

ARISTOPHANES OF BYZANTIUM ON THE PINAKES OF CALLIMACHUS

W. J. SLATER

THE PURPOSE OF THIS PAPER is to illustrate some of the problems of cataloguing faced by the great Alexandrian scholars, the methods they used to solve them, the strife to which those methods gave rise; and most important the difficulties facing those who try to interpret the remaining evidence and find consistent pictures in it. If the reader is not convinced by the thesis in the following pages, at least he will be warned not to accept the testimony of grammarians at face value. It is not unusual even in these days to find that one grammarian cannot accurately summarize the views of another, when he is bent on refuting him, and in antiquity the problem was much worse.

Photius *Lex.* 32.12 εὐθὺ Λυκείου τὸ εἰς Λύκειον· ὅθεν Ἐρατοσθένης (fr. 46 Str. = XL Bern.) καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ὑποπτέει τοὺς Μεταλλεῖς (Pherecr. 110K = 2, p. 306M) καὶ Εὐριπίδης οὐκ ὀρθῶς (*Hipp.* 1198) τὴν εὐθὺς Ἀργεῖος ἀπιδουρίας ὀδόν. The gloss comes originally from a Plato Lexicon,¹ cf. *Lex. Tim.* p. 71R, to which has been appended (ὅθεν . . .) a learned note, which summarizes a grammatical argument not stated. Meineke (*Quaest. Sc.* 2.33) read εὐθὺς since εὐθὺ + gen. would not call for comment, whereas εὐθὺς + gen. was considered a solecism by the grammarians; since the manuscripts of Plato *Lysis* 203a still have mostly εὐθὺς, Meineke will be right against Naber. That Kock, and Rutherford, who wishes we had the rest of the line, (*The New Phrynichus* p. 223), seem to think that the opening words of the *Lysis* are a comic fragment, is an odd oversight, since Ruhnken had already shown the provenance of the Timaeus gloss.

Harpocration 126, 23B: μεταλλεῖς . . . ἔστι δὲ καὶ δρᾶμα Φερεκράτους Μεταλλεῖς, ὅπερ Νικόμαχόν φησι πεποιήσθαι Ἐρατοσθένης ἐν ζ' περὶ τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμῳδίας (fr. 93 Str. = XXXIX Bern.). So too it was probably Eratosthenes who attributed the *Cheiron* to Nikomachos (Ath. 8. 364a). Scholars have rightly combined these two glosses, and deduced that one of the reasons why Eratosthenes took away the *Metalleis* from the ἀπτικώτατος Pherecrates² was that he had there found an offense against

¹So L. Cohn, "Platon-Scholien," *Ῥβ.φ.Κλ.Φιλ.*, Suppl. 13 (1884) 795; but Dr K. Alpers tells me that Georg Wentzel in his unpublished notes did not agree.

²Therein following the precept concerning determination of authenticity as formulated by Schol.Dion.Thrax 472, 3H: κρίνει δὲ πρῶτον μὲν ὁρῶν εἰς τὴν λέξιν, εἰ συνήθης ἔστι τῷ ποιητῇ . . .

We may incidentally deduce that for many dramas there existed no documentary evidence of authenticity in the Alexandrian library, when a scholar with the historical expertise of Eratosthenes was reduced to dubious linguistic rules in the determination

the grammatical canons concerning *εὐθύς*, *εὐθύ*, *εὐθέως*; in this case, if Photius' source is to be trusted, the *Metalleis* had *εὐθύς* + gen. used of direction, when *εὐθύ* + gen. was held to be the correct form despite Euripides, though it is possible that Euripides was cited by a later authority as an exception to the normative canon.³

So far the picture is deceptively clear. Now comes the evidence reconstructed on the basis of *cod. Par. supp. gr.* 1238 by Prof. Nickau⁴ (I omit the very complex apparatus): *εὐθύς καὶ εὐθύ καὶ εὐθέως διαφέρουσιν. εὐθύς μὲν γάρ ἐστιν ὁ κανὼν, εὐθύ δὲ τοῦ γυμνασίου ἀντὶ τοῦ κατ' εὐθείαν τοῦ γυμνασίου, ἢ εὐθύ τὸ κανόνιον. τὸ δ' εὐθέως ἀντὶ τοῦ χρονικοῦ ἐπιρρήματος. ὁ οὖν ἐναλλάσσων ἀμαρτάνει, καθὰ καὶ Μέγανδρος ἐν Δυσκόλῳ (50.52).*

