Eustathius of Thessalonica:

A Qualitative Analysis of the eleventh chapter of the *Commentary on the Odyssey*

Maria Vargemezi

Acknowedgements

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Johanna Akujärvi, for her invaluable guidance and support throughout the entire process of completing this MA thesis. Her expertise and insightful feedback have been instrumental in shaping the direction and quality of this research. Her patience, availability, and willingness to engage in fruitful discussions have been crucial in enhancing my understanding of the subject matter. I am also grateful for her assistance in refining my research methodology, strengthening my argumentation, and honing my writing skills. I am deeply grateful for her mentorship, which has played an integral role in my academic and personal growth. Lastly, I would like to extend my appreciation to the entire faculty and staff who have contributed to my educational journey. I am indebted to their collective efforts in providing a stimulating academic environment that has nurtured my intellectual curiosity. Without their guidance and support, the completion of this MA thesis would not have been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper concerns itself with the work of Eustathius of Thessalonica, *Commentary on Homer's Odyssey.* This book is a collection of Eustathius' personal remarks, the Homeric scholia and numerous extracts from previous authors, some of which are now lost. The author's primary goal was to create a useful guide that provides a deeper understanding to the *Odyssey* for his students. I will focus on categorizing and analyzing the comments on the eleventh book of *Odyssey*, the so-called *Nekyia.*

1.1 EUSTATHIUS OF THESSALONICA & THE *PAREKBOLAI*

Eustathius of Thessalonica (his baptismal name is unknown; this is his monastic name) was one of the most prominent scholars of the 12th century. Data regarding his biography is inadequate. The dates of his birth and death are uncertain. Browning (1962, p. 191) states that he was a contemporary of Euthymios Malakes, who was born between 1115 and 1135. Makrinos claims that he was born around 1115-1118 (2013, p. 140). According to Kazhdan, who follows Smith (2009, p. 115), the generally accepted theory is that he was born between 1106 and 1114. His last known work was a speech delivered in February of 1195. In 1196-1197, the bishop of Thessalonica was Constantine Mesopotamites. Perhaps Eustathius was already dead by then (Kazhdan, 2009, p. 137).

According to Makrinos (2013, p. 140-141), Eustathius began his higher education at the Patriarchal Academy of Constantinople. He continued his studies at the convent of St Euphemia when he entered the monastic life. The Emperor Manuel Komnenos made him deacon and later master of petitions. Simultaneously he was teaching privately grammar and rhetoric. Patriarch Michael III appointed him as μαΐστωρ τῶν ῥητόρων (Professor of rhetoric and philosophy). He was also ordained bishop of Myra in Lycia, but he did not accept the position. Finally, he was appointed as archbishop of Thessalonica (ca. 1178).

The work of Eustathius is broad and multifaceted, with numerous texts of secular and religious content. His most considerable works that exist to this day are his *Commentaries* to Homer, Pindar and Dionysius Periegetes (Kazhdan, 2009, p. 132). Eustathius calls this *Commentaries, parekbolai,*[1] which in Byzantine scholarship generally refers to "a collection of excerpts from one or several sources", or, very seldom, *hypomnemata*[2] (Cullhed, 2016, p. 2).

Browning (1992, p. 212) explains that the *Commentaries* carry oral traces and appear related to the lectures he delivered to his students. Regardless, Eustathius states that his works were primarily, but not only, directed to his students, but also to readers who wished to study them along with the epics or individually from them (Pagani, 2017, p.

---

[1] "Compilation of a set of critical remarks" (LSJ s.v. παρεκ-βολή, ἡ II).
[2] "Dissertations or treatises" (LSJ s.v. ὑπόμνημα, ατος, τό II 5).

80). According to Pagani (2017, p. 80-81), these works are a kind of companion, which can provide further clarification to isolated parts of the epics that the readers wish to study more in depth. This can be concluded by the plethora of annotations in the margins of the autograph manuscript, as she claims. The *Commentaries* were created by a collection of elements that Eustathius considered as important and relevant to the Homeric poems.

In the proem of the *Commentary on the Odyssey,* the author states that this work, as well as the *Commentary on the Iliad,* are not an exegesis but rather a collection of extracts that are addressed to anyone who wishes to go through the poems rapidly and does not have the time to fully explore them. Moreover, there are things that even though are important for the *Odyssey,* are not commented on since they have been previously discussed in the *Commentary on the Iliad* (1.380.13-17).[3]

In the Byzantine era, Homer's epics were schoolbooks and students had to learn them by heart, as they constituted the foundation for acquiring interpretational skills and linguistic proficiency. Usually, students would focus on selected parts and evidently, the *Iliad* was studied more than the *Odyssey* (Browning, 1975, p. 16-17)*.* All students were expected to learn how to utilize the epics in their own rhetorical work. In this context, it is only reasonable that Eustathius' *Parekbolai* worked as a guide to the Homeric epics.

In these books, Eustathius follows the structure of the epics and in each chapter, he analyzes one book. He follows Homer's narration and he begins his comments by quoting or slightly paraphrasing the poem's lines, by giving synonyms to Homeric terms, in order to make it more understandable for his students. Afterwards he starts the commentary. Usually, his analysis consists of more than one comment, with the first one being the most related to the particular Homeric passage. In a plethora of instances, he changes his focus from one linguistic aspect to another, or, he even alternates from one of the categories that are studied in this paper to another. For example, in his mythological remarks, he often includes shorter etymological and grammatical comments, regarding the names of the heroes. Another characteristic of his works is that he returns to previous comments, a technique that makes his *Commentaries* complex and requires the reader's undivided attention. He might, for instance, start with a mythological comment, shift to an etymological one and then, if needed, he will refocus on the first mythological remark.

1.2 *NEKYIA*

Nekyia[4] is the name of the eleventh book of the *Odyssey* in which Odysseus describes his descent into the Netherworld. Tracy (1997(2009)) claims that this book is purposefully placed almost in the middle of the *Odyssey*. The *katabasis* of Odysseus appears of significant value that divides the poem in two parts because of its strategical

---

[3] Ἔσται δὲ ἡμῖν κἀνταῦθα, ὡς καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἰλιάδι, τῆς μεταχειρίσεως ἡ ἐπιβολὴ οὐ κατὰ ἐξήγησιν, ἧς ἄλλοις ἐμέλησεν, ἀλλὰ κατ' ἐκλογὴν τῶν χρησίμων τοῖς ἐπιτρέχουσι καὶ μὴ ⟨ἐν⟩ εὐχερεῖ ἔχουσιν ἑαυτοὺς ἐπαφιέναι τῷ τῆς ποιήσεως πλάτει σχολαίτερον. πολλὰ δὲ τῶν τῇ Ὀδυσσείᾳ ἐγκειμένων ἐν ταῖς τοιαύταις παρεκβολαῖς σεσίγηνται διὰ τὸ ἐν τοῖς εἰς τὴν Ἰλιάδα ἱκανῶς εἰρῆσθαι περὶ αὐτῶν.
[4] "Rite by which ghosts were called up and questioned" (LSJ s.v. νέκυια, ἡ I).

placement. The first part of the *Odyssey* signifies a time of self-discovery for Odysseus, while the latter concerns his return to Ithaca. These two segments are separated by *Nekyia*. Descending to the Netherworld and, in a way, surpassing death, is perhaps the most important achievement for a hero. It symbolizes Odysseus' death and rebirth.

In the *Nekyia*, Odysseus recounts his trip to the Netherworld to the Phaeacians. His *katabasis* begins by meeting Elpenor, a companion of his who lost his life on the island of Circe. He begs Odysseus to bury his body properly. Then, the hero interacts with the prophet Teiresias, whom Odysseus consults regarding his return to Ithaca. After this interaction, Odysseus encounter his mother, Anticlea. Subsequently, Odysseus briefly meets fourteen heroines, namely Tyro, Antiope, Alcmene, Megara, Epicaste, Chloris, Leda, Iphimedeia, Phaedra, Procris, Ariadne, Maera, Clymene and Eriphyle. These encounters are known as the catalogue of women. Odysseus interrupts his narration of the *katabasis* by having a concise conversation with Alcinous, the king of the Phaeacians. He continues his narration by mentioning his meetings with Agamemnon, Achilles and Ajax. The first one refers to his own death, his wife and Telemachus, Odysseus' son. The second, asks about the reasons of his *katabasis*. Ajax is still bitter at Odysseus because he was the reason of his death and does not talk to him. The rhapsody ends with the catalogue of men, similar to the catalogue of the heroines. Odysseus meets Minos, Orion, Tityus, Tantalus, Sisyphus and Heracles.

1.3 PREVIOUS RESEARCH

Most of the research in Eustathius' work concern the *Commentary on the Iliad.* This is not surprising, given the fact that it has been edited by Van der Valk (1971-1987) and is twice the size of the *Commentary on the Odyssey.* However, this does not mean that there is not significant research on the latter. Modern scholars have been studying the innovative remarks of both of the Homeric *Commentaries* from different point of views, in an attempt to add valuable data to the existing literature of the Byzantine scholar. Here, I will only mention studies that are directly relevant to this paper.

Pagani and Kolovou (2017) have published their research in the book *Reading Eustathios of Thessalonike.* In her article, Kolovou (2017) studies the etymological comments of the sixth book of the *Commentary on the Iliad* and distinguishes them in four main categories. The first one concerns comments that are partially or completely personal. The second category discusses remarks that refer to the ancient scholia. Regarding the third one, it is about comments with etymologies attested to the lexica, but are also elaborated by the author's personal and thorough interpretations. Finally, the fourth category includes remarks whose lexical etymologies have been revised by Eustathius. In this particular category, he offers synonyms, antonyms, abbreviations, as well as examples and interpretations. Kolovou displays samples of each category and she also presents an "etymological dictionary" where she offers a list with the etymological remarks of each category.

Pagani (2017) studies the *Commentary on the Iliad* and discusses the material that is collected from the "philological-exegetic work of the ancient grammarians on the *Iliad*". She divides those comments in three groups. The first category refers to the exegetical scholia that have most likely originated from a prototype identical to the Townleianus manuscript. The second one concerns the D-scholia, comments that were

essential in order to interpret words or paraphrases of Homeric expressions and display mythical episodes. Lastly, the third group is a manuscript that Eustathius referred to as a commentary from Apion and Herodorus.

Makrinos' research (2013) concerns Eustathius' citations in the Homeric *Commentaries*. He focuses on Sophocles, who is evidently the most cited author in both of these works and offers a parallel study on them. Sophocles has been cited 516 times in total, even more than Athenaeus, whom Eustathius referred to 408 times. The author points out only one difference between the references in the two *Commentaries*. In the one on the *Odyssey,* the references to Sophocles concern lexicographical and grammatical remarks, while in the *Commentary on the Iliad,* the references are about the Homeric extract. Moreover, he discusses the terminology that Eustathius uses in order to introduce the references to Sophocles. He explains there are three different technical terms that appear, instead of the author's name. These are ὁ τραγικός ("the tragedian"), ὁ φιλόμηρος Σοφοκλῆς ("Sophocles, who is fond of Homer") and ὁ ζηλωτὴς Ὁμήρου Σοφοκλῆς ("Sophocles Homer's zealous admirer/follower"). In the last part of this paper, Makrinos analyzes and categorizes the references to Sophocles according to their accuracy of quotation and their content and educational contribution.

Makrinos (2007) has also conducted a study exclusively on the *Commentary on the Odyssey.* In his research, he examines Codex Marcianus 460 and Parisinus 2702, the two main codices of the *Commentary on the Odyssey*. He begins with a description of the codices by referring to the marginal notes, information that is acquired and the use of ink. He continues with a comparative analysis of them, he discusses their historical features and ends the article with an evaluation of the codices. He argues that both manuscripts are incomplete in some ways and proposes two hypotheses regarding their chronological order. Either Codex Marcianus is a copy of Parisinus and its archetype, or Codex Marcianus is the source of Codex Parisinus.

Lastly, three larger studies on Eustathius' works occur from Van den Berg (2022) and Cullhed (2016 & 2022), with the first researching the *Commentary on the Iliad* and the latter the one on the *Odyssey.* Van den Berg has written the first monographic study. It addresses the Homeric rhetorical qualities of the *Iliad* that Eustathius views as exceptional and focuses on his *Commentary*. Cullhed, in his book, studies, edits the proem and the first two rhapsodies of the *Commentary on the Odyssey* and offers a word-to-word translation. In their last work, Cullhed alongside with Olson (2022), have published an edition with translation of the books 1-4 from the *Commentary on the Odyssey.*

1.4 AIM OF THE STUDY

The intention of this study is to analyze and categorize the different kinds of remarks in the eleventh chapter of the *Commentary on the Odyssey.* It is evident that this *Commentary* has not been studied to the same extent as the preceding and more extensive *Commentary on the Iliad.* Especially the eleventh chapter has not been discussed previously at all. With this study, I aim to contribute to the published literature by studying a chapter that requires further work and provide research on the *Commentary on the Odyssey* from a different perspective than the ones from Makrinos and Cullhed.

1.5 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In this paper, there are two research questions.

RQ1: Into which categories can the comments of the eleventh chapter of the *Commentary on the Odyssey* be divided?

RQ2: Into which sub-categories can the linguistic comments be divided?

Concerning the first research question, I intend to assort the comments in all possible categories that could originate. As for the latter, the linguistic comments, which constitute the largest part of this study, will be further divided according to the part of language they –mostly- refer to. The first research question will provide a principal distinction, while the latter has a more specific scope.

Additionally, I will provide an adequate analysis of the comments as well as try to cite the author's possible sources. It needs to be noted that, due to the length of the chapter that will be studied, not all comments can be analyzed. The ones that can present the characteristics of each category fully and appear of greater significance, meaning the comments that Eustathius dedicated more time and space to, will be prioritized. The goal is to offer a complete viewpoint to the reader and provide sufficient examples for each category.

1.6 METHOD & THEORY

The *Commentary on the Odyssey* is a philological work that interprets Homer's particular epic. Philology is essentially humanistic and concerns itself with the study of texts, principally regarding linguistic and literary disciplines. Byzantine philology intended to maintain the Greek literary tradition, forward it to educational institutions and create canons (Landfester, 2006). In this context, Eustathius collected extracts from the Homeric scholia, other scholars and additionally formed his own, in order to give his students a complete guide for the Homeric epics. Although he does not provide the reader with new information, he successfully collects in one book all the data that is relevant to the epics.

The research questions will be answered using qualitative analysis. Qualitative data has widely distinct definitions in different domains and in everyday life. However, it is different from other methodologies in the sense that there is no structure in analytical forms as for instance in quantitative data. On the contrary, it is a different technique of collecting data that demands an elaborated and systematic approach (Kuckartz, 2014, p. 1-2). Even though qualitative analysis is thought to be a more creative approach, it still needs to follow strict rules. Recently, additional effort has been undertaken in order to make the qualitative approach more precise. The aim is "to find correlations and create causal models that can be generalized" (Kuckartz, 2014, p. 11-12).

Qualitative data varies and can include texts, images, audio-recordings and movies (Kuckartz, 2014, p. 2). Qualitative analysis is a broad term that is hard to define and, when it is done, it is usually in comparison to quantitative analysis. Oswald (2010, p.

75) offers the following definition, "qualitative research uses non-standardized methods of data collection and interpretive methods of data analysis, where the interpretations are not only related to generalizations and conclusions, as in most quantitative methods, but also to the individual cases" (Kuckartz, 2014, p. 6).

In order to systematize and analyze the comments, I will primarily use the following tools: TLG database and various dictionaries, including LSJ dictionary, Etymological Dictionary of Greek (2010), and the Homeric Dictionary for Schools and Colleges (1895). Other sources and studies are indicated as they occur.

In order to collect the material, I started by studying separately each part that Eustathius focuses on, based to the Homeric passage. Afterwards, in each of these parts, I distinguished the comments, that in many cases are united, in their respective categories and selected the most principal ones to analyze, according to what the author concentrates on and analyzes more. Concerning the analysis, I begin by interpreting Eustathius' comments. Following that, I continue by finding the sources he used and cite them, if they are not named.

The study is divided in five chapters. The first one concerns the sub-categories of the linguistic comments, namely etymological, exegetical, syntactical and grammatical. The second chapter focuses on mythological comments. The third deals with comments on the content of the *Odyssey*. The fourth contains historical-geographical remarks. In all of the chapters, the passages of the *Odyssey*, translations of them, as well as Eustathius' remarks, are included in the discussion. However, there are instances in which the author's comments could not be fully quoted, due to their extensive length. In these cases, the most crucial parts are included. The last chapter concerns the summary and conclusion.

2. LINGUISTIC COMMENTS

2.1 ETYMOLOGICAL COMMENTS

In this section of the linguistic comments, I analyze the comments that concern the etymology and derivation of nouns, adjectives and verbs. There are thirteen comments.

2.1.1

τὰ δὲ μῆλα λαβὼν ἀπεδειροτόμησα
ἐς βόθρον, ῥέε δ' αἷμα κελαινεφές. (*Od*. 11.35-6).

I took the sheep and cut their throats over the pit, and the dark blood flowed. (Murray, 1919, p. 403).

Ὅτι ἐν μὲν τῷ, Ζεὺς κελαινεφὴς, ἔγκειται τὸ νέφος. ἔστι γὰρ κελαινεφὴς ἐκεῖνος, ὡς τὰ νέφη μελαίνων τῇ πυκνώσει, νεφεληγερέτης γάρ. ἐν δὲ τῷ, μῆλα λαβὼν

ἀπεδειροτόμησα εἰς βόθρον, ῥέε δ' αἷμα κελαινεφὲς, ἡ λέξις τὸ κελαινεφὲς δηλοῖ, ἤγουν τὸ μέλαν. ἐπεὶ καὶ μέλαν αἷμα φησὶ πολλαχοῦ. καὶ μὴν καὶ Ζεὺς κελαινεφὴς κατὰ ἀλληγορίαν, ὁ μέλας ἰδεῖν καὶ οἰονεὶ αὐτὸς κελαινοφαὴς διὰ τὸ τοῦ νοῦ δυσόρατον. (1.398.14-18).

In this passage, the author gives an etymological explanation regarding the adjective κελαινεφής, which translates to "shrouded in dark clouds" (LSJ s.v. κελαι-νεφής, ές 1) and, according to him, has the meaning of "the one that darkens the clouds". *Etymologicum Magnum* (kappa, p. 313, l. 43-44)[5] offers the same explanation. Eustathius identifies the term νεφεληγερέτης, ("cloud gatherer" LSJ s.v. νεφελη-γερέτᾰ), which is another epithet of Zeus, as being similar to κελαινεφής.

Regarding its etymology, the scholar states in the *Commentary on the Iliad* (1.188.28-30)[6] that the adjective derives from the adjective κελαινός ("black, dark") and the noun νέφος ("cloud"). When merged, they create the adjective κελαινονεφής and, after syncopating the syllable νο from the first word, the compound κελαινεφής originates. Eustathius mentions that the word is used allegorically when describing Zeus. In this particular instance in the *Odyssey*, the word is used as a synonym to μέλαν ("dark") to describe the dark color of the sheep's blood. A similar explanation is offered in the *Commentary on the Iliad* (1.719.9-10).[7] Lastly, it is important to note that Eustathius also uses another form of the word, κελαινοφαής, which according to *Suda Lexicon* (kappa, 1287)[8] is an equivalent for μέλας ("dark") and is attributed to Aristophanes (*Frogs*, l. 1331). Κελαινοφαής is a rare term that only appears in Aristophanes, grammatical and lexical works and a Euripides' fragment (frag. 12, l. 19).[9]

2.1.2

οἳ πολλοὶ περὶ βόθρον ἐφοίτων ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος
θεσπεσίῃ ἰαχῇ· ἐμὲ δὲ χλωρὸν δέος ᾕρει. (*Od*. 11.42-3).

These came thronging in crowds about the pit from every side, with an astounding cry; and pale fear seized me. (Murray, 1919, p. 403).

ἐμὲ δὲ χλωρὸν δέος ᾕρει, τουτέστι χλωροποιὸν, ὠχρότητος ποιητικὸν, ὥσπερ καὶ νωθροὶ νότοι παρ' Ἱπποκράτει οἱ νωθροποιοί. καὶ τυφλὸν ὁ ἔρως ἤγουν τυφλοποιὸν, ἐπεὶ καὶ τυφλώττει τὸ φιλοῦν περὶ τὸ φιλούμενον. (1.398.45-399.1).

In this extract, the author comments on the phrase ἐμὲ δὲ χλωρὸν δέος ᾕρει ("pale fear seized me") with focus on the word χλωρόν. The adjective is explained as meaning the same as χλωροποιόν ("making green or pale", LSJ s.v. χλωρο-ποιός, όν), a compound that occurs from the terms χλωρός and the very common adjective derivative suffix ποιός from the verb ποιέω ("to do, make" LSJ s.v. ποιέω 1). It is also similar to the phrase ὠχρότητος ποιητικόν ("creating pallor"). Hesychius has the same explanation and is a bit more explicit. Eustathius paraphrases the passage

---

[5] ὁ τὰ νέφη μελαίνων.
[6] Ζεὺς δὲ κελαινεφὴς παρὰ τὸ κελαινὸς φαίνεσθαι· τοιοῦτος γὰρ ὁ ἀήρ. ἐντεῦθεν δὲ καὶ αἷμά που ἐρεῖ κελαινεφές. ἢ παρὰ τὸ κελαίνεσθαι καὶ νείφειν, οἰονεὶ κελαινονεφής.
[7] Ἰστέον δέ, ὅτι αἷμα μέν ἐστι κελαινεφὲς τὸ κελαινὸν φαινόμενον.
[8] Κελαινοφαής: ἀντὶ τοῦ μέλαινα. Ἀριστοφάνης Βατράχοις· ὦ νυκτὸς κελαινοφαὴς ὄρφνη.
[9] [κελαιν]οφαῆ τιν' αὐγάν.

τοιοῦτος γὰρ ὁ φόβος, χλωριάσεως ποιητικός from Hesychius (*Lexicon,* chi, 552) and substitutes the rare χλωρίασις ("greenish color, paleness" LSJ s.v. χλωρ-ίασις, εως, ἡ) for the much more common ὠχρότης.

He continues by explaining that the meaning of the words νωθροί ("falling into a heavy sleep" LSJ s.v. νωθρ-ός, ά, όν) and τυφλόν ("blind" LSJ s.v. τυφλός, ή, όν) have a similar meaning with the compounds that occur by combining them with the verb ποιέω ("to do, make"). For the first instance, he uses Hippocrates' phrase νωθροὶ νότοι (*Aphorisms*, 3.5.1-2),[10] which is the same as οἱ νωθροποιοί and translates to "making sluggish" (LSJ s.v. νωθρ-ός, ά, όν II). For the latter, he cites Gregorius Nazianzenus' phrase τυφλὸν ἔρως (*Carmina moralia,* 896). He discusses that love (ἔρως) make one blind (τυφλόν), similarly to τυφλοποιόν ("blinding", LSJ s.v. τυφλο-ποιός, όν). Interestingly, the adjective τυφλόν appears in the neuter gender, even though the noun love (ἔρως) is masculine, perhaps due to him using it in a more general sense.

Eustathius mentions χλωροποιόν three more times in his *Commentaries*, while explaining the meaning of other compound words that include the verb ποιέω. In the *Commentary on the Iliad* (1.239.26-27)[11] he explains that μαλακοί λόγοι ("soft, flattering words") can also be called μαλακοποιοί ("making soft"), in the same way as χλώρον and χλωροποιόν. In the *Commentary on the Odyssey* (1.25.30-32),[12] Eustathius mentions that ἄλκιμον ("stout, brave" LSJ s.v. ἄλκῐμος, ον) is an equivalent to ἀλκιμοποιόν ("making brave"). It needs to be noted that the latter adjective appears only in Eustathius in the TLG database. To further prove his point he uses the same examples, νωθροποιοί from Hippocrates and χλωροποιὸν from the Homeric phrase ἐμὲ δὲ χλωρὸν δέος ᾕρει. Lastly, in the end of the *Nekyia* rhapsody (1.442.9-10)[13] he comments again on the same phrase and states that χλωροποιόν and ὠχροποιόν are synonyms and translate to "making pale".

2.1.3

τοὺς δ᾽ ἐπεὶ εὐχωλῇσι λιτῇσί τε, ἔθνεα νεκρῶν,
ἐλλισάμην. (*Od.* 11.34-5).

But when with vows and prayers I had made supplication to the tribes of the dead. (Murray, 1919, p. 403).

Ἐτυμολογικὸν δὲ τὸ, λιτῇσιν ἐλισσάμην. τοῦτο δὲ καὶ γουνοῦσθαι ἀνωτέρω φησὶν, ὡς καὶ ἐν τῇ πρὸ ταύτης ῥαψῳδίᾳ. εἰς τοῦτο δὲ εἰπόντες οἱ παλαιοὶ πῶς γουνοῦται καὶ λίσσεται, εἰ μὴ προαισθάνονται πρινὴ πίωσιν αἱ ψυχαί; λύουσιν ἄλλως τε, καὶ διὰ τοῦ εἰπεῖν ὡς τιμὴν τοῦτο ποιεῖ τῶν δεσποτῶν, Πλούτωνος δηλαδὴ καὶ Περσεφόνης, ἐπαγγελλόμενος καὶ οὕτω δοκῶν γονυπετεῖν. (1.398.9-13).

---

[10] Νότοι βαρυήκοοι, ἀχλυώδεες, καρηβαρικοί, νωθροί, διαλυτικοί.

[11] Μαλακοὶ δὲ λόγοι οἱ κολακευτικοὶ καὶ ψυχὴν σκληρὰν μαλάσσοντες καί, ὡς εἰπεῖν, μαλακοποιοί, ὡς καὶ δέος χλωρὸν τὸ χλωροποιόν.

[12] ἔστι δὲ τὸ μὲν ἄλκιμον, μετηγμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ χρωμένου ἀλκίμου προσώπου, εἰς τὸ σκεῦος. ἢ τὸ ἀλκιμοποιόν. ὡς καὶ νωθρὸς νότος, ὁ νωθροποιὸς καὶ καρηβαρικός. καὶ δέος χλωρὸν, τὸ χλωροποιόν.

[13] χλωρὸν δὲ καὶ νῦν δέος τὸ χλωροποιὸν ἤτοι ὠχροποιὸν, ὡς καὶ οἶνος ἐρυθρὸς κατὰ τοὺς παλαιοὺς οὐ μόνον ὁ μέλας, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ ἐρυθροποιὸς τοῖς πίνουσιν.

In the second remark, Eustathius explains that the words λιτῆσιν ("prayer") and ἐλισσάμην ("begged") have a common etymology. They both derive from the verb λίσσομαι that translates to "beg", "pray". The first one is a form of the derivative noun λῐτή while the latter is the first singular aorist form of the verb. It is noted that in the previous rhapsody of the poem (*Od.*10.521), instead of using a form of the same verb, Homer used γουνοῦσθαι the present infinitive of the verb γουνόομαι, which also translates to "supplicate", but in the sense of "kneeling" (Autenrieth, 1895, p. 68).

2.1.4

νηὸς ἐπ᾽ ἀλλοτρίης· δήεις δ᾽ ἐν πήματα οἴκῳ. (*Od.* 11.115).

In a ship that is another's, and you shall find troubles in your house. (Murray, 1919, p. 409).

Τὸ δὲ δήεις, πρωτότυπόν ἐστι τῆς μυθικῆς Δηοῦς ἤτοι Δήμητρος ἤ φασιν ἁρπαγείσης αὐτῇ τῆς θυγατρὸς Περσεφόνης περιώδευεν ἐρευνῶσα, καὶ ὡς ἤκουε συχνὰ ἐκ τῶν παραμυθουμένων τὸ, δήεις τουτέστιν εὑρήσεις, ἐκλήθη ἐντεῦθεν Δηώ. (1.402.6-9).

In this short extract, the scholar focuses on the verb δήεις which translates to "find, meet with" (LSJ s.v. δήω (A)) and is always in present with future tense. Eustathius explains that the verb is connected to the mythological proper name Δηώ, which is the Attic short form of Δημήτηρ ("Demeter") (Graf, 2006). According to the myth, the goddess Demeter was persistently searching for her daughter Persephone who was abducted by Pluto (Graf, 2006) and because of her continuous efforts to find her she was eventually called Δηώ. Eustathius has already made a similar remark once before, in his *Commentary on the Iliad* (2.747.15-17).[14]

2.1.5

σῆμα δέ τοι ἐρέω μάλ᾽ ἀριφραδές, οὐδέ σε λήσει. (*Od.* 11.126).

And I will tell you a most certain sign, which will not escape you. (Murray, 1919, p. 409).

Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι σήματος ὅ πέρ ἐστι σημείου ὑποκοριστικὸν κοινότερον εὕρηται σημάτιον, κατὰ τὸ γράμμα γράμματος γραμμάτιον. σημάδιον δὲ εἰπεῖν ἀκολουθεῖ μὲν ἀναλογίᾳ τῇ, χεῖμα χειμάδιον, κατὰ τὸ βασιλέων χειμάδιον. (1.402.39-41).

Here, the author comments on the noun σῆμα ("sign, mark, token" LSJ s.v. σῆμα) and its diminutives. The most regular one, as stated by Eustathius, is the noun σημάτιον that is derived according to the analogy of γράμμα>γράμματος>γραμμάτιον ("letter"). The diminutive suffix ιον is affixed to the stem of the noun correctly, stating that the regularly derived diminutive of σῆμα is, or at least should be, σημάτιον. Even though

---

[14] Τοῦ δὲ «δήετε» παράγωγον ἡ τοῦ μύθου Δηώ, ἐπεί, φασίν, ἁρπαγεῖσαν τὴν θυγατέρα Κόρην ζητοῦσα ἤκουε πρὸς τῶν ἐντυγχανόντων ἐπὶ παραμυθίᾳ τὸ «δήεις», ὅ ἐστιν εὑρήσεις.

the noun γραμμάτιον seems as a common diminutive according to the TLG database and Eustathius follows the same grammatical rule in order to form the diminutive σημάτιον (σῆμα> σήματος> σημάτιον), it needs to be noted that the diminutive does not appear in the TLG database, except for this extract.

Eustathius then offers a second diminutive, σημάδιον, that originates in analogy to χεῖμα>χειμάδιον ("winter weather", LSJ s.v. χεῖμα, ατος, τό) and is commonly used. However, contrary to Eustathius' claim, it is probably derived from χειμάς>χειμάδος>χειμάδιος ("winter season", LSJ s.v. χειμ-άς, άδος, ἡ) and then the adjective χειμάδιος is substantivised and formed as χειμάδιον. In his attempt to explain χειμάδιον ("winter quarters", LSJ s.v. χειμάδ-ιον), he uses the phrase βασιλέων χειμάδιον ("an emperors' winter quarters"). It can also be found in his *Commentary on Dionysius Periegetes* (section 988, 18-19)[15] where he refers to an emperor's winter quarters in the town of Seleucia. It is evident that his source is Strabo's *Geographica* (11.13.1.6-7)[16] since he refers to him as the geographer in the aforementioned passage.

2.1.6

ὁππότε κεν δή τοι ξυμβλήμενος ἄλλος ὁδίτης
φήῃ ἀθηρηλοιγὸν ἔχειν ἀνὰ φαιδίμῳ ὤμῳ. (*Od.* 11.127-128).

When another wayfarer, on meeting you, shall say that you have a winnowing fan on your stout shoulder. (Murray, 1919, p. 409).

ἀθηρηλοιγὸν, ὅ ἐστι πτύον, λικμητήριον, τὸ τῶν ἀθέρων ὀλοθρευτικόν. ἐξ ὧν καὶ τὸ ἀθερίζειν ἐν Ἰλιάδι. (1.402.44-45).

πλάτη γὰρ θαλασσία τὸ ἐρετμόν. καὶ πλάτη χερσαία τὸ πτύον. Σοφοκλῆς δὲ, φασὶ, παραφράζων τὸ Ὁμηρικὸν φησίν· ὤμοις ἀθηρόβρωτον ὄργανον φέρων. καὶ ὤφειλε μὲν ἀθερόβρωτον εἶναι, ἀθὴρ γὰρ ἀθέρος ὡς αἰθὴρ αἰθέρος, ἠκολούθησε δὲ τῷ ἀθηρολοιγός. ὃ καὶ αὐτὸ ἀθερηλοιγὸς ὀφεῖλον εἶναι, ὅμως δι' ἐκτάσεως ἐγράφη διὰ τοῦ η ὁμοίως τῷ, Μεθώνη Μηθώνη. Φέρης Φέρητος Φηρητιάδης, καὶ τοῖς τοιούτοις. πρὸς ὁμοιότητα δὲ τοῦ βροτολοιγὸς, σύγκειται ὁ ἀθηρηλοιγός. τοῦτο δὲ ἰσοδύναμον τῷ ἀθηρόβρωτος. καὶ οἱ μὲν παλαιότεροι οὕτως. οἱ δὲ νεώτεροι ἀθηρηλοιγὸν νοοῦσι τὴν κώταλιν, ἤγουν τὸ τῆς ἀθήρης κίνητρον, ἵνα ἀστείως ὁ ἠπειρώτης ἐκεῖνος ἐκφλυαρίζῃ τὴν κώπην τῇ πρὸς τορύνην ὅ ἐστι δοίδυκα ὁμοιότητι, καὶ ἔχει ἀκριβέστερον ἡ τοιαύτη ἑρμηνεία τοῦ ἀθηρηλοιγοῦ. (1.403.2-9).

In this extract, Eustathius makes an etymological remark regarding the term ἀθηρηλοιγός. He defines it as "winnowing-fan, shovel" (LSJ s.v. πτύον λικμ-ητήριον, τό). The definition is similar to the one offered in *Suda Lexicon* (alpha, 736)[17] as well as in *Scholia in Odysseam* (11.128).[18] In the following, he discusses the derivation of the words with focus on the vowels, since the compounds do not exhibit the expected vowel qualities. He refers to Sophocles (frag. 454)[19] who uses the adjective ἀθηρόβρωτον ("devouring chaff" LSJ s.v. ἀθηρόβρωτος, ον). He clarifies that the

---

[15] Ἐνεχθεὶς δὲ ἐπὶ Σελεύκειαν τὸ τῶν βασιλέων χειμάδιον.

[16] ὁ δὲ χειμάδιόν ἐστιν αὐτοῖς ἐν Σελευκείᾳ τῇ ἐπὶ τῷ Τίγριδι πλησίον Βαβυλῶνος.

