

# On Stephanus of Byzantium β 188: Βύβλος, βύβλος, and φιλύρα

*Lucia Prauscello*

THE ENTRY Βύβλος (β 188) of the epitomized version of Stephanus' *Ethnika* is interesting on various grounds.<sup>1</sup> In particular, historians of Egyptian and Near Eastern religions have been attracted by the explicit link in the first part of the entry between the Syrian city of Byblos and Isis' peregrinations while looking for the corpse of her dead husband Osiris.<sup>2</sup> Less attention in recent time has been given to the lines

<sup>1</sup> Cited from M. Billerbeck et al., *Stephani Byzantii Ethnica* I–V (Berlin 2006–2017). The following are cited by author's name: H. Erbse, *Untersuchungen zu den attizistischen Lexika* (Berlin 1950); P. M. Fraser, *Greek Ethnic Terminology* (Oxford 2009); N. Lewis, *Papyrus in Classical Antiquity* (Oxford 1974).

<sup>2</sup> For an illuminating up-to-date treatment of the issue see J. F. Quack, "Resting in Pieces and Integrating the *oikoumene*. On the Mental Expansion of the Religious Landscape by Means of the Body Parts of Osiris," in S. Nagel et al. (eds.), *Entangled Worlds: Religious Confluences between East and West in the Roman Empire* (Tübingen 2017) 244–273, at 255–259. Until very recently this sequence of events was surely attested only in the so-called 'Byblos episode' of Plut. *De Is. et Os.* 15–16, but the evidence provided by *P.Oxy.* 5481 (1<sup>st</sup> CE) has shown that it must have had a wider and multifarious circulation: P. J. Parsons and L. Prauscello, "5481: Isis Romance," *P.Oxy.* LXXXV (London 2020) 19–29. For a more skeptical approach to the relationship between Steph. Byz. β 188, the Plutarch passage, and

that specify the material used for Isis' headband. The present contribution aims at reassessing the soundness of the text of line 5 as printed in Billerbeck's edition. I will show that what we choose to read there has a not insignificant bearing on what we envisage to be Stephanus' *Urtext* and the sources at his disposal.

Here follow Billerbeck's text, apparatus, and translation of Steph. Byz. β 188 (I 382–383):<sup>3</sup>

1 Βύβλος· πόλις Φοινίκης ἀρχαιοτάτη πασῶν, Κρόνου  
 2 κτίσμα, ἀπὸ | Βύβλης τῆς Μιλήτου θυγατρὸς.  
 3 (Anonymus) “Βύβλος δὲ προσηγορεύθη | ἐκ τοῦ πάσης  
 4 ἀρχαίης βίβλου φυλακὴν ἀσινέα ἐν ταύτῃ γενέσθαι. οἱ  
 5 δὲ | ὅτι ἐν αὐτῇ Ἴσις κλαίουσα Ὅσιριν τὸ διάδημα  
 6 ἔθηκε· τοῦτο δ' ἦν βύβλινον, (ἀπὸ) βύβλου τῆς φιλύρης  
 7 τῆς Αἰγυπτίας, ἧς ἀνέτραφε Νεῖλος ἐν | τοῖς ἔλεσι.” τὸ  
 8 ἐθνικὸν Βύβλιος καὶ Βυβλιάς. εἰσὶ καὶ Βύβλιοι  
 9 Σκυθικὸν | ἔθνος. ἔστι καὶ Βύβλος ἐν τῷ Νεῖλῳ πόλις  
 10 ἀσφαλεστάτη. τὸ ἐθνικὸν | Βύβλιος, ἢ Βυβλίτης τῷ  
 11 τύπῳ τῷ Αἰγυπτιακῷ.

2 βύβλης RQ: βί- PN 3-6 Βύβλος — ἔλεσι anonymo, qui Ionica dialecto de Phoenice scripsit, attribuit Meineke 2 βύβλος PN: βί- RQ 3 ἀρχαίης RQ: -ας PN βίβλου PN: βύ- RQ 4 Ἴσις Xylander: ἴσιν RQP 4-5 βύβλινον Salmasius: βίβλιον RPN, βυβλίον Q 5 (ἀπὸ) βύβλου τῆς φιλύρης Berkel: βύβλου τῆς φυλῆς RQP 6 βυβλιάς R: sine acc. Q, βυβλιάς PN 6-7 ἔθνος σκυθικὸν RQP 8 βίβλιος R

Byblos, Stadt in Phönizien, die älteste von allen; sie ist eine Gründung des Kronos <und ist> nach Byble<sup>4</sup> <benannt>, der

<sup>1</sup> Lucian *Syr.D.* 7, see J. L. Lightfoot, *Lucian: On the Syrian Goddess* (Oxford 2003) 312–319.

<sup>3</sup> I have reproduced the line numbers of Billerbeck's edition, with a vertical stroke indicating line divisions.

<sup>4</sup> Billerbeck and Zubler, *Stephani Byzantii Ethnica* II 310 (*addenda* to vol. I), seem to accept the identification of Byble with Byblis (“Byble, bzw. Byblis”), already suggested by A. Berkel, *Στεφάνου Βυζαντίου Ἐθνικά κατ' ἐπιτομήν, Stephani Byzantini Gentilia per epitomen* (Leiden 1688) 247 n.53, who emended

Tochter des Miletos. <So heisst es> (Anonymus): “Byblos aber nannte man <die Ortschaft> deswegen, weil man dort Papyrus aus ältester Zeit schadlos aufbewahrte. Andere hingegen <berichten>, Isis habe, als sie Osiris weinte, dort ihr Diadem abgelegt; dieses aber sei aus Papyrus <verfertigt> gewesen, und zwar aus Bast von ägyptischen Papyrusstauden, welche der Nil in den Sümpfen emporspriessen liess.” Das Ethnikon <laudet> Byblier und <das Femininum> Bybliadin. Ausserdem gibt es noch die Byblier, ein skythisches Volk. Dazu kommt weiter <ein Ort namens> Byblos am Nil, eine überaus sichere Stadt. Das Ethnikon <laudet> Byblier oder Byblit, abgeleitet nach der Bildungsweise der Ägypter.

Many of Stephanus’ entries revolve around concurrent etymological explanations and β 188 is no exception.<sup>5</sup> Under the entry Βύβλος we are given three different etymologies:<sup>6</sup> Byblos was so called either (1) “after Byble, daughter of Miletos,” or (2) because in the city “were preserved undamaged every kind of old book-roll”<sup>7</sup> (Βύβλος δὲ προσηγορεύθη ἐκ τοῦ πάσης ἀρχαίας

---

the transmitted Βύβλης to Βυβλίδος on the basis of schol. Theocr. 7.115–118b Wendel. On what Berkel’s conjecture can tell us about the history of the transmission of this entry, see §3 below.

<sup>5</sup> For the prominent role of etymologies in the *Ethnika* see M. Billerbeck and A. Hartmann-Neumann, *Stephanos von Byzanz: Grammatiker und Lexikograph* (Berlin 2021).

<sup>6</sup> Modern linguistics inclines to consider Βύβλος the Hellenized version of the city’s Phoenician name Gubal (“mountain”): see Lewis 7–8 n.7; G. J. Thierry, “Gebál, Byblos, Bible. – Paper,” *VT* 1 (1951) 130–131 (fanciful on the etymology of πάπυρος, for which see A. Soldati, “Attorno alla voce πάπυρος nella tarda antichità,” *Glotta* 86 [2010] 159–169, at 160 n.6).

<sup>7</sup> This seems to me the correct translation of the transmitted text, *pace* Billerbeck: πᾶς (+ adj.) + noun without article has the sense of “totally/completely” only with abstract or collective nouns (e.g. πᾶσα ἀνάγκη): see Smyth, *GG* §1171 with examples. Therefore πάσης ἀρχαίας βίβλου does not mean “Papyrus aus ältester Zeit” but “every kind of old book-roll.” That βύβλος refers here to book-roll and not to papyrus *per se* is confirmed by the entry of *Et.Gen.* s.v. Βύβλος (β 287 Lasserre-Livadaras) πόλις Φοινίκης ἀρχαιοτάτη. εἴρηται ὅτι τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ τιθέμενα βιβλία ἄσηπτα διαφυλάττεται

βίβλου φυλακὴν ἀσινέα ἐν ταύτῃ γενέσθαι), or (3) because Isis, while mourning Osiris, deposited there her headband made of papyrus (βύβλος). That (2) and (3), i.e. the sequence Βύβλος δὲ προσηγορεύθη — ἐν τοῖς ἔλεσι, are very likely to be a quotation from a (for us anonymous) prose writer (historian or mythographer?) in the Ionic dialect was first recognized by Meineke.<sup>8</sup> Our concern will be mainly with (3), more specifically with the nature of the διάδημα worn by Isis and the possible sources underlying this information.

