

Tp 151m/1

THE HOMERIC SCHOLIA

BY

T. W. ALLEN

Fellow of the Academy

Price 2s. 6d. net

FROM THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE
BRITISH ACADEMY. VOLUME XVII
LONDON : HUMPHREY MILFORD
AMEN HOUSE, E.C.

Bibliothèque Maison de l'Orient



071485

Tp
151m/1

THE HOMERIC SCHOLIA

BY

T. W. ALLEN

Fellow of the Academy

FROM THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE
BRITISH ACADEMY. VOLUME XVII
LONDON : HUMPHREY MILFORD
AMEN HOUSE, E.C.

THE HOMERIC SCHOLIA

By T. W. ALLEN

Fellow of the Academy

Communicated May 20, 1931

THE age and origin of the collections of scholia which we possess upon the *Iliad* is still a mystery. The principal manuscript (A = Ven. 454) was written towards the end of the tenth century, the next (T = Burney 86) in the year 1059. The other collections are later and undated. A bears the well-known subscription stating that its sources were works by Didymus, Aristonicus, Herodian, and Nicanor, of whom the latest is Antoninian. Beside these scholia there are the two authors quoted by Eustathius, Apio and Herodorus, whose names are believed to imply another collection. On these scholia rest most of our knowledge of the later history of the Homeric poems, and (especially in the case of A) a great deal of Herodian's prosodiacal doctrine.

It is, therefore, of interest to discover the period of their composition in their present, that is to say marginal, form. Light should by this means be thrown on their sources and the nature of their authority, possibly on the individuals who compiled them; and contrariwise we may gain information about the culture and erudition of the period in question, whether it fall nearer the death of Herodian or the writing of A.

To estimate the age of scholia from their contents is an uncertain undertaking. *Prima facie* they are of the age of their latest component parts; but philologists as a rule assume an old nucleus which has been increased by frequent additions. Thus in this case Lehrs and Ludwich held that the compiler of the Viermännerkommentar lived not long after Herodian. On the other hand proof is usually wanting of the amplification of commentaries. They are demonstrably epitomized, and the history of the *Etymologica* shows their progressive dilution and deterioration, but their enlargement

is mostly a pious belief. Therefore where, as in this case, there are considerable quantities of post-Herodian material in all versions of the scholia, and in particular of Porphyrian,¹ we find Reitzenstein (p. 170) putting the prototype of the Ven. A in the sixth century. Obviously, therefore, some external evidence and criterion is desirable, if such can be found.

Such evidence consists in allusions to Homer—interpretations, paraphrases, etymologies, and various readings—in the grammatical works which survive from the early Byzantine world. Late classical and early Byzantine grammarians were ceaselessly occupied with Homer, who all but filled the first stage of their school course, and a considerable mass remains of lexica, etymologica, epimerismi or vocabularies, canons, &c., in which quotations and renderings of Homer are constant. Often there is no reference to sources, often again there are either references by name, or the content closely resembles extant scholia.

I propose therefore to go through the existing Byzantine scholastic literature to find what (if any) is the relation between them and our scholia. Even if the result be mostly negative the review of the evidence may not be without profit.

Two general remarks require to be made. (1) I pass over the so-called scholia minora or Didymi, the oldest MS. of which was written about A.D. 900. They are chiefly though not entirely a vocabulary, and seem to have existed at all periods, being to some extent present in papyri (which provide no predecessor to A and the other collections, and indeed are an argument for the late origin of these collections). I pass over also the scholia of B (Ven. 453, s. xi) and other MSS. (E₄, Et, Ge) where the critical element is nearly though not entirely swamped by masses of Porphyrian allegorical interpretation. B contains here and there some curious information,² but nothing that points to a definite or late date.

¹ E.g., in § A only, A 117, 317 B 249, 308 Γ 175, 250, 314, 325 Δ 105.

² E.g., B 519 Κυπάρισσος ἡ νῦν Ἀπολλωνιάς, E 6 Clearchus ἐν τῷ περὶ τοῦ

(2) The word *scholium* is usually and conveniently restricted in modern times to marginal annotation, which in the theological field bears the title of *catena*. There is no such distinction in Greek, where ὑπόμνημα and σχόλιον are used indifferently, and sometimes of the same note; e.g. E.M. 38.31 οὕτως εὔρον σχόλιον ἐν ὑπομνήμασιν Ἰλιάδος [Γ 219], 22. 53 εὔρον ἐν ὑπομνήμασι σχόλιον [B 513]. To give no more examples, the voluminous comments of Choeroboscus on the canons of Theodosius, which form a large volume by themselves, are called σχόλια, and those of Charax also. No argument, therefore, can be based on the occurrence of either word, for the definition in Zonaras 1701. 22 σχόλιον ἢ ἐρμηνεία διὰ τὸ κατὰ σχολὴν περιτίθεσθαι πρὸς σαφεστέραν ἐρμηνείαν τῶν δυσνοήτων ὀνομάτων καὶ ῥημάτων, where περιτίθεσθαι might be thought to imply a limitation to marginalia, is negligible, since the verb in the identical definition E.Gud. 519. 28 is παρατίθεσθαι. My argument, therefore, *Iliad*, i. 209, that the E.M. took its Homeric from actual marginalia because of its use of the word σχόλια, was an inadvertence and wrong.

On the other hand it is not denied that marginal scholia existed in antiquity. Papyri show them, and we have the touching instance from Marinus' life of Proclus, c. 27 ἤξιωσα παραγράψαι αὐτὸν τὰ ἀρέσκοντα τοῖς τοῦ διδασκάλου βιβλίοις. πεισθέντος δὲ τοῦ ἀγαθοειδεστάτου καὶ παραγράψαντος τοῖς μετώποις τῶν ὑπομνημάτων ἔσχομεν συναγωγὴν εἰς ταῦτὸν ἀπάντων, καὶ ἐγένετο εἰς Ὀρφέα αὐτοῦ σχόλια καὶ ὑπομνήματα στίχων οὐκ ὀλίγων. The resulting commentary was marginal, but it went under both names, σχόλια and ὑπομνήματα. Compare Eust. 270. 33 τὰ δὲ σχόλια γράφουσιν ὅτι ἦν καὶ Τάρνη τις πόλις Ἀχαιῶν. As the actual Homeric scholia do not say this the reference seems to be to Steph. Byz. in Τάρνη.

The lexica give the word the meaning of 'excerpt' (Jerome *praef. in hom. in Ezech.* xii. 41 Migne *eius excerpta quae* ὀρίζοντος, 576 Diodorus ἐν τῷ περὶ σταθμῶν, T 252 παραξίφλα ἦν νῦν ζωνομάχαιραν καλοῦσιν, Ψ 683 athletes nude μέχρι τοῦ νῦν.

Graece σχόλια *nuncupantur* (*Origins*, p. 14, n. 1)). This seems to explain the otherwise strange use of it within the abundant notes in § A on O 705 Π 390, as though it introduced a 'note' from another source, and were equivalent to ἐν ἄλλῳ, ἄλλως. Similarly in Suidas we find σχο, σχό, σχόλια in the sections Βληχωνία Δύσοργος Ἥμαρ, where there are notes corresponding to our actual scholia on Aristophanes and Sophocles. Reitzenstein also (p. 55) has two examples from F, which coincide with extant scholia on Aristophanes (*Frogs* 130, 134).

The principal works on the Etymologica and their sources are the *Geschichte der griechischen Etymologika* by Richard Reitzenstein, 1897, the same writer's article *Etymologika* in Pauly 1907, and the article on Eustathius in Pauly by L. Cohn (1907).

ORION

The earliest Etymologicon that has survived, and if I am not wrong the oldest grammatical work remaining after the death of Apollonius Dyscolus and Herodian (and of the latter we have only the π. μον. λέξ. and an epitome of the π. Διχρόνων), is that of Orion. This grammarian enjoys a biographical notice in Suidas¹ and an allusion in Marinus' life of Proclus,² from which his date results as about 425. He is called ὁ Θηβαῖος, i.e. of the Egyptian Thebes. His Etymologicon, which is the smallest of the four, has come down to us in several sixteenth-century MSS. at Paris.

There appear to be twelve notes on Homeric words: in five cases a grammarian is quoted by name:

1. 43. 12 Δειλός· ὁ Δελιώς τὰς Ἰλας· ἢ παρὰ τὸν Δεισω μέλλοντα. οὕτως Ἀριστόνικος. Nothing in § II., *Od.*

¹ Ὁρίων· Θηβαῖος τῆς Αἰγύπτου. Συναγωγὴν γινωμῶν ἤγουν ἀνθολόγιον πρὸς Εὐδοκίαν τὴν βασιλῖδα γυναῖκα Θεοδοσίου τοῦ μικροῦ βιβλία γ'.

