

ADRIAN S. HOLLIS

SOME NEGLECTED VERSE CITATIONS IN HESYCHIUS

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 123 (1998) 61–71

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

SOME NEGLECTED VERSE CITATIONS IN HESYCHIUS

My main purpose in this paper¹ is to draw attention to some anonymous verse citations in the lexicon of Hesychius which have (to the best of my knowledge) aroused little or no interest elsewhere. Most of them, in one way or another, seem to have a Hellenistic tinge – though on this point it is easy to be deceived, particularly because even the most typical (or most obscure) Hellenistic words had some precedent in earlier poetry. First, however, I would like to discuss the extent to which certain Hellenistic poets are represented in Hesychius.

If we may start with Antimachus of Colophon, it is remarkable how prominent he is, with 32 entries in the Index Fontium of V. J. Matthews' new edition.² About Callimachus there can be no doubt: 'quoquo versum pedem figas, ecce iterum Callimachus'.³ On the other hand M. Schmidt believed that there were no glosses at all from Apollonius Rhodius, and that view seems to have been generally accepted. For example, when considering whether to assign Hesych. α 8363⁴ αὐτανδρον· σὺν αὐτοῖς τοῖς ἀνδράσιν to Call. fr. 7,33 or to Ap. Rh. 3,582 (in both cases king Aietes threatens to burn the Argo with her crew), Pfeiffer decided in favour of Callimachus – reasonably enough,⁵ in view of Callimachus' dominating position among the poets cited by ancient grammarians and lexicographers. But Pfeiffer added (ad loc.) 'ex Ap. Rh. nullae videntur glossae in Hesychio exstare'. Similarly editors of Ap. Rh. do not quote Hesychius among ancient witnesses to the text.⁶

So determined was Schmidt⁷ to banish Apollonius from the lexicon that he attributed v 677 Latte (= 678 Schmidt) νόσφιν ἑὼν· χωρὶς ὑπάρχων not to Ap. Rh. 4,145⁸ (Heracles, though far away, has helped the Argonauts), but to Iliad 8,490 νόσφι νεῶν, 'apart from the ships', even though the comment would then be nonsensical.⁹ It would be surprising if Hesychius had paid no attention to so distinguished a poet as Apollonius, who strongly influenced the Dionysiaca of Nonnus, written probably in the same century as well as the same city as the lexicon of Hesychius. In fact there is strong evidence that Ap. Rh. does figure in the lexicon; I am glad to hear (per litteras) that Dr Hansen takes this view.

Consider together the two following glosses:

α 4908 ἀνεοστασίη· θάμβος

ν 355 νεοστασίη· ἑτεροίωσις, νεωτερισμός, ἔκκληξις.

Despite Schmidt's stern warning on the latter, 'Apoll. Rh. III 76 non spectat', it is hard to resist the conclusion that these two entries represent different views of the puzzling Arg. 3,76. ν 355 attempts to explain our old vulgate (given by manuscripts and scholia) Κύπριν δὲ νεοστασίη λάβε μύθων: the final

¹ Predicted in ZPE 117, 1997, 49 n. 24. For another possible fragment of Callimachus' Hecale, see the accompanying article, Darkness on the Mountains, p. 72.

² Leiden, 1995.

³ Hesychius ed. Schmidt, vol. V p. CLVIII.

⁴ References for α–ο are from K. Latte, Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon (vol. I, A–Δ, 1953; vol. II, E–O, 1966), and for π–ω from M. Schmidt's Editio Maior (in five volumes, Jena 1858–1868). I understand that Dr Peter Hansen, in his continuation of Latte's work, will follow Schmidt's reference numbers for π–ω.

⁵ Dr Malcolm Campbell agrees, though adding that the entry might stem from a different source, given that αὐτανδρος was more widespread in verse than LSJ suggests: e.g. (not in the accusative singular case) Orac. Sib. 1,187; 3,342 and 405.

⁶ though Malcolm Campbell (A Commentary on Ap. Rh. Arg. III,1–471, 1994, p. 418) allows that Hesych. α 4908 ἀνεοστασίη· θάμβος (discussed below) is a corrupt testimonium to Ap. Rh. 3,76.

⁷ IV p. CLV.

⁸ In my view the most likely source, since the lemma is exact. But both Campbell and Hansen suggest that the entry may be meant to be a catch-all, covering νόσφιν ἑόντα/ἑόντοσ/ἑόντες/ἑόντων in Homer (where the nominative singular does not occur).

⁹ Hansen describes Schmidt as 'a very erratic genius whose judgment should never be trusted implicitly'.

gloss, ἔκπληξις, ‘dumb amazement’, represents the desired meaning of νεοστασίη . . . μύθων. But how can one extract that sense from νεοστασίη (a word not attested elsewhere)? The first two glosses attempt to provide a route: the noun means an ‘alteration’ or ‘change’ to her previous state of speaking – Aphrodite had been the first to open her mouth (52 ff.) when the three goddesses met, but now she is struck dumb. α 4908 interprets a different text, Κύπριν δ’ ἀνεοστασίη λάβε μύθων. Here the desired meaning (θάμβος) is stated baldly, without any linguistic justification.¹⁰ It is interesting to compare the explanation of νεοστασίη in Hesych. v 355 with that in the Ap. Rh. scholia,¹¹ ἐν ἐπιστάσει [‘stoppage’] ἐγένετο νέων μύθων which is markedly different and perhaps even more unconvincing.¹² While it is possible that Hesychius (or his source) found the variants νεοστασίη/ἀνεοστασίη in a text of Apollonius, it seems more likely that he drew them from discussion in a commentary.¹³

There may be other traces in Hesychius of an Apollonian commentary differing from (and sometimes fuller than)¹⁴ our surviving scholia. σ 2102 στυφελὸι πάγοι· ἀντὶ τοῦ σκληροῖ has been taken to be an unidentified poetic fragment.¹⁵ But I suspect that a commentator has transferred Arg. 2,1248 στυφελοῖσι πάγοισιν to the nominative case.¹⁶ π 1334 πελιοί· μέλανες κτλ. almost certainly represents a variant (not in our manuscripts or scholia) πελιοὶ λύκοι for πολιοί in Arg. 2,124, as can be seen from Et. Gen. AB¹⁷ πολιοί· [quoting Arg. 2,123–124] γράφεται καὶ πελιοί, πυρροὶ ἢ μέλανες.¹⁸ An interesting and quite detailed comment comes from κ 1856 κατουλάδα. The lemma’s accusative case¹⁹ strongly suggests derivation from Arg. 4,1695 νῦξ ἐφόβει τήνπερ τε κατουλάδα κικλήσκουσιν:

κατουλάδα· τὴν κατίλλουσαν καὶ εἴργουσαν. βελτίον δὲ τὴν κατόλεθρον. ἢ ζοφώδη καὶ συστροφὰς ἔχουσαν ἀνέμων.

