

THE HOMER LEXICON OF APOLLONIUS SOPHISTA II. IDENTITY AND TRANSMISSION*

MICHAEL W. HASLAM

READERS OF HOMER today have a choice of lexica: Homeric or general or in-between: Ebeling or Autenrieth, LSJ or one of its abridgements, the *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. In antiquity, from the first century on, they had the Homeric lexicon of Apollonius. The LSJ of the day was Pamphilus' 95-book amalgamation of all the specialized lexica he could lay his hands on. This was to attain wider circulation in the more affordable abridged form of Diogenianus' 5-book Περιεργοπένητες, which in turn, like Apollonius, was to end up in the capacious net of Hesychius (5th cent.?). Just as Diogenianus served as the standard general lexicon (see P.Oxy. XLVII 3329), so Apollonius immediately became the standard Homeric one, and held its own through the atticistic obsessions of the next centuries. No fewer than seven papyri of it have been recognized. None preserves its title, so we cannot know that they all owned Apollonian authorship, but in most cases their basic identity is assured.¹ Collectively they give an excellent glimpse of the variety of forms that the lexicon took in response to the shifting needs of its consumers. I list them here, in approximate order of date of manuscript.

- Π¹** P. Mich. inv. 5451a, ed. T. Renner, *HSCP* 83 (1979): 321–31, with plate.
I (Haslam: II ed. pr.), Karanis, pap. roll.
12 entries: πολ-, πορ- ποσ-.
- Π²** Bodl. Libr., MS. Gr. class e. 44, ed. E. W. B. Nicholson, *CR* 11 (1897): 390–93; reedited by K. Steinicke, *Apollonii Sophistae Lexicon Homericum* (diss., Göttingen, 1957), pp. ii–iv. Plate on p. 119 below.
II (Haslam: I ed. pr.), provenance unrecorded, pap. roll.
8 entries: εφ- εχ-, ζα-.
- Π³** P.Oxy. XLIV 3206, ed. J. W. Shumaker, *BASP* 7 (1970): 59–66, with plate.
II, Oxyrhynchus, back of documentary pap. roll.
34 entries: δια- to διο-.

* This is Part II of a two-part article. For Part I, "Composition and Constituents," see *CP* 89 (1994): 1–45.

1. **Π¹**, in my view the earliest, is perhaps to be attributed to Apion rather than to Apollonius; see pp. 113–14.

- Π⁴** P.Oxy. XXX 2517, ed. E. Lobel (*The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. 30 [London, 1964], pp. 28–30, with plates 3 and 13); attributed by K. Alpers, “Ein neues Fragment eines Homer-Lexikons auf Papyrus,” *Hermes* 94 (1966): 430–34.
II, Oxyrhynchus, pap. codex.
20 entries: θα- θε-, θι- θο- θρ-.
- Π⁵** P.Oxy. inv. 18 2B.66/F(1) and (9–10), ed. W. E. H. Cockle, *BICS* 28 (1981): 123–41, with plate; attributed by M. W. Haslam, “A New Papyrus Text of Apollonius Sophista,” *ZPE* 49 (1982): 31–38.
III, Oxyrhynchus, back of pap. roll of Aristophanes *Thesmophoriazusae*.
c. 53 entries: κελ- to κλη-, ουρ- to παι-.
- Π⁶** P.Cairo inv. 50208, ed. W. G. Waddell in *Mélanges Maspero*, vol. 2, fasc. 1 (Cairo, 1934), pp. 152–54. Plate in *BICS* 28 (1981), pl. 1.
III (or IV?), Oxyrhynchus, pap. roll.
10 entries: εν-.
- Π⁷** P.Coll.Youtie (*Collectanea Papyrologica: Texts Published in Honor of H. C. Youtie*, ed. A. E. Hanson [Bonn, 1976]) I 2, ed. A. Henrichs and W. Müller.²
V–VI, Hermupolis, pap. codex.
c. 83 entries, alphabetized: αγγ- to αδι-, αει- to αεκ-, αμπ- to ανα-.

The proposition that these are all texts of the same lexicon is invitingly open to challenge. When Edgar Lobel published a fragment of a “Homer Lexicon” as P.Oxy. 2517 (my **Π⁴**), he pointed out that “the contents have an obvious relationship to one of the constituents of the lexicon of Hesychius,” but he refrained from identifying the lexicon as that of Apollonius. Klaus Alpers, on the other hand, did not shrink from affirming the identification. It is, of course, a matter of definition. The text of the papyrus is very different from the text of the Coislinianus, the medieval codex unicus (10th cent.).³ Just compare the two manuscripts’ sections in **θοο-**.

Papyrus (verso 4–14, supplements not assured):-

θοάς τα[χείας. . . ἐνιοι δὲ κα]τὰ σχῆμα [ὁδείας.

θοή τα[χεῖα (+?)

θοήν νύκτα θεῖαν [. . .] ὡς “θοὸν δόμον” [. . . ἐπὶ δὲ] τοῦ “Εκτορος λέγει . . .] δηλῶν [. . .

θορεῖν [πηδησαι (+?)

θοῶς [σφοδρῶς, ταχέως.⁴

θοῦρος [πηδητικός (+?)

Coisl. (88.6–10 Bekker):-

θοῆσι ταχεῖαις. καὶ τὸ **θόωσα** ἀντὶ τοῦ ὥξυνα τὸν μοχλὸν μεταληπτικῶς. “ἐγὼ δὲ θόωσα (δ’ ἐθ- cod.) παραστάς ἄκρον.” τὸ δὲ **νυκτὶ θοῆ** ἀντὶ τοῦ ταχεῖα· ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἡμέρα πολύμοχος οὐσα διὰ τὰ ἔργα μακρὰ φαίνεται, ἡ δὲ νύξ διὰ τὴν ἀνάπαισιν ταχεῖα.

θοῦριδος ἀλκῆς τῆς πηδητικῆς, παρὰ τὸ θορεῖν ὅ ἐστι πηδᾶν.

How different can two texts be, and still be regarded as texts of the same work? Obviously, someone who consulted the papyrus lexicon would not

2. The edition of the papyrus itself is preceded by an excellent and exceptionally thoroughgoing introduction; hereafter cited as “Henrichs and Müller.” For the text of the papyrus I rely on the editors’ transcription.