1. *Isis' headband: τοῦτο δ' ἦν βύβλινον*

Billerbeck printed: οἱ δὲ ὅτι ἐν αὐτῇ Ἱσις κλαίουσα Ὅσιριν τὸ διάδημα ἔθηκε· τοῦτο δ' ἦν βύβλινον, (ἀπὸ) βύβλου τῆς φυλῆς τῆς Αἰγυπτίας, ἧς ἀνέτραφε Νεῖλος ἐν τοῖς ἔλεσι. In the apparatus she tells us that βύβλινον is Salmasius' (unavoidable) correction for the transmitted βίβλιον (RPN) *vel* βυβλίον (Q),<sup>9</sup> and that in line 5 the MSS. reading is βύβλου τῆς φυλῆς (RQPN); the emendation (ἀπὸ) βύβλου τῆς φυλῆς is ascribed to Berkel. The MSS. of Stephanus do indeed have βύβλου τῆς φυλῆς τῆς Αἰγυπτίας, but the correction of φυλῆς to φυλῆς (“lime-tree” and, by metonymy, “its fibrous part,” hence “the internal part of the exterior bark,” or “bast”) is Meineke's, not Berkel's. However, before Meineke Berkel too had entertained serious doubt about

(≈ *Etym. Magn.* β 357, [Zon.] *Lex.* β 410; cf. also schol. Dion. Per. 912 [GGM II 455] Βύβλος ἀρχαιοτάτη πόλις εἴρηται, καὶ ὅτι τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ ἀποτιθέμενα βιβλία ἄσηπτα διεφύλαττε.

<sup>8</sup> A. Meineke, *Stephani Byzantii Ethnicorum quae supersunt* (Berlin 1849) 188: “haec verba usque ad ἐν τοῖς ἔλεσι nescio cuius scriptoris sunt, qui ionica dialecto de Phoenicia scripserat.” Ionic dialect: ἀρχαίης in RQ, uncontracted ἀσινέα, and Αἰγυπτίας; on φυλῆς see below. Meineke wondered whether also the infinitive γενέσθαι should be turned into the Ionic γίνεσθαι. A. Brinkmann, “Lückenbüßer,” *RhM* 64 (1909) 637–640, at 640, suggested that the Ionian writer was Teukros of Kyzikos, author of a five-volume work *On Tyre* (Περὶ Τύρου) according to *Suda* s.v. Τεῦκρος ὁ Κυζικηνός (= *BNJ* 274 T 1; 1<sup>st</sup> cent. BCE).

<sup>9</sup> Instances of the same scribal mistake are discussed by M. L. West, *Hesiod: Works and Days* (Oxford 1978) 386 ad *Op.* 589.

the soundness of the transmitted text and his solution was far more radical. Starting from the corresponding entry of *Etym. Magn.* s.v. Βύβλος,<sup>10</sup> Berkel believed that already the preceding phrase had been tampered with (τὸ διάδημα ἔθηκε required the mention of Isis' head—τῆς κεφαλῆς—from which the headband had been removed), and that an original τῆς κεφαλῆς had thus been somehow transposed rightwards and corrupted into τῆς φυλῆς.<sup>11</sup> The text that Berkel advocated was thus οἱ δὲ ὅτι ἐν αὐτῇ Ἰσις κλαίουσα Ὅσιριν τὸ διάδημα τῆς κεφαλῆς ἔθηκε· τοῦτο δὲ ἦν βύβλινον ἀπὸ βύβλου τῆς Αἰγυπτίας, ἧς ἀνέτραφε Νεῖλος ἐν τοῖς ἔλεσι.<sup>12</sup>

Berkel and Meineke adopted different solutions, but what they shared was a sense of unease about the transmitted βύβλου τῆς φυλῆς from both a syntactic (omission of a preposition indicating origin, be it ἐκ or ἀπὸ, before βύβλου)<sup>13</sup> and a semantic (the contextual meaning of φυλή, usually denoting “tribe/race”) point of view. The same unease had already been expressed by Salmasius who considered the whole of lines 4–6 extensively

<sup>10</sup> Βύβλος πόλις Φοινίκης ἀρχαιοτάτη. εἴρηται ὅτι τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ τιθέμενα βιβλία ἄσηπτα.

<sup>11</sup> For similar conclusions on the value of *Etym. Magn.* for the reconstruction of Stephanus' entry see J. Geffcken, *De Stephano Byzantio capita duo* (Göttingen 1886) 17.

<sup>12</sup> Berkel, Στεφάνου Βυζαντίου Ἐθνικά 247: “Haec Salmasius in codicibus Palatinis corruptissima invenit, quod itidem de Vossiano MS affirmare habeo. Itaque res conjecturis peragenda, quibus non mediocrem lucem & certitudinem praebebunt verba Etymologi, jam proxime allegata ... Pro βίβλιον reposui βύβλινον: et ante τὸ βύβλου praepositionem ἀπὸ [sic] excidisse, evidentissime liquet ex verbis supra allegatis. Illud praeterea τῆς φυλῆς non dumtaxat maxime deturpatum est, verum & loco motum, quod in τῆς κεφαλῆς mutare placuit, & auctoritate Etymologici Magni cum διάδημα conjungere: nam papyri flore Dii olim coronabantur.”

<sup>13</sup> See Billerbeck I 383 n.159: “Ob Berkel's Ergänzung ἀπὸ (vgl. Sch. D.P. 912 [*GGM* II 455.6] βύβλινον ὑπάρχον ἀπὸ τῆς ἐν τῷ Νεῖλῳ φουομένης βύβλου) oder ἐκ das Ursprüngliche ist (vgl. Eust. D.P. 912 [377.2] διάδημα ἐκ βύβλου ὃν Αἰγυπτίας), lässt sich nicht mit Sicherheit entscheiden.”

corrupted and proposed to emend to τοῦτο δὲ ἦν βύβλινον ἢ ἀπὸ Βύβλου τῆς φυλῆς Αἰγυπτίης, ἢ ἀπὸ βύβλου, ἦν (sic) ἀνέτραφε Νεῖλος ἐν τοῖς ἔλεσι.<sup>14</sup>

My impression is that Salmasius' solution was motivated by an attempt to save the transmitted τῆς φυλῆς in line 5 as a prospective reference to an otherwise unspecified "Egyptian tribe" possibly linked to the homonymous Egyptian citadel of Byblos mentioned in Stephanus' entry, ἔστι καὶ Βύβλος ἐν τῷ Νεῖλῳ πόλις ἀσφαλεστάτη (cf. also Βυβλίτης τῷ τύπῳ<sup>15</sup> τῷ Αἰγυπτιακῷ).<sup>16</sup> This, however, will not do: in line 5 we are still in Stephanus' quotation of the Ionic prose-writer. ἔστι καὶ Βύβλος ἐν τῷ Νεῖλῳ πόλις ἀσφαλεστάτη in 8 is clearly no part of that quotation but resumes the 'original' entry of Stephanus, who, by the way, had already mentioned in between the existence of a Scythian *ethnos* so named (Βύβλιοι). To correct the embedded quotation via what comes afterwards in Stephanus' entry is not advisable, since there is no guarantee whatever (it is, to the contrary, quite unlikely) that the Ionic prose-writer went on to mention the Egyptian Byblos.<sup>17</sup> Other attempts to emend the

<sup>14</sup> See Salmasius in T. Rick, *Lucae Holstenii Notae et castigationes postumae in Stephani Byzantii EΘNIKA* (Leiden 1684) 76, as reported by Holstenius (= W. Dindorf, *Stephanus Byzantius cum annotationibus L. Holstenii, A. Berkelii et Th. De Pinedo* II [Leipzig 1825] 163). There is some point in Salmasius' ἦν: the indirect attraction of the relative (the transmitted ἦς) may seem out of place in the plane prose of the anonymous Ionian writer.

<sup>15</sup> For τύπος + adj. in Stephanus to indicate the epichoric, locally current form of a toponym as opposed to the common panhellenic usage, see the several examples in Fraser 64 and 263 s.v. α 538 (Αὔενιῶν ... τὸ ἔθνικὸν Αὔενιωνήσιος τῷ ἐπιχωρίῳ καὶ Αὔενιωνίτης τῷ Ἑλληνι τύπῳ); see also 268.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Ctesias *FGrHist* 688 F 14.37 (Inaros II, the Egyptian rebel prince retreating before Megabyzos) φεύγει δὲ πρὸς τὴν Βύβλον Ἰναρος (πόλις ἰσχυρὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ αὐτῇ). Egyptian Byblos has been identified with Bilbeis in the eastern delta by A. Nibbi, *Ancient Byblos Reconsidered* (Oxford 1985) 90–93.

