

Zeitschrift:	Museum Helveticum : schweizerische Zeitschrift für klassische Altertumswissenschaft = Revue suisse pour l'étude de l'antiquité classique = Rivista svizzera di filologia classica
Herausgeber:	Schweizerische Vereinigung für Altertumswissenschaft
Band:	46 (1989)
Heft:	1
Artikel:	New light on Greek authors from grammatical texts
Autor:	Dyck, Andrew R.
DOI:	https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-36072

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 17.01.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

MUSEUM HELVETICUM

Vol. 46 1989 Fasc. 1

New Light on Greek Authors from Grammatical Texts

By Andrew R. Dyck, Los Angeles

The following are observations gathered during the course of fifteen years' work on the new edition of the *Epimerismi Homerici*.

1. Aesch. fr. 317 Mette; consulto praetermisit Radt (ad fr. 92a)

Ep. Hom. α 284 (= AO 1, 62, 9)¹: ... παρὰ τὸ ἀλαστὸς οὖν ἀλαστῶ, ὡς ἄπιστος ἄπιστῶ. παρὰ δὲ τὸ ἀλαστῶ ῥῆμα ἀλάστωρ ὁ Ζεύς, ἐπὶ τῶν χαλεπόν (-ων cod., corr. Dindorf) τι πρασσόντων. παρηκτικὴ δὲ ἡ εὐθεῖα παρὰ τὴν ἀλάστορος γενικήν. Αἰσχύλος Ἰξίονι (fr. 317 Mette; consulto praetermisit Radt).

πρευμενής ἀλάστορος.

καὶ Φερεκύδης (FGrHist 3 F 175). «ὁ Ζεὺς δὲ Ἰκέσιος καὶ Ἀλάστορος καλεῖται.»

The latest editor of Aeschylus' fragments, S. Radt, follows Nauck's suggestion² that, in the passage quoted, after Αἰσχύλος Ἰξίονι a citation of μέγαν ἀλάστορον (Aesch. fr. 92a apud Phot. α 900 Theodoridis) has dropped out and that the words πρευμενής ἀλάστορος are corrupted from πρευμενῶς ἀλάστορα (Eum. 236)³. This hypothesis aims to satisfy the demands of Occam's razor by removing one of the two instances of the juxtaposition of πρευμενής/-ῶς and ἀλάστορος/-α in the corpus Aeschyleum; it would likewise eliminate the hard oxymoron of πρευμενής ἀλάστορος. But in spite of the advantages offered by this approach, it is unlikely to be right, as a careful study of the grammatical context in which this fragment is embedded will show. Our gloss (s.v. ἀλαστήσας) concludes with the passage quoted above, likely to derive from Herodian's treatise Περὶ πανῶν, which discussed various types of word-formation, including μεταπλασμός (cf. 2, 204f. Lentz). Among the derivatives of ἀλαστῶ cited are ἀλάστωρ and the metaplastic nominative ἀλάστορος (παρηκτικὴ δὲ ἡ

1 I cite *Epimerismi Homerici* by gloss number in my forthcoming edition as well as by reference to page and line of the current edition, *Anecdota Graeca e codicibus manuscriptis bibliothecarum Oxoniensium*, ed. J. A. Cramer, 1 (Oxford 1835).

2 A. Nauck, *De tragicorum Graecorum fragmentis observationes criticae*, Jahresbericht über das Königl. Joachimstalsche Gymnasium (Berlin 1855) 3.

3 *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* 3: Aeschylus, ed. S. Radt (Göttingen 1985), ad fr. *92a.

εὐθεῖα παρὰ τὴν ἀλάστορος γενικήν). For the latter, two apt examples are adduced: πρευμενῆς ἀλάστορος and ὁ Ζεὺς δὲ Ἰκέσιος καὶ Ἀλάστορος καλεῖται. What is not wanted here is a quotation of Eum. 236, πρευμενῶς ἀλάστορα, which does not fit the argument, which demands examples of the metaplastic nominative. Nor does Radt's objection stand that 'totus grammatici contextus graviter turbatus esse videtur', when the only fault in the παράδοσις is the change of χαλεπόν to χαλεπῶν after τῶν. The problems in this passage have been created by modern philologists who a priori would not believe that πρευμενῆς/-ῶς and ἀλάστορος/-α could have been twice juxtaposed in the Aeschylean corpus. But this is a mere supposition and cannot be sustained in the face of the grammatical context. The quotation μέγαν ἀλάστορον could have fallen out after Αἰσχύλος Ἰξίονι; but there is no particular reason to believe that it did, since two different sources are involved (the Συναγωγή for Photius and Herodian for the Epimerismi Homerici); nor is there any reason why Aeschylus could not have used forms of the metaplastic ἀλάστορος on more than one occasion. Radt also has difficulty with πρευμενῆς as a qualifier for an ἀλάστωρ; but the hard oxymoron is much more likely to be Aeschylean than the result of scribal error. This case shows how important it is for the editor of fragments to attend closely to the grammatical context in which they are embedded and how wary he should be of introducing changes which contradict the argument which they were adduced to illustrate⁴.

