

Olga Tribulato*

Two Notes on the Text of Pollux X 1.1–5 Bethe

<https://doi.org/10.1515/phil-2018-0025>

Abstract: The tenth prefatory letter of Pollux' *Onomasticon* transmits two otherwise unattested pieces of information concerning the existence of an anonymous commentary on Xenophon and of a treatise by Eratosthenes of Cyrene entitled *Σκευογραφικός*. The corrupt state of the text in the manuscript tradition, which the standard edition by E. Bethe has not improved, has so far hindered the full understanding of this passage. This article (a) argues that two corrections should be introduced in 10.2–3 Bethe; (b) suggests that the anonymous commentary on Xenophon quoted by Pollux concerned not only the *Περὶ ἵππικῆς*, as traditionally assumed, but also the *Ἰππαρχικός*; and (c) re-examines the evidence supporting the hypothesis that Eratosthenes' *Σκευογραφικός* was not part of the better-known *Περὶ τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμωδίας*, but an independent work.

Keywords: Pollux, Bethe, Xenophon, Eratosthenes

In the incipit of the prefatory letter to book X of the *Onomasticon* Pollux informs his addressee, Emperor Commodus, that he once came across an exegesis on Xenophon, which inspired him to consult the erudite work by Eratosthenes of Cyrene entitled *Σκευογραφικός*. This is a valuable passage because it records two pieces of information attested nowhere else: the existence of an exegetical work on a text by Xenophon usually identified as the *Περὶ ἵππικῆς*, and Eratosthenes' authorship of a work entitled *Σκευογραφικός*. In all the manuscripts of the *Onomasticon* the beginning of the tenth prefatory letter is corrupt, a fact which – paired with Pollux' terse style – has so far hindered the full understanding of the information transmitted by this passage.¹

In the present note I will newly examine the textual problems raised by these first lines from letter X and its reception among scholars, suggesting some correc-

¹ The *Onomasticon* has reached us in the form of an epitome produced before the 9th century and transmitted by four different manuscript families, which E. Bethe traced back to a single authoritative copy possessed and annotated by Arethas, Bishop of Caesarea: see Bethe (1900) v.

*Corresponding author: Olga Tribulato, Università Ca' Foscari Venezia, Dorsoduro 3484/D, 30123 Venice, Italy, E-Mail: olga.tribulato@unive.it

tions to Bethe's text. In § 1 I present Bethe's text and focus on the first sentence, concerning the commentary on Xenophon. In § 2 I discuss the textual and linguistic problems raised by the second sentence, concerning the *Σκευογραφικός*, and consider what use Pollux may have made of this work by Eratosthenes.

1 The Anonymous Commentary on Xenophon

Bethe's text and apparatus read as follows:

Κομμόδω Καίσαρι Ἰούλιος Πολυδεύκης χαίρειν. ἐνέτυχόν
ποτε βιβλίῳ τῷ τὸν Ξενοφώντος Ἴππικῶν ἐξηγεῖσθαι λέγοντι. εὐρῶν δὲ
ὀνόματος κρίσει τοῦτο Ἐρατοσθένην ἐν τῷ Σκευογραφικῷ λέγειν,
ἐπὶ λθέ μοι ζητεῖν τὸ τοῦ Ἐρατοσθένους βιβλίον διὰ τὸ προσαγωγὸν
τῆς χρήσεως· ὡς δ' εὐρον μόλις, οὐδὲν εἶχεν ὧν ἤλπισα.

(Poll. *Onom.* X 1.1–5 Bethe)

1–3 corruptae || 1 ἐντυχῶν II || 2 β. τῷ τοῦ (τῶν F) II β. τῷ Ξ. AB β.
τῶν Ξ. CL | ἵππικῶν II ABCL, Ἴππικὸν Schneider Saxo | δὲ] τε II δ' ἐν? Bekker ||
3 χρῆσιν II | λέγει II || 5 μόλις II | ἔχεν II | ἤλπιζον A