² C. 8 ἐφοίτησε δὲ [ὁ Πρόκλος] καὶ εἰς γραμματικοῦ Ὁρίωνος, ὃς ἦν ἐκ τοῦ παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις ἱερατικοῦ γένους καταγόμενος καὶ μετρίως τὰ τῆς τέχνης ἐπεσκεμμένος οὕτως ὥστε καὶ συγγραμμάτια ἑαυτοῦ ἴδια ἐκπονήσαι καὶ τοῖς μεθ' ἑαυτὸν χρήσιμα καταλιπεῖν.

2. 52. 16 Ἐνδυνα· τὰ ἔντερα [Υ 806] . . . Ἀρίσταρχος ἔτυμολογεῖ . . . οὕτως εὔρον ἐν ὑπομνήμασι τῆς Ἰλιάδος. = §AT + B min. —

3. 93. 14 Λητώ . . . ὁ δὲ Ἀρίσταρχος φησὶ παρὰ τὸ λῆ. . . . §TY72 ἢ λήθη; no mention of Ar.

4. 94. 18 Λάρυγξ [not in Homer] . . . οὕτως Ἀριστόνικος ἐν τῷ περὶ σημείων Ὀλυσσειας. Nothing in § *Il.*, *Od.*

5. 119. 26 ὀπή [ἀνοπαῖα α 320] . . . οὕτως Ἀριστόνικος ἐν τοῖς σημείοις τοῦ ποιητοῦ. = § α 320+; Ar. omitted, but Crates quoted.

In seven cases a 'commentary' is quoted without a grammarian:

1. 8. 21 ἄλεισον . . . οὕτως ἐν ὑπομνήματι τῆς Ὀλυσσειας. . . . § γ 50+.

2. 8. 29 Ἀράχνια . . . οὕτως εὔρον ἐν ὑπομνήματι τῆς Ὀλυσσειας. . . . No § (θ 280 π 35).

3. 54. 7 Ἐρικεῖν [N 441] . . . οὕτως εὔρον ἐν ὑπομνήματι τῆς Ἰλιάδος. . . . No § A: § B—§ T = (different).

4. 55. 20 Εἰαμενή [Δ 483 Ο 631] οὕτως ἐν ὑπομνήματι εὔρον. . . .

Δ 483 § A+ no BT

Ο 631 no A, BT—.

5. 98. 10 Μάρψαι [X 201] . . . οὕτως εὔρον ἐν ὑπομνήματι Ἰλιάδος. No § A: § BT+ on O 137 (μάρψει).

6. 112. 9 Ζίφος· παρὰ τὸ ξέειν· οὕτως εὔρον ἐν ὑπομνήματι. No § ABT (Li on A 194 ἐκ τοῦ ξύω).¹

7. 157. 34 Φέρεκλος [E 59]· ἀρμόζον ὄνομα τέκτονι οἶον φερέκλονός τις ὦν. οὕτως εὔρον ἐν ὑπομνήματι τοῦ ποιητοῦ. = § BT (cf. A).

We may add three survivals on other authors:

96. 38 Λακίδες . . . οὕτως Ἀρίσταρχος ἐν τοῖς σημείοις Ἡσιόλου. ? = *Theog.* 694.

8. 24 Ἄμυστις· ἐξ ἧς ἐστὶν ἄμα πιεῖν ἢ φιάλη χωρὶς τοῦ διαπνεῦσαι· οὕτως εὔρον ἐν ὑπομνήματι Ἀριστοφανικῶ. = § *Ach.* 1229.

18. 22 Ἀχαία ἢ Δημήτηρ· μένηται τοῦ ὀνόματος Ἀριστοφάνης . . . οὕτως εὔρον ἐν ὑπομνήματι εἰς Ἀριστοφάνην. = § *Ach.* 709—.

¹ 165. 31 Ψιάδες [Π 459] . . . οὕτως ἐν ὑπομνήματι τῆς Ἰλιάδος εὔρον, quoting Herod. and Philoxenus. It is easy to alter Ἰάδος to Ἰλιάδος, but Philoxenus wrote π. τῆς Ἰάδος διαλέκτου (e.g. 86. 7). No § ABT on Π 459 (an etymology in Li).

The seven cases of ὑπόμνημα without a proper name, compared with the five where a proper name occurs, make it very probable that in the former, the seven, ὑπόμνημα means a commentary, as it does in the five. (The probability is considerable that Orion used in all twelve places Aristonicus περὶ τῶν Ἀριστοαρχείων σημείων.)

Orion, therefore, does not afford evidence for our 'scholia' having taken shape in his period. The existence of Aristonicus' book, one of the four constituents, makes that even less probable. Had the separate hypomnemata disappeared the correspondence with our actual § would have been more regular. As it is Orion agrees with B and T in six cases each, with A in two, with Li in two.

We must also lend weight to the great number of commentaries he quotes by name: Herodian, Philoxenus, Alexion, Apollodorus, Didymus, Heraclides, Irenaeus, Orus, Soranus, Theon, Eudaemon, Epaphroditus. The more abundantly they survive the less likelihood there is of a catena having been made out of four of them.

His quality and his age are shown by his comparative brevity and the absence of the immediate sources of the *Etymologica Magnum* and *Gudianum*, *Choeroboscus*, *Methodius*, *Zenobius*, *Theognostus*.

STEPHANUS OF BYZANTIUM

Stephanus, author of the Ἐθνικά, the epitomization of which is one of the most grievous losses that philology has sustained, lived about a hundred years after Orion. The epitome was dedicated to Justinian, and B. A. Müller, *Hermes*, 1918, 337 sqq., holds that the original work was composed not long before. Even the epitome quotes an enormous mass of grammatical literature, much of it bearing on Homer. We find Philoxenus τὴν Ὀδύσσειαν ἐξηγούμενος (Ἀλάβανλα), Didymus ὑπομνηματίζων τὴν ν [408] τῆς Ὀδυσσεΐας (Ἀρέθουσα), Heracleo ὁ Γλαύκων τὴν αὐτὴν ὑπομνηματίζων (ib.), Epaphroditus ἐν τῇ π' τῆς Ἰλιάδος (Δωδώνη), the same and Zenodotus ὑπομνηματίζων τὸ β' (ib.), Zeno-

dotus again (Ἄντρων), Didymus again (Ἀπολλωνία), Apollodorus ἐν ἅ νεῶν καταλόγῳ (and saep.), Eraphroditus again (παρατιθεὶς τὸν Ἀρίσταρχον ἐκλεχόμενον οὕτως) in Δουλίχιον, Demetrius Scepsius ἐν ἑκκαίδεκάτῳ τοῦ Τρωικοῦ διακόσμου (Σιλίνδιον). These commentaries, from the abundance of their quotations, and from the abundant mentions of commentaries on other authors,¹ were evidently in existence in Stephanus' day. On the other hand he has no Homeric notes which correspond closely to our scholia.

Among about thirty-seven sections either there are no ξ in existence corresponding to them (B 511, 533, 697, 828, 829, 856 | 445 ω 377), or there are corresponding scholia but less in bulk (this is the usual case), or the scholia exist but are different (B 717 N 6 O 479 α 186). At B 498, 505, 507 O 112 Π 233 there are no ξ A corresponding, but the other ξ agree though brief. Close resemblance is found at ζ 103. From this it results that these notes were not taken from marginal scholia, and that the ὑπομνηματισάμενοι had not lost their separate existence in the time of Justinian, and continuous marginal commentaries had not been made out of them.

Stephanus also quotes the technical grammarians whom we have met in Orion: Didymus, Athenodorus, Orus, Philo, Arcadius, Eudaemon, Charax, Trypho, and even (in Ταμίσις) Georgius Choeroboscus ἐν τῷ ὀνοματικῷ, which, as it is an anachronism (Choeroboscus quotes Stephanus), Meineke cuts out.

CHOEROBOSCUS

More than half a century after Stephanus we come to Georgius Choeroboscus, whose date according to Hilgard (*Prolegomena*, p. lxxvii) cannot be before A.D. 600 (Stefani, however, *Byzantische Zeitschrift* 1907, 190 puts him rather earlier). The first quotations of him are in MS. F of the

¹ Theon on Lycophron (Ἀλνεια, Κύπρια), Sophocles on the Argonautica (Κάναστρον, Ἄβαρνος), Theon, Plutarchus, and Demetrius Phalereus on Nicander (Κορώπη), Alexander Cornelius on Alcman (Ἄραξα).

