

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.¹ 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,² has preserved additional new fragments, which deserve 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.³ The second of these exhibits the characteristic style which R. Devreesse calls "en as de pique"⁴ 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.⁵

¹ Cf. R. Reitzenstein, "Inedita poetarum Graecorum fragmenta," *Index lectionum in Academia Rostochiensis semestri hiberno a. MDCCCXC/XCI.*, 3-18; A. B. Drachmann, *Die Überlieferung des Cyrillglossars* (K. Danske Vidensk. Selskab, *Hist.-fil. Meddelelser* XXI.5, Copenhagen 1936) 33. D. L. Page, "The Sources of Stesichorus Fr. 74 (Bergk) and Sappho Fr. 2.5 (L-P.)," *CR* 73 n.s. 9 (1959) 193-4; W. Bühler, "Ein neues Wort für Aeschylus' Glaukos Potnieus," *Philologus* 110 (1966) 306.

² Despite Ch. Graux's cross-reference to it in his description of the Hauniensis in "Rapport sur les Mss. grecs de Copenhague. Notices sommaires de la grande Bibliothèque Royale de Copenhague," *Archives des missions scientifiques*, III^e sér. 6 (1880) 198-9.

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 Hauriensis and Messanensis, which I call *h* and *m* respectively after Drachmann,⁶ 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 *ὄπισσον*, *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.* *λοπάς*, 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 *μηλονόμος* on), whereas in the first half it follows a different recension, the one indicated by K. Latte with the siglum *n*.⁷ 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.⁸ 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 *Z^c* (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.⁹ To the best

⁶ *Op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) 14 and 24–5.

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 (xlix) 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 *Π* 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) *Συναγωγή*, 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 φ α ι δ ρ ό ς · γεγηθώς (γεγηθῶς Z), *Ιων (ιων Z, ἰών Z^c) ἾΑργείοις (Z^c, ἀργίοις Z) φανερός.

cf. h, m: φ α ι δ ρ ῶ ς (φαιδρός h) · γεγηθῶς.

Hesych. Φ 40: φ α ι δ ρ ό ς · καθαρός, γεγηθώς, φανερός.

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 φαιδρός· καθαρός, which occurs as an independent gloss in the *Συναγωγή λέξεων χρησίμων*,¹⁰ 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 φαιδρός with φαίνω and φανερός (p.547.47).

The reference to Ion is made, I believe, for φαιδρός in the meaning φανερός, 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 ἾΑργεῖοι. 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 φαιδρός with this meaning.

2 φ ά λ α ν θ ο ν · πολιόν, Σοφοκλῆς ἾΑχαιῶν συλλόγῳ. εἰ δὲ (malim οἱ δὲ) φαλακρόν, φάλανθον Νέστορος κάρρα (κάραν Z).

cf. Hesych. Φ 91: φ ά λ α ν θ ο ν · πολιόν. καὶ ἡ Νέστορος κάρρα. οἱ δὲ φαλακρόν.

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 φανερός is supported by the etymology of φαιδρός; cf. E. Boisacq, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*⁴ (Heidelberg 1950), who connects it with the words φαίδιμος and φαῖός and translates it 'brillant, serein, clair.'

¹² Cf. W. Schmid / O. Stählin, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* I.ii (Munich 1934) 518.

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 *Γλώσσαι κατὰ πόλεις*.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' (*ἄνθος*).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 *πολιόν* and before the second or alternative meaning *φαλακρόν*; finally, instead of the reading *εἰ δέ* of our Ms, Hesychius reads *οἱ δέ*. 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 *οἱ δέ* and in the position of the quotation, Hesychius offers a much more attractive reading than our Ms. The phrase *εἰ δέ . . . κάρα*, which in the *Matriensis* 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 well-attested mannerism in Sophocles intended to convey affection or respect on the part of the speaker.¹⁷ The phrase as it stands in our

¹⁴ Critical ed. by K. Latte, "Glossographica," *Philologus* 80 (1924) 137–8. On the reliability of the collection and the antiquity of the glosses of that list, see C. M. Bowra, "Γλώσσα κατὰ πόλεις," *Glotta* 38 (1960) 43–60.