The Hesychian commentator on Ap. Rh. gave two etymologies for κατουλάς, preferring the latter, which is also in our scholia (pp. 325–326 Wendel, ἡ σκοτεινὴ νῦξ κατουλάς καλεῖται παρὰ τὸ ὀλοόν). The scholiast has an advantage in that he goes on to quote from Sophocles’ Nauplius (fr. 433, Radt, Pearson) ἐπέυχομαι δὲ νυκτὶ τῆι κατουλάδι; the Apollonius commentary which lies behind this Hesychius entry might originally have included the Sophocles quotation.²⁰ Another interesting entry is κ 1531 καταψήγων· κολακεύων, ἡσυχῆι τρίβων. The first explanation (κολακεύων) is far from the literal meaning of καταψήγω, ‘rub down’ (as Hippolytus with his horses in Eur., Hipp. 110). But it

¹⁰ Campbell (n. 6 above) ad loc. is not convinced by attempts to justify ἀνεοστασίη philologically (p. 78, ‘a most improbable concoction’).

¹¹ C. Wendel, Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium Vetera, Berlin, 1935, p. 219. Nowhere in the ancient sources is there a hint of the solution favoured by modern editors, which does not require the change of any transmitted letters: Κύπριν δ’ ἐνεοστασίη λάβε μύθων.

¹² The -στασ- element common to νεοστασίη and ἐπίστασις is presumably meant to be significant.

¹³ Wendel (n. 11 above), p. XVIII, gives the names of three ancient commentators on Apollonius, of whom the most notable is Theon, son of Artemidorus, who worked on several other Hellenistic poets.

¹⁴ with regard to the explanation of individual words. We would not expect to find in Hesychius the long accounts of myths, with reference to sources and variant versions, which are a feature of the Ap. Rh. scholia.

¹⁵ Call. fr. anon. 234 Schneider = Suppl. Hell. 1107. The SH editors compare some lines of Ap. Rh., but not 2,1248.

¹⁶ A familiar phenomenon, e.g. σ 1589 στάδιος χιτών, probably from Call., Hecale fr. 43 H. στάδιον . . . χιτών, φ 109 φαλιοὶ ταῦροι· λευκομέτωποι, clearly from a comment on Call., Aetia, SH 254,16 = fr. 383,16 Pf. φαλιὸν ταῦρον, Suid. κ 2679 κύματος ἄκρον ἄωτον· ὁ ἀφρός (Call. used the dative case, Hecale fr. 74,16). Compare n. 22 below. Campbell, however, noting the instances in Tragedy of both στυφελός (see his note on Arg. 3,411) and πάγος, wonders whether the combination may have occurred there (in Ap. Rh. the reference is to Prometheus).

¹⁷ teste Wendel (n. 11 above), p. 134.

¹⁸ cf. Et. Mag. p. 680,21 Gaisford. πελιοῖο λύκοιο is a Homeric variant for πολιοῖο (cf. Allen on Iliad 10,334) in which Et. Gen. (n. 17 above) is also implicated.

¹⁹ also in Photius quoted by Radt on Sophocles fr. 433 (Tr. G. F. IV, p. 359).

²⁰ cf. n. 14 above.

admirably suits the metaphorical use of the verb in Arg. 3,1102 ὧς φάτο, μειλιχίοισι καταπήχων δάροισιν (Jason winning over Ariadne).²¹

Here is a list of further entries in Hesychius which I strongly suspect to come from Apollonius. They all represent the exact form²² found in the poetic text, and are (at least) uncommon. Except where noted, there is nothing to correspond in the Ap. Rh. scholia:

α 201 ἄβρομον· . . . σιγηρόν, ἄψοφον, from Arg. 4,153, where, by coupling together κωφόν τε καὶ ἄβρομον, Ap. Rh. no doubt expresses a view on the disputed *Iliad* 13,41.²³

α 4385 ἀνακτορή· δεσποσύνη (1,839).

α 4610 ἀναστήσειν· ἀνάστατα ποιήσειν, ἀναστατώσειν (1,1349,²⁴ where schol. ἀνάστατον καὶ ἔρημον ποιήσειν).

α 7216 ἀρήκοος· πολλήκοος (4,1707, schol. λίαν ἐπήκοος).

α 8199 ἀτύζει· . . . ταράσσει, ἀπολύει, φοβεῖ (1,465).²⁵

β 999 βουτύπος· ὁ βούν καταβάλλων (πελέκει) (2,91 and/or 4,468 where schol. ὡς τις βούν καταβάλλων).²⁶

δ 1331 διασταδόν· κεχωρισμένον²⁷ (2,67; 4,942).²⁸

δ 1746 διήλυσιν· δίοδος, χωρισμός, ἐκδρομή (4,1573, schol. διεξέλευσις, ἔξοδος). *Harax legomenon*.

δ 2180 δομαίους· οἰκόπεδα, θεμελίους (1,737).

δ 2571 δυσήνεμον· δυστάραχον, τὸ κακοῦς ἀνέμους ἔχον (1,593).²⁹

ε 4901 ἐπικριδόν· ἐπίλεκτον³⁰ (2,302, schol. ἐπικρίναντες), *hap. leg.*

ε 5917 ἐριῶλαι· ἀνέμων συστροφαί, αὔραι, πνοαί (4,1778, schol. αἱ τῶν μεγάλων ἀνέμων καταγίδες καὶ συστροφαί).

ε 7139 Εὐρυμέδων· ὁ Περσεύς . . . (4,1513–1514 Περσεύς/Εὐρυμέδων).

²¹ Campbell refers me to Greg. Naz., *Carm.* 2,2,6,28 (PG 37,1544). The Saint must always be watched (cf. n. 34 below). I was about to include α 4651 ἀναυδέα· ἄρηρα, ἄφωνα among the list of anonymous fragments, until I came across *Carm.* 2,2,7,15 (PG 37,1552), though there ἀναυδέα is accusative singular rather than neuter plural.

²² In principle, words in the lexicon which are taken from a text or from the lemmata in a commentary should represent the exact form used by the poet. In practice, however, one cannot always insist on this point. As soon as an excerptor lifts his eyes from the text or commentary, the exact form becomes vulnerable in several ways: a form which could be either masculine or feminine (e.g. an adjective of two terminations which agreed with a feminine noun) can easily become masculine in the excerptor's comment; masculine forms that could also be neuter may attract a comment in the neuter; oblique cases may gravitate to the nominative, finite verbs to the infinitive. When the entry comes neither from a text nor from a commentator's lemma, but from discussion in a commentary, the poet's form may be transferred to the nominative (cf. n. 16 above). This may also account for the omission of an intervening word or words (postulated below for Hesych. κ 4669 and σ 2775); e.g. Suid. κ 1953 κολουραία πέτρα represents κολουραίη (ὑπὸ) πέτρῃ (*Call.*, *Hecale* fr. 9,1).