Etymologicum Magnum (s. x-xi) and in Vat. Barberini I. 70 of the Gudanium of the same period, but his bulk, his authoritative tone, and the mass of authors he quotes forbid us to put him into the so-called Dark Ages, on the further shore of which we descry Photius collecting the fragments which he put into his Lexicon and Bibliotheca. Choeroboscus is the first grammarian of any size who has survived after Herodian, and—whatever we may think of the puerility of his greatest work, his comments on the canons of Theodosius, which have almost wrung an apology from his editor Hilgard—the independence with which he deals, as it were on an equal footing, with the great grammarians of the heathen period makes an impression on the reader. His quotations show that he dealt with an Hellenic world still practically intact.

He quotes as authorities Herodian, Orus, Arcadius, Eudaemon, Stephanus of Byzantium, Romanus the teacher of Philoponus, Habron, Charax, Irenaeus, Sergius, Hephaestion, Alexander Cotyaensis. On the other hand there are none of the intermediaries whom we find in the Etymologica, Methodius and Zenobius. Further, he quotes no hypomnemata or scholia on Homer. So much may be gleaned from his σχόλια on Theodosius' canons, the only work which has come down to us complete. The epitome of his Ὁρθογραφία contained in Barocci 50 (*an. Ox.* ii. 167 sqq.) quotes Orus, Herodian, Apollonius, Dionysius Thrax, Origenes, Diogenianus, Theodorus, Philoxenus, and has no mention of hypomnemata or scholia on Homer. The same is the case with the anonymous tract περὶ ποσότητος which follows this in *an. Ox.* ii and with the second series of Epimerismi in the same MS. (319 sqq.). Choeroboscus is so imposing for these qualities—his bulk, the number and antiquity of his sources, and also for his subsequent influence—that the circumstance that he does not allude to hypomnemata on Homer, has no notes which resemble our scholia, and deals with so many apparently extant commentators, affords a probability that excerpts from

Didymus, Aristonicus, Herodian, and Nicanor had not yet been arranged on the margins of copies of the *Iliad*, or, if they had, had not superseded these and other ancient sources. It is conceivable that Choeroboscus' period saw the accomplishment of this feat; it can hardly have taken place before, hardly long afterwards.

This conclusion is supported by our failure to find commentaries at all similar to A and T on the margins of papyri, which of course come well down to this period; and further by the improbability that marginalia of such bulk could have been put round papyrus books written in comparatively large hands. The resultant volumes would have been too ponderous for use. Conceive a Ven. A twice as thick as the actual book. Such catenas are hardly conceivable before the minuscule period. This began earlier than A.D. 730, but we do not know how much earlier (*J.H.S.*, 1920, 1 sqq.). A further factor in the date is the cessation of the accentuation of barytone syllables usual in late literary papyri, which Choeroboscus in a well-known passage says was objected to as 'cutting up' the page: *in Theod.* 117. 37 H. δεῖ δὲ γινώσκειν ὅτι φασὶ τινες εἰ καὶ λέγομεν ὅτι πᾶσα συλλαβὴ χωρὶς τῆς συλλαβῆς τῆς ἐχούσης τὸν κύριον τόνον τῆς λέξεως βαρεῖαν δέχεται ἄλλ' οὖν οὐ δεῖ τιθέναι τὸν τύπον τῆς βαρείας, ἵνα μὴ τὰ βιβλία καταχαράττωνται· κακῶς δὲ λέγουσι· τούτῳ γὰρ τῷ λόγῳ ἐὰν εὐρωμεν βιβλίον πᾶν ἐσφαλμένον οὐκ ὀφείλομεν διορθώσασθαι αὐτό, ἵνα μὴ καταχαράξωμεν αὐτό. He agrees, however, that they are unnecessary, like the marks of quantity. These remarks are repeated, evidently at a later time, in the *supplementa artis Dionysiaca* 110, 111 Uhlig (= *an. Bekk.* 674. 31), with the addition τοῦτο νῦν οὐ γίνεται. The practice was objected to, and was going out. It goes on as long as literary papyri last. What caused the objection? No reason can be given, except that the small pages, small hand, and close lines of the typical minuscule book were coming in. The marking of barytona in books such as we have them from A.D. 835 onwards would be intolerable. Perhaps then we may ascribe to Choeroboscus'

period, or soon after it, both the apparition of the minuscule hand, with unaccented barytona, and the continuous marginal commentary. Whether a third contributory circumstance was the Saracenic conquest of Egypt with a papyrus famine at Constantinople, as I suggested *J.H.S. l.c.*, I leave open.

ECLOGAE

We find the first contacts with our scholia in the small grammatical corpus contained in Barocci 50.¹ This MS. is the exact contemporary of the Ven. A, written in the latter part of the tenth century; the period of its contents belongs to the previous century, to the time when, the iconoclastic controversy being over, the fragments of heathen learning were gathered up in lexica, epimerismi, and epitomes. The book opens with Theognostus, who dedicates his canons τῷ δεσπότη μου καὶ σοφῷ στεφηνόρῳ Λέοντι, who must be the Armenian [A.D. 813-19]. This book, which quotes a remarkable number of Herodian's works (καθολ., ὀρθογρ., π. πνευμάτων, τάξις τῶν στοιχείων, ὄνοματ., ἐπιμερ., π. παθῶν, π. μονοσυλλ., π. συζυγιῶν; evidently Herodian had the longest life of grammarians), Philoxenus, Αἰέτιος ὁ ἰατρός, Dion. Thrax, and Aristotle, has a reference to a commentary on Hesiod, (Θάλεια) οὕτως εὔρον παρακείμενον σχόλιον εἰς τὰ Ἔργα Ἡσιόλου [?].

Further on in the book (p. 427) we come to a work entitled ἐκλογαὶ διαφόρων λέξεων συνηλεγμένων ἔκ τε τῆς γραφῆς καὶ τῶν θύραθεν πραγματειῶν. This contains (p. 429) λέξεις ἔκ τῆς ἱστορίας τοῦ ἁγίου Νικολάου. This saint and historian lived

¹ On its contents see Reitzenstein, pp. 166 sqq. It contains two literary pieces, the Batrachomyomachia and Hero and Leander, each in the oldest copy that exists. The facsimile represents f. 7 v. (Theognostus Canones *an. Ox.* ii, f. 13. 21 ὀπλότερος ὁ νεώτερος—f. 14. 14 ὀλκάς). Between lines 17 and 18 will be seen a small piece of syllabic tachygraphy εἰ τε καὶ ταρχην λεξέως, which Cramer overlooked. We see that this tachygraphical system was familiar to the writer of this classical Constantinopolitan hand. (A rough drawing of the passage was given C. R. 1906 xx. 349.)

from 758 to 828; a vocabulary to his works cannot be older than the middle of the ninth century. (Nothing can be deduced from the paragraph p. 487 ἐκ τοῦ ἁγίου Θαλλελαίου, for this saint I find was a hermit contemporary of Theodoret.) This work has several clear coincidences with our Homeric scholia:

(1) 433. 4 ἐτέλειον ἐπαράς [I 456]: = § A with variations: εἶτε om. Ecl., ἢ ἐπιφυλαχθήσεται for ἢ ἐπί, φυλ. Ecl., ἐπιμυγερός Ecl. for ἐπισμυγερός, εἶτα Ecl. for εἶτε, ἐστιν om. Ecl., αἱ συλλαβαὶ ἀναλειμμένοι Ecl. for αἱ συναλειφθεῖσαι. Careless copying and absence of context reduced the ecloga to nonsense.

(2) 433. 27 Ἐκαμήδη [Λ 624] ἢ Νέστορος παλλακίς: ἀπὸ τοῦ ἕκαθεν βουλευέσθαι. No scholium.

(3) 461. 16 οὐλη δ' ἐπενήνοθε λάχνη [K 134]: = § A, but Ecl. is much fuller. Ecl. alone quotes Nicias, Ptol. Ascalonita, Alexion, and Aristarchus. It, however, omits to quote χ 442 at the end, and ὁμοίως before τῷ at the beginning. The shortened version is found also in E.M. 640. 47, and, as a mere mention, in Apion and Herodorus in Eustathius. The Ecloga here justifies itself.