[17] Ἀθηρηλοιγός: τὸ πτύον τὸ τοὺς ἀθέρας ὀλοθρεῦον.

[18] ἀθηρολοιγὸν] ὀξυτόνως. δηλοῖ δὲ τὸ πτύον.

[19] ὤμοις ἀθηρόβρωτον ὄργανον φέρων.

Sophoclean adjective should be written as ἀθερόβρωτον, following the ἀθήρ>ἀθέρος and αἰθήρ>αἰθέρος. Similarly, the Homeric ἀθερηλοιγός was modified to ἀθηρηλοιγός with the letter ε lengthened to η in the same manner as Μεθώνη>Μηθώνη and Φέρης>Φέρητος>Φηρητιάδης. Beekes (2010, p. 29) states "the two η's are surprising", although this feature is not uncommon in the epics due to potential metrical issues. Additionally, he comments on the etymology of the term. It is a compound word that occurs in the same way as βροτολοιγός ("plague of man" LSJ s.v. βροτο-λοιγός, όν). Both of them have λοιγός ("ruin, havoc" LSJ s.v. λοιγός (A), ὁ) as the second component of the words, with the first ones being ἀθήρ ("awn" LSJ s.v. ἀθήρ, έρος, ὁ) and βροτός ("mortal man" LSJ s.v. βροτός I) respectively. He finishes by mentioning the difference of the definitions offered by ancient and modern scholars. The first ones interpret ἀθηρηλοιγός as "devouring chaff" while newer scholars consider it to be a stirrer, a ladle for stirring gruel.

2.1.7

ἄφαρ δ' ἀνάπυστα θεοὶ θέσαν ἀνθρώποισιν. (*Od*. 11.274).

And soon the gods made these things known among men. (Murray, 1919, p. 421).

Ἀνάπυστα δὲ τὰ ἀκουστὰ ἢ φανερά, καὶ κατὰ τοὺς παλαιοὺς εἰπεῖν, ἀνὰ στόμα πᾶσι κείμενα πυνθάνεσθαι. γίνεται δὲ ἡ λέξις ἀπὸ τοῦ πεύθω πεύσω, ἐξ οὗ πύστις ἡ δι' ἐρωτήσεως μάθησις, ὡς ἐκ τοῦ κεύσω ἡ κύστις. ἐκ δὲ τοῦ πύστις ἄπυστον καὶ ἀνάπυστον, καὶ ἄλλως δὲ εἰπεῖν, ἐκ τοῦ πέπυσμαι, πέπυσται, πυστὸν τὸ ἀκουστὸν καὶ ἄπυστον τὸ ἀνήκουστον. καὶ μετὰ δευτέρας στερήσεως ἀάπυστον τὸ μὴ ἀνήκουστον, ἀλλὰ δηλαδὴ ἀκουστὸν, καὶ πλεονασμῷ τοῦ ν δι' εὐφωνίαν ἀνάπυστον. οὕτω καὶ γνωστὸν ἄγνωστον ἀάγνωστον καὶ ἀνάγνωστον, κατὰ τὸν εἰπόντα μηδὲν ἐθέλειν καλὸν ἔχειν ἀνάγνωστον ἀλλὰ δηλονότι πᾶσι γνωστόν. (1.414.14-20).

In this extract, the scholar gives an etymological explanation for the term ἀνάπυστος-ον ("well-known", "notorious" LSJ s.v. ἀνάπυστος, ον). He begins by giving the meaning of the word, "well-known", "heard". According to the ancient scholars, it has the meaning of "that is in the mouths of everybody" (ἀνὰ στόμα πᾶσι κείμενα πυνθάνεσθαι). Following this, he explains the origin of the adjective. Eustathius claims that it derives from the third singular person of the perfect tense of the verb πεύθω ("learn something from a person" LSJ s.v. πυνθάνομαι I), πέπυσται, which is derived from the noun πύστις ("inquiry, that which is learnt by asking", LSJ s.v. πύστις, εως, ἡ I-II), that originates from the future tense of the verb; πεύσω ("will give notice"). In a similar manner, the noun κύστις originates from the future tense of the verb κεύθω ("cover", "hide", LSJ s.v. κεύθω 1), κεύσω.

Eustathius claims that both ἄπυστον and ἀνάπυστον derive from πύστις ("inquiry", "that which is learnt by asking" LSJ s.v. πύστις I & II). Ἄπυστον ("not heard of", LSJ s.v. ἄπυστος, ον) is written with the ἀ- privative prefix. With a second privative ἀ- added, the word modifies to ἀάπυστος. With the double negation, the word gets the meaning of "that which is not unheard of" (τὸ μὴ ἀνήκουστον). In order for the term to become more euphonic, Eustathius explains that the letter ν is added in between the two privatives and the final form of the word occurs. In the same degree, beginning from the term γνωστός ("knowable") and its opposite ἄγνωστος ("unknown"), according to

Eustathius, the adjective ἀάγνωστος with two privative alphas occurs and it appears as ἀνάγνωστος-η-ον with a ν in its final form. Eustathius cites Callimachus (*Fragmenta incertae sedis*, frag. 620)[20] for this example. Even though he does not state Callimachus by name, he paraphrases his comment on the adjective γνωστὸς ("knowable"). A similar reference to Callimachus can be found in the *Commentary on the Iliad* (2.685.11-15).[21] Eustathius has also commented on this grammatical rule in his *Commentary on the Iliad* (3.639.9-14),[22] using the examples of ἀνάπηρος ("maimed, mutilated", LSJ s.v. ἀνάπηρ-ος, ον) and ἀνάπυστος ("notorious"). Even though the terms ἀάπυστος and ἀάγνωστος are not attested elsewhere, the theory of the double ἀ-privative prefix does not originate with Eustathius. It is attested at least in Orion (*Etymologicum,* alpha, p. 31, l. 1-7).[23]

2.1.8

καὶ μὴν Σίσυφον εἰσεῖδον κρατέρ' ἄλγε' ἔχοντα,
λᾶαν βαστάζοντα πελώριον ἀμφοτέρῃσιν. (*Od.* 11.593-594).

Yes, and I saw Sisyphus in bitter torment, seeking to raise a monstrous stone with his two hands. (Murray, 1919, p. 443).

δῆλον δὲ καὶ ὅτι Δωρικὸν ἅμα καὶ Αἰολικὸν ὄνομα τὸ Σίσυφος. σιοὺς μὲν γὰρ οἱ Δωριεῖς φασι τοὺς θεούς, ὡς καὶ ὁ κωμικὸς δηλοῖ ἐν τῷ, ναὶ τὼ σιώ, ἀντὶ τοῦ νὴ τοὺς θεοὺς ἢ τὰς θεάς. σύφος δὲ ὁ σοφὸς παρὰ Αἰολεῦσιν. ὅθεν Σίσυφος ὁ θεόσοφος. καὶ εἰκὸς Κορινθίων διαλέκτου εἶναι τὴν λέξιν, παρ' οἷς δωρίζουσιν ἦρχεν ὁ Σίσυφος. ὡς δὲ οἱ Δωριεῖς ἔχαιρον καὶ αἰολίζοντες, δηλοῖ Πίνδαρος ἀναμὶξ οὕτω ποιῶν, ἤτοι καὶ Δωρικῶς γράφων καὶ Αἰολικῶς. (1.438.34-39).

Τοῦ δὲ εἰρημένου σιοῦ παράγωγον καὶ ὁ θίασος, καθὰ δηλοῖ ὁ δειπνοσοφιστὴς, λέγων, ὅτι ἔρανοι εἰσὶ κατὰ τοὺς πολλοὺς αἱ ἀπὸ τῶν συμβαλλομένων εἰσαγωγαί, ἀπὸ τοῦ συνερᾶσθαί φησι καὶ συμφέρειν ἕκαστον. ἐκαλοῦντο δὲ καὶ θίασοι. καὶ οἱ συνιόντες ἐπὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐρανισταὶ καὶ συνθιασῶται. ἐκαλεῖτο δέ φησι θίασος καὶ ὁ τῷ Διονύσῳ παρεπόμενος ὄχλος ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ὃν σιὸν ἐκάλουν οἱ Λάκωνες. οὐκοῦν σίασος καὶ τροπῇ θίασος, καθὰ καὶ ὁ βρυχησμὸς ὡς μαχησμός, καὶ τροπῇ ὁμοίᾳ βρυχηθμός. οὕτω δὲ καὶ ὠρύω ὠρυσμός, ὡς ῥύω καὶ ξύω ῥυσμὸς καὶ ξυσμός, καὶ μεταβολῇ ὁμοίᾳ τοῦ σ εἰς θ ὠρυθμὸς παρὰ Κοΐντῳ. (1.438.40-45).

---

[20] ἄγνωτον μηδὲν ἔχοιμι καλόν.

[21] Σημείωσαι δὲ καὶ ὅτι ἐν τῷ «ἀνάεδνον» δύο κεῖνται στερήσεις ἀντὶ μιᾶς, μεσολαβηθέντος τοῦ ν διὰ μόνην εὐφωνίαν. Οὕτω καὶ ἀνάγνωστον τὸ ἄγνωστον ἐν τῷ «μηδὲν ἀνάγνωστον καλὸν ἔχοιμι». Εἰ δὲ κατά τινας ἡ ἀνά πρόθεσις δύναται καὶ στέρησιν ἔστιν ὅτε δηλοῦν, εἴη ἂν οὕτως ἀνάεδνον καὶ ἐνταῦθα τὸ ἄπροικον.

[22] τοιοῦτον καὶ τὸ ἀνάπηρος καὶ ἐν Ὀδυσσείᾳ τὸ ἀνάπυστα, ἐν οἷς δηλοῦται ὁ πεπηρωμένος καὶ τὸ πυστόν, ἤτοι ἀκουστόν, πλεονασμῷ τοῦ νῦ διὰ καλλιφωνίαν. ἄπηρος μὲν γὰρ ὁ μὴ ἔχων πήρωσιν, ἀνάπηρος δὲ ὁ ἐστερημένος τῆς τοιαύτης στερήσεως. οὕτω δὲ καὶ ἄπυστος μὲν ὁ στερηθεὶς τοῦ ἀκουσθῆναι, ἀνάπυστος δὲ ὁ ἀκουσθεὶς διὰ τὸ ἐστερῆσθαι τῆς τοῦ ἀπύστου στερήσεως. Τοιοῦτον δέ που εἶναι προεδηλώθη καὶ τὸ ἀνάγνωστος ὁ ἐγνωσμένος.

[23] Ἀναλογία, ὅθεν τὸ ἀκόλουθον, καὶ κατὰ λόγον δύο στερήσεις ἔχει ἡ λέξις· αἵτινες ὁμοῦ οὖσαι κατάθεσιν δηλοῦσιν, ὡς πηρὸς καὶ ἀνάπηρος ὁ πεπηρωμένος. ἔστιν οὖν ὁ λόγος, ἄλογος, ἀλογία, καὶ μετὰ τῆς α στερήσεως, καὶ ἄλλη στέρησις, ἀναλογία. τοιοῦτον δὲ ἐστὶ καὶ τὸ ἀνάπυστα, τὰ περιβόητα· ἐπλεόνασε δὲ τὸν ἐν τῇ λέξει τῇ ἀναλογίᾳ, ὡς ἐν τῷ ἀναίσχυντος, ἀναιδής.

ἔτι ὅρα καὶ τὸ, αἱ ἀπὸ τῶν συμβαλλομένων εἰσαγωγαὶ, ὅ πέρ ἐστι περίφρασις τοῦ, αἱ συμβολαὶ, αἱ συμποσιακαὶ δηλαδὴ, ὧν δήλωσις καὶ ἐν τῇ α̅ ῥαψῳδίᾳ τέθειται. (1.439.3-4).

In this remark, Eustathius discusses the etymology of the proper name Σίσυφος ("Sisyphus") and the noun θίασος ("Bacchic revel, feast", LSJ S.V. θῐᾰσ-ος).

Concerning the term Σίσυφος, the author states that it is a compound word, which derives from two dialects, Doric and Aeolic. The first part originates from the Doric dialect. "God", in Doric, is named σιός instead of θεός. Eustathius explains that with reference to Aristophanes, in whose comedies the Doric form is used (*Pax*, l. 214 & *Lysistrata*, l. 81, 86, 90, 142, 983, 1095, 1105, 1174, 1180). Σύφος is the Aeolic term for σοφός ("wise"). Thus, Σίσυφος has the meaning of θεόσοφος ("wise in the things of God", LSJ s.v. θεόσοφ-ος, ον).

In this context, Eustathius also discusses the derivation of θίασος from the aforementioned σιός ("God"). As Athenaeus mentions in the *Deipnosophistae* (2,1.173.35-174.1),[24] θίασος is a synonym to ἔρανος when it holds the meaning of "feast". It has a similar sense to αἱ ἀπὸ τῶν συμβαλλομένων εἰσαγωγαί, which, Eustathius defines as "convivial gatherings" (συμποσιακαί συμβολαί).

The participants of the feasts (συνιόντες) are also named ἐρανισταί ("members of an ἔρανος", LSJ s.v. ἐρᾰν-ιστής, οῦ, ὁ) and συνθιασῶται ("partners in the θίασος", LSJ s.v. συνθῐᾰσ-ώτης, ου, ὁ), nouns that derive from the above-mentioned terms ἔρανος and θίασος respectively. Lastly, Athenaeus discusses that the term θίασος also refers to the crowd of Dionysus. The scholar addresses the similarity in the meanings of ἔρανος and συμβολή in the first chapter of the *Commentary on the Odyssey* (1.42.7-8).[25] Regarding the etymology of θίασος, Eustathius explains that originally it was spelled as σίασος since it originates from σιός and the letter σ converted to θ.

As the scholar claims, the same change occurs in the nouns βρυχησμός ("roaring") and ὠρυσμὸς ("howling") that convert to βρυχηθμός and ὠρυθμός correspondingly. It needs to be noted that the term ὠρυσμός only appears in this passage in the TLG database. Instances of the term ὠρυθμός can be found in Quintus' *Posthomerica* (13.101 & 14.287).[26] Eustathius makes the same reference to Quintus twice in the *Commentary on the Iliad* (1.551.23 & 2.201.3)[27] as well as in this particular chapter of the *Commentary on the Odyssey* (1.422.32),[28] when he explains that κηληθμός ("rapture, enchantment", LSJ s.v. κηλ-ηθμός, ὁ) occurs correspondingly to ὠρυθμός. Nonetheless, he does not name Quintus in that passage.

2.1.9

---

[24] ἔρανοι δ' εἰσὶν αἱ ἀπὸ τῶν συμβαλλομένων εἰσαγωγαὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ συνερᾶν καὶ συμφέρειν ἕκαστον. καλεῖται δὲ ὁ ἔρανος καὶ θίασος καὶ οἱ συνιόντες ἐρανισταὶ καὶ συνθιασῶται. καλεῖται δὲ καὶ ὁ τῷ Διονύσῳ παρεπόμενος ὄχλος θίασος ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὺς τοὺς θεοὺς οἱ Λάκωνες σιοὺς φασί.

[25] ἔκ τινος καὶ αὐτὰ γινόμενα συμβολῆς καθὰ καὶ ἡ συμβουλὴ, πρὸς ὁμοιότητα ἐράνου.

[26] ὠρυθμός, στοναχὴ δὲ δαϊκταμένων αἰζηῶν & ὠρυθμῷ, στυγερὴ δὲ δι' ἠέρος ἔσσυτ' αὐτή.

[27] κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὠρυθμὸς παρὰ Κοΐντῳ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὁμοίοις & ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ μηνιθμός καὶ παρὰ Κοΐντῳ δὲ ὠρυθμός.

[28] ἀναλογίας δέ ἐστιν ὁ κηληθμὸς τῆς κατὰ τὸν ὀρχηθμὸν καὶ βρυχηθμὸν καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα.

ἥρω’ Εὐρύπυλον· πολλοὶ δ’ ἀμφ’ αὐτὸν ἑταῖροι
Κήτειοι κτείνοντο γυναίων εἵνεκα δώρων. (*Od*. 11.520-521).

The hero Eurypylus!—and many of his comrades, the Ceteians, were slain about him, because of gifts a woman craved. (Murray, 1919, p. 439).

Κήτειοι δὲ κατὰ μὲν Ἀρίσταρχον οἱ μεγάλοι παρὰ τὸ κῆτος, κατὰ ἀναλογίαν τοῦ, κῆδος κήδειος καὶ τῶν ὁμοίων. ἐν οἷς καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ γήρος ἀκάνθης ἐξάνθημα παρὰ τῷ Ἀράτῳ τὸ γήρειον, ὡς ἐν τοῖς εἰς τὴν Ἰλιάδα διεσαφήθη. ἐν δὲ τοῖς τοιούτοις εἰ ζητεῖται διὰ τί τὸ σκότιος, οἷον, σκότιον δὲ ἐγείνατο μήτηρ, ἔτι δὲ καὶ τὸ, σκοτίους ἀπιόντας διὰ τῆς πολεμίας, οὐκ ἐγράφησαν διὰ τῆς ει διφθόγγου ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ σκότος, ὁμοίως τῷ, κῆτος κήτειος καὶ τοῖς κατ’ αὐτὸ, ῥητέον ὅτι γίνεται μὲν σκότιος ἐκ τοῦ σκότος, πλὴν οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ οὐδετέρου ἀλλὰ τοῦ Ἀττικωτέρου ἀρσενικοῦ, κατὰ τὸ, δόλος δόλιος, νόμος νόμιος. (1.431.31-37).

Here, the scholar analyzes the term Κήτειοι, regarding its etymology and meaning. Firstly, he explains that it originates from the term κῆτος (“any sea-monster or huge fish”, LSJ s.v. κῆτος, εος, τό) and translates to “monstrous”, according to Aristarchus. In a similar manner, the terms κήδειος and γήρειον, derive from κῆδος (“care about”, LSJ s.v. κῆδ-ος, Dor. κᾶδος, εος, τό) and γῆρος (“old age”, LSJ s.v. γῆρας, τό) sequentially. The latter example and its source, Aratus’ *Phaenomena* (1.921)[29] has already been discussed in the *Commentary on the Iliad* (4.881.22-882.2).[30]

Following this, Eustathius says tha the adjective σκότιος (“in the dark, in secret”, LSJ s.v. σκότ-ιος, α, ον I) that originates from σκότος (“darkness”, “gloom” LSJ s.v. σκότος, ὁ) and quotes two instances, one that occurs in *Etymologicum Gudianum* (nu, p. 410, l. 32)[31] and one in the *Suda Lexicon* (alpha, 2047)[32] in which the term is spelled with the letter ι instead of the diphthong ει. The reason for this is that the adjective derives not from the neuter form of the noun but the masculine, which is more “Attic”, according to Eustathius, meaning less poetic. In accordance with σκότιος, δόλος (”any trick or stratagem”, LSJ s.v. δόλος (A), ὁ I b) produces δόλιος (“crafty, deceitful”, LSJ s.v. δόλιος, α, ον), and from νόμος (“usage, custom, law”, LSJ s.v. νόμος, ὁ I) νόμιος (“shepherd, pastoral”, LSJ s.v. νόμιος (A), α, ον) occurs.

A variety of instances where Eustathius makes similar comments regarding the diphthongs can be found in this chapter.

2.1.10

ὅτι δὲ καὶ ἕτερος παραφέρεται ἥρως, φωνῆς μὲν κοινωνῶν τῷ εἰρημένῳ Νηλεῖ, γραφῆς δὲ οὔ, ἐκεῖνος γὰρ ἐν διφθόγγῳ ἔχει τὴν παραλήγουσαν, δηλοῖ σὺν τοῖς ἄλλοις ἱστορικοῖς καὶ ὁ γράψας τεχνικὸς τὸ Νειλεὺς ἐν διφθόγγῳ, οὐχ’ ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ Νέστορος ἀλλ’ ὁ Ἀττικὸς, ὁ καὶ Νείλεως, οὗ γενικὴ Νείλεω, ὡς Μενέλεω. (1.410.44-411.3).

---

[29] Ἤδη καὶ πάπποι, λευκῆς γήρειον ἀκάνθης.
[30] λευκῆς δὲ γήρειον ἀκάνθης ὁριστικῶς· ἐν οἷς τὸ γήρειον ἐκ τοῦ γήρος γίνεται οὐδετέρου ἑνικοῦ ὀνόματος ὁμοίως τῷ κῆτος κήτειος, κῆδος κήδειος, καὶ τοῖς τοιούτοις.
[31] σκότιον δὲ ἐγείνατο μήτηρ.
[32] σκοτίους ἀπιόντας διὰ τῆς πολεμίας.

In this passage, Eustathius analyzes the spelling of the proper name Νηλεύς ("Neleus") (*Od.* 11.254,281,288).[33] His source is presumably Aelius Herodianus, even though he does not state his name. Eustathius explains that the name appears with two forms, Νηλεύς and Νειλεύς, with the letter η or the diphthong ει in the first syllable. He explains that the latter form refers to Neleus from Attica and not from Pylus. Added to that, it can appear as Νείλεως and is declined in the same manner as the proper name Μενέλεως. In the *Commentary on the Iliad,* the scholar states that η turns to the diphthong ει according to the Boeotian dialect (3.307.26).[34] The remarks initially emerge in *Περί Ὀρθογραφίας* (3,2.450.24-26 & 3,2.554.3-5).[35]

2.1.11

Τὸ δὲ ἀπειλήτην ἢ καύχημα ἢ σφοδρότητα λόγου δηλοῖ. διττὴ δὲ ἡ γραφὴ τῆς παραληγούσης τοῦ ἀπειλείτην. διὰ διφθόγγου μὲν, ὡς ἀπὸ παρατατικοῦ τοῦ ἠπείλεον, διὰ τοῦ η δὲ, ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἠπειλησάτην κατὰ συγκοπήν. (1.420.9-11).

Again, in this extract, the author draws on Aelius Herodianus as his source *(Περί παθῶν,* 3,2.263.9-12).[36] He gives an explanation on the two spellings of the term "ἀπειλήτην" ("threaten") *(Od.* 11.313).[37] It is either written as ἀπειλήτην with an η on the penultimate syllable or as ἀπειλείτην with a diphthong. The first one is explained to be from the aorist form of the verb, ἠπειλησάτην following a syncope by removing the syllable σα. The latter is the regular form of the imperfect tense ἠπείλεον.

2.1.12

πρὶν γάρ κεν καὶ νύξ φησι φθεῖσθαι ἄμβροτος, ἤγουν οὐκ ἂν διὰ πάσης νυκτὸς περατωθείη ὁ περὶ τούτων λόγος. Τὸ δὲ φθεῖται οὐκ εὔδηλον εἴτε διὰ διφθόγγου, ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ φθέω φθῶ, εἴτε διὰ τοῦ ι ὡς ἐκ τοῦ φθίω. πλεονάζει δὲ ἡ διὰ διφθόγγου γραφή, ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ ῥηθέντος φθῶ. οὗ περ οὐ μόνον τὸ φθείρω παράγωγον, ὡς τοῦ φθῶ τὸ φθείρω, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ φθίνω, ὁμοίως τῷ κλῶ κλίνω. (1.422.18-22).

Lastly, Eustathius comments on the third person singular form φθῖτ' *(Od.* 11.330),[38] that in the modern edition of the *Odyssey* appears with an ι. However, when he paraphrases the Homeric verse, he writes the term as the infinitive form φθεῖσθαι, with

---

[33] ἡ δ' ὑποκυσαμένη Πελίην τέκε καὶ Νηλῆα, καὶ Χλῶριν εἶδον περικαλλέα, τήν ποτε Νηλεὺς & τὴν πάντες μνώοντο περικτίται· οὐδέ τι Νηλεὺς.

[34] καὶ ὁ Νηλεύς, ἔτρεψε δὲ Βοιωτικῶς τὸ η εἰς δίφθογγον, ἵνα πάντη ἀσυνέμπτωτα εἶεν ἡ τοῦ Νηλέως γενικὴ καὶ ὁ Νείλεως.

[35] διὰ τὸ Νειλεύς· τοῦτο γὰρ διὰ τῆς ει διφθόγγου γράφεται· οὐκ ἐπὶ τοῦ Νηλέως τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ Νέστορος, ἐκεῖνο γὰρ διὰ τοῦ η γράφεται, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τοῦ λεγομένου Ἀττικῶς οἷον ὁ Νείλεως τοῦ Νείλεω. & καὶ ἡ Νηλέως γενικὴ ἀπὸ τοῦ Νηλεύς εὐθείας μετάγεται εἰς εὐθεῖαν καὶ προπαροξύνεται οἷον Νείλεως κατὰ τροπὴν τῶν Βοιωτῶν τοῦ η εἰς ει δίφθογγον ὥσπερ οὐτήσω ὠτειλή.

[36] ἀπειλήτην: ἀπειλῶ ἀπειλήσω ἠπείλησα ἠπειλησάτην δυϊκῶς καὶ συγκοπῇ τῆς σα συλλαβῆς ἀπειλήτην. ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀπειλῶ ἠπείλουν τὸ δυϊκὸν ἠπειλεῖτον ἠπειλήτην συστολῇ τῆς ἀρχῆς καὶ τροπῇ τῆς ει διφθόγγου εἰς τὸ η ἀπειλήτην.

[37] οἵ ῥα καὶ ἀθανάτοισιν ἀπειλήτην ἐν Ὀλύμπῳ.

[38] πρὶν γάρ κεν καὶ νὺξ φθῖτ' ἄμβροτος. ἀλλὰ καὶ ὥρη.

the dipthong ει. He states that it is not clear whether it is spelled with the letter ι, coming from the form φθίω or the diphthong ει, originating from φθέω φθῶ. The latter appears to be redundant. Φθείρω ("destroy", "waste" LSJ s.v. φθείρω) with ει and φθίνω ("wane" LSJ s.v. φθίω I) with ι are both derivatives of φθίω.

2.1.13

ὣς ἐφάμην, ψυχὴ δὲ ποδώκεος Αἰακίδαο
φοίτα μακρὰ βιβᾶσα κατ᾽ ἀσφοδελὸν λειμῶνα,
γηθοσύνη, ὅ οἱ υἱὸν ἔφην ἀριδείκετον εἶναι. *(Od.* 11.538-540).

So I spoke, and the ghost of the grandson of Aeacus departed with long strides over the field of asphodel, joyful in that I said that his son was preeminent. (Murray, 1919, p. 439).

Τὸ δὲ κατ᾽ ἀσφοδελὸν λειμῶνα οἱ‿μὲν συναλείφουσι καὶ φασὶ τετρασυλλάβως ἀσφοδελόν, εἰσὶ δὲ οἳ καὶ χωρὶς τοῦ ā γράφουσι σφοδελόν, καὶ φέρεται ἀμφοτέρως, ὡς καὶ ἀσταφὶς καὶ σταφὶς, καὶ ἄσταχυς καὶ στάχυς, ἄλλοι δὲ σποδελὸν διὰ τὴν σποδὸν τῶν καιομένων νεκρῶν. διὸ καὶ ὁ ἀσφοδελὸς ἢ σφοδελὸς ὠκείωται νεκροῖς διὰ τὸ πρὸς τὴν σποδὸν ὁμοιόφωνον καὶ ἐφυτεύετο ἐν τοῖς τάφοις τὸ τοιοῦτον φυτὸν, ὡς δηλοῖ καί τι τῶν παρὰ τῷ Πορφυρίῳ ἐπιγραμμάτων, λέγον, ὡς ἀπό τινος τάφου, ὅτι νώτῳ μὲν μαλάχην καὶ ἀσφόδελον πολύριζον, κόλπῳ δὲ τὸν δεῖνα ἔχω. ὅτι δὲ καὶ πολύριζον ὁ ἀσφόδελος, ἡ πεῖρα δηλοῖ. γνώριμος δέ ἐστι καὶ ἐξ ὀνόματος εἰ καὶ βαρβαρίζεται παρά τισιν. ὀξύνεται δὲ ὁ Ὁμηρικὸς οὗτος ἀσφοδελὸς πρὸς διαστολὴν, ὡς περιεκτικὸς ὢν ἀσφοδέλων. ἀσφόδελος μὲν γὰρ προπαροξυτόνως τὸ φυτὸν κατὰ Ἐρέννιον Φίλωνα, ἀσφοδελὸς δὲ ὀξυτόνως, ὁ αὐτοῦ τόπος. (1.433.19-28).

In this extract, Eustathius focuses on the term ἀσφοδελός ("asphodel"). He explains that it is spelled with four or three syllables, ἀσφοδελός or σφοδελός without a prothetic α, respectively. It follows the same manner as the terms ἀσταφίς or σταφίς ("dried grapes, raisins") and ἄσταχυς or στάχυς ("ear of corn"). He discusses a third spelling σποδελός with the letter π instead of φ, originating from the term σποδός ("ashes"). In this occasion, Aelius Herodianus is surely his source, since extracts of the above-mentioned comment appear in the preceding *Περὶ ὀδυσσειακῆς προσῳδίας* (3,2.152.17-19).[39] The asphodel is a plant that is related to the dead, thus it is planted at graves, according to a parallel which illustrates the interpretation that a grave says "on my back there are mallows and asphodels with many roots in by bosom" (Aristoteles et Corpus Aristotelicum, *Fragmenta Varia,* 644).[40]

Lastly, regarding the accent of the term, in the Homeric texts it has an acute accent on the last syllable. Herenius Philo in *De diversis verborum significationibus* (alpha, 29),[41] whom Eustathius cites in this passage, explains that when the term has an acute accent on the last syllable, it is a comprehensive noun and refers to a place containing asphodels. On the other hand, when it is spelled with an acute accent on the antepenultimate, it has the more specific meaning of the plant asphodel.

---

[39] κατ᾽ ἀσφοδελὸν λειμῶνα: ὀξυτόνως. ἄδηλον δὲ πότερον σφοδελόν ἢ ἀσφοδελόν. λέγεται γὰρ καὶ χωρὶς τοῦ ā. τινὲς δὲ γράφουσι σποδελόν διὰ τὴν σποδὸν τῶν καιομένων νεκρῶν.
[40] ὡς δηλοῖ καί τι τῶν παρὰ τῷ Πορφυρίῳ ἐπιγραμμάτων λέγον ὡς ἀπό τινος τάφου ὅτι „νώτῳ μὲν μαλάχην <τε> καὶ ἀσφόδελον πολύριζον, κόλπῳ δὲ τὸν δεῖνα ἔχω".
[41] [ὀ]ξυτονούμενον δὲ τὸν τόπον, ἐν ᾧ ὁ ἀσφόδελος γίνεται.

2.2 EXEGETICAL COMMENTS

In this sub-category, I focus on comments in which Eustathius offers explanations and interprets Homeric terms and phrases. There are six remarks in total.

2.2.1

ἔνθα δὲ Κιμμερίων ἀνδρῶν δῆμός τε πόλις τε. (*Od.* 11.14).

Where is the land and city of the Cimmerians. (Murray, 1919, p. 401).

δοκεῖ γὰρ παραδηλοῦν κατὰ τὸν ἦχον τῆς προφορᾶς ἡ λέξις, τοὺς περὶ ἠρία κειμένους ἢ περὶ ἔραν, ὡς οἷον νερτέρους. Κράτης μέντοι κερβερίους γράφει, ἀκολουθήσας οἶμαι τῷ κωμικῷ, τόπον τοὺς βερβερίους παίζοντι. ἕτεροι δὲ Χειμερίους τούτους ἔγραψαν, ἐκ τῶν ἀληθῶν ἴσως Κιμμερίων τοὔνομα πορισάμενοι. βορειότατοι γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι καὶ διὰ τοῦτο χειμέριοι. (1.396.32-36).

Here, Eustathius makes a remark about the Cimmerians' name and states various forms of it, as well as their sources. Firstly, the word's pronunciation insinuates those who lie down either on a tomb (τοὺς περὶ ἠρία κειμένους) or on the ground (τοὺς περὶ ἔραν κειμένους), meaning the dead.

Aristophanes in *Frogs* (l. 187)[42] and later Crates, as Eustathius claims, refer to them as Κερβέριοι ("Cerberians") from the hound dog of Hades, Cerberus that guards the gates of the Netherworld. Other sources that he does not name, call them Χειμερίους ("wintry", LSJ s.v. χειμέρ-ιος, α, ον), presumably from the fact that they come from the North. Aelius Herodianus in *Περί Ὀρθογραφίας* (3,2.534.10)[43] discusses that Proteus Zeugmatites is the one that referred to them as Χειμερίους. This remark is congruent to the one in *Scholia in Odysseam* (11.14.1-3).[44]

2.2.2

ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι, τοὶ οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχουσι,
πᾶσι μάλ' ἑξείης. θάνατος δέ τοι ἐξ ἁλὸς αὐτῷ
ἀβληχρὸς μάλα τοῖος ἐλεύσεται, ὅς κέ σε πέφνῃ
γήρᾳ ὕπο λιπαρῷ ἀρημένον· ἀμφὶ δὲ λαοὶ
ὄλβιοι ἔσσονται. τὰ δέ τοι νημερτέα εἴρω. (*Od.* 11.133-137).

To the immortal gods who hold broad heaven, to each one in due order. And death shall come to you yourself away from the sea, the gentlest imaginable, that shall lay you low

---

when you are overcome with sleek old age, and your people shall be dwelling in prosperity around you. This is the truth that I tell you. (Murray, 1919, p. 411).

Θάνατος δὲ ἔξαλος ὁ ἠπειρωτικὸς καὶ ἔξω θαλάσσης, ἵνα λέγῃ ὅτι εἰ καὶ δυστυχεῖς ὦ Ὀδυσσεῦ κατὰ θάλασσαν, ἀλλ’ ὁ θάνατός σοι οὐκ ἐν αὐτῇ ἔσται ἀλλ’ ἔξω αὐτῆς. τινὲς δὲ ἐξ ἁλὸς γράφουσι κατὰ παράθεσιν ἐν δισὶ μέρεσι λόγου, λέγοντες ὡς Τηλεγόνος ὁ Κίρκης καὶ Ὀδυσσέως ἡφαιστότευκτον δόρυ ἔχων οὗ ἀδαμαντίνη μὲν ἡ ἐπιδορατίς, αἰχμὴ δὲ κέντρον θαλαττίας τρυγόνος, χρυσοῦς δὲ ὁ στύραξ. (1.404.23-27).

καὶ οὕτω τῷ κατὰ θάλασσαν ἀεὶ κακῶς πράττοντι ἐκ θαλάττης αὖθις ὁ θάνατος, ὃς ἔπεφνεν αὐτόν. (1.404.28-29).