3. For editions of the Coislinianus see Part I, p. 2, n. 3. References are to Bekker’s edition.

4. Or is the lexis **θόωσα**? But Lobel prints **θωω** [, with a gap after the sigma (not discernible on the plate).

get from it the same information as someone who consulted the Coislinianus. In that sense they are different works. But each of them may still have a right to be called Apollonius' lexicon. That lexicon was a discrete textual entity, originating as such at a particular time and place, and its subsequent textual instability did not compromise its ontological integrity. This is what distinguishes the lexicon from what modern scholars collectively label *scholia minora*. As a popular reference work, it could change without losing its identity, and could exist simultaneously in multifarious forms. *Nec manet ut fuerat nec formas servat easdem sed tamen ipsa eadem est.*

The two extracts I have juxtaposed are extreme in their mutual discrepancy, and the differences between them do not in fact undermine the fundamental identity of the two texts; what signifies are the particulars they have in common.⁵ Together they show some of the kinds of modification to which the lexicon was subject in the course of transmission and diffusion. It was already clear from Hesychius and other sources that the lexicon in its original form had many more entries than are found in the Coislinianus, and the papyrus gives vivid confirmation of that. Even more striking is the discrepancy over the *θοός* cognates. All the data in both texts are probably to be assigned to the original lexicon: it is just that each of them has made a different selection.⁶ A fully informed analysis would require detailed comparison over the whole extent of the texts, as well as bringing in the various other works that utilized the Apollonius lexicon, and more besides. But still a secure reconstruction of the lexicon in its original form would be well beyond reach.⁷

The most pristine of our fragments is Π^2 (see plate, p. 119 below). This is usually said to have been written in the first century C.E., but I would assign

5. E.g., as pointed out by Alpers, the absence of any entries in *θλ-* and *θν-* (but the Coislinianus, unlike the papyrus, has no *θι-* section either). More significant is the relative order of the entries in *θρέσαι θρασυμένονα θρήνυς* (but *θρόνα* discrepant) and in *θειλόπεδον θεοπρόπιον θεουδής*.—I am assuming that] φύλη at R12 is στ]αφυλή, the gloss for *θειλόπεδον* (previously unrecognized). And in passing I would suggest that τ]ο γάρ ποιηθὲν πρ[οὐ]τίθεσ(α) at R9 applies to *θεμελία* (Il. 12.28, 23.255 θ. τε προβάλλοντο); absent from Coisl., and nothing comparable in Hesychius, but cf. Eust. 1298.43 προβαλέσθαι δὲ πάνυ κυρίως ἐπὶ θεμελίων λέγεται, ταῦτόν δὲ τῷ προθέσθαι, ὅθεν τὸ θεμέλια. (For 3 pl. impf. in γάρ clause following the gloss itself cf. e.g., Π^7 gll. 32, 34.)

6. The alternative is (of course) that one or each of them has added and substituted non-Apollonian material, but there is both internal and external evidence to suggest that we are dealing simply with excision and conflation of material that was all present in the original lexicon. E.g., in Coisl. it is clear that the missing link between *θοῆσι* and *θόωσα* is the interpretation of the adjective as "sharp"; that is present in the papyrus, which for its part has apparently dropped the *θόωσα* appendage. The papyrus retains the note on *θοῆν νύκτα*, with its citation of Antimachus, while Coisl. opts instead for the note on *νυκτὶ θοῆ*; in each text, to have *both* notes seemed redundant.

7. Indeed, it can seem almost as if the papyrus accessions put it *further* beyond reach. Cf. Henrichs and Müller, p. 33, n. 16: "Die Sekundärüberlieferung und die Papyri machen es möglich, der Urform hier und da näherzukommen, wenn auch in Einzelfällen die völlige Divergenz der einzelnen Textzeugen den Abstand zur Originalfassung eher vergrößert als verkleinert." This seems to me somewhat exaggerated, however (just three instances are offered where the interpretations of Pap., Coisl., and Hsch. "weichen . . . so sehr voneinander ab, dass kein Vergleich möglich ist," and one of them is *ἀμφοιέλισσας*, where Pap. had *τὰς ἐλαυνομένας ἐξ ἐκατέρων τῶν τοίχων*, Coisl. *ἐπιθετικῶς τὰς ἐξ ἐκατέρου μέρους ἐλαυνόμενας ναῖς*, Hsch. *ἀμφοτέρωθεν ἐλαυνόμενας*; hardly a great divergence), and what it primarily indicates is that Coisl. is even more corrupt than was previously apparent.

it to the second.⁸ It was published in 1897, and needs reediting, for not all the entries have been correctly identified, and more complete restoration is attainable.⁹ And since it is illuminating to compare its text with the Coislinianus', I give a reconstruction of it here, with the corresponding parts of the Coislinianus' text alongside.¹⁰ I print only supplements that seem to me certain or at least highly probable.

