpretation (ζῶστρα, σφαραγεῦντο, ταν⟨α⟩ύποδα), or where he approves either's (ὑποσταχύοιτο), Heliodorus' comes last, as usual. With φυλίης, the interpretation labelled Heliodoran is the conventional one; and one notes that the concluding γὰρ clause pertains to that rather than to the intervening interpretation of Apion. The incoherence is readily explained, here as elsewhere, if we postulate three phases of compilation: (1) original entry (γένους ἐλαίας v.sim., cf. D-schol.), (2) accession of Apion (unorthodox), (3) accession of Heliodorus (explaining φυλία as wild olive). It goes without saying that what is taken from Apion, from Heliodorus, from whomever, is apt to be mutilated in the process.

I find nothing suggesting that Apion and Heliodorus were acquainted with each other's work, or either one with the other's. Schenck is undoubtedly right to oppose Ritschl's view that Apollonius' citations of Heliodorus are drawn from Apion, but I see no basis for his own view that Heliodorus and Apion were rivals. Apollonius seems to have utilized each of them independently.

So far we have confined ourselves to the citations extant in the Coislinianus. The picture is filled in further by references in other lexicographical texts, most if not all of them deriving from Apollonius' lexicon in a fuller form than the Coislinianus. Here again we find ample evidence that the Heliodoran component was a late addition to a preexistent entry. This is particularly clear with entries which append the Heliodoran interpretation of a different passage.

Hel. frag. 4 Dyck (Synag.b: *Anecd. Gr.* I 31.10 Bachmann)
  "ἀδινοῖο γόοιο" τοῦ ἀθρόως ἐκχεομένου. | "Σειρήνων" δὲ "ἀδινάων" (*Od.* 23.326) τῶν συνεχῶς ᾀδουσῶν, ὁ Ἡλιόδωρος ἔφη.
~ Coisl. 9.4–6 . . . καὶ ὅτε φησὶν "ἀδινοῖο γόοιο," τοῦ ἀθρόως ἐκχεομένου. | ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς ψ (τ cod.) ῥαψῳδίας Ὀδυσσείας "ἠδ' ὡς Σειρήνων ἀδινάων φθόγγον ἄκουσεν (ἤ-cod.)," συνεχῶς ᾀδουσῶν· ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ "ἀδινὸν κῆρ," ἐν τῇ τ (ψ cod.) ῥαψῳδία (-ας cod.: an ῥαψῳδί⟨ᾳ Ὀδυσσεί⟩ας? an ἐπὶ τῆς pro ἐν τῇ?), τὸ συνεχῶς λυπούμενον.

Hel. frag. 11 (Hsch. α 3582)
  ἀμενήνωσεν (*Il.* 13.562) ἀσθενῆ ἐποίησεν. | Ἡλιόδωρος δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν "νεκύων ἀμενηνὰ κάρηνα" (*Od.* quater) τὰ ἀδιανόητα ἀπέδωκεν. (Cf. the next entry: ἀμενηνά ἀσθενῆ, κατὰ στέρησιν τῆς δυνάμεως· μένος γὰρ ἡ δύναμις. ἢ ἄψυχα.)
~ Coisl. 27.3–4 ἀμενήνωσεν ἀσθενῆ ἐποίησε, κατὰ στέρησιν τοῦ μένους, ὅ ἐστι τῆς ἰσχύος· "ἀμενήνωσεν δέ οἱ αἰχμήν." | καὶ ἀμενηνός ὁ ἀσθενής· "ἤ κεν ζὼς ἀμενηνὸς ἔα χαλκοῖο τυπῇσι" (*Il.* 5.887).

Hel. frag. 23 (*Ep. Hom.* η 26)
  ἠλίβατος ὑψηλή, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐκεῖ πρῶτον ἐπιβαίνειν τὸν ἥλιον. τινὲς δὲ ἠλίφατος, ἀπὸ

τοῦ <u>φωτίζειν</u> τῆς ἀχλύος τὰ ὑψηλά. | Ἡλιόδωρος δὲ ἀλίβατον, ἐφ' ἣν ἔστιν <u>ἀλιτεῖν</u> <u>βαίνοντας</u> ἢ διὰ τὸ ὕψος ἢ διὰ τραχύτητα.[60]

~ Coisl. 83.25   **ἠλίβατος** ὑψηλή, ἐφ' ᾗ ὁ ἥλιος πρῶτον βάλλει.[61]

In each of these, Heliodorus' interpretation of an *Odyssey* passage has simply been tacked on to a cognate entry. Similarly when one and the same lexis is concerned, as with:

Hel. frag. 3 (P.Coll.Youtie I 2 gl. 3)
[**ἀδευ**]**κεῖ** ἀπεοικότι ἢ ἀδεχεῖ, ἀπροσδοκήτῳ. | Ἡλιόδωρος ἀνεικά[στῳ.]
~ Coisl. 9.15–17   **ἀδευκεῖ** ἤτοι τῷ ἀπεοικότι ἢ οἷον ἀδεχεῖ, ἀπροσδοκήτῳ· "ἀδευκεῖ κεῖται ὀλέθρῳ" (*Od.* 1.46).[62] | ἐν δὲ τῇ δ Ὀδυσσείας ἀδευκεῖ ἀνεικάστῳ.

Hel. frag. 6 (P.Coll.Youtie I 2 gl. 17)
ἀείρας αἴρας. | Ἡλιόδωρος [ἐν τῇ α] Ὀδυσσείας προσενέγ[κας.]
~ Coisl. 10.21–25   **ἀείρας**
    ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ βαστάζειν, "ἤ μ' ἀνάειρε (-αι cod.) ἢ ἐγὼ σέ" (*Il.* 23.724)
        καὶ κατὰ μετοχήν, "ἀείρας ἐς θάλαμον κατέθηκε" (*Od.* 24.165–66),
    ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ πρόσφερε, "μή μοι οἶνον ἄειρε" (*Il.* 6.264),
        καὶ ἐν τῇ α Ὀδυσσείας ἀείρας προσενέγκας.
    εἴρηται δὲ οὕτως, ἐπεὶ ὁ προσφέρων αἴρει τὸ προσφερόμενον. (καὶ αἴρειν τὸ προσ-
    φέρειν.) (ἀπὸ δὲ τούτου καὶ τὸν ἄρτον ὠνόμασται [scripsi: ὠνομάσθαι], ὥς φησιν
    Ἀπολλόδωρος.)[63]

Hel. frag. 9 (Synag. b: *Anecd. Gr.* I 75.24 Bachmann, Phot. α 1043)
ἀλοσύδνης τῆς ἐν ἀλὶ σευομένης (γενο-: correxi). | ὁ δὲ Ἡλιόδωρος τῆς θαλάσσης (Reitzenstein: τὴν θάλασσαν Ba., fere Phot.) ἀπέδωκεν.
~ Coisl. 21.21–23   **ἀλοσύδνην** τὴν ἐν ἀλὶ σευομένην, οἷον ἐνάλιον·[64] "νεπόδες καλῆς ἀλοσύδνης" (*Od.* 4.404). | οἱ μὲν τῆς θαλάσσης, ἔνιοι δὲ τῆς Ἀμφιτρίτης.

Hel. frag. 13 (P.Coll.Youtie I 2 gl. 58, Hsch. α 4153)
ἀμφουδίς περὶ τὸ ἔδαφος. | ὁ δὲ Ἡλιόδωρος ἀμφοτέραις ταῖς χερσὶν ₍εἰς τὸ οὖδας ῥίπτων₎ (om. pap.).
~ Coisl. 29.30–31   **ἀμφοῦδας** περὶ τὸ οὖδας, τὸ ἔδαφος· "ἢ πρὸς γῆν ἐλάσειε κάρη ἀμφοῦδας ἐρείσας" (*Od.* 17.237) (deb. ἀμφουδίς bis)

There is more than one point of interest in these variations, which nicely demonstrate the conditions of variability under which the lexicon was

---

60. The **ἠλίβατος** references are *Il.* 15.273, 619 (also *Od.* 10.88), where cf. scholl. (with H. Erbse, *Hermes* 81 [1954]: 173). The reference of the Heliodoran citation will be *Od.* 9.243, ἠλίβατον πέτρην.

61. The implied etymology requires not βάλλει but βαίνει (unless the lexis was taken to be ηλιβαλος), but Hsch. too has βάλλει: common error, it appears.

62. Editors have tried to reconcile the quotation with *Od.* 4.489, ἤέ τις ὤλετ' ὀλέθρῳ ἀδευκεῖ, but I see no reasonable alternative to referring it to *Od.* 1.46, where the direct tradition gives ἐοικότι κεῖται ὀλέθρῳ. See further M. W. Haslam, "Homeric Readings Lost and Found," *CP* 87 [1992]: 322–25.

63. The lexis for the original polysemantic entry, citing *Il.* 23.724 and *Il.* 6.264, will have been not **ἀείρας** but **ἄειρε**. (It is interesting that the compound ἀνάειρε is included, atypically, under the simple verb—unless we are to posit a reading ἤ' ἐμ' or ἠέ μ' ἄειρε, or articulation as ἤ μ' ἄν' ἄειρε.) This has been conflated with a regular (non-polysemantic) entry on *Od.* 24.165 **ἀείρας** (the link effected with καὶ κατὰ μετοχήν "and participially"), to which the Heliodoran entry on *Od.* 1.141 was appended. The subsequent matter, elucidating αἴρειν = προσφέρειν, was appended probably to the polysemantic entry; the last two items (which I have parenthesized) look like still later additions. In the papyrus the non-polysemantic entry remains discrete (and the polysemantic entry is absent), which suggests that the conflation of the two was post-Apollonian.

64. I take it that the accusatives are due to scribal error (minuscule compendium?); genitive is confirmed by the quotation and the continuation as well as by the other line of transmission. I suspect the original entry started by quoting *Il.* 8.207 (Thetis), and also that in Coisl. ἔνιοι has replaced Apion just as οἱ μέν has replaced Heliodorus.

transmitted. The actual interpretations of a given lexis, and the basic format of their presentation, tend to remain more or less intact. In ἀδευκεῖ, for instance, both the papyrus' and the Coislinianus' versions give "A or B; C." The dispensable components are the quotation, the book reference, and the name of Heliodorus. Only rarely does the Coislinianus fail to cut the last.[65]

If the lexicon is an onion, Heliodorus is its outer layer. The image is not perfect, for there is a certain amount of integration; and as a result, some (many?, most?) of the Heliodoran contributions must elude identification. Relatively few of them actually carry the name, and those that don't are detectable only when they remain structurally discrete, within *Odyssey* series. So we cannot simply peel off the Heliodoran layer. And if we were to shift our attention from the external to the internal evidence and consider the nature of the Heliodoran items, it would be quickly apparent that there is nothing particularly characteristic about them that would enable us to isolate them by content alone. The Heliodoran interpretations are such as one might find in any commentary of the period, a familiar mix of triteness and novelty. Dyck's edition makes that clear enough. (Dyck's general estimate of Heliodorus is somewhat more respectful than mine would be; to a jaundiced eye he evinces little conscientiousness or sophistication. But that is another matter.) I have suggested above that some of the Aristarchan and other material may come from him. Some have called Heliodorus a glossographer, but it is only the Apollonian extracting that makes him look one.[66] Several of the entries have features that betray the fact that they originate in a commentary, and give no ground for thinking that Heliodorus' concerns were predominantly lexical.[67] On the evidence available, he was a conventional exegete in the tradition of Aristarchus.

Incidentally, it seems to me that Lipsius was probably right to suggest that this Heliodorus is to be identified with the famous metrist.[68] There is no lack of γραμματικοί who concerned themselves with lexical and exegetical matters as well as with metrical. One thinks not only of Aristophanes of Byzantium, but also, closer to home, of Philoxenus and

65. The ἀμφουδίς entry, it should be noted, is one of the *Odyssey* αμ- series of entries mentioned towards the outset of this paper; as with ἄμμορον in the same series, the Heliodoran entry has been added to a preexistent one, pulled down into the *Odyssey* series in the process. (Cf., e.g., πλείου and πλῆντο, p. 19 above.) ἀμφοῦδας, the Coislinianus' form of the lexis, I take to represent the intermediate step between ἀμφουδίς and its metaphrasis περὶ τὸ ἔδαφος (i.e., in full, ἀμφουδίς οἶον ἀμφ-οῦδας περὶ τὸ οὖδας τὸ ἔδαφος). The difference between the standard interpretation and the Heliodoran one hangs on the treatment of ἀμφ-: Heliodorus accepted -ουδις>οὖδας but turned his back on the conventional ἀμφ(ί)-περί equation in favor of something more imaginative.

66. Ritschl distinguished "Heliodor der Glossograph" from other γραμματικοί of the same name (*Opuscula philologica*, vol. 1 [Hildesheim–New York, 1978; reprint of *Kleine philologische Schriften*, vol. 1, Leipzig, 1866], pp. 116ff.), and the label has stuck.

