New Fragments of Ancient Greek Poetry

Mark Naoumides

The manuscripts of the lexicon attributed to St Cyril (Lexicon Cyrilli) have thus far yielded a small number of otherwise unknown fragments of ancient writers. These fragments come chiefly from two closely related Mss, the Codex Hauniensis 1968 (XII cent.) and the Codex Messanensis S. Salv. 167 (XIII cent.). A third Ms, related to these but until now completely overlooked, has preserved additional new fragments, which deserves the attention of philologists.

This Ms (which I call Z), Codex Matritensis Bibl. Univ. Z-22 no. 116 (olim E.1 no. 61), is a parchment codex assigned to the X/XI century and written by at least three distinct hands. The second of these exhibits the characteristic style which R. Devreesse calls “en as de pique” and suggests a South Italian origin for our Ms. The text of the Lexicon Cyrilli bears numerous corrections, additions and other notes by various hands (some even writing in Latin) which cannot be clearly distinguished from one another on microfilm.


3 For a summary description see Ch. Graux / A. Martin, “Rapport sur une mission en Espagne et en Portugal. Notices sommaires des manuscrits grecs d’Espagne et de Portugal,” Nouvelles archives des missions scientifiques et littéraires 2 (1892) 130–4. It is beyond the scope of this paper to give a detailed description of this Ms.

4 Les manuscrits grecs de l’Italie méridionale (Studi e Testi 183, Vatican 1955) 34–6.

5 Special acknowledgement is due to the Biblioteca de la Universidad de Madrid for making the Ms available to me in microfilm, as well as to the University of Illinois Research Board for generous financial assistance in connection with my study of the Mss of the Lexicon Cyrilli, the first fruits of which are presented in this paper.
The two related Ms, the Hauniensis and Messanensis, which I call $h$ and $m$ respectively after Drachmann, are not copies of $Z$. Of these, $h$ displays a text close but inferior to that of $Z$, especially in the second half of the Lexicon Cyrilli where its text is, to some extent, epitomized; indeed the scribe of $h$ considerably shortened the longer entries of $Z$, while omitting some others entirely. This explains why the new quotations (all of which occur towards the end of the lexicon) are absent from $h$. However, it seems safe to assume that $h$ was not copied directly from $Z$, since in the entry δισυν, $h$ is clearly copying from a Ms in which the explanation was omitted (see below, gloss 8). Furthermore, the readings καλεῖται (vs. λαλεῖται in $Z$), s.v. λοπᾶς, and τούτους (vs. τούς in $Z$), s.v. πρόγονοι, further indicate that $h$ is not derived from $Z$. The Messina Ms agrees closely with $h$ but only in the latter half of the lexicon (i.e. from the entry μηλονύμος on), whereas in the first half it follows a different recension, the one indicated by K. Latte with the siglum $n$. Despite the close agreement between $h$ and $m$ (which is plainly demonstrated in the glosses published here) the two Mss are not directly related but seem to depend on a common source. It is interesting to note that both these Mss also seem to come from southern Italy.

The new fragments are listed below in the order in which they appear in $Z$. Since the folios of the Ms are unnumbered and the signatures of quadernia have been cut out, more precise reference cannot be made. Scribal errors and corrections are given in parenthesis, accompanied by the sigla $Z$ (for the first hand) and $ZC$ (for all subsequent corrections). The readings of $h$, $m$, and parallels found in other lexica, are given subsequently, the latter only insofar as they are judged to bear directly on the glosses edited here. To the best

---

7 Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon recensuit et emendavit Kurt Latte, I (Copenhagen 1953) xlvii–xlviii.
8 Cf. K. Latte, op.cit. (supra n.7) p. il (xlxi) n.1. The independence of $m$ from $h$ is well illustrated in at least one case in the glosses published here (cf. infra, gloss 4).
9 Unless otherwise indicated, the following editions were used both for quotations from and references to the pertinent texts: Apollon.Soph., Lexicon Graecum Iliadis et Odysseae, ed. H. Toll (Leiden 1788); Etym.Gud., ed. Fr. G. Sturz (Leipzig 1818); Etym.Mag., ed. Th. Gaisford (Oxford 1848); Hesych.Lex., ed. K. Latte (Copenhagen 1953–66) for the sections $A$ to $O$, ed. M. Schmidt (Jena 1858) for the sections $II$ to $Ω$; Phot. Lex., ed. S. A. Naber (Leiden 1864–5); Pollux, ed. E. Bethe (Leipzig 1900–37); Suda Lex., ed. A. Adler (Leipzig 1928–35) Συνεργατικός, ed. L. Bachmann (infra n.10); Zonaras (or rather Ps.-Zonaras), ed. Tittmann (Leipzig 1808).
of my knowledge these glosses do not occur in any other Ms of the *Lexicon Cyrilli* and can safely be considered as interpolations from a more ancient source.

1 \( \phi \alpha \iota \delta \rho \circ \varsigma \cdot \gamma\varepsilon\gamma\theta\varsigma \ (\gamma\varepsilon\gamma\theta\varsigma \ Z) \) \( \varepsilon \iota \omega \nu \ (\iota \omega \nu \ Z, \iota \omega \nu \ Z^c) \) \'\( \alpha \gamma\gamma\epsilon\iota \omega \iota \varsigma \ (\alpha \gamma\gamma\epsilon\iota \omega \iota \varsigma \ Z, \alpha \gamma\gamma\epsilon\iota \omega \iota \varsigma \ Z^c) \) \( \phi \alpha \varepsilon\rho\varsigma \).

 cf. \( h, m: \phi \alpha \iota \delta \rho \circ \varsigma \ (\varphi\alpha\iota\delta\rho\varsigma \ h) \cdot \gamma\varepsilon\gamma\theta\varsigma \).

 Hesych. \( \Phi 40: \phi \alpha \iota \delta \rho \circ \gamma \cdot \kappa\alpha\theta\rho\varsigma, \gamma\varepsilon\gamma\theta\varsigma, \phi\alpha\varepsilon\rho\varsigma. \)

 It is clear that Hesychius has condensed the entry by omitting the reference to Ion's work and has at the same time combined it with the gloss \( \varphi\alpha\iota\delta\rho\varsigma \cdot \kappa\alpha\theta\rho\varsigma, \) which occurs as an independent gloss in the *Συναγωγή λέξεων χρησίμων*, Photius and the *Suda*. There is no other close parallel to our entry in the extant lexicographic works, with the possible exception of the *Etymologicum Gudianum*, which connects etymologically the word \( \varphi\alpha\iota\delta\rho\varsigma \) with \( \varphi\alpha\iota\nu \) and \( \phi\alpha\varepsilon\rho\varsigma \) (p.547.47).

 The reference to Ion is made, I believe, for \( \varphi\alpha\iota\delta\rho\varsigma \) in the meaning \( \phi\alpha\varepsilon\rho\varsigma, \) i.e. the reference here precedes the explanation. This inference is supported not only by the punctuation of the Ms, but also by the fact that of the two meanings attributed to the lemma, the first is the common one and as such needs no confirmatory reference, whereas the second is rare—indeed with the exception of the present fragment, it is completely unattested.\(^{11}\) The reference to the Chian poet comes as no surprise to those familiar with Ion's diction and style.\(^{12}\)

 Very little is known about the \'\( \alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\iota \omega \iota \varsigma \). It is generally assumed that it dealt with the expedition of the Seven against Thebes.\(^{13}\) It would be interesting to know, but vain to speculate, to what subject Ion applied the adjective \( \varphi\alpha\iota\delta\rho\varsigma \) with this meaning.

2 \( \phi \acute{\alpha} \lambda \alpha \nu \theta \circ \nu \cdot \pi\omicron\iota\omicron\nu, \Sigma\omicron\omicron\omicron\kappa\omicron\lambda\iota\varsigma \ 'A\acute{x}a\i\acute{e}\omega \upsilon \sigmaυ\omicron\lambda\lambda\omicron\gamma\nu. \varepsilon\iota \delta \varepsilon \ (m\alim \ \circ i \ \delta \varepsilon) \ \phi\alpha\lambda\alpha\kappa\rho\omicron, \phi\alpha\la\acute{\alpha}\thnu\nu \ \nu\acute{e}\nu\tau\omicron\omicron\omicron \ \nu\acute{e}\nu\tau\omicron\omicron\omicron \ \kappa\acute{a}\rho\acute{a} (\kappa\acute{a}\rho\acute{a} \ Z). \)

 cf. Hesych. \( \Phi 91: \phi \acute{\alpha} \lambda \alpha \nu \theta \circ \nu \cdot \pi\omicron\iota\omicron\nu. \ \kappa\lambda \ \eta \ \nu\acute{e}\nu\tau\omicron\omicron\omicron \ \kappa\acute{a}\rho\acute{a}. \ \circ i \ \delta \varepsilon \ \phi\alpha\lambda\alpha\kappa\rho\omicron. \)

\(^{10}\) Cf. L. Bachmann, *Anecdota Graeca I* (Leipzig 1828) 1–422; also known as *Lexicon Bachmannianum*. For brevity’s sake it is here referred to simply as *Συναγωγή*.