(4) 463. 5 παλλακίδος περιχώσατο [I 449]: οἱ μὲν ἀνέστρεψαν κ.τ.λ. = § A, but A is slightly fuller and cites Alexion.

(5) 466. 18 τρώων ἀνθ' ἑκατόν τε Διηκοσίων τε ἕκαστος [Θ 233]: = § A, but the Ecl. is fuller and cites Ptol. Ascal.

These passages leave no doubt that the compiler of the Eclogae copied a commentary on the *Iliad* which had taken a form similar to that of our scholia, that is to say of marginal paragraphs. Here, then, for the first time we find marginal Homeric scholia. They must have come into existence between the time of Choeroboscus, who shows no trace of them, and the compilation of these Eclogae. Whether the moment of their birth was nearer Choeroboscus or the ninth century there is nothing but probability to show. The earlier state (the Eclogae) is on the whole fuller than the actual scholia, but the isolation of the notes has produced its usual effect, error and omission.

The question of the period of compilation of our scholia—

whether it were nearer Choeroboscus or the date of the *Eclogae*—turns not only on the circumstances mentioned but on what I may call the expectation of life of the *Quattuorviri*. Herodian we know (e.g. from Theognostus' preface) maintained himself till the ninth century. Nicanor appears to have been extant when Melampus (or Diomedes) gave the account of his views which first Bekker, *an.* ii. 758, and then Hilgard, *Scholia in Dion. Thrac. artem*, 1901, 24 sqq., published. But even the latter editor, while denying Melampus' (or Diomedes') good faith, does not affix a date to him. Aristonicus we have found alive in Orion, his further survival is not proved.¹ Didymus is quoted by Stephanus. There were reasons for the survival of Herodian (his authority and the wide range of his prosodical doctrine) which did not apply to Didymus, Aristonicus, and Nicanor, limited (in these treatises) to Homer, even though the survival of Apollonius Dyscolus in several unabbreviated works forbids us to definitely pronounce their sentence. Still, when we take into account the unexacting philological requirements of centuries seven and eight, the probability seems the greater that an epitome of these three writers took place before this period commenced.

A similar argument may be drawn from the character of § A and T. The high proportion of good grain, the absence of mere elementary-school teaching, and the abstract nature of the contents (various readings and prosody) imply a public capable of understanding these matters, and are in remarkable contrast with both Choeroboscus on Theodosius and Eustathius, who, if he possessed scholia similar to A and T, made a very limited use of them.

Further, if the scholia had come into existence in the uncial period we might, as was said above, have expected to find some trace of them in papyrus, and the shorter or 'intermarginal' scholia in A might well be descended from papyri furnished with v.ll. But such papyri as remain,

¹ E.M. 525. 30, Gud. 334. 12 οὕτως εὔρον ἐν ὑπομνήματι Ἀνδρονίκου εἰς τὴν Ὁδύσσειαν [φ 407] it is usual to alter Ἀνδρ- to Ἀριστ-.

though some four of them have marginal scholia of one sort or another, have nothing to be compared for bulk or continuity to AT.

The authors quoted in the scholia are mostly either early or of unknown date (Nemesion, Soterias, Heracleo, Quintus Smyrnaeus): Christodorus quoted on B 461 in ABT celebrated the gymnasium of Septimius Severus, which the dictionaries inform us was burned down in 532. This allows the collection to approximate to Choeroboscus. § B contain Orion, Servius ἐν τρίτῳ τῶν Τρωικῶν (Φ 242), and Λέων ἐν τοῖς χρυσαορικοῖς, who Schrader thinks was Leon of Alabanda, of unknown era, but doubtless Gentile.

The Homeric scholia, like other scholia, abound in personal expressions—οἶμαι, οἶδα, ὡς καὶ ἡμῖν δοκεῖ, οἷς καὶ ἡμεῖς συγκατατιθέμεθα—which at first sight appear to be in the mouth of the editor. But the ancient compiler borrowed form with substance (cf. e.g. p. 24 n.), and most of these formulae in § A come from Herodian.¹ It is only safe to argue from passages where Herodian is mentioned by name, especially where he is contradicted. As Herodian is the last of the Quattuorviri here we may perceive the editor. These passages are in § A:

Δ 66 λέγουσι δὲ τινες ὅτι ἐν τοῖς ἐπιμερισμοῖς λέγει ὁ Ἡρ. ὅτι μετοχή ἐστιν . . . ἐν δὲ τῷ ὀνομαστικῷ λέγει ὅτι ὀνομά ἐστι. καὶ μᾶλλον ὄνομα δεῖ λέγειν αὐτὸ ἥπερ μετοχήν· τῷ γὰρ ὀνομαστικῷ μᾶλλον πιστευτέον ἢ τοῖς ἐπιμερισμοῖς. τοῦτο γὰρ ὠμολόγηται εἶναι Ἡρωδιανοῦ, ἀλλ' εἰσὶ καὶ ψευδεπίγραφοι. The learning of this passage suggests authority, and in point of fact it is an excerpt from Choeroboscus (i, p. 34 Gaisf.): we therefore find a post-Choeroboscan compiler. Similarly at the end of § Ω 318 the compiler observes μακρὸν τὸ ἰ καὶ ἐν τῇ συνθέσει, ὡς ἐν τῷ κ' τῆς καθόλου φησὶν ὁ αὐτός· ἀπὸ γὰρ τοῦ χρόνου τὸν τόνον ἐστήσαμεν. καὶ ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ δὲ τῶν ὀνομαστικῶν περὶ τῆς ἐκτάσεως αὐτῶν ταῦτά φησιν. Here again we have a compiler of Herodian, not directly, nor from any one as

¹ E.g. A 423 B 13, 262, 517, 662 Γ 46 Z 239 H 177 Θ 233, 349, 371 I 147, 321 K 25 Λ 257 N 103 Π 636 Σ 100 and many others.

late as Choeroboscus, but from Arcadius 196. 4 (ap. Lentz).

Herodian is again quoted by name, P 201, without intermediary, Σ 352, perhaps through Choeroboscus (416. 26 Gaisf. ap. Lentz); Δ 235 O 10 suggest Choeroboscus by their wording.

We therefore seem to see in the editor a member of the age of Choeroboscus, perhaps of his circle, perhaps Choeroboscus himself. He appears as careful of his space in H 255 Θ 296, 535, where he excuses himself from copying Didymus, 'who said the same as Aristonicus', but without betraying his age.

ETYMOLOGICUM MAGNUM

Καὶ τὰυτὰ μὲν ἐν τούτοις. If we have found an approximate date for the compilation of these scholia the evidence of the remaining Etymologica is not of essential importance. They are, however, contemporary with A and older than T, and may therefore be expected to throw light on the state of the two collections shortly before our actual transcripts of them were made.

The oldest copies of the Etymologicum Magnum are the Florentine MS. san Marco 304, which the facsimile in Vitelli-Paoli *Codd. Fior.* ii. 20 shows to have been written early in the eleventh century (F), and a Vaticanus 1818 said to belong to s. x-xi (Reitzenstein, p. 2). F was discovered and published by Emanuel Miller in his invaluable *Mélanges de litt. grecque* (1868); extracts from Vat. are given by Reitzenstein. The later MSS. differ from F (and Vat.) in the constant omission of sources, immediate sources such as Methodius, Zenobius, Choeroboscus, Eudaemon, and older authors, Herodian π. παθῶν &c. Some articles have fallen out altogether.¹

¹ I think it unadvisable to use the designations Genuinum, Parvum, &c., which imply separate works, and not successive states of the same work.

The latest author quoted in the *Magnum* is Photius. The actual dictionary, therefore, was compiled between the time of Photius and the writing of F, that is in the tenth century, perhaps early therein. What work of Photius is alluded to is unknown, not the lexicon or the *Myriobiblon*. To establish a closer relation to Photius (Reitzenstein, p. 54 al.) is going beyond the evidence.¹

Throughout the *Magnum* there are obvious annotations on Homer, over two hundred at least. They bear considerable resemblance to our scholia, and may be classified as:

- | | |
|---|-------|
| 1. Approximate agreements with § ABT, about 87. | |
| 2. Fuller than ABT, | ,, 10 |
| 3. Less full than ABT, | ,, 14 |
| 4. Agreements with A only, | ,, 53 |
| 5. No agreements with scholia, | ,, 18 |

In many of these cases direct reference is made to commentaries on the *Iliad*; e.g.

(1) 10. 55 (ἀγκύλον) . . . ὡς εὔρον ἐν ὑπομνήμασιν Ἰλιάδος = § min. B 205.