Ἰστέον δὲ καὶ ὅτι εἴτε ἔξαλος γράφει τις εἴτε ἐξ ἁλὸς, λοξότητα χρησμοῦ μιμεῖται ὁ τοιοῦτος λόγος τοῦ Τειρεσίου διὰ τὸ ἀσαφὲς καὶ δυσεξήγητον. Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι ὁ παρὰ τοῖς μεθ’ Ὅμηρον ἐν δυσὶ λ̄ ἔξαλλος ἄλλο τι παντελῶς ἐστι παρὰ τὸν Ὁμηρικὸν ἔξαλον. καὶ δηλοῖ αὐτὸ καὶ ἡ ἔξαλλος στολή, ὅ πέρ ἐστιν ἡ ἐξέχουσα τῶν ἄλλων καὶ οὕτω παρεξηλλαγμένη. Ἀβληχρὸς δὲ θάνατος ὁ ἀσθενὴς καὶ ἠρεμαῖος διὰ τὸ ἄνοσον, ὁποῖος ὁ ἐν γήρᾳ μάλιστα λιπαρῷ. καὶ τοῦτο μὲν κατὰ τὴν ἔννοιαν τοῦ ἔξαλος. (1.404.35-40).

In these remarks, Eustathius refers to the part of Tiresias’ prophecy that concerns Odysseus’ death and analyzes the phrase ἐξ ἁλός. He explains that the term can appear as either one or two words, ἔξαλος or ἐξ ἁλός. Even though it could be translated similarly in both instances, as “away from the sea”, the scholar points out that the term, when written as ἐξ ἁλός, could have a second meaning. The preposition ἐξ has, among other meanings, the sense of cause and removal (LSJ s.v. ἐκ III 6 & C). Thus, the phrase is ambiguous and up for interpretation, since it could also be translated as “because of the sea”. Homer’s intention when phrasing it in that way was for the prophecy to be vague and not make clear if Odysseus will die away from the sea or because of it. This passage follows *Scholia in Odysseam* where the same interpretation is offered (11.134.7-9).[45]

Although Homer does not refer to Odysseus’ death, Hesiod mentions in *Theogony* (1011-1014)[46] that one of Odysseus and Circe’s sons, Telegonus, while in search of his father, unintentionally kills him in Ithaca. He uses a lance, the tip of which was made from a poisonous ray, by Hephaestus. Thus, his death occurs because of the sea (Zimmermann, 2006).

Lastly, Eustathius comments on the meaning of the adjectives ἔξαλλος and ἀβληχρός. Regarding the first one, when spelled with two λ’s, ἔξαλλος acquires the meaning of “special”, “distinguishing” (LSJ s.v. ἔξαλλος, ον). As an example, he uses the phrase ἔξαλλος στολή, an armament that is different and standing out. As for the latter, ἀβληχρός, when referring to death, it has the meaning of “easy” (LSJ s.v. ἀβληχρός, ά, όν) and is related to the adjective ἔξαλος. An easy death for Odysseus is the one that will occur in his sleek old age, away from the sea that is the cause of his sadness.

---

[45] τὸ ἔξαλος ὡς ἔκβιος, οἷον ἠπειρωτικὸς καὶ οὐ θαλάσσιος. ἔνιοι δὲ κατὰ παράθεσιν, ἐξ ἁλός, οἷον ἀπὸ θαλάσσης, ὡς τὸ "ἐπισσεύῃ μέγα δαίμων ἐξ ἁλός".

[46] Κίρκη δ’ Ἡελίου θυγάτηρ Ὑπεριονίδαο γείνατ’ Ὀδυσσῆος ταλασίφρονος ἐν φιλότητι Ἄγριον ἠδὲ Λατῖνον ἀμύμονά τε κρατερόν τε· [Τηλέγονον δὲ ἔτικτε διὰ χρυσῆν Ἀφροδίτην·].

2.2.3

ἔνθ᾽ ἱερήϊα μὲν Περιμήδης Εὐρύλοχός τε
ἔσχον. (*Od*. 11.23-4).

Here Perimedes and Eurylochus held the victims. (Murray, 1919, p. 403).

Ὅτι Ὁμήρου εἰπόντος ἱερήϊα τὰ ἐν Ἅιδου σφάγια ἐπὶ χοῇ νεκρῶν, φασὶν οἱ παλαιοὶ οὐκ ὀρθῶς εἰρῆσθαι τοῦτο, ἐπὶ γὰρ νεκρῶν τόμια φασὶ καὶ ἔντομα, ἐπὶ δὲ θεῶν ἱερεῖα. εἶτα θεραπεύοντες φασὶν ὅτι ἱερεῖα καὶ ἁπλῶς τὰ θρέμματα. ἐν ἄλλοις δὲ Ἀττικὴ λέγεται ἡ λέξις ἐπὶ τῶν ἁπλῶς σφαζομένων. (1.398.3-4).

In this comment, which is identical to one in *Scholia in Odysseam* (11.23.1-3),[47] Eustathius analyzes the usage of the Homeric word ἱερήϊα ("offering for the dead" LSJ s.v. ἱερεῖον I.2). According to ancient commentators whom the author does not cite by name, this noun is not suitable when referring to sacrifices to the dead. Instead, it is more appropriate to be used when mentioning sacrifices to the Gods. For the first instance, the nouns τόμια and ἔντομα ("victims cut up for sacrifices") appear to be options that are more appropriate. Other scholars, "the ones who try to cure the problem" as he calls them, claim that ἱερεῖα, is also used simply about sheep. The noun has two possible forms in plural, ἱερήϊα and ἱερεῖα, with the only difference occurring in the penultimate syllable, which is spelled with either ηι or ει. In the Attic dialect, the word has the meaning of "slaughtered" as stated in *Etymologicum magnum* (p. 533, l. 35-36).[48]

2.2.4

μή μ᾽ ἄκλαυτον ἄθαπτον ἰὼν ὄπιθεν καταλείπειν
νοσφισθείς, μή τοί τι θεῶν μήνιμα γένωμαι,
ἀλλά με κακκῆαι σὺν τεύχεσιν, ἅσσα μοί ἐστι,
σῆμά τέ μοι χεῦαι πολιῆς ἐπὶ θινὶ θαλάσσης,
ἀνδρὸς δυστήνοιο, καὶ ἐσσομένοισι πυθέσθαι·
ταῦτά τέ μοι τελέσαι πῆξαί τ᾽ ἐπὶ τύμβῳ ἐρετμόν,
τῷ καὶ ζωὸς ἔρεσσον ἐὼν μετ᾽ ἐμοῖσ᾽ ἑτάροισιν. (*Od*. 11.72-78).

Do not, when you depart, leave me behind unwept and unburied and turn away; I might become a cause of the gods' wrath against you. No, burn me with my armor, such as it is, and heap up a mound for me on the shore of the gray sea, in memory of an unlucky man, that men yet to be may know of me. Do this for me, and fix upon the mound my oar with which I rowed in life in the company of my comrades. (Murray, 1919, p. 405-407).

Τὸ δὲ νοσφισθεὶς ἀντὶ τοῦ νόσφι γενόμενος, χωρισθείς, ὑποχωρήσας. Τὸ δὲ σῆμα εἰ καὶ μυριαχοῦ τάφον δηλοῖ, ὡς κἀνταῦθα, ἀλλὰ γενικῷ λόγῳ τὸ ἁπλῶς σημεῖον ἑρμηνεύει, ὃ καὶ συγγενές ἐστι τῷ τεκμηρίῳ. χρῆσις δὲ τούτου καὶ ἐν τῷ, σῆμα δέ τοι ἐρέω, τουτέστι γνώρισμα, ὁποῖον δή τι καὶ τὸ ἀνάχωμα τοῦ τάφου, σημεῖον ὄν, καθὰ καὶ μνῆμα καὶ μνημεῖον ἤγουν μνημοσύνη, τοῦ ἐπὶ νεκρῷ αὐτὸ γενέσθαι. Τοῦ δὲ ὡς ἐρρέθη

---

[47] ἱερήϊα] οὐκ ὀρθῶς· ἐπὶ γὰρ νεκρῶν τόμια καὶ ἔντομα, ἐπὶ δὲ θεῶν ἱερεῖα. ἢ ὅτι τὰ θρέμματα ἱερεῖα ἐκάλουν. V. ἔδει ἐπὶ νεκρῶν ἐντόμια εἰπεῖν. ἢ ἐπεὶ ἁπλῶς τὰ θρέμματα ἱερεῖα ὠνόμαζον.

[48] οὕτω δὲ καλεῖται ἐν Ἀττικῇ τὸ ἱερεῖον τὸ θυόμενον.

γενικοῦ σήματος πολλὰ μὲν καὶ ἄλλα παράγωγα. ἐν ἐκείνοις δὲ καὶ παράσημος ὁ ἀδόκιμος, ὡς ἀπὸ νομίσματος. ὃ κίβδηλον ὂν παράσημον ἐκαλεῖτο, εἰ καὶ ὕστερον δεδόξασται καὶ ἡ τοιαύτη λέξις διὰ τὰ βασιλικὰ παράσημα ἢ καὶ ἄλλως ἀρχοντικά. (1.399.42-400.4).

In this comment, Eustathius offers explanations for the words νοσφισθείς ("turn away", LSJ s.v. νοσφ-ίζω I) and σῆμα ("sign", "sign from heaven", "mound" LSJ s.v. σῆμα 1-3). He begins by claiming that νοσφισθείς is used instead of νόσφι γενόμενος, χωρισθείς, ὑποχωρήσας. All three terms are synonyms with the main one. The only difference is that the first phrase, which consists of the adverb νόσφι ("away from") and the participle of the verb γίγνομαι ("become") in the aorist tense, the preposition has the same root as the participle νοσφισθείς, signifying that they share an identical meaning, while the last two participles are synonyms.

Concerning the noun σῆμα, Eustathius gives three principal meanings. He explains that in many instances, as here, it has the meaning of "mound", "grave". Nonetheless, principally, it translates to "sign", "mark" and has a similar meaning to τεκμήριον ("sign", "token", LSJ s.v. τεκμήρι-ον, τό). In the phrase σῆμα δέ τοι ἐρέω ("I will tell you a most certain sign", *Il.* 23.326 & *Od.* 11.126) the noun has the meaning of "sign by which a thing is made known" similar to γνώρισμα, such as the mound of a grave. Lastly, σῆμα in the general meaning has plenty of derivatives. For instance, the adjective παράσημος, a synonym for ἀδόκιμος and κίβδηλος that translates to "marked amiss or falsely, counterfeit" (LSJ s.v. παράσημ-ος, ον). The word is also used as a neuter substantive, with the prepositional prefix in the sense of "alongside of, beside" (LSJ s.v. παρά G.I) as in the phrase βασιλικὰ παράσημα ("official insignia") (LSJ s.v. παράσημ-ον, τό).

2.2.5

πῶς ἔτλης Ἀϊδόσδε κατελθέμεν, ἔνθα τε νεκροὶ
ἀφραδέες ναίουσι, βροτῶν εἴδωλα καμόντων; (*Od.* 11.475-476).

How did you dare to come down to Hades, where dwell the unheeding dead, the phantoms of men outworn? (Murray, 1919, p. 435).

Ἀφραδέες δὲ νεκροὶ κατὰ τοὺς παλαιούς, οἱ ἄφραστοι καὶ ἀθεώρητοι, ἢ οἱ ἀσώματοι, τουτέστι φρένας μὴ ἔχοντες, αἵ εἰσι κρεμαστῆρες τοῦ ἥπατος, κατὰ τό, ὅθι τε φρένες ἧπαρ ἔχουσι. καὶ ἄλλως δὲ ἀφραδέες νεκροὶ ὡς πρὸς σύγκρισιν τοῦ Τειρεσίου ὃς μόνος ἐπέπνυτο. πῶς δὲ εἴδωλα καμόντων οἱ ἐν Ἅιδου νεκροί, προγέγραπται. (1.429.1-4).

In this passage, Eustathius explains the meaning of the phrase ἀφραδέες νεκροί ("the unheeding dead"). According to the ancient scholars, the term ἀφραδέες ("senseless", LSJ, S.V. ἀφρᾰδ-ής, ές) refers to the dead who are "not perceived, unseen" (LSJ s.v. ἄφραστ-ος, ον II & ἀθεώρ-ητος). Both, Apollonius and Hesychius give the meaning of "unintelligible" (ἀδιανόητος) in *Lexicon Homericum* (p. 49 l. 15) and *Lexicon* (alpha, 8748) respectively, while in *Lexicon in carmina Gregorii Nazianzeni* (alpha, 498) it is translated to "not thought on, unheard of", "senseless, silly" (LSJ s.v. ἀνόητος ον I & II). Another translation the ancient scholars give, according to the extract, is ἀσώματοι "disembodied", or more precisely, the ones without midriff, as in the Homeric phrase ὅθι φρένες ἧπαρ ἔχουσι (*Od.* 9.301) ("where the midriff holds the liver", Murray 1919,

p. 339). This interpretation also appears in *Scholia in Odysseam* (11.476.10-12).[49] Eustathius gives a final explanation according to which the aforementioned term is used to compare Tiresias with the rest of the dead, since he is the only one to still be conscious and having an understanding of what is happening.

2.2.6

ἦ τοι ὁ μὲν σκηριπτόμενος χερσίν τε ποσίν τε
λᾶαν ἄνω ὤθεσκε ποτὶ λόφον· ἀλλ’ ὅτε μέλλοι
ἄκρον ὑπερβαλέειν, τότ’ ἀποστρέψασκε Κραταιΐς·
αὖτις ἔπειτα πέδονδε κυλίνδετο λᾶας ἀναιδής. (*Od.* 11.595-598).

In fact he would get a purchase with hands and feet and keep pushing the stone toward the crest of a hill, but as often as he was about to heave it over the top, the weight would turn it back, and then down again to the plain would come rolling the shameless stone. (Murray, 1919, p. 443).

Λᾶας δὲ οὐ μόνον λίθος ἐνταῦθά τε καὶ ἀλλαχόθι μυριαχοῦ κλινόμενος λάαος καὶ κατὰ κράσιν λᾶος, ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἤλιδος ἐπίνειον κατὰ τοὺς παλαιούς, οὗ μέμνηται καὶ Λυκόφρων κατὰ κράσιν ἐν τῷ· καὶ Λᾶν περήσεις. Λόφος δὲ δῆλον ὡς οὐ μόνον γῆς ὕψος, ἀλλὰ καὶ μέρος ποτὲ τραχήλου ζωϊκοῦ, ἐξ οὗ καὶ καταλοφάδια, ὡς καὶ προεδηλώθη, ἀντὶ τοῦ κατὰ τοῦ τραχήλου. ὅθεν καὶ λωφῆσαι φασὶ κυρίως τὸ ἀποθέσθαι ἄχθος τὸ ἐπὶ τῷ τραχήλῳ, ἐκταθείσης δηλαδὴ τῆς ἀρχούσης, ὡς καὶ ἐν Ἰλιάδι γέγραπται. (1.439.14-19).

Here, Eustathius comments on the meaning of two words, λᾶας and λόφος. Concerning the first one, he offers two translations. His source could potentially be Apion (*Fragmenta de Glossis Homericis* 74.245.15),[50] as the explanations are identical. Commonly, the term has the meaning of "stone", but according to the ancient scholars, it also refers to the seaport of Elis, a town in the mainland of Greece. According to Lafond (2006), Λᾶς was a Spartan town on the west coast of the Laconian Gulf. Eustathius refers to Lycophron's *Alexandra* (l. 95),[51] where the term appears with the second meaning. He also explains that the noun when declined appears as λᾶος in the genitive case, with one α instead of two, due to crasis, the combination of the vowels of two syllables into one long vowel or a diphthong (LSJ, s.v. κρᾶσις, 5). As for the second noun, λόφος, he again offers two translations, namely, the back of the neck of an animal or the crest of a hill (LSJ s.v. λόφος I & II). Καταλοφάδια is a compound word that derives from λόφος and also means the back of the neck of an animal. According to LSJ (s.v. καταλοφάδεια) the term appears as καταλοφάδεια with the ει diphthong but it converts into καταλοφάδια with the letter ι, by metrical lenghtening. It is notable that in the *Odyssey* (10.169),[52] where the word first appears, it is written as καταλλοφάδια with two λ's.

---

[49] ἀφραδέες] οἱ ἀσώματοι. φρένες γὰρ οἱ κρεμαστῆρες τοῦ ἤπατος "ὅθι τε φρένας ἧπαρ ἔχουσι." τινές, οὐ νοούμενοι, ἄφραστοι, ἀθεώρητοι. Η.
[50] λᾶας· ὁ λίθος. καὶ Ἤλιδος ἐπίνειον.
[51] καὶ Λᾶν περήσεις, ἀντὶ δ’ εὐχίλου κάπης.
[52] βῆν δὲ καταλλοφάδια φέρων ἐπὶ νῆα μέλαιναν.

Finally, the author mentions the infinitive λωφῆσαι, that derives from the verb λωφάω that appears in the *Iliad* (21.292)[53] and has the meaning of "rest, give over" (LSJ s.v. λωφ-άω, 1). According to Eustathius, even though it shares the same stem as the noun λόφος, the first syllable is lengthened. He makes the same remark in the *Commentary on the Iliad* (4.505.6-9).[54]

2.3 SYNTACTICAL COMMENTS

In this section, I study the syntactical comments that mainly concern rhetorical schemata and metrical issues. There are eight of them.

2.3.1

διογενὲς Λαερτιάδη, πολυμήχαν' Ὀδυσσεῦ,
ἆ δείλ', ἦ τινὰ καὶ σὺ κακὸν μόρον ἡγηλάζεις,
ὅν περ ἐγὼν ὀχέεσκον ὑπ' αὐγὰς ἠελίοιο. (*Od.* 11.617-619).

Son of Laertes, sprung from Zeus, Odysseus of many devices, ah, wretched man, do you, too, drag out an evil lot such as I once bore beneath the rays of the sun? (Murray, 1919, p. 445).

ἦλθε δ' ἐπὶ ψυχὴ Θηβαίου Τειρεσίαο,
χρύσεον σκῆπτρον ἔχων, ἐμὲ δ' ἔγνω καὶ προσέειπε. (*Od.* 11.90-91).

Then there came up the ghost of the Theban Teiresias, bearing his golden staff in his hand, and he knew me and spoke to me. (Murray, 1919, p. 407).

Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι καὶ μετ' ὀλίγα, καινοπρεπὲς κεῖται σχῆμα τὸ, ψυχὴ Τειρεσίου ἔχων σκῆπτρον, ὡς μικρὸν ὅσον εἰρήσεται. (1.398.8-9).

Ἐν τούτοις δὲ τὸν σεμνὸν Τειρεσίαν σχήματι καινῷ ἐξαγγέλλει, ὡς καὶ προεδηλώθη, καινῶς φράζων τὸ καινὸν, ὡς ἡ ποιητικὴ δηλοῖ φράσις, ἔχουσα οὕτως. ἦλθε δ' ἐπὶ ψυχὴ Θηβαίου Τειρεσίαο, χρύσεον σκῆπτρον ἔχων, ἐμὲ δ' ἔγνω καὶ προσέειπεν. ἔδει μὲν γὰρ εἰπεῖν ψυχὴ Τειρεσίου χρύσεον σκῆπτρον ἔχουσα. καὶ οὐκ ἦν οὐδὲν τοῦτο κώλυμα τῷ μέτρῳ. ἀπεδόθη δὲ ὅμως πρὸς τὸ σημαινόμενον τὸ, ὁ Τειρεσίας. οὕτω δέ πως καὶ ἀνωτέρω ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως μητρὸς καινῶς ἐσχημάτισεν, εἰπών· ἦλθε ψυχὴ μητρὸς Ἀντίκλεια, τουτέστιν ἡ μήτηρ Ἀντίκλεια. πρὸς δὲ ψυχὴ Τειρεσίου ἔχων σκῆπτρον ὅμοιον καὶ τὸ, ἤτοι Ἀθηναίη ἀκέων ἦν. δηλοῖ δὲ ὁ ποιητὴς, ὡς οὐκ ἐχρῆν εἰπεῖν ἐνταῦθα ψυχὴ Τειρεσίου, εἴπερ αὐταὶ μὲν εἴδωλα καὶ σκιαὶ ἀΐσσουσιν, ὁ δὲ πέπνυται, ἀλλὰ ἔδει Τειρεσίαν εἰπεῖν. διὸ εἰπὼν ψυχὴ ἐπάγει τὸ οἰκεῖον, ἤγουν τὸ ἔχων, ὁ Τειρεσίας δηλαδὴ οὐχ' ἡ ψυχὴ τοῦ Τειρεσίου. (1.400.45-401.10).

In this remark, Eustathius points out the discrepancy between the participle ἔχων ("bearing") and the noun that it defines ψυχή ("soul"). While the noun "soul" is of

---

[53] ἀλλ' ὅδε μὲν τάχα λωφήσει, σὺ δὲ εἴσεαι αὐτός.
[54] Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι λωφῆσαι κυρίως παρὰ τοῖς παλαιοῖς, ὡς καὶ ἐν Ὀδυσσείᾳ δηλοῦται, τὸ ἀποθέσθαι ἄχθος τὸ ἐπὶ τῷ τραχήλῳ, ἔνθα ἐστὶν ὁ ὑπὸ ζυγὸν λόφος, ἐκταθέντος δηλαδὴ τοῦ ο, ὡς καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ λοπός.

feminine gender in ancient Greek, the predicative participle appears in its masculine form. There is no evident reason for that, as no metrical issue is detected. The scholar specifies that the participle does not refer to the actual noun that it complements, but rather to the signified, Tiresias. Tiresias is a masculine proper name, thus the participle is in the masculine form. Eustathius calls this figure of speech καινοπρεπὲς σχῆμα ("innovative, newly invented figure"). Instead of using the simple name of the person, Homer uses a circumlocution. The person's name is in the genitive case as attribute to a noun. The participle agrees with the noun in case but with the genitive attribute in gender and number.

He observes that the same schema occurs when Homer announces the appearance of Odysseus' mother, a few lines prior to Tiresias' appearance. He states her presence using the phrase ἦλθε δ᾽ ἐπὶ ψυχὴ μητρὸς κατατεθνηυίης, Αὐτολύκου θυγάτηρ μεγαλήτορος Ἀντίκλεια (*Od.* 11.84-85) ("then there came up the ghost of my dead mother, Anticlea, the daughter of great-hearted Autolycus", Murray, 1919, p. 407).

 Eustathius mentions another instance of this figure in the *Iliad* (*Il.* 4.22 & 8.459) with the phrase ἤτοι Ἀθηναίη ἀκέων ἦν ("Athene to be sure held her peace and said nothing", Murray, 1924, p. 167). As Eustathius discusses in his *Commentary on the Iliad* (1.695.9-12)[55] ἀκέων is not an adverb, as Aristonicus claims in *De Signis Iliadis* (4.22 & 8.459),[56] but rather the masculine form of the participle, which is used instead of the feminine form ἀκέουσα, following the Attic style.

In his *Commentary on the Iliad* (1.492.10-16),[57] Eustathius reflects on a similar issue. He comments on the phrase βίη Ἡρακλέος πέρσας ἄστεα πολλά (*Il.* 2.658-660), which follows the same rhetorical schema as in the ψυχὴ Θηβαίου Τειρεσίαο. Homer again does not use the name of the person in the nominative case but rather he uses a circumlocution. The masculine proper name appears in the genitive (Ἡρακλέος) as an attribute to the feminine noun βίη ("bodily strength"), whereas the participle πέρσας ("had sacked") is in masculine form, even though it complements the noun. The participle agrees with the noun in case and number but not in gender, since it is attributed to the signified, Heracles. Eustathius claims that the above mentioned phrases appears similar solecisms, meaning they are not solecisms but they violate grammatical rules purposefully.

In his attempt to explain Homer's phrase βίη Ἡρακλέος (Heracles' strength) where the feminine noun *strength* is followed by the masculine name Heracles, the author informs the reader that a similar instance can be found in the *Odyssey*. Aristonicus in *De signis Odysseae* (11.90)[58] analyzes the same comment of the *Odyssey* and offers a related explanation. Thus, he could possibly have been Eustathius' source, even though he does not state him.

---

[55] Ὅτι ἐν τῷ «ἤτοι Ἀθηναίη ἀκέων ἦν οὐδέ τι εἶπεν» οὐκ ἔστι τὸ ἀκέων ἐπίρρημα ἀντὶ τοῦ ἡσύχως, ὡς Ἀριστόνικος βούλεται, ὁμοίως τῷ «ἀλλ᾽ ἀκέων δαίνυσθε», ἀλλ᾽ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀκέουσα εἴρηται Ἀττικῶς.

[56] ἤτοι Ἀθηναίη ἀκέων ἦν οὐδέ τι εἶπεν: ἡ διπλῆ πρὸς τὸ ἀκέων, ὅτι ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀκέουσα ἐξενήνεκται· οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἡσύχως & ἤτοι Ἀθηναίη ἀκέων ἦν οὐδέ τι εἶπεν: ἡ διπλῆ, ὅτι ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀκέουσα.

[57] τοῦτο δὲ σχῆμά ἐστι καινόν, ἤγουν τὸ «βίη Ἡρακλέος πέρσας ἄστεα πολλά», καὶ ὡς εἰπεῖν σολοικοφανές. καὶ ὡμοίωται τῷ «ψυχὴ Θηβαίου Τειρεσίου χρύσεον σκῆπτρον ἔχων». ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐν τούτῳ οὐ πρὸς τὸ λεγόμενον ἤγουν πρὸς τὸ «ψυχὴ Τειρεσίου» ἀποδέδοται τὸ ἔχων, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ νοούμενον–ψυχὴ γὰρ Τειρεσίου ὁ Τειρεσίας νοεῖται, ὃς καὶ ἔχων σκῆπτρον ἀσολοικίστως λεχθήσεται– οὕτω καὶ ἐνταῦθα βίη Ἡρακλέος ὁ Ἡρακλῆς ἐστιν, ὃς καὶ πέρσας λέγεται ἄστεα πολλά.

[58] ὅτι πάλιν πρὸς τὸ ἐκ τῆς περιφράσεως νοητὸν ἀπήντησε. ψυχὴ γὰρ Θηβαίου Τειρεσίου ἐστὶν ὁ Τειρεσίας. διὸ ἐπήνεγκεν ἔχων, οὐκ ἔχουσα.

2.3.2

ὡς ἀμφὶ κρητῆρα τραπέζας τε πληθούσας
κείμεθ᾽ ἐνὶ μεγάρῳ, δάπεδον δ᾽ ἅπαν αἵματι θῦεν. (*Od.* 11.419-420).

How about the mixing bowl and the laden tables we lay in the hall, and the floor all swam with blood. (Murray, 1919, p. 431).

Κρητῆρα δὲ ἑνικῶς διὰ τὸ μέτρον ἔφη, οὐ γὰρ ἐνεδέχετο κρητῆρας εἰπεῖν. ἄλλως γὰρ οὐκ εἰκὸς ἐν τοσαύταις τραπέζαις κρητῆρα ἕνα εἶναι. καὶ ὅμως τῷ ἑνικῷ ἐμφαίνεται τὸ πλῆθος εἰδικώτερον. Ἐνταῦθα δὲ σημείωσαι τὸ τοῦ παλαιοῦ, ὃς εἰπὼν ἐπιθυμίαν εἶναι μέθης τοῖς δυνάσταις διό φησι ποιεῖ Ὅμηρος τὸν Ἀχιλλέα λοιδορούμενον τῷ βασιλεῖ, οἰνοβαρὲς κυνὸς ὄμμα τ᾽ ἔχων, λέγει καὶ ὡς ἐφ᾽ ὁμοίοις ὁ ποιητὴς καὶ τὸν ἐκείνου θάνατον ἀποσημαίνει ἐν τῷ, ἀμφὶ κρητῆρα τραπέζας τε πληθούσας ἐκείμεθα. (1.426.19-24).

Τράπεζαι δὲ πλήθουσαι καθ᾽ ὁμοιότητά τε ποταμοῦ πλήθοντος, καὶ πρὸς διαστολὴν δὲ τῶν κενῶν, ὡς τὸ, κεναῖς δ᾽ ἀμφίσταμαι τραπέζαις. ἡ δὲ Ἰλιὰς καὶ σελήνην οἶδε πλήθουσαν. ὅθεν τοῖς ὕστερον συντέθειται τὸ πλησισέληνον, ὅπερ ἄλλοι μετέλαβον εἰς τὸ πλησιφαές. (1.426.25-28).

Here, the author comments on the metrical difficulties of the poem. He explains that Homer uses the word κρητῆρα ("bowl", LSJ s.v. κρα-τήρ, Ion. and Ep. κρητήρ, ῆρος, ὁ) in the singular form due to metrical issues. If the noun was in the plural form, κρητῆρας, the last syllable (ρας) would be converted from short that it is in fact, to long. This is because any syllable that ends with a consonant is considered long when followed by another consonant (West, 1997 (2009), p. 270).

 Even though the noun is in the accusative case of the singular form, it is still clearly deduced that it refers to a multitude. This is due to the fact that the noun τραπέζας ("table", LSJ s.v. τράπεζ-α [τρᾰ], ης, ἡ) that comes after, is in the accusative case of the plural form. Thus, it is reasonable to conclude that the single form denotes more than one and is in conceptual compliancy with the plural form that follows.

He continues by commenting on the participle πληθούσας of the phrase τραπέζας τε πληθούσας ("laden tables"). He mentions that it resembles the phrases πλήθων ποταμὸς ("laden river") and σελήνην τε πλήθουσαν ("laden moon") that appear in the *Iliad* (*Il.* 11.492 & 18. 484). Conversely, it is in contrast with the phrase κεναῖς δ᾽ ἀμφίσταμαι τραπέζαις ("I stand around empty tables") of Sophocles' *Electra* (l. 192). The terms πληθούσας ("laden") and κεναῖς ("empty") are total opposites. It has to be pointed out that the particular participle is not of frequent use in the Homeric epics, thus Eustathius' observation is evident of his in-depth study. Lastly, he mentions that the compound adjectives πλησισέληνον ("becoming full, of the moon", LSJ s.v. πλησῐσέληνος, ον) and πλησιφαές ("with full light", LSJ s.v. πλησῐ-φᾱής, ές) were originated from the phrase σελήνην τε πλήθουσαν.

2.3.3

νῦν δέ σε τῶν ὄπιθεν γουνάζομαι, οὐ παρεόντων,
πρός τ' ἀλόχου καὶ πατρός, ὅ σ' ἔτρεφε τυτθὸν ἐόντα,
Τηλεμάχου θ', ὃν μοῦνον ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ἔλειπες. (*Od.* 11.66-68).

Now I beseech you by those whom we left behind, who are not present with us, by your wife and your father who reared you when a baby, and by Telemachus whom you left an only son in your halls. (Murray, 1919, p. 405).

Τοῦ δὲ τῶν ὄπισθε γουνάζομαι, ἐφερμηνευτικὸν ἐξῆς αὐτίκα τὸ, οὐ παρεόντων. τούτου δὲ αὖθις τὸ, πρός τε ἀλόχου καὶ πατρὸς καὶ Τηλεμάχου, ἵνα ὄπισθεν μὲν εἶεν οἱ μὴ παρόντες. μὴ παρόντες δὲ ἡ ἄλοχος καὶ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ὁ πατὴρ τὰ ὄντως φίλτατα ἐν τῇ Ἰθάκῃ τῷ Ὀδυσσεῖ. καὶ ἄλλως δὲ εἰπεῖν τὸ, νῦν δέ σε τῶν ὄπισθεν γουνάζομαι, ἀντὶ τοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν μελλόντων, τοῦ ἰδεῖν δηλονότι τὴν ἄλοχον καὶ τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱὸν, ὃν μόνον ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ἔλιπες. δῆλον δὲ ὅτι ἐν τῷ γουνάζομαι τῶν ὄπισθεν ἀπὸ κοινοῦ ληπτέον τὴν πρὸς πρόθεσιν, ὡς δηλοῖ τὸ, πρός τ' ἀλόχου. καὶ ὅτι διὰ μέτρου ἀνάγκην ὄπιθεν ἐνταῦθα ἔφη κατὰ ἔνδειαν τοῦ σίγμα, ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ, ἄθαπτον ἰὼν ὄπιθεν καταλείπεις. (1.399.35-43).

Here, Eustathius makes another syntactical remark concerning the phrase τῶν ὄπισθεν γουνάζομαι ("I beseech you by those whom we left behind"). The line refers to Odysseus' wife, father and son who are not present, which is clarified by the following line of the poem. He explains that the preposition πρός ("by") in the phrase πρός τ' ἀλόχου καὶ πατρός ("by your wife and father") is also to be understood with the aforementioned phrase τῶν ὄπισθεν γουνάζομαι. Nonetheless, it does not precede it. The verb γουνάζομαι ("beseech") does not complement with an object in genitive as it appears here (τῶν ὄπιθεν) but rather it needs a preposition, either πρός or ὑπέρ. Thus, πρός here does not complement only the phrase that follows but it pertains to τῶν ὄπιθεν γουνάζομαι as well and needs to be perceived as a complement to both.

2.3.4

νύμφαι τ' ἠΐθεοί τε πολύτλητοί τε γέροντες
παρθενικαί τ' ἀταλαὶ νεοπενθέα θυμὸν ἔχουσαι,
πολλοὶ δ' οὐτάμενοι χαλκήρεσιν ἐγχείῃσιν,
ἄνδρες ἀρηΐφατοι, βεβροτωμένα τεύχε' ἔχοντες. (*Od.* 11.38-41).

Brides, and unwed youths, and toil-worn old men, and frisking girls with hearts still new to sorrow, and many, too, that had been wounded with bronze-tipped spears, men slain in battle, wearing their blood-stained armor. (Murray, 1919, p. 403).

Ἐν τούτοις δὲ ὅρα ὅτι ταῖς νύμφαις τοὺς ἠϊθέους ἀντέθετο διὰ ἡλικίας ταυτότητα, καὶ τοῖς πολυτλήτοις γέρουσι τὰς ἀταλὰς παρθένους κατά τι ἀντιθετικὸν σχῆμα. εἰσὶ γὰρ ἀταλαὶ παρθέναι αἱ μηδὲν δυνάμεναι τλῆναι διὰ τὸ τῆς ἡλικίας ἁπαλόν. τὸ δὲ τοιοῦτον τοῖς πολυτλήτοις ἀντίκειται. Τὸ δὲ νεοπενθέα θυμὸν, ἀπαιτεῖ τὰς μὴ νέας παλαιοπενθεῖς εἶναι. (1.398.24-27).