Π ² (2nd cent.) col. i	Coisl. (10th cent.)
[ἐφέποντες ἐπερχόμενοι] 1 "ἄλγε]α πάσχ[ουσιν κορυφὰς ὀρέω]ν ἐφεπ[οντες] (Od.9.121). ἐφράσθη]ς ἐπ[έγνωσ· "ἀλλ' ἐ- πεὶ ἐφράσθη]ς" (Od.19.485 = 23.260).	79.35 ἐφέποντες ἐπερχόμενοι. 80.10 ἐφράσθην ἐνόησας.
5 'Εφύρους] "τὼ μὲν ἄρ' ἐκ Θρήικης 'Εφύρο]υς" (Il.13.301). ὁ Κομ[ανὸς c.5 c.4] διὰ τουτ[c.9 κε[...]]ν Ἄρη εν[c.10 τα ἄλλα καὶ ἐν 'Ο[δυσσεΐα] "τὼ	80.12 'Εφύρους· "τὼ μὲν ἄρ' ἐκ Θρήικης 'Εφύρους μέτα θωρήσεσθον."
10 δ' ἐπεὶ ἐκ δε[σμῶ]ιο λύθειν κρατεροῦ περ ἐόν[τος αὐτίκ' ἀ- ναΐξ]αντες ὁ μὲν [Θρηίκην- δε βε]βήκει, ἡ δ' ἄρ[ισ]α Κύπρον ἵ- κανε]ν" (Od.8.360-2). οἱ δὲ "Εφυροι κ[αὶ Φλε-	"Εφυροι δὲ Φλεγυῖται βάρβαρα ἔθνη. οἱ δὲ 'Εφύρους εἶναι τοὺς νῦν Ἀκαρνᾶνας λεγομένους, Φλεγυῖας δὲ τοὺς πάλαι Γυρτώνην οἰκ- οῦντας.
15 γυῖαι βα]ρβάρων ἔθνη. ω[c.5]]ς φηεῖν 'Εφύρους [c.2 c.3 το]ύς νῦν Ἀκαρ[νᾶ]ς λε- γομένους, Φλε[γύας δὲ] τοὺς πάλαι] Γυρτών[ιους c.5]]ει	
20 ὁ ποιη]τής "οἱ δ' Ἄ[ργεῖσσαν ἔχ]ον καὶ Γ]υρτώνην [ἐνέμουν]το" (Il.2.738). ἔχματ]α κωλύματ[α, ἀπὸ] τοῦ ἐ- πέχειν]· "χερσὶ [μάκελλ]αν ἔ- χων ἀμ]άρης ἐξ [ἔχματα] βάλλων" (Il.21.259).	80.21 ἔχματα κωλύματα, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐπέχειν· "χερσὶ μάκελλαν ἔχων ἀμάρης ἐξ ἔχματα βάλλων."

8. The hand is a practiced one, of common type: rounded, upright, bilinear, somewhat flattened, informal but regular. It is similar to the Hypereides papyrus (C. H. Roberts, *Greek Literary Hands* [Oxford, 1955], no. 13b), only more delicate; cf. E. G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World* (Princeton, 1971), nos. 22, 24, and 62. As palaeographical benchmarks more recently published than Roberts nos. 13a (ca. 125 c.e.) and 20b (206 c.e.) it is worth comparing the semi-cursive P.Oxy. L 3559, a document written not earlier than 150 c.e., and P.Oxy. XLII 3030 (= Turner, *Greek Manuscripts*² [ed. P. J. Parsons, *BICS* Suppl. 46, London, 1987], no. 87), written 207 or 211 c.e. I would be inclined to put it around the middle of the second century, or somewhat earlier.

9. Steinicke made one notable improvement on the editio princeps in recognizing a mention of Comanus at col. i 6 (recognized independently by Naoumides [n. 12 below]), but in most respects his edition is a woeful regression; and his closing statement "Apollonio emendando vel supplendo papyrus non prodest" (p. iv) is plainly false. A. R. Dyck reedited the 'Εφύρους entry in his edition of the "fragments" of Comanus ("The Fragments of Comanus of Naucratis," in *Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker*, Band 7 [Berlin-New York, 1988], pp. 261-62), where it appears as frag. *21. (Dyck seems to me overcautious in classifying it as a "fragmentum dubium"; while the reconstruction of the body of the note is problematic, ὁ Κομ[ανος] itself is surely beyond doubt.)

10. For the papyrus I rely on a good photograph provided by the Bodleian Library and lent me by Andrew Dyck. The text of this and of the other papyri is written in *scriptio continua* with few if any diacritics and with little or no punctuation; these are editorially supplied for the convenience of the modern reader, who unfortunately has become habituated to them.

- 25 **ἐχώμ]εθα** ἀπεχώμεθα· “ἔνθ’ αὐ-
τοῖ] μὲν ἐχώμε(θα)” (Π.14.129).
ἐχε]πευκέε ἐχέπικρον· “αὐτὰρ
ἔπ]ειτ’ αὐτοῖσι βέλος ἐχεπευ-
κέε] ἐφείε” (Π.1.51). “πευκεδανόν” (Π.10.8) γάρ
30 τὸ π]ικρόν, ἀπὸ τῆς πεύκης·
πικ]ρὸν δ’ ἦτοι κατὰ δύναμιν
ἀπὸ τ]ῶν ἐπιχριε[θέντ]ων
τοῖς βέλ]εσι φαρ[μάκων¹¹
- 80.24 **ἐχώμεθα** ἀπεχώμεθα.
80.18 **ἐχεπευκέε** ἔχον πικρίαν·
“πευκεθανόν” γάρ τὸ ἔχον πικρ-
ίαν, ἀπὸ τῆς πεύκης.

col. ii

(more than 15 lines lost)

- vac. [ζ’
ζαχ]ρη]ϊῶν τῶν μεγάλως ἐ-
πιζαροῦ]ντων, οἶον ἐμπνε-
[ό]ντων [ἀθρόως· “ζαχρειῶν ἀνέ-
5 μων οἱ] [τε νέφεα σκιδόντα” (Π.5.525).
[. . .] [
μεγάλα [
μενω] “ὥδε γὰρ ἔβρι-
c]αν Λυκ[ί]ων ἀγοί, οἳ τὸ πάρος
10 περ ζα[χρειεῖς τελέθουσι κατὰ κρα-
τερ]ᾶς ὑς[μίνας” (Π.12.346–47 = 359–60).
ζα]φελῶε [ὁ μὲν Ἀπίων μεγα-
λο]κότῳ[c· ἐπιφέρει δὲ τὸ μενε-
αί]νειν[
15].[
- 81.1 **ζαχρειῶν** τῶν μεγάλως ἐπιζαρ-
οῦντων, οἶον ἐμπνεόντων ἀθρόως.
80.33 **ζαφελῶς** ὁ μὲν Ἀπίων μεγαλοκότως,
ἐπιφέρει δὲ τὸ μενεαίνειν, δι’ οὗ σημ-
αίνει τὸ ἐγκοτεῖν. . . .