2. PMG 942

Ep. Hom. ε 189 (= AO 1, 171, 28) propounds inter alia this doctrine: τὰ εἰς υς ὀξυνόμενα κατὰ ἀποβολὴν τοῦ σ συντίθεται καὶ φυλάσσει τὸ υ, οἷον ταχύποτμος, βραδυήκοος, «πολύαρνι Θυέστη» (B 106), «εύρυαγνια Μυκήνη» (Δ 52). The author then adds: σεσημείωται τὸ ΠΟΛΥΜΝΙΑ διὰ (scripsi: ἐπὶ cod.) τούτου· καὶ τὸ κύριον καὶ τὸ προσηγορικὸν ἔξενθλιψε τὸ υ. This is the first mention in this passage of the distinction between appellative and proper nouns; however, the previous examples have all been of appellative nouns; hence the author evidently thinks it worth noting that the loss of σ applies in this case equally to both the appellative and proper noun. He then adduces two examples: PMG 942 (πολύμνια παντερπῆς κόρα) and Hes. Th. 78 (Πολύμνιά τ' Ούρανίη τε). It seems likely that the examples have been chosen to illustrate the two types of nouns, respectively appellative and proper; if so, πολύμνια should be taken as appellative in PMG 942, not a proper name, as by Page⁵.

4 On other fragments omitted by Radt cf. H. J. Mette, *Gnomon* 58 (1986) 595.

5 The appellative should likewise be added to H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, rev. H. S. Jones (Oxford 1940) s.v.

3. *Com. adesp. 646 Kock*

Apollonius Dyscolus pron. 21, 3ff. argues that the vocative is used to address persons who are nearby and that therefore the pronouns of the first and third persons properly lack a vocative. Οὗτος is exceptional because by its very nature it involves nearness. He goes on to cite three examples of οὗτος as vocative, namely Sophron fr. 57 Kaibel (ὦ οὗτος, ἦ οἱ στρατείαν ἐσσεῖσθαι), Cratinus, Δραπέτιδες fr. 55 K.-A. (οὗτος, καθεύδεις; οὐκ ἀναστήσει τβοτων) and Aristophanes, Vespp. 1 (οὗτος, τί πάσχεις, ὦ κακόδαιμον Ξανθία;). Ultimately dependent on this passage⁶ is Ep. Hom. τ 72 (s.v. τοῦτο), where we read: ... ἐξαίρετον ἔχει ή οὗτος, πρὸς τὸ μονοπρόσωπον αὐτὴν οὖσαν, τετολμῆσθαι τίθεσθαι καὶ ἐπὶ κλητικῆς «οὗτος, καθεύδεις, ὦ κακόδαιμον», ἥτις κλητικὴ πρὸς πρόσωπον πλησιάζον ἔχει τὴν δεῖξιν. The words οὗτος, καθεύδεις, ὦ κακόδαιμον have found their way into Kock's collection of comica adespota as fr. 646. In fact, however, it is likely that we have here, not an otherwise unknown comic fragment, but a conflation of the passages from Cratinus and Aristophanes quoted by Apollonius Dyscolus (οὗτος καθεύδεις + ὦ κακόδαιμον). If the two were juxtaposed (οὗτος καθεύδεις; οὗτος τί πάσχεις, ὦ κακόδαιμον), an error resulting from homoeoteleuton would have been difficult for scribes to avoid⁷.

