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The aim of my research is to accomplish a comprehensive study of both manuscripts of Eustathius' Commentary on Homer's Odyssey and to provide a full edition of a sample of text (chapters 1379-1397). Here, my PhD thesis is divided into three parts: the introduction, the text and the commentary.

1. The first chapter provides a commentary on Eustathius' life and writings.

2. In the second chapter I discuss the chronological order of Eustathius' Commentary on the Iliad and the Odyssey.

3. The third chapter is concerned with the text. There is a typographical description of both codices (including papers like the use of ink, the marginal notes, the information on the first and last pages) and a comparative examination of the structures of the manuscripts, the composition of the internal evidence together with an examination of the history of the manuscripts and an evaluation of their quality. The reader is provided with some points of the book: the analysis of the codices and the transcription of the archetype.

4. In the fourth chapter I try to clarify the significance of Eustathius' sources.

LONDON 2004
ABSTRACT

Eustathius’ *Commentary on Homer’s Odyssey* is preserved in two manuscripts (Parisinus Graecus 2702 and Marcianus Graecus 460). The latest edition of the work by G. Stallbaum in two volumes (1:1825, 2:1826) is a printed reproduction of the first edition by N. Maioranus in 1550 which was the first attempt of comparative study of the two manuscripts. Since then, there has been no complete edition based on the scientific comparison of both manuscripts and although Stallbaum’s edition corrects some minor editorial mistakes, it does not offer a text based on a full study of both manuscripts; furthermore, it preserves a substantial number of mistakes and it does not provide the reader with neither an apparatus criticus or testimonia. Additionally, there are neither comments nor any translating remarks which could help the understanding of the text.

The aim of my research is to accomplish a comparative study of both manuscripts of Eustathius’ *Commentary on Homer’s Odyssey* and to provide a full edition of a sample of text (chapters 1379-1397). Hence, my PhD thesis is divided in three parts: the introduction, the text and the fontes and testimonia.

The introduction is divided in five chapters:

1. The first chapter provides background information on Eustathius’ life and writings.
2. In the second chapter I discuss the chronological order of Eustathius’ *Commentaries on the Iliad and the Odyssey*.
3. The third chapter is a complete comparative study of the codices; there is an analytical description of both codices (treating matters like the use of ink, the marginal notes, the information acquired in the first and last pages) and a comparative examination of their physical features; the combination of the external evidence together with a short description of the history of the manuscripts and an evaluation of their quality provide the reader with some useful conclusions on their relationship (including a stemma of the codices and the suggestion for an Archetype theory).
4. The fourth chapter treats the subject of Eustathius as a commentator and it deals with problems like his interpretative method and terminology and his allegorical interpretative strategy.
5. In the fifth chapter, there is the identification of Eustathius’ sources.
6. And finally in the sixth chapter, there is a short discussion of Eustathius’ style and language.

The introduction is followed by the edition of the text of Eustathius’ *Commentary on the Odyssey* (1379-1397), with an apparatus criticus based on the comparative study of the manuscripts, the editio princeps and Stallbaum’s edition. The edition of the text also provides the reader with testimonia together with some comments and translating remarks on the most problematic passages.
"καὶ ἔστιν ἀληθῶς βασιλικὸν πρᾶγμα ἡ Ὁμήρου ποίησις".

Eustathius *Commentary on the Iliad* I.2.2-3.

"Βιωψελῆς γὰρ πᾶσα ποίησις".

Eustathius *Commentary on the Odyssey* I.2.34.
Eustathius, archbishop of Thessalonica

(Copy of the fresco of the North wall of St. Georges’ temple in Staro Nagoričino (1317/8) by M. Tsamplakos)
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PREFACE

The first part of my PhD thesis begins with an introductory section dealing with Eustathius’ life and writings; after that, I discuss the chronological order of Eustathius’ Commentaries on the Iliad and the Odyssey.

The third part of the introduction concerns the history of the text of the Commentary on the Odyssey. The text is preserved through the following manuscripts:¹

1. Codex Marcianus Graecus 460 (12th c.)
2. Codex Parisinus Graecus 2702 (13th c.?)
3. Codex Laurentianus plut. 59.6 (14/15th c.)
4. Codex Parisinus Graecus 2703 (16th c.)

Excerpts of Eustathius’ Commentary on the Odyssey can be found in the following manuscripts:

1. Codex Ambrosianus Graecus 1091 (16th c.)
2. Codex Bodleianus Canonicus Graecus 29 (18th c.)
3. Codex Monacensis Graecus 182 (1472?)

In the present edition of the text, I make use only of Codex Marcianus 460 (M) and Parisinus 2702 (P). As Martini’s analysis has established,² Codex Laurentianus 59.6 (which is the next codex chronologically closer to Eustathius) was copied from M (all the lacunae of M are also found in Laur. 59.6) and though of interest of subsequent transmission of the text, there is of no value for the establishment of the text. Since my own investigations confirm Martini’s view that the manuscripts M and P are by Eustathius’s own hand, the later manuscripts have little to contribute to the text.

The first printed editions of Eustathius’ Commentary on the Odyssey are the following:

1. the first edition³ of the text was printed in Rome (1542-50) by Nicolaus Majoranus⁴ and it occupied the 3rd volume of an edition of both Eustathius’

¹ Martini (1907), pp. 277, 279.
² Martini (1907), p. 287.
³ N. Majoranus (1542-50), Εὐσταθίου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θησαυρινής παρεξήγησις εἰς τὴν Ὀμήρου Πηλίδας καὶ Οἰδίπου μετὰ εὐφορικῶν καὶ πάνιν εὐφημίων πίνακων. 4 vols. Rome.
Commentaries (the Commentary on the Iliad occupies the first two volumes) with an index (vol. 4) by Matthaeus Devarius. The edition was based on a collation of both M and P and the 3rd vol. starts from p. 1379 up to p. 1970 (so the whole of the Commentary on the Odyssey numbers 591 pages in its first edition). It contains an introduction by Majoranus in which there is a dedication letter to Pope Julius III and introductory notes on Homer and Eustathius. Apart from Eustathius’ text, Majoranus’ edition also contains the Homeric verses to which each page of Eustathius’ commentary refers.

2. The 2nd edition of the text was made in Basel (1560-9) and it occupied the last volume of a three volume edition of Eustathius’ Commentaries on the Iliad and the Odyssey. The edition is mainly a reproduction of the Roman one (with some more editorial mistakes) and contains 847 pages of Eustathius’ Commentary on the Odyssey and an index of 126 pages added at the end. The first two volumes contain the Commentary on the Iliad and Majoranus introduction form the Roman edition.

All the editions of Eustathius’ Commentary on the Odyssey which followed were a reproduction of the Roman edition and follow the majority of its readings.

The latest editions of Eustathius’ Homeric Commentaries are:

1. Stallbaum’s edition of the Commentary on the Odyssey in two volumes (Leipzig 1825-6) and of the Commentary on the Iliad in four volumes (Leipzig 1827-30) which are a reprint of the Roman edition with some minor corrections and some new editorial mistakes.

2. M. Van der Valk has rightly noted that Stallbaum’s edition of the Commentary on the Iliad needed to be reviewed and he published Eustathius’ Commentary

---

5 S. Guldenbeck (1560-93), Eισταθίου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης παρεκβολαί εἰς τὴν Ὀμήρου Ἰλιάδα καὶ Ὀδυσσείαν μετὰ εἰπωρωθέντος καὶ πάνω ὀφελίμων πίνακος. Froben: Basileae.
6 For example cf. M. Casaubon Eισταθίου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης παρεκβολαί εἰς τὴν Ὀμήρου Ὀδυσσειάν, London 1659.
on the Iliad in four volumes⁹ (Leiden 1971-87) in a modern edition with
analytical introduction, apparatus criticus, fontes and testimonia.

The purpose of the 3rd chapter of the introduction is to examine and compare for
the first time after five centuries the two manuscripts and to give an evaluation of the
codices.

In the 4th chapter, I intend to examine Eustathius as a commentator: the discussion
includes his interpretative method (with several remarks on the purpose of the
Commentary, the way of his commenting and several other issues on Eustathius’
scholarship, like his verbosity) and his terminology. Finally, there is an analytical
examination of Eustathius’ interpretative strategy through allegorical interpretation
applied to examples from the Commentary on the Odyssey.

In the 5th chapter, my aim is to identify Eustathius’ sources in the Commentary on
the Odyssey, to establish possible similarities and differences with the sources of the
Commentary on the Iliad, and to present the image of Eustathius as a polymath and a
writer with many different interests.

In the 6th chapter there is a short discussion of Eustathius’ style and language.

Although many prominent scholars¹⁰ have underlined the urgent necessity for a
new edition of Eustathius’ Commentary on the Odyssey based on the comparison of
his autograph manuscripts and accompanied with an introduction, apparatus criticus,
fontes and testimonia, such an edition has never been published up to now. The
version of Eustathius’ Commentary on the Odyssey (ch 1379-97) presented in part II
and III of my thesis, is the first attempt after almost 500 years from the first edition (in
which both manuscripts were collated) and 200 years from the most recent edition
(which was a reprint) to present a text based on a collation of both M and P and to
provide the reader with an updated and adequate edition of the text with an apparatus
criticus (where the changes of the tradition of the text both through M and P, the first
editions and Stallbaum’s one together with editorial and other mistakes will be
apparent) and a section with fontes and testimonia.

---

⁹ M. Van der Valk (1971-87). Eustathii archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis commentarii ad Homerī
Iliadem pertinentes, 4 vols. Leiden: Brill.

¹⁰ Cf. Browning (1962). p.186f., n.1 on the urgent necessity of a new edition by a team of scholars,
Sevcyns (1929-30), p. 90f. on the deficiency of Stallbaum’s edition and the need for a methodic study
of Eustathius’ work, Reynolds – Wilson (1968), p. 197 where the lack of an apparatus criticus in
Stallbaum’s edition is noted, Collard (1969). p. 165 on the “continuing inaccessibility of much of
Eustathius’ writings and the inadequacy of what editions there are…”.
In his edition, Stallbaum numbers the lines of the text by 10; additionally, he indicates the page of the edition of Basel and the page / line of the Roman edition. However, because of the difference in the length of the lines between the page of the Roman edition and Stallbaum’s page, there can be confusion with the citation of the pages. Hence, I have decided to use my own line numbering system by rearranging and numbering the lines by 5, to omit the numbering system of the edition of Basel and Stallbaum, to include the number of the chapters of the Roman edition (in bold from 1379 to 1397) which I have inserted on the left of my text in order to provide the reader with an idea of the arrangement in the first edition and to make the citations in Stallbaum’s text easy to find. In all the references from Eustathius’ *Commentary on the Odyssey*, I have used Stallbaum’s edition (cited by page / line). When a reference is made to a passage included in my own text of the *Commentary on the Odyssey* (ch. 1379-97), I cited Stallbaum’s edition and in parenthesis the number of page and line of my edition. However, I have kept Stallbaum’s numbering of the *Odyssey* verses in Eustathius’ text; on the top of each page, I have inserted the number of the *Odyssey* verse that Eustathius’ comments refer to, so that the reader can identify the Homeric verses commented on (this should be useful esp. if one considers that Eustathius goes forwards and backwards when commenting).

In order to distinguish where each manuscript’s line finishes, I have applied the following system: for the Parisinus manuscript, I have used a single, black, vertical line for the division of the lines and two black lines for the change of the page whilst for the Marcianus’ manuscript, a single, red, vertical line for the division of the lines and two red lines for the change of each page. Furthermore, an indicator (in black for P and in red for M) on the top of the double lines shows the exact number of the manuscript recto or verso page. In my edition, I have also indicated the exact point of change of a chapter in the editio princeps with an asterisk (*).

In Eustathius’ text one can find two separate kinds of mistakes: some are made by Eustathius\(^1\) and others by the editors of his text.\(^2\) In my edition of the text, I have generally tried to correct all editorial and spelling mistakes in order to provide the reader with a better quality text and to clarify the meaning where necessary. For Eustathius’ mistakes, I have acted depending on whether the mistake influences the

\(^1\) For example in Eust. *ad Od*. 1.2.27 (=3.16 Makr.) ἀπέθανον instead of ἀπέθανοι, 1.10.19 (=18.16 Makr.) σιρίνας instead of σιρινακος, 1.13.11 (=23.21 Makr.) ἤπεφηγάονος instead of ἤπεφηγαγικός etc.

\(^2\) For example in Eust. *ad Od*. 1.4.44 (=8.4 Makr.) ἵππος instead of ἵππος, 1.5.12 (=8.21 Makr.) πολίνοις instead of πολίνοις, 1.24.39 (=46.3 Makr.) δῖδοσι δῶ καὶ instead of δῖδο καὶ δίδωσι etc.
meaning of the text or whether it is a minor error due to carelessness or lack of memory; in the first case, I have intervened to correct any abnormalities\(^\text{13}\) whilst in the second case I have left the text intact and I have added a note to indicate the existence of the mistake.\(^\text{14}\)

In Eustathius' text there is a number of odd combinations, punctuations and accentuations which reflect Eust.'s practice. For example, the words διατοιχό, μέντοι, οιχήκασα appear to be written as one word. I have kept this odd combination like Van der Valk in his *Commentary on the Iliad*. Stallbaum has mainly copied Majoranus' old punctuation and accentuation (with some minor changes); this is why I have also inserted some changes in the accentuation and the punctuation of the text.

My edition of the text includes an apparatus criticus in which I give different readings of the text from the two codices (Marcianus and Parisinus), the two oldest editions (Romana and Basilensis) and that of Stallbaum so that the reader is able to identify mistakes due to either Eustathius himself or to his editors and at the same time to have an overview of the history of the text and its different readings.

In part III, sometimes I refer to works with more than one editions serving for different needs: for example, for the scholia on the *Odyssey* 1.1-309 I used Ludwich's edition; for the rest of the *Odyssey* I refer to Dindorf's edition. The same applies for works like *Etymologicum Geminum*, *Etymologicum Gudianum*, Photius' *Lexicon* etc. for which there are several editions of which the usage I explain in the bibliography. The reference to the scholia of the *Odyssey* includes the codex or codices from which the scholium is taken (in bold) and the book and verse of the *Odyssey* to which it refers; the references to the scholia of the *Iliad* contain all the previous information together with the source of the scholia according to Erbsen's edition. The citation of the different manuscripts in the testimonia is made according to the system that their editor has followed.

In view of the lack of an English translation of Eustathius' text and the fact that some passages need clarification, I have included a translation of some words whenever I judged it was necessary for the reader in order to have a complete view of the meaning. In the identification of sources in part III, I have included some notes

\(^{13}\) For example in Eust. *ad Od*. 1.13.37 (=25.1 Makr.), I have corrected τού δεινος to ζηνος, in 1.24.36 (=45.33) ενδειαν to ελθειαν and in 1.28.46 (=54.3) πειραιας to απ' ιρας etc.

\(^{14}\) In Eust. *ad Od*. 1.25.44, μεντοι should be δε.
that explain some matters concerning Eustathius’ method and writing: for example, I have indicated the most important cases of allegorical explanation or religious allusion, the cases where Eustathius makes any kind of mistake, or when he rationalizes. Furthermore, I found useful for the reader to note whenever Eustathius makes use of a Homeric word or language or generally of a rare word in his Commentary. Finally, I have also indicated where the commentary contains explanations original to Eustathius.

My method in identifying Eustathius’ sources is the following:

1. **Verbatim quotations**: when Eustathius quotes his source verbatim, usually I give the source and when I think it is necessary, I quote in parentheses the passage from the writer either for the reader to note how closely Eustathius follows the wording of his source or to note the kind of passages he quotes.

2. **Changed quotations or paraphrases**: in these cases I write “cf.” and the source and I quote in parentheses the passage from it, so that the reader can understand the extent of Eustathius’ changes. In most cases, I also underline the fact that Eustathius changes the wording from his source or paraphrases it.

3. **Indirect quotations**: in these cases Eustathius quotes a source through another one; I identify the primary source and in parentheses I put the secondary source that Eustathius uses.

4. **Related references**: in these cases it is not sure whether Eustathius had in his mind the source which anyway is related to his comment, so I just refer to it without quoting it.

5. **Unknown source**: in these cases, I was not able to identify a source.

Finally, at the end of my thesis, I have included an index of personal names found in my text.
PART I

INTRODUCTION
a. EUSTATHIUS’ LIFE AND WRITINGS

The biographical notes we have for Eustathius are brief. He was born c. 1115-1118.\textsuperscript{15} The place of his birth is not certain; most views cite Constantinople as the most possible place but some others disagree.\textsuperscript{16} His real name is unknown to us (Eustathios is his monastic name). He received a high education in the Patriarchal Academy of Constantinople, and then he followed the monastic life and carried on his education in the convent of St. Euphemia. Later on, he became a monk in the convent of St. Floros of Constantinople from where he took the nickname "κατά Φλώρον" or "Κατάφλωρος" with which he is often described in some of the titles of his works.\textsuperscript{17}

After the completion of his studies he became a private teacher of grammar and rhetoric. Shortly after, the Emperor Manuel Komnenos (1143-1180) made him deacon of St. Sophia (an administrative position) and master of petitions (a court position) whilst at the same time he continued to teach grammar and rhetoric. After 1170, he was appointed by Patriarch Michael III "μαήστορ τῶν ῥητόρων" (teacher of rhetoric and philosophy)\textsuperscript{18} in the Patriarchal School where he taught and produced much scholarly work.\textsuperscript{19}

Although he was appointed bishop of Myra in Lycia, it seems that because of the insignificance of the place and his life in such an important city as Constantinople, he was not willing to accept this appointment. His high connections together with the vacancy of the Archbishopsric of Thessalonica resulted in his being enthroned by the emperor as Metropolitan in the basilica of St. Demetrius (1176).

There, he turned his home into a centre for people with literary tastes and also continued teaching literature and rhetoric. Probably these lectures inspired him to write his Commentaries on Homer’s Iliad and Odyssey in order to satisfy the requests

\textsuperscript{15} Although Van der Valk suggests a different date of birth (Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. I, p. CXXXVII
\textsuperscript{16} For a discussion of the problem of Eustathius’ date of birth see Browning (1962), p.191.
\textsuperscript{17} Browning suggests that Kataphloros is a surname (cf. R. Browning, “Eustathios of Thessalonike revisited” BICS (1995), p. 84); however, there is still the possibility of a nickname since in the prefecture of Messene there is still nowadays a village and church with the name St. Floros.
\textsuperscript{18} The “maistor ton rhetoron” taught Greek language and philosophy. At a primary level, he taught grammar and orthography in detail with the help of grammatical and vocabulary explanations of difficult passages of several classical texts (also known as “epimerisms”). The grammatical analysis was followed by the reading and the commenting of literary works firstly of the poets (above all Homer and Hesiod) and then of the prose writers.
\textsuperscript{19} Browning suggests “two successive stages in Eustathius’ career first as grammaticos, then as maistor ton rhetoron” and rejects Eustathius’ title ἐπὶ τῶν δεσπότων (master of petitions), cf. Browning (1962), p. 192.
of his pupils.\textsuperscript{20} He also wrote a \textit{Commentary on Dionysius Periegetes} which is preserved, a \textit{Commentary on Pindar} of which only the introduction has survived and a \textit{Commentary on Aristophanes} which is not preserved. When in 1185 Thessalonica was sacked by the Normans of Sicily, he was imprisoned but his courage and his spirit of leadership in the negotiations with the adversary won the trust and the admiration of the citizens. The exact date of his death is not known, but it has been placed c.1192-9.\textsuperscript{21}

After his death, he was regarded and worshipped as a saint and he was recently formally canonised by the Orthodox Church,\textsuperscript{22} the only classical scholar to achieve this status. There are five conjectural representations of Eustathius of Thessalonica preserved to us, all of them belonging to 14\textsuperscript{th} c. The oldest representation (1312) is found in the monastery of Vatopedion. The rest of the frescoes portraying Eustathius are (in chronological order): in the Royal Church in the monastery of Studenica (1314), in St. Nikitas Church in Čučer (before 1316), in St. George’s Church in Staro Nagorici near Kumanovo (1317-8) and in the sanctuary of the Church of the Dormition in Gračanica monastery (1321). All the frescoes have inscriptions identifying the portrait of the saint with “St. Eustathius of Thessalonica” (Ο ΑΓΙΟΣ ΕΥΣΤΑΘΙΟΣ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΗΣ).\textsuperscript{23}

Eustathius’ imperial connections included John Doukas who was the younger son of Anna Komnena and first cousin of the emperor Manuel I and his son, Nikephoros Komnenos and through them the emperor Manuel I.

Eustathius belonged to a group of intellectuals in the capital, many of them probably pupils of Nicholas Kataphloron who was a prominent teacher of rhetoric in the Patriarchal School of Constantinople. Among the group members were Euthymios

\\n
\textsuperscript{20} \textit{Eust. ad II. I.3.3-5} (…\'αλλά ποιεῖν ὅπερ ὡς αὐτόν οὐ πρὸς μεγατάνων τινῶν ἐπετάξαθησθεν, ὥσπερ \nasum{τίνα} πλάττονται οὐ κοιμω, \'άλλα πρὸς φίλους ὑμιλητῶν, οὐς ὑπολήψατος τὶς χρηστῆς περὶ ημῶν ὡπεστ. ἢ \'δε τὸ φιλικὸν \θέλημα διὰ τῆς ἔλιαδος ἐλθεῖν καὶ ἐκποίησασθαι τὰ \χρήματα τῷ διεξειδευτω, οὐ λέγω ἀνδρὶ λογικ. […] \`αλλά νεφρὶ δριτὶ μανήσοντο…). \textit{Π.334.10} (…καὶ τὸν νέον δὲ \ἄκρασιν τὰ πραγματικὰ εἰκότα διδασκεῖ…), \textit{IV.516.20-1} (…οὐκ \ἄρεισιν παρατεθέμενα τοῖς \εὐσεβοῖς πρὸς \μάθησιν).


\textsuperscript{22} After an application from Panteleimon archbishop of Thessalonica and the Sacred Synod of Greece, on June 1988, the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople canonised Eustathius and settled as his official celebration calendar day 20\textsuperscript{th} September; for more cf. \textit{ΑΓΙΟΣ ΕΥΣΤΑΘΙΟΣ} \textit{Πρακτικά Θεολογικού Συνεδρίου (7-9 Νοεμβρίου 1988)}, ed. Panteleimon II (1989), Thessalonica, pp.11-25.

\textsuperscript{23} On more information on the frescoes portraying Eustathius see Σ. Κίσσα. "Εἰκαστικὲς παραστάσεις τοῦ ἀγίου Ευστάθειος θεσσαλονίκης", in \textit{ΑΓΙΟΣ ΕΥΣΤΑΘΙΟΣ} \textit{Πρακτικά Θεολογικού Συνεδρίου (7-9 Νοεμβρίου 1988)}, ed. Panteleimon II (1989), Thessalonica, pp.169-188.
Malakes who delivered a funeral oration over Eustathius’ dead body; Michael Choniates, humanist scholar and archbishop of Athens who studied at Constantinople under Eustathius and his brother Nichetas Choniates one of the most brilliant medieval historiographers; Nicholas Hagiotheodorites who was Michael’s predecessor in Athens; Constantine Manasses and Gregory Antiochos.

The basic categories into which Eustathius’ work is divided are:

1. Philological
   a. The Commentary on the Iliad and on the Odyssey
   b. The Commentary on Pindar (only Eustathius’ proem is preserved; the rest of the Commentary is lost).
   c. The Commentary on Dionysius Periegetes
   d. The Commentary on some plays of Aristophanes (which is now lost)

2. Theological and Pastoral
   His Lenten and several other homilies and works that have to do with monastic life.

3. Historical
   a. Several addresses to different emperors and some prominent persons of his period.
   b. His chronicle of the fall of Thessalonica to the Normans in 1185 (De Thessalonica a Latinis capta).
   c. Several speeches and letters.

---

24 In this list most importance is given in Eustathius’ philological works. For a more complete list of his works see Browning (1962), pp. 186-90.
b. THE CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER OF EUSTATHIUS' COMMENTARIES

For a writer like Eustathius who believed in the unity of Homeric poetry the natural sequence of the Homeric works would suggest the writing of the *Commentary on the Iliad* before the *Commentary on the Odyssey*.\(^9\) The comparison of the size of the two Commentaries shows an impressive difference: the *Commentary on the Iliad* counts 3575 text pages in the TLG whilst the *Commentary on the Odyssey* numbers only 777 pages; the *Comm. on the Odyssey* is approximately one fifth of the size of the Iliadic commentary. The difference could be explained by the fact that the *Odyssey* is smaller than the *Iliad* and its plot for Eustathius is more limited.\(^10\) However, there is also another reason: when writing the *Commentary on the Odyssey*, Eustathius has already elaborated his material and some of the comments have already been included in the *Commentary on the Iliad*, as he himself underlines in his note *ad Od. 1.2.40ff.\(^11\)

Eustathius remarks that a great amount of comments has been omitted from the *Commentary on the Odyssey* because he has already included them in the *Commentary on the Iliad*. The remark is important for dating the *Commentary on the Odyssey* after the *Commentary on the Iliad* because it provides the reader with a methodological explanation on the size of the Commentaries and the chronological order of their composition.

The chronological priority of the *Commentary on the Iliad* is also reinforced by the large number of cross references in the *Commentary on the Odyssey*; in all of these references, the main verb used by Eustathius in order to refer to the Iliadic comments is in past tense which suggests that the latter was already in existence when he came to write the *Odyssey* commentary.\(^12\)

---

\(^9\) On the order and the date in which Eustathius wrote his Commentaries cf. Kuhn (1889), pp. 249-257.

\(^10\) *Eust. ad II. 1.7.9ff. (.ἐκεί δὲ γλίσυχότατος καὶ πάντη ὀλιγυδύς ὁ τοῦ βιβλίου σκοπός), ad Od. 1.2.3 (=2.20f. Makr.) (ιστιον δὲ δὲ πάνυ γλίσχρα ὁ τῆς ἀποθέσεως ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ καὶ ἀσπόρα καὶ ὀλιγυδύς).*

\(^11\) ἐσται δὲ ἴσην κατάστασιν ὡς καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἰλιάδῃ τῆς μεταχειρίσεως ἡ ἐπικολή; πολλὰ δὲ τῶν τῆς Ὀδυσσείας ἐγγεγραμμένων ἐν ταῖς τοιαύταις παρεκβολαίς συγγίγνεται, διὰ τὸ ἐν τοῖς εἰς τὴν Ἰλιάδα Ἡμών ἐρημηθαί περὶ αὐτῶν.

\(^12\) *Eust. ad Od. 1.3.7 (=5.1 Makr. (...ἐντέλεσθε), 3.15 (=5.11 Makr.) (ἐν τοῖς εἰς τὴν Ἰλιάδα ἐκθέσεως), 6.13 (10.18 Makr.) (μοῦ ἐν τοῖς εἰς τὴν Ἰλιάδα γέγονεν), 8.44f. (=15.21 Makr.) (ἐν τοῖς εἰς τὴν Ἰλιάδα εἴρηται), 9.23 (=16.20f. Makr.) (ἐν τῇ Ἰλιάδι πλατήρειον γέγραπται), 19.29 (=36.8f. Makr.) (ἐν τοῖς εἰς τὴν Ἰλιάδα ἐρέσθη), 21.43 (40.25 Makr.) (ὡς εἰς Ἰλιάδι ἐγνωμέν), 22.20 (=41.26f. Makr.) (ἐν τοῖς εἰς τὴν Ἰλιάδα γέγραπται) etc.*
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Furthermore, it is important to underline that the way in which Eustathius handles some of these cross references suggests that the Iliad commentary has been written before the Odyssey commentary but with Eustathius making additions or corrections in the earlier commentary as he wrote the later work. I refer for example to Eust. ad Od. I.29.2-16 (=54.6-24ff. Makr.) where Eustathius talks about ἁπτραγάλως and quotes from Suet. II. πατ. 1.74-96; the same passage (with some minor differences) is also found in Eust. ad II. IV.690.12ff.; moreover, it seems from Van der Valk’s edition, that the text was part of an addition that the author made in his Commentary on the Iliad (by inserting pasted papers on the pair of volumes containing Eustathius’ Commentary on the Iliad which are codex Laurent. plut. 59.2 and codex Laurent. plut. 59.3). Hence, it is plausible to assume that the author has included the passage from Suetonius in his Commentary on the Odyssey and then decided to insert it to his Commentary on the Iliad.

Additionally, in the Commentary on the Odyssey Eustathius refers to the Commentary on the Iliad much more often than vice versa; furthermore, the cross references are found much earlier in the work than those in the Iliad commentary: it is important to note that in the first 20 printed pages of the Comm. ad Od. there are already at least 17 references to the Comm. ad II. whilst in the same number of pages of the Comm. ad II. there is only one reference to the Comm. ad Od. This in itself suggests that Eustathius started writing the Comm. ad II. before the Comm. ad Od. However, the process was not entirely straightforward. The past tense is also used in many of the references to the Comm. ad Od. in the Iliad commentary. This suggests the possibility that he wrote the Commentary on the Iliad before the one on the Odyssey but made use of the latter in subsequent revisions of the former and in this way he did corrections and addings on both works (this would also explain the cases in the Comm. ad II. where Eustathius uses past tense to refer to the Comm. ad Od.). However, in any case the Comm. ad II. has a certain chronological priority.

The chronology of the introductions likewise has a complex relationship with that of the writing of the main text of the Commentaries. In a part of the introduction of the Commentary on the Iliad, Eustathius refers to the Commentary on Dionysius

---

33 On the matter of the insertion of pasted papers in these codices and their authorship see my introduction, p. XLVIII.
34 Eust. ad II. 1.94.20 (δηλαδή καί ἐν τοῖς εἰς τὴν Ὁδίσσειαν), 108.31 (ἐν τοῖς εἰς τὴν Ὁδίσσειαν γέγραπται), 153.28 (διείλθη καί ἐν τοῖς εἰς τὴν Ὁδίσσειαν), 193.27 (ὡς καὶ ἐν τῇ Ὁδίσσεια εἰρηται), 213.20ff. (ἐγραφὴ δὲ περὶ τούτων εἰς τὰ τῆς Ὁδίσσειας).
Periegetes and the Commentary on the Odyssey in past tense which suggests that the two works were already written before this introduction.
Eust. ad II. 1.3.30

Consequently, it is likely that the introduction of the Comm. ad II. was written after the main text of the two Commentaries. The chronological relationship of the introduction of the Comm. ad Od. with the two Commentaries is defined by the reference in Eust. ad Od. 1.2.40ff. cited above: the reference to the comments on the Odyssey is made in past tense (πολλά δὲ τῶν Τῆς Ὀδύσσεις ἐγκεκριμένων ἐν ταῖς τοιούταις παρεκκλήσεως συνεγειναι) and the reference to the Comm. ad II. suggests that the work is already finished; so it is possible that the introduction to the Comm. ad Od. was also written after both the Commentaries were finished.

The chronology of the two introductions is difficult to determine since the data is contradictory: the introduction of the Commentary on the Iliad counts 229 lines in the TLG whilst the introduction of the Commentary on the Odyssey only 83. This difference in size is explicable if we take into consideration the fact that Eustathius has already elaborated his introductory material concerning Homer in the introduction of the Commentary on the Iliad and there is lack of new information for the second introduction. Indeed, all the questions concerning matters of Eustathius’ method, the treating of the myths and the allegorical interpretation, the origins of epos, the terminology, biographical information on Homer’s origin are included in the introduction of the Commentary on the Iliad in such a complete way that sometimes in the introduction of the Commentary on the Odyssey, Eustathius seems only to repeat himself in order to remind his reader of information already elaborated. This fact in itself would give to the introduction of the Commentary on the Iliad a chronological priority because of its completeness.

However, in a passage in the introduction of the Commentary on the Iliad, Eustathius refers to a comparison between the Iliad and the Odyssey already mentioned in the introduction of the Commentary on the Odyssey:

Eust. ad II. 1.7.5ff.

...ὅτι ἀνδρόδης μὲν ἡ Ἰλιάς καὶ σεμνοτέρα καὶ ὤς ἔχουσα, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἤρωι-
κοτέρα· ἡθικῇ δὲ ἡ Ὁδύσσεια, ὡς ἐκεῖ σαφέστερον γέγραπται. (The cross reference concerns Eust. 
*ad Od*. 1.1.38ff. (=2.16ff. Makr.).) 35

The use of the past tense (γέγραπται) implies that the introduction of the *Comm. ad Od*. could have been written before the introduction of the *Comm. ad II*.; however, this could again be explained if we envisage a procedure of revision and corrections after the completion of the bulk of the Iliadic introduction.

---

15 Ἡθικώτερα δὲ τῆς Ἰλιάδος κατὰ τὴν παλαιὰν ἀλήθειαν ἐστίν ἡ Ὁδύσσεια ὡς ἐστίν,
γλυκωτέρα...
c. THE HISTORY OF THE TEXT

Eustathius' Commentary on the Odyssey is preserved to us through two codices: the first is codex Marcianus Graecus 460 in the National Library of Venice, and the other is codex Parisinus Graecus 2702 in the National Library of Paris. The identity of the copyist and the relationship between these manuscripts has occasioned much discussion. Cardinal Bessarion identified Eustathius as the writer of codex Marc. Gr. 460, since then, the codex has been accepted by scholars as an autograph. Martini also suggests that Marcianus Gr. 460 derives from Parisinus Gr. 2702, which is also an autograph.

I have examined both manuscripts by autopsy supplemented by further collation in microfilm form. I believe that the examination and description of the manuscripts together with a detailed collation between them will help us to confirm the conclusions already existing but also to draw some more useful results on the history of these two manuscripts and the relation between their texts.

1. CODEX PARISINUS GRAECUS 2702

i. Description

Codex Parisinus Graecus 2702 is a codex bombycinus, dated by H. Omont to the XIII c. a.D. and it is situated in the Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris. The dimensions of the manuscript are 415 x 275 mm., the lines are full and their typical range per page is 44-47. The dimensions of the margins in each (recto) page are: 2 cm. from the top of the page, 3.8 cm. from the bottom of the page, the left margin is 1 cm. and the right one is 2 cm. The manuscript numbers four pages before the main text, 240 double sided folia of text and one last folium at the end which is blank. There are marginal notes on all pages which are easily read.

37 H. Omont, Inventaire sommaire des Manuscrits Grecs de la Bibliothèque Nationale III, (Catalogue 32), Paris 1888; I do not agree with this dating of the manuscript but I will argue this point later on (see p. LII).
38 I will number these pages I-IV to distinguish them from the rest of the text.
39 The notes are almost always written in Greek but in some isolated cases there are also some Latin words (on 220' in the right margin the word "lupa" is written, on 220' in the left margin the word "SERA" and in 236' in the right margin the words "Romulus Remus Lupa"): for a sample of the marginal notes in P. see Plates II and IV.
There is Arabic numbering at the top right of the recto pages starting from the first page until page 240; the numbers can be clearly read from 24 onwards whilst some numbers in the previous pages can be half read (e.g. p. 22). In addition to this numbering system, there is Greek numbering at the top centre of the pages indicating with capital letters the book of the Odyssey and with small letters the number of the double sided page of the manuscript, the number of the books (from Α to Ω) is always clear on the pages but the number of each page is not. So for example, for the first book of the *Odyssey* the Greek page numbers α - δ do not appear in the first four pages. After them, all page numbers from ε until κβ appear except for page η. When the book of the *Odyssey* changes, the Greek page numbering starts from the beginning (from page α).

The writing is Byzantine minuscule; the handwriting is very thick and clear, with accents and breathings and with many abbreviations. Some of the letters go up and down the lines and some of the lines are not straight.

**ii. The use of black and red ink**

The writer of Codex Parisinus 2702 generally uses black ink for the writing of the text. His handwriting is also recognizable in some notes in the margins for which generally he also uses black ink. However, there are some specific cases in which he uses red ink:

1. Inscriptions (such as the title) and asterisks (both in the text and in the margins) are written in red ink.
2. When the writer begins the comments of each book of the *Odyssey*, in order to show the beginning of the book he puts a title written in red ink (e.g. in the beginning of book 2 he writes in red ink: τέλος τῶν τῆς ᾧ: ἀρχή τῶν τῆς Βῆτα, or in the beginning of book 3 he writes ἐκ τῶν τῆς Γάμμα in red ink).
3. When a new period starts, the word ὅτι is always written in red.

---

30 This fact suggests that the manuscript has been rebound at least once.  
31 For example we have Α ε' for page 5' and 5' of book 1 of the *Odyssey* or Α κβ' for page 22' and 22' of book 1 etc.  
32 The pages containing marginal notes quoted with asterisks are: 14', 36', 44', 65', 102', 115', 118', 145', 146', 177', 178', 230'.
4. In the margins words written in red ink rarely appear and when they do, they are faint and sometimes they cannot be read at all (since in most cases the ink has faded with time). Furthermore, careful examination of some words of the main text in the manuscript shows traces of red underlining. The words are underlined with a single red line.\(^{43}\) A cross-examination of some (they are not all visible) of the words written in the margin with red ink and those underlined with a red line\(^{44}\) proves that the writer underlined in the commentary all citations from the original text of the *Odyssey* and sometimes he wrote them in red ink (only in the case of a single word and not of a whole verse) in the margin in order to have a subtitle next to each verse he discussed.\(^{45}\)

From all the previous examples, I conclude that the writer of Codex P uses the red ink only in some specific cases in order to be able to distinguish notional sections of speech which are independent one from the other and to create inscriptions which helped him in reading or making references through the whole text in a fast way. This system of dividing the text facilitated his memory and his way of correcting or adding information in the context.

iii. The first pages before the text.

At the beginning of the manuscript there are four pages before Eustathius’ text. Pages I’ and I’’ are blank, in II’ there is only a date at the top right corner: 1858 (which is the date in which the Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris took possession of the manuscript). Page III’ is more interesting: apart from the typed library sticker in the

---

\(^{43}\) There is only one exception: on p. 2’, next to line 19, in the margin the word ἐγνω is underlined with a double red line.

\(^{44}\) For example in the first two folia the following words or verses are underlined with a red line: I’ 1.22 ἀνήρ, 1.38 τῷ ἐννεατῶ; 2’ 1.19 ἐγνω (underlined with a double red line), 1.22 νοῦν, 1.23 πολλάν ἀνθρώπων, 1.36 πλάγχυῃ, 1.41 ἐπάγγελῃ, 2’ 1.7 ἵπποι πτολευρόν, 1.11 μάλα πολλά πλάγχυῃ πολλάν ἀνθρώπων δὲ ἀνθρώπων λᾶς ἄστει καὶ νόσον ἐγνω, 1.16 ἀδιό, ἄστει, 1.18 ἰά ἀρνίμενος ἡ τε ψυχή καὶ νόσον ἐπαίρον, 1.30 πολλά ἐπαίρον, 1.31 ήτο τε ψυχή. 1.32 αἰτῶν σφετερίας ἀπαθολίαις ἀπολύσαι νήπιοι, οἱ βοῶς Ὑπερίονος Ἡλίῳ κατῆκοι, 1.33 ἐπαίρον, 1.35 σφετερίας, 1.36 αἰτῶν σφετερίας ἀπαθολίαις, 1.37 ἀπαθολίαι, 1.38 νήπιοι, 1.39 Ὑπερίον, 1.42 ἡμώρ νόστημον etc.

\(^{45}\) This system of subtitles helped the writer to remember the general topic he discussed in each paragraph when he had anyway to remember many things by heart; it should also be underlined that the nature of the *Commentary* obliged the author to read back and forth and this system facilitated the whole procedure by making it faster and more effective.
bottom left of the page and the official number of the manuscript 2702 (written in black ink) next to it, we can read 2 inscriptions:

1. One is in the top right corner of the page and it reads:

   In hoc tertio volum[ine]
   Carti · 239
   Versi · 50 p[er] ogni facia · non 50 · sed 47
   Lettera 140 p[er] ogni verso ·

   (transl. In this third volume)
   Pages 239
   Lines 50 per each page · not 50 but 47
   Letters 140 per each line.

   In this inscription, we can identify two separate hands (which are different from the writer of the main text):

   The first one has written the four lines on the left in which he enumerates the number of the pages (without taking into account the last one probably because it is blank) and he gives an average of lines per folio and an average of letters per line. The person writes in a language between Latin (2 first lines) and Italian (2 last lines).

   The corrective inscription non 50 · sed 47 on the right of the 3rd line is written by a different hand which is later because the person finds a mistake in the number of the lines per page; he underlines (in black ink) the disputed line and adds his correction by the side: not 50 (verses) but 47. In these first pages there is no other indication about the hands which could possibly belong to either clerks or librarians; however, their identity cannot be determined.

2. The second inscription is in the middle of the page and it reads:

---

16 In this sticker we read: “2702 Eustathii Thessalonicensis commentarius in Homeri Odysseam. XIII s. Bombyc. 24° fol. (Medic.-Reg. 1858) G.”

17 The two previous volumes could have been Eustathius’ Commentary on the Iliad.

18 The translation is mine.

19 The language is “volgare” which was the type of Italian used after Dante.
Codex Bomby. 15 fac. scriptus quo continentur Eustathii commentaria in Homeri Odyssean.
(trnsl. Codex Bombycinus written in 15 fascicles which contain Eustathius’ comments on Homer’s Odyssey).

The handwriting of this inscription is identical with the one in which the correction about the number of lines is written hence the inscription should belong to a later hand.
In page IV’ we have the title of the work in Greek:

Πίναξ
Εὐστάθιος μακάστωρος τῶν ρητόρων τοῦ ἄστερον ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης παρεκβολαί εἰς ὅλην τὴν Ὀδύσσειαν Ὀμήρου. καὶ πλέον οὐδέν
(trnsl. Disquisitions on the whole of Homer’s Odyssey by Eustathius, master of orators and later archbishop of Thessalonica. And nothing more).
It is obvious that the inscription is added by a later hand.50

Under the inscription we have the note “de la settima cassa” added by a later hand and the Latin number 21 (n° ΞΧ’).

It is not clear why the word Πίναξ is written above the word Θεσσαλονίκης. Usually, the word Πίναξ (“catalogue”) is linked with a table of contents. Maybe the writer intended to add a table of contents or he simply conceived this title as the representation of the contents.

The Italian subscript de la settima cassa (of the seventh box) is unclear. It should be a classification number. The same applies to No 21 written in Latin which should be the number of a “case” in which the manuscript was placed (probably to be stored).

In the next page (which is full of holes) the commentary begins. The first line above the beginning is written in red letters (like the decorative drawings in its left and its right) and it is the title of the work:51

---

50 See Van der Valk (1971-85), vol. I, p. XII, n. 5 on a similar inscription in a codex of the Commentary on the Iliad: Πίναξ. Εὐστάθιος μακάστωρος τῶν ρητόρων καὶ ἐρεύς Θεσσαλονίκης ἔξτασις εἰς τὰ ἄστερα πεντεκαίδεκα βιβλία τῆς Πιλάδος καὶ πλέον οὐδέν.
iv. The marginal notes

In the manuscript, as already mentioned, there are marginal notes.\(^{53}\) They are read either in the right margin of a verso page or in the left of a recto page and sometimes more rarely at the bottom of a page. The examination of the handwriting and of the ink proves that the number of the writers of the marginalia are three (see plate II):

1. The first one is the writer of the main text (from now on called \(P^1\)). He is identified by the handwriting and by the fact that he always uses an asterisk in order to make a note in the margin. His notes in the margin are limited, they are always written in black ink (apart from the subtitles) and the asterisk both in the text and in the margin is always written in red ink.

2. The second person (who from now on will be named \("P^2\)\)) always writes in the margin in black ink and in a different handwriting than the main writer. He usually writes some isolated words (mainly as subtitles or to clarify them if not easily read) and he uses no asterisks.

3. The third writer (from now on called \("P^3\)\)) uses the newest ink; his handwriting is different than the previous two and the majority of the notes are written by him. When he writes in the margin, he uses no asterisks.

v. The last pages.

In 120\(^{2}\) the writer of the main text finishes the Commentary; the last line is written between decorative "s" and lines in red ink.

---

\(^{51}\) See Plate V.1.

\(^{52}\) The translation is mine.

\(^{53}\) See Plates II and IV.
Two lines have been added in the end; the handwriting belongs to Π:

όμοι τὰ καθόλου φύλλα τῆς παρούσης βιβλίου, εἰςί δὲ ἀπάντων, φύλλα διακόσια, τριάντα ἐνέκα

ἡ δὲ ἡθοπικές γεγραμμένα μόνα, ἢν ὅν ἡ παράφρασις ἀρχηται.

(transl. together all the folia of the present book, are in total, two hundred thirty nine or 239. That is, just the written ones from which the paraphrasis starts).\(^{54}\)

The lines clearly state that this numbering includes only the pages of the main text starting from the beginning of the *Commentary*.

The last page has a two line, clear inscription\(^{55}\) written in black ink. The handwriting is difficult to identify but it is similar to Π (see plates II and V3). It reads:

Γυμνὸς ἐγὼ τὸ πάροιθεν· ἀτάρ μ' ἐλέησε Κάμιλλος.

Τελλερίδης· καλὸν δ' ἔσθος ἐπαμφίεσεν.

(trnsl. I used to be naked before; yet Camillus

Tellerides had pity on me; he put a beautiful garment on me.)\(^{56}\)

The correspondence of the books of the *Odyssey* with the folia is as follows\(^{57}\):

(ff. 1-22') α, (ff. 22'-32') β, (ff. 32'-41') γ, (ff. 41'-57') δ, (ff. 57'-69') ε, (ff. 69'-76')

ζ, (ff. 76'-83') η, (ff. 83'-95') θ, (ff. 95'-108') ι, (ff. 108'-117') κ, (ff. 117'-132') λ,

(132'-143') µ, (ff. 143'-150') ν, (ff. 150'-160') ξ, (ff. 160'-167') ο, (ff. 167'-174') π,

(174'-183') ρ, (ff. 183'-191') σ, (ff. 191'-202') τ, (ff. 202'-209') υ, (ff. 209'-217')

φ, (ff. 217'-225') χ, (ff. 225'-231') ψ, (ff. 231'-239') ω.

---

\(^{54}\) The translation is mine.

\(^{55}\) See Plate V.3.

\(^{56}\) This interesting and mysterious inscription will be commented later on in the introduction.

\(^{57}\) The Greek letters show the number of each book of the *Odyssey*. 
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2. CODEX MARCIANUS 460

i. Description

The second codex with Eustathius' Commentary on the *Odyssey* is Codex Marcianus Graecus 460; it is a codex of mediocre parchment, dated to the XII c. a.D. (and specifically before 1192) and is situated in the Biblioteca Marciana in Venice.\(^{58}\) The dimensions of the manuscript are 415 X 275 mm., the lines are full and the average number of them per folio is 44-47. The dimensions of the margins in each (recto) page are: 3.9 cm. from the top of the page, 4.5 cm. from the bottom of the page, the left margin is 1.4 cm. and the right one 5 cm. The manuscript numbers four pages before the main text, 249 double sided folia of text and two blank pages at the end without page numbering. There are a few notes in the margin of some pages, quoted with asterisks,\(^{59}\) softly corrupted without a damage of writing.

The first fascicle (=16 double sided pages) is lost and today we have 32 fascicles. The fascicles are designated with Greek numbers from β’ to λγ’ in their first and last page usually at the middle right of the page. The number of the folia is shown in Arabic numbering at the top right of the recto pages starting from the first page until page 249, the numbers can be read from the beginning of the manuscript. Apart from these two kinds of numbering there is no other kind (including for the books of the *Odyssey* like in codex P at the top of the page).

The writing is Byzantine minuscule; the handwriting is thick and clear, with accents and breathings and with many abbreviations. Some of the letters are situated under the lines so that sometimes the accents and the breathings seem to be over them.

ii. The use of black and red ink

The writer of Codex Marcianus 460 uses black ink both for the writing of the text and for his notes in the margins. However, as in the case of codex P, he reserves the use of red ink for specific situations:


1. All the inscriptions and asterisks are written in red ink.

2. The beginning of a new book of the *Odyssey* is similarly to Codex P designated with a sentence in red ink (e.g. in 16', in the beginning of book 2 he writes ἐκ τῶν τῆς βῆτα ραψωδίας in red ink). The only difference from Cod. P is that here the writer also designates in the left margin the change of the book of the *Odyssey* by writing in red ink a framed B (with a π for περι). So in 16' l.31 we see in the left margin in red ink something like this:

In the rest of the manuscript the beginning of a book of the *Odyssey* is designated similarly.

3. The word διπλ, which opens a new period, is always written in red.

4. Contrary to P, in M there are no words written in red ink in the margins which means that the writer does not use words from the text of the *Odyssey* as subtitles. In some cases there is only a red underlining line.

iii. The first pages before the text.

At the beginning of the manuscript there are four pages before the Commentary begins.

---

60 Obviously, this system helps the writer to find more easily where each book of the *Odyssey* starts.

61 The fact that M is simpler in the margins with no subtitles is a good argument in favour of the hypothesis that M is a copy of P and that Eustathius wrote it for his personal use. But this problem will be discussed later.

62 The cases I have traced in the whole of the manuscript are only four: 50' l.3 and l.43, 76', 85'.
On 1° there is the following printed passage:

CODEX CCCCLX

in folio, membranaceus, foliorum 250. Saeculi XII.

EUSTATHII Thessalonicensis Commentarii in ODYSSEAM HOMERI

Autographum codicem indicat Bessarionis nota commentarii praefixa:

'Εισταθείτων Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης ἐξήγησις ἐν δὲ ὅλην τὴν
Οδύσσειαν, ἔτσι δὲ τὰ γράμματα τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ ἐκθέντω.

Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Expositio in universam Odysseam,
sunt vero litterae manu ipsius auctoris exaratae.

(trnsl. “Eustathius’ of Thessalonica Commentary on the whole of Homer’s Odyssey
A note of Bessarion prefixed on the Commentary points out that the codex is an
autograph.

Eustathius Archbishop of Thessalonica. Exposition on the whole of
the Odyssey; the text is written in his own hand”).

And in IV°:

τόπος πη

Eustathii Thessalonicensis Expositio in odysseam homeri, liber (sic) b(essarionis)
car(dinalis) Tusculani et est scriptus iste liber manu propria ipsius auctoris.

Loc 82

(trnsl. Exposition of Eustathius of Thessalonica of Homer’s Odyssey; book of
Bessarion Cardinal of Tusculum and written by the very own hand of the writer).

iv. The text and the marginal notes

On the next page, the commentary begins. There are two lines in Greek with the
title of the work and Bessarion’s name, origin and title.⁶³

⁶³ See Plate V.2.
In the manuscript there are marginal notes written in the same handwriting of the main writer and in the majority of the cases they are quoted with an asterisk. We find these marginal notes either in the right margin of a recto page or in the left margin of a verso page but in \( M \) the majority of them is added at the top or bottom of the page. The handwriting in all cases of the marginal notes is identical with the handwriting of the writer of the text.

The last pages of codex \( M \) do not contain any inscriptions.

The correspondance of the books of the \( \textit{Odyssey} \) with the folia is as follows:

(\( \text{ff. 1-16}^{\prime} \) \( \alpha \), starting from \( \ldots \mu\varepsilon\nu\nu\varsigma \\varepsilon\nu\eta \tau\alpha \) \( \text{τ} \) τ\( \ou \) \( \text{Οδυσσέας} \) \( \beta\varphi\iota\appa\lambda\iota\) \( \alpha \), (\( \text{ff. 26}^{\prime}-37 \) \( \gamma \), (\( \text{ff. 37-55} \) \( \delta \), (\( \text{ff. 55-68} \) \( \epsilon \), (\( \text{ff. 68-75}^{\prime} \) \( \zeta \), (\( \text{ff. 75}^{\prime}-83 \) \( \eta \), (\( \text{ff. 83-95}^{\prime} \) \( \theta \), (\( \text{ff. 95}^{\prime}-110^{\prime} \) \( \iota \), (\( \text{ff. 110}^{\prime}-122 \) \( \kappa \), (\( \text{ff. 122-138}^{\prime} \) \( \lambda \), (\( \text{ff. 138}^{\prime}-151 \) \( \mu \), (\( \text{ff. 151-158} \) \( \nu \), (\( \text{ff. 158-169} \) \( \zeta \), (\( \text{ff. 169-176} \) \( \omicron \), (\( \text{ff. 176}^{\prime}-184 \) \( \pi \), (\( \text{ff. 184-193} \) \( \rho \), (\( \text{ff. 193-201}^{\prime} \) \( \sigma \), (\( \text{ff. 202-214} \) \( \tau \), (\( \text{ff. 214-221} \) \( \upsilon \), (\( \text{ff. 221-228}^{\prime} \) \( \phi \), (\( \text{ff. 228}^{\prime}-236^{\prime} \) \( \chi \), (\( \text{ff. 236}^{\prime}-242^{\prime} \) \( \psi \), (\( \text{ff. 242}^{\prime}-250 \) \( \omega \), finishing with \( \delta\lambda\gamma\varphi\omicron\mu\epsilon\rho\omicron\) \( \alpha \) \( \tau\omicron\mu\alpha\nu\tau\alpha \) \( \sigma\pi\omicron\nu\delta\omicron\iota \), \( \iota\nu\tau\alpha\nu\theta \) \( \omega \) \( \delta\iota\eta\nu\nu\kappa\alpha\epsilon \xi \). Folia 250\( ^{\prime} \)-251\( ^{\prime} \) are blank.)
3. CONCLUSIONS

In summary from the collation of the two manuscripts I conclude the following:

1. The external characteristics of both manuscripts are similar: they are both chronologically situated in the same period and they have the same writing rules. The way of writing in lines and the numbering system of their pages is the same.

2. The dimensions of the codices are identical and the amount of written text is the same (esp. if we take into account that M has some more marginal space which explains the reason it has 10 more pages of text than P).

3. The handwriting in both cases is identical. There is the same system of accents and breathings and the same abbreviations. The kind of asterisks used in many cases is identical and their formation is similar. They are both written in Byzantine minuscule and the way of writing with some letters going up and down suggest great similarity between the writing hands.

4. In both manuscripts the writer uses red ink in order to distinguish important inscriptions (such as titles or subtitles), asterisks which refer to footnotes, or the word ὁτι to start a new section. The only important difference is that in contrast to P, M does not have subtitles (with the lemma from the Odyssey which is commented) in the margins. However, this could be explained by the different purpose of each copy of the text or by the importance of the social status and position of its recipient.

5. There are two persons writing in the first pages of P: the first one is Italian and gives information about the number of pages, the number of verses per page and of lines per page. The Greek title of the work in IV together with the Italian indication “de la settima cassa” are written by the same hand. The second person writes in III in Latin and he is later since he corrects

---

"For example, asterisk is used in P 65, M 26, 32, asterisk in P 102, 230, M 18, 30, 35, asterisk in P 115, 21, 22, 42, 45, 52, 72, asterisk in P 146, M 28."

6 It seems that P with its system of subtitles is written in a more organized way than M, so it could be destined for a gift, whilst M could have been written for the writer's personal use or for reference.
the number of lines given by the Italian. Furthermore, in the same page, he adds the title of the work in Latin. On the contrary, in the first pages of M there is no other writing but Bessarion’s in Latin.

6. The title of the work in each one of the codices is different: in P the title is given by the writer of the text (the handwriting is identical) and it gives the name of the author and two of his titles. The main way of identifying the work is παντεουλακτιον which is a common word used by Eustathius to characterise his commentary. In M the title is longer and is added by Bessarion (because of the loss of the first pages). It contains the name of the author and his main title as archbishop of Thessalonica. The identification of the work is different: τιγηγενεται. Furthermore, the use of the expression εις δυσνυ την οδυσσειαν probably hides an effort to consider the missing fascicle as an unimportant loss. Additionally, Bessarion adds the important information of the codex being an autographon and cites his own name including his Greek origin (for obvious reasons) and his title.

7. There are three different people writing in the margins of P. the writer of the main text (P^1), P^2 and P^3. In M, only the writer of the text writes in the margins.

8. As far as the last pages of the manuscripts are concerned, contrary to M which has no subscriptions, P has two subscriptions (one concerning the number of the written pages and one on a person named Camillus Tellerides).
4. THE HISTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPTS.

The description of the two manuscripts has provided the reader with an idea of their physical appearance. However, the only way for these conclusions to be more complete and safe is to examine the history of the manuscripts.

1. The history of codex M.

The main starting points for the history of M are found in its own pages (I', IV', and I'). The information given in these two pages is essential:

- in I' we are informed that the manuscript belonged to Cardinal Bessarion who has also made a note in the codex indicating that it is an autograph of Eustathius.

- Bessarion's own inscriptions follow (in IV' in Latin and in I' in Greek as the title of the text) showing the name and the title of the possessor of the manuscript and confirming that it was written by Eustathius' own hand.

Cardinal Bessarion⁶⁶ (2/1/1403-18/11/172) was born in Trebizond and educated in Constantinople at the school run by George Chrysococcas, where he first met the Italian Francesco Filello (1398-1481) with whom he corresponded in later life. He adopted the name Bessarion upon becoming a monk in the order of St. Basil in 1423 and he spent the years 1431-6 at Mistra in the Peloponnese where he became a pupil and a member of the circle of the Byzantine humanist and scholar George Gemistus Plethon (1355-1450/2). Through him, he was introduced to the emperor John VIII Palaeologus (1390-1448) who made him an abbot of a monastery in Constantinople in 1436. A year later, he was made archbishop of Nicaea by the emperor. In 1438, he accompanied John to Italy (and specifically to the Council of Florence and Ferrara) in order to negotiate a union between the Byzantine and Roman churches as a means of mobilizing assistance against the Turks, who had invaded the Balkan Peninsula and threatened Constantinople.

Bessarion supported union, which was unacceptable to others in the Byzantine church. The council failed to have any important political effects; Bessarion, however,

---

remained in communion with Rome and gained the favour of Pope Eugenius IV (1383-1447), who made him a cardinal in 1439, after he has already converted from the Greek Orthodox church to the Roman Catholic. Thereafter, he lived permanently in Italy. At Rome, he played an active role in the church affairs and several times he was nearly elected pope. He contributed to the development of the Roman Academy of History and of Archaeology, and with his former teacher Gemistus Plethon, the celebrated Neoplatonist, he attracted a circle of philosophers devoted to the study of Plato.

Bessarion’s house in Rome soon became a centre of literary activity. His circle included intellectuals from both Greece (Theodore of Gaza, George Trapezountios) and Italy (Poggio, Lorenzo Valla). He spread the knowledge of Greek literature and helped in the difficult task of its preservation by building a personal library that included a large collection of Greek manuscripts. From 1450 to 1455 he served as papal governor of Bologna, in 1463 he was made Latin patriarch of Constantinople and was sent on embassies to various foreign princes including King Louis XI of France in 1471.

One of the most distinctive things about Bessarion was his famous library and the way he built it. In a letter to Doge Cristoforo Moro, we have the information that Bessarion had begun collecting books in his tender youth and that he had continued to purchase as many as he could either by copying out manuscripts or by spending money on buying them. As Labowsky correctly remarks, we cannot know what particular codices Bessarion possessed when he first arrived in Italy; but probably he brought texts that he needed for the work of the Council and at this stage, it is logical that his library included the basic stages from his education: grammar and rhetoric, theology and his studies in mathematics and Platonic philosophy under Plethon. And Labowsky continues: “Considering his poverty even when he had become archbishop, it is unlikely that he owned at that time many ancient and costly codices, though the number of his books must already have been quite considerable”. So, it is more likely that by the time Bessarion came to Italy, he did not possess M, since he did not have the money to buy old manuscripts.

---

Labowsky (1979), p. 6; see also Mioni (1968), pp. 61-83.
There are two great events in Bessarion's life that played an important role in the building of his library:

- the first one is his elevation to the Cardinalate (1439) which gave him the material ability to enlarge his library.
- the second and more important one is the fall of Constantinople (1453) and the destruction of the great libraries of Byzantium which gave him a more than personal reason to collect manuscripts: the salvation of both pagan and Christian heritage from destruction and its preservation in a safe place until the Greeks were free again.

Labowsky\textsuperscript{68} refers to a letter (chosen from a series of six) written by Bessarion in 1454/5 from Bologna to Michael Apostolis. In this letter, after expressing his grief for the fall of Constantinople, Bessarion asks Apostolis to help him in the enterprise of the preservation of the Greek heritage by buying on his behalf everything shown on a list which he encloses and on which he enumerates all the Greek works still absent from his library. He claims that until then, everything could still be got from all around Greece (including Thessalonica).\textsuperscript{69}

If my hypothesis, that M did not belong to Bessarion in the first stages of building his library, is right, then M was bought by him after the year 1439 which is a terminus post quem and more probably after 1454/5. Additionally, he sends an identical list to bishop Theophanes of Athens and insists that his two helpers should coordinate their searches so that he finally gets only one copy of each work. However, as Labowsky notes, this rule of "one copy" was not applied by the Cardinal since in 1468 he already possessed many duplicates.\textsuperscript{70} This raises the possibility that Bessarion acquired more than one codex containing Eustathius' \textit{Commentary}.\textsuperscript{71} However, this can be only a hypothesis.

---

\textsuperscript{68} Labowsky (1979), pp. 13-4.
\textsuperscript{69} A first indication that Bessarion had some connections in Thessalonica and possibly he could ask for some manuscripts from there.
\textsuperscript{70} "The reasons for this inconsistency are many and obvious, but the most important one is that, especially in the case of the Greek philosophers, the striving after a 'good' manuscript, [...] entailed a multiplication of copies, as the Cardinal would not only acquire additional codices for collation, but also have working copies made from any ancient manuscript. After emendation these were transcribed again, a process which might be repeated several times until in the end a 'pulcherrimus', a finished edition more or less luxuriously produced, would emerge", Labowsky (1979), p.14.
\textsuperscript{71} Maybe Codex P could have been one of the codices acquired by Bessarion; if so, this would be an important information for the passing of P from Greece to Italy.
It would also be important to check whether M was among the list of books that Bessarion required from Greece since this would help to specify the time M was purchased by him; but unfortunately neither of the two lists is preserved.

Almost all the books owned by Bessarion were inscribed by him with a shelfmark, an indication of contents and his ex-libris. The examination of these “inscriptions” which are also found in M as already mentioned, provides us with information about the date of acquisition of M by the Cardinal:

- In f. I there is the inscription concerning the contents of M, it is similar to a general title of the work. It is short and selective on the information it gives. It mentions the writer and its rank; it states that the Commentary covers the whole of the Odyssey, and it underlines that it derives from Eustathius’ own hand. The inscription is written by Bessarion both in Greek and in Latin as he used to do with all his books. The correspondence between the Greek and the Latin inscription is identical in this case. There are no other comments concerning either the quality of the codex or the excellence or rareness of the work.

- In f. IV there is the ex-libris in which Bessarion inscribes himself as “b(eessianonis) car(dinalis) Tusculanii”. This title is used until 1468 when he changes it into “Cardinalis Episcopus Sabinensis”. In my view, this change sets a terminus ante quem for the acquisition of M by Bessarion in the year 1468 since it is obvious that he could not have bought the manuscript after this year and signed with a title that he had before 1468.

- Finally, on the same folium there is the number of the locus (or pressmark) of M: locus 82. As Labowsky explains, Bessarion’s system of pressmarks is different from that of the other Renaissance libraries. It consists of a single element which is the figure indicating the locus. The loci are numbered from 1 to 89, the first 47 are both Greek and Latin codices whilst the rest are exclusively Greek. The number of items corresponding to one locus varies from two to twenty-one. Some of the loca are subject to changes either by Bessarion or some of his copists.

---

2 Although M misses the first fascicle.
3 It is easy to understand that this information gave value both to the codex and to its owner.
4 The fact that Bessarion writes the title of the work in f. I proves that by the time he took possession of M, the manuscript has already been damaged with its first 16 pages already missing.
5 This could possibly mean that Bessarion did not regard M as one of his most beautiful codices.
Consequently, the following conclusions are drawn from my research on the journey of M: it was acquired by Bessarion (either from Thessalonica or even from a different part of Greece) after 1439 (when he became Cardinal) but most possibly after 1454/5 (when his decision to preserve the Greek literary heritage became stronger and more urgent) and before 1468 (a year which marks the change of the title “Cardinal of Tusculum” with which he signs in M, to Cardinallis Episcopus Sabinensis). In the years of its possession by Bessarion, it should have been a part of his library in Rome about which we do not have any knowledge.

In 1468, Bessarion decided to donate his library to the church of San Marco in Venice on the condition that appropriate accommodation would be found for the books in the grounds of San Marco. The Republic accepted the offer and decided to house the books in the Sala Novissima in the Doge’s Palace.

The Act of donation was accompanied by the Index librorum Graecorum et Latinorum or else inventory A which is the oldest one and is said to have been made on behalf of Bessarion and checked by himself. The inventory lists a total of 746 books.

However, Bessarion did not send all of these books to Venice as proved by inventory B which is the fullest of all the preserved catalogues with Bessarion’s donation. Inventory B is divided in two sections:

- B¹ which includes all the books sent to Venice at a time when Bessarion became bishop of Sabina (consignment of 1469)
- B² which includes all the books which arrived after 1469.

As Labowsky stresses “the conclusion to be drawn from this analysis is that of the 746 codices listed in A only 466 were in the thirty boxes sent to Venice in Bessarion’s life-time (these are the books described in B¹). The remaining 280 arrived later, mixed with 278 books acquired by the Cardinal after 1468, (a total of 558 books described in B²) so that the whole donation amounted to ca. 1024 items”.

Both inventories A and B give us useful information about codex M:

---

1 Bessarion becomes bishop of Tusculum in 1449 but this year cannot be used as a safe post quem since according to Labowsky (op. cit. p 19-20) in none of the ex-libris does he call himself by a title which he had before becoming bishop of Tusculum in 1449 although he possessed many of these books before this date, an observation showing that he decided to put inscriptions on the books after 1449.

2 For more information on inventories A and B see Labowsky (1979), p. 23-57.

3 Labowsky (1979), p. 46.
In inventory A, M is found in Ag 447:

"Item Eustathii Thessalonicensis expositio in totam odysseam Homeri, manu ipsius Eustathii scripta, in pergamenō".

From this we conclude that codex M was assigned by Bessarion to be among the 746 codices to be given to Venice.

In inventory B, M is found in B1 40, in the 3rd box:

<3>

In capsa signata C sunt volumina infrascripta

[...] 40 Heustachii in odysseam Homeri, in pergamenis.

From this information, my conclusion is that codex M was in the 3rd box of the thirty which were actually sent to Venice by the first consignment in 1469 and was one of the first 466 codices that were sent there whilst Bessarion was still alive. The box in which codex M was sent has the marking C, it has no color distinctive, it includes Greek books under the general category of Philosophy and Poetry and contained in total 13 items among which a manuscript with Homer's Iliad, a papyrus with Homer's Odyssey and two manuscripts with Eustathius' Commentary on the Iliad. 80

My claim is that Bessarion's decision to include M in the 466 books sent with the first consignment proves the following:

M was not necessary to him for his work, otherwise he would have kept it. Moreover, it is not characterised as "antiquus" so it was among the codices which were relatively new, 81 a good reason to be sent away first. Additionally, M was valuable because it was an autograph so it could be among the codices to give to the Senate an impressive image of Bessarion's donation without his work being influenced by its absence.

80 See the table for the composition of B in Labowsky (1979), p. 41; the kind of books accompanying M is important in case it is revealed that they were acquired at the same place and time with M and maybe from the same source.
81 A codex of 12th century is relatively new for a person living in the 15th century (esp. if he possesses some older ones).
Codex M together with the other books of the first consignment reached Venice at 1469 and were placed in the *Sala Novissima*. In 1485, The College of Cardinals decided that Bessarion’s books should be placed all together at one end of the hall and that a wooden wall would protect them from theft. The books remained there for the next forty-six years.

In 1515. after many years of unfulfilled decisions about the luck of Bessarion’s books, it had been decided that opposite the Palazzo Ducale a new building was to be constructed in order to house the Cardinal’s gift. The compilation of inventory C at the end of June 1524 represents the rearrangement of the Library at this time. M is found in this inventory in chest 11 which is marked by green color and by L:

<11>

*In capsa signata viridi signata L*

The total of items in this chest is 19 (all of them Greek) and the general subject is Grammar.

The books were moved out of the *cameretta* in which they were put in 1485, only in 1531 in order to be transferred to a room in the upper floor of San Marco. On August 1543, inventory D is written in an undetailed and informal way.

M is found in this inventory in banco K, under the number 198:

*Banco K*

[...] 198 Eustathii expositio in odysseam manu propria auctoris, in pergamo

The total number of the items in this banco is 23 and it seems that there is no common subject.

Up to 1559 the Bessarion’s books were still in the room in the church of San Marco. Their moving to the Libreria Sansoviniana took place between 1559 and 1565. Sansovino’s building *in plateis Sancti Marci* has housed Bessarion’s collection ever since (apart from its exile in the Palazzo Ducale for the years between 1812 and 1904). The books were placed in the Sala della Libreria which was designed by Sansovino.
2. The history of Codex P.

Contrary to M, the first pages of P do not give us any important information about
the people who may have had it in their possession. The only conclusion to be drawn
is that there are two hands in III', the first one writing in Italian the other one
correcting in Latin the number of lines per page and adding an inscription in the
middle of the page with the contents in Latin. These indications suggest that the codex
has passed through Italy before ending up in France.

In a letter of dedication to Pope Julius III, N. Majoranus (who is believed to be the
first editor of the text) mentions two existing codices to be collated for the editio
princeps: one of them is M. The other one which is more correct and more perfect
was situated in the library of Cardinal N. Ridolfi with whom, as he says, he has been
close for many years. So Majoranus had two codices of which one was M and the
other one belonged to Ridolfi.

It has been argued that the manuscript in Ridolfi’s library was codex Laurent. 59.6
(14/15th c.). However, as has been proved by Martini, Laurent. 59.6 belonged to the
library of L. de Medici in Florence so it could not have been the manuscript that
Majoranus meant. Martini concludes that the manuscript in Ridolfi’s library was P.

From Ridolfi’s library, P passed through Pietro Strozzi (Besitz des Marschalls) to
Caterina de’ Medici. After her death, her collection was combined with the library of
the King of France and then given to the Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris.

However, in the travels of P there is a historical gap for the period and the
circumstances under which P left Greece until the time it became part of Ridolfi’s
library.

In 120, there is an inscription (probably written as already mentioned by P) which reads:

I used to be naked before; yet Camillus
Tellerides had pity on me, he put a beautiful garment on me.

The passage is rather puzzling: an enigmatic nudity, an unknown but interesting
name and a mysterious "dressing". A literary explanation would make the inscription
reminding more of a dedicating recognition of gratitude from someone who appears to be poor to Camillus Tellerides because the latter one has given him clothes. But who was this person? And why does he owe gratitude to the name Camillus Tellerides?

A careful examination proves that this inscription is important for the history of the subject of the sentence (κυώ) actually refers to the manuscript itself; it is the manuscript that "talks" here and it gives us some important information about itself. The subscipt says "I used to be naked" which means that the manuscript was unbound. Camillus Tellerides, who must be the writer of this note, is also the person who has undertaken the task of the restoration and (re)binding of the manuscript. Possibly, he has added new front covers (ἐσθος, ἐπαμφίεσεν). If we take into consideration the fact that the inscription is written in an almost identical handwriting with the marginal notes written by P^3, I believe that P^3 and Camillus Tellerides are the same person.

"Camillus" is an Italian name and "Tellerides" is a Greek surname with the ending -ides showing origin^83 (either the name of one’s country or the name of one’s father). The surname "Tellerides" is not attested anywhere. However, a person named "Camillus" is mentioned in a letter written in Milan in 1 July 1470 from Francesco Filelfo to Demetrius Castrenus. In this letter, Filelfo expresses his surprise that the Duke of Urbino did not reply to his letters and he mentions that Camillus did not give him any letters of the Duke; then he adds that Camillus only told him verbally some things that Castrenus has already mentioned to him when he was in Milan. Unfortunately, there is no other reference to Camillus either in this letter or in any other document by Filelfo.

Consequently, the information we have on "Camillus" is summarized as follows: Camillus is a contemporary and he knew D. Castrenus and F. Filelfo; additionally, he was a friend of Filelfo, possibly someone in his circle living in Milan. In the specific

---

^83 The Greek ending -ides shows an origin from Pontus.
^84 Legrand (1892), p.156, letter no 88; see also Trapp (1981), I 1-4, no 10811.
^85 Θειμαζο δε σικ αλίγον δι σος δραχον δι δε και ημες μηδεμος απεκρινατο τι προς τα μετερα ματέρον δε οδη δ Καμιλλος οντοσι απαδωκε μοι δ αυ λεγεις τα απο του δραχοντος γραμματα αλλ ειπε παρον δ και σε ενταθα αν προτερον.
^86 If we judge by the way Filelfo refers to Camillus, that is by his first name.
letter, he holds the role of a carrier of some letters. Unfortunately, our information about him finishes here.87

As we have already mentioned, Filelfo was educated in Constantinople at G. Chrysococces’ school together with Bessarion.88 They were both students of George Gemistus Plethon at Mistra in the Peloponnese and they kept up a frequent correspondence in their later life. As shown before, Camillus was a member of Filelfo’s circle and since Filelfo is linked with Bessarion, it is possible that Camillus at least knew Bessarion or even more he could also be a member of the Cardinal’s circle. From all the previous, it is obvious that if Camillus Tellerides is identified with the same Camillus whom Filelfo mentions in his letter, then we are able to talk about more than one manuscript in the hands of different members of the same circle.

Although our knowledge about the exact circumstances under which P passed to Italy is incomplete, it is to be expected that the manuscript passed from Greece to Italy through someone from the intellectual circle of Filelfo and that it would have spent some time in Italy between the fall of Constantinople and its eventual arrival in France.

---

87 Alan Griffiths suggested to me that Κάμιλλος could be identified as the Milanese humanist Angelo Camillo Decembrio, author of De politia litteraria (1463; now edited by N. Witten, Munich: Saur, 2002) who also fits the time-slot nicely. His father was called Uberto, and hailed from Vigevano, to the SW of Milan; however, Griffiths finds difficult to explain the elaborate patronymic.

5. EVALUATION OF THE CODICES

The remaining questions to be answered concerning M and P are the identification of the writer(s) of each of the texts and the chronological order of the manuscripts.

To address these questions, it is necessary first to consider the famous pair of volumes in Florence containing Eustathius' *Commentary on the Iliad* (which are codex Laurent. plut. 59.2 and codex Laurent. plut. 59.3). In this pair of volumes, there is a large number of annotations on pieces of paper, all pasted in the upper and lower margin of each sheet. Martini argued plausibly that the annotations were written by the writer of the text and not by an interpolator because they are not emendations or minor corrections but expansions of the text. Furthermore, he observes that the notes appear to be added over time and unsystematically. In addition, the notes appear to be similar in hermeneutic method to those of the writer in the body of the text. It seems that the writer of L wanted to expand the *Commentary* in order to make it more useful and this expansion presupposes a process of revision. L is thus written not by a simple copyist but by someone who makes significant revisions to the material during the process of writing and does not hesitate to make additions, if he thinks that they will make the *Commentary* more useful.

As aforementioned, M carries a note by Bessarion (both in Greek and in Latin) which states that M is Eustathius' autograph. Although we do not know anything about the evidence on which he bases this assumption or the specific circumstances under which he took possession of M, there are some factors which support the attribution:

- M is dated in 12th c. which is the period Eustathius (1115/8-1192/9) lived.
- Bessarion was an authoritative scholar and the first palaeographer, his authority means that his view has to be taken seriously.
- Both in the Greek and in the Latin note, the fact that M is an autograph is emphasized: in the Greek note with the relatives αὐτοῦ ἐκείνου and in the

---

91 From now on I will refer to these volumes as L; on these codices cf. Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. 1, pp. IXff., Diller (1960), pp. 35-6.
90 Martini (1907), p. 282-3.
Latin with the adverb *vero*.\textsuperscript{93} Whatever the basis for the statement, Bessarion evidently made it in complete confidence.

- In any case, as already mentioned, Bessarion did have both the connections and the material way to obtain manuscripts not only from all over Greece but specifically from Thessalonica.\textsuperscript{94}

There is therefore good reason, as far as the external evidence is concerned, to accept the widely held view, argued strongly by Martini, that M is Eustathius’ autograph.

As we already mentioned in the description of the condition of L, the nature of the additions in its margins is authorial and not scribal; in addition, the handwriting of the marginal notes is identical with the one in the main text; hence both the textual and the palaeographical evidence are consistent with the statement that it is the hand of the author himself which adds the changes in the margin of L. The comparison between L and M gives some important results for the so-called Autographon-Hypothesis: both manuscripts are dated in the period that Eustathius lived. The handwriting in both of them is identical and there is the same system of writing marginal notes (in the same black ink with the text) quoted with asterisks (in red ink). Finally, if we accept it as probable that M is an autograph, it follows that we should accept that L (together with its marginal notes in the pasted papers) is written by Eustathius too.\textsuperscript{95}

The only important difference between the two manuscripts is the process of writing marginal notes: as far as L is concerned, the notes are not routine corrections but additions written after a revision process which means that in this case, Eustathius was interested in improving the material that he had written.

On the other hand, in M the nature of the marginal notes is scribal and not authorial: in the main text, the writer often copies as far as a part of a word, then he omits by mistake some words and he starts from a later point; the error arises either because of a homoioteleuton or an omission of a whole line. The missing text is found in a marginal note (always quoted with an asterisk). For example, in Eust. *ad Od*. I.93.2-3 in M we read: \textsuperscript{96} τὴν ὅ[πον ὁ̣ στρεβλεθαι κατὰ συγκοπὴν Ὠμηρος ἔφη]

\textsuperscript{93} As mentioned, this was a good point to be underlined in order to impress the Senate of Venice for his gift.

\textsuperscript{94} Cf. Martini (1907), p. 281-2 where he argues on Marc. gr. 451 being obtained by Bessarion from the monastery of Theotokos in Thessalonica as mentioned in 4\textsuperscript{th}. It is plausible that he could have obtained Marc. 450 either from the same or a different monastery or from another source in Thessalonica.

\textsuperscript{95} Martini (1907), p. 281-3.

\textsuperscript{96} In order to show the part of the text which is found in the marginal note, from now on I will use the square brackets.
δήλον δὲ δτι... The passage stopped in the ω of the word ὀραν and continued later from δήλον which was the wrong point. A marginal note was added in order to complete what had been omitted. In I.114.44-5 we have the same case: καὶ ἐτέραν ὕπθαλ[μοίς. ὁπολοι καὶ κατὰ τοὺς ἱστορικοὺς ὕπθαλμοι βασιλέων.] ἐκ δὲ τοῦ ὄπωσα... Here the passage stopped in the first part of the word ὕπθαλμοίς.

The examination of some more marginal notes in M suggests that they are corrections of copying mistakes. For example in I.92.7-8, there is a typical case of omission caused by homoioiteleuton: Μ writes καὶ δοὺς τοιαῦτα ἐξ ἐπερθετικῶν [τῶν εἰς στος ἓ]περθετικά the part in the brackets being in a marginal note. Because of an oversight of similar words, the copyist after copying as far as the first word mistakes the second for the place he has reached and he omits what comes in between. Another example is the homoearchon in I.133.44-5 where Μ writes: κοινὸν Ἀττικῶν. [ὅτι δὲ τὸ ἔργον καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἔργου κανονίζοιη τινες, ἀλλαχοῦ ἐξελόθη. καὶ εἰκὸς οὕτω παρῆχθαι καὶ τὸ ἔμπα ως ἀπο τοῦ τρισυλλάβων ἐνεστῶτος τοῦ ἔλεπο] ὅτι ως ἐν τῇ Ἰλιάδι... The copyist mistakes the first ὅτι with the second one and he omits the part between them which is found afterwards in a marginal note.

In the above cases of omission of text, since the nature of the marginal notes is not authorial, my claim is that there are two possibilities concerning the identity of the person who has the completion of the missing text in the margin.

a. We are dealing with the main copyist who by mistake omits a part of the text (this could happen for several reasons: tiredness, distraction of attention, lack of light etc.) and then he realizes the mistake and corrects it by adding an asterisk and writing the missing text in the margins.

b. The corrections have been made by a copyist who has read through the text, found the lacunae and decided to use asterisks and write the missing text in the margins.

The problem of the identity of the writer of the marginal notes in Μ can only be dealt with the help of some palaeographical considerations which suggest that he is the same as the writer of the main text of Μ and the scribe of Λ, who (as was argued above) was probably Eustathius.
-The nature of interruptions in the main text (some words are interrupted and sometimes are left half only to be completed in the margin) in combination with the handwriting and the kind of black ink which are the same both in the text and in the marginal notes.

-The resemblance of the system of quoting with asterisks (in red ink) with the writer of L and the similarities of the asterisks used.

Since all the marginal notes in M are corrections of copying mistakes and since there are no marginalia in the form of additions to improve the quality of the notes, it is obvious that in contrast to L which is an archetyp, M is a copy. Another conclusion is that whilst L is incomplete and in a process of improvement by essential additions of text, M contains no improvement of the text that it copies.

In contrast with M, as far as P is concerned there are no inscriptions or any other indications that help us either with the identity of the writer or with the dating of the manuscript. Although H. Omont\(^97\) attributed P to the 13\(^{th}\) c., Martini\(^98\) has plausibly argued that this is not the correct date and that P should be dated in the 12\(^{th}\) c. His conclusion comes from a comparison between P and M and is based both on the fact that in M there are some gaps in the text that are complete in P\(^99\) and on palaeographical reasons such as the letter formation of the codices and the compendia.

Personally, I believe that in this specific case the palaeographical examination of M and P gives us more safe criteria on the dating and the identity of the writer of the later. An inspection of the physical appearance of the two manuscripts has proved the following:

- The page size and the total number of pages are similar, in addition, the average number of lines per page is the same.
- The handwriting, both in the letter formation and the way some of the letters go up and down the lines is identical in both manuscripts.
- The system of abbreviations and the way of emending the text with marginal notes (including the kind of asterisks used and their formation) are similar.
- The use of red ink and the specific cases in which both writers use it are identical.

\(^97\) Omont (1888), Catalogue 32.
\(^98\) Martini (1907), pp. 284-5.
\(^99\) He gives as an example in L390.13-6 the characteristic case of a homoioteleuton which causes a big lacuna in M; however, the text is complete in P.
The use of iota subscriptum in both manuscripts is inconsistent and there are some words which in both P and M are written as one word (e.g. ὠὖχηκιστα, διατούτο).

In addition to all this palaeographical evidence, the examination of the marginal notes in P confirms its similarity with M and reinforces the theory that they are both written by the same writer. In the marginal notes of P the hands are at least three. The writer of the text itself is identified as one of them both by his handwriting, the kind of black ink and the use of asterisks. The other two hands -P² and P³- never use asterisks and their writings in the margins include words as subtitles, words written more clearly or abbreviations clarified. Hence, the nature of the text by writers 1 and 2 is irrelevant to corrections. This is why from now on by the term “marginal notes in P” I will refer to the corrective notes written by the writer of the main text and quoted with asterisks.

Furthermore, as with M, whilst copying the main text the writer often leaves lacunae sometimes following part of an uncompleted word. The text is restored, as in M, with a marginal note in the same black ink with the main text (quoted by an asterisk in red ink). For example, in 1.154.1 in P we read: ...ἐνδοιαστικῶς ὅτι οὐκ ἔδειν εἴπερ ζῆ ἡ τέθνηκεν. ἢ καὶ ἄλλως οὐκ ἔδειν ἢ ζῆ ἡ τέθνηκεν] ὥσπερ κατωτέρω ἔρει... The text stops in the second syllable of τέθνηκεν and then continues after the second τέθνηκεν. The missing part was restored with a note in the margin. In another example of marginal note in P (II.39.43-45) we read: ὅς ἢ ἡμιφα θείουσα ἦν πῶς δὲ οὕτως; οὐ κατὰ ἱέρακα δηλαδὴ ἄλλα πάντως ὑπὲρ αὐτὸν ἢ καὶ ἄλλως τὸ αὐτὸ φράσαι, οὕτως ἤθεν, ὡς οὐδ᾽ ἢ ἱέρας πέτοιτο. ἦστι μέντοι ἐπείν καὶ ὅτι τὸ ὅς ἢ ἡμιφα θείουσα θά]λασσα ἐταμίν... In this example, the text stops in the second syllable of the word θείουσα and then starts again from the word θείουσα (which is similar); the restoration of the missing text is achieved again with a marginal note.

The purpose of all the marginal notes in P (as in M) is mechanical correction of the text and not creative writing. The most usual mistake in P is the lacuna caused by homoioteleuton: in 1.45.37-8 P reads ἐπίστροφος ἕν ἀνθρώπων [ἡ δρᾶσιν δηλοῖ ὡς ἐν τῇ ἐπίστροφος ἄνθρωπων] ὁ ἐνεργῶν... In this example, a small part of the copied text was omitted; the text was restored with a note. A bigger omission of this
sort in I.122.29-32\textsuperscript{100} shows that the copyist was often careless and omitted a big part of text restored in a note in the margin. Other copying mistakes also exist in P such as the homoearchon in II.43.15-6: λέγει δὲ καὶ ὁς χρήματα ἔξαει[ραν ἦτοι βαστάσαντες ἐξήγαγον] ἀ οἱ Φαλακες…

Since the purpose of the marginal notes in P, as in M, is to correct copying mistakes, the possibilities about the person who wrote the notes are the same: either the writer of the main text corrects his copying mistakes in the margin or someone else who has found the lacunae in the text decided to correct the gaps. The case for the identity of the main writer with the writer of the marginal notes is similar to the one followed for the case of M:

-As in the case of M, the words are interrupted sometimes in the middle and the handwriting of both the main text and the marginal notes is identical. Additionally, both are written in the same black ink.

-The system of quoting the missing text with red asterisks is the same.

From all the above, my conclusion is that similarly to M, the marginal notes of P quoted with an asterisk are written by the author of the text; they contain no new additions on the main text of the Commentary but corrections of copying mistakes. Consequently, P is lacunose too and more specifically the nature of the lacunae is an identical point of resemblance with M. If we are right to conclude with Martini that the hand in all three cases is that of Eustathius, we should probably conclude that in the case of Eustathius’ commentaries, there is no case of “publishing” on any substantial scale: it is the author himself who makes copies of his works. The conclusion that these are non-professional copies is consistent with the lacunose state of both texts. Since we can rule out production for a book market, presumably we should suppose that he copied the texts as gifts. It seems that in the view of the author, the Commentary in the Odyssey has reached a satisfying level of notional completeness at the point that he decided to make the copies, either to ensure a limited circulation or to satisfy a personal request of somebody.\textsuperscript{101}

\textsuperscript{100} ἵναν ἔδει [θεοὺς καὶ ἀναφάνα διελέντας ὡς κείνῳ ἀναφάνα παραστατο Παλλας Ἀθηνής εἰ καὶ οὔτως ἔδει διελένει κήδοιτο τε θυμός τῷ κέν τις κείνων γε καὶ ἐκκελάθοιτο γάρ του, ἅτον δὲ τὸ εἰ γὰρ σὲ ἄτοὺς ἔδει διελένει Ἀθηνα, οὔτε εὐκτίκως ἄλλα ἐνδοιαστικῶς πρὸς τινὸς ληφθέν καὶ ἐπεμβολὴν παθόν τοῖς, οὐ γὰρ πο ἤδειν ἔδει θεοὺς] καὶ ἔδει εἰτα ἐπαναληψθέν…

\textsuperscript{101} The most plausible hypothesis would be a pupil or another member of his intellectual circle. It is less probable that the one of the copies could be destined for a member of high social status (e.g. the emperor) since the level of quality of both manuscripts does not justify such suggestion.
There is an alternative possibility which should be entertained, that is, that the text is by the hand of an amanuensis or pupil (the text would still be contemporary to Eustathius). However, the changes in L appear to be author’s changes. The nature of the corrections (with pasted slips of paper) is easier to square with continuous but unsystematic intervention by Eustathius himself than with dictation to a scribe.

Up to now, it is proved that both P and M are incomplete in a similar way. After comparing the two codices Martini[102] was the first to note some lacunae in the text of M that are however complete in P. The most characteristic example is 1.390.13-6 where the text reads:

μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα τοῦ Ἐν Ἀργει ἀγάλματος τῆς Ἡρας καταγελώσαν εἰς ἄνδρα μεταβαλθῆναι άειδή, τὸ καὶ πίθωνα λέγεσθαι. ἔλεηθέσαν δὲ ὑπὸ Διὸς εἰς γυναίκα μορφωθῆναι αὖθις ὀρατόν καὶ ἀπελθεῖν εἰς Τροίην, ὅπου ἐρασθήναι αὐτῆς Γλύφιον ἐγχώριον ἄνδρα καὶ ἐπιθέσθαι αὐτὴ λοιμένη.

The part from μεταβαλθῆναι until ἐγχώριον ἄνδρα has fallen out from M but exists in P. It is a case of homoioteleuton in which P is more complete than M. The importance of this example is obvious since it establishes a substantial portion of text found in the main text of P and omitted by M.

Based on this example and on some smaller gaps found in M which are complete in P, Martini reached the assumption that P is more complete than M and consequently that M is a copy of P and since he had already concluded on the identity of the writer of M the final conclusion was that both codices were written by Eustathius.

So in this case the stemmatic relation of P and M is:

```
P

M
```

However, the marginal notes of M and P with their context and their peculiar nature (especially if they belong to the hand of the writer, that is Eustathius) is not a

negligible matter in order to establish a stemma of codices. If we compare the marginal notes of P written by the author with the corresponding text in M, the only case in which P is more complete than M is in 1.218.3-5.\textsuperscript{103} in P the writer interrupted the word θυμόν in the first syllable and then wrongly continued from καίνον; however, in P, the missing text is added in the margin. In M the writer omits completely the text which is between θυμόν and καίνον. This case in itself agrees with Martini’s argument for M being a copy of P.

However, things become complicated if we take into account that in all the other cases of marginal notes by the writer of P, all the text missed out by him is complete in the main text of M. For example, in 1.45.37-8,\textsuperscript{104} in P we find the text from ή δράσιν until ἀνθρώπων omitted and then added in a marginal note whilst the text in M is complete; in 1.122.28-32,\textsuperscript{105} the text from θεοὺς καὶ ἀναφάντα until ἴδον ὁδεθεοὺς is omitted in the text of P and restored in the margin whilst in M the text is again complete; in 1.153.46-154.1,\textsuperscript{106} the text from κεν. ή καὶ ἄλλος until ή τέθνηκεν is omitted from the main text of P and written in the margin but in M it is found in the text; in 1.210.25-6,\textsuperscript{107} P omits from Ἀλλιος δὲ until ἐξελθεῖν which is added in its margin whilst in M the text is complete. The same phenomenon may also be noted for the rest of the marginal notes of P and it shows some incompleteness of P in some parts of text whilst M is complete. This incompleteness would agree with the theory that M copied P only if we suppose that P had some gaps that the writer of M completed in the margin from another copy or that M incorporates the marginalia of P into its text.

On the other hand, as far as the marginal notes of M are concerned, when compared with the corresponding text in P, the results are revealing: in 1.119.14-7\textsuperscript{108}
in M the part between ἡμεῖς ὠδυσσήμα. ὡρα and ὅτι τῷ Νέστορι is omitted and is found in a marginal note whilst in P the whole text is omitted starting from ὡρα; in I.123.45-124.1, M stops in the 1st syllable of the word κηδόμενοι and omits from δόμενοι until θλίβοντα which is found again in a marginal note, whilst P stops in παλαιοῖς and starts again from ὅτι τῷ ἔρωτόντι omitting all the part of the text in between. There are also the cases in which P omits exactly the part of the text that M has in its marginal notes like in I.127.43-4 where the part from ὡμοίως δὲ until ἐν Κυδώνας is omitted and restored in the margin of M and completely omitted by P or in I.134.36-7 where the same happens with the part from ἡμ. οὐ καὶ ἡ διὰ until ἵππος.

The only exception in which P has a complete text where M has an omission and completes in the margin is in I.148.35-6; M has got in the margin from καὶ ὁ παρὰ until πολιτείᾳ and P has the whole of the text complete.

These examples indicate that P is incomplete and could suggest where M copies P, the additional text found in the marginal notes of M is copied from another codex more complete than P.

However, it is necessary to examine two interesting examples of marginal notes in M which can be important for the conclusions about the relation between the two codices.

> In I.96.42-6 we read:

> ἔστι δὲ ὁ νοῦς τοῦ εἰρήμενου Ὀμηρικοῦ ἀντιθέτου τοιοῦτος Τηλέμαχε εἰ ποιεῖνται τὰ πατρικῆς ἀρέτης ὡς ἐκείνους ἢν δεινός ἐπιτελεῖς ὡς ἦθελεν οὐκ ἄν εἰς κενὸν ὀδεύσῃς ἀρτι. εἰ δὲ ψευδὴ τὸ εὖ Ὀδυσσέως καὶ Πηνελόπης εἶναι, κακὸς αὐτὸς ὁ καὶ μή κατ’ ἐκείνους ἀγαθὸς ὡς ἀρτι πολλοὶ τῶν πατίδων πάχουσιν οὐκ οἴδα εἰ τελευτησεῖς ἀπερ ἔθελεις, ἀλλὰ μὴ παρέχεις τὰ τὰ ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ εἰς νοῦν οὐκοῦν ἐλπιζήτω τοι τελευτήσας τάδε ἔργα, ὅτι ἐν τῷ...
M stops in the 1st syllable of ἔρημένου, omits from ἕρμένου until τάδε ἔργα and has the omitted text in a marginal note. However, it is surprising that only in this case, the omission in P starts from before (from ἐστὶ δὲ) leaving out not only the marginal note but also words which exist in the main text of M.

In this example, P omits not only the whole of the marginal note of M but also a small part of the main text. It is obvious that in the specific example M does not copy P (since P does not have the text from ἐστὶ δὲ until τάδε ἔργα) but another manuscript which is more complete and has not been copied by P.

➢ In I.135.39.41 M reads:

ο̣ πατὴρ ὁς ᾽Αρης, καὶ διὰ τοῦ τοῦ κλίνεται ὁ Ἀρητος ὡς λέχητος
ἀφ' ὁ Άρητος ὑπὸ τοῦ ἕρμου ἔγραφήν ἐξ ἡς γενικῆς ἀναδρομῆς τῇ ἔις εἰθεῖαν, ὁ ᾽Αρητος ὁ δὲ πέμπτος ὑπὸ τοῦ Νέστορι Θρασυμήδης

However, P omits completely the whole part from ὁς ᾽Αρης until ᾽Αρητος and then it starts: ὁ δὲ πέμπτος, Θρασυμήδης...

In the second example, it is difficult to understand why apart from omitting the text of the marginal note of M, P also continues in a different way than M (without the words ὑπὸ τοῦ Νέστορι). But again in this case it is plausible that M copied from another manuscript different than P and that the latter copied from M when it was still lacunose.

The evidence above suggests two hypotheses:

1. M copies not only from P but also from another manuscript, perhaps P’s archetype, which we shall term A. The Archetype theory also explains the fact that the majority of marginal notes of M do not appear in P. P possibly copied from A and made some copying mistakes. M copied both from P and from A so it corrected the gaps of P by quoting the missing text in the marginal notes. However, M in its turn has made some new copying mistakes which are found correct in P (since it copied from A).
In this case, the stemma of the codices is:

```
A
 |
|--|
P M
```

The problem with this view is that, though it adequately explains those cases where M adds material not obtainable from P, it is odd, if M was based in part on A, that the effect of collation was to supplement gaps in P with half-words in the main text of M, which then had to be further supplemented with additional notes, rather than complete words, phrases or sentences.

2. Martini got the relationship between the manuscripts the wrong way round: M was the source of P. This would account for the places where M is more complete than P. It would also account for the cases where the main text of M breaks off within a word but P further omits the phrasing in the immediate vicinity of the incomplete words. This looks like a tidying up process in which a broken text in M was made to yield meaningful syntax. Since P (as was noted above) contains some material not found in M we should still need to invoke the archetype A in order to make sense of the relationship, but now the stemma would be:

```
A
 |
|--|
M
 |
|--|
P
```
Either hypothesis presupposes a first procedure of composition by Eustathius and at least two more procedures of copying which means that Eustathius wrote the text at least three times. If we take into consideration, that the length of the whole Commentary on the Odyssey is from 240 (cod. P) to 251 (cod. M) double sided folia then the whole procedure of writing and copying should require the writing of a little bit more than 700 double sided handwritten pages. If we consider the obligations of an archbishop, it is surprising that he could find the time for such a mundane task. This may be felt to offer some support to the amanuensis-hypothesis, considered but discounted above. However, if we suppose that the copies were meant as gifts for someone either of high status or close to Eustathius, the generosity with his time becomes more intelligible; we also have to keep in mind that Eustathius was a voluminous writer and that many hours of writing or copying were a daily routine for him.
d. EUSTATHIUS AS A COMMENTATOR.

1. Eustathius’ method

Eustathius’ interpretative method in both his commentaries needs to be analyzed so that we evaluate his contribution to the interpretation of the Homeric epics and the other ancient Greek writers, together with the preservation of valuable fragments and information on works which are now lost. In order to understand both the strategy and the purpose of writing the Commentaries, it is essential to analyze his own comments and views on these subjects (mainly expressed in the two introductions of his Commentary on the Iliad and the Odyssey) and also to remark his way of interpretation through the text.