pap. suppl. Nicholson praeter sequentia col. i 0–2 agnovi, supplevi 3–4 post Naou-
mides supplevi¹² 4]ρ:]θ a.c. 6 Κομ[ανος Steinicke 6–7 Κρανωνλίου]ς· co-
nieci 7–8 ἔθη]κε [τὸ]ν Nicholson 8 ἐν [Θράκη Nicholson 9 αὐτ ἄλλα αὐτ
ἀλλὰ 13 ἡ: οἱ a.c. 14 [καὶ Steinicke 15–16 ὦ]c δὲ (δ’ ὁ Dyck) Κράτη]ς Naou-
mides: an nomen proprium (Ω[ρ-?])? 16–17 εἶ]ναι (Nicholson) vel καλ]εῖ (Naou-
mides) 19 καὶ (Nicholson) vel διὸ λέγ]ει ut vid. 31–32 supplevi 33 τοῖς
Naoumides col. ii 1 ζ’ propter spat. supplevi (vix ζα, cf. i 21/22) 5 an -μων.” οἱ [δὲ?
(spat. post μων) 7 μεγάλα videre videor: μεγαλ]η[Nicholson 15 c]ημα[ι]νει post
Nicholson fort. possis

What is most obvious is the extent to which the Coislinianus is abridged. It cuts out most of the quotations, which the papyrus shows were originally an integral part of the entries, and it severely reduces complex entries (**Ἐφύρους, ἐχεπευκέε, ζαχρειῶν**). Also notable is the order in which the entries occur. In this part of the lexicon the Coislinianus has succumbed to

11. The continuation, I presume, will have been something like ἡ μεταφορικῶς, ἐπεὶ πολλῶν αἴτιος κακῶν, as Coisl. 130.36 in *πευκεδανόν* (cf. esp. scholl. *Il.* 10.8, 1.51, and *Od.* 1.261, where read (οὐ) πάντως [48.28 Dindorf], cf. Porphy. *Quaest. Hom.* ad loc., p. 14.6–12 Schrader).

12. “Naoumides” refers to M. Naoumides, “Notes on Literary Papyri,” *TAPA* 93 (1962): 244–47.

total alphabetization (except that ζαφλεγέες precedes ζαφελῶς), whereas in the papyrus it is satisfying to observe that the last three of the εφ- entries are: *Odyssey* 9; *Odyssey* 19; proper name—i.e., two Heliodoran accessions, with a nom. prop. entry bringing up the rear—while the first three of the εχ- entries are all Iliadic (in no particular order).¹³ As its first editor recognized, Π² presents the lexicon “either in its original state, or at least in a state far more nearly original than that in which it has come down to us.”¹⁴

Π¹, which seems to me earlier than Π²,¹⁵ presents a curiously different picture. I italicize material that is not present in both manuscripts.

i

Π ¹ frag. 1		Coisl.	
. . .			
	πολύ[μητις πολυγνώ- μων, πολύβουλος. πολύτροπος ἐπὶ π[ολ- λὰ τρέπων τὴν διά- νοιαν.	133.11	πολυμήτης πολύβουλος, πολλὰ βουλευσασθαι δυνάμενος. —
5	πολύκμητον μετὰ πολλοῦ καμ(ά)του γ[ε- γονότα ἢ πολὺν [κά- ματον παρέ{ι}χογ[τ]{α, 10 ἦτοι π[ολύεργον.].[133.12	πολύκμητον τὸν σῖθρον ἐπιθετικῶς, τὸν μετὰ πολ- λοῦ καμάτου γεγεννημένον ἢ τὸν πολὺν κάματον παρέχοντα.
. . .			
frag. 2 col. ii			
. . .			
	[πόρτις . . . λέγονται δὲ καὶ] 1 πόρι[ες. c. 9 ἀ- πὸ τοῦ ἡδῆ{ι} πορεύεσθ[αι.	133.29	πόρτις . . . λέγονται δὲ καὶ πόριες.
	πορφύρει πορφυρίζε- ται, τaráσσεται, ὅθεν 5 καὶ καλχαίνειν λέγ[ε- τ]αι τὸ τaráσσειν.	133.32	πορφύρη πορφυρίζεται, τaráσσεται. “ὥς δ’ ὅτε πορφύρη πέλαγος.” ἔστιν οὖν πεποιημένη (ἔστι τῶν πεποιημένων?) ἢ λέξις, ὥς τὸ μορμύρων.

13. The remaining εχ- entries in the Coislinianus are εχη (*Il.* and *Od.*), ἐχόμεν (*Od.* 12), ἐχάνθανεν (*Od.* 17, -ον), and ἔχειαι (*Od.* 18 and 20). No doubt these, and perhaps others too, followed in the papyrus. See Part I for the compositional principles at issue.

14. This has not stopped some scholars asserting, quite groundlessly, that the papyrus’ text is merely a selection of extracts. J. Tolkiehn at *RE* 12 (1925): 2445, “. . . nicht mehr als einen willkürlichen Auszug bietet”; Steinicke, *Lexicon*, p. iv, “Papyri auctor continuum nostri lexicī partem non descripsit, sed singulas glossas Apollonianas delegit.”

15. The hand of Π¹, of informal plain round and upright type, untidily executed, was assigned by its editor to the second century C.E. (p. 321 with n. 10), but I would judge the first century more probable. Of the three 2nd-cent. hands adduced by the editor the most comparable is P.Oxy. XVII 2079, assigned to the first half of the second century, but our papyrus has distinctively earlier characteristics, such as uprights bent to left at the foot (κ, τ, π, γ, φ, υ) and the detached midstroke of ε. It has features in common with Turner, *Greek Manuscripts*, nos. 41 and 57, both assigned to the first half of the first century, and it is clearly earlier than no. 39, the Herodas papyrus (assigned ca. 100 C.E. by Turner). Documents worth comparing are P.Oxy. XLV 3250, of ca. 63 C.E., and XLVII 3356, of 76 C.E. I would put it around the middle of the first century, or somewhat later.