4. ὄριδρόμος vs. ὄρειδρόμος

At Euripides IA 1593, according to Murray's edition, L and P both present ὄρειδρόμον. In other places the second syllable of this word is transmitted with ι alone, not the diphthong. But the diphthongal spelling has found favor with most editors. Thus, for instance, in Pindar, Paean 7, 6, Schroeder's conjecture ὄρ<ε>ιδρόμον for ὄριδρόμον of POxy. 841 has been set in the text by Snell and Maehler (4th edition, 1975) and in Bacchae 985 Murray prints Nauck's ὄρειδρόμων for P's ὄριδρόμων. Dodds ad loc. calls attention, however, to the strong evidence for ὄριδρόμων, including, not only the Pindar papyrus, but also the MSS of Nonnus (5, 229 and 25, 194). On such matters the evidence of manuscripts from the age of etacism is not, however, unimpeachable. Dodds accordingly appealed also to the analogy of the forms ὄριγονος (Tim. Pers. 88) and ὄριβακχος (Opp. C. 1, 24). I should like to call attention to the fact that ὄριδρόμος receives further support from the ancient grammatical doctrine⁸ preserved at Ep. Hom. υ 30 (= AO 1, 417, 9ff.): αἱ παρὰ δοτικὴν τῶν εἰς ος

6 Via the Epimerismoi attributed to Herodian, as I argue in the introduction to my forthcoming edition.

7 Elsewhere the conflation of two verses in the *Ep. Hom.* appears to result from scribes' efforts to fill out incomplete quotations from memory: cf. β 33 = AO 1, 95, 23 (Homer E 255 + 1 101). For other examples of fragments which Kock wrongly included in his collection cf. O. Crusius, GGA 151 (1889) 163–185.

8 Surely derived ultimately from Herodian's *Orthography* (cf. 2, 410, 7ff. Lentz).

οὐδετέρων συντιθέμεναι λέξεις, εἰ μὲν ἐπιφέρονται φωνῆεν ἢ ἐν ἀπλοῦν
(σύμφωνον), φυλάττουσι τὴν γραφήν. Ὁρειγένης, Ὁρειβάσιος, ὄρείαυλος
(Opp. C. 3, 18; H. 4, 309), καὶ Ἡσίοδος «όρειχάλκοιο φαεινοῦ» (Scut. 122). εἰ
δὲ δύο σύμφωνα ἢ ἐν διπλοῦν ἐπιφέρῃ, ἀποβάλλει τὸ ε, οἷον ὄριδρόμος, ὑψίζυ-
γος, ὑψιβρεμέτης.

5. *Posidippus fr. 37 K.*

Kocks prints the following text:

τὸ τῆς ἐλαίας δένδρον.

However, this fragment is quoted s.v. *μεγάροισιν* (Ep. Hom. μ 64 = AO 1, 277, 14) to argue for the existence of both *μέγαρον* and *μέγαρος* according to the precept: γίνεται γὰρ τὰ εἰς ον οὐδέτερα καὶ εἰς ος; other examples include θύον θύος, κρίνον κρίνος and πύον πύος. Thus, when Cramer's edition printed the fragment as above, H. Sauppe offered in his review the evident correction of δένδρον to δένδρος (not mentioned in Kock's apparatus)⁹. In fact, δένδρος proves to be the reading of the manuscript, δένδρον a mistake of the first editor.

6. *New Epic Fragment*

The hexameter at Ep. Hom. λ 1 (= Et. Gud. 370, 11–12 Sturz) seems to have gone unnoticed:

{ναὶ} εὐεπίοις μελέεσσιν ἐφύμνια ταῦτα λιγαίνει.

The hapax *εὐέπιος* is unexpected; one expects rather an -s stem form *εὐεπής*¹⁰, hence *εὐεπέσιν* or perhaps *εὐεπίῃ*. Note that *μελέεσσιν* appears in the same place in the verse as in Homer v 432. The verb *λιγαίνειν*, a vox Homeric (Λ 685) imitated by Aeschylus (Septem 874) and by hexameter poets from the Hellenistic age onward (Ap. Rh. 1, 740, Arat. 1007, Nonn. 7, 48 alibi, AP 2, 1, 389 [Christodorus] alibi), suggests a Hellenistic or later date for this verse.

7. *New Trimeter Fragment*

The opening of a trimeter, probably to be added to the *Supplementum Hellenisticum* rather than to the edition of the *tragica adespota* by Kannicht and Snell, is quoted at Ep. Hom. α 283 (=AO 1, 61, 14):

ἴναινε θυμόν.