\(^{11}\) Cf. *LSJ* s.v. The genuineness of the meaning \( \phi\alpha\varepsilon\rho\varsigma \) is supported by the etymology of \( \varphi\alpha\iota\delta\rho\varsigma \); cf. E. Boisacq, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (Heidelberg 1950), who connects it with the words \( \varphi\alpha\iota\mu\omicron\sigma \) and \( \varphi\alpha\iota\varsigma \) and translates it 'brillant, serein, clair.'


\(^{13}\) Cf. A. von Blumenthal, *Ion von Chios* (Stuttgart/Berlin 1939) 32.
The word φάλανθος is quite rare. Except for our new fragment it is not attested before the third century B.C., but it is listed as a dialectal gloss from Corcyra in the brief list referred to as Γλώσσου κατὰ πόλεως.\(^{14}\) So far as can be judged from the extant passages where the word occurs and from its meaning in the Corcyraean dialect, it was commonly used in the sense 'bald'. In no case does it appear with the meaning 'of whitish, grey hair'. Nevertheless, this sense may well have been the original if we take the two components of the word as standing for 'white' (φαλός) and 'hair' (ανθος).\(^ {15}\) The other meaning was probably due to influence of the cognate φαλακρός.

Hesychius' entry, although clearly related to that of our Ms, differs from it in a few significant points. First, Hesychius has omitted the reference to Sophocles; he has also condensed the quotation and converted it to the nominative case, thus making Nestor's head the equivalent of φάλανθον;\(^ {16}\) the quotation thus condensed appears after the word πολιόω and before the second or alternative meaning φαλακρόν; finally, instead of the reading εἰ δὲ of our Ms, Hesychius reads οἷ δὲ. Notwithstanding obvious blunders, Hesychius' authority should not be rejected in all these points without closer scrutiny. To the contrary, I believe that both in the reading οἷ δὲ and in the position of the quotation, Hesychius offers a much more attractive reading than our Ms. The phrase εἰ δὲ . . . κάρα, which in the Matti­tensis takes the place of a quotation from the Assembly of the Achaeans, has a characteristic Sophoclean flavor. Indeed the use of a periphrasis with the word κάρα and the genitive of a proper name (with or without an additional adjective such as φίλτατον, κράτιστον, κλεινόν, αὐτάδελφον) for a person physically or mentally present or addressed is a well­attested mannerism in Sophocles intended to convey affection or respect on the part of the speaker.\(^ {17}\) The phrase as it stands in our

---


\(^{15}\) For the meaning ἀνθος = 'hair,' cf. Συναγωγή (s.v. φάλανθος) 402.29; Phot. II.255; the Suda Φ 41 (cf. also Α 2518); Etym.Mag. p.786.57; and Ps.-Zon. c.1794. This meaning is not listed in LSJ.

\(^{16}\) For the declension of κάρα as a feminine noun of the first declension in late antiquity and Byzantium, cf. Stephanus, TLG* IV (Paris 1865) col. 956 and LSJ s.v.

\(^{17}\) Cf. Ant. 1, OT 40, 950, 1207 (addressing a person physically present); Ant. 899, 915, EL 1164 (addressing a dead brother); OC 321 (introducing Ismene); OT 1235, OC 1657 (a messenger's reference to a character off stage). In all these cases the disposition of the speaker towards the person addressed or referred to is favorable. Not so in Euripides
Ms, however, seems to be nonsensical both on account of the juxtaposition of the two etymologically cognate adjectives and the absence of a verb. Even if we bracket the word φαλακρόν as a gloss that crept into the text and emend further εἰ δὲ to εἰ δὲ, we still will have to explain Hesychius’ reading. Besides, we are faced with metrical difficulties; for, while such phrases are frequent in the dialogue parts, the resulting phrase could not be accommodated in an iambic line despite its obvious iambic clausula.

Another possibility would be to insert a comma after the word φαλακρόν and translate: “But if (the word means) bald (then cf. the phrase) φάλανθον Νέστορος κάρα. The result is clearly far from satisfactory. (1) The quotation would be left without a reference as to its source. Such practice is limited (so far as our Ms is concerned) only to glosses originating from the Homeric lexicon of Apollonius the Sophist and quoting Homer. This phrase is non-Homeric. (2) To the best of my knowledge there is nowhere a reference to Nestor’s bald head. On the other hand the meaning ‘whitish’, which is attributed to Sophocles in the first half of the entry, would be much more suitable for old Nestor.

Against these two alternatives one could follow Hesychius’ lead and transpose the words φάλανθον Νέστορος κάρα immediately after the reference to Sophocles’ play. Disturbances inside an entry are indeed not unparalleled in the interpolated glosses of our Ms (cf. s.vv. λοπάς and φοώνε). With the quotation restored to its proper place the change of εἰ δὲ to οἱ δὲ is inevitable. The latter phrase was commonly used in the lexica and the commentaries to introduce an alternative but less plausible (in the eyes of the author) view or interpretation. Since φάλανθος with the meaning ‘gray’ is hapax legomenon, the virtual rejection of the meaning ‘bald’ by the lexicographer can be understood only with regard to the passage from which the quotation was taken. The possibility that this gloss originated from a commentary on Sophocles should be seriously considered.

If this theory is correct, viz., that the quotation was taken from Sophocles’ Assembly of the Achaeans, we may further speculate (on the analogy of the use of the periphrasis with κάρα in Sophocles) that Nestor was one of the characters of the lost play and that he was at a certain point addressed respectfully by another character with the

(cf. Hipp. 651, Tr. 1024) who also has the tendency to omit the proper name. The periphrasis occurs once in Aeschylus (Ag. 905; φοῖν κάρα).
words quoted in our entry, which can tentatively be completed so as to give a complete iambic line as follows: \( \text{άλλο } \omega \text{ φάλανθον Νέστορος } \phiλόν \text{ κάρα.} \) Perhaps Nestor was called by the speaker to mediate, as in Homer, in one of the frequent quarrels which erupted in the assemblies of the Achaeans. This would accord both with the little that is known about the plot of the play and the characteristically Homeric treatment of the myths by Sophocles, which has prompted the characterization 'Ομηρικώτατος. Violent quarreling on stage with some attempt at mediation is again not unknown in the extant plays of Sophocles: cf. Odysseus’ mediating between Teucer and the Atreidae in the Ajax; Jocasta’s mediation in the shouting match between Oedipus and Creon in Oedipus Tyrannus; Theseus’ mediation in Oedipus Coloneus, and (to some extent) Neoptolemus’ mediation in Philoctetes.