¹⁵ For the meaning *ἄνθος* = 'hair,' cf. *Συναγωγή* (s.v. *φάλανθοι*) 402.29; Phot. II.255; the *Suda* Φ 41 (cf. also A 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*³ 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 δέ* to *εἶδε*, 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 *φοῦνιξ*). With the quotation restored to its proper place the change of *εἰ δέ* to *οἱ δέ* 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; *φίλον κάρα*).

words quoted in our entry, which can tentatively be completed so as to give a complete iambic line as follows: <ἀλλ' ὦ > φάλανθον Νέστορος <φίλον > 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 ο ἰ ν ι ξ (φοῖνιξ Z)· τὸ δένδρον, “φοῖνικος νέον ἔρνος” [Od. 6.163]. καὶ ὁ καρπὸς καὶ ὁ πυρρὸς τῷ χρώματι, “ὅς τὸ μὲν ἄλλο τόσον (τοσὸν Z) φοῖνιξ (φοῖνιξ Z) ἦν, ἐν δὲ μετώπῳ λευκὸν σῆμ' ἐτέτυκτο” [Il. 23.454–5]. καὶ τὸ φοινικοῦν ἄνθος, ἐν ᾧ τὰ φοινικᾶ (φοινικᾶ Z) βάπτεται, “ὡς δ' ὅτε (ὄτέ Z^c) τίς (τις Z) τ' ἐλέφαντα (Z^c, ελεφαντα Z) γυνή φοίνικι (φοινικὶ Z) μίγη” [Il. 4.141]. καὶ ἔθνος ὄνομα, “δὴ τότε Φοῖνιξ (φοῖνιξ Z) ἦλθεν ἀνήρ” [Od. 14.288]. καὶ κύριον ὄνομα, “Φοῖνιξ (φοῖνιξ Z) ἄττα (Z^c, αττα Z) γεραιέ (Z^c, γεραιε Z)” [Il. 9.607=17.561]. καὶ ὄρνεον ἱερὸν ἡλίου (Z^c, ηλίου Z). καὶ ὄργάνου εἶδος μουσικοῦ, ὅπερ ἔνιοι μαγά<δι>-δα, ὡς Σοφοκλῆς Θαμύρα (θαμυραι Z, θαμυραὶ Z^c), καὶ Ἀλκαῖος (Z^c, ἀλκαῖος Z) φοινικῶνος (φοινίκωνος Z) ὄνομα (fortasse καὶ Ἀλκαῖος. <καὶ > φοινικῶνος ὄνομα).

cf. h, m: φ ο ἰ ν ι ξ (φοῖνιξ m) · τὸ δένδρον φοῖνικος.

Apollon.Soph. p.695–6: Φ ο ἰ ν ι ξ · τῶν πολλὰ δηλουσῶν ἢ λέξεις. τὸ μὲν γὰρ δένδρον, “Φοῖνικος ἔην ἔρνος.” δηλοῖ καὶ τὸ κύριον ὄνομα, τὸν τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως τροφέα. “Φοῖνιξ ἄττα, γεραιέ.” σημαίνει καὶ τὸν πυρρὸν τῷ χρώματι. “Τὸ μὲν ἄλλο δέμας φοῖνιξ ἦν, ἐν δὲ μετώπῳ λευκὸν σῆμ' ἐτέτυκτο.” καὶ τὸ φοινικὸν ἄνθος. “Ὡς δ' ὅτε τίς τ' ἐλέφαντα γυνή μίγη.” καὶ τὸ ἐθνικόν. “Δὴ τότε Φοῖνιξ ἦλθεν ἀνήρ, ἀπατήλια εἰδώς.”

Etym.Gud. p.556.19–24: Φοῖνιξ · τὸ δένδρον.

Φοῖνικος · νέον ἔρνος. καὶ ὁ καρπός, καὶ ὁ πυρρὸς τοῦ
 χρώματος· ὅς τὸ μὲν ἄλλο τόσον φοῖνιξ ἦν, ἐν δὲ μετώπῳ
 λευκὸν σῆμ' ἐτέτυκτο· καὶ τὸ φοινικοῦν· ἐτέτακτο δὲ τὸ
 φοινικοῦν (*sic*) ἄνθος, ἐν ᾧ τὰ φοίνια βάπτεται.

Hesych. Φ 710: φοῖνιξ · τὸ δένδρον· “φοῖνικος νέον ἔρνος.”
 καὶ ὁ καρπός. καὶ ὁ πυρρὸς τῷ χρώματι.

This entry is made up of two easily distinguishable parts. The first and longer one (from δένδρον to γεραιέ) lists the various meanings of the word φοῖνιξ 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.¹⁸ 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 ὄργάνου εἶδος μουσικοῦ and take the phrase ὅπερ ἔνιοι μαγά<δι>δα 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 φοῖνιξ is further supported by the consideration that Thamyras was a king of Thrace and φοῖνιξ, 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 μαγάδιδα 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: *λύραι* (fr.238 P.), *τρίγωνος* (fr.239), *μόναυλοι* and *πηκτῖδες* (fr.241), besides *μαγάδιδες* (fr.238).