In the beginning of his edition of the Commentary on the Iliad, Van der Valk added the following title:

Εὐσταθίου παρεκβολὴ εἰς τὴν Ὄμηρον Ἰλία

Van der Valk remarks that Maioranus’ edition starts with the text of the Commentary (τῶν Ὅμηρον Σειρήνων etc.) and argues that the genuine title of the work was deleted. However, it is plausible that Eustathius should put a title on his work and furthermore, that the title should contain at least his name, a term which would indicate the nature of the work and the ancient text on which he worked (in the specific case Homer’s Iliad).

As far as the Commentary on the Odyssey is concerned, the question is whether the writer has put a title before the text or he has started writing the text as if it was a natural continuation of the Commentary on the Iliad hence, it did not need a title. Since M is corrupted at the beginning, no genuine title is preserved from this manuscript. However, at the beginning of the text in P there is a title, written in red ink:

113 He agrees that the deletion happened either because the codex was stolen or because it was falsely attributed to another ancient writer and he adds that there could not have been a title alone in a previous page since this is the first page of the quaternio. In another codex, there is a title on the first page but it is obvious that this title is a later addition, cf. Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. I, p. XII.
114 The Commentary on the Odyssey in Stallbaum’s edition only has the title Προοίμιον which is the same with Maioranus’ edition and is added by him.
115 Before the text, there is Bessarion’s title: Εὐσταθίου Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης ἔξινης ἡς ἀπὸ τὴν Ὀδυσσείαν εἰς ὑπὲρ τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ ἔκκινον.
The letter formation is the same with the main text and it is written in red ink, a technique that the writer of the main text often uses in order to highlight or distinguish a total of words (usually titles); hence, there is a correspondence between the title and the main text. Moreover, the writer chooses to give his name and his rank together with a category name for his work: παρεκβολαί meaning "disquisitions". The word comes from the verb παρεκβάλλω. It is important to note that this word is the most commonly used by the writer in the introductions of both Commentaries in order to categorise his work: in the Commentary on the Iliad, he uses the verb to describe the process of commenting and later, he talks about the "cause of the digressive purpose". in the Commentary on the Odyssey, the term παρεκβολαί is used in the end of the introduction to characterise the whole of the Commentary. It is interesting that here the παρεκβολαί are called Odyssean in correspondence with the Iliadic ones. This could suggest that the same word was used in the title of the Commentary on the Iliad. Furthermore, the term is used by Eustathius for the title of his work on Dionysius or when he refers generally to his commentary work on the Homeric epics. The importance of Eustathius gives to this word and the consistent repetition with which he refers to it are one more argument in favor of the authenticity of the title in P. Additionally, Eustathius wrote the Commentary on the Odyssey after he has become teacher of orators in the Patriarchal School (that is after 1170); it is therefore chronologically consistent to cite his position as teacher of rhetoric.

116 By this time, Eustathius' name as a scholar was known; both his name and his position would give a special significance and an additional gravity to the value of such a work.
117 The term is also translated as "disquisitions" in Herington (1969), p. 433 or in LSJ s.v. as "compilation of a set of critical remarks".
118 Other words used by Eustathius for his Commentary on the Iliad are: πόνημα (1.3.24), ἐγχείρημα (1.3.23), ἐργον (1.3.27, 29, 35), ἔργασιάν (1.3.28), σύγγραμμα (1.3.33), εξήγησις (1.4.1, 4) but except for ἐργον none is used as many times as the word παρεκβολαί and its derivatives.
119 Eust. ad II. 1.3.17: οὐκ εὐγνωνον ἐστι τὸ χωρίον, δ' παρεκβάλληται.
120 Eust. ad II. 1.7.5: προκλητικόν τοῦ παρεκβολικοῦ σκοποῦ.
121 Eust. ad Od. 1.2.42-4 (=5ff. Makr.): πολλα δὲ τῶν τῆς Ὀδυσσείας ἐγκεκριμένων ἐν ταῖς τοιαύταις παρεκβολαῖς σεισάγεται, διὰ τὸ ἐν τοῖς εἰς τὴν 'Πλάδα ἰκανοὺς εἰρήσασθαι περὶ αὐτῶν ἀρχὴ δὲ τῶν Ὀδυσσεικῶν παρεκβολῶν ενετείνετο.
122 Eust. ad II. 1.634.4: αὐ τοῦ Περιηγητοῦ δηλοῖ τα παρεκβολαί.
123 Eust. ad II. 1.816.8.2-3: αicmp. τα παρεκβολαί.
124 Correspondingly, the missing title for the Commentary on the Iliad should be: Εὐσταθίου μακεδόρος τῶν ἰδιότων τοῦ ἱστοροῦ ἀρχιεπισκοποῦ παρεκβολαί τῶν εἰς τὴν 'Πλάδα.
Eustathius’ choice of term to categorise his work gives an idea on how he perceived the role of his Commentary: the writer conceives himself as a “medium” between Homer’s narration and his own readers. The title suggests that wherever there is a difficulty that would prevent the reader of Homer from the experience of knowledge and understanding, the writer intervenes by narrating in a digression in order to resolve the obstacle.

Eustathius organises his Commentaries according to a specific technical pattern: firstly, he divides the Commentaries in two parts, the introduction and the comments.¹²⁵ In the introduction of the Commentary on the Iliad, he talks about Homeric poetry in general and about the nature of the Iliad; he analyses his method of writing and his terminology and he adds some biographical information on Homer; he finishes this introduction with a comparison between the Iliad and the Odyssey. The introduction of the Commentary on the Odyssey is shorter; he talks about the writing of the Odyssey and he makes a comparison with the Iliad; he comments on the story and the purpose of the poem and he finishes by explaining in a few words his method. In this way, he manages to give to the reader the basic background to follow his work.

The main text follows the natural sequence of the Homeric books and verses, in other words his Commentaries are organized in 24 books¹²⁶ and the comments are written according to the order of the verses. Eustathius explains the reasons for this, when he gives some general instructions on how someone should use his Commentary: someone can read either the work alone or in combination with the Homeric text;¹²⁷ the work is not supposed to be read right through and it is not a single body of work with a single kind of style; this would make the reader tired and it would make the commentary difficult to use. On the contrary, Eustathius encourages¹²⁸ the readers to use his Commentary selectively depending on their needs.

---
¹²⁵ The notional division between his introduction and his comments is apparent in the last sentences of the introductions both in the Commentary on the Iliad (1.8.5-6 ἄλλα γὰρ ἢ δὴ τῷ σκοπῷ ἐγχειρηστέων, ἵνα μὴ πολέμου άκούσωμεν περὶ τὸν Ἐν οὗ δέντει παροξύσωσθαι) and especially in the Commentary on the Odyssey (1.2.44 (=4.7 Makr.)) ἀρχη γ. τῶν Ὀδυσσειακῶν παρεκβολῶν εντείθεν).
¹²⁶ When the comments on a book of the Odyssey start, there are short titles indicating this (e.g. at the beginning of the first book we read: ἀρχη δὲ τῶν Ὀδυσσειακῶν παρεκβολῶν εντείθεν. After the end of the first book, we read: τέλος τῶν τῆς α: ἀρχη τῶν τῆς Βῆτα After the end of the second book: ἐκ τῶν τῆς Γήμων).
¹²⁷ Eust. ad II. 1.3.26-28: ἐπεὶ κατὰ μόνας τις ἀπολαβὸν τὸ παρὼν ἔργον αὐτὸ καθ’ αὐτοῦ θεωροῦ ἐπεὶ καὶ τὴν Ἰλιάδα, κυριαρχομένος σκέπτεσθαι τὴν ἔργωσιν ταύτην βούλεται, εἶ τι ποι ἐν χρώ ἐκείνης παράστασι. For the modern reader it is more natural that the Commentaries are read in parallel with the Homeric text.
¹²⁸ Eust. ad II. 1.3.28-32: πρὸς δὲ τοῖς άλλοις οἰδὲ ἐκτέσται τὸ προκείμενον ἔργον εἰς ἐν τῷ καὶ σῶμα κατὰ συνέχειαν ἀδιάστατον, ἵνα τῷ ἀδιάκοπῳ ἀποκναθή τὸν ἐντυχήσαντα καὶ δισείρετον
since each useful thing exists by itself in an independent way and every transition from one section to the next takes place as if the writer starts from the beginning. The independence of every section helps the reader to find in a precise way what he needs and makes the Commentary a useful tool easy to use.

The purpose of Eustathius’ method is to produce a linear commentary which supplies the reader with the “useful things” on Homeric poetry. The first passage to introduce Eustathius’ method is the following:

“The useful things (for the understanding of the verses of Homer) are chosen in order and in a nice composition, not with the intention to concentrate everything by those who worked on the poet (for this would be a vain and unnecessary task and it is not easily feasible) but in a way that everyone who wants to learn, can find in the appropriate place and in the correct order the relevant things (to the Homeric verses).”

In other words, the important thing in his method is selection (ἐκλέγονται) of the useful things which is combined with an order (κατὰ ἀκολουθίαν, κατὰ τόπον, εὐτάκτως) and a nice composition (εὐσυνθέτως). The same method, not to explain everything but to select, comes also in the Commentary on the Odyssey and makes an important point on Eustathius’ intentions on the length of his Commentary. It is obvious that Eustathius is not restricted by a word or any other space limit when he writes the Commentaries. He often repeats things that have already been mentioned, this being the main reason for which he was criticized for verbosity, which up to a level is a disadvantage of his writing. However, it is important to note

---

129 Eust. ad II. 1.3.8-12: ...καὶ δὴ γίνεται καὶ τοῦτο καὶ τὰ χρήσιμα κατὰ ἀκολουθίαν εὐσυνθέτως ἐκλέγονται, δέχεται δὲ τὰ μὲν τὰ πάντα τούτα εὐσυνθέτως εἶναι τῶν πονηραμένων εἰς τὸν ποιητήν, (τούτο γὰρ καὶ μόνος μάταιος καὶ περιττός καὶ οὐδὲ βρόν ἄνειμος,) ἀλλ’ ὅστε τὸν γινώσκειν (sic) ἐκλέγοντα εἰρήσειν κατὰ τόπον εὐτάκτως τὰ μὴ παράλεικον...

130 Probably he means that the reader can find what he wants in Eustathius’ commentary by following the natural sequence of Iliadic books and verses as followed by the writer. this gives easy accessibility and makes the Commentary easy to use.

131 Possibly it is a personal evaluation on his rhetorical style.

132 Eust. ad Od. 1.2.40-2 (=4.2ff. Makr.). ἦσται δὲ ἡμῖν κάντασιν ὡς καὶ εἰς τὸ Ἱλιάδι τῆς μεταγεμίσεως ἐπιβολή, οἷς κατὰ ἐξήγησιν ἡ ἄλλος εμφάνει, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκλογήν τῶν χρήσιμον τοὺς ἐπιτρέψων καὶ μὴ ἐν εὐχερεί ἐχοσίν εἰσεῖν ἐπαφέαν τῷ τῆς ποιησεως πλάτει σχολαίτερον.

133 Wilson (1983), p. 198: “Taken together they cannot outweigh the fault of verbosity. Anyone who fills several pages with the exegesis of the first line of a poem must be very sure of the quality and
that the writer himself mentions that he does not intend to gather *everything* written by those who worked on Homer (for this would be a vain and excessive work and not easily efficient).\textsuperscript{134} he wants everything to be composed in a brief way with variety,\textsuperscript{135} when he feels that his comments draw him away from his main purpose, he drives himself back;\textsuperscript{136} he clearly states that his purpose is not to write a book full of many words\textsuperscript{137} and when he urges himself to start the *Commentary on the Iliad* he stresses the need to avoid superfluity.\textsuperscript{138} In all these instances, not only do we recognize in Eustathius at least the intention to be concise but also a mechanism of self-restraint which helps him every time that he slips from his main purpose to return; in the introduction to the *Commentary on the Odyssey*, he underlines that many of the things that exist in his comments on the *Odyssey* are passed over without any further annotation since they have been plainly treated in the Iliadic Commentary.\textsuperscript{139} On the other hand, he fails to note how many of his comments on the *Odyssey* are indeed repetitions of the Iliadic ones and should have been, at least according to our own criteria, omitted.

Anyone who spends several pages on the commentary of one verse could not escape the danger of verbosity. However, my view is that this verbosity is justified by the following:

1. It is certain that this is not done intentionally since from the beginning, he clarifies that he wants to include all the useful things and not everything. In any case, it is possible that for a work with such a great importance and large scale, Eustathius did not conceive the size of his *Commentaries* to be exaggerated.

---

\textsuperscript{134} Eust. ad II. 1.3.9-11: οὐ όσε ἡμέτερο ὁμιλεῖ οὐκ εἶναι οὐκ ἐποιημένον εἰς τὸν ποιήμαν. οὐκέτα γὰρ καὶ οὐκ ἡ διὰ τῆς μᾶτας καὶ περιτότος καὶ οὐκ ὑπὸ τοῦ δοκοῦντος.

\textsuperscript{135} Eust. ad II. 1.3.22-3: καὶ ταῦτα οὐκ ἐποιημένον ὡς καὶ ποικίλοις.

\textsuperscript{136} Eust. ad II. 1.6.2-3: καὶ ταῦτα μὴ δεῖτε ὅπως, ἵνα μὴ ἔη πλέον πόρρω τοῦ σκοποῦ πλαζόμεθα.

\textsuperscript{137} Eust. ad II. 1.7.2-3: ταῦτα γὰρ τὰ πάντα εἰς ἕπεμελος φυλοκρινθήσεται τις, βιβλίοις ἱστορικῆς πολλάκις συνεθήκαται. ἡμέν δὲ οὐ τοῖς σκοπώσθω.

\textsuperscript{138} Eust. ad II. 1.8.5-6: ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἡ διὰ τῆς σκοποῦ ἐκχειρηθέν, ἵνα μὴ ποθὲν ἀκούσσωμεν περιττά ἐν οἷς δόντι σφιξαί λαβάναι.

\textsuperscript{139} Eust. ad Od. 1.2.42-4 (=4.5 Makr.): πολλὰ δὲ τῶν τῆς Ὀδύσσειας ἐγκεκριμένων ἐν ταῖς τοιαύταις παρεκκλησίαις συναγίγνηται, διά τὸ ἐν τοῖς εἰς τὴν Ἰλιάδα ἱκανοῦς εἰρήνηθαί περὶ αὐτῶν.
2. His perception of scholarship and teaching was different from the modern one. In Eustathius’ time, an atticist style with verbosity would be considered to be rather an indication of erudition than a negative characteristic of writing.

3. His analytical style is a part of his plan to rescue Homer and his poetry. The quantity of the comments refutes any objections on the emptiness and uselessness of the Homeric poetry.

4. The Commentaries mainly serve teaching needs and were written according to Eustathius for the use of his pupils¹⁴⁰ and it is probable that a persistent repetition serves to reinforce the learning process.

Despite the tendency to verbosity, it is clear that Eustathius is not interested in everything but he does have some criteria of selection, which mostly depend on the purpose of writing his Commentaries.

The purpose of Eustathius’ Commentaries is to prove that Homer’s poetry is didactic and it is divided in two categories:
- The practical purpose, which is to help all those who want to write in prose to express themselves in correct Greek. For this, the commentary will be mainly focused on.¹⁴¹

1. ἐννοεῖ εὐχρήστως, ῥητορικαὶ παραπλοκαὶ: meanings that are easy to use and rhetorical weavings for the one who wants to write in prose.
2. μέθοδοι: methods that Homer uses to narrate which someone could imitate together with admiring them.
3. λέξεις: words (probably technical terms that one can use in order to compose a text); most of these words are suitable for prose writing whilst

¹⁴⁰ Eust. ad II. I.3.1-7 (…Ἀλλὰ ποιεῖν ὅπερ εἰς αὐτῶν οὐ πρὸς μεγιστάνων τινῶν ἐπετάχθημεν, ὥπως τίνα πλάστονται οἱ κομψοὶ, ἄλλα πρὸς φίλων ὁμιλητῶν… ἂν δὲ τὸ φιλικὸν θέλημα διὰ τῆς Ἡλιδᾶς θείων καὶ ἐκπορίσασθαι τὰ χρήσιμα τῷ διεξοδεύοντι, οὐ λέγω ἀνδρὶ λογίᾳ. […] ἄλλα νέῳ ἄρτι μανθάνοντι). II.334.10 (…καὶ τὸν νέον δὲ ἄκροτὴν τὰ πραγματικά εἰκότα διδάσκει…).
¹⁴¹ Eust. ad II. I.3.12-22: ἄλλ’ ὧδε τὸν γινόμενον εὐθύλοντα εὑρίσκει, κατὰ τόσον εὐπάκτως τὰ μή παρέλκοντα, οἷον ἐννοεῖς εὔχρηστοις τῷ καταλογοδήν γράφοντι καὶ βουλομένῳ ρητορικάς ποιεῖν εὐκαίρως παραπλοκάς μεθοδοὺς, εξ ὧν καὶ ὀφελεῖται τὶς μειώσας θέλειν καὶ τῆς εἰστοχιας θαμαίζει τὸν ποιητὴν λέξεις, τὰς πλεονέκτεις μὲν ὡς πεξὶ ἀνέφερεν προσηποικοῖς πολλάκις δὲ καὶ καλήρας καὶ τραχύς καὶ ποιητικάς, ἅς εἰ μὴ ἀναπτύξει τὶς εἰσιμολογοκάτερον, οὐκ εὐγνωστὸν ἔσται τὸ χωρίον, ὃ παρεκβεβληται γνώμαις, αἰς καὶ αὐταῖς πολλάθη ἡ Ἐορθική σεμιννεῖται ποιητῆς ἡμῶν, οὐ μόνον αἰς ἡ ποιητής χράται κατὰ κανόνα οἰκεῖον, ἄλλ’ ἔστιν ὅποι καὶ πλατύτερον, ὡς ἂν ὃν ἔστησαν ἔτερον ἔτι δὲ μίθους, τοὺς μὲν ἄκρατους καὶ ἀθεραπεύτους καὶ κατὰ μόνον θεορουμένους τὸ προσφερόμενον, τοὺς δὲ καὶ μετά θεραπείας ἀλληγορικῆς εἴτε καὶ ἀναγωγικῆς καὶ ἔτερα μύρια καλὰ εἰς βιον χρῆσιμα.
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some others are hard and poetic which need to have an etymological analysis so that the passage examined is read in an easy way.

4. γνῶμαι: opinions with which the Homeric poetry is dignified.

5. ἵστοριαi: stories that the poet uses in a familiar way or that he takes from other writers.

6. μῦθοι: myths which are divided in two categories:
   a. myths which are difficult to treat and hence only cited
   b. myths which take an allegorical explanation

7. ἕτερα μυρὶα καλὰ εἰς βοὴν χρήσιμα: other information, which is useful for everyone’s life since poetry is indeed, as he argues, useful for one’s life.

All these points of Eustathius’ interest are a part of his strategic aim to show how Homer is useful in practical life and are mainly concentrated first on the correct understanding of the passage and then on its use for good prose writing.

- The theoretical purpose of the Homeric work, which is to lead the reader to virtue and to great moral values.

Eustathius notes that the Iliad is the source of every good thing. It is full of good things that come from philosophy, rhetoric, strategic skills, teachings on moral values, on every kind of art and science. Specifically, he focuses on some essential keywords that are important for the way he perceives Homeric poetry and interest him: prudence (φρόνησις), education of the souls (τὸ τὰς ψυχὰς παιδεύειν) and raising of virtue (τὸ εἰς ἀρετὴν ἐπαιρεῖν). Specifically in the Odyssey, the purpose of the poet is concentrated on three moral values: prudence and love for the

---

142 Possibly he means from a practical point of view. The argument is made to defend Homer (and every poet) against those who would argue that one has no practical benefit from reading poetry.
143 Eust. ad Od. 1.2.34 (=3.26 Makr.): βιοφιλετάς γὰρ πᾶσα ποίησις.
144 Eust. ad Il. 1.2.4: εὔτη δὲ καλῶν παντῶν ἦσσιν ἦλιας.
145 Eust. ad Od. 1.2.5-7: γέμισα δὲ μιρίων ἀνὶ τὶς ἐποίησιν καλῶν, φιλοσοφίας, ῥητορείας, στρατηγικῆς εἰπτεχεῖας, διδασκαλίας τὴς περὶ ἡσικῶν ἄρετῶν, τεχνῶν δόλων παντῶν καὶ ἐπιστημῶν.
146 Eust. ad Il. 1.2.9-10: φρόνησιν δὲ οὐκ ἦσσιν εἰπεῖν διὸν περιποιεῖται τῷ προσέχειν ἐπιλογίν. ad Od. ll.31 (=3.21f. Makr.): σωφροσύνη δὲ τῆς ποίησις ταύτης ὁ κεφαλαλοιδοστάτος σκοπός.
147 Eust. ad Il. 1.2.12-3: also in 1.5.31-6.1: ἐν αὐτῷ ἀρετὴ πᾶσα ποίησις.
husband (of which Penelope is the archetype), and justice (for the punishment of the suitors urges one to keep away from injustice).

Eustathius’ purpose at a theoretical level is to focus on the educational character that the Homeric epics have and on the way they lead the reader (and especially the young one) towards all kinds of virtues: from bravery and heroism to morality. Both his theoretical and his practical purpose determine his method of commenting and constitute part of his wider plan to prove that all his effort has a larger educational role: to rescue Homer from the criticism of the time (by proving the poetical text good for prose writing) and to prove that his poetry is didactic (by showing the moral values that it can teach). Eustathius accepts Homer’s role to entertain but mostly and above all he seeks to prove that Homeric poetry is educational.

The most interesting aspects of his way of commenting are the order of his comments and his terminology. In general terms, he inserts disquisitions in order to incorporate additional material into his main comments. The core of his comments is always the Homeric verse and the most usual (but not the only) order of commenting is:

1. He starts with a linguistic analysis which is divided in two parts:

   Firstly, he finds the keywords of the Homeric verse and he examines their meaning; he gives either a paraphrase of the verse or a short explanation of the difficult words; in most cases, he considers etymology as a good method both to examine the history of the words and to embellish his writing (from the regularity of his etymological explanations, it is obvious that he also uses etymology as an interesting and effective way of learning for his students whose linguistic level surely demanded such a kind of analysis). In this way, he detects the exact meaning of the word and he achieves preciseness and clarity.

---

148 Eust. ad Od. 1.2.31-2 (=3.21ff. Makr.): σωφροσύνη δὲ τῆς ποιήσεως ταύτης ὁ κεφαλαιωδέστατος σκοπός καὶ φιλανδρίαν δὲ παιδείς ἐννοοῦν τὸ βιβλίον τούτο, προθέμενον τὴν Πηνελόπην εἰς ἐμφατέρων ἀρχέτυπον.

149 Eust. ad Od. 1.2.32-4 (=3.23ff. Makr.): ἢδη δὲ καὶ ἄδικαις ἀπέχεσθαι ἐπιτυχεῖν, οἷς τοῖς μνηστήριοι τις δικαία πλημμελοῦντας ἀπαλλάττεσθαι οὐκ εἰς ἱστορεῖ.

150 Eust. ad II. 1.7.5-6: ὅτι ἀνδρώδης μὲν ἡ Ἰλίας...ἐπεὶ καὶ ἱστορεῖ.

151 Eust. ad II. 1.7.6: ἡμιτικὴ δὲ ἡ Ὀδύσσεια.

152 Eust. ad II. 1.2.12 (τοῦ τάς σκοπὸς ἡδονεῖν), ad Od. 1.1.22 (=1.27 Makr.) (ψυχαγωγών).

153 Eust. ad II. 1.2.12 (τὰς ψυχὰς παιδεύειν), ad Od. 1.1.22 (=1.27 Makr.) (διδάσκειν).
Sometimes, if appropriate, he proceeds in a grammatical or syntactic analysis of the verses.

2. Secondly, he is interested in stressing rhetorical and stylistic points, which is compatible with his practical purpose: prose writing. Analysis of the persuasive content of Homeric passages and application of technical rhetoric as tools of literary critique are included in his method.

3. Both vocabulary and grammar comments make the text accessible and give him the opportunity to move to a more interpretative level: the Homeric tradition existing before him, which covers a wide chronological range from the Hellenistic until the Byzantine period, is often cited. Eustathius' Commentaries were intended to transmit to the reader the most important pre-existing interpretative studies on the Homeric epics. In the majority of the cases, the names of the sources are not mentioned (apart from the cases whose mention will add value to the Commentaries and their writer), should this be interpreted as an effort of showing his erudition or as an assumption that his reader or listener has been already familiar to a satisfactory level at least with the big names of this tradition? In any case, it is difficult to define the exact criteria he employs in order to decide whether to mention or not the name of his source.

4. Additionally, Eustathius adds his own agreements and disagreements with the interpretations of the previous Homeric tradition or sometimes he is in a position to select between two or more interpretations; in some other cases, he interprets the passages by himself. It is essential for his authority to comment in a creative way so that negative criticism for repetition of old ideas could be avoided. At this level of analysis, he includes comments of geographical, historical and mythological nature described with all kinds of rhetorical means and expressions (with which he was familiar as a teacher of rhetoric).

5. Homer's intention to teach a moral way of life is a dogma for Eustathius. He has always in his mind the theoretical purpose of the Commentaries: to prove the didactic role of the epics in everyone's morality. Thus, he is highly

---


155 Eust. ad Il. 1.4.1-2: ἑνά μὴ τις ἐκφάσισθαι τὸ πρᾶγμα μικτρὶ καὶ τῆς ἑαυτῷ καθάρεις πραγματείας.

interested in making ethical and philosophical judgments concerning the epics. Moral maxims, proverbs and wise sayings are considered to be educative examples for the aspiration of high virtues like bravery, piety, obedience, gratitude, faithfulness, justice and have to be included in the Commentaries.

6. Finally, he has several remarks scattered throughout the text which cover a variety of aspects of a political and sociological nature,\textsuperscript{157} religion, observations on the poet's psychological insight and skill in invention and arrangement.\textsuperscript{158}

\textsuperscript{158} Lindberg (1985), pp.136-40; see also S. Ballogiannis, \textit{Ὁ Λύκος Ὑσταθίως Θεσσαλονίκης καὶ η Ἱατρικὴ ἐπιστήμη τῆς ἐποχῆς του. Ἐφέσας του ἑπί τῆς Ψυχιατρικῆς καὶ ο υπ’ αὐτοῦ καθορισμῶς τῶν βασικῶν στοιχείων τῆς Ψυχιατρικῆς του μίλλιοντος in Ἀγιος Ὑσταθίως – Πρακτικὰ Θεολογικοῦ Συνεδρίου, Thessalonica, 1989, pp. 197-207.

LXIX
2. Eustathius’ terminology

Eustathius uses a specific terminology in his *Commentaries* to organise the comments on each Homeric verse and attract the attention of his reader. He uses the common practice to start an independent section with the word ὅτι and to finish it when the next ὅτι appears. The word is used at the beginning of a section to start a group of comments with a notional continuity and completeness. Usually the comments on a Homeric verse include many small sections starting with ὅτι. In order to draw the attention of the reader, Eustathius uses the words ὅρω and σημειώσαι. The word ὅρω gives importance to the comment and the 2nd person singular imperative gives a sense of directness. The word σημειώσαι is usually used for supplementary or additional comments which have a secondary importance but are still useful. An important comment¹⁵⁹ is noted by the word ἵσθι (again a 2nd person singular imperative) or with the more impersonal verbal adjective ἵστεον.

A different kind of terminology is used when Eustathius wants to refer either to the poet himself or to one or some of his sources. The personal name is replaced by a terminus technicus (usually composed by an article and a word describing the specific category of work of the person implied, e.g. whether he is a poet, a grammarian or a scholiast etc.).¹⁶⁰ Eustathius describes how this system of terminology works for the term ὁ ποιητής¹⁶¹ (which refers to Homer):

[...] “so the one who writes in this way is a poet, whether a comic poet or any other but above all Homer. As when someone says “the orator”, Demosthenes is understood above all, and if we hear about “the lyric poet” we refer to Pindar, so someone hearing “the poet” with the article he thinks of Homer. Why? Because in him there is the virtue of every poetry and because like a seed he became the beginning and the leader for everyone to be poets, as they are called.”¹⁶²

¹⁵⁹ The terminology used with ἵσθι and ἵστεον is standard; however, if we take into account that Eustathius addressed his pupils, these terms become a part of his didactic way of writing.

¹⁶⁰ Of course this kind of terminology has been used before Eustathius by the Homeric scholia and other ancient writers (like Heracleius or Porphyrius) but Eustathius seems to largely appreciate this way of referring since he expands it to almost all his common sources.

¹⁶¹ On the term ὁ ποιητής and its usage see Harmon (1923), pp. 35-47.

¹⁶² Eust. ad II. 1.5.27-6.2: καὶ τοῖς καὶ ποιητής ὁ οὕτω γράφων, ὅποιος ἢν καὶ εἰς εἰτε κοιμικὸς εἴπε όσιοσοιν ἔτεος, ἢς ἵστεον ὕψη ὅμηρος, ὡς γάρ, εἰ τις εἴπῃ ὁ ῥήτωρ, ὁ Δημοσθένες εἴθες.
I will now examine the termini technici used by Eustathius in the *Commentary on the Odyssey* (the examination includes a sample of text from chapters 1379 - 1397) and I will try to draw some conclusions on the correspondence between the term used and the writers implied.

Apart from the term ὁ ποιητής (=the poet) referring to Homer which is the most common,163 Eustathius uses ὁ λυρικός (=the lyric poet) for Pindar,164 ὁ γεωγράφος (=the geographer) for Strabo,165 ὁ κομικός (=the comic poet) for Aristophanes,166 ὁ δειπνοσοφιστής (=the deipnosophist) for Athenaeus,167 ὁ περιηγητής (=the explorer) for Pausanias.168 This characteristic way of introduction could be due to stylistic variety and to the development of a common “code” between Eustathius and his reader which flatters the latter and makes him feel more comfortable with the text.

The term οἱ παλαιότ (=the old scholiasts) in Eustathius usually indicates the Homeric scholiasts,169 however, as Van der Valk has shown,170 it seems that in Eustathius the term has a broader meaning since it is also used in some instances to refer to the *Etymologicum Magnum*, the *Suda*, Stephanus Byz. or even Strabo. This is confirmed by the passages checked by me in the *Commentary on the Odyssey*.171

In a single case, Eustathius mentions the term οἱ ἀκριβεστέροι τῶν παλαιῶν172 (=the most precise of the older scholiasts) for those who say that ἰπέρ μόρον should be written as one word and the accent should be in the antepenult: the answer for the identification of the term οἱ ἀκριβεστέροι τῶν παλαιῶν is given by the A-scholia

---

163 It is repeated 70 times in the aforementioned passage whilst Homer is mentioned by name only 19 times.
164 Eust. ad Od. 1.3.37 (=6.8 Makr.).
165 Eust. ad Od. 1.5.18 (=8.29 Makr.), 12.8 (=21.25 Makr.), 12.28 (=22.16 Makr.), 17.20 (=32.1 Makr.).
167 Eust. ad Od. 1.16.18 (=30.1 Makr.), 18.25 (=34.4 Makr.), 19.42 (=36.24 Makr.).
168 Eust. ad Od. 1.14.18 (=26.5 Makr.).
169 Although in Tzetzes it was used to indicate the scholiasts on Aristophanes (cf. Valk (1971-87), vol. II, p. XLI, n. 6).
171 In Eust. ad Od. 1.10.3 (=17.24 Makr.) (in which he uses *Suda*), 1.14.4 (=25.17 Makr.) (in which he mentions generally παρὰ τοῖς παλαιοῖς and then he cites Herodian citing Pherikydes—and the term indicates Xenomedes), 1.24.25 (=45.18 Makr.) (the term is used for Photius and Hesychius), 1.24.35 (=45.31 Makr.) (again used for Hesychius).
(cited also by Herodian), which give us the name of Aristophanes for ἰπέρμορον and the name of Ptolemy Ascalonites who uses ἰπέρμορα (instead of the adverb ἰπέρμορος). Although again the term οἱ ἀκριβέστεροι is ambiguous, there is a similar use of the term in the *Commentary on the Iliad* in which Eustathius may refer to A-scholia. Consequently, the term was used for Homeric scholia (possibly for the A-scholia) but also in some other cases it is more ambiguous and it is used in a more general way. Alternatively, Eustathius refers to the scholia by the terms νεότεροι, σχόλια, σχολιασται but these terms do not appear in the examined passage.

A term that Eustathius usually uses of commentators is οἱ ὑπομνηματισται which occurs twice in the examined passage. The term οἱ μεθ᾽ Ὄμηρον is used by Eustathius in a general way to refer to authors who wrote after Homer; here it is used in I.4.37 (=7.29 Makr.) to quote Athenaeus and also in I.9.26 (=16.24 Makr.) and 22.28 (=42.3 Makr.).

The *Commentary on the Odyssey* starts with the term (πικροὶ λογισται). The definition of λογιστής (=auditor) is given by Eustathius elsewhere; the word is a synonym to ὁ γραμματεύς and it usually refers to a secretary or someone who announces something by letters. The term is not common, however, here my claim is that Eustathius recalls Greg. Naz. 38, p. 328.1.

---

173 Sch. A ad II. 20.30 (also in Hdn. III.2.112.9-11, 18-22) ἰπέρ μόρον: Ἀριστοφάνης ὡς ἰπέρμορος, ἐν μέρος λόγου ποιόν καὶ οἱ Ἀσκαλανίτης, ἐπεὶ ἀντὶ ἑπαρχήματος τοῦ ἰπέρμορος παρεῖλθηται, ὀμοίως πληθυντικῷ τῷ ἐνθα κεν Ἀργείουν ἰπέρμορα νόστος".
176 Cf. Van der Valk (1949), p. 111, where it is noted that the reference to the νεότεροι is characteristic of Aristarch (on the use of νεότεροι cf. also A. Severyns ByZ XXX 88.)
177 Eust. ad II. 1.414.12, 443.1, 564.16 etc.
178 Eust. ad II. 1.403.16, 411.28, 512.19, 528.6, 539.7, 553.5, 561.29, 576.16 etc.
179 Eust. ad Od. 1.4.16 (=7.1 Makr.), 28.22 (=53.13 Makr.), on the word ὑπομνῆμα and its use by Eust. cf. Gallo (1977), pp. 44ff.
180 The sense of πικρός is also found in Eust. ad II. 1.700.1 (ο ἵππος λογιστεί ὁ κοιμικός); cf. also I.52.19 (οἱ στροφοὶ λογισται) in which Eustathius refers to the opinion of the severe critics of his age on a metrical subject (cf. also Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. I, p. CXXCIV).
181 Eust. ad Od. 1.289.3-4: μνῆμοι δὲ φόρτοι, ὁ γραμματεύς ήτοι ἀποσπασματορ διὰ γραμμάτων, ἤ καὶ ἄλλοις λογιστής.
182 Although Eupolis used it cf. fr. 239 δόροις λογισται τῶν ὑπερήφανων χορῶν (cited by Deinarohs and Harpodration).
183 Greg. Naz. 38, p. 328.1: πρὸς ταῦτα τί φασιν ἢμιν οἱ συκοφάνται, οἱ πικροὶ τῆς θεώτητος λογισται... cf. also Max. Tyg. 5.7f. (λογιστής...πικρός) and Philostr. Vit. Soph. 1512 (ἔπατος...εὐλογιστεῖσι πικρός καὶ διεστρέφως).
Eustathius indicates the grammarians with the term οἱ τεχνικοὶ (= the grammarians) which in our passage is used twice in a general way. In the majority of the cases the word is mostly used to refer to the work of Georgios Choeroboscus and Herodian; however, apart from these two writers the term also applies to Heraclides of Miletus, and the scholia on Dionysius Thrax. The term τεχνογράφοι (= those who use a kind of art in order to write) is used only in Eust. ad Od. 1.1.7 (= 1.8 Makr.) where it is a synonym for τεχνικοὶ.

The term ἡρτορικῶν λέξικον (= rhetorical lexicon) in Eustathius usually applies to the works of Aelius Dionysius and Pausanias but it also includes other lexica such as Photius' Lexicon and the Suda.

From the previous analysis, it is concluded that Eustathius is keen on using several terms replacing the actual name of his source either for reasons of stylistic variety or in order to develop the feeling of a common communicative code with his reader whom he considers to be as erudite as him.

---

185 Eust. ad Od. 1.2.2 (= 2.19 Makr.), 16.1 (= 29.8 Makr.).
186 Cf. Eust. ad II. 1.22.18, 72.15, 102.7 (ὁ τεχνικὸς Γεώργιος) or in I.101.3 (ὁ τεχνικὸς).
187 Cf. Eust. ad II. 1.23.6, or in I.580.16 (ὁ ἀπὸ τοὺς τεχνικοὺς τόν Ὕπροδιανόν). II.545.13, 346.2-3 (καὶ τὰ τέχνη τῶν τεχνικῶν), ad Od. I.107.32, 411.1, II.81.10.
188 Cf. Eust. I.46.13, II.362.16 (in which Heraclides is called τῆς παλαιᾶς τεχνικῆς).
190 The verb is used in Eust. ad II. II.345.18 (ὡς τεχνογράφει Ὕπροδιανός); on τεχνογράφει cf. n. 650.47f.
192 Eust. ad Od. 8.11 (= 14.10 Makr.).
193 Cf. Eust. ad Od. 1.13.24 (= 24.11 Makr.) (possibly from the Suda).
3. Allegory in Eustathius

i. The myths

Eustathius evaluates the importance of myths in Homeric art in the beginning of his *Commentary on the Iliad*. From Eustathius’ defence of Homer’s myths it seems that one of the main objections to Homeric poetry in this period was that it is full of myths with no historical content and that one may be in danger of failing to admire his poetry because it is full of myths.\(^{194}\)

The statement about the myths being the obstacle to admire Homer’s poetry is refuted by a series of arguments. Eustathius argues that “the Homeric myths do not provoke laughter but they are shadows or curtains of noble thoughts”.\(^{195}\) According to Christian beliefs of the time, myths are not events and they were made for no reason but to urge towards laughter; additionally, they are the essential core of comedies and they were invented by the pagans; Jesus narrated neither myths nor comedies, only parables which teach us in an allegorical way about religion and morality. Hence, according to this view, myths are a meaningless, paganistic invention or else lies with no other purpose than ridicule. Eustathius answers that Homeric myths are different: their aim is not laughter but to link our mind with noble ideas and virtue. It is possible that Eustathius’ conception of the myth as a way towards noble ideas is linked with Plato’s conception of myths as a pedagogical instrument. The Neoplatonists considered myths as a way which leads the human being closer to the divine\(^{196}\) and it is possible that Eustathius’ ἐννοιῶν εἰγενῶν σκιᾷ has a religious tone.

Additionally, in the phrase “shadows or curtains of noble ideas”, we find the introduction of the “hidden meaning” that the Homeric myths have, which is closely linked with allegorical interpretation. Eustathius gives us here his definition of a Homeric myth: in Homer a myth is a fiction that illustrates an important truth. For Eustathius, the real value of a myth is found in this “hidden meaning” that it expresses;\(^{197}\) the separation of truth and myth in a poetic work is a mistake because

---

\(^{194}\) *Eust. ad II. 1.2.13-4*: ἐι 8’, ὅτι μιθων γέμει, ἐκπίπτειν αὐτὸν κινδύνον ἔστι τοῦ θαμάζεσθαι.

\(^{195}\) *Eust. ad II. 1.2.14-5*: ἀλλὰ πρῶτον μὲν οὐ πρὸς γέλοια οὐ Ὀμηρικοὶ μὲν ἀλλὰ ἐννοιῶν εἰγενῶν σκιᾷ εἰσιν ἀπαραπετασματα.

\(^{196}\) *Buffière* (1956), p. 37.

\(^{197}\) On those who support the idea that the real value of a myth is in the truth that it expresses and not in the image that surrounds this myth, cf. *Buffière* (1956), p. 33.
the purpose of poetry is by definition to narrate the story mixed with myths.\textsuperscript{198} This is the way the audience can reach the feelings of Ἑδωνή and ἠκαληνίς. On the other hand, the mixture of truth and lies must be in the appropriate measure.

A typical example of the Homeric mixture of truth and lies is the story of Odysseus' wanderings. For Eustathius, the core of the story is without doubt true since it is proved by a number of "historical" factors.\textsuperscript{199} "historical" persons (like Latinos orAuson), real places like the city called Οἰδίπεδα in Iberia or the existence of a cult in the Italian city of Temese in honour of one of Odysseus' companions. All these prove for Eustathius the "historical" character of Odysseus' wanderings.\textsuperscript{200} Eustathius believes that the same formula of expanding and mixing the truth with lies is also used by Homer for the stories of Aeolus, the Cimmerians, the Laistrygones and Calypso. The mythic admixture consists in two ways:

1. Geographical removal of the stories from one place to another (in this case he gives the examples of the shifting by Homer of the Cimmerians who according to him are a real northern nation to Hades or the transfer of Calypso's island to Ocean).

2. Expansion of the characteristics of the story towards a "paradoxical" narration which sometimes reaches exaggeration (in the case of the Laistrygones whose savageness is transformed by the poet into cannibalism or Aeolos who from a craftsman able to sail became the master of winds).

In Eustathius' mind myth and truth are mixed to create good poetry but their purpose is separate: the purpose of the story is didactic in contrast to the myths which exist to entertain.\textsuperscript{201} Eustathius applies the combination of didactics and entertainment in his own work; in Eustathius' text, the word "myth" is repeated and the mythological stories (in most cases the less popular ones) are mentioned in order to enrich his comments\textsuperscript{202} or to justify a note on a word.\textsuperscript{203}

\textsuperscript{198} Eustathius conceives the word ἱστορία as the historical part of the story (or else the truth) whilst the word μιθος represents the total of lies that are mixed with the story.

\textsuperscript{199} Cf. Eust. \textit{ad Od.} 1.1.14ff. (=1.17 Makr.).

\textsuperscript{200} It is useful to note that this is close to a Herodotean or Thucydidean approach of the term "history".

\textsuperscript{201} Eust. \textit{ad Od.} 1.1.21ff. (=1.26f. Makr.): καὶ τὰ μὲν διδάσκον, τὰ δὲ ἐκπλήσσειν ἢ καὶ πράξασθαι.

Eustathius divides myths into the following categories:

A. According to their creator and their content:

1. Firstly, there are the myths which “are made by the poet himself on the subject matter and which are allegorized according to it in an appropriate way (by the poet himself)”

2. Then there are those which are made by older poets and are recalled by him into a way useful to his poetry, their allegory is not found always related to the subject of the Trojan war but they are written in riddles from the beginning by those who made them.

B. According to their treatment

1. There are the myths which are unmixed and impossible to treat and hence are only considered for what they bring to light.

2. There are those which can have an allegorical explanation.

According to Eustathius, myths in Homer’s narrative represent an external seductive veil to attract people to a truth through pleasant stories in order to make them wiser. In this way, Homer achieves a double goal: he establishes methods in order to create myths (μεθοδευτής οὗτος τῆς τῶν μύθων πιθανῆς πλάσεως) and at the same time, he leads those who love learning both to poetry and to all other kinds of literature (καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἔδωκν τοῦ λόγου, καθηγήσεται).

In conclusion Eustathius finds it admirable that although Homer is full of myths, one loves his poetry. It is in this way that Eustathius reaches his goal to prove that

---

203 Cf. Eust. ad Od. I.6.23ff. (=10.32ff. Makr.) where together with the explanation of the word πλάσμας Eust. finds the chance to narrate the story of Mætras’ beast (taken from Ath. Deipn. I.35.1ff.). Eust. uses the story in order to give an example of the word πλάσμα meaning someone who possessed the art of delusion. The same technique is used in Eust. ad Od. I.13.3ff. (=23.11ff. Makr.), where together with the note on the word κατακόμβη Eust. cites Paphlagon’s story.

204 Eust. ad II. I.15–6: οὐ μὲν ἡπ’ αὐτοῦ πλαστόμενοι πρὸς τά ἐποκείμενα, οὐ καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸ ὀφειλόμενος ἀλληγοροῦντα, ad Od. I.11.6f. (=1.7f. Makr.); ...τοὺς δὲ καὶ αὐτοὺς προσαναπλάττονται.

205 Eust. ad II. I.12.17-9: πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ ἐν τῶν παλαιῶν μὲν τοιούτω χρησίμως καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦτον ποίησιν, γιὰ τὴν ἀλληγορίαν ὧν πάντως πρὸς τὰ Τροικά, ἀλλὰ ἔτσι ἐν αὐτῆν ἄρχῃ ἁντίστατο τοιούτω πλασματίζοντα, ad Od. I.1.6 (=1.7 Makr.); ὅτι τοὺς μὲν ὑπ’ ἄλλων δὴς πλασμόντως ἀναλέγονται...

206 Eust. ad II. I.3.20: ἵνα ἡ πρὸς τοὺς μὲν ἀκράτους καὶ ἀθεραπευτοὺς καὶ κατὰ μόνον ἑαυτούς ἐν πρὸς τοὺς προσφερόμενον...

207 Eust. ad II. I.3.21: τοὺς δὲ καὶ μετὰ θεραπείας ἀλληγορίας...

208 Eust. ad II. I.2.21ff.
Homeric poetry is useful and people should read the books both written about and by him.
ii. The allegories

Eustathius believes that allegory is a way of explaining the pagan myths of the epics to the Christians of his era and for this reason he always tries to extract the underlying meaning which is hidden in the myths.\(^{209}\) The categorization of the myths by Eustathius into the ones that are not susceptible to allegorical interpretation (and hence are only narrated) and those which are explained in an allegorical way\(^ {210}\) shows the importance that allegory has in his mind\(^ {211}\) as a basic criterion of evaluating and explaining mythical narration. Allegory constitutes an essential part of Eustathius' interpretative method through all his work: for Eustathius, allegory is the means to reverse the Homeric process of writing in order to discover the hidden ideas and morals beneath the text.

Eustathius does not present his use of allegorical explanation as an innovation; on the contrary, he explicitly grounds it in the commentary tradition of the epics. The central position of the Homeric poems in Greek society meant that some aspects of the mythic narrative (especially the behaviour of the gods) raised moral problems from the archaic periods onward. Allegorizing was one way of dealing with this problem.

It has been observed\(^ {212}\) that allegorism is almost as old as Homer himself and constituted a part of a rationalizing process that began in 6\(^{th}\) and 5\(^{th}\) c. and led to the birth of philosophy, science and history. The first defenders of Homer against impiety are reported to be Theagenes of Rhegium (c. 525 b.C.)\(^ {213}\) and Pherecydes (c. 600 b.C.) who founded the physical or cosmological allegory in order to interpret the acts of gods and heroes by a natural process. However, the main defender against the

---

\(^{209}\) On this matter and on the words μυστηριασθε ἡμεῖς, μυστικός etc. which are repeated in Eustathius' work and show this obscurity cf. Van der Valk, (1971-87), vol. II, p. LXXVI.


\(^{211}\) Note the frequency of the word allegory in Eustathius work; in my text cf. Eust. ad Od. 1.7.38 (=13.17 Makk.), 8.16 (=14.16 Makk.), 9.5f. (=15.31 Makk.), 10.24 (=18.23 Makk.), 11.30f. (=20.30 Makk.), 14.1 (=25.13 Makk.), 15.4 (=27.16 Makk.), 17.9 (=31.18 Makk.), 17.24f. (=32.7 Makk.), 20.1 (=36.31 Makk.), 21.45 (=40.27 Makk.), 22.1 (=41.2 Makk.), 25.12 (=46.27 Makk.), 25.46 (=48.7 Makk.).


\(^{213}\) See also Lamberton (1986), p. 32.
accusations of impiety was the Stoic writer Heraclitus (1st century a.D.) with his work: *Homer’s allegories of the Gods.*

Eustathius belongs to this tradition of "Homeric apologetic." The moral problems presented by pagan myth are especially acute for a Christian (even more for an archbishop). For Eustathius however, allegorical interpretative strategy offered a way to achieve the salvation of a pagan, poetic text in a Christian society. In parallel with this effort, it is in his intention to describe already at the beginning of his *Commentary on the Iliad* all the trends of allegorical interpretation for the treatment of the Homeric myths and to declare his preference for a middle solution.

The wise interpreters of the *Iliad* (the expression ὁ σοφὸς τῆς Ἰλιάδος is ironic) explain everything by allegorical means. According to Eustathius, their mistake is not that they use allegory to interpret the mythical part of the story (μυθικόν) but that they do the same for what is objectively accepted as historical (τὰ ὀμολογουμένα ἱστορούμενα). He objects to the absolute nature of their position which ignores the human nature of the poet.

The opposite view, equally problematic according to Eustathius, identifies itself with the analysis of "what is apparent" (τῶν φανομένων) in other words of the "surface" of the poems leaving nothing to be allegorized by the poet. This position reaches the other extreme: both the myths and the historical elements must stay intact from allegory (οὐδ' ἀλλὰς ἀφήνων ἀλληλογορεῖσθαι παρ' αὐτῷ). The most important supporter of this position is Aristarchus who is the only predecessor Eustathius names when talking about allegorical interpretation and its absence and with whom he clearly disagrees.

After the two opposite views comes the middle position which Eustathius describes in the most flattering way and which is the most interesting for us, since it

216 Eust. ad II. 1.4.11ff.
217 Eustathius gives the examples of Agamemnon, Achilles, Nestor, Odysseus and the rest of the heroes whom he considers as historical persons.
218 Eust. ad II. 1.4.11-17.
219 On the Aristarchean view on allegory cf. sch. D ad II. 5.385 (... Ἀριστοράχος ἁξιόθα "τὰ φανομένα τοῦ ποιητοῦ μυθικότερον ἐκδέχεσθαι κατὰ ποιητικῆς ἐξωτικῆς ὑποθέσεως, μὴ γὰρ ἐξω τῶν φανομένων τοῦ ποιητοῦ περιεργαζομένως"); cf. also Eust. ad II. 1.65.22-9 where Eust. explains Aristarchus' method.
220 Eust. ad II. 1.4.17-23.
221 Eust. ad II. 1.4.23.32.
is the model for his own interpretation; the most precise commentators (οἱ δὲ ἀκριβεστέροι) follow a combination of the previous extremes: their main concern is to keep the historical parts of the story intact. As for the myths, first they narrate them as they are and then they approach their creation (πλάσιν) trying to identify the possibility of truth (πιθανότητα) in them. These commentators know that by definition myths consist of fictions but they explain them allegorically according to three different ways:

1. By examining them from a natural point of view (φυσικὸς)
2. By examining their moral value (κατὰ ἡθος)
3. By examining them from a historical point of view (ἰστορικὸς)

After following the rejection by Eustathius of the two extreme ways of interpreting allegorical explanation, we are now confronted with an interesting point: the identification of the different kinds of allegorical interpretation that the most precise commentators use and that he also follows.

In the first case the word φυσικὸς appears to indicate an analysis which interprets myth and its components either by representation of physical elements or with reference to nature or natural phenomena. The term φυσικὸς is closely related with the term φυσιολογία that Eustathius uses for this kind of allegories. In the second case, the examination is focused on the moral value of the allegory, in other words it deals with allegories conveying a moral lesson. Finally in the third case, we have the allegorical interpretation which is based on “historical” analysis. This kind of examination identifies an illusion of reality which convinces the readers of the historical existence of heroes or deities included in the allegory. Many times this kind of interpretation involves a process of rationalization (for which Eustathius was influenced by Palaiphatus).

Each one of these approaches is essential for Eustathius’ larger interpretative strategy because of some specific and predefined purposes that are always present in

---

222 The characterization shows personal preference.
224 Cf. Eust. ad II. II.82.4 (ἀλληγορίαν ἡμικήν), 97.2-3 (παρὰ τοῖς ἀλληγοροῖσιν ἡμικός), 191.13 (ἐπὶ θεωροῦμεν ταῦτα αὐτοὶ), (ἡ πρὸς ἡσυχ ἀλληγορία), III.721.7 (κατὰ ἀλληγορίαν ἡμικήν).
225 For some examples of “historical” heroes and deities according to Eustathius, cf. Eust. ad Od. 1.1.25ff. on Aiolos, Calypso etc.
his mind and are linked with the general purposes of his *Commentaries*: to clarify the
Homerian text, to show its moral didactics and at the same time to present its real value
to his Christian readers. An analysis based on allegorization in combination with
natural phenomena (physical or natural allegory) clarifies the text, interprets difficult
passages in a scientifically logical way and increases the appreciation of the reader of
Eustathius’ erudition. Furthermore, an analysis which draws lessons from the moral
allegories serves to prove both the didactic value and the moral values (largely
appreciated in Eustathius’ era) that the reading of the Homeric epics can offer.
Finally, the explanation of “historical” allegories with the help of rationalization
makes the epics more accessible and believable to the common reader. In all these
three kinds of allegorical interpretation, Eustathius’ strong linguistic background
provides his commentaries with the etymological analysis which establishes links
between names of Homeric characters and abstract ideas.\(^{227}\)

In the introduction of the *Commentary on the Odyssey*, there is no special
reference to the use of allegory as an interpretative tool (probably in order to avoid
repetition) but Eustathius follows the same patterns of allegorical explanation and this
is proved by the examination of the most important passages of allegorical
interpretation.

We may begin by referring to a passage explaining a natural allegory concerning
Odysseus: in the beginning of his *Commentary*, Eustathius notes the allegory in the
episode of the Cattle of the Sun but he does not proceed to any interpretation. He
promises to analyze the symbolic character of the oxen and generally the whole
allegory later on in his work, in the passage about Thrinakia.\(^{228}\)

His linear method of exegesis prevents him from discussing the allegory at this
point but it is significant that he feels it necessary to mention it in advance even
without details. However, he is consistent in treating this allegory later on: the line
εἰρήσεται δὲ προϊον ὁ λόγος refers to Eust. *ad Od.* I.18.15 ff. where he follows
scholia Q.Vind. 56 on *Od.* 12.129\(^{229}\) citing Aristotle’s explanation of the allegory: the
cattle represents the days of the lunar calendar whose number is 350 identified as the

\(^{227}\) This idea is connected with later Stoic and Platonic views on etymology. see Lamberton (1986), p.
45: for an example of how etymological analysis influences Eustathius’ allegorical interpretation cf.
Amory (1966), pp. 3-57.

\(^{228}\) Eust. *ad Od.* I.7.38-9 (=13.16 Makr.) (τίνες δὲ οἳ τοῦ Ἡλίου βόες καὶ τίς ἢ τοῦ λόγου τούτου
ἀλληγορία, εἰρήσεται δὲ προϊον ὁ λόγος, ἐν Θρινακίᾳ ταῖς τοιούταις ἐντύχει βοώσι).

\(^{229}\) Sch. Q.Vind. 56 *ad Od.* 12.129: Ἀριστοτέλης φυσικός τὰς κατὰ σελήνην ἡμέρας αὐτῶν λέγειν
σφή την ἀποθέουσι άρωμαν ἐκπλασιασάς εἰς τον τριακοστὸν πεντηκοστὸν
περιεστάναι εἰρήσεις.
result of the multiplication of 7 herds by 50 animals each. And he adds that the reason they have neither birth nor end is to show the unchangeable character of the days. When Eustathius cites the Homeric verse about Phaethousa and Lampetia (the shepherdesses of the cattle), he inevitably includes the word ἑκατον, however, when later on he explains the allegorization concerning them, he carefully avoids the word and describes them as the powers or the days of the Sun which govern the time of our daily life. Eustathius’ Christian beliefs prevented him from considering Phaethousa and Lampetia as goddesses. The same applies to the mother of these powers, Neaira, who symbolizes the Sun’s young, strong movement possibly for religious reasons, Eustathius avoids commenting on the Homeric adjective δωρο attributed to her.

Consequently, according to Eustathius, when the poet narrates that Odysseus’ companions have killed the cattle of the Sun, he refers to them wasting valuable time on the island. Eustathius’ own addition is that the poet aims to underline the contrast between the companions’ waste of time and the appropriate use of this time by wise Odysseus.

Additionally, Eustathius cites another allegorical explanation for the cattle of the Sun attributed to the ancients (οἱ παλαιοί) (here the reference comes from the D-scholia and is also found in Heraclit. Paradox). This view identifies the oxen of the Sun with the workers (ἐργάται). However, this explanation is only mentioned cursorily and not analyzed which probably shows that it did not particularly interest Eustathius. The possible purpose of mentioning this explanation is for Eustathius to

230 Od. 12.130-1.
231 Od. 1.131-2.
232 Eust. ad Od. II.18.27-8.
233 Eust. ad Od. II.18.36-7 (Φαθόουςα δὲ καὶ Λαμπητία, αἱ κατὰ τὸν Ἡλίουν δυνάμεις ἢ ἡμέραι αἱ τὸν καθ’ ἡμᾶς βιον ὑπὸ χρόνον ἄντα ποιμαίνονσαι).
234 Eust. ad Od. II.18.29 (δὲ ἔτεκεν Ἡλίῳ Νέαιρᾳ, ἡ ἄει νεάζουσα ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἄκμαία κίνησις).
235 Eust. ad Od. II.18.29-31; cf. also sch. D E J ad Od. 1.8 (...ἀλληλοωρικῶς δὲ υἱὸς Ἡλίου τῆς ἡμέρας νοεῖ, δὲ οἱ τῷ Ὀδύσσεως ἔμοι χακάς διεβιβάζον, ἵστερον δὲ θελήσαντες ὑποστρέφεται πρὸς τὰς οἰκίας αὐτῶν χειμῶνος γεγονότος πολλοὶ τῷ τῆς θαλάσσης κύματι κατεκτάθησαν); cf. also sch. B ad Od. 12.353 (...ἡ λέγεσσιν ἀλληλοωρικῶς υἱὸς Ἡλίου τῆς ἡμέρας, τούτων δὲ καταναλωσάντων ἐκεῖσε τὰς πρὸς τὸν πλαίν ἐπιτηδείας ἡμέρας καὶ μὴ ἐξελθόντων, δεῖ ἂν ἐνδοχόντων, ἐπέσαν ἄτινα ἐπάθει).
236 Eust. ad Od. II.18.31-2 (Ὁδύσσεως δὲ ἄει σποιδίας ἃν παρευλάξατο αὐτὸς ἐς φιλοσόφῳ ἐπέπεπε).
cite some important sources (such as D-scholia) analyzing the symbol of the ox and
to show his erudition.

According to Eustathius,⁵³⁹ Cyclops and his parents are the components of an
allegory involving natural forces and they can be interpreted in two different ways
(which are both mostly based on etymological analysis):

Cyclops is the symbol of anger⁵⁴⁰ and hence it is natural that Poseidon who
represents the wetness and the wildness of the sea is his father. The logical link
between Poseidon (the god of the sea) and anger (the boiling of bloody moisture) is
the liquid element. The view of anger linked with the boiling of the blood of the heart
is already found in Aristotle.⁵⁺¹ Eustathius paraphrases the scholia⁵⁺² by mentioning
that “anger is the boil of bloody moisture”⁵⁺³ and then he cites verbatim from them.⁵⁺⁴

His mother is Thoosa⁵⁺⁵ whose name etymologically comes from θοος which can
mean both “acid” (=δέξις) and “fast” (=ταχύς). In the first case, Thoosa, according to
Eustathius, represents the acidity existing in anger. In this case, the etymological link
between Thoosa and θοος=δέξις belongs to Eustathius but the etymology θοος=δέξις
is found both in the D and T scholia.⁵⁺⁶ In the second case, Thoosa represents the
rapidity which is the characteristic of the actions of angry people; again the link
between Thoosa and θοος=ταχύς belongs to Eustathius but the etymology is found in
the D-scholia.⁵⁺⁷ In conclusion, Eustathius accepts the double etymology of θοος that
he finds in the D-scholia and creates a double etymological link between Thoosa and
θοος either meaning acid or fast.

⁵³⁹ Eust. ad Od. 1.21.44ff. (=40.26ff. Makr.).
⁵⁴⁰ Cf. also Eust. ad Od. 1.332.3ff.
⁵⁺¹ Aristol. de An. 403a.31 (…ολον ὄργη τι ἔστιν: ὁ μὲν γὰρ ὅρεξιν ἀντὶ λυπησάμενος ἢ τι τοιοῦτον, ὁ
δὲ ζέσιν τοῦ περὶ καρδιαν αἵματος καὶ θερμοῦ…), Prob. 869.a.5 (…καὶ γὰρ ὁ θυμὸς ζέσις τοῦ
θερμοῦ ἔστι τοῦ περὶ τὴν καρδίαν).
⁵⁺² Sch. A ad II. 9.256 (…θυμὸς γὰρ ἔστι, φησι, ζέσις τοῦ ἐν καρδίᾳ θερμοῦ…), 678 (…ἔνεπεθεν δὲ
καὶ ἀφίσαντο οἱ φιλόσοφοι "θυμὸς ἔστι ζέσις τοῦ περὶ καρδιάν αἵματος"), sch. A b T 18.110
(…θυμὸς ἔστι ζέσις τοῦ περὶ καρδιάν αἵματος…).
⁵⁺³ Eust. ad Od. 1.22.2-3 (=41.3 Makr.) (θυμὸς δὲ ζέσις ἔστιν αἵματρας ἅρποτης).
⁵⁺⁴ Eust. ad Od. 1.22.10ff. (=41.12f. Makr.) (…ἐν ἢ γίνεται ὁ θυμὸς, ζέσις δὲν τοῦ περὶ καρδιάν
αἵματος).
⁵⁺⁵ Od. 1.71, sch. T ad II. 34 (καὶ Πολυφήμον Θεόσης τῆς Φόρκλετος), sch. H M* V ad Od. 1.71
(Θεόσα: μήτηρ Πολυφήμου τοῦ Κύκλωτος κυρίας οὗτος λεγομένη).
⁵⁺⁶ Sch. D ad II. 1.12 (θούς: ταχείας σημαίνει δὲ καὶ δέξιας), T ad II. 10.394 (…θεόν δὲ τὸ δέξι…);
cf. also Hesych. θ 639, EM 450.16-7, 453.11.
⁵⁺⁷ Sch. D ad II. 1.12 op. cit., ad II. 1.300 (θούς παρά νησι παρά τῇ ταχείᾳ νῆσι); cf. also EM 453.10.
Thoosa’s father is Phorkys; Eustathius suggests that Thoosa is the daughter of Phorkys because someone who is extremely angry behaves like a dog (φέρεσθαι κυνηγόν). The link between someone who is angry and dog characteristics is also found elsewhere in the Iliad, as Eustathius remarks. However, the link between Thoosa’s relationship with Phorkys and the etymology of his name appears to belong to Eustathius (this view is also reinforced by the use of ἵσος which inserts a tone of uncertainty from Eustathius because he expresses a personal opinion). At this point, Eustathius takes the allegorical explanation further by adding some more elements from his own etymological study.

Eustathius explains that the mingling of Poseidon with Thoosa happening in hollow caves and Cyclops’ birth is identified with the creation of the feeling of anger. Anger is the boiling of the blood around the heart; the “hollow cave” represents the hollowness of the heart in which anger is born. As mentioned above, the conception of anger being the boiling of the blood around the heart already exists in Aristotle and Eustathius takes the explanation from A b T scholia; however, it is not clear whether the identification of the hollow cave with the hollowness of the heart is Eustathius’ own conception or a borrowing from an ancient source.

The second allegorical explanation derives the name Κύκλωψ from τὸ ἐν κύκλως ὀπτάνεσθαι and interprets Cyclops as the condition of heaven which is seen in circles (meaning the zodiac, the equatorial, the tropical circle etc.). The name “Thoosa” is etymologically derived from θοῦς = ταχύς (fast) but the link with the allegorical explanation is different: Thoosa represents the speed of the heavenly motion. In this second allegorical explanation, Eustathius gives to the name Phorkys a different etymology which I believe is his own, as in the rival explanation, he links it again with the verb φέρομαι but he specifically suggests that it comes from φορεῖν ὀξεία (rapid motions) and is linked with the speed of the heavenly motions. The

---

248 Od. 1.72; cf. also Sch. Y ad Od. 1.71 (ἦ Θώσα ἦν θυγάτηρ Φόρκυνος τινος ἀλλεσθεὶς).
249 Eust. ad Od. 1.22.6f. (=41.7f. Makr.) (Φόρκυνος δὲ θυγάτηρ ἡ τοιαύτη Θώσα, ἵσος διὰ τὸ φέρεσθαι κυνηγόν τὸν ἄγαν παροξυνόντα). It is obvious that Eustathius draws an etymological link between the name Φόρκυς and the explanation φέρεσθαι κυνηγόν (to behave like a dog). The word κυνηγόν is also found in Soph. (fr. 722.1) and Ar. Eq. 1033 and Nub. 491.
250 Eust. ad Od. 1.22.7f. (=41.8f. Makr.) (ὅτι καὶ ἐν Ἰλιάδι "κυνώπα" τίνα λέγει θυμομενον ὁ ποιητὴς καὶ "κυνοὺς ὀμματα" ἔχειν φορεῖ καὶ "κύνεον" ἀποκαλεῖ).
251 Eust. ad Od. 1.22.8f. (=41.10ff. Makr.) (τὸ δὲ ἐν σπηλαιοις γλαφυροῖς τῷ Ποσειδόνι τὴν Θώσαν μηνυμένην γεννῶν τὸν Κύκλωπα" οὐδὲν ἄλλον ἂν τῇ τοῦ θυμοῦ γένεσιν δήλου, ἢν λέγῃ τὴν τῆς καρδίας κυλίσματα "σπές γλαφυροῖς" ἐν ἂν γίνεται ο θυμός, ἕξις ἀν τοῦ περὶ καρδίαν ἀμάτος).
252 Eust. ad Od. 1.22.11f. (=41.13f. Makr.).
explanation of Thoosa’s mingling with Poseidon is also different: he represents the liquid element creating vapours which are the reason for the continuous motion of heaven. The defeat of Cyclops by wise Odysseus symbolizes the conquest of understanding heaven after reflection. However, Eustathius does not show any personal preference towards one of the explanations. Evidently, his aim is not to arrive at a single unambiguously correct reading but to open up possibilities for an approach to the text which is consistent with Christian belief and his educational goals.

An allegorical reading of the second (moralizing) kind is offered in relation to Athena’s statement that Odysseus wants to see even just the smoke rising from his land and then he is happy to die. Eustathius explains that there is an allegory behind the smoke that Odysseus wishes to see rising from Ithaca: the smoke symbolizes the rising but still dark element of the philosophical knowledge which is desirable to anyone who is disposed towards learning. Furthermore, the whole point here, according to Eustathius, is the compromise that is preferable for someone to do towards something imperfect, if it is not possible to reach perfection.

The figure of Athena is identified by Eustathius, as by many others, as a moral force, the symbol of wisdom (φρόνησις). In one case, she is the protector of a prudent hero, in another she represents Telemachus’ mind being unaware of whether by leaving Ithaca, he will discover any useful information about his father. In Od. 1.96-98, Eustathius sees all the characteristics of wisdom allegorized. The adjective ἀμβρόσια stands for the divine and the χρυσία for the bright characteristic of prudence. The rapidity of prudent thought is shown by the fact that Athena comes with the motion of the wind.

253 Od. 1.57-9.
254 Eust. ad Od. 1.20.1ff. (=36.31 Makr.).
255 Cf. for example Heraclit. All. 19.5ff., 28.1; the identification of Athena as a figure representing wisdom is probably Stoic, see Lambert (1986), p. 94.
256 Eust. ad Od. 1.16.28 (=30.13f. Makr.) (καὶ εἶς ταῦτα ἄνγεται ἡ φρόνησις Ἄθηνᾶ, τό ἀμβρόσιον ἀνθρώπου).
257 Cf. Eust. ad Od. 1.23.9f. (=43.5f. Makr.) (ὅτε τὸ τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν εἰς Τηλέμαχον κατελθεῖν ἐν θάνατι καὶ ἐποτελεῖν τὰ πνεύματα, τῆς τῆς φυσικῆς φρόνησιος ἐπιστήμην δῆλη), 1.25.11ff. (=47.26ff. Makr.) (οἱ γὰρ οὗτοι ἡ τῆς ἀληθείας, Ἀθηνᾶ οὐ παρὰ τῷ Τηλέμαχῳ, τῆς ἀμβρόσιας, μαθῆσαι περί τοῦ πατρὸς τὶ σαφές).
258 Cf. Eust. ad Od. 1.25.19ff. (=47.7ff. Makr.) (ὄντος δὲ δὲ τούτων ὁ πνεῦμα τὸ θεῖον καὶ λαμπρὸν καὶ ἀμβρόσιον τῆς φρόνησιος, τὸ θεῖον μὲν δὲ τοῦ ἀμβρόσιος ὡς παλλαξόν ἐφανεν, διὰ τοῦ ἀμβρόσιας ἑαυτοῦ οὐκ ἔχουσιν καὶ τῆς κατ’ ἀνεμον μορφῆς προΐς, διὰ τοῦ ἀμβρόσιος οὐκ ἔχουσιν καὶ τῆς κατ’ ἀνεμον μορφῆς προΐς τοῖς πρακτέοις (σπέρμα).
Of great interest to us because of its complexity is the case of Calypso for which Eustathius offers a choice between natural, historicizing and moral interpretation. In I.9.10 it is clear that Calypso is identified with the powers of nature (φύσικω δυνάμεις) through which the fruit will come after some time. However, Eustathius explains in a detailed way the ancient views about Calypso as a historical figure: he draws information from ὕι σχολία and says that she was a queen and she ruled in an island, cited by the geographers, however, the “ancient commentators” do not elaborate this information much since it does not offer important results.

The allegorical interpretation of Calypso is divided in two views: the “ancient commentators” see a moral allegory behind Calypso: she symbolizes the human body which covers like a sheath the “pearl” of the soul (as in the case of the smoke of Ithaca, Eustathius uses a metaphor again in order to clarify the allegory). Thereupon, she “concealed” wise Odysseus, since he was a human being wearing his flesh. Calypso’s sea-girt island is identified by Eustathius with Odysseus’ liquid body. The idea of the body subject to inflow and outflow which is full of passions is Platonic. Furthermore, it is interesting to note that Eustathius draws here an iconic parallel between the sea-girt island which is the navel of the sea and the liquid body which is full of passions concentrated all around the belly and the navel.

Eustathius then adds that this is the reason for Odysseus not being able to be released from Calypso in an easy way since she is φιλάκοςτος (it is obvious that he draws a link between the human body and the love for life). It is Hermes (the representation of logic) who will release Odysseus from his body and remind him of the world of philosophy, the intelligible world (symbolised by his country and Penelope). Again Eustathius finds here Platonic allusions in the idea of the intelligible world being the real country of souls. So according to this explanation, Odysseus finds himself between two worlds: the material world of the body with its passions and its love for life and the spiritual world, the world of the knowledge and

259 Eust. ad Od. 1.17.7ff. (31.15ff. Makr.).
260 Sch. ὕι ad Od. 1.55 (Καλυπσίω νοησις πραγματικός γιναϊκα τινα βασιλισσαν...).
261 Str. 2.3.6.6-9 (citing Plat. Tim. 24d4-25d6).
262 On Calypso the “Concealer” and her mythical role in the poem see Clarke (1981), p. 85.
263 Eustathius cites Plato’s idea of the body subject to inflow and outflow (cf. Plat. Tim. 43.α.5-6: ...τας της ἀθάνατος νησιω της περιοδικης ενδοιαν εις επηρεατον συμα και απηρεατον); cf. also Porph. Antr. 10.8ff., 34.6ff.
264 The notion of the source of the body attributed to Calypso is again found in Eust. ad Od. 1.19.19 (=35.26ff. Makr.)(της δε ἀναγομενης εις φιλοτοιαν συματικην Καλυπσίως...).
265 It is possible he refers to Olymp. In Plat. Aec. comm. 94.22 (πατηρ γαρ ἡμων και πατρις ἀληθες ἀνω μονον τατιν).
wisdom. The first one is symbolised by Calypso, the second by Penelope. With the intervention of _logos_ (=Hermes), Odysseus is released from his body and travels towards the spiritual world of Penelope.\(^{266}\)

In order to analyze the second allegorical explanation,\(^{267}\) Eustathius refers to Atlas who is Calypso’s father and his relation with her. He distinguishes two different views on what Atlas symbolizes:

Firstly, he is identified with the tireless providence (πρόνοια), a moral power which is the reason for everything. This connection derives from the etymological explanation of the adjective ὀλοκληρός as the one who thinks of everything (τὰ ἵππερ ὄλων φρονοῦντα). The etymological explanation is given from the H K M\(^4\) scholia\(^{268}\) and is used by Eustathius to proceed to the identification of Atlas with providence.

On the other hand, there is a second view which combines the natural phenomena with the moral powers in Atlas’ allegory, which interests Eustathius more since it is closely connected with the second allegorical explanation for Calypso: Atlas is the imaginary axis which passes through the centre of the earth and the two poles. According to Eustathius, the identification is linked with Aratos\(^{269}\) who also supports the idea that all around this axis the total of heaven is gathered, giving cohesion to the universe. Calypso is the science which is linked with the high notion and the knowledge of this axis; this science was created in order to study heaven which gathers, contains and keeps everything together through this axis. Consequently, according to Buffière,\(^{270}\) because of this relation with Atlas, Calypso is identified with astronomy and astrology and hence, she is related to Odysseus who is the wise man who occupies himself with the stars. Eustathius calls Odysseus ἀποτελεσματικός φιλόσοφος (=someone who is wise on astrology) in order to emphasize this kind of relationship.

---

\(^{266}\) On Odysseus the philosopher and the denial of the flesh cf. Lamberton (1986). p. 42; on this Neoplatonic way of presenting Odysseus and his adventures see Clarke (1981), p. 83.

\(^{267}\) Eust. _ad Od._ 1.17.23ff. (=32.4ff. Makr.).

\(^{268}\) Sch. _H K M\(^4\) ad Od._ 1.52 (ἐλοκληρός; ἑκλινθές διασώνει τοῦ [μάρ] περὶ τῶν ὄλων φρονοῦντος ἰδιὸν ούτες εἰρήνεια...).

\(^{269}\) Arat. _Exc._ var. 56.3 (φαινει δὴ τὸν ἄξονα τούτον εἶναι τὸν παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ Ἀτλαντα ἐιρήμενον); Arat. _Phaen._ 1.2-5 (ἀξονικ αἰνι ἀρπασκοι δε ἀτάλαντον ἀπάντη μετασκευής γαῖαν, περὶ δὲ ὀφελον αὐτῶς ἄγινε καὶ μνε περαινοι διὰ πόλοι ὁμοτρέϕον άλλοι ού μνε σύκ εἰπότος, ο δ' αντίος οἰκ δοράς μεθέν ὀκεανοῦ). Note that the etymological relation of the word ἀτάλαντον (‘equal in weight’) with Atlas certainly attracted Eustathius’ attention for this passage.

The opposite of the astrological knowledge is the kind of wisdom that Penelope represents identified by Eustathius with the methodical and logical wisdom towards which Odysseus wants to return and without which it is not possible to think in a philosophical way. The word here means “systematic” and Eustathius uses the word as a philosophical term. The word is usually used as a grammatical term by Eustathius but it can also have a philosophical meaning: it means “logical” (the term is “the equivalent of Logic in Epicurean philosophy, LSJ s.v.). In this passage, these two terms are selected by Eustathius’ grammatical and rhetorical vocabulary to be used in a philosophical way in order to describe the kind of normative wisdom that Penelope represents as the final purpose of Odysseus’ (the philosopher) trip.

Another example of combination of different kinds of allegorical explanations is the figure of Zeus. Eustathius states that Zeus is interpreted in a multiple allegorical way: firstly, the moral allegory behind Zeus is that he symbolizes either destiny (or mind) (either human or generally the mind of the world); the natural way for allegorizing wants him to represent heaven, aether or simply air or even the sun.

The myth of the building of Troy by Poseidon and Apollo also can be interpreted, according to Eustathius, in an allegorical way. He interprets as = built by god). The interpretation is taken from the scholia.

---

271 Eust. ad Od. 1.17.40ff. (=32.27ff. Makr.) (pothei de, ἵπτη μάλιστα καὶ τὴν μεθοδικὴν καὶ κανονικὴν φιλοσοφίαν. ἥν ἔστω ὑπὸ τοῦ νομοδίκου ὑφαρμός, εἰς ταῦτα ἥθει καὶ εἰς ἑκείνην ἐπανακαμπτέσθαι γίγνεται ἵπτη χειρὶ σῶς ἵπτῃ φιλοσοφίᾳ, διὶ δὲ τοιαύτῃ τις ἢ Πενελόπη, δήλων ἔσται ὅτι τὸν ἱπτῆν θεωρήσῃς τὸν ἣν σιτῆς ἦμιφορόμενον τῇ καὶ σιτῆς ἀναλομένων).


274 Cf. Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. II, p. XVIII.


277 Note that the use of the saves Eustathius from mentioning the two gods in plural and it is a part of his general religious strategy influenced by 

278 Cf. sch. D E H M Q T V a ad Od. 1.2 (ἱπτην πολιομερον, καὶ τὸ τὴν ἐκτίσθαι ὅποι Ἰβην...), sch. Y ad Od. 1.2 (ιπτην πολιομερον, διὶ καὶ τούτῳ ἐκτισθαν...).
Then, Eustathius paraphrases an unknown fragment of Palaephatus’ logical and “historical” explanation of the myth which suggests that Troy is said to be sacred or built by Gods because the treasures of Poseidon and Apollo were spent by Laomedon on the building of the city of Ilion. Eustathius cites a natural explanation of the passage: they have supported the view that the myth has applied the general rule to every building in the specific case of Troy; in other words, in every building there is the need of Poseidon who represents the wetness which will make earth or clay to join the stones together and of Apollo who symbolizes the heat of the sun which makes the building more concrete. Hence, the myth has also applied the general rule on the case of Troy.

279 Cf. Eust. ad Od. 1.6.34ff. (=11.13ff. Makr.) (θεραπεία δὲ τοῦ μίθου κατὰ Παλαίφατον, ὅτι κεκάμηλα Ποσειδώνος τὸ καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος, ἐλαυνικομόν τῆς Ἰλιοῦ ἀπὸ Δαομέδοντος διδασκάνοντος. διὸ δοκοῦσα τρόπον εὐκαταλείπει ὁ Ποσειδών καὶ ὁ Ἀπόλλων εἰς τὰ τῆς Ἰλιοῦ κτισμάτα).

280 Cf. Eust. ad Od. 1.6.36ff. (=11.16ff. Makr.) (τινὲς δὲ οὖσαι δὲ ἀπείρον τὸ κοινὸν παντός κτισμάτος, ὃ μίθος διὰ σημαντικὰ τῇ Τροίᾳ εξεδίωσε. πάντι μὲν γὰρ πολίσμαται καὶ ἀπλοῦς οἰκοδομημένη, χρεία Ποσειδώνος τὸ ἔχουν ἰγρότητος δὲ ἕτερον ὁ τίτανος ἐν πλῆθος ἀρμόσι τοῖς λίθοις, καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος ἦτο θερμότητος ἱλιακῆς τῆς ἐν τῇ περιέχοντι, ὡς ἐν ἐξικμαζόμενον συμπαγείᾳ τὸ κτισμένον, ἡ δὲ μιθολογία, τὸ κοινὸν τούτο, τῇ Τροίᾳ κατ᾽ ἐξαιρέτου ἰδιαζόντος ἀπένεμε.)

LXXXIX
iii. Conclusions

1. In most cases, Eustathius cites at least two different explanations on an allegorical passage which proves two things: a. firstly his flexibility in admitting a plurality of explanations gives more advantages to his narration by making it interesting and at the same time it increases his erudite profile. b. Eustathius is more interested in the possibility of an allegorical explanation than in its unassailable correctness. He wants his reader to be familiarized with two or more allegorical explanations but it is more important for him to establish the existence and importance of an allegorical interpretation for the Homeric text.

2. In the majority of the cases, he does not show preference towards the specific explanations but he does show a personal preference on the method of interpretation which is the distinction between historical and allegorical part of a myth and the analysis of the latest either from a natural or from a moral point of view.

3. Eustathius' allegorical analysis is always assisted by his etymological study (mainly from his sources, scholia or other authors) which is used to establish some links that help in the explanation and the clarification of the allegory. The addition of etymological speculations which sometimes are his own prove that he tries to make maximum use of his wider knowledge in order to show the importance of allegorical interpretation in his work.

4. Eustathius is usually influenced by monotheistic beliefs and generally tries to follow an interpretative strategy within the limits of these beliefs.
e. EUSTATHIUS’ SOURCES

As Van der Valk\textsuperscript{281} notes, it is believed that Eustathius was one of the most educated people of his age, and he had privileged access to the well-hidden treasures of the Byzantine libraries; hence, he could study various writings that came from sources other than those that are extant. Eustathius’ knowledge of codices and writers that are not preserved or of whom little is known makes the process of researching and identifying his sources even more important. In addition, Eustathius supplies us with a great number of parallels which are extremely important; moreover, sometimes we even come across new fragments that are not yet identified by scholars. It is true that Eustathius usually does not mention the name of the author(s) he quotes, possibly because learned commentators want to show even more erudition by withholding their sources;\textsuperscript{282} in some cases, it is difficult to clarify a source either because the whole point is complicated and he cites an author who, in his turn, cites someone else, or simply because the text which he cites has not survived.

In the section of the text researched to date, I have found sources and parallel passages from a wide range of works and authors: first of all, from the Homeric scholia as well as from lexica, grammarians, geographers, tragic, comic and epic poets, orators, historians, philosophers, mythographers, medical writers, ecclesiastical or other writers of the Byzantine age and other commentaries or scholia to which he had access.

1. The Homeric scholia as a source

The references to the Homeric scholia are frequent in Eustathius, who most of the times introduces them as οἱ παλαιοί. Most of our codices with the Homeric scholia are dated after the 12\textsuperscript{th} c.; this gives great importance to Eustathius’ Commentaries and explains why some of his annotations derived from the codices of the Iliad and the Odyssey are different from the ones we have.\textsuperscript{283}

\textsuperscript{281} Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. I, p. XLVII.
\textsuperscript{282} Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. I, p. XLVIII.
\textsuperscript{283} Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. I, pp. CXVI-CXVII.
Van der Valk plausibly argued that in his *Commentary on the Iliad* Eustathius consulted three different kinds of scholia:

1. An ancient commentary often quoted under the name of either Apion or Herodorus or both (ApH)\(^{284}\) which in Eustathius’ eyes was the source with the greatest authority. Most quotations from ApH belong to Herodian. This kind of scholia deals with questions of prosody and orthography which interested the Byzantines. The reference by name to this ancient commentary has the intention to impress.

2. A copy of the T\(^{285}\) recension which was Eustathius principal source for matters of interpretation and explanation of words (and b recension)\(^{286}\)

3. A scholia which provide him with mythographical comments\(^{287}\)

4. Scholia Didymi (D) which he uses mostly for explanations of words.\(^{288}\)

5. Scholia of commentaries that have not been preserved.

Eustathius refers to the same sources in his *Commentary on the Odyssey*; firstly, the ancient commentary ApH is also used in the *Commentary on the Odyssey* and sometimes quoted by name as in Eust. *ad Od*. I.28.11-2 where there is a comment on the meanings of the word ἀστράγαλος:

καὶ δότι συντελεῖ πρὸς τὸ ῥηθέν, τὸ ἀστράγαλος, τρία σημαίνει, τὸν ἐν σφυρῷ καὶ τὸν σπόνδυλον ἀπλῶς. καὶ τὸν παιστικὸν ἢ πεσσικὸν βόλον τὸ τῶν Ἀπίωνος.\(^{289}\)

As in the *Commentary on the Iliad*, Eustathius refers to the A scholia in his *Comm. ad Od.* as οἱ ἀκριβέστεροι τῶν παλαιῶν;\(^{290}\) elsewhere, the reference to the A-scholia is made as οἱ παλαιοί.\(^{291}\)


\(^{289}\) Apion Philol. 74, 255.5-7, SGLG Apion fr. 23.


\(^{291}\) For example cf. Eust. *ad Od*. 1.10.31 (=19.6 Makr.) on ἐπανάληψις, 1.27.1-2 on the breathing of ἀγχιάλος and ἂμφιάλος.
However, in most of the cases, the information drawn can be found in more than one group of scholia: for example, in I.24.28-9 when Eustathius talks about ἄδην:

ὅτι δὲ οἱ μὲν διπλοῦσι τὸ δ' τοῦ ἄδην οἱ δὲ δ' ἐνὸς αὐτὸ γράφουσι καὶ οἱ μὲν ψιλοῦσι οἱ δὲ δασύνουσιν, ἢ Ἡλίας δηλοῖ.

He refers to the citation in the Comm. ad ll. II.56.2-4:

τὸ δὲ ἄδην ἀντὶ τοῦ δασιλῶς, περὶ οὗ καὶ προγέγραπται, Νικίας μὲν ψιλοῖ, διπλασιάζων τὸ δ' διὰ τὸ μέτρον, ὁμοίως τῷ "κύων ἀδδεές", Ἁρίσταρχος δὲ δ' ἐνὸς δ' καὶ βραχέως καὶ δασέως which probably cites sch. A b T in ll. 5.203 ἄδην: Νικίας διὰ δύο δ' γράφει διὰ τὸ μέτρον, ὁμοίως τῷ "κύων ἀδδεές", καὶ ψιλοῖ. Ἁρίσταρχος δὲ δ' ἐνὸς δ' καὶ βραχέως καὶ δασέως...

In some other cases, Eustathius intentionally draws information from more than one source of scholia and mixes them: for example in Eust. ad Od. I.25.32-3 ("ἀκασεῖν" γάρ τὸ λυπεῖν ἥ τὸ ἔχον ἄκην ἔγουν ἄκωκην δ' δέξεως σιδήρου, ἐντεῦθεν δὲ τὸ ἐστομομένον νοεῖται) he draws information from sch. b T ad ll. 14.12 (ἀκαμεῖν δὲ: ἄκην ἔχον, ἤκονηκμένον, μή εἶκον, σκηπρόν, ἀντίτυπον) and sch. D ad ll. 14.12 (ἀκαμεῖν: ἐστομομένον, ὁξυμένον) or sch. ad Od. 1.99 (ἀκαμεῖν: ἐστομομένον) or in Comm. ad Od. I.26.46 on the breathing of the personal name Ἄγχιάλος (ὁ δὲ τοῦ τοιοῦτον Μέντου πατήρ Ἄγχιάλος ψιλοῖ, φασί, τὴν παραλήγουσαν ώς κύριον καθα καὶ ὁ παρὰ τοῖς Φαίαξιν Εὐρύάλος) he draws information from sch. T in ll. 5.609 (...τὸ δὲ Ἄγχιάλον ψιλοτεόν· κύριον γάρ), A ad ll. 15.705 (...ὁ δὲ ἀλός γενικῇ ἐν τῇ συνθέσει ἐπὶ μὲν κυρίων ψιλοῦ ἀποφέρεται τὸ πνεύμα, “Εὐρύάλος”, “Ἀμφιάλος”, “Ἀστάλος”...). Eustathius draws information from scholia D in an etymological note on Olympus:

Eust. ad Od. I.17.27-8

οἱ γε καὶ τὸ "Ολυμπός" λέγοντες γίνεσθαι παρὰ τὸ ὀλολαμπής.

Sch. D in ll. 1.18

..."Ολυμπός ἔστιν ο ὀφρανός, παρὰ τὸ ὀλολαμπής εἶναι.

The scholia in the Commentary on the Odyssey are introduced by Eustathius in the same way as the Iliadic ones (οἱ παλαιοὶ). The examination of some examples of citations from the scholia on the Odyssey may help us to identify some of the sources of the Homeric scholia for Eustathius’ work:
In Eust. *ad Od.* I.3.40ff. (=6.11ff. Makr.) Eustathius cites the ancient commentators for the different meanings of the word ἀνήρ:


ὅτι ἀνήρ παρὰ τοῖς παλαιοῖς
tetraχῶς, ὁ ἦδη τέλειος τὴν ἡλικίαν
καὶ ὁ συζευξθεὶς γυναικί καὶ ὁ
ἀνδρείος καὶ ὁ φύσει, τουτέστιν
ἀν ἐξ ἀνάγκης οἴδεν ἡ φύσις ἀντι-
διηρημένον τῇ γυναικὶ.

Sch. M\(^1\) Q R Y *ad Od.* 1.1

ἀνήρ σημαίνει τέσσαρα: τὸν φύσει,
tὸν γῆμαντα, τὸν ἀνδρείον καὶ τὸν
ἀνδρὸς ἡλικίαν ἔχοντα.

oi παλαιοὶ ἄνδρα τὸν φύσει φασίν.
ὡς εἰ τις εἴποι ἄνθρωπον ἄρρενα.
ἀνδρεῖον δὲ νοήσαι οὐ θέλουσι,
λέγοντες ὅτι ἐπὶ ἄνθρωπον οὐδὲ-
ποτε κείνται δῦο ἄλλεπάλληλα ἐπι-
θετα δίχα κυρίου ἢ προσηγορικοῦ.

Sch. D E M\(^1\) Q R T V *ad Od.* 1.1

ἄνδρα: νῦν τὸν φύσει· οὐ γὰρ
εὑρίσκεται δῦο ἐπίθετα ἄνευ
κυρίου ή προσηγορικοῦ.

Y i *ad Od.* 1.1

ἄνδρα: [...] τὸ εἶδος ἀντὶ τοῦ
γένους, τὸν φύσει· οὐ τὸν
ἀνδρεῖον, ἐπεὶ δῦο ἐπίθετα
οὐχ εὑρίσκεται ἄνευ κυρίου ή
προσηγορικοῦ, ἀλλὰ τὸν φύσει...

From the previous, my suggestion is that Eustathius must have consulted earlier manuscripts belonging to the families of codices M Q R Y.

In Eust. *ad Od.* I.17.25ff. (=32.7ff. Makr.) Eustathius comments on the breathing of the word ὀλοφρονον:

καὶ ὀλοφρονον τὸν τοιοῦτον Ἀτλαντα νοοῦσιν, ὡς τὰ ἅπερ ὅλων φρονοῦντα
ἐγουν τῶν ὅλων φροντιστικόν, διὸ καὶ ὁ Κλεάνθης, ὡς φασίν, ἐδάσυνε τὸ ὁ
tῆς ἄρχουσις, καὶ οὐδὲ ἡμεῖς καὶνπραγούμεν ψιλούντες αὐτό.

XCIV
He draws his information from sch. H K M* in Od. 1.52 (=Cleanth. fr. 549)

δλοφφρονος: Κλεάνθης δασάυει: τοῦ [γάρ] περὶ τῶν δλων φρονοῦντος ἰδιών
οὕτως εἰρήσθαι...

Furthermore, in Eust. ad Od. I.5.1 (=8.7f. Makr.), Eust. paraphrases sch. H M¹ Q R

Leid. ad Od. 1.1:

Eust. ad Od. I.5.1 (=8.7f. Makr.)
καὶ χρήται τῷ τρόπῳ καὶ επὶ
φωνής καὶ επὶ μελῶν ἐξαλλαγῆς,
ὡς επὶ τῆς ἀγδόνος "ἤτε θαμά
τροπόσα χέει πολυχεία φωνῆν."

Sch. H M¹ Q R Leid. ad Od. 1.1
καὶ χρήται τῷ τρόπῳ καὶ επὶ
φωνής καὶ επὶ μελῶν ἐξαλλαγῆς,
ὡς επὶ τῆς ἀγδόνος "ἤτε θαμά
τροπόσα χέει πολυχεία φωνῆν."

Finally, in Eust. ad Od. I.15.18ff. (=28.4ff. Makr.) we have another example of
Eustathius’ comments taken from the Homeric scholia:

Eust. ad Od. I.15.18ff. (=28.4ff. Makr.)
φασὶ δὲ οἱ παλαιοὶ μὴ δείκν ἑνταῦθα
λέγειν “ἐκ γὰρ Ὄρέστοι Ἀτρείδαο”,
ὁτι οὗ τὸν ἐγγόνου τοῦ Ἀτρέως,
ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ὅτι ἐξ Ὄρέστου “τίσεις”
τουτέστων ἐκδίκησις, ἡται τοῦ
"Ἀτρείδου Ἀγαμέμνονος". λέγουσι
γὰρ τὸν Ὅμηρον μὴ σχηματίζειν ἀπὸ
πάππου πατρωμίαν, εἰ μὴ ὁ πάππος
eθύς εἰὴ Διός υἱὸς.

Sch. H¹ K M⁴ ad Od. 1.40
tο δὲ “Ἀτρείδαο” οὐ κατὰ τοῦ
Ὅρέστου, ἄλλα κατὰ τοῦ ᾿Αγα-
μέμνονος τέτακται.

My examination of the scholia on the Odyssey in comparison with the Eustathian text
suggests the following:

1. Although it is obvious that Eustathius possessed and used the scholia of the
Odyssey for his own comments, it is difficult to establish the exact codices used, since
most of the references are found in many different manuscripts. However, it is
possible to establish some trends towards families of codices that Eustathius may have
used.
2. Codices M (Venetus 613 XIII c., =U⁵ Allen), Q (Ambrosianus Q 88, =M⁴ Allen) and K (Cracovensis 543 a. 1469) all belonging to family e offer scholia comparable with the comments of Eustathius. It is likely that Eustathius had a manuscript from family e of the codices and most probably an ancestor of M. The suggestion is reinforced by one more case where it is obvious that Eustathius uses a relative of M:

For example, in Eust. ad Od. I.24.38-9 (=46.1ff. Makr.), comments on Od. I.193:

δι  ἐν τῷ “πέμψω δ’ ἐς Σπάρτην τῇ καὶ ἐς Πύλον ἡμαθόντα” τινὲς γράφουσιν “πέμψω δ’ ἐς Κρήτην τῇ καὶ ἐς Πύλον”.

The reference comes from sch. M* ad Od. I.193.

πέμψω δ’ ἐς Σπάρτην τῇ: τινὲς “πέμψω δ’ ἐς Κρήτην τῇ.” καὶ ἦ ἠθνα ἀλλαχοῦ “ὑπό τινα μὲν ἐς Πύλον ἔλθε… καὶ μὲν δ’ ἐς Κρήτην τῇ παρ’ Ἰδομένη ἀνακτα δς γὰρ δεύτατος ἦλθεν Ἀχαϊῶν χαλκοχιτῶνων.”

3. Another group of scholia regularly found in the citations includes codices Y (=V³ (Allen)), Vindobonensis philol. 56, XV c.) and i (=H² (Allen), Harleianus 5673, XV c.) both belonging to family b of the codices.

For example, in Eust. ad Od. I.6.33 (=11.13f. Makr.), Eustathius uses the adjective θεόκτιστον in order to explain the expression ἱερὸν πτολεμέρον; he draws information from sch. Y ad Od. 1.2 where we read: ἱερὸν πτολεμέρον: δι’ αὐτὸ θεοῦ τοῦτο ἐκτίσαν but because of his monotheistic beliefs he chooses to replace the explanation of the scholia.

Additionally, in Eust. ad Od. I.17.7f. (=31.15f. Makr.), he comments on the possibility of Calypso being a historical person, a queen; the comment is taken from Y i scholia:

Sch. Y i in Od. 1.55 Καλυψώ δὲ νοῆσεις πραγματικῶς γυναῖκά ὑπαρξαν…

In Eust. ad Od. I.16.19f. (=30.3f. Makr.) Eustathius suggests μερίζεται as the synonym for διέται; the explanation is found in M* P¹ in Od. I.48. P¹ is Palatinus 45, a. 1201 (=Pal. Allen) and also belongs to family b and M* is Venetus 613, XIII c. (=U⁵ Allen) and belongs to family e.

4. Finally, another corpus of scholia that Eustathius possibly had at his disposal is the scholia minora (also called vulgata (V) in Dindorf’s edition) which are the scholia falsely attributed to Didymus and which we saw he used for the Iliad. These scholia
include codex Bodleianus V 51, Monacensis 233, Laurentianus 32. 10, 32. 24 (=L⁴ Allen) and 32. 19 (=L⁶ Allen).

5. Another manuscript which appears to be related to Eustathius’ writings is Codex Vaticanus Gr. 1321 (I). The codex belongs to the XV c. but an ancestor must have been related to Eustathius’ text as suggested by the verbatim citation of sch. I in Eust. ad Od. I.6.3ff. (=10.5f. Makr.):

Eust. ad Od. I.6.3ff. (=10.5f. Makr.) Sch. I ad Od. 1.1
οὕτω καὶ νῦν ἐν τῷ “μάλα πολλά
πλάγχθη καὶ πολλὰν ἄνθρωπον ἰδεν
ἀστεᾳ” τὸν τρόπον προεκτίθεται
dι’ ὦ τὴν ποιήσιν πλατυνεῖ.

2. Demosthenes Thrax’s Paraphrase of the Odyssey.

Apart from the Homeric scholia, Eustathius had read and used Demosthenes Thrax’s Paraphrase of the Odyssey. The Suda mentions that Demosthenes of Thrace paraphrased the Iliad in prose:

Su. § 457
Δημοσθένης Θρής: οὕτως ἔγραψε Μετάφρασιν Ἰλιάδος πεζῷ
λόγῳ. Ἐπιτομὴν τῶν Δαμαγήτου τοῦ Ἡρακλεώτου, Περὶ διθυραμβο-
ποιῶν. Μετάφρασιν εἰς τὴν Ἡσιώδου Θεογονίαν.