In this passage, Eustathius draws attention to how the enumeration is effected antithetically. Two pairs of terms that are opposite to each other appear in the poem, namely between ταῖς νύμφαις ("brides")-τοὺς ἠϊθέους ("unmarried youth") and τοῖς πολυτλήτοις γέρουσι ("toil-worn old men")-τὰς ἀταλὰς παρθένους ("frisking girls with

hearts still new to sorrow"). Regarding the first pair, he explains that it lies in the status of the groups, meaning that, even though they are all young people, the νύμφαι are married women, while the ἠΐθέοι are not. Regarding the second pair, the scholar derives the adjective ἀταλαὶ from τλῆναι ("suffer, undergo" LSJ s.v. τλάω) and thus takes it as the opposite of πολυτλήτοις. This explanation appears in *Etymologicum Genuinum* (alpha, 1336)[59] and could possibly be his source.

2.3.5

οὐδέ τι Νηλεὺς
τῷ ἐδίδου, ὃς μὴ ἕλικας βόας εὐρυμετώπους
ἐκ Φυλάκης ἐλάσειε βίης Ἰφικληείης
ἀργαλέας. (*Od.* 11.288-291).

But Neleus would give her to no one except to him who should drive from Phylace the cattle of mighty Iphicles, spiral-horned and broad of brow, and hard they were to drive. (Murray, 1919, p. 421).

Τὸ δὲ οὐδέ τι Νηλεὺς τῷ ἐδίδου ὃς μὴ βόας ἐκ φυλάκης ἐλάσειε κατὰ σχῆμα κάλλους ἔφρασεν ἀποφατικῶς ὁ ποιητής. ἦν δὲ σαφέστερον εἰπεῖν καταφατικῶς ὅτι Νηλεὺς δὲ τὴν θυγατέρα ἐδίδου ὃς ἂν τὰς μητρικὰς βόας ἐξελάσῃ τῆς Φυλάκης πόλεως Θετταλικῆς. (1.416.45-417.2).

In this extract, Eustathius discusses the usage of a negative statement κατὰ σχῆμα κάλλους that explains that the phrase οὐδέ τι Νηλεὺς τῷ ἐδίδου, ὃς μὴ ἕλικας βόας εὐρυμετώπους would have been more concrete if it was affirmative instead of negative. Instead of phrasing it with two negatives (οὐδέ & ὃς μὴ), it could be expressed in the affirmative as Νηλεὺς δὲ τὴν θυγατέρα ἐδίδου ὃς ἂν τὰς μητρικὰς βόας ἐξελάσῃ τῆς Φυλάκης πόλεως Θετταλικῆς, which Eustathius describes as more precise. Instead, Homer preferred the negative and thus uncertain remark for the poem following a stylistic figure, which he names "schema of aesthetics" (σχῆμα κάλλους). This schema appears numerous times in Homer and has been commented on by Eustathius in both of his Homeric Commentaries. Hermogenes in *Περὶ ἰδεῶν λόγου* mentions that this schema of aesthetics occurs when there are two negative particles instead of the equivalent affirmative one (1.12.252-253).[60]

2.3.6

μῆτερ ἐμή, τί νύ μ' οὐ μίμνεις ἑλέειν μεμαῶτα,
ὄφρα καὶ εἰν Ἀΐδαο φίλας περὶ χεῖρε βαλόντε
ἀμφοτέρω κρυεροῖο τεταρπώμεσθα γόοιο; (*Od.* 11.210-212).

---

[59] Ἀταλός Σ 567· ὁ νήπιος· εἴρηται παρὰ τὸ τλῆναι ταλός καὶ ἀταλός, ὁ μηδέπω δυνάμενος κακοπαθῆσαι. ἢ παρὰ τὸ ἁπαλός, κατὰ τροπὴν ἀταλός.
[60] Καὶ μὴν καὶ αἱ διὰ δύο ἀποφάσεων γινόμεναι καταφάσεις κάλλους ἴδιον σχῆμα.

My mother, why do you not stay for me when I wish to clasp you, so that even in the house of Hades we two may throw our arms about each other and take our fill of chill lamenting? (Murray, 1919, p. 415).

Τὸ δὲ φίλας χεῖρε σύνησθες[61] τῷ ποιητῇ σχῆμα. οἶα μυριαχοῦ συζευγνύντι τὰ πληθυντικὰ καὶ τὰ δυϊκὰ ὡς ἰσοδύναμα. (1.408.22-23).

According to Eustathius, another syntactic figure used to justify collocations that are considered wrong from the point of view of regular syntax is the correspondence of the plural and dual forms. This denotes that Homer often uses the two forms as equivalents. In this instance, he uses the dual form χεῖρε as plural. In the *Commentary on the Odyssey*, the author discusses this figure two more times. In the first rhapsody, Eustathius (1.58.3-4)[62] notes that Homer uses a noun in the plural form (μάρτυροι) followed by a verb, which as the scholar claims, is in the dual (ἔστων), in the phrase θεοὶ δ᾽ ἐπὶ μάρτυροι ἔστων (*Od.* 1.273) which translates to "let the gods be your witnesses" (Murray, 1919, p. 33).

 Secondly in the phrase ξείνω δή τινε τώδε, διοτρεφὲς ὦ Μενέλαε, ἄνδρε δύω, γενεῇ δὲ Διὸς μεγάλοιο ἔϊκτον (*Od.* 4.226-27) that translates to "Here are two strangers, Menelaus, fostered of Zeus, two men that are like the seed of great Zeus" (Murray, 1919, p. 121) he explains that even though the terms ξείνω and ἄνδρε are written in their dual forms, they can be perceived as plurals (1.144.10-12).[63]

Lastly, Eustathius makes a similar remark on the phrase ἀνὰ φαιδίμῳ ὤμῳ (*Od.* 11.128). He explains that a common characteristic in Homer is that a phrase that occurs in the dative case of the singular form could also be perceived as its dual form (1.403.20-21).[64]

2.3.7
καὶ τότε δὴ γαίῃ πήξας εὐῆρες ἐρετμόν. (*Od.* 11.129).

Then fix in the earth your shapely oar. (Murray, 1919, p. 409).

Εὐῆρες δὲ ὅτι οὐ μόνον ἐπὶ ἐρετμοῦ οὐδὲ μόνον ἐπὶ πλοίου ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ἁπλῶς ἐπιεικὲς καὶ πρᾷον ἡ λέξις δηλοῖ καὶ εὐάγωγον, καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ ἐδηλώθη. καιρία δὲ ὡς ἐν ποιήσει λέξις τὸ, εὐῆρες ἐρετμόν. διὸ καὶ τρὶς ἐνταῦθα χρῆται Ὅμηρος ταύτῃ κατὰ σχῆμα ἐπιμονῆς. (1.403.38-40).

In this passage, Eustathius comments on two things. The meaning of the adjective εὐήρης and the repetitive use of the collocation εὐῆρες ἐρετμόν in a small passage of the eleventh book of the *Odyssey*. Regarding the meaning, Eustathius notes that the particular adjective can be translated to "suitable", "mild" and "ductile". Nevertheless, when it complements the nouns ἐρετμόν ("oar") or πλοῖον ("ship") it has the meaning

---

[61] [sic. for σύνηθες].

[62] τότε γὰρ, οὐκ ἀνάγκη τὸ μάρτυρ εἶναι ἐν λόγῳ. ἐν τούτοις δὲ κεῖται συνήθως τῷ ποιητῇ ῥῆμα δυϊκὸν μετὰ ὀνόματος πληθυντικοῦ. φησὶ γάρ. μάρτυροι ἔστων ἤγουν ἔστωσαν.

[63] Τὸ δὲ δύω, περιττὸν καὶ ἐνταῦθα κεῖται, ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ, δύω κοσμήτορε. καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις. ἴσως δὲ, καὶ διὰ σαφήνειαν. ἵνα τὸ, ξείνω τώ γε ἄνδρε, καθαρῶς νοηθῶσι δυϊκὰ διὰ τὸ ἔστιν οὗ καὶ ἐπὶ πληθυντικῶν τὰ τοιαῦτα λαμβάνεσθαι.

[64] Τὸ δὲ ἀνὰ φαιδίμω ὤμω, δύναται μὲν καὶ δυϊκῶς νοηθῆναι ἀντὶ τοῦ, ἀνὰ τοὺς ὤμους, Ὁμηρικώτερον δὲ εἰπεῖν αὐτὸ εἰρῆσθαι κατὰ δοτικὴν ἑνικὴν πτῶσιν.

of "well-fitted" (LSJ, s.v. εὐήρης, ες). As for the phrase εὐῆρες ἐρετμόν ("shapely oar"), he discusses that it appears three times (*Od.* 11.121, 11.125 & 11.129) and thus leads to a rhetorical figure that he names σχῆμα ἐπιμονῆς ("dwelling on a point, treating it elaborately" LSJ s.v. ἐπιμον-ή, ἡ 4).

Eustathius refers to this figure four more times in the *Commentary on the Odyssey* regarding the repetition of certain words or phrases. Firstly, he comments on the five-time use of the adverb ἔνθα in just four lines in the *Iliad* (3.108-111) (1.115.33-35).[65] Then, the repetition of the nouns ὄγχνη, μῆλον, σταφυλή and σῦκον, all of which appear two times in two lines of the *Odyssey* (7.120-121) (1.267.22-24).[66] Interestingly, in another passage of the *Commentary on the Odyssey* he claims that the repetition of different verbs that share the same meaning applies in the σχῆμα ἐπιμονῆς (2.222.5).[67] He explains that in a short extract of the *Odyssey* (4.302-305) three different verbs with the meaning of "sleep", "lay" (namely κοιμήσαντο, καθεῦδε and ἐλέξατο) appear. Finally, he refers to a verb and an adjective with the same root (namely ἀμύντορα and ἀμύνοι) that appear three times in the *Odyssey* (16.256-261) (2.123.31-32).[68]

2.3.8

πάσας δ' οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ' ὀνομήνω,
ὅσσας ἡρώων ἀλόχους ἴδον ἠδὲ θύγατρας. (*Od.* 11.328-329).

I cannot tell or name all the wives and daughters of heroes that I saw. (Murray, 1919, p. 425).

Ὅτι σχῆμα παραλείψεως τὸ, πάσας δ' οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ' ὀνομήνω ὅσσας ἡρώων ἀλόχους ἴδον ἠδὲ θύγατρας. λέγει δὲ ὁ ποιητὴς τοῦτο ἐμφαίνων, ὡς, πολλὰ ἔχων εἰπεῖν παρέδραμεν. εἰ δὲ ταύτας νῦν οὐκ ἔχει ὀνομῆναι Ὅμηρος διὰ τοῦ σοφοῦ Ὀδυσσέως, συγγνωστέος ἂν εἴη καὶ ἐν Ἰλιάδι, μὴ ἔχων τὴν τῶν Ἀχαιῶν ὀνομῆναι πληθύν. δῆλον δὲ ὅτι ἐκεῖθεν ὁ στίχος οὗτος παρείλκυσται. παρῳδία δὲ τοῦ ῥηθέντος στίχου καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἑξῆς τὸ, πάντας δ' ἐγὼν οὐκ ἂν μυθήσομαι οὐδ' ὀνομήνω. ἔστι δὲ μυθήσασθαι μὲν τὸ ἄλλως ἀφηγήσασθαι, ὀνομῆναι δὲ τὸ πρὸς μόνον εἰπεῖν ὄνομα. Ἰστέον δὲ καὶ ὅτι καὶ ἐφεξῆς ἐν τῷ περὶ τῶν ἡρώων λόγῳ σχήματι ὁμοίῳ χρήσεται, εἰπὼν, ὡς ἴδον ἂν καὶ ἄλλους οὓς ἤθελον, οἷον καὶ Θησέα καὶ Πειρίθοον, εἰ μή τι δέος ἐκώλυεν, ὑποδηλῶν κἀνταῦθα οἵαν μὲν ἐξεῦρεν εὐπορίαν γραφῆς ἔκ τε τῶν ἡρωΐδων ἔκ τε τῶν ἡρώων, ὅπως δὲ αὐτὴν παρεᾷ διὰ τὸ τῆς ἱστορίας μὴ καίριον, ἔτι δὲ καὶ διὰ τὴν ἄκαιρον μακρολογίαν. (1.422.8-18).

Here is the only instance in the *Commentary on the Odyssey* where Eustathius mentions the rhetorical figure called σχῆμα παραλείψεως. According to LSJ (s.v. παράλειψις, εως, ἡ) it is "a rhetorical figure in which a fact is designedly passed over, so that attention may be specially called to it".

---

[65] Ὅτι Νέστωρ ἐξαριθμούμενος ἐν ἐπιτομῇ ἄνδρας ἐν τῷ Τρωϊκῷ πολέμῳ τρωθέντας ἀρίστους, καὶ οὕτω καταποικίλλων τὴν Ὀδύσσειαν τοῖς ἐξ Ἰλιάδος ἐλλείμμασι, χρῆται σχήματι ἐπιμονῆς.

[66] ὄγχνη ἐπ' ὄγχνῃ γηράσκει. τουτέστι, πέπειρα ὄγχνη, καὶ οἰονεὶ γραῦς, ἤρτηται τοῦ δένδρου ἐπὶ νεοφυεῖ ἑτέρα ὄγχνῃ. οὕτω δὲ καὶ μῆλον ἐπὶ μήλῳ. καὶ ἐπὶ σταφυλῇ σταφυλή. ἐν οἷς καλὸν σχῆμα τὸ κατ' ἐπιμονὴν ὁμοιόσχημον.

[67] διὸ καὶ τρία ἐνταῦθα κεῖται τοιαῦτα ῥήματα κατὰ σχῆμα ἐπιμονῆς.

[68] Ὅρα δὲ καὶ ὅτι τὸ ἀμύντωρ, ὃ καὶ ἡρμήνευσεν, ὡς ἐρρέθη, τρὶς ἐνταῦθα κεῖται κατὰ σχῆμα ἐπιμονῆς.

In this passage, Odysseus does not name the wives and daughters since it is perhaps irrelevant to the development of the myth. Eustathius claims that Homer would rather omit that part since it is comprehensible to the reader and avoid uneccesary information. Similar extracts, in which the speaker does not name the people he is referring to, can be found in both epics (*Il.* 2.488 & *Od.* 11.517).[69] Eustathius refers to the same rhetorical figure once in the *Commentary on the Iliad* (1.644.5-9).[70] In this passage, Helen refers to the "Achaeans whom she recognizes and can tell their names" (Murray, 1924, p. 147) (*Il.* 3.234-236).[71] Despite it is implied that Helen could elaborate further on the Achaeans and share what she knows, Homer purposefully omits the stories that are not relevant to the plot, but in doing so, he draws the reader's attention to the omission of information.

2.4 GRAMMATICAL COMMENTS

In this sub-chapter, I analyze the comments that concern the grammar. There are seven comments that study the grammatical aspect of prepositions, conjunctions, suffixes, verbs and nouns.

2.4.1

σῶμα γὰρ ἐν Κίρκης μεγάρῳ κατελείπομεν ἡμεῖς
ἄκλαυτον καὶ ἄθαπτον, ἐπεὶ πόνος ἄλλος ἔπειγε. (*Od.* 11.53-54).

For we had left his corpse behind us in the hall of Circe, unwept and unburied, since another task was then urging us on. (Murray, 1919, p. 405).

Τὸ δὲ ἐν Κίρκης μεγάρῳ, ἐντελῶς ἐγράφη. τὸ γὰρ ἄλλως ἐν Κίρκης εἰπεῖν ἐλλιπῶς ἔχει κατὰ ἀττικισμόν. (1.399.31-32).

Here, Eustathius comments on the correctness of the language. Concerning the phrase ἐν Κίρκης μεγάρῳ ("in the hall of Circe"), he notes that it is written in its complete form. It could also appear as ἐν Κίρκης without the noun μεγάρῳ added next to it. In that case, it would be an elliptical phrase, common in Greek prose, affected by the rhetorical method that he names Atticism. It needs to be noted that in this passage, the scholar uses the term Atticism in a similar manner to Hellenism. The latter refers to speaking in the way of the Greeks, without solecisms and barbarisms (*Etymologicum Magnum,* p. 331, l. 37-39).[72] It is evident that Eustathius does not use the term Hellenism in any of his works, according to the TLG database. Thus, it could be the

---

[69] πληθὺν δ' οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ' ὀνομήνω & πάντας δ' οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ' ὀνομήνω.

[70] Ὅτι τὸ «νῦν δ' ἄλλους μὲν πάντας ὁρῶ ἑλίκωπας Ἀχαιούς, οὕς κεν ἐῢ γνοίην», ἤγουν εὖ γνοίην, «καὶ τοὔνομα μυθησαίμην, δοιὼ δ' οὐ δύναμαι ἰδέειν», λέγει μὲν ἡ Ἑλένη, ἐμφαίνει δὲ ὡς ἐν σχήματι παραλείψεως εὐμεθόδως, ὅτι ἠδύνατο καὶ ἄλλας ἐνταῦθα πολλὰς ἱστορίας τοιαύτας παρενθεῖναι ὁ ποιητὴς καὶ μυθήσασθαι κατὰ ὁμοίαν ἐπιβολήν, εἰ μὴ ἔξω ἦν τοῦτο τοῦ ἔργου.

[71] νῦν δ' ἄλλους μὲν πάντας ὁρῶ ἑλίκωπας Ἀχαιούς, οὕς κεν ἐῢ γνοίην καί τ' οὔνομα μυθησαίμην· δοιὼ δ' οὐ δύναμαι ἰδέειν κοσμήτορε λαῶν.

[72] ἑλληνισμός ἐστι τὸ καθ' Ἕλληνας διαλέγεσθαι, τουτέστι τὸ ἀσολοικίστως καὶ ἀβαρβαρίστως διαλέγεσθαι.

case that when referring to the correct usage of the Greek language, he names it Atticism.

2.4.2

σῆμά τέ μοι χεῦαι πολιῆς ἐπὶ θινὶ θαλάσσης,
ἀνδρὸς δυστήνοιο, καὶ ἐσσομένοισι πυθέσθαι. (*Od.* 11.75-76).

And heap up a mound for me on the shore of the gray sea, in memory of an unlucky man, that men yet to be may know of me. (Murray, 1919, p. 405).

Τὸ δὲ ἀνδρὸς δυστήνοιο καινότερον πέφρασται. τὸ γὰρ κοινὸν οὕτω· σῆμά τέ μοι χεῦαι ἀνδρὶ δυστήνῳ. αἴτιον δὲ καὶ νῦν ἡ τῆς δοτικῆς καὶ γενικῆς φιλίωσις. δῆλον δ᾽ ὅτι πολλῶν καὶ τοιούτων καὶ ἀλλοίων καινότερον φραζομένων καὶ παρά τε ἄλλοις καὶ παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ οὐκ ἔστι κατειπεῖν τῶν οὕτω σχηματιζομένων σολοικισμὸν εἴτουν βαρβαρισμόν. κέκριται δὲ σολοικοφανῆ τε σχήματα καλεῖν ταῦτα καὶ ἁπλῶς οὕτω σχήματα. πᾶν μὲν γάρ φασι τοιοῦτον λάλημα ἤγουν σχῆμα ἁμάρτημά ἐστιν ἑκούσιον διὰ τέχνην ἢ ξενοφωνίαν ἢ καλλωπισμόν. σολοικισμὸς δὲ ἁμάρτημα ἀκούσιον ἐξ ἀμαθίας λαληθὲν παρὰ ὄνομα ἢ ῥῆμα ἢ ἄλλο τι ὧν λέγουσιν οἱ τεχνικοί. (1.400.3-10).

In this passage, Eustathius begins by explaining the similar use of the genitive and dative case. He focuses on the phrase ἀνδρὸς δυστήνοιο and claims that the use of genitive is a newer linguistic feature, since it would regularly be in the dative, as ἀνδρὶ δυστήνῳ. The reason appears to be the correlation between genitive and dative. He clarifies that it is not the case of solecism or barbarism. According to LSJ, solecism is considered as the "incorrectness in the use of the language" (s.v. σολοικ-ισμός, ὁ), while barbarism is the "use of the foreign tongue or one's mother tongue amiss" (s.v. βαρβαρ-ισμός, ὁ).

He continues on a different narrative, by explaining the difference between the figures that appear as solecisms (σολοικοφανῆ σχήματα) and solecism itself. In the first case, the figures, although they are similar to solecism, they constitute a linguistic mistake that was made on purpose by the author for euphonious or creative reasons. However, solecism is an unintentional mistake that occurs due to ignorance. This comment appears originally in Tryphon's *De Tropis* (26.1.13-16).[73]

2.4.3

τοσσάχ᾽ ὕδωρ ἀπολέσκετ᾽ ἀναβροχέν, ἀμφὶ δὲ ποσσὶ
γαῖα μέλαινα φάνεσκε, καταζήνασκε δὲ δαίμων. (*Od.* 11.586-587).

So often would the water be swallowed up and vanish away, and at his feet the black earth would appear, for some god would dry it all up. (Murray, 1919, p. 443).

---

[73] διαφέρει δὲ σχῆμα σολοικισμοῦ, ἐπειδὴ σχῆμα μέν ἐστι ποιητοῦ ἢ συγγραφέως ἁμάρτημα ἑκούσιον διὰ τέχνην ἢ ξενοφωνίαν ἢ καλλωπισμόν, σολοικισμὸς δὲ ἁμάρτημα ἀκούσιον, οὐ διὰ τέχνην ἀλλὰ δι᾽ ἀμαθίαν γινόμενον.

Τὸ δὲ ἀναβροχὲν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐρροφήθη, κατὰ ὀνοματοποιίαν καὶ μίμησιν ἤχου. τραχύτερον δὲ αὐτοῦ τὸ ἀναβροχθὲν, ἐξ οὗ καὶ ὁ βρόχος καὶ τὸ βροχίζειν, ὡς καὶ τὸ ῥοχθεῖν τραχυφωνότερον τοῦ ῥοθεῖν. τινὲς δὲ καὶ διὰ τοῦ υ γράφουσιν ἀναβρυχὲν καθ᾽ ὁμοιότητα τοῦ βέβρυχεν. Ἰστέον δὲ καὶ ὅτι ἐπείπερ ἡ ἀνὰ πρόθεσις κωλύειν δοκεῖ νοεῖν τὸ ἀναβροχὲν ἀντὶ τοῦ καταποθὲν, ἐπάγει πρὸς ἑρμηνείαν τὸ, ἀμφὶ δὲ ποσσὶ γαῖα φαίνεσκε, καὶ ἔτι μᾶλλον τὸ, καταζήνασκε δὲ δαίμων, τουτέστιν οὐχ᾽ ἀπλῶς γῆ ἐφαίνετο ἀλλὰ καὶ ξηρά, ὥστε ἐν τῷ ὕδωρ ἀναβροχὲν περιττὴ κεῖται ἡ πρόθεσις. οὕτω γὰρ ἔστιν ἀναπιεῖν εἰπεῖν τὸ καταπιεῖν. ἴσως δὲ καὶ διὰ τὸ πολλάκις τὴν τοιαύτην βρόξιν γίνεσθαι ἐρρέθη τὸ ἀναβροχέν. κεῖται γὰρ μυριαχοῦ ἡ ἀνὰ πρόθεσις ἐπὶ τοῦ πάλιν καὶ πάλιν τὸ αὐτὸ γίνεσθαι. (1.437.43-438.4).

Here, Eustathius refers to onomatopoeia. Onomatopoetic words are formed from sounds associated with their names. They are used for the representation of acoustic or optical phenomena (Flury, 2006). Eustathius, in the *Commentary on the Iliad* defines onomatopoeia as the poetic way of imitating sounds (1.51.27-28).[74]

Here, he states that the onomatopoetic word ἀναβροχέν ("gulp back (again)", s.v. ἀναβρόχω, *Homeric Dictionary,* 1895, p. 26) is used instead of ἐρροφήθη ("sup greedily up, gulp down" LSJ s.v. ῥοφ-έω), for the sake of onomatopoeia and imitation of sound. Eustathius claims that it can also appear as ἀναβροχθέν with the addition of the letter θ but it has a more harsh sound, in the same manner as ῥοθεῖν ("making a rushing noise" LSJ s.v. ῥοθ-έω) and ῥοχθεῖν ("dash with a roaring sound" LSJ s.v. ῥοχθ-έω), where the first one has a less intense pronunciation.

The term ἀναβροχέν can be written as ἀναβρυχέν too, with an υ instead of an ο, similarly to βέβρυχεν ("roar" LSJ s.v. βρῡχ-άομαι). According to the TLG database, the term ἀναβρυχέν appears only once, in this particular passage. Finally, he claims that the prepositional prefix ἀνά can be superfluous in some instances. However, since the meaning of ἀναβροχέν is "gulp back again", stating that something that is being repeated, the prepositional prefix does not appear superfluous.

2.4.4

Ἐνταῦθα δὲ σημειωτέον καὶ ὅτι ὁ γράψας τὴν ἀνὰ πρόθεσιν εἰλῆφθαι ἀντὶ τῆς ἐπὶ ἐν τῷ, ἀνὰ Γαργάρῳ ἄκρῳ ἤδη δὲ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς ὁμοίοις οὐκ ἠλλοίωσε τὸ τὴν ἀνὰ πρόθεσιν ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις τὴν ἄνω σχέσιν δηλοῦν. καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἡ ἐπὶ πρόθεσις ἐπὶ τοιούτου ἔστιν ὅτε σημαινομένου τίθεται. εὖ δὲ πάντως λέγει ἐκεῖνος καὶ ὅτι ἡ ἀνὰ πρόθεσις ἐν μὲν τῷ ἀνάθορε τὴν ἄνω σχέσιν δηλοῖ, ἐν δὲ τῷ ἀνέλαβε τὸ ἐξ ὑστέρου, ἐν δὲ τῷ χρυσέῳ ἀνὰ σκήπτρῳ ἀντὶ τῆς συν εἴληπται, ἐν δὲ τῷ ὤχθησαν δ᾽ ἀνὰ δῶμα Διὸς τῇ κατα ἰσοδυναμεῖ, ἐν δὲ τῷ κτείνονται δ᾽ ἀν᾽ αὐτὰς ἶσον δύναται τῇ παρὰ, βαρυνομένη δὲ ὡς ἐν τῷ, ἀλλ᾽ ἄνα εἰ μέμονάς γε, τὸ ἀνάστηθι σημαίνει. (1.403.27-33).

Here is another instance where Eustathius comments on the preposition ἀνά and analyzes the different interpretations it can possibly acquire while using passages of the *Iliad* as examples.

---

[74] ἡ δὲ ὀνοματοποιΐα τρόπος ἐστὶ ποιητικὸς καὶ αὐτὴ μιμουμένη τοὺς τῶν σωμάτων ἤχους, καὶ γέμει ταύτης ἡ ποίησις, ὡς πολλαχοῦ δειχθήσεται.

In the phrase ἀνὰ Γαργάρῳ ἄκρῳ (*Il.* 14.352) that translates to "on topmost Gargarus" (Murray, 1925, p. 93), he explains that the preposition ἀνά is similar to ἐπί and has the meaning of "on". In the phrase χρυσέῳ ἀνὰ σκήπτρῳ (*Il.* 1.15) "on a staff of gold" (Murray, 1924, p. 13) the preposition ἀνά is equivalent to συν ("with"). In the extract ὄχθησαν δ' ἀνὰ δῶμα Διὸς θεοὶ Οὐρανίωνες (*Il.* 1.570) "then the gods of heaven throughout the palace of Zeus were troubled" (Murray, 1924, p. 57) ἀνά is equal to κατά ("on, over, throughout", LSJ s.v. κατά B.I.2). Ἀνά has the same meaning as the preposition παρά ("from the side of, from beside , from", LSJ s.v. πᾰρά A) in the phrase κτείνονται ἀν' αὐτάς (*Il.* 13.110) "but are being slain among them" (Murray, 1925, p. 11). Lastly, when the accent is drawn back to the penultimate syllable, as in the passage ἀλλ' ἄνα εἰ μέμονάς γε (*Il.* 9.248) "but up then, if you are inclined" (Murray, 1924, p. 413) it has, among other interpretations, a similar meaning as the verb ἀνίστημι ("make to stand up, raise up" LSJ s.v. ἀνίστημι I). Finally, he claims that in the term ἀνάθορε ("spring up" LSJ s.v. ἀναθρῴσκω), the prepositional prefix has the meaning of "upwards". In ἀνέλαβε ("get back, regain, recover" LSJ s.v. ἀναλαμβάνω II) it has the meaning of "back, again". This is also stated by Apion in *Fragmenta de glossis Homericis* (74.219.13-14).[75]

2.4.5

ἥρω' Εὐρύπυλον· πολλοὶ δ' ἀμφ' αὐτὸν ἑταῖροι
Κήτειοι κτείνοντο γυναίων εἵνεκα δώρων. (*Od.* 11.520-521).

The hero Eurypylus!—and many of his comrades, the Ceteians, were slain about him, because of gifts a woman craved. (Murray, 1919, p. 439).

Ἐν δὲ τῷ, ἥρω Εὐρύπυλον, οἱ μὲν ἥρωα νοοῦσι κατ' ἔκθλιψιν, οἱ δὲ ἥρω φασὶ δισυλλάβως ἢ κατὰ κλίσιν ἰσοσύλλαβον, ἢ μᾶλλον κατὰ ἀποκοπήν, ὁμοίως τῷ γέλω ἔκθανον. Ὅρα δὲ καὶ ὅτι Εὐρύπυλος μὲν τὸ κύριον, τὸ δὲ ἐπιθετικὸν εὐρυπυλές, ὡς δηλοῖ τὸ, εὐρυπυλὲς Ἄϊδος δῶ. ἔχει δέ τινα ὁμοίαν διφόρησιν καταλήξεως καὶ τὸ ἄτερπος καὶ ἀτερπὴς, ὧν τοῦ μὲν χρῆσις ἐν τῷ, ἀτέρπου ὀϊζύος, τοῦ δὲ ἐν τῷ, ἀτερπέα δ' αὖλιν ἔκυρσαν. (1.431.27-31).

In this remark, Eustathius focuses on the term ἥρως ("hero", LSJ s.v. ἥρως, ὁ) and the proper name Εὐρύπυλος ("Eurypylus"). Regarding the first one, he explains that it can be declined following either the third or the second declension's rules. In the first instance, the accusative case will be ἥρωα. In the second, it will be ἥρω by elision, declined as having the same number of syllables or because of apocope. The latter also appears in another passage of the *Odyssey*, namely γέλω ἔκθανον (*Od.* 18.100) ("to die with laughter", Murray, 1919, p. 207), where the noun γέλως ("laugther", LSJ s.v. γέλως) appears in the dative case having the same number of syllables and no ending. Aelius Herodianus mentions that the Athenians decline this kind of nouns as having the same number of syllables, thus this could be a characteristic of the Attic dialect (*Περὶ κλίσεως ὀνομάτων,* 3,2.714.2-4).[76]

---

[75] ἢ τὸ ἐξ ὑστέρου, ὡς τὸ „ἀνέλαβεν".
[76] ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι Ἀθηναῖοι ἐπὶ τούτων πάντων ἰσοσύλλαβον ποιοῦνται κλίσιν· τοῦ γέλω γὰρ καὶ τοῦ Μίνω καὶ τοῦ ἥρω λέγουσιν.

As for Εὐρύπυλος, he firstly makes a distinction between the proper name (Εὐρύπυλος) and the adjective and he continues by analyzing the latter. He explains that the adjective can appear with two different suffixes, either as εὐρυπυλής or as εὐρύπυλος "with broad gates" (LSJ s.v. εὐρυ-πυλής, ές). The first one is an adjective of the third declension and the masculine and feminine forms are the same (εὐρυπυλής) while the neutral has the ending ες. The second one is an adjective of the second declension and each gender has a different suffix, namely εὐρύπυλος, -η, -ον. Homer uses the epithet in the form of the third declension in the phrase εὐρυπυλὲς Ἄϊδος δῶ that appears in both epics (*Il.* 23.74 & *Od.* 11.571).

In a similar manner, the adjective ἄτερπος ("unpleasing, joyless" LSJ s.v. ἀτερπ-ής, ές) has a second form with an η instead of an ο in the last syllable, namely ἀτερπής. Eustathius offers two examples on from Homer (ἀτέρπου ὀϊζύος, *Il.* 6.285) and one from Oppianus (ἀτερπέα δ᾽ αὖλιν ἔκυρσαν, *Halieutica* 1.34) for the forms ἄτερπος and ἀτερπής respectively. According to the TLG database, the first form (ἄτερπος) appears only in Homer and commentaries to the epics, while Aristonicus states that there are scholars who do not acknowledge that form (*De signis Iliadis,* 6.284-5.6-7).[77]

2.4.6

ἢ δολιχὴ νοῦσος, ἦ Ἄρτεμις ἰοχέαιρα
οἷσ᾽ ἀγανοῖσι βέλεσσιν ἐποιχομένη κατέπεφνεν; (*Od.* 11.172-173).

Was it long disease, or did the archer, Artemis, assail you with her gentle shafts, and slay you? (Murray, 1919, p. 413).

Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι ἐν τῷ, ἢ δολιχὴ νοῦσος ἢ Ἄρτεμις, ὁ η̄ σύνδεσμος διαπορητικός ἐστι κατὰ τοὺς παλαιούς, δίχα δηλαδὴ ἐρωτήσεως ὡς ἐν τοῖς εἰς τὴν ἄλφα ῥαψῳδίαν τῆς Ἰλιάδος γέγραπται. ἔνθα δεδήλωται καὶ ὅτι πολλαχῶς ὁ τοιοῦτος νοεῖται σύνδεσμος. διαζευκτικός τε γάρ ἐστι καὶ διασαφητικὸς καὶ παραδιαζευκτικὸς καὶ διαπορητικὸς ὅτε τις μὴ ἐρωτᾷ, καὶ ἰσοδύναμος τῷ εἰ καὶ ἐρωτηματικὸς καὶ βεβαιωτικὸς καὶ συγκριτικός. ἐνταῦθα δὲ ῥητέον ὅτι καὶ λυτικὸς νόμῳ φιλοσόφων, οἷον· διὰ τί ἐπαινεῖται ἡ μέλισσα. τοῦτο ἀπορία. λύσις δὲ αὐτῆς τό, ἢ ὅτι ἀγαθὴ ἐργάτις ἐστί. λαμβάνεται δέ ποτε καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ εἰ μή, οἷον· τί ἂν καλὸν ἐποίησα ἢ τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον θαυμάσας, ἤγουν εἰ μὴ θαυμάσας. τοῦτο δὲ ἰσοδύναμόν ἐστι τῷ ἀλλὰ συνδέσμῳ. λαμβάνεται δέ ποτε τὸ ἢ καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ καθό, φασιν, ἢ ω̄ς. (1.406.14-22).