Bethe himself acknowledges the corrupt state of the first three lines. According to the text he proposes, after the greeting formula Pollux states: “I once came across a book that said to be an exegesis on Xenophon's work on horsemanship”. The use of *ἐξηγεῖσθαι*, which is a technical verb, makes it clear that this work belonged to the genre of exegetical literature: it may have been an actual *ἐξήγησις*, or a collection of interpretative notes; more likely, considering the kind of sources used by Pollux, it was a lemma by lemma commentary or a specialist glossary (more on this below).²

In the text transmitted by the manuscript tradition *ἐξηγεῖσθαι* is missing an object and is preceded by some syntactically unacceptable forms:

- codd. AB have βιβλίῳ τῷ Ξενοφώντος ἵππικῶν: a comparison with the other codices suggests that this is an error of haplography;³

2 It is clear that Pollux, like other lexicographers of his time, relied on previous collections of *lexeis*, such as those compiled by Aristophanes of Byzantium, and on specialist glossaries such as that by Rufus of Ephesus on anatomy. In letter IX he makes a passing reference to an *onomasticon* compiled by one Gorgias. An up-to-date work on Pollux' sources is a desideratum: for a basic overview, see the classic Bethe (1917) 777–778. On the broader meaning of the term *ἐξήγησις* in the context of erudite works, see Luiselli (2015) 1217–1218 with n. 15.

3 Cod. A (Par. gr. 2670) is the only representative of the third family of *Onomasticon* manuscripts which Bethe (1900) ix believes may be traced back to a codex owned by Arethas of Caesarea, the

- according to Bethe, the archetype which lies at the basis of codd. F and S, which he refers to as II, had βιβλίω τῷ τοῦ Ξενοφώντος ἵππικῶν; however, F reads βιβλίω τῷ τῶν Ξενοφώντος ἵππικῶν, which is close to the reading provided by codd. CL;⁴
- codd. CL have βιβλίω τῶν Ξενοφώντος ἵππικῶν, here too with the omission of one of the two articles.

Clearly, these variously erroneous readings must be corruptions of an original text in which ἐξηγεῖσθαι was preceded by an object. The first modern editions by Manutius, Seber and Lederlin/Hemsterhuis overlook the problem,⁵ but already Johann Gottlob Schneider, in his 1817 edition of the *Περὶ ἵππικῆς*, suggested that the transmitted text be emended to the accusative τὸν Ἴππικόν.⁶ This conjecture was later accepted by Bekker in his edition of the *Onomasticon*, which marked a significant improvement compared to the previous editions (including Dindorf 1824, who still followed the 1706 edition by Lederlin/Hemsterhuis).⁷ Schneider's conjecture has influenced the interpretation of this passage in all studies dealing with it, down to Bethe's edition and even beyond, since it introduces an alternative title for the *Περὶ ἵππικῆς*.

In his edition, however, Bethe strikes a compromise: he keeps the τῷ transmitted by the manuscripts (= τινι) but accepts Schneider's τόν, after which he inserts the genitive plural Ἴππικῶν. Bethe, therefore, posits the existence of an unexpressed noun (λόγος may be a good candidate) referring to a work that Pollux would cite under the title of Ἴππικά.

archetype for all medieval manuscripts of the *Onomasticon* (Bethe 1900, vi–vii). Cod. A was created by combining parts of family III with a codex from family IV, the source for cod. B (Par. gr. 2647). This explains the fact that B agrees both with A and with C (Heidelb. Pal. gr. 375) and L (Laur. plut. 56.1), the two main codices from family IV.

4 On II and its descendants F (Par. gr. 2646) and S (Salmant. I 2.3), see Bethe (1900) vii–ix.

5 Both the 1502 Aldine *editio princeps* and Seber (1608) 455 print βιβλίω τῷ Ξενοφώντος ἵππικῶν ἐξηγεῖσθαι λέγοντι, which translates into Latin as “*Incidit olim in Xenophontis librum, de equorum cura tractantem*” – a translation which apparently ignores the problem of what governs ἐξηγεῖσθαι (for a description of the manuscripts on which Aldus' and Seber's editions were based, see Bethe 1900, vii–ix; xvi). The subsequent Dutch edition, by Lederlin/Hemsterhuis (1706), is based on codd. FS and reads βιβλίω τῷ τῶν Ξενοφώντος ἵππικῶν ἐξηγεῖσθαι λέγοντι. This text stands at the origin both of the Latin translation suggested in that edition, “*Incidit quondam in Librum Xenophontis, qui titulum praeferbat de re equestri*” (Lederlin/Hemsterhuis 1706, 1146), and of the text printed by Dindorf (1824) 1283.