There seems to be some confusion in the very last sentence of the entry. The phrase *καὶ Ἄλκαϊος φοινικῶνος 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 φοινικῶνος ὄνομα, ὡς Ἄλκαϊος*. Another possibility should be reckoned with, however, that a connective particle (e.g. *καί*) 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 attributives *ὁ κωμικός* or *ὁ κωμωδιογράφος*. 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 *χειροβοσκόν* · τὸν διὰ τῶν χειρῶν ζῶντα. Σοφοκλῆς *Δαιδάλω* (*Z^c*, *δαιδαλω Z*). *γαστρίχειρα* (*γατρὶ χεῖρα Z*) δὲ Ἄντιμαχος ἔφη.

cf. *h, m*: *χειροβοσκόν* · τὸν (τῶν *h*) διὰ τῶν χειρῶν ζῶντα.

Hesych. X 286: *χειροβοσκόν* · τὸν διὰ τῶν χειρῶν ζῶντα.

Etym.Gud. p.564.25–26: *χειροβοσκός* · ὁ διὰ χειρὸς ζῶν, 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

¹⁹ Cf. my article "Fragments of Greek Lexicography in the Papyri," in *Classical Studies Presented to Ben Edwin Perry* (Urbana 1968) 194–5.

than the nominative of the *Gudianum*. Save for this unique reference the word is known only through the works of lexicographers and grammarians²⁰ 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,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 *ἐρρηνοβοσκός* (or *ἀρρηνοβοσκός*; *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 *χειρογάστρωρ*, first used by Hecataeus (fr.367 J.). Our lexica list two more words comparable to the above, *γαστερόχειρες* and *ἐγχειρογάστορες*,²² and paraphrase them "οἱ ἀπὸ χειρῶν ζῶντες." The second of these words is attested by Athenaeus 1.4D,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 Τίρυνθι ὀρμητηρίῳ χρήσασθαι δοκεῖ Προῖτος καὶ τειχίσαι διὰ Κυκλώπων, οὓς ἑπτὰ μὲν εἶναι καλεῖσθαι δὲ γαστερόχειρας τρεφομένους ἐκ τῆς τέχνης, ἦκειν δὲ μεταπέμπτους 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 . . . ἦττον ἂν τις προσοῖτο*; and *Etym.Gud.* p.572.49, *χειροβοσκός· ὁ διὰ τῶν χειρῶν βοσκόμενος*, which is a mere variant of the previous entry of this lexicon.

²¹ *Cf.* A. C. Pearson, *The Fragments of Sophocles I* (Cambridge 1917) p.110, and C. Robert, "Daidalos," in *RE* 4 (1901) 1995ff.

²² *Cf.* Hesych. *Γ* 191; *Lex. Bekkerianum* no.5, p.230.13; *Suda Lex. E* 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 *ἐγχειρογάστορες*.

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 *Ἡφαιστοτεύκτους* (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 (χιλίαγρα Z)· ζώφιον, ὡς Ἴππωνάξ (ἵππώναξ Z). καὶ νόμισμα.

cf. Hesych. X 461: χιλιάγρα · ζώφιόν τι.

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 (*ζώφιον*) 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.²⁴ Since the word *χιλίαγρα* 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 *ἀτταγᾶς* (fr.39.7 D³), *γρόμφις* (fr.69 B⁴), *κριγῆ* (fr.50 D³) and *ῥκη* (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, ὀδοντάγρα, 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 σκολόπενδρα (our centipede) in ancient technical writings and which in the spoken Greek of today is characteristically called *σαρανταποδαρούσα*, ‘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 *σηπία* (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, ὄρεοβαζάγρα and τανάγρα, which are apparently of obscure origin.

²⁶ For the use of the word χίλιοι as a first component to indicate a large number, cf. χιλιόφυλλος, χιλιόδυναμος. Cf. also the compounds with μύριοι and ἑκατόν.

²⁷ The word σκολόπενδρα is also used in Modern Greek, restricted for the most part to the formal idiom (the *katharevousa*). In the vernacular of Cephallenia, however, according to an oral communication by Mrs René Kahane, the word has been preserved in the form *σκουλόπετρα*—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), βοῦς (B 968, Δ 551, E 3183), γλαυξ (Γ 610, 615), κόρσιον (K 3663), μέλισσα (M 717), πέλεκυς (H 515, Π 1313), σίλφιον (B 350), χελώνη (K 495), and possibly also ἵππος (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 *XIMAIPA* to *XIIAΓPA*. 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.³⁰ 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 *χίμαιρα* (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.

6 ψ α λ ά σ σ ω ν (ψαλαύσον Z)· κινούμενος, Σοφοκλῆς Ἀλεξάνδρω.
 *Ἴων (ἰών Z) δὲ Εὐρυτίδαις (εὐριτίδαις Z) ἀντὶ τοῦ ψαῦσαι,
 ἀφ' οὗ καὶ ἄ ψ ἄ λ α κ τ ο ς καὶ (lege ó) ἄψαυστος.

cf. h, m: ψ α λ α ύ σ ο ν · κινούμενος.