<sup>17</sup> It would not have made sense: the aition narrated by the Ionic writer depended on Isis leaving Egypt and wandering as far as Byblos in Phoenicia.

passage are that of an anonymous “vir doctus” mentioned in Meineke’s apparatus,<sup>18</sup> who suggested φυλῆς to be a corruption of ὕλης (presumably in the sense of “undergrowth/corpe” as opposed to “forest tree?”);<sup>19</sup> and that of Brinkmann, who tentatively suggested emending βύβλου τῆς φυλῆς τῆς Αἰγυπτίας to βύβλου τῆς φίλης τῆ Αἰγυπτίη.<sup>20</sup> The most recent editor of Stephanus, Billerbeck, prints Meineke’s conjecture φιλόρης. What was the reason for Meineke’s emendation? On the basis of what sources? And, above all, were Meineke’s sources also the sources available to Stephanus? Before trying to see whether the transmitted text in line 5 can be saved, let us first have a closer look at Meineke’s φιλόρης.

## 2. Βύβλος, πάπυρος, and φιλόρα

The Ionic prose-writer quoted by Stephanus tells us that the headband of Isis was βύβλινον. What follows is a specification of the precise kind of βύβλος meant: the Egyptian βύβλος, that is, papyrus. So much is clear, even if the precise *Wortlaut* in line 5 remains obscure. But why was a qualification necessary? Was the adjective βύβλινον not enough to clarify matters? Modern translations (e.g. Billerbeck’s “aus Papyrus <verfertigt>”) tend to obfuscate an important fact, namely that in non-technical writings βύβλος and its derivatives can extend, via the trans-cultural phenomenon of “borrowing of foreign nomenclature for a similar local object,” to anything made of reeds of rushes and similar aquatic plants, including (but not exclusively) also

<sup>18</sup> I owe to the editor José M. González the observation that the “vir doctus” was someone of unknown identity to Meineke who had annotated the Aldine edition he was using. See his apparatus to line 16 at 385 *ad Κροκοδείλων πόλις*.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. LSJ<sup>9</sup> s.v. ὕλη A.

<sup>20</sup> Brinkmann, *RhM* 64 (1909) 640; quoted also by W. Knauss, *De Stephani Byzantii Ethnicorum exemplo Eustathiano* (Bonn 1910) 63 n.1.

the *Cyperus papyrus*.<sup>21</sup> It is this potential ambiguity of βύβλινον that explains the subsequent specification βύβλου — ἐν τοῖς ἔλεσι. We have also seen that Billerbeck accepts Meineke's emendation φιλύρης and translates (ἀπὸ) βύβλου τῆς φιλύρης τῆς Αἰγυπτίας, ἧς ἀνέτραφε Νεῖλος ἐν τοῖς ἔλεσι “und zwar aus Bast von ägyptischen Papyrusstauden, welche der Nil in den Sümpfen emporspriessen liess.” Yet, if the Ionic author meant to say that Isis' headband was made “precisely of the fibrous material (i.e. bast) of the Egyptian papyrus-reeds,” the transmitted word order is extremely convoluted: one would have expected e.g. (ἀπὸ) τῆς φιλύρης τῆς βύβλου τῆς Αἰγυπτίας. Equally problematic seems to me also the *iunctura* βύβλου τῆς φιλύρης: in its proper sense φιλύρα means “lime-tree” (Lat. *tilia*),<sup>22</sup> but it can also be used, metonymically, to indicate “the bass underneath

<sup>21</sup> Thus Lewis 11–12, 15, 16 n.19 (the same applies for the Lat. *papyrus*), 78, and 79 with n.16. However, not all the evidence quoted by Lewis is equally convincing. In particular, he seems to me to give too much weight to Eust. *In Od.* II 264.27–29 Stallbaum βίβλινον δὲ οὐ τὸ ἐκ βίβλου, ὃ ἐστὶ παπύρου Αἰγυπτίας, ἀλλὰ βοτάνης τινὸς ἐμφοροῦς παπύρω (commenting on *Od.* 21.390–391 ὄπλον ... βύβλινον): this is just Eustathius' interpretation of the Homeric text (an interpretation that had an exegetic tradition behind it: cf. schol. *Od.* 21.391 Dindorf βίβλινον] καννάβινον. ἢ τὸ ἐκ παπύρου [QV]). The world of the *Odyssey* shows clear knowledge of Egypt: cf. M. Fernández-Galiano, in *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey* III (Oxford 1992) 197–198, who takes βύβλινον in its stricter sense, “made of papyrus.” On the (permeable) distinction in Greek sources between βύβλος (usually denoting the plant as a source of fibers for manufacturing book-rolls or woven items) and πάπυρος (the plant as foodstuff) see Lewis 14–15; for Theophrastus see S. Amigues, *Théophraste, Recherches sur les plantes* II (Paris 1989) 264 n.6. In non-technical literature, πάπυρος itself can simply denote a “rush”: e.g. the equation of φλέως (*Erianthus Ravennae*: a kind of aquatic reed) with πάπυρος in schol. rec. *Ar. Ran.* 243–244a ὁ δὲ φλέως τὸ λεγόμενον πάπυρος.

<sup>22</sup> See R. Strömberg, *Griechische Pflanzennamen* (Göteborg 1940) 117. The correct paroxytone accentuation is defended by K. S. Kontos, “Φιλολογικά σύμμικτα,” *Ἀθηνᾶ* 3 (1891) 523–576, at 574.



its bark, used for writing” (instances in LSJ<sup>9</sup> s.v. φιλύρα II).<sup>23</sup> Can φιλύρα in its metonymic meaning of “bast/inner rind” refer to the fibrous part of *any* plant, not only that of the lime-tree? If we then turn to the extant evidence, the term φιλύρα, be it in the proper sense “lime-tree” or in its metonymical meaning “bast,” is occasionally juxtaposed with or compared to the papyrus, but never identified with it.<sup>24</sup>

The main piece of evidence, which must have been the basis of Meineke’s emendation, is a gloss by Aelius Dionysius (2<sup>nd</sup> cent. CE), one of the founders of Attic lexicography. Ael. Dion. φ 14 as printed by Erbse reads:

φιλύρα· φυτόν ἔχον φλοιὸν βύβλου, παπύρω ὅμοιον, ἐξ οὗ τοῦς στεφάνους πλέκουσιν

This gloss is transmitted by various lexica and etymologica (*Synagoge* φ 136 Cunningham, Phot. *Lex.* φ 207 Theodoridis, *Etym. Magn.* s.v. φιλύρα 795.3–4 Gaisford; [Zon.] *Lex.* φ 1810 Tittmann) and by Eustathius in his commentary on Dionysius Periegetes (912, *GGM* II 377.22–27) within a larger exegetical section on the toponym Βύβλος.<sup>25</sup> We owe to Eustathius the explicit attribution of the text to Aelius Dionysius (Αἴλιος δὲ Διονύσιος ἐν τοῖς περὶ Ἀττικῶν λέξεων). However, the text printed by Erbse is not immediately intelligible:<sup>26</sup> exactly what does

<sup>23</sup> E.g. Joh. Lydus (6<sup>th</sup> cent. CE) *De mens.* 1.28 οἱ γὰρ ἀρχαῖοι ξύλοις καὶ φλοιοῖς καὶ φιλυρίνοις πίναξι πρὸς γραφὴν ἐκέκρητο. ἐστὶ δὲ καὶ σανὶς φιλυρίνη, ἐφ’ ἧς τὰ ρήματα τῆς ἐλευθερίας εἴωθε γράφεσθαι. Τιλία δὲ παρὰ τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἢ φιλύρα τὸ ξύλον· ὅθεν κῶδιξ τὸ βιβλίον.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. e.g. Hesych. s.v. Ναυκρατίτης στέφανος (ν 123 Cunningham): ἀπὸ τῆς Αἰγυπτίας Ναυκράτεως, ὁ βύβλινος (Musurus: βίβλινος H), ἢ ὁ ἐκ φιλύρας, ἢ ὁ σαμψύχινος (Anacr. *PMG* fr.89); Eust. *In Od.* II 264.27–29 βίβλινον δὲ οὐ τὸ ἐκ βίβλου, ὃ ἐστὶ παπύρου Αἰγυπτίας, ἀλλὰ βοτάνης τινὸς ἐμφοροῦς παπύρω. οἱ δὲ καννάβινόν φασιν, ἕτεροι δὲ τὸ ἐκ φιλύρας.

<sup>25</sup> Eustathius is discussing Dion. Per. 912 Βύβλον τ’ ἀγκίαλον. On the context of Aelius Dionysius’ quotation by Eustathius see §3 below.

<sup>26</sup> The same wording is already in Schwabe’s edition: E. Schwabe, *Aelii Dionysii et Pausaniae Atticistarum fragmenta* (Leipzig 1890) fr.317.