This is a rare passage where Eustathius comments on conjunctions. He focuses on the conjunction ἢ and its different interpretations. According to the ancient scholars, ἢ is an interrogative conjunction and is followed by two questions. He continues by stating that it could also be disjunctive, affirmative, confirmatory, comparative when not followed by a question and confutative. In some instances, it is equivalent to εἰ ("if") and εἰ μή ("if not"). In the last case, it is also equivalent to the conjunction ἀλλά ("but"). Rarely, it appears similar to the adverb καθό ("in so far as, according as", LSJ s.v.

---

[77] ἔνιοι δὲ ἀγνοήσαντες γράφουσιν ἀτέρπου.

καθό). A similar extract where he analyzes these interpretations also appears in the *Commentary on the Iliad* (1.100.1-17).[78]

αὐτὸ δὲ καὶ ἧχι μετ' ἐπεκτάσεως γίνεται ἀντὶ τοῦ ὅ που. ἔστιν ἥ καὶ ὅρκιον μετὰ τοῦ μήν, οἷον· ἦ μὴν ποιήσω τόδε. οὕτω δὲ καὶ μετὰ τοῦ μέν, οἷον· ἦ μέν μοι πρόφρων ἔπεσι καὶ χερσὶν ἀρήξειν. Περὶ δὲ τοῦ ἦ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔφη, ῥήματος ὄντος, ἕτερος λόγος. ὅτι δὲ ὁ ἥ σύνδεσμος λαμβάνεταί ποτε μετὰ ψιλῆς καὶ περισπωμένης ἀντὶ τοῦ ἄρα τοῦ κατ' ἐρώτησιν προπερισπωμένου, οὐκ ἄδηλόν ἐστιν. ἐκεῖνο δ' ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις καινὸν φέρεται, ὅτι τὸ ἥ, ἀντὶ τοῦ δή, ὅτε φασὶ καὶ ἐγκλίνεται, οἷον· ἐπείη. καὶ μὴν περὶ τούτου ἀλλοῖόν τι ἐν τοῖς εἰς τὴν Ἰλιάδα ἐγράφη, ὃ καὶ ζητητέον ἐκεῖ. (1.406.22-28).

Eustathius continues with the same comment and offers some more details on the conjunction ἤ. He explains that the conjunction can appear as ἧχι due to extension and is similar to ὅ που ("where"). It can also precede the particle μήν, in which case it indicates an oath, and similarly μέν. He distinguishes the conjunction ἦ from the third person singular form of the imperfect tense of the verb ἠμί (ἦ), which Homer uses instead of ἔφη in the *Iliad* (1.528).[79] He comments on its accentuation. It occurs with both, the grave accent and the circumflex. Aelius Herodianus points out that the conjunction is disjunctive and since it appears twice, the first one is pronounced with the grave accent (ἢ δολιχὴ νοῦσος) and the latter with the circumflex (ἦ Ἄρτεμις ἰοχέαιρα) (*De prosodia catholica,* 3,1.518.12-14).[80] This is also mentioned in *Scholia in Iliadem* (20.17.3-5).[81]

A newly-invented feature of the conjunction is that it can substitute the particle δή. In that case, it is pronounced with the grave accent. Thus, the conjunction ἐπειδή can appear as ἐπείη. That can be found in many instances in Homer's *Iliad.* This comment is quite similar to the one regarding the distinctions of the preposition ἀνά. He attempts to explain grammatical rules in an uncomplicated way, most likely for his students to understand the phenomena.

---

[78] διασαφητικὸς τοιοῦτος σύνδεσμος ὁ μεταξὺ δύο λόγων τιθέμενος καὶ ἐκλεγόμενος τὸ ἕτερον, εἰς ἐπίτασιν δέ ποτε προσλαμβάνων τὸ μᾶλλον ἐπίρρημα, κατὰ τὸ ῥηθὲν τοῦ Φωκίονος νόημα, ἢ τὸν περ σύνδεσμον, ὡς ἀνωτέρω γέγραπται. παραδιαζευκτικὸς μέντοι ὁ μὴ τῶν δύο λέξεων τὸ ἓν δεχόμενος οἷον· ἢ Ἀχαιοὶ ἢ Πελοποννήσιοι. τοῦτο γὰρ διαζευκτικοῦ τοῦ ἢ συνδέσμου ἴδιον· ἀλλά πως καὶ τοὺς δύο, οἷον «χιτῶνά μοι χρῆσον ἢ καὶ ἱμάτιον». αἰτεῖ μὲν γὰρ τὸ ἕτερον, οὐ λυπεῖ δὲ καὶ τὰ δύο δοθέντα. ὅτι δὲ δίχα τῶν εἰρημένων καὶ ἄλλα σημαινόμενά εἰσι τοῦ ἢ συνδέσμου, δηλοῖ ὁ γράψας, ὅτι ἐστὶ καὶ διαπορητικός· οἷον «ἢ ὅγε φάσγανον ὀξὺ ἐρυσάμενος» καὶ «ἠὲ χόλον παύσειε» καὶ «ἢ δολιχὴ νοῦσος ἢ Ἄρτεμις ἰοχέαιρα». ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἰσοδύναμος τῷ εἰ· οἷον «ἢ καὶ ἐμὸν δόρυ μαίνεται ἐν παλάμῃσι» καὶ «ἢ τοιόσδε ἐών» ἐν τῇ γάμμα ῥαψῳδίᾳ. ἔστι καὶ παρέλκον ὑποτασσόμενον πύσματι· οἷον «ἀλλὰ τί ἤ μοι ταῦτα διελέξατο θυμός;» ἔστι καὶ ἐρωτηματικὸν διαλαμβανόμενόν ποτε καὶ δὶς καὶ τρὶς ἐν διαζευκτικαῖς διανοίαις ἐντελέσιν· οἷον «ἠέ τι Μυρμιδόνεσσιν ἢ ἐμοὶ αὐτῷ» καὶ ἑξῆς. ἔστι καὶ βεβαιωτικὸν οἷον «ἦ μάλα δὴ τέθνηκε Μενοιτίου ἄλκιμος υἱός». ἔστι καὶ συγκριτικὸν οἷον «τοῦ ἑλομένου τὸ ἀγαθὸν οὐχ' ἧττον ἢ τοῦ παρασχόντος τὰ σπέρματα». ὅτι δὲ καὶ ἄλλα τινὰ ὀλίγα σημαίνει ὁ ἢ σύνδεσμος, ἐν τοῖς εἰς τὴν Ὀδύσσειαν δηλοῦται, ὅπου ἡ Νεκυία.

[79] Ἦ καὶ κυανέῃσιν ἐπ' ὀφρύσι νεῦσε Κρονίων. ("The son of Cronos spoke, and bowed his dark brow in assent", Murray, 1924, p. 53).

[80] ἐν μὲν γὰρ τῷ «ἢ δολιχὴ νοῦσος ἢ Ἄρτεμις ἰοχέαιρα» διαζευκτικὸν τὸ αἰφνιδίως τελευτῆσαι τοῦ μακροχρονεῖν. ὅθεν ὁ πρῶτος ἐγκλίνεται, ὁ δὲ δεύτερος περισπᾶται.

[81] ἢ δολιχὴ νοῦσος ἢ Ἄρτεμις ἰοχέαιρα" (λ 172), „ἠὲ νέον μεθέπεις ἦ καὶ πατρώϊός ἐσσι" (α 175)· ἐν γὰρ ταῖς τοιαύταις συντάξεσιν ὁ μὲν πρότερος ἢ ἐγκλίνεται, ὁ δὲ δεύτερος περισπᾶται.

2.4.7

τιμὴν δὲ λελόγχασιν ἶσα θεοῖσι. (*Od*. 11.304).

And they have won honor like that of the gods. (Murray, 1919, p. 423).

Τὸ δὲ λελόγχασι, δηλοῖ μὲν τὸ ἔλαχον, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐξαιρέτως ἔσχον, ἀπὸ τοῦ λέγω. ἐξ οὗ ὁ ἐπίλεκτος καὶ τὸ ἐπιλέγδην ἐπίρρημα. καὶ οἱ λογάδες οὐ μόνον ἄνδρες, ἀλλὰ καὶ λίθοι. ἔστι δὲ χρόνου ἢ παρακειμένου καθ’ ὁμοιότητα τοῦ κέκλοφα καὶ κέκοφα, ἵνα ᾖ λέλοχα καὶ πλεονασμῷ τοῦ ν̄ δι’ εὐφωνίαν λέλογχα, ἢ μέσος παρακείμενος λέλογα προσλαβὼν καὶ τὸ χ̄, ἢ καὶ ἀμφοτέρων μίγμα τοῦ τε λέλογα καὶ τοῦ λέλοχα. οὕτω δὲ μικτόν τι καὶ τὸ ἐνήνοχα καὶ τὰ ἐξ αὐτοῦ σύνθετα. τὸ μὲν γὰρ μικρὸν ὁ μέσου παρακειμένου ἴδιον, ἐνεργητικοῦ δὲ τὸ σύμφωνον τῆς παραληγούσης. καὶ οὕτω μὲν κοινότερον. Ἡρωδιανὸς δὲ ἐκ τοῦ λήχω τὸ λαγχάνω παράγων τὸ λέλοχα τροπῇ τοῦ η̄ εἰς ο̄ μικρὸν ὁμοίως τῷ πήθω πέποθα λέγει καὶ πλεονάζειν ἐν αὐτοῖς τὸ ν̄, ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ κέχανδα, οἷον, οἶκον κεχανδότα πολλὰ καὶ ἐσθλά. Σημείωσαι δὲ ὅτι τὸ λελόγχασι συστέλλει τὴν παραλήγουσαν, παρὰ τὴν κοινὴν μὲν παρατήρησιν, ἢ μακροπαράληκτα οἶδε τὰ τῶν τοιούτων παρακειμένων τρίτα πρόσωπα, πλὴν ἄλλως, ἀναλόγως τῇ πρὸ αὐτοῦ ὅλῃ κλίσει τοῦ λέλογχα. εἰ δ’ ἴσως εὑρεθείη που κατ’ ἔκθλιψιν τῆς ληγούσης γραφόμενον, τιμὴν δὲ λελόγχασ’ ἶσα θεοῖσι, τότε δὴ καὶ αὐτὸ ἐκτεταμένον ἔσται κατὰ τὸ τετύφασι καὶ πεποιήκασι καὶ τὰ ὅμοια. (1.418.28-40).

In his comment to this short extract of the *Odyssey*, Eustathius comments on the morphology and prosody of the third plural indicative perfect active λελόγχασιν of λαγχάνω ("obtain by lot" LSJ s.v. λαγχάνω). In addition to the perfect active λέλογχα, described as poetic and Ionic in LSJ (s.v. λαγχάνω), two more perfect active stems were in use: εἴληχα, which is the common perfect active, used in (Attic) prose and the rare and mostly late λέλαχ-, first attested in a fragment of Empedocles (frag. 115).[82] Eustathius does not connect λελόγχασι to either stem.

Eustathius begins by defining meaning and derivation. It means ἔλαχον (from λαγχάνω), "got" or rather "had especially" (ἐξαιρέτως ἔσχον) and it derives from the verb λέγω, later clarifying that this derivation is the more common one and that Herodianus offers another.

If it derives from λέγω, the form can be explained in three ways, Eustathius explains. Either it is a perfect, formed similarly to κέκλοφα and κέκοφα, perfects to κλέπτω and κόπτω, respectively, with a vowel change of ε to ο and aspiration of the velar stop to λέλοχα, but adding a ν for the sake of euphony, becoming λέλογχα. Another explanation is that it is formed without aspiration (λέλογα) with a redundant χ. Or it is a mixture of the two types of formation. Eustathius cites the perfect ἐνήνοχα and its derivatives as a parallel for this mixed type of formation. This perhaps refers to the explanation that ἐνήνοχα is from the Attic formation ἐνήνεγχα by turning ε to ο and loss of γ (*Παρεκβολαὶ τοῦ μεγάλου ῥήματος* p. 13, l. 17-18).[83] He further explains that the o-grade of the vowel is typical of stem perfect (the so-called μέσος παρακείμενος), while it is more common that the stem of κ-perfects (the so-called ἐνεργητικὸς παρακείμενος) remains unchanged.

---

[82] δαίμονες οἵτε μακραίωνος λελάχασι βίοιο.

[83] Πόθεν τὸ ἐνήνοχα; ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐνέγκω ἐνέγξω ἤνεγκα, καὶ Ἀττικῶς ἐνήνεγχα, καὶ τροπῇ τοῦ ε̄ εἰς ο̄ καὶ ἀποβολῇ τοῦ γ̄ ἐνήνοχα.

According to the derivation ascribed to Herodianus, the form λαγχάνω is derived from λήχω and that λέλοχα is from λήχω by a change of η to o and that it has a redundant ν just like πέπονθα from πήθω (for πάσχω). The perfect κέχανδα (from χανδάνω) is adduced as another example of perfect with a redundant ν. Both λήχω and πήθω, as well as other created forms like λήβω (for λαμβάνω) are verbforms that are not attested outside grammatical and lexicographical works and scholarly literature dependent on them. They seem to originate from Herodianus' grammatical works, at least according to both Eustathius and others, for instance Choeroboscus (*Περὶ παθῶν* 3,2.358.16-22).[84] However, pseudo-Zonaras ascribes present forms like θήνω rather than θνήσκω to the aorist ἔθανον, λήβω (not λαμβάνω) to the aorist ἔλαβον, and μήθω (not μανθάνω) to the aorist ἔμαθον to Zenodotus (*Lexicon* epsilon, 622).[85]

Both, λαγχάνω and χανδάνω belong to rather small group of verbs, whose present is formed with a nasal infix and the suffix ανω and which have thematic aorists (ἔλαχον and ἔχαδον), but, unlike most verbs in this group, their perfect stem syllables retain or are strengthened with the nasal (Kühner & Blass, 1892§269.4b and 223.2 Anmerk 2). The perfect from πέπονθα is cited as a parallel to this formation, the ν of the stem is conceived as redundant rather than part of the root o-grade (πνθ-/πενθ-/πονθ).

Finally, Eustathius draws attention to the fact that the penultimate syllable in λελόγχασι is shortened for the sake of the meter, in contrast to the general rule that the third person in the perfect has a long penultimate syllable. According to Herodianus, poets sometimes shorten that syllable (*De prosodia catholica* 3,1.535.28-34).[86] However, he also notes that if it would be spelled λελόγχασ- with elision of the final vowel, the α of the personal ending has its regular prosody and is long, as in τετύφασι and πεποιήκασι.

3. COMMENTS ON THE CONTENT

In this section, I study the comments that refer to the content of the *Odyssey.* There are two kinds; the ones that explain the meaning of the content and the ones that explain the Homeric techniques of narration. There are eight comments in total.

3.1.1

---

[84] τὸ η̅ εἰς α̅ τρέπεται ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ ἀορίστῳ κατὰ τὴν παραλήγουσαν, εἰς α̅ δὲ συστελλόμενον διὰ τὸ τὸν δεύτερον ἀόριστον βραχείᾳ θέλειν παραλήγεσθαι, λήβω ἔλαβον, μήθω ἔμαθον, πρήθω ἔπραθον, φήγω ἔφαγον, λήθω ἔλαθον, πήθω ἔπαθον, δήκω ἔδακον, λήχω ἔλαχον, τήκω ἔτακον, πλήσσω ἔπλαγον, ἐξ οὗ τὸ ἐπλάγην πρὸς διάφορον σημαινόμενον, εἰ μὲν γάρ τις σωματικῶς πλήσσεται, ἐπλήγην, εἰ δὲ ψυχικῶς, ἐπλάγην.

[85] Ἔθανον. οὐκ ἀπὸ τοῦ θνήσκω, ἀλλ᾽ ἀπὸ τοῦ θήνω, ἔθανον, ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ λήβω ἔλαβον, μήθω ἔμαθον. οὕτω Ζηνόδοτος.

[86] Τὰ εἰς σι λήγοντα ῥήματα μακρᾷ παραλήγει, ἱστᾶσι, κιχρᾶσι, ἑστήκασι, βεβασιλεύκασι, τετύφασι, γεγράφασι, νενοήκασι. ποιηταὶ δὲ ἐνίοτε συστέλλουσι, ὡς παρὰ Ξενοφάνει «ἐξ ἀρχῆς καθ᾽ Ὅμηρον ἐπεὶ μεμαθήκασι πάντες» καὶ πάλιν «ὁππόσα δὴ θνητοῖσι πεφήνασιν εἰσοράασθαι», καὶ παρ᾽ Ἀντιμάχῳ «οἱ δὲ πάροιθε πόνοιο νενεύκασιν ἄλλος ἐπ᾽ ἄλλῳ» καὶ παρὰ Ὁμήρῳ (λ 304) «τιμὴν δὲ λελόγχασι».

ἄνδρας ὑπερφιάλους, οἵ τοι βίοτον κατέδουσι
μνώμενοι ἀντιθέην ἄλοχον καὶ ἔδνα διδόντες. (*Od.* 11.116-117).

Contemptuous men that devour your livelihood, wooing your godlike wife, and offering wooers' gifts. (Murray, 1919, p. 409).

Τὸ δὲ τῶν μνηστήρων δοκεῖ ἀστεῖον εἶναι, εἰ ἐκ μέρους μὲν βιάζονται κατέδοντες τὰ τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως, ἐκ μέρους δὲ καταβάλλονται ἔδνα, ὡς οἷον ἀντισηκοῦντες τὸ ἀδίκημα, καὶ τῇ βίᾳ καὶ ἀδικίᾳ παραμιγνύντες δικαιοπράγημα. ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλως εἰπεῖν, ὅτι τὸν μὲν Ὀδυσσέα περιφρονοῦντες ὡς μηκέτι ὄντα κατέδουσι τὰ ἐκείνου, βίοτον τοῦτον ἀλλότριον, τὴν δὲ Πηνελόπην ἕκαστος ὡς γυναῖκα ἕξων θεραπεύει δώροις. (1.402.9-13).

In this extract, Eustathius comments on the content of the *Odyssey* and specifically on the suitors' behavior. He explains how their actions appear funny to him. The suitors are trying to devour Odysseus' fortune as they woo Penelope. Since they use both force and devour to achieve it, they try to look righteous by offering wedding gifts as if to compensate for the injustice with their wrongdoing.

3.1.2

Ἀντιθέαν δὲ αὐτὴν Ὀδυσσεὺς λέγει κληθῆναι παρὰ τοῦ Τειρεσίου, ὑποδεικνὺς τῷ Ἀλκινόῳ ἀγαθῆς ἀντιποεῖσθαι γυναικός, δι' ἣν οὐκ ἂν ἐθέλοι μένειν παρὰ τοῖς Φαίαξιν, ἀλλὰ ταχὺ ἀπελθεῖν ἵνα νικήσας τοὺς μνηστῆρας ὁποῖά τι μέγα ἔπαθλον νίκης αὐτὴν λήψεται. (1.409.13-16).

Here, Eustathius notes that Penelope is called ἀντιθέαν, ("equal to the gods, godlike", LSJ s.v. ἀντίθεος, η, ον) an adjective that is applied to the companions of Odysseus and the suitors but rarely to women (Autenrieth, 1895, p. 33). Indeed, the particular adjective can only be found in the TLG database in the feminine form, besides *Odyssey*, in Quintus' *Posthomerica* where he uses it to refer to Helen in several occasions (2.97, 6.152, 13.503, 13.525)[87] and only once to the nymph Clonia (1.235).[88] By this maneuver, Eustathius draws attention to Odysseus' clever rhetorical tactics. He points out Odysseus' lack of validity by implying that Odysseus is the one claiming that Tiresias calls his wife ἀντιθέαν. Since he is the narrator of the story, he might not be completely objective and present certain situations differently. In fact, it is Odysseus himself who calls his wife ἀντιθέαν, but he creates the impression that the high evaluation of his wife stems from someone else.

3.1.3

ἀλλ' ἄγε μοι τόδε εἰπὲ καὶ ἀτρεκέως κατάλεξον·
τίς νύ σε κὴρ ἐδάμασσε τανηλεγέος θανάτοιο;
ἦ δολιχὴ νοῦσος, ἦ Ἄρτεμις ἰοχέαιρα
οἷσ' ἀγανοῖσι βέλεσσιν ἐποιχομένη κατέπεφνεν;
εἰπὲ δέ μοι πατρός τε καὶ υἱέος, ὃν κατέλειπον,

---

[87] ἀντιθέης Ἑλένης, ἀντιθέη Ἑλένη, ἀντιθέην παράκοιτιν, ἀντιθέης Ἑλένης.
[88] Αἶψα δ' ὅ γ' ἀντιθέην Κλονίην βάλε.

ἢ ἔτι πὰρ κείνοισιν ἐμὸν γέρας, ἦέ τις ἤδη
ἀνδρῶν ἄλλος ἔχει, ἐμὲ δ' οὐκέτι φασὶ νέεσθαι.
εἰπὲ δέ μοι μνηστῆς ἀλόχου βουλήν τε νόον τε,
ἠὲ μένει παρὰ παιδὶ καὶ ἔμπεδα πάντα φυλάσσει,
ἦ ἤδη μιν ἔγημεν Ἀχαιῶν ὅς τις ἄριστος. (*Od.* 11.170-179).

But come, tell me this, and declare it truly. What fate of pitiless death overcame you? Was it long disease, or did the archer, Artemis, assail you with her gentle shafts, and slay you? And tell me of my father and my son, whom I left behind me. Does the honor that was mine still remain with them, or does some other man now possess it, and do they say that I shall no longer return? And tell me of my wedded wife, of her purpose and of her mind. Does she remain with her son, and keep all things safe? Or has one already married her, whoever is best of the Achaeans? (Murray, 1919, p. 413).

Σημείωσαι δὲ καὶ ὅτι τριῶν οὐσῶν ἐρωτήσεων ἐφεξῆς τῷ Ὀδυσσεῖ πρὸς τὴν μητέρα, ἤγουν, τίς νόσος αὐτὴν ἐδάμασε, καὶ εἴπερ τὸ αὐτοῦ γέρας παρὰ τῷ Λαέρτῃ καὶ τῷ Τηλεμάχῳ ἐστὶ, καὶ πῶς ἔχει τὰ κατὰ τὴν γυναῖκα. διὸ καὶ τρὶς ἐν τούτοις κεῖται τὸ, εἰπέ μοι τόδε, καὶ πάλιν, εἰπὲ δέ μοι πατρὸς καὶ υἱέος, καὶ, εἰπὲ δέ μοι μνηστῆς ἀλόχου βουλήν. ἡ μήτηρ ἐν τῷ ἀποκρίνεσθαι ἀναποδίζει. καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ τέλους ἀρξαμένη ἄνεισιν εἰς τὸ πρῶτον κατὰ βαθμίδα τινά. καὶ πρῶτα μὲν φησὶ περὶ τῆς γυναικὸς ὡς λίαν μένει παρὰ τῷ υἱῷ τετληότι θυμῷ, εἶτα περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ, καὶ μετ' αὐτὸν περὶ τοῦ πατρός. ἐφ' οἷς ἐπαναβᾶσα εἰς τὸ πρῶτον λέγει περὶ τῆς νόσου. ὅθεν δῆλον ὡς οὐ πάντῃ ἀναγκαῖον ἐν ταῖς πεύσεσι πρῶτον ἀπαντᾶν πρὸς τὸ πρῶτον καὶ ἑξῆς πρὸς τὰ καθ' εἱρμὸν, ἀλλ' ὅπῃ τύχῃ γίνεσθαι τὰ τῆς ἀποκρίσεως καὶ ὅπως ἂν συμφέρῃ τῷ ἀποκρινομένῳ. (1.406.37-45).

In this passage, Eustathius comments on the three questions that Odysseus asks his mother. Firstly, he asks about the cause of her death, then about his son and father and lastly about his wife. All three questions begin with variations of the same phrase that translates to "tell me". "Μοι τόδε εἰπὲ" for the first and "εἰπὲ δέ μοι" for the other two. In her response, Odysseus' mother answers the questions in the opposite order. She starts by mentioning his wife, then his son and father and finishes by referring to her death. Eustathius claims that it is not necessary for the questions to be answered in the particular order they were asked. It could be a random order, or rather one that is convenient for the responder. Perhaps Eustathius' intention was to encourage his students to learn composing.

In *The structures of the Odyssey* (1997 (2009)), Tracy comments on this particular extract, mentioning that Homer uses a technique called ring structure. This is a frequent technique in which the three questions are answered in a reverse order, starting from the last and finishing with the first, in the form of abc-cba. It could have been out of courtesy that his mother refers to his wife first, even though she was mentioned last, due to Odysseus being impatient and is looking for information. Nevertheless, mentioning her death last draws attention to herself and is a way of showing Odysseus the significance of his homecoming (p. 447-448 & 451).

3.1.4

διογενὲς Λαερτιάδη, πολυμήχαν᾽ Ὀδυσσεῦ,
τίπτ᾽ αὖτ᾽, ὦ δύστηνε, λιπὼν φάος ἠελίοιο
ἤλυθες, ὄφρα ἴδῃ νέκυας καὶ ἀτερπέα χῶρον; (*Od.* 11.92-94).

Son of Laertes, sprung from Zeus, Odysseus of many devices, what now, unlucky man? Why have you left the light of the sun and come here to behold the dead and the place where there is no joy? (Murray, 1919, p. 407).

τέκνον ἐμόν, πῶς ἦλθες ὑπὸ ζόφον ἠερόεντα
ζωὸς ἐών; (*Od.* 11.155-156).

My child, how did you come beneath the murky darkness, being still alive? (Murray, 1919, p. 411).

διογενὲς Λαερτιάδη, πολυμήχαν᾽ Ὀδυσσεῦ,
σχέτλιε, τίπτ᾽ ἔτι μεῖζον ἐνὶ φρεσὶ μήσεαι ἔργον;
πῶς ἔτλης Ἄϊδόσδε κατελθέμεν, ἔνθα τε νεκροὶ
ἀφραδέες ναίουσι, βροτῶν εἴδωλα καμόντων; (*Od.* 11.473-476).

Son of Laertes, sprung from Zeus, Odysseus of many devices, stubborn man, what deed yet greater than this will you devise in your heart? How did you dare to come down to Hades, where dwell the unheeding dead, the phantoms of men outworn? (Murray, 1919, p. 435).

Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι συχνὰ ὁ ποιητὴς ἀπορεῖ περὶ τῆς εἰς Ἅιδην καθόδου τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως διὰ τὸ ἄγαν μυθῶδες. ἐνταῦθα μὲν γὰρ ὁ Τειρεσίας ἔφη· τί δή ποτε ὦ δύστηνε, καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς. Ὀδυσσεὺς δὲ πρὸ τούτου ἐπέστησεν ὅτι εἰς Ἅιδην οὔπω τις ἀφίκετο νηὶ μελαίνη. ἡ δὲ μήτηρ Ἀντίκλεια ἐν τοῖς ἑξῆς ἐρωτᾷ· τέκνον ἐμόν, πῶς ἦλθες ὑπὸ ζόφον; καὶ Ἀχιλλεὺς ὁμοίως· σχέτλιε, πῶς ἔτλης Ἄϊδόσδε κατελθεῖν; ἔνθα καὶ τὸ τοῦ πράγματος ἀναιδὲς ἐπισημαινόμενος ὁ ποιητὴς φησί· σχέτλιε τίπτ᾽ ἔτι μεῖζον ἐνὶ φρεσὶ μήσεαι ἔργον; δηλῶν, ὡς καὶ ἄλλα μὲν ἐτόλμησε περὶ Ὀδυσσέως τερατεύσασθαι, τοῦτο δὲ τῶν ἄλλων τὸ τερατωδέστερον. (1.401.13-19).

Here, Eustathius comments on the marvelous element of the *katabasis*. He begins with a reference to the tenth book of the *Odyssey* where Odysseus refers to Circe and states that no one can guide him to Hades because no one has traveled there in a black ship (501-502),[89] although others have descended before him. Eustathius mentions that as well on a previous chapter in the *Commentary on the Odyssey* (1.391.10-12).[90]

In this extract, he combines three different passages of the *Odyssey* (book 11), in which Odysseus is asked, by a different person each time, how he managed to descend to the Netherworld. The prophet Tiresias is the first one to ask Odysseus about the reason he visited Hades, even though he is still alive. Then, his mother Anticlea wonders the same thing. Finally, Achilles asks him the same question, while also emphasizing that this is Odysseus' hardest task yet. The repetition of this question strengthens Eustathius' exaggeration argument. The scholar claims that the *katabasis* is too excessive, even in comparison with the other achievements of Odysseus. Eustathius points out how unreal this task is even for someone like Odysseus. Homer's narrative about Odysseus is boldly marvelous in other parts too, but this is the most marvelous of his inventions.

---

[89] ὦ Κίρκη, τίς γὰρ ταύτην ὁδὸν ἡγεμονεύσει; εἰς Ἄιδος δ᾽ οὔ πώ τις ἀφίκετο νηὶ μελαίνη.
[90] Τὸ δὲ νηὶ μελαίνῃ, πρὸς ἀσφάλειαν κεῖται λόγου. εἰ γὰρ καί τινες εἰς Ἄιδος ἀφίκοντο οἷον καὶ Ἡρακλῆς καὶ Θησεὺς καὶ Περίθους, ἀλλὰ νηὶ μελαίνη οὐδείς.

Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι ἀποσεμνύνων καὶ πάλιν ἑαυτὸν Ὀδυσσεὺς ἐπὶ τῇ εἰς Ἅιδην καθόδῳ καὶ ἄλλως δὲ εἰπεῖν ἐνδεικνύμενος ὁ ποιητής, καθὰ καὶ αὐτὸ προερρέθη, ὡς πάντῃ τολμηρῶς ἡ τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως ἐπλάσθη κάθοδος, ποιεῖ τὸν Ἀχιλλέα ἐρωτῶντα. (1.428.38-41).

Once more, Eustathius mentions the exaggeration of Odysseus' *katabasis* and his subjective narrative. He claims that Odysseus glorifies himself with his portrayal of the story by having yet another hero, namely Achilles, asking about his descent to the Netherworld. In this manner, Odysseus' daring is indirectly praised by another individual and thus proves his excellence. This comment is similar to the one where his wife is named *godlike* by Tiresias (see comment 3.1.2).

3.1.5

διογενὲς Λαερτιάδη, πολυμήχαν᾽ Ὀδυσσεῦ,
ἆ δείλ᾽, ἦ τινὰ καὶ σὺ κακὸν μόρον ἡγηλάζεις,
ὅν περ ἐγὼν ὀχέεσκον ὑπ᾽ αὐγὰς ἠελίοιο.
Ζηνὸς μὲν πάϊς ἦα Κρονίονος, αὐτὰρ ὀϊζὺν
εἶχον ἀπειρεσίην· μάλα γὰρ πολὺ χείρονι φωτὶ
δεδμήμην, ὁ δέ μοι χαλεποὺς ἐπετέλλετ᾽ ἀέθλους.
καί ποτέ μ᾽ ἐνθάδ᾽ ἔπεμψε κύν᾽ ἄξοντ᾽· οὐ γὰρ ἔτ᾽ ἄλλον
φράζετο τοῦδέ γέ μοι κρατερώτερον εἶναι ἄεθλον.
τὸν μὲν ἐγὼν ἀνένεικα καὶ ἤγαγον ἐξ Ἀΐδαο·
Ἑρμείας δέ μ᾽ ἔπεμπεν ἰδὲ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη. (*Od.* 11.617-626).

Son of Laertes, sprung from Zeus, Odysseus of many devices, ah, wretched man, do you, too, drag out an evil lot such as I once bore beneath the rays of the sun? I was the son of Zeus, son of Cronus, but I suffered woe beyond measure; for I was made subject to a man far worse than I, and he laid on me hard labors. Once he sent me even here to fetch the hound of Hades, for he could devise for me no other task harder than this. The hound I carried off and led out from the house of Hades; and Hermes was my guide, and flashing-eyed Athene. (Murray, 1919, p. 445).

Ὅτι ὁ ποιητής τε καὶ ὁ Ὀδυσσεὺς ὁ μὲν συνιστῶν παρὰ Φαίαξιν ἑαυτὸν ὡς Ἡράκλειον ἆθλον μικροῦ ἀνύσαντα καὶ τῶν Ἡρακλέος ἄθλων τὸν δυσκατεργαστότερον, ὁ δὲ τὸ ἄπιστον τῆς εἰς Ἅιδου καθόδου τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως θεραπεύων ῥητορικῷ νόμῳ δι᾽ ὁμοίου διηγήματος ὡς μηκέτι καινὸν ὂν τὸ κατὰ τὸν Ὀδυσσέα, εἰ καὶ ἄλλοτε τοιοῦτόν τι γέγονε, πλάττουσι τὸν Ἡρακλέα ἐν Ἅιδου, ὡς ἔγνω τε τὸν Ὀδυσσέα καὶ διογενῆ καὶ πολυμήχανον ὀνομάσας προσφωνεῖ οὕτως. (1.441.15-20).

Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι καὶ Ἡρακλῆς, ὡς καὶ ἐν Ἰλιά δηλοῦται, εἰς φιλόσοφον ἄνδρα ἐκλαμβάνεται παρὰ τοῖς παλαιοῖς. διὸ καὶ οὐκ ἀπίθανον Ὀδυσσέα τε καὶ Ἡρακλέα φιλοσοφίας τροφίμους ἄνδρας, τὰ αὐτὰ ποιεῖν ἐνεργήματα. ὅθεν καὶ καθὰ τῷ Ὀδυσσεῖ Ἀθηνᾶ τὰ πλείω κατορθοῖ, δι᾽ ἧς καὶ τῆς Καλυψοῦς ἀπολέλυται συμπράξαντός τι καὶ τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ, οὕτω καὶ τὸν Ἡρακλῆ Ἀθηνᾶ πέμπει καὶ Ἑρμῆς, ἀνάξοντα τὸν θρυλούμενον Κέρβερον. οὗ ἡ ἀλληγορία ἑτέρωθι κεῖται. (1.441.26-31).