6 Schneider (1817) 149. Cf. the apparatus in Bethe (1931) 191 and the subsequent edition of Xenophon's *Opuscula* by Sauppe (1838) 191.

7 Bekker (1846) 400.

Although Bethe's reading solves the most obvious syntactical difficulties, it raises other problems. Bethe seems to interpret the form Ἴππικῶν as an exegetical genitive referring to a definite work of Xenophon's, which the ancient tradition unanimously transmits under the title of Περὶ ἵππικῆς but Pollux quotes as Ἴππικά.⁸ Of course, a priori it cannot be ruled out that Pollux was familiar with an alternative title, that he rephrased the original title, or that the way in which he cites the Περὶ ἵππικῆς is simply an oversight.⁹ However, the real hurdle lies in the fact that the use of Ἴππικῶν to further define τὸν (λόγον?), and hence to refer to a particular work, requires an article, which here is missing (even though it appears in the version transmitted by FCL).

In the light of these considerations, the genitive Ἴππικῶν printed by Bethe strikes me as a poor choice. Schneider's conjecture (τὸν Ἴππικόν or, alternatively, τὸν ἵππικόν in lowercase) remains a much better solution, even though it assumes that Pollux mentioned the treatise under an alternative title. But there is also another possibility: to think that Pollux wished to refer not to a work entitled Ἴππικά but, more generically, to "works on horsemanship by Xenophon", i.e. ἵππικά (in lowercase). In other words, Pollux may be quoting an exegetical work that concerned both Περὶ ἵππικῆς and Ἴππαρχικός. Of the two treatises, the former certainly requires particular exegetical attention, as it is replete with rare technical expressions that would have been unfamiliar to lay readers. However, it is not implausible that both treatises received much the same attention and were therefore jointly read and commented upon. Although we have very little information about their reception in Antiquity, indirect clues for this interpretation may be provided by the fact that most medieval manuscripts present the two treatises side by side.¹⁰ Moreover, the very fact that Xenophon composed them in sequence (notwithstanding the doubts surrounding the date of composition of each) suggests that they constituted a joint project – something ancient exegetes may have been aware of.¹¹

8 Xenophon's work is only ever referred to as Περὶ ἵππικῆς: see Diog. Laert. 57 and Ath. 3.94. A complete overview of sources is provided by Tommasini (1902) 95–96.

9 This passage from letter X aside, Pollux never mentions the title of the treatise. However, it is widely acknowledged that he draws upon this work in many parts of the *Onomasticon*: see Althaus (1874) 23–26; Michaelis (1877) 15; Tommasini (1902) 95; Persson (1915) 92–93; Pierleoni (1932) 27–44; Widdra (1964) xxi. The last part of book I (chs. 181–220) is particularly rich in material that may be traced back to this treatise: see Pierleoni (1932) 27–44; other material is to be found especially in books VII and X.

10 This is the case with 10 of 19 codices recorded by Widdra (1964) v–vii. Most of the other manuscripts contain both treatises, though not side by side.

11 See Blaineau (2011) 60. Concerning the dates of composition of the two works, see the overview in Petrocelli (2001) x–xv. Most scholars today believe that Xenophon wrote the Περὶ ἵππικῆς first, since in one passage (which some scholars consider spurious) from the last chapter

This interpretation also allows us to reconsider the issue of the article τὸν inserted by Bethe. Although it cannot be ruled out that with τὸν ἵππικῶν Pollux was referring to more than one work on horsemanship – as I have just suggested – the expression is certainly a peculiar one. One possibility is to conjecture τό, neuter, instead of Schneider’s τόν, masculine. Unlike the masculine accusative τόν, the neuter τό would find an immediate antecedent: the neuter noun βιβλίω. Pollux would thus first be mentioning a βιβλίον which in turn contains the exegesis “to *that* on horsemanship by Xenophon”. What we would have is an elliptic structure: an article defined by a genitive (τὸ ... ἵππικῶν *vel* τὸ τῶν ἵππικῶν) that lacks the noun which it agrees with, but which can nonetheless be reconstructed based on the context.¹² As a loose parallel, though perhaps not entirely matching Pollux’ style, let us consider the two following passages discussed by Peters in his study on the use of the article in the *New Testament* as an example of “shorthand”:¹³

Ev. Luc. 5.33: οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου νηστεύουσιν πυκνὰ καὶ δεήσεις ποιοῦνται ὁμοίως καὶ οἱ τῶν Φαρισαίων.