²³ Campbell, however, writes 'It seems to me that we are on shakier ground with entries of the type "x or y", where x may account for the form cited, with ἦ . . . thrown in as an acceptable/familiar alternative.'

²⁴ In fact only cod. G and schol. J have this; other manuscripts and scholia give the unmetrical ἀναστήσειν (Campbell).

²⁵ ἀτύζει may be the right reading in Nicander, *Alex.* 193. But the sense of the verb there is hard to understand and not illumined by any of the glosses in Hesychius.

²⁶ cf. *Et. Mag.* p. 210,18 s.v. βούτυπος, quoting Arg. 2,91.

²⁷ Perhaps rather κεχωρισμένως (but cf. n. 30 below).

²⁸ Conceivably from Aratus, *Phaen.* 209. But the only unmistakable gloss from the *Phaenomena* which I have noticed is δ 2011 δίχα νυκτός· τὸ μεσονύκτιον (from *Phaen.* 583). That is admittedly odd. Note that Gregory of Nazianzus uses διασταδόν more than once (e.g. *Carm.* 1,2,5 (PG 37,643), 9).

²⁹ The fact that δυσήνεμον has an explanation in the neuter (τὸ . . . ἔχον) whereas in the text of Ap. Rh. it is attached to a masculine (αἰγιάλον) is not suspicious (cf. n. 22 above). But note that Arg. 1,592–593 are described by Vian as 'alterius recensionis vestigia'. 592 and the first word of 593 are quoted by *Et. Gen.* s.v. προτέρωσε (E. Miller, *Mélanges de Littérature Grecque*, Paris, 1868, p. 255), cf. *Et. Mag.* p. 691,13.

³⁰ ἐπιλέκτως Meineke, who himself noted that the correction is not essential (cf. n. 27 above).

κ 1130 κατ'αἰκες· καταπνοαί (3,1376, schol. συστροφαί and καταιγίδες). The only example of the plural (Campbell).

κ 2058 κέκλεο· κάλεσον (1,707).³¹

λ 1486 λωβήεντα· βλαβερά (3,801).

μ 73 μαιμώνοντι· ἐνεργῶς κινουμένωι (4,1544).

π 710 παρατρέπει· παρηγορεῖ (3,902).³²

π 2317 πινέν· ῥυπαρόν, πιναρόν (2,301, schol. ῥερυπωμένον).

π 3995 προτιόσσεται· προοῤαται, προσδέχεται, προσαγορεύει (3,552, schol. προῤαται).

σ 1892 στοιχηδόν· κατὰ τάξιν, κατὰ στοιχείον (1,1004).³³

σ 2000 στρηνές· σαφές, ἰσχυρόν, τραχύ . . . (2,323).

υ 142 ὕλακή· ὕλαγμός, βοή (3,749 and 1040).³⁴

Let us now consider more briefly the representation of some other Hellenistic poets in Hesychius. Latte wrote (vol. I p. XLII):

Apollonium Rhodium, Lycophronem non adhibuisse videtur, Nicandrum et Euphorionem, quamquam utrumque nominatim affert (v. ἄλλιξ, θιβρήν),³⁵ tam raro, ut quae apud illos legantur, Callimacho potius utriusque auctori adsignanda videantur.

On Lycophron, Latte seems to have followed the opinion of Schmidt in his Index (vol. V p. 156), 'Glossae e Lycophronis Alexandra . . . insunt nullae'; having said that, Schmidt went on to list 60 glosses which he believed to come from Lycophron's lost tragic sources. A number of these show the exact form which we find in the Alexandra: e.g. ε 2739 ἐνδατουμένη (155), η 413 ἡμάθυνε (79), τ 720 τεφρώσας (227), φ 638 φλοιδούμενος (35), χ 667 χραισμήσουσι(v) (292).³⁶ There seems no good reason to deny that Hesychius and/or his sources made direct use of the Alexandra,³⁷ which provides such rich material for a lexicographer. Evidence for anonymous quotation of Euphorion in Hesychius is relatively scanty³⁸ but, I think, convincing. Above all π 3268 πρήνιξε (Suppl. Hell. 418,41, cf. fr. 18 P.), since there was a lively debate among ancient scholars as to whether Euphorion had used the verb

³¹ noted by Campbell on Arg. 3,85. See LSJ s.v. κέλομαι.

³² I owe this entry and δ 3995 προτιόσσεται below to Dr Hansen's draft of Hesych. II.

³³ Ap. Rh. seems to me the most likely source, though the form is also found in Aristotle and Theophrastus (see LSJ). Campbell has doubts, noting related (prose/technical) words in the vicinity.

³⁴ So far in this article I have put forward just over 30 Hesychian entries which may plausibly be referred to Ap. Rh. One could make further lists, e.g. (a) of forms exactly corresponding with the text of Ap. Rh. but recurring in another writer known to have been excerpted by Hesychius. This would include ε 243 ἐγκονέοντες (Arg. 2,812 or Greg. Naz., Carm. 2,1,13,192), ε 2833 ἐνδυκές (1,883 [as Et. Gen.: MSS and scholia have the unmetrical ἐνδυκέως] or Nicander, Ther. 263), ε 5836 ἐπιθηλέα· μεγάληως θάλλουσαν (the feminine gender would suit Arg. 2,723 as well as Greg. Naz., Carm. 1,1,27,32); in these cases Ap. Rh. seems at least as likely a source as the alternative. Then again one could list (b) instances where the correspondence is not exact, but derivation from Ap. Rh. is still worth considering, e.g. α 2989 ἀλίβροχον (Arg. 2,731 ἀλίβροχοι), α 8200 ἀτυζηλόν (2,1057 ἀτυζηλωί), ο 1000 ὀπιδνή (2,292 ὀπιδνοτάτη), π 1840 περίπυστα (4,213 περίπυστος). Schmidt himself (IV p. CLV) drew attention to ε 4281 Schmidt (= 4268 Latte) ἐπαύροι· ἀπολάβοι, μεταλαμβάνοι. This might represent a variant reading in Arg. 2,174 (ἐπαύρηι LGE: -ροι A and seemingly a scholiast (τύχοι p. 139 Wendel)). Odd bits of miscellaneous information in the lexicon may come from (a commentary on) Ap. Rh., e.g. ξ 182 Ξυνιάς· ὄνομα λίμνης (not very helpful as it stands, but perhaps abbreviated) from 1,67–68 λίμνης / Ξυνιάδος. I feel sure that I have overlooked further entries in Hesychius which could plausibly be connected with the Argonautica, but hope that the material presented above will suffice to dispel the notion that Hesychius does not contain anything from Apollonius.

³⁵ The references are to θ 579, naming Nicander (with regard to Theriaca 35) and α 3141, naming Euphorion (cf. 144 Powell) who is also named in α 5328 (fr. 147 P.). In none of these entries is there a verbatim quotation from the named poet.