In Eust. Comm. ad II. there is no mention of Demosthenes’ name or of his Paraphrase of the Iliad. There is only one passage (Eust. ad II. IV.894.18) where Eustathius talks in general about the “ancient paraphrasers of words” (οἱ παλαιοὶ μεταφολεῖς τῶν λέξεων) but as Van der Valk correctly remarks, when Eustathius quotes Demosthenes Thrax in the Comm. ad Od., he uses the singular of the word (μεταφολεῖς); consequently, since the Iliadic passage probably does not imply Demosthenes, it is plausible that Eustathius did not have the Paraphrase of the Iliad.
However, in Eust. *ad Od*. I.42.39 we read:

μεταβάλλειν δὲ, λέγεται μὲν καὶ ἐπὶ παραφραστικῆς μεθόδου, μεταβάλλειν γὰρ λέγεται καὶ λέξεις, ὁ διγλώσσος, δέθεν καὶ τὸ βιβλίον ὅλον τούτο παραφράσας Ὑρρίξ, Δημοσθένης, "μεταβολᾶς Ὀδυσσέας" τὴν τοιαύτην αὐτοῦ πραγματείαν ἐκάλεσεν.

Eustathius explains the term "μεταβάλλειν" with the meaning "to paraphrase" and he informs us that Demosthenes Thrax wrote a paraphrase of the whole of the *Odyssey* under the title: μεταβολὰ Ὀδυσσέας.

Eustathius quotes Demosthenes Thrax and introduces him in several ways amongst which the most common is as "Demosthenes the paraphraser"; he uses more often the expression ὁ μεταβολεύς Δημοσθένης and once ὁ παραφραστής.

In Eust. *ad Od* I.8.34f. (=15.8f. Makr.), Eustathius introduces Demosthenes as "wise Demosthenes Thrax" (ὁ σοφὸς Υρρίξ Δημοσθένης) and mentions an interpretation of ἀμόθεν as ἀμηγέτη in his *Paraphrase of the Odyssey* (ἐν ὅλης παρέφρασε τὴν Ὀδύσσειαν); the work is mentioned elsewhere in the *Commentary*.

In Eust. *ad Od*. I.27.37-8 (=51.24f. Makr.), Eustathius gives an exact interpretation of the word πεπτεύουσιν according to the paraphraser - orator (τὸν μεταβολέα ῥήτορα):

πεπτεύουσι δὲ ταυτόν δὲ εἴπειν κατὰ τὸν μεταβολέα ῥήτορα, διακυβεύονται προπάροιθε τῶν θυρῶν, διὰ δειλίαν.

The use of the term "orator" for Demosthenes Thrax arouses suspicions of a possible confusion in this case in Eustathius' mind between Demosthenes the paraphraser and Demosthenes the orator, especially if we take into account that the works attributed by the *Suda* to Demothenes Thrax are not rhetorical; it remains possible however, that Demosthenes Thrax was a rhetorician himself.

It is therefore plausible both from the frequency of the citations and the exact way in which Demosthenes Thrax is quoted, that Eustathius had in his possession and used his *Paraphrase of the Odyssey*, a work no longer preserved.

---


293 Eust. *ad Od*. I.152.40 (τοῦ παραφραστοῦ Δημοσθένους).

294 Cf. Eust. *ad Od*. I.42.41 (μεταβολᾶς Ὀδυσσέας τὴν τοιαύτην αὐτοῦ πραγματείαν ἐκάλεσεν), 164.31 (ὁ τῶν Ὀδυσσειακῶν μεταβολέας Δημοσθένης).
3. Lexica

Eustathius had fewer scholia at his disposal for the *Commentary on the Odyssey* than that of the *Iliad*, so he has made more extensive use of the lexica in order to add comments, etymologies or explanations in his work. Furthermore, the work is supposed to be read by pupils and the pre-digestion of the material by Eustathius would make their reading easier.\(^{295}\)

The two Attic lexicographers whom Eustathius uses as primary sources are Pausanias and Aelius Dionysius. Pausanias is cited by name and is most of the time quoted from memory by Eustathius. In I.10.18-9 (=18.15f. Makr.), Eustathius takes from him the explanation of the word γλεῦξις, in I.12.46ff. (=23.6ff. Makr.) of the word δωδέκιδες and notes that elsewhere\(^{296}\) the word is found as δωδεκήδες.

In I.21.9f. (=39.9f. Makr.) the comparison with the source proves Eustathius’ quotation to be imprecise:

Eustathius I.21.9f. (=39.9f. Makr.) Pausanias κ 28
Παυσανίας γοῦν φησιν ὅτι “Κέσκος
λιμήν που, ὃ παράκειται ποταμός
Νοῦς καλούμενος”

Pausanias κ 28
Κέσκος ἐν πόλις ἐν Κιλικίᾳ
καὶ παρ' αὐτὴν ποταμός Νοῦς
ἄνομα

It is obvious that Eustathius omits details found in his source or reports his source imprecisely because he cites from memory.

A memory mistake concerning a citation from Pausanias is found elsewhere in Eustathius:

Eustathius ad Od. I.24.36 (=45.33 Makr.) Pausanias γ 14
Παυσανίας δὲ λέγει καὶ “γυναῖκας
eἰλιπόδας” διὰ τὴν εἰλησίν
tῶν μηρῶν.

Pausanias γ 14
γυναῖκας εἰλιποδες, διὰ τὴν εἰλησίν
tῶν μηρῶν.

tῶν μηρῶν.

In I.26.5ff. (=48.14ff. Makr.) Eustathius quotes Pausanias explanation of βρίσκειν and again makes some mistakes:

\(^{295}\) Eustathius usually introduces these lexica with the term ῥητορικῶν λεξικῶν (cf. I.13.39; I.8.11 for Photius’ *Lexicon*, I.13.24 for the *Suda*), see p. LXXIII.

\(^{296}\) He means Phot. δ 867.
Παυσανίας μέντοι περὶ τούτου φησίν, δότι "βρίκελα" προσωπεῖα βροτῷ ἴκελα.
ἡ Βρίγειν ἴκελα. οὕτω δὲ φησιν ἐλεγον τοὺς βαρβάρους. ὦ δ' αὐτός, καὶ "βριμοῦσθαι"
λέγει τὸ "μετὰ τινος ἀπειλῆς ἐκφοβεῖν"

Pausanias β 20-1

βρίκελος: ...ἐστι δὲ βαρβαρικόν
tὸ ὤνομα, τίθεται δὲ [καὶ] ἐπὶ
προσώπων τραγικῶν καὶ εἰρηται
οἷονε βροτῷ ἐβίκελος ἢ Βρίγειν
ἐβίκελος. Βρίγες γάρ ἔθνος

βαρβαρικόν.
βριμοῦσθαι: τὸ μετὰ τινος
ἀπειλῆς ἐκφοβεῖν.

Eustathius I.26.10 (48.20f. Makr.)

δότι δὲ Βρίγες καὶ οἱ Φρύγες ἐλέγοντο,
δήλοι ὁ γεωγράφος, ὡς ἐν τοῖς τοῦ
περιηγητοῦ γέγραπται.

As proved by the quotations, Eustathius’ quotation from Pausanias on βρίκελος is
only partly verbatim: at the beginning, Eustathius paraphrases Pausanias’ explanation
of the word βρίκελος and he only mentions that the barbarians were so called; then,
he gives a verbatim citation from Pausanias of the explanation of βριμοῦσθαι; in the
final part, he cites Str. 7.3.2.6 on Βρίγες and mentions a similar explanation by
Pausanias Periegetes. Here Eustathius confuses Pausanias Periegetes with Pausanias
the Atticist who gives us the comment on Βρίγες.

In the rest of the cases Pausanias’ work Ἀττικῶν ὄνομάτων συναγωγῆ is
cited under the general category of a rhetorical lexicon (ἐν ῥητορικῷ λεξικῷ) and is
quoted verbatim. However, the number of mistakes in the cases discussed above
suggests that Eustathius quoted Pausanias from memory.

Aelius Dionysius’ Αττικαὶ λεξεῖς is a direct source for Eustathius’ work. The most
common way of citing Aelius Dionysius is by name (Αἰλίος Διονύσιος φησὶ or
ἱστορεῖ, ἐπει τῶν τοῦ Διονυσίου ἐπέρως); sometimes the title of his work is also
added (ἐπει καὶ Ἀττικαῖς λέξεις οἱ θρεῖς Διονύσιος ἐπεξέρχεται). The majority of the
quotations are either grammatical (including punctuation) or

297 On the explanation of the words θελγίνες (Eust. ad Od. I.19.32f. (=36.12f. Makr.)), ἀλασμός and
νυκτάλων and νυκτάλωπος (I.21.26f. (=40.2f. Makr.)).
ἀγαθότερος and ἀγαθότατος that do not exist as grammatical types.
lexicographical notes. He is also quoted as οἱ Ἀττικοὶ or in a more general way Eustathius uses again the term ὁ ἐν ῥητορικῷ λεξικῷ εἰπών.

Of great interest are the notes in which he talks about words or expressions which are linked with “ἀδηφάγοι ἦπιοι”:

Eustathius ad Od. I.24.32-4 (=45.27 Makr.)
“ἀδαίον” παρὰ Σώφρονι “τὸ εἰς κόρον ἐργον”. [...] Λυσίας δὲ καὶ “ναῦν ἀδηφάγον” φησὶ τὴν τὸν μισθὸν λαμβάνουσαν ἐντελῆ καὶ “λύχνους ἀδηφάγους” τοὺς πότας, ὅποιος ὁ ἐν Νεφέλαις παρὰ τῷ Ἀριστοφάνει.

Ael. Dion.
α 33 ἀδαίον: τὸ εἰς κόρον ἔγον <ἡ τὸ ἄριστος; οὐτω> Σώφρων.
α 35 ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀδηφάγον" εἶπε Λυσίας τῇ τέλειον μισθὸν λαμβάνουσαν τριήρῃ. Ἀλκαῖος δὲ ὁ κομικὸς καὶ τοὺς πότας λεγομένους λύχνους "ἀδηφάγους" ἔφη χαριεντισάμενος.

Though it is obvious from both the selection of the examples and the authors that Eustathius quotes from Aelius Dionysius, it is also evident from the comparison of Eustathius’ passage with his source that he prefers to cite the name of the author from whom the expressions derive as if he quotes directly from him. So he talks about ἀδαίον in Sophron and ναῦν ἀδηφάγον in Lysias as if he directly quotes from the two writers without mentioning Dionysius’ name. This is an example of Eustathius omitting his source in order to give to his readers the image of an erudite scholar. Additionally, in the last case, he copies the example λύχνους ἀδηφάγους from Dionysius. However, although Dionysius cites Alcaeus the comic poet as his source for ἀδηφάγους, Eustathius prefers to replace the source and give an example of an Aristophanic use of the expression πότης λύχνος, probably both because Aristophanes is a more impressive and more familiar source than Alcaeus and because of the non-availability of the source to his audience; it is probable that by Eustathius’

301 Cf. Eust. ad Od. I.24.30ff. (=45.23ff. Makr.) on the word ἄρην and the examples ἀδηφάγοι ἦπιοι and ἀδηφάγοι ἄρμα quoted from him.
304 Ar. Nub. 57.
time Alcaeus’ works had already been lost whilst the audience could easily verify the example in Aristophanes’ *Nubes*.

But the most important passage where Ael. Dionysius is a direct source is Eust. *ad Od*. I.19.1ff. (=35.1ff. Makr.) in which Eustathius examines 33 examples of words that have two genders (either with the same or different meaning). It is important that Eustathius adds in his work an interpolation of 12 lines full of examples taken from Dionysius (with verbatim quotations) because it reinforces the suggestion that he had a copy of Dionysius’ *Attikai Lexeis* and that he was keen on quoting from this author.

In general terms, scholars have expressed different opinions on Eustathius’ dependance on the *Suda*, from an unimportant reliance to the hypothesis that Eustathius could have been the author of the lexicon.\(^{305}\) However, Eustathius certainly used the *Suda* as a source for the *Commentary on the Iliad* since he quotes it by name.\(^{306}\) The use is more frequent in the *Commentary on the Odyssey* because Eustathius’ sources in the latter were weaker and more brief, hence he ornamented the Commentary with more explanations from the lexica. It is true that in the *Commentary on the Odyssey* the *Suda* lexicon is mentioned by name in total 10 times\(^{307}\) (whilst in the Commentary on the Iliad only twice, one of which as a grammatical example) and it is also certain that Eustathius has consulted the lexicon more than that. Only in the examined text, there are more than 50 cases in which Eustathius uses words which are found in the *Suda*; however, the *Suda* may be the source only in some of these cases.\(^{308}\)

Hesychius’ *Lexicon* is not mentioned by Eustathius but it has been observed that it was used.\(^{309}\) However, he was not Eustathius favourite lexicographer: this is proved by the low number of the verbatim citations\(^{310}\) and the fact that in most cases Hesychius is mostly used as a parallel source in combination with the other lexica.


\(^{308}\) Eust. *ad Od*. I.13.27f. (=24.15f. Makr.) (however, since the same explanation of ἀρετὴς is also given by Aelius Dionysius, it may be that here he used him), I.22.29 (the explanation of the word μεθησαι is more similar to the one from Suda than that of Hesychius), I.22.41 (on ὀργῶμα κακᾶ).


\(^{310}\) Out of 48 cases only in 3 cases Hesychius can be Eustathius’ source: I.8.10 (on ἀνοοτος), I.22.42 (where there is also a copying mistake as Eustathius forgets to copy the word τέκνη from Hesychius), I.24.40 (in which Hesychius is considered to be one of the ancient sources). There are also 3 more cases in which Hesychius could have possibly been a direct source (I.22.29, I.24.25, I.26.26).
Eustathius also made extensive use of Photius’ works for the *Commentary on the Odyssey* as is proved by the verbatim citations of both *Biblioteca* and *Lexicon*. Eustathius’ story about Egypt as the place of origin of the Homeric poems is taken from Photius *Bibl*. 190.151a.37-151b.6, citing Ptolemy Hephaestion, book 5. In Eust. *ad Od*. 1.24.26 (=45.20f. Makr.) there is a verbatim citation from Photius’ *Lexicon* on the explanation of the words μηλωθρα and μηλωσαί. Another example of direct citation from the *Lexicon* is a line about δηρτα and δηρτικαλα in Eust. *ad Od*. 1.26.4f. (=49.13 Makr.). In three more examples, Eustathius gives us some explanations that could have been taken from Photius but in two of the cases we find the same explanations in Aelius Dionysius and in the third in Hesychius.

There are two instances in the *Commentary on the Odyssey* in which Eustathius mentions το μεγα ‘Ετυμολογικόν: the first one is Eust. *ad Od*. 1.29.23 (=55.4f. Makr.) about the word δθαξ (cf. *EM* 2.2, EGud α 2.13f.). It is not clear which of the two sources Eustathius has in mind but since he mentions the etymology of the word, it is more probable that he consulted *EM*. The second explanation concerns the pleonasm of π in ηγανον - πηγανον. As Van der Valk notes, Eustathius has copied a mistake that *Etymologicum Gudianum* has made and that *Etymologicum Magnum* has got right (the correct reading should be ηγανον - τηγανον). This example is strong evidence that the characterisation μεγα ‘Ετυμολογικόν is attributed by Eustathius to the *Etymologicum Gudianum*. However, this does not mean that Eustathius did not use the *Etymologicum Magnum* (at least in parallel with another lexicon): the etymology of ηνιαυτος from the verb ιαιω possibly originates from *EM* 342.34-6, the etymology of νεω from νοστος could also have been taken from *EM* 607.12-3 and the comment on the relation between ηγλευκης and γλευκος from *EM* 11.36.

---

311 Eust. 1.2.25ff. (=3.14ff. Makr.).
312 Cf. Eust. *ad Od*. 1.13.31 (=24.20 Makr.) on the word ημαξιον where we have Ael. Dion. α 98.10 = Phot. α 1197 and Eust. *ad Od*. 1.13.40f. (=25.5ff. Makr.) on the word μéfonoν where we have Ael. Dion. μ 2 = Phot. μ 5.
313 See Eust. *ad Od*. 1.24.24f. (=45.18f. Makr.) on the word μηλωφρασι where we have Ael. Dion. μ 265.25 = Hsch. μ 1184. However, in this case it is more probable that the citation comes from Photius since Eustathius quotes him for the word μηλωφρα in the following line.
314 Both *EM* and EGud. have the same explanation of the word but the latter does not give the etymology.
315 Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. 1, pp. LXV-LXVI.
317 Eust. *ad Od*. 1.22.26f. (=42.1f. Makr.).
As Van der Valk suggests, Eustathius was also acquainted with a number of other lexicographical works amongst which Suetonius’ works Περὶ βλασφημιῶν and Περὶ παιδιῶν. In Eust. ad Od. 1.28.16-29.10 (=52.26-54.17 Makr.) where Eustathius comments on the game of dice, he quotes an unusually large part of Suetonius Περὶ παιδιῶν 1.1-96 and he introduces both the writer and the work by name twice.\footnote{Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. I, pp. LXVII-LXVIII; there was no indication of use of the rest of the lexica mentioned by Van der Valk like Aristophanes of Byzantium’s Λέξεις or Zenodorus’ Περὶ τῆς Ὀμφρου συνηθείς or the Lexicon GraecoLatinum.}

4. Grammatical handbooks

The main sources used for grammatical explanations by Eustathius are Herodian, Georgius Choeroboscus and Heraclides of Miletus.

It has been argued by scholars\footnote{Eust. ad Od. 1.28.16 (ὅδε τὰ περὶ Ἑλληνικῆς παιδιάς γράφας), 29.7-8 (ὅ τὰ περὶ τῆς καθ’ Ἑλληνικῆς παιδιάς γράφας).} including Van der Valk\footnote{Cohn (1907), pp. 1470-3, Erbse (1950), p. 3.} that Eustathius knew an epitome of Herodian’s works and quoted him from there. The conclusion is based on the fact that generally no title of Herodian’s works is mentioned by Eustathius and it is highly possible also for another reason: in the majority of the cases Herodian is not quoted verbatim but he is paraphrased by Eustathius.

A citation by name (καθ’ Ἑρῳδιανὸν) on the conjugation of the personal name Ἀτλας, which is included in Heronian’s work Περὶ κλίσεως ὅνομάτων (III.2.637.29-33) is attested only by Eustathius:

Eust. ad Od. 1.18.27ff. (=34.6ff. Makr.)

οὗ τῆς κλίσεως ὃ καὶ νῶν τουστός καθ’ Ἑρῳδιανὸν τὰ παρὰ μετοχὴν εἰς ἀς δισύλλαβα διὰ τοῦ νῦ κλίνεται, οἷον “τλᾶς” “Ἀτλας” “Ἀτλαντος”, “φᾶς” “Περίφας” “Περίφαντος”. τοιούτη δὲ κλίσει εἴκεινος ὑπάγει καὶ ὡσα διός τὸ αὐτὸ σύμφωνον ἔχει, “Γίγας” “Γίγαντος”, “Μίμας” “Μήμαντος” δρος.

However, it is possible in some cases that Eustathius quotes Herodian as an indirect source, in other words through another primary source: for example, in I.15.36ff. (=28.27ff. Makr.) Eustathius refers to Herodian twice by name in a note about the words ἀνερ and πάτερ and about the genitives in -ος like θυγατρός or...
γυναικός. However, the passage is cited by Choeroboscus in his work on *Theodosius and Orthography* which we know that Eustathius consulted and it is more possible that he adopted the passage from there and he cited the name of the primary source which was Herodian.

The third citation by name on the word γαιήροχος is also attested only by Eustathius and included in Herodian’s work *Περὶ ὁρθογραφίας* (III.2.409.24-410.2). The parallel citation of Didymus’ name suggests that the passage could have been extracted from the Homeric scholia:323


σημειώσας δὲ ὡς “γαιήροχος” μὲν μοναχῶς διὰ δυσθόγγου, “γεούχος” δὲ καὶ “γηρύχος”, καθ’ Ἡραδιανὸν μὲν καὶ Δίδυμον...

However, in the majority of the cases Herodian is quoted without any reference to his name. The total number of indirect references to Herodian is more than 30 whilst the cases in which he is used as a parallel source are much more, which means that Eustathius found his work useful for his purposes and agreed with his grammatical notes in most cases. The references are basically derived from four of Herodian’s works which are also the most relevant to the didactic purposes of Eustathius’ *Commentary:*

- *De prosodia catholica* (The work is mainly used for the accents on words).324
- *Περὶ παθῶν* (The examination of most cases refering to this work proves that it is used for the selection of examples which in most of the cases concern the formation of words by pleonasm).325

---


325 Eust. *ad Od.* I.6.19f. (=10.26ff. Makr.) (Eust. uses some examples also mentioned by Hdn. like τερψιμβρότος, πιπλητα, φυγάγα, κρυγάγα, to explain the pleonasm of ν), I.10.38 (=19.11 Makr.) (Eust. uses the example χαμαλή χαμαλή from Hdn. for the pleonasm of θ), I.13.17 (=24.2ff. Makr.)
This of course does not mean that there are no passages possibly extracted from the rest of Herodian’s work. In conclusion, Eustathius makes extensive use of Herodian’s works mainly in order to cite rules or to select grammatical examples.

Eustathius’ high opinion of Heraclides of Miletus (shown in the *Commentary on the Iliad*) is also continued in the *Commentary on the Odyssey*. He is not cited many times but he is quoted by name together with an adjective of admiration (ὁ καλὸς Ἡρακλείδης) in (Eust. *ad Od*. I.7.30ff. =13.6ff. Makr.), when Eustathius talks about δέχω and ἄχω and their formation in Doric. However, Eustathius’ admiration does not prevent him from noting when there is a disagreement between Heraclides and other scholars on the formation of the form ἔσθα by pleonasm of θ. Unfortunately, the passage from Heraclides is not preserved. Both fragments are preserved only by Eustathius.

Eustathius quotes by name Georgius Choeroboscus (ὁ Χοιροβοσκός, ὁ Χοιροβοσκός Γεώργιος, κατά τον τεχνικὸν Γεώργιον etc.) and specifically his work on *Theodosius’ Orthography* and his *Commentary on Herodian’s Onomacicon* in the *Commentary on the Iliad*. His name is mentioned only once in

(on the different breathings of ἄθροος according to its meaning), I.14.14f. (=25.29f. Makr.) (on words which have pleonasm of β like βρίδιον βρίδιον, βράκος βράκος, λυπὴν λυπὴν), I.23.2f. (=42.29f. Makr.) (on the example ἐχῖσα ἔγχος for the pleonasm of γ).  
332 Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. I, p. LXXIII (see also note 2).  
333 Van der Valk says that Eustathius quotes Heraclides more often in the *Commentary on the Odyssey* (Van der Valk 1971-87, vol. I, p. LXXIII).  
336 Eust. *ad II*. I.575.22 (ὁ Χοιροβοσκός παρασημείωται ἐν ὅς ἔξηγεται τὸν Ὁριοδιανόν.)
the Commentary on the Odyssey. However, as Eustathius often does, Choeropobcos is sometimes quoted without his name but under the name of the primary source (just like in the case of Eust. ad Od. I.15.36ff. (=28.27ff. Makr.) examined before).

It has also been suggested that it is probable that Eustathius has used the scholia on Dionysius Thrax. As Van der Valk argues, these scholia were often used by Eustathius’ contemporaries (e.g. Tzetzes uses them in his Exegesis on the Iliad) and there are some examples where Eustathius may indirectly refer to them. In my examined text, there is no passage demonstrably linked in a direct or an indirect way with the scholia on Dion. Thrax.

Another important point is Eustathius’ use of grammatical terms, which proves his wide knowledge of grammar: some of the most characteristic examples are the terms παραγωγή, πλεονασμός, ἑτυμολογία and παράκρημα which are common; additionally, Eustathius comments on the Homeric use of παραγωγή in the words 'Ὀρέσσεα and 'Ἀτρείδαο for which he also mentions that they are ὁμοιοκατάληκτα. Furthermore, he refers to διονύμεα for the adjectives used instead of the name of a god, for the name Cyclops and for the two names of Skamandros. Other common grammatical phenomena mentioned by Eustathius are παραγωγή, παραπληρωματικός and ἐπέκτασις.

334 Eust. ad Od. I.1302.2.
335 Cohn (1907), p. 1469; cf. also Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. I, p. LXXIII.
343 Eust. ad Od. I.118.38 (=34.20 Makr.) and 20.9 (=37.10 Makr.), 28.5 (=52.12 Makr.) (παράκρημα), 20.12 (=37.13 Makr.); cf. also Keizer (1995), p. 413.
344 Eust. ad Od. I.8.32 (=15.5 Makr.), 22.32 (=42.8 Makr.); cf. also Keizer (1995), p.413.
5. Geographers

Eustathius refers to Strabo as ὁ γεωγράφος and in most cases uses him as his main source. The high frequency of the verbatim references and passages where Strabo is used proves that Eustathius used him as a primary source as far as geographical matters are concerned (like in I.17.8 (=31.16 Makr.) and I.17.20ff. (=31.31ff. Makr.) where he talks about Calypso’s island and he gives information provided by Strabo 2.3.6.6-9 (citing Plat. Tim. 24e4-25d6); in I.26.9f. (=48.20 Makr.) on the alternative name Βριγες of the Phrygians; in I.26.35ff. (=49.21f. Makr.) where Eustathius paraphrases Str. 10.2.14.2-7 and 20.1 in order to give information on Ταφίοι and Τηλίβοι).

The longest reference from Strabo’s work is found in Eust. ad Od. I.11.34ff. where Eustathius comments on the geographical position of the Aethiopians. The information is taken from Strabo (Str. 1.2.24-8); the passage is long and confusing because of the numerous different opinions and Eustathius prefers to organize the information in separate groups: he mentions the several different opinions on the Aethiopians and then he summarizes the three main theories (Aristarchus, Crates and Strabo); finally, he makes a list with the arguments and the main proponents possibly to make it easier for the reader to remember.

However, Eustathius does not use Strabo exclusively for geographical matters. Sometimes he cites him in order to explain a general belief or for a grammatical remark.

Eustathius refers to Stephanus of Byzantium in many ways in his Commentary on the Iliad (ὁ Ἐθνικογράφος, ὁ Ἐθνικολόγος, ὁ Ἐθνικός, ὁ τά Ἐθνικά

---

347 He refers to Ephorus’ view (Eust. ad Od. I.11.35-40), Aristarchus’ view (Eust. ad Od. I.11.40-12.7), Strabo’s view (Eust. ad Od. I.12.7-12) and Crates’ view (Eust. ad Od. I.12.12-9) all cited by Strabo.
348 Together with Crates’ view on the Ocean dividing the Aithiopians (cf. Broggiato (2001), fr. 37, pp. 46ff.), Eustathius also mentions “the mathematicians” (Eust. ad Od. I.12.19 (=22.6f. Makr.) ὁ δὲ τὴν μαθηματικὴν ὑπόθεσιν, 12.21f. (=22.9 Makr.), 12.24f. (=22.13 Makr.) κατὰ τοὺς μαθηματικοὺς) although they deal with a geographical issue in which mathematics played an important role; the reference to the mathematicians belongs to Strabo (I.2.24.18 τῶν μαθηματικῶν λέγεσιν).
349 Cf. Eust. ad Od. I.5.12ff. (=8.22ff. Makr.) on the view (taken from Str. I.1.16.2-6) that people thought highly of the heroes who travelled a lot and 1.5.18 where he quotes Str. I.2.23.6 in order to give an example of this belief.
350 For example in I.19.13f. (=35.19f. Makr.) there is a general grammatical note on the gender of the word χῖός which, as Eustathius says, is found as female in many passages from Strabo and in I.24.41 (=46.5 Makr.) there is a cross reference to Eust. ad II. 1.153.24-6 where Eustathius refers to Str. 8.3.14.23, 30.87 in order to show that the geographer uses the personal name Pylos as male.
γράψας). The 98 references prove him to be one of the primary sources of Eustathius. However, this number of references by name decreases noticeably in the Commentary on the Odyssey in which he is attested only once. It is important to note a tendency of Eustathius in the Commentary on the Odyssey to use Strabo as his primary source rather than Stephanus. However, in the examined part (1379-97) Stephanus is used as a source (although not cited verbatim): in I.1.17 (=1.20f. Makr.), Eustathius talks about a city in Iberia called 'Οδύσσεια. The word should be emended to 'Οδυσσοɵεις because Eustathius’ source here is Steph. Eth. 484.7 ('Οδυσσοɵεις, πόλις 'Ιβηριας, ἄρσενικῶς, καὶ τὸ θηνικὸν ὁμοιον...).

In I.7.10f. (=12.11f. Makr.) there is a note on the words ἀστυ and ἀστείος for which Eustathius has used Steph. Byz. 140.1-6 and 70.21-2.

Eust. I.7.10f. (=12.11f. Makr.)
"ἀστυ" δὲ κοινῶς μὲν πᾶσα πόλις,
ὀθὲν καὶ "ἀστείος" κυρίως ἀνήρ ὁ
ἐξ ἀστείως καὶ μὴ ἀγρότης.

Steph. Byz. 140.1-2
ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς ἀστεῖας γενικῆς ἀστείους,
ὅπερ ἀντιδιέσταλται τῷ ἀγροικοῖς.

Steph. Byz. 70.21-2
ἐλέγετο δὲ κατ’ ἐξοχὴν πόλις καὶ
πολίται ἐξ αὐτῶν, ὡς ἀστυ ὁ
Ἀθῆναι καὶ ἄστοι καὶ ἄστικοι
οἱ Ἀθηναίοι.

Steph. Byz. 140.5-6
...ὅτι δὲ καὶ ἡ 'Αλεξάνδρεια ἀστυ
ἐκλήθη εἴρηται.

In I.18.23f. (=34.2f. Makr.) Eustathius refers to the word 'Ἀτλαντες as a name of a nation and he mentions that this is shown many times. It is possible that he has in mind Steph. Byz. 142.17 (... 'Ἀτλαντες, ἔθνος Αἰβυκόν, Ἡρόδοτος τετάρτῃ, ἔστι
dὲ τὸ ὅνομα ἀπὸ τῶν ὄρων τῶν ὅσον Ἀτλαντων.)

352 Eust. ad Od. I.141.8 (ὁ τα Ἐθνικά γράψας).
6. Athenaeus

The high number of quotations from Athenaeus in Eustathius’ work make him one of the authors most cited by Eustathius. He usually cites Athenaeus either by his name or by the words ὁ δειπνοσοφιστής. However, it is widely accepted\textsuperscript{353} that Eustathius did not use the full Athenaeus text but the Epitome of this author. Some scholars went further and considered Eustathius to be either the writer or the promoter\textsuperscript{354} of the Epitome. The examination of some of the quotations from Athenaeus in the 
\textit{Commentary on the Odyssey} proves that Eustathius uses the Epitome:

In Eust. \textit{ad Od}. I.7.6 (=12.6ff. Makr.) we read:

\begin{quote}
“λάρω” δ᾽ ἐκείνος εἶκασε τὸν παράσιτον, διὰ τὸ πληστεύεσθαι οἷς ἀπληστεύεται, ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ “λαρινεύεσθαι” δ᾽ ἐστὶ σιτίζεσθαι κατὰ Σώφρωνα, ὡς παρασημειοῦται Ἀθήναιος, δὲν καὶ “βόες λαρινοὶ” φησιν ἄσπερ καὶ σῶς. αὐτοὶ δὲ καὶ ἄλλος καλοῦνται “λαρινοὶ” ἢ ἀπὸ Λαρίνης Ἰ. Ἡπειρωτικῆς κόμης ἢ ἀπὸ τινός Λαρίνου βουκολοῦντος αὐτᾶς.
\end{quote}

If we compare these lines with the corresponding lines from Athenaeus and the Epitome, we note the similarity between Eustathius and the Epitomator:

Ath. 9.18.19-25 (=Sophron fr. 104)

...καὶ Ἐρατοσθένης ἐκ Ἀντερνών τούς σώς λαρινοὺς προσηγόρευσε μεταγαγών καὶ αὐτῶς ἀπὸ τῶν λαρινῶν βοῶν· οἱ οὕτως ἐκλήθησαν ἦτοι ἀπὸ τοῦ λαρινεύεσθαι ὑπὲρ ἐστὶ σιτίζεσθαι. Σώφρων “βόες λαρινεύονται” ἢ ἀπὸ τινὸς κόμης Ἰ. Ἡπειρωτικῆς Λαρίνης ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ βουκολοῦντος αὐτᾶς. Λαρίνος δ᾽ οὕτως ἐκαλεῖτο.

Ath. \textit{Epit}. 2.2.7.10-3

ἔρατοσθένης δὲ σώς λαρινοὺς προσηγόρευσε μεταγαγών ἀπὸ τῶν λαρινῶν βοῶν οὕτω κληθέντων ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ λαρινεύεσθαι ὃ ἔστι σιτίζεσθαι κατὰ τὸν Σώφρων, ἢ ἀπὸ κόμης Ἰ. Ἡπειρωτικῆς Λαρίνης ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ βουκολοῦντος αὐτᾶς Λαρίνου.

\textsuperscript{353} Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. I, p. LXXX.
\textsuperscript{354} For these views see Collard (1969), pp. 158ff.
The same happens in Eust. *ad Od.* 1.14.6f. (=25.19f. Makr.) in a note on the accusative τῶν Ζεῦν: the text of Eustathius is almost identical (with a change of the order of words) with the Epitome (Ath. *Epit.* 2.1.158.37) and much shorter than Ath. 8.13.13.

However, the similarity between Eustathius and the Epitome is apparent also in terms of expression in shorter quotations in which Eustathius either cites verbatim or adapts the text of the Epitome:

In Eust. *ad Od.* 1.16.34f. (=30.21f. Makr.), we have the explanation on "καρίδας":

ός δὲ καὶ "καρίδας" ἔστιν οὗ ἡ τοιαύτη λέξις σημαίνει, δηλοῖ Ἀθηναῖος ἐν τῷ "κάμμοροι καὶ τι γένος καρίδων ὑπὸ Ἀρωμαίων οὕτω καλούμενον"

The Epitome has exactly the same explanation (Ath. *Epit.* 2.1.137.20 (κάμμοροι, καρίδων γένος ὑπὸ Ἀρωμαίων οὕτω καλούμενον) whilst the explanation in Athenaeus is slightly different (Ath. 7.75.1-6 (κάμμοροι. [...] ἐστὶ δὲ καρίδων γένος καὶ ὑπὸ Ἀρωμαίων οὕτως καλούνται).

In Eust. *ad Od.* 1.18.36f. (=34.19f. Makr.), there is an adaptation from Ath. *Epit.* 2.2.82.16-7 (only the word περιβολαῖς is added by Eustathius),355 in Eust. *ad Od.* 1.18.38f. (=34.21f. Makr.) there is a verbatim citation from Ath. *Epit.* 2.2.82.18-9356 and in Eust. *ad Od.* 1.24.16ff. (=45.7f. Makr.), Eustathius cites from the Epitome by adapting the text from Ath. *Epit.* 2.2.22.36 and at the same time adds a short comment of his own.357

However, there are several places where Eustathius gives in some quotations a reading different from both Athenaeus and the Epitome:


8 Κηφισοδότρον: 10, 16 Κηφισοδότρον: Κηφισοδότρον Eust. *ad Od.* 1.6.24 (=11.1 Makr.)

Ath. *Epit.* 2.2.125.31 Κηφισοδότρον


357 Cf. Ath. 9.73.4ff.
27 Πανταλέων: Παντολέων Eust. ad Od. 1.6.24 (=11.1 Makr.)
Ath. Epit. 2.2.125.32 Πανταλέων

Ath. 5.42
23 ἐκτός ἐξαπήξεις: ἐντός ἐξαπήξεις Eust. ad Od. 1.18.26 (=34.5 Makr.)
Ath. Epit. 2.1.77.3-4 ἐκτός ἐξαπήξεις

Ath. 3.59 (Archestr. fr. 62)
16 ἔδοντες CE: ἔθοντες Eust. ad Od. 1.13.6 (=23.14 Makr.)
Ath. Epit. 2.1.19.25 ἔθοντες

10 ὲφαντά: ὲφαινόμενα Eust. ad Od. 1.14.19 (=26.7 Makr.)
Ath. Epit. 2.2.82.15 ὲφαντά

Ath. 12.65
28 πρόσωπον AEC: μέτωπον Eust. 1.16.14 (=29.26 Makr.)

In most of the cases the different readings could be due to either copying or memory mistakes and their quality would not justify a position favorable to the hypothesis that Eustathius was the Epitomator. However, according to Collard, cases like the last one “illustrate well the variable skill and care of Eustathius both as transcriber from a source and as independent critic and their nature is quite consistent with him having been the Epitomator”.\(^{358}\)

7. Lycophron

Lycophron is cited by name in I.8.41 where Eustathius quotes two verses (v.1 and 8) from the beginning of Alexandria. In I.11.33 he mentions the use of the word ἀλήθια by Lycophron for Athena (in Alex. and again in I.16.4 he mentions the expression εὐφήτας κόρας (in Alex. 23-4) and omits everything else. All these citations are used in order for Eustathius to give examples on the use of words or expressions; additionally, all the quotations have a general character and most of them are from the beginning of the work that betrays citation from memory.\(^{359}\)

\(^{359}\) It is normal that one remembers more easily by heart the beginning of a work.
8. Aristophanes

Eustathius wrote a *Commentary on Aristophanes*, hence, it is not surprising that he is familiar with his work and quotes him often. In my text, Aristophanes is quoted 18 times, either as ὁ κωμικός (13 times) or by name (3 times), in all the remaining places he is quoted either with a general reference (ὁ εἰπών) or without any particular introduction. The references to the extant comedies in the examined passage are: *Nubes*, 4; *Aves*, 2; *Ranae*, 5; *Plutus*, 3; *Vespa*, 1; *Thesmophoriazusae*, 1; *Eccles.*, 1; *Equites* 1.

The cases of verbatim quotation are very limited: in Eust. *ad Oed. I*. 1.9.46.-10.1 (=17.20f. Makr.), he quotes Ar. *Ran.* 347-8 but changes the order of the words. On the other hand, the majority of the quotations concern a rare word or a usage of an Aristophanic word or phrase: in 1.4.37 (=7.28 Makr.), Eust. mentions the word στρόφις used in "comedy" implying Ar. *Nub.* 450, in 1.11.26 (=20.24f. Makr.) on the word αἰώνας (Ar. *Thes.* 246), in 1.5.42f. (=9.26ff. Makr.) there is a note on the phrase πολλοί τού βολόν attributed to Aristophanes (ὁ κωμικός ὁστειότερον φράσως), in 1.11.19-20 on the invocation ὁ Δάματερ (Ar. *Plu.* 555 and 872), in 1.13.22 (=24.8f. Makr.), Eustathius makes a note on the word ἀπαφανῶν (in Ar. *Ran.* 1089 there is ἐπωφαινῶν); in 1.21.21 on βλέπω βλέπος (Ar. *Nub.* 1176), in 1.25.5 on the word σπάρτη where Eustathius quotes Ar. *Av.* 815 by name (ἐν τοῖς ὸρνείοις), in 1.5.6 on the words περίπτριμμα and πατώλη (Ar. *Nub.* 447 and 260). In 1.5.45-6 Eustathius makes a comment on the phrase ἀπελεύσομαι παρά τοῖς πλείωνας and he refers generally to the author as ὁ εἰπών and ἐκείνος ἔφη. The meaning of ὁι πολλοί for the dead is found in Ar. *Eccles.* 1073 but not combined with the verb ἀπελεύσομαι that Eustathius uses here. In 1.24.34 Eustathius makes a comment on the expression λύχνους ἀδημόφαιρους and he cites Ael. Dion. a 36.6-7 citing the comic poet Alcaeus (Alc. Com. fr. 21) on this expression; as already mentioned, he replaces Dionysius' example with a use of the expression in Ar. *Nub.* 57 citing both the poet and the work by name (ὁποῖος ὁ ἐν Νεφέλαις παρὰ τῷ Ἀριστοφάνει). In 1.28.30 (=53.13 Makr.) there is a verbatim citation of Ar. *Ran.* 1400 and in 1.29.11 (=Makr. 54.17f.) there is a quotation from Ar. *Ran.* 970.

---


On the Aristophanic references in Eustathius and on ὁ κωμικός see Miller, (1942), pp.353-7.
Finally, in 1.13.25f. (=24.12 Makr.), there is also a fragment from one of Aristophanes’ unknown plays (Ar. fr. 633) where Eustathius mentions ἴστιν τις ὀσπερ τοὺς ὅρεικόμους ἄθροις.

The rest of the citations are introduced as general references to the plays.

In the examined passage, no special direct reference is made from Aristophanes’ scholia, but the closest case to the scholia is 1.25.37f. (=47.30 Makr.) where Eustathius makes a note about the word στιβάς. The explanation has many similarities with sch. Ar. Pl. 663.8:

Eust. 1.25.37f. (=47.30 Makr.)

στιβάς ἢ ἓκ χόρτον στρομην, ἢ τοιούτο τι. καὶ γίνεται παρά τὸ στείβειν, ὃ ἐστι τὸ περιπτεῖν.

στιβάς γὰρ κυρίως ἢ πεπιλημένη καὶ οἶον καταπεπατημένη.

Sch. Ar. Pl. 663.8

9. Tragic poets

Sophocles is one of the most frequently encountered ancient authors in Eustathius probably because of the close relation with the Homeric epics as the citation φιλόμηρος also proves. It is generally believed that Eustathius was deeply familiar and had direct knowledge of Sophocles’ works.

The proportion of citation of the extant dramas in the examined text is as follows: Ajax 5; Trachiniae 1; Oedipus Tyrannus 1; Antigone 1; Electra 1; Philoctetes 1. In most of the cases, Eustathius cites Sophocles by name and quotes him verbatim; in the majority of the cases, he quotes a word or a phrase, sometimes a whole verse and

---

363 For more on the total of Sophocles’ references in Eustathius see Miller (1946), pp. 99-102.
366 Eust. ad Od. 1.21.20 (=39.23 Makr.) (Fl. 488).
some other times he paraphrases Sophocles.\textsuperscript{367} In two of the cases, I have noted a different reading from Eustathius but the changes are not of great importance:

Soph. Ant. 505 \textit{γυγκλησι}: Eust. \textit{ad Od.} I.20.38 (=38.17 Makr.) \textit{γυγκλείσι}

Soph. Phil. 791 \textit{ζέευ}: Eust. \textit{ad Od.} I.26.32 (=49.18 Makr.) \textit{ζέευε}

From no longer extant works there is a citation in I.28.17ff. (=52.28ff. Makr.) where Eustathius cites a verse from Sophocles’ \textit{Palamedes} (Soph. fr. 479), in I.28.29 (=53.12ff.) where Eustathius refers to a “tragic proverb” taken from Sophocles (Soph. fr. 895) and in I.28.41f. (= 53.28 Makr.) in a discussion about \textit{πεσοσούς} (Soph. fr. 429); all the references were copied by Eustathius from Suet. \textit{Π. παιδ}. (1.3ff., 1.28f., 1.50f.).

It is has been noted\textsuperscript{368} that of Aeschylean tragedies \textit{Prometheus Bound} is the one most frequently referred to in Eustathius’ work. The examination confirms that the majority of the citations come from \textit{Prometheus Bound} (4 out of 6). Most of the citations by name are made on single words\textsuperscript{369} apart from a single case where a whole verse is quoted.\textsuperscript{370}

From no longer extant or unknown works we have a citation in I.11.31 (=20.31 Makr.) where Eustathius has a note on \textit{αιθήρ} \textit{Ζεός} (Aesch. fr. 70).

Euripides is mentioned twice by name: in I.2.20 (=3.7f. Makr.) with \textit{ἐσωσά α’ ως Ἰασοῖ from Medea} 476, when Eustathius talks about τὸ συχνὸν τῷ συγμοῦ and in I.4.40 (=7.31f. Makr) when Eustathius, discussing the word πωσιλόγφρων, cites Euripides (implying Hec. 131). Finally, in I.26.33 (=49.19 Makr.) (on the phrase ἀναξ \textit{Κεφαλήνων}), Eustathius puts the reference ὑπὸ τῶν ποιητῶν ἔγειται in plural, because apart from Soph. Phil. 264 he also has Eur. \textit{Cycl.} 103 in his mind.

From no longer extant plays, there is a reference to Euripides \textit{Telephus} (Eur. Fr. 888) taken from Suet. \textit{Π. παιδ}. 1.32.

\textsuperscript{367} Eust. \textit{ad Od.} I.9.39 (=17.11 Makr.) (\textit{Tr.} 550-1) when he underlines the difference between ὁ πόσις and ὁ ἄνυφ by using an example from Sophocles about Hercules’ different relations with Deianira and Iole.

\textsuperscript{368} Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. I, p. LXXXVII.

\textsuperscript{369} Eust. \textit{ad Od.} I.17.32 (=32.16f. Makr.) (\textit{Pr.} 349) on the unique column of Atlas, I.18.12f. (=33.20f. Makr.) (\textit{Pr.} 721) on \textit{ἀστρογείτονας}, I.26.3 (=48.12 Makr.) (\textit{Ag.} 143) on δρυκαλα; in I.16.5 (=29.14f. Makr.), the quotation is not by name but the phrase \textit{μοινόδα στροτόν} is taken from \textit{Pr.} 804.

\textsuperscript{370} Eust. \textit{ad Od.} I.11.31 (=20.31 Makr.) (\textit{Pr.} 846).
10. Epic poets

As far as the epic poets are concerned, Hesiod is cited 4 times by name: the first is 1.7.44f. (=13.24 Makr.), a grammatical point about the pronoun σφέτερος being in all cases 3rd person apart from Hes. Op. 2; the remark about this grammatical exception in Hesiod suggests a careful reading of his work by Eustathius. The rest of the references concern an etymological example from Hes. Op. 477 on εἰσοχθέων, the phrase αἰμύλα κωτίλλουσα used in Op. 374 and a verbatim quotation from Hes. Th.145-6 on the single eye of the Cyclops.

Additionally, in 1.1.15 (=1.18 Makr.), Hes. Th. 1011-6 serves as source to Eustathius for Latinus' genealogy from Odysseus and Circe and in two more cases Hesiod is quoted without his name.371

References to Batrachomyomachia and Homeric Hymns have not been found.

11. Oppian, Theocritus, Dionysius Periegetes, Quintus Smyrnaeus.

Oppian is not one of the most frequently cited authors in Eustathius. He is found in the Commentary on the Iliad as ὁ Κίλιξ ποιητής / σοφός. In my text, he is not quoted by name; however, there is a passage in Eust. ad Od 1.14.12 (=25.27 Makr.), where Eustathius talks about the explanation of the word λόθρον that may recall Oppian Halieutica 5.9.

Theocritus is cited in 1.21.29-32, where Eustathius talks about Cyclops’ eye and he quotes Theocritus but he changes the words:

Eust. ad Od. 1.21.29ff. (=40.7ff. Makr.)

Theocr. Id. 11.53
καὶ τὸν ἐν’ ὀφθαλμόν, τὸ ὁμι
γλυκερότερον οὐδέν.

Id. 11.31-2
...μοὶ λασία μὲν ὀφρύς ἐπὶ
παντὶ μετάπορ / ἐξ ὄροις τετα-
ταί ποτὶ θάτερον ὡς μία μα-
κρά...

A second reference by name is some lines ahead in 1.21.36 when Eustathius talks about the change of -πτ- into -φθ- ad gives the example of ἐπιφωθεῖν in Theocritus (cf. ld. 7.127) and then again in 1.28.46 (=54.4 Makr.) in a quotation from ld. 6.18 that he copies from Suet. II. παιδ. 1.60. Finally, in Eust. ad Od. 1.14.19 (=26.7f. Makr.), where Eustathius comments on the word ῥόμβος, there is a reference in Theocritus’ scholia (ζητεῖ δὲ περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τοῖς κατὰ τὸν Θεόκριτον) which Eustathius has studied, as Van der Valk suggests.

It is not surprising that Eustathius was well acquainted with Dionysius Periegetes’ work since he wrote a Commentary on him. He is usually quoted as ὁ περιηγητὴς Διονύσιος as in 1.18.15-8 where Eustathius comments on Atlas’ column being situated in “the Libyan mountain” and paraphrases Ὁ. P. 66-8. In the examined extract Eustathius quotes twice from his own Commentary on Dionysius Periegetes and he introduces the comments ἐν τοῖς τῶν περιηγητῶν or ἐν τοῖς εἰς τὸν περιηγητήν.

One of the late Greek poems that Eustathius read was Quintus Smyrnaeus’ Posthomerica. Eustathius does not cite him very often and he introduces him as ὁ 'Τὰ μεθ’ Ὀμηρον γράψας like in 1.4.43 where he mentions two examples from Posthomerica (12.171 and 390) on the different uses of the word πολύτροπος.

12. Lyric poetry

Of the lyric poets, Pindar is the most appreciated by Eustathius and this is indicated by many factors:

- Eustathius wrote a commentary on Pindar
- The number of Pindaric references in Eustathius’ work is bigger than that of any other lyric poet which suggests that Eustathius had wide access to Pindar’s work.
- The way Pindar is introduced by Eustathius: either as ὁ πολύνους or ὁ αὐτομαθὴς καὶ θυμόσσοφος Λυρικός in the Commentary on the

372 Cf. sch. Theocr. 2.30a1-4, 30b1.
373 Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. I, p. XCI.
375 Eust. ad Od. 1.26.24f. (=49.7f. Makr.) on the island of Taphos.
Iliad\textsuperscript{376} or simply as δι καλός Λυρικός in Eust. Comm. ad Od. 1.3.37 (=6.8 Makr.)\textsuperscript{377} where the expression is used to show appreciation on the part of Eustathius. This characterisation is used in a reference to Pindar’s Olympian 6.4 on the frequently cited verse χρή ἄρχομένου ἔργου πρόσωπον θείναι τηλαυγές. Eustathius’ decision to explain Homer’s invocation at the beginning of the Iliad and the Odyssey by using the words of a lyric poet is successful, because not only does it show a parallel process of thinking between Homer and Pindar but it also indicates that this process which was initiated by Homer was followed by many poets and writers (the number of references to Pindar’s verse in other authors convinces us that Homer’s idea of starting his poem with an invocation to the Muse and Pindar’s verse became popular).

The rest of the references are given by name\textsuperscript{378} and most of them come from Pindar’s Olympians. However, there is no direct reference to Eustathius’ own Commentary on Pindar although we know that he sometimes refers to it with the introduction ἐν τοῖς τοῦ Πινδάρου.\textsuperscript{379}

From the rest of the lyric poets, Eust. refers by name to fragments from Hipponax\textsuperscript{380} and Alcaeus,\textsuperscript{381} and he also mentions the name of Stesichorus\textsuperscript{382} but the references are all made from Suetonius Π. ψαίδ. 1.45ff., 58ff., 88f.

13. Orators

Eustathius (and the other Byzantine writers) held the books about the art of rhetoric in great esteem. This is not only due to the fact that he had studied and taught

\textsuperscript{376} Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. I, p. XC n. 4.

\textsuperscript{377} ο ποιητής προγόρας θεάν τῆς εαυτοῦ ποιήσεως, καθά καὶ ἐν Ἰλιάδι, καὶ τῇ ταύτης ἐπικλήσει μοσφόλητος ὑπονόησες καὶ φαντάσας θεωρήσεται λαλεῖν, ἀφορμὴν ενέδοξεν τῷ καλῷ λυρικῷ γνωστεύονθαι ὡς ἄρα χρή ἄρχομένου ἔργου, πρόσωπον θείναι τηλαυγές.

\textsuperscript{378} Eust. ad Od. 1.8.4 (=14.1 Makr.) (Ol. 7.39) on Υπαρχονική, 1.18.10f. (=33.16 Makr.) (P. 1.20) on an example of the influence of Atlas’ column on poetic imagination, 1.18.45f. (=34.30f. Makr.) (Ol. 13.6) on an example of Dorian syntax.

\textsuperscript{379} Eust. ad II. 1.529.2, 542.10, III.321.1, ad Od. 1.412.2, II.170.40; on his acquaintance with the Vatican recension of the scholia on Pindar see Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. I, p. XC n. 5.

\textsuperscript{380} Eust. ad Od. 1.28.38-9 (=53.24f. Makr.) (‘Ἰππώνας; τί μὲ σκιράφοις ἀπιτάλαξες’) (Hippon. fr. 129a).

\textsuperscript{381} Eust. ad Od. 1.28.45 (=54.2f. Makr.) (‘Ἀλκαίου δὲ φησὶν ἐκ πλήρους γνών δ’ οὕτως ἐπικρέτει κινήσεις τὸν ἀπ’ ἱπτομένον λίθον’) (Alc. fr. 351).

\textsuperscript{382} Eust. ad Od. 1.29.7 (=54.12f. Makr.) (λέγεται δὲ τις ἐν αὐτάς φησὶ καὶ Στηρίχορος).
rhetoric (one of his titles was μακατωρ τῶν ρητόρων") but also to his belief in the
traditional view that Homer's work was full of rhetorical art.\(^{383}\) Hence, Eustathius' own writing is full of comments on rhetorical terms and schemata for which he shows an exceptional preference.

A common example of such a schema is προέκτεσις\(^{384}\) which is also found in the Commentary on the Iliad\(^{385}\) many times and is said to have been used by Homer.\(^{386}\) Additionally, it is noted by Eustathius that the term προέκτεσις is identical to the term προαναφώνησις.\(^{387}\) Both these terms are extracted from the Homeric scholia.\(^{388}\)

In the same category of schemata we should include προοικονομία.\(^{389}\)

Another rhetorical term commonly used by Eustathius, also originating from the Homeric scholia is ἐπανάληψις.\(^{390}\) Eustathius states that according to the ancient commentators (he implies the Homeric scholia) it was used a lot by Homer in the Iliad and only once in the Odyssey.\(^{391}\) According to Eustathius, the schema of ταυτολογία\(^{392}\) was used by Homer\(^{393}\) and by many ancient poets.\(^{394}\) Another schema called διάσκεψις occurs in Eustathius\(^{395}\) and shows the rhetorical elaboration of a topic.\(^{396}\) Additionally, we also find the schema ὤμοιοτέλεστον\(^{397}\) frequently quoted

\(^{383}\) On ῥητορεία in the Iliad see Eust. ad II. 1.2.5-6 and on ῥητορικὴ ὁδύτης in the Odyssey see Eust. ad Od. 1.2.2 (=21.19 Makr.).

\(^{384}\) Eust. ad Od. 1.6.2 (=10.3 Makr.), 6.5 (=10.8 Makr.), 22.35 (=12.12f. Makr.) (ἀναφωνητική), 24.1 (=44.19 Makr.), 1.6.4 (=10.6 Makr.), 24.5 (=44.24 Makr.) (προεκτίθεται).


\(^{386}\) Eust. ad II. 1.6.4 (τὸν τρόπον προεκτίθεται δι' οὗ τὴν ποιητὴν πλατύνει).

\(^{387}\) Eust. ad Od. 1.24.1 (=44.20 Makr.); also I.8.3 (=13.30 Makr.) (προαναφωνοɣύμον); 24.4 (=44.22 Makr.) (προαναφώνες); on the term προαναφώνησις cf. Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. I, p. XCIV (with note), Keizer (1995), p. 430.

\(^{388}\) Sch. b T ad II. 13.171, 15.601-2, A ad II. 18.483a, sch. V ad Od. 2.127.


\(^{391}\) Eust. ad Od. 1.10.31 (=19.1f. Makr.) (ὅτι παρασκευαζόμεναι οἱ παλαιοὶ τῶν ποιητῶν ἐν μέν Ἰλιάδι πολλάς ἐπαναλήψεις χρησιμοῦντο εν τοῖς τῇ κατὰ τοὺς Αἴδιοις).


\(^{393}\) Eust. ad Od. 1.15.33f. (=28.23f. Makr.) (ὅτι οὐκ ἀπανανομένος ὁ ποιητῆς τὴν καίριον ταυτολογίαν…).

\(^{394}\) Eust. ad Od. 1.754.2ff. (ὅτι καὶ τὰ ταυτολογία ἐξηλοῦτο τοῖς παλαιοῖς, οὐκ ἔστων ἀμφιθαλεῖν…)

\(^{395}\) Eust. ad Od. 1.23.18 (=43.17 Makr.); also I.1.11 (=1.13 Makr.) (διασκεδαστική), 2.23 (=3.11 Makr.) (διασκεδαστική), 25.13 (=46.28 Makr.) (διασκεδαστική).


which is the same as πάρισον and δομοιοκατάληκτον and another schema which is called either ὑστερολογία or πρωθόστερον and is found in the Homeric and Aristophanic scholia and in the scholia on Dionysius Thrax. The term ἀναγωγή is frequently used in order to give the meaning of an “allegorical explanation” and ἔπαγωγή is used with the meaning of “induction”.

However, there are also some rhetorical terms that Eustathius uses specifically either to characterise Homer’s poetry or to specify a Homeric usage of a word. The term σεμνότης is frequently used by Eustathius in order to show the virtue and the moral value of the Homeric poems. The term ἀνινττομαι is used mainly when the passage under discussion can have an allegorical interpretation (the most common subjects for the verb are usually “Homer” or “the myth”). The words πλατύνω and πλατυμοὺς are used for the instances where Homer tries to treat a subject at length or to expand his narration. The term exists in the Homeric scholia which the author quotes. Eustathius underlines the use of this schema from the beginning of his introduction especially for the Odyssey since the story does not provide much inspiration. The rhetorical terms πιθανολογία πιθανότης which concern the use of probable and persuasive arguments are also common in Eustathius. Additionally,
the words τερατεία and τερατολογία are used for the narration of extraordinary things by Homer and the terms δεινός and δεινότης are used by Eustathius in order to show the high quality of Homer. Moreover, the term μέθοδος denotes the mode of treating a subject and is usually used either in a general way or more specifically to characterize the ingenious way in which Homer treats his subjects. Finally, there are certain other terms which derive from rhetorical vocabulary and are less often repeated by Eustathius.

As far as the orators are concerned, quotations by name are not many. Lysias is mentioned once in the examined passage: in I.24.32ff. (=45.29ff. Makr.) Eustathius in his discussion of the word ἀδησφαγός, gives the example of νοῦς ἀδησφαγός found in Lysias' fr. 343.14; however, the reference is not direct but originates from Ael. Dion. α 36.5-6. Demosthenes’ name is only mentioned by Eustathius (I.8.20) in a speculation: Homer by invoking the Muse asks for divine inspiration, just as someone who is talking like Plato or Demosthenes (πλατωνίζειν ἢ δημοσθενίζειν) is supposed to be wise. I have not found any references from Aeschines or Isocrates which are anyway rare as sources in Eustathius.

14. Historians

Among the historians, Herodotus is the most appreciated by Eustathius. He is frequently quoted by name in the majority of the cases for examples of grammatical use but also in geographical or even etymological references.

---

412 Eust. ad Od. 1.9.20 (=16.26 Makr.) (τερατεία) 25.25 (=47.13 Makr.) (τερατολογία); cf. also I.1.7 (=1.9 Makr.) (τερατεύσεως); 12.19 (=22.6 Makr.), 18.31 (=34.11 Makr.) (τερατώδης); 23.40 (=44.11 Makr.) (τερατωδόστερον); cf. also Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. II, p. XXV, Keizer (1995), p. 457.
414 Eust. ad Od. 1.2.24 (=3.13 Makr.).
416 Some examples are: επιτώσις Eust. ad Od. 1.9.30 (=16.29 Makr.), 20.28 (=38.4 Makr.); πίστις Eust. ad Od. 1.14.46 (=27.11 Makr.); the schema ἐκ μέρους τὸ πάν Eust. ad Od. 1.7.25 (=12.30f. Makr.), 19.44 (=36.27 Makr.), 24.23 (=45.15f. Makr.), 27.46 (=52.6 Makr.); περιφράσεις Eust. ad Od. 1.6.40 (=11.22 Makr.), 20.13 (=37.15 Makr.); παρεκκλήσεις Eust. ad Od. 1.24.5 (=44.24 Makr.), 24.3 (=44.22 Makr.) (παρεκκλήσεις); ὁμφαλίως Eust. ad Od. 1.25.6 (=46.19f. Makr.); the schema ἐκ τοῦ διώκοντος τὸ διωκόμενον 1.27.12 (=50.21f. Makr.).
417 In Eust. ad II. Aeschines is quoted twice and Isocrates four times.
Thucydides is rarely quoted. In the examined passage he is quoted by name only once, in 1.19.8 in a grammatical example for the use of the word *μήκον* however, here again Eustathius quotes from another source than the one he cites. The passage comes from Ael. Dion. μ 19 who cites Thuc. 4.26.8.2 on *μήκον* *μεμελιτωμένην*. Once more Eustathius avoids the name of the secondary source in order to show his erudition.

Polybius is also rarely mentioned. Eustathius cites his name (καθ’ και τῷ Πολυβίῳ δοκεῖ) at the beginning of the introduction (I.1.39) and paraphrases his comment on the mixture of truth and lies in Odysseus' journey and in the story of the Iliadic war. Diodorus' name is also mentioned once in a fragment preserved by Eustathius on the peak of the Alps and the expression ὁφρανὸς ῥάχις.

Arrian, Procopius and Psellus are not directly cited although there are indications that Eustathius was acquainted with their work.

15. Philosophers

Apart from the citation where the word *πλατωνίζειν* is explained as a reference to Plato's wisdom, Eustathius seems to consult mainly the *Timaeus* though sometimes other works. However, it seems that he uses Plato for common and general issues more than philosophical matters. Aristotle is not cited by name in the examined passage but in some instances he is used as a source like in I.22.2-3 where Eustathius gives an Aristotelian definition of anger as the "boiling of the bloody liquidness"; Eustathius was aware of the definition either by Aristotle or by the

---

422 Eust. *ad Od.* 1.8.7f. (=14.5 Makr.) (on the personal name Εἰδάλθον), 8.25ff. (=14.28ff. Makr.) (on the grammatical use of οἰδαμός, οἰδαμάς and πρός οἰδαμόν ἀνθρώπον), 27.31 (=51.15 Makr.) (on the use of the phrase τὰ μὲν ἤτε, τὰ δὲ ἔφεσα).
423 Eust. *ad Od.* 1.11.42f. (=21.10f. Makr.) where he discusses about the Aithiopaeans and he quotes Hdt. 3.97.5 (Ἀιθιόπας οἱ πρόσωποι Αἰγύπτου); also in I.18.24f., (=34.2f. Makr.) when Eust. mentions the existence of a nation called "Ἀτλαντες", the source for the information could be Hdt. 4.184.18.
424 Eust. *ad Od.* 1.12.34f. (=22.23f. Makr.) where he cites Herodotus for the derivation of Poseidon's and Heracles' name.
426 Polyb. 34.3.4.
427 Eust. *ad Od.* 1.18.13f. (=33.21f. Makr.).
429 Eust. *ad Od.* 1.8.20 (=14.21 Makr.).
430 Eust. *ad Od.* 1.17.12 (=31.22 Makr.) (on Plato's idea of the "flowing body" in *Tim.* 43.a.5-6).
431 For example Eust. *ad Od.* 1.18.4 (=33.10 Makr.) where Plato is cited by name in a comment on the earth's axis called χιλόν in Resp. 616.5.4-6; in 1.2820f. (=52.32f. Makr.) there is a quotation from *Phdr.* 274c5ff.; in 1.28.27 (= 53.10f.) there is a reference to *Lg.* 968e9.
Homerian or Aristophanic scholia.430 Another instance where it is possible that Aristotle was consulted is I.22.14-5, on the movement of the sky which never stops.431 However, it seems that Eustathius was occasionally interested in Neoplatonic ideas and he cites some of the Neoplatonists by a general name (κατὰ τοῦς Πλατωνικούς), as in I.17.16 where he talks about “the real country of the souls” which is “the intelligible world” (ὁ νοητὸς κόσμος) citing Olympiodorus.432

As Van der Valk remarks Eustathius sometimes cites Aelianus’ *Varia Historia* or *Historia Animalium* or even the lost work *Περὶ Προνολακίας*. In Eust. *ad Od*. I.18.20ff. (=33.29ff. Makr.) Eustathius makes a direct, verbatim reference to Aelianus (φησὶ γοῦν Αἰλιανὸς αὐτὰς λέξεων οὕτω) which comes from one of his lost works *Περὶ θεῖων ἐναργείων* (Aelian. fr. 188) which Eustathius must have had in his possession.

Finally, although Eustathius was also familiar with the works of Plutarch and Xenophon433 there are no quotations from these two authors in the examined text.

16. Mythographers

Van der Valk434 states that Eustathius possessed handbooks about mythology such as *Bibliotheca Personati Apollodori* and codices of Palaephatus’ works (certainly more than those which have survived to us). Within the limits of the examined passage, there is no direct reference to the first work; however, there is a direct reference to Palaephatus. Eustathius435 refers to the well-known myth of the building of Troy, according to which Priam’s city walls were built by Poseidon and Apollo when they were under the command of king Laomedon. He uses this story to justify the adjectives ἱερὰν and θεόκτιστον attributed to Troy, and he also decides to give the “logical” explanation of the myth according to Palaephatus436 (θεραπεία δὲ τοῦ μύθου κατὰ Παλαίφατον):

431 Aristot. *De mundo* 399a.19s
432 Olymp. *In Plat. Alc. comm*. 94.22.
433 Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. I, p. CIV.
434 Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. I, p. CIX.
Eust. ad Od. 1.6.34ff. (=11.13ff. Makr.)

τεραπεία δὲ τοῦ μόθου <τοῦτον> κατὰ Παλαῖφατον, ὡς κειμήλια Ποσειδῶνος
tὲ καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος εἰς ἀνοικισμὸν τῆς Ἱλίου ὑπὸ Λαμμέδωντος δεδαπάνητο.
dιὸ δοκοῦσι τρόπον τινὰ θητεύσαι ὁ Ποσειδῶν καὶ ὁ Ἀπόλλων ἐν τῷ τῆς Ἱλίου κτίσματι.

It is possible that Eustathius also refers to sch. T ad II. 21.444d. This kind of combination of the myth with its “logical” explanation makes Eustathius’ passage more interesting and increases his prestige as an educated scholar (something which Byzantine scholars wanted).

17. Proverbs

Van der Valk remarks that although Eustathius is interested in quoting proverbs, it is not known what kind of tradition he follows. In I.1.17 (=1.21 Makr.), he talks about “the hero from Temese exceeding wrathful mentioned in the proverbs”. Here Eustathius does not give a name but in I.46.29 he mentions Polites. Hence, his source for the proverb must be Str. 6.1.5.1-5 who cites the same name in contradiction to Suda ε 3510 which gives Alybas as the hero from Temese. However, it is strange that Eustathius uses the plural of the word proverb (ἐν ταῖς παρομίαις) in his citation which could indicate that he had consulted more than one source.

In I.15.29ff. (=28.18f. Makr.) Eustathius quotes another proverb which is associated with the Homeric verse νῦν δ' ἄθροα πάντα ἀπέτισεν (Od. 1.43) that he mentioned some lines before. The proverb is πάντα ἄθροα ἀποτίσαι and Eustathius gives his own explanation of the proverb in the lines following.

In I.24.16f. (=45.8f. Makr.), Eustathius mentions a proverb talking about Τηλεμάχου χύτρα. Eustathius explains again in a few words that the proverb is used of the people who eat a lot of either pulses or cheap food because of their poverty. The reference is made by Eustathius in order to clarify a possible confusion on the name Telemachus of the proverb: the name does not belong to the Homeric hero but

437 οἱ δὲ διὸ φασίν ἐργασαμένους ἀμισθὶ ἀναθεῖναι Ἀπόλλωνι καὶ Ποσειδῶνι, οἱ δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν ἱερατικῶν χρημάτων ἑκδόμησιν αὐτά.
438 Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. I, p. CXII.

CXXIV
to an Acharnian Telemachus who always used to eat a lot of beans from a pot. The reference here is a paraphrase from Athenaeus.439

Finally, in I.28.43f. (=53.30f. Makr.) Eustathius mentions the proverb κινεῖν τὸν ἄφιερᾶς and in I.29.9 (=54.16) he refers to the proverb Χίος παραστάς Κῶνον οὐκ ἐξάω both taken from Suet. Π. παιδ. (1.53ff. and 1.94f.).

18. Medical writers

Although, Eustathius is familiar with some medical works440 medicine does not seem to be relevant to his subject, since no direct references have been found to either Hippocrates441 or Galen.

19. Ecclesiastical writers

Of Ecclesiastical works and writers,442 Eustathius is familiar with the Psalms and the New Testament since they were part of the sacred liturgy of the Byzantines. There are only two passages where Eustathius mentions two words from biblical vocabulary: in I.9.40 (=17.12 Makr.), he attributes the word ὑπέρακμος to Deianira; the word is rare and is attested in N. T. 1 Cor 7.36.2. The second reference concerns the word ὑπέρλιαν which is attested in N. T. 2 Cor. 11.5, 12.11.

No direct references to the works of Tzetzes443 or of Porphyrius444 have been identified in the examined text but as proved by Van der Valk, Eustathius was familiar with these two Byzantine writers.

---

439 Ath. Epit. 2.2.22.36 (=Ath. 9.73.4ff.).
441 There is only one reference in Eust. ad Od. I.25.30f. (=47.22 Makr.) where Eustathius could have had Hippocrates in mind (either Aphorismoi 3.5 or De humoribus 14).
442 Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. I, pp. CXVI-CXVII.
443 For a comparison between Tzetzes' Commentaries and Eustathius' works cf. Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. I, pp. CXXXVI-CXXXVII.
20. Conclusions

In summary, the identification of Eustathius' sources suggests a large variety of authors, categories of works and information selected; Eustathius was acquainted with a large number of sources which he used for his Commentary: my view is that his scholarship was not only focused on strictly linguistic or grammatical points but it covered a wide range of ideas and comments which sometimes were also related with anthropological, ethnographical, geographical or folklore material. Additionally, Eustathius is keen in introducing every kind of information from different writers and does not restrict his selection according to the area of knowledge of his sources (for example, as already proven, he draws lexicographical or etymological comments even from Strabo or Herodotus).

Especially in the Commentary on the Odyssey, Eustathius makes extensive use of lexicographical works for reasons of erudition and predigestion of material for his students. Furthermore, he uses a double system of quoting his source depending on his choice: if the comments are taken from the primary source, he usually cites either by name or in an indirect way (see Eustathius' terminology); if the information is drawn from a secondary source (for example from a lexicon or Athenaeus etc.), he prefers to refer directly to the primary source; in some cases, as I have shown before, he even changes the examples of his source in order to adapt the citation to the needs of his audience.

Another important remark is that the identification of sources gives us important information on works now lost; specifically, for the examined text from Eustathius' Commentary on the Odyssey the most characteristic example of such a writer is Demosthenes Thrax and his work Paraphrase of the Odyssey which I suggest that Eustathius possessed.
f. EUSTATHIUS’ STYLE

Eustathius’ expression in his *Commentary on the Odyssey* is characterised by simplicity and a didactic tone which are explained from the nature of his audience or readers. Eustathius tries to use common words that everyone will understand, and those which seem to be difficult are explained in the best manner possible, either by a gloss or by examples offering their etymology, or even with mythological *paradeigmata* that make the narration more pleasant. In addition, Eustathius also likes to rationalise his writings, which would surely help in the demystification of ancient Greece in the eyes of the Byzantines. It is believed that this effort of simplification of expression is also based on the whole climate of this period: the Comneni emperors wanted Attic morals to be revived as we learn from the works of Anna Comnena and Nicetas Choniates.\(^{445}\)

However, Eustathius’ vast knowledge of language is something that can be confirmed, especially from his *hapax legomena*, but also from another characteristic of his language: the mimic of the Homeric diction.\(^{446}\)

I hope that the previous examination of Eustathius’ *Commentary on the Odyssey* combined with the modern edition of the text which follows, with updated footnotes (based on the collation of the manuscripts) and corrected punctuation, numbering and orthographical or other mistakes will provide the reader with an unprejudiced and complete opinion about the way Eustathius’ mind traveled through Homer’s “poetic Ocean”.

---

\(^{445}\) Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. 1, p. CXXI.

\(^{446}\) For example cf. Eust. *ad Od*. 1.2.7 (=2.25 Makr.) (ἀπραξόν), 2.10f. (=2.30 Makr.) (μεγαγκελας), 16.29 (=30.15 Makr.) (μεμυρίζων).
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PART II

TEXT
Περί την Ὀδύσσειαν καθὰ καὶ τὴν Ἰλιάδα εἰλήχασι λογισταῖ, καὶ μᾶλλον ταύτην ἦπερ εἴκεινη διασπαρράτουσι. διδωσὶ δὲ λαβᾶς εἴκεινος τὸ καὶ ἐνταῦθα πολὺ τοῦ μυθόδους. καὶ τοῦτο διαβάλλοντες εἴκεινοι | συνεκβάλλουσι τῷ μύθῳ καὶ τὴν ἀλῆθεαν, διὰ τὸ τὸν ψεύδος παρέκτοθεν ὑπόπτως ἔχοντες καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἱστορίαν αὐτὴν. χρὴ δὲ οὐκ οὔτω ποιεῖν, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἔργον σκοπεῖν τῆς ποιήσεως, εἴκειν εἰδότας, ώς ἄρα νόμος τοῖς ποιηταῖς μὴ γυμνὴν τὴν ἱστορίαν ἐκτίθεσθαι, ἀλλὰ μῦθος καταπεκάζων, ὅτι τῶν μὲν ἄλλων ἢ ἡ πλασθήσεις ἀναλέγονται, τοῖς δὲ καὶ αὐτὸθεν προσαναπλάττονται. | δέδοται γὰρ κατὰ τοὺς τεχνογράφους τῇ ποιήσει καὶ τερατεύσθαι, ὡς ἂν ἐκ τοῦτων ἰδοθήν τῇ ἀμα τοῖς ἀκροαταῖς καὶ ἐκπλήξεως ἐμποιήσειν. οὕτω τοῖς καὶ ὁ ποιητὴς πολλαχοῦ, ὡς φασιν | οἱ παλαιοὶ, τοὺς ἱστορομενοὺς ὁμολογῶν παραπλέκει καὶ μῦθος, καὶ τοῖς θρυλουμένοις ἀληθείᾳ προστίθησι τι καὶ τῶν οὐκ ἀληθῶν, ἐκὼν οὕτω ἐνιστῶν την τὸν ἀδυνάτου γραφῆν. καὶ οὐ πάντη | πρὸς πλάσμα διασκευάζει καὶ μῦθος, ἀλλὰ, κατ’ αὐτὸν φάναι, “πολλὰ ψεῦδα” λέγει “ἐτύμως ὁμοία” θεν ἂν τις οὐδε ἱδοθο. “πολλὰ” μέντοι καὶ οὐ πάντα ψεῦδεται. οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἔτι | “ἐτύμως ὁμοία” ἡ ποιήσεις φθέγγοιτο εάν ψεύδη πάντα εἰς συνεργοῦσα, αὐτικά τῆς Ὀδύσσεως πλάνης τὸ πολὺ περὶ Σικελίαν γενέσθαι καὶ Ἰταλίαν καὶ ἐπέκεινα τεθρύλληται συμφώνως τῷ ποιητῇ. | καὶ τοῦτο δηλοὶ δίχα πολλῶν ἄλλων καὶ τῆς ἱστορίας Λατίνου καὶ τοῦ Ἀθηναίων, οἱ εἰς Ὀδύσσεις καὶ Κίρκης κατὰ τίνας οἱ καὶ τῆς ὄμονυμου αὐτοῖς χώρας εκράτῃσαν, καὶ ἀφ’ ἑαυτῶν τὰ ἔθνη ἐκάλεσαν. | ὁμολογεῖ δὲ τούτοις καὶ ἡ ἐν ἱβηρίᾳ πόλις Ὀδύσσεις, καὶ ἐν παροιμίαις Τεμέσισι ἡ ἰδεις ο βραχμηνῆς. εἰς τῶν Ὀδύσσεις συμπλευσάντων ἐσώρου ἐν Τεμεσίᾳ τῇ Ἰταλικῇ τιμωμένον. καὶ οὗτω μὲν | οὐκ ἔστιν ἀμφιβαλεῖν ὅτι ἐκεῖ τὰ πλείον πεπλάνηται Ὀδύσσεος, ὁ δὲ γε ποιητῆς ἔστι τῆς τοῦ Ὀδύσσεως πλάνης καὶ ἐξωκεανίζων φαίνεται, ὡς ἐκ νῷ τῆς ἐξής φανερῶς δειχθῆσαται, | φυλάττον μὲν καὶ τῆς ἱστορίας προστίθεσις δὲ καὶ τερατολογίας ποιητικῆς, καὶ ποιήσεως νόμοι τὸ ψεύδος τῇ ἀληθείᾳ παραμικνύσις, καὶ τὰ μὲν διδᾶσκον, τὰ δ’ ἐκπλήττοντ’ ἢ καὶ πυγχαγωγῶν. οὕτω δὲ καὶ τὸν Αἰάλων καὶ τοῦ Κιμερίου καὶ ταῖς την Καλυψοῖς εἶστιν ἅρμισμαν, ως δειχθῆσαι, προσεπιθησαί τι καὶ τερατολογίας, πή μὲν ἐκτοπίζων τὰς ἱστορομενάς καὶ μετακινῶν αὐτὰ εἰς ἄλλων τόπων εἰς ἄλλους, πή δὲ τὰς ἰδιότητας τῶν ἱστορομενῶν προσακοῦσι καὶ μετάγει τὰ παραδοξότερον ἐκτοπίζουν μὲν, ὡς ἄτο ποιητῆς τὸ ἀληθῆς βόρειον ἐθνος εἰς τοὺς ἔσπεριος τόπων τοὺς πρὸς τῷ |
Αϊδή μετάγει ψευδός και τήν τής Καλυψώς δε νήσου εἰς Ὡκεανόν μετατίθησα τάς δὲ ἱδίότητας ἐπαυξάνων, ὡς ὅτε | τοὺς Λαιστρυγόνας ἀγρίους ἄλλους ὄντας αὐτός καὶ ἀνθρωποφαγοῦντας ποιεῖ, καὶ τὸν Ἄιδωλον δὲ τεχνῆτιν ὄντα τοῦ πλέειν ἐγκατακλείειν τοὺς ἀνέμους φησίν. οὐ ψευδόμενος πάντη | ἀλλ’ ὑπερβάλλων τὸ ἱστοροῦμεν. ψευδός γὰρ ἀπλῶς διόλου τῆς Ὁμήρου καταγγέλλων ποιήσεως πάντη ψευδός. ψευδός γὰρ τοιοῦτον οὐδ’ “αὐτός ἔρει,” εἶποι ἂν αὐτὸς. “μᾶλα | γὰρ πεπνυμένος” εἶπεν. οὖν ὁ καὶ Ὅδυσσεύς παρὰ τῷ Ἐβύμα. “τί σε χρή τοιού ἐόντα, μασιδίως ψεύδεσθαι;” ὅσ τόγε ἄλλως μὴ “μασιδίως” ἀλλ’ ἐν δεοντὶ | ψεύδεσθαι, ἐπιτηδεύετον ποτὲ καὶ οὐ ψεκένον τοῖς γε ἐχέφρος τόν γοῦν Αὐτόλυκον “ὅρκῳ κεκοσμήσατι” φησίν. δ’ ἔστιν, τὸ ψευδέστεν ἑντέχνους ὄρκους συφίσεσθαι. καὶ αὐτὸν | δὲ τὸν Ὅδυσσεάν φανερῶς εἰσάγει ψευδόμενον ἐν τε τοῖς πρὸς τὸν Ἐμυῖον τοῦ δοῦλον λόγου καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις. οὗκοι οὗτε πάντα ψευδόμενον ὑποληπτέον τὸν ποιήτην οὗτο μὴ | πάντα φθεγγόμενον πρὸς ἀλλήσθην, ἀλλά τῷ ἀληθεὶ καὶ ψευδόσι τι παραπλέκοντα, καθά καὶ τῷ Πολυβίῳ δοκεῖ ὃς “τὴ | τοῦ Ὅδυσσεώς πλάνη καθά καὶ τῷ Ἰλιακῷ πολέμῳ μικρὰ” φησί τὸν ποιήτην προσμυθεσθαίσατι, καὶ ταῦτα μὲν οὕτω, ἡθικώτερα δὲ τῆς Ἰλιαδός κατὰ τὴν παλαιὰν ἀλλήσθεν ἐστιν ἢ Ὅδυσσεία, δ’ ἐστιν γλυκυτέρα τῇ καὶ ἀφελεστέρα. ἡδή | δὲ καὶ ἐξετέρα διὰ τά εἰς φαντασία ἐπιπολαίον ἀφελείας βάθη τῶν νοημάτων, ὡς οἱ τεχνικοὶ λέγουσι. τούτῳ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἐξούσια ῥητορικῆ, νοημάτων βαθύτης ἐν ἑπιπολαξούσῃ | ἀπλότητι. ἦστεν δὲ ὅτι πάντων γλίσχορα τά τῆς υποθέσεως ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ καὶ ἀσπορα καὶ ὑλιγύλα. καὶ εἰ μὴ ἢ ποιήτης ἡξεφησκεν, οὖς αὐτός, μηχανὰς πλατυσμοῖ τῇ ποιήσει ἄλλοτε ἄλλας, οἷον τόν τοῦ Τηλεμάχου πλοῦν, τῆς παρὰ τοῖς Φαίαξι μακρὰν ἀδολεσχίαν, τά παρά τῷ Ἐμυῖῳ λαμπρὰ ψεύσματα καὶ τά ἄλλα, | ἐν στενῷ κομιδῆ ἐκεῖτο αὐτὸς τά τῆς κατὰ ποίησιν διασκευῆς, δ’ ἀλλὰ ταῦτα καὶ τοιοῦτα πολλὰ τεχνασάμενος τῆς στενῆν ἀτραπόν τῆς τοῦ βιβλίου περιπετείας εὑρήκαν πρὸς πεδιάδα λογογραφίας ἐξίσχυσι καὶ ὡς ἐκ χειμαρρόδωδος λιβάδος πλήθουσας ῥητορείας ἐξέρρησεν ποταμοῦ, ὁποῖοι συχρήστα καὶ τὴν Ἰλιᾶδα περιλημαζοῦσιν, εἰ καὶ τὶς Μικδάλαος, ἢ ἔστε Λαρισσαῖος ἐπεὶ Μακεδών ἐπεὶ καὶ ἄμφω, λειψοῦσιν οἷον ἐκεῖ καταγόνθι τοῦ ποιητικοῦ Ὡκεανοῦ, ἄκρηχηγησα μισαγγείας ὁ νῦς δίκην, σιέλους ὡσπέρ τινας ἡ μέξας | τά παρ’ ἑαυτόν. λέγεται γὰρ ὅτι παρενέβαλε τῇ Ἰλιᾶδι ἐκεῖνος στίχον πρὸς στίχον, ἐπιγράφας τὸ σύγγραμμα “Τρωϊκά”, οἷον, “μὴνιν ἄειδε θέα Πηληίδεω Αχιλῆος, ἢ ἐβεθε Χρύσου κεχολωμένος εἵνεκα κούρης, οὐλομένην, ἢ μυρ’ Ἀχιλεὺς ἄλγε δὴ παρακηγορεῖ.”
"Εκτορος ἐν παλάμησι δαιζομένων ὑπὸ δουρί." καὶ οὗτῳ μὲν ὁ εἰρημένος Τιμόλαος τὴν Ὁμηρίκην Ἰλίαδα, ὡς οἶχον ὄνθυλεύσας ἠλίπανε. Τρυφιόδουρος δὲ, φασίν, ἐνάπαλιν αὐτοῦ δραμών, Ὁδόσσειαν λειπογράμματον ποίησα ἰστόρηται, ἀπελάσας αὐτῆς τὸ σίγμα.41 τάχα μὲν, οὗτῳ τηνάλλῳ. Ἰσάς δὲ, καὶ ἵνα μὴ ψελλός ὁ ἄρησι τὴν λαλίαν ἄτροχος, ἀπέχοντα τοῦ μετ' ὑποστηρικτῆς, ἵνα μὴ ὁ τραυλίσμος αὐτοῦ ἠλέγχῃ, ὅτι δὲ τοῦ σίγμα ἥχος καὶ ἀλλὸς λυτεῖν οἶδεν ἀκρόασιν διὰ τὸ συχνὸν τοῦ σιγμοῦ ὅτε στοιβάζεται, ὡς ἐν τῷ ἐξώσωσά τί ἤσασιν42 καὶ ἐξῆς, τὸ τοῦ Ἐβριπίδου δηλοὶ καὶ ὁ πρὸς τινα ἐν διπλασιασμοῖς τοῦ τῆς ἀπεκτίσιον, εἰπόν, ὡς εὐ γάρ σοι ὁπήλλαξαν ἡμᾶς τῶν σιγμάτων Ἐβριπίδου,43 καὶ ταῦτα μὲν τοιαύτα. ὁ δὲ τοιοῦτος ποιητὴς ὁ λόγῳ πλούτων, οὐ φράσαι ἣ ἁμείνων οὐδὲς, ὁ διασκευασαί δεινότατος, ὁ διηγήσασθαι πιθανότατος,44 ὁ πάσης τῆς ἐν λόγοις τέχνης καθηγητής, εἴ οὐ ὤτος τὸν ἄκεναν, "πάντες ποταμοί καὶ πάσαι" λογικῶν μεθοδῶν "πηγαίνων ὁμοίως οὗτος εξέφυγε παρεγγράπτῳ γραφήν συγγραφής."45 φασι46 γάρ Ναυκράτην47 τινα ἰστορήσα, ὡς ἄρα Φαντασία γυνή Μεμφήτης, "ἀναφηταὶἐνυσωφήτης.48 Νικάρχου49 θυγάτηρ, συντάξαςαυτοτες τοι τε Ἰλιάδον καὶ τὴν Ὀδύσσεαν πλάνην, ἀπέδοτο τάς βιβλίους εἰς τὸ κατὰ Μέμφιν τὸν Ἡφαιστοῦ | ἄδουντ. ἐνθά τὸν ποιητὴν ἠλθόντα λαβεῖν παρὰ τινὸς τῶν ἱερογραμματέων ἀντίγραφα, κάκειθεν συντάξι ἐν τὴν Ἰλιάδα καὶ τὴν Ὀδύσσειαν. ὅτι δὲ | ἡ Αἰγυπτίως ἂν η ἡ ἡ ἁμαρτήσεως ἀμαρτήσεως τοῖς ἐκεῖ ἰστοροῦσι τινές.52 καὶ ἐν τῷ περὶ τῶν πλαγκτῶν δὲ λόγῳ ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου53 τεθήσεται τις ἰστορία τούτου δηλωτική. σωφροσύνῃ δὲ τῆς ποιήσεως ταύτης ὁ κεφαλαιοδότατος, ἵνα καὶ συνάδιδιν τοῦ βιβλίου τοῦτο, προθέμενον τὴν τὴν Ἑννελόπτην εἰς ἀμφοτέρων ἀρχέτυπον.54 ἤδη δὲ καὶ ἀδίκιας ἀπέχεσθαι ὑποτίθησιν, οἷς τοὺς μνηστήρας οὐ δίκαια πλημμελοῦντας ἀπαλλάττεσθαι | οὐκ εὗ ἱστορεῖ. δεὴ δὲ καὶ ἄλλα σποράδην ὁ ποιητὴς παιδεύει55 νόμῳ οἴκειο "βιοφελὴς γὰρ πάσα ποίησις", τὰ κατὰ μέρος τοῦ βιβλίου διδαξοῦσιν. ἀνακηρύμενο δὲ πώς | καὶ τὴν Ἰλιάδα ἡ βιβλίον αὕτη.56 ὅ γάρ ὁ ποιητὴς ἔκει ἐνέλλιπεν ενταῦθα προσαναπληρείσθη.57 καὶ ἐστὶν ενταῦθα δύσα τῶν άλλων, ἦς ἔλεγεν τὸν ἐκεῖ συγγραφήτη,58 καὶ ἢ Αἰαντός τοῦ τέ μεγάλοι καὶ τοῦ Λοκροῦ ἄπερ εἰκέ οὐκ ἐγνωμεν,59 καὶ ἀριστεῖαν Νεότολέμου,60 καὶ δόλον Ὄδυσσεας ὅτε ἤπαθος πόλιν κατεδύ,61 καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὸν δώρειον ἱππον,62 καὶ ἄλλα | ὁν οἴκειον ἀριστήλας τῇ |
'Ιλιάδι ἐντεθείται. καὶ ὅλος, καρύκευμα τι τῷ ποιητῇ ἐντεθα τὰ τῆς Ἰλιάδος ἔστιν ἐλλείμματα. ἐσται δὲ ἡμῖν κἀνταόθα ὡς καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἰλιάδι τῆς μεταχειρίσεως ἡ ἐπιβολή, οὐ κατὰ ἐξήγησιν ἢς ἄλλοις ἐμέλησεν, ἀλλὰ κατ' ἐκλογὴν τῶν χρησίμων τοῖς ἐπιτρέχουσι καὶ μὴ <ἐν> εὐχερεί ἑξουσίν ἐαυτοῖς ἐπαφεῖν τῷ τῆς ποιήσεως πλάτει | σχολαίτερον. πολλὰ δὲ τῶν τῆ Ὀδυσσείᾳ ἠγεγκεμένων ἐν ταῖς τοιαύταις παρεκβολαίς σεσιγνυται, διὰ τὸ ἐν τοῖς εἰς τὴν Ἰλιάδα ἰκανῶς εἰρήσθαι περὶ αὐτῶν.53 ἀρχὴ δὲ τῶν Ὀδυσσειακῶν παρεκβολῶν ἐνετεθεὶν.64 |
ὅτι ἡ μὲν Ἰλιάς, ὡς καὶ ἐν τοῖς εἰκεὶ ἐδηλώθη, ἐκ τούτου τῆς Ἰλιῶν ἐσχε τὴν ἐπιγραφήν, ὥς τὰ κακὰ περιέχοσα ὅποια ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τῆς μνήμης περί τῆς Ἰλιῶν συνέπεσον οὐ μόνον τοῖς Ἰλιεῦσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ μάλιστα τοῖς Ἐλλησι τοῖς μὴ τοσούτοις πρὸ τοῦτο πιποῦσιν, ὡς καὶ ὁ ποιητὴς ἐπισημαίνεται, λέγων· ἡ μυρί

5 Ἀχαιῶς ἀλλ’ ἐθηκεν, εἰ καὶ ἀλλως νόμωρ πολέμου ἔποιες ἐν τῷ ἱερέως ἐπιθῆμι φυχαί· καὶ Τροίκων ἤρων εἰς Ἀἴδου φίλον ὧδη ἢ Ὁδύσσεα φανερῶς εἰς ὀρισμένου προσώποι τοῦ Ὁδύσσεος δηλαδή ἐπιγέρραπται, ὃς μόνος ἐνταῦθα ἡ τὴν ὀλὴν ποιήσαι συνιστᾷ. προπαροξύνεται δὲ ἡ λέξες ὑμοῖς τῷ ἴσχες ἱερεία, ἡ βασιλεὺς βασίλεια, ἐ εἰ καὶ ἀλλας κατὰ λόγον κτητικοῦ παροτρύνεσαι ὀφειλελ. ἡκολούθησε δὲ μάλιστα ὁ τόνος τῆς βριθείςς λέξεως τῷ "Πατρόκλεια," "Δολώνεια" καὶ τοῖς ὁμοίοις περὶ ὁν ἀκριβέστερον ἐν τοῖς εἰς τῆς Ἰλιάδα δεδῆλωται. (Vs. 1) ὁμοιοσχῆμων ἡ μὲν ἢ τε τῆς Ἰλιάδος εἰσβολή καὶ ἢ τῆς Ὁδύσσεας. Μοῦσαν τῇ ἐπικαλομένῃ καὶ τῆς κλήσιν προστατικῆς σχήματισσα. ἐκπέφυγε δὲ ἀλλως πολυτρόπως τὸ τοῦ σχηματισμοῦ ὅμοιοις. εἰκηκεῖ μὲν γὰρ ὁ ποιητὴς ἁείδε, θεά, ἐνταῦθα δὲ ἐννεπε Μοῦσας φησιν. οὐ μόνον τοῖς ῥήμασι ποικιλόμονος, ἀλλὰ καὶ φράζων σαφέστερον. ὁ γὰρ ἀπλούστερος ἀκροατής ζητήσῃ ἄν εν τῇ καταρχῇ τῆς Ἰλιάδος. ποιαν Ὅμηρος λέγει θεάν καὶ εὰν Μοῦσαν ἀκούσῃ πάλιν προσεκηπήσει ποιαν ταῦτα τοῖς ἐννεά. διπλὴν ἀπορίαν προϊσχόμενος ἐνταῦθα μέντοι ἐννεπε Μοῦσας εἰπών ὁ ποιητής καὶ ὅτω τὴν τοῦ ἀκροτοῦ ἐκείνης ζητήσιν ἡμισεσάς. σαφέστερον ἐφρασεν, ἐπεὶ καὶ προσεκηπήστερον τῷ ποιητικῷ οὐκ ἦν τὸ "Μοῦσα" ἤπερ τό "θεά" ὡς δὴ Μοῦσης παράγωγον περιεκτικὸν τὸ "μουσεῖον" καθα καὶ τῆς ὕδης το "φδείων" καὶ τῆς σχολῆς τὸ "σχολεύον". εἰ δὲ προϊών ἔρει, "θεά, θύγατερ Διός, εἰπὲ καὶ ἡμῖν," σαφήνειαν ἔχει καὶ εἰκηκεὶ ὁ λόγος διὰ τὸ "θύγατερ Διός" ὡς εἰκηκεὶ βρεθήσεται. ἐτὶ καὶ ἀλλαζ διαφόρως ἐπικαλομένης τὰ τῶν βιβλίων προοίμια ἐν τῷ μὴν ἱερείς ἐννεπε. ἀρθεὶ δὲ ὁ ἄνόη πολλὰ ἐπάθεν ἁλγει. καὶ σημείσαι εἰς τοῦτος ὡς τοῦτον ὑμῖν εἰπεῖν ἁλγει καὶ πολλά ἡ "μάλα πολλά." ἐτὶ διαφέρουσι καὶ καθότι εἰκηκεὶ μὲν ἱερείς φησιν ἀπλόως, ἐνταῦθα δὲ ὡς ὀρισμένως ἐννεπε μοι. Ισθι δὲ ὡς τὸ μὲν ἱερείς ἀφορμὴν ἐκείς τῷ λέγεσθαι "φδάς" τὰ ποτίματα, ἐκ δὲ τῷ ἐννεπε ἀρχὴ ενδέδοται τοῖς καλούσι τοῖς ἡρωικοὺς στίχους ἐποικοῦσιν τοῖς