In these passages, Eustathius comments on Odysseus meeting Heracles as well as Heracles' descent to the Netherworld. Heracles was sent to Hades in order to take Cerberus out of there, with Athene's support, which is considered his hardest labour.

In Eustathius' analysis, this meeting serves a double purpose, one for the poet, the other for Odysseus.

Eustathius claims that Heracles' appearance aims to persuade the reader of the veracity of Odysseus' *katabasis* since his descent to Hades appears extravagant. Heracles was the only one before Odysseus that descended and managed to return. Proving that someone else has achieved a similar task before makes it seem more believable that Odysseus can do the same. With this myth, Homer achieves to disprove the imaginary element of the *katabasis* by proving that it has occurred before, hence it is achievable and accurate. Odysseus does not appear as excessive and impudent; rather his mission is believed to be truthful. As for Odysseus, he is given the opportunity to show the Phaeacians that his achievement is equivalent to Heracles' hardest labour.

As mentioned in a long discussion in the *Commentary on the Iliad* (2.105.13-106.3)[91] where Eustathius discusses allegorical interpretations of elements of Heracles' myths as philosophy, the ancient scholars perceived Heracles as an ingenious man, in the same manner as Odysseus. Therefore, it would be reasonable for them to attain the same achievements. Another quality they share is the help they received from Athene and Hermes. Odysseus was able to leave Calypso's island and Heracles was able to get Cerberus back only after receiving help from the aforementioned Gods.

3.1.6

ὅσσαι ἀριστήων ἄλοχοι ἔσαν ἠδὲ θύγατρες. (*Od.* 11.227).

All those that had been the wives and the daughters of chieftains. (Murray, 1919, p. 417).

Ὅτι πάνυ δεξιῶς ὁ ποιητὴς τὴν ῥαψῳδίαν ταύτην ἡρώων ἅμα καὶ ἡρωΐδων πεποίηκε κατάλογον, Ἡσιόδου μόνων γυναικῶν ποιησαμένου κατάλογον. καὶ ἔστιν ἰδεῖν αὐτὸν ἐνταῦθα τῇ τῆς νεκυίας ἀφορμῇ πῇ μὲν ἱστορικῶς ἐμπλατυνόμενον καὶ διηγήσεσιν ἐγκροαίνοντα, πῇ δὲ ἐπιτρέχοντα τὰ πολλὰ καὶ στενολεσχοῦντα καὶ τὴν πολυλογίαν ἐπιτέμνοντα καὶ μικροῖς μακρὰ παραβύοντα, ὡς ἐν τῷ, Φαίδρην τε Πρόκριν τε ἴδον καὶ Μαῖραν Κλυμένην τε. ἀφ᾽ ὧν δῆλον ὡς καὶ τῷ σκοτεινῷ καὶ στενῷ τὴν ἱστορίαν Λυκόφρονι αὐτὸς ἐνδοῦναι φαίνεται ἀρχάς τινας τῆς ἐκείνου ποιήσεως. ἐρεῖ δέ τι καὶ περὶ Ἀχιλλέως καὶ Ἀγαμέμνονος καὶ Αἴαντος, ἀναπληρῶν τε, ὡς καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ ἐρρέθη, ἅπερ τῇ Ἰλιάδι ἐλλέλειπται, καὶ ἅμα πλατύνων οὕτω τὴν ποίησιν. εὐταξίαν δὲ τῇ ποιήσει τεχνώμενος καὶ ἀκμὴν καταλέγει πρῶτον ἡρωΐδας, εἶτα διαναπαύσας τὸν λόγον βραχὺ πρὸς ἥρωας μεταβαίνει ἀρχόμενος ἀπὸ Ἀγαμέμνονος. Ἰστέον δὲ καὶ ὡς πρὸς

---

[91] Ὁ δὲ Ἅιδης παρὰ τὸν ὦμον βέβληται, ὑψηλὸν ὄντα τόπον ἐν σώματι, διότι εὐσκόπως πάλιν ὁ αὐτὸς Ἡρακλῆς, τουτέστιν ὁ φιλόσοφος λόγος, κοῦφον εἶναι αὐτὸν καὶ ἀνωφορούμενον κατενόησεν. ὅπουγε καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ ὑπόγαιος ἀὴρ τοιοῦτός ἐστι φύσει. ἢ μάλιστα διότι ἡ καιριωτάτη βολὴ τοῦ λόγου κατὰ τοῦ ἀέρος ἄνω που γίνεται, ὅτε τὰ μετέωρα σκέπτεται. καὶ γὰρ θεωρεῖ μὲν αὐτὸς καὶ τὰ κάτω τοῦ Ἅιδου, ἤτοι τοῦ σκοτεινοῦ καὶ μέλανος ἀέρος, καταβαίνων εἰς αὐτὸν καὶ οἷον ἐρεβοδιφῶν. ἐπὶ μᾶλλον δὲ τῆς αὐτοῦ κεφαλῆς ἐφίεται καὶ κατὰ τῶν ἄνω τείνας ἑαυτὸν ἐπιβάλλει τοῖς ἐκεῖ σκοπιμώτατα. Τριγλώχιν δὲ ὀϊστὸς ὁ τῆς φιλοσοφίας τριπλοῦς τρόπος, ὁ ἠθικός, ὁ φυσικὸς καὶ ὁ μαθηματικός, οἷς χρώμενος ὁ Ἡρακλῆς λόγος ἐπιτυχῶς βάλλει κατά τε ἀνδρῶν καὶ θεῶν, ἤτοι ἐπιτυγχάνει φιλοσοφίας λόγῳ τῆς τῶν θείων τε καὶ ἀνθρωπίνων καταλήψεως.

ὄνομα μὲν πλειόνων μέμνηται ἡρωΐδων, ἐμπλατύνεται δὲ ὅμως φαιδρότερον τοῖς τῶν ἡρώων διηγήμασι. (1.409.4-15).

In this passage, Eustathius refers to the catalogue of heroines and heroes. He begins by briefly commenting on Hesiod and stating that he, in contrast, wrote a catalogue only referring to women. Eustathius claims that the catalogue is an excuse for Homer to extend his narrative from a historical perspective. At the same time, the poet's approach is brief and he does not speechify. Homer begins with the catalogue of the heroines who appear to be more than the heroes. Nevertheless, the narration concerning the heroes is more thorough. Eustathius mentions that the reference to Achilles, Agamemnon and Ajax is a way to compensate for what is missing in the *Iliad*.

The catalogue of heroines (*Od.* 11.225-329) consists of a general introduction (11.225-34) and nine entries. Each of them starts with the verb ἴδον ("see" LSJ s.v. ὁράω I) and the personal names followed by a relative clause, with the entries progressively decreasing in length (Edwards, 1980, p. 101-102).

Tracy (1997(2009)) explains the structure of the eleventh book of the *Odyssey*. The book is divided in two parallel episodes. Each of them contains three encounters of Odysseus and one catalogue. In the middle of the book there is the "intermezzo", an intermediate between the six souls Odysseus meets in the Netherworld and the two catalogues. Firstly, Odysseus encounters Elpenor, Tiresias and his mother Anticlea. All three of them give him valuable information about his family and future. Then, the narration of his encounters is interrupted by the catalogue of the heroines. Afterwards, he meets with Agamemnon, Achilles and Ajax. The last three souls are individuals from his past that ask about the world of the living. The rhapsody ends with the catalogue of the heroes (p. 465-466).

3.1.7

Ὅτι πλάττει ὁ ποιητὴς ἐμφανισθῆναι τῷ Ὀδυσσεῖ μετὰ τὸν Ἀγαμέμνονα ἥρωας, τὸν Ἀχιλλέα, τὸν Πάτροκλον, τὸν Ἀντίλοχον, καὶ τὸν Αἴαντα. καὶ περὶ μὲν Ἀχιλλέως, ὃν Ὅμηρος φιλεῖ ἐπιμάλιστα, ὡς ἡ Ἰλιὰς ἐδήλωσε, διηγεῖται πλείονα. περὶ δὲ Πατρόκλου καὶ Ἀντιλόχου οὐδὲν οὐδόλως, ἀλλ' ἀρκεῖται εἰπὼν ἀορίστως καὶ παραλειπτικῶς τό, αἱ δ' ἄλλαι ψυχαὶ ἔστασαν ἀχνύμεναι, εἴροντο δὲ κήδεα ἑκάστη, τουτέστιν ἔλεγον εἴτε τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως ἐρωτῶντος, εἴτε καὶ ἄλλως μὴ ἐρωτώμεναι. (1.428.10-15).

In relation to the aforementioned brief reference regarding the heroes that Odysseus interacts with, Eustathius proceeds to give a more extensive contextual analysis. Beginning with Achilles, he points out that Homer, in both of his epics, devotes lengthy narrations to him, showing in that way his preference for the hero. Lastly, Eustathius emphasizes the contradiction between Achilles' and Patroclus' and Antilochus' narration. Concerning the last two, the scholar states that their reference appears rather brief and vague.

τὸν Αἴαντα δὲ πλάττει προσφωνούμενον μέν, μὴ ἀπαμειβόμενον δέ, διὰ τὸ πρὸς τὸν Ὀδυσσέα μῖσος περὶ Τροίαν ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν ὅπλων κρίσει. εἰ δὲ ὁ Αἴας μισῶν οὐ προσφθέγγεταί τι, πιθανῶς ἄρα ὁ ποιητὴς οὐ πλάττει ψυχὴν Τρωϊκὴν ἐπιφανεῖσαν τῷ Ὀδυσσεῖ, ὃς ἐπὶ τῷ τῆς Τροίας ἀφανισμῷ ἔσχε πτολίπορθος λέγεσθαι. (1.428.15-18).

As for Ajax, he is the only one that does not answer to Odysseus, despite the fact that he calls him by name. Ajax appears to still be wrathful because of the contest of the arms. Eustathius points out that it is a very realistic feature of the *Odyssey* that Odysseus does not encounter the soul of anyone from Troy in the Netherworld in light of his meeting with Ajax. Since the latter is still angry with Odysseus, even though they were comrades once and both in the Greek camp, an encounter with someone from the enemy side would be disastrous given the fact that Odysseus played a crucial role in the destruction of Troy.

3.1.8

νύμφαι τ' ἠΐθεοί τε πολύτλητοί τε γέροντες
παρθενικαί τ' ἀταλαὶ νεοπενθέα θυμὸν ἔχουσαι,
πολλοὶ δ' οὐτάμενοι χαλκήρεσιν ἐγχείῃσιν,
ἄνδρες ἀρηΐφατοι, βεβροτωμένα τεύχε' ἔχοντες·
οἳ πολλοὶ περὶ βόθρον ἐφοίτων ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος
θεσπεσίῃ ἰαχῇ· ἐμὲ δὲ χλωρὸν δέος ᾕρει. (*Od.* 11.38-43).

Brides, and unwed youths, and toil-worn old men, and frisking girls with hearts still new to sorrow, and many, too, that had been wounded with bronze-tipped spears, men slain in battle, wearing their blood-stained armor. These came thronging in crowds about the pit from every side, with an astounding cry; and pale fear seized me. (Murray, 1919, p. 403).

Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι φάντασμα ἦν τὰ τοιαῦτα τῷ Ὀδυσσεῖ. ἐπεὶ καὶ κλῆρος ἦν Ἑλληνικὸς, τὸν ἀέρα εἴδωλα τῶν τεθνεώτων σκιώδη καὶ ἀμενηνὰ ἐκματτόμενον καὶ ὡς οἷον ἐν σκιαγραφίᾳ εἰκονικῇ τυποῦντα φαντάζειν οὕτω τοὺς βλέποντας, ὡς τόν τε γέροντα τοιοῦτον εἶδος ἐναπλῦναι τῷ ἀέρι, καὶ τὸν βεβλημένον δὲ τοιαύτην θέαν ἐνθεῖναι αὐτῷ, καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς ὁμοίως. (1.398.30-34).

In this passage, Eustathius comments on the way Odysseus perceives the dead in the Netherworld, perhaps in order to help the readers, and especially his students, have a clear image of Hades and Odysseus views. He explains that the dead appear as ghosts and the hero views them as shady and fleeting figures, short of an imaginary painting or perhaps an illusion. The souls appear as they were when they passed away, which indicates that their age and condition is visible to Odysseus. Eustathius continues this comment by giving specific examples (1.398.34-40).[92] People who have passed away recently are gloomy and melancholic, men who died in the war have visible wounds, the elderly look shriveled and young married women appear as brides.

Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι τὰ ῥηθέντα Ὁμηρικὰ ἓξ ἔπη, τὸ, νύμφαι τ' ἠΐθεοί τε καὶ ἑξῆς ἕως τοῦ, ἐμὲ δὲ χλωρὸν δέος ᾕρει, ἀθετοῦσιν οἱ παλαιοί. οὔπω γάρ φασι καιρὸς τοῦ ἔρχεσθαι, καὶ

---

[92] ὥστε ἐκεῖνο βλέπεσθαι, ὃ καὶ ζώντων προεφαίνετο τὸν σωματικὸν δηλαδὴ χρῶτα καὶ τὰ περὶ αὐτὸν ἐπιπολάζοντα πάθη. διὸ καὶ αἱ νεοφανεῖς νύμφαι κατὰ νυμφικὸν σχῆμα προσπίπτουσι τοῖς τοῦ ὁρῶντος ὀφθαλμοῖς. καὶ οἱ πεσόντες νεοπενθεῖς ἐν σκυθρωπῇ καταστάσει φαίνονται, καὶ οἱ ἐν ὅπλοις θανόντες ὅμοιοι φαντασιοῦνται, καὶ οἱ θηρῶντες ἐν κυνηγετικῷ σκιαγραφοῦνται σχήματι, καὶ οἱ μετὰ συμμάχων πεσόντες ἀγηγερμένον ἔχουσι περὶ ἑαυτοὺς τὸ συμμαχικόν, ὡς ἐν τοῖς ἑξῆς δηλοῖ τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ἀγαμέμνονα, καὶ αἱ τῶν βεβλημένων φαντασίαι μετὰ ὠτειλῶν ἐπιφαίνονται, καὶ αἱ τῶν γερόντων ῥικναὶ, καὶ αἱ τῶν κατηφιώντων στυγναὶ, ὥσπερ δῆτα καὶ ἐν ὀνείροις.

οὐδὲ δυνατὸν τὰς ψυχὰς φέρειν σωμάτων πληγάς. οἱ δὲ λυτικοὶ περὶ μὲν τῶν πληγῶν λαλοῦσιν ὡς ἀνωτέρω ἐγράφη. (1.399.2-4).

It needs to be noted that, according to Eustathius, the ancient scholars reject the aforementioned theory of the way the dead appear in Hades, since it is not possible for souls to have physical wounds, as they claim. On the contrary, other scholars argue against and share the aforesaid view. This comment appears in *Scholia in Odysseam* (11.38.1-8).[93]

4. MYTHOLOGICAL COMMENTS

In this chapter, I systematize the comments that concern mythology. Eustathius focuses on genealogy and different interpretations of the myths. There are seven comments.

4.1.1

ἔνθ' ἦ τοι πρώτην Τυρὼ ἴδον εὐπατέρειαν,
ἦ φάτο Σαλμωνῆος ἀμύμονος ἔκγονος εἶναι,
φῆ δὲ Κρηθῆος γυνὴ ἔμμεναι Αἰολίδαο. (*Od.* 11.235-237).

Then, you must know, the first that I saw was highborn Tyro, who said that she was the daughter of flawless Salmoneus, and declared herself to be the wife of Cretheus, son of Aeolus. (Murray, 1919, p. 417).

In this passage of the *Odyssey* begins the narration of the tales of the heroines. The first one is the story of Tyro. Odysseus tells the story of how Tyro was seduced by Poseidon (*Od.* 11.235-259). Eustathius makes a rather lengthy remark on Tyro, which in its essence is mythological, with some linguistic interferences.

ἐρασθῆναι δέ φησιν Ὅμηρος τὴν Τυρὼ ποταμοῦ Ἐνιπέως. αὐτῆς δὲ αὖ πάλιν ἐρῶντα Ποσειδῶνα ὁμοιωθῆναι τῷ ῥηθέντι ἐραστῇ ποταμῷ καὶ οὕτως αὐτῇ μιγῆναι. τὴν δὲ ἐκ Ποσειδῶνος τεκέσθαι Πελίαν καὶ Νηλέα, ὧν Πελίας μὲν ἐν Ἰωλκῷ ἐβασίλευσε, Νηλεὺς δὲ ἐν Πύλῳ. καὶ τούτους μὲν τοὺς δύο οὕτω γενέσθαι αὐτῇ ἐκ Ποσειδῶνος, ἀπὸ δέ γε Κρηθέως Αἴσονα καὶ Φέρητα καὶ Ἀμυθάονα. (1.410.1-5).

ἀοίδιμοι δὲ ἐν ἱστορίαις οἱ ῥηθέντες πέντε τῆς Τυροῦς παῖδες, καὶ ὡς μὲν ὁ Πελίας Ἰωλκοῦ ἐβασίλευσε, Νηλεὺς δὲ Πύλου, περιᾴδεται. Οἱ δὲ Κρηθεῖδαι ποίους εἶχον τόπους, ἔστιν ἄλλοθεν μαθεῖν. δῆλον δὲ, ὡς καὶ αὐτοὶ περί που τὰ Θετταλικὰ ᾤκουν. ὁμοίως δῆλον καὶ ὅτι Πελίας μὲν δόλῳ τῆς φαρμακίδος Μηδείας ἀφετήθη. Νηλεὺς δὲ, ὁ τοῦ Νέστορος πατὴρ, ὑφ' Ἡρακλέος ἐδυστύχησε. (1.410.33-37).

---

[93] νύμφαι τ' ἤΐθεοί τε] οἱ ἐξ παρὰ Ζηνοδότῳ καὶ Ἀριστοφάνει ἠθετοῦντο ὡς ἀσύμφωνοι πρὸς τὰ ἑξῆς. οὐ γὰρ μεμιγμέναι παραγίνονται αἱ ψυχαί· νῦν δὲ ὁμοῦ νύμφαι, ἤΐθεοι, γέροντες, παρθένοι. καὶ ἄλλως οὐδὲ τὰ τραύματα ἐπὶ τῶν εἰδώλων ὁρᾶται. ὅθεν ἐρωτᾷ, τίς νύ σε κὴρ ἐδάμασσε; τὸν Ἀγαμέμνονα. Η.Q. ἀθετοῦνται οὗτοι οἱ ἐξ, ὅτι οὔπω προσέρχονται· καὶ ὅτι ἀδύνατον φέρειν τὰς ψυχὰς τὰς τῶν σωμάτων πληγάς. ἀλλὰ πρὸς ἀνακεφαλαίωσιν πεποίηται τῶνμετὰ ταῦτα ῥηθέντων.

In these remarks, Eustathius briefly refers to Tyro's five children, who were famous in songs. Tyro, after being seduced by Poseidon, who was assuming the shape of the river god Enipeus, bore twin sons whom she abandoned, namely Pelias and Neleus. Pelias was king of Iolcus and was later deceived by Medea. Neleus, who was the king of Pylus and father of Nestor, was miserable because of Heracles. Even though Eustathius does not analyze that, it is probable that he refers to Heracles killing Neleus' sons, except for Nestor. According to Stenger (2006), Heracles killed Iphitus and then asked Neleus for purification, since this was a power of kings in Ancient Greece. However, due to his friendship with Iphiclus' father, Neleus refused to do so. Heracles ended up taking revenge by killing eleven of his twelve sons. In *Dictionary of Classical Mythology* (2014, p. 327) it is mentioned that Heracles killed Neleus too.

 Lastly, she had three more children with Cretheus. He was her father's brother whom she married after her father died (1.425.9-11).[94] Their children were Aeson, Pheres and Amythaon. Eustathius states that they inhabited in Thessalia.

A part of the story that Eustathius does not mention, but is important for the reader, is how Pelias took possession of the throne. After Cretheus, the king of Iolcus died, Pelias usurped the throne from Aeson. Because of that, Hera intended to take revenge on him with the help of Iason and Medea. Pelias was informed from an oracle that a man who arrived in Iolcus with one shoe would kill him. When Iason returned to Iolcus having lost one sandal, Pelias thought that he was the one to kill him, so he sent him to bring the golden fleece. Years later, Iason came back with the golden fleece and Medea. The latter, convinced Pelias' daughters to dismember him and she would rejuvenate him. However, she did not and this is how Pelias died (*Dictionary of Classical Mythology,* 2014, p. 379).

Ἰστέον δὲ καὶ ὅτι φέρεται λόγος ὡς Τυρὼ δύο γεννήσασα παῖδας παρὰ τοῖς Ἐνιπέως ῥείθροις ἔλιπεν, ὧν τὸν ἕτερον μὲν κύων ἀφαιρεθεῖσα τῶν σκυλάκων ἔτρεφε θηλὴν ἐμπαρέχουσα, τὸν δὲ ἕτερον ἵππος πατήσας κατὰ τὸ μέτωπον ἐκ συνδρομῆς αἵματος ἐπελίωσε, τουτέστιν ἐμέλανε, πελιδνὸν ἐποίησεν. ὅθεν τοῦτον μὲν ἱπποφορβὸς ἀνελόμενος Πελίαν ἐκάλεσε, τὸν δὲ ἕτερον Νηλέα διὰ τὸ παραδόξως ἐλεηθῆναι, ἢ διὰ τὸ ὑπὸ τῆς μητρὸς μὴ ἐλεηθῆναι. (1.410.41-45).

Here, Eustathius refers to Pelias and Neleus. They were found and raised by a horse-breeder. Neleus was breastfed by a female dog and Pelias was kicked in the face by a horse and got a dark mark because of extravagated blood.

Eustathius also comments on their names. He explains that the name Pelias (Πελίας) derives from the adjective πελιός that translates to "dark" (LSJ s.v. πελι-ός, ά, όν), in reference to his mark. He claims that Neleus (Νηλεύς) originates from the verb ἐλεέω that has the meaning of "to have pity on, show mercy to" (LSJ s.v. ἐλε-έω). Perhaps it has to do with the mercy he showed to his mother contrary to expectation, since he was abandoned by her as a baby, or the lack of mercy from her side. It appears that his interpretation of the name's origin comes from *Etymologicum Gudianum.* It is stated there that the adjective νηλής ("pitiless, ruthless" LSJ s.v. νηλής, ές) originates from the future tense of the verb ἐλεῶ, which is ἐλεήσω and the privative preposition νη. The adjective is originally formed as νηλειής and is converted to νηλής after syncope (nu,

---

[94] μετὰ θάνατον Σαλμωνέως κομιζομένη Τυρώ, τουτέστιν ἐπιμελῶς ἐκτρεφομένη παρὰ Δηϊονεῖ τῷ θείῳ, κορεύεται ὑπὸ Ποσειδῶνος. εἶτα Κρηθεῖ τῷ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀδελφῷ δίδοται εἰς γάμον, ἐξ ἧς γεννᾶται Νηλεύς.

p. 407, l. 53-55).[95] It is evident that Eustathius connects the adjective νηλής with the proper name Νηλεύς due to their similar roots. Beekes (2010, p. 1016) mentions that they could be related, but the proper name Νηλεύς could also be Pre-Greek.

Κρηθεὺς δὲ Σαλμωνέως ἦν ἀδελφός. ἀμφότεροι δὲ παῖδες Αἰόλου καὶ Λαοδίκης τῆς Ἀλωέως. περὶ δὲ Σαλμωνέως φασὶν οἱ νεώτεροι, ὡς ἄρα ὁ ἀνὴρ ἀσεβὴς ἦν, ἀντιβροντῶν τε καὶ ἀνταστράπτων τῷ Διΐ, δι’ ἃ καὶ ἐκεραυνώθη. Ὅμηρος μέντοι οὐκ οἶδε τοιοῦτόν τι, ἀλλὰ ἀμύμονα τὸν Σαλμωνέα φησίν. ἱστορεῖται δὲ καὶ περί που τὴν Ἠλεῖαν βασιλεῦσαι ὁ Σαλμωνεύς. ὅθεν καὶ μία τῶν ὀκτὼ περὶ Πίσαν πόλεων αἳ καὶ Πισάτιδες λέγονται Σαλμώνη ἐκλήθη ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ. (1.411.8-12).

Here, Eustathius refers to the brothers Cretheus and Salmoneus. He claims that they are the children of Aeolus and Laodice. However, Apollodorus states that their mother is Enarete (1.50.9-13).[96]

The scholar focuses on Salmoneus and explains that he appeared as arrogant and disrespectful towards Zeus, since he attempted to imitate his thunder. Because of that, he was struck with thunderbolts by Zeus and died. This is only mentioned by newer scholars. Homer, not only does not state that, in the contrary, he calls him flawless (*Od.* 11.236).[97] Salmoneus was the king of one of the eight cities surrounding Pisa in Elis. It was named Salmone after him.

4.1.2

καὶ Χλῶριν εἶδον περικαλλέα, τήν ποτε Νηλεὺς
γῆμεν ἐὸν διὰ κάλλος, ἐπεὶ πόρε μυρία ἔδνα,
ὁπλοτάτην κούρην Ἀμφίονος Ἰασίδαο,
ὅς ποτ’ ἐν Ὀρχομενῷ Μινυηΐῳ ἶφι ἄνασσεν·
ἡ δὲ Πύλου βασίλευε, τέκεν δέ οἱ ἀγλαὰ τέκνα,
Νέστορά τε Χρομίον τε Περικλύμενόν τ’ ἀγέρωχον.
τοῖσι δ’ ἐπ’ ἰφθίμην Πηρὼ τέκε, θαῦμα βροτοῖσι,
τὴν πάντες μνώοντο περικτίται· οὐδέ τι Νηλεὺς
τῷ ἐδίδου, ὃς μὴ ἕλικας βόας εὐρυμετώπους
ἐκ Φυλάκης ἐλάσειε βίης Ἰφικληείης
ἀργαλέας. τὰς δ’ οἶος ὑπέσχετο μάντις ἀμύμων
ἐξελάαν· χαλεπὴ δὲ θεοῦ κατὰ μοῖρα πέδησε
δεσμοί τ’ ἀργαλέοι καὶ βουκόλοι ἀγροιῶται.
ἀλλ’ ὅτε δὴ μῆνές τε καὶ ἡμέραι ἐξετελεῦντο
ἂψ περιτελλομένου ἔτεος καὶ ἐπήλυθον ὧραι,
καὶ τότε δή μιν ἔλυσε βίη Ἰφικληείη
θέσφατα πάντ’ εἰπόντα· Διὸς δ’ ἐτελείετο βουλή. (*Od.* 11.281-297).

And I saw beauteous Chloris, whom once Neleus wedded because of her beauty, when he had brought countless gifts of wooing. Youngest daughter was she of Amphion, son

[95] Νηλέϊ χαλκῷ, ἡ εὐθεῖα νηλὶς, γίνεται ἐκ τοῦ ἐλεῶ ἐλεήσω, καὶ μετὰ τοῦ νη στερητικοῦ καὶ κατὰ συγκοπὴν νηλὶς, ὁ ἐστερημένος τοῦ ἐλέους.

[96] καὶ γήμας Ἐναρέτην τὴν Δηιμάχου παῖδας μὲν ἐγέννησεν ἑπτά, Κρηθέα Σίσυφον Ἀθάμαντα Σαλμωνέα Δηιόνα Μάγνητα Περιήρην, θυγατέρας δὲ πέντε, Κανάκην Ἀλκυόνην Πεισιδίκην Καλύκην Περιμήδην.

[97] ἣ φάτο Σαλμωνῆος ἀμύμονος ἔκγονος εἶναι.

of Iasus, who once ruled mightily in Orchomenus of the Minyae. And she was queen of Pylos, and bore to her husband glorious children, Nestor, and Chromius, and lordly Periclymenus, and besides these she bore noble Pero, a wonder to men. Her all who dwelt about sought in marriage, but Neleus would give her to no one except to him who should drive from Phylace the cattle of mighty Iphicles, spiral-horned and broad of brow, and hard they were to drive. These the flawless seer alone undertook to drive off; but a harsh fate of the gods ensnared him, hard bonds and the country herdsmen. Nevertheless, when at length the months and the days were being brought to fulfillment, as the year rolled round, and the seasons came on, then at last mighty Iphicles released him, when he had told all the oracles; and the will of Zeus was fulfilled. (Murray, 1919, p. 421-423).

καὶ οὕτω μὲν ὁ ποιητὴς ἀσαφῶς καὶ μᾶλλον τὰ περὶ τὸ τέλος τοῦ διηγήματος ἐξέθετο διὰ συντομίαν ἐπίτηδες, οὐδὲ γὰρ προέθετο τοιαῦτα ἱστορεῖν. ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν ἐν παρέργῳ μεσολαβεῖται, αὐτὸς δὲ σπεύδει ἐπὶ τὰ ἑξῆς τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ὀδυσσέα. οἱ δέ γε ἱστοροῦντες οὕτω φασὶ σαφέστερον ἐπεὶ καὶ πλατύτερον. (1.415.6-9).

Referring to the story of Neleus and Pero, Eustathius points out that Homer intentionally narrates the myth briefly and without precision. The myth is not part of the main story and the poet's intention is to go back to Odysseus narrative quickly. Eustathius takes the opportunity and narrates the story more thoroughly in an extensive passage (1.415.8-416.16). It needs to be noted that he offers two different versions (1.415.8-18 & 1.415.18-416.16). However, the only difference between them seems to be the length of the story. Both of them recount the same facts but the latter is more thorough, especially when it comes to the part of Melampus. Here, a summary of the story is presented, with emphasis to the aspects that Eustathius has not discussed when narrating the story of Tyro.

Eustathius begins his narration by referring to Neleus again. He married Chloris because of her beauty and gave her plenty of gifts to win her. They had twelve sons and one daughter, Pero (*Dictionary of Classical Mythology,* 2014, p. 126). Pero was of extraordinary beauty and because of that, she had many suitors. Neleus decided that he would give her to the man who would bring him Iphiclus' cattle from Phylace.

Melampus, a prophet who was able to understand the language of birds and animals, decided to bring the cattle on his brother's behalf. He had predicted that he would be caught and imprisoned for a year. He was indeed caught by Phylacus, the father of Iphiclus. While in prison, Melampus heard worms talking in the roof of his cell, saying that the wood was almost eaten and that the roof would fall. He asked to be moved to a different cell and shortly after the roof fell. Melampus explained what happened to Phylacus and Iphiclus. He promised to cure Iphiclus' impotence as long as he could get the cattle. A vulture adviced Melampus on how to cure him. After following his instructions, Iphiclus was able to have children. Finally, Melampus gave the cattle to Neleus, and his brother Bias married Pero.

Concerning the part of the story where Melampus brings the cattle to Phylace for his brother, Eustathius' source appears to be Pausanias (*Graeciae descriptio* 4.36.3).[98] In

---

[98] εἴη δ᾽ ἂν Θεσσαλικὸν τὸ γένος τῶν βοῶν τούτων, Ἰφίκλου ποτὲ τοῦ Πρωτεσιλάου πατρός· ταύτας γὰρ δὴ τὰς βοῦς Νηλεὺς ἕδνα ἐπὶ τῇ θυγατρὶ ᾔτει τοὺς μνωμένους, καὶ τούτων ἕνεκα ὁ Μελάμπους χαριζόμενος τῷ ἀδελφῷ Βίαντι ἀφίκετο ἐς τὴν Θεσσαλίαν, καὶ ἐδέθη μὲν ὑπὸ τῶν βουκόλων τοῦ Ἰφίκλου, λαμβάνει δὲ μισθὸν ἐφ᾽ οἷς αὐτῷ δεηθέντι ἐμαντεύσατο. ἐσπουδάκεσαν δὲ ἄρα οἱ τότε πλοῦτόν

general, Apollodorus (*Biblioteca* 1.96-102) has previously narrated the myth in great extent. Thus, he is evidently Eustathius' main source for this part. The myth is identical to the *Scholia in Odysseam,* where two similar extensive versions are given (11.287.1-38 & 11.290.1-25).

4.1.3

καὶ Λήδην εἶδον, τὴν Τυνδαρέου παράκοιτιν,
ἥ ῥ᾽ ὑπὸ Τυνδαρέῳ κρατερόφρονε γείνατο παῖδε,
Κάστορά θ᾽ ἱππόδαμον καὶ πὺξ ἀγαθὸν Πολυδεύκεα,
τοὺς ἄμφω ζωοὺς κατέχει φυσίζοος αἶα·
οἳ καὶ νέρθεν γῆς τιμὴν πρὸς Ζηνὸς ἔχοντες
ἄλλοτε μὲν ζώουσ᾽ ἑτερήμεροι, ἄλλοτε δ᾽ αὖτε
τεθνᾶσιν· τιμὴν δὲ λελόγχασιν ἶσα θεοῖσι. (*Od.* 11.298-304).

And I saw Leda, the wife of Tyndareus, who bore to Tyndareus two sons, stout of heart, Castor the tamer of horses, and the boxer Polydeuces. These two the earth, the giver of life, covers, alive though they be, and even in the world below they have honor from Zeus. One day they live in turn, and one day they are dead; and they have won honor like that of the gods. (Murray, 1919, p. 423).

This Homeric passage is dedicated to Leda. However, Eustathius takes the opportunity again to refer extensively to male heroes, the Dioscuri. They were the twins Castor and Polydeuces, sons of Leda by either Zeus or Tyndareus (*Dictionary of Classical Mythology,* 2014, p. 165). According to Homer, they were the sons of Tyndareus. However, Eustathius states that newer scholars claim that Polydeuces is the son of Zeus, while Castor is the mortal son of Tyndareus (1.417.15-16).[99] References of that can be found in the *Cypria* and Apollodorus' *Biblioteca*. The first divide the twins to mortal and immortal as stated above (8.1-2),[100] while the latter also mentions their sisters (or half-sisters) Helen and Clytaemnestra. He explains that Polydeuces and Helen are the children of Zeus, thus the immortal ones, whereas Castor and Clytaemnestra are mortal, by Tyndareus (3.126.6-127.1).[101] Dioscuri are known for their devotion and love to each other, as the Actorione (1.417.20-21).[102] The latter are Siamese twins with two heads, four arms, four legs, and merged bodies, who are extraordinarily strong (Auffarth, 2006) as also stated in the *Commentary on the Iliad* (3.320.10-12).[103]

ἡμισεύθη γὰρ τῷ Πολυδεύκει τὸ τῆς ἀθανασίας ἀΐδιον τῷ πρὸς ἡμέραν θανάτῳ, ἐν ᾗ συγκατακρύπτεται τῷ ἀδελφῷ. οὕτω δὲ καὶ τὸ συνεχὲς τοῦ θανάτου τῷ Κάστορι τῇ ἐφ᾽ ἡμέραν ζωῇ ὁπηνίκα συναναβαίνεται τῷ ἀδελφῷ. καὶ ταῦτα παρατεθέντα ἓν παρ᾽ ἓν τὸ

τινα συλλέγεσθαι τοιοῦτον, ἵππων καὶ βοῶν ἀγέλας, εἰ δὴ Νηλεύς τε γενέσθαι οἱ βοῦς ἐπεθύμησε τὰς Ἰφίκλου.