Hesych. Ψ 47: ψ α λ ά σ σ ε ι · τινάσσει, ψηλαφῶ, κινεῖ, ψαύει,
 ψάλλει· ἀφ' οὗ καὶ ἄ ψ ἄ λ α κ τ ο ς , ó ἄψαυστος.

The simple verb *ψαλάσσω* had not been attested before the Hellenistic period, although *προψαλ[άξης]* occurs in Soph. *Ichn.* 241 and *ὑποψαλάσσετε* is found in Ar. *Lys.* 84. Note also that the verbal adjective *ἀψάλακτος* 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.³¹ The explanation *κινούμενος*, which is not listed in *LSJ* but is confirmed by Hesychius' *ἐψαλάξατο* (E 7693, translated *ἔψαυσεν* and

³⁰ 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 *κραπαταλός* (K 3971) is explained as follows: *παρὰ πολλοῖς ὁ μωρός. ἢ νόμισμα*. It is only with Pollux' assistance (9.83) that the nature of that strange "coin" is fully revealed.

³¹ For the vocabulary shared by Sophocles and Ion, cf. T. B. L. Webster, "Sophocles and Ion of Chios," *Hermes* 71 (1936) 268ff.

ἐκινήθη), suggests that Sophocles used it as an intransitive verb.³² Hesychius' *κινεῖ* (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 *ἀψάλακτος*). The use of the aorist infinitive (*ψαῦσαι*) in the explanation seems to suggest that Ion used it in that form, but it is also possible that the form *ἐψαλάξατο* (*ἐψαλάσσατο* *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 ψ ε φ α ί α ς ν υ κ τ ό ς · σκοτεινῆς (σκοτινῆς Z), Σοφοκλῆς Τρωϊλῶ (Z^c, τρωϊλῶ Z). γράφεται δὲ καὶ ψεφαιγοῦς (ψεφαιγοῦς Z) ὡς λυκοφῶς (sic, fortasse Λυκόφρων).

cf. h, m: ψ ε φ α ί α ς ν υ κ τ ό ς · σκοτινός.

Hesych. Ψ 134: ψ ε φ α ί α ς ν υ κ τ ό ς · σκοτεινῆς.

Ψ 135: ψ ε φ α υ γ ο ῦ ς · σκοτεινῆς.

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, *ψεφαιγοῦς* was a *varia lectio* for *ψεφαίας*, 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 *ψεφαιγοῦς*, possibly Lycophron; or the form was explained on the parallel of the adjective *λυκαυγής* '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.

³² 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 $\underline{\nu} - \psi\epsilon\phi\alpha\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma \nu\upsilon\kappa\tau\acute{o}\varsigma - \underline{\nu} - \upsilon \underline{\nu}$). 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.³³ 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.

8 ὄπισσον · τὸ τῆς γυναικὸς αἰδοῖον, Μακεδόνες.

cf. h: ὄπισσον · ζήτ(ει).

Hesych. O 1020: ὄπισσον · λάχανον ἄγριον. ἢ τρωκτόν. ἢ †ἄπιστον.

The reading of *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 *h* was not copied directly from *Z*. On the other hand *m* left the entry out altogether, depriving us of any more precise evidence of the degree of its relationship with *h*.

The word ὄπισσον is not listed in *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 *membrum muliebre*.³⁴ The sexual connotation may in fact be responsible for the apparent disturbance in the latter part of Hesychius' explanation.

9 φάκτον · μέτρον παρὰ Ἀρκάσιν, κοτύλαι Ἀττικάι (κοτυλεάττει καὶ *Z*) τρεῖς. φάυλωσ · κακῶς. ἔνιοι δὲ ὄλοσχερῶς.

cf. h, m: φάκτον · μέτρον.

Hesych. Φ 76: φρακτεῖν · φράττειν. φρακτὸς γὰρ ὁ φραγμός. καὶ τὸ μέτρον φάκτον.

Φ 74: φάκται · ληνοί, σιπύαι, πύελοι.

³³ Cf. Dio Chrys. 11.77–78 and A. C. Pearson, *op.cit.* II (*supra* n.21) p.253ff.

³⁴ Cf. the similar case of σέλινον recorded in Hesychius and Photius. For more examples see E. Ληγαίου (Ch. Charitonides), *Ἀπόρρητα* (Thessalonica 1935) 20ff.