5.2 tit. ἐπιγραφή add. in marg. P².
5.6-7 tit. Ὁδύσσεα add. in marg. P².
5.21 tit. μουσεῖον add. in marg. P³.
5.31 tit. φοίν add. in marg. P².
5.32 tit. ἐποικοῦσιν add. in marg. P².
ποιητάς 79 νεώτερον δὲ ἢ τοῦ "ἔπος" χρήσει ἐπὶ τῶν | ποιητικῶς μετροῦντων. 80 Ὁμηρος γὰρ ὡς δὲ ὅλης τῆς αὐτοῦ ποιήσεως φαίνεται, τὸν ἀπλῶς λόγον "ἔπος" φησίν, 81 οἷον "ποίον σε ἔπος φύγο", 82 καὶ τὸ "ἔπεα πτερόντα" 83 ὁτι δὲ τὰ ἕξαμετρα οὐ | πάνω ἠξίων "ἐπη" καλείσθαι, δήλοι ὁ ἐν Ῥητορικῷ λεξικῷ εἰπὼν ὡς ἀντέκειτο ὁ ἐποποιῶς τῷ μελοποιῷ, 84 καὶ "ἥρα" ἔλεγον, οὐκ ἡ "ἐπη", τὰ ἕξαμετρα. 85 σημειώσας δὲ ὅτι κάνναται ὁ ποιητής *προγράψας θεάν τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ποιήσεως, καθὰ καὶ ἐν Ἡλιάδι, 86 καὶ τῇ ταύτῃ ἐπίκλησι μούσαλητος 87 ὑπονοηθεὶς καὶ φαντάσσας θεόθεγκτα λαλεῖν, ἀφορμῇ ἐνδέδωκε τῷ καλῷ λυρικῷ γνωματεύσασθαι ὡς ἀρα "χρή ἄρχομένου ἐργου, πρόσωπον θείαι τηλαγιεῖς". 88 οὕτω γὰρ καὶ αὐτὸς Ὁμηρος τηλαγιεῖαν τῶν ἑαυτοῦ ποιήσεων | προέγραψεν, οἷς τὰ θεία πρόσωπα τούτων προϊλαμέπαι καὶ οἷς ἡρωϊκὰς πράξεις τὲ καὶ πάθη καθιστορήσῃ προεξέβετο. 89 ὁτί ἄνὴρ παρὰ τοῖς παλαιοῖς τετραχῶς. 90 | ὁ ἡδὴ τέλειος τῆς ἡλικίαν καὶ ὁ συμευθεὶς γυναικὶ καὶ ὁ ἀνδρείς καὶ ὁ φύσις, τούτων ὁν ἐς ἀνάγκης οἴδεν ἡ φύσεις ἀντιδιηρθημένων τῇ γυναικί. ἐντάθου ὁν ἐν τῷ "anaxρα μοι ἐννεπε, Μοῦσα", 91 οἱ παλαιοὶ "ἀνδρα" τὸν φύσει φαινόν, ὡς εἰ τις εἰπόν ἄνθρωπον ἄρρενα, ἄνδρειον δὲ νοεῖ ταύτα δὲ ταύτα θελοῦσι, λέγοντες ὅτι ἐπὶ ἄνθρωπον οὐδὲποτε κεῖται δῦο ἀλλεπάλληλα ἐπιθετα δίχα κυρίου ἤ προσηγορικόν. 92 ἡς γὰρ ἐν ποτε εἰπόν, "σοφὸς δίκαιος" ἀνευ κυρίου τοῦ "Ἀριστείδης" ἤ τοιουτοῦ τινός, 93 τις δὲ ἐν ἑρεῖ "τραχύς θράσος", δίχα προσηγορικόν | τοῦ "ἵππου" τυχόν 94 ἢ "Πήγασος"; 95 οὕτω γὰρ οὐδὲ εντάθου ἄνδρείον πολύτροπον ἐστίν εἰπεῖν, διότι οὔτε "ἀνήρειν" οὔτε "Ὀδυσσέα" προσέθηκεν. εἰρηται ὡς ὅτι ἂνθρώπων οὐ κεῖται δῦο ἐπιθετα, | πρὸς διαστολὴν τοῦ ἕπι δαιμόνον. 96 ἐπὶ ἐκεῖνον γὰρ πολλάκις γίνεται στοιχῆ ἐπιθέτων δίχα κυρίου, οἷον "ἐνυαλίο ἀνδρειφόντι" 97 καὶ "χρυσηλάκατος κελαδεινή", 98 καὶ "ὁ πότι ἐννοοίγασε εἰρυσθενὲς". 99 οἴτιν τὸ ἐπὶ τὰ γείτονα τὰ θεία ἐπίθετα καὶ ἐπὶ εὐς τινὸς ἀρισμένου κεῖται προσόπου καὶ διατούτου ἀντὶ κυρίου αὐτὰ διανοίμαν 100 λογίζεσθαι. τὰ μέντοι λοιπὰ ἐπιθετα, κοινὰ ὅντα πολλάκις καὶ ἀορισταίνοντα, οἷον τὸ "δύος", "ταχύς", "ποδόκης", "σοφος", "δαίφρον", "ἀνδρείς" καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα, οὐ δύναται ἀλλὴς ἐπίστοιβαθήναι δίχα κυρίου ἤ προσηγορικοῦ τοῦ ὀρίζοντος αὐτὰ. διὸ ἢ "ἀνήρ" 101 κατὰ πέμπτον σημαινόμενον καὶ ὁ ἀπλῶς ἄνθρωπος δῆλον καὶ ἐκ τοῦ "ἐσχατον ἄνδρων" 102 καὶ ἐκ τῶν | "ἀνδραποδιστῶν" 103 καὶ τῶν "ἀνδραποδῶν" 104 καὶ τῶν "ἀνδροφόνων". ἐν αὐτοίς γὰρ τῷ τοῦ ἄνδρος ὁνόματι πάς ἄνθρωπος δηλοῦσθαι δύναται. 105 εἰ καὶ ἄλλως λέγεται ὡς ἐκ μέρους τοῦ ἄνδρος καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ γένη σημαίνεσθαι, παραδείγματα δὲ τῶν προειρημένων τεσσάρων σημαινομένων ἀρίθμηλα 106

---

6.1 vocem ποιητικῶς add. in marg. P. 3
6.4 tit. ἐπη item add. in marg. P. 3
6.12 tit. ἄνηρ add. in marg. P. 3
6.14 ενταυθ' edd. ενταυθα P. 3
6.22 voces ἐπ' ἐκείνων add. in marg. P. 3
παρά τοῖς ὑπομνηματισταῖς. οἱ πρὸς ὑπόδειγμα | νέου μὲν τελείου δὲ ἀνδρός καὶ τὸν ἀνδρόπαιδα παραδιδόσαι, 107 τῷ νεωτάτῳ καὶ πάντῃ ἀτελεῖ ἀποκληρώσαντες τὸν βοῦπαίδα. 108 σημείοισι δὲ ὅτι σιωπᾷ τὸ τοῦ Ὄδυσσεως εὖ ἀρχής ὄνομα ὁ ποιητής, 109 ἐξαιρῶν αὐτὸν σεμνοὺς ἐκθέτοις καὶ ἐγκωμιοίς, καὶ ἀναρτῶν τὸν ἀκροατήν. 110 καὶ ἄλλως δὲ εἰπεῖν, σεμνοτέρον τοῦ κυρίου κρίνας ὄνοματος, τὸ εὖ ἀν ὀπλαίν ἐτήλ | γνωρίσαι αὐτὸν, ἃ καὶ ὡς ἐξαιρετὸν τι παράστημον ἦν αὐτῷ, ὡς γὰρ τοῦ τυχὸν εἰπὼν “ἀνδρὰ μοι ἐννεπε, Μοῦσα” ὃς ἀνέλει “Εκτορά τα δὲ τινα ἐποίησεν ἢ ἔπαθε, τὸν | Ἀχιλλέα δὴλοι, οὕτω καὶ τὸ εἰπεῖν, “ἀνδρὰ μοι ἐννεπε, Μοῦσα” ὃς τὴν Τροίαν ἐλὼν τοῖς δὲ τις περιέσε, τὸν Ὅδυσσεα ἔδηλωσε κατ’ ἐξοχήν, καὶ διαφέρει καὶ οὕτως

10 ἢ προομικαία αὕτη ἔννοια τῆς ἐν Ἰλιάδί. εκεῖ µὲν γὰρ αὐτὸς εὕθως ὄρισεν ὁ ποιητὴς πρόσωπον τὸν Ἀχιλλέα οὗ χάριν ἐπικαλεῖται τῇ Μοῦσῃ. ἐνταῦθα δὲ ἀορίστους εἰπὼν καὶ μετεωρίσας 111 ἰκανὸν τὸν ἀκροόμενον, ταμιεύεται μετ’ ὀλίγα τῇ Μοῦσῃ τῷ τοῦ Ὅδυσσεως ὄνομα. 112 ἑνῶ ἐκεῖνον ἀντιθέον Ὅδυσσα ἔρει. 113 τὸ δὲ ἑννεπε” πλεονασμὸν ἔχει | τοῦ ἐκὸς νῦ. 114 καὶ δήλον εἰς ὁν πολλαχοῦ τὸ ἑνεπο” δὲ ἐνος νῦ ἐκφέρεται, ἀπὸ τῆς εἰς προβάσεως καὶ τοῦ ἕπος 115 εἰς οὐ καὶ τὸ ἕπος. οὕτω καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ τὸν ἐνόθα”, “ἐνσο” τῷ κινύ. 116 τὸ μὲν ἐνοσίθην, δὲ ἐνος ἐκφέρεται νῦ. 117 τὸ δὲ ἑννοσίατος διπλάζει τὸ ἀμετάβολον. 118 δήλον δὲ ὃτι καιρώτερον ὡς ἐν ποιησίν ἐκ ”αὐτῆς ἤπερ τὸ ἑννεπε”. ἢ “αὐτῆς” μὲν γὰρ τὸ μετά μέλους, οὐκεν καὶ ”φοῖ”, τὰ ποιήματα. ἑννεπε” δὲ καὶ τὸ ἀπλῶς λέγειν, ὡς δήλοι μετ’ ὀλίγα τὸ

20 εὐτε καὶ ἡμῖν,” 119 ταῦτον ὅν τῷ ἑννεπε”. τὸ μέντοι ”ἀκαλλείν” ἀμφοῖν διαφέρει ὡς ἀλλαχοῦ δηλοῦται. 120 ὅρα δὲ ὅτι τὸ μὲν ἑννεπεῖν ἢ ἀντὶ τοῦ θείου ἢ ἀντὶ τοῦ λέγειν ἀπλῶς κεῖται. 121 τὸ δὲ εἰς αὐτοῦ ”ἐνίπτειν” 122 καὶ ”ἐνίσσειν” 123 ὁδιδερεν ἐκεῖνον δηλοῖ. ἀλλ’ ἐπιπληθεῖν καὶ ἀμφο δηλοῦσθι, την διὰ λόγων μέντοι εἴτ’ οὖν δὲ ἐπον. ὃτι τὸ ”πολύτροπον” 124 ταύτων ἐστὶ τῷ τὸ εὐκινητον, ποικίλον, πολύμετρον, πολύνουν, ἐπιχειρηματικόν, πολύβουλον, πολύστροφον, οὐκ ἐν’ ἐνος ἑστάτα στα γεγραμμένην εἰκόνα. 125 τρεπόμενον δὲ, το ταλλα δόξως βουλευμάτων ὡς Ὅδυσσεϊ προέπε τῷ πολυμπόσῳ, τῷ ”παντοίος δόλοις” κακοσυμμένων καθά φησιν ὁ ποιητής. 126 ὡς τὸν γε μὴ οὕτω πολύτροπον, ἱ ἅλα στρόφιν 127 κατὰ τὴν κομβιδαν, καὶ ως ὃι μεθ’ ”Ομηρον σκώπτουσι πολύσανα, 128 κακίζει ὁ ποιητής 129 εἰς ὁε φησὶ μισεῖν ἀνδρὰ ὃς ”ἀλλο µὲν κείθει εν φρασιν ἀλλο ἰ δὲ βάζει” 130 ”πολύτροπον” οὖν, ὁ διὰ πολλὴν εμπείριαν πολύφων ὡς ὁ ποιητὴς μετ’ ὀλίγα ἔρει, 131 καὶ ως Ἐφριπίδης ἢν εἴποι ”ποικιλόφρον”. 132 ἢτι δὲ πολλαὶ ὁε ἔρεθη ἢ” ἀπραπό εὐβουλευμάτων τρεπόμενοι, οὐ μὲν ὁ πρὸς πολλά ἤθελ ἐμπαλλόμενος καὶ ἀντικρισε εὐρίπος ή

7.2-3 tit. ἀνδρόπαιδα et βοῦπαιδα add. in marg. P.².
7.10 vocem τῆς add. in marg. P.
7.20 tit. ψάλλειν add. in marg. P.
7.23 δηλοῦσι P. Rom. Stall.: δηλοῦσι Bas.
χαμαίλεαιν τὸ ἥθος, τρόπον γὰρ οὐκ οἶδε τὸ ἥθος ὁ ποιητής, ὡς τε οὐδὲ ἂν λέγησι πολύτροπον τὸν πολυβήθη καὶ τὰ εἴδη διάφορον. καὶ ὁ "Τὰ μεθ' Ὁμηρον" δὲ γράφας τὴν λέξιν ταύτην ἐπὶ τε ποικιλίας νοεῖ, ως ὅτε εἶπη "αἴλασι πολύτροπον",133 καὶ ἐπὶ δόλου, ἐν οίς ἤ λέγοι "ηπεροπῆα πολύτροπον"134 καὶ ἡ Κήρκη δὲ ποὺ "πολύτροπον" τὸν Ὁδυσσέα καλέσει, δόλιον καὶ φρόνιμον βουλουμένη προσεπείν.135 ὅτι δὲ τὸ "πολύτροπον" ἐπαινουμένην τινα σημαίνει καὶ πολυειδῆ ἐνέργειαν δηλοῖ καὶ τὸ περὶ ἀπόδονος ὑπὸ τοῦ ποιητοῦ λεχθὲν, τὸ "τρωπόσα χεῖ οὐρνηχεα φωνήν".136 ἐν γάρ τῷ "τρωπόσα πολυμεθέα φωνήν" πολύτροπον εἰς ὅθην τὴν ἀπόδονα φησιν.137 ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι Ὅμηρον "πολύτροπον" τὸν Ὁδυσσέα γράφαντος, τις τῶν ὑστερον138 σκωπτικῶς παρφόρος ἐγραφε τὸ "ἀνδρά μοι ἔννυπε | Μοῦσα πολύκροτον", ὅπερ ἐστὶ κακεντρεχὴ καὶ μὴ ἀπλοῦν. δοκεῖ δὲ εἰρήσθαι ἡ τοιαύτη λέξις παρὰ τὸ τοῦ κοιμικοῦ κρόταλον139 ὅθεν καὶ τὸ "κροταλίζειν" ἐπὶ γέλωσι. Ὅμηρος δὲ τὸ ὑπὸ γίνεσθαι κρότον τινα ὅτε ἄρματα κτυποῦσι ἀνατρεπόμενα "ἀνακυμβαλιάζειν" εἴπεν εἰς τῇ Ἰλιάδι.140 τῷ δὲ γε κοιμιδικῷ κροτάλῳ ἱσον δύναται καὶ τὸ | περίτριμμα141 καὶ ἡ παισάλη142 ἐτὶ δὲ καὶ τὸ ἀπαίσημα143 καὶ ἡ ἀπαίσημη.144 οὐκ ἂν εἰς τοῦ ἁρτος καὶ τὸ κροτέιν κομφοδὶς ἐπιτρέπουσιν οὔτε ἡ ἀπλαὶ παισάλη, καθὰ οὐδὲ | τῷ παισάλδεν, καὶ εἰσὶ ταῦτα δήλα εκ τῶν πολλαχοῦ χρήσεων. (Vs. 2 and 3) ὅτι ἐπαινεῖ τὸν Ὁδυσσέα ὡς μάλα πολλὰ πλανηθέντα καὶ πολλῶν ἱδόντα ἀνθρώπων ἀστεα καὶ νόον | γνώντα, δὲ ἐστιν ἥθος, ἐθος, διαγωγή. οὔ τῆς πλάνης Ἰξυν μέχρι καὶ τῶν εἰσάγων τῆς 'Εσπερίας 'Ιβηρίας, ὡς ἰστοροῦσιν οἱ παλαιοὶ.145 εἰ δὲ οὐ ὁ Ὁδυσσέας διὰ ταῦτα πολυλοστάρ.146 πολυειδής147 τὴν ἐμπειρίαν, καὶ ὡς εἴρηται πολύνους, οἷα τοιαύτα παθῶν καὶ νοῶν τοσοῦτον θράβηθεν οἷον εἰσοικήσαμενος, ἐπεὶ καὶ τῶν ἥρωων φρονιμωτάτοις οἱ παλαιοὶ ἀπεραιόντο τοὺς ἀποδημήσαντας ἢ πλανηθέντας μακράν. καὶ γάρ ἐν μεγάλῳ ἐτίθεντο ἐκείνοι πολλῶν ἀνθρώπων ἱδέαν ἀστεα καὶ νόον γνώναι.148 Ἡρακλῆς οὖν καὶ Διὸνύσος κατὰ τὴν ἑστορίαν | μακράς ἀποδημίας ποιηθόμενοι μεγάλοι ἐδοξαν.149 σεμνύνεται δὲ ποὺ καὶ ὁ Νέστορ διὸς μετάπεμπτος ἢλθε τοὺς Λαπίθας μακράν ὁδόν.150 εναβρύνεται δὲ ἐν τοῖς ἐξής τῇ πλάνῃ | καὶ ὁ Μενέλαος, ἐνθα καὶ πλεῖστο του εἰκότος ἀλαζονεύεται,151 καθάπερ καὶ Ὁδυσσέας τὰ καθ' ἑαυτὸν δηνῳμεύεσεν.152 ἀλαζόν γάρ, ως ὁ γεωγράφος φησι, "καὶ ὁ πλάνην ἐαυτοῦ ἀφηγομεύομενος"153 καὶ εἰν Ἰλιάδι | καὶ ὁ ποιητής πορίζεται σεμνότητα154 παραβολῆς ἐκ τοῦ πολλῆν γῆν ἐπεληθωθότος, λέγων ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἂν ἀξίη νόος ἀνέρος καὶ τὰ ἐξής.155 σημειώσω δὲ ὅτι πλεῖο εμπειρίαν ὁ ποιητής | ἑνταῦθα τῷ Ὁδυσσεί ἐπιμαρτύρεται ἦπερ ἐν Ἰλιάδι τῷ Νέστορι. ἐκεῖνος μὲν γάρ μὴ ἐναβρύνεται ὅφε τῇ

133 ηπεροπῆα. P'; ἦπεροπῆ εdd.
134 τροπόσα P'; τροπόσεα edd.
135 δι οίς P; add. in marg. P'.
136 τοῦ P'; ἤ λέγοι edd.
137 τοῦ P'; ἤ λέγοι edd.
138 Ὅμηρος. P'; Ὅμηρον edd.
139 κρόταλον. P'; κρόταλον edd.
140 εἰς τῇ Ἰλιάδι. P; ἐπὶ γέλωσι edd.
141 περίτριμμα. P'; περίτριμμα edd.
142 παισάλη. P'; παισάλη edd.
143 ἀπαίσημα. P'; ἀπαίσημον εἰς τῇ Ἰλιάδι edd.
144 ἀπαίσημη. P'; ἀπαίσημον edd.
145 πολυλοστάρ. P'; πολυλοστάρ edd.
146 πολυειδής. P'; πολυειδής edd.
147 ἐμπειρίαν. P'; ἐμπειρίαν edd.
148 Ἡρακλῆς οὖν καὶ Διὸνύσος κατὰ | τὴν ἑστορίαν | μακράς ἀποδημίας poibharmo megaloj edoxan. P'; Ἡρακλῆς οὖν καὶ Διὸνύσος κατὰ τὴν ἑστορίαν μακράς ἀποδημίας edd.
ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Πύλου εἰς τοὺς Θεταλικοὺς Λαπίθας. Ὅδεσσεύς δὲ ἡ πολλῶν ἀνθρώπων ἦδην ἢ ἀστατοῖς καὶ νόσον ἔγνω· πληθήν οὐκ ἦδη τοῦ Νέστορος ἡ Ὅδεσσεύς ἦν ἀλλὰ μετα ὅτε τοιούτος ἀλλὰ μετα Ἡρώδης ἄλοσιν γην τοὺς μετακράτησε· καὶ πολλὴν ἐμπειρίαν | συνήγαγεν, οὐ μόνον πλανηθέντες, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλά, καὶ οὗ ἄπλως πολλά, ἄλλα καὶ μάλιστα πολλά. εἶ ᾧ ἓν ἀμικρότερός ἐστι ὃς ὁ Πολλάκης ἔργον καὶ ὁ παλαιά τοι πολλά τε εἰδώς. καὶ ὃς γήραμεν μὲν | κυρίως ἔγνω, πολλά δὲ ἔγραμεν· οἶς ἀνάπαυσιν ἔχει ἀκοιμώμα τοι πολλά τε εἰδώς. ὅρα δὲ ὅτι ἕν ἔγνω· αἰτιατικὴ συνετάξεις ἀνομοίας τῷ γνώσει ἁλληλοιούν. ἵστεν δὲ καὶ ὅτι τί σώον ἐνεταθὰ ἐστὶ νόησαι οὐ μόνον τὸ κατὰ νοῦν τινὰ ἁμένων ἐθημὸν καὶ νόμιμον ἐν ἔθνεσι καὶ τὸ κατ’ ἤθος καὶ διαγωγὴν παρ’ αὐτοῖς ἔννοιαν ἢ ἄλλως φασικόν. καὶ ὅ ὁ χαρακτηρίζονται ἀνδρικοὶ τυχὸν ἢ ἀπόλεμοι, πανορθοῖ ἢ ἀπλοὶ, σύνθετοι ἢ εὐθεῖς, φιλόξενοι ἢ ἀπανθρώποι, λόγοι ἢ ἄπεροι, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν τοῦ Ὅδεσσεύς | νοῦν. ἵνα εἰη, ὅτι πολλῶν ἀνθρώπων οὗ Ὅδεσσεύς ἠδον ἀστατε, νόσον ἔγνω, τούτωσι μαθῶν, συνιάζει νοῦν. καὶ οὕτως ἀπέβη τῇ συχνῇ ἱστορίᾳ πολυνοῦ, καὶ ὅτι ἐστὶ ποὺ ὁμοιὸν τοῦτο κατὰ γε τὴν φράσιν πρὸς τὸ μάλιστα δὲ αὐτὸς ἀνέγνω. ἐνεταθὰ δὲ ἵστεν καὶ ὅτι τὸ μὲν πολλῶν ἀνθρώπων κυριολεκτήτη καθὰ καὶ τὸ πολλὰ πλάγχθε καὶ τὸ πολλὰ ἠγέα. διαφασμοῦ γὰρ εἰσὶ ποσοῦ ἢ καὶ τὸ ἀρσενικὸν αὐτὸν ἐνικόν ὁ πολλὸς, οὗ πληθυντικὸν οἱ πολλαί, τὸ δὲ πολλὸς γὰρ τὶς ἕκειτο παρθόρως ἐνθα καὶ ἐνθα ἐννιὰ μὲν συνεξεῖ ποιῆν ἐπειδηληθῆ. ἤλθοι δὲ ὅμοιοι καὶ αὐτὸ πλῆθος μελῶν πεφιλοτιμημένοι ταῖς κατὰ τὸν κείμενο τρίς διαστάσεις. τὸ δὲ πολὺς ἀνθρώπος καὶ εἰ τι τοιοῦτον οὐ κατὰ ταῦτα λέγεται ποσοῦ δίκην, ἢ ἀλλὰ ποιοτήτα ἐμφαίνει δοκεῖ, καὶ ταῦτα ἢ ἐπαινεῖ τὴν ὁ πολὺς τὴν θεολογίαν ταῦτα δὲ εἰπέν ἐπετῶς κατὰ τὸ ὁ ἐπετῶς Ἀριστείδης ὁ δὲ πολὺς ἀνθρώπος ἢ ψεκτὴν ὡς τὸ ό ὃν μέγας τις καὶ ό σωφρός ταῦτα ἔριε ἀλλὰ πολὺς ἀνθρώπος ἢ ψεκτὴν ὁ Πολλοὶ ὁ Πολλοὶ δὲ τοῦ ἔρημον διὰ λαίμα. τοῦτο δὲ ὁ κωμικὸς ἀστεῖότερον φράσεως ἃς τοὺς πολλοὺς | εἶτ’ οὐν τοὺς χυδὴν διακειμένους ἀνδρὰς οὐχ ἄπλως ἐψη πολλοὺς ἀλλὰ πολλοὺς τοῦ βολοῦ ἢ ψηφαρὰς δηλαδὴ τὸν εὐτελῶν καὶ εὐθυνῶν εἰδῶν. δὴ δὲ τοῖς τοιοῦτοις δῖοις πληθυντικὸς τις ἐμφαίνεται ἄναγκαιος καὶ ὑπὸ τὸ διωρισμένον ἀνάγωνται ποσον, ἐδῆλον τοῖς ἐφιστώσιν. ὡς δὲ καὶ νεκρὰς προσφυγεῖ τὸ ὃ πολλοὶ καὶ τὸ ὃ πλείους δῆλοι ὁ εἰπὼν τὸ ἀπελεύθουσαι παρά

9.1 τῆς Πύλου P:\ τῆς Πύλου edd.
9.2 vocem ἦδη add. in marg. manus recentior.
9.8 vocem ἔγνω add. in marg. P:\
9.9 voc νόσον add. in marg. P:\
9.12 σύνθετοι P:\ συνετοί edd.
9.18 tit. πολλὸς add. in marg. P:\
9.26 tit. ἄρ<ιστοφάνης> add. in marg. P:\
τοὺς πλείονας· ὁ ἔστι θανόμαι. "πλείονας" γάρ τοὺς τεθνεότας ἐκείνος ἐφι. ὅτι ὁπερ ἐν τῇ Ἰλιάδι εἰσών "μυρία Ἀχαιοῖς ἔθηκεν ἀλέγει καὶ πολλὰς ἰ ἱφίμους ψυχὰς." Αἰδί προῆλθεν. 174 ἐνέφημεν τοῖς ἄκροσταίς ὡς ἐν προεκθέσεσις λόγφι. 175 ὡς ἔσται αὐτῷ ὅλη τῆς τῆς ποιησικῆς πλατυσμοῦ, τὰ "μυρία ἀλέγει" 176 καὶ τῶν πολλῶν θάνατος, οὕτω | καὶ νῦν εἰς τῷ "μᾶλα πολλὰ πλάγαθη καὶ πολλῶν ἀνθρώπων ἴδεν ἀστεα" τὸν τρόπον προεκτιθέται δι᾿ οὗ τὴν ποιησιν πλατυνθῇ. 177 ἢ γάρ πολύπλαινος τοῦ Ὀδυσσέας περιόδος πλάτος | τῇ ποιησῇ ἐνδαψεύσεται. 178 καὶ ἔσται ο ὁ ὁ πρόπος, οἷον προεκθέσις. τὸ μέντοι "ἀνδρά μοι ἐννέσε" 179 τὸν τῆς Ὀδυσσείας σκοπὸν προκάλει, ὡς τὸ γάρ τῆς Ἰλιάδος τὸ "μὴν ἄνειδε Ἀχιλλέους". 180 ὁ δὲ λαβὼν ἀφορμῆν κατὰ τοὺς παλαιοὺς 181 ὁ ποιητής ἐκ τοῦ "πολύ", ὅπερ ἔγκειται τῇ λέξει τοῦ "πολύπροσ", ἐπείπεν τῇ ὁμοιότητι τοῦ ὁνόματος, εἰσών "πολλὰ ἐπιλάγχησι", "πολλῶν δὲ ἀνθρώπων ἴδεν ἀστεα", "πολλὰ δὲ ἐπαθεν ἀλέγεια". 182 τὸ δὲ "πλάγαθη" ἀναζητήθην ὃν ἱσταὶ προίκησεται ὡς φίλον Ὀμήρῳ, χαίροντι μὲν καὶ ταῖς κοιναῖς ῥηματικαῖς αὐξήσεις, οἷς ἥκιστα δὲ καὶ ταῖς | ἀναξέπε τοῖς ἔρωτοι κινήσεσιν, οἳ δὲ γε ὡστερον ἀττικικῶντες 183 οὗτος ἀπλῶς αἴξειν τοὺς παραφρασμένος οἴδασιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀναδιπλοῦι τὴν αὔξεσιν εἰς πολλοῖς, ὡς δήλον | ἐκ τοῦ "ἡνδράξε" καὶ "ἡνώχλησεν", ἐτί δὲ καὶ εἰς τῷ "ὀνοματοποιήται" καὶ "ἐκδεδιηθημένος" καὶ ἄλλων μυρίων ἄν μνεία ἐν τοῖς εἰς τὴν Ἰλιάδα γέγονε. 184 τινὲς δὲ καὶ ἄλλως καινοπραγοῦσι, αὔξοντες ἐφ’ ὡς οὐκ ἔχρην. οἷον ἐν τῷ "ἡμελλε" 185 καὶ "ἡδύνατο" καὶ ἐν τῷ "διηκόνησε" 186, 187 τροπὴ γάρ ἐν τούτοις τῷ ἐ εἰς ἕ ἐκ τοῦ "ἐμελλον", "ἐδύνατο", "διεκόνησεν", ὅγκωσεν εἰς πλέον τὴν συνήθη αὔξεσιν. τὸ μέντοι "ἀφορέων" ἐτεροίδον τι ἐστί. 188 οὐκ αὔξησαν αὐτὸ ἄλλα μεταθέμενον τὴν ἰδίμον Ἀττικοῖς παραλήγουσαν | τὴν τοῦ ὁ μεγάλου εἰς τὴν ἀρχουσαν. καὶ ταῦτα μὲν οὕτω. τὸ δὲ ὡς ἐρρέθη "ἐπιλάγχησι" ἀπὸ τοῦ "πλάζει" γενόμενον 189 πλεονασμὸν ἐπαθε τοῦ νῦ διὰ καλλιφωνάται καὶ ὁγκὸν ἤκου, ἢ καὶ εἶπ τοῦ ἀμφασία 190 ἐγένετο καὶ εἶπ τοῦ "ἀμβροτος" 191 καὶ "ἐπερυμβροτος" 192 καὶ "τύμπανον" καὶ "πμπλημί" 193 καὶ "χρύμπτον" 194 καὶ "φασιμβροτος" καὶ "λίγξε βιός" 195 καὶ εἶπ τοῦ "λαγχάνῳ" 196 καὶ "ἀλέγχησε" 197 καὶ "φυγάνῳ", 198 "ψυγάνο", "ἐφυγάνο", 199 "συγάνο" καὶ ἐπὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν ἐρμηνεία δὲ τοῦ "πλάζειν" κοινὴ διάλεκτο τὸ πλανών, 200 δὲ κατὰ τῶν παλαιούς ἀπὸ | τοῦ "ἀλη" γίνεται προσθέσει στοιχείων τοῦ πι> καὶ λάμβδα 201 ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ πλαγάζειν τῆς ὁρθῆς, εἰς αὐτοῦ δὲ "ὁ πλάνης" καὶ "ὁ πλανῆτης", ἔτι δὲ καὶ "ὁ πλάνος" τέχνην αὐτὸς ἔχων τινὰ | καὶ τὸ ἀποπλανών τοὺς θεωμένους, ὁποῖοι

10.24 tit. πλεονασμός τοῦ νῦ add. in marg. P2. 
10.27 φασιμβροτος P1 Rom. Bas.: φασιμβροτός Stall.  
10.29 tit. ἀπὸ τοῦ πλανάν add. in marg. P2.  
10.30 πὶ P1: π edd.
Κηφισόδωρος τις και Πανταλέων, διέ θα και Ματρέας ὁ Ἀλεξανδρεύς, ὡς κατὰ τὴν ἱστοριαν τοῦ Ἀθηναίου ἐλεγε πρὸς ἀινήγμα θηρίων τι τρέφειν ὅπερ αὐτὸ έαυτὸ ἑσθείει, ὡς καὶ ζητείσθαι φησὶ μέχρι τοῦ νῦν τὸ “Ματρέα θηρίων”; τὸ δὲ ἡ θυμὸν Ἰσας ἢ φθόνον δὴ λοί ή λύπην καὶ τὶ κομικότερον ἐμπαθής, εἰλήφθαι δὲ δοκεῖ ὁ ῥήης τοῦ Ματρέα μάγος ἢ ἐκ τοῦ ἐν θυμόν κατέδοι τοῦ πολύποδος ὡς “ἐν” ποτὲ “πόδα τένειε” ὅτι τὸ “πέι” οὐ μονὸν σύνδεσμος ἔστιν αἰτιολογικός ἀλλὰ ἐν πολλοὶς καὶ χρονικῶν ἐπίρρημα, ὡς καὶ ενταῦθα “ἐπεὶ Τροής πτολείθρου ἐπέρεσαν”, ἀντὶ τοῦ “ἀφ’ οὐ”, ὅπερ “ἐξ οὐ” φησὶν ἐν τῇ Ἴλιαν μή ἐν τῷ “ἐξ οὐ δή τὰ πρῶτα διαστητήν”  ὅτι τῇ Τροίᾳ ἐνταῦθα “ἰερὰν” καλεῖ, ὡς καὶ ἐν τῇ ἡ τῆς Ἴλιαδος τοῦ Ἡθίωνος πόλιν τῆν Θήβην τούτῳ δὲ καὶ ἐπ’ ἄλλων ποιεῖ πόλεων καὶ ζητείσθεν τὴν αἰτίαν ἐν τοῖς γραφεῖσιν εκεῖ ὅπερ δὲ καὶ μύθος τής ἐπείτης, λέγει ὑπὸ Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ Ποσειδώνος κτισθήσατο τὴν Ἰλίου, ὅτι καὶ “ἰερὰν πτολείθρου” Τροής, ὡς θεὸς κτιστῶν λέγεται. θεραπειά δὲ τοῦ ποοῦ τούτου κατὰ Παλαίρατον, ὅτι κειμήλια Ποσειδώνος τῆς Απόλλωνος εἰς ἀνοικίσμων τῆς Ἰλίου ὑπὸ Λαομέδοντος δεδαπάνητο. διὸ δοκοῦσι τρόπον ἵνα θητείσαι ὁ Ποσειδών καὶ ἡ Ἀπόλλων ἐν τῷ τῆς Ἰλίου κτίσματί, τινὲς δὲ ὀρνύται  ὅτι ἄστειον τὸ κοινὸν παντὸς κτίσματος ὁ μύθος διὰ συνόπτην ὁ Τροίᾳ ἐξείσκεσε. παντὶ μὲν γὰρ πολίσματι καὶ ἀπλῶς οἰκοδομήματι χρεία Ποσειδώνος τῇ ἰσχύς ὑγρότητος δὴ ἢς ὁ τίτανος ἢ ὁ πηλὸς ἀρμόζει τοὺς λίθους καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος ἤτω θερμότητος ἡλιακῆς τῆς ἐν τῷ περιέχοντι, ὡς ἐν κείμενων συμπαγείᾳ τὸ κτίσμενον. ἡ δὲ μονολογία τὸ κοινὸν τούτο τῇ Τροίᾳ καὶ ἐξαίρετον ἱδαπάτον  ἀπένειμε. περὶ ὑπαρξιας ὅτι τὸ “Τροής πτολείθρον” ἀντὶ τοῦ “Τροίας”. σημεῖώσαι δὲ καὶ ὅτι τὸ “Τροής πτολείθρον ἐπέρεσαν” ἀρχὴ ἐστὶ τῆς τοῦ πτολείθρου ὁ ὁδοστάσας συνθέσεως. διὰ γάρ ταύτην ἐκείνον τὸ “πτολείθρος” ἐπωνύμαται. ὅτι δὲ αὐτὸς ἐκεῖ τῇ Τροίᾳ διὰ τοῦ δουρείου ἱππου μηχανῆς, ἐσθλῶν, ἐρεί γὰρ ὁ ποιητῆς, σῇ δ’ ἢ ἡ ἴλω κουλῆ πόλεις Πριάμου”. (Vs. 4) ὅτι “πόντος” κυρίως τὰ καὶ κοινῶς πᾶν πέλαγος, ὡς δὴ λόγῳ καταπελάσα ὁ “πολλά δ’ ο’ γ’ ἐν πόντω πάθεν ἀλγεία”. ἡ ἰδίως δὲ “πόντος” παρὰ τοῖς ἑντερόν καὶ ὁ Εὐδείσσυς ἐκκληθῶν αὐτοῦ τῶν Ἐλβίανας διὰ τὸ ἐκτετοπίσατο. διὸ, φασὶ, τοὺς ποτικοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐλέγον εἰ ποιοντοῦ ἐκ τοῦ πολλοῦ ἢκεῖν πόντον, ὡς εἰπερ ἐλέγον ἐξ ὀλίθρου ὅτι προσφέυει εἰ καὶ ἀνθρώποις πολυπλανών καὶ περιπολεῖτο τὸ “μάλα πολλά πλάγχη”. “πολλῶν δ’ ἀνθρώπων ἰδὲν ἀστεία καὶ νόον ἐγνώ”. Ἰσας

11.2 Αθηναίου P’ Rom. Stall.: ἀπανήαιου Bas. 11.5 θυμὸν add. edd.
11.13 ἄλληγορικός add. in marg P’.
δὲ καὶ τὰ ἔξης. Μάρτων δὲ ὁ παρθός ἐξ ὅμηρου λαβὼν ἐφή ἐπὶ δεῖπνον τὸ "δεῖπνα μοί ἐννέπε Μοῦσα πολύτροφα καὶ μάλα πολλὰ" καὶ ἐξῆς, ὡς ἐκείνος ἐπελεξαίτο. ἐν οἷς μέμνηται καὶ παρασιτὸν δὲ σχεδόθη ἤν ἐφη "πεινώντι λάρῳ ὄρνηθ ὡσεικός, νήστις, ἀλλοτριόν ἐδ εἰδός δειπνοσύνανον". λέγει δ’ ἐν τούτωι ἐκείνος καὶ τοὺς ἑχόνους "καρποκομώντας ἄκανθας" καὶ τὴν τρίγλυν | "μιλτοπάρην". "λάρῳ" δ’ ἐκείνος ἐκάσε τὸν παράσιτον, διὰ τὸ πλησιέσχεται οἷς ἀπληστεύεται, ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ "λαρινεύσατος" ἐστὶ στιίξεθαί ἐκατὰ Σώφρωνα, ὡς παρασημειούτατο | Ἀθηναίος, θεῖον καὶ "βόες λαρινοῖ" φησιν ὁσπερ καὶ σύνες. αὐτοὶ δὲ καὶ ἄλλος καλοῦντα "λαρινοῖ" ἢ ἀπὸ Λαρινῆς νῆετορικῆς κόμης ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦς Λαρινοῦ βουκολοῦσσες αὐτάς. καὶ οὖτω μὲν ταῦτα, ἢ τὸ δέ "ἰδεν" ἀοριστός ἐστι δεύτερος, ἢς οὗ καὶ τὸ "ἰδεῖν" ἀπαρέμφατον καὶ "ἰδὼν" μετοχή.  "ἀστυ" δὲ κοινώς μὲν πάσα πόλις, ὡς ἢν καὶ "ἀστείας" κυρίως ἄνηρ ὁ ἐξ ἀστειοῦ καὶ μὴ | ἀγρότης. Ἀττικὸι δὲ ἱδίως οὖτως τὰς Ἀθηναίας ἀνώμαζον κατὰ τὸ ἕξαιρετον, ὁσπερ καὶ οἱ Ἀλεξανδρεῖς "πόλιν" ἐξαιρέτως τὴν Ἀλεξανδρείαν. ἔλεγον οὖν Ἀθηναίοι | καὶ "ἀστοικα" καὶ "ἀστάκας" ἄνδρας τὲ καὶ γυναῖκας τοὺς ἐξ Ἀθηνῶν, καὶ "ἀστή" ἐλαίαι τὴν ἐκείθεν καὶ μάλιστα τὴν ἐξ ἀκροπόλεως τὴν καὶ ἱερὰ. (Vs. 5) ὅτι τὸ "ἀρνύμενος ἢν τε ψυχὴν καὶ νόστον ἢταίρονων". ὁ ἔστιν ἀντικαταλασσόμενος, ἀπὸ μέρους εἰλήπτει τῶν πάλαι ποτα μεσιτευόντων ζύμων τοῖς συναλλάγμασι, τούστερα ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρνῶν, ἔνος εἴδους τῶν τετραπόδων. ἢ ἂρ ὁν καὶ Σοφοκλῆς "ἀρνείον φούνον" λέγει τὸν τῆς λειας ἀπάσης τῆς συμμίκτου. καὶ ὁ ποιητὴς τῶν θεότητοι ἐν Ἡλλάδι "πολύπαρα" ἐφή ἀντὶ τοῦ πολυβρέμονα. καὶ ἔστι κυρίως μὲν "ἀρνυθάι" τὸ "ἀρνα ἄδιδον" ὡς ἐν καταλλαγῇ ἀντιλαμβάνει τίνερ θρήσμον, καταχρηστικῶς δὲ καὶ τὸ ἄπλως ἀντικαταλάσσεσθαι. ὁσπερ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρνῶν τὸ "ἀρνυθάι" εἰλήπται, οὔτω καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπὸ τοῖς ζῴων πώλων εἰρήται τὸ "πωλείν". ἀρέσκει δὲ τισὶ καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ζῷων κατὰ ἐκτάσει τῆς ἀρχούσης τὸ "ἄνεσθαι" παράγεισθαι, ὅτι ἢ τῇ τίμια ἢσαν τὰ θρέμματα καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς οἱ παλαιοὶ τὴν κατὰ βίον ἔχον εὐθέτησιν δήλων ἐκ τῶν ἱστόριων. διὸ καὶ τὴν περιούσιαν πρόβασιν ἔλεγον διὰ τὸ ἐν ζῷως περιούσιαξεθῇ τοὺς αὐτόθεν δυναμένους προβαίνειν. ὁσπερ δὲ τὸ "ἀρνυθάι" ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρνῶν καὶ τὸ "πωλείν" ἐκ τῶν πώλων καὶ τὸ "ἄνεσθαι" ἀπὸ τῶν ἁρνῶν ὡς ἐκ μέρους τὸ πάν, οὔτω καὶ τῶν γυναικῶν αἱ τοιοῦτοι, "ἀλφεσίβοιαι" ἀπὸ τῶν ἑδῶν, εἴδους ἄλλου τετραπόδων, ἂρ᾿ ὁν καὶ σταθμοὶ τινὲς τιμημέτον ἢσαν, τὸ
τεσσαράβοιον, τὸ δωδεκάβοιον, τὸ εἰκοσάβοιον, τὸ ἐκατόμβοιον.252 καὶ ὁ Θηβαῖκος
de τοὺς πόλεις μῆλων γενέσθαι λέγεται τῶν τοῦ Ὑδίποδος.253 ἔνθα νοεῖται ἀπὸ τὸ
μέρους τῶν μήλων τοῦ Ὑδίποδος ἀπαντα πράγματα. ἀλλαὶ μέντοι
tὸ "ἀνυμένων" φασίν ἀντὶ τοῦ λαμβάνει καὶ περιποιούμενος, ἀπὸ τοῦ "αἴρω".254

5 τὴν de τούτου παραγωγῆν ἔστη ἐν τῷ ἀλφα τῆς Ἰλιᾶδος ἐν τῷ "ἀχνύμενος".255

perí οὗ ἐτεροῦν τι παραδίδουσι ὁ καλὸς Ἡρακλείδης φησίν ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ "ἀχω"

gίνεται "ἀχώ" καὶ Δωρικὸς "ἀχών", ἐς οὗ καὶ καθ' ὑπέρβασιν τοῦ

ν ἐν "ἀχωμαι". οὕτω καὶ τοῦ "ἀχω", "ἀχομαι" παράγοντας "ἀχών", ὡς "ἀνω",

"ἀνώ". Δωρικεῖς ἀπὸ "ἀχών" φασί. μεταθέσεις δὲ ὁμοιά, γίνεται "ἀχομαι".256 ὡς εἰκὸς
de οὕτω καὶ τὰ ὅμοια. ὅτι πολλὰ ἔσταθεν Ὅδυσσεύς τὴν τε ψυχὴν ἀρνύμενον ἀστήρ
cαὶ τοῖς ἐταῖροις νόστων. ἐκείνος μὲν, ὅτι φίλαυτον καὶ φίλοξφον ἐν τοῖς καιρίοις ὁ

σπουδαῖος ἀνθρώπος. τὸ de ἐνετέρω, ὅτι οὐ περιορᾷ ἐν κινδύνοις τούς φίλους ὁ

σωφρόν.257 ἵστεν δὲ ὅτι πρώτη ἐνταῦθα παράφρασις τῷ ποιητῇ ἐν τῷ 

"ἀνυμένον".258 ὅγοιν οἶδαν, ὅπερ ἀνωτέρω ἡφῇ "ἐν κατὰ θυμὸν".259 | (Vs. 6-7) λέγει δὲ καὶ

"ὡς ἐρρύσατο ἄν εἰκινόις, εἰ μὴ αὐτῶν σφετέραις ἀτασθαλίας ἀπολύλασε νήπιοι, οἱ

βοῶς Ὅπεριόνος Ἡλλιοὺς κατηθίσθον".260 τῖνες δὲ οἱ τοῦ Ἡλίου βοῶς καὶ τὶς ἢ τοῦ

λόγου τοῦτον ἀλληγορία, ἔστη τὸ πρῶτον ὁ λόγος, ἐν Ὅριακι ταῖς
tοιαύταις ἐντύχη μοισί.261 σημείωσε δὲ ὅτι ἐταῖρους Ὅδυσσεός ἐνταῦθα λέγει κατ'

ἐξαιρέτων μόνον τοὺς ἐν τῇ ἐκείνου ἡπί, τεσσαράκοντα ὅντας καὶ τέσσαρας. αὐτοὶ

γὰρ καὶ τῶν τοῦ Ἡλίου βοῶν ἐφαγόν, μόνοι περιτειρεθέντες τῷ Ὅδυσσεῖ. καὶ αὐτοὶ

μόνοι σωθῆσαι ἥδυναίτο εἰ μὴ ἐφαγόν. οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι, ἐν διαβόροις καὶ τρόποις, 

βιαῖς προαπολύλασαι ὡς διηγηθῆσαι ὁ ποιητής. τὸ de "σφετέραις"

ἀντωνυμία ἐστὶ τρίτον προσώπον ἄντι τοῦ "ταῖς ἐκείνον".262 καὶ ἄει οὕτω 
tιθεῖται, ἐν ὅτι καὶ Ἡσίοδος ἐνετέρω αὐτὸ ἐταξάθαν, ἐν τῷ "σφετερν πατέρα

υμνεύουσαν"263 ἐν τοῦ "ὑμνετέρων". ἵστεν δὲ ὅτι τοῦ "αὐτῶν σφετέραις

ἀτασθαλίας"264 ἀντὶ συνθέτου κεῖται ἀντοιχυμίας τῆς "εἰσερχόν" ἢ ἄντι τοῦ "σφῶν

αὐτῶν", ὅποιος μάλιστα χαίρει ὁ ποιητής οἷα τὰς συνθέτους μὴ εἰδῶς. "ἀτασθαλία"
de οὐ μόνον ἤ ταῖς ἀταῖς θάλλουσα ἀφροσύνη, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἢ "ἐν θαλαίας" ἐπὶ ὁ

ἐνωχίας ἢτ έκ παροινίας, ὡς φησίν Ἁθηνάιος.265 (Vs. 8) ὅρα δὲ ὅτι, ὅπερ ἐν τῇ

Ἰλιᾶδι, οὕτω καὶ ἐν τῇ Ὅδυσσείᾳ τὸ "νήπιοι" προαναφωνούμενον ἀποτέλεσμα δηλοῖ

οὐκ ἀγαθὸν οἷς ἐν ἑπιφανείᾳ.266 Ὅπεριόνος ὃ ἑλίου, ἢ πατρωνυμικῶς ὁ κατὰ
Πίνδαρον ὑπεριονίδης. 267 εἴ οὖν ὁ ὑπεριονίδης οὗτος καὶ κατὰ συγκοπὴν ὁ τοῦ ὑπεριονίδης οὗτος καὶ κατὰ συγκοπὴν "ὑπεριονίδης". 268 οὖτω γάρ αὐτὸν ὁ μύθος γενεαλογεῖ, ἡ ἐπιθετικὴ ἡ ὁ ὑπέρ ἡμᾶς ἱόν. 269 καὶ ὀφειλεῖν εἶναι "ὑπεριονίδης" ὁ δυτίκος ὁ μετοχικὸς ὁνόμα, μετέπεσε δὲ | διὰ ἀποφυγῆς συνεμπτώσεως 270 εἰς καθαρὸν ὁνόμα, ὅποιον καὶ τὸ ὁ ἀμφίτονον καὶ τὰ τοιαύτα. 271 οὖτω δὲ καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἐξτάσεως "Ἐξέλθων" μετοχῆς "Ἐξέλθων" βαρυτότον παρὰ Ἡροδότῳ κύριον ὁνόμα. 272 (V 9) ὁ Ὀμηρὸς μὲν ἢμαρ νόστιμον τὸ τῆς οἰκίας ὑποστροφής λέγει, οἱ δὲ μεθ' ὁ Ὀμηρὸς καὶ "βρόμα" φασὶ νόστιμον, ώς καὶ ἄλλου ἀκολουθεῖα. 273 καὶ ἢν ὁδότον δὲ τὴν ἡμέρας, διὰ τὸ ἢν τοῦ Ὀμηρίκου νόστοι. δὴν καὶ "ἐννοστος" φαύλον φασίν ἀγαλμάτων παρὰ τοῖς μύλωσιν, 274 ὡς ἐν ἐντέρφη ῥητορικῷ λεξικῷ κεῖται, "Εὔνοστος, | τρόπος ἐπιμύλων, δοκοῦσα ἐφορᾷ τὸ μέτρον τῶν ἀλευρῶν". 275 (V 10) ὁ Ἰλίαδι μὲν αὐτὸς ὁ ποιητὴς ἐν προοιμίωσις ὀρθεὶ σύντοκον τὴν Μοῦσαν, διὰ τὴν πολιτείαν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀχιλλείας μήνιδος, διὰ τὸ ἀριστον ἐκεῖ τοῦ σκοποῦ τῆς ὑποθέσεως. 276 ἐνταῦθα δὲ διὰ τὸ πάνυ πολλὰ πάθη τῆς πλάνης τῆς Μοῦσας ἀνατίθησα ὁρεῖ πάντα ἐν τοῖς πολλών βουλοκτον, εἰπάνν "τῶν ἀμέθεν γε, θεά, θυγατέρι Δίως, εἰπὲ καὶ ἡμῖν," 277 ως ἐν ἐν καὶ οὖσα ποικίλους ἐν τῷ τῶν προοιμίων ἑκατέρων σχηματισμῷ. 278 κατὰ δὲ | ἀλληγορίαν 279 τῇ ἁπατω ἡ ἡ σύνηδος τὸ πάν ἀνατίθησαν, ἴνα "Μοῦσαν" μὲν συνήθες ὁνομάζει, ως ἡσυχίης εἰς τοῦ "μόν" τοῦ ζητοῦ 280 "θεάν" δὲ διὰ τὸ ἔξω καὶ ταχύ, ώς ἀπὸ τοῦ "θετείν". 281 "θυγατέρας" δὲ "Δίως," | ὡς νοῦς προβολήν καὶ ἐνέργειαν. Ζεύς γὰρ ὁ νοῦς. 282 σημείοναι δὲ κάτωθι ὁς καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἰλιάδι τὴν προοιμίωσιν σύστασι καθ' ἤν ἡ ποιητὴς ἀνατω ἐν τοῖς λόγιοι συνιστά. ως γὰρ ὁ "πλατωνίζειν" ή "δημοσθενίζειν" φάμενος ἐφασαίνει ϑαρρεῖν σοφός εἶναι κατά Πλάτωνα ή Δημοσθένην, οὗτοι καὶ ὁ θεάν προκαλεσάμενος ἀδείς ἐννέπειν "ἐνθεάζειν" οἴον τοῖς λόγοις ἐνέργεια. 283 τὸ δὲ ἀμέθεν δήλοι μὲν τὸ ποθὲν καὶ ἀπὸ τὸν ἄνδρα ἄνεος ἐν σχηματίζεται δὲ οὕτως "ιμός" λέγεται ὁ εἰς ὁ τὸς Ἰονικῶς εἶτε καὶ Ἀριστίκως, ἔξ ὁ "ιμόθεν" μὲν τὸ ποθὲν καὶ ἀπὸ τὸν ἄνδρα ἄνεος, "οὐδαμόθεν" δὲ τὸ οὐδέποθεν. 284 εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ οὕτως πολλαὶ κινήσεις ἐκ τοῦ τοιούτου ἀμός, ἔστι γὰρ εἰς αὐτὸν κατὰ ἀπόφασιν ἀλλὰ τις εἰθεῖα ἡ "οὐδαμός," ὁ ταυτὸν ἔστι τῷ ὁδέ | τις," ἀφ' ὁ παρ' Ἡροδότῳ τὸ "οὐδαμοί" εἰθεῖα πληθυντική. 285 ἀντὶ τοῦ "οὐδέ τινες," καὶ θηλυκὸν "οὐδαμάς," 286 ὅθεν γενική "πρὸς οὐδαμῶν ἀνέρθωσιν," 287 εἴ οὗ ἐπίρρημα μεσοτήτος τὸ "οὐδαμός" ἀντὶ τοῦ καὶ οὐδένα τινὰ τρόπον, ἀφ' ὁ τὸ "οὐδαμή," οἷς ἱσοδύναμα τὸ "μηδαμῶς" καὶ το "μηδαμή." καὶ ταύτα μὲν εἰς τὸν "οὐδαμός" ἀρρήτου ἐνικοῦ συνθέτου

ἀρσενικοῦ ὄνοματος, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ "ἄμως" πρωτοτόπου καὶ ἐκ τῆς πληθυντικῆς αὐτοῦ γενικῆς τὸ "ἄμως" ἐπίρρημα γίνεται, ὁ ἐστὶ μετρικῶς. ὅσπερ δὲ "οὐδαμῶς", "οὐδαμῆ" καὶ "μηδαμῶς", "μηδαμῆ" καὶ "πῶς", "πῆ" καὶ "πάντως", "πάντη" καὶ "ἄλλως", ἀλλή, οὕτως ἐκ τοῦ "ἀμῶς" γίνεται "ἄμη". ἐκ δὲ τούτων τῶν δύο, ἦγουν ἐκ τοῦ "ἀμῶς" καὶ τοῦ "ἀμῆ", κατὰ πρόσαλησιν διπλής συνδετικῆς παραπληρώσεως συντίθεται τὸ "ἀμοσγέπως" καὶ τὸ "ἀμηγήπη", τουτέστιν ἐπ’ ὀλίγον, μετρικῶς, κατὰ ἕνα τινά τρόπον, οἷον "ἀμοσγέπως ἡματο λόγου", "ἀμηγήπη εὐφοροφίσην" αντὶ τοῦ κατὰ τι καὶ ἐπὶ βραχύ καὶ μετρικῶς καὶ ὡς εἰπεῖν ἢ "ἀμόθεν". διὸ καὶ ὁ σοφὸς Ἐρώτρις Δημοσθένης ἐν οἷς παρέφρασε τὴν Ὀδυσσείαν τὸ "ἀμόθεν" "ἀμηγήπη" ἡμῖνευσε. τὸ δὲ καὶ ἡμῖν ἦ παρέκκλου ἔχει τὸ "καὶ καθά πολλαχοῦ γίνεται" ἢ διὰ τὸ μέλλον εἰρθήσεται, ὡς εἰκὸς ὧς, πολλοὺς μεθ’ Ὀμηρον εγχειρήσειν τοιοῦτον ἔργον. ἢσως δὲ καὶ διὰ τὸ παραφράσθηκεν, εἰ τις ἀναπολεῖ τὴν προεκτεθειμένην ἱστορίαν, ὅτι δηλαδή Αἰγυπτόθεν ἡ λαβή τῆς ποιήσεως τῷ Ὀμηρῷ, ὡς πρὸ ὀλίγου ἐγράφη, ἢν λέγη ὅτι "ὡς ἐτέρας φάσσασα εἰπας, εἰπὲν γὰρ ἡμῖν". (Vs. 11) ὅτι τὸ "ἔνθα" οὐ μόνον τοπικῶν ἐστὶν ἀλλὰ καὶ χρονικῶν, ὡς τὸ "ἐνθ’ ἄλλους μὲν πάντες ὁσοὶ φύγεται αὐτὸν ὄλεθρον", αντὶ τοῦ "τότε". καὶ "οὐδ’ ἔνθα περιγέμνοις ἢν ἁθλον", ὥς δὲ τὸ "πάντες ὁσοὶ φύγον", ὥς δὲ τὸ "ἄλλος ὁσοὶ φύγον", ὥς δὲ τὸ "ἄλλος ὁσοὶ φύγον". (Vs. 12) ὅτι τὸ "εἰς οἶκον" Ἀττικὸι μὲν "οἶκοι" φασίν ἢ παραγματικῶς κατὰ ἔλθειν, τὸ γὰρ ἐνετέλες ἔνθα εἰσίν "οἱ οἶκοι". (Vs. 13) ποιητῇ δὲ "οἰκονῇ" φασί. τὸ δὲ κοινότερον ἢ αὐτοῦ "οἰκαδε", ὡς "οὐκηνδε", "φύγαδε", περὶ ὃν καὶ ἐν τοῖς εἰς τὴν Ἡλιάδα εἰρθαι. ὅτι οὐδὲ ἐνταῦθα τὴν ἁρχὴν τῆς τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως πλάνης ἁρχὴν τῆς οἰκού ποιήσεως Ὀμηρος τίθεται, ἀλλ’ ὅσπερ εἰς τῇ Ἡλιάδι, ὅπως καὶ νῦν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐγχυς τοῦ τέλους ἀρχηται. ἢ γὰρ Καλπυω ἀρ’ ἥς ποιεῖται ἡ Μοῦσα τοῦ λόγου τὴν καταρρέχον κατάντημα ἐς γένος τῆς πλάνης τῷ Ὀδυσσεί. εἰς αὐτὴν γὰρ ἐσώθη κελητίζων οἷον ἐπὶ τῆς τρόπεως, τῆς μεντοῦ ἁρχῆς τῆς τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως πλάνης εὐρήσεις εἰς τῇ ἡ ἱστορία ἐν τῷ "Πλαθέν με φέρον ἄνεμος Κικόνεασι πέλασσεν" ἐκείθεν γὰρ Ὀδυσσεύς εἰς πλάνην ἐξωκειλέν. (Vs. 13) ὅτι δύο ταύτα λέγει ὁ ποιητής διὰ πόθου μάλιστα εἶναι τῷ Ὀδυσσεί, τὴν τε πατρίδα καὶ τὴν σώφρονα γυναικα. φησὶ γὰρ "νόστου κεχρημένον ἢδὲ γυναικὸς" οἵ δὲ ἢ τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως καὶ τῆς Πηνελόπης ἀναγωγη ἐκένου ἀλληγορία, ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς εἰρθήσεται. ὅρα δὲ ὅτι ἄλλῃ καὶ ἀρχηται ὁ ποιητής τῇ τε σημασίᾳ καὶ τῇ συντάξει τοῦ "κεχρημένος" ἢπερ ἡμεῖς. ἡμεῖς μὲν γὰρ "χρῆσθαι" φαίμεν τὸ μεταχείριζεσθαι καὶ δοτική πτώσει συντάσσομεν. οἴμηρος δὲ τὸν

15.9 τίτ. Δημοσθένης ὁ Θρῖς. ἀδδ. in marg. P.²
15.17 τίτ. Λυκόφρον. ἀδδ. in marg. P.²
15.14-8 ὃτι ἐχεῖν ἀδδ. in marg. P.¹
15.21 τίτ. φύγαδε. ἀδδ. in marg. P.²
χρήστοι "κεχρημένον" λέγει καὶ γενικὴ συντάσσει τὴν λέξιν ἀπὸ τοῦ "χρηίζω" ἢ "χρήζω" κινηθείσαν κατὰ ἐλλειψιν τοῦ σίγμα.306 (Vs. 14) δρα δὲ καὶ τὸ γυναικὸς ἀστείως ἢ λεχθὲν πρὸς τὸ ἐφεξῆς "ὁ μὲν γὰρ κεχρημένος ἢ γυναικὸς". Καλυψὼ μὲν ἐπὶ τῶν ἐνεσαρμένων τῇ γῇ καὶ τοῖς φυτοῖς καὶ τοῖς νάμασι φυσικῶν δυνάμεων τίθεται. | δι' ὅ ἄν αἱ τῶν καρπῶν προθέσεις ἐν καιρῷ γίνονται κατὰ τὸ νέον φαινόμενα, ἦτοι κατὰ τὸ ἔαρ, δὴν καὶ ἢ "νώμφη" συντεθεῖται ὑπονεί "νεόμφη" καὶ Ἀιολικὸς "νύμφη", οὗ δὲ μύθος καὶ δαιμονία τίνα νύμφας φησὶ γεωχαρῆ καὶ σωματικῶτερα, ὡς καὶ ἐν Ἡλιαδὶ ἐρρήθη,307 ὅποιαί τινες αἱ Νήδες308 καὶ Ἀμαδρυάδες309 καὶ Ἀμανθιάδες310 καὶ Λειμωναίδες311 αἱ μυθικαί.

τοιαύτη τις καὶ ἡ Καλυψώ κατὰ τὸν μύθον, ἀλλὰ δὴ καὶ ἡ Κίρκη, ὡς καὶ "αιδηνάσσας" ὁ ποιητὴς ἔρει.312 ὃ ἐστὶν ἀνθρωπίνη καὶ τῇ κάτω καὶ καθ᾽ ἡμᾶς χρωμένας φωνῆ. | τούτῳ γὰρ ἢ "αὐθή" καὶ αἱ καθ᾽ ἡμᾶς δὲ "νύμφαι" ἐς ὅμοιότητος τῶν τοιοῦτον νυμφῶν τὴν ἐπονομαζόμενον εἰλήφασι. καὶ αὐταὶ γὰρ τὰ πρὶν θαλαμεύομενα νέον φαίνονται ὅτε | τὸ τῆς ἦλικίας ἕαρ αὐταῖς ἑπανθεῖ. ὅτι μέντοι οὐ μυθικὰ νῦμφαι ἤσαν ἡ Καλυψώ καὶ ἡ Κίρκη ἢ καὶ τῶν ἱστοριῶν δὴλόν ἔστιν,313 εἰ καὶ ὁ ποιητὴς διὰ τερατείαν ἄλλως μυθολογεῖ | τὰ περὶ αὐτῶν. δῆλον δὲ ὅτι καὶ συγγενικὴ ποτὲ λέξις ἐστὶ τὸ "νύμφη", ὡς δηλοὶ καὶ τὸ "νύμφα φιλῆ". ὅτι τὸ "δία" ἢ ἐνδοξότητα, διὰ τὸν Διόνυσον, ἐτernal ὑπερετικῶς μετὰ γενικῆς. ἐπεὶ γὰρ ὑπερεκίσθαι πάντων ἔδοξε ο Ζεύς, διὰ τούτο καὶ τὸ "δίος" καὶ τὸ "δία" ἢ καὶ τῆς Διός γενικῆς γινόμενα ὑπερθετικὴ συντάξει ἐξουσίων, ὡς ὁ ἐν τῇ Ἡλιαδὶ πλατύτερον γέγραπται.314 Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι διὰ τὸ ὡς ἐρρήθη ὑπεροχικὸν τοῦ Διός, οὐ μόνον "μέγαν" ὁ ποιητὴς αὐτὸν λέγει, ὡς ἐν τῷ "Διός μεγάλου ἐναιστοί"315 καὶ "Διός μεγάλου ἐκτητε"316, εἰ καὶ κατ' ἄλλον λόγον μείζον ὁ Κρόνος κατὰ τὴν αὐτὸν ὡς φασὶ317 σφαίραν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπέληθαν αὐτοῖς κατὰ τὴν κλίσιν οἱ μεθ᾽ Ὑμηρον ὡς Ἀλλίος Διονύσιος ἱστορεῖ. "Δίες" γάρ φησὶ τὸ πληθυντικὸν τοῦ Διὸς καὶ δράμα οὖτος ἐπιγέραται318 καὶ αἱ εφεξῆς πτωτεῖς "Διων" καὶ "Διω" καὶ "Δια". ἦτε ἱστέον ὅτι καθὰ τὸ "δίος" οὐ παράγεται σύγκρισιν ἢ ἡ ὑπέρθειν, διὰ τὸ φῶς τῆς λέξεως ὑπεροχικῶν, οὐδεὶς γὰρ λέγει "διότερος" ἢ "δίοτατος", οὖτος οὖδὲ τὸ "ἀγαθὸς" διὰ τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ τοῦ ἄγαν ἐπιτασσ. φησὶ γὰρ οὖν Ἀλλίος Διονύσιος319 ὅτι "ἀγαθότερος καὶ ἀγαθώτατος παρ᾽ οὐδενὶ τῶν 'Ελλήνων κεῖται". (Vs. 15) ὅτι τὸ

15.32 tit. κεχρημένον add. in marg. P.2.
16.3 tit. Καλυψώ add. in marg. P.1.
16.6 tit. νύμφη add. in marg. P.2.
16.23 ὡς P.1 Rom.: ὡς Stall.: ὡς Bas.
16.27 tit. διος add. in marg. P.2.
"γλαφυρόν" κυρίως μὲν ἐπὶ χειροκίμητον κοιλότητος, οὖν οἱ | λιθοθέτοι καὶ οἱ | ξοανογλύφοι ἐντυποῦσι, παρά τὸ "γλάφω"220 τὸ κοιλαίνω γενόμενον, περὶ οὗ ἐν τοῖς | μετὰ ταῦτα ρηθήσεται.231 ἐπὶ δὲ σπηλαίων232 | μεταφορικῶς λέγεται καὶ ἐπὶ νησί,233 διὰ | τὸ ἀπλός κοίλον καὶ τοῖς γλαφυμένοις παρέπεται. ἢδη δὲ ἡ λέξις μετήκται καὶ | ἐπὶ νησιάτων. καὶ λέγεται καὶ "νοήματα γλαφυρά", τὰ ἐχοντὰ τι βαθῦ, πλὴν μετὰ | καὶ χάριτος καὶ διαφανείας τινὸς καὶ λαμπρότητος, | ἢς μὴ πάνω εἶναι διὰ τὸ βάθος | σκοτεινὰ. εἰ δὲ καὶ "σπίνου στόμα γλαφυρόν"234 ἀκούσεις σοφοῦ τινός λέγοντος, | ἐνετεύθην ποθὲν νόει μετηνέχθαι τὴν λέξιν. ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅταν τὰς λέγει "φρίσσειν τὰ | λήμα γλαφυρόν"235 διὰ τὸ ἐπικυροτοῦσθαι τοὺς στάχυς τοῦτο λέγει, καὶ γίνεσθαι τινα | οὐτὸν ὑπ' ἑκείνους κοιλότητα. δὴ δοκεῖ μὲν ἀδιάφορα εἶναι ὁ πόσις τε καὶ ὁ ἀνήρ. | Σοφοκλῆς δὲ ἐν Τραχύνισσας236 ὑπεμαραίνει διάφοραν τινὰ τῶν λέξεων τοῦτον ἐνα | δέδοικεν ἢ ὑπάρχομεν237 Δημάνειρα, μὴ ποτὲ ὁ Ἰρακλῆς αὐτῆς μὲν εἰ ἤτο πόσις, τῆς | δὲ νεωτέρας Ἡ Ἰόλης ἀνήρ. παρανόμασται δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς "πόσεως" ὁ "πόσις" ὡς δοκεῖ | τοῖς παλαιοῖς, διὰ τὴν σχετικῆς ἡγούμενα,238 ὡς καὶ ὁ "ἀρσην" ἀπὸ τοῦ | "ἀρδείν",239 καὶ ὁ "ὐίος" ἀπὸ τοῦ "ἵειν",240 διὸ καὶ τὸ "ὅμπυειν" ἐνετεύθην αὐτοῖς | ἐδόκει παράγεσθαι.241 οἶονει τὸ "διὰ τῆς ὅπης θεὸν" θέου ὁ ὑιος.242 (Vs. 16) δὴ τὸ | "περιπλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν" ἐκ τοῦ "περιπλομένων" γίνεται, ὁ ἐκτὸς γενομένων ἢ | περιπλομένων, κατὰ συγκοσμή.243 δὴ δὲ τὸ "πέλεσθαι" καὶ ἐπὶ τοιοῦτον λέγεται | δηλοῖ τὸ "ἡματα μακρὰ πέλονται".244 ἐνιαυτὸς δὲ, ἂς καὶ ἐν Ἡ Ἰλιάδι ἐδηλώθη,245 | ὁ μακρὸς χρόνος καὶ διατριβήν ἔχον ἢ πολλὴν, παρὰ τὸ "μακρὸ" τὸ διατριβῆ.246 διὸ καὶ | ὁ κωμικὸς ἐπιθετικῶς αὐτὸ τῆς ἐνέθησαν ἐν τῷ "ἐπὶ" χρόνων ἐνιαυτῶν".247 ἢσθεν | δὲ ὅτι ἀπὸ μὲν τοῦ "ἐνιαυτοῦ" τὸ "ἀπενιαυτίζειν" γίνεται, ἀπὸ | δὲ τοῦ ἔτους | "ἀμφιετεῖσθαι" τὸ κατ' ἐτος περιήχεσθαι, καὶ ἐπίρρημα δὲ ἐνετεύθην παρὰ τοῖς | παλαιοῖς ἢμπιεσθεῖ.248 (Vs. 17) δὴ τὸ "ἐπεκλώσαντο θεοὶ"249 τροπικῶς ῥηθὲν ὡς ἀπὸ | τῶν ἤτοι κλωθομένων νηματῶν εἰρήμον τινας <σημαίνει> καὶ κόκλων καὶ ἐλθοῦσι | τινα καὶ στροφὴν τῶν ἐν γενέσει πραγμάτων, οὐκ ἔχοντων μένειν ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ. | λαμβάνεται δὲ ἡ λέξις ἐπὶ ἀποδέσει πραγμάτων ἓναθὸν καὶ μὴ τοιοῦτον. | ἐπικλῆθεσθαι" γάρ τισι φαμέν τὰ τε χρηστά καὶ τὰ μὴ τοιαῦτα. αἰ μέντοι | "κατακλώθες" ἐσκαίνετι ἐπὶ κακοῦ λαμβάνεσθαι. διὸ καὶ ἑπερίδας αὐτὰς ἐπονομαζεῖ ὁ
ποιητής εν τῷ "κλόθες τε βαρεῖται".340 καὶ ὁ τοῦ Ἰζίωνος δὲ τροχὸς ὁ ἐκείνος κατὰ τὸν μύθον συνδεδεμένος εἰλείται τοιούτων τι παραδηλοῖ. κλώσματος γὰρ στροφῆ ἐσικέκεν ἢ τοῦ τροχοῦ περιδίνησιν. (Vs. 18) ὅτι δὲ καὶ μοιρὰ ἡ Κλώθω καὶ ὅτι ἔκειθεν ἡ λέξις εἰληπταί οἱ παλαιοὶ δηλοῦσιν.341 δὴ εἰσφωνήσαν εὐπλοῖος τεχνώμενος ὁ ποιητής καὶ ἕνεκεν μὲν πολλαχοῦ τοῦτο ποιεῖ, ἐστὶ δὲ ὅτε καὶ διὰ προσθήκης στοιχείου ἢ ἀφαίρεσις προσθήκης μέν, ὡς εἰ τῷ "πλάγχθη"342 καὶ τοῖς ὤμοιοις καθά προγέραπται.343 ἀφαίρεσις δὲ, ὡς εἰ τῷ | "πεφυγμένοις ἄθλοιν".344 "περευγμένος" γὰρ ὄφειλαν εἰπεῖν, ἐξώθησε τὸ ἐ τῆς διηθόγου διά τὸ εἰσφωνότερον.345 οὕτω καὶ ἐκ τοῦ "πεῦθω" "πεῦζω" "πῦστις" ἢ δι' ἄκοψης μάθησις.346 καὶ ἐκ τοῦ "κεῖθω" ἢ "κύστις" καὶ ὁ ἐκ τοῦ "προδίδω" τὸ "ἐρυθρόν" καὶ τὸ "ἐρυθῆμα" καὶ ἤθος ὁ "ἐρυθίνος"347 καὶ "ἐρυθρόδανον"348 οὕτω καὶ τὸ "ἀφυκτον" "ἀφυκτον"349 λέγεται καὶ τὸ "πέπεισαι" "πέπισσαι"350 καὶ τὸ "ψεῦδηρόν" "ψεῦδρον"351 καὶ τὸ "ἀπιστον" "ἀπιστον"352 καὶ "ἀλευσε" "ἐλυσε"353 καὶ "ἐκτυκτον"354 καὶ τὸ "τετεύχθαι" "τετύχθαι"355 καὶ "νειστάειν".356 οὕτω καὶ ἐκ τοῦ "τεύχω" "τέχνη"357 καὶ τὸ "γλυκὴ" ἢ τοῦ "γλεύκου".358 οὕτω καὶ "γλεύδες" κατὰ Παυσανιάν359 οὐνομ πολὺ ἔψωμα ἔχων, ὃ νῦν φησι "σίραιος". ὃ δ' αὐτὸς καὶ "σίραιον" οὐδὲτέρος.359 "ἀθλοῦς" καὶ δὲ σεμώνος ὁ ποιητὴς εἰπε τοὺς τοῦ Ὥοδουσίας πόνους καὶ οἶνον ἁγόνας.360 οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ ἄγονυπατόν οἶδε τὴν λέξην κείμενην, πολλαχοῦ φαίνεται. πρὸς τινα δὲ ἀντίπαλον ἢ ἀνθρείνων ὁ Ὅδουσίας. ἢ η πάντως πρὸς τὴν ἀντικειμένην αὐτῷ τύχην. ἐνοθῆ δὲ πρὸς τινὸν τὸ "ἀθλῶν" καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ μόχθου καὶ πόνων, παρὰ τὸ ἅ στερητικὸν καὶ τὸ εἶδεν, ὡς οὐκ ἂν τις ἐθέλω.361 (Vs. 20) ὅτι ή τοῦ Ποσειδώνος | όργῃ ἂν κατὰ Ὅδουσίας τρέφει, ἱνα πέλαγος μέθυν πλατύ ἄλληγορίας κυάθρα μετρήσουμεν, | διστυχίαν παραδηλοῖ τοῦ ἥρωος κατὰ θάλασσαν.362 τὰ γὰρ περὶ γῆν εὕ ἔχων τύχης διστυχῶς εἴχε τῶν κατὰ θάλασσαν καὶ διὰ τούτο δοκεῖ "ἀσπερχες μενεαίνειν" αὐτῷ ὁ τῆς θαλάσσης ἐπιστατῶν Ποσειδῶν. Νέστωρ μέντοι ἐπειτυχεῖ τοῦ πλοῦ γενόμενος | οὐ μόνον φίλος Ποσειδῶνος λέγεται, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς συγγενεῖαν αὐτῷ εἰσποιεῖται παρὰ τοῖς ποιηταῖς363 οι σχον εὑρικός, ὡς εἰρήται τὰ εἰς πλοῦν, ὡς εἰ τῇ γάμμα ραφωθὶ ἱστορεῖται.364 "ἀσπερεχὲς" δὲ καὶ ἐπίτασιν τὸ πολυσπερχεῖ καὶ ἐντερχεῖ καὶ πολυσπούδαστον.365 Ὅσοκλῆσ δὲ αὐτὸ "περισπερχεῖς" λέγει,366 οὐ ἀρσενικόν ο ἔρημηρχής καὶ θηλυκόν ἡ περισπερχεῖα.  

18.1 tit. κλόθες add. in marg. P². 18.1 Ἰζίωνος P²: Ἰζίωνος edd. 18.1 tit. τροχὸς Ἰζίωνος add. in marg. P². 18.4-6 tit. εὐφωνία κατὰ ἀφαί-ρεσιν add. in marg. P². 18.9 πῦστις P²: πῦστις edd. 18.10 κύστις P²: κύστις edd. 18.12 πεπεισμα πεπεισμα P² Rom. Bas.: πεπεισμα πεπεισμα Stoll. 18.16 σίραιος corr. Makr.: σίραιος P² edd. 18.17 tit. σίραιον add. in marg. P².
ἐντεύθεν | δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἀϊθιοπάρχην ἤτοι κύριον στρατηγοῦ ὅνομα. (Vs. 21) ὅτι παρασημειούνται οἱ παλαιότεροι τὸν ποιητὴν ἐν μὲν Ἰλιάδι πολλαῖς ἐπαναλήψεις χρῆσασθαί, ἐνταῦθα δὲ μὴ τῇ κατὰ τοὺς Αἰθιοπαρχοὺς. | ἦν γὰρ ὁ ποιητής ἢ τὸν Ἱλιάδα μετεκιάσας τῇ ἴδια ἀποδόσει, Αἰθιοπαρχοὺς, διὸ διὰ δεδαίας ἐξαστοι ἄνδρόν, ἤγους ἀνθρώπους ὡς προδεδοθῇσας, δὲ φαίνεται καὶ ἐν τῷ πατήρ ἄνδρόν | τε θεον τε. (Vs. 23) ἦστι δὲ τὸ μὲν διχάθα, καθὰ καὶ ἦν Ἰλιάδι τὸ τριχάθα καὶ τετραχάθα. Αἰθιοπαρχοὺς ἢ Ἰλιάδι τὴν θητάν ἐν τοῦτος ἐπενθεσις, ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ ποννῷ ποννῆως ἐποπόνηκα. (Vs. 23) καθὰ καὶ ἦν Ἰλιάδι τὸ τριχάθα καὶ τετραχάθα. Ἀριστοκράτοις ἄριστας ἐθελοντάτας τὸν ἠμέτρητον ἐποπόνηκα, ὡς καὶ ἦν Ἱλιάδι τὸ τριχάθα καὶ τετραχάθα.
παλαιοίς· τοῖς μὲν γὰρ δοκεῖ δέον εἶναι Αἰθίοπας δέχεσθαι, τοὺς παρ' ὅλην τὴν μεσημβρινὴν ὁκεανίτην γῆν διατείνοντας καὶ ἀπὸ ἥλιου ἀνίσχοντας, μέχρι δυσμένου διήκοντας, οἱ δίχα διηρήναντι φυσικῶς τῷ Ἀραβίῳ ἦτοι Ἐρυθραῖῳ κόλπῳ. 417 οἱ μὲν ἔθενε κείμενοι τοῦ κόλπου, οἱ δὲ ἐκείθεν ἀνατολικῷ τε καὶ ἐπὶ θάτερα δυτικῷ. μεγίστη γὰρ ἡ Αἰθιοπία καὶ μείζων φασὶν ἦτερ ἡ πρὸς Βορρᾶν ἀπὸ ἐναντίας Σκυθία. Αἰθιοπία γὰρ καλεῖται τὰ μεσημβρινὰ | πάντα τὰ πρὸς τὸν Ἡμέραν ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν χειμερινῶν παρῆκοντα μέχρι δυσμένων. 418 καὶ ταῦτα μὲν τῖς. ἔτεροι δὲ ἐπαναντίας ἠκοντες τοῖς δοξάζουσι παρακεντάτας | καὶ νοτιώτατοι τοὺς Αἰθιοπας εἶναι μετάγουσιν αὐτοὺς τῇ ἱστορίᾳ καὶ κατάγουσιν ἐπὶ τὰ πρὸς τῇ Αἰγύπτῳ τῆς Λιβύης ἐσχατᾶ ὑφήμα. ἃν μέμνηται καὶ Ἡρόδωτος, λέγων "Ἀθηναίος | οἱ πρόσωποι τῆς Αἰγύπτου". 419 καὶ τούτως εἶναι φασὶν 420 τοὺς παρ' Ὄμηρῳ Αἰθιοπας, οἵς ἀκολουθῶν καὶ Ἀρισταρχος, αὐτοὺς νοεῖ Αἰθιοπίας μεμερισμένους μὲν δίχα, διότι σχίζων | τῇ κατ' αὐτοὺς γῆν ὁ Νεῖλος, τοὺς μὲν ἄφησε δυτικότεροι κεῖσθαι, τοὺς δὲ ἀφορίζει πρὸς τὸ ἀνατολικότερον, "ἐσχάτους" δὲ "ἀνδρῶν", ἰδιαδη μέν τοῖς βορειοτάτοις μέρεσι τῆς Αἰγύπτου | τοῖς περὶ θάλασσαν. καθαῦ καὶ Αἰσχύλος φησὶν "ἐστι πάλις Κάνωνθος ἐσχάτῃ χθονός": 421 καὶ αὐτὸς γὰρ τὴν Κάνωνθον "ἐσχάτῃν χθονῶς" λέγει ἃς κείμενῃ βορειοτάτην ἐν τοῖς πρὸς τῇ θαλάσσῃ | μέρεσι τοῖς Αἰγύπτου. 422 ἀλλ' οὕτω μὲν καὶ οἱ περὶ Ἀρισταρχος. συντρέχει δὲ τῇ τοιαύτῃ ἐννοίᾳ καὶ οἱ εἰπών 423 ζητεῖ ἡ Αἰθιοπία ἐπὶ εὐθείας κεῖται τῇ Αἰγύπτῳ στενῇ καὶ μακρᾷ καὶ ἐπίκληστος. τὰ μέντοι έξω αὐτῆς ἀνδρά καὶ σπανίως οἰκούμενα τα μὲν πρὸς ἐω, τὰ δὲ πρὸς δύσιν κείμενα, θαν διὰ καὶ διήρήναντι οἱ Αἰθιοπες "οἱ μὲν δυσομένου ἥλιου, οἱ δ' ἀνίσχοντος". 424 ζητεῖ τοῦ ἐμφανώς λέγει καὶ οἱ εἰπόν Αἰθιοπας τοὺς ὑπὲρ Αἰγύπτου καὶ "Ἀραβας καὶ τοὺς ἀπὸ ἥλιου ἀνατολῶν. <καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἀπὸ ἥλιου ἀνατολῶν> λέγων "ἐθνότριχας" εἶναι, τοὺς δὲ ἐκ | Λιβύης, τρίχωμα ἔχειν πάντων οὐλόστατων. 425 δὲ οἱ γεωγράφοι λέγει καὶ ὅτι καὶ ἄλλος δὲ οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν στηλῶν καὶ τῆς ἐρυθρᾶς παραπλεύσαντες τῷ Ἡμέρας τῇ Λιβύης "τὰ τελευταῖα | χορία ἐκ τῆς πλεόντες ἥλιου, Αἰθιοπικά προσηγόρευσαν", ὑπὸ τῆς τοιαύτης ὁν φησίν ἀκολουθίας ἄχθεις καὶ οἱ ποιητής ὡς εἰκός δίχα διαιρεῖ τοὺς Αἰθιοπας τοὺς μὲν πρὸς ἀνατολήν, τοὺς δὲ πρὸς δύσιν. ἐτί δὲ Αἰθιοπες τῆς Λιβύης ἐπελθόντες μέχρι δύσεως, οἱ μὲν αὐτοὺς ἔμειναν, οἱ δὲ καὶ τῆς παραλίας κατέσχον πολλῆν, 426 ἄλλοι δὲ νοούσι | τῇ διακεκαμένην πάσαν ζωῆν τῆς πρὸς τῷ νότῳ, κατέχονται ὑπὸ <Αἰθιόπον> μεσολαβοῦντος τοῦ Ἡμέρας. ἐτέρωθεν δὲ αὐτῆς κείονται δύο εὐκράτεις, | μίαν μὲν τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐν | τοῖς νοτιώσις ἱστορουμένην καὶ φαινομένην, ἐτέραν δὲ

21.9 ἱστορίᾳ P1 Rom. Stall.: ἱστορίᾳ Bas.
21.15 vocem τῆς add. in marg. P1.
21.18 τάς P1: om. edd.
21.23-4 καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἀπὸ ἥλιου ἀνατολῶν P1 R Bas.: om. Stall.
ἡμῖν ἀνιστόρητον τὴν ἐκείθεν ἀντιπέραν τοῦ Ὡκεανοῦ καὶ ὡς εἰπείν, ὑπερνότιον. 5 οπδὲν καὶ τοὺς Αἰθίοπας διηχὶ μεμερίσθαι λέγουσιν ὅπο τοῦ τοιούτου Ὡκεανοῦ εἰς τὸ τοὺς παρ᾽ ἡμῖν μεσσημβρίων. Αἰθίοπας ἐσχάτως οὔντας πρὸς τῷ Ὡκεανῷ, καὶ εἰς τοὺς ὡς εἰκὸς ἀντικρόν πέραν τοῦ Ὡκεανοῦ, ἐσχάτως καὶ αὐτοὺς κειμένους ἐν τῇ ἐτέρᾳ εὐκράτῳ τῇ ἄθεατῳ ἡμῖν. 427 ὁ δὲ λόγος οὗτος, εἰ καὶ πιθανός, ἀλλ᾽ οὖν τερατώδης διὰ τὴν μαθηματικὴν ὑπόθεσιν τῆς ἀντιπέραν εὐκράτου. 428 διὰ ταῦτα τούτων τὸ ἑσχατοὶ ἄνδρῳ, τριχῶς νοεῖται: ἡ διότι παρακεῖναι κατὰ μεσσημβρίαν εἰσίν οἱ Αἰθίοπες, ἂν ἀοικητος ἢ ἐπέκεινα διὰ καίματος ὑπερβολὴν. ἢ ἐσχάτοι πρὸς τὰ βόρεια τῆς Αἰγύπτου, κατὰ Ἀρισταρχον, ἢ κατὰ τοὺς μαθηματικοὺς, ἐσχατοὶ διὰ τὸ παρ᾽ ἐκάτερο ἀς εἰρηται κείθαι τοῦ Ὡκεανοῦ. οἱ μὲν νότιοι, οἱ δὲ εἰκεῖθεν ὡς ἢς ἐπιτοις τοῖς ὑπερνότιοι 429 ὡς ἢν τοιαύτῃ τινι καταγραφῇ. 430

Αἰθίοπες ἀντικείμενοι τοῖς καθ᾽ ἡμᾶς μεσσημβρινοῖς, οἰκούντες ἐν τῇ πέραν εὐκράτῳ κατὰ τοὺς μαθηματικοὺς. Ὡκεανός μεσσημβρινός, περὶ ὃν ἢ διακεκαμηνέν ζώνην. 15

Αἰθίοπες μεσσημβρινοὶ πρὸς αὐτῷ Νότῳ ἐν Λιβύῃ ἐσχάτοι τῆς ἡμετέρας ἐκεῖ εὐκράτου τοῖς γεωγράφοις. Αἰθίοπες ἐτεροὶ ἐν τῷ βορειοτάτῳ εὐκράτῳ τῆς αὐτοῦ τῆς Λιβύης τῷ κατὰ Αἰγύπτου καὶ Ἐσπερίαν ἢλασσαν ὡς Ἀριστάρχου δοκεῖ. 1

ὅτι δοκεῖ τισίν ὁ ἐνταῦθα Ἰομηρικός Ποσειδῶν πρὸς τοὺς ἀνατολικοτέρους 20

Αἰθίοπας ἀπελθεῖν, διὰ τὸ λέγειν ἐν τοῖς ἐξής τοῦ ποιητῆν ὅτι ὁ Ποσειδῶν πλέονται τὸν Ὀδυσσέα εἶδεν ἐκ Σολώμων ὀρέων ἀπερ εἰσίν εκεῖ ἀνατολικότερα. 431 ἢ ἵστεν δὲ ὅτι εὐλόγος δοκεῖ ὁ Ποσειδὸς τῇ τῶν Αἰθίοπων γῇ χαίρειν. 432 αὐτὸ μὲν γὰρ περὶ Λιβύην, ἀπὸ Λιβύων δὲ ἐξ ἀρχῆς κατὰ Ἡρώδοτον τὸ τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος ὄνομα ἠλθὲν εἰς Ἐλληνας, 433 καθὰ καὶ τὸ τοῦ Ἡρακλῆος. 434 (Vs. 25) ὅτι ταῦταν καὶ ἄρνεων εκατομβίη τῷ Ποσειδῶνι εὔθετο, καθὰ δηλοῖ καὶ τὸ ποιητῆς ἐνταῦθα, εἰπόν ἀντιόων ταῦταν τὲ καὶ ἄρνεων εκατομβίην,” 435 “ταῦταν” μὲν διὰ τὸ γόνυμον τοῦ άδατος τὸ ἐκ τοῦ “ἀρδευν”, εἰγε καὶ “ἀρδευν” λέγεται “ἀνήρ” ὡς προείρηται. 436 ἢ ἐν δὲ καὶ “πόσες” ὃ αὐτὸς ὡς γόνυμος, καὶ ἄλλος δὲ διὰ τὸ τοῦ ἱδατος ἢ ἱστέν ὁτι ὁτι ἀντιόων δηλοῦσιν ὁι “ἄρνες” καὶ τι “ἄρνει αὐτοῦ νεάζον καὶ θαλερόν, καὶ δια τὸ ὅντον εἰπεῖν χειρόθες τῆς γαληνῆς καὶ ἀπαλῶν ἐν εὐθίας καιρῷ. ἢστεν δὲ ὅτι ὁμ ταῦταν δηλοῦσιν οἱ “ἄρνες” καὶ τι “ἄρνει αὐτοῦ”, ἀλλὰ τελειοτέρον ἄτοι τοῦ “ἄρνος” ὃ “ἄρνει ἀς ἐν τοῖς

21.32 Αἰθίοπων add. edd.
22.17 τῆς P1: om. edd.
22.23-4 τὶς Ὁρῶδοτον Ἰσάκων Ἐδών καὶ Ἡρακλῆος ὄνομα add. in marg. P2.
22.36 ταύτων P1: ταύτων edd.
22.32 τῆς ἄρνες ἄρνειοι add. in marg. P2.
μετά ταύτα δειχθήσεται,438 διό καὶ Ἄδωνις ἐκ ποιησισμάτων ἐκείνων,439 καὶ Άρνιος δὲ αὐτῶν σφυξε τόν τηλικούτων εκ τοῦ Κύκλωπος.440 γίνεται δὲ ἐκ τοῦ "Αρνιος" πλευνασμό τῆς εἰ δισφόγγου, ὡς "Ἄδωνις" "Ἀδελφός" "Αδελφείς" καὶ ὅσα ταὐτά.441 περὶ δὲ εκατόμηβας ἐν τῇ Ἡλλάδος γεγραπται.442 ἵστεον δὲ ὡς οὖ μονὸν εκατόμβαι ἀλλὰ καὶ τριττίες ἦσαν, ὃ ἐστι τριῶν φῶν θυσία, ὡς καὶ ἐν τοῖς μετὰ ταύτα φανήσεται.443 κατὰ δὲ Παυσανίαν καὶ "δωδεκάδες θυσία δώδεκα εἰρεθέντων",444 περὶ οὗ εἰρήσεται ἄλλαξον,445 ὅτι "δωδεκάδες" σὺν τῷ γραπτέον, συνήρθησαν γὰρ, φασίν, ὡς τὸ "Βρισιθός" "Βρισιθός" "Καμηθός" "Καμηθός" καὶ ὅσα ὅμοια.446 εκ δὲ τῆς "εκατόμηβας" καὶ μὴν Ἀττικός "Εκατομβαίων" διὰ τὰς ὡς εἰκός τότε ἐπιφανεῖς εκατόμβας.447 ἵστεον δὲ ὅτι στροφὲς ἐκατόμβης τοιαύτης ἱστορήται τις βασιλεύς Παφλαγών πολυφαγῶν, ὡς ἐκατόν, φασὶ,448 πάντα παρετίθετο ἐπὶ τὴν τράπεζαν ἀπὸ βοῶν ἀρείων και καὶ ποὺς εκατομβην τινὰ ὅτους εκεῖνο ἐφεσάδαν, εἰ δὲ σκώμμα τοῖς πόλει πῖνοισι προσφέρει τὸ "οἱ πίνουσι μονὸν βατράχων τρόφον οὕδεν ἔθοντες"449 ἔγονον ὠδίνοις, ὁδ θρήσις καὶ ἐν Ὡλιαδι,450 ολλ' ἐκεῖνος ὅ Παφλαγών αὐτὸ μὲν ἔξερευν, τὸ δὲ παμφάγος εἶναι οὐκ ἄν ἔχοι διεκφυγείν. σημεώσαι δὲ ὅτι, καθά καὶ ἄλλοι διελθώσατα,451 καταμάνας ἐκ τῆς "ἀντί" προθέσεως γίνεται οὖ μονὸν τὸ "ἀντίσχον" ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ "ἀντίαν" καὶ ὁ "ἀντίος" ἐκ τούτων καὶ "ἐναντίος" καὶ "ἐναντίων".452 λόγῳ δὲ ὦμοιος καὶ ἐκ τῆς "περι" προθέσεως "ὁ Πέρμος" κύριον453 καὶ ἐκ τῆς "ἀμφί" ἡ "Ἀμφίος"454 καὶ ῥῆμα ἡ τὸ "ἀμφιεῖρα" καὶ ἐκ τῆς "ὑπὸ" "Ὑπίος",455 ἔτομος Παφλαγωνίκους, εἰ δὲ ἐκ τῆς "ἀνά" προθέσεως ὁ "Ἀνισός", ἀλλ' αὐτὸ ὑπονοεῖται456 ἀλλος γὰρ ἐκ τῆς ἂναις αὐτῶς παρανομᾶσθαι δοκεῖ.457 οἱ δὲ τὸν Δία, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἀέρα, ἑθελοῦσαν ἐπιμολογεῖν παρὰ τὸ δι' αὐτὸ τὰ κατὰ γῆν διοικεῖσθαι, εἰς δ' δοκεῖς συντελεῖν αὐτοῖς καὶ τὸ "ἐκ Δίας ἀρχόμεθα"458 καὶ ἔξης τοιοῦτον τι, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ Δίας βούλονται νοεῖν, ὡς τῆς "διὰ" προθέσεως ὑνομαζούσης αὐτών. (Vs. 27ff.) ὅτι τὸ "ἀθρόος καὶ "ἀθρόος" πρὸς διαφορον σημασίαν διαφόρος οἰ