The disciples of John often fast and pray as also *those of the Pharisee*.

Heb. 7.27: ὃς οὐκ ἔχει καθ’ ἡμέραν ἀνάγκην, ὥσπερ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς, πρότερον ὑπὲρ τῶν ἰδίων ἁμαρτιῶν θυσίας ἀναφέρειν ἔπειτα τῶν τοῦ λαοῦ.

Who does not have a daily obligation, such as the high priests, first to bear sacrifices on behalf of their own sins, then *the ones of the people*.

In both these passages, an article followed by a genitive (οἱ τῶν Φαρισαίων, τῶν τοῦ λαοῦ) lacks the noun which it agrees with, but which has just been mentioned before (μαθηταί, ἁμαρτιῶν). Of course, if the τό I suggest inserting into Pollux’ text refers back to a βιβλίον, intended as a physical vector of text(s), this means that Pollux considered Xenophon’s works on horsemanship to make up a single book. This raises the question of whether it is likely or even physically possible

(12.14) it refers to the Ἰππαρχικός; see again Petrocelli (2001) xiii–xiv and the cautious position adopted by Delebecque (2002) 12, who had previously argued that the Ἰππαρχικός was the more recent of the two (Delebecque 1950, 12–15).

¹² The hypothesis that the sentence should be emended as ἐνέτυχόν ποτε βιβλίω τῷ <τὸ> τῶν Ξενοφώντος ἵππικῶν ἐξηγεῖσθαι λέγοντι is perfectly likely, since it presupposes an easy haplogy in the transmission of the sequence τῷ τὸ τῶν. The article τῶν agreeing with ἵππικῶν would make the meaning even clearer, but is perhaps not strictly necessary, given Pollux’ customarily terse style.

¹³ See Peters (2014) 219.

that the two rather extensive treatises by Xenophon were copied on the same scroll. Despite the poor information we have on the matter, there are at least two factors that make this hypothesis not entirely unlikely.

First of all, examples are known of scrolls that bring together several books from the same work (e.g. the *Iliad*) or different prose treatises, even though the general tendency was to divide an author's works into separate scrolls.¹⁴ Secondly, the average length of such scrolls known to us shows that they could contain two works of the length of the Ἰππάρχικός and Περί ἵππικῆς. Of the Oxyrhynchus papyri, POxy. 1810 (= MP³ 00256.000, first half of the 2nd cent. AD) contains five orations by Demosthenes (*Olynth.* 1–3, *Phil.* 1, *De pac.*), while POxy. 4314 (= MP³ 00255.010, late 1st–early 2nd cent. AD) contains *Olynth.* 2–3 and *Phil.* 1.¹⁵ Using the number of words recorded for each work by the electronic TLG, we obtain an overall length of 9,525 words for POxy. 1810 and 7,690 for POxy. 4314. Johnson, moreover, discusses the case of PSILaur. inv. 19662 (MP³ 2087, 3rd cent. AD), which features the catalogue of a book collection on its verso.¹⁶ This catalogue mentions a scroll containing the Platonic dialogues *Meno* and *Menexenus* (10,269 words in total) and another one containing the two *Hippias* and the *Euthydemus* (25,769 words in total).¹⁷ If these figures indicate the rough extension of a multi-work scroll, we can conclude that Xenophon's two treatises on horsemanship could easily fit on a single scroll: their overall length is 12,765 words.