The form *φάκτον* points toward the adjective *φακωτός*, 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 (*φαύλως· ὀλοσχερῶς καὶ τὰ ὅμοια, 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 π ά σ (*Z*^c, *λόπας Z*)· Συρακόσιοι τὸ τήγανον (*Z*^c, *τίγανον Z*). παρὰ δὲ Θεοπόμπῳ (*Z*^c, *θεοπομπῳ Z*) ἐν Ἀδμήτῳ ἢ σορός (*σωρός Z*)· καὶ παρὰ τοῖς κωμικοῖς· καλεῖται (*λαλεῖται Z*) δὲ οὕτως καὶ ὁ ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι (*Z*^c, *ελλάδη Z*) γινόμενος (*γενόμενος Z*) λίθος.

cf. *h*: λ ό π α σ · Συρακούσιοι τὸ τίγανον· παρὰ δὲ Θεοπόμπῳ ἐν Ἀδμήτῳ ἢ σορός· καὶ περὶ τοῖς κωμικοῖς· καλεῖται δὲ οὕτως καὶ ὁ ἐν τῇ ἀλλάδῃ γινόμενος λίθος.

Suda Λ 674: Λ ο π ά σ · παρὰ Συρακουσίοις τὸ τήγανον· παρὰ δὲ Θεοπόμπῳ ἢ σορός, καὶ παρὰ τοῖς κωμικοῖς· καλεῖται δὲ οὕτω καὶ ὁ ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι γινόμενος λίθος· Ἀριστοφάνης· ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν ἂν ὀρνίθων κτλ. [*Vesp.* 508–511].

Hesych. Λ 1262: λ ο π ά σ · τὸ τήγανον καὶ λίθος ἐν Ἑλλάδι (*sic codex*).

Phot. I.393: λ ο π ά σ · σορός.

λ ο π ά δ α · τὴν θεόν· Θεόπομπος.

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 *αλλαδη* (with the indication of it as a *locus desperatus*!) against the concerted testimony of the Marcianus and the *Suda*, both of which read *Ἑλλάδι*. Our 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 *ἐν Ἑλλάδι* to *ἐν Ἡλιαία*³⁶ was undoubtedly suggested by the Aristophanean passage (*Vesp.* 508–511) quoted in the *Suda* immediately after *λίθος*.³⁷ It is, however, completely unwarranted. Far superior is Koraes’ emendation of the *Suda* passage to *ὁ ἐν τῇ ἐλαία γινόμενος ἥλος*,³⁸ which is amply supported by Theophr. *HP* 4.14.3. A slight improvement can be effected by substituting for *ἐλαία* the form *ἐλάα*, which not only is the Attic form of the word and the form used by Theophrastus,³⁹ but also explains better (palaeographically) the change of *ΕΛΑΑΙ* to *ΕΛΛΑΔΙ* (possibly through an intermediate form *ΕΛΛΑΑΙ*).⁴⁰

The identification of the writer cited in the gloss with Theopompus Comicus cannot be seriously challenged. F. Jacoby’s⁴¹ preference for the historian Theopompus dates from a period when the testimony of *h* was not known, while Edmonds⁴² has apparently overlooked the inconspicuous reference to the playwright in Adler’s edition of the *Suda*.

³⁶ Cf. *Philologus* 13 (1858) 508–9. The correction was adopted by M. Schmidt in his ed. of Hesychius.

³⁷ There can be no doubt that the quotation from the *Wasps* is not a part of the original gloss, but was added by the compiler of the *Suda*, who freely inserted quotations from the extant comedies of Aristophanes. Cf. V. Coulon, *Quaestiones criticae in Aristophanis fabulas* (*Diss. Philol. Argent.* XIII.1, Strassburg 1907) esp. 9–10 and 265; A. Adler, “Suidas,” in *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 *γινόμενος* in the *Suda* unexplained.

³⁸ Cf. A. Koraes, *Ξενοκράτους καὶ Γαληνοῦ περὶ τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν ἐνύδρων τροφῆς κτλ.* (Paris 1814) 156.

³⁹ The form *ἐλάα* is also used by Hesychius; cf. *s.v.* *γεργέριμος* (Γ 412).

⁴⁰ The tendency of the scribes to duplicate letters is well attested. Duplication of *lambda* occurs frequently in the Mss, e.g. in the word *Ἀπρίλιος* (spelled *Ἀπρίλλιος*).

⁴¹ *FGrHist.* 115 F 408.