(2) 15 53 (ἀγών) . . . οὕτως εὔρον ἐν ὑπομνήμασιν Ἰλιάδος = § B Σ 376.

(3) 22. 53 (Ἀζειδαο) εἰς τὴν Βοιωτίαν [513] εὔρον ἐν ὑπομνήμασι σχόλιον = § Li.

(4) 31. 29 (F) (αἰαί) οὕτω εὔρον ἐν ὑπομνήμασιν Ἰλιάδος = § ABT + B 87.

(5) 36. 9 (αἰναρέτη) οὕτως εὔρον σχόλιον Ἰλιάδος π' [31] = § ABT +.

(6) 42. 41 (αἰδρις) οὕτως εὔρον σχόλιον ἐν ὑπομνήμασιν = § A, BT - Γ 219.

(7) 85. 1 (ἄμοτον) οὕτω μὲν ὠρίων [20. 29]· ἐγὼ δὲ εὔρον ἐν ὑπομνήμασιν Ἰλιάδος = § ABT - Δ 440.

¹ Photius (codd. 145-158) quotes no less than fifteen lexica as extant in his day. He often suggests the formation of new and more practical lexica out of them, e.g. c. 152 fin., c. 153 fin., c. 155, so that the extant *Etymologica* may well be due eventually to his influence.

(8) 193. 12 (F) (βεβήμεν) οὕτως εὔρον ἐν ὑπομνήμασιν Ἰλιάδος = § T P 510 (slight).

(9) 283. 52 (Δόρπος) οὕτως ὤρος (ὠρίων F)· ἐγὼ δὲ φημι ὡς εὔρον σχόλιον παρακείμενον ἐν τῷ β' τῆς Ἰλιάδος [381] = § AB, T—.

(10) 304. 9 (εἰρύσασθαι) οὕτως εὔρον ἐν σχολίοις Ὀμήρου. No § A 216.

(11) 454. 27 (θρέπτα) οὕτως εὔρον ἐγὼ = § A, no BT Δ 478.

(12) 502. 21 (F) (κέλευθος) οὕτως εὔρον σχόλιον = § A, B—, no T A 312.

(13) 541. 2 (κρόκος) οὕτως εὔρον ἐν ὑπομνήματι τ' [1] Ἰλιάδος = Gud. 348. 18. No §.

(14) 566. 13 (λίμνη) οὕτως εὔρον ἐν ὑπομνήμασι τῆς Ἰλιάδος = § γ 1 (less).

In none of these passages is the reference to scholia found in earlier lexica. In fact in (7) and (9) the writer distinguishes between the two sources, lexica and commentators.

In other places commentators are quoted by name:

(1) 221. 27 (Γάργαρος) οὕτως Ἐπαφρόδιτος ἐν ὑπομνήμασι θ' [48] Ἰλιάδος. No §.

(2) 277. 35 (Διόνυσος) Ἐπαφρόδιτος ἐν ὑπομνήματι ζ' Ἰλιάδος [132] (quotes Alex. Thasius, Ar.). No § A, § B different.

(3) 572. 19 (λύχνος) οὕτως Ἀριστόνικος ἐν τῷ περὶ σημείων τοῦ Ὀμήρου = § τ 34—.

(4) 702. 9 (ῥαδανίζειν) Ἡρακλέων ἐν ὑπομνήματι σ' [576] Ἰλιάδος. ὤρος. No § AB, T—.

When, then, the writer quotes a commentator by name he does not take him from scholia. Where he takes him from a lexicon he names the lexicon, as in 4. Very likely Aristonicus also (3) came from Orus. Here, therefore, there is no reason to suppose once fuller scholia. On the other hand it would be rash to infer the survival of Epaphroditus and Aristonicus till A.D. 1000. Orus or 'another Etymologus' handed them on.

The cases where the Magnum agrees with existing scholia but is shorter than they do not interest us; we see the excerpt away from its context suffering by isolation. Where, however, the Magnum is fuller than existing scholia, or

there are no existing scholia at all, consideration is necessary. The question is, whether the version in the Etymologicum shows an earlier state of the scholium (literally the Etymologicum is younger than the scholia), or takes its information not from the scholia but from an earlier source.

*Magnum fuller.*¹

(1) 1. 35 ἀαπτος [A 567] quotes Philoxenus (Philo F), Methodius, Herodian. = s A om. Phil. Method. (ἐμοὶ δὲ δοκεῖ = Herodian).²

(2) 415. 43 [A 255] ὅτι τὸν ἠ σύνδεσμον ἐξ διαφόρως φησὶ σημαίνειν ὁ Ἡρωδιανός κ.τ.λ. = s A different.

(3) 419. 10 ἦδη ἐκ τοῦ ἦλαιν κ.τ.λ. shortened from Choeroboscus in *Theod.* ii. 85, 86 Hilgard, quoting Ar. = s A on E 64 Σ 404 less.

(4) 420. 24 ἦλος [A 576] quotes Herod. in two works. = s A, Herod. in one work.

(5) 477. 56 ἴστη [I 202] quotes Philo, Trypho, Herod. = s A εἰσὶν δὲ οἱ only.

(6) 486. 26 Κάλυμνος [B 677] quotes Apollodorus. = s A om. Apoll.

(7) 508. 25 κείνος θ' ὡς [B 330] long. = s A short.

(8) 535. 28 κρατερός [A 280] long. = s A short.

(9) 536. 54 κρείον [I 206] quotes Orus, Herod., Euphotion, Ptol., Choerob. [*Orthogr.* 231. 33] = Gud. 344. 11. = s AT—(Euphotion only).

(10) 578. 54 μεμνῶτο [Υ 361] quotes Crates. = s A different.

(11) 621. 33 ὀληαι [Γ 417] quotes Orus, Tyrannio. = s A—, no BT.

(12) 649. 13 παλιμπλαγχθέντας [A 59] long. = s A short.

(13) 678. 32 πόθος [A 240] quotes Ar., Her., Philox. = s A—.

¹ The Magnum is longer than the scholia but without material difference at 337. 3 [Σ 458], 343. 46 [A 53], 365. 14 [Σ 68], 427. 41 [O 619].

² 302. 7 εἰνάνυχες [I 470] is not really fuller, for ἐπιφέρει παραίος = ἐπιφερόμενον παράσει of s A. Magnum is here more corrupt than the s.

(14) F πῶς δαί [K 408] quotes Apoll., Herod., Ioannes Vestinus. = § A—.

(15) 709. 30 σελλοί [Π 234] quotes Ar. = § A—.

(16) 742. 44 σταφυλή [B 765] quotes Ptol., Heracl. = Ammonius in Σταφυλήν. = § A—.

(17) 761. 33 τόδέ μοι [A 41] quotes Ar., Herod. = § A—.

(18) F τυμβοχοῆς [Φ 323] quotes Ptol. = § A less Ptol., § Ge with Ptol.

In five places, (1), (3), (9), (11), (16), the article betrays lexicographical sources (Orus, Choeroboscus, Ammonius *de diff. voc.*); the others we can hardly help regarding as fuller states of the Homeric scholia.

Scholia wanting.

This section consists of an analysis of the articles in the *Magnum*.

(1) 89. 3 ἀμφίβασιν [E 623] paraphrase without source.

(2) 90. 39 ἀμφικύπελλον [A 584] Ἄρισταρχός φησι σημαίνειν τὴν λέξιν τὴν διὰ τῶν ὠτων ἑκατέρωθεν περιφέρειαν.

(3) 124. 8 ἀπὸ ἔθεν [E 56] ὁ Σιδώνιος μέμφεται Ἄριστάρχω κ.τ.λ.

(4) 142. 19 ἀρίζηλος [B 318] οὕτω Κρατίνος ἐν τῇ ἐπιτομῇ τῶν Βασιλείδου περὶ ὁμηρικῆς λέξεως. οὕτως εἶχεν εἰς τὸ ἄλλο, εἰς τὸ μέγα δὲ οὕτω.

(5) 150. 6 ἀρτεμῆς [E 515 Θ 308] quotes Philox., Herod. π. παθῶν. = § Li m. rec.

(6) 208. 15 βουκόλος quotes Did. = Gud. 112. 30.

(7) 238. 23 γόνον [Z 500] quotes Apoll., Herod. through Zenobius (F), no authorities in §.

(8) 308. 14 ἑανός [Γ 385 E 734 Σ 352, 613] quotes Dion. Thrax. (§ B Σ 352, § A min. Σ 612 no Dion.)