	<p>πόρδαλις ὁ ἄρσην ἀ- π]ὸ τοῦ προάλλεσθαι, [ή δε] θήλη[ι] πάρδαλις ἀ- 10 π]ὸ τοῦ παράλλεσθαι.</p>	133.34	<p>πόρδαλις· τοῦ ποιητοῦ λέγοντος ποτὲ μὲν διὰ τοῦ ο στοιχείου, “πόρδαλις ἡδὲ μέγας σῦς,” ποτὲ δὲ διὰ τοῦ α, “παρδαλέην ὅμοισιν ἔχων.” Ἀπίων δὲ φησι διαφέρειν· πόρδαλιν μὲν γὰρ τὸ (τὸν?) ἄρσενικ- όν, πάρδαλιν δὲ τὴν θήλειαν, καὶ τὸν μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ προάλλεσθαι, τὴν δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ παράλλεσθαι. ῥητέον δὲ ὅτι κοινῶς φαίνεται λέγων “θάων πορδαλίων (τε) λύκων τ’ ἦα πέλονται,” ὥστε ἐπὶ τοῦ ζῴου διὰ τοῦ ο, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς δορᾶς διὰ τοῦ α. πορφύρεος θάνατος μέλας καὶ βαθύς.</p>
	<p>πορ]φύρεος θάνατος [μέ- λας] καὶ (βα)θύς.</p>	134.7	
	<p>πόρ]εν ἔδωκε.</p>		— ¹⁶
	<p>πόρ]τακι μόσχωι. π[όρταξ</p>		—
15	<p>ὁ ἄρ]σην, δάμαλις δ[ί]’ ἡ θή- λε]ια.</p>		
	<p>πόρ]φυρε ἐδίσταζεν, [ἐ- μερί]μνα.</p>		—
	<p>πορσαί]γειν κατα[σκευ-</p>		—
20	<p>άξ]ειν.</p>		—
	<p>πόσις] ἀνήρ γυν[αικ-</p>		—

Frag. 1.8 γονατα pap. frag. 2 col. i negligible remains ii 8 προελέσθαι a.c.

13 πορ]εσ pap. 15 δαμαλιν pap.

Supplements and corrections mostly as proposed in ed. pr.

Homeric references: πολύμητις passim; πολύτροπος *Od.* 10.330; πολύκμητον *Od.* 14.324; πόρ-
ρις *Il.* 5.162 (-ιος), πόριες *Od.* 10.410; πορφύρη *Il.* 14.16; πόρδαλις *Il.* 21.573 (v.1. πάρ-);
πορφύρεος θάνατος *Il.* 5.83 = 16.334 = 20.477; πόρε et πόρεν passim (πόρες nusquam); πόρ-
τακι *Il.* 17.4; πόρφυρε *Il.* 21.551, *Od.* 4.427 = 572 = 10.309; πορσαίνειν *Od.* 3.403, 7.347 (πόρ-
σαινε), *Il.* 3.411 (πορσανέουσα); πόσις passim.

Here there is something of a bombshell, which we may defuse or allow to explode as we choose: the respective entries on πόρδαλις. The Coislinianus' entry starts by noting the vacillation in spelling as between πόρδαλις and παρδαλέην (*Il.* 3.17), then records the semantic and etymological distinction that Apion drew between πόρδαλις and πάρδαλις,¹⁷ then adduces *Il.* 13.103 as justifying a different semantic distinction. What we find in the papyrus is precisely what is implied as having stood in Apion's lexicon. The inference that would normally be drawn from such a state of affairs is that it is Apion's lexicon that we have in the papyrus. It seems to me that this would be a perfectly tenable view to take.¹⁸ If it is true, we then have to recognize that Apollonius took over

16. Coisl. has a πόρεν entry seriously discrepant with the papyrus' entry at 133.25 (πόρεν περιποιήσεν, οὐχὶ δὲ πάρεσεν, ad *Il.* 6.168), but since it is clear that pap. and Coisl. follow the same sequence of entries, that must be left out of account. Coisl. may have lost the papyrus' πόρεν entry, along with the following ones, between πορφύρεος and πόσιος (134.8).

17. It would tidy up the grammar if δὲ were excised after Ἀπίων (Ludwich).

18. That the papyrus offers etymology for πόρρις/πόρις could be taken as a supporting piece of evidence, though not a strong one, since it could easily have been dropped from the Coislinianus. (That the etymology is standard is no argument against its being Apionic.) It might also be noted that the information purveyed in its πόρτακι entry is at variance with what we find in the Coislinianus (in πόρρις: λέγει δὲ

Apion's lexicon more or less entire. That is the straightforward interpretation of the evidence, and I see no compelling reason to think that it was not so. To be sure, it makes Apion a sort of Apollonius before Apollonius (cf. Erbse's scornful comment on Forsman's postulate of an Aristarchan glossary, "Hier wurde also, nach ehemals beliebter Methode, ein Apollonios vor Apollonios konstruiert," *Beiträge*, p. 407), but we should not beg the question of Apollonius' relation to his predecessors.

If the inference is to be resisted, it must be by positing that in the papyrus the Apollonian entry has been sheared in such a way as to remove both the Apionic provenance of the information and the surrounding material. This too seems to me a tenable view to take, but the only grounds for actually preferring it would be *a priori* ones.¹⁹ We simply do not know enough about Apion's lexicon, or about Apollonius' relationship to it, to say that this is not it.²⁰

With the other papyrus fragments, there is no such dilemma. They make it clear that Apollonius' lexicon swept the field, while at the same time illustrating the various kinds of modification to which it lent itself. Adaptability and success went hand in hand.

The papyrus copies are far from uniform, in appearance or in content. In the 2nd cent. codex Π^4 , as in Π^2 , the lexicon is accorded the same respect as a classical literary text, at least in outward appearance.²¹ Π^3 and Π^5 , by contrast, are cheap productions, the text carelessly copied and sloppily written on the back of discarded rolls (a documentary register and an Aristophanes respectively).²² Editorial impulses—it is hard to know whether the editor was the scribe himself—are everywhere in evidence. Naturally the alphabetization tends to get tidied up: the 5th–6th cent. Π^7 , unlike the Coislinianus (which conceivably was copied from an exemplar earlier than Π^7), has succumbed completely.²³ Since the fragmentary ancient mss represent

αὐτὴν [sic] καὶ "πόρτακα"); but to find contradictory data within Apollonius is nothing out of the ordinary. Nor can weight be put on the entries in *πόσις* (pap.) vs. *πόσιος* (Coisl. 134.8: ποτὲ μὲν τῆς πόσεως, ποτὲ δὲ τοῦ κατὰ νόμον ἀνδρός). Renner assumes that the papyrus entry must have connected *πόσις* "husband" with *πόσις* "drink." That is possible (though his suggested ἀνὴρ γυν[αῖκα γὰρ ποτίζει is intolerably elliptical), but it seems likelier that this entry dealt only with *πόσις* "husband"; a polysemantic *πόσιος* entry may have followed. Other discrepancies between the two texts can likewise be explained either in terms of the difference between Apion and Apollonius or in terms of the defectiveness of the Coislinianus.