One must also consider the fact that, as already mentioned, these works on horsemanship were chiefly read by specialists, as shown by the limited number of actual quotes from these works to be found in Greek literature. Therefore, although it cannot be ruled out that some quotes were lost along with much of the technical and erudite literature of Antiquity,¹⁸ it is likely that the two treatises on horsemanship circulated through reference editions of the sort that favoured usability over aesthetics (smaller characters, narrower margins) and brought together several works in the same scroll.

Similarly, it cannot be ruled out that these miscellaneous reference works also included the *Κυνηγητικός*, which is longer than the other two treatises but only brings the overall length of the hypothetical miscellaneous scroll up to

¹⁴ On miscellaneous Homeric scrolls, see West (1967) 24–25, although these are for the most part Ptolemaic age copies: see Johnson (2004) 144.

¹⁵ See Johnson (2004) 143, who rules out that the fragments of POxy. 1810 come from different scrolls.

¹⁶ Johnson (2004) 144.

¹⁷ These miscellaneous scrolls are also studied by Puglia (1996), who discusses the length of the prose works that could fit on a single scroll. See too table 3.7 in Johnson (2004).

¹⁸ See Blaineau (2011) 62.

21,910 words – less than the longest scroll described by PSILaur. inv. 19662. Over a century ago, at the end of his survey of the *Onomasticon* material probably deriving from *Περὶ ἵππικῆς* and *Κυνηγητικός*, Persson concluded: “Da ja die Handschriftentradition für den *Kynegetikos* und *Περὶ ἵππικῆς* dieselbe ist, muss auch die Rolle, die Pollux für jene Schrift spielt, dieselbe sein”.¹⁹ One may suggest, therefore, that the transmission of these ‘technical’ treatises by Xenophon via papyri foreshadowed the kind of practice that is later reflected by much of the medieval tradition of the *Opuscula*.²⁰ Clearly, these considerations do not prove the existence of a scroll exclusively devoted to Xenophon’s technical works, or the correctness of the conjecture τὸ (*vel* τὸ τῶν) *Ξενοφώντος ἵππικῶν*, but they do make them likely hypotheses.

Having examined the first sentence of epistle X, it is now necessary to draw two more general conclusions. First of all, there is no evidence that in Antiquity Xenophon’s *Περὶ ἵππικῆς* circulated under the title of *Ἴππικός* or *Ἴππικόν*. I would argue that the re-evaluation of the textual tradition of Poll. *Onom.* 10.1 and the new reading that I have suggested make Schneider’s conjecture redundant. The whole question is usually ignored in more recent editions of the *Περὶ ἵππικῆς*, with very few, usually dated, exceptions.²¹ However, it is a question worth addressing, since a reference study such as the classic *Pauly-Wissowa* entry for Xenophon²² – which evidently is still based on the text by Bekker, ignoring Bethe²³ – states that the treatise circulated under this alternative title.²⁴

19 Persson (1915) 99. The ancient tradition of the three technical treatises is practically unknown to us, with the exception of Xen. *Cyn.* 13.5–74, which has been transmitted by PReinach Gr. 2 78 (MP³ 01562.000, 2nd cent. AD). In the Middle Ages the technical treatises were instead partly transmitted via different channels compared to Xenophon’s main works and his other four treatises: in addition to the critical reference editions, see Erbse (1961) 268–269 and Jackson (1990).

20 In this regard one may note that the five speeches by Demosthenes transmitted by the miscellaneous papyrus POxy. 1810 are the very same treatises that mark the beginning of the medieval tradition of Demosthenes: Johnson (2004) 143.

21 Ruehl (1912) and Widdra (1964) are silent on the matter. Tommasini (1902) 95 and Pierleoni (1937) 193 only record the correction *Ἴππικόν* made by Schneider, without taking any stance. See too Pierleoni (1937) xxiv. Marchant (1920) 143 instead presents the alternative title as the one actually transmitted by Pollux, thereby following Bekker. Persson (1915) 92 also claims: “es scheint also, als ob Pollux *Περὶ ἵππικῆς* des Xenophon unter dem Namen *Ἴππικός* gekannt hätte” (cf. Persson 1915, 160; Münscher 1920, 168).