(9) 358. 1 ἐπιβλής [Ω 453] Ἄρισταρχος ὡς ἀλήτης, ὁ δὲ Ἄσκαλωνίτης ὀξύνει ὡς ἀδμής (F)¹ def. § A, BT—, Eu. wrong.

¹ Hence the note on this line in my apparatus should be corrected "ἐπιβλής Ar. (ὡς ἀλήτης), ἐπιβλής Ptol. Ascal. (ὡς ἀδμής) § A, ὡς τὸ προβλής ὀξύνεται § BT, fallitur Eu. (ἐπιβλής Ar.)."

(10) 358. 46 ἐπιδέξια [B 353] accent: see *an. Ox. i.*
No § here.

(11) 382. 10 ἐς τί ἔτι [E 465] quotes Ptol. Asc. def. § A,
BT—.

(12) 383. 25 ἔστορι [Ω 272] v. l. ἔκτορι. = § min. Ge.

Here we might expect the Magnum to have followed other sources, and this is clearly the case in (4), where two sources are given, (5) where Herodian π. παθῶν certainly existed apart from the Homeric scholia, (7) where Zenobius is quoted, and perhaps (10). The cases (9) and (11), where A is wanting, do not come into account. Some of the remainder have slight coincidences with scholia (Li, being Eustathian, is irrelevant).

Accordingly, as might be supposed, the Magnum was not limited in Homeric matters to one source. It drew from 'other etymologica' as well as from hypomnemata or scholia on Homer. These two types of sources are distinguished 283. 52 (p. 17), 540. 50 (M 253) ταῦτα μὲν δ' ὠρίων· ἐγὼ δὲ εὖρον σχόλιον παρακείμενον. . . .

Converting this to the other side of the question we find that the Homeric scholia at the time of the composition of the Magnum as we have it, that is between the time of Photius and the beginning of the eleventh century, were in various passages fuller than we have them in A. This would be a natural circumstance about any such body of annotation, particularly of annotation which had to be adapted to the margin of a book containing the text, and where space was left for the critical signs and for a second series of shorter scholia. We also see that the sum of Homeric learning in the world was not, or not long ago had not been, limited to the Homeric scholia, as indeed from the subscription of the scholia A we should not expect. The scholia do not as a rule quote intermediaries; they were compiled from the Viermänner directly and that about the time of Choeroboscus. The Magnum drew from them, but also from the intermediaries Choeroboscus, Methodius, and Zenobius, and from the older Etymologica.

The Magnum and the Odyssey scholia

The relations between the Magnum and the scholia on the *Odyssey* are more definite, and require a separate statement. The § on the *Odyssey* as now surviving are slight and late; they are contained in thirteenth-century MSS., Harley 5674, Venetus 613, Palatinus 45, Parisinus 2403, in one fourteenth-century, Hamburg 15, and one fifteenth-century, Ambros. Q 88 sup. Its scholia minora are found in a good eleventh-century copy, once at san Marco at Florence, now Bodl. Auct. v. 41.

These sources are not only much later than A and T, but notoriously scanty. It has been supposed that a book furnished with § on the scale of A and T once existed and has been lost. The evidence of the Magnum throws doubt on this view.

The Magnum has forty references to the *Odyssey*: in twenty-seven cases there are corresponding scholia. Of these eighteen are shorter than the entry in the Magnum, often much shorter. It is, therefore, unlikely that the forty entries were taken from fuller scholia; and in the thirteen cases where no § exist other sources are given by the Magnum.

Erastrotoditus:

117. 10 (ἄωροι) οὕτως 'Ε. ἐν ὑπομνήματι τῆς μ' Ὀδυσσεΐας [89].

507. 26 (Κεφαλληνία) οὕτως 'Ε. ἐν ὑπομνήματι τῆς Ὀδυσσεΐας [where?].

Asclepiades:

144. 15 ('Αρναῖος) οὕτως Ἡρωδιανὸς ἐν τῇ ἀνωμάλῳ προσωδίᾳ. Ἄσκ. δὲ ὁ Μυρλεανὸς ἐν τῷ ὑπομνήματι τῆς Ὀδυσσεΐας [σ 5] παρὰ τὸ ἄρυσθαι. (§—.)

Aristarchus and Herodian:

316. 25 (ἐλήλαται) εἰ μὲν διὰ τοῦ ᾱ ὡς Ἄρ. καὶ . . . ἄλλοι . . . Ἡρωδιανὸς [χ 56].

Aristarchus and Callistratus:

390. 34 (εὐηγενέων) Ἀρίσταρχος ψιλοῖ, Καλλίστρατος δὲ Δασύνει (F) [τ 114].

Aristonicus:

377. 37 (ἔρσαι) ὡς Ἀριστόνικος ἐν σημείοις [ι 222], perhaps from Orion.

572. 18 (λύχνος) οὕτως Ἀ. ἐν τῷ περὶ σημείων τοῦ Ὀμήρου [τ 34]. = Orion 94. 16.

525. 30 (κόλλοψ) οὕτως εὔρον ἐν ὑπομνήματι Ἀνδρονίκου εἰς τὴν Ὀδύσσειαν (F) [φ 407]. Andronicus is also in Gud. 334.

12: from a common source therefore, doubtless again Orion, where in the article the name has fallen out.

It is usual to correct to Arist.

627. 40 (ὀπή) οὕτως Ἀριστόνικος ἐν σημείοις [α 320]. From Orion 119. 26.

Heracleo:

421. 47 (ἠεροειδὲς ἄντρον ἐπήρατον) Ἡρ. ἐν Ὀδυσσεΐας ὑπομνήματι [μ 80 al.]. s v 366—.

Choeroboscus:

460. 1 (Θῶνος) ζητεῖ περὶ τούτου διεξοδικώτερον Χοιροβοσκός περὶ τόνου τῆς εὐθείας τῶν Δυϊκῶν = I. 373. 4 Hilg. [Δ 228].

Apollonius and Herodian:

472. 10 (ἴξον) οὕτως Ἀ. ὁ δὲ Ἡρ. . . . [Δ 1]. s—.

Zenodotus:

F (μανίφυλλον) γρ. δὲ Z. μανέφυλλος [ν 346].

Crates, Lysanias, Sidon., Pindario, Ptol. Asc.:

779. 9 (ὑπερικταίνοντο) (F) [ψ 3]. s Ar. only.

Similarly on ι 222 Magnum adds Apio, on Δ 84 Hellanicus, on λ 579 Aristarchus and a λεξικὸν ῥητορικόν, on φ 146 Aristarchus, on ι 184 a commentator whose name has fallen out (φησι γοῦν ἐξηγούμενος), on α 70 Herodian, on χ 126 Apollodorus and Crates, on χ 84 Pius and Alexander Cotyaensis (from Orus), on ξ 6 Didymus (οὕτως εὔρον ἐγώ), on τ 553 Theon, on λ 509 Didymus again, on π 468 Pius again.

At α 320 the scholia for once are fuller, but Ἀριστόνικος ἐν σημείοις does not occur there, but is found in Orion 119. 26, E.M. 111. 19, 627. 40, Zonaras 187. 2.

The probability of the *Odyssey*-scholia having once been much fuller and having contained more commentators'

names is slight. There is no reason to suppose that a corpus of scholia on the *Odyssey* existed comparable to A and T. The fuller notes in the Magnum came from the hypomnemata themselves, no doubt through earlier lexica, in particular that of Orion.

ETYMOLOGICUM GUDIANUM

The oldest copy of this, Vat. Barberini i. 70, is a highly abbreviated¹ MS. of the end of the tenth century, as two rather dark photographs at the end of Reitzenstein's book show. It is slightly older than F. It and the next oldest MS. (Vind. 23, s. xii) indicate authors and intermediate sources by monograms prefixed to the articles. Some are perspicuous $\overset{\rho}{\delta}\mu$, $\psi\alpha$ or $\psi = \psi\alpha\lambda\mu\acute{o}\iota$, $\overset{\mu}{\pi}\overset{\epsilon}{\tau}\overset{\omega}{\lambda}\epsilon$, $\overset{\omega}{\epsilon}\overset{\rho}{\nu}\overset{\omega}{\iota}\overset{\omega}{\sigma}$, $\overset{\rho}{\gamma}\overset{\rho}{\omega}$ or $\overset{\rho}{\gamma}\overset{\epsilon}{\omega}$ (= Choeroboscus), $\overset{\omega}{\iota}\overset{\omega}{\lambda}\overset{\omega}{\delta}$, $\overset{\alpha}{\alpha}$, $\overset{\sigma}{\sigma}\overset{\epsilon}{\epsilon}$ (= σέλευκος). Others are less clear, but have been read by Stefani, *Byz. Zeitschrift*, 1907, 54. One, $\overset{\phi}{\phi}$, not unnaturally was supposed to refer to Photius;² its meaning is τὰ φῶτα, that is the Epiphany.