3 \( φ \circ ι \nu \iota \xi \text{ (φοίνιξ } Z) \cdot \text{τὸ δέντρον, } \text{"φοίνικος νέον ἐρνος" } \text{[Od. 6.163].} \) καὶ ὁ καρπὸς καὶ ὁ πυρὸς τῷ χρώματι, "ὅσ τὸ μὲν ἄλλο τόσον (τοσόν } Z) \text{φοίνιξ } \text{(φοίνιξ } Z) \text{ἡ, ἐν δὲ μετάπω λευκὸν σήμα } \text{ἐτέτυκτο" } \text{[Il. 23.454–5].} \) καὶ τὸ φοινικόν ἂνθος, ἐν \( \omega \) τὰ φοινικὰ (φοινικὰ } Z) βάπτηται, "ὡς δ’ ὅτε (ὅτε } Z) τίς (τίς } Z) τ’ ἐλέφαντα (}\text{Z}, \text{ἐλέφαντα } Z) \text{γυνὴ φοίνικι (φοινικὶ } Z) \text{μιῆς" } \text{[Il. 4.141].} \) καὶ ἔθνος δόμοια, "δὴ τότε Φοίνιξ (φοίνιξ } Z) \text{ἡθεὶν ἀνήρ" } \text{[Od. 14.288].} \) καὶ κύριον ὄνομα, "Φοίνιξ (φοίνιξ } Z) ἀττα (}\text{Z}, \text{ἀττα } Z) \text{γεραιὲ (}\text{Z}, \text{γεραίε } Z)" \text{[Il. 9.607 = 17.561].} \) καὶ ὄρνησιν ἱερὸν ἡλιοῦ (}\text{Z}, \text{ηλιοῦ } Z) \text{καὶ ὀργάνου εἴδος μονακίου, ὅπερ ἔνοι μαγά } \text{di-} \text{δα, ὦς Σοφοκλῆς Θαμύρα (θαμύρα } Z, \text{θαμύρα } Z)\text{), καὶ Ἀλκαῖος (}\text{Z}, \text{άλκαῖος } Z) \text{φοινικῶν } \text{(φοινίκων } Z) \text{ὄνομα (fortasse καὶ Ἀλκαῖος. <καὶ> φοινικῶν ὄνομα).} \)

cf. \( h, m: \phi \circ ι \nu \iota \xi \text{ (φοίνιξ } m) \cdot \text{τὸ δέντρον φοίνικος.} \)

Apollon.Soph. p.695-6: \( \Phi \circ ι \nu \iota \xi \cdot \text{τῶν πολλὰ δηλουσῶν ἡ λέξις.} \) τὸ μὲν γὰρ δένδρον, "Φοίνικος ἐθν ἔρνος." δηλοῖ καὶ τὸ κύριον ὄνομα, τὸν τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως τροφέα: "Φοίνιξ ἀττα, γεραιὲ." σημαίνει καὶ τὸν πυρὸν τῷ χρώματι. "Τὸ μὲν ἄλλο δέμας φοίνιξ ἡ, ἐν δὲ μετάπω λευκὸν σήμα ἐτέτυκτο." καὶ τὸ φοινικὸν ἂνθος: "Ὦς δ’ ὅτε τίς τ’ ἐλέφαντα γυνὴ μιῆς." καὶ τὸ ἐθνικὸν: "Δὴ τότε Φοίνιξ ἡθεὶν ἀνήρ, ἀπατήλια εἴδως."
This entry is made up of two easily distinguishable parts. The first and longer one (from δένδρον to γεραιε) lists the various meanings of the word φοίνιξ in the Homeric poems with supporting quotations, thus reproducing with some variations the text of the Homeric lexicon of Apollonius the Sophist. The latter part deals with some unusual meanings of the lemma and comes from a different source, possibly a lexicon of the kind referred to as Ξένως εἰρημένα. Although both Hesychius and the Etymologicum Gudianum leave off much before the end of the first part of the entry, their close agreement with our Ms in this part as against the text of Apollonius, together with their closeness to the interpolated glosses of the Matritensis in general, suggest that their ultimate source contained the full entry as we find it in our Ms.

The two references which appear in the second half of the entry are both problematic. Sophocles, in his Thamyras (fr.238 Pearson), used the word μαγάδιδες, and prima facie this seems to be what the lexicographer is referring to. Since it was a common practice, however, to quote from or refer to works which attested the various meanings of the lemma, it would be more natural to connect the reference to the Thamyras with the words ὄργανον ἐίδος μουσικόδ and take the phrase ὅπερ ἐνοι μαγάδιδα as parenthetical. This is not impossible, since our lexicographer is shown to be a mere compiler who excerpts and adapts from a more extensive source and is not always accurate or precise (see below, s.v. λοπάς). The view that the reference is to the use of the word φοίνιξ is further supported by the consideration that Thamyras was a king of Thrace and φοίνιξ, according to Athenaeus 14.637B, was an instrument used at the banquets of Thracian kings. The fact that Sophocles also used the word μαγάδιδες in the same play does not invalidate this hypothesis, since Sophocles

18 The correction of μαγάδα to μαγάδεα seems inevitable. The error is a typical one due to haplography.
mentions a number of different musical instruments in the same play, which after all dealt with a famous musician and his musical contest with the Muses: лάφρα (fr.238 P.), τρίγωνος (fr.239), μοναυλιοί and πηκτίδες (fr.241), besides μαγάδες (fr.238).

There seems to be some confusion in the very last sentence of the entry. The phrase καὶ Ἀλκαίος φοινικώνος ὄνομα, in my understanding, introduces an entirely new meaning of the lemma that equates the name of the date tree with a grove of date trees. Alcaeus is cited as a source for this rare meaning, which seems to be completely unknown elsewhere. The normal word order in this case would be: καὶ φοινικώνος ὄνομα, ὡς Ἀλκαίος. Another possibility should be reckoned with, however, that a connective particle (e.g. καὶ) following immediately after the reference to Alcaeus and introducing the last meaning was omitted by the scribe. In this case both references would support the meaning 'type of musical instrument'.

It is not clear whether Alcaeus in the second reference is the lyric poet from Lesbos or the Athenian comic writer, for the latter is often referred to simply as Alcaeus without the attributive ὁ κωμικός or ὁ κωμῳδιογράφος. The balance of probability is perhaps in favor of the former, since our lexicographer, when referring to poets of the Attic stage, always quotes the play in which the word occurred.

4 χ ε ἵ ρ ο β ο σ κ ο ν · τῶν διὰ τῶν χειρῶν ζωντα. Σοφοκλῆς Δαιδάλω (Z), δαιδάλω Z). γαστρίχειρα (γατρὶ χειρα Z) δὲ Ἄντι-μαχος ἔφη.

cf. h, m: χ ε ἵ ρ ο β ο σ κ ο ν · τῶν (τῶν ἡ) διὰ τῶν χειρῶν ζωντα.

Hesych. X 286: χ ε ἵ ρ ο β ο σ κ ο ν · τῶν διὰ τῶν χειρῶν ζωντα.

Etym.Gud. p.564.25–26: χ ε ἵ ρ ο β ο σ κ ο s · δ ὄ δια χειρὸς ζων, ὡς φησὶ Σοφοκλῆς [fr.1113 P.].

To the Sophoclean use of the word χειροβοσκός, known from the Etymologicum Gudianum, our Ms adds the name of the play in which the word occurred. It also attests the case in which the word was used, for it was a well-established method of the old lexicographers to use in the lemma the exact form of a word as it appeared in the passage from which they excerpted it.¹⁹ The close parallel with Hesychius leaves no doubt that the accusative has more authority

than the nominative of the *Gudianum*. Save for this unique reference the word is known only through the works of lexicographers and grammarians\(^\text{20}\) and can safely be classified as *hapax legomenon*.

As for the context in which it occurred, very little can be guessed, since the remains of the *Daedalus* are scanty and the actual plot quite uncertain. It seems reasonable to consider it as a derogatory epithet for Daedalus; or, if the title of the play indicated Hephaestus,\(^\text{21}\) it could have been used in reference to the smith-god. The derogatory sense of the word is attested by Pollux (cf. n.20). The known compounds with -βοσκός are not earlier than Sophocles, who used the words ἀνθοβοσκός (fr.31 P.), γηροβοσκός (Ajax 570) and ἐρηνοβοσκός (or ἀρηνοβοσκός; cf. fr.655 P.) besides χειροβοσκός. In most cases the second component has an active meaning, but λωτοβοσκός (Trag. Adesp. 236 N.) shows that the passive meaning of χειροβοσκός was not unique.

The reference to Antimachus is entirely new, as is the word γαστρίχειρ attributed to him in our entry. It seems likely that Antimachus coined it by reversing the word χειρογάστωρ, first used by Hecataeus (fr.367 J.). Our lexica list two more words comparable to the above, γαστερόχειρες and ἐγχειρόχαρπες,\(^\text{22}\) and paraphrase them “οἱ ἀπὸ χειρῶν ζώντες.” The second of these words is attested by Athenaeus 1.4D,\(^\text{23}\) while the first occurs only in Strabo, in a passage which I quote, because it seems to have some bearing on the matter discussed here: Τῇ μὲν οὖν Τίμωνι ὀρμητηρίῳ χρήσασθαι δοκεῖ Προῖτος καὶ τειχίσαι διὰ Κυκλώπων, οὐς ἔπτα μὲν εἶναι καλεῖσθαι δὲ γαστερόχειρας τρεφομένους ἐκ τῆς τέχνης, ἥκειν δὲ μεταπέμπτος ἐκ Λυκίας . . . (8.6.11 Meineke).