⁴² *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 *τὴν θεόν* is simply a scribal error for *τὴν σορόν* effected by the proximity of the word *Θεόπομπος*. 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 glosses⁴³ in which the word *λοπάς* is equated with the word *σορός* reference is made to Theopompus, together with Pollux' silence about such a meaning of the word,⁴⁴ 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 *καὶ παρὰ τοῖς κωμικοῖς* in the *Suda* 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,⁴⁵ we may speculate that a transposition of the phrase *καὶ παρὰ τοῖς κωμικοῖς* 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: *Συρακόσιοι τὸ τήγανον· καὶ παρὰ τοῖς κωμικοῖς· παρὰ δὲ Θεοπόμπῳ κτλ.*⁴⁶ 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 *λοπάς* in the sense 'frying pan' (*τήγανον*) 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 *τήγανον* 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 *λοπάς*. A hasty reader, however, could have misunderstood Athenaeus.

⁴³ The fourth reference found also in Photius seems to be of the same origin as those discussed here.

⁴⁴ Pollux lists a number of words used in reference to a coffin, such as *σορός*, *πύελος*, *κιβωτός*, *ληνός* (*cf.* 7.160, 8.146 and 10.150).

⁴⁵ *Cf.* Eubulus fr.109 K. and Archedicus fr.2.4 K.

⁴⁶ In view of the general structure of the entry, the reading *παρὰ Συρακουσίου* in the *Suda* may be considered as that of the original gloss.

- 11 χαμαιπετῶς· ὥστε μὴ εἰς τοῦδαφος (τούδαφος Z) ῥίψαι
 (ῥίψαι Z). Αἰσχύλος Γλαύκῳ Ποτνιεῖ.
 cf. *m, h*: χαμαιπετῶς· Αἰσχύλος γλαυκοποτνεῖ.⁴⁷
 Hesych. X 135: χαμαιπετῶς· ὥστε μὴ εἰς τοῦδαφος
 ῥίψαι.

M. Schmidt, in his edition of Hesychius, bracketed the puzzling negative *μὴ* of the explanation, while suggesting as an alternative that the original entry was *μὴ 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',⁴⁸ 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 *πέτομαι* 'to fly'.⁴⁹ 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.⁵⁰ 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 *ρίπτω* 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 *πέτομαι* and *-πετής* from *πέτομαι* as well as *πίπτω* (*cf.* 522, 543).

⁵⁰ Cf. W. Schmid, *Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern* IV (Stuttgart 1896) 660ff.

containing the new fragments. All, except *ἀμωσγέπως* which is termed *ρήτορικὴ 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 *ἀμωσγέπως* (*ἀμώσγεπως Z*). τοῦτο ἐν ἴσῳ, καθ' ὄντινα (ὄτινα Z) οὖν τρόπον. ἔνιοι (ἔνιοι Z) δὲ τὸ μετρίως. παρὰ Πλάτωνι [Charm. 175c etc.] τὸ ἐκ παντὸς τρόπου.
Also in *h*. Cf. schol. Plat. Charm. 175c (ed. Greene, p.116), *Etym.Gud.* 128.7 DeStef., *Etym.Mag.* 95.19, Hesych. A 4182.
- 2 *κωφόν*. ἀναίσθητον. μεταφορικῶς τὸ ροῖζον (ροῖζόν Z) μὴ ποιοῦν. “κωφὸν (κῶφον Z) γὰρ βέλως ἀνδρὸς ἀνάλκιδος οὐτιδανοῖο” [Il. 11.390]. ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ κύματος. “ὡς δ' ὅτε (δ' τε Z) πορφύρη (πορφυρεῖ Z) πέλαγος μέγα κύματι κωφῶ (κωιφῶι Z)” [Il. 14.16], τῶ μηδέπω (μηδέπωι Z) καχλάζοντι ἀρχομένῳ (ἀρχόμενοι Z) δὲ μεγαλύνεσθαι ἀφόφως.
Also in *h*. Cf. *Etym.Gud.* 359.6, Hesych. K 4902, Apollon. Soph. 427–8.
- 3 *κωχεύουσι*. ὀχοῦσι, μετεωρίζουσιν. Σοφοκλῆς *Καμικοῖς*, “πιστοί με κωχεύουσιν ἐν φορᾷ (ἐνφοραὶ Z) δέμας” [fr.327 P.].
Also in *h*. Cf. Hesych. K 4905, *Etym.Gud.* 360.5.
- 4 *κέπφος*. ὄρνεον κοῦφον, ὡς Ἀριστοτέλης φησὶν [HA 593b 14, 620a13], περὶ τὴν θάλασσαν τρίβον. οἱ δὲ λάρων (λάρων Z).
Also in *h*. Cf. Hesych. K 2242, schol. Ar. Plut. 912 (ed. Dübner, p.372), *Etym.Mag.* 504.1, Zonaras 1183.
- 5 *νῦν δὲ θεοὶ μάκαρες*. τοῦτό φασιν ἐξόδιον εἶναι τραγωδῶν (*lege* ῥαψωδῶν). “νῦν δὲ θεοὶ μάκαρες τῶν ἐσθλῶν ἄφθονοὶ (*lege* ἄφθονοί) ἐστε.”
Also in *h, m*. Cf. Hesych. N 730, Ael.Dion A 76 Erbse.