³⁶ And Et. Mag. p. 660,6 goes some way to confirming that π 1381 πέμπελον comes from Lycophron 826 (cf. ZPE 115, 1997, 55 n. 5 and 56 n. 14).

³⁷ Dr Hansen tells me that he had formed the same opinion.

³⁸ Of course we possess only a tiny fraction of Euphorion's extensive poetic output.

correctly.³⁹ Other entries which reproduce Euphorion's exact forms are α 1893 αἴθυιαι (fr. 130 P., probably = SH 429,48), α 8016 ἀτάρμυκτον (fr. 124), ε 7135 εὐρυκόωσα (fr. 112), θ 408 θέσσαντο (fr. 136), φ 719 φοιταλέος (fr. 93).

With regard to Nicander I find Latte's comment (above) quite incomprehensible,⁴⁰ since Schmidt in his Index Scriptorum in Hesychio Allatorum⁴¹ listed 200 glosses from the Theriaca and Alexipharmaca. Let us consider just two Nicandrian items. λ 92 λάθαργοι· σκώληκες, ἢ τὰ ζυόμενα ἀπὸ τῆς βύρσης ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρβήλων clearly comes from a comment on Theriaca 422–423:

οἶον ὅτε πλαδῶντα περὶ σκύλα καὶ δέρε' ἵππων
γναμπτόμεναι μυδῶσιν ὑπ' ἀρβήλοισι λάθαργοι.

The choice of meanings for λάθαργοι – either 'worms' (σκώληκες) or scrapings from leather⁴² – is offered also by our Nicander scholia.⁴³ Another entry which provides a variant reading⁴⁴ in the text of Nicander (Alex. 475) may not have been noticed by editors of that poet.⁴⁵ π 1870 περισταλαδόν· περισταζόμενον, περιρρεόμενον τῶι χόλωι.⁴⁶ Our manuscripts of Nicander have περιστολάδην; Bentley deduced περιστάλαδην from the scholia,⁴⁷ but Hesychius' περιστάλαδόν⁴⁸ seems no less plausible.⁴⁹

I come now to anonymous and unidentified poetic fragments in Hesychius. Most consist of a single word. One reason for the neglect of this category is that O. Schneider, in transcribing entries from Hesychius for the Fragmenta Anonyma in vol. I of his Callimachea (Leipzig, 1870), quickly lost interest in single-word fragments: on Call. fr. anon. 164 ἔοσσητήρ (p. 742) he wrote 'sed eius modi fragmenta anonyma, quae una tantum voce constant, postea fere omittam'. In my opinion they should not be despised, since even single words can suggest a genre, a style or a particular poet. Wilamowitz was clearly right to note⁵⁰ η 985 ἠφαιστόδαπτα· πυρίκαντα as being tragic. I suspect a similar origin for α 6142 ἀπιθαλώσεν· ἐξεπύρωσεν.⁵¹ On the other hand κ 3937 κραμβαλίζουσιν· καπυρίζουσιν ('live

³⁹ See Collecting Fragments, ed. Glenn W. Most (Aporemata 1, Göttingen, 1997), p. 120. But Dr Hansen points out that πρήνιζεν occurs in Greg. Naz. Carm. 2,1,13,54 (PG 37,1231); cf. n. 21 above.

⁴⁰ It is true that the subject of 'adhibuisse videtur' in Latte is Diogenianus, not Hesychius. But I can find no indication that Latte meant 'Diogenianus had few entries from Nicander <but Hesychius took a very large number from elsewhere>.' Many of the entries which Schmidt ascribed to Nicander are marked with a marginal 'D' (= Diogenianus) by Latte, e.g. ε 1579 ἐκ παλαχῆς, where Latte himself adds '(Nic. Ther. 449?)'. To take up Latte's point about preferring to ascribe entries to Callimachus rather than Nicander, that might apply to a very small number of those in Schmidt's Index: α 7806 ἀσταγές, to Hecale fr. 124 H. rather than Ther. 307; ο 1283 ὀροτύπος to SH 276,6 rather than Ther. 5; υ 613 ὑποδράξ to Hecale fr. 72,1 rather than Ther. 457.

⁴¹ Schmidt vol. V, pp. 158–159 (on Nicander).

⁴² A. S. F. Gow in CQ 45 = NS 1, 1951, 103 judges 'bits of leather' to be the more plausible meaning.

⁴³ pp. 176–177 ed. A. Crugnola, 1971. In this instance at least the relationship between the Hesychian comment and the surviving Nicandrian scholia is much closer than we found to be the case in entries referring to Ap. Rh. (discussed above).

⁴⁴ On which topic, could ε 7395 ἐφ' ἔργμασιν· ἔργοις be a variant for ἐπ' ἔργμασιν in Theocritus 16,14? The aspirated form (guaranteed for Hesychius by alphabetical order) is adopted by some editors in Pindar, Nem. 4,6 and 84, but I have not found any discussion (ἔργμα = 'fence' is connected with εἶργω). A Pindaric form might be considered appropriate in the Pindarizing Theocritus 16.

⁴⁵ though Schmidt (ad loc. and in his Index s.v. Nicander) mentions Alex. 475.

⁴⁶ Hesychius' comment περιρρεόμενον ('dripping all over') τῶι χόλωι might suggest the existence of an incorrect variant in Alex. 474 χόλος (for the correct χλόος) ἔδραμε γυίοις. Note σκότωσις χολώδης, ἰκτερώδης (words which must refer to 474–475) in the schol. to 473 h (p. 166 ed. M. Geymonat, 1974).

⁴⁷ which include the words κατὰ σταλαγμόν and καταστάζουσαι.

⁴⁸ Hansen confirms that the MS has περιστάραδον (sic).

⁴⁹ To end this section with one or two less prominent Hellenistic poets, λ 1108 λιρά· ἀναιδή would (as Schmidt and Latte agree) well suit Alexander of Aetolia fr. 3,30 Powell λιρά νοεῖσα γυνή. That being so, α 4871 ἀνέλοιτο· λάβοις might come from the nearby fr. 3,25. δενδαλίδαξ is the exact form found in Eratosthenes fr. 10,2 Powell. And could ε 2047 ἐλήισατο be ἐλήισατο, from Parthenius (SH 624)?

⁵⁰ In the margin of his copy of Hesychius (teste Latte).