22.32 τί. ἄρνιος add. in marg. P². 23.2 σφυξε corr. Ἄδωνις ἐκ σφυξεi P¹ edd. 23.5 τίτριτος add. in marg. P². 27.7 τῶν δωδεκάδες add. in marg. P². 23.10 τῶν εκατομβαίων add. in marg. P². 23.11 τῆς ἱστορίας add. in marg. P². 23.13 τοῦ σκωμία add. in marg. P². 23.14 τοῦ ἐθνοτες add. in marg. P². 23.17 τοῦ αντι add. in marg. P². 23.19 τῦ περὶ add. in marg. P². 23.20 τοῦ ἀμφί add. in marg. P². 23.20 τοῦ ὑπὸ add. in marg. P². 23.21 Παφλαγωνίκους corr. Ἄδωνις ἐκ Παφλαγώνος add. in marg. P¹ edd.: cf. Eust. ad ll. 1.119.11. 23.21 τί. ἂν add. in marg. P². 23.22 τοῦ Δία add. in marg. P².
'Αττικοί ἐπενεμάτιζον, ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ "ἀφινώδου" ψιλοῦντες αὐτὸ διὰ τὴν τοῦ ἄ στέρησιν, οἷονεῖ τὸ "δίχα θρόο", τουτέστι θορόβου, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ "ὁμοῦ" δασύνοντες διὰ τὴν ἄθροισιν. ὡς γὰρ τὸ "ἀμα θρό" ἦτοι θορόβῳ ἢ τὸ "ἀμα θορόν" ἦγουν πιθήσαν. τὸ δὲ ἄθροισικόν αὐτὸ δασύνεται, τὸ γούν "ἀθροῖ  ἴσαν" καὶ "ἀθρόα πάντες ἀπέτευσαν" ἐδασύνετο Ἀττικῶς ἐν τούτῳ τῷ λόγῳ διὰ τὴν ἄθροισικήν σημασίαν. οἱ δὲ νῦν ὅπως ἂν ἔχοι ψιλοῦσιν αὐτὰ διὰ τὸ πρὸς δασεύς κείσθαι τὸ ἄ, οἱ δ’ αὐτοὶ Ἀττικοὶ καὶ τὸ "ἀσθω" ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ ψαλίνῳ ἐψίλουν, ἐπὶ οὖ καὶ τῇ "ήγος" ἢ ἡμέρα, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ ξηραίνου ἐδάσυνον. εἰς οὖ καὶ τὸ "ἀπαφαυάνθην" παρὰ τῷ κομικῷ ἢ ἐπεξηράνθην. καὶ τὸ "ἐλρα" δὲ ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ κολύον ἐψίλουν, καὶ καὶ δήλον ὑπὸ τοῦ "ἀπειρέζουν", ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ ἐγκλείου ἐδάσυνον, ὡς δηλοὶ τὸ "καθειρέζειν", ὃν ὁ δὲ δασύνεται καὶ ἡ "εἰρκήν" ἐν δὲ ῥητορικοῖς λεξικοῖς φέρεται καὶ ταύτα. ἐκ τοῦ "ἀθροὸς" γίνεται "ἀθροὺς", οἴον "ἀθροὺς ἐπελθὼν ο ἀρχηγός", ἦγουν σὺν ὅλῳ τῷ στρατεύματι. καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης "ἐστώτας ὅσπερ τούς ὄρεωκούς ἄθροους". τότε δὲ ἢ Ἀσκαλονίτης ἢ ἀξιών περισσάν ἄτοπως, ἐπεις φησιν ἢ διαφεσίς ἐστιν ἄθροος, ἢ ἡ χρήσις παροξύνει. καὶ ζητεὶ πώς ἀτόπως. δασύνεται δὲ φησιν Ἀντικῶς τὸ "ἄθροος", καθὰ καὶ τὸ "ἀθρέων" ὃ ἐστὶ περισσότερον καὶ μετε ἐπιστάσεως ὅραν. παρὰ δὲ τοὺς παλαιοὺς καὶ τὸ "ἀθηρμα", φασὶ, δασύνεται, ὡς καὶ "ἐνος" ἢ οἰνοτος. ὃν ἂν ἐφευρεῖ. ὃ ἀπὸ ἐνευρίσκων γεννημάτων πλοῦτος καὶ τὸ ἐν θεῖ δὲ καὶ νέα δασείαν τότε ἢ εἴξε, καὶ ἢ ἀμις καὶ ἢ ἢ ἀμαξά. δὲν καὶ τὸ "καθημαζευμένος" ὡς φησιν Ἀλλίως Διονύσιος. καὶ "θαμάζον" τὸ ἀμάσιον. χαίρωσι γὰρ, φησι, τῇ δασείᾳ οἱ Ἀττικοὶ. διὰ τὸ ὄθος εἰπεῖν "ἀθροίν" πρὸς δῆλον διαφόρον σημασίαν παροξύνεται, δηλοὶ ο παραδείπνος ὡς "ἀθροῦ" μὲν ὁ ἄθρομος προπαροξύνεται, "ἀθρόος" δὲ ὁ συνθηρομένος παροξύνεται. διὶ πολιτικῶτερον ὡς ἐν Ἰλιάδι οὖτος κανταύθα μεταχειρίζομενος ὁμιρος τὰ δαμόνια βουλάκες θεῶν καθίζει ἀνθρωποκότερον καὶ πρῶτον τέχνη ἐνταύθα ἐν οἷς ὁ Ζεὺς προκάθηται καὶ προλογίζει φιλοσοφών, ὡς αὐτίκα εἰρήσεται. παιδευτικὰ δὲ καὶ ταύτα τῶν τοῦ ποιητοῦ, ὡς δέν ὁν μηδὲν ἀπροβουλεύτως καὶ ἀπρονοήτως γίνεσθαι. ἀστείος ἢ ἐνταύθα τὸ "ἐνθ" ὅτε τρέπετο δαίτι παρήμενος, οἱ δὲ δὴ ἄλλοι
Ζηνός ἐνὶ μεγάροις Ὀλυμπίου ἄθροι ἦσαν," ῥηθησαται ποτὲ ὅτε πολλῶν τινῶν ἐς μεγάλου τινὸς ιόντων, εἰς ἕτοις γίνεται τοῦ τρυφάν. "μέγαρον" δὲ ὡς ἐν ρητορικῷ φέρεται λεξικῷ, οὐ μόνον τὸ κοινῶς, ἀλλὰ καὶ "ε-θητικῶς μέγαρα κατάγεια οἰκήματα φησὶ ταῖς θεαῖς" ἔγγον Δήμητρος καὶ Περσεφόνης. Αἴλιος δὲ Διονύσιος φησὶ καὶ ὅτι "μάγαρον" οὐχὶ "μέγαρον", εἰς ὅ τὰ μυστικὰ ιερὰ κατατίθενται. ὁ δὲ ὅ τι Ὅδουσείρ ὁ ποιητής ὅσπερ οὐδὲ ἐν τῇ Ἡλλάδι ἐθέλει μοισακόπος εἶναι καὶ σιλλός ὅτι μὴ πᾶσα ἀνάγκη, "ἀμφότερον" γοῦν ὅνῳμετον νῦν τὸν ἄτασσαλον Ἀργισθον ὁ Ομηρικός Ζεύς, οὐκ ἐκ τῶν ἐκεῖνου κακῶν λαβὼν τὸ ἐπίθετον, ἀλλ' ἀφ' ἄν ὡς εἰκὸς εἶχε καλῶν. εἶχε δὲ τὸ εὐγενὲς, τὸ εὐειδὲς, τὸ συνετόν, καὶ εἶ τι που ἄλλο. ἄλλος δὲ ὁδὸς ἐκήρυ τῷ μεγάλῳ Δίφιλουρῳ ἦδος προσαναπλάσσεθαι τὸν ποιητήν. περὶ δὲ ὁ "Δίος", οὐ δήλωσι καὶ ἐν τοῖς εἰς τὴν Ἡλλάδα θρetre κάνταβθα διὸ πολλαχῶς λαμβάνεται. μυθικὸς τε γὰρ καὶ πρὸς ἀλληλόοριαν, ἔτι δὲ καὶ ἄλληλοριαν. οὐ μόνον εἰς εἰμαρμένην ἐκλαμβάνομενος, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς νοῦν τὸν τε ἀνόρατον καὶ τοῦ κόσμου καὶ εἰς οὐρανόν καὶ αἰθέρα καὶ ἀπλός ἀέρα καὶ εἰς ἥλιον. καὶ ὅτι τῶν εἰς εἰς ὁμομάτων ὑπὲρ μιὰν συλλαβὴν ὄντων, μονήρης μένει ὁ "Ζεὺς" ὡς μονοσύλλαβος, καὶ ὅτι πολλαῖς eἰς ἄλλειας παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς ποικιλλέται. "Δίς" γὰρ, οὐ γενικῇ "Δίος", καὶ "Ζήν", καὶ "Ζάν", καὶ "Ζάσ", καὶ "Ζῆσ", παρὰ Φερεκόδη, καὶ Βοιωτικὸς, "Δεύς" καὶ "Δάν", καὶ ὅτι τοῦ "Ζεύς" ἐστὶ καὶ αἰτιατική παρὰ Πολυκράτει τῷ σοφιστῇ, καὶ μονοσύλλαβος, τὸν Ζεύν, περισσομενὴν κατὰ τὸ " λίς " "λίν" καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τοιαῦτα μονοσύλλαβα. ἐν οἷς καὶ τὸ τὴν θείν "Αρτεμίν" κράθεν αὐτὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ τῆς θεόν. (Vs. 32) διὸ τὸ "οἰ πόθοι" φανερῶς ἐνταῦθα οὐκ ἔπει θρήνου κεῖται, ἐν τῷ "οἷς πόθοι οἶον δὴ ἤν" ὑπὸς βροτοὶ αἰτιοῦνται, αὐτές, αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ τῆς Ἡλλάδος πλατύτερον εἰς δὲ τὸ βροτός γράφουσιν οἱ παλαιοὶ ὅτι οἱ οἰονικοὶ θεοὶ οἱ μεταμφίας οἱ τῇ εἰμαρμένη ὑποπετακτικῶς. δὲ μύθος παρὰ τόν βροτόν παρῆγαι τῇ λέξιν, ὅπερ ἐστὶ μολυσμός αἵματος, ἦσαν ἀλήθον τὸ ἔκ τῶν μιθεομένων γιγάντων. ἄλλος δὲ κοινότερον παρά τὸ βέρα γίνεται "βροτός" ὁ ῥῆ ὑποκείμενος, καὶ πλεονασμὸ τοῦ β' Ἀιαλίκως "βροτός", ὃς ὁ μοιοί τῷ "ράδιον" "βραδίον", "ράκος" "βράκος", "ρόδον" "ράδον"
“βρόδον”, 501 ἴς ή “βρίζα”, 502 ἵς δὲ καὶ “ῥόδων”, 503 εἰς οὐ “βρόδεις” ἢ οἴσην βρόδεις τῷ ξάντι. οὔτω δὲ καὶ “ρυτήρ” “ρυτήρ” ὁ | χαλινός. 504 δὲ αὐτὸς καὶ “τροχίσκον” δηλοί τὸν καὶ “ῥόμβον” καλοῦμενον. 505 ὅν τύποντες ἴμασι καὶ στρέφοντες ἐποίουν δινεῖσθαι καὶ ψόφον ἄποτελεῖν. Εὐπολίς | δὲ, φασι, “ῥόμβον” αὐτὸν εἶπε διὰ τοῦ ὦ ψιλοῦ. 506 ὁ δὲ διὰ τοῦ ὦ μικροῦ “ῥόμβος”, παρεσημειώθη ἐν τοῖς τοῦ περιηγητοῦ. 507 δοκόν αὐτὸς καὶ τί ἐργαλεῖον εἶναι τοῦ ἱφαίνειν, ἢ ὡς ἐδήλω ἐκ τοῦ ἴματι πορφυρᾶ καὶ κρόκινα ῥόμβου ἱφαίνομενα. 508 ζήτητε δὲ περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τοῖς κατὰ τὸν Θεόκριτον. 509 (Vs. 34) ὅτι φιλόσοφον διὰ τοῦ Δίος ὁ ποιητὴς ἢ ἀνακινήσεις θεώρημα, εἰ ἄρα εἰς εἰμαιριμένης αἰς κακόσεις τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἢ “ὑπὲρ μόρον” ἤγουν ὑπὲρ τὴν μοῖραν εἰς ὀικείας εἰσίν ἀτασθαλίας, λυεί αὐτῷ κατὰ τινα λόγων | ἀντιπαραστάσεως διὰ τοῦ “καὶ” συνδέσμου, λέγον ὡς οὐ καθόλου καὶ ἄδιορθός τὸ μοιριὸν αἰτιατόν τῶν κακῶν, ἀλλὰ ῥητέον ὅτι τὰ μὲν τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις κακῶν | Διὸθεν εἰσίν ἦτοι ἐκ τοῦ πεπρωμένου. Ζεὺς γὰρ καὶ τὸ πεπρωμένον. 510 ὡς πολλαχοῦ φαίνεται. 511 “οὐ δὲ καὶ αὐτῷ” βλάπτουσιν εαυτοὺς “σφήναν ἀτασθαλίσθην ὑπὲρ μόρον ἀλλη’ ἑχοντες.” 512 οἶκον Ῥοπόλυτος μὲν οὖν δικαίως ὑπὸ Κύπριδος κακὰ παθῶν, καὶ Ὑρακῆς χόλῳ τῆς Ὕρας ἑλαυνόμενος, καὶ Βελλοροφόντης κατὰ τὸ γῆρας μελαγχολῶν, καὶ Εὐιχήνωρ ἐν Τροῖς θυσίαν διὰ τὸ καὶ οἰκάδε ἄναγκην εἶναι νόσῳ παραπολέσατο, καὶ Ὀδυσσείς ἐν τῇ πλάνῃ μωρία πάσχαν κακά καὶ εἰ τινὲς ἄλλοι τοιοῦτοι | οὐκ εἰς οἰκείας ἀτασθαλίας πάσχουσι τὰ κακὰ. ἔκεν δὲ Ἀλγισθός. 513 Ἔρημοι εἰπόντος μήτε τὸν ᾿Αγαμέμνονα κτείνειν “μήτε μνᾶσθαι ἄκοιτιν”, ἀπειθῆ, γῆμας ἄλοχον τῷ βασιλεῖ ἡ μητήρ ταυτὸν, καὶ οἱ Ὀδυσσείως ἐταῖροὶ τῶν ἀπειρημένων ἀψάμενοι τοῦ Ὑλίου βοῶν, ἀπόλονται, καὶ Ἀχιλλεῖς δυνάμενος ἐν Φηία διάγει καὶ ἐπὶ μακρὸν ζῆν, εἶτα | ἑλθὼν ἐς Τροίαν τελευτᾷ καὶ Ὀλέξανδρος τὸ μὲν ᾿Οινόνης λέχος περιφορόντας τὴν δὲ ᾿Ελένην ἀρπάσας, πάθῃ κακῶς καὶ ἐλπίνωρ οἶνος βαροῦμενος πέσῃ καὶ ἐκτραχνισθῇ, ἐς οἰκείας ἀτασθαλίας οὕτοι πάσχουσιν. ἵστον δὲ ὅτι εὐλόγως τὸ “σφῆν” ἀντὶ τοῦ “ἰδίαις” τῷ ἥ παραλήγησαι, διὰ τὸ “σφῆν” εἶναι τὸ προὔποκείμενον, ὡμοίας τῷ | “αῖς” “ἐφό” “ταῖς ἰδίαις”. τὸ μέντοι “σφῆν” ἀντὶ τοῦ “αὐτῶς” οὐ καλῶς παρά τοῖς μεθ’ Ὀμηροῦ διὰ τοῦ ἥ ἢ ἔχει τὴν παραλήγουσαν. 514 τὸ δὲ “ὑπὲρ μόρον” συνθέτωσι εἰς ἐνὶ μέρει λόγου | οἱ ἀκριβεστέροι φασὶ τῶν παλαιῶν, προπαραγώγοντες διὰ τὴν σύνθεσιν. 515 ἵστον δέ ἐνταῦθα καὶ ὅτι τῆς ὑπὲρ προβέβηκας δηλούσης ἔστιν ὁτε περιπτύτηται καὶ

26.1 tit. β βρόδος add. in marg. Π².
26.2 tit. βρυτήρ add. in marg. Π².
26.4 tit. ρόμβος add. in marg. Π.
26.16 Βελλοροφόντης corr. Makr.: Βελλοροφόντης Π¹ add.
26.24 πάθη corr. Makr.: πάθοι Π¹ add.
26.28 tit. σφῆν add. in marg. Π².
τοῦ “μόρου” λαμβανομένου | ποτὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ “καθήκοντος”, νοεῖται δ᾿ αὐτὰ τὸ “ὑπέρμορον ἄλγεα πάσχειν”516 καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ “ὑπέρ τὸ καθήκον”.517 οὕτω δὲ φασὶ καὶ “ὑπερηνορέων”518 ὁ παρὰ τὸ καθήκον ἀνδριζόμενος, | τῆς “ὑπέρ” ἵσοδυναμούσης τῆς “παρὰ” ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις, ὡς καὶ εἰν τῷ “ὑπερβασία ἀλεγείναι”519 καὶ εἰν τῷ “ὑπέρμετρον”.520 εἰ μέντοι τῷ “ὑπερβαλλόντως”521 καὶ εἰν τῷ “ὑπέρθυμος”522 | καὶ εἰν τῷ “ὑπερήσει”523 ἀντὶ τοῦ “ὑπερακοντίσει” καὶ τοῖς ὤμοιοῖς, ὡς κεκτήθη ἀλλ’ ἔπαινεν σημαίνει περιττότητα ἢ “ὑπέρ” πρόδεσις. (Vs. 32ff.) ἐν τούτῳ δὲ τῷ χαρῷ σημεῖοισαι τὸ τοῦ λόγου | σεμνῶν.524 ἀποφαντικῶς γάρ ὁ Ζεὺς λαλεῖ καὶ γνωμικότερον, καὶ μέμφεται τοὺς οὕτως εἰκῆ αἰτιωμένους τὸ θεῖον, εἰπον “ἂν πόσοι οἴον δὴ <νυ> θεοὺς 10 βροτοί αἰτιώνται, εἰ ἡμέων γὰρ φασὶ | κακὰ ἔμμεναι525 καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς, κεῖται δ᾿ ἐνταῦθα καὶ πίστεις τοῦ καθόλου ῥητορικοῦ μερικῆ εκ παραδείγματος τὸ “ός καὶ νῦν Ἀλγισθος”526 ἐπόησε τόδε τι.527 (Vs. 38) ὅτι ὁ πρὸς Διὸς μάλιστα δὲ “θεόθεν” πεμπόμενος Ἐρμῆς ἢ ἔσκοπος ἀργευφόντης.528 οὐ τῷ Αἰγίσθῳ ὑποδεικνύον τὰ μέλλοντα, ὁ καθ᾿ ἡμᾶς φυσικὸς λόγος ἔστιν,529 οὐ πολλάκις παραδεικνύντος | τὸ ὑποροφυγμένον ἡμεῖς τυφλῶττοντες, δόμως περιπτικομένων καὶ ἀπολλύμεθα.530 δὴ δὲ οὗ Ἐρμῆς εἰς τὸν λόγον ἀλληγορεῖται.531 οὸν ὁδείς τῶν περὶ λόγους ἡγόνησεν. ἦστι | δὲ τοῦ περὶ τούτων Ὀμηρίκων βητὸν τοιοῦτον. ἔπειρ πρὸ οἱ εἰπομέν ἡμεῖς Ἐρμείαν πέμψαντες ἔσκοπον ἀργευφόντην, μὴ αὐτὸν κτείνειν, μὴν μνάσσαθι ἄκοιτιν”.532 καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς, ἢ τοῦτο δὲ τὸ “προειπομένον πέμψαντες Ἐρμῆν” ὑποβάλλει μή μόνον φυσικοὺς λόγους ἀλλὰ καὶ προφορικοὺς ὑπονοεῖν τὸν Ἐρμήν, ἢν δὲ τοιούτος λόγος, ὡς τοῦ αὐτοῦ, ὅν ὁ Ὀμηρός εἰς τῇ ἑ ῥαποδίᾳ ἔρχει,533 ὡς φιλῆ σὺ τῇ Ἐλυταιμήσῃ κατερήθη τοῦ Αἰγίσθου, ὡς εἰκός, ἀ λέγει ἐνταῦθα ὁ Ζεὺς. (Vs. 39) “ἄκοιτις” δὲ ἢν καὶ “ἄλλοι” ᾠωτέρᾳ ἐφή, οὐ μόνον ὡς ὁμόκοιτις, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἢ μὴ κοιναθεῖσα σὺν ἑτέρῳ ἄλλ’ ἐκ παραθεῖας ληφθείσα.534 (Vs. 38) ὅρα δὲ καὶ ὅτι θαυμασίως ἐνταῦθα κεῖται | τὸ “ἔσκοπος” καὶ τὸ “ἀργευφόντης”, περὶ οὗ ἐν Ἡλιαδέ ἔρηται.535 οὐ γὰρ ὁ δόλιος536 Ἐρμῆς ἢ ὁ χθόνιος537 ἢ ὁ στρόφιος538 ἢ ὁ ἐμπολαιός539 ἢ τοιοῦτος ἐπαιδεύε τοῖς Αἰγίσθοιο, [540] ἢ “ἄλλα” “ἔσκοπος”, δὲ οὐ προσκοπεῖθαι εἰς τὰ μέλλοντα,540 καὶ ὁ ἀργευφόντης, ὡς ἄργον φόνου541 ὑπετιθεῖ εἶναι τὸν Αἰγίσθον καὶ μὴ κτείνειν τὸν Ἀγαμέμνων. (Vs. 40) ὅτι τοῦ “ἐκ γὰρ ὁ Ορέστασι τίσις ἔσεσται Ἀτρείδας ὀππότ’ ἀρ’ ἠθησει τε καὶ ἢς ἱμείρεται αἷς”,542 ὑποδηλοῖ ὁ ποιητής τὸν τῆς ἡβης

26.31-27.1 τιτ. ὑπέρ add. in marg. Πp.
27.3 τιτ. ὑπερηνορέων add. in marg. Πp. / 27.9 νῦ add. Makr. (cf. Od. 1.32).
27.11 τιτ. ῥητορικοὺς add. in marg. Πp.
27.16 vocem ἀλληγορικῶς add. in marg. Πp.
27.25-6 tit. Ἐρμοῦ ἐπιθετα add. in marg. Πp.
27.26 ἢ τις Πp Rom.: ἢτις Bas. Stall.
27.30 ὀππότ’ ἀρ’ Πp eadd.: ὀππότ’ ἀν Od. 1.41
καὶ όρχην εἶναι τοῦ φρονεῖν τὰ βελτίω, τις δὲ ἡ "ηβή" καὶ πόθεν | γίνεται, ἐν τοῖς τῆς Ἰλιάδος γέγραπται. ἐν τούτοις δὲ καὶ ποιητικὴ ἐστι παρίσωσις. πάροισα γάρ τὸ Ὀρέσταον ἢ Ἀτρείδαιον ἤγουν ὁμοιοκαταλήκτη ἢ ὁμοιότελευτα. Αἰολέων δὲ εἰσὶν | αἱ τοιαύτα γενικαί, ὡς καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἰλιάδι γέγραπται. φασὶ δὲ οἱ παλαιοὶ μὴ δεῖν ενταῦθα λέγειν "ἐκ γάρ Ὀρέσταον ἢ Ἀτρείδαιον", ἦτοι τοῦ ἔγγονον τοῦ Ἀτρέως, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ὅτι ἢ Ὀρέσταον "τίσις", τούτεστιν ἐκδίκησις, ἐστι τοῦ Ἀτρείδου ἢ Ἀγαμέμνονος. λέγουσι γάρ τὸν Ὀμηρον μὴ σχηματίζειν ἀπὸ πάππου πατρωνυμία, εἰ μὴ ὁ πάππος εὐθὺς εἰς Διὸς υἱὸς. καὶ ὁ λόγος εὐλογος. ἀπὸ γὰρ προσεχοῦς καὶ ἐγγυτάτω αἰτίου χρὴ γενεαλογεῖν ὅποιον τι ὁ πατήρ, ὁ δὲ πάππος πόρρω αἰτίων. εἰ μέντοι πάνυ ἐνδοχός ὁ πάππος, ὡς οἱ ἐκ τοῦ Διὸς, τότε δὲ | χαρακτηριστέον καὶ εἰς αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀπόγονον, οὐχ' ἡς προσεχοῦς αἰτίου ἀλλ' ἢ ἐπιφανεστάτου. ενταῦθα δὲ ὁ τοῦ Ὀρέσταον πάππος Ἀτρέως οὐκ εὐθὺς ἢς Διὸς. διὸ οὐδ' ἢς αὐτοῦ τῷ Ὀρέστη ἐστί πατρωνυμία. (V. 41) τὸ δὲ ἢς αἰτησε, ἀντὶ τοῦ "ἰδίας" συντελεῖ πρὸς τὸ ἀσφαλῶς οἰκείαν λέγειν τὴν πατριὰ. (V. 49) (V. 43) ὅτι τὸ "τοῦ καὶ θνάστος απέτισεν" οἰκείοις λεγθεῖν | ἐπὶ τοῦ μιᾶν μὲν ἀλλὰ μεγάλη | δόντος ποινὴν ἐπὶ πολλοῖς κακοῖς προοιμάται. (V. 44) ἐπὶ δὲ τινὸς ἀξίων ἀπολωλότος καλὸν εἰπεῖν τὸ "καὶ λίθη κείνοις γε θουκότες κεῖται θρόφρ. ὅ ἢς ἀπόλικτο καὶ ἀλλος δὲ τοιαύτα γε βέζοι", σημειώσομαι δὲ δότι τὸ "πάντα καθό ἀποτείσα" μετηνεκτά παροιμοδίως ἢς τῶν πολλά ὁμφίλοντον καὶ μὴ κατ' θλίγγον | ἀποτινόντων, ἀλλ' ὡμοί | πάντα καταβαλλομένων βαρέως ἀντοίχ. λέγει δὲ Ὀμηρος "πάντα" τὴν τοῦ Ἀιγίσθου μοιχέαν, τὸ μὴ ὑπακούειν Ἠρμη καὶ τοῖς αὐτῶν στείλασι τὸν τοῦ βασιλέως φόνον καὶ τάλλα, ὅταν πάντων ἐκτίσις ἢ αὐτοῦ | ἀναίρεσις γέγονεν, ἢς ὀφειλέτης ἤν. (V. 45ff.) ὅτι οὐκ ἀπαννυμένος ἢ ποιητὴς τὴν καίριον ταυτολογίαν, ἢς ἢς Ἰλιάς ἐδείξε. ποιῶν δὲ ὡθοῦ καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ βιβλιᾷ, πλάτειε | ενταῦθα | τῆν Ἀθηνᾶς προσφονεύσαν τὸν πατέρα Δία, στίχο χρο πολλαχοῦ καὶ τῆς Ἰλιάδος ἀκεφαλημένην. εἰποῦσαν "ἐδέασε ἡμέτερον Κρονίδη, ὅπετε κρειόντων". δὴλον δὲ δότι καθα τὸ "ἀνερ" ὡθοῦ | καὶ τὸ "πάτερ" μὴ δεξυνόμενα ὁμοίως ταῖς αὐτῶν εὐθείαις ἀπὸ Ἁιλιάδος διαλεκτὸν ἐμμεμηνήκασιν, εἰπεῖν καθ' Ἰρρθοδιάνον. εἰκὸς δὲ καὶ τὸ "σωτέρ" τούτοις συνεκδραμεῖν Ἀιλικιώτερον. ὅ | δὲ Ἰρρθοδιάνος καὶ τὸ "θυγατρός" καὶ "θυγατρί", καθὰ καὶ τὸ "γυναῖκος" "γυναικί" ἢς ἡμαρτημένα πρὸς ἀναλογίαν παρασημεοῦμενος, λέγει ὃς οὐδεμία γενικὴ εἰς ὡς λήγουσα ὑπὲρ ὁδὸ συλλάβας δεξύτονος ἐστίν. ὁμοίως οὐδὲ δοτικὴ εἰς ἤ περαιομένην.
σημειώσεις 561 παρ’ αυτή και το "θυγατέρος" και "μητέρος", δι’ ότι προ μίας την οξείαν ἔχει καὶ οὐ τρίτην ἁπό τέλους | κατά τὸ "Δημήτερος", "εἰνάτερος", καὶ ἄρσενικα "ἐρήμος" "φράτερος", ὅτι ἐθὸς τῷ ποιητῇ πολλαχοῦ ἐκ τῶν παρὰ πόδας ἀφορμῶν ἀπλοῦστερον λαμβάνειν προσώπια, ὡς ὁμιλησθηκέναι, καθὰ περ καὶ ἐνταῦθα, τοῦ Διὸς μνησθέντος τῶν κατὰ τὸν Αἰγίσθον, αὐτὸν δὲ ποριζέται προσόμιμον ἡ ὡς καὶ ἐν Ἰλιάδι 562 κείται "γλαυκώπις" Ἀθήνη, λέγουσα, ὡς καὶ ἄνωτέρῳ | ἔκκειται, 563 ὅτι ἐκείνος μὲν ἑαυτόκτως κείται ὀλοκληρώθηκε, καὶ ἀπόλοιπο καὶ ἄλλος τοιαύτη τέχνην. Ὅδε διαίρεσις δὲ διατί, ἀγαθός ὡς, πάσχει τὰ καὶ τὰ; 564 καὶ καλοῦσιν οἱ τεχνικοὶ καὶ τὸ τοιούτων ἀπὸ καιροῦ προσόμιμον. 565 ἵστεν δὲ ὅτι τε τοῦ ἡ γλαυκώπις ἄρσενικὸν ὁ γλαυκώπις. 566 ὁμοίως τῷ ὁ κυνώπης. 567 οὗ κλητικα ἐν Ἰλιάδι τὸ "ὁ κυνώπη". 568 καὶ ὅτι πενταχάρα γὰρ παρὰ τὸν ὁδὼν δημοτικῶν, ἡγοῦν τὰ μὲν ἐκ αὐτῆς τῆς εἰδοτικῆς ἀποκλειοῦμεν, σχηματίζονται, ἡγοῦν τὰ μὲν ἐκ αὐτῆς τῆς εἰδοτικῆς ἀποκλειοῦμεν, σχηματίζονται, ἡγοῦν τὰ μὲν ἐκ αὐτῆς τῆς εἰδοτικῆς ἀποκλειοῦμεν, σχηματίζονται, ἡγοῦν τὰ μὲν ἐκ αὐτῆς τῆς εἰδοτικῆς ἀποκλειοῦμεν, σχηματίζονται, ἡγοῦν τὰ μὲν ἐκ αὐτῆς τῆς εἰδοτικῆς ἀποκλειοῦμεν, σχηματίζονται, ἡγοῦν τὰ μὲν ἐκ αὐτῆς τῆς εἰδοτικῆς ἀποκλειοῦμεν, σχηματίζονται, ἡγοῦν τὰ μὲν ἐκ αὐτῆς τῆς εἰδοτικῆς ἀποκλειοῦμεν, σχηματίζονται, ἡγοῦν τὰ μὲν ἐκ αὐτῆς τῆς εἰδοτικῆς ἀποκλειοῦμεν, σχηματίζονται, ἡγοῦν τὰ μὲν ἐκ αὐτῆς τῆς εἰδοτικῆς ἀποκλειοῦμεν, σχηματίζονται, ἡγοῦν τὰ μὲν ἐκ αὐτῆς τῆς εἰδοτικῆς ἀποκλειοῦμεν, σχηματίζονται, ἡγοῦν τὰ μὲν ἐκ αὐτῆς τῆς εἰδοτικῆς ἀποκλειοῦμεν, σχηματίζονται, ἡγοῦν τὰ μὲν ἐκ αὐτῆς τῆς εἰδοτικῆς ἀποκλειοῦμεν, σχηματίζονται, ἡγοῦν τὰ μὲν ἐκ αὐτῆς τῆς εἰδοτικῆς ἀποκλειοῦμεν, σχηματίζονται, ἡγοῦν τὰ μὲν ἐκ αὐτῆς τῆς εἰδοτικῆς ἀποκλειοῦμεν, σχηματίζονται, ἡγοῦν τὰ μὲν ἐκ αὐτῇ
άλλων ρηθέντα, ώς ὁ δειπνοσφιστής ἐκτίθεται. Ετί ἱστεόν καὶ ὁτι ὁ "γλαυκῶπις" οὕτω καὶ ἡ "ἐλικώπις" καὶ ἡ "ερμώπις" καὶ ἡ "βοώπις". (Vs. 48) ὅτι τὸ "ἄλλα μοί ἀμφ Ἕδουση δαιφρονεί δεῖται ἦτορ" ἀντὶ τοῦ "μερίζεται,", ὅπερ καὶ μεριμνίζειν λέγεται. τὸ δὲ εἰπεῖν "καὶται μοι τὸ ἦτορ" ἀνοίκειον τῇ Ἀθηνᾶ κατὰ τοῖς παλαιοῖς. ὁ ἄρθρος γὰρ φασὶ προσώπου τὸ τοιοῦτος λόγος ἔστὶ. ὅρα δὲ τὸ "ἀμφ Ἕδουση" δὲ ἐνὸς σίμα γραφέν. ὅσορ πάρ ἐν τῇ Ἰλιάδι, οὕτως καὶ ἐν Ἕδουσείῃ τὸ "Ἅδουσεύς" ποτὲ μὲν διπλῶς σηματίζεται, ποτὲ δὲ δὴ ἐνὸς σίματος εὑρίσκεται. Ἰασὶ μὲν διὰ μέτρου ἀνάγκην, Ἰασὶ δὲ καὶ διὰ αἰτίαν ἐχουμένην λόγου. ἐπεὶ γὰρ εἰ τοῦ "ὕδωσον" τὸ ὄργιομαι παράγει αὐτῷ ὁ ποιητής, οὐ δὲ μέλλοντα "ὕδωσον", διὰ μὲν τὸν ἔνεστότα ἐν τοῖς δυσι τὸ προαχθῆται, διὰ δὲ τὸ μέλλοντα, ἐν ἔξει σ̣, ὅτι δὲ καὶ δασύνεται κατὰ τίνας ἡ ἄρχουσα, ἐν τῇ Ἰλιάδι εἰρητα. τὸ δὲ "δαφρονεί δεῖται ἦτορ" ἀρτὸς ἐν Ἕδουσεύς ἑστὶν, ἵνα καὶ ἀναπτύσσεται τὸ "δαφρον" διὰ τοῦ "δαφείται ἦτορ" καὶ εἰς ταῦταν ἄγηται ἡ φρόνησις."Ἀθηνᾶ τῷ φρονίμῳ ἀνδρί. καὶ γάρ καὶ ὁ Ἕδουσεύς οὐγινός δεῖται τὸ φρονοῦν τῇ πυχεῖς, μεριμνήσαν καὶ μερισμόν. καὶ Ἀθηνᾶ ὅμοιος "δαιφεὶ ἦτορ" πολύβουλος ὄντα, ἢ καὶ ἄλλος, παρηκτῆσες τὸ τοιοῦτον σχῆμα ἑστὶ. καὶ γάρ τὸ "δαφρον" ἐκ τοῦ "δαίον" παράγεται. οὐ δὴ παρακείμενον τὸ "δαιφεί ἦτορ" παρηκτῆσες σχῆμα ἐνέσπην. (Vs. 49) ὅτι ἐπὶ δυστυχοῦς ἀποδήμου οἰκεῖον τὸ "δύσμορος, ὃς δὴ δηθά φίλων ἀπὸ πήματα πάσχει". λέγει δὲ "δύσμορον" τὸν δυστυχοῦς. ὃς ἄλλαχος καὶ "ἄμμορος" καὶ "ἀνέμορος" λέγεται. ἑτὶ δὲ καὶ "κάμμορος", ὅπερ ἐστὶν κακόμορος ἢ κακοδήματος, ὃς δὲ καὶ "κάριδας" ἑστὶν ὅτι οἱ τοιαύτη λέξεις σημαίνει, δηλοὶ Ἀθηναῖος ἐν τῷ "καμμοροι καὶ τὶ γένος καρίδων ὑπὸ Ρομαιοῦ οὕτω καλοῦμενον". καὶ Ἰασὶν ἐνεβίθεν οἱ χυδαῖοι τοῖς καβαλούροις παρεφθείραν. (Vs. 50) ὅτι εἰπόν "νήσος ἐν ἀμφιρύτῳ, ὅθε τῷ ὁμφαλὸς ἑστὶ" θαλάσσῃ ἐπαγεί ἐκεῖθεν, "νήσος δενδρήσεως" καὶ ὅψειλε ἡ μὲν εἰπεῖν "νήσοφ δενδρήσησι" ὡς καὶ πρὸ μικροῦ ἐρεθήτω, κατὰ σχῆμα ἐπαναλήψεως. ἐστὶ δὲ ἄλλος ὁ λόγος ἀποστατικοῦς ἡ ἀρχής, ἱνα λέγη ὅτι νήσος ἑστὶ "δενδρήσεως." τοιοῦτον τί "ιλιαίδι τῷ φημὶ κατανεῦσαι τὸν Δία καὶ καὶ ἐν Ἰλιάδι τῷ "φημὶ κατανεῦσαι τὸν Δία," ἀστράπτων ἐπιδέξεια. καὶ ἐκεί γάρ, ἀσυνήθως κατὰ ἀπόστασιν ἀρχεῖαι, οἴον ἀστράπτων ἢν ὁ Ζεὺς ἐπιδέξεια. ἱνα λέγητη τὸ "νήσος δενδρήσεως" ἑστὶν αὐτῷ τῷ "ὄμφαλος θαλάσσης," ἵνα λέγη ὁτι "ὄμφαλος θαλάσσης νήσος δενδρήσεως."
οὔτω καὶ μετ’ ὅλιγα εἰπὼν "Κύκλωπος | κεχώλωται"519 καὶ μέλλων ἐπαγαγεῖν
"ἀντίθεου Πολυφήμου", ὅμοις ἠλλαξε τὴν σύνταξιν ὁμοιοπτάτως τῇ ἐπεμβολῇ.
"Κύκλωπος, δὲν ἀλάσωσαν, ἀντίθεου Πολυφήμου".620 ὥρα | δὲ ὅτι ἐν τῷ "νήσῳ ἀμφίρυτη"621 δὲ ἐνῶς ἱ γράφει τὴν λέειν ὅ ποιητής διὰ τὸ μέτρον ἀφεὶς τὸν τοῦ ἰ
διπλασιασμόν, ποιεῖ τὸ τοῦτο καὶ ἐν ἀλλίος πολλοῖς, τὸ δὲ ἰ "δενδρήσσασα" οὐχ ἀπλῶς παρερριψεν ὁ ποιητής, ἀλλὰ προοικονομοῦν τὴν κατασκευήν τῆς σχεδίας ἢν ὁ Ὕδυσσεύς ἐκ τῶν ἐκεῖ δενδρον συμπήτευται καὶ ἀμύνῃ ἐν ἁ νήσος οἰκεία ἡ μυθικὴ νύμφη, ἀλσώδης οὕσα. οὔτω δὲ καὶ τὸ "νήσος ἐν ἀμφίρυτη" παρεσμένη πρὸς πιθανότητα τοῦ ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἀφότου εἶναι παρὰ τῇ Καλυψῷ τὸν πολυμήχανον.
καλώς δὲ καὶ τὸ "ἀμφίρυτη" | πρὸς διαστολὴν τῶν χερρονήσιων, ὅποια καὶ Ἡ
Πελοπόννησος· ἐκεῖνα γὰρ οὕς ἀμφίρυτοι. ἵστεν δὲ ὅτι τὴν μὲν γῆν ὁ μῦθος περὶ
που τὴν Δελφικὴν χώραν λέγει μεσαζότατα, ἄστοις | μετρήθεσιν ὑπὸ Δίως.622 διὸ καὶ ὁμφαλὸς" καὶ "μεσόμαφλον γῆς" ὁ Πίθηκος τόπος ὁ περὶ Δελφοῦς ἐλεγετο.623
tὸν δὲ ὀμφαλὸν ἦτο τὸ μεσαίτατον τῆς ἀτλαντικῆς ἡ τῆς ὀλῆς θαλάσσης ὁ | ἡ ποιητής εἶναι πλάτει ἐκεῖ ὅπου ἡ νήσος τῆς μυθικῆς Καλυψῶς.624 (VS. 51) ὅτι τὴν
Καλυψῶ εἰ μὲν βασιλίσσα ἦν625 καὶ νήσοι δικρᾶτε, ἤν καὶ οἱ γεωγραφοῦντες ἐπαραδίδοσι.626 μικρά | περιεργάζονται οἱ παλαιοί.627 μεταπλάττουσι δὲ αὐτὴν τῇ ἄλλη φοίλη ἐς τὸ καθ’ ἡμᾶς σώμα, ὡς συγκαλυμμένους ἑντὸς δίκην ἔλυσεν τὸν
ψυχικὸν μάργαρον.628 ἤτις καὶ αὕτη | κατεῖχε τοῦ φιλοσοφοῦν Ὁδυσσέα629 ὡς ἀνάθρωνον ἐνεδεμένον σαρκῆς, καὶ μυθικὸς εἰπεῖν "ἐν ἀμφίρυτη νῆσο ὅτα
δενδρήσσεσα ἡτίς ὀμφαλὸς ἐστὶν θαλάσσης",630 τούτουτον | ἐν ύγρῇ σώματι ὅντα καὶ ὁ
ὁ Πλάτων εἶπα "ἐπιρρύταιραι καὶ ἀπορρύταιραι",631 ἐτὶ δὲ ὑλαῖρ καὶ ἀμφιλαύτητος τοῖς
πᾶσι τοῖς τῇ ἀλλός καὶ τοῖς περὶ γαστέρα καὶ ὀμφαλον.632 καὶ | οὕτω μὲν Ὅδυσσεος δωσιπαλάκτως εἶχε τῆς εἰρμήνευσις Καλυψῶς οἱ ὡς εἰκός φιλοζώς.633
'Ερμοῦ μέντοι ὃς ἐν τοῖς μετὰ ταῦτα αἰνεῖται ὁ ποιητής634 μεσιεδοντός ὁ ἐστὶ
λόγου, γέγονεν τῆς κατὰ τὴν φιλοσοφίαν ποδομένης πατρίδος, ἦγουν τοῦ νομοῦ κόσμου, ὃς ἐστί κατὰ τοὺς Πλατωνικῶς ψυχῶν πατρίς ἀληθῆς.635 ὁμοίως γέγονε καὶ τῆς Πηνελόπης φιλοσοφίας, λιθεῖς | καὶ ἀπαλαγεῖς τῆς τοιαύτης Καλυψῶς.
λέεται γὰρ τρόπον τοῖς τοιχὼ ὁ φιλοσοφός καὶ ἀσχολεῖ τοῦτον συνέχεται.
καὶ ἐστίν οἰκεῖον εἰπείν τῆς τοιαύτην Καλυψῶ πρὸς τὸν ἀπόδημον αὕτης τῇ
diανοία φιλοσοφοῦν, ὅτι ὁ νοῦς σου παρὼν ἀποδημεί.636 ἵστεν μέντοι ὅτι καθ'
ιστορίαν ἦν τις νήσος Καλυψώς, περὶ ἣς ὁ γεωγράφος Φησίν637 ὅτι "Σόλων ἵστορεσε περὶ τῆς Ἀτλαντίδος νήσου παρὰ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ιερέων, φοιτήσας ἐκεῖ καὶ ἐμαθὼν ὅτι ποτὲ οὐδαμὴ ἡ νήσος οὐκ ἔλαττον ἤρειρον τὸ μέγεθος ἐστερον ἤρανος, καὶ ὅτι πλάτει αὐτὴν ὁ ποιητής". (Vs. 52) τὸν δὲ Ἀτλαντα, ὃς πατήρ εἶναι λέγεται τῆς σωματικῆς Καλυψώς638 καὶ "θαλάσσης πάσης βέθεα οἶδε, καὶ κίονας ἔχει αὐτῇ γῆν τε ἐπὶ μέσου συνέχουσιν <καὶ> οὐρανὸν ἀνέχουσιν".639 οὶ μὲν ἄλλα γνωρίζετε εἰς τήν ἀκάματον καὶ ἀκατάνοιαν πρόνοιαν τήν πάντων αἰτίαι καὶ ὀλοκληρωμένα τὸν τοιοῦτον Ἀτλαντα νοοῦσιν, ὡς τὰ ὑπὲρ ὄλων | φρονοῦντα ἔχουσι τῶν ὄλων φρονιστικῶν, διὸ καὶ ὁ Κλαέαθρος, ὃς φασίν, ἐδάκυνε τὸ ὁ τῆς ἀρχοῦσης, καὶ οὐδὲ ἤμεις καινοπαγούμενοι ψιλοῦντες αὐτὸ.640 οἴ γε καὶ τὸ Ἁλυμπός" λέγοντες γίνεσθαι παρὰ τὸ ὀλοκληρωμένος ὡς ἄθροιμοι Ἀιολικὸς αὐτὸ καὶ οὐ δασνοῦμεν.641 καὶ οὕτω μὲν τινες, ἄλλοι δὲ642 Ἀτλαντα τὸν νοεστὸν ἄξωνα νοοῦσι τὸν διὰ | μέσης τῆς γῆς ἐπιλαμβανόν643 καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ βορείου εἰς τὸν νότιον πόλον καθήκοντα, περὶ δὲν ὡς καὶ τῷ Ἀράτῳ δοκεῖ, οὐρανὸς εἰλεῖται.644 εὐθέως ἀσώματον τινα ὄντα καὶ ἀδόρατον, | συνεκτικὴν τοῦ παντὸς, ὃς συνεχὶς μὲν ἔστι κατὰ τὴν ὅλοτητα καὶ εἰς. διὸ καὶ Αἰσχύλος ἐν Προμηθεί "κίονα" ἔπειν ἐνικῶς καὶ οὐ "κίονας."645 ἄλλος δὲ εἰς δύο διασαρκωμένος κατὰ τε ὁ ὑπόγαιον αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ ὑπέργειον κίονον πέμπεται τινά τεοτεινήν φαντασίαν, ὃς αἷς κίοσιν ἡ γῆ τοῦ οὐούμπεκε, καὶ οὐρανὸς ἔπανεχεται. τοῦ τοιούτου δὲ Ἀτλαντος ἢ θυγάτηρ καὶ ἔτερον τρόπον ἤψιλότερον ἢ Καλυψώ, τουτέστα τῆς τοῦ ἄξωνος ταύτης ἐννοίας καὶ περὶ αὐτοῦ θεωρίας τε καὶ μαθήματι, τέλος καὶ ἀποτέλεσμα καὶ οἶνον εἰπείν γενήτημα, τὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν τὸν τὴν γῆν τε ἀνωθεν καλύπτοντα ἢτοι σκέποντα καὶ περιέχοντα πάντα ἑαυτῷ καὶ σφίγγοντα, τηρεῖν διὰ τῆς τοῦ τοιούτου ἄξωνος μονιμίτητος ἐν ταυτότηται κυκλοφορίας κίνησις καὶ κατακαλύψεις καὶ περιστερίς τοῦ παντός. ταύτη δὲ τῇ Καλυψώ σύνεσι μὲν ὁ ἀποτέλεσματικὸς646 γνώσιμος Ἐδόξος, οἱ καὶ "Πλειάδας θέασι καὶ θεωράτον Ὁρίονος" κατὰ τὸν ποιητήν.648 καὶ τὰ ἐξής, ποθεὶ δὲ ὡς μάλιστα καὶ τὴν μεθοδικὴν καὶ κανονικὴν εἰς ταύτῃ ἠλθεὶ καὶ εἰς ἑκείνην ἐπανακαλµάτων γιλίτεσε ἦς χωρὶς οὐκ ἔστει πολισφοιν.650 ώς δὲ τοιῶθα τῆς ἡ Πινελόπη, δήλον ἔσται ὅτε τὸν ἱστον ἤθελοχος καὶ ἐπαναλέομεν τὸ ὅπις ἀυτῆς ὑπανοῦμένον τον
καὶ αὖθις ἀναλυόμενον.551 καὶ ταῦτα μὲν τοιαῦτα. ἔπει δὲ ὁ τοιούτος ἄξων τὸ τοῦ παντὸς μέσον τέμνει, διὰ τούτο καὶ τὴν τῆς Καλυψώς | οἴκησιν ὁ μύθος ἐν ὁμφαλῷ βαλάσσης ἱδρύει, ἀντὶ τοῦ μέσου τοῦ παντὸς ἦτοι τοῦ κοσμικοῦ λαβὼν τὸν τῆς βαλάσσης ὁμφαλόν, ἐπεθυμέ ὁ δὲ ὁμφαλὸς μεσάζῃ | τὰ ξυλά.652 διὸ δὲ τὸν ᾧ Ἀτλαντα ἔκει που περὶ τὸν ὁμώνυμον Λιβυκῶν τόπον ἦγουν κατὰ τὸ ὄρος τὸν Ἀτλαντα ὁ μύθος553 κινοφοροῦντα554 ποιεῖ, διὰ τούτο καὶ τὴν τῆς Καλυψώς | νήσον περὶ τὸ Ἀτλαντικὸν ὁ αὖτος ἐκτοπίζει πέλαγος,555 συμμετακινών πιθανῶς τὴν θυγατέρα Καλυψώ τῇ γεννησαμένῳ Ἀτλαντι. καὶ οὕτω μὲν τὸν Ἀτλαντα καὶ τοὺς ἀχθοφορομένους | ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ κίονας εἰς τὸν κοσμικὸν ἐστὶ μεταλαμβάνειν ἄξωνα, ὁν "κίονα" καὶ ὁ Πλάτων καλεῖ.556 τὸ δόνῳ παρ’ Ὁμήρου λαβῶν,557 ἡ δὲ γε ἱστορία558 Λίβυν ἄνδρα σοφὸν τὰ ἀποτελεσματικὰ τὸν | Ἀτλαντα παραδίδουσι, πολλὰ τῶν μελλόντων ἐκ τῆς τῶν οὐρανίων κινήσεως προσημειούμενον καὶ προλέγοντα, ὅθεν καὶ ἀνέχειν τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐμμεθεύει, ὡς ὁ δὲ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν οὐρανὸν ἄνθηκον τῇ πολυδυνάμῳ σοφίᾳ. ὁ μὲντοι περιηγητῆς Διονύσιος559 ἄλλος ἐμφαίνεται θεαρπείων τὸν μύθον λέγων περὶ τὸ Λιβυκῶν ὄρος τὸν ᾧ Ἀτλαντα κίονα χάλκεον ἀνέχειν, | εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀνατρέχοντα, πάντων πολύν τὸ ύψος, διὸ καὶ δωκεῖν ἄριστον οὐρανοῦ ἤκειν. ἐστὶ δὲ καὶ ἄλλως, εἰς τὸ ἄπλως πολύ τοῦ κατὰ τὸ ᾧ Ἀτλαντικὸν ὄρος ύψους, τὴν κιονικὴν φαντασίαν συμβιβάσασθαι. οὕτω καὶ Πινδάρος "οὐρανίαι κίονα” λέγει τὴν Ἀτλην560 καὶ οἰκείη δὲ τὸν ὁδότης ὁν τῆς Ἱκύλης σκόπελον τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐφόρον ἰκάνειν561 φαι. καὶ Ἀισχύλος δὲ ὁ ἀστρογείτωνα562 τὰς τοῦ Καυκάσου λέγει κορυφάς. καὶ Διόδωρος ἀκραν τινὰ τῶν Ἀλπεων κορυφήν τοῦ σύμπαντος ὄρους δοκοῦσαν "οὐρανοῦ ράχιν"563 ισοτείρ συ τῶν ἑγχωρίων καλεῖσθαι. καὶ τοιαύτα μὲν καὶ τὰς ἱστορίας. ὁ δὲ μύθος ἐξα τῶν Τίτανῶν εἶναι τὸν ᾧ Ἀτλαντα βούλεται, ὡς ἐπ’ ὀλέθρῳ κατατέθη τὰ ψηλάττα τῷ Δίῳ, διὸ καὶ ὁλοκληρον564 λέγεται, τιμορίαν κατεκρίθη τῷ τὸν κίονον ἄχυδο. φασὶ565 δὲ τὸν Ἡρακλῆς διὰ τὰ χρυσά μῆλα εἰς Λιβυῆν ἐλθόντα ὑπελείβειν τὸν φόρτον διὰ φιλίαν, καὶ διαδέχεται τὸν Ἀτλαντα πρὸς βραχύ, εἴτε ἀνθείς | ἐκεῖνῳ ἐπιτρέψαι τὰ συνήθη πάσχειν. τὸ δ’ ἔστω, ὅτι τῷ σοφῷ ὁ Ἀτλαντι καθητεύσας ὁ Ἡρακλῆς προδέλεγε τίναι καὶ αὐτός τῶν μελλόντων, κάνετεθεν ἢ τοῦ ἄχθους ἐμμεθεύθη | διαδοχή φαινέ γυνὸς Ἀλιανός566 αὐταῖς λέξειν οὕτως: "λόγος ἔχει Ἀτλαντι φοιτήσαντα τὸν Ἡρακλέα σπουδάσαι τὰ οὐρανία ταῦτα τοι καὶ συγγράφαι διαδέχεσθαι | τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐν κόσμῳ, αἰνιγματικῶς τῶν συγγραφέων567 τὴν παράδοσιν τῆς σοφίας τούτων τὸν τρόπον568 ὁτι δὲ τὸ ὄρος ὁ

33.10 tit. ἱστορικὸς add. in marg. P.2.
33.11 Λίβυν P Rom. Stall.: Λίβυν Bas.
33.19 post οὐρανόν vocem οὐρανόν add. Stall.
33.22 tit. οὐρανοῦ ράχις add. in marg. P.2.
33.23 tit. μυθικός add. in marg. P.2.
33.28 tit. Ἡρακλῆς> ἀλληγορικὸς add. in marg. P.2.
"Ἀτλας" καὶ πληθυντικὸς προφέρεται "Ἀτλαντες", ὁ λόγος καὶ ἡ "Μάλεια" ἦν ὁ ὄρος καὶ νήσος ἡ "Κρήτη" "Μάλειαι" καὶ "Κρήται" ὠριζόταν, καὶ ὁτι καὶ ὅρμος ἐν τῷ τοιούτῳ παροικοῦντος ὅρει οἱ "Ἀτλαντες" πολλαχοῦ διαφαίνονται.569 καὶ ἱστος τοιαύτης ἐνεώσει παρά ἄ τῷ δεινοταξικῷ ὁτι "Ἀτλαντεν ἐν τῷ περιτρέψει τὴν ναῦν Ἀτλαντες ἐντὸς ἕξαπτης",570 εἰ μὴ ἄρα ζώδια εἶναι ἄνθρωπον ἦσαν αὐτοὶ ἐπιλεμένοι πρὸς μίμησιν Ἀτλαντος, ὁδὸς τῆς κλίσεως οἱ κανὼν τοιοῦτος καὶ Ἡρωδιανών572 τὰ παρά μετοχῆν εἰς ἀς δισελλαβὰ διά τοῦ νῦν κλίνεται, οἷον "ἐλάς" Ἀτλας Ἀτλας, "φάς" "Περίφας" "Περίφαντος", τοιαύτη δὲ κλίσει ἐκείνος ὑπάγει καὶ διὰ διὰ τὸ αὐτὸ σύμφωνον ἔχει, "Γίγας" "Γίγαντος", "Μίμας" "Μίμαντος" ὀρος, ὃς μηδετερ "Ομηρος ἐν τοῖς ἐξής",573 ἦτο ἰστέον καὶ διῆτο ὁ περὶ Καλυψοῦς καὶ Ἀτλαντος ἐνταῦθα μῦθος οὐ μόνον ἑγείρει τὸ ἀφηγηματικὸν ὑπικον574 ὡς τερατώδης ἄλλα καὶ ἄλλον τρόπον ἀφελῶς ἔχει διὰ τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν ὁ ὅτσα εἰκὴ ἀφηγομένην τῷ εὖ εἰδότα παρὰ τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ἀτλαντα. δήλων δὲ καὶ ὡς Ἀτλας λέγεται ἡ "πρὸς στέρησιν τοῦ μή τάλας εἶναι"575 ἡ ἐπιταξικὸς ὡς "πολύταλας576 εἰ δὲ καὶ ἐν ἀνεγραμματίσται ἀπὸ τοῦ "τάλας" ὁ Ἀτλας, περιήγην μὲν εἰπεῖν, οὐ πάνη δὲ ὑπόκενον.577 δήλων δὲ δυσοίως καὶ ὁτι τὸ ὁς <τε> θαλάσσης πάσης βέβειθα οἰςδὲ καὶ ἐξής ἐν τῷ ἀμφίπλησθαι578 οὐ μακρὰν θείας ἐννοιας ἐστίν. ὡς δὲ "θάλασσα" οὐ μόνον στοιχειακὸν ὄνομα579 ἦν ἄλλα καὶ ἴματι μορφοφαινετο, δήλων έκ τοῦ εἰπόντος580 "πορφυρὰς περιβόλας καὶ ιδραφεῖς καὶ πακινθίνας καὶ φλογίνας καὶ θαλάσσωσι ἐστίν". ἤσος δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ ἀκτής θαλάσσιας παρώνων ἦν τι φόρημα, ὡς δηλοὶ ὁ γράφως τὸ "φοροῦντες δὲ καὶ ἀκταίας. ἐστι δὲ", φασὶ, "τοῦτο σπάθην ἵσχος καὶ κουφότητος | χάριν", εἰ μὴ που έκ τοῦ "άγο" τὸ κλώ ἡ εἰρημένη "ἀκταια" γίνεται "κατακλύνται γάρ τὰ σπαθίμηνα."582 (Vs. 50) ὅτι ὁ Ὅμηρος "ὁμφαλὸν θαλάσσης" νυεῖ τὸ μέσον ἀκολούθως τοῖς τοιλήμασι γῆς ὁ ὁμφαλὸν εἰπεῖν τό καὶ "μεσομφαλὸν γῆς" παρὰ Σοφοκλῆς.583 δηλοὶ καὶ ἡ μεταβολεῖς Δημοσθένη584 εἰπὸν ὡς "ἐν νήσοι ποὺ ὑπὸ μέσης τῆς θάλασσας καὶ ὁδοῦ φιλοτομένου ἤν ποτε Καλυψοῦς τῆς Ἀτλαντος, ὁν σύ", φησιν, ἀλλη "Ζεύς, την τε βαλονίς γνώσει ἐξεπίστασθαι, καὶ τὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς ἔδραν συνέχειν ἐταξίας." (Vs. 51) ὅτι τὸ "θεᾶ δὲ" ἐν δῷματα | ναεί585 καινότερον συντέκτακται εἶτε γὰρ εἴποι "τις τιναίει τά δώματα" οὐ πάνυ συνηθῆς ἡ σύνταξις, εἴτε εἰποὶ "ἐν τὰ δώματα ναεί" Δωρίκως συντέκτακται, ὡς ἔστοι ἐκ τοῦ Πινδάρου | μαθεῖν.586 (Vs. 53) ὅτι θηλυκώς λέγει "τας"
κίνας<sup>687</sup> κατά διάλεκτον Ιωνικήν. ἦστι δὲ τούτῳ καὶ τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς.<sup>688</sup> μυρία δὲ τοιαύτα ἦστι παρὰ τοῖς ποιηταῖς, οἱ “τὰς βοῦς”<sup>689</sup> λέγουσι καὶ “τὰς ἱπποὺς”<sup>690</sup> καὶ “τὰς ἁμιόνους”<sup>691</sup> καὶ “τὰς ἐλλούς”<sup>692</sup> καὶ “τὰς κύνας”<sup>693</sup> καὶ “τὰς δίς”<sup>694</sup> καὶ ἕτερα. Ἀλλος δὲ Διονύσιος, παρασημειούμενος τινα ὅπως κατὰ γένει προφέρονται, φησιν 5 ὦτῳ “κακκάβη” θηλυκός ὁ κάκκαβος,<sup>695</sup> ὁ καὶ παρὰ τῷ Ἀθηναίῳ κεῖται ἐν τῷ “κακκάβαζεσα”.<sup>696</sup> ὦτῳ καὶ ἢ ἀρπάγη<sup>697</sup> δι’ ἥς ἐκ φρεάτων κάθοδος ἀνάγουσιν, ἐτί καὶ ἡ βόλος<sup>698</sup> καὶ ἡ δαλος<sup>699</sup> καὶ ἡ φάρυγξ<sup>700</sup> καὶ ἡ στρύχνος<sup>701</sup> καὶ ἡ χάραξ<sup>702</sup> τὸ τῆς ἀμπέλου ὑπόστημα, ὁ μέντοι “χάραξ” ἀρσενικός, τὸ χαράκινα τοῦ στρατοπέδου, ἐτί θηλυκός καὶ ἡ τύλη<sup>703</sup> τὸ φύμα τὸ ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐξένου καὶ ἡ ὀμφαξ<sup>704</sup> καὶ ἡ δοξολος<sup>705</sup> καὶ ἡ ψύλλα<sup>706</sup> καὶ ἡ ἄρειξ<sup>707</sup> καὶ ἡ θόλος<sup>708</sup> καὶ ἡ μήκων”.<sup>709</sup> Θουκιδίδης οὖν “μῆκονα μεμελισμένην” φησί. ταῦτα κατὰ γένος θηλυκόν, ἀρσενικός δὲ “ὁ χοῦς”.<sup>710</sup> “ὁ ὄροφος”,<sup>711</sup> “ὁ θις”,<sup>712</sup> “ὁ λιμός”,<sup>713</sup> “ὁ σκότος”,<sup>714</sup> τὸ τάρας”.<sup>715</sup> ὁ ἀκράγας”.<sup>716</sup> οὐδέτερα δὲ τὸ νῦτων”,<sup>717</sup> τὸ γυγον”.<sup>718</sup> τὰ ἐπίσεια”,<sup>719</sup> τὸ στραμματσείεν”,<sup>720</sup> τὸ θύμον”,<sup>721</sup> τὸ σιάλον”,<sup>722</sup> τὸ κέδρον”,<sup>723</sup> τὰ 10 θεμελία”.<sup>724</sup> τὸ τέμαχος”.<sup>725</sup> ἀρσενικά δὲ καὶ οὐδέτερα, ὁ τάριχος καὶ τὸ τάριχον”,<sup>726</sup> τὰ στάδια καὶ οἱ στάδια”,<sup>727</sup> ὤδηλον δὲ ὅτι Ἀττικοῖς ταῦτα πάντα, ἐπει καὶ Ἀττικαῖς λέγειν ὁ θηβεις Διονύσιος ἐπεξήρηται. ἄλλος γὰρ καὶ ἡ θις<sup>728</sup> λέγεται, ὁτι καὶ ἡ λιμός<sup>729</sup> καὶ ὁ σκότος<sup>730</sup> καὶ ἡ τάρας<sup>731</sup> καὶ ἡ ἀκράγας”.<sup>732</sup> καὶ ἕτερα τὸν τοῦ Διονύσιον ἑτέρον. ὁ χοῦς” τὸν τοῦ μέτρον ἄει ἀρσενικός.<sup>733</sup> ὁ δὲ γε τῆς γῆς καὶ θηλυκός εὐρήται παρὰ τῷ γεωγράφῳ<sup>734</sup> (Vs. 54) δότι ἐν τῷ “γαίαν καὶ ὄρανον ἔχουσιν”<sup>735</sup> ἐλλέπειται ἡ ἀνὰ πρόθεσις. ἐστὶ γὰρ ἀντὶ τοῦ “ἀνέχουσι καὶ ἀναβαστάζουσι”.<sup>736</sup> πολλάκις δὲ τοιαύτα ποιεῖ Ἰομπρός, ὡς καὶ εἰν Ἡλιδία φαίνεται”.<sup>737</sup> “μαλάκοις καὶ αἰμελιοίς λόγοις ἡ Καλυψιω τῶν Ὀδυσσεά ἐθελγεν ὅπως Ἰακχὸς ἐπιλήπτεται”.<sup>738</sup> εἰν ζ’ ἂν τῆς μέν ἱστορομυκενής Καλυψίως “αιμελιοί λόγοι”, οἱ κατὰ ἐρωτα κολακεύσοντες καὶ οὕς ἄν οἴη γυνῆ ἐρωσί καὶ διατύπωτα κατὰ τὸν Ἡσιόδουν “αιμελιό κατίλλουσα”.<sup>739</sup> τῆς δὲ ἀναγομενής εἰς φιλοξενίαν<sup>740</sup> σωματικήν Καλυψίως αἰμελία ρήματα νοζίντο αν, τὸ εαυτό τινα κήδεσθαι, τὸ μὴ ὁ τούθην ἐδείμερίμναις, τὸ τῆν χούσιν ὁ ἡδεός μᾶλλον στοιχάθαι ἕπερ τοῦ λυπηροῦ, τὸ τὴν ἡδονὴν ἀσχημαία εἶναι σαρκός, τὸ μὴ ποιεῖν ὄγον ὡς ἄν εἰς μακρόβιος καὶ μικροῦ καὶ ἀθάνατος καὶ ὅσα τοιαύτα. 20 ἄλλως δὲ “μαλακοὶ καὶ αἰμελίοι λόγοι” οἱ κολακευτικοὶ καὶ προσηνεῖς<sup>742</sup> “μαλακοῖ”

34.21 tit. ákata add. in marg. P<sup>2</sup>. 35.1 tit. ἀρασενικός καὶ θηλυκός προφέρονται add. in marg. P<sup>2</sup>. 35.7 tit. στρύχνος add. in marg. P<sup>2</sup>. 35.13 οὐδέτερα corr. edd.: οὐδέτερα P<sup>1</sup>. 35.15 tit. ἀρασενικός οὐδέτερος add. in marg. P<sup>2</sup>. 35.19’ Ἀκράγας ipse Makr.: ἀκράγας P<sup>1</sup> edd. 35.25 tit. αἰμελιοί λόγοι add. in marg. P<sup>2</sup>. 35.31 tit. ἄλλως αἰμελίοις λόγοι add. in marg. P<sup>2</sup>.
μὲν πρὸς διαστολὴν τῶν ἁμειβητικῶν σκληροὶ γὰρ ἐκείνοι, “αἰμύλιοι” δὲ κατὰ τοὺς παλαιοὺς δόλιοι, πιθανοὶ, πλάνοι, ποικίλοι. καὶ ἄλλος δὲ “αἰμύλιοι” οἱ ὡς εἰπεῖν γνῆσιοι καὶ οίκους ἄν εἴποι τις τῶν πρὸς ἀματος.743 ἢ καὶ ἄλλος “αἰμύλιοι”, οἱ μὴ ψυφοθαντες εἰκῆ περὶ τὰς ἀκοῆς πρόθυρα ἄλλ’ ἦσαν παρακινδύνες καὶ οἰνὸν ἀναμένειν ἀματος.744 ἢ θερμοὶ καὶ ὑνεργοὶ, οὐ μὴν ψυχροὶ καὶ ἀπρακτοί, ὡς ἐκ μεταφοράς τῶν ἐναίμον γξίων ὃ θερμότερα τῶν ἐναίμον εἰσι.745 παράγωγον δὲ τοῦ “αἰμύλιος” ὁ “αἰμύλιος” ὡς δηλοὶ τὸ “αἰμύλα κατίλλυσα”. τὸ δὲ “θέλησιν”,746 περὶ οὐ ἀκριβῶς ἐν τοῖς εἰς τὴν Ἰλιάδα ἔφεσθη.747 οὖθ’ ἐνταῦθα ἥδονην ἀπλῶς δηλοὶ, ἀλλὰ τὴν οὐκ ἐπ’ ἀγαθῷ καὶ ἀπατηλῆν, ὡς δηλοὶ τὸ ἑνα Ἰάκθης ἐπιλήσεται.748 οὐ γὰρ ἦθελεν τὸν Ὄδυσσα ἢ Ἒλεαι ἢ ἔδεσθη, ἀλλὰ παρῆγγελον οὐ ἐκείνος ἐπεθύμει, τοῦ τὴν πατρίδα ἰδεῖν, εἰ καὶ μὴ ἔπειθεν. ὅτι δὲ ἐκ του τοιοῦτου θέλειν οἱ θελησίνες δηλούσιν ὃ οἱ παλαιοὶ, παρὰ οἷς καὶ “θελησίνες” οἱ αὐτοὶ λέγονται.749 εν γούν ῥητορικῇ λεξίκῃ καὶ στοιχεῖον προιόντων, γράφεται “θελησίνες, γοήτες, φαρμακοί”.750 εἵπρησθεν ἄρα τὸ θέλειν ἐξ οὕτω, ἀνθρώπους παρὰ πάντα. (Vs. 58) ὅτι

15 Ὅδυσσεὺς οὖτως φιλόπατρος ἦν, ὡς “καὶ καπνὸν μόνον ἑφύσεως ἀποθρόσυκνον νυσσα λαὶ γαίης”,751 ἦσαν τῆς οἰκου γῆς, τουτεστὶν εἰ μὴ ἤ αὐτῆς Ἰάκθης ἐπηλθήσει μέλλον, κἂν γούν πόρρωθεν ποθὲν αὐτὴν τεκμήρισθαι οἷς τὰ τοιαύτα τεκμαίρονται ἀνθρωποι.752 τεκμαίρονται δὲ ὡς τὰ πολλὰ μακρόθεν, πορὶ εἰς καὶ τῷ τοῦ πυρὸς σημείῳ καπνῷ, ὅν οἱ μὲν καπνὸν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ μάλιστα χρήσομος, ὃ δὲ πυρὸς τῇ νυκτί τείχεισι μέντοι καὶ οἰκήματος ἐπάρσει οὐκ ἔστω ἐκαθὲν ἢλ’ εἰ καὶ τῶν εγγυτέρω τεκμαίρεσθαι. ὅροις ὡς οὐς ἄν εἴποι τὴν πατρίδα πόλιν σημείο μὴ ἄνω τοῦ εἰς καὶ πεκτολισμένην ἀλλὰ τινὰ τῶν περίπτωσι. καπνὸν δὲ παράγωγον τὸ καπνίζειν, ὃ ἐστὶ θεύεις ὡς καὶ παρακαλούχηματος. Ὁμνος δηλοὶ εἰς τῷ “καίσαν τε κατὰ κλίσιας.”753 εἰ τοῦ καπνίζειν δὲ “καπνιστὰ κρέα” παρά τῷ δειπνοσοφιστῇ.754 διὸ οὐς τα τὰς δυστυχίαν Ὅδυσσεύς ὑπνήκη τῆς Αἰδώλου λήσιον ἐπανόρω καὶ ἐγγύσας τῇ πατρίδι καὶ ἤδη πῶς ἀνακαίησαν μέλεων ἐπιλάγχη ὄπισθα. ἑσθεν δὲ τῇ σχῆμα ἂν ἐστιν ἐνταῦθα, δηλοὶ εἰς méρους τῷ πάν.755 τῷ γὰρ ἠμερινῷ σημείῳ τῷ καπνῷ δὲ συνεπινοεῖν καὶ τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πυρὸς νύκτερον σύμβολον. τῷ γὰρ διαφέρει εἴτε καπνὸν | ὁ Ὅδυσσεύς ἰδοὶ τοῦ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τῆς Ἰάκθης σημαίνοντα, εἴτε πυρὸν τοῦ ἐν νυκτί εἰ μὴ ἄρα τοῦ κρείττονος μείνηται; καλλίον γὰρ ἐνταῦθα οἱ καπνὸς ὡς αἰρετωτέρω ὀντός | τοῦ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ πλοῦ.756 ἢ δὲ ἄλληγορία καπνὸν βούλεται νοεῖν τὸ ἀνοικοφόρον μὲν σκοτεινὸν δὲ ὁμας τῆς φιλοσόφου γνώσεως καὶ ὀὑπο

λαμηρόν. \(36.31\) ὅπερ καὶ αὐτὸ στερκτὸν ἐκεῖν ὅτε τῷ φιλολόγῳ διακειμένη λογίζεται. εἰ γὰρ τινὶ μὴ τοῦ τελειοτάτου ἐφικέσθαι δυνατὸν, τὸ γοῦν ἁμαρτά τῶν προτελείων γενέσθαι αἰρετῶν. | καὶ γὰρ καὶ μέλιτος εἰ μὴ κορέσεσθαι οἴον τε, ἀγαπητὸν οὖν τὸ ἀπογέεσσαθαι. ἵστεον δὲ ὅτι τῷ “ἡς γαίης” \(36.38\) οἱ ὀστεροὶ \(36.39\) “οἰκείας” φασὶ εἰν ἀπλότητι λέξεως. \(36.60\) ὣς ἀλλὸτες οὐτῶ “πατρίδα” ὅπερ ἐκ τοῦ “οἰκείν” καὶ τοῦ “οἶκου” καὶ τοῦ ἐκ τοῦτον “οἰκείου” λεγόμενον, πάνυ διαφέρει τῷ ἰδίαις εἰπεῖν. διότι ὁ οὐδεὶς εὑρήσῃ ὅπερ “οἰκείαν” οὕτω καὶ “ἰδίαν” καταμόριση τῆς πατρίδας εἰπὼν. ἵστεον δὲ ὅτι τριῶν τούτων ὄντων αἰτίων γενέσεως τέκνων, πατρὸς, μητρός, τόπου. “πατρὶ” μὲν παροιμώμαται ἢ “πάτρα”, \(36.70\) πολλαχοῦ κειμένη τῆς ποιῆσεως καὶ τὸ εἰς αὐτοῦ παρόνμοιον ἢ “πατρίς”. “μητρὶ” δὲ οὐχ ἢ “μήτρα” τοπικὰς αὐτῇ γὰρ μόριον ἀφόρισται τῇ τοῦ ἐμβρύου ἐνοικίσει, ἀλλὰ ἢ “μητρὶς” ποιητικῶτερον. \(36.83\) ἔτι δὲ καὶ ἢ “μητρόπολις” κάλλιον. οὕτω γὰρ τῷ ἐπὶ τὰς Ἐθῆς “Διονύσου μητρόπολιν” ἦγον πόλιν τῆς ἐκείνου μητρὸς Σεμέλης. \(36.104\) τοῦ δὲ παρανομία τὸ “Ἡθαχήσιος”, “Ἐθῆς”, “Ἄθηναῖος” καὶ τὰ τοιαύτα. οὕτω δὲ πας ἔχει καὶ τὸ, ἢς ἐρρέθη, ἢς γαίης.”, \(36.65\) ὁ περιφράσις ἐστὶ τοῦ “οἰκείας” ὅπερ ἐλλειπτικῶς τῆς ὀἰκείαν γῆν δηλοῦν. ταῦταν δὲ εἰπεῖν τὴν ἢ “πάτραν” ἢ “πατρίδα” ἢ “μητρόπολιν”. ἔτι σημεῖωσα καὶ ὅτι Ὀδυσσεύς μὲν δίχα ψόγου κληρονομήσας ἔχει τὸ φιλοπατρις εἶναι. Κόρος δὲ βασιλεύει ταῦταν ἐπίδους ὑπὲρ τῆς | τῶν πατριωτῶν Ἀθηναίων νίκης, ἦς καὶ Λυκόφρον ὑπολαλεῖ. \(36.76\) ἐποίησε “Κόρος” καλείθαι τοὺς δὶ ἀρχαῖοτητα εὑρέθη. \(36.76\) (VS. 60) ὅτι “ἐντρέψεσθαι” λέγει τὸ “ἐπιστρέψεσθαι”. \(36.68\) τοῦτο δὲ | καὶ ὃνὶς ὅτι καὶ “οπίς” ἢ ἐπιστροφῆ. \(36.69\) εἰ δὲ τοῦτο παράγεται τὸ “ἐντροπαλίξεσθαι” ἐν Ἰλιάδι. \(36.70\) ἦτοι ἐν τῷ φεύγειν ἐπὶ τὰ ὅπισώ στρέψεθαι. δύναται δὲ καὶ ἀλλὰς | νοεῖσθαι τὸ “ἐντρέπονται” ἀντὶ τοῦ “μετατρέπεσθαι”, “μεταβάλλεσθαι”. τὸ δὲ “ἐντρέπεθαι” ἦγον “ἐπιστρέψεσθαι” ἄλλη τὸ “μετατρέπεσθαι” λέγεται, οἶον “οὔτε μετατρέπῃ ὁ” οὐδὲ “ἐλεγεῖσθαι”. \(37.71\) (VS. 60-2) ὅτι τῷ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ῥητὸν τὸ Ὀδυσσεος ἔχαριστο ἤρεσεν ἐν Τροίῃ τί οὖν οἱ τόσον ὀδύσσας Ζεῦς \(37.72\) παρῆκισις ἐστιν ἢ μᾶλλον ἐπιμολογίεα ἢ ἡ τοῦ “Ὀδυσσέως” εἰς τὸν Ὁδύσσα μεταμολογομένον. ἄστηες δὲ ὁ λόγος μονονοχείς ἔγονσις τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς μετὰ βαρύτητος, ὅτι φερούμως ἐλεγεῖται “Ὀδυσσεός” οἷα “οὐ διὸς ὁδύσσαμένου αὐτῷ”. \(37.75\) κἂν ὁ πάππος | Ἀὐτόλυκος ὁ “Ὀδυσσέα” τοῦτον ἐνόμασα, διότι πολλοὶ
ἐκείνω τῷ Αὐτολόκῳ ὁδύσσαντο. ἐνταῦθα δὲ σημειώσαι ὡς Ἀθηνᾶ μὲν τὸν Ὄδυσσα σοι ἐνεπίβεβη τὸν Ὄδυσσα ἐφή· οὗτος καὶ ἐπὶ συνέει αὐτὸν σημειώσαι. τὸ δὲ "ἐν Τροί" ἐπιτάσσει· ὅτι τοῦ ἐνεπίβου ἔργου, οὐ γάρ ἐν Ὁδύσσει ἔσθεν ἐπιπλούτει, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ ξένοις, ἐνθα ὡς εἰκός ἐχρήν φείδοσθαι. (Vs. 62) τὸ δὲ "χαρίζετο" ἢ ἀπολύτως νοητόν ἢ συντακτέον τῷ "ἰερά". (Vs. 64) ὅτι τὸ "τέκνον ἐμὸν ποιῶν σε ἔργοι φύγει ἐρκος ὀδόντων", καὶ σκωπτικόν ἐστι τῇ λεπτοῖς, τῷ γοῦν σχηματισμῷ επικρύπτει τὴν πολλὴν σφραγίστη. βουλεύται μὲν γὰρ εἰπεῖν "ποιῶν λόγον παρέρριψας καὶ οὐ | δεδόντως εἶπας". ἢ δὲ πάνυ άποτίς εἰσγαγόμε. "ποιῶς λόγος ἐξέφυγε σου τὰ χείλη", ὡς εἴπερ οὐχ ἐκοῦσιν ἢ τὸ κακῶς λαληθέν. αἰνίττεται δὲ ὁ ποιητής ὡς ἡ φύσις, ἵνα μὴ περάστεντες ἢ φυσίς οἱ λόγοι προπετῶς ἔχουν τοῦ στόματος εξίστασθαι, διηλὼ ἔρκει τὴν αὐτῶν διέξοδον ἐπεγάγονος τῷ τῶν ὀδόντων τῷ τῶν χειλέων, καὶ τείχοις οἰον ἐπὶ τείχει τούτο | ἐμπεσοράστο, καὶ ὡς δεσμώται τοὺς λόγους ἐγκατέκλεισέν. τὸ τοῖνυν μή καίριος λόγος λέγοιν ἀν τυραννήσαι τὴν ἐξόδον, καὶ φυγάς τῶν ὀδόντων ἐρκος δικηκεσεῖν. ὅτι | δὲ τὸ σιγὰν ἐγκλεισμῷ λόγου ἑοίκε, δηλοὶ καὶ Σοφοκλῆς, εἰ παίνον "εἰ μὴ γλώσσαν ἐγκλείσοι φόβος", σημειώσαι δὲ ὅτι τὸ δηλωθὲν βαρὺ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἢθος ἐν τῷ "τι οἱ τόσον ὁδύσσασαν" ἀμείβεται | ὁ Ζεὺς διὰ τοῦ Ῥηθέντος σκώμματος εὐφως. (Vs. 65) ὅτι ὅπινικ τις ὁδειδοθεὶς ὡς ἐκπληθεῖς τινος ἐνδόξου, εἴποι ἃν καλῶς, τὸ "πῶς ἃν ἐγώ ἐπείτα ἀνδρὸς θεοῖο λαθοῦμην, ὃς τοῦσδε ἢ τοῦσδε ἐστι". δεῖ δὲ εἰδέναι ὅτι τὸ "πῶς ἃν ἐγώ τοῦ ἐνιὸς λαθοῦμην" ενδιαθετεώρθη τούτο τοῦ "οὐκ ἃν τοῦ δεϊνος λαθοῦμην". τοῦτο μὲν γὰρ σεβοivité τὸ δὲ ἀποφαστικῶς ἐξαγαγόθη, ἢκεῖνο δὲ ἱδέας ἀληθοῦς διὰ τὸ τῆς ἀρατόσεως ἀνατίθησι. (Vs. 66) ὅτι δύο ταύτα ὁ ποιητής τῷ Ὅδυσσει ἐπιμαρτύρεται διὰ τοῦ Δίως ὡς προδεόμηκαι ἀγαθά, ὅτι τε κατὰ νῦν περίεστι πάντων ἐστὶν ὑπερέχει, καὶ ὅτι περὶ τὸ καλὸν ἐσεβεῖ. σύνεσις ἄρα καὶ εἰσέβεβαι μάλλον τῶν ἄλλων οἶδε κοσμεῖν τὸν ἄνθρωπον. καὶ ἔσται εἰσαναθανὸς ἀνδρὸς τοιούτου τῷ "ὅς περὶ μὲν νῦν ἵπτε βροτῶν, περὶ δὲ ἔρα θεὸς ἀθανότω ἐδωκεν ὡς ὀφρανίων εὐφρὸν ἐχειν". ἐν οἷς σημεῖσαι ὅτι Ἀθηνᾶ μὲν τὸν Ὅδυσσαν "ἰερὰ βέβαιαν" ἀπλὰς ἐπιπλέε. Ζεὺς δὲ καὶ τούτῳ ἐκπέτειν. διὸ καὶ "θεόν" αὐτὸν ἐπεί καὶ "περίνοιναν" αὐτῷ ἐπεμαρτύρατο. καὶ ποις τῇ Ἀθηνᾶ ἐπισκόπετε

37.27 tit. ἐπιμαρτύρα add. in marg. P².
38.3 ἐσεβεῖ P¹ Rom. Stahl.: ἐσεβεῖ Bas.
38.7 ὀδόντων P¹ Rom. Stahl.: ὀδόντων Bas.
38.15 δικηκεσεῖν P¹ Rom.: δικηκεσεῖν Bas. Stahl.
38.16 tit. Σοφοκλῆς add. in marg. P².
38.17 ἐγκλεισοι P¹ edd.: ἐγκλεισοι Soph. Ant. 505.
38.19-20 tit. ἔρα <ὀν> add. in marg. P².
38.26 tit. σύνεσις ἐσεβεῖα add. in marg. P².
ούτω λήθην εἰς, δύο τούτων ἀγαθῶν ἐξαιρέτων | ἄντων τῷ Ὁδυσσεῖ, εσκίγησε τὸ ἐν ἐκείνη ὡς οἱ λαθομένη αὐτοῦ· παιδευτικά δὲ ταῦτα οὐ μόνον εἰς τὸ μὴ δέον εἰναι τοὺς ἄρχοντας λήθην πάσχειν τῶν εἰς αὐτοὺς χαρίτων, ἀλλὰ | καὶ τὸ "θείον" ἐπιστροφον εἶναι τῶν σπουδαίων ἀνδρῶν.794 τὸ δὲ σχῆμα τοῦ "περὶ μὲν νόον ἐστὶ βροτῶν"795 ἐξ Ἰλιάδος παρείλθυσαι, ἦγουν ἐκ τοῦ "οἱ περὶ βουλῇ Δαναῶν περὶ δ᾽ ἐστὲ μάχεσθαι".796 ἐν οἷς ὁρὰ τὸ "περείναι" καὶ αἰτιατικῆ καὶ δοτικῆ καὶ ἀπαρεμφάτῳ ῥήματι συντασσόμενον, ὡς δηλοὶ τὸ "νόον" καὶ τὸ "βουλή" καὶ τὸ "μάχεσθαι" ὅνοματι καὶ αὐτῷ ἑοκός ὡς | ἄλλαχον εἰρήται.797 σημειοῦσαι δὲ ὅτι ὁμώνυμον καὶ ὁ "νοῦς". Παυσανίας γοῦν φησὶν ὅτι "Κέσκος λιμήν που, ἃ παράκειται ποταμός Νοῦς καλούμενος".798 (Vs. 68) ὅτι Ποσειδών "γαἰήχος"799 οὐ μόνον διὰ τὸ ἐπὶ γαῖς ὁ ἰχθείσα ἢ διὰ τὸ συνέχειν τὴν γαῖαν τῇ ἱγρότητι ὡς ἄλλαχον ἐνδηλώθη.800 ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ "δροῦσα γαῖειν" ὃ ἑστὶν ἄρμασι χαίρειν· ἵππους γὰρ ὁ Ποσειδῶν.801 ἵστεν δὲ ὡς "Ποσειβάων" μὲν κύριον, "Ποσειδέων" δὲ μηνὸς ὁμομ.802 εκείνης ἐν δεί τὴν παραλήγουσαν Αἰολικῶς ὁ "Ποσειδών", ὃς καὶ αἱ γενικά τὸ "πυλάων", "μουσάων", "νυμφάων" καὶ αἱ λοιπαί. σημειῶσαι δὲ ὡς "γαἰήχος" | μὲν μοναχῶς διὰ διφθόγγου, "γεούχος"803 δὲ καὶ "ηγούχος"804 καθ᾽ Ἡρώδιανον805 μὲν καὶ Δίδυμον διὰ τοῦ ἐ ψιλοῦ παρά τὴν ψιλογραφομενὴν "γέαν" ἢς συναίρεσι ἢ "γή".806 ἄλλοι δὲ807 διὰ τῆς αἱ διφθόγγου | παρά τὴν λοιπὴν γαῖαν εἰς ἢς καὶ ὁ "γαἰήχος". διότι τὸ "ἀσκελής αἰεὶν κεχόλωσα"808 ἢ ἀντὶ τοῦ πάνυ σκληρὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ "σκέλλων" τὸ ἕξαρκον, ἐξ οὗ καὶ τὸ "σκέλος" καὶ ὁ "κατεσκληκής" καὶ ὁ "σκελετός" ἢ καὶ ἄλλος "ἀσκελής" τὸ ᾽ἀμετάβατον καὶ ᾽ἀμέτακτον, ἀπὸ στερήσεως τῶν σκέλων.809 Ἰσως δὲ καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ "κατεσκευαμένον" καὶ "πολυσπερχές" καὶ οἶον "πολυσκελές", κατὰ τὸ "新城 καὶ πολύπος καὶ πολύχειρ".810 τῇ δὲ παραγωγῇ του "σκέλλων" "σκέλος" ἀνάλογον καὶ τὸ ἐπὶν ἐποῖον,811 "βλέπων",812 "βλέπων", παρὰ τῇ κωμικῷ,812 "έθων" ἐποἶον,813 "τρέφοντο αἰναλλαγή τοῦ | ἐν "βρέφον".814 (Vs. 69) ὅτι ἐν τῷ ὁφθαλμῷ ἀλάσσετα815 περιττεύει τὸ ὁφθαλμὴν κείμενον ἀπλῶς ὁμως διὰ σαφῆνειν. ἄλλος γὰρ καὶ χωρὶς τοῦ ὁφθαλμοῦ νοεῖται τὸ ἀλάσσει ἐπὶ τυφλότητα, εἰπέρ ἀλάσει ὁ μή λάον ἔνσεγν ὁ μή βλέπετον.816 ὁμως καὶ ἄλλαχον ποτερ πολλαχον, ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ γέκων κατατεθενειότατων".817 καὶ ἐκεί γάρ το