22 Breitenbach (1967) 1761.

23 Bekker (1846) and Bethe (1931).

24 This is probably due to the fact that, as Pernot (2014) 281 n. 2 informs us, Breitenbach (1967) drew much of his information from the classic study by Münscher (1920), which was published

Secondly, it is worth carefully considering the information concerning the existence of some kind of exegesis on Xenophon. In the most recent bibliography on Xenophon there is almost no mention of an erudite work of this sort, which it is worth reconsidering from a fresh perspective.²⁵ Since we know absolutely nothing about the kind of exegesis to which Xenophon was subjected in Antiquity, it is impossible to pinpoint the genre of the exegetical work to which Pollux refers. On balance, I would be inclined to think that the infinitive ἐξηγεῖσθαι identifies a work devoted to the explanation of the language of the two (or even the three) technical works: perhaps a lemma by lemma commentary or a technical glossary.²⁶ Even though its real nature and author are probably destined to remain anonymous, this erudite work is likely to have constituted an important source for Pollux, particularly since the extensive presence of both the *Κυνηγητικός* and the *Ἱππαρχικός* in the *Onomasticon* seems to have been based on a second-hand use, which no doubt was aided by the existence of an exegesis of some kind.²⁷

2 Eratosthenes' Σκευογραφικός

In the next sentence of the letter, Pollux states that when reading the commentary on Xenophon he came across a quote from Eratosthenes. Bethe's text reads: εὐρῶν δὲ ὀνόματος κρίσει τοῦτο Ἐρατοσθένην ἐν τῷ Σκευογραφικῷ λέγειν. At first sight it seems natural to construct τοῦτο as the object of λέγειν and Ἐρατοσθένην as its subject. However, the comment that Bethe makes in the apparatus to another passage, 1.145,²⁸ clarifies that he actually took τοῦτο to be a reference

before the second volume of Bethe's edition (1931). Münscher (1920) himself, however, widely drew upon Persson (1915), who – as we have seen – accepted Schneider's emendation.

25 After the fleeting remarks in Schneider (1817) 149, Michaelis (1877) 15, Münscher (1920) 168, Pierleoni (1932) 42, Pierleoni (1937) xxiv and Marchant (1925) xi = Marchant/Bowersock (1968) xi, no reference to this work is to be found in the section on the *Περὶ Ἱππικῆς* and the *Nachleben* of Xenophon in Breitenbach (1967), as well as in the reference editions Marchant (1920) and Delebecque (1950) = (2002).

26 For lemmatized commentaries, concerning narrow aspects of a literary text, see Dubischar (2015) 557; 599. Technical glossaries focusing on specific authors or works are discussed by Dubischar (2015) 581–584.

27 On the *Κυνηγητικός* see the divergent stances of Persson (1915) 93 and Pierleoni (1932) 42 n. 1. Quotes from the *Ἱππαρχικός* have been detected by Althaus (1874) 26 and Michaelis (1877) 15–16, but Delebecque (2003) 31 – possibly following Münscher (1920) 167? – claims that Pollux never quotes the work directly. Even Bethe's indexes make no mention of the *Ἱππαρχικός*, despite the fact that some passages from this work are recorded in the apparatus (see e.g. 1.196.22 and 1.214.21).

28 Bethe (1900) 47: “τοῦτο (sc. *de re equestri*) Ἐρατοσθένην λέγειν ἐν τῷ Σκευογραφικῷ ...”.

to the *Περὶ ἵππικῆς* and hence that he interpreted the sentence as “having found, in the evaluation of a term, that Eratosthenes cited the *Περὶ ἵππικῆς* in the *Σκευογραφικός ...*”. This seems difficult to me, since Pollux would use a neuter to refer back to a work which, if we follow Bethe’s text, he has previously defined with the masculine *τὸν Ξενοφώντος Ἴππικῶν*. In fact, this seemingly ‘natural’ construction has caused difficulties not just to Bethe, but also to the other scholars who have tried to come to terms with it.²⁹