⁵¹ LJS recognize ἀπαιθαλώ only as a falsa lectio in Theophrastus.

riotously', 'revel' LSJ)⁵² to me conveys a strong flavour of Hipponax; the sense, the metrical shape (suitable to end a choliamb) and the -ίζω termination⁵³ all point in this direction.⁵⁴ And Latte reasonably appended 'poetae Alexandrini' to ε 2734 ἐνδάπιον· ἐγγώριον.⁵⁵

Pfeiffer included some of Schneider's *Fragmenta Anonyma* from Hesychius among the *Fragmenta Incerti Auctoris* (764–777) in his *Callimachus*, vol. I (Oxford, 1949), and others, omitted by Pfeiffer, appear in *Supplementum Hellenisticum* (1983) in the section entitled *Frustula Adespota ex Auctoribus* (1063–1127). Neither Pfeiffer nor the SH editors added to these sections any anonymous fragments of Hesychius which had been omitted by Schneider.⁵⁶ So omission by Schneider has generally meant oblivion for these tiny anonymous verse-fragments from Hesychius, unless they happen to coincide with a newly-published papyrus. In my list below⁵⁷ I have not included any which appear in Schneider, since these already have sufficient prominence:

α 1413 ἀεσίμαινα· ἢ τοῖς πνεύμασι τῶν ἀνέμων μαινομένη. θαλάσσης δὲ τὸ ἐπίθετον. So perhaps ἀεσίμαινα θάλασσα, with $\bar{\alpha}$ metri gratia. This compound (and ἀλιήμαθον below) may seem too extravagant for the style of Callimachus.⁵⁸

α 3004 ἀλιήμαθον· παρὰ τὸν ἄλλα καὶ τὴν ἄμαθον. E.g. ἀλιήμαθον (ἀκτὴν). Or the epithet could have been attached to a place-name.

α 3312 ἀλυστάζουσα· ἀλύουσα. The same lemma and explanation in *Et. Mag.* p. 71,54. This might conceivably once have been a variant in *Call.*, hymn 4,212.

α 3768 ἀμπάζονται· ἀναπαύονται. A spondaic hexameter ending? *Et. Mag.* p. 86,8 explains the same lemma with ἀναβάλλονται.

α 4452 ἀναμφήριστον· ἀναμφίβολον. ἀμφήριστος occurs twice in Homer (*Il.* 23,382 and 527) and became popular in Hellenistic poetry (see MacLennan on *Call.*, hymn 1,5).

α 5056 ἀνήλυσιν· ἄνοδον. Compare διήλυσιν, likewise unique, in *Ap. Rh.* 4,1573 (see Livrea at loc.)⁵⁹ and ἐπήλυσιν in *Callimachus*, *Hecale* fr. 132,1 H.

α 5073 ἀνηπελίη· ἀσθένεια. From the same stable as εὐηπελία (see Hopkinson on *Call.*, hymn 6,135) and κακηπελίη (*Nicander*, *Theo.* 319). The parent was ὀλιγηπελίη (*Od.* 5,468).

α 6064 ἀπεστύς· ἀποχώρησις. Nouns in -τύς, not so rare in Homer, are particularly associated with Antimachus of Colophon (see Matthews on fr. 54 = 48 Wyss, which included πωρητύς), *Callimachus* (e.g. fr. 10 Pf. μαστύς ἀλλ' ὄτ' ἔκαμνον ἀλητύι) and *Eratosthenes* (fr. 31 ἀντιμαχητύς may be a joke at the Colophonian's expense, SH 397,ii,2 γραπτύς). Among nouns of this termination in Hesychius, which might come from lost Hellenistic poetry, I have noted also ἀποδαστύς, δωμητύς, ὄργητύς, ποτητύς, φραστύς, χαλεπτύς. See below on δειπνηστύς and λειμωνιάς †ἄρκτος (perhaps read ἄρτύς).⁶⁰

⁵² I do not understand the alternative explanation κατασειούσιν (possibly corrupt?).

⁵³ Compare Hipponax fr. 19,2 and 104,12 West ἀσκαρίζοντα, fr. 102,8 πυκταλίζουσι.

⁵⁴ Dr Martin West suggests to me that the author alternatively might be a Hellenistic iambographer writing in the tradition of Hipponax; thus in *Callimachus*' Fourth Iambus we find τινθυρίζουσαι and κωτιλίζουσι (fr. 194,62 and 81).

⁵⁵ See Campbell on *Moschus*, *Europa* 11 (not mentioning the Hesychius entry). Restoration of this adjective in *Euphorion*, SH 418,37 is very plausible.

⁵⁶ SH 1067 was mentioned by Schneider on fr. anon. 143, while SH 1070 = fr. anon. 147 and SH 1076 = fr. anon. 158.

⁵⁷ All these items would fit hexameter or elegiac verse, though some could alternatively belong to other metres.

⁵⁸ though he was capable of φυκτιόκωι (fr. 194,67). We find a liking for elaborate compounds in e.g. the *Alexandra* of Lycophron, the *Ara* of Dosiadas (Powell, *Coll. Alex.* p. 175), or in the papyrus list of compound epithets, SH 991, which may have been written during *Callimachus*' lifetime (we cannot tell how many of the entries come from recent poetry).

⁵⁹ whence, in my opinion, Hesych. δ 1746 (see above).

⁶⁰ For a full list (too full, since some items should be removed) of Hesychian nouns in -τύς, see Buck and Petersen, *A Reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives*, pp. 609–610.

α 7087 Ἄρδαλίδες· αἱ Μοῦσαι. The Muses were honoured under this title at Troezen; Ardalus was a son of Hephaestus (Pausanias 2,31,3). For rare local designations of the Muses in Hellenistic poetry cf. e.g. Euphorion, SH 416,2 παρθενικαὶ Λειβηθρίδες (with note on SH 988,1).

α 7396 ἀρπεδόεν· ὀμαλόν. Hesychius also has α 7397 ἀρπεδόεσσα· ἰσόπεδος, ὀμαλή, the exact form found in Antimachus fr. 5 Matthews, Wyss. This entry might belong to Antimachus himself or to an imitator; the same could apply to σ 1503 σπιδόεν (see below). Adjectives in -όεις (or -ήεις) are much favoured by Hellenistic poets in general and Nicander in particular.

α 8625 ἀφεψάλου· ἄνευ σπινδήρος λαμπροῦ. In the anonymous riddle on the oyster, we find ἀφέψαλος (SH 983,6) with the attached explanation (SH 984,30–31) φέψαλοι⁶¹ εἰσιν οἱ σὺν μεγάλῳ ἦχῳ ἀναφερόμενοι σπινθήρες.

α 8709 ἀφνύει, ἀφνύνει· ὀλβίζει. The active is not attested elsewhere. These alternative forms could have been variants in the same text, as in Callimachus, Hecale fr. 48,3 where the papyrus has ἀφνύονται, but one manuscript of Suid. offers ἀφνύνονται. Antimachus liked verbs with this termination (see Matthews on fr. 148 = fr. 112 Wyss); for another prize specimen cf. ο 846 ὀμφύνειν (discussed below).

γ 344 γενετήρι· πατρί. It is surprising that the earliest poetic occurrence of γενετήρ (enormously common in Nonnus) may be in the ‘Telephi Epyllium’ Powell, Coll. Alex. p.76, line 10), of unknown date and authorship. There must have been (other) Hellenistic instances, and this entry may point to one.