67. Cf., e.g., 32.13–32 ἀνέσαιμι . . . (long and multi-source entry mainly *re* analysis of *Od.* 2.185 ἀνιείης: cognate with ἀνία, or ἀν-ἱείης)· κατὰ δὲ τὴν Ἡλιοδώρου ἀπόδοσιν ἁρμόζει {ἐπανείης} (Bekker: an ἐπὶ τὸ ἀνιείης?) κἀκεῖνο οὕτως εἰρῆσθαι, "ἀλλ᾽ ἀνίης, ἐπεὶ αὐτὸς ἐγείναο παῖδ᾽ ἀίδηλον" (*Il.* 5.880), τῆς μεταφορᾶς οὔσης ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνιεμένων (scripsi: -ης) τῶν κυνῶν κατὰ τὰς θήρας ἀφέσεως. καὶ τοῦτο τῆς ἀποδόσεως διήκει καὶ (ἐπὶ τὸ) (supplevi) ἐπὶ τοῦ Τηλεμάχου λέγεσθαι καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀθήνης. So Heliodorus adduced the *Iliad* passage. Cf. ἀθεμίστων, and n. 39 above.

68. J. H. Lipsius, *Neue Jahrb. f. Phil. u. Paid.* 81 (1866): 609–10. Reputation as a metrist: "inter Graecos huiusce artis [i.e. metrics] antistes aut primus aut solus" (Juba ap.) Apthon. ("Mar. Vict.") *Ars Gramm.* 2.9, *Gramm. Lat.* VI 94.7–8.

Varro.[69] The Alexandrian Atticist Irenaeus (Minucius Pacatus) is attested as the metrist's pupil.[70] Heliodorus is best known to us for his Aristophanic colometrization, which was likewise heavily dependent on the work of Alexandrian predecessors.[71] The absence of metrical comments in the material extracted by Apollonius is no argument against the identification; hexameters are hexameters. Then, as with Apion, it was a prominent scholar's work that Apollonius used. But since the name is not uncommon, and first-century commentators were many, there can be no certainty.

II. APION

As we have seen, Apollonius often pairs Heliodorus with Apion. But there are many more citations of Apion than of Heliodorus. The work of Apion's on which Apollonius drew was a Homeric lexicon. That is established not by Hesychius' reference to the Homeric lexica of Ap(p)ion and Apollonius, but by the citations within Apollonius' lexicon. Van der Valk maintains that Apion published two works on Homer, one entitled Γλῶσσαι Ὁμηρικαί and the other a commentary, and suggests that Apollonius may have used the latter.[72] We shall come to the Γλῶσσαι Ὁμηρικαί shortly. But the belief that Apion wrote a commentary is groundless,[73] and in any case there can be no doubt that the work that Apollonius used took the form of a lexicon. Formulae such as ἀποδίδωσι or ἀποδέδωκε, found with reference to Apion in several entries, are indeterminate. So is a direct extract such as (143.20f.):

ὁ δὲ Ἀπίων οὕτως μεταφράζει· **σμῶδιξ** τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς πληγῆς οἴδημα.

But consider an entry such as 17.14–17 (gl. 171 Steinicke, Ap. frag. 11 Neitzel):

αἰητον ἐπὶ τοῦ "ἦ καὶ ἀπ᾽ ἀκμοθέτοιο πέλωρ αἴητον ἀνέστη" (*Il.* 18.410) ἤγουν τὸ μέγα, μεθ᾽ ὁρμῆς.[74] | ὁ Ἀπίων προθεὶς τὴν λέξιν φησὶν **αἰητον** (Ludwich: φησι ποιητὸν) πνευστόν, πυρῶδες· τάσσεται δ᾽ ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἡφαίστου ἡ λέξις· τὸ γὰρ φυσώμενον μέγα γίνεται. | οἱ δὲ (Ludwich: τὸ δὲ) αἰετηδὸν παρὰ τὸν ἀετόν.

---

69. Philoxenus wrote π. τῶν παρ᾽ Ὁμήρῳ γλωσσῶν as well as π. μέτρων (Suda). (Erbse, *Beiträge*, pp. 430–31, traces Philoxenan etymologies in Apollonius.) And he, Varro, and Heliodorus were all three derivationists.

70. Suda ει 190, adduced by Lipsius. I see little reason to think that τοῦ μετρικοῦ is mistaken, as Dyck suggests.

71. See O. Hense, *Heliodoreische Untersuchungen* (Leipzig, 1870); W. G. Rutherford, *A Chapter in the History of Annotation* (London, 1905), pp. 88–92.

72. *Researches,* 1:301.

73. It rests on nothing more than EM's entry on **ὅπλα**: . . . σημαίνει καὶ τὰ χαλκευτικὰ ὄργανα, ἤγουν ἐργαλεῖα, ὥς φησιν Ἀπίων, Ἰλιάδος σ ἐκ τοῦ "φύσας" (*Il.* 18.412). Whatever the precise relations between this and the corresponding entries in EtGenᴬᴮ (see Ap. frag. *86 Neitzel), "Ap." (see below), and ApS. (also see below), it would be most unsafe to postulate a commentary on the basis of this isolated book-reference even if it were clear that the reference was given by Apion. (Scholars are often too ready to postulate commentaries on the basis of isolated notices.)

74. It may be that an initial rendering has fallen out (e.g., αιη⟨τον φυση⟩τον), and also that ἐπὶ τοῦ is ἐπὶ ⟨τοῦ Ἡφαίσ⟩του. But I think the text is probably sound as it stands; the function of ἤγουν is explicative, and ἐπὶ τοῦ can be used with quotes (e.g., 9.2).

Here again it appears that Apion's entry is quoted verbatim;[75] but the notable feature is the introductory προθεὶς τὴν λέξιν. If even this phrase is not quite definitive, consider 102.3–5 (Ap. frag. 54 Neitzel), which is I think unique:

κολ<ώνη· κολ>ωνός, πᾶν ἀνάστημα τῆς γῆς· "ἔστι δέ τις πόλιος προπάροιθ{εν} αἰπεῖα κολώνη."[76] | ὁ δὲ Ἀπίων παρεὶς τὸ σημαινόμενον, προθεὶς δὲ τὸ κολώνη πόλις Τρωική.

Apion failed to give the meaning of κολώνη (sc. as a common noun) and glossed it only as a proper name.[77] What is implied for Apion is a comprehensive Homeric lexicon.[78]

Yet Apollonius saw fit to compile one of his own. If it was conceived in rivalry, we would expect it to be polemical. But criticism of his predecessor is surprisingly muted. The majority of his reports are given neutrally. There is the implicit criticism just quoted, there is an "absurd" applied to one of Apion's etymologies (χαυλιόδοντα quasi καυλιόδοντα, 167.4) and a "wrong" applied to one of his interpretations (ὄψον = κρέας, 126.1), but otherwise, adverse comment is restricted to the occasional preference expressed for non-Apionic interpretations.[79] If he shared Roman contemporaries' view of Apion as a prize specimen of pretentiousness,[80] he certainly does not show it. Apion is the one authority that Apollonius does not hesitate to contradict, but when he takes it upon himself to rebut one or another of Apion's more preposterous interpretations, he pours no scorn. The impression he conveys is of a humble toiler in the Homeric vineyard, capable of recognizing nonsense where he finds it but for the most part content to serve as a receiver and transmitter, fulfilling the function of scholarly middleman by assembling the lexical interpretations of others. He intervenes little—more, to be sure, than Orion or the

75. Whether the citation of Apion extends to γίνεται (so Ludwich) or terminates at πυρῶδες (so Neitzel) hardly matters for present purposes. I take it that the etymology has been cut. Ludwich's suggestion that Apollonius and Apion gave the word respectively proparoxytone and oxytone accentuation is without foundation.

76. *Il.* 2.811, with προπάροιθε πόλιος inverted (in attempt to mend the metre, I take it). The same gloss apparently occurs in a first-century B.C. papyrus commentary ad loc., P.Oxy.VIII 1086 iii 20 (Pap.II 100 Erbse), κολώνη (ἐστι) [π]ᾶν [ἀνά]σ[τ]ημα [γῆς (or τῆς γῆς?). Editors' acquiescence in κολωνός (unhomeric) as the lexis is surely untenable.

77. It is absurd to take κολώνη at *Il.* 2.811 as a city name: the reference will have been to *Il.* 11.757 (πέτρης τ' Ὠλενίης, καὶ Ἀλισίου ἔνθα κ/Κολώνη | κέκληται), where the matter was in fact in dispute; but in that case Τρωική is patently wrong—perhaps an error on Apollonius' part in taking over Apion's entry? The participles, bereft of main verb, are another oddity, though hardly a serious one (sc. φησι after κολώνη).

78. Which, like Apollonius', included place-names. In Apollonius these tend to be grouped at the end of the relevant two-letter section. Did he take them over from Apion, I wonder (n.b. ggll. 26–28, 3.32–4.2, Ἀβαρβαρέη–Ἀβυδόθεν?), or did they each mine a separate work devoted to such names?

79. Typical is 43.23–27 (Ap. frag. 20 Neitzel), ἀρητόν εὐκτόν, ἢ βλαβερόν, ἢ πολυχρόνιον ὡς Ἀπίων (not hidden etymology ἀεὶ ῥητόν, *pace* Neitzel, but α- = πολυ as often). βέλτιον δὲ τὸ πρῶτον· θέλει γὰρ εἰπεῖν ὅτι τοῖς δι' ὑπερβολὴν φιλοστοργίας γονεῦσιν ἀπολέσασι τοὺς γεννηθέντας ἡδὺ καὶ αἱρετὸν κλαίειν καὶ πενθεῖν. "ἀρητὸν δὲ τοκεῦσι γόον καὶ πένθος ἔθηκεν (deb. -ας)" (*Il.* 17.37). While Apollonius' preference is his own, the grounds for it are traditional.

80. The Emperor Tiberius ap. Pliny *HN* praef. 25 (*cymbalum mundi*); Pliny *HN* 30.18 (his dedications conferred immortality on the dedicatee); Sen. *Ep.* 88.40–41. "Every age produces its literary imposters, brilliant but shallow, and greedy of applause": J. W. White, *The Scholia on the "Aves" of Aristophanes* (Boston and London, 1914), p. xlv.

diligent Hesychius half a millennium later, but less than other scholars of his time. His own contributions are modest. Like the best lexicographers, like Diogenianus, like Hesychius, he seeks not to be original, but useful.

Given the tralatitious nature of most of the scholarship of the period, it would not surprise if Apollonius took over Apion's lexicon more or less entire, acknowledged him only when quoting particularly zany bits or expressing disagreement, made a few trifling alterations and additions, and put the product out as his own. It could be true.[81] On the other hand, it does look from the internal evidence as if Apollonius' use of Apion came only at a relatively late stage in the composition of his work, and one might well guess that Apion's lexicon had only just appeared.[82] I get the impression that Apion's lexicon served not as a basis but more as a supplement for Apollonius'. But it must be admitted that that impression could be largely due to the latter's selectivity of citation. At all events, Apollonius mined it for its etymologies, with which Apion was fertile and creative (often proffering alternatives), as well as for its interpretations.[83] Often the expressly Apionic accessions are merely appended at the end of the relevant entry, with or without comment by Apollonius. Apollonius comments on them with comparative freedom and frequency, in strong contrast to the bareness of the bulk of the lexicon's data.[84]

We are in no position to make a real comparison of Apion's lexicographical enterprise with Apollonius', since the latter effectively buried the former. But we may suspect that they differed in the relative weight accorded the two departments of word-study, etymology and semantics.[85] Apollonius' devotion to Alexandrian exegetical tradition could not wholly insulate him from the orientational shifts that Stoic language theory had brought about, but it is not as a matter of routine that his lexical definitions are etymologically informed, as appears to have been the case with Apion.

---

81. Some papyrus evidence will be presented in Part II.

82. We do not know whether it was composed at Alexandria or at Rome—or indeed elsewhere: he travelled. (He seems to have been quite an academic jet-setter, in fact, and books can be written en route: see M. L. West, *Introduction to Greek Metre* [Oxford, 1987], preface.) Nor do we know where Apollonius (or his father Archibius) worked; one presumes Alexandria, but it is not actually attested.

83. The fact that the Apionic interpretations tend to be deviant does not mean that Apion's lexicon will not have been highly derivative. Even from Apollonius' selections, which are no doubt disproportionately idiosyncratic, it is clear that much of what is labelled Apion's is inherited. But it does seem that he specialized in contriving novel etymologies for much-discussed words, almost as if to show it is a game that anyone can play; e.g., on ἀβίων we see him applying two further functions of initial ἀ-. He will have had less depth of commitment to his Homeric scholarship than to his anti-Semiticism.

84. The most conspicuous examples are fastened on by Schenck in his chapter on Apion (*Quellen*, pp. 13–26, cf. p. 8), with a view to demonstrating, *contra* Gattiker, that Apollonius was "ein positiv Mitarbeitender." But it needs to be noted that this is not typical of Apollonius' behavior in the lexicon as a whole, where his reticence is extreme.