Although we do not know from which of Antimachus’ works the word γαστρίχειρα was taken, we may assume that, like all the new fragments, it was excerpted from a poetic composition. Since, however, so far as the evidence goes, Antimachus employed exclusively

---

\(^{20}\) Cf. Pollux 7.7, τὸ γὰρ χειροβοσκός . . . ἄττον ἄν τις προσόστορ; and Etym.Gud. p.572.49, χειροβοσκός: δ δία τῶν χειρῶν βοσκόμενος, which is a mere variant of the previous entry of this lexicon.


\(^{22}\) Cf. Hesych. Φ 191; Lex. Bekkerianum no.5, p.230.13; Suda Lex. Ε 141.181; Etym.Mag. p.221.52, 313.29; and Zon. c.598.

\(^{23}\) Cf. also the title of a comedy by Nicophon which is given variously as χειρογάστορες or ἐγχειρόχαρπες.
dactylic hexameter and elegiac couplet, we are immediately faced with a serious difficulty, because this word (with a short syllable between two long ones) is unfit for dactylic meter. The parallel of Ἡφαιστοσεϊκτος (fr.62 Wyss) from the Lyde, which is assumed to have been in elegiacs, does not help, because that word has long been suspected by scholars as a false reading. Unless we are ready to suppose that Antimachus occasionally employed other meters as well (such as the iambic), we must resort to emendation in order to obtain a word that will fit a dactylic verse. The simplest way would be to change the unparalleled γαστρίχειρα to the attested γαστερόχειρα. Strabo's passage can then give us a clue as to the context in which the word may have been used. Indeed, I cannot resist thinking that Strabo, who quotes Antimachus a number of times, had him in mind when he referred to the Cyclopes who built Tiryns. The difference in form (accusative singular vs. nominative plural) is trivial and may be explained by the different contexts in which the word is quoted. Neither Strabo nor our lexicographer pretends to reproduce the exact form. The latter obviously changed the word so as to agree in form with his lemma. Strabo's plural, however, has more claims to genuineness because of the number of Cyclopes and because our lexica (see n.22 above) use the same form as the lemma.

We have no way of deciding as to which poem was the source of the word, but perhaps the Thebais would be the most natural choice.

5 χιλιάγρα (χιλιάγρα Ζ). ζωόφιον, ὡς Ἰππώναξ (ἴππονάξ Ζ). καὶ νόμισμα.


Our Ms seems to have preserved the correct form of the lemma (with a slight error in the place of accent) as against Hesychius, who was until now our sole source for this word. The first part of the explanation (ζωόφιον) is almost identical with Hesychius' and suggests that the lexicographer did not know exactly what animal was meant. The reference to Hipponax for what appears to be a strange little animal comes as no surprise in view of this poet's tendency to introduce the names of animals both common and uncommon into his poems. Since the word χιλιάγρα is clearly descriptive, we may venture a hypothesis as to the kind of animal indicated by that name. A

24 Rare names of animals mentioned by Hipponax include ἄτταγος (fr.39.7 D3), γρόμψις (fr.69 B4), κρεγή (fr.50 D3) and δη (fr.136 B4).
comparison with the attested compounds of ἄγρα indicates that the formation of χιλιάγρα is unique. Indeed in all instances of such compounds the first component functions as a complement of ἄγρα (e.g. κρεάγρα, ὠδοντάγρα, πυράγρα),\(^{25}\) while the first component of χιλιάγρα is the numeral χίλιοι. Although one could press the point that χιλιάγρα is the animal that preys on a thousand different animals, a more likely interpretation may be of the animal with a thousand ‘catches’, or claws, or feet.\(^{26}\) As such it would refer to a member of the class of myriapoda, probably the one called σκολόσενδρα (our centipede) in ancient technical writings and which in the spoken Greek of today is characteristically called σαρανταποδαρώσα, ‘one with forty feet’.\(^{27}\) This myriapod (whose number of legs varies from species to species) is known for its poisonous bite (actually inflicted by the foremost pair of feet) and its name could have been used by Hipponax either literally or metaphorically in a reference to a greedy person—one with a thousand claws or venomous “bite.”

The second part of the explanation (καὶ νόμισμα)\(^{28}\) poses a difficult question, since there is no important coinage featuring a myriapod or any other animal with many appendages.\(^{29}\) The Eretrian coins with cuttlefish on the reverse can be safely excluded, both because the cuttlefish was commonly known by the name στηλία (which has also survived in spoken Greek of today in the form of σουπιά) and because Hipponax mentions this very animal with its traditional name (cf. fr.68b B.4). In view of these difficulties Miss Margaret

\(^{25}\) Cf. P. Chantraine, *Études sur le vocabulaire grec* (Études et Commentaires 24, Paris 1956) 44. The author does not discuss the word χιλιάγρα nor the words ὀνάγρα, ὄρεοβαζέρα and πανάγρα, which are apparently of obscure origin.

\(^{26}\) For the use of the word χίλιος as a first component to indicate a large number, cf. χιλιόφυλος, χιλιόδύναμος. Cf. also the compounds with μύριοι and έκατόν.

\(^{27}\) The word σκολόσενδρα is also used in Modern Greek, restricted for the most part to the formal idiom (the *katharevousa*). In the vernacular of Cephalenia, however, according to an oral communication by Mrs René Kahane, the word has been preserved in the form σκουλόσεντρα—the change clearly effected by the observation that the little animal lurks under stones (πέτραι) in search of necessary humidity.

\(^{28}\) Both the depiction of animals on coins and the custom of referring to particular coins by the figures consistently depicted on them are well attested. Hesychius, to whose *Lexicon* the Matritensis is closely related, has preserved a number of examples: ἄγκυρα (A 577), βότος (B 968, Δ 551, Ε 3183), γλαυκή (Γ 610, 615), κόραι (Κ 3663), μίλισσα (Μ 717), πέλεκυς (Η 515, Π 1313), ολφίων (B 350), χελώνη (Κ 495), and possibly also ἄμφος (I 848).

\(^{29}\) For information pertaining to the Greek coins I am deeply indebted to Dr Margaret Thompson, Curator of Greek coins of the American Numismatic Society, who was kind enough to answer my queries on the subject.
Thompson has suggested a possible corruption of the word ΧΙΜΑΙΡΑ to ΧΙΛΙΑΓΡΑ. To quote from her letter, "It is certainly strikingly close. In that case the coinage is undoubtedly that of Sicyon, where the Chimaera is an almost invariable obverse type. This was a very extensive coinage, comparable to the turtles of Aegina, the owls of Athens and the colts of Corinth, and might well have been given a popular designation." The emendation is indeed compelling and I adopt it here without hesitation. Since, however, the word χιλιάγρα cannot be entirely dismissed, I am inclined to think that we have here an example of the conflation of two neighboring glosses into one, caused by the similarity of their lemmata. It is a mere coincidence, but a very characteristic one, that an entry χιλιάγρα (this one a genuine Cyrillean gloss) appears in the Matritensis immediately after the entry χιλιάγρα. A comparable fusion of two successive entries is shown in the entry φάκτον (see below). Unfortunately Hesychius has preserved no trace whatsoever of the second gloss, and consequently we lack any decisive proof for this theory.

The simple verb ψαλάσσω had not been attested before the Hellenistic period, although προφαλάζω occurs in Soph. Ichn. 241 and υποψαλάσσετε is found in Ar. Lys. 84. Note also that the verbal adjective ἀφάλακτος is attested in Soph. fr.550 P., Ar. Lys. 275 and Crates Com. fr.46 K. Our entry offers two more instances of the simple verb from two fifth-century tragedians, each of whom used it in a different sense. The explanation κινοῦμενος, which is not listed in LSJ but is confirmed by Hesychius' ψαλάζω (E 7693, translated ἰψανοῦσεν and

---

6 ψ α λ α σ ω ν (ψαλάύουν Ζ)· κινοῦμενος, Σοφοκλῆς Αλεξάνδρω.
Hesych. Ψ 47: ψ α λ α σ ε ἱ πιάσσει, ψηλαφάζει, κινεῖ, ψαύει, ψάλλει· ἀφ' οὗ καὶ ἂν ψ̣ α λ α κ τ ς κ αὶ (λέγε ρ' ) ἰψανοῦσι.

cf. h, m: ψ α λ α ύ σ ω ν · κινοῦμενος.