φλοιὸν βύβλου mean? φλοιός in botany is a technical term meaning “bark”<sup>27</sup> that can be used with reference to various parts of a plant: the stem, the leaves, the fruit, all of them have a φλοιός, Theophrastus tells us.<sup>28</sup> How should we then translate φλοιὸν βύβλου? Since φλοιός is here predicated of a “plant” in general (φυτόν), it is likely that in this passage φλοιός refers, as it commonly does, to the stem/stalk of the lime-tree and hence indicates its “bark.” What kind of genitive then is βύβλου? A *genitivus materiae* will not do: to say that the lime-tree is a plant that has a bark made of βύβλος defies understanding. A possessive genitive is also quite unlikely: “having a bark [that is proper] of βύβλος” is hardly more comprehensible. To invoke the under-determined meaning of “reed” is equally unsatisfactory: in lexicographical works βύβλος never has the generic sense of “reed” but is routinely and consistently glossed with πάπυρος:<sup>29</sup> this strongly advises against taking βύβλου in Ael. Dion. φ 14 in the loose sense of aquatic “rush.”

If we look at the text of all the witnesses of φ 14, we see that except for Eustathius all the other witnesses (*Synagoge*’’,<sup>30</sup> Photius, *Etym.Magn.* and [Zonaras]) read not ἔχον φλοιὸν βύ-

<sup>27</sup> Theophr. *Hist.Pl.* 1.2.6 φλοιὸς μὲν οὖν ἔστιν τὸ ἔσχατον καὶ χωριστὸν τοῦ ὑποκειμένου σώματος. For the etymology of φλοιός see Beekes, *EDG* II 1582 s.v.

<sup>28</sup> See R. Strömberg, *Theophrastea. Studien zur botanischen Begriffsbildung* (Göteborg 1937) 118–119, on the “Grundbegriff” covered by the term φλοιός in Theophrastus and other technical writers.

<sup>29</sup> *Synagoge* β 115 (βύβλον· πάπυρον ≈ *Suda* β 587), Phot. *Lex.* β 309 (βύβλος· πάπυρος ≈ [Zon.] *Lex.* β 410 βύβλος. ὁ πάπυρος). This is true also for the scholiastic literature in general, cf. e.g. schol. Nic. *Alex.* 362 βύβλον· παπύρου, schol. D.P. 912 πολλὴ βύβλος ἐκεῖσε φύεται, ἦτοι πάπυρος.

<sup>30</sup> *Synagoge*’’ indicates an expanded version of *Synagoge* and denotes agreement of MS. B of the *Synagoge* (= *Coislín.gr.* 345) with Photius: see I. Cunningham, *Synagoge: Συναγωγή λέξεων χρησίμων. Text of the Original Version and of MS. B* (Berlin 2003) 50.

βλου, παπύρω ὅμοιον (as printed by Schwabe and Erbse)<sup>31</sup> but ἔχον φλοιὸν βύβλω παπύρω ὅμοιον. Modern editors of the *Synagoge*, Photius, and *Etym.Magn.* have printed different texts over time.<sup>32</sup> The most recent editor of Photius' *Lexicon*, Theodoridis, prints at φ 207 ἔχον φλοιὸν βύβλου, παπύρω ὅμοιον, thus correcting Photius on the basis of Eustathius. Porson printed instead ἔχον φλοιὸν βύβλω παπύρω ὅμοιον (without comma between βύβλω and παπύρω),<sup>33</sup> whereas Naber accepted Kuster's emendation φλοιὸν βύβλω <ῆ> παπύρω ὅμοιον.<sup>34</sup> In the case of the *Etym.Magn.*, Gaisford s.v. φίλυρα (sic) printed ἔχον φλοιὸν βύβλω παπύρω ὅμοιον but observed in the apparatus that according to Sylburg "παπύρω glossema est."<sup>35</sup> In fact Sylburg in his 1594 edition of the *Etym.Magn.* (and the posthumous revised edition of 1816)<sup>36</sup> printed ἔχον φλοιὸν βύβλω ὅμοιον, athetizing παπύρω. Still different is the solution adopted by Tittmann for the *Lexicon* of pseudo-Zonaras: he corrected the transmitted text to ἔχον φλοιὸν βύβλω παπύρου ὅμοιον (no Latin translation is

<sup>31</sup> Both G. Bernhardt, *Dionysius Periegetes graece et latine* (Leipzig 1828) 958, and Müller, *GGM* II 377, register no variant for βύβλου in Eustathius' MSS. On the MSS. tradition of Eustathius' commentary see A. Diller, *The Textual Tradition of Strabo's Geography. With Appendix: The Manuscripts of Eustathius' Commentary on Dionysius Periegetes* (Amsterdam 1975) 81–207.

<sup>32</sup> For the stemma of the relationships between *Synagoge*, Photius' *Lexicon*, *Etym.Gen.*, and *Etym.Magn.*, see Cunningham, *Synagoge* 13; in particular it is worth remembering that Photius' *Lexicon* draws on both *Synagoge*" and *Synagoge*"', two expansions of *Synagoge*: Cunningham 29. The *Etymologica* also depend on a further expanded version of *Synagoge* (that is, *Synagoge*"") contaminated with *Synagoge*<sup>b</sup> (Cunningham 50).

<sup>33</sup> R. Porson, *Φωτίου τοῦ Πατριάρχου Λέξεων Συναγωγή* (ed. P. P. Dobree) (London 1822).

<sup>34</sup> S. A. Naber, *Photii patriarchae Lexicon* II (Leiden 1864); L. Kuster, *Suidae Lexicon, graece et latine* III (Cambridge 1705) 614 with n.7.

<sup>35</sup> T. Gaisford, *Etymologicum Magnum* (Oxford 1848) 795.

<sup>36</sup> F. Sylburg, *Ἑτυμολογικὸν τὸ Μέγα, editio nova correctior* (Leipzig 1816) 870.

provided).<sup>37</sup> Finally, the entry φ 136 of the *Synagoge* printed by Cunningham reads ἔχον φλοιὸν βύβλω παπύρω ὅμοιον (without comma). Since both Photius and the etymologica derive from the *Synagoge*,<sup>38</sup> we have three possibilities among which to choose: (1) ἔχον φλοιὸν βύβλω παπύρω ὅμοιον of the *Synagoge* is the original text of Aelius Dionysius' gloss; (2) Eustathius alone preserves Aelius Dionysius' correct wording ἔχον φλοιὸν βύβλου παπύρω ὅμοιον; (3) neither the *Synagoge* nor Eustathius transmits the original text but both represent different stages of corruption.

As I have tried to show above, φιλύρα is never used to indicate the fibrous material (from the phloem) of the papyrus proper, and in lexicographical sources πάπυρος is the standard *interpretamentum* of βύβλος. These two considerations strongly support the view that the original text of Aelius Dionysius φ 14 must have been φιλύρα· φυτὸν ἔχον φλοιὸν βύβλω ὅμοιον κτλ. ("lime-tree: a plant having a bark similar to [that of] the papyrus" etc.). παπύρω is thus a gloss intruded quite early in the original text (as already seen by Sylburg) and Eustathius' φλοιὸν βύβλου παπύρω ὅμοιον represents a further stage of the corruption, where βύβλου is a clumsy attempt to make sense of the intruded gloss παπύρω. Aelius Dionysius' gloss φ 14, once correctly understood, thus does not support Meineke's conjecture βύβλου τῆς φιλύρης (τῆς φυλῆς MSS.) τῆς Αἰγυπτίης for Steph. Byz. β 188. A further element in favor of this conclusion is the relative unlikelihood that the Ionic prose-writer quoted by Stephanus would resort to such a technical source (Aelius Dionysius' collection of Attic glosses) to explain the material composition of Isis' headband. The use of Atticist lexicographers and grammarians is well attested in Stephanus' epitomized *Ethnika* and it is possible that it was even more extensive in its

<sup>37</sup> J. A. H. Tittmann, *Iohannis Zonarae Lexicon* II (Leipzig 1808) 1810 with n.74.

<sup>38</sup> See n.32 above.

*Urfassung*.<sup>39</sup> Yet to suppose that the Ionic prose-writer cited by Stephanus was equally familiar with Atticist glosses seems to me quite an unlikely proposition (though unverifiably so).