19. It is curious, however, that Hesychius' entry is essentially the same as the papyrus' (*πόρδαλις* ὁ ἄρσην, ἢ δὲ θήλεια *πάρδαλις*: ὁ μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ προαλέσθαι [προελέσθαι cod., read -ἀλλεσθαι?], ἢ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ παραλέσθαι [-ἀλλεσθαι?]). For other attestations of the differentiation and the etymology see Renner, p. 329.

20. On Apollonius and Apion see Part I, pp. 26–28.

21. Π^4 has a page number μβ, 42, at a point corresponding approximately to p. 88 of Bekker's edition. If the book contained nothing but the lexicon (as I would suppose), and the proportions remained more or less constant (but did they?—see below), it will have had ca. 82 pages (41 leaves) altogether.

22. The script of Π^3 is a clumsily executed bookhand, that of Π^5 a practiced but very informal script with many ligatures. The text on the front of Π^5 (*Thesm.*) is now published as P.Oxy. LVI 3839, that on the front of Π^3 (described as "a scrawled register"), so far as I am aware, remains unpublished. Π^1 , for its part, while apparently written on previously unused papyrus, is very carelessly copied.

23. On the alphabetization in Coisl. see Part I, esp. p. 10. Earlier lexicon manuscripts with apparently total alphabetization are P.Oxy. XV 1802 (II–III, ξένα ὀνόματα), P.Oxy. LXVII 3329 (III–IV, Diogenianus?), and PSI VIII 892 (IV, Diogenianus). [A newly published fragment of an early general lexicon is P.Berol. 9965 (G. Poethke, "Fragment einer alphabetisch geordneten Wörterliste," *Archiv für Papyrussfor-*

different parts of the lexicon's text, they cannot readily be compared directly with one another, and the extent of textual instability can best be gauged by comparison with the Coislinianus. Π⁷, to take the most extensive as well as the least old, is more severely cut down than the Coislinianus (though less so than its editors represent it as being), and has relatively little material that that manuscript does not. But despite the Coislinianus' overall superiority, there is still no lack of places at which the papyrus exposes its defectiveness. Here is a list, to give an idea of the sorts of things involved; the Coislinianus' defects vis-à-vis the papyrus range from simple copying errors to substantive omissions of citation and interpretation.

Π⁷ line 8 ἄδεια metaphrased

- 10 Heliodorus given as authority for ἀδευκει = ἀνεικάστω
- 15–16 ἄδην connected with ἀδηκότες²⁴
- 24 Lexis correctly given as αεικης (ἀείκαστος Coisl., i.e. αεικ(ή)ς ἀ(ν)ει(κ)αστος, I presume), and Heliodorus given as authority for interpretation as εὐκαταφρόνητος
- 29 Metaphrasis of ἀεκαζομένους rightly given as ἄκοντας (ἐκόντας Coisl.)
- 31–32 Heliodorus given as authority for αείρας = προσενέγκας in *Od.* 1
- 40 ἀμύμονα entry retained in oblique case (nom. in Coisl.)
- 43 ἀγαπῶν rightly in metaphrasis of ἀμφαγαπαζόμενος (ἀγαπώμενος Coisl.)
- 45 ἀγρυξία given as one of the glosses for ἀμφασίη²⁵
- 46 ἀμφαφῶν entry retained in nom. (acc. in Coisl., attracted by citation of ἀφώοντα)
- 50 Lexis rightly given as ἀμφηρεφέα (ἀμφιρεφέα Coisl.)
- 63–66 Explication of ἀμφιβρότη shield (63–66)²⁶
- 70 Alternative interpretation of ἀμφιγύοισι correctly given as τοῖς διὰ χειρὸς ἐχομένοις (τ. δ. χ. δυναμένοις Coisl.)
- 73 εἴσπλουν (εἴσπλους Coisl.) in gloss on ἀμφίδυμοι
- 75 ἐξ ἐκατέρων τῶν τοίχων (ἐξ ἐκατέρου μέρους Coisl.) in gloss on ἀμφιελίσσας
- 86 ἀμφιλύκη glossed ἡ ὄρφη ἄρτι φωτιζομένη²⁷

schung 39 [1993]: 17–20), III–II B.C.; entries from βη- (or rather βε-, if 8 ἴσφει relates to βεμβικίζει, as I would imagine it does) to βο-. Notable features are (1) alphabetization to two places; (2) multiple occurrence of the same lexis differently glossed (βλυσυρος 19, 21, 23, βλαξ 18, 29), indicating compilation from multiple (lexicographical?) sources; (3) the occurrence of entries otherwise attested only in later lexicographical tradition (22 βλυδιον, 31 βουπρ(ε)ιωνες); and (4) express identification of Attic vocabulary (e.g., βλαξ μωρός: Ἀθηναῖοι). 30 βληχος I suspect is corrupt for βληχος.]

24. I take it the word was spelled with a single δ in the papyrus (αδδην ed. pr.), in accordance with its spelling of ἀδικοτες. In Coisl. (9.9–11) this tailpiece has been dropped, and there is a separate entry later for αδδην (9.25–26). Both quote *Il.* 5.203 (. . . ἐδμεναι ἀδδην), the only occurrence with long first syllable.

25. So too in Hesychius. Coisl. has ἀφασία, ἀφωνία. The original was evidently ἀφασία (ὅ ἐστιν) ἀφωνία, ἀγρυξία. ἀγρυξία makes the point that the word means not only inability to speak but inability to utter any sound at all, οὐδὲ γρῶ.