⁵¹ For brevity's sake no distinction is made between Z and Z^c, except when some particular problem is involved.

- 6 ξ υ μ φ ο ρ ά · συντυχία (συντυχεία Z). και ἐπὶ ἀγαθοῦ τάσσεται, ὡς παρ' Αἰσχύλῳ ἐν Καβείροις [fr.49 Mette], και ἐπὶ κακοῦ παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ.
Also in *h, m.* Cf. Hesych. E 114.
- 7 ὄ λ ε θ ρ ο ν · ἔνιοι (ἔνιοι Z) παρὰ Ἀριστοφάνει [cf. fr.320.3 K.] ἐπὶ κόσμου γυναικείου (γυναικίου Z), οὐ καλῶς. ἄλλοι τὸν βαθύν (βαθύ Z). ἔστι δὲ ὄλεθρον. ἀποδυσπετοῦντα γὰρ εἰπεῖν τὸν παρὰ τῷ (τὸ Z) Ἀριστοφάνει· ὄλεθρος γὰρ ὁ θάνατος.
Also in *h, m.* Cf. Hesych. O 516.
- 8 ὄ μ α υ λ ο ν · ὁμόκοιτον, σύγκοιτον (σύνκοιτον Z), ὁμοῦ αὐλιζόμενον· Σοφοκλῆς Φινεῖ (φίνει Z) [fr.717 P.].
Also in *h, m.* Cf. Hesych. O 681.
- 9 π ο ρ κ ά ς · ἔλαφος. ὑπὸ Ἀρκάδων τὸ ταχύ. παρὰ δέ τινι <***>.
Also in *h, m.* Cf. Hesych. Π 3039.
- 10 π ρ ό γ ο ν ο ι · οἱ πρωτόγονοι (προτόγονοι Z) ἄρνες. οἱ δὲ μετὰ τούτους (τούς Z) μέτασσαι (μετάρσαι Z). ἔρσαι δὲ οἱ παλαιοὶ (lege ἀπαλοὶ) και τὸ ἔαρ γινόμενοι (lege τῷ ἔαρι γεννώμενοι). “ἔρχατο, χωρὶς μὲν πρόγονοι, χωρὶς δὲ μέτασσαι (μετάσσε Z), χωρὶς δ' αὖθ' ἔρσαι (δαυθέρσαι Z)” [Od. 9.221–2].
Also in *h, m.* Cf. Hesych. Π 3371, Apollon.Soph. 568–9.
- 11 π ρ ο γ ό ν ο υ ς · τοὺς πρεσβυτάτους ἄνδρας, Τροιζήνιοι (τρυζίνιοι Z). λέγονται δὲ και οἱ τοῖς γαμήσασι προγεγονότες παῖδες.
Also in *h, m.* Cf. Hesych. Π 3372.
- 12 σ ῶ μ α (σῶμα Z)· Ἀρίσταρχος σημειοῦται τοῦτο τῇ διπλῇ, ὅτι σῶμα οὐ δὴ ποτε λέγει Ὀμηρος ἐπὶ τοῦ ζῶντος ἀλλ' ἐπὶ νεκροῦ· “σῶμα (σῶμα Z) δὲ οἴκαδ' ἐμὸν (οἰκαδέμον Z) δόμεναι πάλιν” [Il. 7.79, 22.342]. και “ὡς δὲ (ὡς τε codd. Pliadis) λέων ἐχάρη μεγάλῳ ἐπὶ σώματι κύρσας” [Il. 3.23]. τὸ δὲ τοῦ ζῶντος <δέμας>. “δέμας δ' ἦϊκτο (δίκτου Z) γυναικί” [Od. 13.288, 16.157], παρὰ τὸ συνδεδέσθαι αὐτῷ (αὐτό Z).
Not in *h, m.* Cf. Etym.Gud. 519.37, Apollon.Soph. 629, Hesych. Σ 3072.