85. Cf., e.g., Varro *Ling.* 5.1.2 for a conventional formulation of the division and interrelationship: a word has two "natures," *a qua re et in qua re vocabulum sit impositum.* The remains of Varro's treatise, though more heavily stoicized, make an excellent companion to Apollonius' lexicon. So does Cornutus (see G. W. Most, "Cornutus and Stoic Allegoresis," in *ANRW* 2 36.3, 2014–65). On ancient (Stoic) etymological theory see K. Barwick, *Probleme der stoischen Sprachlehre und Rhetorik,* Abh. Leipzig Philol.-Hist. 49.3 (Berlin, 1957); J. Pinborg, "Das Sprachdenken der Stoa und Augustins Dialektik," *C&M* 23 (1962): 148–77. A study of lexicographica from this perspective—it is, after all, the area where philosophy and literature meet—would be a worthwhile undertaking.

Something that has badly muddied the waters is a polysemantic Homeric lexicon transmitted under Apion's name. But first we should register the presence of polysemantic entries in Apollonius' own lexicon.

III A. POLYSEMANTICS

Apollonius' entries typically take the form of a simple gloss on a particular lexis in a particular place, identified by quotation.[86] The interpretation relates to a given occurrence of the word or phrase. (This is what gives the lexicon its strong affinity with the D-scholia.) Now and again, as we have seen, combination will result in a multiple entry, which may bring together two or more occurrences of the word in question, or two or more forms of it, sometimes with the same interpretation, sometimes with a similar one, sometimes with a significantly different one. When Apollonius encounters competing interpretations he simply records them both, with or without attribution; occasionally he may declare a preference or make a comment, occasionally he may even venture an alternative interpretation himself (he is fond of suggesting that the Homeric word bears its present-day meaning). Now and again an entry will be longer and more complex, and may include reference to Aristarchus or other earlier scholars, or quote other poets, but these entries too follow basically the same form, inasmuch as they have a single point of departure. Entries are built up by accretion.

Standing out starkly among such basic uniformity are occasional polysemantic entries. One does not need to spend much time leafing through the lexicon's pages before they begin to leap to the eye, even without the formatting that I confer on them below. Instantly recognizable in the first few pages, for instance, are ggll. 43 and 54 (4.32–34, 5.25–28 Bekker), ἀγάασθαι and ἀγχίμολον, which for the sake of the contrast I give together with their immediate neighbors:

ἀγοστόν ἀγκῶνα. | τὸ ὑγιὲς[87] τὸ ἐντὸς τῶν χειρῶν ἢ βραχιόνων· τούτοις γὰρ τοῖς μέρεσι (l. μέλεσι?)[88] προσαγόμεθα πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς ὃ ἐὰν (= ἂν) βουλώμεθα. διό φησιν "ἕλε γαῖαν ἀγοστῷ." | τοῦτο τὸ μέρος οἱονεὶ ὁ ἀγκών, ὁ ἄγων, τοῦ κ´ πρὸς τὸ γ´ (Tolle: τ´) συγγένειαν ἔχοντος. | ἄλλοι δὲ ἀγοστός ἀγκών, παρὰ τὸ ἄγαν ὀστώδης εἶναι.[89]

---

86. The quotations are often absent from the Coislinianus, but consistently preserved in an early papyrus (P.Bodl.Lib.Ms.gr.class.e.44, first or second century; see Part II), and cf. n. 4 above. The proper term for what I have been referring to as the "interpretation" or "gloss" is the "metaphrase" (μετάφρασις; cf., e.g., Apollonius' references to Apion's entry on σμώδιξ, quoted on p. 26 above, or the end of the ὑποσταχύοιτο entry, p. 16 above). As for the "lexis" itself—the item metaphrased, etymologized, identified as a hapax, whatever—moderns have gotten into the regrettable habit of referring to it as the "lemma," a term I see no reason to extend beyond contexts such as commentaries and scholia, where what are conventionally called lemmata serve to key the annotation to the text.

87. Variously emended, but sound. The term is used when upholding an interpretation as "sound." ὑγιῶς δὲ or κατὰ δὲ τὸ ὑγιές would be the more regular formula (cf., e.g., 86.4, 116.30), and Schenck here adds ⟨κατὰ⟩ (Quellen, pp. 82, 147), but the superficially corrupt Hesychian entry ἄγος· τὸν ἀγκῶνα. τὸ δὲ ἀγὲς τὸ ἐντὸς κτλ implies the same text (except that it perhaps justifies τὸ ⟨δ'⟩ ὑγιές). That is not definitive, for Hesychius and the Coislinianus may occasionally share error (see n. 61 above), but we find τὸ μὲν ὑγιὲς likewise used at 99.17.

88. μέλος and μέρος are constantly confused in manuscripts. At Heliod. Aithiopica 7.10.2 τραῦμα οὐ μέρους μόνον ἢ μέλους ἀλλὰ καὶ ψυχῆς αὐτῆς I take ἢ μέλους to be an intrusive v.l. (leg. οὐ μέλους μόνον ἀλλὰ).

89. This entry amalgamates two competing interpretations, and etymology for each (philologically preposterous, as usual); the incoherence of the presentation is clearly due to the serial adoption of discrete bits

ἀγάασθαι ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ θαυμάζειν, "ὡς σὲ γύναι ἄγαμαί ⟨τε⟩ τέθηπά τε δείδιά τ᾽ αἰνῶς"
          ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ φθονεῖν, "ἐξείπω, καὶ μήτι κότῳ ἀγάσησθε ἕκαστος"
          ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ ζηλοῦν, "ὡς δ᾽ αὖ νῦν μοι ἀγάασθε θεοὶ βροτὸν ἄνδρα
              παρεῖναι."[90]

ἄγη θάμβος καὶ κατάπληξις· "ἄγη μ᾽ ἔχει· οὐκ ἂν ἔμοιγε ἐλπομένῳ τὰ γένοιτ᾽, οὐδ᾽ εἰ
θεοὶ ὣς ἐθέλοιεν."[91]

. . .

ἄγριον αἶγα αἴγαγρον· "εὑρὼν ἢ ἔλαφον κεραὸν ἢ ἄγριον αἶγα."

ἀγχίμολον ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ μετ᾽ ὀλίγον, "ἀγχίμολον δὲ μετ᾽ αὐτὸν (-οὺς cod.) ἐβήσετ⟨ο
          δώματ⟩᾽ Ὀδυσσεύς"[92]
             καὶ "ἀγχίμολον δὲ σύες τε καὶ ἀνέρες ἦλθον ὑφορβοί"[93]
          ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ σύνεγγυς τόπου, "τὸν δ᾽ ἐξ ἀγχιμόλοιο ἰδὼν ἐφράσσατο κῆρυξ."

ἀγχιβαθής ἡ ἀγχοῦ τῆς γῆς βαθεῖα· "ἀγχιβαθὴς δὲ θάλασσα, καὶ οὔ πως ἔστι πόδεσσι
στήμεναι."

We encountered some such entries when on the trail of Heliodorus. Here is one of them once again, along with the entries that follow (152.35–153.13).

τιμήν ἐπὶ μὲν τῆς δόσεως καὶ τῆς συνήθους ἡμῖν, "τιμῆς ἧς τέ μ᾽ ἔοικε τετιμῆσθαι
       μετ᾽ Ἀχαιούς"
       ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς τιμωρίας, "τιμὴν ἀρνύμενοι"
       ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ προστίμου, "τιμὴν δ᾽ Ἀργείοις{ιν} ἀποτινέμεν"
       ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς ὠνῆς, "τιμὴν ἀμφὶς ἄγοντες ἐεικοσ{σ}άβοιον"
—μήποτε δὲ καὶ τοῦτο ἐπὶ προστίμου λέγεται (Bekker: λέγεσθαι cod.). | ὁ δὲ Ἡλιό-
δωρος καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν οὕτως φησὶν εἰρῆσθαι· "ἢ ἔτ᾽ ἔχει τιμὴν πολέεσσι (πολέσιν
deb.) μετὰ Μυρμιδόνεσσι."
τίννυνται τιμωροῦνται
τίσιν ἀντέκτισιν
τιτύσκετο ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ ἡτοιμάζετο, "ὑπ᾽ ὄχεσφι τιτύσκετο"
         ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ στοχασμῷ χρῆσθαι, "Μηριόνης δ᾽ ἐν τοῖσι τιτύσκετο δουρὶ
          φαεινῷ"
            καὶ "ἰοῖσίν τε τιτυσκόμενοι"
         καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ψυχικῶς κατεστοχάζετο, "τιτύσκετο δὲ φρεσὶν ᾗσιν ἤ τευ
          ἀκοντί⟨σ⟩σαι ἠὲ σχεδὸν ὀρμηθῆναι."

Two polysemantic entries, with a pair of mutually related regular entries intervening; the *Odyssey* set follows (see p. 13 above). Apollonius expresses reservation about the last of the four meanings of τιμή that the entry distinguishes, and appends a further one from Heliodorus. The second quote exemplifying the second meaning of τιτύσκετο may reflect his

---

of data, which I have marked off with bar-lines. (Schenck, *Quellen,* pp. 82–83 offers analysis. I am not sure he is justified in adding explicit mention of Apollodorus, from Hesychius.)

90. The quoted verses (*Od.* 6.168, *Il.* 14.111, *Od.* 5.129) show variants that are not to be emended away (τ᾽ not δ᾽ after δείδια, ἐξείπω not πείθεσθαι, ἀγάασθε not ἀγασθε). Cf. n. 51 above.

91. It is presumably this entry that is responsible for the polysemantic ἀγάασθαι entry's being put here. As to the ἄγη entry itself (on *Od.* 3.227f.), it may be that one of the two glosses is Heliodorus', pulled up out of the separate *Odyssey* section by a preexistent entry.

92. *Od.* 17.336, with ἐβήσετο for ἐδύσατο/ετο: possibly transmissional corruption, like those I have mended (-οὺς for -ὸν by compendium misreading, omission by τοδ-τοδ parablepsy), but more probably an ancient reading.

93. One of the two quotes (both Odyssean) added from Heliodorus? Polysemantic entries normally give just one exemplification per meaning. Cf. the case of τάμνεν, p. 11 above.

incorporation of an entry τιτυσκόμενοι στοχαζόμενοι v.sim. on *Il.* 3.80. But that will be the extent of his intervention.

Clearly there was in existence a polysemantic Homeric lexicon, whose entries Apollonius freely took over. This simple conclusion seems to be practically inescapable. General acknowledgment of it has been impeded by the fact that the focus of scholarly investigation has been diverted, first by the question of the authenticity of the polysemantic "Apion" lexicon, and secondly by the question of the quality of Apollonius' scholarship. Gattiker long ago isolated the polysemantic material as a component of the lexicon,[94] but his incidental characterization of Apollonius' working methods as *mechanisch* had unfortunate if predictable results. Erbse countered with the assertion that it was Apollonius himself who assembled the polysemantic entries.[95] But that there was an independent work on which Apollonius drew, for individual entries and also it may be as a model, seems hard to deny.

Apollonius' own practice is quite different. Occasionally he will combine an entry with a related one (though we can never be sure it is Apollonius who is responsible, rather than his source or a reviser), but the limits to his concern to make meaningful connections among the various items of his motley material are very soon reached. Different verb-forms, for instance, typically have each their own entry. We need go no further than ggll. 3–4, 8–9, 11–12:

> ἄασαν ἔβλαψαν
> ἀασάμην ἐβλάβην, ἄτῃ περιέπεσον
> . . .
> ἀάσαι πολλαχῶς καὶ ἄγαν βλάψαι
> ἀᾶται ἄγαν βλάπτει[96]
> . . .
> ἀάσατο ἠγνόησεν, ἥμαρτεν, {ἐφθόνησεν}[97]
> ἀᾶσθαι λωβᾶσθαι, κακοῦν,

where Apollonius' sorting does not extend beyond the juxtaposition of kindred items.[98] Sometimes, indeed, there are two separate entries for one and the same lexis—e.g., **δάσονται**, glossed φάγονται and μερίζουσι respectively.[99] Each entry, in short, is founded on a given occurrence of a particular word. Lexeis in other passages may occasionally be adduced,

---

94. *Verhältnis*, pp. 20–21.

95. *Beiträge*, p. 412: "Apollonios hat offensichtlich, eben um ein praktisches Nachschlagewerk für den Homerleser zu schaffen, Bedeutung und Beleg aus den zu verschiedenen Dichterstellen gehörenden Vulgatscholien zusammengetragen, nicht ohne seine eigene Ansicht bei umstrittenen Übersetzungen zu Gehör zu bringen" (cf. ibid., p. 409, n. 2). It is an image of Apollonius' procedures that simply defies the evidence. Cf. n. 107 below.