On the Latin side, the famous and famously problematic passage of Pliny the Elder describing the manufacture of papyrus roll (*HN* 13.74 *preparatur ex eo charta diviso acu in praetenues sed quam latissimas philyras*)<sup>40</sup> might at first sight support the extension of φιλύρα “bast” with reference to the *Cyperus papyrus*, since *philyrae* is used as quasi-synonym for the *schedae* of the papyrus proper.<sup>41</sup> What these *philyrae* really are has been variously debated (simply “strips,” a well-attested meaning in Latin,<sup>42</sup> or

<sup>39</sup> See the overview by E. Honigmann, “Stephanos (Byzantios),” *RE* 3A (1929) 2369–2399, at 2379–2383, who is over-confident, however, on Stephanus’ direct or indirect use of Aelius Dionysius (Honigmann relies entirely on Stemplinger’s misleading identification of Dionysius son of Tryphon with Aelius Dionysius: E. Stemplinger, *Studien zu den EΘNIKA des Stephanos von Byzanz* [Munich 1902] 19–27, at 26–27). In the extant version of the *Ethnika* the grammarian Pausanias is explicitly quoted at α 103 (Αιγίλιω) and variously referred to in the apparatus of *loci similes* of the Freiburg edition (κ 269, ν 47, ψ 18); Aelius Dionysius is never directly quoted in the extant epitome. For Stephanus’ activity as lexicographer see A. Neumann-Hartmann, “Stephan von Byzanz und seine Tätigkeit als Lexikograph,” in *Munera Friburgensia. Festschrift zu Ehren von Margarethe Billerbeck* (Bern 2016) 89–110, and now the extensive treatment by Billerbeck and Neumann-Hartmann, *Stephani Byzantii Ethnica* IV, esp. 57–70 (“Lexikographie als Kulturwissenschaft”).

<sup>40</sup> “Paper is made from the papyrus plant by separating it with a needle point into very thin strips as broad as possible” (Lewis 37). The exact meaning of almost every word of this sentence is disputed: see T. Dorandi, “*Preparatur ex eo charta*. Per una rilettura del capitolo di Plinio (*Nat. Hist.* XIII 71–83) sulla fabbricazione della carta di papiro,” *ZPE* 202 (2017) 84–95 (esp. 85–86 with previous bibliography).

<sup>41</sup> See *TLL* X.1 2040 s.v. *philyra* 1b (“adhibetur pro materia voluminum. strictius de parte tiliae”: Plin. *HN* 13.74 is quoted with the comment “transfertur ad schedam papyri.”)

<sup>42</sup> N. Lewis, *Papyrus in Classical Antiquity: A Supplement* (Brussels 1989) 19: “as used by Latin authors *philyra* regularly denotes a thin strip; the *Oxf. Lat.*

“peeled off sheets”).<sup>43</sup> Yet, whatever interpretation one adopts, it is worth observing that in the passage of Pliny *philyra* is used in the *plural*, that is, not in the singular as it would be in Stephanus’ entry if we accepted Meineke’s emendation. *Philyrae* in Pliny 13.74 does not indicate the raw matter as such (bast) but the shape (strips) in which the papyrus is cut. Neither Aelius Dionysius’ gloss φιλύρα nor Pliny *HN* 13.74 supports Meineke’s conjecture βύβλου τῆς φιλύρης.

### 3. *Eustathius on Dion. Per. 912 (GGM II 376–377)*

Meineke’s ingenious but ultimately unconvincing φιλύρης must have had its origin, as we have seen, in Aelius Dionysius’ gloss φιλύρα (φ 14), whose most extended witness is Eustathius’ commentary on *Dion. Per. 912*.<sup>44</sup> In that portion of his commentary Eustathius leisurely expands on the toponym Βύβλος (Müller, *GGM II 376–377*):<sup>45</sup>

ἡ δὲ Βύβλος κτίσμα καὶ αὐτὴ Κρόνου, Ἀδώνιδος ἱερὰ, Κινύρου βασίλειον ἀρχαιότατον, ἀπὸ Βύβλου τινὸς στρατηγοῦ ἢ ἀπὸ Βύβλης γυναικὸς οὕτω κληθεῖσα, ἢ διὰ τὸ πάσης ἀρχαίας βίβλου κατὰ τοὺς παλαιοὺς τὴν (45) φυλακὴν ἀσινέα ἐν αὐτῇ γενέσθαι, ἢ καὶ διότι Ἰσις τὸν Ὅσιριν κλαίουσα ἐκεῖ τὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἀπέθετο διάδημα ἐκ βύβλου ὄν Αἰγυπτίας. Φυτὸν δὲ ἡ βύβλος κατὰ τοὺς παλαιοὺς φυόμενον ἐν τοῖς Αἰγυπτιακοῖς ἔλεσι, ῥάβδος ψιλῆ, ὡς φασιν ἐκεῖνοι, ἐπ’ ἄκρῳ χαίτην (50)

*Dict.* s.v. gives more than half a dozen citations, from Horace, from Ovid and, most notably, from Pliny himself.”

<sup>43</sup> I. H. M. Hendrik, “Pliny, *Historia naturalis* XIII, 74–82, and the Manufacture of Papyrus,” *ZPE* 37 (1980) 121–136, at 122–126; but see Lewis, *Supplement* 18–19.

<sup>44</sup> Schwabe’s edition of the Atticists’ fragments (n.26 above) postdates Meineke’s edition of Stephanus. The same applies to W. Rindfleisch, *De Pausaniae et Aelii Dionysii lexicis rhetoricis* (Regimonti 1866). Bernhardt’s 1828 edition of Dionysius Periegetes (n.31) must have been the first port of call for Meineke.

<sup>45</sup> For convenience’s sake I adopt here, as in the TLG, a continuous numeration of the lines across the two pages of Müller’s edition.

ἔχουσα, φουομένη πολλή καὶ ἐν τοῖς κάτω μέρεσι τοῦ Δέλτα, ἥς κρείττων, φασίν, ἢ λεγομένη ἱερατική. τῆς δὲ βύβλου τὸ κάτω ὅσον ἐπὶ πῆχυν τρώγεται, ὡς φησιν Ἡρόδοτος, πνιγὲν μάλιστα ἐν κλιβάνῳ διαφανεῖ. Ζητητέον δὲ μή ποτε ἀπὸ τῆς τοιαύτης βύβλου, (55) ὡς πεφυκυίας ὑφαίνεσθαι ἢ πλέκεσθαι ἢ ἄλλως πως συντίθεσθαι, καὶ αἱ τῶν γραμμάτων φύλακες πτύχες βύβλοι ἐλέγοντο, διὰ τὸ τυχὸν ἐκ τοῦ τοιοῦτου φυτοῦ τὰς τοιαύτας τότε κατασκευάζεσθαι, καὶ ἡ κλήσις παρέμεινε καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς, ἐναλλαγέντος τοῦ υ εἰς τὸ συγγενές (60) δίχρονον.<sup>46</sup> Ἐγίνετο δὲ καὶ πέδιλα ἐκ τοῦ φυτοῦ τῆς βύβλου· οἱ γοῦν Αἰγύπτιοι ἱερεῖς βύβλινα λέγονται ποτε φορεῖν ὑποδήματα, καὶ πλοίων δὲ ναυπηγουμένων αἱ ἀρμονίαι βύβλῳ παρεβύοντο, καὶ ἰστία δὲ πλοίοις ἐγίνοντο βύβλινα, καὶ τὴν ἐν Ἀβύδῳ δὲ τοῦ (65) Ξέρξου γέφυραν, ὡς Ἡρόδοτός φησιν, Φοίνικες μὲν λευκολίνῳ ἐγεφύρου, Αἰγύπτιοι δὲ βύβλῳ. Αἴλιος δὲ Διονύσιος ἐν τοῖς περὶ Ἀττικῶν λέξεων ὑπογράφει σαφέστερον τὴν τοῦ φυτοῦ φύσιν τῆς βύβλου, ἔνθα περὶ φιλύρας φησίν, ὅτι φυτὸν ἢ φιλύρα φλοιδὸν ἔχον (70) βύβλου, παπύρῳ ὅμοιον, ἐξ οὗ τοὺς στεφάνους πλέκουσι. καὶ ταῦτα μὲν περὶ Βύβλου.

Byblos itself too is a foundation of Kronos, a city sacred to Adonis and the venue of the most ancient palace of Kinyras. It was so called from a certain Byblos, a military leader, or from a woman named Byble, or because according to the ancients it was in Byblos that every kind of old book was preserved without damage, or also because Isis, mourning Osiris, deposited there from her head her headband made of Egyptian *byblos*. According to the ancients *byblos* is a plant that grows in the Egyptian marshes, a bare stalk, as those say, having foliage on top and growing in abundance in the lower parts of the Delta; its better variety is, they say, the so-called hieratic. The lower part of the papyrus, up to a cubit, is edible, as Herodotus says, especially stewed in a red-hot pan. One must inquire whether it is from such *byblos*—since its nature is such that it can be woven, twisted, or put together to use in some other way—that the folded tablets

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Eust. *In Od.* II 264.29–31 Stallbaum: οὕτω καὶ ἡ ῥηθεῖσα βύβλος διφορεῖται κατὰ τὸ δίχρονον, ἐρρέθη μὲν καὶ ἐν τοῖς τοῦ περιηγητοῦ, δηλοῖ δὲ αὐτὸ καὶ ὁ γράψας ἐν ῥητορικῷ λεξικῷ, ὅτι βύβλινον καὶ βίβλινον διχῶς (= Ael. Dion. β 19 Erbse).

that preserve letters are called *bybloi*, because it so happened that from this plant such tablets were then made, and the name remained up to our time, with the *υ* changed into the cognate anceps [that is, *ι*]. Sandals too were made of the plant of the *byblos*. Indeed it is said that Egyptian priests once wore sandals made of *byblos*; in ship carpentry *byblos* was used to caulk the joints; ships' sails were made of it, and so Xerxes' bridge at Abydos, as Herodotus says. Phoenicians used to that purpose white flax, Egyptians *byblos*. In his work on Attic words Aelius Dionysius explains rather clearly the nature of the plant *byblos* where he says about the lime-tree that it is a plant having the bark of *byblos*(?)<sup>47</sup> similar to the papyrus, from which garlands are woven. So much about Byblos.