δ 395 δεδμήσται· κρατοῦνται. With e.g. peoples or cities as subject?

δ 522 δειπνήεντα· δειπνοφόρα, εὖ δυνάμενα τρέφειν ἡμᾶς and

δ 523 δειπνηστύν· τὴν τοῦ δείπνου ὥραν. The combination of these exquisite forms (by contrast δειπνηστος is Homeric, Od. 17,170) with this subject matter makes me think of a parodist who wrote on gastronomy, e.g. Arcestratus (SH 132–192).

δ 1742 διηλασίην· δίοδον. Unique.

δ 2570 δυσηβόλον· δυσάντητον. Akin to (but clearly not identical with) Call., SH 257,29 δυσηβολίοιο τράγου (the editors note this Hesychius entry). Perhaps from a different piece of Callimachus.

δ 2580 δυσθερέας· δυσαλθήτους. Not attested elsewhere; the word has a Nicandrian ring.

δ 2661 δύσστακτον· κακοδάκρυτον. Unique – this might come from Tragedy.

ε 5376 ἐπιφάντιος· ὁ ἑωσφόρος ἀστήρ (perhaps therefore a hexameter ending ἐπιφάντιος ἀστήρ). Very much in the spirit of the Alexandrian Museum. In Iliad 11,162 οὔλιος ἀστήρ was (and is) generally read. But both Callimachus (fr. 177 = SH 259,5–6) and Apollonius (4,1629–1630) took up the variant οὔλιος, ‘the star that brings animals to their steadings’. ἐπιφάντιος is clearly a variation of the variant. But I do not understand why Hesychius should refer to Eous rather than Hesperus, even allowing for the poetic cliché that they were one and the same.

ε 5915 ἐριώδυνον· μεγαλώδυνον. Otherwise only in the astrological poet Maximus (161).⁶²

ε 6850 εὐήρεας ἵππους· εὐαγώγους, καὶ εὖ ἥρμοσμένους. In the Odyssey this epithet is always applied to oars.

ε 7217 εὐστρέπτοισιν⁶³ ἱμάσι· σειραῖς δερματίνας. Taken by Latte (and apparently Schmidt) to be a variant reading for Od. 2,426 εὐστρέπτοισι βοεῦσιν. But this seems just as likely to be something different.

η 380 ἠλκάζοντο· ἠμύνοντο.

κ 217 καὶ ἐν δαί· καὶ ἐν τῇ μάχῃ. Homer has ἐν δαί several times, but never preceded by καί. So this seems to be an unidentified fragment, probably standing after the feminine caesura, with correction of καί.

⁶¹ The noun is not so rare; the SH editors note this Hesychius entry.

⁶² The exact form, but Maximus (whatever his date) does not seem a very likely source for Hesychius: ‘antiquiorem igitur epicum imitatus est Maximus’ (Schmidt on his ε 5933).

⁶³ or perhaps εὐ- (if the entry is not from Od. 2,426).

κ 2752 Κινύφιον· τὸν Ἀνταῖον, ἀπὸ Κινύφου τοῦ ποταμοῦ. This Libyan river, more often called Κίνωψ (Herodotus 4,175 etc.) enters the sea east of Leptis Magna. It is first mentioned in poetry by Callimachus (fr. 384,24, from the Victory of Sosibius), who probably uses it there to denote the western boundary of Ptolemaic power. Callimachus must be a strong candidate for the authorship of this fragment too, since he was much interested in the geography, antiquities and mythology of Libya, as of his native Cyrene.⁶⁴ Antaeus appears first in Pindar (Isthm. 4,52ff.). There is a faint possibility that Callimachus mentioned Antaeus in connexion with Heracles' title Παλαίμων,⁶⁵ which some derived from his wrestling with Antaeus.⁶⁶ If it was Callimachus who called Antaeus 'Cinyphian', he would be the likely source of 'Cinyphius' in Latin poetry⁶⁷ (first in Virgil, Georgics 3,312).

κ 4654 Κυπρογενέος προπόλον· προαγωγόν. Although πρόπολος can refer straightforwardly to the attendant or temple-servant of a deity, the gloss προαγωγόν, 'procurer', suggests that the reference is to someone or something (e.g. an old nurse, wine, lamplight) which promoted and procured love. Κυπρογενέος could reasonably be scanned as a choriamb (otherwise emend to Κυπρογενοῦς) by analogy with Κυπρογενέα in Hesiod, Theogony 199.

κ 4669 Κυρηναῖοι λίβες· [the explanation has fallen out]. Concerning the south-west wind λίψ (= Africus), see Gow on Theocritus 9,11. Latte was worried by use of the plural, but unnecessarily (cf. Euphorion, SH 415,i,23 ὅτε λίβες αἰθύσσονται). Schmidt (his κ 4668) apparently takes the phrase⁶⁸ to be iambic (with Κῦρ-); it could also be dactylic (with Κῦρ- or Κῦρ-). I might wonder about a pentameter arranged —(υ) Κυρηναῖοι —υυ—υ λίβες.

λ 528 λειμωνιάς ἄρκτος· νόμφαι, ἐπειδὴ αἱ νόμφαι ἐν τοῖς λειμῶσιν. In place of the corrupt ἄρκτος,⁶⁹ we need something that could sensibly have elicited this comment. Perhaps a collective noun, or at least a word which might stand in apposition to νόμφαι. I wonder whether the required noun (not too far from the transmitted text) may be preserved elsewhere in Hesychius, at α 7544 ἀρτύς.⁷⁰ That very rare word basically means 'a harmonious coming together';⁷¹ λειμωνιάς ἀρτύς, 'concord in the meadows', could perhaps function as a phrase in apposition to νόμφαι, rather as 'felix concordia' in Ovid, Met. 8,303 'cum Pirithoo, felix concordia, Theseus'.

λ 1532 λῶφαρ· λώφημα. Not otherwise attested. The termination might be influenced by μῆχαρ (in the sense of a remedy for troubles). Antimachus of Colophon comes to mind.

μ 268 μαργγέντων· λυσσώντων. Not elsewhere. Conceivably of horses (as Call. fr. 195,27 μαργώντας ἵππους)?

ν 354 νεοστεφέος· νεοκράτου ('newly mixed'). If the comment is not misplaced, it will refer to wine (LSJ compare the use of ἐπιστεφής). E.g. <οἴνοιο> νεοστεφέος, or even (by analogy with Nicander, Ther. 591 παλαισταγέος οἴνοιο) a hexameter ending νεοστεφέος <οἴνοιο>, preserving the effect of the digamma.

ο 783 ὁμορβεῖν· ἀκολουθεῖν, ὁδοιπορεῖν. This form with initial omicron might represent a (vain) scholarly attempt to distinguish between poetic words in ἄμορβ-, all of which are normally spelled with initial alpha. Sometimes the dominant meaning is to 'travel' or 'accompany', sometimes to 'serve' or

⁶⁴ See the material collected by Pfeiffer on his fr. 602.