96. The ἄγαν in these glosses is etymological of the initial ἀ-! (Cf. the ἀφυσγετός entry, 48.34.) I do not know what the reference of ἀάσαι (or ἀᾶσαι?) is meant to be. Did it start life as ἀάσας?

97. This last gloss was evidently meant for ἀγάσατο, as Villoison recognized. Cf. the polysemantic ἀγάασθαι entry, quoted above.

98. Contrast the polysemantic (disemantic) entry on the homonymous ἄσε, 44.30 (gl. 654), clearly preexistent. The appended reference to Apion indicates that the entry was common to both lexica (ὁ δὲ Ἀπίων ἀμφότερα ἐτυμολογῶν κτλ).

99. 56.22 (gl. 912), 24 (gl. 914) (read μεριοῦσι). The passages concerned, as Steinicke recognizes, will be *Il.* 22.354 and *Od.* 2.368. Even a hapax can receive two different entries, e.g., δεδμήατο, 57.1 (gl. 920), 18 (gl. 932).

as in a commentary, but such adduction is a far cry from the systematic treatment of the formally distinct polysemantic entries. A normal entry, if it extends beyond a simple gloss, accumulates data bit by bit, often becoming progressively incoherent in the process. (E.g., ἄγοστον above.) The polysemantic entries, with their *pari passu* treatment of a word's various inflections in various occurrences, with a definite number of meanings assigned and no variant interpretations admitted, are fundamentally different, both in form and in function.

In its fullest form a polysemantic entry first lists the Homeric meanings, then gives exemplification of each in turn:

19.10 ἀκειόμενον ἰώμενον καὶ ἐπισκευάζοντα·
        ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ ἰώμενον "ἕλκος ἀκειόμενον,"
        ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ ἐπισκευάζοντα "νῆας ἀκειόμενον." [100]

We find this basic pattern systematically followed in a first-century papyrus fragment of a polysemantic Homer lexicon, discussed on pp. 36–37 below. It is a very methodical but also a very uneconomical form of presentation, and it is no surprise that in the Apollonius lexicon, or at least in the Coislinianus, the full form is only rarely preserved intact.[101] Usually the initial listing of the different meanings is dropped, or else the subsequent repeat of them; and often there is assimilation of form and/or content to the local environment.[102] So the distinction between polysemantic entries and accretive ones, for all that it is fundamental, tends to get blurred.

It is not only their lexicographically distinct character that indicates the discrete origin of the polysemantic entries. Sometimes we find clusters of them, evidently taken over en bloc. One such block is put at the beginning of the αρ- section (41.6ff.).[103]

---

100. This entry recurs in partly fuller form in the derivative polysemantic lexicon found in Ambrosianus C 222 inf., for which see n. 143 below.

101. E.g., 169.15–17 χωόμενος χολούμενος, ἀνιώμενος καὶ συγχεόμενος κατὰ ψυχήν. ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ πρώτου (sc. χολούμενος) "βῆ δὲ κατ' Οὐλύμποιο καρήνων χωόμενος ⟨κῆρ⟩" (*Il.* 1.44), ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ ἀνιώμενος καὶ συγχεόμενος "χώσατο δ' Ἕκτωρ (*Il.* 14.406); 63.3–5 εηος ἀγαθοῦ, προσηνοῦς. ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ, ἐπεὶ παρὰ τὰ εα τὰ ἀγαθά (⟨"*Il.* 15.138?"⟩), τὸ δὲ (olim fuerit ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ) προσηνοῦς "εἰ δύνασαί γε, περίσχεο παιδὸς εηος" (*Il.* 1.393). Cf., e.g., "Ap." in ἀργύριον.

102. E.g., the slightly garbled 43.9–11 ἀρετᾷ ἐν ἀρετῇ ἐστίν καὶ εἰς ἀρετὴν ἀπολήγει· "οὐκ ἀρετᾷ κακὰ ἔργα" (*Od.* 8.329), ⟨εἰς ἀρετὴν ἀπολήγει⟩ (post Steinicke supplevi, coll. Hsch.), ὅταν δὲ λέγῃ "ἀρετῶσι δὲ λαοὶ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ" (*Od.* 19.114), ἐν ἀρετῇ εἰσίν (scripsi: ἐστίν) βούλεται δηλοῦν; cf. 49.33 ἄχνας with EM's entry in ἄχνη. An entry such as 54.2–4 γέγωνε ἐφώνει. ἐνίοτε δὲ τάσσει τὴν λέξιν ἐπὶ τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ δυναμένου μέχρι πολλοῦ ἐξακούεσθαι (φθόγγου). "τόσσον γὰρ ἔην βώσαντι γεγωνεῖν," on the other hand, is more probably to be construed as accretive (two individual entries combined) than as polysemantic in origin.

103. Likewise the next section, ασ-, is headed by a polysemantic pair, ἆσε and ἀστράγαλος. Cf., e.g., the polysemantic set towards the beginning of αυ-: αυτως, αὐλός, (αὔτμή), αὐτή; at beginning of δε-: δειλός, δειρή, ?δεδμήατο (ex-δεδμῆσθαι?), progressively interfered with. Routinely retained at the beginning of the relevant two-place alphabetical section are sets such as τόν-τοῦ-τούς-τό. The polysemantic κνίση entry (tellingly prefaced σημαίνει τρία, cf. the γενεή entry, prefaced σημαίνει πολλά and followed by the polysemantic γέρων) is likewise not brought into the three-place alphabetical sequence that otherwise obtains throughout κ-, but is appended at the end of the κν- section. The polysemantic οὐδος οὐλον pair remain together in defiance of the three-place alphabetization that would shift the latter.

αρ   σύνδεσμος ἴσος τῷ (Tolle: τὸ) δή, "ἐπεὶ ἄρ σε θεοὶ ποίησαν ἱκέσθαι"
     καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἄρα, "ὣς ἄρα φωνήσας"[104]
αρμονιαων ἐπὶ μὲν τῶν συνθηκῶν, "μάρτυροι ἔσ(σ)ονται καὶ ἐπίσκοποι ἁρμονιάων"
           ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν ἁρμογῶν, "γόμφοισιν δ' ἄρα τήν γε καὶ ἁρμονιῇσιν ἄρηρεν"
αρης   ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ θεοῦ, "῎Αρης τε βροτολοιγός"
       ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ σιδήρου, "ἔνθα ⟨μάλιστ'⟩ ἀφίει μένος ὄβριμος ἄρης"
       ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ τραύματος, "ἔνθα⟩ (supplevi) μάλιστα γίνεται ἄρης ἀλεγεινός"
       ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ πολέμου, "τοὺς μὲν ἀπώλεσ' ἄρης"
       ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς εἰς πόλεμον ὁρμῆς, "δῦ δέ μιν ἄρης δεινὸς ἐνυάλιος"
αργος   ἐπὶ μὲν τῆς Πελοποννήσου, "πολλῇσι(ν) νήσοισι{ν} καὶ ῎Αργει παντὶ ἀνάσσειν"
        ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς πόλεως τῆς ἐν Πελοποννήσῳ, "οἱ δ' (οὐδ' cod.) ῎Αργος τ' εἶχον
          Τίρυνθά τε τειχιόεσσαν"
        ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς Θεσσαλίας, "νῦν αὖ τοὺς ὅσ(σ)οι τὸ Πελασγικὸν ῎Αργος ἔναιον"
        ὅταν δ' ὀνοματικῶς, τὸν 'Οδυσσέως (Villoison: -έα cod.) κύνα· "ἂν δὲ κύων
          κεφαλήν τε καὶ οὔατα κείμενος ἔσχεν ῎Αργος 'Οδυσσῆος"
αργον   ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ λευκοῦ, "αἰετὸς ἀργὴν χῆνα φέρων"
        ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ ταχέος, "ἅμα τῷ γε ⟨δύω⟩ κύνες ἀργοί"
αραιαι ⟨ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ ἀσθενοῦς⟩ (Villoison), "ὑπὸ δὲ κνήμαι ῥώοντο ἀραιαί"
        ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ λεπτοῦ καὶ στενοῦ, "ἀραιὴ δ' εἴσοδος"
αροιτο ἀπενέγκοιτο, λάβοι· "κλέος ἐσθλὸν ἄροιτο"   Il. 5.3
αργαλεην ⟨χαλεπήν⟩ (Villoison)· "ἀργαλέην, πολέμοιο τέρας"[105]   Il. 11.4
αρη   εὐχή. ποτὲ δὲ ἡ βλάβη· "ἄρης ἀλκτῆρα γενέσθαι"   Il. 18.100
αρητηρ ὁ ἱερεύς, ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν θυόντων τὰς εὐχὰς ποιεῖσθαι. ὅθεν νῦν
        ἀρώματα ἐπιθυμιάματα   (Il. 5.78)
αργεννων λευκῶν, λαμπρῶν. ἀφ' οὖ καὶ ἄργυρος καὶ ἀργύφεον   Il. 18.529[106]
αραρυιας ἡρμοσμένας· "ἐπισφυρίοις ἀραρυίας"   Il. 18.459

The important thing here is the initial set of six polysemantic entries. I have continued beyond them partly to illustrate the contrast (we observe for instance that the multiple renderings offered for ἄροιτο and ἀργεννῶν are quasi-equivalents, not differential as in polysemantic entries),[107] and partly for the sake of more incidental gains. Earlier we isolated *Odyssey* sequences, which I would associate with Heliodorus. Here, with the entries succeeding the polysemantic ones, we apparently have an *Iliad* sequence.[108] (The αρητηρ entry clearly owes its position to the preceding

104. Contrast the later entry on ἄρα (gl. 627, 43.12), denying the second meaning: ἀντὶ τοῦ δή παρ' 'Ομήρῳ διὰ παντός, παρὰ δὲ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐν τῷ βίῳ συλλογιστικὸς σύνδεσμος.
105. The quote (*Il.* 11.4) will have originally extended to the end of the verse (μετὰ χερσὶν ἔχουσαν), but illustrates the tendency to quote only the verse in which the lexis occurs. The antecedent, ἔριδα, is in the previous verse. The principle is explicitly acknowledged in the first of the entries carrying the τῶν ἅπαξ εἰρημένων label, ἀβάκησαν, where ὁ περιέχων τὴν λέξιν στίχος prefaces the quote (which in that instance, however, continues beyond the end of the verse).
106. Steinicke adopts Villoison's "correction" of the lexis from ἀργεγνῶν to ἀργεννάων, and refers it to *Il.* 3.198, but the reference is surely to *Il.* 18.529, where ἀργεννῶν is in fact the transmitted text (-έων edd.).
107. The ἀραρυίας entry is also worth noting, for the lexicon gives separate entries for ἀρηρώς, ἀράρισκεν, ἄρηρεν, and ἀραρών—each glossed with a form of ἁρμόζω. Someone who did not bother to co-ordinate such entries as these is hardly likely to have compiled the polysemantic entries!
108. Cf. towards the end of the section, the six entries from ἀριζήλη to ἄριστον (44.4–9), respectively from *Il.* 18, 18, 19, 19, 23, 24. But *Iliad* sequences are far less strongly in evidence than the *Odyssey* sequences we have associated with Heliodorus. In fact it is the *lack* of Homeric sequence outside of the Heliodoran sections that seems to me remarkable. Explanation for the organization is sought largely in vain.

αρη entry.)[109] This is pertinent to our assessment of the formally incongruous **αρη** entry. The unhomeric nominative suggests an originally polysemantic entry, such as in fact we find in the polysemantic lexicon attributed to Apion,[110] but the occurrence of an entry on *Il.* 18.100, ἀρῆς βλάβης v.sim., has pulled it down here. The resultant entry—abbreviated in the Coislinianus, it appears from Hesychius, but retaining its basic structure[111]—is an amalgam. We have already seen comparable interference with polysemantic entries in the cases of ἀμφίς, ἄμμορον, τάμνεν, φορήμεναι, ἀείρας, and τιμήν, and it would be easy to extend the list.

Some of the polysemantic entries have characteristics which indicate that they are not just sorted amalgamations of kindred items, but are a unified set. The metonymic ἄρης entry finds precise counterparts in entries for other divinities/personifications: ἄτη (ἐπὶ μὲν τῆς σωματοειδοῦς θεοῦ . . ., ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς βλάβης. . .), ἀφροδίτης (ἐπὶ μὲν τῆς θεοῦ . . ., ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς πρὸς ἄνδρας συνουσίας. . .), ἔρις, ἥφαιστος (contaminated), ἠώς, θέμις, μοῖραι, ὕπνος (ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ εἰδωλοποιουμένου θεοῦ . . ., ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ πάθους . . ., ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ θανάτου. . .); ζεύς and χάρις missing. In such entries the relationship with the "Apion" lexicon (on which see below) is particularly close.

