

New Light on Greek Authors from Grammatical Texts

By Andrew R. Dyck, Los Angeles

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

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

Ep. Hom. α 284 (= AO 1, 62, 9)¹: ... παρὰ τὸ ἄλαστος οὖν ἀλαστῶ, ὡς ἄπιστος ἀπιστῶ. παρὰ δὲ τὸ ἀλαστῶ ῥῆμα ἀλάστωρ ὁ Ζεὺς, ἐπὶ τῶν χαλεπὸν (-ων cod., corr. Dindorf) τι πρᾶσσόντων. παρηκτικὴ δὲ ἡ εὐθεΐα παρὰ τὴν ἀλάστορος γενικὴν· Αἰσχύλος Ἰξίονι (fr. 317 Mette; consulto praetermisit Radt).

πρηνεμένης ἀλάστορος·

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. PMG 942

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

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

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

3. *Com. adesp. 646 Kock*

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

4. *ὀριδρόμος vs. ὀρειδρόμος*

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

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

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

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

οὐδετέρων συντιθέμεναι λέξεις, εἰ μὲν ἐπιφέρονται φωνῆεν ἢ ἐν ἀπλοῦν <σύμφωνον>, φυλάττουσι τὴν γραφήν· Ὀρειγένης, Ὀρειβάσιος, ὀρείαιλος (Opp. C. 3, 18; H. 4, 309), καὶ Ἡσίοδος «ὀρειχάλκοιο φαεινοῦ» (Scut. 122)· εἰ δὲ δύο σύμφωνα ἢ ἐν διπλοῦν ἐπιφέρῃ, ἀποβάλλει τὸ ε, οἷον ὀριδρόμος, ὑψίζυγος, ὑψιβρεμέτης.

5. *Posidippus fr. 37 K.*

Kocks prints the following text:

τὸ τῆς ἐλαίας δένδρον.

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

6. *New Epic Fragment*

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

{ναί} εὐεπίοις μελέεσσιν ἐφύμνια ταῦτα λιγαίνει.

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

7. *New Trimeter Fragment*

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

ἴθαινε θυμόν.

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

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

8. *New Fragments of Authors of Technical Prose*a) *Philinus of Cos*

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

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

b) *Heraclides Ponticus*

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

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

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

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

14 Cohn 88ff.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

c) *Cassius Longinus*

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

- (1) Eust. 67, 26: Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι τε τὸ «ἄλλ' ἦτοι μὲν ταῦτα μεταφρασόμεσθα καὶ αὐτίς» (A 140) ὑστεροβουλίας ἐστὶ σκοπός, ὃ δὴ καὶ ἐπιφράζεσθαι καὶ ἐπιμηθεύεσθαι λέγεται. καὶ ὅτι ἀνωτέρω τούτου στίχος εἷς κεῖται δοκῶν κατὰ τὸν Λογγῖνον εἶναι παρένθετος. ἔστι δὲ ἐκεῖνος τὸ «ἄξω ἐλών» (A 139). ἀρκεῖ τε γάρ, φησὶν, εἰς τελείαν ἔννοιαν τὸ ἄνω αὐτοῦ κείμενον ἔπος καὶ τὸ ἐφεξῆς δὲ τοῦ «ἄξω ἐλών» «ὃ δὲ κεχολώσεται, ὃν ἂν ἴκωμαι» (A 139) εἰς οὐδὲν δέον ἐκ περισσοῦ τέθειται. τίς γάρ οὐκ οἶδεν ὡς λυπῆσεται ὁ ἀδικηθεὶς;
- (2) Eust. 106, 33: τινὲς δὲ ἀρέσκονται, ὡς καὶ Λογγῖνος δηλοῖ, νόθον εἶναι τὸν δεῦτερον στίχον, οὗ κατάρχει τὸ σήμαινε (sc. A 296), στίζοντες εἰς τὸ «μὴ γὰρ ἔμοιγε» (A 295) τελείαν καὶ λαμβάνοντες ἐκ κοινοῦ τὸ ἐπιτέλλεο, ἵνα λέγη, ὅτι «ἄλλοις ἐπιτέλλεο· μὴ γὰρ ἔμοιγε ἐπιτέλλεο».
- (3) Ep. Hom. α 347 (=AO 1, 83, 10ff.): Κάσσιος δὲ Λογγῖνος «ὄρνις δ' ὡς <π>ανοπαῖα» (α 320; corr. Nauck), ἴν' ἢ χελιδῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Πανόπης, ἦγουν ἢ Φωκική, ἐπειδὴ ἐν <Δ>αυλίδι τῆς Φωκίδος τὰ περὶ Τηρέως λεγόμενα μυθολογεῖται, καὶ ἡ Πανόπη δὲ Φωκική πόλις.

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

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

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

22 See n. 19 above.

- (4) Eust. 1919, 15 (ad χ 57–58): ἡ δὲ τοιαύτη τιμὴ καὶ τῆμος λέγεται κωμικώτερον, ὡς Λογγῖνος δηλοῖ, ὁμοίως τῷ χολῆ χόλος, ὠνὴ ὠνος καὶ τοῖς τοιούτοις.
- (1) Here Longinus follows Aristarchus (sch. Ariston. A 139a) in athetizing A 139 as otiose; in this he is not followed by modern editors.
- (2) Longinus merely reports the athetesis of A 296, for which we have no other evidence (the Venetus A has no obelus at this point). Presumably the cause was, once again, redundancy.
- (3) Longinus' reading πανοπαῖα, very probably a conjecture, would restore the designation of a specific type of bird, the swallow, just as Aristarchus had seen in ἀνοπαῖα the name of a bird (sch. α 320). EM 111, 23 and sch. M on α 320 preserve Longinus' reading, but not his name.
- (4) Similar doctrine appears at Eustathius 563, 24 and 1148, 36, the latter citing Archil. fr. 124 b 2 West. Kock lists τῆμος as Adesp. 1164. The form was, however, poetic in general (cf. Archil. l. c., Aesch. Ch. 916; LSJ s.v.), not just comic²³.

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