*τί φῆς; ἰδὼν ἐνθένδε παῖδ' ἔλευθέραν
ἔρων ἀπῆλθες εὐθύς; (εὐθύς;) ὡς ταχύ.*

καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ γραμματικὸς ἐν τῷ Πρὸς τοὺς Πίνακας Καλλιμάχου περὶ Ἀντιφάνους διαστέλλει τὴν λέξιν. τινες μέντοι τῶν ἀρχαίων φησὶ καὶ τῷ εὐθύς ἀντὶ χρονικοῦ κεχρηθῆσαι. φησὶ γοῦν κατὰ λέξιν. "δεῖ δὲ τὸ μὲν εὐθύ λέγειν ἐπὶ τινος εὐθέως, οἷον ἐὰν μὲν ἦ θῆλυ τὸ ὄνομα "ἢ εὐθεία δόδος," "ἢ εὐθεία βακτηρία," ἐὰν δὲ ἄρσεν "εὐθύς ὁ κανὼν," ἐὰν δὲ τὸ οὐδέτερον καλούμενον "εὐθύ τὸ ξύλον." οἱ δ' ἀρχαῖοι ἐνίοτε τὸ εὐθύ ἐπιθέσαν τὸ ἐφ' ὁδοῦ τῆς τεχνούσης ἐπὶ τινα τόπον. εὐθύ τῆς στοᾶς (cf. FCG 4 p. 601 M.), "εὐθύ τῶν ἀρωμάτων" (Eupolis 2 p. 550 M., fr. 304, 2K. = Edm.). τὸ δὲ κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους οὐ λέγεται, ἀλλ' εὐθύς, οἷον

γῆμαντος αὐτοῦ δ' εὐθύς ἔσομ' ἐλεύθερος

(FCG 4 p. 601 M., com. fr. ad. 582 K. = Edm.), καὶ

ὡς τοῦτ' (ο δ') εἶδεν, εὐθύς ἦν τᾶν κατὰ

(ibid. M., com. fr. ad. 583 K. = Edm.)." Ammonius⁵ here, with some initial confusion of his own, gives his opinion that *εὐθύς* and *εὐθέως* are not to be confused: A. *εὐθύς*, *εὐθύ* are adjectives but *εὐθύ* + gen. of direction is in order; B. *εὐθέως* is used for the adverb of time, and *εὐθύς* as adverb of

of authorship. In view of the little we know about the cataloguing procedures, we are entitled to suspect that it was much less scientific than we are normally led to believe.

³Cf. Barrett's explanation *ad loc.*, though we must reckon with the likelihood that exceptions to the doctrinaire rules have been emended away in our mss.

⁴The text as here quoted is that reconstructed by Prof. K. Nickau in *Rh M* 110 (1967) 348–349. It supersedes the text of gloss 202 in his valuable edition of Ammonius, Leipzig 1966.

⁵What we call Ammonius is a compilation of essentially similar works by Ammonius, Erannius or Herennius Philo, and Ptolemaios of Askalon, which exists in various mss. under these names and in different editions. I do not believe that gloss 202 can be assigned to any particular scholar. Note the use of *κατὰ λέξιν*: since the authority for the quotations is missing, we must assume a certain epitomization here, since it seems to have been the habit of Aristophanes always to give the source of his quotes.

time is a solecism, as it is in Menander. Then he paraphrases Aristophanes of Byzantium for the following view: (a) yet some of the ancients used also εἰθὺς (v. 1. εἰθέως) ἀντὶ χρονικοῦ, and he quotes him, (b) εἰθὺ (i.e., εἰθὺς, -εἶα, -ύ) is a declinable adjective, (c) some of the ancients used εἰθὺ + gen. of direction, (d) εἰθὺ is not used of time, but εἰθὺς (and we have to suppose εἰθέως).