[99] τούτων δὲ κατὰ τοὺς νεωτέρους Πολυδεύκης μὲν θείου αἵματος λέγεται εἶναι, Κάστωρ δὲ θνητοῦ, τοῦ Τυνδάρεω γάρ.

[100] Κάστωρ μὲν θνητός, θανάτου δέ οἱ αἶσα πέπρωται, αὐτὰρ ὅ γ᾽ ἀθάνατος Πολυδεύκης, ὄζος Ἄρηος.

[101] Διὸς δὲ Λήδᾳ συνελθόντος ὁμοιωθέντος κύκνῳ, καὶ κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν νύκτα Τυνδάρεω, Διὸς μὲν ἐγεννήθη Πολυδεύκης καὶ Ἑλένη, Τυνδάρεω δὲ Κάστωρ <καὶ Κλυταιμνήστρα>.

[102] Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι θρυλοῦνται οἱ ῥηθέντες Διόσκουροι ἐπὶ φιλαδελφίᾳ, καθὰ καὶ οἱ Ἀκτορίωνες, περὶ ὧν ἐν τῇ Ἰλιάδι ἐγράφη.

[103] διὸ καὶ Ἀκτορίωνες λέγονται καὶ Μολίονες, ὡς προσεχῶς εἴρηται. φιλάδελφοι δὲ ἱστοροῦνται, καὶ μιᾷ ψυχῇ ἐν δυσὶ σώμασι διοικούμενοι. ὁ δὲ μῦθος εἰς ἓν συνάπτων αὐτούς.

ἑτερήμερον αὐτοῖς ἐξήρτυσαν. αἰνίττεται δέ φασιν ὁ μῦθος ταῦτα εἰς τοὺς ἐν οὐρανῷ διδύμους, οἷς οἱ αὐτοὶ λέγονται εἶναι οἱ Διόσκουροι. (1.417.23-27).

In this remark, Eustathius refers to the gift of immortality that was originally given to Polydeuces by Zeus. However, since his brother was dead, Polydeuces could not accept that and instead asked Zeus to share the immortality with Castor to which Zeus agreed. They would take turns, each day one would be alive, and the other one dead. This is found in Apollodorus (*Biblioteca* 3.137.3-5).[104] Finally, he refers to the constellation of the Gemini, where Zeus placed the Dioscuri, in order to honor their devotion (*Dictionary of Classical Mythology,* 2014, p. 165).

Eustathius continues his comment on the Dioscuri by mentioning that they have been glorified by poets and scholars. He offers many instances where they have been discussed. He begins by mentioning that the mythical narrative of them being born from an egg is thought to be a figment by newer poets. It also appears that Homer does not mention it, but rather he refers to them in moderation. (1.417.34-37).

Next Eustathius offers a rich collection of explanations regarding the myth of Leda being born from an egg. It is likely that his ultimate source is Athenaeus, since he has a similar discussion in *Deipnosophistae* (2.50.9-45). According to Clearchus (Frag. 35),[105] ancient scholars called the ὑπερῷα, "the upper parts of the house", where women resided (LSJ s.v. ὑπερῷον) ᾠά, "eggs" (LSJ s.v. ᾠόν, τό 1). That lead to the belief that Helen was born from an egg, and by extension, Dioscuri too. Actually, the noun ᾠά was used to explain that she was raised in the upper part of the house (1.417.37-39).

According to Neocles from Crotona, the egg that Helen was born from fell from the moon, where the women lay eggs and whoever is born there appears fifteen-fold bigger. This passage appears in Herodorus (frag. 28).[106] Eriphus, states that Leda brought into the world eggs similar to the ones gooses lay (frag. 7).[107] According to Ibicus, the Actorione twins were similarly born from an egg (frag. 4).[108] This is also stated in the *Commentary on the Iliad* (4.803.14-18)[109] (1.417.37-44).

Regarding Sappho, Eustathius explains that she follows the same narrative as the previous poets and focuses more on the linguistic part of it. He points out that the noun "egg" is not spelled as ᾠόν, with two syllables, which is its most common form, neither as ὤεον, with an ε and three syllables, as it previously appeared in Ibicus. Rather, she

---

[104] μὴ δεχομένου δὲ Πολυδεύκους τὴν ἀθανασίαν ὄντος νεκροῦ Κάστορος, Ζεὺς ἀμφοτέροις παρ' ἡμέραν καὶ ἐν θεοῖς εἶναι καὶ ἐν θνητοῖς ἔδωκε.

[105] ἐκάλουν δὲ καὶ τὰ νῦν τῶν οἰκιῶν παρ' ἡμῖν καλούμενα ὑπερῷα ᾠά, φησὶ Κλέαρχος ἐν ἐρωτικοῖς, τὴν Ἑλένην φάσκων ἐν τοιούτοις οἰκήμασι τρεφομένην δόξαν ἀπενέγκασθαι παρὰ πολλοῖς ὡς ἐξ ᾠοῦ εἴη γεγεννημένη.

[106] Οὐκ εὖ δὲ Νεοκλῆς ὁ Κροτωνιάτης ἔφη, ἀπὸ τῆς σελήνης πεσεῖν τὸ ᾠόν, ἐξ οὗ τὴν Ἑλένην γεννηθῆναι· τὰς γὰρ σεληνίτιδας γυναῖκας ᾠοτοκεῖν, καὶ τοὺς ἐκεῖ γεννωμένους πεντεκαιδεκαπλασίονας ἡμῶν εἶναι, ὡς Ἡρόδωρος ὁ Ἡρακλεώτης ἱστορεῖ.

[107] ᾠά. Β. λευκά γε καὶ μεγάλα· χήνει' ἐστίν, ὥς γ' ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ.
Α. οὗτος δέ φησι ταῦτα τὴν Λήδαν τεκεῖν.

[108] τούς τε λευκίππους κόρους τέκνα Μολιόνας κτάνον, ἅλικας ἰσοκεφάλους ἐνιγυίους ἀμφοτέρους γεγαῶτας ἐν ᾠέωι ἀργυρέωι.

[109] Ῥητέον δ' ἐνταῦθα καὶ ὅτι τῷ διφυεῖ τῶν Ἀκτοριώνων τιθέμενος καὶ ὁ μελοποιὸς Ἴβυκος, ἐξ οὗ παρεφθάρθαι τοῖς Τεχνικοῖς δοκεῖ τὸ βυκινίζειν, φησὶ καὶ τοὺς Μολιονίδας ἐξ ᾠοῦ γεννηθῆναι, ὁμοίως δηλαδὴ τοῖς Διοσκούροις, εἰπὼν αὐτοὺς «ἅλικας ἰσοκεφάλους, ἐνιγυίους, ἀμφοτέρους γεγαῶτας ἐν ᾠέῳ ἀργυρέῳ», καθὰ καὶ ἐν τοῖς εἰς τὴν Ὀδύσσειαν γέγραπται.

writes it as ὤϊον, with three syllables but with an ι instead of an ε (frag. 166 & 167)[110] (1.417.44-418.2).

Lastly, Eustathius refers to Epicharmus and Athenaeus. Concerning the first one, he explains that as Ibicus, he writes the noun "egg" as ὤεον with an ε (frag. 152).[111] This extract appears in *Deipnosophistae* (2.50.9-10), which could have been the author's source.[112] As for Athenaeus, except from spelling "egg" as ὤεον too, he also uses the diminutive of the noun ᾠόν, which is ᾠάριον ("small egg" LSJ s.v. ᾠάριον [ᾰ], τό). It has four syllables and the suffix ιον. It occurs correspondingly to the diminutives of the noun στάμνος ("earthen jar, bottle for racking off wine", LSJ s.v. στάμν-ος, ὁ), σταμνίον and σταμνάριον ("wine-jar", LSJ s.v. σταμν-άριον, τό) (*Deipnosophistae* 2.50.11-16).[113] Finally, Στάμνιος ("wine-jar", LSJ s.v. σταμν-ίας, ου, ὁ) is an epithet of Zeus used by Aristophanes (*Ranae* 1 22)[114] and originates from the noun στάμνος (1.418.3-5).

4.1.4

τὴν δὲ μέτ᾽ Ἀντιόπην ἴδον, Ἀσωποῖο θύγατρα,
ἣ δὴ καὶ Διὸς εὔχετ᾽ ἐν ἀγκοίνησιν ἰαῦσαι,
καί ῥ᾽ ἔτεκεν δύο παῖδ᾽, Ἀμφίονά τε Ζῆθόν τε,
οἳ πρῶτοι Θήβης ἕδος ἔκτισαν ἑπταπύλοιο
πύργωσάν τ᾽, ἐπεὶ οὐ μὲν ἀπύργωτόν γ᾽ ἐδύναντο
ναιέμεν εὐρύχορον Θήβην, κρατερώ περ ἐόντε. (*Od.* 11.260-265).

And after her I saw Antiope, daughter of Asopus, who boasted that she had slept in the arms of Zeus himself, and she bore two sons, Amphion and Zethus, who first established the seat of seven-gated Thebes, and fenced it in with walls, since they could not dwell in spacious Thebes unfenced, mighty though they were. (Murray, 1919, p. 419).

Ὅτι Ἀντιόπη κατὰ μὲν Ὅμηρον θυγάτηρ ἦν Ἀσωποῦ Θηβαίου ποταμοῦ. οἱ δὲ νεώτεροι Νυκτέως αὐτὴν ἱστοροῦσι. ταύτης καὶ Διὸς υἱοί, Ζῆθος καὶ Ἀμφίων, οἰκισταὶ Θηβῶν, οἳ θεσπέσιόν τι χρῆμα ἔσχον ἐκ Διὸς ἢ Ἀπόλλωνος. διὰ λύρας γὰρ ἀνακρουόμενοί φασι μέλος ἐτείχισαν Θήβας, τῶν λίθων ὥσπερ ὑπὸ τῷ θρυλουμένῳ Ὀρφεῖ, οὕτω καὶ ὑπὸ τούτοις κηλουμένων ὁποῖα ἐμψύχων, καὶ κινουμένων, καὶ ἀλλήλοις ἐπιστοιβαζομένων εἰς τειχισμόν. ὡς τάγε πρώην ἀτείχιστοι οὖσαι ὑπὸ Φλεγύων ἐβλάπτοντο, οἳ τοὺς ἐκεῖ ἐσίνοντο. Ζήθου δὲ καὶ Ἀμφίονος θανόντων, Εὐρύμαχος Φλεγύων βασιλεύς, περὶ ὧν ἀκριβέστερον ἐν τοῖς εἰς τὴν Ἰλιάδα κεῖται, τὰς Θήβας ἠρήμωσε. Κάδμος δὲ ὕστερον ἀνέκτισε. (1.412.16-23).

---

[110] φαῖσι δή ποτα Λήδαν †ὑακίνθινον† πεπυκάδμενον εὕρην ὤιον & ὠίῳ πόλυ λευκότερον.
[111] ὤεα χανὸς κἀλεκτορίδων πετεηνῶν.
[112] ὤεα δ᾽ ἔφη Ἐπίχαρμος ὤεα χανὸς κἀλεκτορίδων πετεηνῶν.
[113] Σιμωνίδης ἐν δευτέρῳ ἰάμβων (fr. 11 B4)· οἷόν τε χηνὸς ὤεον Μαιανδρίου. διὰ τεσσάρων δ᾽ αὐτὰ προενήνεκται Ἀναξανδρίδης ὠάρια εἰπών (II 163 K). καὶ Ἔφιππος· σταμνάριά τ᾽ οἴνου μικρὰ τοῦ Φοινικίνου, ᾠάρια, τοιαῦθ᾽ ἕτερα πολλὰ παίγνια.
[114] ὅτ᾽ ἐγὼ μὲν ὢν Διόνυσος, υἱὸς Σταμνίου.

In this remark, Eustathius refers, again, to mythological genealogy. Even though he begins with a reference to the heroine Antiope, he results discussing her sons in detail, in the same manner with Dioscuri.

According to Homer, she is the daughter of the river god Asopus, while the tragedians mention that she is the daughter of Nycteus, king of Thebes. This comment is identical to *Scholia in Odysseam* (11.260.1-2).[115] Additionally, instances of that appear in Strabo (*Geographica* 9.2.12.9)[116] and Apollodorus (*Biblioteca* 3.42.1-2).[117] According to the myth, she was impregnated by Zeus and bore twin sons, Zethus and Amphion. They built the walls of the city Thebes while playing the lyre. Before that, the city was unfortified and its people had been harmed by Eurymachus, the king of Phlegyans. After Zethus and Amphion died, Eurymachus laid waste to Thebes. Cadmus was the one to rebuild it. Eustathius comments on this myth in the *Commentary on the Iliad* as well (3.474.20-23).[118]

οἱ δὲ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀγαθοὶ βασιλεῖς εἶναι φαίνονται καὶ μειλίχιοι. διὸ καὶ μετὰ λύρας πυργῶσαι τὰς Θήβας ᾄδονται, ὡς ἐμμελῶς καὶ ἱλαρῶς καὶ ὡς εἰπεῖν ἐμμούσως καὶ δίχα τοῦ ἄπῳδόν τι τοῖς ὑπηκόοις ἐνδείξασθαι, τειχίσαι τὴν πόλιν, ἣν ἑπτάπυλόν φασιν ἤνοιξαν ἐκεῖνοι διὰ τὸ ἑπτάχορδον εἶναι τὴν λύραν αὐτοῖς, ὡς εἶναι τὰς ἐκεῖ πύλας ἰσαρίθμους ταῖς ῥηθείσαις χορδαῖς. ὁ δὲ γεωγράφος καὶ τὴν Τερπάνδρου ἑπτάχορδον ἱστορεῖ. (1.412.29-33).

Eustathius continues with another comment that concerns the city of Thebes. He explains that Zethus and Amphion created seven gates at Thebes, for it to be equal to the seven strings of the lyre. According to Eustathius, Strabo states that the musician Terpander was the creator of the seven-stringed lyre (*Geographica* 13.2.4.18-21).[119]

4.1.5

καὶ Μεγάρην, Κρείοντος ὑπερθύμοιο θύγατρα,
τὴν ἔχεν Ἀμφιτρύωνος υἱὸς μένος αἰὲν ἀτειρής. (*Od.* 11.269-270).

Megara I saw, daughter of Creon, high of heart, whom Amphitryon's son, he whose strength never weakened, had to wife. (Murray, 1919, p. 421).

Ὅτι Μεγάρα Κρέοντος θυγάτηρ βασιλέως Θηβῶν Ἡρακλεῖ γημαμένη ἔσχε παῖδας τρεῖς. Ἡρακλέος δὲ σταλέντος τηνεὶς Κέρβερον ἐκάκου τοὺς Ἡρακλείδας τούτους Λύκος βασιλεὺς τηνικαῦτα Θηβῶν. Ἡρακλῆς δὲ ἄνω γενόμενος ἀνεῖλεν ἐκεῖνον αὐτῇ γυναικὶ καὶ τέκνοις. Ἥρας δὲ χόλῳ εἰς μανίαν συνελαθεὶς διεχειρίσατο καὶ τοὺς παῖδας, ὧν χάριν ἀνεῖλε τὸν Λύκον. διὸ καὶ τεκνοραίστης κεῖται παρὰ Λυκόφρονι. ὡς δέ τινές φασι, καὶ τὴν Μεγάραν διεχειρίσατο. μέλλων δέ φασι καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰφικλέα

---

[115] Ἀντιόπην] ὁ μὲν ποιητὴς Ἀσωποῦ, οἱ δὲ τραγικοὶ Νυκτέως. Μ.
Νυκτέως αὐτὴν οἱ νεώτεροι ἱστοροῦσιν. Η.
[116] κτίσμα δὲ Νυκτέως τοῦ Ἀντιόπης πατρός.
[117] Ἀντιόπη θυγάτηρ ἦν Νυκτέως.
[118] καὶ τὰς Θήβας δὲ διὰ τὸ ἐξ αὐτῶν δέος τετειχίσθαι ὑπ' Ἀμφίονος καὶ Ζήθου φασίν. ὧν θανόντων ἀλῶναί τε πάλιν τὴν πόλιν ὑπὸ Φλεγυῶν Εὐρυμάχου βασιλεύοντος καὶ ἔρημον μεῖναι αὐτὴν μέχρι Κάδμου.
[119] καὶ Τέρπανδρον δὲ τῆς αὐτῆς μουσικῆς τεχνίτην γεγονέναι φασὶ καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς νήσου, τὸν πρῶτον ἀντὶ τῆς τετραχόρδου λύρας ἑπταχόρδῳ χρησάμενον.

διαθέσθαι τὰ ὅμοια, ἐκωλύθη φθάσαντος ἐκείνου κατὰ φύσιν θανεῖν. ἑτέρωθεν δὲ τὰ τῆς ἱστορίας ταύτης. Ὅμηρος γὰρ στίχῳ ἑνὶ περιέγραψε τὴν Μεγάραν οὐδέν τι προσειπὼν, ὃ καὶ ἐφ' ἑτέρων τινῶν ποιήσει ἐν τοῖς ἑξῆς, ποικιλίαν καὶ οὕτω τεχνώμενος τῷ λόγῳ ἐκ τοῦ, τῶν μὲν πλατύτερον μεμνῆσθαι, τῶν δὲ πρὸς μόνα ὀνόματα διὰ τὸ δῆλα εἶναι τὰ περὶ τῶν τοιούτων ἱστορούμενα. (1.413.3-11).

Similarly, in this passage, Eustathius starts with the heroine Megara that is discussed in the Homeric extract and ends up addressing a male hero related to her. He also comments on Homer's brevity and narrative technique and explains that he intentionally offers only one line to her.

In this case, the passage is about Megara, the daughter of Creon and wife of Heracles, with whom she had three children. While Heracles was completing the labour of Cerberus away from Thebes, Lycus, the king of the city, threatened his wife and children (Scherf, 2006). Once he returned, Heracles killed him, but he unintentionally killed his children too, because he was struck mad by Hera. Eustathius states that, according to some scholars, Heracles killed his wife too. Evidence of that can be found in Pausanias (*Graeciae descriptio* 10.29.7.2-5).[120] He also killed two children of Iphiclus (*Dictionary of Classical Mythology*, p. 268). Because of that, Lycophron in *Alexandra* (l. 38)[121] named him "child-destroyer" (LSJ s.v. τεκνο-ραίστης, ου, ὁ).

4.1.6

μητέρα τ' Οἰδιπόδαο ἴδον, καλὴν Ἐπικάστην,
ἣ μέγα ἔργον ἔρεξεν ἀϊδρείῃσι νόοιο
γημαμένη ᾧ υἷϊ· ὁ δ' ὃν πατέρ' ἐξεναρίξας
γῆμεν· ἄφαρ δ' ἀνάπυστα θεοὶ θέσαν ἀνθρώποισιν.
ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐν Θήβῃ πολυηράτῳ ἄλγεα πάσχων
Καδμείων ἤνασσε θεῶν ὀλοὰς διὰ βουλάς·
ἡ δ' ἔβη εἰς Ἀΐδαο πυλάρταο κρατεροῖο,
ἁψαμένη βρόχον αἰπὺν ἀφ' ὑψηλοῖο μελάθρου
ᾧ ἄχεϊ σχομένη· τῷ δ' ἄλγεα κάλλιπ' ὀπίσσω
πολλὰ μάλ', ὅσσα τε μητρὸς ἐρινύες ἐκτελέουσι. (*Od.* 11.271-280).

And I saw the mother of Oedipodes, beautiful Epicaste, who did a monstrous thing in the ignorance of her mind, wedding her own son; and he, when he had slain his own father, wedded her; and soon the gods made these things known among men. Nevertheless, in lovely Thebes, suffering woes, he ruled over the Cadmeans by the dire designs of the gods; but she went down to the house of Hades, the strong warder, making fast a deadly noose from the high ceiling, caught by her own grief; but for him she left behind countless woes, all that a mother's Furies bring to pass. (Murray, 1919, p. 421).

---

[120] Ταύτην γυναῖκα ἔσχεν Ἡρακλῆς τὴν Μεγάραν καὶ ἀπεπέμψατο ἀνὰ χρόνον, ἅτε παίδων τε ἐστερημένος τῶν ἐξ αὐτῆς καὶ αὐτὴν ἡγούμενος οὐκ ἐπὶ ἀμείνονι τῷ δαίμονι.
[121] ὁ τεκνοραίστης, λυμεὼν ἐμῆς πάτρας.

Ὅτι τὴν τοῦ Οἰδίποδος φύσει μὲν μητέρα, δυσποτμία δὲ γυναῖκα Ἰοκάστην Ἐπικάστην ὁ ποιητὴς οἶδεν. ἣν καὶ καλὴν ὀνομάζει. καὶ ἱστορῶν ἐν βραχεῖ τὰ κατ' αὐτὴν οἷα ὡς εἰκὸς φειδόμενος ἐμπλατύνεσθαι τοῖς περὶ τούτων λόγοις φησίν· (1.413.12-14).

In this extract, Eustathius comments on the tragic story of Oedipus and Iocaste. He states that Homer knows her as Epicaste and refers to her as "good", "beautiful" (καλὴν). The poet, again, does not refer extensively to the story since it is not principal for Odysseus. This gives Eustathius the chance to explain the myth in greater detail.

εἶεν δ' ἂν ταῦτα οὐ τὰ ὑπ' ἄλλων ἱστορηθέντα, ἡ λεγομένη φυγὴ τῆς πατρίδος καὶ ἡ πλάνη καὶ ἡ τύφλωσις, ἀλλ' ἡ κατάρρησις τῶν εἰδότων, ἡ ἐκ τῶν πολιτῶν περιφρόνησις, ἡ τῶν προσγενῶν ἀποστροφὴ, τηκεδόνες νόσων, φόβοι ὡς εἰκὸς νύκτεροι, τὸ δὲ μεῖζον, ἡ σύνεσις, ὅτι σύνοιδεν εἰργασμένος δεινά. τῇ δὲ τῶν ἄλλων προσγενῶν ἀποστροφῇ συνεισακτέα καὶ ἡ τῶν ἀρρένων παίδων, οἳ καὶ ἀπώλοντο ἀλληλοκτονήσαντες διὰ τὰς ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀράς. ὧν αἴτιον κατά τινας, ὅτι παρέθεντο ἐκεῖνοι τῷ πατρὶ ἐκπώματα ἅπερ ἐκεῖνος ἀπηγόρευκε. (1.413.20-25).

In this passage, Eustathius explains that Oedipus, after finding out the truth about what he did, left Thebes and put out his eyes. He then spent the rest of his life wandering. As for his two sons, Eteocles and Polyneices, it is stated that their father cursed them, after they insulted him. They ended up killing each other after Eteocles did not comply with their agreement, according to which each of them would rule Thebes for a year and then alternate with the other (Bloch, 2006). The story is mentioned in Aeschylus (*Septem contra Thebas* l. 778-784)[122] and Sophocles (*Antigone* l. 51-52).[123]

Δοκεῖ δὲ ἀπορίαν ἔχειν, πῶς αἱ μὲν τῆς μητρὸς Ἐριννύες ἄλγεα τῷ Οἰδίποδι ἐκτελέουσιν, αἱ δὲ τοῦ φονευθέντος πατρός, οὔ. καὶ ἔστιν εἰπεῖν, ὡς τυχὸν ὁ Οἰδίπους ἐλύπησέ τι πλέον ἤπερ ἔδει τὴν μητέρα γνωσθέντος τοῦ κακοῦ, διὸ καὶ μετῆλθον αὐτὸν αἱ μητρικαὶ Ἐριννύες. εἰ γὰρ διὰ μόνον τὸν ἔκθεσμον γάμον μετέρχονται αὐτὸν, οὐκ ἂν ἀφῆκαν αὐτὸν ἔξω ποινῆς οὐδὲ διὰ τὸν πατέρα οὐχ' ὁσίως πεφονευμένον. (1.413.30-34).

Here, Eustathius comments on the Erinyes, "the goddesses of retribution who exacted punishment for murder and other serious crimes" (*Dictionary of Classical Mythology*, p. 198). He states that it is strange how they wanted to punish Oedipus for marrying his mother but not for murdering his father. Perhaps the first iniquity appeared worse as it led his mother to committing suicide. However, the scholar mentions that even if the Erinyes wanted to punish him initially only for that offence, they could not exclude his father's death.

Σημείωσαι δ' ἐν τούτοις καὶ ὡς εἴπερ ἄλγεα πάσχων ἤνασσε Καδμείων ὁ Οἰδίπους μέχρι τέλους, ὡς φαίνεται δοκεῖν Ὁμήρῳ, οὐκ ἄρα ἔφευγεν ἢ ἐπλανᾶτο κατὰ τοὺς τραγικούς. εἰ δὲ καὶ ἐτύφλωσεν αὐτὸν, οὐκ ἂν αὐτὸ ἐσίγησεν ὁ ποιητὴς, ὡς οὐδὲ τὴν ἀγχόνην τῆς Ἐπικάστης. Ἰστέον δὲ καὶ ὅτι ἀνέστρεψε τὴν τοῦ διηγήματος ἀρχὴν Ὅμηρος μνησθεὶς πρῶτον τοῦ γάμου τῆς μητρός, εἶτα τοῦ φόνου τοῦ πατρός. καὶ τοῦτο οὐχ' ἁπλῶς κοινότερον, ἀλλὰ στρυφνότερον. οὐ γὰρ ἔφη γημαμένη τῷ υἱῷ ἐξεναρίξαντι τὸν πατέρα, ἀλλὰ γημαμένη τῷ υἱῷ. (1.413.34-39).

Lastly, in this remark Eustathius refers to the differences in the Oedipus narrative between Homer and the tragic poets Aeschylus and Sophocles. According to Homer,

---

[122] ἐπεὶ δ' ἀρτίφρων ἐγένετο μέλεος ἀθλίων γάμων, ἐπ' ἄλγει δυσφορῶν μαινομέναι κραδίαι δίδυμα κάκ' ἐτέλεσεν πατροφόνωι χερὶ †τῶν κρεισσοτέκνων δ' ὀμμάτων† ἐπλάγχθη.

[123] πρὸς αὐτοφώρων ἀμπλακημάτων, διπλᾶς ὄψεις ἀράξας αὐτὸς αὐτουργῷ χερί.

Oedipus stayed and ruled Thebes until his death, while, the tragic poets state that he put out his eyes and wandered for the rest of his life, as it was previously mentioned. In addition, Eustathius notes that in his narrative, Homer reversed the chronology of the events. In the *Odyssey,* Homer firstly mentions that Epicaste wedded Oedipus and then that the latter killed his father.

4.1.7

Φαίδρην τε Πρόκριν τε ἴδον καλήν τ' Ἀριάδνην,
κούρην Μίνωος ὀλοόφρονος, ἥν ποτε Θησεὺς
ἐκ Κρήτης ἐς γουνὸν Ἀθηνάων ἱεράων
ἦγε μέν, οὐδ' ἀπόνητο· πάρος δέ μιν Ἄρτεμις ἔκτα
Δίῃ ἐν ἀμφιρύτῃ Διονύσου μαρτυρίῃσι. (*Od.* 11.321-325).

And Phaedra and Procris I saw, and beautiful Ariadne, the daughter of Minos of baneful mind, whom once Theseus tried to bring from Crete to the hill of sacred Athens; but he had no joy of her. Before that, Artemis slew her in seagirt Dia because of the witness of Dionysus. (Murray, 1919, p. 423-425).

In relation to this passage of the *Odyssey,* Eustathius makes a lengthy remark on the story of the Minotaur (1.420.43-421.27). The Minotaur was a hybrid of a bull and a man. It was the outcome of the union of Pasiphae and a bull (Stenger, 2006). It should be noted that Eustathius does not focus on the heroines, but rather, he takes the opportunity to focus on Theseus.

 Eustathius narrates that Androgeus, son of Minos, departed from Crete to Athens in order to participate in athletic contests. He won the contest of the five exercises, which made the Athenians envy him and ultimately murder him. This unfair act caused the wrath of Gods and lead them to send an oracle, according to which, seven unmarried young men and seven unmarried young women randomly chosen would be fed to Minotaur every year (1.420.43-45). However, there are different opinions on frequently the sacrifice would occur. It was either annually or every nine years (*Dictionary of Classical Mythology,* 2014, p. 319). Daedalus was asked to build the Labyrinth, an underground maze in which the Minotaur would live (1.421.1).

Eustathius states that Theseus purposely added his name to the lot and sailed to Crete with the rest of the unmarried youth for Minotaur's tribute (1.421.2). He had decided to kill Minotaur for the sake of his land. However, according to March (2014, p. 471), it is not certain, whether he volunteered to go, his name emerged during lot, or if Minos personally chose the victims.

Ariadne, Minos' daughter, fell in love with Theseus and helped him accomplish his mission. She gave him a ball of thread given by Daedalus, which Theseus could use in order to get out of the maze safely, once he had killed the Minotaur (1.421.3-7). Eustathius refers to that part of the story also in the *Commentary on the Iliad* (4.268.15-19).[124] His comments appear similar to *Scholia in Odysseam* (11.322.1-20), where the

---

[124] Περὶ δὲ Ἀριάδνης καὶ τῶν κατ' αὐτήν, ὅτι τε Θησέως ἐρασθείη, καὶ ὅπως εἰς Κρήτην ἐκεῖνος ἔλθοι, καὶ ὡς Δαιδάλου ὑποθήκαις ἀγαθῖδα μίτου δοῦσα τῷ Θησεῖ αἰτία γένοιτο ἐκείνῳ διεξοδεῦσαι τὸν λαβύρινθον, ἱστοροῦσι πολλοί, καὶ ἐν τοῖς εἰς τὴν Ὀδύσσειαν δὲ γέγραπταί τινα.

story is narrated in detail. It is interesting that when referring to the "ball of thread", the very specific phrase ἀγαθῖδα μίτου is used. It appears only three times in the TLG database, one in each Homeric Commentary and in the *Scholia in Odysseam.*

Theseus sailed away from Crete with Ariadne and the unmarried youth. They traveled to an island called Dia, which was later named Naxos. Then goddess Athena ordered Theseus to sail to Athens and leave Ariadne there. According to Homer, Artemis killed Ariadne in Dia. However, newer scholars state that god Dionysus gave her a golden crown and married her (1.421.8-21). Hesiodus in *Theogonia* mentions that Dionysus married Ariadne and Cronus made her immortal and ageless for him (l. 947-949).[125] In Epimenides' *Fragmenta* it is also stated that Dionysus gave Ariadne a golden crown made by Hephaestus, which was later set among the stars (frag. 25).[126] In this passage, Eustathius conflates the well-known story, that Theseus leaves Ariadne, with an attempt to explain the Homeric version that is otherwise unknown to us (1.421.14-21).

Finally, Eustathius explains that the Cretan Labyrinth is not the only one. There are also Labyrinths in the city of Nauplia, which are made by the Cyclops and are called Cyclopeans. He makes a similar reference in his *Commentary on the Iliad* (1.441.10-12).[127] His source appears to be Strabo (*Geographica* 8.6.2.18-20),[128] since Eustathius paraphrases him.

5. HISTORICAL-GEOGRAPHICAL COMMENTS

In this chapter, I focus on the historical-geographical comments, where Eustathius analyzes historical people and places and compares them to the Homeric ones. They consist the shortest category of the paper, with three comments.

5.1.1

ἔνθα δὲ Κιμμερίων ἀνδρῶν δῆμός τε πόλις τε,
ἠέρι καὶ νεφέλῃ κεκαλυμμένοι. (*Od.* 11.14-15).

Where is the land and city of the Cimmerians, wrapped in mist and cloud. (Murray, 1919, p. 401).

---

[125] χρυσοκόμης δὲ Διώνυσος ξανθὴν Ἀριάδνην, κούρην Μίνωος, θαλερὴν ποιήσατ᾽ ἄκοιτιν· τὴν δέ οἱ ἀθάνατον καὶ ἀγήρων θῆκε Κρονίων.

[126] (περὶ τοῦ Στεφάνου) οὗτος λέγεται ὁ τῆς Ἀριάδνης ... ὅ τε τὰ Κρητικὰ γεγραφὼς λέγει, <ὅτι> ὅτε ἦλθε Διόνυσος πρὸς Μίνω φθεῖραι βουλόμενος αὐτήν, δῶρον αὐτῆι τοῦτον δέδωκεν, ὧι ἠπατήθη ἡ Ἀριάδνη. Ἡφαίστου δὲ ἔργον εἶναί φασιν ἐκ χρυσοῦ πυρώδους καὶ λίθων Ἰνδικῶν ... ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἄστροις ὕστερον αὐτὸν τεθηκέναι.

[127] διέχει δὲ Ναυπλίας περὶ δώδεκα στάδια, ᾗτινι Ναυπλίᾳ ἐφεξῆς σπήλαια, φησί, καὶ οἰκοδομητοὶ λαβύρινθοι. καλεῖται δὲ Κυκλώπεια.

[128] ἐφεξῆς δὲ τῇ Ναυπλίᾳ τὰ σπήλαια καὶ οἱ ἐν αὐτοῖς οἰκοδομητοὶ λαβύρινθοι, Κυκλώπεια δ᾽ ὀνομάζουσιν.