Sometimes, too, the polysemantic lexeis are expressly labelled as such. The five listed meanings of φοῖνιξ are prefaced: τῶν πολλὰ δηλουσῶν ἡ λέξις. We may posit the existence of a work carrying the title Polysemantic Homeric Words alphabetically arranged.[112] Aristophanes' work was no doubt seminal.[113]

Other classes of word given such formal recognition in Apollonius' lexicon are Homeric hapaxes, τῶν ἅπαξ εἰρημένων, and onomatopoeic words, τῶν (ὀνοματο-)πεποιημένων (κατὰ μίμησιν). These too no doubt had been collected in independent works. Hapaxes were marked by Aristarchus, and exposition of Aristarchus' sigla became widely diffused; so identification of hapaxes would have been available in more comprehensive works such as commentaries.[114] But as F. Martinazzoli pointed out (*Hapax Legomenon,* vol. 1, pt. 2 [Bari, 1957], p. 25), the lexicon's style of labelling them, in contradistinction to the phraseology of the Homeric scholia, presupposes "un inventario già concluso," and as evidence

---

109. And the αραρυιας entry has apparently slipped down by one line, as often happens. This is confirmed by the next entry, ἀργυρόπεζα, which belongs next to ἀργεννῶν, just as ἀργιόδοντος, ἀργεστᾶο νότοιο, and ἀργέτι δημῷ (all λευκ-) are brought together a little further on. Then comes the Odyssean ἀρηρώς ἡρμοσμένος, apparently attracted by ἀραρυίας, then another apparent Iliadic sequence: ἀρήγειν 1.521 (ἀφ' οὗ καὶ ἀρηγών 5.511), ἄρειον ?leg.-ων 2.707 (καὶ ἀρείω 10.237), ἀρνειός and ἄρνες 3.197 and 4.102, ἀρτεμέα 5.515.

110. ἀρά δ' (sc. σημαίνει)· εὐχήν, κατάραν, βλάβην, δέησιν. (For ἀρά read -ή, or contaminated from a general lexicon, cf. Hsch. [see next note]?) That entry precedes entries for ἀραιαί and ἄρης. The correspondence with entries in the Apollonius lexicon is considerable, but not without discrepancies, telling against direct dependence of one on the other. See below for the relationship between the two lexica.

111. Hsch.: ἀρή εὐχή, "ἀράων ἀίων," καὶ βλάβη ἡ ἐν τῷ ἄρει τουτέστιν ἐν πολέμῳ. This is followed by (presumably extraneous) ἀπειλή, εὐχή, κατάρα.

112. σημαίνειν and δηλοῦν are interchangeable in this context (cf., e.g., 36.21/23, 61.17/19), though the former is the more frequent.

113. Cf. C. K. Callanan, *Die Sprachbeschreibung bei Aristophanes von Byzanz,* Hypomnemata 88 (Göttingen, 1987), p. 90.

114. Cf. n. 165 below.

of direct use of a Homeric hapax lexicon I would note the two consecutive entries carrying the τῶν ἅπαξ εἰρημένων label at 99.23–26 (**Κήτειοι, κίστη**), which violate the three-place alphabetization: the entries drawn from the hapax lexicon did not always get distributed to their precisely correct place in Apollonius.[115] Onomatopoeic entries, for their part, would probably repay investigation. The fifth–sixth-century Berlin papyrus in at least two of its entries preserves the full formula τῶν πεποιημένων κατὰ μίμησιν ἤχου ἢ φωνῆς.[116]

III B. THE "APION" LEXICON

We can now bring into the picture the Homeric lexicon that came through the middle ages under the name of Apion.[117] It is precisely the sort of work implied by the Apollonian entries we have been contemplating. It consists exclusively of polysemantic entries: for each word a specific number of distinct meanings are listed. Erbse misstates the case when he says that this lexicon treats "Homonyma und Hapax legomena" (*Lex. Gr. Min.*, p. xv). Hapax legomena are altogether excluded. Neitzel (p. 309) finds two, **ἀπάλαμνος** and **ἴον**, but both are unreal. For **ἀπάλαμνος** two meanings are listed (ἄπειρος and ἀμήχανος), which in this lexicon implies at least two passages.[118] Clearly the compiler of the lexicon did not realize that the word was a Homeric hapax—any more than did Apollonius, the prima facie source (37.22: ἀπάλαμνος ἀμήχανος, κατὰ στέρησιν τοῦ παλαμᾶσθαι, . . . · σημαίνει δὲ καὶ τὸν ἄπειρον)! **ἴον** too is given two meanings, τὸ ἄνθος and τὸ μέλαν. The latter was referred by Ludwich to *Il.* 11.298 ἰοειδέα πόντον—close, but no cigar: the implied reference is surely *Il.* 4.278, φαίνετ᾽ ἰὸν κατὰ πόντον, where ἰον was evidently taken as adjective rather than as participle![119]

---

115. Cf. **Κυλλήνιος**, between κυμ- and κυν-: ΛΛ momentarily misread as Μ? Other notabilia: separate entries for **εἴρερον** (from the hapax lexicon) and **ἴρερον** (a disquisition on the orthography, ειρ/ιρ-), also however for **ἐπλίσσοντο** and **πλήσσοντο** (l. πλί-), both identified as hapax (*Od.* 6.318). The hapax lexicon seems to have included comment on post-Homeric usage: n.b., the **ἴδιον** (vb.) entry, which notes frequent usage in Old Comedy. Expressions such as δὶς δὲ κέχρηται τῇ λέξει ὁ ποιητής (52.11 **βουγάιε**, cf. 59.21 **δνοπαλίξεις**, 94.29 **καμμονίην**), as opposed to the τῶν ἅπαξ εἰρημένων (ἡ λέξις) formula, may be taken over rather from commentaries. And in the case of the few hapax entries that proceed to make mention of Aristarchus, I would take the notices to be extraneous additions (*pace* Martinazzoli, *Hapax Legomenon*, pp. 79–81), just like the notices of Heliodorus and Apion.

116. Gl. 61 **ἀναβέβρυκε** (~ Coisl. 32.33), gl. 74 **ἀναμορμύρεσκεν** (~ Coisl. 35.20). Cf. gl. 72 **ἀναμαιμάει** (~ Coisl. 37.3), where [των πε]]ποιημεγῳν [κατα μιμησιν | η]χου η φωνης might be worth checking for the editors' ποιητ....[, η]χου......[). In the Coislinianus the formula is routinely shortened or dropped (κατα μίμησιν ἤχου at 37.3).

117. Ed. Ludwich, see n. 21 above. There are four medieval manuscripts, three of them very partial, none earlier than fourteenth century; the title in two of them is Ἀπίωνος Γλῶσσαι Ὁμηρικαί. (See Ludwich for details.) The ascription to Apion can be traced back at least as far as Eustathius (Apion frag. *23 Neitzel), and is doubtless ancient if not original.

118. Some other cases where the listed meanings outnumber the actual attestations are given by van der Valk, *Researches*, 1:295. He is wrong to infer that the "ciphers"—the numerals that state the number of meanings (e.g., ἀπάλαμνος β᾽ sc. σημαίνει)—are of later origin. The formula occurs in Apollonius' lexicon—only rarely in the Coislinianus (101.27 κνίση{ς} σημαίνει τρία), perhaps less rarely originally (n.b. Sud. in μετά, EM in μενεαίνω).

119. More conventional exegesis, reflected in the etymological tradition and inherited by Eustathius, related ἰόν to 276 ἰωή; the definition of ἰωή as ἡ φωνὴ ἡ δικνουμένη εἰς ἀκοήν simultaneously deploys ἴω (ἰέναι) and exclamatory ἰώ. (Van der Valk misunderstands Eustathius' note.)

The controversy that has swirled around the question of the "Apion" lexicon's authenticity has perhaps obscured the fact that its importance lies less in who composed it than in what it is. For the moment, let us suspend the matter of attribution; I shall take it up at the end of this section.

First there is another document that must enter the picture. The "Apion" lexicon—hereafter "Ap." for short—is not our only sample of the sort of work that was available to Apollonius for polysemantic items. We are fortunate enough to have a much superior specimen, in the form of a fragment of a first-century manuscript from Oxyrhynchus.[120] The attribution to the first century was made by A. S. Hunt, the first editor, on paleographic grounds, and is as secure as such datings can be; I would myself be inclined to put it around the middle of the century, or earlier rather than later, but any such precision must be treated with reserve. Here is the surviving text.[121]

ὀμφ]αλός β′ (sc. σημαίνει),[122] κυρίως τὸν ἐν ἀνθρώποις, καὶ τοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἀσπίσιν ἥλου[ς].
   ὅταν μὲν [τ]ὸν ἐ[ν] ἀνθρώποις, "γαστέρα γάρ μιν τύψε παρ' ὀμφαλόν,"
   ὅταν δὲ τοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἀσπίσιν ἥλους, "ἐν δέ οἱ ὀμφ[α]λ[ο]ὶ ἦσαν ἐ[ε]ίκοσι κασ-
   σιτέροι[ο."
ὄνειρο]ς β′, τὸν θεόν καὶ τὸ δι' αὐτοῦ θέα[μα.
   ὅταν] μὲν τὸν θεόν, "βάσκ' ἴθι οὖλε Ὄνει[ρε,"
   ὅταν δὲ τ]ὸ δι' αὐτοῦ θέαμα, "ὥς {σ}οἱ ἐναρ[γὲς ὄνειρον ἐπ]έσσυτο."
ὅπλον] γ′, τό τε σχοινίον καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν κατασ]κευὴν κ[αὶ τὰ π]ολεμιστήρ[ι]α ὅπλα.
   [ὅταν] μὲν τὸ σ[χοι]νίο[ν], "ἔ̓νθ' ἐμὲ μὲν κα[τέδησαν εὐ]σσ[έλμῳ ἐνὶ [νηὶ ὅ]πλ[ῳ]
   εὐστρε[φέι,"
   ὅταν δὲ πᾶσαν τὴν κα]τασκ[ε]υήν, [" ἔνθα δὲ νηῶν ὅπλα μελαι]γ⟨ά⟩ων,"
   ὅταν δὲ [τὰ πολεμιστήρια ὅπλα, "μῆτερ] ἐμή, τὰ [μὲν ὅπλα θεὸς πόρεν."

The initial importance of this fragment lies in its date. Lehrs, ending with a flourish his discussion of Apion in his *Quaestiones Epicae,* had roundly declared that the Γλῶσσαι Ὁμηρικαί, i.e., "Ap.," could not possibly be ancient: "has toto colore recentiores esse statim intelligitur," adding for good measure, "nec quemquam latere debebat." The papyrus' casual, cruel confutation serves as warning against judgments of such certitude.[123] As Hunt pointed out, the polysemantic Homer lexicon represented by the papyrus fragment "may be earlier than Apion; it can hardly be later."

What is the relation between "Ap." and Pap.? Pap. was published under the name of Apion, but the question of identity is a slippery one. Of the three extant entries in Pap., only one, ὅπλον, has a counterpart in "Ap.":[124]

120. P.Ryl. I 26. Ludwich, somewhat misleadingly, incorporated it in his edition of "Ap."
121. The transcript is basically Hunt's (I have used only the published plate), the disposition on the page mine. I do not include the entry following ὅπλον, of which only the first ὅταν survives. (But it may be worth noting that the spacing would allow ὀνείατα β′, τὰ βρώματα καὶ τὰ χρήματα.] κτλ.) The cited passages are: *Il.* 21.180, 11.34; *Il.* 2.8, *Od.* 4.841; *Od.* 14.345, 6.268, *Il.* 19.21.
122. The grammatical structure is unfortunately misunderstood by K. McNamee, *Sigla & Select Marginalia in Greek Literary Papyri* (Brussels, 1992), in her chapter on anomalous inflections, pp. 68–69.
123. Nonetheless, the tradition continues: note the superlative in Latte's endorsement (*Hesychii Lexicon,* vol. 1 [Copenhagen, 1953] p. ix, n. 1): "quae ab ipso Apione profecta esse rectissime negavit Lehrs." Lehrs' opinion had been expertly challenged by Kopp ("Apios Homerlexicon," *Hermes* 20 (1885): 161–80) before the accession of the papyrus.
124. Some have been misled by Ludwich's incorporation of the fragment in his edition of "Ap." into believing that all three entries are in common.

ὅπλα· σχοινία. καὶ τὰ πολεμικὰ ἐργαλεῖα. καὶ τὰ τεκτονικὰ ἢ χαλκευτικά.

We can easily postulate that the entries in **ὀμφαλός** and **ὄνειρος** were cut out in transmission, along with the exemplifying passages for the listed meanings of **ὅπλον/ὅπλα**, but that still leaves the correspondence disconcertingly approximate. Apart from the differences of order and phrasing in the definitions ("Ap." #3 τὰ τεκτονικὰ ἢ χαλκευτικά ~ Pap. #2 πᾶ[σαν τὴν κατασ]κευήν),[125] there is the formulaic difference between the two: Pap.'s ὅταν μὲν . . . , ὅταν δὲ . . . is foreign to "Ap.," whose quotations, when present, follow directly on each definition (introduced normally by ὡς). The question of identity becomes a question of definition. Pap. is not "Ap.": the text of Pap. is not the text of "Ap.": the text of "Ap." does not derive from the text of Pap. (at any rate, not according to Ludwich or Neitzel),[126] nor vice versa. If "identity" is to be maintained, it must be in terms of a common original.