Other possibilities cannot, of course, be entirely discarded, since the evidence available to us is indeed very slim. Hesychius offers a striking example, which shows how absurd the reduction of an already abbreviated passage can be. The word γραπταλῆς (K 3971) is explained as follows: παρά πολλοῖς ὁ μορφ. ἡ νόμισμα. It is only with Pollux' assistance (9.83) that the nature of that strange "coin" is fully revealed.

81 For the vocabulary shared by Sophocles and Ion, cf. T. B. L. Webster, "Sophocles and Ion of Chios," Hermes 71 (1936) 268ff.
suggests that Sophocles used it as an intransitive verb. Hesychius' κωνέ (s.v. ψαλάσσει) is not decisive, since his is clearly a composite entry compiled from two or more related glosses. It is at least conceivable that in Hesychius the voice of the verb was changed to active so as to agree with that of all the other verbs in the explanation. The second meaning, here ascribed to Ion, is that of a transitive verb and is more common (cf. also ὑποψαλάσσω and ἑψαλάκτως). The use of the aorist infinitive (ψαλᾶμαι) in the explanation seems to suggest that Ion used it in that form, but it is also possible that the form ἑψαλάξατο (ἑψαλάσσατο cod.) in Hesychius may have been the one used by Ion.

Our entry contributes nothing towards a better understanding of the plot of either of the two plays.

7 \(\psi \varepsilon \phi \alpha \ι \alpha \sigma \nu \nu \kappa \tau \circ \sigma \cdot \) σκοτεινής (σκοτινής Z), Σοφοκλῆς Τρωίλω (Ζ
e, τρωίλω Z). γράφεται δὲ καὶ ψεφαυγοῦς (ψεφαυγοῦς Z) ὡς λυκοφῶς (sic, fortasse Λυκόφων).

cf. h, m: \(\psi \varepsilon \phi \alpha \iota \alpha \sigma \nu \nu \kappa \tau \circ \sigma \cdot \) σκοτινής.
Hesych. Ψ 134: \(\psi \varepsilon \phi \alpha \iota \alpha \sigma \nu \nu \kappa \tau \circ \sigma \cdot \) σκοτεινής.
Ψ 135: \(\psi \varepsilon \phi \alpha \nu \gamma \circ \delta \sigma \cdot \) σκοτεινής.

Hesychius has clearly split the entry into two while omitting the reference (or references). As with χιλιάγρα, this is the only occurrence of the word outside Hesychius.

As is clear from the construction of the explanation, ψεφαυγοῦς was a varia lectio for ψεφαῖας, and therefore this gloss must have originated ultimately, like the entry φάλανθον, from a commentary. The end of the entry, which attempts a justification of the other form, is unfortunately corrupt. So far as I can see, there are two ways to explain the unintelligible λυκοφῶς; either an authority was quoted for the rare form ψεφαυγοῦς, possibly Lycophron; or the form was explained on the parallel of the adjective λυκανής 'of the grey-twilight', which the scribe subsequently confused with the more familiar word λυκόφως 'twilight'. In view of the practice of abbreviating the names of authorities in the grammatico-lexicographic works, I am inclined towards the first possibility. It should be noticed, however, that whereas Lycophron is known for his work on comedy, there is no evidence for any critical work of his on tragedy.

The intransitive sense of the verb may have been the original one. Cf. E. Boisacq, op.cit. (supra n.11) 1074 s.v. ψάλλω.
The lemma as it stands forms part of an iambic line (most likely \textit{πολεμός νυκτὸς πόλις}). It is not necessary, however, to assume that the words stood in the text in the same order and proximity as in our entry. The reference to the dark night is consistent with the story of the ambush of Troilus by Achilles. As to the context from which it was taken, one could suggest a number of possibilities, e.g. in the planning of the ambush or in a messenger’s speech announcing the circumstances of Troilus’ death.

In addition to the fragments of ancient authors our Ms contains a number of dialectal glosses, of which the following are, to the best of my knowledge, new in the sense that their dialectal origin has not been attested by any other source.

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{σπανός} \textit{αἰθοῖον, Μακεδόνες}.
  \item \textit{καλάχανον ἄγριον. ἦ τρωκτόν. ἠ ἀπιστόν.}
\end{itemize}

The reading of \textit{h} suggests that its scribe found the explanation missing in his exemplar, which apparently omitted it for reasons of modesty. It becomes therefore clear that \textit{h} was not copied directly from \textit{Z}. On the other hand \textit{m} left the entry out altogether, depriving us of any more precise evidence of the degree of its relationship with \textit{h}.

The word \textit{διπυόν} is not listed in \textit{LSJ}. Its genuineness, however, is confirmed by Hesychius, who in turn does not record the meaning preserved in our Ms. There is no doubt, however, that a word indicating a type of vegetable or plant could also be used metaphorically for the \textit{membrum muliebre}. The sexual connotation may in fact be responsible for the apparent disturbance in the latter part of Hesychius’ explanation.

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{φάκτον \παρὰ \'Ἀρκάσων, κοτύλαι \'Αττικαί (κοτυλεάττει καὶ \textit{Z}) τρεῖς. \φακτόν \παρὰ \λαῖος \κακῶς. ἑνοὶ δὲ \δολοσχερῶς.}
  \item \textit{Hesych. \textit{Φ} 76: \φράκτειν. \φρακτόσ καὶ \τὸ \μέτρον \φάκτον.}
  \item \textit{Hesych. \textit{Φ} 74: \φάκτον \παρὰ \λαῖοι, σπυραι, πύελοι.}
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{33} Cf. Dio Chrys. 11.77-78 and A. C. Pearson, \textit{op.cit.} II (\textit{supra} n.21) p.253ff.

\textsuperscript{34} Cf. the similar case of \textit{στέλων} recorded in Hesychius and Photius. For more examples see \textit{E. Ληται} (Ch. Charitonides), \textit{Ἀπόρρητα} (Thessalonica 1935) 20ff.
The form φάκτον points toward the adjective φακώτος, which was
given to lentil-shaped bottles. Apparently the measuring unit referred
to in our entry had (at least originally) such a shape. On the other
hand, Hesychius’ φάκται (Φ 74 Schmidt) supplies additional evidence
in behalf of the genuineness of the form φάκτον, which is otherwise
unattested.

The latter part of the Ms entry is clearly an independent gloss that
was confused with or absorbed by the entry φάκτον. This gloss does
not appear in other Mss of the Lexicon Cyrilli and must, therefore,
have found its way to our Ms from the same source as the other
entries peculiar to Z. Hesychius supports such a view by offering a
close parallel to the latter gloss (φαίλως· ὀλοσχέρως καὶ τὰ ὅμως, Φ
249). The fusion of the two entries into one indicates that the source
from which the interpolated glosses were taken listed the entries
continuously and not in a line-by-line arrangement as was common
in the oldest Mss of the Cyrillean lexicon.35

Two more entries, although already known from the Mss related
to the Matritensis, deserve to be discussed here more fully, because
of the special problems which they present and because the readings
of our Ms throw new light on these problems.

10 λ ο ν α ἕ (Z°, λόπας Z). Συρακούσιοι τὸ τήγανον (Z°, τίγανον Z). παρὰ
dὲ Θεσπόμπω (Z°, θεσπόμπω Z) ἐν Ἀδήμήτῳ ἡ σωρός
(σωρός Z). καὶ παρὰ τοῖς κωμικοῖς. καλεῖται (λαλεῖται Z)
dὲ οὕτως καὶ ὅ ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι (Z°, ελλάδη Z) γινόμενος
(γενόμενος Z). λίθος.

cf. h: λ ὃ π α ἕ. Συρακούσιοι τὸ τίγανον. παρὰ δὲ Θεσπόμπω ἐν
Ἀδήμήτῳ ἡ σωρός. καὶ περὶ τοῖς κωμικοῖς. καλεῖται δὲ
οὕτως καὶ ὅ ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι γινόμενος λίθος.

Suda Λ 674: Λο π α ἕ. παρὰ Συρακούσιοι τὸ τίγανον. παρὰ
dὲ Θεσπόμπω ἡ σωρός, καὶ παρὰ τοῖς κωμικοῖς. καλεῖται δὲ
οὕτως καὶ ὅ ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι γινόμενος λίθος. Ἀριστοφάνης.
ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν ἀν ὁρνίθων κτλ. [Vesp. 508-511].