---

39.6 tit. περείναι. add. in marg. P.².
39.9 Κέσκος corr. Makr.: κέσκος edd.
39.15 tit. γ<εκικα> άου add. in marg. P.².
39.16 tit. γεύσιχος add. in marg. P.².
39.20 σκελός P¹: σκέλον edd.
39.21 tit. σκελετός add. in marg. P.².
39.23 tit. παραγωγὴ add. in marg. P.².
39.25 tit. βρέφος add. in marg. P.².
"κατατεθειεῖτον" ἐκ περισσοῦ κείθεται δοκεῖ. Ἡ ἱστοῖο δὲ ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ "ἀλάωσεν ὀφθαλμοῦ" κεῖται ἐν ῥητορικὴι λεξικῷ "ἀλαστός" 481 σύνθετος ὁ ἀφανῆς ἢ ὁ τυφλός, ὡς "νυκτάλωσ" ὁ νύκτωρ ἄλαος τοὺς ὃπας καὶ "νυκταλωπῶν" ὁ νυστάτων. 482 ἐκ δὲ τοῦ "ἀλάωσε" γίνεται ἄλαστός 483 ἢ τυφλός. σημεῖοσαὶ δὲ ὅτι ὁμορίας μὴ ὀφθαλμοῦ Κύκλωπος μνησθεὶς οὐκ ἐπιστημονοῖ ἐκεῖ δυὸν ποτὲ δύντων αὐτῷ καὶ θατέρου ὑπεθέτο ὅτι ὁδόσσεικας καὶ τὸν λοιπὸν ἤφαινειν ἐκεῖ καὶ ἐκ γενετῆς ἐνα ἑίχε. 484 Θεόκριτος ὑπετάσσειν ὄλος φησιν ὁ Ησιοδός 485 περὶ τῶν μυθικῶν Κυκλώπων ὃν ἀκάστω "κυκλοτηρῆς" ὁ ὀφθαλμός ἐς εἰς ἐνεκέειτο μετάφρασις, φησιν ὅτι τῷ Κύκλωπι ἐνα ἐχοντι γλυκὸν ϑραμβοῦν ἵππον ὕδρα, "ὑφροῦς μία ὡς ἑτέρῳ ὅπος εἰς ἑτέρῳ τέτατον." 486 ὅτι δὲ τῷ Κύκλωπ ἀγαθᾷ χάρι νῦκτα καὶ ἡμερῶς ἐπὶ ἄδεως, ἀποκολοθεὶ χείπον κόρην. 487 ὅπως ὅτι ὅπος τὸ "τίπτε" 488 ἀντὶ τοῦ "τί ποτε" τὰ δύο ψιλά κανονικῶς εἰς δύο ἀντίστοιχα ἐν διασέ ἐτερεφεν ἐν τῷ "τίφθ" οὐ τῇ ἑστήκη. 489 ὅμοιο λόγῳ καὶ τῷ μόριων οὐκετὲν τὸν "οπτικῶν ἀλληται" 488 ἀντὶ "ἀπταλμοῦ" ὦ ϑραμβοῦν ἐρρῆπη. 489 ὁμοίατε ἐπὶ πρὸς ταῦτα καὶ ἐν τῷ "τετυπται" ἐν εἰς ἐπείρηται: 490 ἐπιλείπτεται ἐπιληφθῆ 491 καὶ τοῖς ὁμοίοις. τούτοις ἐξηκολοθοῦσος καὶ τὸ πάρα Θεόκρῖτος ἐπιληφθῆ 492 ἀντὶ τοῦ "ἐπιπτοῦν γοητευτικῶς" 493 ἐτι δὲ καὶ τῷ "φθοῦν" "φθοῦσο" 494 ἐκ τοῦ "πετῶν" "πτῶ" "πτάσον" ἐπὶ τῷ πάρον 495 ἢ μὴ ἀρα, ὃς ὅπος τὸ "Ἀγίπτιος" 496 ἐν τοῖς εἰς θύρηται ὁμοία ὑποταφεῖ καὶ τὸ "Κύκλωπ" ἐξ ἐνικοῦ εἰς κόρων μετέπεσεν, ἐξηκολοθημένου τοῦ "Πολυφήμου" τοῦ κοινοῦ, ἐπει καθ "Ομήρον ἱματὸς ἐτίθην" ἀντὶ τοῦ "μέγιστον πάσι Κυκλώπεσσαν" 494 καὶ διατοῦτο ἑτα διάνυμος ὁ ἀνήγ. ὅπον οὐκ ἄν ἀφηκέν ὁ ποιητῆς ἀνερμηνευτον, καὶ εἰς ἐνικοῦ τῶν διανυμίας 491 ἐπιστημανεῖοτον ὅτι ἐν ἡλιότι ἐξερχέθην ἐπὶ τοῖς Αἰγαίους καὶ τοῦ Σκαμάνδρου καὶ ἄλλων. 492 σημεῖοσαὶ δὲ ὅτι εἰς τὸν ἀνήγ. ὁ τοιοῦτος Κύκλωπ ἀλληγορεῖται ὡς ἐν τοῖς μετα ταῦτα ἐκ νῦκτων ρηθήκην 493 διὸ καὶ Ποσειδώνος αὐτῶν τοῦ θαλαττίου τὸ μύθος γενεαλογεῖ, ὃς ὑγρὸν καὶ εὐκυκλητον εἰς τοῦμον. 494 καθα που καὶ τῷ Ἀχιλλεῖ τῆς ὁς ὁργής. 495 40.1ff. tit. διά τοῦ ἀλάωσεν add. in marg. P. 40.3 tit. νυστάτων add. in marg. P. 40.7 tit. Θεόκρῖτος > Ἰσιόδος add. in marg. P. 40.9 ὀφθαλμοῦ add. edd. 40.11 tit. κύκλωπα κόρην add. in marg. P. 40.13 ὅτι τῇ ἑστήκη P.1 edd.: στῆτος ἑστήκη II. 4.243. 40.14 tit. εὑρομένοις ὀφθαλμοῦ add. in marg. P. 40.16 tit. εὐφυόν add. in marg. P. 40.17 tit. φθάνον add. in marg. P. 40.17 τοῦ cor. edd.: τὸ P. 40.24 tit. διάνυμος add. in marg. P.
προσονειδίζει ὅτι "γλαυκῆ δὲ σ’ ἐτικτε ὀλλασσα". 486 ἔτι δὲ Ποσειδῶνος υἱὸν αὐτὸν ἡ ἀλληγορικὴ μετάληψις 487 νοεῖ, ἐπεὶ καὶ ὁ Ποσειδῶν οὐδεὶς τῆς ἐστὶν ὑπά. 488 καὶ ὁ θυμὸς δὲ ἔστις ἐστὶν αἰματηρᾶς ὕψος τητος. 489 (Vs. 71) Θόωσα 490 δὲ μῆτρα αὐτῶν γεννᾷ, διότι "θοῦν" 491 λέγεται τὸ δέξῃ εὐ χρ. 492 καὶ "θοῦρα" τὸ ἀποξύναι, 493 τοιούτων δὲ τι καὶ ὁ "θυμὸς", ἢ ὅλη καὶ οἱ "θυμικοὶ" ὀξύς λέγονται, καὶ τὸ εἰς θυμὸν δὲ κινῆσαι "παροξύναι". ἢ καὶ ἀλλὰς "θοῦν" μὲν τὸ ταχύ. ταχεῖς δὲ δράν καὶ οἱ θυμοῦμενοι καὶ οὐκ εἰδότες ἀναβολή συμβουλής. | (Vs. 72) "Φόρκνυνος" δὲ "θυγάτηρ" 495 ἡ τοιαύτη Θόωσα ἰσος, διὰ τὸ φέρεσαι κυνηγὸν τὸν ἀγαν παραξυνθέντα. 496 διὸ καὶ ἐν Ἰλιάδι "κυνάπα" 497 τινά λέγει θυμοῦμενον ὁ ποιητῆς καὶ "κυνός δηματα ἕχειν" 498 φησί καὶ "κύνεον" 499 ἀποκαλεῖ. (Vs. 73) τὸ δὲ "ἐν σπειλαίον γλαφυροίς τῷ Ποσειδῶνι τῇ Ἰλιάδι μιγνυμένην, γεννάν τόν Κῦκλωπα 500 οὐδὲν άλλ᾽ ἢ τήν τοῦ θυμοῦ γένεσιν δηλοῖ, ἵνα λέγη τήν τῆς καρδίας κολυτότα "σπές" 501 γλαφυρόν 502 ἢ γίνεται ο θυμός, ζέσις ἃν τοῦ περὶ καρδίαν αἰματος. 503 ἐνιού 504 δὲ "Κῦκλωπα" μὲν τῆς τῶν οὐρανίων ὑποθίσαι κατάστασιν διὰ τὸ ἐν κύκλοις ὀπτάνεσθαι, ὅποιος ὁ ζωικάκος, ὁ ἱστιμερινός, οἱ τρωποί καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ. 505 Ἀθόωσαν δὲ τὸ θοῦν καὶ ταχύ τῆς οὐρανίας κινήσεως, διὸ καὶ | Φόρκνυνος ἡ τοιαύτη Θόωσα тούτης "φοράς ὀκείας" καὶ Ποσειδῶνι μίγνυται, τῷ τῶν ἀναθυμιάσεων αἰτία ὑπάρ, ἐπεὶ ὡς πολλοὶ νομίζουσιν εἰς ἀναθυμιάσεων ὁ οὐρανός ἔχει τὸ ἐνδόσιμον 506 τῆς ἀπαύστου κινήσεως. 507 τοιούτων Κῦκλωπα ἐκτυφλοῖ ὁ φιλόσοφος "Οὐδεσσεύς" 508 ήγου τῆς θέας καὶ θεωρίας αὐτοῦ φιλοσόφους καθικνεῖται καὶ παραγίνεται. 509 | δι᾽ ὅτι ἀλλὸς ἀτρυγέτου μέσοντα 510 τὸν Φόρκνυνα εἶπόν ἡ ποιήτης οὐκ ἀποστειρεῖ τὸν Ποσειδῶνα τοῦ "εὐρυμεδόντα" 511 εἶναι, ὡς οὐδὲ τὸν 'Αγαμεμνόνα "εὐρυκείνοντα" 512 εἰπόν ἀφείλετο ὅτι τοὺς λοιποὺς βασιλεῖς τῶν Ἀργείων τὸ λέγεσθαι τοιούτως. καὶ Τηλέμαχος ἐν ὑπ. 513 τοῖς ἐξῆς, αὐτὸς ὡς βασιλεὺς μετὰ τοῦ πατέρα, πολλοὶ δῆμος εἶναι βασιλεῖς ἐν 'Ἰδικῇ φησί. 514 διατι δὲ "ἀτρύγετος" λέγεται ἄλς καὶ διὶ καὶ ἐπὶ ἀέρος καὶ αἰθέρος ἡ λέξις κεῖται, ἐν τοῖς εἰς τὴν Ἰλιάδα γέγραπται. 516 (Vs. 74) ὅτι συμβουλευομένῳ οἰκεῖον τὸ "ἀλλ᾽ ἀγεθ" ἠμεῖς οἴδε περιφραζόμεθα | πάντες 517 ὅπως τόδε τι γένηται. (Vs. 75) τὸ δὲ "οὐ γάρ τι δυνήσεται ἀντὶ πάντων ἐριδώνον ὁδὸς" 518 χρῆσιμον ῥηθήναι πρὸς τὸν μονοτονόντα καὶ πάσιν ἀντικαθίστασθαι θέλοντα. (Vs. 76) ὅτι τῷ "ἀλλ᾽ ἀγεθ" 519 δῆλον ὅτι οὐ τὴν κοινὴν σημασίαν ἡ λέξις δηλοί, ἀλλὰ παρακελευσματικὴν δύναμιν ἔχει. 520 διὸ καὶ εἴπεν "ἀγε περιφραζόμεθα" ὅρθως ἄν ἐφράσεν, ὡς καὶ ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν "φέρετε ποιήσωμεν τόδε" ἢ "φέρε ποιήσωμεν". (Vs. 77) ὅτι ἐρμηνευὸν ἐνταῦθα τί
Εστι νόστος, φησὶν "νόστον, ὅπως ἐλθησίν" ἢ οὐν "ἐπανέλθη". εἰπεῖν γὰρ ἐν ἀνθένος | νόστος. Εστὶν ἐπανέλευσις εἴτεν ἐπάνοδος εἰς τὰ οἰκεῖα δήλα. ἢ ὅτι τὸ "μεθῆσει τὸν χόλον" οἱ μεθάρμησεις πρὸς τινὲς αὐτοὺς, ἢ τὸν κοινώτερον, ἀμελῆς, ὅθεν καὶ οἱ "μεθῆσιν" καὶ "μέθη" ἢ χαυνούσα τὸν νόστον καὶ μέθιν τὸ παύσιν. (V. 83) ὁτι ἐν τῷ "ὅρατε δόμονδε" αὐτό τοῦ εἰς τὸν ἐν τῶν δόμου φαίνεται φαινομένος ὡς οὕτως εἰς ἀνάγκη, τῷ ἢ τῷ ἐν τῇ εἰς προθέσεως λαμβάνει, ἀλλὰ πολλάκις καὶ περιττὸν τῷ ἐμοὶ, ὡς ἐπέκτασις ἢ ὡς παραπλήρωσις. Οὔτεις ὁτι ἐντὸς δόμονδε ἀντὶ τοῦ εἰς τὸν ἐν τῶν δόμον | ἀλλὰ ὁμολογούμενος εἰ μὴ τὰ δύο δὲ, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐν γούν ἐπεκτατικόν ἐστὶ καὶ ὁ λαμβάνεται αὐτοῦ προθέσεως. (V. 84) ὁ τὰ ἢ ἐπεισετὼν, διάκτορον ἀργείοντην, νῦν ἐξ Ἡγανίης ὄντον | καὶ εὐθείας ἢ τὸν "νόστον ὅδοισθος ταλασίφρων ὡς καὶ νέπηται" προεκθέσεις ἐστιν ἀναπφορητική τῶν μετὰ τοῦτο, ἐπὶ τῷ μισείς εὐκρινείᾳ εὐρημικόν καὶ παραμυθία τοῦ ἀρχαίου. "διάκτορος | δὲ ἀργείοντην" ὁ διάγον ἀντὶ ἀγγελίας καὶ ἐναργώς καὶ σαρώς φαίνον τῶν ἐξαγγελλόμενα. ὁ δὲ πεπερασμένος ἀφίθη "φύλαξ, φυλάκος" καὶ ἀφ' αὐτοῦ εὐθείας ὁ "φυλακός" ἀναπροκόμος εἰς εὐθείας τῆς γενεκῆς καὶ τὸ "ὑπὸς" "ὑπὸς" ὁ ἀρχικός ἀρχίν ἀρχικῶς καὶ "διάκτορος διάκτορος" ὁ διάκτορος", ἔτεροι δὲ "διάκτορον" φασί καὶ πλανεσμόν τοῦ ἢ "διάκτορον", ἢ τοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σαρή | ἀναγελον. άντις ἐρωτεῦσαι ἀλλαχούτων. (V. 85) ἢ "ἀγγελία" ἰδεῖ ὡς "ἀγγελίαν" διεκλίσει ἀλλαχούτων. (V. 86) ἐν τοῦτος δὲ καὶ "νύμφης εὐπλοκώμου" ῥηθεὶς τῆς καλλωποῦ, φασιν οἱ παλαιοὶ ὑπὸ τὸν πλοχοὺς μὲν ἐπὶ ἀνδρῶν ὡς ἐν Ἕλληνι, ὁ οὗ πλοχοὶ ὁ χρυσῶς ἢ ἀργύρως ἀργυρίους "πλοκαμοὶ" ἢ ἐπὶ γυναικῶν. καὶ ὅτι ἐμφαίνεται τὸν "πλεῖκε" παραγόμενος δὲ μεν χυκοῦν καὶ τὸν διαφοράν, ὅτως δέ καὶ "ὑποκομοί" μὲν ἐπὶ γυναικῶν, "καρπηκομένους" δὲ ἐπὶ ἀνδρῶν. (V. 87) τὸ "νόστον ὅδοισθος ταλασίφρως ὡς καὶ νέπηται" τρόπος ἐκπόνεσις ἐστίν. ἀπὸ τοῦ νέου νώς τοῦ ἀνέμου ἄνου οὔτω δὲ μὲ τὸ "ἐγχος" ἐκπόνεσις φησὶν "παλάμη δὲ ἐχε ἀνέκου ἐγχος" ἢ τὸν ἐγχος γίνεται. δὲ τὸν ταλασίφρων οικεῖως ἐναύθια προσορθήθη τὰς μύρίας ἰδιὰ ἐπὶ ὅ ἤρως καὶ ὅτι δὲ τοῦ ἢ ἐχαράς ταλασιφρων ὑπὸς "βλάψεως" βλασφερών καὶ ὅσα ἤτοι. τοῦ
δὲ "ταλάσσω" μέλλοντος ἢ χρῆσις εἰς Ἰλιάδι. 294 δέον καὶ οὐ "τάλας" γίνεται καὶ οὐ "ταλασσία" 295 καὶ τὸ "ταλασσίον" 296 καὶ οὐ "ταλασσεργία" 297 περὶ ὅν ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς που ῥηθήσεται. 298 | τὸν δὲ "ταλασσίφρονα" τούτον ἥρωα, πρὸ βραχέων "δαίφρονα" 299 καὶ "πολύφρονα" 300 εἶπεν. (Vs. 89) ὅτι ο προθυμοποιῶν τινα εἶποι ἂν τὸ "ὄφρα μᾶλλον ἐποτρύνω καὶ οὐ | μένος ἐν φρεσὶ θείω". 301 (Vs. 88) ὅτι τὸ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς εἰς Τηλέμαχον κατελθεῖν ἐν Ἰθάκῃ καὶ ὑποβαλεῖν τὰ ποιητέα τῆν τῆς φυσικῆς φρονήσεως ἐπιδημίαν δηλοῖ, ἢτοι, ὡς μετὰ | ταῦτα ἔρει ὁ ποιητής, "μένος" τῷ Τηλεμάχῳ ἔννεκε καὶ θάρσος" 302 καὶ νῦν μᾶλλον ἢ περὶ πρὸν ὡς εἰκός "ὑπέμνησε τοῦ πατρός" 303 καὶ οὐκ οὔτε ἀναφορρησάντα, κατὰ τῶν μνηστήριον ἤρθισαν 304 καὶ οὐς ποτὲ ἀναφορρησάντα, κατὰ τῶν μνηστήριον ἤρθισαν τοῖς ἀποδημίαις δέουσαν ἑστείλεν, 305 ὡσόμονον μὲν ἄει ἐν φρεσὶ τὸν πατέρα ἐπὶ ποθὲν ἐλθὼν σκεδάσαι τοὺς μνηστήρας, 306 ἢρτι δὲ κατὰ τὸν τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς λόγον μᾶλλον ἐποτρύνθηντα καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ βουλεύσθη αἱ εἰς πράξεις παρακινθηθέντα. δὴ ἢς καὶ περὶ τοῦ πατρός ἐνόμισε τι μαθεῖν καὶ "κλέος ἐσθλῆν" 307 σχεῖν ὡς φιλοπάτορ. ἤδη γὰρ ὁ Τηλέμαχος ἤηλίκιας ἐπέβη τελείοτερας καὶ φρονεῖν ἁροῦσθε 308 καὶ οὐ πρὸς τῶν μνηστήριον ἐπέσχεν ἢ δὲ εἰς Ἑπόρη καὶ εἰς Πύλον ἀπέλευσες αὐτοῦ καὶ ἄλλος ἐπιτεθεῖται ἢ τῷ ποιητῇ εἰμεθῶσος, εἰς πλατυμοῖν 309 τῆς τε ποιήσεως καὶ εἰς διασκευήν 310 καὶ διατηρήσεαν 311 λόγου χαρίεσαν καὶ εἰς πορισμὸν συχνῆς ἡσυχίας ὡς μετὰ ταῦτα φανήσεται, 312 ἢ τὶς καὶ εἰς πολλὴν ποιητικὴν πιθανότητα. 313 νησιώτης γὰρ ἄν ὁ παῖς καὶ μηδὲν εἰδὼς ἢ φρονῶν ἄξιον τοῦ πατρός μανθάνει ἐν τῇ τοιαύτῃ ἀποδημίᾳ πρὸς τῶν εἰς εἴδότων πολλά καὶ καλά τῶν τοῦ Ὀδυσσεός, 314 καὶ ὁ λόγον μεγάλου ἄξιος ὁ πατὴρ τά τε εἰς φρόνησιν τά τε εἰς πόλεμον, 315 καὶ οὕτως εἴναι καὶ πατρί πεῖθεται, εἰς τὴν ἐπικίνδυνον μνηστηρικτονίαν παρακαλοῦντος αὐτῶν, 316 ἵστεν γὰρ ὅτι ενετεύθην ὁ ποιητὴς ἄρχεται τά κατὰ τὴν μνηστηριοφονίαν τεκτάνεσθαι, καὶ τῆς ἐπ' αὐτῆς πιθανολογίας 317 θεμελίως εἰς μακρὸ προκαταβάλλεσθαι. αὐτὴ γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ κοσμίωτατον τέλος 318 τῆς ποιήσεως ταύτης. καὶ τὸ τῶν πράξεων τοῦ μακρύ τοῦτον 319 ἀνθρώπου, 320 καὶ ἡροϊκόν, 321 αὐτῷ δὲ τὴν ποιητὴν καὶ τὸν τρόπον τρόπον ταῦτα πεπλήσαται. διὸ καὶ αὐτὴν ἀνύσας ὁ ποιητής συγκατατάσσεται καὶ τὸ βιβλίον. 322 ἤπει δὲ ἀπίθανον ἂν ἴσος τίσι τὸ πράγμα δόξης πάς γὰρ ὁ Ὀδυσσεὺς ὁ ἀσπιλος, ὁ εἰς τῶν τοιούτων καὶ τοιούτων μνηστήρων περιγενήσεται; πολλάκις τὸ πιθανόν ἐγκατατίθεται. καὶ οὕτω προκατασκευάζει τὴν μνηστηρικτονίαν, ὅτι τὸν ἀκροατὴν καὶ πρὸ τῆς πράξεως ὁμολογήσαι ἂν δυνατόν εἶναι καταπαραχθῆναι αὐτὴν ὡς καὶ ὑπὸ μόνον ὁ Ὀδυσσεός ἀναιρέθηναι τοὺς μνηστήρας. 324 ὁλίγον τὸ ὄντα ἐπὶ τοὺς ἑκατόν, 325 εἰ συνε τὸ πρὸς τριακοσίων ἀξίομαχος ἢ ὁ ἐν τοῖς εξῆς ἱστορηθῆσαι. 326 εἰ δὲ καὶ μὴ μόνος αὐτὸς ἀντικαταστάται τοὺς μνηστήρας, καὶ οὗτος ἀσπιλος ἀλλὰ καὶ μεθύσασθαι εἰκεῖνοι
ἐπιτίθεται. εἶναι δὲ καὶ οἱ ὁσίοι ἡφασμάκῳ ἄνδροφόνῳ κεχρισμένοι ὡς ἐν τῇ ῥαγῳδίᾳ ταύτη ἔτει. ἔχοι δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν λίαν πάνω φρονούσαν τὰ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ καὶ συμμαχοῦσαν ὡς καὶ τοῦτο δείκνυται, πολλῷ μάλλον τὸ ἔργον πιθανόν ἀνυσθήσεται. οὕτως εἰς αὐτὴς ἀρχῆς τοῦ βιβλίου τὴν μνησιπροκοτονίαν ὡς ἔραμεν προασφαλίζομενος οἱ ποιητὴς, ὅρθοις ὑπὸ τὰ εἰς αὐτὴν συντείνοντα. ἂν δὲ καὶ άλλοις ὧν εἰς τὸν ὅλους ἀλλοπαθήν ἄρτι τῆς καὶ ἀβασιλεύνοντος ἀλλὰ ἂν διὰ τοῦτο κρατήσῃ φάρμακον ἐμβαλεῖν καὶ οὕτως αὐτοῦ πάντας ὀλέσαι ἀπερ ἡ μνηστήρες ἐπὶ Τηλέμαχο ἦποπτεύουσιν. δὲ καὶ άλλως τῇ ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰθακείων ἐξέλασιν πιστοῦσαν διὰ τὴν οἰκίαν ἄδικιάν. ἂν δὲ καὶ τοῦτο τὸ τερατωδέστερον ἐπελέξατο καὶ ἄλλος διακήρυξεν ἐξεργαστέον καὶ ὥσπερ εὑμεθόδως μελετήθη καὶ ἁσφαλῶς πιθανολογηθέν, ἔχειν ἀν ἐξελέγχειν τὴν ἐν λόγοις αὐτοῦ ἀρετήν. ἦτοι ἱστόν καὶ ὅτι Ἄθηνα ἐνταῦθα καὶ ἡ κατὰ τὴν Ὀμηρικήν ἡ δεινότητα μεθοδος ἐστι καθ' ἡν ὁ ποιητής ἐπινοεῖται τὴν τε τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς εἰς Ἰθάκην καθόδουν καὶ τὰ ἐπ' αὐτή καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ἰππιν ἐπὶ τῇ Καλλισκοί. ἦτοιν δὲ καὶ ὅτι οὐκετισθεῖν ἡ ἡγήσθη οἷς ἐξάλησαν η μυθική Ἴθηνα καὶ ἀκούσασα ὅτι οὐκ ἀγάθον ἐπος διέδρα τὰ χείλη αὐτῆς, ἔταναθα συστρέφει εἰς νὸι καὶ ἐντελῶς καὶ τῆς ποιήσαι τὸν Τηλέμαχον καὶ μηδενὸς ἀντεισόντος, εἰδος κατάρχει ἔργον. συμπεσαν δὲ καὶ ὅτι σχῆμα καὶ ἐνταῦθα προεκθέσεις ἐνοραφοφυνόμενοι εἰς οἷς ἴ Ἐθηνά λέγει ὅτι ἀπελεύσομαι εἰς Ἰθάκην καὶ ποιήσω τὰ καὶ τὰ. ἐπει γὰρ μέγα ἐπεισόδιον μέλλει ποιήσειν ὅ τοις ἐκδημίας τοῦ Τηλέμαχου καὶ παρεκβήναι εἰς λόγους πολλοὺς, φάναι προσανάρκων καὶ τοῦτο, ἵνα καὶ ἢ ἀκραίτης ἐλπίς, καὶ αὐτούς μὴ δοξῆ ἀκαίρως καὶ ἄτεχνος ἀλλ' ἀναγκαίως ποιήσασθαι τὴν παρέκβασιν. ἔτι δὲ προεκτίθεται τεχνικὸς καὶ τὴν μετ' ὅλη τοῦ Τηλέμαχον δημηγοριάν καὶ ὡς ἀπείπῃ τοὺς μνηστήρας. καὶ ὤντως εἰςυνόπτως διὰ σαφήνειαν κεφαλαίοιται τὰ ἔφεξης. (Vs. 93) σημειώσαι δὲ καὶ ὅτι νῦν μὲν ἀπλῶς εἰκομένος ἀπηριθημένατα. εἰπών "πέμψω ἐς Σπάρτην καὶ εἰς Πύλων", προϊόν δὲ καὶ τὴν τάξιν τῶν πραγμάτων ἐκτίθεται λέγων "πρώτα μὲν καὶ εἰς Πύλων ἔλθε", ἢ καὶ τὸ "πέμψω ἐς Σπάρτην καὶ εἰς Πύλων" σχῆμα ὑστερολογίας ἐστιν ἦπος προθυστερον. πρώτων γὰρ εἰς Πύλων ἦλθε Τηλέμαχος, ἔται εἰς Σπάρτην. ὁμοίως προθυστερον ἦν καὶ τὸ Ἐρμείαν
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δρόμονειν". 969 | "αὐτὰρ ἔγιν Ἰθάκην δ᾿ ἐλέεσσομαι". 970 πρῶτον γὰρ Ἀθηνᾶ εἰς Ἰθάκην κάτειςιν, εἶτα Ἐρμῆς εἰς τὴν Καλυψόν. ιστέν ὡς ὅτι Ὁδοςσείς Τηλέμαχον ὡς εἰκός τὸν παῖδα ἄνωμασεν, ἐκθυμόμενος οἶον τὸ | δυστυχές. ἦν δηλαδή ἐπειδὴ πόλεμος ἤδη μέγας ὁ κατὰ Τροίαν ἥπιζετο εἰς ὄν ἔχρην ἀπελθεῖν καὶ τὸν Ὕδοσσεά, μὴ διαβαίη χρόνῳ ποτὲ τὰ τῆς τύχης ταύτης καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν ἀλλ᾿ εἶη "τῆλε | μάχης", καθ᾿ ἠσχίαν ἥζων. τάχα δὲ καὶ ἐκ μαντίας γνοὺς ὡς τῆλε χρόνου παραταθήσεται ὁ Ἰλιακός πόλεμος. Τηλέμαχον ἄνωμασε τὸν υἱόν. σημείωσας δὲ καὶ ὅτι παροιμία ἡ λέγουσα "Τηλέμαχου χύτρα" ἐπὶ τῶν διὰ πενίαν ἐν ὀσπρίας ὡς ὅλως εὐτελοῦσι εὐδεστοὶ πολυφαγοῦστον ὁυκ ἐκ τοῦ Ὀμηρικοῦ εἴληται ἠρώος, ἀλλὰ τίνος Ἀττικοῦ Τηλέμαχον. Ἀχαρνέως τὸν δήμον, δς φαί κυκών | χύτραν ἀεὶ σιτούμενος ἴν. 971 (Vs. 91) ὅτι τὸ καλὺσαι καὶ λόγοις ἀποτρέψασα οἱ ἀπειπέν”. 972 λέγεται πάρα τῷ ποιητῇ, οἰον “παῖς μνηστήριον ἀπειπέμεν”. 973 λέγεται δὲ ποτε ἀπειπέν” | καὶ τὸ εν ἄγων ἡ μάχη ἀπαγορεύει καὶ ἀποκαμεῖν, ὅπερ ἐστὶν Ἰον τῷ ἀπαυδήσαι” καὶ ἀπειρηκέναι καὶ ἀπαγορεύεσαι”. ἐν δὲ τῇ Ἰλιάδι τὸ ἀπειπέν” ἀπομιθείσαι” | ὁ Νέατωρ φησιν. 974 (Vs. 92) ὅτι εν τῷ “μῆλα” ἀδίνα σφαξουσιν. 975 εκ μέρους καὶ ἄλλα νοστέον ζόρα, αἰγὰς τε, ὡς δηλώσει ποι ὁ Μελάνθιος. 976 καὶ σος ὡς εκ τοῦ Εύμαιοι φανίσατται 977 ἔνα λέγη καὶ ἴν “μήλα” τὰ βρέματα ἐξ ὁν καὶ τὸ “μπαρθήσι” περι ὃς φασὶν ὁι παλαιοὶ ὅτι “μπαρθήσατο” τὸ ψηλαφησι. 978 μὴ ποτε δὲ ἐπὶ βοσκίματιον, οἰον μῆλα ἄφασαι 979 | ἡ ἄπο τοῦ “μῆλωσι” ἦγουν βάισαι δὲν φασι καὶ “μῆλωθρα, τὰ βεβαμένα ἔρια” 980 ἀδίνα 981 δὲ τὰ πυκνὰ καὶ δαψιλή καὶ εἰς κόρον ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄδην ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄβος ἤτοι κόρος. 982 ὡς τὸ “ἀδος τε μίν ἴκετο θυμόν”. 983 διὸ δὲ οἱ μὲν διπλοῦσι τὸ δ τοῦ ἄδην, οἱ δὲ δὲν ἐνὸς αὐτὸ γράφουσι καὶ οἱ μὲν ψιλοῦσιν, οἱ δὲ δασύστουν, ἡ Ἰλιάς | δηλοὶ 984 καὶ δὲν τὸ ἄδην ἤγεται. ἐν δὲ ῶπτορικοῖς λείκοι 985 φέρεται καὶ ταῦτα. “ἄδην” Ἀττικὸ τὸ “βασιλῶς” 986 δὲν καὶ τὰ τελείου | ἀδημάγοι ἔποιη 987 οὶ τελείου καὶ “ἀδημάγον ἁρμα” 988 | διὰ τοὺς κατ᾿ αὐτὸ τελείους ἔποιη καὶ “ἀδος” κόρος, πλημμονή, κάματος, ἀφ’ οὐ “ἀδολέσχος” δι’ ἐνὸς δ ὁ καὶ “ἀδολέσχης” καὶ ἀδαίνων παρὰ Σῶφρονι “τὸ εἰς κόρον ἔγραψεν”. 989 | ἐτὶ δὲ καὶ ὅτι “ἀδημάγοι ἔπισεν” 990 οὶ τελείοι. “τοῖς γὰρ πόλιοις, φησὶν, “οὐκ ἐδίδοσαν τροφῆς πλῆθος”. 991 Λυσίας δὲ καὶ “νωᾶν ἀδημάγους” 992 φησι, τὴν τὸν μισθὸν | λαμβάνουσαν ἐντελὴ καὶ “λύχνους ἀδημάγους” 993 τοὺς πότας, ὅποιος ὁ ἐν Νεφέλαιας παρὰ τῷ Ἀριστοφάνε. 994 διὰ ὅσπερ “ἐλείζοκερας βούς” 995 ὁ στρεβλοκέρας παρὰ τοὺς παλαιοῖς. | οὔτω καὶ βόες εἰλιπόδες” 996 οἱ τοὺς πόδας κατὰ τὴν πορείαν ἐλίσσοντες. 997 Παυσανίας δὲ λέγει καὶ “γυναῖκας ἐλιπόδας” 998 διὰ τὴν ἐλήρην τῶν μηρῶν. “ἐλίκες” δὲ, ὅτι οὐ μόνον | βοῦν ἐπιθετον δηλοῦν τοὺς μέλανας ἄλλα καὶ ψέλλα σημαινει
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ἐστὶν δὲ καὶ ἐνώτια, δηλοῦται ἄλλοις.⁵⁹⁹ (Vs. 93) ὅτι ἐν τῷ "πέμψω δ’ ἐς Σπάρτην τῇ καὶ ἐς Πύλον ἡμαθόντα"¹⁰⁰⁰ τινὲς γράφουσιν "πέμψω δ’ ἐς Κρήτην τῇ καὶ ἐς Πύλον".¹⁰⁰¹ οὐκ ἀγαθὴ δὲ ἡ τοιαύτη γραφὴ διὸ καὶ διδόσκε δίκαια τοῖς παλαιοῖς. Πύλος δὲ, πόλις | περὶ τὸ ἐπισέρον τῆς Πελοποννήσου πλευρῶν. ὅτι δὲ τρεῖς ἦσαν Πύλοι¹⁰⁰² καὶ διʼ ὅ gauge μονὸν θηλυκὸς ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀρσενικὸς λέγεται ὁ Πύλος, ἐν ἀλλαὶς πλατύτερον | γέγραπται.¹⁰⁰³ ἐνταῦθα μέντοι επιτροχαῖς ἐκεῖνο ἰστέον ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσιν ἐν Πελοποννήσῳ Πύλοι δειν καὶ τὸ "ἐστι Πύλος πρὸ Πύλοιο Πύλος γε μέν | ἐστι <καὶ ἄλλη".¹⁰⁰⁴ εἰσὶ δὲ ὁ Τριφυλιακὸς, ὁ Ἀπερατικὸς καὶ ὁ Μεσσηνιακὸς καὶ ἄδηλον ἐκ ποιοῦ ὁ Νέστωρ. σπειδοῦσι δὲ ὅμως ἕκαστος εἰς πατρίδα ἐγγράφεσα τῷ | Νέστωρι.¹⁰⁰⁵ δεὶ δὲ εἰδέναι καὶ διʼ ἐν εἰς καὶ ἄλλοι¹⁰⁰⁶ κατὰ γένος ἀρσενικὸν χρῶνται τῷ Πύλῳ, ἀλλ’ ὁ Ὀμήρος ὁ δοκεῖ οὕτω φράζειν.¹⁰⁰⁷ εἰ γὰρ "Πύλον ἡμαθόντα"¹⁰⁰⁸ φησίν, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἡμαθεῖς θηλυκοῦ γένους δοκεῖ. ὅμως τῷ "ὑλήντει Ζακύνθων".¹⁰⁰⁹ τί δὲ ἐστὶν "ἡμαθεῖς" καὶ ὡς ποταμοῦ ἐστὶν ὅνομα, ἐν τοῖς εἰς τὴν Ἰλιάδα καὶ αὐτὸ γέγραπται.¹⁰¹⁰ "Σπάρτῃ" δὲ, | πόλις ἡ χαριν Ῥακονικόν. ἐκλήθη δὲ οὕτω ἀπὸ τῶν μυθευμένων μετὰ τοῦ Κάδμου σπαρτῶν ἀνδρῶν, οἱ κατὰ τὴν παλαιὰν ἱστορίαν ἔκει ἐπεξεύρητες, Σπάρτην | ἀφ’ ἑαυτῶν τὴν πόλιν ἄνωθεν. ἰκανὸς δὲ περὶ αὐτὴς ἐν τοῖς εἰς τὴν Ἰλιάδα γέγραπται.¹⁰¹¹ ἵστεν δὲ ὅτι καὶ εἰδός τι σχοινίου ὄνομαζεται "σπάρτη", ὡς ὁ κακικὸς ἔμφασιν ἐν τοῖς ὁ Ὀρνησι.¹⁰¹² τοῦτο δὲ ὁ ποιητὴς οὐδετέρως λέγει "καὶ δὴ σπάρτα λελυνται".¹⁰¹³ (Vs. 95) ὃ δὲ σχήμα ἀμφιβολίας¹⁰¹⁴ τὸ "ἥ’ ἵνα μὲν κλέος ἐσθλὸν ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν ἔχρισι".¹⁰¹⁵ δηλοῖ γὰρ ὅπου φήμη ἔχει εἶναι τὸν Ὅδοςα ή διακέκυλε έχει τὸν Τηλέμαχον ώς κοπιάσσαντα ὑπὲρ τοῦ πατρός καὶ ἢστι κρείττων αὐτή ἡ ἐννοια. κλέος δὲ ἐσθλὸν ή εὐκλεία, | ὡς εἰ τις εἶπτο "φήμη ἐσθλῆ".¹⁰¹⁶ τὸ μέντοι μὴ ἐσθλὸν δυσκλεία¹⁰¹⁷ ἐστὶν. οὕτω καὶ "αὐτοῖς"¹⁰¹⁸ μέσος ἔχει καθα καὶ τὸ κλέος, ζρῆς ἔχει τις αὐτοῖς τινα ἐπὶ καλοῖς ἢ αὐτοῖς ἐπὶ κακοῖς. ἐνταῦθα δὲ ἐμφαίνει καὶ τοῖς πρακτέοις ἀμφιρρεπές¹⁰¹⁹ τὸ ποιητής ἐν τῷ "ὅτι που ἄκουσε νόστον πατρός"¹⁰²⁰ τὸ Τηλέμαχος. οὐ γάρ οἴδεν ἡ τῆς ἀλληγορίας Ἀθηνά¹⁰²¹ | ἡ παρὰ τῷ Τηλεμάχῳ, εἰ ἀποδημήσας, ὑπράπτεται περὶ τοῦ πατρός τι σαφὲς. (Vs. 96) ὃ δὲ διασκεδάζας ὅς που ἐν Ἡλιάδι¹⁰²² οὕτω καὶ ἐνταῦθα ὁ ποιητής τὴν σκευὴν τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς, φησίν "ὡς εἰπούσα, ὑπὸ ποισιν ἐδήσατο"¹⁰²³ καὶ τὰ ἔξης ὡς εἰπόδος φανησέται. ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι ἐν τῷ "ὑπὸ ποισιν
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εδήσατο πέδιλον.1024 τὸ ῥῆμα κείται, ἀφ’ οὗ τὸ ὑπόδημα γίνεται. Εκ ἦν γὰρ τοῦ "ὑποδείσαθαι" τὸ "ὑπόδημα", ὅσπερ εκ τοῦ ἀναδείσαθαι καὶ "διαδείσαθαι", τὸ "ἀνάδημα" καὶ τὸ "διάδημα". δήλων δὲ ὡς ἐπὶ ποδῶν μὲν τὸ "ὑποδείσαθαι", ἀναδείσαθαι | δὲ καὶ "ἀναδείσαθαι" ἐκ τοῦ διαμεταδόθηκε. τὸ μέντοι διὰ τοῦ σώματος "διάδημα".1025 τὰ δὲ ρηθέντα πέδιλα "καλά",1026 φησιν, "ἀμβρόσια", "χρύσεια",1027 λέγων καὶ ὅτι "αὐτὰ ἐφερον αὐτὴν ἐπὶ τε | ὑγρὴν ἐπὶ τε ἀπειρονα γαϊν ἀμα πνοιας ἀνέμου". (Vs. 98) ἦτοι ὅμοιος ἀνέμους, δηλοὶ δὲ διὰ τοῦτων οἱ ποιητὴς τὸ θείον καὶ λαμπρόν καὶ ὄξυκίνιστον τὴς φρονήσεως.1029 τὸ θείον μὲν | διὰ τοῦ "ἀμβρόσια".1030 θείον γὰρ τι ἀμβροσία ὡς πολλαχοῦ εφάνη.1031 διὰ δὲ τοῦ "χρύσεια" τὸ λαμπρόν.1032 τὸ δὲ ὄξυκίνιστον1033 διὰ τῆς κατ’ ἀνέμου φοράς.1034 προϊόν δὲ καὶ ὡς ὄρνιν | αὐτὴν ἔρει διὴπτασθαι. τὸ δὲ γε "ὑποδείσαθαι"1035 τὴν Ἁθηνᾶν τὸ τῆς φρονήσεως εὐδοκούσ1036 καὶ ἀπρόσκοπον1038 εἰς τοὺς πρακτείος ὑποθλοῖο. ὁ ὅτι οὐ φερεθάται τὰ πέδιλα λέγει ἀλλ’ αὐτά φέρειν καὶ κουφίζειν τὴν Ἁθηνᾶν ὧς οἶον πεποίηται. καὶ ἐστὶ τοῦτο τερατολογία1039 τις ποιητική. ποδήνεμον οἶον ποιοῦσα καὶ τὴν Ἁθηνᾶν. οὕτω δὲ καὶ τὸν Ἰ. Ἀχιλλέα ἐν Ἰλιάδι1040 τεραστείως ἐκούφιζον τὰ ὅπλα φορούμενα. (Vs. 97) ὅρα δὲ καὶ ὅτι τὸ "ἐφ’ ὑγρῆν"1041 ὃ ἔστιν ἐπὶ θάλασσαν, ἔπεισε τοὺς μεθ’. ὁμηροῦν1042 "ἐξηράν" ὄνομάσαι τὴν γῆν. καὶ τοῦτο μὲν τοιοῦτον. | (Vs. 97) τὸ δὲ τῆς Ἁθηνᾶς ἐγχώς ἐγκομιάζουν "ἀλκίμον" λέγει "ἀκακυμένον δέξει χαλκῷ, βριθοθετήθηκεν, φιδάμην1043 σίκας ἄνδρῶν ἡρώων, τοῖς1044 τε κοτέοσεται | ὃρμωμετρητῇ".1045 δηλοὶ δὲ ταῦτα, τὸ ἐνεργὸν1046 καὶ ἄνδρωδες1047 τῆς Ἁθηνᾶς καὶ δραστήριον.1048 ἔστι δὲ τὸ μὲν ἁλκίμον, μετημένον ἀπὸ τοῦ χρωμένου ἁλκίμου προσώπου, εἰς τὸ σκεῦος | ἢ τὸ ἁλκίμωμον.1049 ὡς καὶ "νωθρὸς νότος" ὁ νωθροποῖος καὶ καρπακρικὸς1050 καὶ "δέος χλωρόν" τὸ χλωροποίον.1051 τὸ δὲ "ἀκακυμένον δέξει χαλκῷ",1052 τὸ λυποῦ τῇ ὃτι ὃτι τοῦ σιδηροῦ, "ἀκακεῖν" γὰρ τὸ λυπεῖν ἢ τὸ ἑχον ἢ ἄκην ἢ ἄκωκην δι’ ὃτι ὃτι σιδηρόν, ἐνετθὲν δὲ τὸ ἐστομωμένον νοεῖται.1053 (Vs. 100) τὸ δὲ "βριθοθ" καὶ τὸ "μέγα" καὶ τὸ "στιβαρόν"1054 συγκροτοῦσιν ἄλληλα | εἰς θείον ἐγχώς σεμνότητα.1055 τοῦτων δὲ "στιβαρόν"1056 μὲν τὸ πυκνὸν καὶ στερεόν, μετενεχθὲν ἀπὸ τῆς καταπεπατημένης γῆς καὶ διατοῦτο πεπυκνομένης. "στείβων"1057 γὰρ κύριος | τὸ περιπατῶ καὶ τὸ καταπατῶ. ὡς τὸ στείβον δ’ ἐν βάθροισι.1058 καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν γίνεται καὶ "ἡ στιβάς"1059 ἢτις ἐστὶ κυρίως εὔπτηλης καὶ καταπεπατημένη στρομηνή. (Vs. 101) τὸ δὲ "στίχας"1060 τὸ πολύ δηλοὶ τῆς ρομαλεότητος. οὐ γὰρ στίχα τινὰ μίαν, ἀλλὰ "στίχας ἄνδρῶν δάμνηται". τὶ δὲ ἢ στίχες δηλοὶ, ἢ Ἰλιάδι κείται.1061 τὸ δὲ "ἱρώων"1062 οὐδ’ αὐτὸ μάτην πρόσκειται ἀλλ’ ἐνα δείξη | καὶ δ’ αὐτὸ τὸ ἁλκίμη1063 τῆς Ἁθηνᾶς, οὐ γὰρ τοὺς τυχόντας δαμαζεῖ ἄλλα ήρωας οἷα τοὺς μὴ τοιούτους.
περιφρονοῦσα.1064 καθα καὶ “κόων”, φασίν, “‟Ινδός λέοντι ἐπεξιῶν καὶ παριβάλει, λύκος ἤπεροργα καὶ ἀλώπεκας.”1065 τὸ δὲ “οἶς κοτέσσεται”,1066 τὸ κριτικὸν1067 ἐμφαίνει τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς. οὐ γὰρ εἰκῇ καὶ ἀπλῶς μαίνεται κατὰ ἥρων, ἀλλὰ οἷς ἄν διακρινεῖ δέον εἶναι ἕτοι κοτέσσεται.1068 δήλων δὲ ὁτι τὸ “κοτά” “κοτέσσα”, τὸν „εγκοτέσσεται‟ ἐπίπλον.1069 τὸ δὲ “ὁβριμὸποτατὴ”1070 μυθικῶς μέν, τὸ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἐμφαίνεται ἔξαιρετον.1071 ὁτι δηλαδὴ πατέρα μόνον ἔχει ὁ ὁβριμόν οὐ μὴν καὶ τίνα μητέρα. διὸ οὐκ ἃν καὶ ἡ Ἀφροδίτη ὁβριμὸποτατὴ οὕτω λεχθεῖν.1072 ἄλλην, ἀλληγορικῶς μέντοι1073 ὁβριμὸποτατὴ Ἀθηνᾶ1074 ἡ πατέρα ὁβριμόν ἐχουσα τὸν νοῦν, ὁ σφάντης.1075 ὁβριμός” δὲ πόθεν γίνεται, τά εἰς τήν Ἰλιάδα δηλοῦσι.1076 καὶ νῦν δὲ Ῥητονὶ δὴ παρὰ τῷ βρι στικὸν, ἐξ οὐ καὶ ὁ βρι στικός τὸ ἰσχυρόν, γίνεται κατὰ πλεονασμὸν καὶ παραγωγῆς ὁβριμός.1077 οθὲν καὶ ὁ ὁβριμοποτής.1078 ἐκεῖθεν καὶ ὁ βρισκόντης1079 παρὰ Ἀισχύλῳ1080 “λεόντων σκυμνία”,1080 τὰ δηλαδὴ καὶ ὁβρισμα καὶ καλα. ἔτεροι δὲ φασίν ὁτι τέ “ὁβρι σα καὶ ὁβρίκαλα λεόντων καὶ λύκων σκυμνία”1081 καὶ οτι ὁ βρίκελοι διὰ ἰχθύναν, τὰ μορφολόκεια.1082 Πανονιάς μὲν τοι φασίν ὁτι βρίκελα κροσσωπεῖα βροτῷ ἵκελαι ἢ βριζεῖν ἵκελα. οὐτὸ δὲ”, φασιν, “‟ἔλεγον τοὺς βαρβάρους”.1083 ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς καὶ “βριμοῦσθαι” λέγει τὸ “μετὰ τοῦ νῦν ἀπειλῆς ἔκφροτεβίν.”1084 καὶ Αίλιος δὲ Διονύσιος “βριμοῦσθι” φασιν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀπειλῆ.1085 ἄλλοι δὲ “βριμαίσθαι” φασίν ἐν ἦ δεύτερη συγγία τῶν περισσομένων.1086 ταῦτα δὲ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ βρί ἐπιτατικοῦ παράγονται,1087 οθὲν καὶ ἢ Ἅρμον πελασμένον τι δαμόνιον φοβερόν.1088 ὁτι δὲ Βρίγασ καὶ οἱ γυγοὺς ἔλεγοντο, δῆλον ν γεωγράφος,1089 ὡς ἐν τοῖς τοῦ περιηγητῶν γέγραπται,1090 γεγονότες Ἰσος καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκ τοῦ βρι.1091 οθὲν καὶ “Βριάρεως” κύριον τετρασυλλάβος.1092 ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς καὶ πεντασυλλάβος ὁ ὁβριάρεως.1093 προσελέει τοῦ ὃ.1094 καὶ τῷ βριθῳ δὲ ἀπ᾿ αὐτοῦ παρῆκατα ἄρ’ οδ καὶ τῷ βριθῷ1095 καὶ ὃ βριθὸς,1096 ὃς συντεθεῖς, ἔτεροίς γίνεται καταλήξεως, οὐ γὰρ ὁ ὅστερ τραχῦς1097 „ἀτραχῦς“.1097 „διάζης” „κάτοξος”,1098 οὐτῶ καὶ “βριθὸς” “ἐμβριθὸς”, ἀλλὰ “ἐμβριθὸς”.1099 ὃς ἀπὸ τοῦ βριθοῦς, πρὸς ὁμοίωτα τοῦ Ἰδᾶς “ἀπῆδης”1100 διὰ τὸ Ἰδᾶς καὶ „γλυκύς” „ἀγλευκής1101 διὰ τὸ γλευκοῦς1102 καὶ „βαρὺς” „ἀβαρῆς1103 διὰ τὸ βάρος, ἐνθυμητέον δὲ καὶ ὁτι τῷ „δόρῳ βριθῷ”1104 ἐφερμηνευτικά εἰνα τὸ “μέγα” καὶ τῷ “στιβαράν”, δήλων δὲ ὁτι τα καὶ μεγάλα καὶ στιβαρά σώματα βριθίδα εἰσίν.1105 (Vs. 103) ὁτι „δήμος“ τριχῶς παρὰ τοὺς παλαιοὺς, πλῆθος τὸ γὰρ ἀπλῶς καὶ πολιτικὸν σύστημα ἐξ οὗ τὸ δημοκρατεῖσθαι εἰρήται καὶ τόπος τις ἐν Ἂθική ὦτῳ καλούμενος ἐνθα τα τοῦ

47.19 τοῖσι P1 edd.: τοῖσιν Od. 1.101.
48.2 οἶς κοτέσσεται P1 M edd.: τοῖσιν τε κοτέσσεται Od. 1.101.
48.5 μυθικὸς Ρ1 Μ Rom. Stahl.: μυθικὸς Bas.
48.12 tit. ὁβρίκαλα add. in marg. Ρ1.
48.14 tit. βρίκελοι add. in marg. Ρ1.
48.15 Brizēn corr. Makr.: Brizēn P1 edd.
48.24 tit. κατάληξεις<с> add. in marg. Ρ1.
48.31 καλούμενος hinc incipit cod. M.
'Οδυσσέας βασίλεια.100 φησὶ γοῦν ὡς τὸν μῦθον Ἡθηνά "ἐστὶ"107 Ἡθήκης ἐν δήμῳ ἐπὶ προθύροις "Οδυσσέας".106 δύναται δὲ καὶ ἄλλως τὸ "Ἡθήκης ἐν δήμῳ"109 νοηθῆναι, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐν τοῖς Ἡθακτισίοις110 ὡς καὶ μετʼ ὁλίγα έπει "Тρώων ἐνι δήμῳ"111 ἤγουν τὸν τῶν Τρώων.112 τὰ δὲ πρόθυρα προϊόν ἐνικῶς λέγει "βῆ δ᾿ θεὸς προθύριον".113 τοῦτο δὲ καὶ "οὐδόν ἀδελείων" φησίν, εἰπὼν "ἐνι προθύροις ὁδουδίω ἐπι αὐδείων".114 τὸ δὲ "στήνῃ ἐπὶ προθύροις" καὶ θύραις εφεστάναι λέγει; φησὶ δὲ ποὺ καὶ "θύραις πρῶτας" τὸ "πρόθυρον".115 (Vs. 105) διὸ "Τάφος" νήσος μια *τῶν Ἐξινάδων νήσων τῶν πρὸς τῷ "Ἀχελώφῳ"116 περί ὀν εἰρήται καὶ ἐν τῇ Βουστίᾳ117 καὶ ἐν τοῖς εἰς τὸν περιηγητήν.118 λησταὶ δὲ οἱ Τάφοι κατὰ τοὺς παλαιοὺς.119

εἴλεγοντο δὲ οἱ αὐτοὶ καὶ Τηλεβοῖ120 ἢ διότι ληψόμενοι, τήλε τοὺς βόσας ἀπήγων121 ἢ διὸ οὐ τοὺς πλησιοχώρους μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς τῆλε καὶ μακράν, βοῦν ἢ ἦτοι μάχης συνίστων, ἢ καὶ ὡς εὑρίσκοντα καὶ τήλε τοῦτο ἐπιστάντας μακρὰν, βοῶν εξετάγοντες.122 εἰς τούτοις Ἄμφιττρώων ὁ τοῦ Ἡρακλέους πατήρ ἱστρατεύσατο, λησθαμένους βόσας τῆς γυναικὸς Ἀλκμήνης, ἔχων συστρατευόμενον καὶ τινα

Κέφαλον ἄνδρα φυγάδα ἢ Ἠθηνά, ἢ ἶνα τότε ἤθελος, ἢ συντομίσας τοὺς Τηλεβοῖς117 καὶ τοὺς ὑπὸ τῶν ποιητῶν λέγεται.117 καὶ ὕστα ἐν ταῦτα, ἢ ἔνθα ναυτικοὶ οὐδὲ τοὺς Ταφίους τούτους, διὸ τούτων τοὺς μὲν ἐπὶ τοὺς βόσας ἀπήγων.128 Ἰσθεῖν δὲ καὶ ὅτι ὁ γεωγράφος τεῦχες τοὺς Ταφίους καὶ τοὺς Τηλεβοῖς ἐν τῷ "Τάφοι οἱ καὶ τῇ Τηλεβοῖν, εἰπὼν δὲ καὶ ὅτι λήσται οἱ Τάφοι καθαὶ καὶ οἱ Τηλεβοῖαι, ὅπερ αὐτῶς διαφοράν τινα ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐπηηλικοὶ.129 φησὶ καὶ οὕτως τοὺς Κεφαληνίας μᾶλλον

Κεφαλήνας, ἢ ἀπὸ Κέφαλον τοῦ Δησίνεως κληθῆναι. ἦν δὲ Ἡθηνάν φυγάδα παραλαβὼν Ἄμφιττρώων, κατέσχε φησὶ νήσον καὶ παρέδοξαν αὐτῷ, ἢτοι ἐπικώνυμος ἐκεῖνῳ γέγονεν.130 ἢ ὅτι ὁ τῆς ἱστορίας "Μέντης Ἀχιλλείου παῖς,"131 ἔταλατο ἢν τῷ ποιητῇ, ὅτι καὶ ἄμειβόμενος τῆς φιλίας ὁ ποιητὴς ἢς καὶ Ἡρώδοτος ἱστορεῖ ἐν τοῖς περὶ Ὀμήρου γενέσεως, τῇ ποιηῆς ὁ ὅνων ἐνεβήτα112 καὶ τὴν

'Ἁθηνάν αὐτῷ εἴκασεν, ἀπὸσειμνώνων113 σῶτος τὸν ἐταίρον ἢς ἱδύνατο.134 καὶ ἄλλως.
μέντοι οὐκ ἀπιθάνονς 5 | ὁ ποιητὴς ἐπλάσατο Τάφιον τινα Μέντην | ἔλθοντα ἐν τῷ Τηλεμάχῳ καὶ εἰσεῖν ἄγαθα. ὃν δὲ Μέντην καὶ εἰς προσωπεῖον ποιεῖ τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ διὰ τὸ | φρονίμως συμβουλεύσασθαι οία θεόθεν κατασειμφέντα. καλλεῖ γὰρ ὁδόν σαμύ κρόνον, εἰρεθήναι τίνα ἐπαίρον ἄρχαίον ὅπτα τῷ Ὀδυσσεί καὶ τοῖσι υπὲρ έκείνου ποιήσαι. 10 ὁ δὲ τοῦ τοιοῦτο | Μέντου πατὴρ " Ἀγχιάλος" ψιλιώ, γιασί, τὴν παραλήγουσαν ὡς κύριον καθὰ καὶ ὁ παρὰ τὸς Φαιαξίν 11 "Εἰρώλαας". ὁ δὲ "Ἀγχιάλος τόπος" καὶ "Ἀμφιάλος" διασύνουσι τὸ μέσον ἅλφα κατὰ τοὺς παλαιοὺς. 15 ὁ ὅποιος καὶ ὁ "Ἀμφιάλος", οὐ χρήσις κατὰ τὸν Ἀθηναίων παρὰ Ποσειδώνιφ ἐν τῷ ὁδὸν κατὰ τὸ πλησιάλον, ταῦτα δὲ εἰπεῖν "Ἀγχιάλον", νικήμασσας τὴν μάχην. 20 περὶ δὲ | τοῖσιν ἀρχαϊκῶν πνευματισμῶν ἐν τοῖσι εἰς τὴν Ἰλίαδα σαφὼς γέγραπται. δῆλον δὲ ὡς τὸ μὲν κύριον ὁ "Ἀγχιάλος" καὶ τὸ ἐπιθέτον ὁ "Ἀγχιάλος τόπος" καὶ πόλις δὲ Θρήκες "Ἀγχιάλος" ἢ καὶ Ἀγχιάλη. ἐπαραποζύνονται. Ἀγχιάλος ὁ πολίων, σχολίον ἐξέλεται. 25 τὸ δὲ "Ἀγχιάλοιο" Θετταλίκης γλώσσης ἔστι καὶ ὅσα κατ’ αὐτὸ, καθὰ καὶ Ἰλιαίς ἐδήλωσε. δῆλοι | δ’ αὐτὸ καὶ ὁ γράφας οὕτω: "Μίδας Μίδου" καὶ "Γέτας ζΗΤΟΥ" κοινῶς, "Μίδα" δὲ καὶ "Γέτα" Δωρικῶς. ὁ ὅποιος καὶ "Αἰνείας Αἰνεία". "Αἰνεια" δὲ Βοιωτῶν καὶ Ἀλλών Δωριέων. Ἀττικῶν δὲ καὶ Ἰονίων, "Μενέλαος" καὶ "Αἰνειω". Θετταλῶν δὲ "καλοῦν". ὅτι τὸν Ὀδυσσέα μὲν εἰς φιλόσοφον οἱ παλαιοὶ μεταλαμβάνουσι. 30 τὴν δ’ ὅπ’ αὐτῶς διακομένην Πηνελόπην εἰς φιλοσοφικὴν ἐκλαμβάνονται, ὡς τὴν ἱστορίαν εξαφανίζοντες ἀλλὰ τὸ ταπεινόν φιλοσόφος ἀνάγοντες καὶ χαρακτηρίζοντες ἐκ τοῦ διάκοντος, δ’ ἔτει, τὸ διακόμης. ἧν οὖν ἐκ τοῦ φιλοσοφοῦ Ὀδυσσέας ὑποδεικνύντες καὶ τὴν ὅπ’ αὐτῶς διακομένην ἦσαν ποιημένην γυναῖκα καὶ φιλοσοφικὴν εἶναι ὑπονοοῦντες ἐξ ἑκείνου καὶ αὐτῶς τοὺς δὲ γε μινηστήρας, ἤρατας φιλοσοφίας νοοῦσιν. οἱ πολλοὶ μὲν | αὐτὴν μνήσανται καὶ περὶ την αὐτής κτίσιν μνησοῦνται παρεμφερές δὲ τῷ τῷ φιλοσόφῳ μὲ ἔχοντες Ὀδυσσεῖ μ’ μὴ δὲ τὸ ἐπαγγέλλον ὁτὲ ἐκείνων πλουτοῦντες, | αὐτῆς μὲν ἐκπίπτουσιν, ἄλλης δὲ συνουσίας γίνονται ταῖς θεραπαινίσι πλησιάζοντες, ὁ ἐστὶ ταῖς λοιπαῖς τῶν τεχνῶν συγγενιμένοι, ὁν τέχνη ἐστὶν | ἡ φιλοσοφία καὶ ὡς δέσποινα ὑπερκάθηται. καὶ αὐτοὶ μὲν οὕτως ταῖς ὑποδεσποτῆς ὑμολογεῖ τέχναις. ἡ 35 δὲ καλλιστή καὶ ἀρχιτέκτων τῷ Ὀδυσσεῖ | τεταμείρεται μόνη, τῷ ὅτεις φιλοσόφοι. 88 καὶ οὕτω μέχρι τοῦτο τὴν ἱστορίαν ἀναγάγοντες οἱ παλαιοὶ τῷ 50.7 'Ειρώλαος P1 Μ Bas.: 'Ειρώλαος Rom. Stall. 50.7 signum - et vox σημείωσε > add. in marg. P2. 50.8 tit. Πλησίαλος add. in marg. P3. 50.12 Αγχιάλος P1 M Rom. Bas.: Αγχιάλος Stall. 50.13 προπαροξύνοται P1 edd.: προπαροξύνεται M. 50.13 Αγχιάλος P1 M Rom. Bas.: Αγχιάλος Stall. 50.19 tit. ἀλληγορικὸς add. in marg. P2. 50.31 άναγγόντες M edd.: άναγόντες P1.
έντειθεν καταβαίνουσι, καὶ μνηστηροφονίαν, καὶ Τηλεμάχου καὶ Είματο εὐνοιαν, καὶ θεραπαινίδων θάνατον, καὶ εἰ τι τοιοῦτον, ψιλῆ ἀφιάσι τῇ ἱστορίᾳ. οὐχ ὅτι οὐ δύνανται τι λαλεῖν καὶ ἐν τούτοις, ἀλλὰ ὅτι περιττὸν ἡγοῦνται τοιοῦτος ἐναδολεσχεῖν.1153 | (Vs. 106) ὅτι τὸ "ἀγήσωρ" οὗ μόνον ἐπὶ ψόγου λαμβάνεται ὅτε καὶ δηλοὶ τὸν θρασύν καὶ ὑβριστὴν ἄλλα καὶ ἐπὶ ἐπαίνου, ὡςποκέ αὐτῷ τὸν ἄνδρας δηλοῖ, ὡς πολλὰχοι τῷ Ἱλιάδος εὑρηται.1154 γίνεται δὲ ἄμφοτερα ἐκ τοῦ "ἀγαν" καὶ τοῦ "ἡνωθε" τοιοῦτον ἄνδρα.1155 διίτον γὰρ τὸ "ἀγαν". τὸ μὲν, καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ὅπερ καὶ ψέσται, διὸ καὶ παραγιγέται τὸ "μηδὲν ἄγαν".1156 καὶ ἐκ τοῦ τοιοῦτο "ἀγαν" γίνεται "ἀγήσωρ" ὁ θρασύς. τὸ δέ, κατὰ μεσοτήτα ἐστὶν "ἀγαν" καὶ ἐπαίνου. ἐστὶ γὰρ ποτὲ καὶ τῷ λιαν κατὰ τὴν τραγῳδίαν χράσθαι καλῶς, καθ' ὁ σημαίνομεν, | λέγομεν τινα ὑπερλᾶν1157 σοφὸν, καὶ ἐκ τοῦτοΥ | τοῦ "ἀγαν", "ἀγήσωρ" ὁ ἄνδρεος ἠγέται. καὶ ἄλλως δὲ "ἀγήσωρ" ὁ ἄνδρεος ἄπο τοῦ "ἀγεῖν ἄνδρας" ἦτοι ἀρχεῖν ἄνδρων.1158 ὅπερ καὶ | "λοχαγός" καὶ "στρατηγός" | ὁ ἄγαν λόχου καὶ στρατόν. ἥ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄγειν ἄνδρας ἦτοι λήξεσθαι. δηλοὶ γὰρ καὶ τοιοῦτον τι τὸ "ἀγεῖν". οἷον "τὰ μὲν ἡγε, τὰ δὲ ἔφερε" παρὰ Ἡροδότορ.1159 ἐν δὲ τῇ Ἱλιάδι καὶ κύριον ἢν νόμομα ὁ "Ἀγήσωρ".1160 ἐν ἦ καὶ "Μέντης" ἐτερος παρὰ τὸν ἐντάθη ἱστόρηται.1161 δήλον δ' ὅτι καὶ ὑπερήσωρ δύναται ο "ἀγήσωρ" | λεχθῆναι. καὶ αὐτὸ κατ' ἅμως τὰς ῥήθεισας ἐννοιας, τὴν τε ἐπαινετὴν καὶ τὴν πειθὴν.1162 ὡς δηλοὶ τὸ "κακὸς ὑπερνορόφοντες" διαστελλόμενον πρὸς τοὺς ὡς εἰκὸς ποτέ | καὶ εὐλόγων | ὑπερνορέοντας. (Vs. 107) ὅτι μνηστήρων ἔργον ὅτε μὴ περὶ τραπέζων εἰσα, τοὺς πάντη λαναχάις μετ' ὅλιγῃ εἰρησμομένοις περὶ που | τὸ τέλος τῆς δὲ τῆς ραφφίας "πεσοῖς, προπάροιθε θυράων θυμὸν τέρπειν".1163 ἐστι δὲ ὅτι καὶ "ἐν τυκτῷ δαπέδῳ" γυμναζέσθαι, ὡς ἐν τοῖς ἔξω | ὁ ποιητὴς ἔρει.1164 "πεπτεύομαι" δὲ ταῦτα δ' εἰπεῖν κατὰ τὸν μεταβολα ῥήτορα | διακυβεῦονται προπάροιθε τῶν θυρῶν διὰ δελίαν".1165 ἵνα μὴ λάθῃ | ἔξοδος τις ἢ εἰσόδους μελετώμενη τυχῶν ἐπὶ βλάβῃ αὐτῶν. ὁ δὲ "πεσοῖς" παρὰ τὸ "πεσεῖν" ἐτυμολογεῖται1166 καὶ ταῦτα δικλασισμὸν τοῦ ὅ. "πεσεῖν" δὲ καὶ "συμπεσεῖν"1167 λέγεται τὸ κατὰ τύχην συμβῆναι τι.1168 εἰς οὐ καὶ "περιπέτεια" τὸ τυχῆν σύμβαμαι.1169 ὅτι δὲ ο "πεσοῖς" τύχης ἔστιν ἄθωμα1170 καὶ αὐτῇ | ἀνάγεται, ἠπαίνων οἱ κατακυβευόμενοι. ἠπειν δὲ ὅτι φανερὰ διαφορά ἐστὶ

51.7 tit. ἄγαν add. in marg. P².
51.8 καὶ M edd.: om. P¹.
51.13 λοχαγός M edd.: λοχαγῶς P¹; tit. λοχαγός add. in marg. P².
51.15 tit. ἄγειν add. in marg. P².
51.17ff. tit. ὑπερήσωρ add. in marg. P².
51.19 ὑπερνορόφοντες M edd.: (cf. Od. 2.266): ὑπερνορόφοντος P¹.
51.19 διαστελλόμενον M edd.: διαστελλόμενος P¹.
51.26 δικλασισμὸν corr. Mкт.: δικλασισμὸν M P¹ edd.
51.26 tit. πεσεῖν add. in marg. P².
51.28 tit. περιπέτεια add. in marg. P².
51.28 δὲ M edd.: om. P¹.
"κύδων" καὶ "πεσσόν" παρὰ τῶν παλαιοῖς. "κύβοι" μὲν γὰρ οἱ καταρριπτόμενοι ἑξάπλευροι βόλοι, καὶ οίοις κατακυβιστώντες ἐν τῷ βάλλεσθαι, εἰς ὅν καὶ τὸ κυβικὸν παρονόμασται σχῆμα. ὁ δὲ "πεσσός" ἐτεροῦν τι ἐστίν. ὁ Ἡρόδοτος οὖν φανερῶς διαφέρειν διῆλθος "κύβον" καὶ "πεσσόν" ἐν οἷς λέγει ὁ Ὅλυτοι τοὺς κύδωνες εὐφονον καὶ τοὺς ἀστραγάλους καὶ τὴν σφαίραν καὶ ἄλλα ἡ πάλιν. πλῆθος ἡ πεσσῶν, ἀστείον καὶ ὡς ποτὲ μὲν ἐκ γένους "κύβος" ἡ δὲ διάθεσις τῆς πεδίας. τοτε δὲ "πεσσός", καὶ ὁ δὲ "βόλλα κυβιστῶν" τοὺς πεσσοὺς φασιν οἱ παλαιοὶ καὶ ὁ δὲ "πεσσός" ὀδετέρως οἱ "πεσσοὶ". καὶ ὁ δὲ "πεσσός" ὀμοιόμορος καὶ ἡ γραμμὴ καὶ ἡ ψῆφος, οἷον καὶ "πεσσός πεντάγραμμα". καὶ ὁ δὲ πέντε ἦσαν ὃς ἐξορόντοι καὶ ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ πέντε γραμμαίς τὰς ψήφους ἐτίθεντον. ὁ σὲ μέση ἑιραν ἐκαβελεῖτο καὶ ὁ διὰ τὰς πέντε ταύτας καὶ "πετετέα" ἐδοκεί κληθῆναι ὡς οὗτοι "πεντεία" τὰς οἶσσα. καὶ ὁ δὲ Παλαμηδὴς εὑρεῖν αὐτὴν λέγεται. ὁ δὲ παρώνυμον τὸ "Παλαμήδηειον ἀβάκιον" καὶ ὁ δὲ "πεσσός" καὶ πεττός οἱ πίπτοντος φασίν οἷς ἐκ τῆς ἁλίας καὶ πεττοὶ συννυστοῦσιν μὲν οἷος ὁ Παλαμηδὴς εὑρεῖ. καὶ ὁ δὲ δοκεῖ τὸ "κυβεῖεν" καὶ "πετετεῖν" καὶ "ἀστραγάλειεν" λέγεται. ὡς ἐπιμαίνεται ἀκόμα τοῦ "ἀστραγαλοίσουν ἐν τῇ κατὰ τὴν Ὀδύσσειαν πολιτεία καὶ ὁρχοῦσα καὶ σφαιρίζουσιν. καὶ ὁ δὲ συνυστελεῖ πρὸς τὸ ῥῆβην τὸ "ἀστράγαλος, τρία σημαίνει. τὸν ἐν σφυρῷ καὶ τὸν σπόνδυλον ἀπλῶς. καὶ τὸν παιστικόν ἡ πεσσικὸν βόλον" τῷ Ἂπιόνος. καὶ ὁ δὲ "κύδων" οἱ κυκλοθεν ἐξ οὗ ὁ καταστραμμένος οἷος τοῦ "κυβῶν" "κυβήσω" τὸ καταστρέφω, οὗν καὶ "κύβιτον" τῷ ἄγκωμα Ῥωμαίος καὶ "κυβιστῶν" τῷ ἐπὶ κεφαλῆς πίπτειν. τῆς δὲ λέξεως τῶν "πεσσῶν" ἢ ἐν δυσι σίγμα γραφή χητετέα εἰ φυλάσσεται καὶ ἐν τοῖς παρὰ Ἀρχίγενεν πεσσοὶ. φάρμακα δὲ εἰς ἰατρικὰ φασίν ἐκείνα, οὐ γνωστὰ εἰ ἐν δυσί δὲ γράφεται. ὁ δὲ τὰ περὶ Ἑλληνικῆς παιδίας γράφως διαφορών καὶ αὐτὸς εἰδὼς "κύδων" καὶ "πεσσόν" καὶ παλαιοστήτην εἰσάγει τῇ "κυβερνητικῆ παιδίας" ἐπαγεῖ Σωφρόκλους μὲν ἐκ Παλαμήδους ὀμοιόμορος τῷ ἑρωί δράματος τὸ πεπεράζει πεσσοὺς κύδων τοῦ τερπνὸν ἀργίας ἄκος καὶ Ἐφεσιῶν τὸ "πεσσά νεανιάδασ" λέγει δὲ καὶ "ἐν μὲν Ἡλίῳ διεκνύσθαι λίθον ὑπὲρ ἐπέστειλεν οἱ Ἀχαιοί. ἐν δὲ ἢ "Ἀργεῖ τὸν λεγόμενον Παλαμήδους πεσσόν" καὶ ὁ δὲ Πλάτων τῇ τῶν πεσσῶν εὑρεῖ
Αἰγυπτίος ἀνατίθησιν ἐν Φαΐδρῳ, λέγων "αὐτούς πρῶτον, ἀρίθμον | καὶ λογισμὸν εὑρέθην καὶ γεωμετρίαν καὶ ἀστρονομίαν ἐτὶ δὲ πεπείμαν τε καὶ κυβεῖαν καὶ ἡ γράμματα".1192 καὶ ὅτι οἱ τοῦ Πλάτωνος ὑπομνηματισται | ὅβ τὴν παρ’ Ἐλλησι πεπείμαν σημανὴν ἔσοι ὑπὸ Πλάτωνος ἀλλὰ τὴν τοῦ ἱερομένου πεπειμίσθιν.1193 καταγράφονται γὰρ τι πλινθὸν ὅσπερ ἐν τῇ | πεπειμίσθιν παιδίδι δι’ ὅσπερ τὰ κινήματα τοῦ ἱλίου καὶ τῆς σελήνης ἐτὶ δὲ καὶ τὰ ἔλλειπτικά, πραγματευόμενοι οἱ ᾿Αἰγυπτίοι. καὶ ὅτι ἐξερῶντο οἱ | παλαιοὶ τρισὶ κύκλοις καὶ οὐχ’ ὅσπερ οἱ νῦν, δυσὶ. διεκαίρυ καὶ παροιμία ἐπὶ τῶν μηδὲν διὰ μέσον κινδυνεύονταν, τὸ "ἡ τρίς ἐξ ή τρεῖς κύκλοις".1194 | ἀπὸ τοῦ μεγίστου καὶ ἐλαχίστου ἀρίθμου ἢς | μέμνηνται Πλάτων ἐν Νόμοις εἰπὼν "ἡ | τρεῖς κύκλοις βάλλοντες" τουτέστι τρεῖς | μονάδας.1195 "κύβον" γὰρ φασι, | διαφορὰς ἔλεγον. αὐτὸ τε τὸ ἀναρριπτοῦμεν, οἶκον | παροιμία τραγικὸ τὸ "ἀεὶ γὰρ εὖ πίπτουσιν οἱ Δίος κύκλοι"1196 καὶ τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ | μονάδα. διδόνειν ἡ ποιητὴς καὶ τὸ ποιητὴς ἐν τῷ παρὰ Ἄριστοφάνους | κοιμηθοῦσαν σίμχε γῆ βῆβλη Αἰχιλλείος δύο κύβο | καὶ τέτταρα"1197 καὶ εἶχες, λέγει | γὰρ δύο μονάδας καὶ τέτταρα. ἐκείτο | δ’ ὁ στίχος ἐν τῷ Ἐυριπίδου Τηλέφορος σὺν | ἄλλοις ιαμβικοῖς, ἐνθα κυβεῖοντας τοὺς ἱρωᾶς εἰς ἱγαγε.1198 περιπηρέθη δὲ φησιν ὅλον | ἐκείνον τὸ ἐπεισόδιον, | χειρασθέντος εἰς αὐτῷ τοῦ ποιήματος. λέγει δὲ τὸ ταῦτα | παραδείγματος καὶ ὡς οἱ τῇ παιδίδα ταύτῃ χρόμενοι, ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν τοῖς κύκλοις τρηματῶν, | (“τρηματικά”) ἔβλεγοντο.1199 παράγων καὶ χρήσειν Σώφρονος τὸ "δειπνήσας | ὁστίζεται τοῖς τρηματιζόντεσιν."1200 καὶ ὅτι ἐσπευδάτετο ἡ κυβεῖα οὐ μόνον παρὰ | Σικελοῖς ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἀθηναίοις. | οἱ καὶ ἐν ἱεροῖς ἄθροιζομενοι, ἐκπειράτων. καὶ | μάλιστα ἐν τῷ τῆς σκιράδος Ἀθηνᾶς τῷ ἐπὶ σκίρῳ.1201 ἀφ’ οὗ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα | κυβευτήρια σκιράφεια | ἀνομάζετο.1202 ἐξ ὅν καὶ πάντα τὰ πανοργήματα διὰ τὴν | ἐν σκιραφεῖος ῥαδιούργιαν σκιράφοι ἐκαλούντο. Ἰππαίναξ: "τί με σκιράφοις | ἀτιτάλλεις;"1203 πεποίθησι δὲ φησὶ καὶ προστάτι τοῦ ὡτὸ παίζειν Ἐρμῆς καὶ Πάν | καθὰ τῆς μουσικῆς Ἀπόλλων καὶ Μοῦσας. τοὺς δὲ "πεσοῦς" λέγει ψήφος καὶ εἶναι | πέντε αῖς ἐπὶ πέντε | γραμμῶν ἐπαίζον ἐκατέρθωσεν, ἵνα ἐκατότο καὶ πεπειμίσθιν ἐξή τάς καθ’ ἑαυτών. Σοφοκλῆς: "καὶ πεσόν| πεντάγραμμα καὶ κύκλοις βολαϊτ."1204 | παρετείνετο δὲ φησὶν δ’ αὐτῶν | καὶ μέση γραμμή, ἢν "ἰεράν" ἄνωμαζέων ὡς ἀνοτέρω | δηλούνται.1205 έπει οἱ νικώμενοι ἐπ’ ἱσχύνται αὐτήν ἦτται. ὅθεν καὶ παροιμία "κινεῖν

53.5 tit. πεπειμίσθιν add. in marg. P².
53.5 παιδί M P Bas. (cf. Suet. II. παιδ. 1.20): παιδί Ῥom. Stall.
53.8 διδοί corr. edd.: δῦο M P¹.
53.11 ἀναρριπτοῦμεν M P Bas. Rom. Stall.: ἀναρριπτοῦμεν Bas.
53.12 tit. παροιμία add. in marg. P².
53.23 tit. σκιράφεια add. in marg. P².
53.23 ἀνομάζετο M edd.: ἀνομάζοντο P¹.
53.27 tit. πέντε add. in marg. P².
“σήλια” καὶ “τηλία” ὡς ἐν τοῖς τοῦ κομικοῦ ἔγραφει "Αθήναιος." Ετυμολογίαν δὲ τοιούτου | “ἄβακος” ὡς καὶ κοινολεκτείται, ἐν τῷ μεγάλῳ ἔστιν εὑρέθη ἐτυμολογικῶς. ( Vs. 108) ὁτι οὗτο βίαιοι οἱ μνηστήρες, ὡστε ὁ μόνον κτείνοντες τούς τοῦ Ὀδυσσέας || βοᾶς ἀπεχράντο τῇ ἔκθεθεν | τροφῆ, ἀλλ᾽ οὐδὲ τῶν υπηρέτας παρεχόμενοι τοῖς ἑπτατείς. Εφησοί γοῦν ὅτι ἐπετευκόνησαν, ἦμενοι ἐν τοῖς βοῶν ὁ μόνον ἐκταίρων αὐτοῖς. Σημείωσε δὲ ὅτι ἔχει τι σκόμματος | οὗτος ὁ λόγος. ὠσπερ γὰρ Ἡρακλέος ἐγκόμιον τὸ λέοντος ἔχειν δορᾶν ὃν ἐκταίρων αὐτοῦ, οὗτοι ψύχοι τής τῶν | μνηστήρων τριφῆς ἡ τῶν ρινών τῶν βοῶν χρῆσις ὃς ἐκταίρων αὐτοῖς. | ( Vs. 109) ὁτι ἐνδοξότεροι θεραπόντων, οἱ κήρυκες. Βασιλικοὶ μὲν γὰρ ἄνδρες | καὶ θεῖον γένος οἱ κήρυκες. οἱ δὲ θεραπόντες ἀπλῶς ἑπηρέτα εἰς τις φίλοι σύν οὐ μὴν κατὰ τοῖς δοῦλωσ. οἱ μὲν τοῖς Κρήτας φασὶ θεράποντα | τὸν ὁκλοφόρον δοῦλον καλεῖν. Ίστεν δὲ καὶ ὅτι κήρυκα μὲν ὁτρυόν ὅτι ὁ λόγος, θεράποντα δὲ πολλαχοῖς καλεῖ ὁτρυόν. | Παρὰ τὸ | τρόπῳ τὸ δηλιώτ. ἢ παρα τὸ ὄρυγνο. ( Vs. 110) ὁτι ἐκφράζον ὁ ποιητής ἐπιμέλειαν συμποσίου, φησι. Κήρυκες δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ θεραπόντων οἱ μὲν οἶνον | ἐμεσοι ἔνι κρητηρίσοι καὶ δόσοι, οἱ δὲ σπόγγοις πολυτρήτους τραπέζας νίζον καὶ προτίθεντο, ἱδὲ κρέας πολλὰ δατέντο, τούτοις ἐμέριζεν. ἣ διὰ τοῦ ὁ δαίτρος. καὶ ὡς ἐντελεῖσιν συμποσίον καὶ τοῦ ὁ πολλὰς τῶν σπαταλώτων μνηστήρων. τὰ γὰρ καίρια μόνα προτίθεντα | οὐδὲν τὶ τῶν περίχρον τῷ συμποσίῳ παρεισκρίνουσι, τοίς | ἀναγκαίοις ἀρκοῦμενοι, διὸ ὃς ἄφας ἀρκοῦτοσ. οἷς οἱ κρητήρες δηλοῦσιν. οὶ δὲ ποιήμα, ἐκ τοῦ “κεράν” ὑποκρίνουσιν. διάφορα γὰρ εἴδη κράσεων καὶ ὁμιλεῖς ἐγίνοντες. οἱ δὲν καὶ τὸν Ἀχιλλέα ἐποίησαν ἐπιστῶ τα ἐς ὁ ἐπίκροτον δὲ κέρατος. ὃ κέρατος, οὐκ ἂν πάντως διαστῆλαντα ἐμ η τῶν καθημερινῆς κράσεις ὡς φησιν "Αθήναιος." 55.1 tit. τηλία σήλια add. in marg. P². 55.1 tit. Αριστοφάνης add. in marg. P². 55.12 τοῖς κήρυκες θεραπόντες δοῦλοι add. in marg. P². 55.15 τρόπῳ P¹ edd.: πρῶ Μ. 55.22 κρητήρες M edd.: κρατήρες P.
PART III

FONTES AND TESTIMONIA
1 1.1 Πικροί - λογισταί Cf. Greg. Naz. In theoph. 36.328.1-2, (πρός ταύτα τί φασιν ἡμῖν οὐ συκοφαντά, οἱ πικροὶ τίς θεότητος λογισταῖ...), 657.40-1, Max. Tyt. 5.7f. (λογιστής...πικρός) and Philostr. Vit. Soph. 1512 (ὅπατος...ἐλογιστευει πικρός καὶ διστρόφος); on the definition of λογιστής cf. Eust. ad Od. I.289.3-4 (=γραμματεύς ἦτοι ἀποσημάντωρ διά γραμμάτων), LSJ s.v. “auditor”; cf. also Eust. ad II. I.52.19, Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. I, p.CXXXII-CXXXV.

2 1-2 καὶ - διασπαρέσσοις Eust.’s own opinion.


4 τερατεύεσθαι Eust. ad Od. I.315.39.

5 9-10 ὢς - ἐμποίησεν On the term ἱδονήν, cf. LSJ. s.v. II. Metaph.; on ἐκπληξίν cf. LSJ s.v. II.

6 10 ὁ ποιητής On the terms ὁ ποιητής, ὁ ρήτωρ, ὁ λυρικός etc. cf. Eust. ad II. I.4.10-5.

7 10 ὢς φασίν οἱ παλαιοὶ General reference.


9 16-7 αὐτίκα - ποιητή Polyb. 34.2.9 (...τὸ δ’ ὅλον περὶ Σικελίαν καὶ τῷ ποιητῇ πεποίησαν καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις συγγραφέοις, διὸς τάπιχρα ἠλέγουσι τά περὶ τὴν Ἰταλίαν καὶ Σικελίαν.).

10 18 τῆς ἑστορίας Λατίνος His source is Hes. Th. 1011ff. as it seems from Eust. ad Od. II.117.14 (ἐκ Κίρκης υἱόι καθ’ Ἡσiodον ’Οδοσσεῖ Αὔγιος καὶ Λατίνος); cf. also Hdn. καθ. III.1.223.21-2, Steph. Byz., Eth. 534.1 (...ἀπὸ Πραινέστου τοῦ Λατίνου τοῦ Ὀδοσσέας καὶ Κίρκης υἱοῦ).


12 21 ’Οδόσσεια Eust. wrongly writes ’Οδόσσεια instead of the correct ’Ωδοσσέα (in Steph. Byz. 484.7 we read: Οδόσσεας, πόλις Ἡβρίας, ἀρακενικός, καὶ τὸ εὐνικὸν ὄμοιον...).

13 21 καὶ - οἱ βαρμυγνοὶ Cf. Str. 6.15.1-5 (...ἐστὶ δὲ πλεῖστον τῆς Τεμέσης ἤρθον ἀγριελαίοις συμποτεύει Πολύτοι τοὺς ’Οδοσσάως ἐταίρων, ἡν δολοφονηράντων ὑπὸ τῶν βαρβάρων γενέσθαι βαρμυγνοῖς, ώστε τοὺς περιοίκους δασμολογεῖν αὐτῷ κατὰ τὰ λόγιν καὶ παροιμίαν εἶναι πρὸς τοὺς ἄθικες, τὸν τὴν Τεμέση λεγόντων ἐπικείνθαι αὐτοῖς). Eust. (like Str.) mentions elsewhere (ad Od. I.46.29) that the hero from Temese is Polites, one of Odysseus’ companions. However, the Suda (p 3510) gives Albas as the name of the hero from Temese; on the proverb cf. also Plut. Prov. 342, (ἐν Τεμέση ἡρώς... ὁ ἀπαίτης τις αὐτοῦ ὄστρεον προσοφείλων εὐρεθή, ἐν Τεμέση γέγονεν ἡρώς); cf. also Paus. 6.6.7.2ff.

14 24 ἐν τοῖς εξής The reference is general; possibly he means Eust. ad Od. I.1.22ff. (=1.27ff. Makr.).

15 25-6 τερατολογίαν ποιητικὴν Eustathius mentions this term many times (ad II. III.711.13, III.858.19, IV.369.2, ad Od. I.25.25, 308.33, 316.3, 326.14); on Homer’s τερατολογία cf. Polyb. 34.2.1, Str. 1.2.9.11, Procl. In remp. I.74.3; on τερατολογία and other relevant terms cf. Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. II, XXXV; on τερατώδες in Odysseus’ story cf. Allen (1924), p.167.

16 27 καὶ τὸν Αἰδώλον Od. 10.1-77.

17 27-8 καὶ τοὺς Κυμερίους Od. 11.14.

18 28 καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὴν Καλυψώ Od. 5.1-277.

20 32 τὸ - ἔνοχος Eust.'s own opinion.

21 2.1 ὥς ὅτε - ψευδῶς *Od*. 5.275, see also Circe’s words to Odysseus *Od*. 10.508, 511. Odysseus puts the country of the Cimmerians at the end of Oceanus (*Od*. 11.13-4).


25 6-7 μάλα - ἄστιν Eustathius uses the words πεπνυμένος - μανθιδίῳs in the same way as Homer in *Od*. 3.72, 75.

26 8 τὶ σὲ - ψευδόθηκε *Od*. 14.364-5; Eust. uses direct speech in a typical example of homerizing language in order to make his text more lively for the reader.


30 14-6 καθὰ - προσαμβεβαιάσαι Eust. paraphrases Polyb. 34.2.9 (...οὐδὲ ὅλην τὴν Ὀδυσσέας πλάνην, ἀλλὰ μικρά μὲν προσαμβεβαιάσαι, καθάπερ καὶ τῷ Ἰλιάκῳ πολέμῳ...).


33 20-1 ἓστεον - ὁλιγόθα. For a similar position expressed in the proem of the *Commentary on the Iliad* cf. Eust. *ad il*. I.7.96f. (ἐκεί δὲ γλυκρόστατος καὶ ὁλιγόθος ὁ τοῦ βιβλίου σκοπός); Eust. here expresses indirectly a personal preference for the *Iliad* (cf. also Eust. *ad il*. II.1.22f.).

34 22-3 ὅτι - πλοῦν Telemachus’ trip to Pylos and Sparta is described in 1,118 verses.

35 23 τὴν παρὰ - ἀδολεσχίαν The narration about the Phaeacians in books 6-13 is described in 3,684 verses.

36 23-4 τὰ παρὰ - ψεύδομα Odysseus’ lies to Eumaeus are narrated in 207 verses.


38 2.28- 3.1 εἰ καὶ τις - δοῦρ περὶ Timolaus cf. *Su*. τ 626 (=Anaximen. *FGH* 2a 72, T.20 (Τιμόλαος, Λαρισάως ἐκ Μακεδονίας, ῥήτωρ, Ἀναξιμένου τοῦ Λαμψακηνοῦ μαθητής; δς καὶ ποιητικός ἔχων παρενέβαλε τῇ ῾Ιλιάδι στίχων πρὸς στίχον καὶ ἑπάγαγε τὸ σύνταγμα Τροικόν...δαλιομένον ὑπὸ δοῦρι); cf. also Eust. *ad Od*. I.125.37, 432.31; Eust. compares Homer's successful poetic method with other examples of use of the same material in order to show its value.

39 2.30 μισαγγελίας A Homeric word (only in *Il*. 4.453); Eust. often mimics Homeric diction.

40 3.2 ὀνθυλεύσας A rare word which survives in modern Greek, usually with the proposition συν-. We call συνονθυλεύσα ση a gathering or 'miscellany' of dissimilar things and the verb for
this action is συνονθυλεω. There are disagreements about whether the word comes from ὕθος or from another noun ὄνθυλη which is not preserved.

41 2-4 Τρυφιδώρος - τὸ σίγμα Cf. Συ. ν 261 ("ἲλιδα λειπόγραμματον ἦτοι ἄστοιχετον; ὁμιλοὶ δὲ αὐτῷ Τρυφιδώρος ἔγραψεν ὁδόσειαν...), τ 1111 (Τρυφιδώρος: [...] ἔγραψεν... ὁδόσειαν λειπόγραμματον); cf. also Eust. ad Od. 1.312.40; Eust. cites Tryphiodorus’ case in order to praise the Homeric use of the poetic material.

42 7-8 ἔσωσα σ’ ὡς Ιασι Eur. Med. 476.


44 11 ὁ διασκεύασαι - πιθανότατος Eust. often praises Homer’s fiction for its plausibility and probability.


46 10-4 ὃ δὲ - συγγραφῆς Eust. uses a rhetorical style in order to show his personal appreciation of Homer.

47 14-18 φαςι - ὁδόσειαν Phot. Bibl. 190.151a37ff. (citing Ptol. Heph. 5 in Westermann, Mythogr. 194.10ff.), (ὅτι Φαντασία τις Μεμφήτης Νικάρχου θυγήτρι συνέταξε πρὸ Ὀμήρου τὸν Ἰλιακὸν πόλεμον καὶ τὴν περί Ὀδώσειας διήγησιν καὶ ἀποκεφαλάθη φασὶ τὰς βιβλίους ἐν Μέμφητι, Ομηροὶ δὲ παραγονόμενοι, καὶ τὰ ἀντίγραφα λαβόντα παρὰ Φανίτου τοῦ ἱερογραμμάτως, συντάξει ἑκεῖνοι ἀκολουθοῦσα...); note the verbal similarity between Eust. and his source; cf. also Höfer, s.v. Phantasia, in Roscher (1908), v. VII p. 2271-2; according to Allen (1924), p. 138, the name Phantasia is fiction.


49 15 Μεμφήτης Eust. writes Μεμφήτης by mistake whilst Photius has Μεμφήτης (cf. Phot. op. cit.).

50 15 σοφίας ὑποφήτης This must be part of a dactylic hexameter. However, I cannot find Eust.’s source.

51 15 Νικάρχου Unknown person.


53 20 καὶ εἰν τῷ - τούτῳ Eust. ad Od. I.216.8, II.7.39ff.

54 21-3 σωφροσύνη - ἀρχέτυπον Note the didactic role ascribed to poetry by Eust.; for the “purpose” (ὀποθής) of the Iliad cf. Eust. ad II. I.7.24ff.

55 25 παιδεύει The verb is used on purpose to underline the didactic role of the Homeric poetry.

56 3.27 θη βιβλίος αὐτῆ He means the Odyssey; on βιβλίος cf. Eust. ad II. I.10.10ff.

57 26-8 ἀναπληροῖ - προσανεπλήρωσε On a similar idea cf. Longin. De subl. 9.12 where the Odyssey is considered to be the epilogue of the Iliad.

58 28-9 Αχιλλέως - συγκεκρίθη Od. 11.475-6, 486, 488-91.

59 29-30 καὶ Αιαντος - ἔγνωμεν Od. 11.549-569.
30 καὶ ἀριστεῖαν Νεοπτολέμου Od. 11.506-540.
31-31 καὶ δόλων - κατέδυ Od. 4.240-264.
31 καὶ τὰ - ἵππων Od. 4.271-89; cf. Eust. ad Od. 1.314.33.
3-6-7 διὰ τὸ - αὐτῶν The reference concerns generally all comments already mentioned in the Comm. ad II. which he does not intend to repeat in his Comm. ad Od.
3-7 ενετεύθεν The short expositions of events happening in each book of the Odyssey (υπόθεσις), which is found in Stallbaum’s edition before the beginning of Eustathius’ comments on each book, are taken from the Roman edition; they were initially copied from the D-scholia by Majoranus (on this matter in the Comm. ad II. cf. also Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. I, p. XII.
3-1.2-5 άποευθεύνεστε Eust.’s own comment.
3-1.1.1.1. 14 άποευθεύνετε II. 1.1.
3-1.1.1. 24-5 άνενεψε Μεώσα Od. 1.1.
3-1.1.1. 24-5 εκεῖ - σαφέστερον Note that Eust. links the Odyssey and the Iliad together as parts of a complementary poetic project.
3-1.1.1. 26-7 καὶ παντί - αὐτῶν The terms δράσεις - πείσις are used by Simp. In Aristot. 7.115.19, 7.578.14, but not in the way in which Eust. uses it here; cf. also Eust. ad II. 11.839.17.
3-1.1.1. 26-7 άλλα - Ποιητής The terms δράσεις - πείσις are used by Simp. In Aristot. 7.115.19, 7.578.14, but not in the way in which Eust. uses it here; cf. also Eust. ad II. 11.839.17.
3-3-5 δε - μελοποιών Cf. Alcm. PMG fr. 27, Pind. Ol. 3.8; cf. also LSJ s.v. IV b “generally, poetry, even lyrics”.
3-3-5 ομήρος - φιάννα II. 3.38, Od. 4.597, 8.91, 11.561.
3-3-5 ποιον σε ὑπονόηθεν II. 1.201, 2.7, 4.69, 4.92, 4.203, 4.284, 4.312, 4.337, 4.369, 5.123, 5.242, 5.713 etc., Od. 1.122, 2.269, 2.362, 4.25, 4.77, 4.550, 5.117, 5.172, 7.236, 8.346, 8.407, 8.442 etc.; cf. also Hsch. ε 4286, Eust. ad II. 1.5.10.
3-3-5 δει - μελοποιών Ael. Dion. a 50 (ἐπὶ ἕρως: οὐκ ἐπη, τὰ ἐξήμετρα. διέκειται τῷ μελοποίῳ); cf. also Aristot. Poet. 1447b14, 1459b18, 1459b23; on ἐποποίου cf. Eust. ad II. 1.5.15; on μελοποιία cf. Aristot. Poet. 1449b33, 1450a10, Aristox. Harm. 48.4.
3-3-5 καὶ - ἐξήμετρα Cf. Steph. in Rh. 316.14ff.
3-3-5 καθα - 'Ὑλιάδε δια Eust. means the invocation in II. 1.1.
3-3-5 μοισάλητος Eust.'s own word; cf. also I.18.12, 249.7, 399.10, Van der Valk (1971-97), vol. II, p. XXXV.
Est. 5.12-3; cf. also Eust. ad II. I.478.17, 485.6, ad Od. I.262.46.

9-11 οὔτω - προεξέβατο Eust.’s own comment.

10 11-3 ὅτι - γυναικὶ Sch. M1 Q R Y ad Od. I.1 (ἀνὴρ σημαίνει τέσσαρα: τὸν φύσει, τὸν γήμαντα, τὸν ἀνδρεῖον καὶ τὸν ἀνδρός ἥλικιαν ἔχουν...).

11 14 ἄνδρα - Μοῦσα Od 1.1.

12 14-7 οἱ παλαιοὶ - προσηγορικὸν Sch. D E M1 Q R T V d ad Od. I.1 (ἀνδρα: νῦν τὸν φύσει: οὗ γὰρ εὑρίσκεται δὸς ἐπίθετα ἄνω κυρίου ἢ προσηγορικοῦ), Y i ad Od 1.1 (ἀνδρα: [...] τὸ εἴδος ἀντὶ τοῦ γένους, τὸν φύσει. οὗ τὸν ἀνδρεῖον, ἐπεὶ δὸς ἐπίθετα οὐχ εὑρίσκεται ἄνω κυρίου ἢ προσηγορικοῦ, ἀλλὰ τὸν φύσει...).

13 17-8 τίς γὰρ - τινὸς On the example of δίκαιος Ἀριστείδης cf. Su. α 3903, μ 1068, Steph. In Rh. 281.33; cf. also Eust. ad II. I.523.7.

14 19 τυχόν The word is used here as an adverb and it means “perhaps”.


16 21-2 πρός - δαιμόνων For religious reasons he uses the word δαίμονων instead of the word θεῶν; for similar cases in which daemon is preferred to gods cf. Lambert (1986), p. 260f.

17 23 ἐννιάλῳ ἄνδρειφόντη II. II. 2.651, 7.166, 8.264, 17.259; cf. also Eust. ad II. I.488.10, II.432.17.

18 23 χρυσηλάκατος κελαδεινή II. 20.70.

19 23-4 ὁ πόποι - εὐφυσθενὲς II. 8.201.


22 29-30 ἐσεται αὐτὸν ἄνδρων Od. I.123.

23 30 ἁνδραποδιστῶν Cf. Ar. Plut. 521-2; cf. also Tz. Ar. Plut. 521.15.

24 30 ἁνδραπόδων Cf. Eust. ad II. II.504.4-11, ad Od. I.57.16.

25 29-32 κατὰ - δὸναται Eust.’s own comment.

26 33 ἀρίσθημα The word is also found in Eust. ad II. I.235.8.

27 7.1-2 οἱ πρὸς - παραδείδωσι Cf. Phot. α 1769, Hsch. α 4768, Su. α 2187.

28 2-3 τὸν βουκαιδᾶ On the word βούκαις cf. also Eust. ad II. II.630.3, 757.26, ad Od. II.108.18.


30 3-4 σημεῖον - ἀκροατη On Eustathius’ own comment.

31 4 μεταφόρισας On μεταφόρισα cf. LSJ s.v., “buoy up, to elevate, esp. with false hopes”.

32 9-13 καὶ διαφέρει - ὄνομα Eust.’s own comment.

33 13 ἐνθα - ἐκέι Od. I.121.

34 13-4 τὸ δὲ - τοῦ ἐνος νῦ Cf. sch. Y i ad Od. I.1 (ἐννέε: πάθος λεγόμενον διπλασιασμός); cf. also Eust. ad II. III.282.21-2 (with note) IV.447.17, ad Od. I.273.12, 322.34, Π.328.31; on the word ἐννέε cf. Chantrenne (1948) I 101, (1968-80) 349-50 s.v.

35 7.15 ἀπὸ - ἐπώ Note Eustathius’ etymological analysis.

36 15-6 ἄδου τὸ κίνω Cf. sch. V ad Od. 3.6, Hdn. Part. 34.3, Su. a 162.

37 16-7 τὸ μὲν - νῦ Cf. Su. ε 1398, Hsch. ε 3261 (ἐννοικίζων), ε 3217 (ἐννοικίζων); cf. also Eust. ad II. II.564.3.

38 17 τὸ δὲ - ἀμετάβολον Cf. Su. ε 1396, Hsch. ε 3215, Eust. ad II. II.564.1ff.
20 εἰπὲ καὶ ἡμῖν Od. 1.10.
20-1 τὸ μέντοι - δηλοῦται Eust. ad II. IV. 637.7.
21-2 δρα - κεῖται Eust.'s own comment.
24-7 ὁτι - πολυμηχανός Cf. Eust. ad II. I. 737.3-6 (with note).
24-6 ὁτι - εἰκόνα Cf. Hsch. π 276, 2722, 2911, 2934, 2935, Eust ad II. I. 125.34ff.
27-28 τὸ παντοῖος - ποιητής Od. 3.122; cf. also Od. 9.19, 422, 13.292.
28 ἀλλά - κομψώσαν Ar. Nub 450, sch. Ar. Nub 451b; cf. Su. σ 1222; the word στρόφις
is also used of Hermes (cf. Eust. ad II. IV. 914.8, ad Od. I. 15.12 (=27.26 Makr.), II.101.4);
the word is not used of Odysseus in comedy; this is Eust. appropriating a piece of comic
diction.
29 καὶ ὁς - πολύποδα Cf. Ath. VII. 100ff. citing: Aristoph. fr. 196, 197, Alc. Com. fr. 1,
14, Diph. fr. 33; cf. also Aristot. Pol. 1281b5ff., Eust. ad Od. I. 1225.17ff.
29 κατίζει ὁ ποιητής A well established way of reading poetry: everything the
characters say is attributed to the poet.
30 ἀλλο - βαζει II. 9.313.
31 ὁς ὁ ποιητής - ἔρει Cf. Od. 1.3-4.
32-3 καὶ - πολυτροπον Quint. 12.171.
34-3 καὶ ἐπι - πολυτροπον Quint. 12.390.
4-5 καὶ - προσεπειν Od. 10.330.
36 7 τροπόδοσ - φωνή Od. 19.521.
37-8 ἐν γὰρ - φησιν Eust. paraphrases sch. H M Q R Leid. ad Od. 1.1, Porph. 1.1.14ff.,
Antisth. fr. 51.19 (καὶ χρήται τό τρόποφ καὶ ἐπι φωνής καὶ ἐπι μελῶν ἐξαλαγηγῆς, ὡς ἐπι τῆς ἀπόδονος "ἡτε θαμά τροπόδοσ χέι tropeχξα φωνήν"); cf. also Eust. ad Od.
II. 215.13, 21, 216.25, 36, 217.12, 225.45.
38 9 τις τῶν ὀστερον The name is unknown to Eust.
10-2 ἄνδρα - κρόταλον Eust. changes sch. Ar. Nub. 260ff. (τῶν ἄνδρων τούς
κακεντρεχεῖς καὶ μὴ ἀπλοὺς τρίμματα καὶ πολυτρήματα καὶ πολύκροτους καὶ
crótala. δεν καὶ τὸν πρῶτον τῆς Ὄδοσσειας στίχον οὕτω τινὲς λέγουσι γράϕεις
ἄνδρα μοι ἐννεπο Μοῦδα τολύκροτον"); cf. Hes. fr. 198.3 (ὕός Λαέρταο πολύκροτα
μήδεα εἶδός), Su. τ 988; cf. also West (1988), pp. 69-70; on the word κρόταλον cf. also
sch. Ar. Nub. 260c-d.
14 το περίτριμμα On the word περίτριμμα cf. Ar. Nub. 447, Ar. Nub 447e; cf. also Su. τ
988, Hsch. κ 4205.
15 ἡ παπάλη On the word παπαλή cf. Ar. Nub. 260, Av. 431, sch. Ar. Nub 260e, g, 262,
15 το ἄπαυλημα Cf. Aesch. Ch. 1002, Soph. fr. 1018, Hsch. α 5727, Phot. α 2216, Su. α
2959, Ael. Dion. α 154, Eust. ad II. I. 552.17.
8.19-20 ὁ τῆς πλάνης - οἱ παλαιοι On Ἐσπερία cf. Eust. ad Od. I. 396.22-4; cf. also
Su. τ 678.
21 πολυστόρω The adjective is also used to characterise Nestor (Eust. ad II. IV. 744.10),
Demodocus (Eust. ad Od. I. 318.17) and Phenius (Eust. ad Od. II. 286.29).
21 πολυειδης Eust. uses the word for Odysseus once again (ad II. I. 335.33), once for
Helen (ad II. 1.678.16) and many times for Homer himself (ad II. 1.789.22, II.743.6, III.693.30, ad Od. II.283.25).

148 22-5 ἑπι - γνώναι Str. 1.1.16.2-6 (...οὶ γονὸν ποιητάς φονομοτά αυτός τῶν ἱρῶν αὐτοῦ πολλαχότας καὶ πλανηθέντας. ἐν μεγάλῳ γάρ τι ὁ πολλάκαν ἀνθρώπων ἰδεῖν ἄστεα καὶ νόν γνώναι...).

149 25-6 Ἡρακλής - ἔδωξαν On the example of Heracles and Dionysus cf. Str. 1.3.2.29ff.; on Heracles cf. Str. 1.1.16.19ff.; on Dionysus cf. Str. 1.2.20.21ff.

150 26-7 σεμνύνεται - δὴν Str. 1.1.16.7ff.; cf. II. 1.262-273; this kind of format ("somebody mentions somewhere") is frequent in Eust.


152 28-29 καθάπερ - διηγούμενος Eust. means Odysseus’ narration of his adventures in Od. 9-12.

153 29-30 ἀλαζών - ἀφηγούμενος Str. 1.2.23.6 (...ἀλαζών δὴ πάς ὁ πλᾶνην αὐτοῦ διηγούμενος...).


155 30-2 καὶ ἐν Ἰλιάδι - ἐξῆς II. 15.80-2; cf. sch. b T ad II. 15.80 (sch. ex.), D ad II. 15.80, Eust. ad II. 1.704.15ff.


158 2-5 πλῆν - πολλά Eust.’s own comment.

159 6-7 δὲ γῆραι - ἐν Od. 2.16.

160 7 ἄκοσμα - εἰδῶς II. 2.213.

161 8 γνώτι τὸ ἀλλήλοι ὅ Od. 21.36.

162 9-11 οὐ μόνον - φυσικόν Cf. sch. D E H Q ad Od. 1.3 (νόμον: τὸ ἔθος, τὴν διαγωγὴν καὶ τὸ πολλέμα).

163 13-4 πολλάκα - ἐγνω Eust. changes Od. 1.3.

164 14 τουτέστατι - νοῦν Eust.’s own comment.

165 15-6 μάλλοντα - ἀνέγνων II. 13.734

166 16-9 διωρισμένου - πολλοῖ Cf. also Eust. ad II. II.431.6.


168 23 ὁ πολύς τὴν ἱδομογίαν Eust.’s own religious example; cf. Niceph. Greg. 2.911.13 (the expression ὁ πολύς + a noun (usu. in accusative) is still used in formal modern Greek).

169 23-4 ταύτον - Ἀριστείδης Cf. also Eust. ad II. I.766.16 (...καὶ ἀπὸ τετελεῖται μέγαν καὶ πολλάν κατὰ τινά ἀρετήν, ὡς δηλοῖ τὸ "περίττος Ἀριστείδης" καὶ τὸ "περίττος τὴν σοφίαν", ὥστε οὖν τῶν "πολύς τὰ θεία" καὶ τῶν τοιούτων: λέγει δὲ πού καὶ Ἐυριπίδης ἐπὶ ἐπανέχει τὸ "περίσσος ὄν ἄνηρ", ἀντὶ τοῦ μέγας, πολύς), the origin of the expression ὁ περίττος Ἀριστείδης is unknown (cf. Van der Valk n. 484.14).

170 24-5 οὐ μέγας - ἀνθρώπου Eust.’s own example.


172 26-8 τούτο - ἐβολοῦ Aristoph. Eq. 649, 945; cf. Su. τ 1137 (...τῶν πολλῶν τοβόλου: τουτέστατο τοῖς εὐθώνιοι,...).