- 13 τ ά φ ο ς · τὸ γινόμενον περιδείπνον ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν ἀρχομένων τιμῇ (τιμῆ Z). “σὺ δέ κεν τάφου ἀντιβολήσαις” [Od. 4.547]. καὶ ὁ ἐπ’ αὐτοῖς ἀγών· “Πατρόκλοιο (πατρόκλης Z) τάφου μνημῆιον (μνημ’ ἔμμεναι codd. Pliadis)” [Il. 23.619],, οἶον ἐπιτάφιον (ἐπὶ ταφίου Z). οὐδέποτε δὲ ἐπὶ {διὰ} τοῦ καθ’ ἡμᾶς σημαινομένου (σημαινομεν Z) τίθησιν, ἀλλὰ τύμβον αὐτὸ καὶ σῆμα. τίθησιν δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ ἐκπλήξεως τὴν λέξιν· “τάφος δ’ ἔλε (δέλε Z) πάντας (παν τοὺς Z) Ἀχαιοῦς (sic etiam lexicis, ἰδόντας codd. Odysseae)” [Od. 21.122]. καὶ πόλιν ἢ νῆσον· “ξεῖνος δ’ οὗτος ἐμὸς πατρῷος ἐκ Τάφου ἐστίν” [Od.1.417]. καὶ {εὐ}θυτικῆς σημειῖόν τι.
Not in *h, m*. Cf. *Etym.Gud.* 524.1, Hesych. T 278, Apollon. Soph. 634–5, *Etym.Mag.* 748.28.
- 14 φ ι λ ε ῖ ν · ξενίζειν· “χαῖρε, ξεῖνε, παρ’ ἄμμι (παράμμη Z) φιλήσαι (φιλήσαιε Z)” [Od. 1.123]. κατὰ ψυχὴν ἀγαπᾶν· “ἢ μούνοι (ἡμουνι Z) φιλέουσ’ ἀλόχους (φιλέουσα λάχους Z)” [Il. 9.340]. τὸ δὲ καθ’ ἡμᾶς φιλεῖν κυνεῖν φησιν· “κύνεον ἀγαπαζόμενοι” [Od. 21.224].
Also in *h, m*, abbreviated. Cf. Apollon.Soph. 688–9, Hesych. Φ 462, *Etym.Gud.* 553.37.
- 15 φ ω ς · ὀξυτόνως μὲν ἄν(θρωπ)ος ἀπὸ τοῦ φωτίζειν τῷ λόγῳ πάντα, περισπωμένως (περισπομένως Z) δὲ τὸ πῦρ καὶ μεταφορικῶς ἢ χαρά. οἶον· “Τρώων ῥῆξε (ρίξε Z) φάλαγγα, φῶως (φοῶς Z) δ’ ἐτάροισιν ἔθηκεν” [Il. 6.6].
Also in *h, m*, abbreviated. Cf. *Etym. Gud.* 560.38, Apollon. Soph. 701–2, Hesych. Φ 1119.
- 16 χ ι τ ῶ ν (χιτῶν Z)· ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ συνήθους, “τὸν δὲ (τόνδε Z) χιτῶν’ ἐνόησα περὶ χροῖ (χρωῖ Z) σιγαλόεντα (Z^c, γαλόεντα Z)” [Od. 19.232]. ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ θώρακος (θώρακος Z) “Ἐκτόρεον δὲ χιτῶνα (χειτῶνα Z) περὶ στήθεσσι (στήθεσιν Z, στήθεσσι Z^c)” [Il. 2.416].
Not in *h, m*. Cf. *Etym.Gud.* 567.1, Apollon.Soph. 711–2, Hesych. X 486; cf. also *Etym.Mag.* 812.9.
- 17 χ λ ῆ δ ο ς · ἀρσενικὸν (ἀρσενικῶν Z) καὶ περισπώμενον (περισπόμενον Z). κυρίως δὲ ὁ σωρὸς τῶν λίθων. Κράτης δὲ

τροπικῶς· “ἀργυρίου χλήδον (χλήδονα Z, χληδόνα Z^c)
λαβών (Z^c, λαβόν Z)” [fr.28 K.].

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

- 18 χ λ ι δ ῶ ν (χλύδων Z)· χύδην, σωρηδόν (σοριδόν Z). ἐπὶ (Z^c, [. . .]
Z) γὰρ (fort. μὲν) πλήθους ἐμφάσεως, ὡς Αἰσχύλος
“Ὀπλων κρίσει [fr.290 Mette]. καὶ χλιδῶντα (χελιδόντα
Z) ἀντὶ τοῦ πληθύνοντα.

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., *φοῦνιξ* 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 Diogenianus⁵² (the main source of Hesychius' lexicon), which is occasionally quoted by the Byzantines down to the XII century.⁵³ The argument for Diogenianus as a source for such glosses rests on the

⁵² Cf. R. Reitzenstein, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) 3; and K. Latte, *Hesychius* (*supra* n.7) pp.x-xi.

⁵³ 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 extensive or complete than the corresponding entries in Hesychius. This argument, however, may be countered by the following considerations: (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 *ἐπιγραφάς*, 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 reference 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 century, has preserved a fragment of a lexicon much like that of Hesychius, 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, conceivable 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 occupation 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 lexicæ, but the almost complete absence of references to Hesychius before the end of the Byzantine period.⁵⁷

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

May, 1968

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).