Hesych. Λ 1262: λ ο ν α ἕ. τὸ τήγανον καὶ λίθος ἐν Ἑλλάδι
(sic codex).

Phot. 1.393: λ ο ν α ἕ. σωρός.

35 Cf. my article (supra n.19) 185 and n.10.
The new editor of Hesychius has replaced the entry preserved in the Marcianus with the entry of \( h \), notwithstanding his view that \( h \) was interpolated not from Hesychius but from Diogenianus. Latte, indeed, relying too heavily on the authority of \( h \), went so far as to retain the corrupt \( \alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\delta\eta \) (with the indication of it as a \textit{locus desperatus}!) against the concerted testimony of the Marcianus and the \textit{Suda}, both of which read \textit{\'E\ll\alpha\delta\iota}. Our \textit{Ms} dispels any doubts as to which reading is the "genuine" one, i.e. the one that goes back to the common source of all three lexica. The reading is nonetheless erroneous and ought to be emended. A. Meineke's correction of \( \epsilon\nu \textit{\'E\ll\alpha\delta\iota} \) to \( \epsilon\nu \textit{\'H\lambda\omega\alpha\iota} \)\textsuperscript{36} was undoubtedly suggested by the Aristophanean passage (\textit{Vesp.} 508–511) quoted in the \textit{Suda} immediately after \( \lambda\iota\delta\oslash \).\textsuperscript{37} It is, however, completely unwarranted. Far superior is Koraes' emendation of the \textit{Suda} passage to \( \delta \epsilon\nu \tau\gamma \textit{\'e\lambda\alpha\iota\gamma} \textit{\gamma\nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma} \textit{\gamma\dot\omicron\nu\sigma} \),\textsuperscript{38} which is amply supported by Theophr. \textit{HP} 4.14.3. A slight improvement can be effected by substituting for \( \textit{\'e\lambda\alpha\iota\gamma} \) the form \( \textit{\'e\lambda\alpha\iota} \), which not only is the Attic form of the word and the form used by Theophrastus,\textsuperscript{39} but also explains better (palaeographically) the change of \( \textit{\'E\lambda\alpha\alpha\iota} \) to \( \textit{\'E\ll\alpha\delta\iota} \) (possibly through an intermediate form \( \textit{\'E\lambda\alpha\iota\alpha} \)).\textsuperscript{40}

The identification of the writer cited in the gloss with Theopompus Comicus cannot be seriously challenged. F. Jacoby's\textsuperscript{41} preference for the historian Theopompus dates from a period when the testimony of \( h \) was not known, while Edmonds\textsuperscript{42} has apparently overlooked the inconspicuous reference to the playwright in Adler's edition of the \textit{Suda}.

\textsuperscript{36} Cf. \textit{Philologus} 13 (1858) 508–9. The correction was adopted by M. Schmidt in his ed. of Hesychius.

\textsuperscript{37} There can be no doubt that the quotation from the \textit{Wasps} is not a part of the original gloss, but was added by the compiler of the \textit{Suda}, who freely inserted quotations from the extant comedies of Aristophanes. Cf. V. Coulon, Quaestiones criticæ in \textit{Aristophanes fabulas} (\textit{Diss. Philol. Argent.} XIII.1, Strassburg 1907) esp. 9–10 and 265; A. Adler, "\textit{Suidas}," in \textit{RE} 4A (1931) 698. Meineke apparently missed the broad joke effected by the playwright's fanciful metaphor and interpreted the Aristophanean passage too literally and pragmatically. Besides, he left the word \textit{\gamma\nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma} in the \textit{Suda} unexplained.

\textsuperscript{38} Cf. A. Koraes, \textit{\'E\nu\omega\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}t\acute{\alpha}s kai \Gamma\alpha\lambda\nu\nu\acute{o}d pi\rho\iota\acute{\eta}s ap\acute{o} t\acute{o}wn \'e\nu\delta\rho\omicron\nu\tau\rho\omicron\acute{\eta}s ktl.} (Paris 1814) 156.

\textsuperscript{39} The form \( \textit{\'e\lambda\alpha\iota} \) is also used by Hesychius; cf. \textit{s.v.} \textit{\gamma\rho\omicron\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\mu\omicron\varsigma} (\textit{I} 412).

\textsuperscript{40} The tendency of the scribes to duplicate letters is well attested. Duplication of \textit{lambda} occurs frequently in the \textit{Mss}, e.g. in the word \textit{\'A\nu\rho\omicron\acute{l}i\omicron\varsigma} (spelled \textit{\'A\nu\rho\omicron\acute{l}i\omicron\varsigma}).

\textsuperscript{41} \textit{FGrHist.} 115 f 408.

\textsuperscript{42} \textit{The Fragments of Attic Comedy} I (Leiden 1957) p.876 (fr.92).
There can be little doubt that Photius' second gloss is related to the one discussed here. The reading $\tau\eta\nu\ \theta\epsilon\omega\upsilon$ is simply a scribal error for $\tau\eta\nu\ \sigma\omicron\rho\omicron\upsilon\nu$ effected by the proximity of the word $\Theta\epsilon\omega\omicron\pi\omicron\mu\omicron\upsilon\sigma\omicron\varsigma$. Photius in fact, who clearly draws here from a different lexicographic source, seems to have preserved the exact form in which the word occurred in Theopompus, although he has omitted the name of the play.

The fact that in three of the four glosses in which the word $\lambda\omicron\sigma\pi\alpha\varsigma$ is equated with the word $\sigma\omicron\rho\omicron\varsigma$ reference is made to Theopompus, together with Pollux' silence about such a meaning of the word, seem to suggest that Theopompus was the sole source for such a meaning, or at least that this meaning was extremely rare. Hence the phrase $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\alpha\rho\acute{a} \ \tau\omicron\iota\zeta$ $\kappa\omicron\mu\omicron\kappa\omicron\iota\varsigma$ in the $\Sigma\delta\alpha$ and in our Ms (both of which clearly draw here from the same lexicographic source) seems to me extremely suspicious. Since on the other hand the meaning 'frying pan' is attested from at least two comic writers, we may speculate that a transposition of the phrase $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\alpha\rho\acute{a} \ \tau\omicron\iota\zeta$ $\kappa\omicron\mu\omicron\kappa\omicron\iota\varsigma$ took place at some stage of the transmission of the gloss. In that case we would be justified in transferring the phrase before the reference to Theopompus so as to read: $\Sigma\upsilon\rho\alpha\kappa\omicron\omicron\acute{o}\omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\dot{\iota}$ $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\alpha\rho\acute{a} \ \tau\omicron\iota\zeta$ $\kappa\omicron\mu\omicron\kappa\omicron\iota\varsigma$. The dislocation may indeed go back to the original compiler, who in excerpting and perhaps compressing the work presumably of the lexicographer Pamphilus (see below) committed an occasional blunder. Our entry offers another instance of an error which can be detected with the assistance of Athenaeus. The reference to the Syracusans for the use of the word $\lambda\omicron\sigma\pi\alpha\varsigma$ in the sense 'frying pan' ($\tau\eta\gamma\alpha\nu\upsilon\nu$) is indeed contradicted by the corresponding passage in Ath. 6.229b, who seems to draw here from Pamphilus and who unmistakably states the opposite, i.e. that the Syracusans used the word $\tau\eta\gamma\alpha\nu\upsilon\nu$ not for a frying pan (the sense which the word commonly had in Athens) but for the dish or platter for which the Attic employed the word $\lambda\omicron\sigma\pi\alpha\varsigma$. A hasty reader, however, could have misunderstood Athenaeus.

---

The fourth reference found also in Photius seems to be of the same origin as those discussed here.

Pollux lists a number of words used in reference to a coffin, such as $\sigma\omicron\rho\omicron\varsigma$, $\nu\upsilon\delta\omicron\omicron$, $\kappa\iota\beta\iota\alpha\omicron\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\delta\sigma$, $\lambda\eta\nu\omicron$ (cf. 7.160, 8.146 and 10.150).

Cf. Eubulus fr.109 K. and Archedicus fr.2.4 K.