173 9.31 – 10.1 ἀντελέσσομαι - πελείονας Cf. Ar. Eccles. 1073, sch. Ar. Eccles 1073; Eust. refers to an expression used in the vocabulary of the daily life of his age; cf. also Eust. ad II. II.170.2-3 (with note) (εἰ δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἀποικισμένους πελείονας φαμεν, διὸν ἔκκινδυνεσσα
παρὰ τούς πλείονας ἀπελθεῖν, ἤγουν θανεῖν, εἰ ᾗν καὶ αὐτὸ ἐξ Ὤμήρου ἀποσυλλήθην.
174 2-3 μυρία προϊάσεν II. 1.2-3.
176 4 μυρία ἄλγεα II. 1.2; cf. also Eust. ad II. I.26.11-2.
177 5-6 οὕτω - πλατυνεῖ Cf. sch. I ad Od. 1.1 (οὖν χοι συν, πολύτροπον, δειμάλα πολλά: τόν τρόπον προεκτίθετα, δι’ οὗ τήν ποιήσει πλατυνεῖ ἡ γὰρ πολύτροπος τοῦ Ὁδυσσέας περίοδος πλάτος τῇ ποιήσει ἐμπλατυνεῖ); cf. also Eust. ad II. I.13.8-10.
178 7 ενδαπιλεύεται On the word ἐνδαπιλεύω, - omia cf. Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. I, p. CXXVII, Eust. ad II. I.545.2, III.430.21 (with note), IV.200.13 (with note); cf. LSJ s.v. “to be bestowed lavishly”.
179 8 ἀνδράς μοι ἄννεπε Od. 1.1.
180 9 μήνιν ἔδειδε Ἀχιλλέως II. 1.1.
181 9-12 ἐκτι - ἄλγεα Unknown source.
182 10-12 ἐπιτήκης - ἄλγεα Stylistic comment by Eust.
183 14-5 οἱ ἐκτι - ἀπεκτίκουντες Eust. may refer here either to orators (Demosth. or Ael. Aristid.) or to people of the church (such as Greg. Naz., Athanasius the Great, John Chrysostom, Michael Psellus etc.) who make use of these grammatical forms.
184 17-8 ἐκτι - γέγονε On ἰνέφεξε cf. LSJ s.v. ἰανέγγυμι late Greek irregular form; on ἰνώχλησεν cf. Choer. Th. II.56.15; on ἰνοματοποιεῖ cf. LSJ s.v. “coin names”; on ἐκδειγμημένος cf. LSJ s.v. ἐκδοιτικά (with examples); cf. also Eust. ad II. IV.819.7 (with note).
185 19 ἡμελλε Cf. Hes. Th. 478, Theogn. El. 1.906, Ar. Eccl. 597, etc.
186 20 διηκόνησε Aristid. III.196, 230, 265.
187 19-20 οἶον - διηκόνησε Eust. ad II. I.106.1, 819.3.
188 21-2 τὸ μέντοι - ἐστι Cf. Hdn. παθ. III.2.268.21, Eust. ad Od. I.199.34.
191 26 ἄμβροτος Cf. Eust. ad II. I.64.23.
194 27 χρήμπτω Cf. Eust. ad II. III.454.21.
195 27 λίγος μιᾶς II. 4.125; cf. sch. b T ad II. 4.125 a (sch. ex.), Eust. ad II. I.64.25, ad Od. II.281.5.
196 27 λαγχάνω Cf. Eust. ad II. I.46.30, ad Od. I.387.1, 418.34.
201 29-30 ἀλάμβανο C. EM 516.38ff., 674.13-8. However, in Eust. ad II. II.290.18, III.190.7 πλανῶ and πλάνη are the original forms and ἀλάμδω and ἀλή are derived from them.
1-2 ἔτι δὲ - θηρίον Ath. 1.35.1-4 (…Ματρέας ὁ πλάνος ὁ 'Αλεξανδρέας, ὡς ἔλεγε καὶ θηρίον τρέφειν ὃ αὐτὸ ἐαυτό κατεσθέει: ὡς καὶ ζητεῖσθαι μέχρι νῦν τὸ Ματρέα θηρίον τί ἐστιν...); cf. also Su. μ 286.

3-4 τὸ δὲ - ἐμπαθεῖ Eust's own comment.

5 δὲν θυμόν κατέδον II. 6.102.


7 ἐπεί Od. 1.2.

9 εὖ ὣδε - διαστήτην II. 1.6.


11 καὶ - ἔχει. In Eust. ad II. 1.185.3-7 a religious explanation of the word ἱερός is given ("ἱερά" δὲ οὐ μόνον ἡ θρησκεία Θήβη, ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσα πόλις, ὡς φυλακτική τῶν ἐντός, ὅπερ θείον τῷ ὄντι ἐστιν... καὶ ἐν 'Οδυσσείᾳ δὲ "ἱερὸν Τροίης πτολείθρον"") which is similar to sch. D E a ad Od. 1.2 (ἡ πάν τὸ τινὸς περιεκτικὸν καὶ φυλακτικὸν ἱερὸν καὶ θείον); cf. also Eust. ad II. II.134.9, 362.12-3.

13 ἵερον πτολείθρον Od. 1.2.

13 ἰερόν πτολείθρον Od. 1.2 (ἱερὸν πτολείθρον: δι τι θεό τοῦ ἐκτίσαν; cf. also sch. Eur. Tr. 1317 (διὰ τὸ θεόκτιστον εἶναι τὴν πόλιν), sch. T ad II. 12.3-4 (sch. ex.) (...ἐπὶ τὸ θεόκτιστον τείχος...), Eust. ad II. II.533.28ff.

15 θεραπεία Θεραπεία here is “logical meaning”.

16 καὶ ἰατρεία - κτίσματι Palaeph. Exc. Vat. fr. IV, p. 89 (Πώς λέγεται 'Ἀπόλλων καὶ Ποσειδῶν τείχισα Ίλιον. ὅτι τὸν 'Απόλλωνα καὶ τὸν Ποσειδώνα, λέγουσι τείχισα τὴν 'Ιλιον. τὸ δὲ οὐχ οὕτως ἔχει ἄλλος Λαμεδέων ἐπείγουσα τὴν πόλιν οὐχ ὡστός. ἢν δὲ ἐν τῇ ἀκροπόλει ἱερόν 'Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ Ποσειδῶνος διαφερόντως τιμώμενον, δέθεν συλὸν ανήλικε τὰ χρήματα εἰς τὴν τοῦ τείχους κατασκευὴν; cf. sch. T ad II. 21.444d (sch. ex.) (οὐ δὲ δύο φασίν ἐργασιμαζομένους ἀμιθή ἀναθείναι 'Ἀπόλλωνι καὶ Ποσειδώνι. οὐ δὲ οἵ τινες ἱερατικῶς χρήσματος φυλόδημον αὐτᾶ); cf. also Eust. ad II. II.534.8ff. (with note); Van der Valk says that Eust. changes sch. T.

17 16-21 τινὲς - κτιζόμενον Eust. ad II. II.534.10f (with note).


19 18 ἔξωδος Rare word; here it means “to appropriate”.

20 18-21 παντὶ - κτιζόμενον For a similar explanation on Apollo and Poseidon cf. Heraclit. All. 56.2, 58.2.

22 21 ἰδίαζόντως Rare word; cf. LSJ. s.v. “apart, privately” (cf. also Sext. Emp. P. 1.182.6).


23 22 Τροίης πτολείθρον ἐπερεῖ Od. 1.2.

24 23-5 ἄρχη - ἐπονομάσταται Cf. II. 2.278, 10.363, Od. 8.3, 16.442, 18.356, 22.283, 24.119, Eust. ad II. I.143.4, 335.9, 364.2, II.600.19, III.702.10, ad Od. I.1428.18, II.47.41, II.279.39; cf. also sch. A ad II. 2.278 a (Ariston.), T ad II. 2.278 b (Did. | sch. ex), D ad II. 2.278, A 15.56 a (Ariston.), A 21.550 a (Ariston.), T 21.550 b (sch. ex. | Ariston.).

26 26 σῆ - Πράμασι Od. 22.230.

26-8 πολλά - ἄλγεα Od. 1.4.

354*14.
228 29-31 διό - ὁλέθρου Ath. Epit. 2.1.166.29-30 (=Ath. 8.44.6-7) (citing Callisth. FGrH 2b, 124, fr.5.29-30) (...τοὺς Ποντικοὺς ἐκ τοῦ πολλοῦ ἥκειν πόντου δῷσπερ ἐκ τοῦ ὁλέθρου...).
229 32 μάλα πολλὰ πλάγχθη Od. 1.1-2.
230 32 πολλῶν - ἔγγο Od. 1.3.
231 12.1-2 Μάτρων - πολλὰ Ath. 4.13.1-5 (=Ath. Epit. 2.1.36.7) (citing Matron fr. 1.1).
232 3-4 πεινώντι - δεπυποσυνάωv Ath. 4.13.16-7 (citing Matron. fr. 1.9-10).
233 5 καρκικόμωνας ἀκάνθας Ath. 4.13.25 (citing Matron fr. 1.18); in Homer we find κάρη κομόντας as two words (II. 2.11, 28, 51, etc., Od. 1.90, 2.7, 408, 20.277) but Eust. copies from Ath.
234 6 μιλτοπάρρην Ath. 4.13.36 (citing Matron fr. 1.28).
235 7-10 ὡς ἀπὸ - αὐτάς Ath. 9.18.19-25 (=Ath. Epit. 2.2.7.10-3) (=Sophr. fr. 104) (...Ερατοσθένης δὲ σῶς "λαρινοῦς" προσηγόρευεσ μετάγων ἀπὸ τῶν λαρινῶν βοῶν οὕτω κληθέντων ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ λαρινεύεσθαι δ ἐστὶ αἰτιζέσθαι κατὰ Σώφρωνα ἢ ἀπὸ κώμης 'Ἡπειρωτικῆς Λαρίνης ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ βουκολοῦντος αὐτὰς Λαρίνου...); cf. Ath. 9.18.22-26; cf. also Phot. λ. 97, Συ. λ. 120.
236 10-1 τὸ δὲ - μετοχὴ Eust.’s own comment.
238 13 Ἄττικοι - εξαίρετων Cf. Steph. Byz. 70.21-2 (ἐλέγετο δὲ κατ’ ἐξοχήν πόλις καὶ πολίται εξ αὐτοῦ, ὡς ὅστι αἱ Ἀθηναίαι καὶ ἁστικοὶ οἱ ὧν Ἀθηναίοι).
239 14 ὅσπερ - Ὅλεγον Cf. Steph. Byz. 140.5-6 (...δὴ τὸ ἢ Ὅλεγον ἀστικὸν ἵκληθη εἰρητη).
240 14-5 Ἀθηναῖοι Cf. Phot. α 466 (ἀλλ’ ἀντὶ τοῦ Ἀθηναίας φασὶν ἁστικας λέγεονται καὶ Ἄττικας); cf. also Ael. Dion. α 43.
241 17 ἄρνυμενος - ἐταῖρον Od. 1.5.
242 17-19 δὴ τὸ - τετραπόδων Here Eust. uses the Aristarchean method Ὅμηρον ἐξ Ὅμηρου σαρφηγίζειν in order to explain the passage.
244 21 καὶ - ἔφη II. 2.106.
245 22 καὶ - ἄτο ἴνα Eust.’s own etymology.
246 22-4 καὶ ἐκτὸς - ἀντικαταλλάσσεσθαι Sch. H V ad Od. 1.5 (ἀρνύμενος: ἀντικαταλλάσσομενος); cf. sch. M B T ad Od. 1.5 (...δὲν ἄρνυθαι τὸ ἀνταλλάσσειν ἠγον τὸ διδόναι τι καὶ λαμβάνειν ἐπερον), EM 146.40ff., Phot. α 2854, Et. Or. 4.7, Eust. ad II. 1.113.22-3 (with note).
247 24-5 ὅσπερ - πολεῖν Cf. EGud. 489.2ff.
248 25-6 ἀρέσκει - παράγεομαι Unknown source.
249 27 εὐθέτησιν Cf. LSJ s.v. “good arrangement, prosperity”.
250 27-8 ὅθλον - ἱστορῶν A general note.
251 28-9 διό - προβαίνετι Cf. Hsch. π 3338, Eust. ad Od. I.368.36.
252 12.31-13.1 οὕτω - ἐκατόμμβονι Cf. Eust. ad II. I.384.32-3, IV.461.5-7, ad Od. I.74.11.
254 3-4 ἄλλοι - αἴρο EM 146.40, EGen. α 1211, Et. Sym. II.216.30-1.
256 6-10 περὶ - ὅμοια Heracl. Mil. fr. 22.
257 11-3 ἕκεινο - σοφὸς Eust.’s own comment.
14-5 ἦν τε ψυχὴν Od. 1.5.
14 δὲ κατὰ θυμὸν Od. 1.4.
14-6 λέγει - κατηθήσον Eust. changes Od. 1.6-9.
16-8 τίνες - διοι Eust. ad Od. II.18.15ff.; on this allegory cf. also Heraclit. All. 70.12.
23-4 τὸ δὲ - ἔκεινον Cf. sch. v ad Od. 1.7 (σφετέρησι: ταῖς έαυτῶν).
25-6 αὐτῶν σφετέρας ἄτασσαλίας Od. 1.7.
27-9 ἄτασσαλία - Ἁθήναίος Ath. 1.21.14-6 (ἐξ ὧν εἰκὸς λεχθῆναι καὶ τὴν ἄτασσαλίαν, ὅτι ἐν ταῖς θαλαίας τὰ πρῶτα ἐξημάρτανον οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἰς ἄλληλους).

13.31-14.4 ἡ πατριώμοονικὸς - Ὕπεριονίδης Pind. Ol. 7.39; cf. also Od. 22.176, Heraclit. All. 44.6, on Ὅπεριον and Ὅπεριονίδης cf. West (1988), p. 72.
2.3 Ὅπεριον Cf. Eust. ad ll. IV.348.11-3.
2-3 ἡ ἐπιθετικής - Ίδων Hdn. ὧν τις III.256.92 (παρά γὰρ τὴν ἱμαῖ τομοχή γέγονε Ὅπεριον δ' ἡμᾶς ἱμαί τον...), Vit. Hom. Plut. 2.1081; for a different etymology cf. Heraclit. All. 44.5.
3-5 καὶ ὕπελεν - τοιοῦτα Hdn. καθ III.1.40.29 (...τά εἰς ἱόν λήγουσι μετοχα δισύλλαβοι δεξαμενομέναι καὶ ὑμωμα κύρια γινόμενα μετατιθέασε τὸν τόνον ὅνον "Αμφιόν, Ὅπεριον").
5-6 οὐδὲν - ὄνομα Hdt. 4.162.8, 12, 16, 18, 5.104.5.
7-8 οἱ δὲ - ἀποθέτατο Cf. Eust. ad ll. I.204.1.
7-9 ὁ δὲ - μύλωσιν Hsch. ε 231 (ἐνδοντος: ἀγαλματίων εὐτελές ἐν τοῖς μυλώσιν, ὁ δοκεῖ ἔφορὰν τὸ ἐπιμετρόν τῶν ἀλευρών, ὅπερ λέγεται νόστος...).
10-1 Ἐδύσωκος - ἀλεύρων Phot. ε 37 (Εὐδυσωκος: θέος ἐπιμύλως, ἡ δοκοῦσα ἐφοράν τὸ μέτρον τῶν ἀλευρών); cf. also Su. v 501, EM ε 394, Eust. ad ll. I.326.12f.
12-3 οὗτος - ὑποθέσεως Eust.'s own comment.
15 τῶν ἄμοδον - ἡμῖν Od. 1.10.
15-6 ὡς - σχηματισμῷ Eust.'s own comment.
16 κατὰ δὲ ἀλληγορίαν On the word ἀλληγορία cf. Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. II, p. LXXVI-LXXVIII; cf. also my introduction p. LXXVII.
18-9 κατὰ - νῷος Cf. sch. Y ad Od. 1.10 (θυγατέρα δὲ Διὸς ψυχὴς νοῆσαις νῦν τὴν γνώσιν: ἡ γὰρ γνώσις θυγατήρι ἐστὶ τοῦ Διὸς, ἤγουν τὸ νῷος...); Eust. is rationalizing, and especially in a way which allows the retention of pagan theology in a Christian context.
232 20-3 σημειώσαι - ἐνέσφημτο Eust.'s own comment.
24-6 τὸ δὲ - οὐδεπόθεν Eust. paraphrases sch. E ad Od. 1.10 (παρὰ τοῖς Δωριέσιν ἦστιν οὖν ἄμος ἣς ὀσούνησαν τῷ τις, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦτο γίνεται τὸ "ἀμόθεν" δηλοῦν τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦτο ἡμέρους τούτων. ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄμοθεν γίνεται καὶ τὸ οὐδαμόθεν...).
28-9 εἰ - πληθυντικῇ Hdt. 1.18.11, 24.5, 57.14, 143.16, 173.18, 2.50.11, 80.5,
3.15.14, 7.106.10, 139.6, 8.142.6, 9.58.11.

286 29 οδηγός Hdt. 4.114.9.

287 30 πρός οδηγόν ἀνθρώπων Hdt. 4.45.18, 7.60.2.

288 15.4 παραπλήρωσες On the word παραπλήρωσις Van der Valk (1971–87), vol. II, p. XXXII.

289 6-5 ἐκ δὲ - ἀμωσιγέφως Sch. Ε ad Od. 1.10 (άπό δὲ τοῦ ἀμωσιγέφως γίνεται τὸ ἀμωσιγέφως).

290 6-7 ἀμωσιγέφως - ἐφιλοσοφήσαν Eust.'s own examples; for a similar example cf. Hermog. Id. p. 411.1ff. (Ἀμυγένη προσαψάμενος εἰδῶν τοῦ λόγου).

291 8-10 διό - ἱμηρήνευες The reference comes from Demosthenes Thrax’s Paraphrase of the Odyssey and should be added to the collection of his fragments; on Demosthenes Thrax cf. Su. δ 457, my introduction p. XCVI.

292 13-4 ὦς - ἐγγράφη Eust. ad Od. 1.2.25ff. (=3.14ff. Makr.).

293 15-6 ἕνθ' ἄλλοι - ἐλέθρον Od. 1.11.

294 13-6 δτι - τότε Eust.'s own comment; cf. LSJ s.v. 2 “thereupon, then”.

295 16-7 οὖθ' ἔνθα - ἀέρθον Od. 1.4.

296 17 πάντες δασοὶ φύγον Od. 1.11.

297 18 λέξα - ἔχο Lycophr. Alex. 1-8.

298 18-20 δτι - ὄκοι General remark on the use of the word by the Attic writers; cf. LSJ s.v.


300 20-1 ποιηται - εἰρήνηται Eust. ad Il. I.72.2, 8-11, 235.9, 525.29, II.287.6, 551.17, III.231.4-5, 262.1.

301 24 κατάντημα Cf. LSJ s.v. “an end, goal”.

302 27 Ἄλλοθν - πέλασασεν Od. 9.39.

303 29-30 νόστου - γυναικός Od. 1.13.

304 30-1 οία δὲ - εἰρήνηται Eust. ad Od. 1.17.40ff. (=32.27ff. Makr.), 27.10ff. (=50.18ff. Makr.), 86.34ff.

305 32-3 ἤμεις - συντάσσομεν Cf. LSJ s.v. χράομαι II.


307 7-8 δὲ - ἐρρήθη Eust.'s own comment probably recalling II. 20.8-9.

308 8 Νησίδες Eust. ad Il. II.235.8, IV.152.3, 962.12, 964.6, ad Od. I.385.15.

309 9 'Αμακρόουδες Eust. ad Il. II.350.9, III.303.23, ad Od. I.385.15.

310 9 'Ορεστιάδες Eust. ad Il. II.350.4, ad Od. I.385.15.

311 9 Λευκωνάδες Eust. ad Od. II.350.9.

312 10-1 ὦς καὶ - ἔρι Od. 10.136 (Circe), 12.448-9 (Calypso).

313 14-5 δτι μέντοι - ἔστιν Eust. means different legends (ἐξ τῶν ἱστοριῶν) like the one about Circe’s and Odysseus’ son in Eust. ad Od. I.1.14ff. (=1.17 Makr.).

314 20-1 ὦς - γέγραπται Eust. ad Il. 1.35.5, 120.24-8.

315 22 Διός μεγάλου ἐνιαυτοί Il. 2.134.


317 23 φασὶ Il. 5.721; cf. Eust. ad Il. II.293.6ff., II.603.6 (with note).

318 23-5 ὦς - Αἰλίος - ἐπιγεγραμμέται Ael. Dion. δ 21; cf. PCG adesp.VIII fr. 6; cf. also Plut. Mor. 425E.

319 29-30 φησι - κεῖται Ael. Dion. δ 10 (ἀγαθότερος <δὲ> καὶ ἀγαθότατος παρ' οὐδενὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων κεῖται).

320 16.30-17.2 δτι τὸ γλαυρόν - γενόμενον Eust. ad Il. II.1274.9, III.303.3.
14 το “τετεύχαι” “τετούχαι” Cf. ll. 15.110, Od. 1.391; Eust’s own example.
16-7 δ’ αὐτός - αὕδετέρως Paus. Att. σ 12 (= Phot. σ 513.7) (σίραιον· τὸν ἐσπημένον οἶνον καὶ γλυκύν).
17 ἀθέλους - ἀγώνας Eust.’s own comment.
18-1 δενήθη - τόθελοι Eust.’s own comment.
19-4 ὅτι ἦ - θάλασσαν Allegorical explanation.
26-7 οὐ μόνον - ποιηταῖς Maybe Eust. implies the patronymic Νηλημιάδης (ll. 14.42) or Νηλημίος (ll. 23.349) which show a relationship with Poseidon.
28 ὡς ἐν - ιστορεῖται Od. 3.130-200.
28-9 ἀσπερχές - πολυπούδαστον Eust. ad ll. I.698.6.
29-30 Σοφοκλῆς - λέγει Soph. Aj. 982.
19.1 ἐντεύθεν - ὄνομα Cf. Eust. ad ll. III.547.6-8, IV.734.6-8.
1-2 το οπασταμειούνται - χρήσασθαι Sch. A ad ll. 6.154 (Ariston.), 7.138 (Ariston.), 12.96 (Ariston.), 20.372 b (Ariston.), 23.642 a (Ariston.).
3-4 Αἰθίσαται - ἀνδρῶν Od. 1.22-3.
5 πατήρ - θεών τε Od. 1.28; cf. Eust. ad ll. I.1226.21.
7 ἐστι - δικάθα Eust. ad Od. 1.110.21 (=20.17 Makr.).
7-9 ὡς καὶ - “πέπονθα” Cf. Hdn. μεγ. ῥήμ. 15.11 (=EM 662.9-10) (πόθεν τὸ πέπονθα; παρὰ τὸ πονὸν πονήσαν πεπόνθα, καὶ δ’ ἐκέρκου πέπονθα, καὶ πλεονάσαμον τοῦ θ’ πέπονθα); cf. also 16.13; on a different derivation of πέπονθα from πήδω cf. Hdn. παθ. III.2.289.31; cf. also sch. Hom. 89.1.
7-10 “μαλακός” “μαλακός” Hdn. ὀρ. III.2.547.34.
11 “χαμαλή” “χαμαλή” Hdn. παθ. III.2.287.1.
11-2 - ἀκούει Heracl. Mil. fr. 34.
13 καροστία όχι Although the references to καροστία are numerous, none mentions Eustathius’ etymology.
17 ἐσπατοι ἀνδρῶν Od. 1.23.
18 τηλθέθη κοίντας Od. 1.22.
18-9 καὶ μὲν - άννοντος Cf. Od. 1.24; Eust. rationalizes by replacing “Ὑπέριονος” with “νῆλιού”.
19 διχάθα μεμερίσθη αὐτοὺς Cf. Od. 1.23.
21 νῆσορ ἐν ἀμφιρύτῃ Od. 1.50.
22 νῆσος δενδρήμασα Od. 1.51.
25 εἰμενέαυε Od. 1.20.
388 24-6 ἔνταθα - Ὠδυσσεῖ Eust.'s own comment.
389 27-8 διὸ καὶ - διήγαγον II. 1.423-5.
390 30-1 καὶ - Ἰλλαδί The word is not repeated in the Iliad; I am not sure what Eust. means here.
391 31 Δωριέων - τοι Eust.'s own comment (?).
392 20.2-3 ὃς - οἶδε Od. 1.52-3.
393 3 ὃ Because of the explanation which follows Eust. should have ὃ instead of ὅ.
394 3 ὦ γὰρ - χολοθεῖς II. 1.9.
395 9-10 παραδεδοται - ἀρθρον On protaktikόν ἄρθρον cf. Apoll. Dysc. 2.2.27.2-3, 72.4-5, 123.1ff., 446.1ff.
396 10-1 καὶ δῆλον - θατερος Cf. Et. Or. 74.15ff., EM 443.27ff. (citing Hdn. παθ. III.2.344.9ff.); cf. also Eust. ad Od. 1.268.5.
397 15-6 καὶ τό - κομικῶν Ar. Plu. 555, 872.
398 17-8 τό δὲ - Ἰλλαδί II. 2.668, 3.363, 15.189.
399 19 διήχη Cf. Eust. ad II. I.126.20.
400 19 διή Cf. Eust. ad II. I.126.21.
401 22 ὦς - διαφαίνειν On διάφαίμα cf. LSJ s.v. “musical interlude, used by the LXX, in the Psalms, for the Hebr. Selah”; on διαφαίνειν cf. LSJ s.v. “accompany with a δίδακλον”; on διαφαίνειν cf. LSJ s.v. διαφαινω “show through, let a thing be seen through”; Eust.'s own examples.
402 23 διάνοιξα γευσέται There are two verbs used with διάνοιξα in the Iliad: the first is δώκε (“to give”, II.9.37) and the other is μερμηρίζεν (“to think”, II. 1.189, 9.37, 13.455). Eustathius here explains the second case, in which διάνοιξα underlies the division of the thought or heart in two ways. Eust. usually seems to insist on this specific use of διάνοιξα: cf. Eust. ad II. I.126.26-31, II.554.11-6); cf. also sch. b T ad II. I.189-93 (sch. ex.), T ad II. 8.167 (sch. ex.), A in II. 8.168 (Ariston.); cf. also the two equal in meaning expressions δίχα δὲ σφιν ἤνδειξα διπλή Ἰλλαδί (II. 18.510) and διηθά μοι κραδίη μέμονε φρεσίν ὄρμανοντι (II. 16.435).
403 24-5 δίτι ἀπό - αἰθός Ar. Thes. 246.
406 25-7 καὶ οἱ - πλέον Cf. Ptol. Apoll. 2.2.2.4ff. (κατὰ κορυφῆν λαμβάνοντες τὸν ἥλιον καὶ διακοιμοντες μέλανες τα σώματα καὶ τῶν ἱδακας οὐκοὶ τακτοὶ τοι ἀνακοιμησιν ζωῆς οἰκοῦντες Αἰθιόπες έσοι κατὰ κορυφήν ἑχοντες εν ταῖς τροπαίας τὸν ἥλιον).
408 28 καὶ δίτι - αἰθίου I cannot find aithiow as an epithet for Zeus.
409 30-1 οὖκ - φαινόν Note the frequency with which allegorical explanation is sought.
410 31 παρὰ - λάμπω Cf. Hsch. a 1900, sch. Pind. P. 8.65a, Eust. ad II. I.379.28, 560.10, II.503.10, ad Od. II.190.2.
411 31 αἰθήρ Zeis Aesch. fr. 70; cf. Eust. ad II. III.630.2.
413 32 καὶ τὸ αἰθριον Cf. Phot. a 578, Su. a152.
414 33 ὁς οἰκός - φωσφόρος Lycophr. Alex. 359; cf. also sch. Lycophr. 359, Eust. ad II. I.704.11, II.3.3, 38.2, 214.5, 258.2, 595.21, III.782.24, IV.89.15, 19, 376.8-9, 377.2, 413.7-
10, ad Od. I.133.30, II.189.28.

41 34-5 οἱ μὲν ἁνατέλλοντος Cf. Od. 1.24; Eust. rationalizes by replacing "Ὑπερίονος" with "ἡλίου".

41 20.35-21.1 τούτῳ - παλαιοῖς Eust. means the several writers that he mentions afterwards; on the Ethiopians and on this partition cf. West (1988), p. 75-6.

41 1-4 τοῖς μὲν - κόλπῳ Cf. Str. 1.2.28.48-52.

41 4-7 οἱ μὲν - δυσμόν Cf. Str. 1.2.28.6-9 (citing Ephor. IIA.70 fr. 30a).

41 10-11 δὲ μέμνηται - Ἀιγύπτου Hdt. 3.97.5.

41 11-2 καὶ - Ἄρισταρχος Str. 1.2.24.43-50, 25.16ff.

41 15-6 καθ' - χθονὸς Aesch. Pr. 846.

41 16-8 καὶ αὐτὸς - Ἀιγύπτου Eust.'s own comment.

41 18-9 συντρέχει - ἀνιόντος Str. 1.2.25.24-8 (καὶ γὰρ αὕτη στενὴ τε ἐστὶ καὶ μακρὰ καὶ ἐπικλύστος, τά δ’ ἐξ ὧν τής ἐπικλύστου ἐρημία τε καὶ ἀνυδρα καὶ σπανίως σικείσαθαι δυνάμενα, τά μὲν πρὸς ἐω τά δὲ πρὸς δύος κεκλιμένα πὼς οἴνοι καὶ δίχα διήρηται:).

42 21-2 οἱ - ἀνιόντος Cf. Od. 1.24; Eust. rationalizes by replacing "Ὑπερίονος" with "ἡλίου".

42 23-5 καὶ τοὺς - οὐλόστατον Eust. changes Aristot. GA 782b33ff (καὶ διὰ τούτο οἱ μὲν ἐν τῷ Πόντῳ Σκύθαι καὶ Θρᾴκες εὐθύτριχες. [...] Αἰθίοπες δὲ καὶ οἱ ἐν τοῖς θερμοῖς οὐλότριχες).


42 21.30-22.5 ἀλλοι δὲ - ἀθετήτρι ημῖν Eust. changes Str. 1.2.24.17ff.; with the expression ἀλλοι δὲ Eust. means Crates; on Crates’ opinion cf. Gem. 16.21-8, Crates fr. 37.

42 5-6 οἱ δὲ - εὐρίσκοντο Eust.'s own comment.

42 6-11 διὰ ταύτα - ἕπερνόσται Eust. gives a conclusive paragraph on the three different interpretations of ἕσχατον ἀνδρῶν.

42 11 ὡς ἐν - καταγραφῇ Eust.'s own list; there seems to be some repetition here maybe due to lack of revision.

41 20-1 ὅτι - ἀνατολικότερα Od. 5.5283; cf. sch. T ad ll. 6.184 (sch. ex.), sch. P Q T ad Od. 5.5282, M* 1.23; cf. Str. 1.2.28.26, Eust. ad Od. I.1217.35-40.

42 21-2 ἱστέον - χαίρειν Eust.'s own comment.

42 23-4 ἀπὸ Λιβόν - Ἐλληνας Hdt. 2.50.11.

42 24 καθ’ - Ἡρακλέους Hdt. 2.43.4.

42 26 ἄντισων - ἐκαταρμῆδι Od. 1.25.

42 26-7 ταῦρον - προερήπη Eust. ad Od. 1.9.42 (=17.14 Makr.); cf. also Hdn. γάμ. συμβ. III.2.904.11, 034. III.2.353.25.


42 22.32-23.1 ἀλλὰ - διεισχύομαι Eust. ad Od. I.337.1, 339.32; cf. Phot. α 2805, Eust. ad Od. I.354.9, 354.18.

42 1 ἄρνειος πτησιμάλλῳ ll. 3.197.

42 2 καὶ ἄρνειος - Κύκλωπος Od. 9.432, 444.

42 3-4 γίνεται δὲ - τοιαῦτα Cf. Hdn. καθ’ III.1.135.7-9 (τὸ δὲ ἄρνειος κατὰ πλευνασμὸν ἐσχῆ τινὶ εἰ διεφθογγον. ἡ γὰρ ἄρνος γενικῆ μεταγέται εἰς οὐδὲν ὡς ἄρνος κατὰ πλευνασμὸν τής εἰ γίνεται ἄρνειος...), ῥήμα III.2.444.13 (καὶ μεταγέται αὕτη ἡ γενικῆ εἰς οὐδὲν οὖν ἄρνος κατὰ πλευνασμόν τής εἰ γίνεται ἄρνειος ὡς ἄρνος ἁμένειος, ἄδελφος ἄδελφειος), 478.26-8 (ἄρνειος. [...] ἄσπερ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄδελφος γίνεται ἄδελφειος κατὰ πλευνασμόν τής εἰ διεφθόγγοις ὡς καὶ ἄρνος ἄρνειος); cf. also Eust. ad ll. I.70.28, 635.23.
443 5-6 ἵστεν - φανινήσαται Eust. ad Od. I.404.11 ff.
444 6-7 κατὰ - ἱερεῖον Παυσ. Ἀττ. δ 29 (= Συ. δ 1444, τ 1030).
445 7 περὶ - ἄλλαχον Φοι. δ 867 (δῶδεκα θυσίαι δώδεκα ἱερεῖον).
446 8-9 συνήρθησα - δόμοι Cx. Ηδ. ὑθ. III.2.555.22 (ἀπό γάρ τοῦ Νηρηίδες καὶ Βρησιδίδαι καὶ Χρησίδαις καὶ Καμηλίδις συνερέθη Νηρηίδες, Βρησίδαις, Χρησίδαις καὶ Καμηλίδις).
447 9-10 ἕκ δὲ - ἕκατομβας Cx. Συ. ε 366.
448 10-3 ἵστεν - ἐσχεδίαζεν Ath. 4.25.7 ff. (citing Theopomp. Hist. ΠΒ, 115, fr. 179) (Θεόπομπος δ’ ἐν τῇ τριακοστῇ καὶ πέμπτη τῶν ἱστοριῶν τῶν Παρθαγόνων φησι βασιλέα Θύν ἔκατον πάντα παρατίθεσθαι δειπνοῦντα ἐπὶ τὴν τράπεζαν ἀπὸ βοῶν ἄρξαμενον), Ath. Epit. 2.1.42.38 ff. (Θεόφραστος δὲ φησι βασιλέα Παρθαγόνων τινα ἔκατον πάντα παρατίθεσθαι δειπνοῦντα ἐπὶ τὴν τράπεζαν ἀπὸ βοῶν ἄρξαμενον); Eust. either moves by a process of association to include material which looks digressive or wishes to display learning.
449 14 oἱ - ἔδωνες Ath. Epit. 2.1.19.24-5 (οἱ πίνουσι μόνον βατράχων τρόπον οὐδὲν ἔδωνες), = Ath. 3.59.16 (…ἔδωνες), citing Archestr. fr. 62; note Eust.’s agreement on ἔδωνες with Ath. Epit. CE whilst A has ἔδωνες; cf. also Eust. ad I. Π 797.15 (with note).
450 15 οὖ - Ἰλίαδι II. 16.260.
451 16-8 σημείωσα - ἄντιος Eust. ad I. Π 111.8 ff.
452 18 εκ δὲ - εναντιῶ Κε. Ηδ. καθ. ΠΒ 1.1.228.15-6.
453 19 καὶ εκ - κύριον Cx. Ι. 16.695, Ηδ. παθ. ΠΒ 2.248.23, Eust. ad I. Π 111.9-10.
454 19-20 καὶ - Ἀμφίος Cx. Ι. 2.830, 5.612, Ηδ. καθ. ΠΒ 1.1.225.26-6, I.119.10-1.
455 20 καὶ - Ὑπιος Cx. Ηδ. καθ. ΠΒ 1.1.125.21-2, ὑθ. ΠΒ 2.435.8, 596.19, Eust. ad I. Π 119.11.
456 21 εἰ δὲ - ὑπονοεῖται It is not clear what Eust. means here; maybe he implies that the preposition ἀνά is not identified in the name Ἄντιος as easily as other prepositions in the previous examples or that there are alternative derivations (like some people think that it comes from ἀνά, cf. Eust. ad I. Π 111.12), so the derivation offered must remain conjectural.
457 22 ἄλλας - δοκεῖ Cx. Eust. ad I. Π 119.8-13, ΠΒ 44.1-4, ΠΒ 916.8-11.
458 24 εκ Διός ἀρχῶμεθα Arat. Phaen. 1.1; cf. also Theocr. XVII.1, Alcm. fr. 29, Pind. Nem. 2.1.
459 24.2-4 το δίχα - πηδήσαν EM 25.57, 655.22-2, EGud. 33.11 (Stef.); cf. also Eust. ad I. Π 1.783.6 ff. (with note).
460 2-3 ἐπὶ - ἅφοσιν Cx. sch. ΗΙ 1 ad Od. 1.27 (= Ηδ. παθ. ΠΒ 2.130.1-2) (ἄθροιοι. δασυνέτων το α. και προ τέλους ο δεξια, ἐπειδὴ σημαινεὶ ὁμοφ.).
461 4 ἄθροι ἤσαν Od. 1.27.
462 4-5 ἄθροι πάντι ἀπείζουσα Od. 1.43.
463 5-6 ἐδασυνέτω ἀναφέρονται Cx. Ηδ. καθ. ΠΒ 1.538.2 (το ἄθροισ, διε ἐπιτατικόν ἔχει το α, δασυνέτω παρ’ Ἀττικοῖς).
465 8-9 εἰ δὲ - κομικῷ Ar. Ran. 1089; note that Eust. follows the vulgate tradition and writes ἀπαφανήνη.
466 11 δὲν - εἰρκτῇ Cx. Ηδ. καθ. ΠΒ 1.538.6, 546.4, sch. Ar. Ach. 330a, Eust. ad Od.
II.79.38. A different opinion is expressed in Su. ei 200 (τὸ δὲ ἕπι τῆς ἐπικήτης ψυλῆς Ἀττικώ). 

467 12 ἐκ τοῦ - ἀθροὺς Eust.'s own addition; cf. Su. a 758, Eust. ad Od. I.100.37. 
468 13 καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης - ἀθροὺς Ar. fr. 633. 
469 13-5 καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης - παραθέτει Ael. Dion. a 46 (verbatim citation) citing Ptol. Ascalon. 
470 16-7 περισσοπείν - ὅραν Ael. Dion. a 45 (ἀθρεῖν: τὸ περισσοπείν καὶ μετ’ ἐπιτάσεως ὅραν), (=Su. a 752); cf. Phot. a 480, Eust. ad Od. II.214.46, 215.1. 
471 17 παρὰ - δαισύνεται Cf. Ael. Dion. a 47. 
473 18 ὅθεν ἀφενὸς Eust. ad ll. I.117.1, III.908.7, ad Od. I.59.43. 
474 19-20 καὶ ἡ ἀμίς - Διονύσιος The word καθημαζωμένως is a mistake; Ael. Dion. a 98 (ἀμιδᾶ. δασάως [...] λέγουσι δὲ καὶ ἀμάζουν δασάως καὶ καθημαζωμένα...); on ἀμαζά cf. also Hdn. κ.λ. ὄν. III.2.716.6, Phot. a 1030, Eust. ad Od. I.352.21; on καθημαζωμένα cf. also Hdn καθ. Ι.Ι.154.3, II. Pros. III.2.108.30. 
475 20 καὶ - ἀμάζον Αελ. Dion. a 98 = Phot. a 1197 (...καὶ τὸ ἀμάζον οὕτως λέγουσι θαμάζον...). 
476 21-3 ὅτι δὲ - παραθέτει Hdn. καθ. III.1.126.21-3 (τὸ δὲ ἀθρόος παραθύτοτον ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀθροίζειν, προπαραθύτοτον δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ αἰφνιδίου ὡς καὶ ἀθρόος ὁ ἄφωνος κατὰ στέρησιν τοῦ ἄφωος). 
479 2 Ῥηθήσεται - τρυφάν Eust.'s own comment. 
480 2-4 μέγαρον - Περιεφόνη Παυσ. Αττ. μ 9 (μέγαρον· κοινός ὑπέρφον, οἰκήμα ἑδίκος <ἀδ> μέγαρα· κατάγεια οἰκήματα τάνθα θεαίν); note that Eust. copies Pausanias' wrong spelling of ἑδίκος. 
481 3-6 Ἀλιος - κατατίθενται Ael. Dion. μ 2 (=Phot. μ 5) (μέγαρον· οὐ μέγαρον, εἰς ὁ τὰ μυστικὰ ἱτάτατα γίνεται: οὕτως Μέγανδρος (=Men. fr. 553)); cf. also Henrichs ZPE 4 (1969), pp. 32-6 (on the word μέγαρον p. 35f.). 
482 7 ἀμίμμονα Od. 1.29. 
483 11-2 περὶ - Ὑμάδα Eust. ad ll. I.33.24 ff., 136.5 ff., 177.15 ff. 
484 12-3 μυθικός - ἀληθινὰν Note the passion for allegorical explanation which is an attempt to claim the pagan classics for a Christian readership. 
485 13 οὐ μόνον - ἐκκαμβανόμενος Eust. ad ll. I.37.10 ff. 
488 15 καὶ εἰς ἦλιον Cf. Eust. ad ll. I.197.2, 10, 197.15. 
489 18 Ζάν Cf. Ar. Av. 570. 
490 15-8 καὶ ὅτι τῶν - Βοιωτικῶς Eust. changes Hdn. μον. III.2.911.8 "...ὅτι δὲ ποικίλως εὑρίσκεται υπὸ παλαιῶν ὁ θεὸς οὐκ ἄγνων. καὶ γὰρ Δίς καὶ Ζήν καὶ Δήν καὶ Ζάς, καὶ Ζής παρὰ Φερεκύθης κατὰ κίνησιν ἴδιαν, καὶ υπὸ Βοιωτῶν καὶ Δεσι καὶ Δάν." (Pherercyd. Syr. fr. I =Diog. Laert. Vit. Phil. 1.119); (note that he also changes Φερεκύθης to Φερεκύθης); cf. also καθ. III.1.402.7 (...Ζής παρὰ Φερεκύθης...), Eust. ad ll. I.177.15 ff., 686.28 fff. 
491 19-20 καὶ ὅτι - Ζεύν Αθη. Epit. 2.1.158.37 (σημειώσας ὅτι εὑρίσκεται αἰτιατική τῶν Ζεύν ἀπὸ εὐθείας τῆς Ζεύς παρὰ Πολυκράτει τῷ σφοιστῆ...) (=Ath. 8.13.13) (citing
Aeschr. fr. 4).

492 20 περισπομένη - λίν Cf. sch. A ad II. 11.480 c (= Hdn. καθ. III.1. 415.5ff.); cf. also Hdn. καθ. III.1.402.21, II. Pros., III.2.73.31, 77.3f., Eust. ad II. III.238.1.

493 21 εν οίς - θεὸν Hdn. καθ. III.1.415.7 ("κάπα αιτιατική μονοσύλλαβος εἰς τὴν λήγουσα περισπάται, ἀπέστραπται δὲ τὸν ὃς τὸν τόν θυμὸν <μῶν, μαρνάν, σύν, θιν, δρόν, λίν> τῇ τε λίν ἦγαν δαιμόν, <γην, ναόν, γραύν, θεὸν> τῇ θεόν Ἀρτεμίνι οἱ ἔπαθεν τῇ θεόν κατά κράσιν...)."

494 22-3 ὃ πόσοι - αἰτιώτατοι Od. 1.32; Eust. forgets vu.

495 22-4 δι τὸ - ἀγανάκτησιν Eust. ad II. I.154.8-13, 19-22; cf. also I.155.1-5, 334.10-11.


502 1 βρίσα βρίσα Cf. Eust. ad II. I.337.28.

503 1 βρῶ βρῶ Cf. Eust. ad II. I.160.23.


505 2-3 δ' αὐτὸς - καλούμενον Cf. sch. Theocr. II.30b, Eust. D.P. 1134.28ff.

506 4-5 Ἐθνολίξ - ψίλιθον Ath. Epit. 2.2.82.23 (...ρύμοι δὲ αὐτὸν Ἐθνολίξ εἶπε) (Eupfr. fr. 83).


508 6-7 ιματία - ὑφαίνομεν Ath. Epit. 2.2.82.14-5 (=Ath. 12.29.9-10) (Democr. Eph. Π.267 fr. 1, πορφορά καὶ κρόκινα ρόμβους ωφαντά;); Eustathius cites υφαίνομενα instead of ωφαντά.

509 7-8 ζήτης - Θεοκρίτουn Sch. Theocr. II.30a (ῥόμβος ά χάλκεως: χαλκοῦν ἐφή ρόμβον τὴν ἐκ τοῦ κτηρίου καὶ τοῦ πτερυγίου τυγγα διὰ τὴν στεροτίτη καὶ δύναμιν τῶν φαρμάκων. τὸν δὲ ρόμβον ο τ "Αττικοὶ ρόμβον καλοῦσαντ;) 30b1 (ῥόμβος, ἀπρικτος, ἄ χαλκοῦ ροχος ή ς στερεος;) cf. Eust. D.P. 1134.32ff.

510 8-13 δὲ - φιλόσοφον - πεπρωμένου Eust.'s own comment; note the allegorical explanation in 1.13; cf. Eust. ad Od. I.14.2 (=25.13 Makr.).

511 13-4 ζεῦς - ωφαίνεται Eust. ad II. I.133.12, 27, 37.13f. 256.12 685.20, 22, 686.3, II.118.18f., 212.6, 329.10 etc.

512 14-5 σφήνων - ἐχόντες Eust. adapts Od. 1.34 for his text.

513 20 μήτη μνᾶσθαι ἄκοιτι Cf. Od. 1.39.

514 27-9 τὸ μέντοι - παραληγόουσαν Cf. also Eust. ad II. I.725.18ff.


516 27.2 ὑπέρμορον ἄλγεα πάσχειν Cf. Od. 1.34.
2 ὑπὲρ τὸ καθήκον Cf. sch. b T ad ll. 16.780 (sch. ex.), Ap. S. 160.21, Hsch. v 433, Eust. ad Od. II.261.35.

3 ὑπερηργορεόν Cf. EM 778.55ff., EGud. κ 352, Hsch. v 391, Su. 284.


5 ὑπέρμετρον Plat. Lg. 864d, Stob. 3.5.28.5, 4.31c.83.2; cf. also EM 39.22, Hsch. ε 3519, π 1758, ν 438.

6 ὑπερβαλλόντως Diog. Laert. Vit. Phil. 7.170.6, Su. ε 1584, 516, ν 235 etc.


8 ὑπερήπτει Od. 8.198.

9 σεμνόν On the word cf. my introduction p. CXIX, n. 405.

10-9 ὁ πότιον - ἐξμεναι Od. 1.32-3.

11-2 ὃς καὶ - Ἀγίωθος Od. 1.35.

12 τόδε τι Cf. Od. 1.35ff.

13 ἐπικοπος ἀργεφόντης Od. 1.38.

14-4 δι ὁ πρόσ - ἐστίν Cf. Heraclit. All. 67.5 (πεῖδη ποικίλλων λόγων), 72.4 (ἐμφρων λόγως).

15-5 ὁ πολλάκις - ἀπολλύμεθα Note the didactic style.

16-6 δι ἐ - ἀληθορεῖται Allegorical explanation; cf. also Eust. ad ll. I.17.3ff., 30.24, 279.21ff., IV.882.5 etc.


19-1 ἰν δὲ - ἐρει Od. 3.306-310.

24-4 ἄκοιτις δὲ - ληθεύεσα Cf. Porph. 120.15ff. (Sod.). Eust. wants to correct Porph.’s explanation of ἄκοιτις; note that he is always concerned to find Christian morality where he can.


26-6 ὁ δόλιος Ἐρμῆς Soph. Phil. 133, Ar. Plu. 1157; cf. Eust. ad ll. I.281.19, 760.6-8, IV.360.26-7, ad Od. II.80.22-3.

26 δ χόνυνος This adjective is already known to Eust. as a standard one for Hermes from the tragic poets (Aesch. Pers. 628, fr. 273 a8-9, Soph. Aj. 832, Eur. Alc. 743) and from Aristophanes (Ar. Ran. 1145), as he mentioned earlier (ad ll. II.102.1, IV.362.15); cf. also Heraclit. All. 72.18.

27 ὁ στρόφις Ar. Pl. 1153-4; cf. Hsch. ε 5954, Eust. ad ll. IV.914.8, ad Od. II.101.4.

27 ὁ ἐμπολαῖος Ar. Pl. 1152, 1155; cf. Eust. ad ll. IV.913.19, ad Od. II.101.4, II.282.37.

27 ἐνεκικοπος - μέλλοντα However, Eust. gives another explanation of ἐνεκικοπος elsewhere (ad ll. I.407.19-20).

28 καὶ ὁ ἀργεφόντης - φόνου Sch. b T ad ll. 2.103 (sch. ex.), sch. H1 M1 V M* Y D E J ad Od. I.38; cf. Eust. ad ll. I.279.25, IV.545.20; for a different explanation cf. Heraclit. All. 72.10.

29-30 Ἀτρείδαο - αἶς Od. 1.40-1; Eust. has ὅπποτ’ ἄρ’ instead of ὅπποτ’ ἄν’.

29-1 ὑπὲρ τὸς δέ - γέγραπται Eust. ad ll. I.690.22-691.6, II.146.1-6; cf. also III.182.23-28, III.504.1-10.

2 ἐν τούτοις - παρίσωσις Eust. uses here a rhetorical term that he has used before.

3-5 Αἰολέων - γέγραπται Eust. ad ll. I.21.9-11; cf. Hdn. καθ III.1.408.22.

4-7 φαιν - Ἀγαμέμνονος Sch. H1 K M* ad Od. 1.40 (τὸ δὲ Ἀτρείδαο oὐ κατὰ τοῦ Ὀρέστου, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος τέτακται); cf. also sch. M* ad Od. 1.40 (Ἀτρείδαο τοῦ ὑιοῦ τοῦ Ἀτρέως), M* (ἥγουν τοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος).
547 5 ἰκ - Ἄτρείδαο Od. 1.40.
548 13 ἄις Cf. Od. 1.41
549 13-4 τὸ δὲ - πατρίδα Cf. Eust. ad Il. II.483.12, ad Od. 1.20.13 (=37.14f. Makr.).
550 15 νῦν - ἀπέτεισον Od. 1.43.
551 17-8 καὶ - ἰέβοι Od. 1.46-7.
552 18-20 σημειώσα - ἐκατος Eust.'s own comment.
553 24 τὴν καίριν ταυτολογίαν trsm. "a timely pleonasm".
554 24 ὧς - ἐδείξει A general comment on the pleonasmics of the Iliad.
555 24-6 πλάττει - ἐκπεφονημένο Eust. notes what we would call "formula".
556 26 ὁ πάτερ - κρείοντον Od. 1.45.
558 (φημὶ δὲ τῷ ἄνερ, πάτερ, σώτερ, δάερ, ταύτα γὰρ οὐχ ἔχει τὴν αὐτήν ὀρθὴν καὶ ἱλητικήν. [...] τὸ μὲν ἄνερ, πάτερ, δάερ, ἱκολούθησα τοῖς συγγενικοῖς αὐτῶν, φημὶ δὲ τῷ μήτερ καὶ θυγατέρ. ὧςον γὰρ τῷ μήτερ καὶ θυγάτηρ διείλοντα ἐν τῇ γενικῇ προπαροξυνθήσει διὰ τὸ φυλάξαι τὸν τόνον τῆς εὐθείας ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ συλλαβῇ οἷον μήτερ μήτερος καὶ θυγάτηρ θυγατέρος, ὧςον Δημήτηρ Δημήτερος καὶ εἰνάτηρ εἰνάτερος (σημαίνει δὲ τὴν σύννυμφον), οὐ πρὸ παραράξηθα ἀλλὰ παραράξηθαι οἷον "μήτερος, θυγατέρος" καὶ ἱκολούθησα τοῖς συγγενικοῖς αὐτῶν, φημὶ δὲ τῷ "ἀνέρος πατέρος δαέρος", τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου τὰ ἀρσενικά τοῖς θηλυκοῖς ἱκολούθησα κατὰ τὴν κλητικήν; ὁμ μήτερος καὶ θυγατέρος cf. also III.2.749.14-9.
559 29 εἰκὸς - Ἀιολικότερον Hdn. κλ. Ὀν. III. 2.717.32ff. (τὸ δὲ σώτερ ψευδολοικόν ἐστι καὶ τοῦτον χάριν συνεδετεῖ τὴν εἰς τὸ ἐν τῇ κλητικῇ καὶ ἤδαιονθῇ; cf. also παθ. III.2.359.7-8.
560 29-32 ὁ δὲ - ἐστιν Cf. also Hdn. καθ III.1.240.13-4 (πᾶσα γὰρ γενικῇ ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβας εἰς οἷς λήγουσα ἑπέστραπται τὴν δέξαι τὰς χωρίς τοῦ γυναικὸς καὶ ἱθατρός).
561 32 ὀμοιώς - περαιομένη Cf. also Hdn. καθ III.1.412.12-4 (καθόλου γὰρ πᾶσα δοτικὴ ἱσοσύλλαβος τῇ ἴδιᾳ γενικῇ καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἔχει τόνον καλῶς καλῶς φοτός φωτὶ. εἰ οὖν τὸ γυναικὸς καὶ ἱθατρός δέξαται, εἰκότως ἢ ἄρα καὶ τοῦτον δοτικαὶ δέξαται).
562 28.1 σημειώδες Cf. LSJ s.v. σημειώδης "remarkable, conspicuous".
563 5-6 ὧς καὶ - κεῖται Il. 1.206.
564 6 ὧς - ἐκκείται Eust. means Zeus' talk in Od. 1.35-43.
565 7-8 δοικότει - καὶ τά; Cf. Od. 1.46-62.
566 8-9 καὶ - προσομιον Unknown source.
568 10 ὁ κυνόπης Cf. Eust. ad Il. II.1.12-5, II.776.18-19, IV.651.4.
569 10 οδ - κυνόπη Il. 1.159.
570 12 γλαυκών Cf Hdn. καθ. III.1.247.23, Eust. ad il. IV.651.6.
571 12 γλαυκόπης δράκοντες Pind. Ol. 6.45-6.
573 12-3 δην - Λυκόφρονι Lycophr. Alex. 23-4.
575 13-4 εἰς - τράπεζαν Ath. Épit. 2.1.44.13-4 (=Ath. 4.28.1ff.) citing Philox. 836 b.
577 14-5 μονόντα στρατόν Aesch. Pr. 804; cf. sch. Aesch. Pr. 801.a, 804.c, 793.20.
578 12-5 γλαύκων - στρατόν Eust. changes Hdn. καθ III.1.247.23 (ἢ τῶν ἰδιαζόντων μονών, ὁ μονόθελος, κελαίων, τυφλῶν, γλαυκῶν, "γλαυκόπης δράκοντες", εὐόνω, "εὐόνα παρείδαν" παρά Σοφοκλεῖ "εὐόνες" παρά Λυκόφρονι...), Eust. ad Il. II.776.14.
15-6 τά δὲ - τοιαύτα. Ἀδ. καθ. III.1.247.27; cf. Eust. ad II. II.776.16-7, IV.651.5-6.
17-8 ἐπει - ὁδυσώπης. Ἀδ. Ἑπίτ. 2.1.984.5 (=Ath. 6.56.4.5).
18 δεξιοπέτατος. Ἀθ. 3.8.10.
19 δεξιοπέτατος. Ἀθ. 8.48.13.
19 εἰςοπός. II. 15.653; for the meaning of the word cf. Eust. ad II. III.780.21-3.
20 εκκυμίου. Ἀδ. καθ. III.1.188.4, Eust. ad II. II. 776.22, IV. 651.3, 6.
20 σκυθρώπου. Ἀδ. καθ. III.2.582.19.
21 οὖν - Ἀδ. καθ. III.1.189.8-9 (σημείωσε τὸ Ἀδ. καθ. τὸ δὲ ὁ δὲ ὁ δὲ ὁ ὁ δὲ μὲν - ἐν ξεις ὅ Eust. own comment; cf. Eust. ad II. I.108.27-9.
12 δαίφρονι δαίεται ἢτορ Od. 1.48; cf. Eust. ad Od. I.73.11-3.
12 δέ - ἐκτίν Eust. follows the Aristarchean view on Homer explaining himself.
13-4 ἡ φρόνησις - ἄνδρι. Allegorical explanation; cf. my introduction p. LXXXIV.
15 μεριμνῖζων Homerian word; Eust. may not have a specific passage in mind but the word is used in Od. 19.2, 52, 20.10, 28, 38 etc.
16-7 καὶ γὰρ - παράγεται. ᾽Μ. H. Q. ad Od. 15.519, Hdn. παθ. III.2.261.8 (=EM 245.14).
19-20 ἀγει - δυστυχί Od. 1.49; cf. also 20.194, 24.311, Eust. ad II. IV.337.1-5.
20 ἀμμορος II. 6.408, 18.489, 24.773, Od. 5.275; cf. Eust. ad II. III.363.5-6.
20 αἰνόμορος II. 22.481, Od. 9.53, 24.169.
21 κάμηρος Od. 2.351.
20-1 ἐπει - κακόμορος. ᾽Μ. Sch. P ad Od. 5.160, EM 488.42f. (=EGud. κ 297.6f.), Ὥχσ. κ 604.
21 κακοθάνατος ᾽Μ. a 2003 (αἰνόμορον. κα<κακόθάνατον>); cf. also ᾽Μ. δ 2612, Su.
δ 1662.
610 22-3 δήλοι - καλούμενον Ath. Epit. 2.1.137.20 (κάμμοροι, καρίδον γένος υπό Ἀθηναίων οὕτω καλούμενον) = Ath. 7.75.1-6 (κάμμοροι. [...] ἔστι δὲ καρίδον γένος καὶ ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων οὕτως καλούνται).
611 23-4 καὶ Ἰσως - παρέφθειραν A puzzling comment.
612 24-5 νήσας - θαλάσσης Od. 1.50.
613 26 ὡς καὶ - ἐρρήθη Eust. ad Od. 1.10.44ff. (=19.19ff. Makr.).
615 28 φημι - Δία Cf. Il. 2.250
616 29 ἀστράπτον ἐπιδέξεις Il. 2.253
617 30 νήσος δενδρήμεσα Od. 1.51.
618 31 ὄμφαλός θαλάσσης Od. 1.50.
619 31.1 Κύκλωπος κεχόλωται Od. 1.69.
620 3 Κύκλωπος - Πολύφημον Κf. Od. 1.69-70.
621 3-4 νήσας ἀμφιρύτη Od. 1.50.
622 11-2 ὄστεν - Δίος Κf. Πινδ. P. 4.4ff., sch. Πινδ. P. 4.6 (ἔνθα ποτὲ χρυσᾶων: λόγος τὶς τοιούτου περιηγεῖ, ὅτι ὁ Ζεὸς καταμετρήσασθαι τῆς οἰκουμένης τὸ μεσαίτατον βουλήθηκε ίσος κατὰ τὸ τάχος ἀείως ἐκ δύσεως καὶ ἀνατολῆς ἀφήκεν οἱ δὲ διτπάσανοι συνέπεσον ἄλληλους κατὰ τὸν Πυθώνα, ὡστε τὴν σύμπτωσιν ὄριζειν αὐτότις τῆς ὅλης οἰκουμένης τὸ μεσαίτατον...), Str. 9.3.6.6 (citing Πινδαρός) (καὶ ἐκάλεσαν τῆς γῆς ὄμφαλόν, προσπλάσαντες καὶ μέθυσαν τὸν Πύθαρα, ἵτι συμπέσουσιν ἐνταῦθα οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἐν τῇ ἔρημῃ ὑπὸ τοῦ Δίος, ὁ μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς δύσεως ὁ δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνατολῆς...), sch. Soph. OT 480, sch. Eur. Or. 331.
624 15-6 ἄν τιν - ἄν Sch. Y 2 ad Od. 1.55 (Καλυψω δὲ νοῆσεις πραγματικῶς γυναῖκα τινα βασιλίσσον...); Eust. wants to rationalize the myth.
625 16-7 ἄν - παραδίδουσι I think when Eust. mentions Calypso’s island, he implies Atlantis for which cf. Str. 2.3.6.6-9 (citing Plat. Tim. 24e-25d); cf. also Eust. ad Od. 1.17.20ff. (=31.31ff. Makr.); on Calypso’s island cf. also West (1988), p. 81, 260.
626 15-7 ἄν - παλαιοὶ Eust. implies that the information for Calypso being a queen given in the scholia (see above) is not much.
627 17-9 μεταπλάττουσι - μάργαρον On ἔλυστρου cf. Lsj s.v. 4 “the body, as being the case or shell of the soul”; the word is used in this meaning in Plat. Resp. 588e; on μάργαρον cf. Lsj s.v. =μάργαριτας ("pearl").
629 19 ἦτης - ἢ Θεοσσα Εουστ. underlines the role of Calypso the “Concealer”; cf. my intro LXXVf..
630 20-1 ἄμφιρύτη - θαλάσσης Κf. Od. 1.50-1.
631 21-2 καὶ ὡς - ἀπορρύθη Κf. Tim. 43.a-56 (...τὰς τῆς ἄθανάτου ψυχῆς περιόδους ἐνδόθων εἰς ἐπίρρυτον σῶμα καὶ ἀπόρρυτον).
632 22-3 ἄν - ὄμφαλον Eust.’s own addition.
633 24 οὖ - φιλόξως Perhaps he applies this characterisation to Calypso because of her
offer to Odysseus to make him immortal; on the word φιλόσοφος cf. LSJ s.v. “fond of one’s life”.

 Cf. Od. 5.97ff.

26-7 ἤγουν - ἀληθής Allegorical explanation; cf. Olymp. In Alc. 94.22 (πατήρ γὰρ ἡμῶν καὶ πατρὶς ἀληθῆς ἄνω μόνον ἐστίν). No comment.

30-1 καὶ ἀπόδημει Eust.’s own comment.

32.1 περὶ ἢς - ποιητῆς Str. 2.3.6.6-9 (citing Plat. Tim. 24e-25d) ...καί τὸ τοῦ Πλάτωνος ἐκ παρατίθεσιν, ὅτι ἐνδέχεται καὶ μὴ πλάσμα εἶναι τὸ περὶ τῆς νήσου τῆς Ἀτλαντίδος, περὶ ἡς ἑκείνος ἱστορήσαι ΣΩΛΩΝΑ φησι πεποιμένων παρὰ τῶν Ἀἰγυπτίων ἱερέων, ὡς ὑπάρχοντα ποτὲ ἀφανισθεὶ, τὸ μέγεθος οὐκ ἐλάττων ἣπειροῦ...

38-4 ὅς - Καλυψώς Od. 1.52, 7.245.

5-6 θαλάσσης - ἀνέχουσιν Cf. Od. 1.52-4.

6-7 οἱ μὲν - αὐτὸ Sch. H K M* ad Od. 1.52 (=Cleanth. fr. 549) (διάφορονος: Κλεάνθης δασύνε: τοῦ [γαρ] περὶ τῶν δόλων φρονύντος ἱδιὸν οὕτως εἰρήθαι...; cf. also sch. H P Q V ad Od. 1.52: ...διάφορονος [...] oι δὲ ἐδάσυναν, ἤν ἐπὶ περὶ τῶν δόλων φρονύντος...), Y ad Od. 1.52 (ή τοῦ ὀλιβρίου καὶ κακοῦ, ἢ περὶ τοῦ δόλου φρονύντος); cf. Hdn. Od. Pros. III.2.130.10; note the allegorical explanation; on the word διάφορον cf. West (1988), p.82.


12 καὶ οὖτω - δὲ Though Eust. does not choose, both explanations are rationalizations.

12-3 άλλοι - εἶλαμένον Sch. Eur. Hipp. 747.5 (τινὲς δὲ Ἀτλαντα εἰρήκασιν αὐτὸν τὸν ἄξονα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, δὲ ὁ τοῦ παντὸς κίνησις γίνεται), Arat. Exc. var. 5b.3 (φασὶ δὲ τὸν ἄξονα τούτον εἶναι τὸν παρὰ τὸ ποιητῆ Ἀτλαντα εἰρήκασιν...).


16 διὸ - κίονας Aesch. Pr. 349.

25 ἀποτελεσματικὸς On ἀποτελεσματικοῖ (cf. LSJ s.v “the astrologers”) cf. Eust. ad II. I.96.7 (with note), III.640.6; on ἀποτέλεσμα cf. Eust. ad II. II.195.16-196.1 (with note), LSJ s.v. II. Aristol. “result of certain positions of the stars on human destiny”; on ἀποτελεσματικὴ ἐπιστήμη cf. III.378.9 (τὸ δὲ "οὐδέ ἐτέλεσεν" ἄρχην καὶ αὐτὸ τὸν ἄξονα τοὺς ἀνθρώπους μεθοδίως ἐνδιδόντας τοὺς μὲθ'); Ομηρος τοῦ ἀποτελεσματικῆς καλέσαι καί τὴν περὶ τούς τοιούτους ὄρνης ἐπιστήμην.) Thesaur. I.2 1729; cf. also Eust. ad Od. 1.18.5 (=33.11 Makr.), 49.5.

25 φιλόσοφος Eustathius applies the characterisation φιλόσοφος to Odysseus elsewhere too (cf. Eust. Od. I.22.15 (=41.19 Makr.), 319.8, 332.31, 379.1).
(=the methodical and logical wisdom) is used by Eust. to describe the systematic, logical wisdom symbolized by Penelope; on μεθοδικός as a rhetorical term cf. Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. II, p. XXVII, pp. LXVII-LXVIII; the word μεθοδικός is used in a similar meaning in Eust. ad ll. III.711.14 (μεθοδικός 'Αθηνᾶς); the word τὸ κανονικόν is "the equivalent of Logic in Epicurean philosophy (LSJ s.v.); on κανονικός as a grammatical term cf. Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. II, p. XVIII.

650 28-9 ἄρ' ἥς - φιλοσοφεῖν Note that the whole journey becomes an allegory.

651 32.29-33.1 ὅτι δὲ - ἀναλυόμενον Eust. ad Od. I.84.35ff.; cf. also ad ll. I.640.14ff. (with note).

652 4 ἔπειδή - ζῶα Cf. Eust. ad ll. II.459.8.

653 4-6 διότι - ποιεῖ Cf. Eust. ad Od. I.18.8ff. (=33.14ff. Makr.)

654 6 κινοφοροῦντα Rare word.

655 6-7 διὰ τοῦτο - πέλαγος Eust. refers to Atlantis; cf. Pl. Tim. 24ε3ff.

656 9-10 ὅν - καλεῖ Plat. Resp. 616.b.4-6.

657 10 τὸ ὄνομα - λαβὼν Eust. means Od. I.53.

658 10-4 ἡ δὲ - σοφία Sch. Aesch. Pr. 425c-d (γέγονε δὲ καὶ τις ἀνήρ Λίβυς μάθημακτικότερος, ἢ λάμπη σὲ τὴν κλήσιν, ὡς ἐμθεοῦτο τὸν οὐρανόν ἔχειν, διὰ τὸ ἀριστας ἀστρολογεῖν καὶ περὶ τῶν οὐρανίων ἀκριβέστερα διδάσκειν); cf. also Aristot. fr. varia 1.3.35.8, Diog. Laert. Vit. Phil. 1.1.7; Eust. rationalizes.


661 19-20 καὶ ὁ ποιητής - ικάνειν Od. 12.73.

662 20 καὶ Αἰσχύλος - κορυφᾶς Aesch. Pr. 721.


664 24 διό - λέγεται Od. I.52.

665 25-9 θαυμ. - διαδόχη A digression which offers another opportunity for allegorical explanation; the source could be Aelianus as suggested later on.

666 29-32 φησι - τρόπων Aelian. fr. 188.

667 31-2 αἰνιγμαζόν τῶν συγγραφέων Unknown source; the fragment is preserved by Eust.


671 3-5 καὶ Ἰσώς - ἐξαπήχεις Ath. 5.42.22 (Δαλαντές τε περιτρέχον τὴν ναόν ἑκτός ἐξαπήχεις) (=Ath. Epit. 2.1.77.3-4 Δαλαντές τε περιτρέχον τὴν ναόν ἑκτός ἐξαπήχεις).

672 6-10 οὖ τής - ὄρος Hdn. κ.λ. οῦν III.2.637.29-33; cf. also III. 2.636.4, 656.29.

673 10 οὖ - ἐξῆς Od. 3.172.

13-4 ἐνιαὶ Eust.'s own explanation (?).
15-6 οὖ - ὑπόκενον Eust. finds this rearranging of letters logical.
16-7 καὶ οἷς - ἐξουσίον Od. 1.52-4.
17-8 ὡς δὲ - ὅνομα On the word στοιχειακός cf. LSJ s.v. “connected with the elements"; Eust. often uses the word στοιχειακόν for water (Eust. ad II. II.564.13, III.615.3, IV.133.3) and once he also explains the reason (ad II. III.615.3: εἰς τὸ στοιχειακόν ὕδωρ δοκεῖ τὰ ἄλλα στοιχεῖα γίνεσθαι, τὸ γὰρ ὕδωρ ἀρχήν τινς πάντων ἔθεντο...).
18-20 δὴλον - θαλασσαιδεῖς Eust. cites Ath. Epit. 2.2.82.16-7 (πορφυρᾶς τε καὶ ἱσθαφεῖς καὶ ὑικινθίνας καὶ φλογίνας καὶ θαλασσαιδεῖς) and adapts it in his text; =Ath. 12.29.13 (εἰς δ' αἱ μὲν πορφυράς τοῦτον, αἱ δὲ ἱσθαφεῖς, αἱ δὲ ὑικινθίνας: λάβοι δ' ἂν τις καὶ φλογίνας καὶ θαλασσαιδεῖς).
20-2 ὡς δὴλοι - χάριν Ath. Epit. 2.2.82.18-9 (φοροῦντες δὲ καὶ ἁκταίας, ἐστι δὲ τούτῳ σπαθητῶν ἰσχύος καὶ κοινόφτιτος χάριν...); =Ath. 12.29.17-9 (...ιδοὺ δ' ἂν τις, φησιν, καὶ τὰς καλομένας ἁκταίας [...] εἰσὶ δὲ τούτῳ σπαθητῶν ἰσχύος καὶ κοινόφτιτος χάριν...) (citing Democrit. Eph. III.A.267 fr. 1).
23 κατακλάνται - σπαθωμένα Eust.'s own comment.
25 τό καὶ - Σοφροκλῆ Soph. OT 480.
28-9 θεὰ - ναι Od. 1.51.
31 ὁς - μαθεῖν Pind. Ol. 13.6.
34.31-35.1 τὰς κίνονας Od. 1.53.
39 τὰς βοῦς Cf. Soph. fr. 314.167, 208, 402; note that in order to show the gender, Homer adds a word e.g. ἄροπην (II. 20.495) or ταῦρος (II. 17.389); cf. also EM 473.36, Eust. ad II. I.112.4.
40 τὰς ἤπειρος In full cf. II. 5.269 (θῆλες ἤπειροι) and II. 11.680-1, Od. 4.635-6 (ἡπειρ θῆλειαί); cf. also Eur. Hel. 386 (τὰς τεθρίππεος), Aesch. fr. 89.15; cf. also EM 473.35, Eust. ad II. I.112.5, II.504.1, III.177.18.
43 τὰς ὑμινόνοις Cf. EM 473.36 (τὰς δύνος), Eust. ad II. I.112.5.
41 τὰς ἐκλογὰς In Od. 19.228 the word ἐκλογάς is male; I don't think Eust. has a specific poet for this word in mind; he generalizes in parallel with the rest of the examples.
43 τὰς κύνας Cf. Theocr. ld. 1.135; cf. also Eust. ad II. I.112.6, II.504.2.
43 τὰς δίς Cf. Eust. ad II. I.112.5, III.177.18.
45-5 Αἰλιος - κάκκαθος Ael. Dion. σ 4 (...κάκκαθη: ἢ ἡμεῖς κάκκαθον...).
5-6 δ καὶ - ζεύοσα Ath. 8.19.9 (=Ath. Epit. 2.1.160.10) (...ἐφασκέν ἐν κάκκαθη ζεύοσάς...).
6 δ' οὖν - ἀνάγοναι Ael. Dion. α 175 (ἀρπαγή, ἄυπτόνως ἡ διαρπαγή, ἢ ἠ ἄρπαγη βαρύτυπως τὸ σκέπος, ὥ τούς κάδους ἀνάγοναι εἰκ φρεατών).
7 ἡ βολῶς Ael. Dion. β 21 (...βολῶς: θηλυκός ὁ Ἀττικός, ἄρσενικός ἤ ἦρως). 
8 ἡ ἑαυτὸς Ael. Dion. γ 1 (...ἑαυτῶς: διὰ τοῦ α, οὔχι δελός, καὶ θηλυκός ἡ ἑαυτος, καὶ βάλινον).
70 ἢ φάρυγξ Ael. Dion. ϕ 3 (...φάρυγξ: θηλυκός ὁ Ἀττικός). 
70 ἢ στρύγχος Ael. Dion. τ 27 (...τρύγχων: τὴν πόλιν. θηλυκός λέγουσα τὴν τρύγχον, οὐ τὸν τρύγχον. [σὺν τῷ δὲ "στρύγχων" οὐδαμοῦ εἴδον]...).
8 η χάραξ - στρατοπέδου Ael. Dion. ξ 5 (χάραξ: θηλυκός το τής άμπελου υπόστημα, ἄρσενικός το χαράκτωμα το στρατοπέδου).
9 ἐκι - αὐχένος Ael. Dion. τ 28 (τύλη: το ἐπ τῶν τενόντων <αὐχενίων> φύμα).
10 ἕμφαξ Ael. Dion. ο 20 (OnInit: θηλυκός ἅ Ἀττικοί, ἄρσενικός ἴωνες).
11 ἕ ἅσβολος Ael. Dion. α 186 (ἄσβολος: θηλυκός ἢ ἅσβολος, οὐκ ἄρσενικός ὁ ἅσβολος).
12 ἕ ψύλλα Ael. Dion. ψ 5 (ψύλλα καὶ ψύλλα: θηλυκός...).
13 ἕ μειραξ Ael. Dion. μ 12 (μειραξ: ἡ θηλεια, μειράκιον καὶ μειρακίσκος ὁ ἄρσην).
14 ἕ θόλος Ael. Dion. θ 14 (θόλος: <θηλυκός>, ὁ θόλος περιφερής...).
16 ἐ χώς Ael. Dion. ξ 16 (citing Thuc. 2.76.2.4) (χώς: ἄρσενικός, τὸ ἐπιβαλλόμενον τῇ ὀρφῇ λεπτὸν χόμα. Θουκυδίδης).
17 ἐ χρόνος Ael. Dion. ο 29 (ἄρσενικός καὶ ὀρφή: ἡ στέγη).
18 ἐ χθες Αel. Dion. θ 13 (θῆς: ἄρσενικός).
19 ἐ λιμός Ael. Dion. λ 16 (λιμόν: ἄρσενικός οἱ Ἀττικοί τὴν λιμόν).
20 ἐ σκότος Αel. Dion. σ 26 (σκότος καὶ σκότον ἐκατέρως).
21 ἐ τάρας Ael. Dion. τ 2 (Τάρας: <ἄρσενικός και θηλυκός>.
22 ἐ ἀκράγας Ael. Dion. α 67 (Ἀκράγαντα: ἄρσενικός).
24 ἐ τὸ ζυγὸν Ael. Dion. ζ 6 (ζυγόν: οὐδέτερος τὸ τῶν υποζυγίων).
25 ἐ τὸ ἐπίδεσμα Αel. Dion. ε 53 (ἐπίδεσμα: οὐδέτερος Ἀττικοῖ, οὐχὶ ἐπίδεσμος).
26 ἐ τὸ στρωματόδεσμον Αel. Dion. σ 39 (στρωματόδεσμα: οὐδέτερος Ἀττικοῖ...).
27 ἐ τὸ θύμων Ael. Dion. θ 15 (θύμων: οὐδέτερος).
28 ἐ τὸ σίαλον Ael. Dion. σ 14 (σίαλον: οὐδέτερος Ἀττικοῖ).
29 ἐ τὸ κέδρον Ael. Dion. κ 18 (κέδρον οὐδέτερος λέγουσι τὸ θυμίαμα).
30 ἐ τὸ τέμαχος Ael. Dion. τ 8 (τέμαχος: οὐδέτερος <Ἀττικοῖ>.
31 ἐ τὸ τάριχος - τὸ τάριχον Ael. Dion. τ 3 (τάριχος: οὐδέτερος οἱ Ἀττικοὶ ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ, ἐπὶ ἔλαττον καὶ ἄρσενικός. Μένανδρος: ἔπεσα ἐπὶ τὸ τάριχος ἄλαστρον).
32 ἐ τὰ σταδία - οἱ στάδιοι Ael. Dion. σ 31 (citing Thuc. 2.78.4) (στάδια καὶ στάδιοι ἐκατέρως λέγουσιν. ὁ Θουκυδίδης δὲ στάδιος ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πάν: ἅπας ὡς μόνον στάδια ἑτήσειν ἐν ζῆς: ἐν γὰρ τῷ πρόσθεν ἐπὶ πολλά στάδια μέλλων ἑτήσιν...).
77 22-3 πολλαχοῦ - φαίνεται General note.
78 23-4 μαλακοῖς - επιλήσται Cf. Od. 1.55-6; the vulgate gives δ’ ἐν μαλακοῖς λόγοις
θέλει but a minority of mss. omits ἐν (cf. Van der Valk (1949), p. 49).
80 27 φιλοζοσφαί τον Cf. LSJ s.v., “love of life”; allegorical explanation.
81 26-30 τῆς δὲ - τοιαῦτα Eust. own explanation.
83 36.1-3 αἰμόλοι - αἴματος Cf. sch. M3 (ἡ ψεύδεσιν. ἡ συγγενείας, παρὰ τὸ αίμα.), Y (ἀπατητικοίς) ad Od. 1.56, EM 35.31 (ποικίλλον, πυκνὸν, πανούργον, δολερόν).
84 3-5 ή καί - αἴματος Eust.'s own explanation.
85 5-6 ἢ θερμοί - εἰσί Eust.'s own comment.
86 7 θέλειν Od. 1.57.
87 7-8 περὶ - ἐκρήσθη Eust. ad Il. III.384.24-6 (ὅτι δὲ τὸ θέλειν οὐκ ἐπὶ ἡδονῆς κεῖται
παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ, ὡς ἡ ὀστερόν ἔχει χρήσις, δῆλον μὲν καὶ ἴδιον φανερός, καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις δὲ πολλαχοῦ ὁ ποιητής αὐτὸ παριστάτ...), 497.27-30 (ὅτι τὸ θέλειν πανταχόο
παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ, ἡς καὶ προερρήθη) ἔκτροπην τίνα δηλοῦν καὶ μετάθεσιν τοῦ κατὰ
φώνην διὰ φόβον ἢ λύπην ἢ ἥσυχον ἢ ἔτερων τι πάθος υπερβάλλον...), IV.501.13
(θέλειν δὲ οὐδὲ νῦν ἅπαξ κατὰ τούς μεθ’ Ὀμηρον τὸ εὐφραίνειν, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἀπατάν.
ἄλοις γὰρ εἰπεῖν, όυκ ἔστι γλυκεία λέξεις το τὸ θέλειν καὶ ἐπαινετῆ, ὡς πολλαχοῦ
φαίνεται...).
88 9 ὃνα Ἡθακῆς επιλήσεται Od. 1.57.
89 11-2 δὴ δὲ - λέγονται Cf. Hdn. ὕδρ. ΙII.2.520.5, Xenom. fr. 4 (θέλειν: Ἐνομιδῆς
ἐτυμολογεί ο τὰ Θεία γράφας τοὺς Τελχίνας ἀπὸ τὸ θέλειν, παρά φησι καὶ τοὺς
Τελχίνας ὡστε θελγίνας φησι...), Paus. Att. τ 18.2 (Ἐνομιδῆς δὲ ο τὰ Κεῖα γράφας
καὶ τοὺς Τελχίνας ἐτυμολογήσας εἶπεν, ὅτι θελγίνες ἦσαν), Su. Θ 103, Hsch. Θ 210,
EM 445.10, EGud. Θ 257.24ff., Eust. ad Il. III.498.1-3, IV.501.13-6; on the word Τελχίνες
cf. Eust. ad Il. II.788.28-789.20.
90 12-4 εν γούν - φαρμακοὶ Paus. Att. Θ 4 (Θελγίνες: γόπτες, φαρμακοί); cf. also Hsch.
Θ 210 (Θελγίνες: οἱ Τελχίνες, γόπτες, πανούργοι, φαρμακευταί), Eust. ad Od. II.202.22.
92 14-18 δὴ - ἀνθρώποι Eust.'s own comment.
93 23 Ὀμηρος - κλισίας II.2.399; cf. Eust. ad Il. I.373.6, III.298.23, IV.146.5-6.
94 24 καπνιστά - δειπνοσοφιστῇ Ath. 4.38.32, (=Ath. Epit. 2.148.6); cf. also Eust ad Il.
II.711.15-6 (with note).
I.778.1f., IV.757.7f., ad Od. I.7.25f. (=12.30f. Makr.), 138.28f., II.142.44.
96 28-31 τί - πλοῦτ Eust.'s own comment.
97 36.31-37.1 δὲ - λαμπρόν Allegorical explanation.
98 4 τῆς γαίης Od. 1.59.
99 4-6 ἵττεν - εἰπεῖν Cf. sch. D H M Q V ad Od. 1.59, D E ad Od. 1.59; cf. also sch. T 9.28.
100 4-5 εν ἀπλότητι λέξεως Eust. means that late authors use an elliptical way to replace the
expression ἐν γαίης with the word οἰκείας.
101 9 πατρι - πάτρα Cf. EGen. α 1319, EGud. 394.10, EM 159.7-9, 434.45, 584.55, 656.25,
Eust. ad Il. I.289.4-8, II.400.11-2.
102 9 πολλαχοῦ - ποιήσεως Cf. Pind. Ol. 12.16, Aesch. Pr. 665, Ar. Ach. 147, Ran. 1427,
Th. 136, Alex. fr. 198 etc.
763 10-1 μητρι - ποιητικέτσεσι Ευστ.'s own comment.
764 12 ουτω - μητρόπολιν Soph. Ant. 1122.
765 14-5 δς γατης Od. 1.59.
766 18-9 Κόδρος - ἱππολαξει Lycogor. Alex. 1389.
767 19-20 ἐποίησε - εὐθείας Cf. Su. ε 3391 (ο ἐρήμος το Κόδρος ἐπὶ το ἄντιμον ἐχρησαντο); a different explanation for "Κόδροι" (="old-fashioned persons") is given in Hsch. κ 3208.
769 20-1 τοῦτο - ἐπιστροφή Cf. Su. o 455, EM 627.47, 628.9, EGuD. 432.1, Eust. ad Il. IV.626.5, ad Od. II.71.39.
770 21-2 ηκ δέ - Ἡλιδί I. 6.496, 11.547, 21.492; cf. also Eust. ad Il. IV.422.21, 389.16-7.
771 25 στι - ἀλεγίζεις Il. 1.160.
772 26 Ὀδυσσέας - Ζεῦ Cf. Od. 1.60-2.
774 29 φερωνύμοις On the word φερωνύμιος and its relation with Odysseus' name cf. Eust. ad Il. II.811.19-20.
775 29-30 λέγεται - αὐτῷ Eust. analyses in his own words Athena's thought in Od. 1.62.
776 37.30-38.1 καὶ - ὀδώσαστο Od. 19.403-9; cf. sch. D D' E J M T ad Od. 1.103 (Ομηρος μὲν ετυμολογον τὸν Ὀδυσσέα πεποίηκε τῶν Αὐτόλυκων λέγοντα "πολλοίς γάρ ἐγὼ δὴ ὀδυσσάμενος τόδε ἱκάνον"); cf. also sch. Lycogor. 786 ("Ομηρος γάρ παρεισάγει εν Ὀδυσσέη τῶν Ὀδυσσέως πάππον Αὐτόλυκων λέγοντα κληθήναι τὸν παίδα Ὀδυσσέα: πολλοὶ γάρ μοι ὀδώσαντο ήτοι ὄργισθεν"). Eust. ad Il. II.345.1-3, IV.668.26-7.
777 3 αὐτή - ἡπ Eustathius is referring to Od. 1.60-2.
778 4 ἐν Τροῆ Od. 1.62.
779 4 τὸ δὲ - ἐπίτασις Eust.'s own comment.
780 5 κραύγετο Od. 1.61.
781 6-7 τέκνων - ὀδόντων Od. 1.64.
782 9 ὁ δὲ - ἐσχημάτισε Cf. also Eust. ad Il. II.547.21; Eust.'s own comment.
783 9-10 ποῖς - χείλη Eustathius paraphrases Od. 1.64.
784 11-5 αἰνιττεται - ἐξονῦν Eust.'s own comment; the word αἰνιττεται ("hints at") in often used of Homer (cf. Vit. Hom. 122, Lamberton (1986), p.41, 48).
785 16-7 δήλω - φοβεσ Soph. Ant. 505; Eust. writes ἐγκλείσοι instead of ἐγκλήσοι.
786 17-8 τί - ὀδύσασαι Od. 1.62.
787 20 πώσ - ἐστι Eust. changes Od. 1.65-6.
788 21 πώσ - λαθοίμην Cf. Od. 1.65.
789 25 κατὰ - πάντων Cf. Od. 1.66.
790 27-8 ος περι - ἐχει Eustathius paraphrases Od. 1.66-7; he replaces περι δ ἵπτα θεοισιν ἄθανατοις ἐδωκε, τοι οὐρανός εὐρόν ἐχοισιν with the verse περι δ ἱπτα θεοὶ ἄθανατο ἐδωκεν δα οὐρανόν εὐρόν ἐχει, apparently because he is a strong supporter of monotheistic religion; on this matter cf. Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. I, p.CXVIII, n.9 and (1971), p. 11, n.31.
791 29 ἵπται ἐξαι Cf. Od. 1.61.
792 29 εὐσι συ Od. 1.65.
793 30 καὶ περίνουν - ἐπεμματῦρατο Eustathius refers to Od. 1.66: περι μὲν νόν...; on
the word “περίνοια” cf. Van der Valk’s note 1244.6-7 in Eust. ad II. IV.529.17 and note 1344.63-4 in Eust. ad II. IV.886.6 (personally, I believe that Eust. uses the word “περίνοια” here with the meaning that Van der Valk gives in this note (citing Lamp 1067, s.v. 2): “over-cleverness, subtlety”); cf. also Eust. ad Od. I.157.24.

794 39.2-4 παιδευτικά - ἀνδρῶν Eust. underlines the didactic purpose of the passage.

795 4-5 περί - βροτῶν Od.1.66.

796 5-6 οἱ περί - μάχεσθαι II. 1.258.

797 8 καὶ αὐτὸ - εἰρηται Eust. ad II. I.156.9ff.

798 9-10 Παυσανίας - καλούμενος Paus. Att. κ 28 (Κέσκος ἦν πόλις ἐν Κιλικίᾳ καὶ παρ’ αὐτῇν ποταμός Νοῦς ὄνομα...).


800 10-2 οὐ μόνον - ἑπιλόθη Eust. ad II. II.86.15-6 (with note); Eust. rationalizes.


802 13-4 Ποσειδέων - οὔνομα Cf. Phot. π 444.25ff. (Ποσειδέων καὶ οὕτως μην ἀθηναίοις οὕνωμασθεῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ καθηροῦσα τοῖς Ποσειδέων. Ποσειδέων ἐκτὸς μὴν παρὰ Αθηναίοις οὕτω καλούμενος), Su. π 2104 (Ποσειδέων ἐκτὸς μὴν παρὰ Αθηναίοις οὕτω καλούμενος. Ὕν Αὐγουστος); cf. also Eust. ad II. III.719.8 (with note).

803 16 γαϊήχος Cf. Agatharch. 95.2; cf. also Hsch. γ 385.

804 16 γαϊήχος Cf. Hsch. γ 512.

805 16-7 γαϊήχος - Ἡμερίδιαν Ηδν. ὑφθ. III.2.409.24ff. (the passage is quoted only by Eust.); cf. also III.2.485.7 (γαϊήχος ἡμερίδια: γαϊήχος ὁ τὴν γῆν συνέχων. γαϊήχος ὁ τὴν γῆν ἔχων).

806 17-8 μὲν - γῆ Cf. Hdn. καθ. III.1.283.29, ὑφθ. III.2.424.35-6, 485.6, παθ. III.2.319.27; cf. also Su. 230.5ff., sch. Hes. 159.9 (Gaisford); although Eust. speaks here of συναίρεσιν, that is contraction, elsewhere he talks about crasis (Eust. ad II. I.289.10: γέα διὰ τοῦ ἐν φιλοῦ, δεν κατὰ κράσιν τὸ γῆν, ὅτι δὲ καὶ γαῖα διὰ διυφθόγγου..., IV.222.3: καὶ ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ γέα τοῦ ψυλλομφομένου κέκραται ἡ γῆ, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐν τῷ ἐν γαῖα μὲν οὐ παρῆκαται...) like Steph. Byz. 206.17 (Γῆ, ἀπὸ τοῦ γέα κράβεν).

807 18-9 ἄλλοι - γαϊήχος EM 22.3.4ff., EGud. γ 294.11f., EM 22.3.4ff.

808 19 άσκελές - κεχώλωται Od. 1.68-9.


810 23 ἥξι - πολύχειρ Soph. El. 488.

811 24 τὸ ἔκο ἐποιος Cf. Apoll. Dysc. II.1.1.133.3.


813 25 διὸ δίδος Cf. EM 319.18, 759.20 (=Hdn. παθ. III.2.250.7).

814 25 τρέφω - βρέφος Cf. EGud. 286.15ff (Stef.).

815 26 ὀφθαλμοῦ ἀλάσσε Od. 1.69.

not see very well, cf. Van der Valk’s note on 821, 55-7), 238.13 (άλαος here means someone totally blind, as in our passage).

817 39.29-40.1 νεκτόν - δοκεῖ ΙΙ. 7.409, 10.343, Od. 10.530, 11.37; cf. also Eust. ad II. II.483.4, 484.4-7, III.86.18-20, IV.632.1-2; for the form κατατηθευμένος cf. Eust. ad II. IV.647.3-6; for Eust. underlining the schema ἐκ περίσσος cf. Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. II, p.XXXII.


819 3 νυκτάλων - νυστάτων Paus. Att. n 3 (νυκτάλων: ὁ νύκτωρ ἄλαος τοῦ ὀπας. καὶ νυκτάτων<ι>: ὁ νυστάτων).

820 3-4 ἐκ δὲ - τυφλόσις Od. 9.503; on the word ἄλαστος cf. Ael. Dion. a 73, Hsch. a 2791.


822 7-9 Θεόκριτος - ὄφαλμον Eust. changes Theocr. Id. 11.53 (καὶ τὸν ἐν’ ὄφαλμον, τῷ μοι γλυκεράτερον οὐδέν.).

823 7-8 οὖς - μετάπειρα Hes. Th. 144-6 (μοῦνος δ’ ὄφαλμος μέσος εἴκεκετο μετάπειρ’ | Κύκλοπος δ’ ἄνων ἦσαν εἰκάνον, οὕνεκ’ ἄρα σφόν | κυκλοτερής ὄφαλμος έεις εἴκεκετο μετάπειρ’ | ισχυς δ’ ἦδε βίη καὶ μηχαναν ἦσαν εἴπ’ ἐργοις).

824 9-10 οὖς - τέτατο Eust. changes Theocr. Id. 11.31-2 (…μοι λασία μὲν ὄφρυς ἐπὶ παντὶ μετάπειρ’ | εἰς ότος τέταται ποτὶ θάτερον ὡς μία μακρά...).

825 11 κύκλοπα κόρην Emp. 84.19, 35 (κύκλοπα κούρην).


827 13 τίρθ’ - ἐστήτε Eust. has a mistake here; cf. II. 4.243 (στοιχος ἐστήτε), Eust. ad II. I.136.2-4, ad Od. I.146.17.

828 13 ὀπτικόν - ἀλλατει Theocr. Id. 3.37; cf. Eust. ad II. I.440.6.

829 13-4 ἄντι - ἐφηθήν Cf. EM 644.16-7.


831 15 πέπληκτα ἐπιλήψθη Choer. Th. II 201.22; cf. also Eust. ad II. I.741.3.

832 16-7 καὶ τό - ἐπιφώθειειν Theocr. Id. 7.127, 2.62; cf. Eust. ad Od. I.146.18.

833 16 ἐπιτύπωτος γοιητευτικός Sch. Theocr. II.59-62 (ἐπιφώθειον: ἐπιπτόος), VII.127α.3 (φθαίειν δὲ τὸ πτεῖν Δωρικός), b.2 (ὅτις ἐπιφωθείος: ἐπιπτόος Δωρικός).

834 17 φθάσον φθάσον Cf. EGud. 483.23ff., Eust. ad II. IV.761.16.

835 17 ἐκ τοῦ - πτάσαν Choer. sch. A T ad II. 4.200 a’, b (sch. ex.), Et. Or. 131.24, Zonar. p 1592.26-7, EGud. 485.20, EM 666.37, 673.6, 694.5, 20, Eust. ad II. III.585.9 (πετα, πτα); Choer. Epim. Ps. 102.15-6, EGud. 455.12 (πτάσαν) in both references πτάσαν comes from the verb πτάνω meaning “to fear”.

836 17 φθάσειν Choer. Eust. II. IV.761.18.

837 19 καὶ ἧ Ἡλιάς ἐξεταίρευε Eust. ad II. II.100.1-4 (η δὲ διὰ τοῦ ὃ γραφή τοῦ ἔρωτος ἡ διὰ τὸ ἴας διασύνεται τὸ ἱάλλον παρά τις γίνεται ἡ κατὰ τινα γλώσσαν τροπή τοῦ ψυλλο εἰς δασὺ, ὃ καὶ εν τῷ κακαρνηως γίνεται κατὰ ‘Ηραδιανὸν κεκαπνον γὰρ μισι τὸ ἄναλογον’, III.595.9-10 (σιπαλόν γὰρ τινῶς φασὶ τὸ εἰδεχθήν, παρά δὲ Δυκάρις σῖφθυν κείται τὸ τοιοῦτον [συγκοπὴ καὶ τροπὴ τοῦ ψυλλο πι εἰς δασό τῷ τῇ], 865.4-7 (τὸ δὲ σπείδων [...] δηλοὶ δὲ τὸ ἡπειγμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ σπείδων, ἀφ’ οὗ καὶ ἡ σπουδὴ τραπέντος τοῦ ψυλλο εἰς δασὺ, ἵνα ἡ σπείδων).

838 20 κύριον - Πολύφρωνοι On Πολύφρωνος as a proper name cf. Hsch. p 2938.

839 20-1 εἰ μη - δόνουμ Od. 2.15; cf. sch. b T ad II. 8.120 (sch. ex.), Eust. ad II. III.456.30, 673.15-6, ad Od. I.78.32 (for more references to Αλύσπτας as a proper name cf. Hsch. a
1747).

840 23 κράτος - Κυκλώπεσι Od. 1.70-1.

841 25 τας διονυσίας On the word διονυσία cf. LSJ s.v., Thesaur. II 1595 s.v.; cf. also Eust. ad II. III.344.19 (with note), III.763.14 (with note); on διόνυσος cf. Eust. ad II. II.786.3, 811.9, III.642.29, IV.347.3.


843 26-8 σημείωσαι - ῥηθήσεται Eust. ad Od. I.332.3; cf. also Heraclit. All. 70.4-5; note the allegorical explanation.

844 28-9 διὸ - θυμόν Cf. sch. Η Q ad Od. 106 (…τὶ δ᾽ ἄτοπον ἐκ Ποσειδώνος τὸν ἄγρον τούτων γεγονέναι; ὡσπερ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα εἰς αὐτοῦ ἀναλόγως τῇ θαλάσσῃ ἄγρια γεννᾶται ἢ τερατώδης ἢ παρηλλαγμένα.;)

845 40.29-41.1 καθά - προσονειδεῖ Cf. also sch. Α D ad II. 1.197 (Ariston.) (…αἰνίττεται τὸ θερμόν καὶ ὄργιλον τοῦ ἡρωος…), b T ad II. 9.254-8 (sch. ex.) (…δ Πηλεύς εἰδὼς Ἀχιλλέα ἄνδρεον μὲν, ὄργιλον…); cf. also Epim. Hom. (Pars Prior) 197A, Eust. ad II. I.130.11, II.708.23, 732.4-5, 751.8.

846 1 γλαυκή - θάλασσα II. 16.34; by τις Eust. means Patroclus who addresses Achilles: μὴ ἐμὲ γ᾽ οὖν οὗτος γε λάβοι χόλος, ὅν σὺ φυλάσσεις (II. 16.30), νηλές (II. 16.33), ὅτι τοῦ νόος ἐστὶν ἄπηδής (II. 16.35); possibly, Eust. is so unspecific (καθά ποι, τις) because he does not remember the exact passage and the name of the person who addresses Achilles.

847 2 ἀλληγορική μετάληψις On ἀλληγορική μετάληψις cf. Eust. ad II. I.126.17, II.70.14-6, III.179.7; cf. also Heraclit. All. 26.11 (μεταλητικώς).

848 2 ἔπει - ἔγρα Cf. Heraclit. All. 41.9 (…τὴν δὲ ἔγραν ὁσίαιν Ποσειδώνι προσέθηκε…).

849 2-3 ἔπει - ἔγραττος Aristot. de An. 403a.31 (…οὗ πρὶν ἔστιν τι δὲ ὁ μὲν γὰρ δρέειν ἀντὶ λυπήσεως ἢ τι τοιοῦτον, δὲ ἐξέστιν τοῦ περὶ καρδίαν αἵματος καὶ θερμοῦ…), Prob. 869a.5 (…καὶ γὰρ ὁ θυμὸς ζέσις τοῦ θερμοῦ ἐστὶ τοῦ περὶ τὴν καρδίαν) (cf. also Aristot. PA 651a.1); sch. A ad II. 9.256 (sch. ex.) (…θυμός γὰρ ἐστὶ πηθείς, ζέσις τοῦ τῆς καρδίας θερμοῦ…), 678 (…ἐνενεθέθεν δὲ καὶ ὄρισαντο οἱ φιλόσοφοι θυμός ἐστι ζέσις τοῦ περὶ καρδίαν αἵματος), A b T 18.110 (…θυμός ἐστι ζέσις τοῦ περὶ καρδίαν αἵματος…) (sch. ex.), sch. Ar. Ran. 844 (θυμός γὰρ ἐστι ζέσις τοῦ περὶ τὴν καρδίαν αἵματος…); cf. Egud. 267.7ff., Su. 0 573, 565, Eust. ad II. IV.146.2 (with note).

850 3-9 θάλασσα - γεννᾶ Od. 1.71; cf. sch. Η Μο V ad Od. 1.71 (Θάλασσα: μῆτηρ Πολυφήμου τοῦ Κύκλωπος κυρίως οὕτως λεγομένη).