9 H. Sauppe in: *Zeitschrift für die Alterthumswissenschaft* 2 (1835) 676.

10 Cf. A. Debrunner, *Griechische Wortbildungslehre* (Heidelberg 1917) 72.

8. New Fragments of Authors of Technical Prose

a) *Philinus of Cos*

Ep. Hom. α 339 (=AO 1, 82, 6) s.v. ἀμολγῷ. ... Φιλῖνος δὲ πᾶσαν ὥραν τῆς νυκτὸς ἀμολγὸν εἶπε διὰ τὸ τότε τὴν γῆν τὸν ἀέρα ἔλκειν καὶ ἄρδειν πάντα τὰ φυτὰ τῇ ἴκμαδι. καὶ γὰρ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τούναντίον· τὰ γὰρ κάτω ἄνω ἀμέλγεται. Φιλόξενος δὲ (fr. 435a) ἐν ἦν οὐδεὶς μολίσκει· ἀμολός καὶ ἀμολγός. καὶ ἀβρότη (Ξ 78) γὰρ ἐν ἦν βροτοὶ οὐ φοιτῶσιν.

This isolated fragment escaped the eye of Deichgräber¹¹. It seems likely that the views of Herophilus' pupil were transmitted via Philoxenus and therefore Φιλῖνος δὲ – ἀμέλγεται should be added to Philoxenus fr. 435a Theodoridis. Possibly the explanation referred originally to ἀμόργη, since ἀμολγός is not attested in the Hippocratic corpus.

b) *Heraclides Ponticus*

Orion's Etymologicum cites as a source in four passages 'Ηρακλείδης ὁ Ποντικός. It is likely that the twenty-one passages in which etymologies are attributed merely to 'Ηρακλείδης derive from the same source. In addition, further entries in Orion's collection can be assigned to Heraclides, as Cohn has shown on the basis of the order of the glosses¹². The problem is whether the author was the elder or the younger Heraclides Ponticus, the pupil of Plato or of Didymus. For neither is a work titled Περὶ ἐτυμολογιῶν (as in frr. 1–3 Osann¹³) expressly attested. Cohn argued for the former on grounds that the fragments treat the etymology of terms from the realm of physics and ethics that would have been of interest to the philosopher and that the method is akin to that of Plato's Cratylus, rather than the more sophisticated pathology evolved by Philoxenus¹⁴. F. Wehrli, however, did not edit these fragments along with those of the elder Heraclides but assigned them instead to the younger man. He argued that the preserved fragments do not betray any particular philosophical tendency, such as that observable in the Cratylus; that the grammatical method used in several glosses is, in fact, the one described by Cohn as younger; that Orion's source was evidently organized as a lexicon, an unlikely form for a fourth century author to have chosen; and that so old a work would hardly have continued in use into the late empire in competition with the works of Philoxenus, Soranus and Herodian¹⁵.

11 K. Deichgräber, *Die griechische Empirikerschule* (Berlin 1930) 163–164 and 225f. = frr. 322, 327, 328, all transmitted via Eretian from Philinus' work against Bacchius' Hippocratic lexicon.

12 L. Cohn, *De Heraclide Pontico etymologiarum scriptore antiquissimo*, *Commentationes philologae in honorem Augusti Reifferscheidii* (Vratislaviae 1884) 84ff.

13 F. Osann, *Quaestionum Homericarum particula III* (Gissae 1853).

14 Cohn 88ff.

15 *Herakleides Pontikos*², ed. F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles* 7 (Basel/Stuttgart 1969) 118–119.

Though Wehrli has shown that Cohn's position is inadequate, not all of his arguments carry equal weight. If we had to reconstruct the Cratylus from the fragments of its etymologies preserved in the EM, for instance, we would have a very imperfect notion of its philosophical tendency¹⁶; and an illustrious name from the past might have greater cachet than a more recent one (the Λέξεις of Aristophanes of Byzantium continued in use into the twelfth century). Nevertheless the elder Heraclides was evidently not the author of the work Περὶ ἐτυμολογιῶν cited by Orion. In addition to Wehrli's argument from the form of Orion's source, note that the frequency of its citation and the regularity with which it appears in a certain place within the series of glosses on each letter of the alphabet insure that it, along with commentaries on poets, Soranus, Herodian Περὶ ὀρθογραφίας and Περὶ παυῶν, Philoxenus and the Herodianic Symposium and Epimerismoi, was among the sources which Orion used directly¹⁷. Thus Orion has the citations of Didymus (p. 185 Schmidt) and Theon (fr. 17 Guhl) at fr. 1 Osann or of Apollodorus (FGrHist 244 F 284) at fr. 24 Osann via Heraclides, and the elder bearer of this name is thus chronologically excluded. Therefore unless, in spite of Occam's razor, we want to posit a third Heraclides Ponticus or assume a confusion with Heraclides of Miletus, we must attribute the work Περὶ ἐτυμολογιῶν to the pupil of Didymus, even though his one known work of scholarship was the Λέσχαι in three books of hendecasyllables, a work so obscure as to require commentary¹⁸. A new edition of the fragments of the work Περὶ ἐτυμολογιῶν is much needed. In the meantime, I call attention to the following fragments not listed by Osann:

(1) Ep. ad Hom. A 9A1b: Λητοῦς· ... γέγονε δὲ κατὰ μὲν Πλάτωνα (Crat. 406 a 6) ἀπὸ τοῦ λήθω· πραεῖα γὰρ καὶ πάντας ἐλεοῦσα· τὸ γὰρ ἡμερον καὶ πρᾶον ἐκ τοῦ ἐπιλελῆσθαι τῶν εἰς αὐτὴν πεπλημμελημένων ἐπιφαίνεται. ὁ δὲ Ἀρίσταρχος παρὰ τὸ λῆ, τὸ Δώριον, ὃ ἐστι θέλει, ἐπειδὴ πᾶν, ὃ ἀν τις θέλῃ, παρ' αὐτῆς λαμβάνει, πραϋτάτης οὖσης τῆς θεᾶς. οὕτως Ἡρακλείδης.

(2) Et. Gen. (AB): πόσις· παρὰ τὴν τοῦ ὕδατος φύσιν, ἐπειδὴ μιγνύμενον τῇ γῇ γεννητικὸν (B: om. A) γίνεται τῶν φυτῶν καὶ σπερμάτων· οὕτως καὶ (A: om. B) ὁ ἀνήρ μιγνύμενος τῇ γυναικὶ αἴτιος (B: -ον A) γίνεται τῆς τοῦ παιδὸς (τοῦ π. A: παιδῶν B) γεννήσεως· οὕτως Ἡρακλείδης.

16 Sc. etymologies of 'Ρέα, ἔρως, Λητώ, ἡμέρα, σῶμα. Only the last, the famous derivation from σῆμα, gives a hint of Plato's philosophical position.

17 Cf. H. Kleist, *De Philoxeni grammatici Alexandrini studiis etymologicis* (Diss. Greifswald 1865) 25; the fragments of Heraclides appear between Herodian's works on orthography and pathology on the one hand and Philoxenus' work Περὶ μονοσυλλάβων ὥημάτων on the other.

18 Et. Gud. 297, 50 Sturz (ἐν ὑπομνήματι α' Λέσχης Ἡρακλείδου [Meineke for ἀλέσχης Ἡρακλείδος]); other works attributed to him are ποιήματα ἐπικὰ πολλά and πυρρίχαι (Su. η 463); the evidence was collected by A. Meineke, *Analecta Alexandrina* (Berlin 1843) 377–381.

c) Cassius Longinus

The Suda (λ 645) attests several works of Cassius Longinus dealing with Homer: (1) Ἀπορήματα Ὀμηρικά, (2) Εἰ φιλόσοφος Ὀμηρος, (3) Προβλήματα Ὀμήρου καὶ λύσεις ἐν βιβλίοις β', (4) Περὶ τῶν παρ' Ὀμήρου πολλὰ σημαινουσῶν λέξεων δ'. Of these, (2) is evidently of a philosophical, (4) of a lexicographical character. Lehrs plausibly suggested that (1) and (3) represent different forms of reference to the same work¹⁹. Writing about 'problems' in the poet's text went back to Aristotle²⁰ and was continued by Longinus' pupil Porphyry²¹. The surviving fragments fall into two groups, those dealing with alleged interpolations (frr. 1–2) and those discussing individual words (frr. 3–4). Though frr. 1–2 were already discussed by Lehrs and Aulitzky in connection with Longinus' Homeric studies²², it might be useful for the known fragments to be united in one place. The fragments illustrate, if nothing else, the degree of influence exercised by Aristarchus in the third century: Aristarchus was followed by Longinus in fr. 1; his reading was evidently noted by him in fr. 2; and his interpretation was possibly the starting-point for a conjecture by Longinus in fr. 3.