26. τοιαύταις γὰρ ἀσπί[σι]ν ἐχρῶν[το] . . . ἐπὶ ἑκτο[ρο]ς “ἀμφὶ δέ μιν σφ)υρά τ[ύ]πτε [καὶ ἀ]λχένα [δέρμα] κελαινόν” (*Il.* 6.117). (λέγει γὰρ after ἐχρῶντο?) For such explication cf. that offered on ἀμφίβασας (defined as ἡ περὶ τοῦ νεκροῦ μάχη): περιβάντες γὰρ κτλ, present in both pap. and Coisl. but in somewhat different forms (pap. correctly has imperfect, ὑπερεμάχοντο, rather than Coisl.'s present, ἀγωνίζονται).

27. Coisl., by contrast, has σκοτία, ἡ μήπω δὲ φῶς, obviously corrupt; Bekker (before the accession of the papyrus) suggested ἡ (μηκέτι νύξ). Read σκοτία, ἡ (ἡ?, ἡ ἡ?) ὄρφη ἄρτι φωτιζομένη μήπω δὲ φῶς? Cf. (incorporating the λυκ-/λυγ- equation found in Coisl.'s continuation and routinely elsewhere) the D-schol. in *A* on *Il.* 7.433, . . . παρὰ τὴν λύγην ὅ ἐστι σκοτίαν, οἰονεὶ λυγῶφως τι ὄν, τὸ μὴ καθαρὸν φῶς ἀλλ' ἔτι σκοτῶδες.

- 90 *ἐρευνᾶς* offered as second gloss for *ἀμφιπολεύεις*²⁸
- 102–3 Lexis *ἀμφοῦδις* given in uncorrupt form (*ἀμφοῦδας* Coisl.), and Heliodorus' interpretation retained and attributed²⁹
- 106 Entry for *ἀνάβαλλε* (*Od.* 19.584) retained
- 107–9 Full formula for onomatopoeic characterization of *ἀναβέβρυκε* preserved,³⁰ and Coisl.'s corruption of gloss avoided (*ἀναβέβληκει* [deb. -εν]: *ἀναβέβηκεν* Coisl.)
- 111 *ἀναβροχεν* (*Od.* 11.586) and gloss given in uncorrupt form (*ἀναβροχθέντος* Coisl.)³¹
- 115 *ἀνένδοτος* retained as gloss for *ἀναιδής*³²
- 117 *ἀναπηδήσας* as gloss for *ἀναιξας*³³
- 120 Heliodorus' interpretation of *ἀνακτορήσι* retained and attributed³⁴
- 123 Etymological gloss on *ἄναλτον* (οὐδὲν ἄλις) retained
- 124–27 *ἀναμαιμάει* entry preserved in more complete form (glosses and onomatopoeic formula)
- 133 *ἀναπρήσας* and gloss given in uncorrupt form (*ἀναπρήσαι* Coisl.)

In all the mss later than Π^2 , what is most strongly in evidence, surface corruption apart, is simplification, effected mostly by straightforward omission. The cuts are of two basic kinds. (1) Entries are liable to be passed over in their entirety, and (2) individual entries are liable to be pruned.

(1) Of the 34 reconstructible entries in Π^3 , only 20 are represented in Coisl. (the two mss follow the same sequence of entries), whereas all 34 are represented in Hesychius. A similar picture is presented by Π^4 , Π^5 , and Π^6 .³⁵ But Π^7 , with over 80 entries represented, has only two entries not also

28. *ἐρευνᾶς* is a most unexpected gloss for *ἀμφιπολεύεις*, however (the word occurs only at *Od.* 24.257, τεῦ δ' ὄρχατον ἀμφ.), and I think it must be corrupt: for *ἐνεργεῖς*? (No D-schol. ad loc., but 244 *ἀμφιπολεύειν*, where again ὄρχατον is object, is glossed *ἐνεργεῖν*; likewise *Od.* 20.78; *-επειν* seems to have been routinely rendered *-εργεῖν*.)

29. ἀμφοτέραις ταῖς χερσίν (εἰς τὸ οὐδας ῥίπτων) (suppl. from Hsch.). Cf. Part I, p. 25, n. 65.

30. τῶν πεποιημένων κατὰ μίμησιν ἤχου ἢ φωνῆς. So too with *ἀναμορμύρεσκεν* (129–31), and, I suspect, *ἀναμαιμάει* (124–27). Cf. Part I, pp. 34–35.

31. See Part I, p. 2, n. 4.

32. For this entry see Part I, p. 20, n. 50.

33. While the papyrus has merely *ἀναιξας* ἀναπηδήσας, Coisl. gives *ἀναιξαντες* ἀνορμήσαντες, and appends: τίθησι δὲ τὴν λέξιν καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ μετὰ προθυμίας ἀνισταμένου: “ὁρθὸς ἀναιξας” (*Od.* 21.119). (This latter Heliodorus?) I take it the original entry included ἀναπηδήσας too, perhaps on a different instance of *ἀναιξας*.

34. Likewise in Hesychius (α 4780), where Latte adopts M. Schmidt's alteration of ἀπολείας to ἀπό λείας. But the papyrus too has -ειας (with damage preceding): the papyrus' editors regard this as common error, labelling ἀπολείας an “Uniform” (p. 51); but I would regard it as sound. See further Part I, p. 19, n. 47 (communicated to A. R. Dyck too late for incorporation in his “The Fragments of Heliodorus Homericus,” *HSCP* 97 [1993]: 22–23; similarly with Part I, p. 22, n. 58, on the text of frag. 37, p. 14, n. 37, on the text of frag. 31, and p. 25, n. 67, on the text of frag. 18).