The later MSS. (for which see Reitzenstein, pp. 70 sqq.) omit these monograms, and are consequently without authorities. For the book as a whole we depend on the edition of Sturz, 1818, taken, if the transcript is true, from one of the worst MSS. ever written. Reitzenstein gives specimens of Alpha. A new edition by Luigi di Stefani, which ran to two numbers (α-3) was interrupted by his death.

Gud. is in all respects smaller than Magnum, gives less

¹ Among the rarer tachygraphical signs it has αι, αντι, αυ, εκ, επι, ερ, το, τον, του. Some of these are visible in the facsimile.

² The sentence οὕτως ἐγὼ Φώτιος ὁ πατριάρχης (586. 37) is an appropriation from an earlier lexicon. These personal liftings are universal; I give some examples: Zonaras 159. 20 (πτόρθος) . . . οὐχ εὔρον αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐτυμολογίαν. This is in the E.M. Zonaras 1771. 17 ἐν τῷ ῥηματικῷ εὔρον. This also is in the E.M. Even in § A the personal statements are mostly from Herodian.

valuable information, and quotes fewer authorities. The later ones, Methodius and Zenobius, do not appear. Masses of canons and epimerismi are included; there is next to no prosody. Etymology is the staple. This character agrees with the few coincidences with A.

There are fifty Homeric notes, more or less, in Gud. The majority coincide generally with our scholia, in four cases with A only. There are also cases where there are no scholia extant, or very slight scholia.

(1) 27. 44 ἄκος (l 250) οὕτως εὔρον ἐν ὑπομνήματι τῆς Ἰλιάδος = s B and min. on X 2.

(2) 49. 39 ἀμφιτρίτη (γ 91 al.) quotes Didymus. No s.

(3) 54. 17 ἀέγναμψαν (ξ 348). s— (no Did.).

(4) 73. 26 ἀργειφόντης (α 38 al.) παρὰ τὸ ἐναργεῖς τὰς φαντασίας ποιεῖν ὡς φησιν Ἀλεξίων καὶ Ἀρίσταρχος, ἧ . . . ὁ μεγάλως φανταζόμενος τοῖς ὄνειροις ὡς Δίδυμος καὶ Τρύφων. No s.

(5) 75. 21 ἀρετὴ [*pass.*] ἦν αἰροῦνται πάντες· οὕτω Δίδυμος ἐν ὑπομνήματι· ὁ δὲ Ἡρακλείδης ἐν τῷ π' ἐτυμολογιῶν . . . ὡς δὲ ἐν ὑπομνήματι εὔρον Θέωνος . . . = Orion I. 7 (om. Theon).

(6) 87. 52 ἀσφάραγος [X 328] Ἀριδίκης δὲ φησιν πλεονασμῷ τοῦ α̅ καὶ τοῦ σ̅ εἶναι σφάραγον ἀντὶ τοῦ φάρυγγα. Πολέμαρχος δὲ ὅτι ὁμοίως (τῷ) ἀσπαίρει. ἄλλοι δὲ . . . οὕτως Ἡρωδιανός. = E.M. in v. (F) Herod. only. No s.

(7) 112. 30 βουκόλοι . . . οὕτως εὔρον ἐν ὑπομνήματι τῆς ἠ. Δίδυμος δὲ παρὰ τὸ κορεῖν. = E. M. 208. 15. No s.

(8) 222. 18 εὔσαι . . . δεῖ θῦσαι λέγειν [β 300] = E.M. 398. 35. No s.

(9) 256. 40 θειλόπεδον [η 123] quotes Alexion. Om. Alex. s.

(10) 334. 12 κόλλοψ [φ 407]· οὕτως εὔρον ἐν ὑπομνήματι Ἀνδρονίκου. = E.M. 525. 30. No s.

(11) 344. 11 κρεῖον [l 206] quotes Orus, Herod., Euphron, Ptolem., Choerob. (*Orthogr.* 231. 33). = E.M. 536. 54. = s AT—.

(12) 347. 21 κρίκε [π 470] quotes Zenod., Herod. = s Li—.

(13) 348. 18 κρόκος [Ξ 348]. οὕτως εὔρον ἐν ὑπομνήματι Ἰλιάδος Ἀριστονίκου. No §.

(14) 348. 53 κρόσσας [M 258]. = § A—, BT.

(15) 368. 18 ληιστοί [I 406] paraphrase. No §.

(16) 380. 29 μάρψαι [X 201]. οὕτως εὔρον ἐν ὑπομνήματι. § T— (no AB).

(17) 412. 5 νότος [B 145]. οὕτως εὔρον ἐν ὑπομνήματι Ἰλιάδος. = § Li.

(18) 430. 59 ὄου [B 325]. = § T—, α 70—.

(19) 431. 47 ὀπή [ἀνοπαῖα α 320]. οὕτως Ἀριστόνικος ἐν σημείοις = Orion 119. 26. § α 320 different.

(20) 489. 2 πωλῶ [accent] οἶον νέμω, νωμῶ, νώμησαι κινή βῶν ἀζαλέαν βύρσαν ξηράν [H 238]. Extract from lexicon.

(21) 519. 37 σῶμα [Γ 23]. Ἀρίσταρχος σημειοῦται τοῦτο τῇ διπλῇ ὅτι σῶμα οὐδέποτε λέγει ὄλεε ἐπὶ ζώντων = Ar. *lex.* in v. § A Γ 23— (om. Ar. dipl.).

(22) 581. 42 ὡς [A 116]. = Ἐκλογαί *an. Ox.* ii. 472. = § AGeM1—.

Gud. agrees with § A only at 44. 29 [Γ 11], 304. 55 [A 464], 310. 33 [B 330], 513. 33 [B 308]; with § B only 544. 14 [A 148]; § Li only 412. 5 [B 145].

Accordingly (21) betrays its source as Apollonius, (22) comes from the fuller state of the scholia in the Ἐκλογαί, (8), (10), (11) from the source common to Gud. and Magn., ultimately perhaps Orus, (5) and (19) from Orion, and very likely (13) also. There remain (4) and (6), which look more likely to hail from Orus or Orion than from fuller scholia.

Gud. is fuller than extant scholia at 54. 17 (ξ 348), 256. 40 (η 123), 317. 60 (Γ 273), 334. 40 (M 147), 344. 11 (I 206), 531. 46 (A 41), but used them.

On the opposite side we see that the Homeric scholia about A.D. 975 were no longer as full as they once had been (e.g. no. 22), but on the whole there is not very much difference in bulk between them as we have them and as utilized in Gud. Most of Gud.'s additional information came from external sources.

There are extracts from commentaries (sometimes called ὑπομνήσεις, a kind of mannerism of Gud.) on other authors also: e.g.

124. 2 Ἀλεξίων ἐν τῇ ἐπιτομῇ τοῦ Διδύμου συμμίκτων.

36. 15 Ἰερώνυμος καὶ Ἐπαφρόδιτος ἐν ὑπομνήσει Ἀσπίδος Ἡσιόδου.

54. 23 Δίδυμος ἐν ὑπομνήματι [= Orion 301. 43].

338. 25 Δίδυμος ἐν ὑπομνήματι Μενάνδρου.

which, as the scholia on Hesiod and Menander have more completely disappeared than the Homeric, it is natural to suppose came from earlier lexica.

ZONARAS

The lexicon which Tittmann ascribed to Zonaras is later than Magn. or Gud. It quotes Psellus and Tzetzes; it does not quote Eustathius; it may therefore have come into existence during their period. It quotes Methodius and Zenobius, and therefore seems descended from Magn. rather than from Gud. Beside these it quotes Herodian, Longinus, Sergius, Phileas, Orion, Orus, Theognostus, Choeroboscus, Phrynichus, and a quantity of prose authors, Polybius, Chrysippus, Procopius, Philo, Iuba; and admits more theology than the other Etymologica, being diluted with large doses of John of Damascus, the LXX, other biblical commentators, as well as commentators on Aristotle.

It often adds authorities where they are wanting in the vulgate Magnum (e.g. in μήλη, νέφος), and therefore seems descended from a fuller version, either F or a MS. like F.