Eustathius' familiarity with Stephanus' *Ethnika* in his major commentaries on the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, and Dionysius Periegetes is abundantly attested.<sup>48</sup> The extent to which the version of the *Ethnika* accessible to Eustathius differed (or not) substantially from its surviving epitome was hotly debated at the turn of the previous century with divergent results.<sup>49</sup> Recent

<sup>47</sup> On the text of Aelius Dionysius' gloss φ 14 as quoted by Eustathius see §2 above. Müller (377) translates lines 68–71 “Aelius porro Dionysius in opera de vocibus atticis clarius indicat bybli plantae naturam ubi de philyra planta dicit, philyram corticem bybli habere similem papyro, quo ex cortice nectunt etiam coronas.”

<sup>48</sup> See M. Billerbeck, “Eustathios und die *Ethnika* des Stephanos von Byzanz,” in M. Tziatzi et al. (eds.), *Lemmata: Beiträge zum Gedenken an Christos Theodoridis* (Berlin 2015) 418–430. In his commentary on Dionysius Periegetes Eustathius never explicitly mentions Stephanus as his source (as he does in his works on the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*) but his use of it is well documented: see Billerbeck and Neumann-Hartmann, *Stephani Byzantii Ethnica* IV 163, and Fraser 320 n.5.

<sup>49</sup> L. Cohn, “Eustathios 18,” *RE* 6 (1907) 1452–1489, advocated the view that Eustathius had at his disposal a text of the *Ethnika* substantially fuller than our epitome; *contra* Knauss, *De Stephani Byzantii* 63 n.1, claimed that this was not the case in the majority of the cases pleaded by Cohn and argued instead that Eustathius had in front of him the Epitome more or less as we have it.



scholarship seems to agree that the version of the *Ethnika* used by Eustathius did not differ very much from ours, apart from the fact that his copy did not suffer from the loss of some text for the letters κ, λ, and ο as ours does.<sup>50</sup> Lines 43–48 of Eustathius' comments on D.P. 912 are close enough in wording to Stephanus β 188 to assure us that Eustathius was here clearly drawing on the *Ethnika*.

But should we suppose that the quotation of Aelius Dionysius at the end of the Byblos excursus of Eustathius (lines 68–70) also comes from Stephanus, in this case from a for us non-extant portion of *Ur-Stephanus* still available to Eustathius, as Meineke's conjecture φιλόρης seems to imply? Under closer scrutiny this assumption turns out to be highly unlikely, and not only because of the consensus among scholars that Eustathius' *Ethnika* was very similar (without being absolutely identical) to our epitome. More importantly, the whole text of Eustathius is punctuated by clues, more or less explicit, that make sufficiently clear that his Byblos section is a learned potpourri of very heterogeneous origins. Apart from the explicit mention of Herodotus (lines 54 and 66, with reference to Hdt. 2.92 [edibility of the papyrus] and 7.36 [Xerxes' bridge at Abydos]), Eustathius cites also οἱ παλαιοί at 49 (κατὰ τοὺς παλαιούς) and 50 (ὡς φασιν ἐκεῖνοι): these "ancients" are very likely to be identified with Strabo (and perhaps also with the Atticist grammarian Pausanias, but the matter remains *sub*

<sup>50</sup> So Billerbeck, in *Lemmata* 418–430, and Billerbeck and Neumann-Hartmann, *Stephani Byzantii Ethnica* IV 163–176; cf. Fraser 314 and 320 n.5; Erbse 4; M. van der Valk, *Eustathii archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem* I (Leiden 1971) lxxvii. For the most recent and detailed treatment of the history of the epitomization of the *Ethnika* in Late Antiquity and Byzantine times see M. Bouiron, "Du texte d'origine à l'Épitomé des *Ethnika*: les différentes phases de réduction et la transmission du lexique géographique de Stéphane de Byzance," *Rursus* 8 (2012) 1–42, at 26–28, on Eustathius' use of Stephanus; cf. also Billerbeck and Neumann-Hartmann 10–16.

*iudice*).<sup>51</sup> Also the very beginning of Eustathius' lemma is quite revealing: if compared with Stephanus, it adds the information that Byblos was sacred to Adonis and establishes an early link with Cyprus (Κινύρου βασίλειον ἀρχαιότατον).<sup>52</sup>

Above all, Eustathius does *not* identify Byble with Miletos' unhappy daughter, otherwise known in all other extant sources as Byblis, but speaks simply of "a woman" Byble (line 44 ἀπὸ Βύβλης γυναικός). We have already seen that Berkel was the first to suggest that Stephanus' Βύβλης of β 188 line 2 should be corrected into Βυβλίδος on the basis of schol. Theocr. 7.115–118b.<sup>53</sup> The relevant portion of Eustathius' text (lines 43–44 ἀπὸ Βύβλου τινὸς στρατηγοῦ ἢ ἀπὸ Βύβλης γυναικὸς οὕτω κληθεῖσα) is telling in at least one respect. We know with certainty that Eustathius was well acquainted with the incestuous love story of Kaunos and Byblis.<sup>54</sup> This suggests that already in

<sup>51</sup> Cf. Strab. 17.1.15 φύεται δ' ἐν τοῖς Αἰγυπτιακοῖς ἔλεσι καὶ ταῖς λίμναις ἢ τε βύβλος [...] ἀλλ' ἢ μὲν βύβλος ψιλὴ ράβδος ἐστὶν ἐπ' ἄκρῳ χαίτην ἔχουσα [...] ἐν δὲ τοῖς κάτω μέρεσι τοῦ Δέλτα πολλή, ἢ μὲν χείρων, ἢ δὲ βελτίων ἢ ἱερατικῆ. As to Paus. 24\* Erbse s.v. βύβλος: φυτὸν φυόμενον ἐν τοῖς Αἰγυπτιακοῖς ἔλεσιν, ράβδος ψιλὴ, ἐπ' ἄκρῳ χαίτην ἔχουσα, φυομένη πολλή καὶ ἐν τοῖς κάτω μέρεσι τοῦ Δέλτα\*\*, the fragment is marked as dubious by Erbse (Erbse prints for Pausanias the text of Eustathius in *GGM* II 376.48 ff., which raises the suspicion of circularity, as G. Ucciardello pointed out to me).

<sup>52</sup> Cf. Strab. 16.2.18 ἢ μὲν οὖν Βύβλος, τὸ τοῦ Κινύρου βασίλειον, ἱερά ἐστὶ τοῦ Ἀδόνιδος κτλ. For Osiris Adonis in Cyprus see Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἀμαθοῦς (α 249) πόλις Κύπρου ἀρχαιοτάτη, ἐν ἣ Ἄδωνις Ὅσιρις ἐτιμάτο, ὃν Αἰγύπτιον ὄντα Κύπριοι καὶ Φοίνικες ἰδιοποιοῦνται.

<sup>53</sup> See n.3 above. Schol. Theocr. 7.115–118b Wendel: Ὑετις δὲ καὶ Βυβλὶς ὄρη καὶ κρήνη Μιλήτου. KL<sup>1</sup>·2U<sup>1</sup>·2E<sup>1</sup>·2A<sup>1</sup>·2 Μιλήτου γάρ, φασίν, <τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος> (suppl. Ahrens, coll. schol. A.R. 1.185, schol. Dion. Per. 825, et Steph. Byz. κ 139) καὶ Ἀρείας ἐγένοντο παῖδες Καῦνος καὶ Βυβλὶς.

<sup>54</sup> Eust. *In D.P.* 533 = *GGM* II 321 ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι καὶ πόλις ἐστὶ Καρίας λεγομένη Καῦνος, ἀπὸ τινος Καῦνου ἀνδρός, οὗ ἐρασθεῖσα ἡ ἀδελφὴ Βυβλὶς ἀπήγγαστο· ὅθεν καὶ ὁ παρὰ τῇ παροιμίᾳ Καῦνιος ἔρωσ, ἐπὶ τῶν ἀθέσμων ἐρώτων ἢ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν βλαβέντων ἐφ' οἷς ἀθέσμως ἠράσθησαν. Cf. also schol. *D.P.* 825 (*GGM* II 454).