The evidence of Apollonius' lexicon—ApS., let us call it—complicates the picture further. Like "Ap.," ApS. has no entry for **ὀμφαλός** (at least, the Coislinianus does not), but we may profitably compare the entries in **ον-** to **οπ-** (121.7–122.22 Bekker).[127] I use bar-lines to mark off a normal (non-polysemantic) entry's serial components, and I have flagged entries that have a counterpart in "Ap." (or in Pap.) with an asterisk.

> **ὄναρ** ὄνειρος (Tolle: ὅμηρος). "καὶ γάρ τ᾽ ὄναρ ἐκ Διός ἐστιν." | ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀνίσκειν, ὅ ἐστιν ὠφελεῖν. | ἀρσενικῶς δὲ ***ὄνειρος** ἢ παρὰ τοῦτο ἢ παρὰ τὸ ⟨τὸ⟩ (Bekker) ὂν εἴρειν, τουτέστι τὸ ὑπάρχον λέγειν.
>
> **ὀνειροπόλος** ὁ περὶ τοὺς ἰδίους ὀνείρους πολούμενος.
>
> **ὀνειρίῃσι πύλῃσι** ὁ μὲν Ἀπίων τοῦ ὕπνου· διὰ γὰρ τούτου ἐκπέμπονται.[128] | ἡμῖν δὲ φαίνεται κυρίως κατὰ τὸ μυθικόν.
>
> ***ὀνείατα** οἱ μὲν γλωσσογράφοι ψιλῶς ἀποδεδώκασι βρώματα. | οὐκ ἔστι δέ, ἀλλ᾽ ἐτύμως (Tolle: ἑτοίμως) πάντα τὰ ὄνησιν παρέχοντα.
>
> ***ὄνειαρ** ὠφέλημα.
>
> **ὄνθος.** "ὄνθον ἀποπτύων" (καὶ "ἐν δ᾽ ὄνθου βοέου") κόπρον.[129]
>
> ***ὀνόσαιτο** ἐκφαυλίσειεν, μέμψαιτο. | καὶ **ὀνοσ⟨σ⟩άμενος** ἐκφαυλίσας.
>
> **ὀνομάκλυτος** Ἄλτης τῷ ὀνόματι ἔνδοξος.

---

125. The matter is further complicated by the entries in EtGen[AB] and EM, which quote Ap. in slightly different form (Ap. frag. *86 Neitzel; I disagree with her analysis on p. 318). For ApS. see below.

126. Whereas Hunt proposed that the papyrus was a fragment of Apion's lexicon "in its original form," Ludwich thought it more probable that it contained only excerpts (Lex. Gr. Min., p. 208, n. 7). But since it is unclear whether or not the papyrus' entries were alphabetized beyond the first letter (I would suppose not), the evidence fails. Neitzel, on inadequate grounds, suggests that the papyrus does not preserve the full wording of the original (p. 302).

127. Incidentally, while in this vicinity, I observe that there are no entries between **ορθ-** and **ορο-** (I do not count ὄρινε and ὀρίνετον, whose position indicates they were spelled ὀρειν-; likewise, e.g., 58.33 δι(ε)ιπετέος; cf. "Ap."'s practice, in e.g., εἶπες and εἰς). Evidently they were lost by Θ/Ο parablepsy. Future editors should signal the lacuna.

128. Rather opaque, though it is easy enough to supply "dreams" from the adjective as the subject of ἐκπέμπονται; variously emended (Lehrs, Quaestiones Epicae, p. 27, Baumert, Apionis Fragmenta [diss., Königsberg, 1886], p. 34), defended by Ludwich (Lex. Gr. Min., p. 328), who would take ὕπνου as Ὕπνου, the god, on the basis of the ὄνειρος entry in the papyrus lexicon, (quoted above, p. 36); but then Apollonius' own interpretation does not differ. Neitzel accepts Lehrs' τῷ ὕπνῳ, but that seems facile. Perhaps read ⟨τῷ βάθει⟩ τοῦ ὕπνου κτλ. as D-schol. ad loc. (ςι-ει parablepsy), in which case the corruption precedes Hesychius; perhaps also εἰσ- as Hesychius for ἐκ- (just ἔρχεται D-schol.); and τούτων for τούτου?

129. The entry is incoherent, even after my punctuation. The nominative lexis evidently relates to Il. 23.775, τῇ ῥα βοῶν κέχυτ᾽ ὄνθος, but the given quotations are of neighboring passages, 781 and 777.

ὀξυόεντι ὁ μὲν Ἀπίων ὀξεῖ ἔγχει. | ὀξυόεντι δὲ ὀξυΐνῳ.¹³⁰

ὅπατρος τοῦ αὐτοῦ πατρός τινι γεγονώς, οἷον ἐν τῷ μ τῆς Ἰλιάδος "καί οἱ Τεῦκρος ⟨ἄμ᾽ ἦε⟩ κασίγνητος καὶ ὅπατρος."

*ὀπαζόμενος· ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ κατεπειγόμενος "χειμάρρους κατ᾽ ὄρεσφιν ὀπαζόμενος Διὸς ὄμβρῳ" (οὐχ ὡς Δημήτριος ὁ Πύκτης, πληρούμενος)
    ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ προχειρισάμενος "αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ κήρυκά τ᾽ ὀπασσάμενος"
    ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ κατεπείγεσθαι πάλιν "χαλεπὸν δέ σε γῆρας ὀπάζει"
    ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ περιεποίησαν "ὤπασαν."¹³¹

ὀπάων ἀκολουθῶν (-ος Villoison). | εἴρηται δὲ παρὰ τὸ ἕπεσθαι. | ἔστι δὲ καὶ κύριον ὄνομα· "ἄμ᾽ Ὀπάονα (-ωνα cod.) καὶ Μελάνιππον."¹³²

ὀπιπεύεις περιβλέπεις. "ὀπιπεύεις δὲ γυναῖκας." | καὶ παρθενοπίπας ὁ παρθένους περιβλεπόμενος.¹³³

ὀπηδεῖ ἀκολουθεῖ.

ὄπιδα ἐπιστροφὴν καὶ ἐντροπήν· "οὐκ ὄπιδα φρονέοντες (-ος cod.)."

ὁπλότερος ὁ κατὰ τὴν σύγκρισιν νεώτερος.

**ὅπλα τὰ πολεμικὰ λέγει, καὶ τὰ τῆς νεὼς σχοινία, καὶ τὰ χαλκευτικὰ ἐργαλεῖα.

ὀπός τὸ τῶν δένδρων δάκρυον. | (ὅθεν καὶ σμύρνα καὶ λίβανος οὕτως λέγεται.) | ἀπὸ δὲ τούτου καὶ ἡ ὀπώρα λέγεται, ὅτι ὀπὸς αὐτὴν ὠρεῖ, τούτεστι φυλάσσει. | οὐκ ἀπιθανῶς μὲν οὖν· τὸ γὰρ καθολικὸν τοιοῦτόν ἐστιν· ἐπὸς γάρ ἐστιν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐπεῖναι κατὰ τὴν ἀποτομήν. εἰδικῶς μέντοι Ὅμηρος οἶδεν ὀπόν τινα λεγόμενον, ὡς ὅταν λέγῃ "ὡς δ᾽ ὅτ᾽ ὀπὸς γάλα λευκόν."

ὀπύειν ὁ μὲν Ἀπίων ὁμιλεῖν· | οὐκ ἔστι δέ, ἀλλὰ τὸ κατὰ νόμους γυναῖκα συνοικεῖν ἀνδρί· καὶ γὰρ δάμαρ ἡ γυνὴ παρὰ τὸ δεδαμάσθαι ὑπὸ ἀνδρός.

ὀπωπή ἐντροπή | ἢ πρόσοψιν.¹³⁴

We may pause to observe the presence (1) of Apion and (2) of polysemantic entries.

(1) In three of these entries we find Apion named: apropos ὀνειρίησι πύλῃσι (*Od.* 4.809), for the meaning of (ἔγχει) ὀξυόεντι, and for the meaning of ὀπύειν. All three entries take basically the same form: Apollonius opposes Apion's interpretation (ὁ μὲν Ἀπίων) to one preferred by himself. None of them is even potentially polysemantic. Ap.ap.ApS. is quite different from "Ap."

(2) There are two polysemantic entries.

(a) ὀπαζόμενος. The third of the four listed meanings is anomalous, inasmuch as it repeats the first, and avowedly so (πάλιν); the fact that one is passive and the other active does not lessen the anomaly.¹³⁵ This is

130. Cf. *Il.* 5.50 D-schol., ὀξεῖ ἢ ἀπὸ ὀξύας εἴδους δένδρου κατεσκευασμένῳ. Scholl.bT ad loc. have οὐκ ἀπὸ ὀξύας· μελίνοις γὰρ ἐχρῶντο, and van der Valk, *Researches*, 1:225, supposes that the common source that he postulates for the D-scholl. and bT gave the interpretation that bT reject. This seems to me quite wild, and I think attempts to isolate potentially identifiable sources on the basis of interpretative content (as distinct from formal factors) are generally futile.

131. The passages are (1) *Il.* 11.493, (2) *Od.* 10.59, with αὐτὰρ for 58f. αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ . . . , δὴ τότ᾽, (3) *Il.* 8.103, and (4) (not fully quoted) *Il.* 6.157, *Od.* 13.121 or 305 (cf. n. 136 below).

132. This articulation, as opposed to Ἀμοπάονα, is non-Aristarchan (cf. A-schol. ad loc., *Il.* 8.276).

133. The παρθενοπίπας addition may be a kind of internal interpolation (the phrase is Leyde's) from the entry on παρθενοπίπα (128.19), παρθένους ὀπιπεύων, ὅ ἐστι περισκοπῶν, but is at least as likely to have been taken over already attached to the ὀπιπεύεις item.

134. The incoherence is even worse than it looks, for neither nominative nor accusative is attested in either epic, nor is "respect" (ἐντροπή) a tenable meaning for any of the word's attested occurrences. The D-scholl. reasonably do not bother to gloss the word except at *Od.* 10.512, ὄψεως. Has there been confusion with ὄπιδα (above)?

135. A formal anomaly is also κατεπείγεσθαι inf. not κατεπείγει indic. (as ὀπάζει in the quote), but this kind of inconsistency, evidently reflecting tension between conflicting impulses (preservation of the

evidently a further example of fusion of a polysemantic entry with a regular one. We might note in passing that the polysemantic entry includes ὤπασαν, which according to the lexicon's normal principles would belong in ω—where, indeed, we find an independent ὠπάζετο entry, with an implicit ὤπασαν entry appended to it.[136]

(b) ὅπλα. Even without the corresponding "Ap." and Pap. entries, it is clear that the proffered interpretations are not alternative renderings of the lexis in a given passage, as in a regular entry, but a differentiated listing of the word's three Homeric meanings. Like "Ap.," ApS. dispenses with the Homeric exemplifications that are preserved in Pap.[137]

To get a sense of the relationship between the two lexica, we may confront this block of ApS. entries with the corresponding section in "Ap." Actually, since "Ap." is not alphabetized beyond the initial letter (a sign of superior antiquity, or merely of comparative brevity?), it does not actually have a corresponding section: its entries in ov- to οπ- are not grouped together. It is worth making the point, since the lexicon's editor alphabetizes.[138] But here are its entries in question, in the order in which they occur in the only manuscript to transmit them.[139]

ὀνᾶσθαι· μέμψασθαι. καὶ ἐκφαυλίσαι.

ὅπλα· σχοινία. καὶ τὰ πολεμικὰ ἐργαλεῖα. καὶ τὰ τεκτονικὰ ἢ χαλκευτικά.

. . .

ὀπάζειν· τὸ περιποιεῖν. τὸ διδόναι. τὸ ἐξόπισθεν διώκειν. προχειρίζεσθαι. καταλαμβά-
νειν. ἐπείγεσθαι. ὀρέξασθαι. ὁρμῆσαι. ἅψασθαι.

. . .

ὀνείατα· βρώματα. ἢ χρήματα.

What is immediately clear is that the relationship between the Apollonius lexicon and the Apion lexicon is not a straightforward one. All four "Ap." entries have counterparts in ApS., but there is no simple correspondence. That ApS. depends on "Ap." is untenable. When I began this investigation I confidently expected to find myself in agreement with Ludwich's position, in favor of the fundamental authenticity of "Ap." and hence of ApS.'s dependence on it. But it entails too much special pleading, and unwarrantably procrustean procedures. We can save such a hypothesis only by postulating drastic transmissional alteration—alteration not only by omission and addition but also by substitution. Since there is nothing but

---

actual lexis vs. grammatical assimilation), is common enough; cf., e.g., ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ βαστάζειν . . . ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ πρόσφερε in the ἀείρας entry, quoted p. 24 above. All the same, one would have expected -ειν rather than -εσθαι, if it were not for κατεπειγόμενος above.