⁶⁵ cf. Hesych. π 131 Παλαίμων· ὁ Ἡρακλῆς.

⁶⁶ See Pfeiffer on Call. fr. 787, and compare Pindar, Isthm. 4,53 προσπαλαίσων.

⁶⁷ I am sometimes surprised that commentators on Latin poetry are not more interested in discovering Greek antecedents for such learned epithets, confining their search to Latin authors.

⁶⁸ ascribed to 'incertus scenicus'.

⁶⁹ The Bears of Brauronian Artemis will not help us here.

⁷⁰ There explained with σύνταξις.

⁷¹ Hesych. α 7539 ἀρτύν· φιλίαν καὶ σύμβασιν may refer to Callimachus, frs. 80 + 82,19 ἀρ[τὸν πιστο]τέρην ἔταμες (see Pfeiffer's Addenda et Corrigenda in vol. II, p. 113).

‘attend to’ (particularly of people who look after animals). See my note on Call., Hecale fr. 76 ἀμορβεύ-εσκεν (which Et. Gen. glosses with συνωιδιοπόρει).

ο 846 ὀμφύνειν· αὔξειν, σεμνύνειν, ἐντιμότερον ποιεῖν. Verbs in -ύνω were liked by Antimachus of Colophon,⁷² and this one would suit the ‘vis et gravitas et minime vulgare eloquendi genus’ which Quintilian (10,1,53) saw in Antimachus. It is interesting to compare ancient Latin explanations of the religious word ‘adolere’, which include ‘augere’, ‘honorare’, and ‘numen auctius facere’.⁷³

π 158 παλαχῆθεν· ἐκ γενεᾶς, ἐκ παλαιοῦ.⁷⁴ In π 157 Hesychius explains παλαχῆ with ἀρχή, λῆξις (‘lot’), μοῖρα, γενεά, while ἐκ παλαχῆς (Nicander, Theriaca 449) is glossed ἐξ ἀρχῆς both by the scholiast ad loc. and by Hesychius ε 1579. LSJ translate παλαχῆ as ‘anything acquired by lot’, connecting the noun with παλάσσω.⁷⁵ The form παλαχῆθεν strongly suggests Hellenistic poetry; perhaps one should allow for the possibility of <ἐκ> παλαχῆθεν, or <ἐκ> . . . παλαχῆθεν, by analogy with Call., Hecale fr.35,1 ἐκ . . . σιπύηθεν.

π 1304 Πελεθρόνιος· ὁ Χείρων, ἀπὸ τοῦ Πελεθρονίου, ἐν ᾧ ἐτράφη· οἱ δὲ πολυφάρμακος.⁷⁶ It appears that, in a lost piece of poetry, Cheiron had been so described; this may have been the source for Latin poets’ adoption of the epithet ‘Pelethronius’, first in Virgil, Georgics 3,115).⁷⁷ Compare the case of κ 2752 Κινύφιον, discussed above.

σ 240 σαρωνίδες· πέτραι, ἢ αἱ διὰ παλαιότητα κεχηνυῖαι δρύες. The second explanation would fit Callimachus, hymn 1,22 and Aetia, SH 276,10 and Parthenius, SH 646,4. G. McLennan⁷⁸ sees a connexion between the two interpretations in the hollowness (κεχηνυῖαι)⁷⁹ of the rocks as well as the old oak trees. I suspect, however, that two totally different items have been conflated, and that, in the first explanation, σαρωνίδες is not a word meaning ‘rocks’ but the name of particular rocks from which Saron (according to some, a king of Troezen) jumped, or fell, to his death in the Saronic Sea.⁸⁰ These Σαρωνίδες πέτραι would be a counterpart to the Σκιρωνίδες πέτραι⁸¹ from which Sciron’s victims (and eventually Sciron himself) were hurled into the sea. Although no other authority mentions

⁷² See above on α 8709 ἀφύνει, ἀφύνει.

⁷³ See the texts quoted in the Latin Dictionary of Lewis and Short.

⁷⁴ ἐκ παλαιοῦ looks like a childish attempt to connect the παλ- element in the two words.

⁷⁵ Presumably also with πάλλω (in the sense of shaking lots in a container) and πάλος. For παλαχῆ/παλάσσω, Martin West (per litteras) compared ταραχῆ/ταράσσω. The link with ἀρχή and γενεά may be that characteristics are assigned, as if by lot, from the moment of birth (ἐκ γενεᾶς). Suid. has an entry π 52 Adler παλάμη· τῆι ἀρχῆι immediately after Παλατῖνοι. We should surely emend to παλαχῆι, restoring both sense and alphabetical order.

⁷⁶ As for the second explanation, perverse ingenuity may have tried to connect Πελεθρόνιος with θρόνα and perhaps πολυθρόνιος/πολύθρονος. It is not clear to me whether (a) in some poetic text πολυθρόνιος was a variant for Πελεθρόνιος as an adjective applied to Cheiron, or (b) the name Pelethronium is being explained as due to the abundance of θρόνα in the neighbourhood, or (c) an originally unconnected entry on πολυθρόνιος or πολύθρονος (for the latter, see ZPE 95, 1993, 45) has been conflated with one on Πελεθρόνιος. Immediately above, Hesychius has π 1303 Πελεθρόνιον· πολυφάρμακον. Could that originally have been πολύθρονον· πολυφάρμακον, exactly as in Suid. π 1967 Adler = Callimachus, Hecale fr. 2 H.? Of course that would involve postulating considerable dislocation of Hesychius’ alphabetical order. Perhaps one should delete οἱ δὲ πολυφάρμακος at the end of π 1304, ascribing it to influence from π 1303.

⁷⁷ In this case there was an alternative Greek model available in Nicander (Ther. 440 and 505, where the epithet is applied to βῆσσαν and νάπος respectively). No Latin poet applies ‘Pelethronius’ to Cheiron, but in Priapea 68,15 we find ‘Pelethroniam . . . citharam’ of his lyre. Richard Thomas (on Virgil, Georgics 3,115) erred in saying that Pelethronium ‘was mentioned by Callimachus (ap. Strabo 7,299)’, since it is clear that Callimachus is being criticized only for Calypso’s isle (see fr. 13 Pf.), ‘others’ for Pelethronium.

⁷⁸ commenting on Call., hymn 1,22.

⁷⁹ κεχηνυῖαι points to an attempted etymology, connecting σαρωνίς with σαίρω (A) in LSJ, which may be used of a ‘gaping’ wound or even a metrical hiatus.

⁸⁰ Sometimes called the Σαρωνίς λίμνη and properly to be distinguished from the Saronic Gulf (πόντος or κόλπος Σαρωνικός). See W. S. Barrett on Euripides, Hippolytus 148–150 and 1198–1200, with a map on p. 383 of his Oxford, 1964 edition.