Eustathius' time the entry of Stephanus must have read Βύβλης and not Βυβλίδος: no need here to invoke access, on the part of Eustathius, to a Stephanus *uberior*.

What should we make of the fact that Eustathius does omit Byble's parentage as detailed in Stephanus (τῆς Μιλήτου θυγατρὸς)? Eustathius may have been following another source or a conflation of different sources;<sup>55</sup> or he may have judged Stephanus' τῆς Μιλήτου θυγατρὸς to be an unreliable autoschediasm.<sup>56</sup> There is no way of knowing: the only certain fact is that Eustathius did not think of connecting Stephanus' Byble with the famous Byblis of myth.<sup>57</sup>

<sup>55</sup> Knauss, *De Stephani Byzantii* 64 with n.1, suggests that Eustathius' words ἀπὸ Βύβλου τινὸς στρατηγοῦ may go back to Malalas *Chron.* 8.30 (Βύβλος δέ τις στρατηγὸς δυνατός, ὃς καὶ ἐν τῇ παραλίᾳ Φοινίκη ἤρε κώμην καὶ ἐποίησε πόλιν τειχίσασα αὐτήν, ἣν ἐκάλεσε Βύβλον εἰς ὄνομα αὐτοῦ).

<sup>56</sup> Knauss, *De Stephani Byzantii* 10 n.1, thinks that this omission is in keeping with Eustathius' more compendious attitude (Eustathius "saepius vocabulo latioris significationis contentus est, ubi in epitoma ipsa nomina patris aut parentum proferuntur"). On the possibility of an autoschediasm by Stephanus (or his sources) see Billerbeck and Zubler, *Stephani Byzantii Ethnica* II 310 ("Ob hinter dieser Gründungssage mehr steht als ein Autoschediasma, ist schwer auszumachen").

<sup>57</sup> If we leave apart Steph. β 188, there is no extant ancient evidence stating a direct link between Byblis, Miletus' daughter, and the Phoenician city of Byblos. For a critical survey of the sources on Byblis and Kaunos see J. L. Lightfoot, *Parthenius of Nicaea* (Oxford 1999) 433–443. In our literary sources the geographical context of Miletos and his children's peregrinations is that of "un ensemble caro-lycien, voire créto-caro-lycien," where Syria/Phoenicia does not seem to feature (quotation from F. Vian, *Recherches sur les Posthomerica de Quintus de Smyrne* [Paris 1959] 144, cf. 141). Both Miletos and Kaunos are explicitly cast as city-founders, but not so Byblis: she is the eponym not of a city but of a fountain in or by Miletos, or anyway in Caria (Antoninus Liberalis 30.2 is no exception). We hear of a tradition of Byblis' wanderings (after Kaunos left Miletos) only in Konon *Narr.* 2 ἡ Βυβλίς ἐκλείπει καὶ αὐτὴν πατρῶαν οἰκίαν, καὶ πολλὴν ἐρημίαν πλανηθεῖσα κτλ., and Ov. *Met.* 9.639–650 (where she too leaves Miletos and in her peregrinations to find her brother she wanders through Caria and Lycia reaching as far as

To sum up: this constant shifting and intermingling of sources in Eustathius' text, acknowledged and unacknowledged, makes it extremely unlikely that the quotation of Aelius Dionysius' gloss on *φυλώρα* at the end of his Byblos tour de force was something that he found in the version of Stephanus' epitome at his disposal. Most probably it was something he added himself out of his direct knowledge of Attic lexicography.<sup>58</sup>

4. *Steph. Byz. β 188 line 5 again*

Let us now go back to our point of departure: the transmitted text of Steph. Byz. β 188 line 5, βύβλου τῆς φυλῆς τῆς Αἰγυπτίας κτλ. Various editors, past and present, have considered the passage corrupt, but there have also been those who have retained the wording of the MSS. (e.g. Dindorf, Westermann). While the syntactic difficulty (absence of a preposition indicating origin before βύβλου) is not insurmountable (the simplex genitive can express *genitivus materiae*), the sense of τῆς φυλῆς with reference to a plant is at first sight perplexing and calls for some explanation. In Stephanus' epitome φυλή ("race/tribe") is consistently used to indicate, in Fraser's words, "hereditary membership" of

---

Limyra). In Ovid we are told explicitly that she followed the steps of her brother (640 *profugi sequitur vestigia fratris*), who, as far as we know, did not reach Syria. Lightfoot (435) tentatively suggests that Nicaenetus too may have known Byblis' wanderings (fr.1 Powell: Byblis mourns Kaunos' departure ἀπροπὸ πύλων, "outside the gates" of Miletos) and that he too should be considered, together with Apollonius Rhodius' Καόνου κτίσις (fr.5 Powell), a possible candidate as the common source for Byblis' peregrinations. This may be (ἀπροπὸ πύλων is very under-determined spatially), but it remains the case that the geographical horizon of these wanderings are restricted, as far as we can tell from extant sources, to a Cretan-Carian-Lycian scenario with no Phoenicia in sight, *pace* G. Huxley, "Nicaenetus and Oikous," *GRBS* 11 (1970) 251–257, at 256: "In Stephanos of Byzantion (*s.v.* Βύβλος) she becomes the eponym of Byblos (to which, we may suppose, in one version of the tale she wandered in search of her brother)."

<sup>58</sup> For Eustathius' first-hand access to Atticist lexicography see Erbse 7–22.

a tribe or race.<sup>59</sup> However, in β 188 the Ionic ending of the adjective Αἰγυπτίης, unanimously transmitted by the MSS., strongly suggests that we are still within Stephanus' *verbatim* quotation of the Ionian prose-writer.<sup>60</sup>

This authorizes us to look for a looser meaning of φυλή in our passage, a meaning not necessarily consistent with Stephanus' linguistic usage. LSJ<sup>9</sup> s.v. φυλή III alerts us that when predicated "of things" φυλή means "γένος, kind, species," and quotes (as sole example) Xen. *Oec.* 9.6 κατὰ φυλάς διεκρίνομεν τὰ ἔπιπλα.<sup>61</sup> Here Ischomachus is explaining to his wife the importance of order in good housekeeping: everything must be in its proper place, from weapons to kitchen utensils.<sup>62</sup>

This passage, however, is not so straightforward as it may seem because all other instances of φυλή in Xenophon have the usual meaning of "tribe" or, by extension, "military contingent sent by a tribe," whereas for "kind/type" Xenophon uniformly uses elsewhere the neuter φῶλον (as one would expect).<sup>63</sup> An added difficulty is that the rhetoric of Ischomachus' reported

<sup>59</sup> For the terminology of ethnic, regional, or civic membership in Stephanus of Byzantium see Fraser ch. 2.

<sup>60</sup> Unless one is ready to argue that the ending -ίης is a scribal mistake induced by the ensuing ἦς (τῆς Αἰγυπτίης, ἦς ἀνέτραφε κτλ.).

<sup>61</sup> Cf. the repetition at 9.8 ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐχωρίσαμεν πάντα κατὰ φυλάς τὰ ἔπιπλα. In both passages there are no textual variants for the transmitted φυλάς. To the best of my knowledge, there are no other instances of φυλή meaning "kind/set."

<sup>62</sup> Cf. *Oec.* 9.7 ὄπλων ἄλλη φυλή, ἄλλη ταλασιουργικῶν ὀργάνων, ἄλλη σιτοποικῶν, ἄλλη ὀψοποικῶν, ἄλλη τῶν ἀμφὶ λουτρόν, ἄλλη ἀμφὶ μάκτρας, ἄλλη ἀμφὶ τραπέζας.