136. 171.13–15 ὠπάζετο κατόπιν ἐδίωκεν. δηλοῖ δὲ καὶ τὸ περιεποίησεν, ὅτε συντελικῶς καὶ πληθυν-
τικῶς ("aor.pl.") λέγει "τῷ δὲ θεοὶ κάλλος τε καὶ ἠνορέην ἐρατεινὴν ὤπασαν." The latter part *could* of course be an internal interpolation from a fuller version of the ὀπαζόμενος entry, but there is little reason to think it is, and in any case the point still stands.

137. Cf. p. 32 above.

138. Of the nineteen o- entries in D (see next note), the four entries in question come first, second, ninth, and thirteenth.

139. I take the text from Ludwich's edition (n. 21 above), except that I restore the transmitted order (and exclude the text of the papyrus); I exclude ὄν, which the lexicon lists under ω. The manuscript is D, Darmstadt 2773, fourteenth century.

the hypothesis itself to serve as control, we are trapped by circularity.[140]
The reverse hypothesis, that "Ap." depends on ApS., also leaves uncom-
fortably many things to be explained away, e.g., the divergencies between
the two lists of meanings for ὀπάζειν/ὀπαζόμενος,[141] and the less devel-
oped alphabetization in "Ap."; not to mention the existence of Pap.,
which is clearly not dependent on ApS.[142] The problems vanish if we
account for the commonality between them in terms of common source
material. What this small sample suggests—and more extensive investi-
gation only strengthens the suggestion—is that there is no direct relation
between the two lexica. There seems to me a good possibility that "Ap."
has been interpolated from ApS. (and in that case the "contamination" is
liable to have been in both directions), but the primary relation between
them is that each draws independently on a commonly available stock of
polysemantic material. That at any rate seems to me to yield the only ac-
count of the phenomena that does not subject the evidence to intolerable
strain, inasmuch as it gives adequate recognition not only to what they
have in common but also to what they do not.

Rather than attempting to fix "identity" and stemmatic relationships,
then, I propose a model of less rigidity. We may recognize the existence of
a body of polysemantic material, and see Pap. and "Ap.," along with the
polysemantic entries in ApS., as individual representatives of it.[143] It is
the same, only more so, with the scholia minora. Thanks to the papyri, we
have numerous examples of the kind of word-by-word glossing that goes
under that anachronistic label.[144] The medievally transmitted D-scholia
are only the most extensive.[145] We can envisage a floating corpus of inter-
pretative tradition, fundamentally unstable, dynamically transmitted, con-
tents and contours in perpetual flux, with no sort of fixity beyond what its
many instantiations were momentarily and continually investing it with.[146]
Individual glosses might recur identically over centuries,[147] but were con-
stantly liable to substitution, displacement, augmentation. Under the terms

140. Neitzel, though ultimately sympathetic, rightly points out (p. 305) that Ludwich operates "mit
einer beliebig einsetzbaren Unbekannten" in his postulates.

141. Cf. further the lists given in the scholia: the D-schol. on *Il.* 5.334 (as given in A) starts ἡ λέξις
αὕτη πλείονα σημαίνει, and proceeds to list and exemplify περιποιεῖν καὶ διδόναι, καταφέρεσθαι, ἐπι-
λέγεσθαι, and διώκειν.

142. That "Ap." depends on ApS. was argued by Baumert; controverted by Neitzel, pp. 307–9.

143. Another appears to be the polysemantic lexicon found—along with so much else—in Ambro-
sianus C 222 inf.; still unpublished, as far as I am aware. A hastily made copy of the first few entries was
printed by Reitzenstein, *Geschichte der gr. Etymologika* (Leipzig, 1897), p. 336, n. 3. At least partial de-
pendence on ApS. looks clear, but Reitzenstein recognized the presence also of another, similar work—
not "Ap.," it appears. (Erbse, *Beiträge,* pp. 410–11, takes up the question of the relations with the Etymo-
logicum Magnum.)

144. Collected by L. M. Raffaelli in *Ricerche di filologia classica,* vol. 2 (Pisa, 1984), pp. 139ff. (with
bibliography); discussed by A. Henrichs, "Scholia Minora zu Homer I," *ZPE* 7 (1971): 99ff., F. Montan-
ari, *Ricerche di filologia classica,* vol. 2 (Pisa, 1984) pp. 125ff.

145. The mythological ἱστορίαι that the D-scholia also incorporate are of discrete origin (cf. M. W.
Haslam, "A New Papyrus of the Mythographus Homericus," *BASP* 27 [1990]: 31).

146. Note the *Iliad* "lexicon" published by de Marco in 1946 (*Scholia Minora in Homeri Iliadem,* rec.
V. de Marco, Pars prior: ΛΕΞΕΙΣ ΟΜΗΡΙΚΑΙ, fasc. 1 [Vatican City, 1946]), which is simply an alphabet-
ization of such scholia minora as were found entered in a manuscript of the poem.

147. And over many miles. It is easy to underestimate the extent to which Homeric exegesis was dif-
fused. E. Fraenkel long ago drew attention to the importance of Homer commentaries for ancient exegesis
of Virgil, as well as for Eustathius' own mammoth commentaries on the Homeric poems (*Kleine Beiträge*

of a model such as this, to characterize "Ap." (or ApS.) as derived from
the D-scholia is either false or not worth saying.

But to stay a little longer with the polysemantic material. What it reflects
is an enterprise of some interest. To set about systematically collating the
Homeric occurrences of the various forms of a given word (or coincident
forms of different words)[148] and making a semantic classification of those
occurrences was a not unambitious undertaking. It entailed making both
connections and distinctions that glossaries and commentaries, and lexica
derived therefrom, were not in the habit of making. Its built-in urge for mul-
tiple semantic differentiation evidently led to some excesses,[149] but consid-
ered as a lexicographical undertaking it is far more sophisticated than the
alphabetized extracting represented by the bulk of ApS. It stands side by
side with the semantic differentiation of synonyms systematically collected
by Herennius Philo.[150] Informing the professionally bloodless presentation
we find in the Rylands papyrus is an intelligent application of the principle
Ὅμηρον ἐξ Ὁμήρου σαφηνίζειν, based on an enviable command of the to-
tality of the Homeric text (no concordances or data-banks to provide short-
cuts); the differentiations there made do not substantially differ from those
made in the lexica we use ourselves. Of course such a lexicon is a reductive
systematization of earlier, more detailed philological work,[151] but Latte's
scornful characterization, "hoc librorum genus puerorum in usum condi-
tum," is not altogether just.[152]

Viewed from this perspective, whether "Ap." in its original form (how-
ever we conceive of that) was actually composed by Apion is perhaps not
a question of the highest importance. But since it does make some differ-
ence to what we make of Apollonius' lexicon, the question must be tack-
led: Is it or is it not by Apion?

There is only one difficulty in the way of accepting the ascription, but
it is a severe one: the extreme mismatch between the image of Apion's

zur classischen Philologie vol. 2 [Rome, 1964], pp. 381–89, his review of vol. 2 of the Harvard Servius),
but the observation has been strangely neglected. Eustathius' editor van der Valk attributes to Eustathius
himself observations that thanks to Servius are demonstrably inherited items of exegesis. This is the sub-
ject of research in progress by Dr A. Georgiadou.

148. Coincident, that is, prior to extratextual discrimination, cf. n. 6 above; e.g., ειμι, ελισσετο (see
Neitzel, p. 304 for more).

149. Cf., e.g., the precise differentiations applied to ἠώς, in both "Ap." and ApS. (though differently in
either case), or the metonymic applications of, e.g., Ares (cf. p. 33 above).

150. Ammonius *De Adfinium Vocabulorum Differentia*, ed. K. Nickau (Leipzig, 1966); cf. Erbse,
Beiträge, pp. 295–310. The Suda attests also a π. τῆς ἐν συνωνύμοις διαφορᾶς for Seleucus, and a π. δι-
αφορᾶς λέξεων for Ptolemy of Ascalon. Cf. the *Odyssey* commentary P.Oxy.LIII 3710 (2nd cent.) ii 9–11,
distinguishing κοῖτος and ὕπνος at *Od.* 20.138.

151. In particular we miss in our specimens the identification of different kinds of usage that is charac-
teristic of Alexandrian semantic classification. Not always, however: e.g., ApS. 4.12 ἀγορεύειν κυρίως μὲν
ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ λέγειν, καταχρηστικῶς δὲ ψιλῶς τὸ λέγειν (λεγόμενον cod.); cf., e.g., P.Oxy.VIII 1086 (first
century B.C.; Pap.II Erbse) on *Il.* 2.728, . . . ἱμάσσαι γ(ὰρ) κυρίως (ἐστὶ) τὸ ἱμάντι πλῆξαι, καταχρηστικῶς
δὲ ὁπωσδήποτε. Cf. also the Rylands papyrus in ὀμφαλός (above), but it is my impression that the Apollo-
nius lexicon generally derives such comments on usage not from the specialized polysemantic source but
from commentaries.

152. It seems conditioned by his dismissal of "Ap." as "misella glossaria e scholiis vulgatis concin-
nata" (*Hesychii Lexicon*, p. ix), as he sited himself at one extreme of a polarized Lehrs-Ludwich debate
(cf. n. 123 above). Latte's view of the lexicon's composition fails to take adequate account of the idiosyn-
crasy of some its interpretations, as van der Valk pointed out (*Researches*, 1:298–301), and the accession
of the papyrus should have served to put matters in a different light.

lexicographic activities given by the citations in the Apollonius lexicon—
Ap.ap.ApS.—and the image of them given by "Ap." If "Ap." had come
down without attribution, no one would have proposed Apionic authorship
for it, or if anyone had, the proposal would have met with derisive rejec-
tion. As it is, the fact that the lexicon comes with Apion's name attached
to it changes the rules of the game. Scholars seek to reconcile the con-
flicting sources, "Ap." on the one hand and Ap.ap.ApS. on the other.

The correlation between them could scarcely be lower. Ap.ap.ApS.
consists almost wholly of material that is almost wholly absent from
"Ap.," viz. etymologies (often alternative ones for one and the same
word) and translation-interpretations (with or without etymologies to
match) of non-polysemantic words. There is little or no differentiation of
meanings in different contexts,[153] and the lexeis are rarely even poten-
tially polysemantic. In short, there is gross discrepancy. Ludwich, and
more recently Neitzel, have done their best to efface the difference by ap-
peal to "Ap.'''s transmission. We may postulate an excerptor who cut out
the etymologies, and had a special liking for "homonyms." In this way
we can construct an Ur-"Ap." to serve as the source of Ap.ap.ApS. This
is plausible enough, up to a point. That "Ap." (which is any case not a
unitary entity, but a conglomerate of its medieval representatives) has
undergone abridgement is beyond dispute, and as for Ap.ap.ApS., Apol-
lonius' excerpting was obviously selective: both "Ap." and Ap.ap.ApS.
may give a distorted image of the original lexicon, and the skewing is
liable to have been in different directions.

But there are two things telling strongly if not fatally against the at-
tempt to reconcile "Ap." and Ap.ap.ApS. One is the sheer recalcitrance of
the evidence. Where there *is* contact between "Ap." and Ap.ap.ApS., they
still do not jibe.[154] The other is less empirical, and has received less at-
tention. The difference between "Ap." and Ap.ap.ApS. reflects a funda-
mental difference of lexicographical orientation. Ap.ap.ApS. is devoted to
providing etymologies, and accordingly definitions, for given Homeric
lexeis; contextual determinants of meaning are brought into play only as
convenient. The polysemantic "Ap.," on the other hand, more like a mod-
ern lexicographer, is concerned to compare the occurrences of a given
word in all its various forms (or coincident forms of different words) and
to distinguish the various meanings that the word appears to carry, on the
basis of contextual appropriateness. The level of philological respectabil-
ity informing each of these exercises may not be exceptionally high (the
etymologies of Ap.ap.ApS. are quite wondrously free-wheeling, and some
of "Ap.'''s assigned meanings are rather fanciful), but that is beside the
point. The two enterprises stand at opposite lexicographical poles.

---

153. *Pace* Neitzel (p. 310 with n. 51), who gives a list of "homonym-glosses." Where Ap.ap.ApS.
offers more than a single rendering, they are not necessarily meant to apply to different passages.

154. Consider, e.g., σχέτλιος. "Ap." distinguishes five meanings: ὁ κακοποιός, ἢ ὁ ἀγνώμων, ἢ ὁ
ἰσχυρόψυχος, ἢ ὁ δυστυχής, ἢ ὁ ἀμνήμων. Ap.ap.ApS., on the other hand (148.1): τάλας, ἀγνώμων, χαλε-
πός, ἀπὸ τοῦ σχέδην τλῆναι, ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐπισχετικὸς ἐν τῷ δηλοῦσθαι ὑπαρχεῖν. They could hardly have
less in common. (This class of evidence—corresponding entries in the two lexica, with mention of Apion
in ApS.—has been much rehearsed, from Lehrs, *Quaestiones Epicae*, p. 34, to Neitzel, pp. 317–26. I take
my example *not* from Neitzel's "schwer erklärbare Widersprüche.")