Ammonius' gloss is structured, like a few others, notably 226 Nickau, as rule, quotation of authors offending against rule, διαστολή of a previous grammarian. This gloss differs in that the cited grammarian (a) not only allows exceptions to the rule but (d) flatly contradicts it. In addition the rule that εἰθὺς is never to be used meaning εἰθέως is so opposed to the facts that we are not surprised to learn that no other grammarian repeats it. What Ammonius does not say here—though in gl. 204 he has it right—is what all our other sources insist on, that εἰθὺ is used of place while εἰθὺς is used of time, which is what Aristophanes says. Out of Aristophanes' statement (d) εἰθὺ is not used of time but εἰθὺς, Ammonius has created the statement (a) some of the ancients use εἰθὺς of time; and the rule (b) that εἰθὺς should never be used of time. This does not make sense, and though Ammonius is often too doctrinaire, I do not believe he produced either the rule or the argumentation (a) because the rule is so patently at variance with facts: (b) because no other grammarian gives this rule: (c) because the grammarian he cites flatly contradicts his rule, and this happens nowhere else in Ammonius: (d) because the statement that εἰθὺ is not to be used of time is in his source, but missing in his rule. Valckenaer⁶ tried to solve the difficulty by emending the text of Menander to suggest that Ammonius was condemning εἰθὺς + gen. of place; but the papyrus of the *Dyskolos* is against this. We either have to accept the nonsense as we have it, or attempt to fit it into a larger and more sensible framework.

The normal doctrine is a simple one. The only correct usages are εἰθὺς or εἰθέως of time and εἰθὺ + gen. of place; εἰθὺ of time (and εἰθὺς of place) are wrong, or to be precise are not found. This doctrine of the atticists was already known to Eratosthenes, who used it as *Atticismi accuratus observator*⁷ to suspect the authenticity of certain plays. In an unfortunately confused passage he is said to have spoken of *pseudattici*, i.e., those

⁶Ammonius, *De differentia adfinium vocabulorum* (Leipzig 1822) *Animadversiones* p. 70 = p. 90 of the original edition.

⁷The phrase is that of Carl Strecker, *De Lycophrone, Euphronio, Eratosthene comicorum interpretibus* (diss. Greifswald 1884), which is still the main work on Eratosthenes' non-scientific achievements. Though Wilamowitz (*Lysistrata* p. 1) praises the work—Strecker was his pupil—my own view is that most of the attributions are scarcely justifiable, and like his later work on Erotian take too simple a view of the complexity of Alexandrian scholarship.

who smuggled improper attic usages into texts,⁸ and we are justified in thinking of him as one of the first atticists. It then appears that Aristophanes felt compelled to define in detail the use of the word *εἰθῦς* in his discussion of the catalogues of Callimachus in regard to the comic poet Antiphanes. In our miserable remnants of that poet there is an example of *εἰθῦς* that could suggest difficulty,⁹ and there seems to have been question in antiquity concerning at least one of the dramas attributed to him (Athen. 9.409d). The resulting doctrine then passed into the later atticists as dogma.

The doctrine is wrong, and there are other factors that arouse suspicion, though none of them is absolute evidence, that Aristophanes did not mean what Ammonius says.

1. We would have to believe that Eratosthenes set up the false atticist doctrine in criticizing the cataloguing of Callimachus, and then that his successor Aristophanes came along and defined in detail exactly¹⁰ the same doctrine in criticizing the same catalogues.

2. Whereas we have no evidence of doctrinaire atticism on the part of Aristophanes except for this one fragment, which is reported by a doctrinaire atticist, we have a large amount of evidence that he attacked such linguistic dogmatism. In particular the *Concerning Suspected Words* indicates that he was in the habit of dredging up grammatical and morphological oddities,¹¹ and proving that words occurred in senses that had been suspected (as unattic?) by his predecessors. In short, this work was

⁸Schol.Ar.*Ranae* 1263 = fr.149 Str. The term became a favourite insult among grammarians, and is explained by, e.g., Phrynichus *Ecl.* gl.41, 54 Fischer.

⁹Fragment 166, 4K = CAF 2, 79 from the *Neaniskoi*, where the intrusive *εἰθῦς* in line 3 can be explained as a gloss or correction of *εἰθῦς* (originally *εἰθῦ* ?) in line 4. The metre allows both, but if *εἰθῦ* was the original reading, whether Antiphanes wrote it or not, then we should have an example of *εἰθῦ* temporally used. This seems to be a use that becomes commoner in Hellenistic times. The atticist rules, like most others, were designed to prevent writers doing what came naturally to Hellenistic Greeks. If fr. 166 is not the one dealt with by Aristophanes, we should have to give Antiphanes a new fragment *εἰθῦ*. At Euripides fr. 1040 N² Lobbeck read *εἰθῦ* because of Porson's Law.

¹⁰I am assuming that if Eratosthenes said that *εἰθῦς* of place was wrong, he also said that *εἰθῦ* of time was wrong, since he would be discussing the difference between them.