35. Π^6 is really too short to generalize from, but it does have two entries missing from Coisl. but shared with Hesychius: *ἐνταυθοῖ* and *Ἐνυώ*, the latter labelled a πλαστόν πρόσωπον. Hsch. omits the *Ἐνυώ* etymology that we find in the papyrus, ἐν-αῦειν = φωνεῖν (cf. i.a. scholl. on *Il.* 5.333, παρὰ τὸ ἐναυεῖν, ὃ σημαίνει τὸ ἐμφωνεῖν, where Erbse mistakenly obelizes ἐμφωνεῖν). The papyrus and Hesychius also have a separate *ἐντα δαιτός* entry, in addition to an entry (or entries) on *ἐντα*; cf. Coisl. 69.19–20. The papyrus' entry on *ἐντυπάς* is present both in Coisl. and in Hsch. in slightly different but clearly related forms. (I cannot make sense of οὐχ ἀπλῶς οὐδὲ περικεκαλυμμένος in the Coisl. entry, despite Erbse's acceptance of it: has e.g., περιβεβλημένος [cf. schol. Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 1.264] dropped out after ἀπλῶς? Then surely ἀλλ' ὥς(τε) τετυπῶσθαι κτλ.) It is possible that the papyrus incorporates material from elsewhere (cf. A. Henrichs, “Scholia Minora zu Homer: I,” *ZPE* 7 [1971]: 111, n. 47), but I would assume that the entries shared with Hesychius represent Apollonius. The editor's readings and supplements are not wholly reliable.

in Coisl.³⁶ We may infer that α- is disproportionately well represented in Coisl., which evidently did not begin to drop entries in substantial numbers until at least halfway through that letter; thereafter it seems to get progressively thinner. Hesychius had access to a much fuller copy.

(2) Within individual entries, the most frequent casualties were inevitably the lexis-exemplifying Homeric quotations, an integral component of the work in its original form but unnecessary for ordinary users. Though scrupulously retained in Π², the lexicon normally circulated without them. They are absent from all the later papyri (as well as from Π¹),³⁷ and if it were not for Coisl., in which they are quite generously represented, one might have guessed that they disappeared from circulation altogether.³⁸ Even Coisl. has lost most of them.³⁹

Any entry of greater complexity than a simple gloss tended to suffer reduction. The lexicon sometimes adduced passages from other authors in illustration (or in contradistinction) of Homeric usage. Clearly such passages were never more than an occasional feature, and only one omission on the part of Coisl. is exposed by our papyri: Π⁴ retains a quote from Antimachus in illustration of a meaning of θός.⁴⁰

Also dropped by Coisl., perhaps in considerable quantity, were internal citations of other Homeric passages. We have seen instances in Π² (two quotes in the Ἑφύρους entry, in addition to the initial one), and the other papyri reveal more. Coisl.'s ἀμφιβρότη entry, for instance, has only the definition (ἡ περὶ ὅλον τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀσπίς, 28.7), where Π⁷ adds exegesis and supporting quotation (n. 26 above); both have lost the lexis-exemplifying quotation itself.⁴¹

Other casualties are citations of Homeric authorities. Even when competing interpretations are retained, the names of their sponsors tend to be dropped. This is most strikingly revealed by Π⁷: the papyrus preserves five citations of Heliodorus (in ἀδευκέι, ἀεικής, αἰράς, ἀμφουδῖς, and ἀνακτορήσι), not one of which is retained in Coisl.⁴² Some of the lexicon's

36. ἀνάβαλλε, ἀνακλ(ε)ῖναι, both in Hesychius. Conversely, Coisl. has some 20 entries not present in the papyrus (36 according to Henrichs and Müller, pp. 33–34, but I count no more than 21 or 22); but in some cases the papyrus' omission will be attributable to its alphabetization (e.g., ἀμφαδον and ἀμφαδιην appear in separate places in Coisl., each glossed φανερώς: the alphabetized Π⁷ understandably dispenses with ἀμφαδον).

37. Π⁷ has three Homeric quotations (*Il.* 5.203 at gl. 5bis ἄδην, *Il.* 17.4 at gl. 32 ἀμφίβασις, *Il.* 6.117 at gl. 34 ἀμφιβρότη), but two of them do not exemplify the lexis itself but contribute to its elucidation.

38. In this respect, but not in others, it is true to say that Coisl. "dem ursprünglichen Text des Lexikons viel näher steht als die einzelnen Papyri" (Henrichs and Müller, p. 29).

39. Discussing the sources of the "Zonaras" lexicon, K. Alpers mentions "eine Reihe von Homerglossen, gewöhnlich mit Homerzitat, die weder in den eben genannten Quellen, noch in irgendeiner der bekannten Homerscholienklassen Entsprechungen haben" (*RE* 10A [1972]: 749). Could the source (direct or indirect) be a fuller version of the Apollonius lexicon, I wonder?

40. V8, Antimachus' θεόν δόμον cited in support of the interpretation "divine" (θεῖαν) in the Homeric phrase θεὸν νύκτα. A competing interpretation both in the Homeric and in the Antimachean phrase was "black"; I take it that the papyrus' ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἑκτορος λέγει (V9–10), with reference to *Il.* 12.462–63 ὁ δ' ἄρ' ἔσθορε φαίδιμος Ἑκτωρ | νυκτὶ θεῖ ἁτάλαντος ὑπώπια: λάμπε δὲ χαλκῷ, is in refutation of this. The interpretation as θεῖαν appears to be etymologically based, (θεῖναι, as with interpretation as ἐδραῖαν and ἀκίνητον (which may also have been present in the lexicon).

41. Cf. Π³ i 2 ὅταν δὲ λέγῃ] ἡ ὁ π(οιητής) [... (from an entry on δημος, perhaps?), Π⁴ V9–10 (adduction of *Il.* 12.462–63, see prec. n.).

42. Cf. the citation of Comanus in Π² (i 6, in Ἑφύρους). The papyrus evidence is complemented by that of the indirect tradition, cf. Part I, pp. 23–24, and the next note.

citations of scholarly authorities can be recovered from Hesychius, but by no means all of them.⁴³ Users of the lexicon were less interested in doxography than in being told what the words meant.

*University of California,
Los Angeles*

43. Of Π⁷'s five Heliodorus citations, three are in Hesychius. To the five Comanus citations preserved in Coisl. (ἄταλλε, ὀλοοίτροχος, στεφάνη, στέφανος, συμφορτή), Hesychius adds two more (αἰνίζομαι, ἀλίπλοα), but is without the citation in Ἐφύρους provided by Π².