I conclude that the attribution to Apion is to be rejected. After all, there is no need to accept it if there is evidence against its correctness, and Apollonius' citations of Apion provide ample such evidence.[155] False ascriptions are nothing new, and ascription of a Homeric lexicon to Apion would be natural enough, given that he was the best-known Homeric lexicographer after Apollonius.[156] It has long been accepted that citations of Apion and Herodorus in Eustathius have nothing to do with Apion (or with Herodorus, for that matter).[157] It is evident from references to Apion in the later lexicographical tradition that "Ap." travelled through later antiquity under Apion's name, and hence is to be regarded as a distinct textual entity, but for us its importance, like that of the Rylands papyrus fragment, consists in its exemplification of this particular response to the never-ending challenge of how to read Homer.[158] The profitable comparison is not with Apollonius' citations of Apion, but with his own polysemantic entries.

IV. COMMENTARIES

Heliodorus' *Odyssey* commentary, Apion's Homer lexicon, a lexicon of polysemantic Homeric words: direct utilization of each of these has left distinct traces in Apollonius' lexicon. Other specialized collections such as Homeric hapaxes and onomatopoeic words were clearly laid under obligation too, seemingly at first hand though possibly at a remove or two. What else did Apollonius use?

We have already found ourselves at some distance from Erbse's vision of Apollonius' procedures, and I fear we may have to move further away yet. Erbse granted to Gattiker that the D-scholia constituted Apollonius' principal source, but his treatment was designed to rescue Apollonius from a perceived reputation as a mere transcriber and to establish him as a true scholar,[159] and he hastened to lay stress on learned treatises. He argued that Apollonius had recourse to Aristonicus' book on Aristarchus' sigla, the prosodical treatise of Ptolemy of Ascalon, and other such works; and at least one exegetical commentary.[160] Schenck, elaborating Erbse's

155. Scholars too often treat questions of attribution, as well as textual matters, as if judicial standards of proof were appropriate. If we assume all data to be right (~ innocent) that cannot be proved beyond reasonable doubt to be wrong, we shall be accepting much more than we should (for the evidence is often lacking). What we should do is assess the balance of probability, as best we can.

156. Witness Hesychius, *praef.,* οἱ μὲν τὰς Ὁμηρικὰς μόνας (sc. τὰς κατὰ στοιχεῖον συντεθείκασι λέξεις), ὡς Ἀππίων καὶ Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ τοῦ Ἀρχιβίου. From the lexicon's internal evidence it appears that Hesychius knows Apion only through Apollonius. Cf. his reference later in the preface to τῶν Ἀριστάρχου καὶ Ἀππίωνος καὶ Ἡλιοδώρου λέξεων, similarly derived from Apollonius' lexicon.

157. Lehrs, *de Aristarchi studiis Homericis*[3] (Leipzig, 1882), pp. 364–68; further progress by Erbse, *Beiträge,* pp. 127–73, and van der Valk, *Researches,* 1:1–28.

158. Some interesting discussions in *Homer's Ancient Readers: The Hermeneutics of Greek Epic's Earliest Exegetes,* ed. R. Lamberton and J. J. Keaney (Princeton, 1992).

159. "Die Möglichkeit, dass der Verfasser ein belesener und gelehrter Mann gewesen sei . . . , dass man ihn also nicht mit Herablassung behandeln dürfte wie einen stumpfsinnig arbeitenden Abschreiber, wurde in den Diskussionen nicht einmal erwogen" (*Beiträge,* p. 407); "Apollonios war nicht der armselige Schlucker, als den man ihn hinzustellen versuchte" (ib., p. 431); echoed by Schenck, *Quellen,* p. 144, cf. p. 8. It is a rather artificial polarization, it seems to me.

160. For what is meant by an "exegetical" commentary see, e.g., H. Erbse, *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem,* vol. 1 (Berlin, 1969) pp. xi–xiii. The term is used in contradistinction to "Aristarchan" or "critical" or "VMK" products such as Aristonicus'. But no commentaries so far found observe the distinction.

work, added more scholarly names to the list of direct sources. This seems to me to have been a move in the wrong direction.

It detracts nothing from the value of Erbse's analytical work if I take a more mundane view. Beyond the material drawn from the sources we have discussed, is there anything in Apollonius' lexicon that he could not have found in run-of-the-mill commentaries of the time? The sporadic irruption of detailed scholarly material, the occasional citation of learned sources, the contextual glossing of individual words and phrases, these are a familiar mix. Franco Montanari has well spoken of "il frammischiamento di materiale glossografico-parafrastico con materiale critico-esegetico tipico degli *hypomnemata*."[161] The distinction between "exegetical" commentaries and Aristarchan ones is not respected by such actual commentaries as we have, as Erbse knows as well as anyone.[162] I wonder, in fact, whether there ever were such things as exegetical commentaries, in the sense in which that term is usually employed. Commentaries would start including Alexandrian (and Pergamene) text-critical material just as soon as it came on the scene.[163] Our papyrus specimens are fascinatingly varied in nature as well as quality, but they make it clear that commentaries typically contained just the same kind of admixture that we find in Apollonius' lexicon, from unadorned glosses and paraphrases to learned Alexandrian disquisitions.[164]

Reference in the lexicon to Aristarchus, or coincidence with A-scholia, does not mean that Apollonius consulted Aristonicus.[165] At the other end of the scale, the affinity between the bulk of the lexicon's entries and the D-scholia does not mean that he stooped to scholia minora.[166] The full range of the lexicon's material was available in ready-packaged form, requiring only reassembly. If I sat down to convert to lexicographical form the commentary represented by P.Oxy. 1086, for example, it would come out looking very much like Apollonius. To illustrate, here are some extracts from the first two surviving columns of that commentary, with actual ApS. entries subjoined for comparison.

Comm. 9f.   εἰνοσίφυλλον κινησίφυλλον· . . . βούλεται τὸ σύνδενδρον δηλοῦν.
ApS.   εἰνοσίφυλλον κινησίφυλλον· . . . τὸ σύνδενδρον θέλει σημαίνειν.

---

161. *Proceedings of the XVIII International Congress of Papyrology*, vol. 1 (Athens, 1988), p. 343.

162. Cf. his remarks at *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem*, 1:xiii ("Fragmenta scholiorum, quae in Papyris asservantur, neutri eorum generum . . . addici possunt"). Some scholars have nonetheless been misled by the distinction into thinking that papyrus commentaries fall into one class or the other (cf., e.g., M. M. Willcock, reviewing the above volume at *JHS* 91 [1971]: 144, "[the papyrus commentaries] differ basically from A and bT in that they are simple, not in any way contaminated or mixed"). It is also worth remembering that explanation of the Aristarchan sigla habitually entails Homeric exegesis; and cf. next note.

163. The (?mid-)third-century B.C. "extraits commentés" at Lille, published by C. Meillier in *Mélanges Vercoutter* (Paris, 1985), pp. 229–38, have paraphrases and glosses. We can trace a direct line of development from this sort of thing to the likes of the first-century B.C. P.Oxy. 1086 (Pap.II Erbse), which also has paraphrases and glosses but incorporates Aristarchan material as well.

164. Our best samples, in order of date of manuscript (composition will have been a bit earlier), are P.Oxy. 1086, on *Il.* 2 (first century B.C.); P.Oxy.VIII 1087 (Pap.VI Erbse), on *Il.* 7 (first century [A.D. rather than B.C., in my view]); P.Oxy.II 221 (Pap.XII Erbse), on *Il.* 21 (early second century); and P.Oxy. LIII 3710, on *Od.* 20 (second century).

165. Aristarchus' critical signs received detailed explanation in commentaries prior to Aristonicus, witness P.Oxy. 1086. Aristonicus was just a way-stage in a continuous tradition of exposition. The same goes for Didymus, of course.

166. Detailed comparison between ApS.'s entries and the actual D-scholia gives results more remarkable for lack of coincidence than for agreement. It should also be remembered that in the lexicon's original form many of the entries were appreciably fuller than they appear in the Coislinianus.

Comm. 20   ότριχας όμότρ]ιχας
ApS.   ότριχας όμοιότριχας

Comm. 20   οἰέτεας ἰσοετεῖς
ApS.   οἰέτεας ἰσοετεῖς, ὀμήλικας

Comm. 28   on φόβον Ἄρηος· τὸ σημεῖον πρὸς τὸν φόβον ὅτι τὴν τοῦ Ἄ[ρεως φυγὴν
            δηλοῖ.
ApS.   φόβος· Ἀρίσταρχος σεσημείωται ὅτι συνήθως φόβος ἐπὶ τῆς φυγῆς.

Comm. 35   λωτόν ἤτοι τὸν παρ' ἡμῖν λεγόμενον [μελίλωτον ἢ καὶ ἄλλο ὅ]μοιόν τι
            τούτῳ ἔδεσμα.
ApS.   λωτόν· οὕτως λέγεται πᾶν ἄνθος καὶ ὁ ἰδίως λεγόμενος

Comm. 41   οἱ δ' ἄρ' ἴσαν . . . · οὕτως δὲ ἐπορεύοντο . . . (paraphrase)
ApS.   ἴσαν ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ ἐπορεύοντο· "οἱ δ' ἄρ' ἴσαν σιγῇ" (Il. 3.8) . . .

Comm. 47   τὸ δὲ σημεῖον πρὸς τὸ χωομένῳ ὅτι νῦν τὸ χολουμένῳ δηλοῖ.
ApS.   χωόμενος (i) χολούμενος, (ii) ἀνιώμενος καὶ συγχεόμενος κατὰ ψυχήν (poly-
            semantic)

Comm. 52   μέγα ἀντὶ τοῦ μεγάλως
ApS.   μέγα . . . ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ μεγάλως

Comm. 73–74 ἀλίαστος ἀνέκκλιτος, ἀναπότρεπτος (-τριπτος pap.)
ApS.   ἀλίαστος ἀνέκκλιτος (ἀνέγκλιστος Coisl., ἀνέγκλητος Hsch.)

That shows the sort of procedure I would posit for Apollonius. He used commentaries, plus a polysemantic lexicon and other derivative specialized collections, plus Apion's lexicon. Who would ask for more? No doubt several commentaries were mined. We owe to Erbse the recognition that the lexicon's citations of Comanus are drawn from a commentary on Il. 12–13.[167] Imperfectly integrated use of multiple sources is clearly what is responsible for the accumulative and often incoherent nature of many of the lexicon's entries. This is why there are two different entries for the hapax δεδμήατο, for instance, and different entries for βιόσσαο and ἐβιόσσαο (Od. 8.468 σὺ γάρ με/μ'ἐ-βιόσσαο) or for πέρασας and ἐπέρασας (Il. 21.78 καί με/μ'ἐ-πέρασας).[168] No doubt, too, Apollonius used the best commentaries he could lay his hands on. He may even have thought he had Aristarchus'.[169]

University of California,
Los Angeles

167. *Beiträge,* pp. 330–31. It is symptomatic of Schenck's treatment that he prefers to assume (in the teeth of the evidence) that Apollonius had direct access to Comanus' work. Cf. A. Dyck, "The Fragments of Comanus of Naucratis," *SGLG* 7 (1988): 222–23. (Trypho, according to Dyck, *did* have direct access: I find no reason to think so.)

168. While in each case it is one and the same Homeric passage that is concerned, the glosses differ (πέρασας is glossed εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς γῆς διεπέρασας, ἐπώλησας, while ἐπέρασας is glossed ἀπέδου). This puts it beyond doubt that the entries are drawn from different sources, and undermines Leyde's postulate of a redactor who interpolated the variant forms of the lexeis (*De Apollonii Sophistae Lexico Homerico* [diss., Leipzig, 1885], p. 7), "Utrasque enim formas Apollonio deberi nemo putaverit," echoed by Steinicke (n. 1 above), p. xxxii, "Apollonium ipsum utrasque lectiones diversis locis iam protulisse nemo contendere audebit"—a prediction I hereby falsify.

169. That is the most natural interpretation of such references as (on ἐμπλήγδην) ἐν δὲ τῷ ⟨τῆς?⟩ υ τῆς Ὀδυσσείας ὑπομνήματι ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος εὐμεταβόλως, or (on ἑρμῖν') ὁ δὲ Ἀρίσταρχός φησιν ". . .," (cf., e.g., 146.25, 161.22). Commentaries may have got Aristarchus' name attached to them, innocently or not. We have a remnant of a commentary on Herodotus that went under Aristarchus' name in the second century C.E. (P.Amh. I 12). Scholars accept it at face value, but I think suspicion is in order.