In view of the general structure of the entry, the reading $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{a} \Sigma\upsilon\rho\alpha\kappa\omicron\omicron\acute{o}\omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\dot{\iota}$ in the $\Sigma\delta\alpha$ may be considered as that of the original gloss.
M. Schmidt, in his edition of Hesychius, bracketed the puzzling negative μη of the explanation, while suggesting as an alternative that the original entry was μη χαμαιπετῶς. Our Ms confirms the authenticity of the reading of the Marcianus and calls for a new consideration of its meaning.

While the second component of the adjective χαμαιπετής is derived from the verb πίπτω 'to fall', the adverb χαμαιπετῶς in its single occurrence (Lucian, Icar. 10) is used to describe the low flight of the geese and is, therefore, derived from the verb πέτωμαι 'to fly'. Although this meaning is found in a later author, it should not be rejected a priori, especially since Lucian and his contemporaries at times revived poetic or otherwise obsolete words and usages. Such a meaning of the word χαμαιπετῶς as occurs in Lucian is not completely incongruous with the one offered by Hesychius and our Ms, especially since the latter contains the notion of 'keeping off the ground'. And although it would better satisfy our expectations if the word were used in the sense common to the adjective χαμαιπετής and in reference to Glaucus' being thrown down from his chariot by his own horses, the available evidence points in a different direction, possibly the flight of Glaucus' swift horses.

In addition to the glosses presented above our Ms contains about forty entries with references to and quotations from extant works of classical literature or with fragments of lost works already known from other sources. Eighteen of these form a special class in that they have no parallels in the other Mss of St Cyril's lexicon and can, therefore, be considered as interpolated together with the glosses.

---

47 This entry in the form in which it is preserved in h and m became known recently through a brief communication of W. Bühler, op. cit. (supra n.1).
48 The Συναγωγή, St Cyril, Suda and the Etym. Mag. use the passive form of πίπτω in interpreting the word χαμαιπετής. Since, however, the semantic difference between 'falling down' and 'being thrown down' is slight (the one indicating the result, the other stressing the process), one should not press the point too far.
49 H. Frisk, Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch (Heidelberg 1954-), derives the adjective πέτης from πέτωμαι and -πέτης from πέτωμαι as well as πέπτω (cf. 522, 543).
containing the new fragments. All, except ἰμωσγέτως which is termed ἱητορικὴ λέξις by the Etymologicum Genuinum and the Etymologicum Magnum, are found in the latter half of the lexicon. Since their presence in the Ms bears on the question of the origin of the new fragments, I edit them here, indicating briefly their closest parallels in the extant lexicographic works.51

1 ἀ μ ω σ γ ἔ π ως (ἀμωσγέτως Z). τοῦτο ἐν ἵσω, καθ’ ὄντινα (ὄντινα Z) οὖν τρόπον. εἴνοι (ἐνοι Z) δὲ τὸ μετρίως. παρὰ Πλάτωνι [Charm. 175c etc.] τὸ ἐκ παντὸς τρόπον.


2 Κωφόν· ἀναισθητον. μεταφορικῶς τὸ ῥοῖζον (ῥοίζων Z) μὴ ποιοῦν. "κωφόν (κωφόν Z) γὰρ βέλος ἀνδρὸς ἀναλίκους οὐτιδανῶ" [ll. 11.390]. ἑπὶ δὲ τοῦ κύματος. "ὡς δ’ ὅτε (δ’ τε Z) πορφύρη (πορφυρεῖ Z) πέλαγος μέγα κύματι κωφώ (κωφῶι Z)" [ll. 14.16], τῷ μηδέπω (μηδέπωι Z) κακλάζοντι ἄρχομένω (ἄρχόμενοι Z) δὲ μεγαλύνεσθαι ἀφόφως.


3 Κωχοσι, μετεωρίζοντον. Σοφοκλῆς Καμικώις, "πιστοὶ με κωχεύοντιν ἐν φορᾷ (ἐνφορᾷi Z) δέμας" [fr.327 P.].

Also in h. Cf. Hesych. Κ 4905, Etym.Gud. 360.5.

4 Κεπός· ὀρνεον κωφόν, ὡς Ἀριστοτέλης φησίν [HA 593b 14, 620a13], περὶ τὴν θάλασσαν τρίβοι. οἶ δὲ λάρον (λάρον Z).


5 νῦν δὲ θεὸν μὲ καρποὶς τοῦτο φανερὸν ἐξόδιον εἶναι τραγῳδῶν (λέγεραμβωδῶν): "νῦν δὲ θεοὶ μάκαρες τῶν ἔσθλων ἀφανοὶ (λέγεραμβων) ἔστε." 

Also in h, m. Cf. Hesych. Ν 730, Ael.Dion A 76 Erbse.

51 For brevity’s sake no distinction is made between Z and Zσ, except when some particular problem is involved.
6 ξυμφορά: συντυχία (συντυχεία Z). καὶ ἐπὶ ἄγαθον τάσσεται, ὡς
παρ’ Αἰσχύλῳ ἐν Καβείροις [fr.49 Mette], καὶ ἐπὶ κακοῦ
παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ.
Also in h, m. Cf. Hesych. Ξ 114.

7 ὅλε θρονί - ἐνοί (ἐνοί Z) παρὰ Ἀριστοφάνει [cf. fr.320.3 Κ.]
ἐπὶ κόσμου γυναικείου (γυναικίου Z), οὐ καλῶς. ἄλλοι τοῦ
βαθύν (βαθύ Z). ἐστὶ δὲ διήθρον. ἀποδυσπέπτοντα γάρ
ἐιπέν τὸν παρὰ τῷ (τῷ Z) Ἀριστοφάνει: διήθρος γάρ ὁ
θάνατος.
Also in h, m. Cf. Hesych. Ο 516.

8 μαῦλων: ὁμόκοιτον, σύγκοιτον (σύγκοιτον Z), ὁμοῦ αὐλιζό-
μενον. Σοφοκλῆς Φίνε (φίνε Z) [fr.717 P.].
Also in h, m. Cf. Hesych. Ο 681.

9 πορκάς: ἐλαφος. ὅπως Ἀρκάδων τὸ ταχῦ. παρὰ δὲ τινι <***>.
Also in h, m. Cf. Hesych. Π 3039.

10 προγενος: οἱ πρωτόγονοι (πρωτόγονοι Z) ἄρνες. οἱ δὲ μετὰ τού-
tους (τοὺς Z) μέτασαι (μετάσας Z). έροι δὲ οἱ παλαιοὶ
(λέγε ἀπαλοὶ) καὶ τὸ ἔρο γνώμενο (λέγε τῷ ἔρῳ γνώ-
μενο): "ἔρχατο, χωρὶς μὲν πρόγονοι, χωρὶς δὲ μέτασαι
(μετάσαι Z), χωρὶς δ’ αὖθ’ έροι (διανεράσας Z)” [Od.
9.221-2].

11 προγενος: τοῖς πρεσβυτάτοις ἄνδρας, Τροιζήνιοι (τροι-
ζήνιοι Z). λέγονται δὲ καὶ οἱ τοῖς γαμήσαι προγενόντες παῖδες.
Also in h, m. Cf. Hesych. Π 3372.

12 σῶμα (σῶμα Z): Ἀρίσταρχος σημειοῦται τοῦτο τῇ διπλῇ, ὅτι
σῶμα οὐ δὴ ποτε λέγει "Ὁμηρός ἐπὶ τοῦ ζώντος ἄλλ’ ἐπὶ
νεκροῦ: "σῶμα (σῶμα Z) δὲ οἶκα’ ἐμὸν (οἴκαδέμον Z)
δόμεναι πάλιν” [Il. 7.79, 22.342]. καὶ "ὡς δὲ (ὡς τε codd.
Iliadis) λέων ἐχάρη μεγάλῳ ἐπὶ σώματι κύριος” [Il. 3.23].
tὸ δὲ τοῦ ζώντος <δέμας>. "δέμας δ’ ἦκτο (δικτοῦ Z)
γυναικί” [Od. 13.288, 16.157], παρὰ τὸ συνδεδέσθαι αὐτῷ
(αὐτὸ Z).
Not in h, m. Cf. Etym.Gud. 519.37, Apollon.Soph. 629,
Hesych. Σ 3072.
13 τ ᾧ φ ο ἑ· τὸ γινόμενον περιδείπνουν ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν ἀρχομένων τιμῆ (τιμῆ Z). “σιδ’ δὲ κεν τάφον ἀντιβολήσαις” [Od. 4.547]. καὶ ὁ ἐπὶ αὐτοῖς ἄγων· “Πατρόκλου (πατρόκλης Z) τάφου μνη-

μίον (μνήμι ἐμμεναι codd. Ἰλιάδις)” [Il. 23.619)], οἶνον ἐπιτάφιον (ἐπὶ ταφίῳ Z). οὐδὲποτε δὲ ἐπὶ {διὰ} τοῦ καθ’ ἡμᾶς σημανομένου (σημανομέν Z) τίθησιν, ἀλλὰ τύμβου αὐτὸ καὶ σήμα. τίθησιν δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ ἐκπλήξεως τὴν λέξιν·
“τάφος δ’ ἐλε (δέλε Z) πάντας (παν τοὺς Z)” “Ἀχαιῶν (sic etiam lexica, ἴδοντας codd. Ὀδυσσεί”) [Od. 21.122]. καὶ πόλιν ἦ νήσον· “ἐξεῖνος δ’ οὔτος ἐμὸς πατρώιος ἐκ Τάφου ἐστὼ” [Od.1.417]. καὶ {εὐ}θυτικὴς σημεῖον τί.