- (1) Eust. 67, 26: Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι τε τὸ «ἄλλ’ ἥτοι μὲν ταῦτα μεταφρασόμεσθα καὶ αὗτις» (A 140) ύστεροβουλίας ἐστὶ σκοπός, ὃ δὴ καὶ ἐπιφράζεσθαι καὶ ἐπιμηδύεσθαι λέγεται. καὶ ὅτι ἀνωτέρω τούτου στίχος εἰς κεῖται δοκῶν κατὰ τὸν Λογγῖνον εἶναι παρένθετος. ἐστι δὲ ἐκεῖνος τὸ «ἄξω ἐλών» (A 139). ἀρκεῖ τε γάρ, φησίν, εἰς τελείαν ἔννοιαν τὸ ἄνω αὐτοῦ κείμενον ἔπος καὶ τὸ ἐφεξῆς δὲ τοῦ «ἄξω ἐλών» «οὐδὲ κεχολώσεται, δον ἀν ἵκωμαι» (A 139) εἰς οὐδὲν δέον ἐκ περισσοῦ τέθειται. τίς γὰρ οὐκ οἶδεν ὡς λυπήσεται ὁ ἀδικηθείς;
- (2) Eust. 106, 33: τινὲς δὲ ἀρέσκονται, ὡς καὶ Λογγῖνος δηλοῖ, νόθον εἶναι τὸν δεύτερον στίχον, οὐ κατάρχει τὸ σήμαινε (sc. A 296), στίζοντες εἰς τὸ «μὴ γὰρ ἔμοιγε» (A 295) τελείαν καὶ λαμβάνοντες ἐκ κοινοῦ τὸ ἐπιτέλλεο, ἵνα λέγῃ, ὅτι «ἄλλοις ἐπιτέλλεο· μὴ γὰρ ἔμοιγε ἐπιτέλλεο».
- (3) Ep. Hom. a 347 (=AO 1, 83, 10ff.): Κάστιος δὲ Λογγῖνος «ὅρνις δ’ ὡς ⟨π⟩ανοπαῖα» (a 320; corr. Nauck), ἵν’ ἡ χελιδὼν ἀπὸ τῆς Πανόπης, ἥγουν ἡ Φωκική, ἐπειδὴ ἐν ⟨Δ⟩αυλίδι τῆς Φωκίδος τὰ περὶ Τηρέως λεγόμενα μυθολογεῖται, καὶ ἡ Πανόπη δὲ Φωκικὴ πόλις.

19 K. Lehrs, *De Aristarchi studiis Homericis*³ (Leipzig 1882) 220; he is arbitrary, however, in assuming that frr. 1–2 below are too rhetorical in character to derive from this work. No less arbitrary is Aulitzky, RE 13, 2 (1927) 1406, 54ff., who distinguishes the two works and assigns frr. 1–2 to the Ἀπορήματα Ὀμηρικά without giving any reason.

20 Cf. H. Hintenlang, *Untersuchungen zu den Homer-Aporien des Aristoteles* (Diss. Heidelberg 1961).

21 Porphyrii *Quaestionum Homericarum reliquiae*, ed. H. Schrader, 2 voll. (Leipzig 1880–90); see also Porphyrii *Quaestionum Homericarum Liber I*, ed. A. R. Sodano (Naples 1970); there is need for a new edition based both on excerpts independently transmitted and those transmitted among the Homeric scholia.

22 See n. 19 above.

(4) Eust. 1919, 15 (ad χ 57–58): ἡ δὲ τοιαύτη τιμὴ καὶ τῖμος λέγεται κωμικώτερον, ως Λογγῖνος δηλοῖ, ὁμοίως τῷ χολὴ χόλος, ὡνὴ ὕνος καὶ τοῖς τοιούτοις.

(1) Here Longinus follows Aristarchus (sch. Ariston. A 139a) in athetizing A 139 as otiose; in this he is not followed by modern editors.

(2) Longinus merely reports the athetesis of A 296, for which we have no other evidence (the Venetus A has no obelus at this point). Presumably the cause was, once again, redundancy.

(3) Longinus' reading *πανοπαῖα*, very probably a conjecture, would restore the designation of a specific type of bird, the swallow, just as Aristarchus had seen in ἀνοπαῖα the name of a bird (sch. α 320). EM 111, 23 and sch. M on α 320 preserve Longinus' reading, but not his name.

(4) Similar doctrine appears at Eustathius 563, 24 and 1148, 36, the latter citing Archil. fr. 124 b 2 West. Kock lists τῖμος as Adesp. 1164. The form was, however, poetic in general (cf. Archil. l. c., Aesch. Ch. 916; LSJ s.v.), not just comic²³.

23 I am grateful to Prof. Felix Heinimann for useful comments on an earlier draft of this paper.