Eustathius begins his commentary to the Cimmerians by referring to the historical Cimmerians (1.396.41-397.9). They are not connected to the Homeric Cimmerians because of their mythical location at the entrance of Hades. Their identity and location have not been sufficiently determined. They have been mainly associated with the tribe of the 8th/7th centuries BC that lived in the far north (Heubeck & Hoekstra, 1990, p. 77-78). According to Eustathius, Cimmerians were a Scythian nomadic people from the north. They penetrated into Asia Minor and captured Sardis. They were also called Treres, as it is evident in Strabo (*Geographica* 1.3.21.23-24).[129]

Ἀρριανὸς δέ φησιν ὅτι Κιμμέριοι Σκυθικὸν ἔθνος ἐξ ἠθῶν τῶν οἰκείων ἀναστάντες καὶ πάντας τοὺς διὰ μέσου βλάπτοντες ἦλθον ἕως Βιθυνίας. Ἡρόδοτος δὲ ἱστορεῖ ὅτι βασιλεύοντος Ἄρδυος τοῦ Γύγου Κιμμέριοι ἐξαναστάντες τῶν οἰκείων ἠθῶν ὑπὸ Σκυθῶν τῶν νομάδων ἀφίκοντο εἰς Ἀσίαν, ὅτε καὶ τὰς Σάρδεις εἷλον. ἄλλοι δέ φασι καὶ ὅτι ἱερὰ θεῶν καταδραμόντες ἐσύλησαν ἐν Ἀσίᾳ. ὅθεν οἱ ἀοιδοὶ μὴ ἔχοντες ἄλλως αὐτοὺς βλάψαι μυθοπλάστῳ ἐκτοπισμῷ τὴν τοῦ ἔθνους κακίαν ἠμύναντο κατά τι φασὶ κοινὸν ἔχθος Ἰώνων πρὸς αὐτούς. Ἴων δὲ καὶ ὁ ποιητὴς ὁ τῶν τοιούτων ἀοιδῶν κορυφαῖος. (1.397.9-15).

In this extract, the author offers three interpretations about the origin of the Cimmerians. According to Eustathius, Arrianus states that the Cimmerians were a Scythian nation that had to migrate all the way to Bithynia, while destroying everything on their way (*Bithynicorum Fragmenta* 44).[130] Herodotus in *Historiae* (1.15.1-6)[131] mentions that in the reign of Ardys, the son of Gyges, the Cimmerians were driven away from their homes by the nomadic Scythians and it was at that time that they arrived in Asia Minor and conquered Sardis. Other scholars, whom Eustathius adds without naming claim that the Cimmerians also destroyed temples in Asia.

According to Eustathius, due to the disasters caused by the Cimmerians, the poets of Homer's time created myths where the Cimmerians' nation faced difficulties and migrated to lands far away. This was the only way for the poets to express the Ionian's hate for them.

5.1.2

πέρατα δὲ Ὠκεανοῦ νῦν οὐχὶ τοῦ πρὸς Γαδείροις, ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἐπέκεινα πρὸς ἑσπέραν ἄκρου, κατὰ τὸ πλάσμα τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως ἤτοι κατὰ τὸ μυθικὸν αἴτημα, ὅ που γῆς μὲν πέρας τῆς ἑσπερίας, ἀρχὴ δὲ τῶν ὑπὸ γῆν, ὅ ἐστι, τοῦ Ἅιδου καταρχή. (1.396.23-24).

Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι καθάπερ ποταμοὺς ὑπὲρ γῆς ὄντας καὶ ἱστορουμένους μετήγαγεν ἡ μυθικὴ αὐτονομία εἰς Ἅιδην, ὀνόματα ἐπιλεξαμένη τοῖς κάτω προσήκοντα, ὡς καὶ προδεδήλωται, οὕτω καὶ τοὺς Κιμμερίους, ἔθνος ὄντας ἱστορίαις γνωστόν, μετοικίζειν

---

[129] οἵ τε Κιμμέριοι, οὓς καὶ Τρῆρας ὀνομάζουσιν, ἢ ἐκείνων τι ἔθνος.

[130] Ἀρριανὸς δέ φησιν ὅτι Κιμμέριοι Σκυθικὸν ἔθνος ἐξ ἠθῶν τῶν οἰκείων ἀναστάντες καὶ πάντας τοὺς διὰ μέσου βλάπτοντες ἦλθον ἕως Βιθυνίας.

[131] ἔτεα, τοῦτον μὲν παρήσομεν τοσαῦτα ἐπιμνησθέντες. Ἄρδυος δὲ τοῦ Γύγεω μετὰ Γύγην βασιλεύσαντος μνήμην ποιήσομαι. οὗτος δὲ Πριηνέας τε εἷλε ἐς Μίλητόν τε ἐσέβαλε, ἐπὶ τούτου τε τυραννεύοντος Σαρδίων Κιμμέριοι ἐς ἠθέων ὑπὸ Σκυθέων τῶν νομάδων ἐξαναστάντες ἀπίκοντο ἐς τὴν Ἀσίην καὶ Σάρδις πλὴν τῆς ἀκροπόλιος εἷλον.

ἐθέλει πρὸς παροικίαν Ἅιδου διὰ ὁμοιότητα καὶ αὐτοὺς ὀνόματα ἐπιλεξάμενος. (1.396.29-32).

In the first passage, Eustathius explains that according to Odysseus' story, that is the assumption of the myth, the end of the land of the west of Oceanus signifies the beginning of the underworld, the domain of Hades. According to Schmitt (2006), Oceanus in mythology is the link between the earth and heavens, "the medium between separate domains".

In the second extract, the scholar points out that Homer refers to existing rivers and nations while making the necessary adjustments regarding their locations with mythic license. For instance, in the *Commentary on the Odyssey* (1.392.21-22),[132] he says that Acheron, Styx, Phlegethon, Lethe and Cocytus are actual rivers, from which the rivers in Hades are created. Eustathius mentions in a few more instances the relocation of Oceanus in the epics and that it leads to Hades (1.405.20-22).[133] The same applies to Circe's island and it appears in a different location due to the mythic assumption (1.399.26-28).[134] The main point of this is that just as Homer transfers actual known geographical features to create the landscape of Hades, he also moves the historically αknown tribe of the Cimmerians from Asia Minor to the entrance of Hades.

There is a third instance in the eleventh chapter of the *Commentary on the Odyssey* (1.442.34-443.5) where Eustathius discusses Oceanus. He begins by explaining that Homer, by poetic assumption, refers to Oceanus as a river in a specific part of the eleventh book of the *Odyssey* (11.639).[135] In other cases, he considers Oceanus identical to the sea, as it is according to the philosophers. Eustathius claims that it is not Homer's intention to refrain too much from the truth (1.442.34-37).[136] He continues by mentioning that Odysseus' mother, Anticlea, also refers to Oceanus as a river (*Od.* 11.157)[137] and at the same time implies that after Oceanus the Netherworld begins (1.442.39-41).[138] Lastly, a similar mention to Oceanus as the river appears in the beginning of the twelfth book (*Od.* 12.1).[139] Strabo in *Geographica* explains that the river is not considered as the whole Oceanus, but rather as a part of it (1.1.7.29-30).[140]

---

[132] ἡ μέντοι ἱστορία οἶδε ποταμὸν ἀληθῶς ὑπὲρ γῆς Ἀχέροντα καὶ Πυριφλεγέθοντα δὲ καὶ Κωκυτὸν, καὶ πηγήν τινα Στύγα, ἐξ ὧν τὰ ἐν Ἅιδου πλάττονται.

[133] διὰ μέσου ἄρα τοῦ Ὠκεανοῦ μυθεύεται εἰς Ἅιδην Ὀδυσσεὺς ἐλθεῖν πλεύσας νηῒ πανημέριος, ὡς προδεδήλωται, οἷα τῆς κατὰ τὴν Κίρκην νήσου ἢ ἐν Ὠκεανῷ πεπλασμένης εἶναι ἢ πρὸς τῷ Ὠκεανῷ κατὰ τὴν ποιητικὴν τερατείαν.

[134] ποίοις γὰρ ἐσομένοις ἔμελλε τὸ σῆμα φαίνεσθαι ἐν παράπλῳ εἴπερ ἀοίκητος ἡ τῆς Κίρκης νῆσος ὑπόκειται; εἰ μὴ ἄρα ἐμφαίνει διὰ τούτων ὁ ποιητής, ψευδῆ μὲν εἶναι τὸν ὠκεανισμὸν ἢ ἄλλως ἐκτοπισμὸν τῆς νήσου Αἰαίης, ἀληθῶς δὲ ἐν τόποις περιπλεομένοις κεῖσθαι αὐτήν.

[135] τὴν δὲ κατ' Ὠκεανὸν ποταμὸν φέρε κῦμα ῥόοιο. ("And the ship was borne down the river Oceanus by the swell of the current", Murray, 1919, p. 447).

[136] Ὅτι εἰ καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις ὁ ποιητὴς ἐμφαίνει θάλασσαν εἶναι τὸν Ὠκεανὸν κατὰ τοὺς φιλοσόφους, ἀλλ' ἐνταῦθα ποταμὸν φανερῶς αὐτὸν λέγει ποιητικῶς φράζων, οὔτε τῆς ἀληθείας ἐθέλων ἀπέχεσθαι, καὶ τῇ ποιήσει δὲ τὰ εἰκότα χαριζόμενος. φησὶ οὖν· τὴν δὲ νῆα κατ' Ὠκεανὸν ποταμὸν φέρε κῦμα ῥόοιο.

[137] μέσσῳ γὰρ μεγάλοι ποταμοὶ καὶ δεινὰ ῥέεθρα, Ὠκεανὸς μὲν πρῶτα. ("For between are great rivers and appalling streams; Oceanus first", Murray, 1919, p. 411).

[138] ἴσως δὲ καὶ Ἀντίκλεια εἰποῦσα ὅτι μέσσῳ γὰρ μεγάλοι ποταμοὶ καὶ δεινὰ ῥέεθρα Ὠκεανὸς μὲν πρῶτα ποταμὸν δοξάζει καὶ τὸν Ὠκεανόν, δηλοῦσα ἐκεῖ καὶ αὐτὴ, ὅτι πέραν Ὠκεανοῦ ἡ νεκύα πλάττεται τῷ ποιητῇ.

[139] Αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ποταμοῖο λίπεν ῥόον Ὠκεανοῖο. ("Now after our ship had left the river Oceanus", Murray, 1919, p. 449).

[140] οὐ γὰρ τὸν ὅλον, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἐν τῷ ὠκεανῷ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ῥόον μέρος ὄντα τοῦ ὠκεανοῦ.

5.1.3

ἀλλ’ οὕτω μὲν οἱ Ὁμηρικοὶ Κιμμέριοι ὡς ἐν πλάσματι περιφέρονται τῶν ἀρκτῴων ἐξοικισθέντων τόπων ἐπὶ δυσμάς, ὑπηρετοῦντος τῇ ποιήσει κἀνταῦθα τοῦ πολλὰ παρ’ αὐτῇ δυναμένου μύθου, καὶ οὐ μόνον ἐκ τῆς ἄρκτου εἰς ἑσπέραν, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν Ἄιδην ἀναστατοῦντος αὐτούς, ὃς οὐδὲ ἑξαμήνῳ γοῦν φωτὶ κατὰ τὸ θρυλλούμενον περιλάμπει αὐτούς. ἀλλὰ παρ’ Ὁμήρῳ διὰ βίου ὑπὸ σκότει ποιεῖ. καὶ τί γὰρ ἀλλ’ ἢ προσοίκους τῷ Ἄιδη; τοὺς δὲ τοιούτους, οὐδέ ποτε εἰκὸς Ἡλίῳ λάμπεσθαι. (1.396.36-40).

In this passage, Eustathius explains how the Cimmerians appear differently in Homer’s poetry in the same manner as the rivers and Oceanus. They were a nomadic tribe perhaps of Iranian descent (von Bredow, 2006). With the help of poetry and the power of myth, the Cimmerians are moved from the northern locations. They are even dislocated into Hades, so that they cannot see the light of the sun at all anymore.

6. SUMMARY & CONCLUSION

The study discusses the eleventh chapter of the *Commentary on the Odyssey* by Eustathius of Thessalonica. The two research questions concerned dividing and systematizing the comments i. in general, and ii. subcategorizing the linguistic comments. After distinguishing them, four categories occurred, namely, linguistic, comments on the content of the *Odyssey,* mythological and historical-geographical. Additionally, the linguistic comments were divided in four sub-categories, etymological, exegetical, syntactical and grammatical. For the analysis, the TLG database, LSJ dictionary, Etymological Dictionary of Greek (2010) and the Homeric Dictionary for Schools and Colleges (1895) were the tools that were primarily used. All the comments were inevitably connected to one another and had to be separated into smaller extracts depending on the category they belonged to. In general, this study provides new and critical insight to a Byzantine Commentary that still has not been studied to full degree.

It is difficult to compare this study to previous research, due to the fact that they study Eustathius’ work from a totally different perspective. The only preceding study that appears similar to a certain degree is the article of Kolovou (2017), where she addresses the etymological remarks of the sixth chapter of the *Commentary on the Iliad.* Thus, as for the etymological part, it appears as he follows the same way of analyzing the Homeric extracts. In general, he follows the etymologies attested in the *Lexica* embedded with his own personal remarks.

In many occasions, the linguistic comments did not appertain to a specific subcategory, given that various aspects of the language cannot be studied or commented on in isolation. In that case, they were separated according to the basic scope of the comment. If, for instance, an extract was primarily etymological, with a minor focus on grammar, it would be considered etymological. Following that, linguistic observations also appeared in the other categories too.

It is noticeable that the linguistic aspect of the *Commentary* takes up most of the space in the chapter. His Homeric *Commentaries* were products of various extracts he collected, paired with the Homeric Scholia and his own comments with the intention of helping his students to thoroughly understand the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Thus, it is only logical that, as a teacher of rhetoric and grammar, he would concentrate on providing linguistic explanations and simplifying the Homeric passages. This is evident in a plethora of comments where Eustathius uses the terms ἤγουν or τουτέστι ("that is to say"), which introduce comments that provide linguistic explanations. It is clear that he refers to his students and intends to simplify the Homeric verses.

In general, the linguistic comments work as interpretations for the students. Concerning, the etymological and exegetical comments, Eustathius gives synonyms to plenty of words, provides etymological explanations either by quoting other authors and *Lexica* or by offering his own elaborations. His goal was to help his students improve their linguistic skills by firstly understanding how words are created, their function in the Homeric narrative, and ultimately apply that knowledge in their own works.

In the syntactical remarks, he comments on metrical issues in the poem and rhetorical schemata. As for the grammatical comments, he addresses the usage of cases, prepositions, suffixes, conjunctions along with the derivation and conjugation of verbs and nouns. These two categories appear more complex, as they study many-faceted aspects of the language. Grammar and syntax are profoundly associated and constitute the entire set of rules of a language. Thus, with these comments, Eustathius' intention was to go a step further in his teaching, and, not only expound the composition of words but also that of sentences. Undoubtedly, his objective was principally didactic. By analyzing all qualities of the language, he was able to teach his students how to properly use linguistic rules in their own studies.

Concerning the mythological and historical-geographical remarks, instances of linguistic comments were found there as well. Consequently, these passages were separated and the remarks were distinguished in the respective category. Mythology was of great significance in the Byzantine era, so, as a tutor, Eustathius aimed to educate his students on it. In his discussion on mythology, the comments function as clarifications regarding genealogy and narrate further the mythological stories that, in his view, Homer did not focus on intentionally. He displayed and compared different versions of the same story, provided by several sources. By changing his focus from the Homeric heroines to the heroes they are connected to, the author intended to compose the genealogical tree of the heroines that are less known, and present their relation to the common and classical mythological figures. In that manner, he teaches his students the background of all the well-known heroes and myths.

As for the historical-geographical comments, they appear to be the shortest category of the chapter. In these extracts, Eustathius mainly discusses the tribe of Cimmerians, Oceanus and Circe's island in relation to their appearance in Homer's epics. He also points out the differences that occur between the real historical figures and places and the ones that emerge in the Homeric narrative. His main source for this section is evidently Strabo. By reflecting on the correlation between reality and poetry, Eustathius explains how the mythic license works and consequently teaches his students how to separate the actual from the mythical facts and implement the technique practically in their studies.

Lastly, regarding the comments on the content of the *Odyssey,* they are the only category where linguistic references are extremely rare. In this section, I have collected passages where Eustathius concentrates on the narrative and structures of the *Odyssey,* the mythical aspect of Odysseus' *katabasis* and the purport of certain actions, for instance, the suitors' behavior, Odysseus' endeavors in the Netherworld. A particularly interesting aspect of these comments is that Eustathius does not only reflect on Homer as a poet, but he also examines Odysseus' way of narrating his story to the Phaeacians.

A potential subject for future research could be a similar systematization of comments in other chapters of the *Commentary on the Odyssey.* It could be possible that different categories of remarks will originate, depending on the subject of the particular chapter of the *Odyssey.* It is evident, that due to Eustathius' focus on the linguistic aspect of the Homeric epics, similar categories will also occur. In that case, a study of similarities and differences on the linguistic categories of various chapters could also be beneficial. In addition, the comments of the *Commentary on the Odyssey* can be compared to the ones of the *Commentary on the Iliad.*

7. REFERENCES

Texts Editions used, in TLG DATABASE

Aeschylus, *Septem contra Thebas* = *D.*L. Page, *Aeschyli Septem Quae Supersunt Tragoedias*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972: 45-87.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0085:013:0

Apion, *Fragmenta de Glossis Homericis* = A. Ludwich, "Über die homerischen Glossen Apions," *Philologus* 74 (1917) 209-247; 75 (1919) 95-103.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?1152:003:59693

Apollonius, *Lexicon Homericum* = I. Bekker, *Apollonii Sophistae lexicon Homericum*, Berlin: Reimer, 1833 (repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1967): 1-171.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?1168:001:0

Aratus, *Phaenomena* = J.-M. Martin, *Arati phaenomena*, Florence: La Nuova Italia Editrice, 1956: 3-154.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0653:001:0

Aristonicus, *De Signis Iliadis* = L. Friedländer, *Aristonici Περὶ σημείων Ἰλιάδος reliquiae emendatiores*, Göttingen: Dieterich, 1853 (repr. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1965): 39-350.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?1194:002:0

Aristonicus, *De Signis Odysseae* = O. Carnuth, *Aristonici Περὶ σημείων Ὀδυσσείας reliquiae emendatiores*, Leipzig: Hirzel, 1869: 3-164.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?1194:001:0

Aristophanes, *Lysistrata* = N.G. Wilson, *Aristophanis Fabulae*, Tomus II, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007: 7-65.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0019:025:0

Aristophanes, *Pax* = N.G. Wilson, *Aristophanis Fabulae*, Tomus I, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007: 283-338.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0019:023:0

Aristophanes, *Ranae* = N.G. Wilson, *Aristophanis Fabulae*, Tomus II, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007: 135-204.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0019:027:0

Aristoteles, *Fragmenta Varia* = V. Rose, *Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta*, Leipzig: Teubner, 1886 (repr. 1967): 23-425.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0086:051:0

Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* = G. Kaibel, *Athenaei Naucratitae deipnosophistarum libri xv*, 3 vols., Leipzig: Teubner, 1-2:1887; 3:1890 (repr. 1-2:1965; 3:1966): 1:1-491; 2:1-498; 3:1-560.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0008:001:0

Callimachus, *Fragmenta Incertae Sedis* = R. Pfeiffer, *Callimachus*, vol. 1, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949: 354-399, 401-402, 406-429, 431-437, 440-452, 454, 456, 458-464.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0533:013:0

Cypria = A. Bernabé, *Poetarum epicorum Graecorum testimonia et fragmenta*, pt. 1, Leipzig: Teubner, 1987: 43-50, 53-55, 59, 61, 63.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?1296:001:0

Empedocles, *Fragmenta* = H. Diels and W. Kranz, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, vol. 1, 6th edn., Berlin: Weidmann, 1951: 308-374.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?1342:004:0

Epicharmus, *Fragmenta Epicharmi* = G. Kaibel, *Comicorum Graecorum fragmenta, vol. 1.1* [*Poetarum Graecorum fragmenta* 6.1. Berlin: Weidmann, 1899]: 91-126, 128-132.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0521:001:11513

Eriphus, *Fragmenta* = T. Kock, *Comicorum Atticorum fragmenta*, vol. 2, Leipzig: Teubner, 1884: 428-430.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0455:001:673

Etymologicum Gudianum = F.W. Sturz, *Etymologicum Graecae linguae Gudianum et alia grammaticorum scripta e codicibus manuscriptis nunc primum edita*, Leipzig: Weigel, 1818 (repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1973): 229-584.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?4098:002:0

Etymologicum Genuinum = F. Lasserre and N. Livadaras, *Etymologicum magnum genuinum. Symeonis etymologicum una cum magna grammatica. Etymologicum magnum auctum*, vol. 2, Athens: Parnassos Literary Society, 1992: 15-20, 22, 24, 26-36, 38-44, 46, 48-50, 52-58, 60-64, 66-68, 70, 72-79, 81-83, 86-89, 91-92, 94-95, 97, 104, 106-116, 118-122, 124-131, 142, 144-161, 164-168, 170-176, 178-196, 198-204, 426-444, 446-456, 458-462, 464-480, 482-510, 512-525.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?4097:002:0

Etymologicum Magnum = T. Gaisford, *Etymologicum magnum*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1848 (repr. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1967): 1-826.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?4099:001:0

Eustathius Thessalonicensis, *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem* = M. van der Valk, *Eustathii archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes*, vols. 1-4, Leiden: Brill, 1:1971; 2:1976; 3:1979; 4:1987: 1:1-802; 2:1-838; 3:1-944; 4:1-991.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?4083:001:0

Eustathius Thessalonicensis, *Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam* = G. Stallbaum, *Eustathii archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam*, 2 vols. in 1, Leipzig: Weigel, 1:1825; 2:1826 (repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1970): 1:1-443; 2:1-334.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?4083:003:0

Eustathius Thessalonicensis, *Commentarium in Dionysii Periegetae Orbis Descriptionem* = K. Müller, *Geographi Graeci minores*, vol. 2, Paris: Didot, 1861 (repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1965): 201-407.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?4083:006:0

Flavius, A., *Bithynicorum Fragmenta* = A.G. Roos and G. Wirth, *Flavii Arriani quae exstant omnia*, vol. 2, Leipzig: Teubner, 1968 (1st edn. corr.): 198-223.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0074:009:0

Herennius, P., *De Diversis Verborum Significationibus* = V. Palmieri, *Herennius Philo. De diversis verborum significationibus*, Naples: M. D'Auria, 1988: 125-231.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?1416:001:0

Hermogenes, *Περὶ Ἰδεῶν Λόγου* = H. Rabe, *Hermogenis opera*, Leipzig: Teubner, 1913 (repr. 1969): 213-413.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0592:004:0

Herodianus, A., *De Prosodia Catholica* = A. Lentz, Grammatici Graeci, vol. 3.1, Leipzig: Teubner, 1867 (repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1965): 3-547.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0087:001:1193023

Herodianus, A., *Παρεκβολαὶ τοῦ Μεγάλου Ρήματος* = J. La Roche, *Παρεκβολαὶ τοῦ μεγάλου ῥήματος ἐκ τῶν Ἡρωδιανοῦ* [*Programm Akad. Gymn. Vienna*. 1863]: 4-37.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0087:050:0

Herodianus, A., *Περὶ Ὀδυσσειακὴς Προσωδίας* = A. Lentz, Grammatici Graeci, vol. 3.2, Leipzig: Teubner, 1870 (repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1965): 129-165.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0087:008:0

Herodianus, A., *Περὶ Κλήσεως Ὀνομάτων* = A. Lentz, *Grammatici Graeci*, vol. 3.2, Leipzig: Teubner, 1870 (repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1965): 634-777.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0087:013:0

Herodianus, A., *Περὶ Παθῶν* = A. Lentz, Grammatici Graeci, vol. 3.2, Leipzig: Teubner, 1870 (repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1965): 166-389.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0087:009:0

Herodianus, A., *Περὶ Ὀρθογραφίας* = A. Lentz, Grammatici Graeci, vol. 3.2, Leipzig: Teubner, 1870 (repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1965): 407-611.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0087:011:0

Herodorus, *Fragmenta* = K. Müller, *Fragmenta historicorum Graecorum (FHG) 2*, Paris: Didot, 1841-1870: 28-41.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?1427:003:0

Herodotus, *Historiae* = N.G. Wilson, *Herodoti Historiae (2 vols.)*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015: vol. 1: 3-436; vol. 2: 439-844.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0016:002:0

Hesiodus, *Theogonia* = M.L. West, *Hesiod. Theogony*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966: 111-149.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0020:001:0

Hesychius, *Lexicon (Π-Ω)* = M. Schmidt, *Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon*, vols. 3-4, Halle, 3:1861; 4:1862 (repr. 1965): 3:251-439; 4:1-336.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?4085:003:680348

Hippocrates, *Aphorismi* = É. Littré, *Oeuvres complètes d'Hippocrate*, vol. 4, Paris: Baillière, 1844 (repr. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1962): 458-608.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0627:012:0

Homerus, *Ilias* = T.W. Allen, *Homeri Ilias*, vols. 2-3, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1931: 2:1-356; 3:1-370.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0012:001:0

Homerus, *Odyssea* = P. von der Mühll, *Homeri Odyssea*, Basel: Helbing & Lichtenhahn, 1962: 1-456.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0012:002:0

Ibycus, *Fragmenta* = D.L. Page, *Poetae melici Graeci*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962 (repr. 1967 (1st edn. corr.)): 144-150, 152-162, 164-167.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0293:001:2662

Lexicon in carmina Gregorii Nazianzeni = D. Kalamakis, *Λεξικὰ τῶν ἐπῶν Γρηγορίου τοῦ Θεολόγου μετὰ γενικῆς θεωρήσεως τῆς πατερικῆς λεξικογραφίας*, Athens: Papadakis, 1992: 145-227.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?4303:004:17936

Lycophron, *Alexandra* = L. Mascialino, *Lycophronis Alexandra*, Leipzig: Teubner, 1964: 1-65.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0341:002:3747

Nazianzenus, G., *Carmina Moralia* = J.-P. Migne, *Patrologiae cursus completus (series Graeca) (MPG)* 37, Paris: Migne, 1857-1866: 521-968.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?2022:060:0

Orion, *Etymologicum* = F.W. Sturz, *Orionis Thebani etymologicon*, Leipzig: Weigel, 1820 (repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1973): 1-172.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?2591:001:40504

Pausanias, *Graeciae Descriptio* = F. Spiro, *Pausaniae Graeciae descriptio*, 3 vols., Leipzig: Teubner, 1903 (repr. 1:1967): 1:1-420; 2:1-389; 3:1-217.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0525:001:705035

Pseudo-Apollodorus, *Biblioteca* = R. Wagner, *Apollodori bibliotheca. Pediasimi libellus de duodecim Herculis laboribus* [*Mythographi Graeci* 1. Leipzig: Teubner, 1894]: 1-169.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0548:001:193019

Pseudo-Zonaras, *Lexicon* = J.A.H. Tittmann, *Iohannis Zonarae lexicon ex tribus codicibus manuscriptis*, 2 vols., Leipzig: Crusius, 1808 (repr. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1967): 1:1-1070; 2:1077-1900.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?3136:001:744419

Quintus, *Posthomerica* = F. Vian, *Quintus de Smyrne. La suite d'Homère*, 3 vols., Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1:1963; 2:1966; 3:1969: 1:12-44, 56-81, 96-126, 136-159; 2:18-44, 67-92, 105-134, 144-163, 180-202; 3:16-36, 48-68, 88-111, 128-151, 176-203.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?2046:001:0

Sappho, *Fragmenta* = E. Lobel and D.L. Page, *Poetarum Lesbiorum fragmenta*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955 (repr. 1968 (1st edn. corr.)): 2, 5-68, 70-103, 108-110.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0009:001:0

Scholia in Odysseam = W. Dindorf, *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Odysseam*, 2 vols., Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1855 (repr. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1962): 1:7-402; 2:403-732.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?5026:007:875090

Sophocles, *Antigone* = H. Lloyd-Jones and N.G. Wilson, *Sophoclis fabulae*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990: 182-238.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0011:014:0

Strabo, *Geographica* = A. Meineke, *Strabonis geographica*, 3 vols., Leipzig: Teubner, 1877: 1: xiii-xv, 1-396; 2:397-814; 3:815-1173.

Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0099:001:0

Suda = A. Adler, ed., Suidae lexicon, 4 vols. [Lexicographi Graeci 1.1-1.4. Leipzig: Teubner, 1.1:1928; 1.2:1931; 1.3:1933; 1.4:1935]: 1.1:1-549; 1.2:1-740; 1.3:1-632; 1.4:1-854.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?9010:001:0

Tryphon II, *De Tropis* = M.L. West, "Tryphon. De tropis," *Classical Quarterly* n.s. 15 (1965): 236-248.
Retrieved from: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?1763:001:0

REFERENCES

Auffarth, C. (2006). "Actorione", in: *Brill's New Pauly*. Consulted online on 26 April 2023 http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e112440

Autenrieth, G. (1895). *A Homeric Dictionary for Schools and Colleges.* University of Oklahoma Press.

Beekes, R. (2010). *Etymological Dictionary of Greek.* Leiden: Brill.

Bloch, R. (2006). "Eteocles", in: *Brill's New Pauly*. Consulted online on 28 April 2023 http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e402890

Brill's New Pauly = H. Cancik & H. Schneider (eds), *Brill's New Pauly*, Antiquity volumes. English Edition by: Chr.F. Salazar. First published online: 2006. First print edition: 9789004122598, 20110510.

Browning, R. (1992). *The Byzantines and Homer.* Lamberton R. & Keaney J. J. (Eds.), Homer's Ancient Readers: The Hermeneutics of Greek Epic's Earliest Exegetes, pp. 134-148. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Cullhed, E. (2016). *Eustathios of Thessalonike: Commentary on Homers Odyssey : Volume 1: On Rhapsodies α–β (1st ed.).* Retrieved from: http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:uu:diva-306986

Cullhed, E. & Olson D. (2022). *Eustathius of Thessalonica, Commentary on the Odyssey. Volume I: Preface and Commentary on Rhapsodies 1-4.* Leiden & Boston: Brill.

Edwards, M. W. (1980). *The Structure of Homeric Catalogues.* Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-2014), vol. 110 (1980), pp. 81-105. The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Flury, P. (2006). "Onomatopoeia", in: *Brill's New Pauly*. Consulted online on 15 May 2023 http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e831440

Graf, F. (2006). "Demeter", in: *Brill's New Pauly*. Consulted online on 12 May 2023 http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e314080

Heubeck, A. & Hoekstra A. eds. (1990). *A Commentary to Homer's Odyssey.* Clarendon Press.

Kazhdan, A. & Franklin S. (2009). *Studies on Byzantine Literature of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries.* Cambridge University Press.

Kolovou, G. (2017). *A Technical Approach to the Etymological Remarks of Eustathius in his Commentary on Iliad Book 6.* Pontari F., Katsaros V. & Sarris V. (Eds.), Reading Eustathios of Thessalonike, pp. 111-127. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter.

Kuckartz, U. (2014). *Qualitative Text Analysis: A Guide to Methods, Practice and Using Software.* SAGE Publications Ltd.

Kühner, R. & Blass, F. W. (1892). *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache.* Vol. 2. Hannover, Hahnsche Buchhandlung.

Lafond, Y. (2006). "Las", in: *Brill's New Pauly*. Consulted online on 12 May 2023 http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e631880

Landfester, M. (2006). "Philology [I1]" in: *Brill's New Pauly*. Consulted online on 25 May 2023 http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e15201850

LSJ = Liddell, H.G. & Scott, R. (1961). *A Greek-English lexicon*. (A new ed., revised and augmented throughout). Oxford: Clarendon. Retrieved from: https://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/lsj/#eid=1

Makrinos, A. (2007). *Eustathius, Archbishop of Thessalonica, "Commentary on the Odyssey": Codex Marcianus 460 and Parisinus 2702 Revisited.* Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies, Vol. 50 (2007), pp. 171-192. Oxford University Press.

Makrinos, A. (2013). *Tragedy in Byzantium: The Reception of Sophocles in Eustathios' Homeric Commentaries.* Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies. *Supplement,* 2013, No. 126, Dialogues with the Past 1: Classical Reception Theory & Practice (2013), pp. 139-161. Oxford University Press.

March, J. R. (2014). *Dictionary of Classical Mythology.* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxbow Books.

Murray, A.T. (1919) (transl.). *Homer. Odyssey, Volume I: Books 1-12.* Rev. by G.E. Dimock. Loeb Classical Library 104. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Murray, A.T. (1919) (transl.). *Homer. Odyssey, Volume II: Books 13-24.* Rev. by G.E. Dimock. Loeb Classical Library 104. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Murray, A.T. (1924) (transl.). *Homer. Iliad, Volume I: Books 1-12*. Rev. by W. F. Wyatt. Loeb Classical Library 170. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Murray, A.T. (1925). *Homer. Iliad, Volume II: Books 13-24*. Rev. by W. F. Wyatt. Loeb Classical Library 171. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Pagani, L. (2017). *Eustathius' Use of Ancient Scholarship in his Commentary on the Iliad: Some Remarks.* Pontari F., Katsaros V. & Sarris V. (Eds.), Reading Eustathios of Thessalonike, pp. 79-110. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter.

Scherf, J. (2006). "Lycus [1]", in: *Brill's New Pauly.* Consulted online on 27 April 2023 http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e713820

Schmitt, T. (2006). "Oceanus [2]", in: *Brill's New Pauly*. Consulted online on 16 May 2023 http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e829570

Stenger, J. (2006). "Minotaurus", in: *Brill's New Pauly*. Consulted online on 25 April 2023 http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e805860

Stenger, J. (2006). "Neleus [1]", in: *Brill's New Pauly*. Consulted online on 16 May 2023 http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e819470

Tracy, S. (1997 (2009)). *Οι Δομές της Οδύσσειας (The Structures of the Odyssey).* Powell B. B. & Morris I. (Eds.). Εγχειρίδιο Ομηρικών Σπουδών, pp. 446-471. Petika F., Skempis M., Mouratidis M. (transl.). Athens, 2009. A New Companion to Homer. Leiden, 1997.

Van den Berg, B. (2022). *Homer the Rhetorician: Eustathios of Thessalonike on the Composition of the Iliad.* Oxford University Press.

Von Bredow, I. (2006). "Cimmerii", in: *Brill's New Pauly*. Consulted online on 16 May 2023 http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e613800

West, M. (1997 (2009)). *Το Ομηρικό Μέτρο (Homer's Meter).* Powell B. B. & Morris I. (Eds.). Εγχειρίδιο Ομηρικών Σπουδών, pp. 268-291. Petika F., Skempis M., Mouratidis M. (transl.). Athens, 2009. A New Companion to Homer. Leiden, 1997.

Zimmermann, S. (2006). "Telegonus", in: *Brill's New Pauly*. Consulted online on 12 May 2023 http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e1202800