¹¹Nickau, *RhM* 110 (1967) 347 note 5; Latte, *Hermes* 50 (1915) 373 ff. = *Kl. Schr.* (Munich 1968) 612 ff. Lossau, *Untersuchungen zur antiken Demosthenesexegese* (Palin-genesia 2, Berlin 1964) 97 manages to get wrong every single fact. There are not 21 glosses but 36; and Homer is practically not noticed. Aristophanes wrote γόμος not γόμφος. Lossau's arguments are as odd as his facts. Pfeiffer makes a division of the glossary into two parts (*History of Classical Scholarship* [1968] 199): I cannot find evidence for this. Pfeiffer further propagates the notion that it was part of a larger work called Λέξεις. This is a common error, but there was no such work. The title of the Paris epitome ἐκ τοῦ Ἀριστοφάνους περὶ λέξεων διαλαβόντος is due to the epitomator, who suppressed the titles of the three works he abbreviated.

a polemical *anagraphe*,¹² and we find, even in the mutilated epitome of it that we have, sufficient evidence of such a tendency, e.g., the accusation of ἀγνοια¹³ and the criticism of Megakleides for too strict a definition of the word Ἀθηναία.¹⁴ But we would have to believe that in this one instance he accepted at length a similar overly strict doctrine, that was false.

3. In the whole of ancient lexicography there is only one place where the standard doctrine is contradicted, viz., in the corrupt pamphlet which Ruhnken called the *Antiatticist*.¹⁵ There we read the eccentric doctrine (96,8B): εὐθύ·ἀντὶ τοῦ εὐθέως—i.e., εὐθύ· ἀντὶ τοῦ χρονικοῦ, and Lobeck¹⁶ demonstrated that this view is odd but defensible, against the views of Phrynichus gl.113 Fischer, Ammonius, Timaeus, Moeris, Photius, and the *Synagoge* (*Su* ε3523 + 4Ad). Now it has been known since Nauck that the *Antiatticist* is indebted for his massive learning to none other than Aristophanes himself, and of the thirty-six glosses that can safely be attributed to *Concerning Suspected Words*, no less than fourteen reappear with approximately the same explanation in the *Antiatticist*,¹⁷ and glosses from other works of Aristophanes also are present. Even where Aristophanes wrongly¹⁸ attempted to defend the ending -οσαν by quoting

¹²cf. Gudeman *RE* 2A s.v. *Satyros*, p. 234 for the term, and G. Arrighetti, *Satiro, Vita di Euripide* (Pisa 1964) 31.

¹³Eustath. *Comm. in Od.* 1827, 47; *Antiatt.* 96, 12 = fr.LXVII N.

¹⁴Ael. Dion. α 43 Erbse gives an idea of what has to be added to Nauck p. 213. The many pages of discussion that survive from antiquity over the question of the proper appellation for an Athenian woman derive probably from a passage like Plato *Laws* 1.626d (cf. M. Goebel, *Ethnica* [Warsaw 1915] 1); but the discussion really begins with a fatuous explanation by the peripatetic Megakleides (in the fourth century) in his work on Homer. This valuable discussion is the only one that survives to show who were the opponents of Aristophanes, against whom he wielded his massive learning. In the original work there can be little doubt that every gloss was preceded by an indictment of the person who claimed to have suspected that this or that word or usage was not found and so suspect. (It is clear from the discussion that Hesychius gl. 1575 L should be corrected (ἀσπή· Μεγακλείδης) and not as Latte prints.) It is because of this epitomization that we cannot trace most of the quarrels of the Alexandrians back to the Athenian peripatetics, and show the continuation of the trends that are already to be seen in the Derveni papyrus.

¹⁵See Latte's article cited in note 11. For the influence of the *Antiatticist* on Phrynichus see Fischer, *Die Ekloge des Phrynichos* (Berlin 1974) 39 ff. Of course Phrynichus polemises against the *antiatticist*, whereas the *antiatticist* followed Aristophanes.

¹⁶Lobeck, *Phrynichi Eclogae* (Leipzig 1820) 144–145.

¹⁷But Aristophanes' view that ἐπιστάτης meant no teacher other than παιδοτρίβης may be contradicted by the *Antiatticist* 96,12, who says it can mean a διδάσκαλος. Ammonius gl. 144N denies this. We cannot be sure that the gloss belongs to *Suspected Words* or if there is a definite contradiction.