Its Homerica, which amount to over thirty, are without exception identical with those of the Magnum, and therefore do not throw any new light upon the history of the Scholia. They are, however, often fuller than those in the Magnum as printed, e.g., 420. 6 γάργαρος, 434. 11 ἀέρτρον, 603. 12 ἔγκασιν, 1199. 25 κελευθίων, 1387. 18 ναιετάωσιν, 1417. 12 ξίφην, 1805. 3 φῆς.

The glossary of Symeon (Reitzenstein, p. 258 sqq.) belongs to the same age.

EUSTATHIUS

One cannot in this connexion pass over the greatest Byzantine commentary that has come down to us, the $\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\kappa\beta\omicron\lambda\alpha\iota$ of Eustathius of Thessalonica. This vast book has the advantage of a date (Eustathius died in 1198) and a person. It suffers, however, as is natural, from its period. The proportion of scientific information about prosody and variants in Eustathius is so small that Villoison's discovery of Ven. A in 1788 had the far-reaching results that we all know of.

On a very much smaller scale than A and T Eustathius is still occupied with the ancient critics and their readings; and the coincidences between him and AT (collected by Neumann, *Eustathios als kritische Quelle für den Iliastext*, 1893) make it plain that he drew from similar sources (in one or two cases superior to ours).¹ As with the Gudianum and Zonaras, his stock of information is relatively small. The seemingly new contribution which he makes consists of the notes or $\sigma\chi\omicron\lambda\iota\alpha$ of Apio and Herodorus (collected by Neumann, l.c., 181 sq., Cohn in Pauly vi, 1907, pp. 1464 sqq.; cf. also Howald, *Rh. Mus.*, 1929, 171,² Lehrs, *Aristarchus*³, 364 sqq.). He quotes these about fifty times. These good Hellenic names are strange at this period of the world, and it is not clear what meaning is to be put upon them. Are we to suppose an independent hypomnema, composed by this pair apparently in partnership, lasting till the twelfth century? It would be unique. A few lexica (e.g. Pollux and Apollonius) and the major etymologica are all we have now, and Eustathius had a few more (chiefly glossaries), for which see Cohn, or *Iliad prol.* p. 258. Moreover partnership is not usual in Greek philology. They were too jealous. By a curious coincidence Ἀπίων καὶ Διδώωρος are twice quoted by Athenaeus (501 D, 642 E), but at the second place through Pamphilus, the Neronian

¹ E.g. at B 865, 866 a, M 283.

² I apologize to Herr Howald for misspelling his name in my *Iliad*. Κύρια ὀνόματα give trouble. Herr Reitzenstein has dorized me (δαῖ τοῦ ᾱ).

grammarians. Pamphilus cited them as authorities for the same word in his glossary; they agreed, but no one supposes that Diodorus, a disciple of Aristophanes of Byzantium, collaborated with the better-known Apion, a hundred and fifty years his junior.

Or do the two names imply a collection of marginal scholia compiled by or from Apion and Herodorus? There is no case of marginal scholia being referred to by the names of their compilers; the Ven. A scholia do not appear as Δίδυμος καὶ Ἀριστόνικος, nor those of Ven. 474 of Aristophanes as Σύμμαχος καὶ Φαεινός. Individuals are quoted for their private opinions, not as authors of bodies of marginal scholia.

It seems more probable that in some Etymologus or lexicon Eustathius found a certain number of tmemata preceded by the monograms $\alpha^{\pi\pi}$ and ρ_{η} , sometimes together, sometimes one without the other. This is, as we have seen, the usage of Gud. and Barocci 50 (Reitzenstein, pp. 166sq.). Eustathius copied the entries, authorities and all (and therefore the quotations are not more than about fifty). Or, as has been suggested to me, one of the pair quoted the other (Apio quoted Herodorus) and the compiler took both. So in Stephanus we find Τρικόρυνθον· οὐδετέρως Δίδυμος καὶ Διόδωρος: Τρινεμεῖς· Δῆμος τῆς Κεκροπίδος φυλῆς, Διόδωρος καὶ Δίδυμος ἀναγράφουσι τὸν Δῆμον: Χόλαργος· οὕτω Δίδυμος καὶ Διόδωρος. This is the epitomizer's equivalent of Δίδυμος Διόδωρον παρατιθέμενος.

The pair, therefore, would be two among the many Hellenic commentators quoted in lexica, in no nearer relation to one another. They produced no joint corpus of scholia. Apio is often quoted in Magn. and Gud., Herodorus apparently not. ρ_{η} is an ambiguous abbreviation, applying equally to Herodotus and Herodian. Moreover, Hesychius in his preface states that he used the Ὀμηρικοί λέξεις of Aristarchus, Apio, and Heliodorus, and quotes the last half a dozen times. The coincidence is curious.

There is no sound grammarian later than the father of Bryson (about 400 B.C.) with whom to identify Herodorus. The namesake often quoted on the story of Heracles in the \S Ap. Rhod. is unknown.

As to Apio I see nothing to prevent him being the well-known first-century grammarian, best known to us through Apollonius' lexicon; a portion of him was found in the Rylands papyrus 26, and material from late MSS. under his name has been published at the end of Sturz's *Gudianum*, by Kopp, *Rh. Mus.*, 1887, 118, and Ludwich, *Philologus*, 1912, 206, 1919, 95. There is, therefore, no difficulty in supposing him to have survived till the time of Eustathius.

It may be objected that the expression Ἀππιῶν καὶ Ἡρόδωρος ὧν βιβλίον εἰς τὰ τοῦ Ὀμήρου φέρεται (Eust. on A 20) implies the separate existence of the book in Eustathius' time. Φέρεται means 'is current, is reported', practically 'is quoted by an authority'. So, three hundred years before Eustathius, Photius in his *Bibliotheca*—

485 b (Antiphon) φέρονται δὲ αὐτοῦ λόγοι ξ', ὧν ὁ Καικίλιος κ' καὶ ε' φησὶν αὐτοῦ καταψεύδασθαι, ὡς εἶναι τοὺς Διαφυγόντας τὸ νόθον ε' καὶ λ'. No one supposes that these numbers of Antiphon's speeches existed in the ninth century.

486 b (Isocrates) φέρονται δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀριθμὸν ξ'.

488 b (Lysias) φέρονται δὲ αὐτοῦ κέ καὶ ὑ'.

490 a (Isaeus) Δ' καὶ ξ', of which ν' are genuine.

496 b (Lycurgus) οὕτω παρέσχεν ἡμῖν ὁ χρόνος λόγους ἀναγῶναι, φέρεσθαι δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐξ ἱστορίας ἰε' μεμαθήκαμεν.

These are wonderful figures till we perceive that the entries come bodily from Plutarch's *Lives of the Ten Orators*. Suidas also states under Κέβης that three of his dialogues φέρονται; of Crates the comedian φέρεται αὐτοῦ Δράματα τρία; of Panaetius φέρεται αὐτοῦ βιβλία φιλόσοφα πλεῖστα; of Prodicus φέρεται δὲ καὶ βιβλίον Προδικίου ἐπιγραφόμενον Ὑραι; of Tyrannio καὶ ἄλλα δὲ βιβλία αὐτοῦ φέρεται χρήσιμα; of Choerilus καὶ ἄλλα τινὰ ποιήματα αὐτοῦ φέρεται.¹ No one

¹ Cf. also Steph. Byz. 603. 6 Rhinthon ὁ Ταρανταῖος . . . φέρονται Δ' αὐτοῦ Δράματα λή, unlikely in Stephanus' time.

supposes that these works were extant about A.D. 975; the statements were taken by Suidas with the rest of the sections from his sources. The proper form of the statement will be found under Sisinnius; οὐκ ἀκόμψους τε πολλοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ φέρεσθαί φασιν.

The same remarks apply to the synonymous πράττεσθαι, σώζεσθαι. Under Λυκοῦργος we have (in Suidas) λόγοι δὲ αὐτοῦ εἰσι γνήσιοι οἱ σωζόμενοι, with a list of fourteen.

The quotations of ApH agree closely with A, but, as Cohn observes, critical scholia on Homer are bound to be substantially the same, and the small number of mentions of ApH does not allow near characterization.

To sum up, the Etymologica and other documents later than A.D. 1000 do not throw material light on the history of the Homeric scholia, but their version of them is often fuller, and should be more taken into account by editors of the scholia than has been done. The scholia themselves took their shape earlier than the Dark Ages, not before Choeroboscus, and perhaps during his period.

T. W. A.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS, OXFORD
BY JOHN JOHNSON, PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