⁸¹ e.g. Eur., Hipp. 979–980, Apollodorus, Epit. 1,2.

Σαρωνίδες πέτραι unambiguously, there is reason to connect them with the poet Euphorion of Chalcis (fr. 172 Powell). The two sources citing Euphorion are obviously related, but differ in some details:

(a) Schol. Dion. Per. 420 καὶ ταύτην τὴν Κορινθίαν [sc. θάλασσαν] Σαρωνίδα καλοῦσιν, ὡς μὲν Εὐφορίων φησίν, ἐπειδὴ Σάρων τις κυνηγὸς ἐπιδιώκων (σὺν) ἐκεῖθεν κατεκρημνίσθη εἰς θάλασσαν.

(b) Et. Mag. p. 708,52 Σαρωνίς· Εὐφορίων φησίν, ἐπειδὴ Σάρων τις κυνηγὸς ἐπιδιώκων (σὺν) ἐκεῖθεν κατεκρημνίσθη εἰς θάλασσαν, διὰ τοῦτο Σαρωνικὸν ἐκλήθη τὸ πελαγός.

Both accounts include the words ἐκεῖθεν κατεκρημνίσθη. In (a) there is nothing for this phrase to refer to.⁸² In (b) ἐκεῖθεν apparently refers to Σαρωνίς, which should therefore be the name, not of the sea, but of the rocky place (understand πέτρα ?) from which (according to Euphorion) Saron fell. This takes us most of the way towards the Σαρωνίδες πέτραι. So Euphorion may have had a double aetion, of the rocks as well as the sea.⁸³ Besides sharing the widespread Hellenistic taste for obscure local mythology, Euphorion specialized in curse poems, for which fatal falls from rocks were apt material.⁸⁴

σ 1503 σπιδόεν· μέλαν, πλατύ, σκοτεινόν, πυκνόν, μέγα.⁸⁵ This unique epithet starts from controversy over whether to read διὰ σπιδέος or δι' ἀσπιδέος πεδίοιο in *Iliad* 11,754. Taking the former view, Antimachus (fr. 149 Matthews = 114 Wyss) created an adverb σπιδόθεν = μακρόθεν. Here we see an unknown poet⁸⁶ forming an adjective with a favourite Hellenistic termination.

σ 2775 Συρίη ἐνὶ γαίη· τῆι περὶ Πόντον. This represents Musurus' entirely convincing emendation.⁸⁷ 'In Greek ethnography there were . . . Leukosyroi, Syroi or Assyrioi in northern Asia Minor, who lived in Pontos . . . Sinope was one of their towns, and their territory extended along the coastlands of the Euxine at least as far eastwards as the mouth of the Thermodon.'⁸⁸ In mythology this area was associated particularly with Amazons, Argonauts and the nymph Sinope (*Ap. Rh.* 2,946ff.). A hexameter ending Συρίη ἐνὶ γαίη would be metrically infelicitous in Callimachean terms.⁸⁹ But not all poets are Callimachus; one might also think of Συρίη ἐνὶ (— ∪ ∪) γαίη. E.g. it could be said that Zeus settled Sinope there, Συρίη ἐνὶ (νάσσατο) γαίη.⁹⁰

⁸² This point has worried some; e.g. van Groningen in his *Amsterdam*, 1977, edition of Euphorion (p. 225, n. 1, on his fr. 170) wrote 'c'est à dire ἀπὸ Κορίνθου?.'

⁸³ For competitive etymologies of the Saronic Gulf (or the Saronic Sea) in Hellenistic poetry, see ZPE 95, 1993, 50–51. Pausanias (2,30,7) has a rather different version of Saron's drowning (appropriate to the actual nature of the Σαρωνίς λίμνη as a shallow lagoon) in which he does not fall from cliffs; Saron had earlier founded a cult of Artemis, who was called Σαρωνίς after him.

⁸⁴ Thus fr. 9,4 Powell (Herse), fr. 9,7 (Sciron), SH 415,14 (Apriate).

⁸⁵ Schmidt suspected that μέλαν and σκοτεινόν were meant to apply to σκιδόεν.

⁸⁶ conceivably Antimachus himself.

⁸⁷ for the manuscript's συρίη· ἐνηγαίη τη. In fact Musurus produced ἐνὶ γαίη τῆι, 'adding just one subscript and forgetting completely to alter the punctuation' (Hansen). The entry may have escaped attention from collectors of verse fragments because Schmidt in his *Editio Maior* (vol. IV, 1862, p. 110) condemned the emendation ('nulla geographiae ratione habita'); he seems to have changed his mind quickly, since Συρίη ἐνὶ γαίη appears in his 1868 *Index* under the heading *Epicis Incerti*, and is also printed in the 1867 *Editio Minor*. There was nothing wrong with Musurus' geography, though this entry in Hesychius has clearly been conflated with another, perhaps after the second lemma fell out – thus Dr Hansen who suggests that the text originally read as follows:

Συρίη ἐνὶ γαίη· τῆι περὶ Πόντον (epic. adesp.).

(Συρίη)· ἡ νῦν λεγομένη Σῶρος νήσος· ἔστι δὲ τῶν Κυκλάδων (*Od.* 15,403).

This would mean that the alphabetical arrangement was not entirely correct, but there are countless cases where two adjoining glosses are the wrong way round (Hansen).

⁸⁸ I quote George Huxley (not speaking of Hesychius) in *GRBS* 12, 1971, 211.

⁸⁹ with word-break after the princeps of both the fourth and the fifth foot. See M. L. West, *Greek Metre*, Oxford, 1982, p.155.

⁹⁰ Cf. *Ap. Rh.* 2,946–947 ἔνθα Σινώπην / θυγατέρ' Ἀσωποῖο καθίσσατο, and, for (νάσσατο), 4,567 ἔνθα Ποσειδάων Ἀσωπίδα νάσσατο κούρην.

υ 176 ὑμεδαπῶν· τοῦ ὑμετέρου ἐδάφους. Formed by analogy with the better established ἡμεδαπός, just as ἀλλοδαπός calls forth the later and rarer ἐνδάπιος. Greg. Naz. Carm. 2,2,7 (PG 37,1573) 290 has ὑμεδαποῖσι.

υ 618 ὑποδρασίη· ὑποψία. Unique.

ω 66 ὠδυσίη, ὠδυσις· ὀργή, μέμψις. Connected with ὀδύσσομαι.⁹¹

Keble College, Oxford

Adrian S. Hollis

⁹¹ Parts of this paper were aired at a seminar in All Souls College, Oxford, in May 1997. I am grateful to Dr Jane Lightfoot, who organized the seminar, and to the audience on that occasion. Also to Dr Martin West for individual observations, and to Drs Malcolm Campbell and Peter Hansen, who read a complete draft and commented particularly on Hesychius and Apollonius Rhodius. We must hope that Dr Hansen will be enabled to complete his work on those parts of Hesychius not covered by Latte.