¹⁸So it would appear from the testimonia, but perhaps the *Antiatticist* 91,14 suggests that Aristophanes' doctrine has been corrupted, for there we read that the ending is used by the Alexandrians. It is improbable that Aristophanes considered it a genuine Attic usage on the basis that it occurred in Lycophron alone. If he considered it to be a

Lycophron (*Alex.* 21), we find the Antiatticist following. But we are asked in this instance to believe that the Antiatticist can produce a doctrine that is not only eccentric but confutes Aristophanes.

4. In a discussion of the dining habits of the ancients, Aristophanes violently criticized his predecessors for not observing the distinction between *κατὰ χεῖρός*—before meals, and *ἀπονίψασθαι*—after meals; this is the only other certain fragment from his work on Callimachus' catalogues, and presumably also had to do with determining authenticity. It so happens that this distinction was also treated by Ammonius, by Tryphon, by Polemon, and in a long disquisition by Athenaeus 408f ff., as well as by many of the atticists following. One thing is clear: that Ammonius contradicts Aristophanes, by stating that *κατὰ χεῖρός* is used before and after meals (gl.68 Nickau). Clearly the contradiction is deliberate, as we can see from Athenaeus 410c, where the same view is cited without author or evidence but with a reference to Aristophanes' doctrine. There is in fact no evidence known to us against Aristophanes' distinction, and I should be inclined to think that some scholar had quoted Homer against him (cf. Athenaeus 409a) when Aristophanes himself was patently talking of Attic authors only; the absence of citation in Athenaeus suggests that the criticism of Aristophanes was unjustified. Now although Eustathius *Comm. in Od.* 1.137, p. 1401,42 reports the view of Tryphon who agrees with Aristophanes, his words refer to later times (*κατὰ χερῶν* for *χεῖρός*,¹⁹ *νίψασθαι* for *ἀπονίψασθαι*) so that we can not use this evidence. More interesting is the note that Polemon had dealt with the problem (fr. 62 Pr.); there follows in Athenaeus 410c the only known fragment of the comic poet Demonicus (*CAF* 3 p. 375), which proves only that Boeotians were so lacking in manners that they put off the elementary decency of washing their hands till after mealtimes. One can however believe that the polemical Polemon might have cited it to contradict Aristophanes, but since the two are contemporaries that is not demonstrable. But it does look as if Ammonius is following a source that opposed Aristophanes in the long and doubtless acrimonious debate over dinner customs. Of the two certain fragments of Aristophanes' catalogue work Ammonius followed him as an authority in one and specifically rejected him in the other.

Euboean usage as Eustath. 1761,30 suggests because he found it only in Lycophron, that would be typical of the thinking of all early glossographers and is methodologically a reasonable procedure (K. Latte, "Glossographica," *Philologus* 80 [1925] 164 ff.). But since the fashionable dating of the *Alexandra* is after Kynoskephalai in 197, the author would have to be a younger contemporary of Aristophanes, and Aristophanes elsewhere cites no poet later than Menander and new comedy, not even the great Alexandrians. A *non liquet* seems in order, before we condemn the great scholar, but clearly some Alexandrian believed that Lycophron of Chalcis wrote the *Alexandra*.

¹⁹Itself an error, as the atticists rightly pointed out. See Nauck p. 251 ff.

5. The paraphrase of Aristophanes arouses suspicion. Did Aristophanes in fact say "that some of the ancients use εἶθ' temporally"? Surely anyone who glances through the comic fragments, let alone someone who is supposed to have edited them all, ought to know that not "some" but "all" the ancients use εἶθ' temporally. Similarly the words 'οὐ λέγεται' we are accustomed to find in the later atticists meaning "is not found in the best authors".²⁰ If, as I suspect, the point of Aristophanes' remarks was to apply his rule to a comic text, e.g., to emend Antiphanes fr.166,4 to εἶθ' from εἶθ', he must have had more to say than simply that "εἶθ' of time is not found." For the one place where it is found and guaranteed by metre is Callimachus *Hymn* 2.103,²¹ and Callimachus wrote nothing ἀτέκμαρτον, if we are to believe his own words,²² and we can suspect that Alexandrians knew it.