14 φ ἱ λ ᾰ ὐ ν· ἕνειζεν· “χαῖρε, ξείνε, παρ’ ἄμμι (παράμμη Z) φιλήσεαι (φιλήσαιε Z)” [Od. 1.123]. κατὰ ψυχῆν ἄγαπάν· “ἡ μοῦνοι (ἡμοῦν ᾦ Z) φιλέουσα ἀλόχους (φιλέουσα λάχους Z)” [Il. 9.340]. τὸ δὲ καθ’ ἡμᾶς φιλεῖν κυνεῖν φησιν· “κύνεον ἀγαπαζόμενοι” [Od. 21.224].


15 φ ῦ σ· ὀξυτόνως μὲν ἄν (θρώπ)ος ἀπὸ τοῦ φωτίζεων τῷ λόγῳ πάντα, περισσωμένως (περισσομένως Z) δὲ τὸ πῦρ καὶ μετα-

φορικῶς ἡ χαρά. οἶνον· “Τρϊῶν Ῠζε (ῥίζε Z) φάλαγγα, φόως (φῶς Z) δ’ ἐτάροιον ἐθηκεν” [Il. 6.6].


16 χ ι ὰ ν (χιτῶν Z)· ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ συνήθους, “τὸν δὲ (τὸν Z) χιτῶν’ ἐνόησα περὶ χρότ (χρωτ Z) συγγόντα (Zʼ, γαλόντα Z)”
[Od. 19.232]. ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ θώρακος (θώρακος Z) “Εκτόρεων
dὲ χιτὼνα (χιτῶνα Z) περὶ στῆθεσιν (στῆθεσιν Z, στή-

θεσιν Z)ʼ” [Il. 2.416].


17 χ λ ᾰ δ ο σ· ἄρσενικόν (ἄρσενικόν Z) καὶ περισσώμενον (περισσό-

μενον Z). κυρίως δὲ ὁ σωρὸς τῶν λίθων. Κράτης δὲ
τροπικῶς: "ἀργυρίῳν χληδον (χληδόνα Z, χληδόνα Z") λαβὼν (Zο, λαβὸν Z)" [fr.28 K].

Also in h, m, abbreviated. Cf. Etym.Gud. 567.43, Hesych. X 510, Συναγωγή 419.6.

18 χ λιδον (χληδόν Z)· χύδην, σωρηδόν (σωριδόν Z). ἐπὶ (Zο, [. . .] Z) γὰρ (fort. μὲν) πλῆθος ἐμφάσεως, ὡς Αἰσχύλος "Οπλον κρίτει [fr.290 Mette]. καὶ χληδόντα (χελιδόντα Z) ἀντὶ τοῦ πληθύντα.

Also in h, m, abbreviated. Cf. Etym.Gud. 567.34, Hesych. X 509.

As with the entries containing the new fragments, the closest parallels to these glosses are almost exclusively found in the lexica of Hesychius, Apollonius the Sophist and the Etymologicum Gudianum. The agreements with Hesychius are especially noticeable both in number of parallels and degree of closeness and are indeed of special importance for determining the source. Since it is known, on Hesychius' own testimony, that he has absorbed the dictionary of Apollonius the Sophist through the medium of Diogenianus' lexicon, and since our Ms agrees with Hesychius whenever its text deviates from that of Apollonius, it becomes clear that the latter was not the direct source of the pertinent glosses. The relationship with the Etymologicum Gudianum is also very striking. Since, however, the archetype of that dictionary is contemporary with, if not later than the Matritensis, it cannot have influenced the latter. At any rate, the independence of our Ms is convincingly shown from such entries as, e.g., φοινὺς and χειροβοσκός. It becomes clear, therefore, that both the Madrid Ms and the Gudianum drew independently from a common source. This source, which was very closely related to Hesychius, must have reached southern Italy some time before the supposed date of the Matritensis (i.e., roughly speaking, ca. A.D. 1000).

So far the tendency among experts in the history of ancient lexicography has been to attribute such glosses to the lost lexicon of Diogenianus51 (the main source of Hesychius' lexicon), which is occasionally quoted by the Byzantines down to the XII century.52 The argument for Diogenianus as a source for such glosses rests on the

51 Cf. R. Reitzenstein, op.cit. (supra n.1) 3; and K. Latte, Hesychius (supra n.7) pp.x-xi.
52 Cf. Latte, Hesychius pp. xlii-xliv.
observation that the lexica which quote him display a number of
glosses (anonymous to be sure) which are similar to, yet more ex­
tensive or complete than the corresponding entries in Hesychius. This
argument, however, may be countered by the following considera­
tions: (1) the express testimony of Hesychius himself, who, in his
dedicatory letter to Eulogius, states that he has absorbed in toto
Diogenianus’ dictionary and that the latter lacked ἐπιγραφᾶς, i.e.
references to the sources of the glosses, those found in Hesychius’
lexicon having been supplied by Hesychius himself; (2) the complete
agreement between Hesychius and Diogenianus in the entries in
which the latter is expressly referred to and the absence of any refer­
ence to him in precisely these glosses which are used to support the
theory of a fuller Diogenianus; (3) the testimony of PSI 892 (Pack²
2125); this papyrus, dated earlier than Hesychius by at least one cen­
tury, has preserved a fragment of a lexicon much like that of Hesych­
ius, yet entirely bare of quotations or references and for this reason
rightly attributed to Diogenianus. To counter these objections, the
exponents of the theory of a fuller Diogenianus have postulated the
existence of several versions of that lexicon, one of which was much
more extensive than the other. Some even have gone so far as to
theorize that Hesychius supplied his own dictionary with quotations
and references he found in the fuller version.⁵⁴ Despite this argument
I believe that the balance of probability is against the existence of a
fuller Diogenianus.

On the other hand it is well established that Hesychius’ text, as
we know it from our unique XV-century Ms, has been interpolated
and (at least occasionally) also abbreviated.⁵⁵ It seems, therefore, con­
ceivable that our interpolated glosses may have been taken not from
a supposed fuller version of Diogenianus but from a somewhat fuller
version of Hesychius’ lexicon, one that contained longer entries as
well as more references and quotations than the Marcianus. This
possibility, which I advance here as a mere hypothesis, receives some
strength from the well-established fact that a copy of Hesychius (an
ancestor of our XV-century Ms) was in the vicinity of southern Italy
(where the Matritensis originated) from the time of the Arabian occu­
pation of the neighboring island of Sicily.⁵⁶ On the other hand, there

⁵⁴ Cf. esp. Latte, Hesychius pp. xi-xii.
⁵⁵ Examples are given by Latte, Hesychius pp. xvii-xviii, xxi, xxiii-xxiv.
⁵⁶ Cf. Latte, Hesychius pp. xxii ff.
is not the slightest evidence for the parallel existence of a copy of Diogenianus' lexicon in that area. One may even go so far as to conjecture that Hesychius was occasionally referred to as Diogenianus, on account of the express and unreserved acknowledgement of his debt to his predecessor. This would explain not only the existence of the supposedly "Diogenian" glosses occasionally found in Byzantine lexica, but the almost complete absence of references to Hesychius before the end of the Byzantine period.  
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57 Latte, Hesychius p. xxi, mentions only one reference to Hesychius besides the two found in the scholia of Arethas to Pausanias (cf. Fr. Spiro, "Pausanias-Scholien," Hermes 29 [1894] 143–9).