<sup>63</sup> As observed by S. Pomeroy, *Xenophon, Oeconomicus: A Social and Historical Commentary* (Oxford 1994) 301, with reference to F. W. Sturz, *Lexicon Xenophonteanum* IV (Leipzig 1804) 513 s.v. In modern Greek φυλή means only "race/tribe," not "kind" or "type," cf. Triantafyllides, *Λεξικό της κοινής νέοελληνικής* s.v. Chantraine, *DELG*<sup>2</sup> 1233 s.v. φῶλον, φυλή, records the meaning of "espèce" for φυλή in Xenophon; not so Beekes, *EDG* II s.v. φυλή, where the meaning "kind" is ascribed to φῶλον alone.

speech aims at establishing a relationship of co-extensiveness and almost equality between the public and the private sphere, frequently applying to the latter vocabulary that belongs, at least *stricto sensu*, to the former.<sup>64</sup> At *Oec.* 9.15 Ischomachus goes so far as to compare the perfect housewife to a guardian of the law (νομοφύλαξ), a garrison-commander (φρούραρχος) inspecting his guards, and the βουλή exerting its rights of δοκιμάζειν: the perfect housewife has taken on, in her own household, the roles of Greek (specifically Athenian) male magistrates.<sup>65</sup>

This rhetoric casts an ambiguous shadow on Xenophon's use of φυλή in *Oec.* 9.6–7. According to Pomeroy, Xenophon would be here purposely using φυλή in its original meaning of “tribe” as a unit of subdivision of the Athenian citizen body to assimilate once more the household sphere to that of the polis.<sup>66</sup> Is Xenophon's metaphoric use of φυλή at *Oec.* 9.6–7 in the sense of “set/kind” enough to justify βύβλου τῆς φυλῆς τῆς Αἰγυπτίας, that is, “made of papyrus of the Egyptian kind” in Steph. Byz. β 188? Closer inspection leaves room for considered skepticism. Pomeroy is certainly right to emphasize the rhetorical strategy of Ischomachus' speech (the constant assimilation of the private sphere of the household to that of the city). One might observe that whereas the image of the housewife as the garrison-commander and city council at 9.15 is introduced in an explicit comparison (ὡσπερ ὁ φρούραρχος ... ὡσπερ ἡ βουλή; cf. 8.20 ὡσπερ καὶ κύκλιος χορός), in *Oec.* 9.6–7 we have the bare κατὰ

<sup>64</sup> Pomeroy, *Xenophon, Oeconomicus* 284, on Ischomachus' analogies drawn from the public realm of navy, army, and dithyrambic choruses in *Oec.* 8.

<sup>65</sup> Pomeroy, *Xenophon, Oeconomicus* 302–303.

<sup>66</sup> Pomeroy, *Xenophon, Oeconomicus* 301, who speaks of Ischomachus' “tribal division.” Cf. the translation κατὰ φυλὰς διεκρίνομεν τὰ ἔπιπλα by E. C. Marchant, O. J. Todd, and J. Henderson, *Xenophon. Memorabilia. Oeconomicus. Symposium. Apology* (Cambridge [Mass.] 2013) 469: “we set about separating the furniture ‘tribe by tribe’”; P. Chantraine, *Xenophon: Économique* (Paris 1949) 73, translates “Quand nous avons réparti les objets en diverses catégories.”

φυλάς and φυλή, without the explicative and attenuating use of ὡσπερ. This may suggest that Ischomachus is here not straining usual vocabulary beyond common understanding and usage. Yet this argument seems to me unconvincing. Ischomachus' choice of φυλή, rather than φῶλον, is deliberate: it is meant, at the very least, to evoke its civic overtones, in keeping with the agenda of his whole speech.

The use of φυλή as “kind” in Xen. Oec. 9.6–7 is a *hapax* and is contextually motivated (metaphorical use of “tribe”). This makes the case for φυλή having a standard meaning of “type/kind” quite dubious, especially when used by our Ionic prose-writer in a passage where the metaphorical use of “tribe” would be, so far as we can see, not motivated by the context.<sup>67</sup> But why the need to specify that the papyrus in the anonymous quotation in Steph. β 188 was “of the Egyptian variety”? According to ancient sources papyrus grew also in Ethiopia (Strab. 16.4.14), Syria, and Mesopotamia (Plin. *HN* 13.73<sup>68</sup> and

<sup>67</sup> As pointed out to me by A. C. Cassio, the *unctura* φυλή Αἰγύπτου is attested in the Septuagint (Zach 14:18 ἐὰν δὲ φυλή Αἰγύπτου μὴ ἀναβῆι μηδὲ ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖ κτλ.), where it does not mean “tribe of Egypt” but “Egyptian people/Egyptian nation” *in toto*, since Zacharias is referring to the whole *ethnos* of the Egyptians. In this passage φυλή translates the Hebrew מִשְׁפָּחָה (*mišpāḥāh*), whose primary sense is that of “clan” but came to cover also that of “people/nation” (J. Strong, *Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible* 4940 s.v. 1.f, <https://biblehub.com/hebrew/4940.htm>). What is particularly interesting in our case is that according to Strong this term occurs once and only once in the Bible in the sense of “kind/type,” in Jer 15:3 (Strong 3.a; LXX translates מִשְׁפָּחָה here with εἶδη). This provides comparative evidence for the semantic extension of “clan/tribe” > “kind/type.” It remains the fact, however, that I could not find any other Greek passage where φυλή = “kind.”

<sup>68</sup> Pliny's comment that “it has been recently realized that papyrus growing in the Euphrates near Babylon can also be used in the same way for paper” (*nuper et in Euphrate nascens circa Babylonem papyrus intellectum est eundem usum habere chartae*) may suggest that it was the Seleucids who introduced the papyrus plant in Babylonia: see Lewis 10–11.

his unacknowledged source Theophr. *Hist.Pl.* 4.8.4), in the river Niger (5.44), and on Grand Canary Island (6.205).<sup>69</sup> Although a specification of the place where papyrus grew was not so superfluous for the uninformed reader, line 5 of β 188 remains problematic.

As alternatives to the transmitted text one could think of either (i) βύβλου τῆς φυτῆς [τῆς] Αἰγυπτίας “made of papyrus, namely *that* grown in Egypt,” with φυτῆς verbal adjective from φύω<sup>70</sup> or (ii) βύβλου τῆς φυταλιῆς τῆς Αἰγυπτίας “made of papyrus, the Egyptian plant.”<sup>71</sup> Yet neither is entirely satisfactory: why, in the case of (i), should a semantically transparent φυτῆς have been corrupted into φυλῆς? In the case of (ii), the attestations of φυταλιά in the sense of “planting” > “plant” are very few and exclusively poetic: Call. *Hymn* 5.26 τᾶς ἰδίας ἔγκονα φυταλιᾶς with reference to Athena’s olive tree; *Anth.Gr.* 6.44.2 (Leonidas?) πρώτης δράγματα φυταλιῆς referring to the first-fruits of the vine and 7.714.6 (anonymous) λευκοῦ φυταλιῆν καλάμου.<sup>72</sup> As a third possibility Giuseppe Ucciardello suggested to me that the original text might have been βύβλου τῆς φουομένης [τῆς] Αἰγυπτίας, with the participle written in the abbreviated form φουο(εν)ης, which would have mislead the copyist.

To sum up: the transmitted text of Stephanus β 188 line 5 βύβλου τῆς φυλῆς τῆς Αἰγυπτίας remains suspicious: βύβλου as *genitivus materiae* can stay but τῆς φυλῆς meaning “kind/variety” is problematic. Aelius Dionysius’ gloss φιλύρα (φ 14) was most

<sup>69</sup> Ancient sources are collected and discussed by Lewis 6–7.

<sup>70</sup> A form of φύω is present in schol. D.P. 912 (*GGM* II 455) Βύβλος ἀρχαιοτάτη πόλις εἴρηται, ... οἱ δὲ φασιν ὅτι ἡ Ἱσις ... ἐκεῖ καὶ κλαίουσα τὸν Ὅσριν τὸ διάδημα τῆς κεφαλῆς ἀπέθετο, βύβλινον ὑπάρχον ἀπὸ τῆς ἐν τῷ Νεῖλω φουομένης βύβλου· ἢ ὅτι πολλὴ βύβλος ἐκεῖσε φύεται, ἦτοι πάπυρος (≈ *Etym.Gen.* s.v. Βύβλος 286 Lasserre-Livaradas).

<sup>71</sup> Giambattista D’Alessio too independently suggested to me *per litt.* correcting φυλῆς to φυταλιῆς.

<sup>72</sup> Cf. LSJ<sup>9</sup> s.v. Π. On the semantics of φυταλιά in early epic see J.-L. Perpillou, *Essais de lexicographie en grec ancien* (Louvain 2004) 24–28.



likely *not* part of the original entry of Stephanus' epitome but an addition by Eustathius; Meineke's conjecture τῆς φιλόρης should be abandoned and the text of Aelius Dionysius φ 14 should read φιλόρα· φυτὸν ἔχον φλοιὸν βύβλω ὅμοιον ἐξ οὗ τοὺς στεφάνου πλέκουσιν. Until further progress is made, the best option for an editor of the *Ethnika* is to print a crux before τῆς φυλῆς and suggest diagnostic conjectures in the apparatus.<sup>73</sup>

July, 2023

Oxford

lucia.prauscello@all-souls.ox.ac.uk

<sup>73</sup> My heartfelt thanks to A. C. Cassio, G. D'Alessio, E. Dettori, and G. Ucciardello for invaluable comments on an earlier draft of the paper. My sincerest thanks also to Annette Neumann-Hartmann for allowing me to read, while still unpublished, the chapter of *Stephanos von Byzanz* on etymologies in Stephanus' *Ethnika*. It goes without saying that I alone am responsible for any mistake or infelicity.