I am led to believe that the words of Aristophanes have been distorted by omission of the relevant exceptions, for he could not have taken sides in what was obviously an ongoing argument by simply repeating an atticist canon. Whether the words "is not found" are the words of Aristophanes paraphrased by the source of Ammonius, or whether a part of Aristophanes' explanation has been omitted, it is impossible now to say. If we consider the antiatticist picture of Aristophanes I have painted, the natural progress of the argument would be that Callimachus gave the play to Antiphanes, Eratosthenes took it away from him on the basis that εἶθ' was wrongly used, and Aristophanes dealt in greater detail with the text, possibly emending it to suit Eratosthenes. But if we follow the Antiatticist, he must have indicated passages where the doctrine of Eratosthenes was broken, and we cannot accept everything that Ammonius has to tell us at face value.

It may be worth adding that ἀρμῶι is also cited from the *Metalleis* by Erotian, who is also much indebted to Aristophanes of Byzantium via Bakcheios of Tanagra and Artemidoros ὁ Ἀριστοφάνειος,²³ but the word is also cited by Theon, son of Artemidoros, from Kallimachos (fr. 274Pf). It occurs among the other Alexandrian poets, but in Attic writers only at Aesch. *PV* 615. This doric gloss too is the sort of word that would be held to be unattic and defended by Aristophanes of Byzantium.

Yet another gloss among many others that may belong to Aristophanes

²⁰E.g., Phrynichus, *Ecl.* gl. 87 Fischer. The phrase does not recur in the remains of Aristophanes or Ammonius.

²¹Also Theocritus 26.15.

²²We should, in view of the parallels adduced by Norden on *Aen.* 6.264. For this kind of linguistic joking see Erbse, "*Homerscholien und hellenistische Glossare bei Apoll. Rhod.*" *Hermes* 81 (1953) 163 ff.; Giangrande, "*Arte Allusiva*," *CQ* 17 (1967) 85 ff.

²³M. Wellmann, *Hippokratesglossare, Quellen u. Studien zur Geschichte der Naturwiss. und d. Medizin* 2, 1931, 19 ff., against Strecker's oversimplification in *Hermes* 26 (1891) 262 ff.

of Byzantium is Antiatt. 78, 32: ἀλήθειν· οὐκ ἀλεῖν (cf. 109.23: νήθειν οὐ μόνον νεῖν). This gloss, before being epitomized to meaninglessness, meant: not only is ἀλεῖν found but also the rare ἀλήθειν.²⁴ The citation is missing, but may well have been Pherekrates 74K, where Edmonds has emended ἀλήθει into ἀλεῖ, a banalization of the type Aristophanes sought to prevent.

If my analysis is right, Aristophanes' ἀναγραφὴ πρὸς τοὺς πίνακας τοῦ Καλλιμάχου consisted not only of possible corrections to the details there given but also of notes concerning other scholars' attempts to criticize them. We can also see that arguments concerning atticistic rules grew up around the attribution of works in the library, and the movement can therefore be said to begin at least 230 B.C. Eratosthenes appears as a strict atticist, Aristophanes as a milder follower of the συνήθεια.

It is worth adding that the reason that Eratosthenes was so vehemently attacked by later scholars including Polemon and Strabo may have been his irascible nature as much as his actual scholarly errors. A man who was not only an extreme sceptic historically but enjoyed coining polemical vocabulary like βεργαῖζειν, βιβλιαίγισθος for his colleagues could scarcely complain if some of them described him as Beta and Pentathlos.²⁵ That Eratosthenes had attacked Callimachus we knew;²⁶ it should not surprise us therefore if he himself was criticized by his own successor Aristophanes.²⁷

McMASTER UNIVERSITY, HAMILTON

²⁴Its occurrence in Herodas (2.20?, 6.81) would be warning enough to expect it in comedy.

²⁵Pfeiffer (above, n. 11) 170, where add Steph. Byz. s.v. Βέργη and Bekker, *Anecd.* 1.226,12; also Merkelbach, *ZPE* 11 (1973) 261. Aulus Gellius reports grammarians called Insanus and Pleistoneices.

²⁶Evidence in P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* 2 (Oxford 1972) 661 n.89,757 n.61, to which we should probably add Quintilian 11.2.11 = Eratosthenes fr.124 Str. How a gloss of Eratosthenes could get into Ammonius is shown by fr.125-6 Str.

²⁷Perhaps the disagreement over the nature of Solon's κύρβεις is an example, Nauck, *Ar. Byz.* p. 220, where Ammonius seems rather to agree with Eratosthenes gl.57 Nickau. The evidence concerning the Pinakes is collected by Pfeiffer on fr.429-456 of Callimachus, where he cites the most important literature.

I wish to thank the journal's editors and Professor E. G. Schmidt of Jena, who eliminated much bad argument in an earlier draft.