851 4 θοῦν - δέχο Sch. D ad II. 1.12 (θοᾶς: […] σημαίνει δὲ καὶ δέχεσας…), T ad II. 10.394 b (sch. ex.) (θοῦν δὲ τὸ δέχοντά;); cf. also sch. Hes. 619.21 (Gaisford), EM 453.10, Hsch. e 639, Eust. ad II. I.39.32f., III.98.1, 503.4, ad Od. 1.345.11-2, II.100.5-7.

852 4 εὔς - ἀφοζίζει Cf. also Hsch. 0 675 (where ἀφοζίζει is given as a synonym) and Eust. ad Od. II.100.7.

853 7 φόρκυνος - θυγάτηρ Od. 1.72; cf. sch. Y ad Od. 1.71.


855 8-9 διὸ - ποιητῆς II. 1.159; with τινα Eust. means Agamemnon whom Achilles addresses.

856 9 κυνος δίματα ἔχειν Cf. II. 1.225; again Achilles addresses Agamemnon.

857 10 κόνεον II. 9.373; here Achilles speaks of Agamemnon.
10-1 ἐν σπηλαίοις - Κύκλωπα Eust. paraphrases Od. 1.71 and 73.

data Od. 1.747.18-9) although as Van der Valk explains (cf. n. 472,41) the form σπῆς is not
found in the Greek writers (we only find the dative plural σπεσι); cf. West (1988), p.74.

12 σπῆς γλαφυρόν Cf. Od. 1.73; the expression σπέσι γλαφυροῖς is common in Homer
(cf. Od. 1.15, 4.403, 5.155, 9.30, 114, 23.335); cf. also sch. Y i ad Od. 1.14, T D E H M θ Q V Y M i ad Od. 1.15, H K M θ ad Od. 1.73.

10-3 τὸ δὲ - τοῦ περὶ καρδιῶν ἀματος The reference here is verbatim from the scholia
(see above 41.2-3).

(with note); otherwise, the source is unknown.

14-5 διὰ - λοιπον Cf. Eust. ad II. III.144.15f., IV.220.17f.

18 τὸ ἐνδόσιµον On the word ἐνδόσιµον cf. LJS s.v. “signal”, Eust. ad II. III.863.17
(with note).

17-8 ἔπει - κινήσεως On the movement of the sky which never stops cf. Aristot. De

18-20 τὸν τοιούτου - Ὄδυσσεως For φιλόσοφος Ὄδυσσεως cf. 1.17.39, 319.8, 332.31, 379.1.

19-20 ἡγοῦν - παραγίνεται On καθικνοῦμαι cf. LJS s.v. “attack”.

20 ἄλος - μέδοντα Od. 1.72.

21-2 ὅπειρο μεσοπερεῖ - εἶναι Pind. Ol. 8.31; cf. also Eust. ad II. I.88.10, 143.31.

22 εἰρυκρείνοντα II. 1.102, 355, 411, 3.178, 7.107, 322, 11.107, 11.238, 13.114, 16.273,
23.887 Od. 3.148.

23 πολλών - φησι Cf. Od. 1.394-5.

25-6 διατί - γέραπται Eust. ad II. I.170.2ff., III.696.22-697.6, (αἰθὲρ ἄτροφος),
IV.74.6-9; cf. also West (1988), p. 84.

26-7 ἄλλο - πάντες Od. 1.76.


29 ἄλλο ἄγετε Od. 1.76.

29-31 ἐν δὲ - ἔχει Cf. sch. B ad Od. 2.178 (ἢ δ' ἄγε] τὸ ἐνα καὶ ἄγε καὶ ἄρε
ἐπιρρήματι παρακελεύσματι...), Eust. ad II. I.78.28-30 (ἀλλ' ἄγε δ'), 167.15ff., 176.4
(on the use of ἄγε as an exhortative word), IV.296.19-20 (ἢ δ' ἄγε νῦν), ad Od. I.57.32f.,
91.1, II.231.32; cf. also Hdn. II. Pros. III.2.26.31ff., EM 186.37ff., Hsch. a 406, Su. a 180,
sch. Dion. Thrax 101.8-12.

42.1 νόστον - ἔλθειν Od. 1.77.

882 νόστος - διηλαδῇ Sch. H M θ P T V ad Od. 1.53 (νόστον: τὴν ἐπάνοδον) (cf. also sch.
S ad Od. 1.413.6); cf. Phot. v 303.7 (νόστος: ἡ οἴκαδε ἐπάνοδος...), Hsch. v 669 (νόστος-
ἤ ἐς οίκον ἀνακοιμηθή ἢ ἐπάνοδος), EM 607.7, EGen. 410.4, Su. 500 (νόστος λέγεται
καὶ ἢ ἐς τὸν οίκον ἀνακοιμηθή καὶ ἀναστροφή).

3 μεθήσει τὸν χόλον Eust. writes it instead of ὅν (cf. Od. 1.78).

3-4 διὰ τὸ - προθέσεως Cf. sch. D E H M θ P Q V ad Od. 1.77 (μεθήσει: ἐάσει).

4 μεθήσειν - ἀμελήσειν Su. μ 424 (μεθήσειν: ἀμελῆσειν); cf. Hsch. μ 545 (μεθήσει.
ἀμελῆσειν: ἐάσει).
IV.759.22.

864 6 άνδε άδομνδε Od. 1.83.

865 8 ἐπεκτασεις On the word ἐπεκτασεις cf. Eust. ad II. I.72.1-14, II.470.2-3.

866 8 παραπλήρωσις On the word παραπλήρωσις cf. Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. II. p. XXII.


888 11 Ἐρμείαν - οτρύνομεν Od. 1.84-5.

889 12 νόστον - νέμηται Od. 1.87.


914-5 διάκτορος - ἐξαγγελλόμενα Cf. sch. M1 ad Od. 1.84.

916 δ ά φυλακός Cf. sch. A T ad II. 24.566 d, Hdn. καθ. III.1.150.3, 196.31-2, κυρ. ἐπιθ. III.2.5.37, II. Pros. III.2.128.12, παραν. III.2.854.11.


920-20 άγγιξα - νήσου Od. 7.725-4, 12.448-9, sch. H V ad Od. 1.85 (‘ άγγιξα: η Καλυψώνη νήσος); cf. also sch. H1 M1 P Q ad Od. 1.58.


921 άρχαία - <τείχη> I think here we must add the word τείχη because I believe that Eust. copies Hsch. ο. 26 (άρχαία: άρχαία τείχη).

921-2 άπο - Θεβόν Su. ο. 12 (‘ άγγιξα κακά: ἐπὶ τῶν ωχλὸν ἐπεὶ συνεβή Κάδμον τῶν άγγίξαν διὰ τὰς θυγατέρας κακοῖς περιπεσεν. ἀμείνον δὲ λέγειν άγγιξα κακά, τὰ παλαιὰ τοῦτο γὰρ ἢ λέξεις δηλοῦ.)

922 άτιμος εὐπλοκάμου Od. 1.86.

924 πλοχοί - ἐκερίσκων II. 17.52; cf. Eust. ad II. III.218.1, IV.12.7, 203.2-3 in which Eust. only refers to this Homeric verse.

924 πλοκάμου - γυναικείον Eust. ad II. IV.13.3-4, in n. 1094,52 Van der Valk suggests that the observation about πλοχοίς is Eust.'s own opinion. However, in sch. b T ad II. 19.126 (sch. ex.) we read: "οὔδέποτε πλοκάμου ἐπὶ ἀνδρός ἄπε".


926 άποκιμως - γυναικείον Eust.'s own comment (cf. also Eust. ad II. I.602.20-7, III.217.19); for the use of the word in Homer cf. II. 1.36, 19.413, 24.602; Od. 11.318.

926 καρπηκομάντες - ἀνδρόν Eust.'s point of view (cf. also Eust. ad II. I.255.12ff., I.602.20-7); for the use of the word in Homer cf. II. 3.43; cf. also LSJ s.v.

927 νόστον - νέμηται Od. 1.87.

927-8 άπο - γίνεται Cf. EM 607.12-3 (παρὰ τὸ νέσω... καὶ νόστος), An. Ox. I 297.7, cf.
EQuod. 410.44ff., Eust. ad ll. I.51.19 (with note), 322.16-8, 338.14, II.472.7-8; I agree with Van der Valk’s opinion that the parallel νόστος - Νότος is Eust.’s idea since this kind of connection is not found in the sources (cf. Van der Valk n. 684,9).

908 29-30 ταλάμη - ἔγχος Od. 1.104.
909 30 ἀπό - γίνεται Hdn. παθ. III.2.283.29 (ἔγχος: δόνομα ῥηματικόν παρα τὸ ἔχω ἔχος καὶ ἔγχος πλεονασμῷ τοῦ ἔ...), EM 313.1 (ἔγχος: τὸ δόρυ. παρὰ τὸ ἔχω ἔχος καὶ ἔγχος...), EQuod. 398.4 (Stef.) (ἔγχος: ...παρὰ τὸ ἔχω ἔχος καὶ ἔγχος); cf. Eust. ad ll. II.321.2-7, 625.20-1.
910 30 ταλασίφρων Od. 1.87; on the word ταλασίφρων cf. Eust. ad ll. I.778.3-5, III.563.1-2 (I agree with Van der Valk that the etymology of ταλασίφρων from ταλάσαω should be attributed to Eust.); cf. also Eust. ad Od. I.162.41-2.
911 32 δηλοί - πολύτιλαν Cf. Eust. ad ll. III.235.13-4 (cf. n. 857,2 where Van der Valk rightly remarks that in the commentary ad ll. III.52.22-3 and 235.13-4 Eust. gives to the words ταλασίφρων and τλήμων the meaning “audacious”, whilst here he gives them the meaning of “someone who tolerates everything”).
913 34 βλάψω βλαψίφρων Eust.’s own example.
914 42.33-43.1 τοῦ δὲ - Ἡλίαθι ll. 13.829, 15.164.
915 2 ταλάσια Cf. Plat. Leg. 805ε, Xen. Mem. 3.9.11, Oec. 7.41, Plu. Rom. 15 etc.
916 2 ταλάσιον Cf. Xen. Oec. 7.6 (ταλάσια ἔργα).
917 2 ταλασιεργία Cf. Ath. 5.17.5 (=Ath. Eytm. 2.1.67.30).
918 1-3 δέν - ῥηθήσεται Eust. ad Od. 1.67.6-8 (‘Ηλακάτη δὲ λέγεται, τὸ ἐριουργόν ἐργάλειον παρὰ τὸ ἠλάκατο τὸ ἐν πλάνῃ ελλοῦμαι, περὶ ἣν τὸ ἐριον ἡλάσκει δ ἐρμηνεύει τὴν ταλάσιαν καὶ τὸ ταλάσιον, κατὰ τὸν εἰπόντα Παυσανίαν, ὅτι ταλάσια τὰ ἐριουργικά. καὶ ταλάσια ἢ ἐριουργία); Paus. Att. τ 6 (ταλάσια: ἐριουργία. ταλάσιον: ἐριουργικόν. ταλασιουργία: ἢ τῶν ἤριων ἐργασίας); cf. also Phot. τ 567.10, Hsch. τ 70, Su. τ 43.1.
919 3 δαίφρονα Od. 1.48.
920 4 πολύφρονα Od. 1.83.
921 4-5 ὅφρα - θεία Cf. Od. 1.88-9.
922 7-8 μένος - θάρσος Cf. Od. 1.320-1.
925 9-10 καὶ εἶς - ἐστειλέν Cf. Od. 1.280-5.
926 10-1 ὁσόμονον - μνηστήρας Cf. Od. 1.253-66.
927 13 κλέός ἐσπελύν Od. 1.95.
929 16 πλατυσμός Significant for Eust.’s literary views; on the word πλατυσμός cf. Lampe 1090, s.v. I “extension, expansion”, LSJ s.v. I “dilatation”, Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. II, p.XXXIV, Eust. ad ll. I.334.9 (with note), 450.1, III.462.1, 796.27 (cf. also n. 1042,11f.), IV.29.6, 74.19-20, 921.6, ad Od. 1.2.4 (=2.22 Makr.), 6.2ff. (=10.4ff. Makr.), 187.9, II.38.33, 102.18, 312.23.
II.9.46, 26.35 etc.

931 17 διατριβήν Cf. LSJ s.v. III. “occasion for dwelling on a subject”; cf. also Eust. ad II. II.721.2ff.

932 18 ὁς - φανησάται Possibly Eust. means that in books 3-4, Homer introduces the story telling.


934 19-20 νησίωτης - Ὄδησσάς Astute remark by Eust.

935 21 καὶ ὅτι - πόλεμον Cf. Od. 3.120-2, 4.240-291.


938 25 σκοπιμότατον τέλος On σκοπιμότατον τέλος cf. Eust. ad II. II.747.31 (with note).

939 26 τόῦ βιβλίου τοῦτον Eust. means the Odyssey; cf. also Eust. ad II. I.10.10f.

940 26 ἀνδρώδης Cf. Eust. usually uses the adjective ἀνδρώδης for the Iliad and the adjective ηθικὴ for the Odyssey; cf. also Eust. ad Od. II.269.30.

941 26 ἡρῴκον On the different meanings of the word ἡρῴκος cf. Eust. ad II. II.642 (with note) (here the word means “heroic” and this is why it is combined with ἀνδρώδῆς); cf. also Eust. ad II. III.488.20-1 where Eust. uses the word ἡρῴκον for the Iliad (ἡ δὲ Ἡλίades πολλὸν ἔχει τὸ ἡρῴκον καὶ σεμνόν...); in the same way he has used the word ἀνδρώδης for the Iliad (see note 805 on ἀνδρώδης); for the same use of the word ἡρῴκον cf. Eust. ad Od. I.374.44.

942 28 συγκαταπαύει Cf. LSJ s.v. “bring at the same time to an end”; for the Passive form cf. Olymp. in Mete. 34.6, 61.7, 94.18, in Alc. 227.9.

943 28 τὸ βιβλίον i.e. the Odyssey; Eust. speaks loosely here because the poem does not end immediately after the killing of the suitors.

944 31-3 ὅστε - μνηστήρας Cf. Od. 16.235-9; cf. also 2.122.27-31.

945 33 δάλγον - ἐκατόν Cf. Od. 16.245-53.

946 33-4 εἰς - ἵστορηθείσατι Cf. Od. 13.390-1; cf. also Eust. ad Od. II.53.11-29.


948 5 προασφαλιζόμενος Cf. Eust. ad II. I.85.3.

949 4-5 οὕτως - συντείνοντα Eust.’s own comment.

950 8-9 καὶ οὕτως - ὑποπτεύουσιν Cf. Od. 2.326-30.

951 9-10 οὕτως - ἀδικίαν Eust.’s own comment.

952 11 τερατωδότερον On the word τερατωδότερον cf. also Eust. ad II. I.15.22, 31.5, II.199.16, 281.10, 326.23, III.147.16, 256.5, 260.13, IV.92.20, 158.28 etc., ad Od. I.122.37, 197.25, 249.36, 257.4, 315.42, 401.19, II.39.2, 282.5-6, 288.32; on the words τερατωδότερον, τερατεία and τερατολογία cf. Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. II, p. XXXV-XXXVI.

953 11 διουχεῖσθαντον Word used only by Eust. only here; cf. LSJ s.v. “hard to work out”.

954 12 εἰμιθυόδως Cf. Eust. ad II. I.11.31, 24.21, 101.31, 240.16, II.45.13, 47.22, 115.19-20, 122.15, III.98.22, 149.1, 239.16, 243.6, IV.147.16, 284.14, 421.16, 466.4, 500.7 etc.; ad Od. I.23.17 (=43.16 Makr.), 23.41 (=44.12 Makr.), 132.16, 373.19, II.45.42, 58.46, 68.38, 73.18, 82.29, 97.37, etc.; on the word εἰμιθυόδως cf. Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. II, p. XXVII,
p.LXVIII.


956 14 μέθοδος Cf. Van der Valk (1971-87), p. LXVIII.

957 16-7 καὶ ἄκοινασα - αὐτής Cf. Od. 1.64.


959 19-20 ἢ προαφαννύσεως On the word προαφαννύσεις cf. Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. II, p. LXVI; cf. also Eust. ad II. I.148.4, 7, 21, 194.26, 260.28-9, 371.24, 573.4-5, II.118.5, 319.21, 330.6, 473.4, III.23.16, 44.17, 85.1, 120.25, 204.7, 343.21, 362.6, 393.23, 410.11, IV.37.19, 85.15, 140.7, 192.17, 304.11, 351.4, 381.15 etc.; ad Od. I.50.27, 104.30, 130.30, 196.19, 218.10-11, 252.36, 272.45, 361.36, 427.33, II.45.38, 150.26, 180.7, 234.12, 244.19.

960 20-1 ἀπελεύσομαι - τὰ καὶ τὰ Eust. writes ἀπελεύσομαι instead of ἀσελεύσομαι because he paraphrases and simplifies Od. 1.88-95; ; on Od. 1.88 cf. Van der Valk (1949), p.45.

961 24 παρέκκλισιν I suggest this should be corrected to παρέκκλισιν (LSJ: “digression”) because Eust. uses the verb παρεκκλίνω before and the word παρέκκλισις is used as critical term in ancient scholia (cf. sch. A ad ll. 1.234-40a (Nic.), D E3 ad Od. 1.284, P Q V ad Od. 19.hyp.4).

962 24 προεκτίθεται Cf. ad Od. I.6.4 (τὸν τρόπον προεκτίθεται...) in which Eust. uses the same verb; cf. also notes 133 and 822.


964 26 σαφήνειαν Cf. Eust. ad ll. II.825.5-6 (with note).

965 27-8 πέμψον - Πάλη Od. 1.93.

966 29-30 πρότισ - ἐλθέ Od. 1.284.


969 44.31-45.1 Ἐμειναν ὁτρόνομεν Cf. Od. 1.84-5.

970 1 αὐτάρ - ἐξελέομαι Eust. puts ἐξελέομαι instead of ἐσελέομαι (cf. Od. 1.88).

971 7-11 σημείωσα - ἢ Ἀθ. Epit. 2.22.22.36 (ὅτι ἡ παροιμία ἡ λέγουσα Τηλεμάχου χύτρα τοιαύτη τις ἔστιν: Ἀχαρνέως ἢ τῶν δήμων ὁ Τηλέμαχος, ὃς κυάμων χύτρας ἀφεί δισοβόμενος ἦν); =Ath. 9.734.4ff. (χύτρα πολθοῦντα μαθεῖν πολλάκις τις ἡ Τηλεμάχου καλουμένη χύτρα καὶ τίς ὁ Τηλέμαχος [...] ὅτι δὲ καὶ τῶν δήμων Ἀχαρνέως ὁ Τηλέμαχος...); a digression which fits Eust.'s compositional technique.

972 11 ὅτι τὸ - ἀπειπεῖν Cf. Eust. ad ll. II.487.5ff.
973 12 πάσι μνηστήραν ἀπειτέμεν Od. 1.91.
974 14-5 ἐν - φησίν II. 9.109; cf. Eust. ad II. II.668.6ff.
975 15 μὴλ’ ἀδινὰ σφάζουσιν Od. 1.92.
977 16-7 καὶ σύς - φανήσεται Od. 14.41ff., 107f.
978 18 περί - ψηλαφήσαι Phot. μ 386 = Hsch. μ 1184 (μηλαφήσαι: ψηλαφήσαι).
979 18-9 μὴ ποτε - ἀφάσαι Eust.’s own comment.
980 19-20 ἢ ἀπὸ - ἔρια Phot. μ 395 (μήλοθρα: τα βεβαμμένα ἔρια: καὶ το βάψαι, μηλόσαι); cf. also EM 583.49, Hsch. μ 803, 1203, Su. μ 939.
981 20 ἀδινὰ - ἀδὴν Cf. sch. A^im ad II. 2.87 c₁ (=Hdn. II. Pros. III.2.31.18) (ἀδινὰν: δασυνητόν τὸ ἀδινάον- ἀπὸ γάρ τοῦ ἀδὴν καὶ ἀδίνος ἢ κίνησις), b T 2.87 c³ (sch. ex.) (ἀδινὰν: παρὰ τὸ ἀδὴν: διὸ δασύνεται), 16.481f. f (sch. ex.) (ἀδίνον κῆρι: πυκνὸν, παρὰ τὸ ἀδὴν...), 18.316 a (sch. ex.) (οἱ δὲ δασυλῶδες, παρὰ τὸ ἀδῆν), T (ἀδὴν δὲ εἰς κόρον), D ad II. 5.203 (ἀδηνίων: δασυλώς...), E Q V ad Od. 1.92.1-2 (ἀδινὰ ἦτοι λεπτὰ πρὸς σύγκρισιν τῶν βοῶν, ἢ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀδίνον, ἢ πυκνὸς καὶ συνεχῶς), B (ἀδινὸν τὸ μάλα οἰκτρόν. γίνεται δὲ ἐκ τοῦ ἀδήν, δὲ σημαίνει τὸ δασυλώς, καὶ ἀδίνον τὸ συχνὸν καὶ πυκνὸν); in n. 178.26-9 on Eust. ad II. I.273.20ff., Van der Valk remarks that he does not know Eust.’s sources on the word ἀδίνος; Eust. here paraphrases the Hom. sch. (at least the etymology from the adverb ἀδὴν and the meanings of πυκνὸς καὶ δασυλῆς); cf. also EGen. a 73.1ff., 76.1ff., EM 17.28, Eust ad II. II.392.16, III.887.9.
983 21-2 ἀδὸς - θυμὸν II. 11.88.
984 22-3 δῆτι δὲ - δηλοὶ Eust. ad II. II.56.2-4 (τὸ δὲ ἀδὴν ἀντὶ τοῦ δασυλῶς, περὶ οὗ καὶ προγέγραπται, Νικίας μὲν ψιλό, διπλασίαζον τὸ δ διὰ τὸ μέτρον, ὁμίοιο τῷ “κόνω ἀδδεξε”; Ἀρίσταρχος δὲ δὲν καὶ βραχέως καὶ δασέως,) probably citing sch. A b T ad II. 5.203 a (= Hdn. II. Pros. III.2.49.10ff., ὅρθ. III.2.467.13ff.) (ἀδηνίων: Νικίας διὰ δύο δογμά καὶ τὸ μέτρον, ὁμίοιο τῷ “κόνω ἀδδεξες”, καὶ ψιλό. Ἀρίσταρχος δὲ δὲν καὶ βραχέως καὶ δασέως...); cf. also sch. A^int ad II. 5.203 a², Eust. ad II. I.273.22f. (ἄς τοῦ ἀδηνίου δασυμονεύον παρὰ τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς. ἐνα καὶ σημείοις την διὰ ἐνὸς τῆς γραφῆς τοῦ ἀδήν καὶ του τα συστολῆν, III. 477.18-9 (...δῆτι καὶ εν ταῦτα κεῖται τὸ ἀδὴν ἀντὶ τοῦ δασυλῶς δὲ ἐνὸς καὶ συστολῆς του τα), IV.353.5-7 (καὶ σημείοις δῆτι καὶ ἀδὸς τος ποιήσις τοῦ ἀδήν, δὲ στοι το ἀδὶς, δὲ ἐνὸς γραφῆς δ δυστέλλων το διάχρονον).
985 23-4 ἢ δὲ - ταῦτα Eust. means Ael. Dion. whom he quotes.
986 24 ἀδὴν - δασυλῶς Ael. Dion. a 35 (ἀδηνίων. ἄλλης εἰς κόρον, ἵκανος, δασυλῶς...).
987 25 ἀδηφάγοι - τέλειοι Ael. Dion. a 36 (citing Aristoph. fr. 758 and Pher. fr. 212) (ἀδηφάγοι ἔποιειν: οἱ τέλειοι πρὸς τὴν πόλα διάκρισιν...); cf. also Phot. a 345, Hsch. a 1110, Poll. 1.18.4.
988 25 ἀδηφάγοι ἄρμα Ael. Dion. a 36 (ἀδηφάγοι ἄρμα: το τέλειον καὶ μέγα); cf. also Phot. a 341.
989 27 ἀδαίον - ἔργον Ael. Dion. a 33 (citing Sophr. fr. 130) (ἀδαίον: το εἰς κόρον ἄγων <ἡ το ἄρην> ὠντω> Σώφρων).
990 28 ἀδηφάγοι ἔποιειν Repetition; cf. Eust. ad Od. 1.24.30 (=45.25 Makr.).
991 28-9 τοις γάρ - πλάθος Unknown source; maybe Eust.’s changes Ael. Dion. a 36 (πρὸς τὴν πόλα διάκρισιν) and adds his own comment.
992 29-30 Λυσίας - ἐντελῆ Αελ. Dion. (citing Lys. fr. 103) a 36.5-6 (珙珙 καὶ "ὑδηφάγον"
ἐπε Λυσίας τὴν τέλειον μισθόν λαμβάνουσαν τρήηη). cf. also Harp. p. 10.2, Su. a 469,
Phot. a 345, Hsch. a 1110.
993 30 λόγχους - πότας Αελ. Dion. a 36.6-7 (citing Alc. Com. fr. 21) ("Αλκαίος δὲ ὁ
κομικός καὶ τοὺς πότας λεγομένους λόγχους "ὑδηφάγους" ἔφη χαριντισάμενος); cf.
also Harp. p. 10.6-7, Su. a 469, Phot. a 345, Hsch. a 1110.
994 30-1 οποίος - "Αριττοφάνει Ar. Nub. 57; Eust. changes Ael. Dion.'s example and
replaces it with his own from Aristophanes.
995 31 ἐλεξέκρεος - παλαιώς Hsch. e 2101 (ἐλεξέκρεος; στρεβλόκερος).
996 32 βόες εἰλίποδες Cf. Od. 1.92; cf. also Eust. ad II. II.763.5.
997 32 βόες - εἰλίσσοντες Sch. Gen. ad II. 6.424 (εἰλίποδας ἐπιθετικῶς λέγει τοὺς βοῦς,
ὅτι εἰλίσσουσι τοὺς πόδας κατὰ τὴν πορείαν), (="sch. D ad II. 6.424 with some changes),
EGud. 418.7f. (Stef.) (εἰλίποδας τὰς βοῦς, ὅτι εἰλίσσουσι τοὺς πόδας κατὰ τὴν
πορείαν), EM 299.25 (εἰλίποδος ἐπίθετον τῶν βοῶν, ὅτι εἰλίσσουσι τοὺς πόδας κατὰ τὴν
πορείαν.), Hsch. e 899 (εἰλίποδος βοῦς: ἐπιθετικῶς τὰς βοῦς διὰ τὸ εἰλίσσειν τοὺς
πόδας κατὰ τὴν πορείαν); cf. also sch. H M R Q T ad Od. 1.92.
998 33 Παυσανίας - μηρῶν Paus. Att. γ 14 (γινούσας εἰλίποδες. διὰ τὴν εἰλίσειν τῶν
μηρῶν); on εἰλίποδας cf. West (1988), p. 86.
999 45.33-46.1 ἔλικες - ἄλλαξα ἐν Eust. ad II. IV.202.24 (γναμπταὶ δὲ ἔλικες ἐνώτια ἢ
πέλλια πάρα τὸ εἰς κύκλον εἰλίσσωσθαι), cf. also Hsch. e 2071 (ἔλικες: τῆς ἀμέλεου τὰ
κληματώδη, ἢ ἐνώτια, ἢ πέλλια); on the meaning of ἔλικες as μέλανας cf. Eust. ad II.
III.393.24-5.
1000 1-2 πέμψω - ἠμαθεόντα Od. 1.93.
1001 2-3 πέμψω - Πύλων Sch. M* ad Od. 1.93. (πέμψω δ' ὡς Σπάρτην τε: τινὲς "πέμψω δ' ἢ
縻ρφ δ' εἰς Κρήτην τε." καὶ ἢ 'Ἀθηνᾶ ἄλλαξα 'πρῶτα μὲν ἐς Πύλων ἐλθέ... κέιθεν δ' ἢς
Κρήτην πε τα' Ἰδομενῆ ἀνακτα: ἢ γὰρ δεύτατος ἦθεν Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων."),
M' T 93.14-5 (οὐκ ἑσθίν ἐν ἑτέροις βιβλίοις ὁι στιχοί "κέιθεν δ' ἢς Κρήτην τε παρ' Ἰδομενῆ
ἀνακτα: ἢ γὰρ δεύτατος ἦθεν Ἐχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων."); the reference for
tινὲς implies Zenodotus as we can understand from sch. H M Q R ad Od. 3.313; cf. also
1002 4-5 δι - - Πύλων Cf. Str. 8.3.7.6-11.
1003 5-6 καὶ δι - - γέγαραιται Eust. ad II. I.153.24-6 (refering to Str.) (τὴν δὲ Πύλων παρὰ
μὲν ὁμήροι ὡς ἀνατριχήτως εὐθεῖη λεγομένην κατὰ γένος ἄρσενικόν ὁ
μέντοι Γεογράφος καὶ ἄλλοι τὸν Πύλων φασίν. δι τὶς Πόλις καὶ δι τις μὲν
τίθει τῆς Πόλου, οἱ δὲ ἐκείνης φασίν ἄρχειν τὸν Νέστορα, οἱ δὲ καὶ τῶν τριῶν,
γραφεῖται καὶ εν τοῖς εξῆς), 268.6-8 (ὅτι τὸ "Πύλων ἠμαθόντος" ἀντὶ τοῦ
ἡμαθοδήσης, εἰ μὴ ἄρα τίς ἄρσενικός ὄνομασε τὸν Πύλων ὅπερ, εἰ καὶ παρὰ
ἄλλους ἑστιν, ὡς προείρηται, ἄλλα παρὰ τὸ πουντη ὃυ φαίνεται...), 458.2-5 (refering
to Steph. Byz. and Str.) (Πύλων δὲ τρεῖς κατὰ τὸν Ἂ Εὐθηνία γράφαντα, Μεσονήθων,
Τριφυλίας, 'Ἀρκαδίας, ὁ δὲ Γεογράφος, παρ' φ δὲ ἄρσενικός ὁ Πύλος λέγεται...);
on Eust.'s false reference to Steph. Byz. cf. also Van der Valk (n. 296,26f.); on the location
1004 7-8 ἐστι - ἀλλή Str. 8.3.7.8f.; cf. also Eust. ad II. I.458.6.
1005 9-10 σπέδουσι - Νέστορι Str. 8.3.7.11ff.
1006 10-11 εἰ καὶ - Πύλων Eust. means Str.; cf. Str. 8.3.17.20ff., Eust. ad II. I.458.3ff.
1008 12 Πύλων ἠμαθάντα Od. 1.93, 2.214, 359.
1009 13 ἐλήνετι Ζακύνθῳ Od. 1.246, 16.123, 19.131; cf. also Eust. ad II. I.286.6-9.
1011 17 ίκανός - γέγραπται Eust. ad II. I.454.17- 455.2.
1013 19 καὶ - λέλυνται II. 2.135.
1014 19-20 σχῆμα ἄμφιβολος On this σχῆμα ἄμφιβολος cf. Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. II, p. LXV; cf. also Eust. ad II. I.253.17, 333.4, 630.15, 658.19, 757.27 (with note), II.43.15 (with note), 717.3, III.35.16, 350.9, 696.17, 699.21, IV. 466.15; cf. also II.337.21, 706.21-2, III.385.3-4 (ἄμφιβολος έχει); II.420.23, III.50.5, 171.4, 175.11, 212.20, 266.1 (ἀμφιβολοὶ); ΙΙ. 560.2, ΙΙΙ.223.24 (ἄμφιβολος ἔννοια); ΙΙ.706.18 (δύο περιώνυμοι ἄμφιβολοι); ΙΙΙ.405.2 (τόπος ἄμφιβολος); IV.183.20, 723.22 (τρόπος ἄμφιβολος); IV.183.20 (ἄμφιβολον).
1015 20 ἣδε ἦνα - ἐξῆρα Od. 1.95; Eust. writes ἔχειν instead of ἔχειν (cf. Od. 1.95).
1016 22-3 κλέος - έκκλη Eust.'s own explanation; cf. Lamp. (1961-8), 566 s.v.
1018 24 οὖν οὖν - κλέος Cf. Eust. ad II. II.329.8-9 (with note).
1019 25-6 ένταθα - ἄμφιβολης Cf. Eust. ad II. I.305.21, III.176.21 (with note), 249.29, Lamp. (1961-8), 93 s.v.
1020 26 ην ποι - Τηλέμαχος Cf. Od. 1.94.
1021 27 η τῆς - 'Αθηνᾶ Note the allegorical explanation; on allegorical Athena cf. Eust. ad II. I.65.23-5 (with note), 128.29, 132.13-5 (with note), 134.7-9, 24-6, 137.9-10, 189.32-5, 385.10-2, ΙΙ.184.12-3, 388.4-6, IV.159.7-10, 530.10f.
1022 28 ὅτι - Ἡλίας Maybe Eust. refers to II. 14.186 and he confuses Hera with Athena.
1023 29-30 εἰπόωσα - ἐδήσατο Eust. writes εἰπόωσα ὑπὸ ποσίν instead of εἰπόωσα ὑπὸ ποσίν (cf. Od. 1.96).
1024 46.30-47.1 ποσίν - πέδιλα Eust. writes ποσίν ἐδήσατο πέδιλα instead of ποσίν ἐδήσατο, καλά πέδιλα (cf. Od. 1.96).
1025 1-4 εκ γὰρ - διάδημα On ὑποδείκται and ἀναδείκται cf. Eust. ad II. I.262.21-2 (with note); the word διάδημα is found in Eust. only here; on ὑπόδημα cf. Eust. ad II. op. cit. (EM 782.13, EGud. v 544); the word ἀναδήμα is found in Eust. only here (cf. EM 96.15); on ἀναδήμη cf. Hsch. a 4262, Phot. a 1445; the word διάδημα is also found in Eust. ad II. IV.657.5, 11-2, ad Od. I.31.27, Eust. D. P. 912.47 but this explanation of the word is only found here.
1026 5 καλά Od. 1.96.
1027 5 ἀμβροσία, χρόσεια Od. 1.97.
1028 5-6 αὐτά - ἅνεμου Eust. changes Od. 1.97-8.
1029 7-8 δῆλοι - φρόνησες Allegorical explanation.
1030 8 τὸ θεῖον - ἄμφιβολα Cf. sch. D H M ¹ P V Y ad Od. 1.97 (ἀμβροσία: θεία).
1031 8-9 θεῖον - ἐφάνη Eust. ad II. I.247.22-3 (τὸ δὲ νέκταρ καὶ ἡ ἄμβροσία πέπλασται τῇ ποιήσῃ καὶ ἑστιν ὑνόματα τροφῆς θεία), II.86.4-5 (οἱ θεοὶ ἄμβροσιαν καὶ νέκταρ προσφέρονται, οὐ μὴν σίτον καὶ ὕδων. τὰ δὲ νέκταρ καὶ ἄμβροσια χρώμενα ἀθάνατα εἰσίν. οἱ θεοὶ ἄρα ἀθάνατοι), III.607.26-7 (εἰπός δὲ ἀν καίριον ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις ἄμβροσίων εἰπέν μὴ μόνον τὸ θεῖον συνήθως, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ἀνθρώπων).
1032 9 διὰ δὲ - τὸ λαμπρὸν Cf. Eust. ad II. IV.914.17.
1033 9 τὸ δὲ ἐξεκύκλωσαν Cf. also Eust. ad II. I.134.9.
1034 8-10 τὸ θεῖον - φοράς Note how systematic the allegorical explanation is.
1035 11 ὑποδείκται Od. 1.96.
1036 11 τὸ τῆς φρόνησας On the correspondance between Athena and φρόνησας cf. Eust. ad II. I.65.24-5 (with note), 132.13-4, 802.16, II.2.3, 3.3-4, 70.15, 72.30, 116.22, 137.11,


1038 11 απέρροσκοπον Only here in Eust; cf. LSJ s.v. “unseeing”.

1039 13 τερατολογία On the word τερατολογία cf. Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. II, p. XXXV, n. 7, 8, p. XXXVI, n. 1; cf. Eust. ad II. III.711.13, 858.19, IV.369.2-3, ad Od. I.1.21 (=1.25 Makr.), 1.23f. (=1.29 Makr.), 25.25 (=47.13 Makr.), 308.33, 316.3, 326.14; cf. also Eust. ad II. I.223.22, III.434.12, ad Od. I.258.21 (τερατολογείν); Eust. ad II. I.280.22, III.434.3, ad Od. II.39.20 (τερατολογείν); Eust. ad II. I.440.28 (τερατολογείν); Eust. ad Od. II.119.4 (τερατολογηθῆσαι).

1040 14-5 οὔτω - φορούμενα Cf. II. 19.386; cf. also sch. A ad II. 19.386 a (Did.), Eust. ad II. IV.346.2-6.

1041 16 εφ’ ύγρην Od. 1.97.


1043 18 φ’ διάμνησι Eust. writes φ’ instead of το’ (cf. Od. 1.100).

1044 19 τοῖς Eust. writes τοῖς instead of τοῖς (cf. Od. 1.101).


1046 19-20 τὸ ἐνεργὸν On the word τὸ ἐνεργὸν cf. also Eust. ad II. I.299.34, 609.14, II.247.13, III.89.26, 173.6, 560.21, IV.279.18.

1047 20 ἀνδρόδες On the word ἀνδρόδες cf. Eust. ad Od. I.23.25 (=43.26 Makr.) (καὶ τὸ τῶν πράξεων τοῦ βιβλίου τοῦτον ἀνδρόδες καὶ ἡρωικόν,...), II.269.30 (τὸ τῆς Ὀδυσσείας ἀνδρόδες ἐν τῇ ῥαφώδει ταύτῃ κεῖται); cf. also Eust. ad II. I.7.5 (ἀνδρόδης μὲν ἡ Ἰλίας) where Eust. attributes the adjectif ἀνδρόδης to the Iliad and not to the Odyssey.


1049 20-2 ἔττι - ἀλκιμοποιόν Cf. Eust. ad II. III.2.13 (with note), III.148.2, ad Od. II.248.15, 282.46.


1052 23 ἀκαμέμνον δὲ ἐξεῖ  ἀλκιμῷ Od. 1.99.

1053 24-5 τὸ λυπῶν - νοεῖται Eust. changes the words from sch. b T ad II. 14.12 (sch. ex.) (ἀκαμέμνον δὲ: ἀκήν ἔχον, ἱκανομένον, μη εἶκον, σκηλρόν, ἀντίτυπον), sch. D ad II. 14.12 (ἀκαμέμνον: ἐστομομένον, ὕξυμμενον), sch. D E2 H K M1 P Q V ad Od. 1.99 (ἀκαμέμνον: ἐστομομένον, ἱκανομένον), Hsch. α 2306 (ἀκαμένει: σοβεῖν. ἠπίστασι. ἀκαμήμενος: λυπούμενος, ἀκαμέμνον ἔχος: ἱκανομένον δόρον, ἐστομομένον); cf. also sch. T II ad II. 15.482 (sch. ex.).

1054 25-6 τὸ δὲ - στιβαρόν Cf. Od. 1.100.

1055 26 θείου ἔχουσι σεμνότητα Religious comment; on the word σεμνότητα cf. Eust. ad II. I.31.5, 50.1, 62.30, 64.25, 136.11, II.333.4-7 (with note), 513.4, 522.23, 626.5, 821.3 (with note), III.162.23, 173.15, 314.20, IV.49.16, 205.1, 314.22, 467.20, 488.27, 490.7, 523.6,
574.17, 576.4, 689.1, 897.15, 971.5 etc., *ad Od. I.* 1.5.19 (=8.30 Makr.), 6.36-7, 96.28, 104.14, 119.30, 125.15-6, 142.28, 198.44, 252.11, 321.11, 371.36, 426.43-4, II.184.5-6, 229.40, *D. P.* 1166.8; cf. also Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. II, pp. LXIII-LXIV.

1056 27 τούτων - στερεόν Cf. *EM* 727.42ff., *EGud.* 511.55ff.; cf. also Eust. *ad II.* II.107.6-7 (with note): I agree with Van der Valk’s opinion that Eust. takes the etymology given by the sources (στιβαρός is derived from στείβω) but he replaces what they call “τὸ πεπλημένον καὶ συνημένον” with “τὸ πυκνόν”. The explanation “μετενεχθὲν ἀπὸ τῆς καταπεπατημένης γῆς καὶ διατούτου πεπυκνωμένης” is given by Eust. in order to join in a logical way the etymology of στιβαρόν (from στείβω) with the explanation (τὸ πυκνόν).


1058 29 στείβον δ’ ἐν βόθροισι *Od.* 6.92.

1059 30 ἡ στίβας - στρωμην Cf. sch. Ar. *Plut.* 663.6ff. (στιβάς ἢ ἐκ χόρτων στρωμή, ἢ τοιούτω τι καὶ γίνεται παρὰ τὸ στείβειν, ἵ ἐστι τὸ περιπατεῖν. στιβάς γὰρ κυρίως ἡ πεπλημένη καὶ οἶνον καταπεπατημένη); on the etymology of the word στιβάς cf. Eust. *ad II.* I.682.22-3 (in n. 434.12 Van der Valk underlines that he does not know the source of Eust.’s etymology for στιβάς), II.107.7 (in n. 563.36 Van der Valk repeats that the source is unknown but he adds that possibly it could be his own etymology), 820.1-3, III.247.26-8, 420.8, *ad Od.* I.1240.37-8, 279.41-2; on the meaning of the word cf. Hsch. σ 1843, Su. σ 1096, 1097.

1060 31 στίχας *Od.* 1.100.


1062 32 ἡρώωn *Od.* 3.101.

1063 33 τὸ ἀνδρέιον Cf. *LSJ* s.v. ἀνδρεῖος, neut., τὸ ἀνδρέιον=ἀνδρεία.

1064 47.34-48.1 οὐ γὰρ - περιφρονοῦσα Eust.’s own comment.

1065 1-2 καθ’ καὶ - ἀλλόπεκας Them. *Or.* 154a8; cf. also Eust. *ad II.* I.319.23-5 where Eust. cites the source by name.

1066 2 οἷς κοτέσσεται Eust writes οἷς κοτέσσεται instead of τούσιν τε κοτέσσεται (Od. I.110).

1067 2 τὸ κριτικὸν Cf. *LSJ* s.v. κριτικός, neut. “the power of discerning”.

1068 3-4 οὐ γὰρ - κοτέσσαθαι Eust.’s own comment.

1069 5-6 δῆλον - τὸ ἄπλον Cf. *EGud.* 472.3 (Stef.), *Choer. Epim. Ps.* 149.34.

1070 7 δημιοπάτη *Od.* 1.101.


1072 10-11 ὅτι - λεγεθείσα Eust.’s own comment.

1073 7-9 ἄλληγορικός - φρόνησις Note the allegorical explanation

1074 8 δημιοπάτη Ἀθηνα *Od.* 1.101.

1075 7-9 ἄλληγορικός - φρόνησις Sch. *DE* *J ad Od.* I.101 ("δημιοπάτη" λέγεται ἡ Ἀθηνά, διότι ὑφ’ φρονήσεως πατήρ ὁ νοῦς ἔστη. παῦντον δὲ κρείττων καὶ ἱσχυρότερον ὁ νοῦς); on allegorical Athena cf. *Eust. ad Od.* I.125.12 (=46.27 Makr. with note).


1077 10-11 - όρμος *Eot. Or.* 118.3 (ὁρμος. βρι ἐπιτατικόν. ἐστι μόριον, καὶ πλεονασμῷ τοῦ ὃ, ὁρμος), *Zonar.* 1422.16ff. (ὁρμος. ἵσχυρος. γενναίον. παρά τὸ βρι ἐπιτατικόν μόριον γέγονε παράγωγον βριμόν, καὶ πλεονασμῷ τοῦ ὃ ὁρμος),
sch. Opp. H. 1.360 (δήμιον παρά τό βρι, ἐπιτατικόν μόριον κατά πλευνασμόν τοῦ ο καὶ παραγωγῆν, δήμιος ὁ πάνυ ἰσχυρός); ἄρα also EM 126.57, 613.25.


1077 12 δήμικαλα παρά Αἰσχύλῳ Aesch. Ag. 143.

1081 11-2 εκθεῖθεν - σκυμνία Cf. sch. Aesch Ag. 143a; ἄρα also Eust. ad II. I.602.5, ad Od. I.337.12-3.

1084 13 ἐτεροί - σκυμνία Phot. o 314.22 (δήμια καὶ δήμικαλα: τά τῶν λέοντων καὶ λόκων σκυμνία); ἄρα also Ael. Dion. o 2.

1083 13-4 καὶ ὁ τοῦ - μορμολύκεια On μορμολύκειον cf. Eust. ad II. IV.203.20 (with note), 494.3, LSI s.v. 2 "comic mask".

1086 15-6 βρίκελα - βαρβάρους Paus. Att. β 20 (βρίκελος; ...ἐστι δὲ βαρβαρικόν τὸ ὄνομα, τίθεται δὲ [καί] ἐπὶ προσώπων τραγικῶν καὶ εἶρηται οὐνεί βριστή [ἐπίκελος ὁ βρίζεν ἔκελος. Βρίγες γὰρ ἔθνος βαρβαρικόν].

1087 16-7 ὁ δ' αὐτός - ἐκφοβεῖν Paus. Att. β 21 (βριοῦσαθαι: τὸ μετὰ τινὸς ἀπειλῆς ἐκφοβεῖν).

1082 17 καὶ Αἴλιος - ἀπειλεῖ Ael. Dion. β 18 (βριοῦσαι: ἀπειλεῖ).

1081 18-8 ἄλλοι - περισσομένον Cf. Hdn. Part. 6.13 (βριμώμαι, ῥήμα, τό ἐπιπλήττω); ἄρα also EGDud. 344.52, EM 536.46.

1088 18-9 ταῦτα - παράγονται Repetition; ἄρα also Eust. ad Od. I.26.2 (=48.19 Makr.).

1089 19-20 διέν - φοβερὸν His own explanation of the the personal name Βριοῦ (note that he avoids the name of Persephone that the etymological lexica give and he replaces it with δαιμόνιον); the name is found only here in Eust; on Βρίγω cf. EGen. β 261, EM 213.49ff., Et. Sym. I.502.21ff., sch. Opp. H. 1.360.4.

1083 20 οἱ - γεσογράφος Str. 7.3.2.6 (καὶ αὐτοὶ δ' οἱ Φρύγες Βρίγες εἰσὶν, Ἐρετικὸν τι ἔθνος; note that Eust. drifts here.


1089 21 γεγονότες - βρι Eust.'s own explanation.


1089 22 οἱ Βριάρεως Cf. Hes. Th. 734, EM 346.41.

1089 22-3 ὁ δ' αὐτός - τοῦ ὁ Cf. Hdn. path. III.2.173.15; ἄρα also Eust. ad II. I.192.21-22, II.345.17-8, 332.25-6.

1089 23 καὶ το - παρῆκται scil. βρίθω from Βριάρεως and βρίθως from βρίθω, cf. Zonar. β 408.9ff., EGen. β 253.3, EM 213.15ff., (also 214.13), Et. Sym. II.498.25.

1089 24 καὶ ὁ βρίθως Cf. EGen. β 253.5, EM 213.17, 398.4, Et. Sym. II.498.27.

1089 24-5 τραχύς τραχύς It is doubtful whether it is his own example, cf. Eust. ad II. I.531.30 (with note); the word τραχύς is rare in Eust. cf. Eust. ad II. III.161.1 (with note); on τράχυς cf. Thesaur. I2 2400 s.v.

1089 25 δὲς κάτασκης Eust. ad II. III.161.1 (with note); cf. Thesaur. IV 1359.


1089 26 ἠδός ἀπήδης On this example cf. sch. A ad II. 2.764 (= Hdn. II. Pros. III.2.37.5-8), Hdn. καθ. III.1.82.16-7, Eust. I.531.31 (with note).

1089 26-7 γλυκός γλυκευκής Eust.'s own example; also note the similarity in meaning between ἠδός - γλυκός and ἀπήδης - ἀγλυκευκής.

1089 27 διὰ τὸ γλεύδικος EM 11.36 (παρὰ τὸ γλεύδικος ἀγλυκευκής); ἄρα also Et. Sym. I.40.23.
23-4 δηλοὶ Eust.’s own comment.

21-5 ἵστεον - κληθῆναι Eust. paraphrases Str. 10.2.14-2-7 (...οἱ δὲ τῇ Τάφῳ, καὶ Ταφίους τοὺς Κεφαλληνίους, τοὺς δ’ αὐτοὺς καὶ Τηλεβόας, καὶ τὸν Ἀμφιτρώνα δεύτερο ἐπιστητεύει μετὰ Κεφάλου τοῦ Δημονέας ἐκ’ Ἀθηνῶν ψυγάδος παραληψάθεντος, κατάσχοντα δὲ τὴν νήσον παραδόουσι τῷ Κεφάλῳ, καὶ ταύτην μὲν ἑπάνων ἔκεινον γενέσθαι...) and Str. 10.2.20.1 (οἱ δὲ τῶν Ταφίων νήσοι, πρῶτον δὲ Τηλεβών, ὃν ἦν καὶ ἡ Τάφος νῦν δὲ Ταφίας καλουμένη, [...] ἀλλὰ ὡς ἐτέροις ἠγεμόνοις ταττοῦνται, Ταφίως καὶ Τηλεβώας. πρῶτον μὲν ὁ Ἀμφιτρώος ἐπιστητεύει αὐτοὺς μετὰ Κεφάλου τοῦ Δημονέας ἐκ’ Ἀθηνῶν ψυγάδος, ἔκεινον τὴν ἀρχήν παρεδόκηκεν αὐτῶν. δ’ ἐστὶν ὑπὸ Μέντη τετάχθαι φαινι λατρεῖς καλοῖς αὐτῶς, καθάπερ καί τοὺς Τηλεβώας ἀπαντᾷ φασί).

27 Μέντης Ἀγχάλου παῖς Eust. changes Od. 1.180-1, 418-9 (Μέντης Ἀγχάλου...ὑιός...).

27-9 ὁτι - γενέσεως Eust. paraphrases Vit. Hom. Herod. 361-5 (μέμνηται δὲ καὶ τοῦ ναυκράτου μεθ’ ἐκ πλείστους καὶ εἰδ’ πόλικα το πολλὰ καὶ χόρια, δ’ ἄνω ἤν Μέντης, ἐν τοῖς ἔπειτα τοῦτα “Μέντης Ἀγχάλου δαφρώνος εὐχαριστεῖ αἰτῶ ὑιός, ἄτάρ Ταφίως φιληρέτουσιν ἄνασσος.”); a different opinion about Μέντης is expressed in Heraclit. All. 61.4; cf. also West (1988), p. 89.

30 ἀποσεμινών The word is also used in Heraclit. All. 67.2.

29-30 καὶ τὴν - ἥδυνατο Eust.’s own comment.


5-3 κολαῦει - ποιήσαι Eust.’s own comment.


6 ὁ - Φαίαζειn Od. 8.115, 127, 140, 158, 396, 400.

7-8 ὁ δὲ - παλαιότερο Sch. A ad ll. 15.705 (= Hdn. ll. Pros. III.2.97.29-30, Od. Pros. III.2.133.11f., παρων. III.2.854.20f.) (...ἐπὶ δὲ ἐπικεχισμένων τὸ ἱδίων τεραπεύμα πολλὰ τὴν ἀμφιάλον Ἰωάθηκη, Ἰανυάλον τ’ Ἀνεράθανα...), Od. ad ll. 8.114 (...ταῖς ψυλοῦσι τὸ ἀμφιάλος: δύναται μέντω καὶ διασύνεσθαι); cf. also Hdn. Od. Pros. 147.11f.

8-10 οὕτω - μάζην Athen. 8.7.8-9 (=Ath. Epit. 2.1.158.7-8) (=Posid. fr. 101) (δοῦναι κατὰ τὸ πληθύσμον νικήσαντες τὴν μάζην).

10-1 εἶρη - γέγραπται Eust. ad ll. II.26.4-27ff.

13 ἀγχαλός - ἀδύνατα Unknown source.

13-4 τὸ δὲ - αὐτὸ Eust.’s own comment.


15 Μίδας Μίδου Cf. EM. 65.14, Su. μ. 1036.13.

15-6 καὶ - Δωρικώς Eust.’s own comment.


20 τὸ ταπεινὸν Religious word to imply Odysseus’ desire for Penelope; on the word ὑπήκομεν cf. Van der Valk (1971-87), vol. II, p. XL.

22 καὶ - διωκόμενον The words τὸ διδόκον, τὸ διωκόμενον are rhetorical terms used here for Odysseus and Penelope.
26 τὸ ἐπαγωγὸν On the word ἐπαγωγὸς cf. also LSJ s.v. II “attractive, alluring”; Eust. gives the words ἤδι, ἐφελκτικὸν, ἐφολκόν as synonyms (cf. Eust. ad II. III.170.12, IV.92.23 (with note), ad Od. I.112.19, II.74.18-9, 79.12-3).


51.4 ἐναδολεσχεῖν On the word ἐναδολεσχεῖν cf. also Eust. ad II. II.285.24 (with note), ad Od. II.114.32.


8 διο - ἄγαν On the proverb cf. Eust. ad II. II.371.4-7 (with note), III.57.2-7 (with note), 471.8, 553.31-2, IV.329.4-5, 505.2-3, ad Od. I.194.17, II.91.40-1.

11 ὑπερλάιαν Cf. N.T. 2 Cor. 11.5, 12.11; cf. also Eust. ad II. II.332.7 (with note), III.213.27, IV.329.4 (with note).

12-3 καὶ ἄλλως - ἄνδρον Eust’s own etymology; cf. also Eust. ad II. III.747.4, IV.654.20-1 (with note), IV.697.17.

15 οἶνον - Ἡρόδοτον Hdt. 3.39.13 (ἔφερε δὲ καὶ ἤγει πάντας...).


16-7 ἃν ἢ - ἰστόρηται Il. 17.73.


122 πεσοῦς - τέρπειν Cf. Od. I.1.07.

22-3 ἐν τυχτῷ - ἤρει Cf. Od. 4.627, 17.169.

23-4 πεπετεύχθη - δειλίαν The reference comes from Demosthenes Thrax’s Paraphrase of the Odyssey and should be added to the collection of his fragments; on Demosthenes Thrax cf. Su. δ 457, my introduction p. XCVI.

25-6 δὲ “πεσοῦς” - ἑτυμολογεῖται Sch. D E2 H1 H M4 Q V ad Od. (πεσοῦσι: βολλίστοι: [παρά] τὸ πεσείν).

27 σωμαεσίν Cf. Eust. ad II. II.456.18, ad Od. I.220.12ff.

28-7 πεσείν - τι Eust.’s own comment (?).

29-8 εὖ οὖ - σύμβαμα Eust.’s own explanation; cf. also Phot. π 420, Hsch. π 1811, Su. π 1242, Steph. In Rh. 284.7ff., Eust. ad Od. I.52.12f.


52.1-2 κόβοι - βάλλεσθαι Eust.’s own explanation (?).

3-2 εὖ οὖ - σχῆμα Cf. Pl. Tim. 55c.

3-6 Ἡρόδοτος - πεσοῦν Hdt. 1.94.12-5.

7-6 ἱστέσι - πεδίας Eust.’s own comment.

9 καὶ πεσοῦ πεντάγραμμα Soph. fr. 429; cf. also Hsch. 2020, Poll. 9.97.5-7, Et. Or. 126.3-127.1, Eust. ad II. III.88.1-2 (with note).


12-3 οδ - αύβακιον EM 666.21f.
182 23 και δι - ἐξον Su. κ 2602.
183 23 δεν - ὅρμαστο Eust. means the Latin word cubicum; cf. also Ruf. De corp. 79, Poll. 2.141.4ff.
184 23-4 και κυμβστᾶν - πίπτειν Su. κ 2594; cf. also EM 543.21 (= EGud. κ 351.32-3).
185 23-6 τῆς δὲ - γράφεται Unknown fragment by Archigenes.
186 26-7 δὲ τὰ περὶ - ὅπως ἐξέλεγεν The passage in Eust. ad Od. I.28.16-29.10 (= 52.26-54.17 Makr.) is taken from Suet. II. παιδ. 1.1-96; Eust. changes some words and adds his own comments where necessary.
187 29-30 ἐκείνος - ἄκος Eust. changes Soph. fr. 479 (εφημερεί φλοίσθου μετά κόπον καθημένου, πεσσούς κόμους τε, τερπον ἀργίας ἄκος;).
188 30 καὶ - ναυπλιάδαν Euph. fr. 61.
190 52.32-53.1 και δι - Φαλόρφ Phdr. 274c5ff.; cf. also Stob. 2.4.18.14ff.
191 3-5 και δι - πετευστηρίου Unknown source.
193 9-11 ἀπὸ - μονάδας Plat. Lg. 968e.9.
194 12 ἑσθ - κόμου Soph. fr. 895 (from Suet.).
196 15-6 ἐκείνο - εἰσήγαγε Eur. fr. 888 (from Suet.)
197 19 τριματίκτην - Eust. writes τριματίται (cf. Eust. ad II. III.922.10ff., with note), instead of τριματίκται (cf. Suet. II. παιδ. 1.38); on τριματίτικαι cf. LSI s.v. τριματίτικας "dice-player", Poll. 9.96.6, Hsch. τ 1316.
198 19-20 δειπνήσας - τριματιζόντες Sophr. fr. 129.
200 22-3 ἄφι - ἀνομαζέω cf. Phot. σ 521.5ff., Poll. 7.203.5f., 9.48.10, 96.7f., Su. σ 620.
201 24-5 ἑπιώνας - ἀττιάλλεις Hippion fr. 129a.
203 29-30 ὅς - δηλοῦται Eust. ad Od. I.28.3ff. (= 52.10ff, Makr.).
204 53.30-54.2 δεν - δεομένων On the proverb cf. Ael. Dion. τ 21, Paus. Att. α 176, Phot. α 3354, τ 594.20, Su. α 4613, κ 1642, Poll. 7.206.3f., Eust. ad II. II.277.16ff.; cf. also Hsch. α 8674, τ 1118.
207 2 Σώφρων - ἱερᾶ Sophr. fr. 122 (κινησώ δ ἢ ἡ καὶ τὸν ἀφ ἱερᾶ).
208 2-3 Ἀλκαῖος - λίθον Alc. fr. 351 (from Suet.).
209 4 τοιούτοιν - λίθον Theocr. Id. 6.18 (from Suet.).
1210 4-6 Διοδότου - χορείας Suet. II. παιδ. 1.62f.
1211 6 Κλέαρχος - ἀναλογεῖν Cleave. fr. 12 (from Suet.).
1212 6-24 λέγει - προδεδήλωται Cf. Eust. ad ll. IV.690.12ff.
1213 7 ἀστριας Eust. omits Suet.'s example (cf. Suet. II. παιδ. 1.77ff.) from Call. fr. 676 (ζορκός τοι, φιλέ κοῦρε, Λιβυστίδος αὐτίκα δῶσι πέντε νεόμικτους ἀστριας); the example is found in Eust. IV.690.14; in Eust. IV.690.13 (with note), Eust. mentions both words ἀστριας (from ἄστριας) and ἀστριας from (ἄστριας) whilst here he mentions only ἀστριες (from ἄστριας); cf. also Call. Hec. fr. 276 (=EGud. a 1312, EM 159.28f.), Poll. 9.99.6ff.; cf. sch. Plat. Lys. 206e; sch. Plat. mention only ἄστριας, cf. also Thesaur. Ι.2 2265 s.v.
1214 7 ἄστριαι Cf. Ael. Dion. a 190, Poll. 9.99.9, Eust. ad ll. IV.690.8.
1215 12-3 λέγεται - Στησίρχορος Stesich. TA 38; cf. also Eust. ad ll. IV.691, Suet. II. παιδ. 1.88f., sch. Plat. Lys. 206E.
1216 12-3 λέγεται - Εὐριπίδης Eust. omits Suet. II. παιδ. 1.89-91 (Στησίρχορος μὲν ἄστριας σημαίνει τὴν ὀκτάδα, ἐπειδή ἦν Ἰμέρα <τῇ> Σικελικῇ τοῦ μελοποιοῦ τὸ τάραξεν ἑκτὸς ἄκαμπτος συνεκίνητο, Εὐριπίδης, δὲ τῶν μ. ἐξ γὰρ Εὐριπίδης τῶν τεσσαράκοντα Ἀθηναίων προστατῶν τῶν μετὰ τὴν τῶν λ. τυχόννων κατάληψιν καταστάθηκαν); however, Eust. includes the passage in Eust. ad ll. IV.691.2-7; cf. also Poll. 9.100.4ff.
1217 13-5 ἔτει - κόμων Suet. II. παιδ. 1.92-6; cf. Eust. ad ll. IV.691.7ff.
1218 14-5 καί ὅτι - "κόμων" Cf. Poll. 9.100.2ff., Epigr. Gr. 1038.
1220 16-7 ἢς μέμνηται - λέγειν Strattt. fr. 24; cf. Eust. ad ll. IV.691.9-10.
1221 17-8 ἐνθα - Κείνος Ar. Ran. 970 (Eust.'s own addition); cf. Eust. ad ll. IV.691.10-1 (with note).
1222 18-9 καί νοτέον - κωμικοὶ Eust.'s own comment.
1223 19-23 περι - κόμων Suet. II. παιδ. 1.65-8. (the only difference πεπετυκτικών κειμένων).
1224 23 διὰ - ἀναιδές Eust.'s own comment.
1225 23-4 ὅτι δὲ - προδεδήλωται Eust. ad Od. 1.29.9 (=54.15 Makr.)
1226 24-7 ὅτι - βαλλόντες Eust. changes Ath. 10.63.19ff. (Ath. Epit. 2.2.42.38ff.).
1227 27-8 ἐπιφανεστάτα - ἐξί&omicr;ον Eust. changes Ath. 10.63.28 (Ath. Epit. 2.2.43.5f.).
1228 28-30 εἰς - δὲ Ον ἄδακτον cf. Paus. Att. a 1 = Phot. a 25, Poll.10.105.7; on ἄβας cf. EM 2.2 = ΕΥ. Συμ. I.4.31f. = ΕΥ. Ορ. 18.17f., EGud. a 2.13; cf. also Eust. ad Od. I.163.42, II.282.23f.
1229 54.30-55.1 ἢ καί - σήθειν Ar. Vesp. 147, Plut. 1037.
1230 2-3 καθά - 'Αθηναίος Ath. 10.46.26-8 (Ath. Epit. 2.2.36.28-30).
1231 3-4 ετυμολογίαν - ετυμολογικό EM 2.22ff. (ἄβας: κυρίως ὁ μή ἔχων βάσιν καταχρηστικός δὲ καὶ ἐὰν οὐδήποτε σανιδίου. οὕτως 'Ωριαν. γίνεται δὲ παρὰ τὸ βω τὸ βαίνω), EGud. a 2.13f.; the expression ἐν τῷ μεγάλῳ ΕΤΥΜΟΛΟΓΙΚΟ probably implies EM which has both the explanation and the etymology of the word ἄβας and not EGud. which gives only the explanation.
1232 4-6 ὅτι - υπηρέταις Cf. sch. D E descend H I M V ad Od. 1.1108 (ρίνοισι: βύρσαις).
1233 4-6 ὅτι - υπηρέταις Cf. sch. D E H I M V ad Od. 1.110 (ἡμεῖς ἐν ρίνοισι: διὰ τοῦτο τὸ βίαιον ἐμφαίνει τῶν μνηστηρίων, τοῦ καὶ τῶς βύρσας ὑποστρωνύοντες τοῖς θρόνοις).
1234 6-7 ἐπέτευκαν - αὐτῶν Eust. changes Od. 1.107-8.
1235 7-10 σημείωσε - αὐτῶν Eust.'s own comment.
1236 10 ὅτι - κήρυκες Eust.'s own comment.
1237 11 βασιλικός - κήρυκες Sch. A D ad ll. 1.1334 (Δίος ἄγγελοι: ἁσυλον γὰρ καὶ θείον
τὸ γένος τῶν κηρύκων Ἐρμής γὰρ μιγείς Πανδρόσῳ τῇ Κέκροπος θυγατρὶ ἔσχεν παίδα ὄνοματι Κήρυκα, ἃς οὖν τὸ τῶν Κηρύκων, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Πτολεμαῖος ἢ ὅτι τὰς ἱερὰς αὐτοῦ ἄγγελουν, ἢ ὅτι ἀπὸ Ἐρμοῦ ἔστιν, ὡς ἄγγελος Διός), Παυσ. 1.38.3.11ff., Poll. 8.103.5ff., An. Gr. Matr. 422.14ff., Eust. I.171.27ff.; cf. also Eust. ad II. I.175.13, IV.60.20-1.

128 11-2 οἱ δὲ — φίλοι LSJ s.v. θεράπων II “servant”, Hdt. 1.30, 5.105, Ar. Pl. 3.5 etc.
129 12 οὗ μὴν — δούλους Cf. sch. Μ* ad II. 109 (θεράποντες οἱ δούλοι...); cf. also Eust. D. P. 533.56ff. (at Chios θεράπων = slave).
131 14 θεράποντα — ὅτι ὁρὰν II. 1.321, Od. 1.109, 4.23, 38, 217
134 15-6 ὅτι — φησὶ Unknown source.
135 16-8 κηρύκες — διεύθυνε Eust. changes Od. 1.109-112.
136 18 ἐμερίζον Sch. Η Κ Μ* Ο Τ Ψ ad Od. I.112 (διεύθυνε: ἐμερίζον).
137 19 ἀν — οὗ ὁ διατρόφος EM 250.44ff., 252.1ff., EGud. δ 330.8, 24, 349.23, Eust. ad II. III.304.23, ad Od. I.35.44ff., II.80.9ff., 94.40ff., 149.18ff.; cf. also Ath. 1.15.17, 81.24, 5.20.35, 37, 6.13.10, Plut. Mor. 644A, Hsch. δ 114, 118, Phot. δ 23, 24, Eust. ad Od. I.34.4, 35.44ff., 36.24 etc.
139 24 ζωρότερον — κέρασε II. 9.203.
140 23-5 δόθην — ὁ Αθηναῖος Ath. 1.17.23ff. (οὐκ ἄν γὰρ Ἀχιλλεύς τὸ ζωρότερον κεραίρειν διέστειλε, μὴ οὖσῃ τινὸς καθημερινῆς κράσεως).
BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. ANCIENT WRITERS

a. Eustathius of Thessalonica

Editions


Guldeneck S. (1560-9), Εὐσταθίος ἄρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης παρεκβολαὶ εἰς τὴν Ὤμηρον Ἰλιάδα καὶ Ὀδύσσειαν μετὰ εὐπορωτάτου καὶ πάνω ὅφελίμῳ πίνακος, Froben: Basileae.


---------- (1827-30), Eustathii archiepiscopii Thessalonicensis commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem ad fidem exempli romani editi, Leipzig: Weigel.


Maioranus N. (1550), *Eiσταθίου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης παρεκβολαὶ εἰς τὴν Ὀμήρου Ἡλιάδα καὶ Ὀδύσσειαν μετὰ εὐπορωτάτοι καὶ πάνυ ὀφελίμῳ πίνακος*, Rome.


Concordances

b. Homer

Editions


Commentaries


Scholia


c. Other writers


Hilgard A. (1901), *Grammatici Graeci recogniti et apparatu critico instructi*, vol. 3.1, Leipzig: Teubner.

-------- (1889-94), *Choerobosci scholia in Theodosii Alexandrini canones*, (=Grammatici Graeci IV, 1 and 2).


-------- (1878), Epigrammata Graeca ex lapidibus conlecta, Berlin: Reimer.


---------- (1912-4), *Die Homerdeuterin Demo*, Zweite Bearbeitung ihrer Fragmente, Königsberg.


Schneider R. - Uhlig G. (1878-1910), Apollonii Dyscoli quae supersunt, Leipzig (in Grammatici Graeci II 1-3).


Theodoridis Ch. (1976), *Die Fragmente des Grammatikers Philoxenos (Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker* 2, Berlin, New York: De Gruyter.


2. Literature


(1955), "De Eustathio, Tzetza, Moschopoulos, Planude Aristophanis commentatoribus" Mnem. 8, pp. 196-206.

Kukules Ph. (1950), "Θεσσαλονίκης Ευσταθίου τα λαογραφικά" Εταιρεία Μακεδονικών Σπουδών vols 5-6, Athens: Εταιρεία Μακεδονικών Σπουδών.

Kuhn F. (1889), Quo ordine et quibus temporibus Eustathius commentarios suos composuerit, Commentationes in honorem Gulielmi Studemund, pp. 249-257.


La Roche J. (1863), Παρεκβολαὶ τοῦ μεγάλου ρήματος ἐκ τῶν Ἡρωδιανῶν, Programm Akad. Gymn. Vienna.


-------- (1968), "Bessarione biblofilo e filologo", Rivista di studi bizantini e neoellenici, n.s. 5 (XV), Rome.


Panteleimon II (1989), ΑΓΙΟΣ ΕΥΣΤΑΘΙΟΣ, Πρακτικά Θεολογικού Συνεδρίου (7-9 Νοεμβρίου 1988), Thessalonica.


In addition to the works cited above, I gratefully acknowledge help gained from use of the CD-ROM of Greek authors produced by Thesaurus Linguae Graecae, Irvine.
## INDEX OF PERSONAL NAMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Stall. (vol. I)</th>
<th>Makr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Αγαμέμνων</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.14, 20</td>
<td>27.29, 28.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.17</td>
<td>41.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Αγήνωρ</td>
<td>27.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Αγχιάλος</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αγχιάλη</td>
<td>50.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Αγχιάλος</td>
<td>26.39, 46</td>
<td>49.27, 50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.5, 6</td>
<td>50.11, 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Αθηνᾶ</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.35, 45</td>
<td>28.25, 29.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.21, 28, 29</td>
<td>30.5, 14, 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.31</td>
<td>34.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.21, 23, 26, 38</td>
<td>37.25, 28, 38.1, 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.1, 3</td>
<td>38.28, 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.9, 13, 34, 42, 43, 45</td>
<td>43.5, 11, 44.2, 13, 14, 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.2, 12</td>
<td>44.20, 45.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.12, 14, 23, 24, 25, 28, 30, 40, 43, 45, 46</td>
<td>46.27, 29, 47.11, 13, 14, 17, 20, 34, 48.3, 5, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.19, 41, 44</td>
<td>49.1, 49.30, 50.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.37</td>
<td>53.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Αθήναι</td>
<td>7.12, 13</td>
<td>12.13, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.30, 38</td>
<td>49.15, 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Αθήναιος</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7-8</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.34</td>
<td>13.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>30.225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.22, 40</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.3, 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Αθηναίος</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>12.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.12, 16</td>
<td>13.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.36</td>
<td>37.14, 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αίας</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αίγαλων</td>
<td>21.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αίγιαθος</td>
<td>13.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.1, 2, 8-9, 12, 14, 31, 44</td>
<td>27.12, 13, 22, 27, 28, 28.21, 29.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αίγύπτιος</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.20, 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.1, 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αίγυπτος</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.42, 43, 46</td>
<td>21.10, 11, 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.2, 3, 6, 21, 29</td>
<td>21.18, 19, 23, 22.9, 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αίγυπτοθεν</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>15.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αλάς</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αλίπιστος</td>
<td>11.29</td>
<td>20.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αλίπιστια</td>
<td>11.28, 30, 38, 39</td>
<td>20.27, 30, 21.5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>21.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αλίπιστικά</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>21.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αλίπισην</td>
<td>10.31 (twice), 32</td>
<td>19.3 (twice), 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.5, 6, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 20, 24, 27, 29, 31, 33</td>
<td>21.21, 22, 28, 29, 32, 22.2, 3, 8, 12, 15, 17, 20, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.12</td>
<td>29.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αλλιανάς</td>
<td>18.20</td>
<td>33.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αλλίαιας</td>
<td>27.8, 9</td>
<td>50.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αλλίειαο</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>50.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αλλίειο</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>50.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αλλίες</td>
<td>15.18</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αλλίκικός-ή̣-όν</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>28.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αλλός</td>
<td>1.22, 28</td>
<td>1.27, 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.42</td>
<td>36.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αλλόκοτος</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.13</td>
<td>39.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αλλός</td>
<td>15.37</td>
<td>28.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αλλός</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>21.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.32</td>
<td>32.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.12</td>
<td>33.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>48.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αλλόώος</td>
<td>16.11, 13</td>
<td>29.22, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αλλόνη</td>
<td>18.11</td>
<td>33.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άλλόγαιας</td>
<td>19.13</td>
<td>35.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άλλοξανδρεύς</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>12.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άλλοξανδρεία</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>12.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άλλοξανδρος</td>
<td>14.32</td>
<td>26.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άλλοξανδρος</td>
<td>28.45</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άλλοξανδρος</td>
<td>26.29</td>
<td>49.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άλλοξανδρος</td>
<td>18.13</td>
<td>33.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άλλοξανδρος</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άλλοξανδρος</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άλλοξανδρος</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>23.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άλλοξανδρος</td>
<td>26.28, 38</td>
<td>49.13, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άλλοξανδρος</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άλλοξανδρος</td>
<td>13.11</td>
<td>23.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άλλοξανδρος</td>
<td>28.12</td>
<td>52.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άλλοξανδρος</td>
<td>6.32-3, 34, 35, 38</td>
<td>11.12, 14, 16, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άλλοξανδρος</td>
<td>28.40</td>
<td>53.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άλλοξανδρος</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>21.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Pages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αράβιος</td>
<td>11.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αράτος</td>
<td>17.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αργειοι</td>
<td>22.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αργος</td>
<td>28.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρισταρχος</td>
<td>11.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αριστείδης</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αριστοφάνης</td>
<td>13.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρτεμις</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρχιγένης</td>
<td>28.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ασκαλωνίτης</td>
<td>13.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ατλαντικός-ή-όν</td>
<td>18.2, 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ατλας</td>
<td>17.23, 25-6, 29, 34, 46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ατλαντες</td>
<td>18.23, 24, 25, 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ατλαντίς</td>
<td>17.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αττικός-ή-όν</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αττικοί</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αττικώς</td>
<td>13.19, 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ατρείδης</td>
<td>15.15, 17, 19, 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ατρεύς</td>
<td>15.19, 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ατυς</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αβασων</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αιτόλικος</td>
<td>1.33-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.25 (twice)</td>
<td>30, 32 (twice), 34, 32 (twice), 34, 33, 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.23, 24, 25, 26</td>
<td>34.1, 3, 4, 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αφροδίτη</td>
<td>25.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αχαιοί</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αχαρνεύς</td>
<td>24.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αχιλλεύς</td>
<td>2.12-3, 36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.21, 24</td>
<td>7.8, 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>14.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.31</td>
<td>26.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.46</td>
<td>40.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.26</td>
<td>47.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.30-1</td>
<td>53.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.38</td>
<td>55.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.25</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Β**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Αναφορά</th>
<th>Βιβλιοφύλης</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.26</td>
<td>26.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>25.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1 (twice)</td>
<td>23.8 (twice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>20.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>20.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>49.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>48.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>48.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>48.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>25.26 (not a personal name)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Γ**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Αναφορά</th>
<th>Βιβλιοφύλης</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.8 (twice)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.15-6, 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.29</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Δ**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Αναφορά</th>
<th>Βιβλιοφύλης</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>25.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>31.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>31.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.6 (Zeus)</td>
<td>25.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>17.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.38</td>
<td>49.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.19</td>
<td>20.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.40</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.42</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.20, 34</td>
<td>14.22, 15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.41-2</td>
<td>34.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.28</td>
<td>16.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.15</td>
<td>39.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>16.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.13</td>
<td>33.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.46</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.14-5</td>
<td>8.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.11</td>
<td>37.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.26, 30</td>
<td>16.24-5, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.30, 40</td>
<td>24.20, 25.4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.2-3</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>48.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Διονύσιος</td>
<td>5.14-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.7-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.12, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δίς</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δισί</td>
<td>9.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Διών</td>
<td>9.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δολόνεια</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δωρίδη</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δωρίες</td>
<td>7.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δωρικός-ἡ-όν</td>
<td>10.36, 11.11, 18, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δωρικός</td>
<td>7.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.15, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ε

<p>| 'Εκατοβατών | 13.2 | 23.9 |
| 'Εκτωρ    | 2.14 | 3.1 |
|            | 4.21 | 7.7 |
| 'Ελένη     | 14.32 | 26.24 |
| 'Ελληνες   | 3.9  | 5.3 |
|            | 6.45 | 11.29 |
|            | 9.30-1 | 16.30 |
|            | 12.35 | 22.24 |
|            | 28.23 | 53.3 |
|            | 29.8  | 54.14 |
| 'Ελληνικός-ἡ-όν | 28.16 | 52.27 |
| 'Ελπηνωρ   | 14.33 | 26.25 |
| 'Ερμείας   | 15.5 | 27.17 |
|            | 22.34 | 42.11 |
|            | 24.11 | 44.31 |
| 'Ερμής     | 14.29 | 26.20 |
|            | 15.1, 4, 6, 7, 12, 32 | 27.13, 16, 19, 20, 26, 28.21 |
|            | 17.14 | 31.25 |
|            | 23.44 | 44.15 |
|            | 24.12 | 45.2 |
|            | 28.39 | 53.25 |
| 'Ερμηναίος | 11.37 | 21.3 |
| 'Εσπερία   | 5.10 | 8.20 |
|            | 12.29 | 22.18 |
| Εβέλθων    | 8.7  | 14.5 |
| Εβμαίος    | 1.32, 35 | 2.7, 12 |
|            | 2.5   | 2.23 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ευνοστός</th>
<th>24.24</th>
<th>45.17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ευπολίς</td>
<td>27.21</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ευξεινος</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>14.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ευριπίδης</td>
<td>14.17</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ευρύαλος</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>11.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ευφορίαν</td>
<td>2.20, 22</td>
<td>3.8, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ευχήνωρ</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>7.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Εχινάδες</td>
<td>28.32</td>
<td>53.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>54.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.18</td>
<td>52.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.27</td>
<td>26.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.24</td>
<td>49.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Ζές - Διός | 3.24 (twice) |
|            | 8.15, 18 (twice) |
|            | 9.21, 22 (twice), 24 (twice), 25, 27 |
|            | 11.5, 29, 31 |
|            | 13.12, 13, 14, 35, (--) |
|            | 43, 45, 46 |
|            | 14.4, 5, 6, 20, 24, 44 |
|            | 15.1, 9, 21, 23, 25, 35, 44 |
|            | 16.39, 40 |
|            | 17.5 |
|            | 18.16, 43 |
|            | 20.22, 24, 26, 27, 39, 44 |
|            | 21.2 |
|            | 28.29 |
| Ζάκυνθος  | 25.1 |
| Ζάν       | 14.5 |
| Ζάς       | 14.5 |
| Ζεύν      | 14.7 |
| Ζήν       | 14.5 |
| Ζής       | 14.5 |

<p>| Η | 29.19 |
| Ηγασίλοχος | 54.28 |
| Ηετίων     | 6.31 |
| Ηλίος      | 11.10 |
| Ηλιός      | 7.38 (twice), 41 |
|           | 13.16 (twice), 20 |
|           | 11.27 |
|           | 20.26 |
|           | 14.31 |
|           | 26.22 |
| Ήρα        | 14.26 |
| Ήρακλείδης | 26.16 |
| Ήρακλής    | 7.30, 10.39 |
|           | 13.6, 19.12 |
|           | 5.14 |
|           | 8.25 |
|           | 9.40 |
|           | 17.12 |
|           | 12.35 |
|           | 22.24 |
|           | 14.26 |
|           | 26.16 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Επιστολή</th>
<th>Νομοθέτης</th>
<th>Χρονολόγηση</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ηρόδοτος</td>
<td>8.8, 25</td>
<td>14.6, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.42</td>
<td>21.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.34</td>
<td>22.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.40</td>
<td>49.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.31, 44</td>
<td>51.15, 52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>52.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ηρώδιανός</td>
<td>15.37, 38</td>
<td>28.28, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.27</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>39.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ησίοδος</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>13.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.42</td>
<td>19.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.19</td>
<td>35.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.30</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ηφαιστος</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Θ | Θελγίνες | 19.33 | 36.13 |
|   | Θεόκριτος | 14.19 | 26.8  |
|   | 21.29, 36 | 40.7, 16 | 54.4 |
|   | 28.46     | 9.1   |
|   | Θεταλικός-η-όν | 5.22 | 50.14 |
|   | Θεταλοί | 27.9  | 50.18 |
|   | Θῆβαι | 20.11 | 37.12 |
|   | 22.42     | 42.22 |
|   | Θηβαίκος | 7.27 | 13.1  |
|   | Θηβαίος | 20.12 | 37.14 |
|   | Θήβη | 6.31 | 11.10 |
|   | Θουκυδίδης | 18.8 | 35.11 |
|   | Θώωςα | 22.3, 6, 9, 12, 13 | 41.3, 8, 11, 15, 16 |
|   | Θράκη | 27.5 | 50.12 |
|   | Θρῆς | 8.34 | 15.9  |
|   | Θρινακία | 7.39 | 13.17 |
|   | Θυέστης | 7.17 | 12.21 |

| Ι | Ιάδι | 11.6 | 19.29 |
|   | Ιβηρία | 1.17, | 1.20 |
|   | 5.10 | 8.20 |
| Ιδάκη | 19.17, 30, 35, 45-6 | 35.24, 36.9, 16, 29 |
|       | 20.2 | 38.4 |
|       | 22.19 | 41.24 |
|       | 23.9, 43 | 42.6, 44.15 |
|       | 24.2, 11, 12 | 44.20, 45.1, 2 |
'Ioakhtios
20.12
23.40
26.21

'Iliakos-η-όν
1.38
24.16

'Ilias
1.1, 39
2.9, 11, 15, 26, 28, 35, 39, 40 (twice), 43
3.7, 15 (twice), 19, 36
4.23
5.6, 18, 21, 23
6.1, 6, 13, 30, 31
7.17, 30
8.2, 12, 19, 44, 45
9.13, 23, 45
10.31, 35, 46
11.4, 7, 21
12.44
13.6, 33, 42, 46
14.10
15.11, 16, 18, 34, 35, 45
16.2, 22, 26, 39
19.16, 29
20.18
21.6, 39, 43
22.7, 20, 44
23.4, 6
24.22, 29
25.1, 4, 13, 26, 39
26.1
27.4, 7, 24, 31

'Ileis
3.8

'Ilothe
9.2

'Ilon
3.7, 8,
6.33, 35, 36
28.19

'Ivados
25.41

'Ixion
10.8

'Ile
9.40

'Ipoldutos
14.25

'Ipandaz
28.38-9

'Italia
1.14

'Italiakos-η-όν
1.19

'Iones
27.9

'Iovikos-η-όν
11.7
19.1

'Iovikos
8.22

'Iovikos
48.31, 49.1, 2
37.13
44.10
49.3
2.15
45.7
1.1, 2.16,
2.28, 31, 3.2, 15, 18, 27,
4.1 (twice), 2, 6
5.1, 11, 12, 16, 6.7
7.10
8.14, 30, 33, 9.3
10.2, 9, 18, 11.8, 10
12.21, 13.5
13.30, 14.11, 20, 15.21, 23
16.8, 20, 17.19
19.2, 8, 22
19.27, 31, 20.18
23.4
23.15, 24.24, 25.6, 12
25.24
27.25, 28.2, 4, 24, 26, 29.6,
29.10, 30.6, 12, 28
35.23, 36.8
37.22
39.5, 40.19, 25
41.8, 26, 42.18
42.32, 43.1
45.14, 23
46.14, 17, 28, 47.15, 32
48.9
50.11, 14, 51.6, 15

5.3
15.27
5.1, 3
11.12, 15, 16
52.31
48.1
18.1
17.13
26.15
53.24
1.17
1.22
50.17
19.30
35.1
14.25
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Κάδμος</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>46.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Καλυψώ</td>
<td>1.23, 27</td>
<td>1.28, 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>15.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.10, 15, 19</td>
<td>16.3, 10, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>19.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.2, 7, 14, 17, 19, 20, 23, 35, 39, 44</td>
<td>31.9, 15, 16, 24, 28, 30, 32.1, 5, 20, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.2, 3, 30, 42</td>
<td>33.2, 8, 34.10, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.17, 18, 19, 30</td>
<td>35.23, 24, 27, 36.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.41, 43</td>
<td>42.20, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.44</td>
<td>44.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.12</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.8, 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Καμηῆς</td>
<td>13.1 (twice)</td>
<td>21.16 (twice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κάνωβος</td>
<td>12.1 (twice)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Καύκασος</td>
<td>18.13</td>
<td>33.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κείος</td>
<td>29.11, 12</td>
<td>54.18, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κέρκωψ</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>29.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κέσκος</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κεφαλήν</td>
<td>26.31, 32 (twice), 33, 37</td>
<td>49.17, 18 (twice), 19, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κεφαληνία</td>
<td>26.31, 33</td>
<td>49.16, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κεφαλήνιος</td>
<td>26.37</td>
<td>49.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κέφαλος</td>
<td>26.30, 38</td>
<td>49.15, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κηπισόδαρος</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κημέριοι</td>
<td>1.22, 26</td>
<td>1.28, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κίκονες</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>15.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κίρκη</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.15, 19</td>
<td>16.10, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κλεάνθης</td>
<td>17.26</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κλέαρχος</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κλυταιμήστρα</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>27.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κλωθό</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κόδρος</td>
<td>20.15, 16</td>
<td>37.18, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κρήται</td>
<td>18.24</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.30</td>
<td>55.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κρήτη</td>
<td>18.23</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.39</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κρονίδης</td>
<td>15.36</td>
<td>28.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κρόνος</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>16.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κύκλωψ</td>
<td>12.43</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.6, 42, 43, 21.28, 30, 31, 32, 39, 41, 42, 44</td>
<td>40.5, 8, 9, 10, 20, 22, 23, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.9, 11, 15</td>
<td>41.11, 13, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κύπρις</td>
<td>14.25</td>
<td>26.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κύρος</td>
<td>29.9, 10 (twice)</td>
<td>54.15, 16, 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Λαιστρυγόναι</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Λακωνικός-ή-όν</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>46.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Λαομέδων</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>11.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Λαπίθαι</td>
<td>5.16, 22</td>
<td>8.27, 9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Λαρισσαίος</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Λαρίνη</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Λαρίνος</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>12.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Λατίνος</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Λευκωνιάδες</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Λεπρεατικός</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Λίβανοι</td>
<td>12.34</td>
<td>22.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Λίβος</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>33.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Λιβόη</td>
<td>11.42</td>
<td>21.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.7, 9, 11, 27, 29, 34</td>
<td>21.24, 26, 29, 22.15, 17, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.17</td>
<td>33.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Λιβυκός-ή-όν</td>
<td>18.1, 8</td>
<td>33.5, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Λοκρός</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Λυκός</td>
<td>27.45</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Λυκόφρων</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>15.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>20.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>29.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.16</td>
<td>37.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Λυσίας</td>
<td>24.33</td>
<td>45.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Μακεδόν</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μάλεια</td>
<td>18.23</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μάλειαι</td>
<td>18.23</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ματρέας</td>
<td>6.24, 26, 27</td>
<td>11.1, 3, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μάτρων</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μεγαρικός</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μελάνθιος</td>
<td>24.23</td>
<td>45.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μελάνωπος</td>
<td>16.10</td>
<td>29.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μεμφήτις</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μέμφις</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μενέλαος</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>8.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>50.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μέντης</td>
<td>26.39, 43 (twice), 46</td>
<td>49.27, 50.1, 2, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.32</td>
<td>51.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μεσσηνιακός</td>
<td>24.43</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μίδας, -ου</td>
<td>27.7, 8</td>
<td>50.15, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μίμας, -ντος</td>
<td>18.29</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μούσα</td>
<td>3.16, 18, 19, 21, 22 (twice), 42</td>
<td>5.12, 15, 17, 19, 20, 21, 6.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.20, 22, 24, 25</td>
<td>7.7, 8, 11, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>8.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.12, 14, 16, 46</td>
<td>14.12, 14, 17, 15.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.40</td>
<td>53.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ν</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ναυκράτης</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Νεοπτόλεμος</td>
<td>11.45</td>
<td>21.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Νέιλος</td>
<td>5.16, 21, 23</td>
<td>8.26, 33, 9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Νέστωρ</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>18.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.22, 44 (twice)</td>
<td>45.15, 46.9, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Νεφέλαι</td>
<td>24.34</td>
<td>45.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Νηλίδες</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Νόμοι</td>
<td>28.27</td>
<td>53.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Νότος</td>
<td>12.27</td>
<td>22.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>42.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Νοίξ</td>
<td>21.10</td>
<td>39.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Νικαρχος</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ο</th>
<th>26.12</th>
<th>48.22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Οβριάρεως</td>
<td>1.1, 17, 39</td>
<td>1.1, 21 ('Οδυσσείς), 2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Οδύσσεια</td>
<td>2.16, 29, 43</td>
<td>3.3, 18, 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.11, 16</td>
<td>5.6, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.2, 35</td>
<td>13.30, 15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.42</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.23</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.10</td>
<td>52.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Οδυσσειακός-η-νυ</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Οδυσσεύς</td>
<td>1.13, 15, 17, 19 (twice), 32, 35, 37</td>
<td>1.16, 19, 21, 23, 24, 2.7, 11, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.27, 38</td>
<td>3.16, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5, 17-8, 22, 25, 26, 36, 45</td>
<td>6.20, 7.3, 9, 13 (twice), 26, 8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2, 9, 11, 17, 20, 22, 23, 25, 31 (twice)</td>
<td>8.9, 18, 20, 28, 32, 9.1, 3, 9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.4, 41</td>
<td>13 (twice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.33, 39, 41, 44</td>
<td>10.7, 11.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.2, 3, 4, 5</td>
<td>13.10, 18, 20, 15.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.19-20, 21, 23</td>
<td>15.25, 27, 29, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.3, 4</td>
<td>18.17, 19, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.32, 42</td>
<td>19.25, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.27, 30</td>
<td>22.21, 23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.46</td>
<td>26.18, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.20, 22, 23, 28, 46</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.10, 13-4, 39</td>
<td>30.3, 6, 7, 14, 31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.42</td>
<td>31.19, 24, 32.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.17, 30, 34, 42, 45</td>
<td>34.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35.23, 36.10, 15, 25, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Οιδίπους</td>
<td>7.27, 28</td>
<td>13.2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Οινώνη</td>
<td>14.32</td>
<td>26.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ολύμπιος</td>
<td>13.37</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ολυμπός</td>
<td>17.27</td>
<td>32.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ομηρικός- ή- όν</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>22.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.43</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>27.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.43</td>
<td>42.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.18</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ομηρικός</td>
<td>13.31</td>
<td>24.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ομηρος</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.19, 32, 38</td>
<td>5.17, 6.2, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.38, 43</td>
<td>7.29, 8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2, 4</td>
<td>8.9, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>10.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.2-3</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.8, 9, 36, 38, 45</td>
<td>14.6, 7, 15.11, 13, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.8, 26</td>
<td>15.33, 16.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>21.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.34</td>
<td>24.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.36</td>
<td>26.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.8, 20, 31</td>
<td>27.21, 28.7, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.5, 30, 40</td>
<td>33.10, 34.10, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.16, 41</td>
<td>35.22, 36.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.28, 42</td>
<td>40.4, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.28</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.45</td>
<td>46.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.27, 34, 41</td>
<td>47.16, 49.20, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.38</td>
<td>55.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Οινώνη</td>
<td>14.32</td>
<td>26.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ορέατης</td>
<td>15.14, 17, 19, 20, 24, 25</td>
<td>27.29, 28.3, 5, 6, 12, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ορεστιάδης</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ορνίθες</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>46.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Π</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Παλαιφατος</td>
<td>6.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Παλαμηδειον</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Παλαιμῆδης</td>
<td>28.5, 8-9, 17, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πάν</td>
<td>28.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πανταλέων</td>
<td>6.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πατρόκλεια</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πασσανίας</td>
<td>10.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Παφλαγονικός</td>
<td>13.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Παφλαγών</td>
<td>13.3, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πελοπόννησος</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.40, 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πέριμος</td>
<td>13.9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περίφας, -ντος</td>
<td>18.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περσαφρόνη</td>
<td>13.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πήγασος</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πηληφάδης</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πηνελόπη</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.17, 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πίνδαρος</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.11, 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πλάτων</td>
<td>8.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.20, 22, 23, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πλατωνικοί</td>
<td>17.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πλειάδες</td>
<td>17.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πολύβιος</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πολυκράτης</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πολυσπέρχων</td>
<td>10.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πολύφημος</td>
<td>16.42-3, 43-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.40, 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ποσειδάων</td>
<td>21.12, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ποσειδεών</td>
<td>21.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ποσειδών</td>
<td>6.33, 34, 35, 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.23, 26, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.2, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.31, 32, 33, 34, 35-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.9, 12, 39, 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.1, 2, 8-9, 13, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ποσειδάνιος</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πρίσμος</td>
<td>6.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Προμήθεως</td>
<td>17.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πύθος-α-ον</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πύλος</td>
<td>5.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|  | 24.8, 9 (twice), 10, 38, 39, | 44.28, 29, 30 (twice), 46.2, 3,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ρ</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ρόδιοι</td>
<td>29.17</td>
<td>54.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ρωμαίος</td>
<td>16.35</td>
<td>30.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ρωμαίστι</td>
<td>28.13</td>
<td>52.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Σ</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Σεμέλη</td>
<td>20.12</td>
<td>37.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σικελία</td>
<td>1.13-4</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σικελοί</td>
<td>28.36</td>
<td>53.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σκύλη</td>
<td>18.12</td>
<td>33.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σόλυμα (δρη)</td>
<td>12.32</td>
<td>22.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σόλων</td>
<td>17.20</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σοφοκλῆς</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>12.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.39</td>
<td>17.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.29</td>
<td>18.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.14</td>
<td>29.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.41</td>
<td>34.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.37</td>
<td>38.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.32</td>
<td>49.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.17, 41</td>
<td>52.28, 53.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σκάμανδρος</td>
<td>21.44</td>
<td>40.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σκύθια</td>
<td>11.39</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σπάρτη</td>
<td>23.16</td>
<td>42.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.8, 9 (twice), 10, 38</td>
<td>44.27, 29 (twice), 31, 46.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.2, 3</td>
<td>46.14, 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Στηρίχορος</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>54.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Στράττις</td>
<td>29.10</td>
<td>54.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σώφρον</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.32</td>
<td>45.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.35, 44</td>
<td>53.15, 54.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Τ</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Τάφιος</td>
<td>26.26, 34, 35, 36 (twice), 42</td>
<td>49.9, 21, 22 (twice), 23, 50.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τάφος</td>
<td>26.24</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τελξίνες</td>
<td>19.32</td>
<td>36.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τεμέση</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τεμέσιος</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τηλεβόαι</td>
<td>26.26, 35, 36 (twice)</td>
<td>49.10, 22, 23 (twice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τηλέμαχος</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.18</td>
<td>41.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.9, 10-1, 15, 39, 46</td>
<td>42.6, 8, 14, 44.9, 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.3, 5-6, 10, 12, 16, 17, 18</td>
<td>44.22, 25, 31, 45.2, 7, 8, 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.7-8, 11, 12</td>
<td>46.21, 26, 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.43</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τήλεφος</td>
<td>27.20-1</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τιμόλαος</td>
<td>28.32</td>
<td>53.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τιτάνες</td>
<td>2.9, 15</td>
<td>2.28, 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τραχίνια</td>
<td>18.15</td>
<td>33.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τριφυλιακός</td>
<td>9.39</td>
<td>17.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τροία</td>
<td>24.43</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.29, 30, 33, 37, 40 (three times), 41</td>
<td>11.8, 9, 13, 17, 21, 22, 23 (twice), 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.27, 32</td>
<td>26.17, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.22, 28</td>
<td>37.26, 38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.14</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τρυφιώτης</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τρωάς</td>
<td>2.14, 38</td>
<td>2.34, 3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.21 (twice)</td>
<td>49.3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τρωίκα</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τρωικός-ή-όν</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τρόας</td>
<td>22.38</td>
<td>42.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τρώας</td>
<td>22.38</td>
<td>42.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Τέλες</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Υπερινίδης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Υπερινίσιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Υπερίων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Υπιος</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Φ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Φαικές</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φαίδρος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φαντάσια</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φερεκύδης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φθία</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φιλόξενος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φόρκυς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φρύγες</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Χίος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χρόνος</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ψ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[\cdots]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ωυγής</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ωνύμη-α</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ωκεανός</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ωρίων</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plate I. Codex Marcianus Graecus 460 fol. 1'.
(Biblioteca Marciana, Venice)
Plate II. Codex Parisinus Graecus 2702 fol. 1r.
(Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris)
Plate III. Codex Marcianus Graecus 460 fol. 1v.
(Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Venice)
Plate IV. Codex Parisinus Graecus 2702 fol. 8v.
(Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris)
V.1. Codex Parisinum Graecus 2702 fol. 1f.

V.2. Codex Marcianus Graecus 460 fol. 1f.

(Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris)

Plate V. The title of the work in both codices (V.1, V.2) and the inscription mentioning Κάμιλλος Τελερίδης (V.3).
VI.1. Eust. *ad Od.* I.28.5ff. in Codex Marcianus Graecus fol. 8v

VI.2. Eust. *ad Od.* I.28.5ff. in Codex Parisinus Graecus fol. 1v

Plate VI. Eust. *ad Od.* I.28.5ff. in Codex Marcianus (VI.1) and Codex Parisinus (VI.2).