I believe that a better candidate as the antecedent of *τοῦτο* is the anonymous βιβλίον consulted by Pollux, which – if correct – forces us to take *τοῦτο* as the *subject* of the infinitive and *Ἐρατοσθένην* as its *object*: “having found, in the evaluation of a term, that it stated *Eratosthenes: in the Σκευογραφικός ...*”. In other words, this short phrase would be a brachylogy meaning that in consulting the anonymous βιβλίον Pollux literally found the expression “Ἐρατοσθένης ἐν τῷ Σκευογραφικῷ”, a shorthand comment on the *locus* in which a certain term was used.³⁰ Short expressions of the kind ‘author X (uses) word Y in work Z’ are perfectly normal in exegetical literature and especially in glossaries and lexica, a fact which may provide an additional hint as to what type of text Pollux was using.³¹

In this sentence the expression *ὀνόματος κρίσει* is also problematic. Supposing that the text is correct, the simple dative can only be a complement of limitation or of purpose: “as regards / for the *ὀνόματος κρίσις*”. But if this were the case, *κρίσει* ought to be defined by the article: *εὐρών δὲ τῆ ὀνόματος κρίσει* “having found that, as regards the evaluation of a term ...”. This would yield the required meaning, because in this passage *κρίσις* must be determined (Pollux is referring not to a general assessment but to a specific circumstance).

²⁹ For instance, Nesselrath (1990) 88 n. 67 posits a lacuna: “wenn man diese drei Zeilen nicht gleich mit Bethe zu ‘corruptae’ erklären will, muß man zumindest eine Lücke ansetzen, in der ein Begriff verschwunden zu sein scheint, über den Pollux dann im Anschluß sagt: *εὐρών δὲ ὀνόματος κρίσει τοῦτο Ἐρατοσθένην ἐν τῷ Σκευογραφικῷ λέγειν κτλ*”.

³⁰ Geus (2002) 302 n. 103 makes the claim that “Pollux wird die Angabe über den *Σκευογραφικός* vielleicht in den *Studien* (Λέξεις) des Aristophanes von Byzanz, einer seiner Hauptquellen, gefunden haben”, but it seems to me that this connection is impossible to prove.

³¹ Lexica and glossaries often use short expressions in which a gloss is followed by indication of author and *locus classicus*, the latter in the dative. In Atticist lexicography alone, cf. e.g. *Antiatt.* α 1 Valente: ἀπό στόματος: *Ξενοφῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀναβάσει*, Πλάτων Θεαιτήτω; Phryn. *Ecl.* 330 Fischer: τὸν παῖδα τὸν ἀκολουθοῦντα μετ’ αὐτοῦ· *Λυσίας ἐν τῷ Κατ’ Αὐτοκράτους* οὕτω τῆ συντάξει χρῆται; Poll. *Onom.* 2.61.1: ἀνάπηρος δ’ ἐστὶν ὁ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα πεπηρωμένος, ὡς *Ἰσαῖος ἐν τῷ κατὰ Ἀρεσαίμου*; 2.61.2 *Ἀντιφῶν δ’ ἐν τοῖς περὶ ἀληθείας* καὶ ἀνάπηρα εἶρηκεν. Comparable examples are frequent.

Actually, the best solution, which Bethe recorded in his apparatus but rejected, had already been outlined by Bekker, who suggested changing δέ into δ' έν.³² In the expression δ' έν όνόματος κρίσει the lack of an article does not constitute a problem, because it is the very use of the complement of place followed by the genitive that determines κρίσις: “in the evaluation of a term”. I therefore suggest that we emend the text of these two sentences from letter X as follows:

Κομμόδω Καίσαρι Ίούλιος Πολυδεύκης χάρειν. ένέτυχόν ποτε βιβλίω τω τώ Ξενοφώντος ίππικών έξηγεΐσθαι λέγοντι. εύρών δ' έν όνόματος κρίσει τοΰτο Έρατοσθένην έν τώ Σκευογραφικῷ λέγειν, έπήλθέ μοι ζητεΐν τώ τοΰ Έρατοσθένου βιβλίον διά τώ προσαγωγόν τής χρήσεως.

Pollux salutes Caesar Commodus. Once I came across a book that commented upon Xenophon's one on horsemanship. Having found, in the evaluation of a term, that it stated “Eratosthenes: in the Σκευογραφικός”, I thought of searching for Eratosthenes' book, intrigued by the possibility of using it.

The corruptions of this opening section of letter X are probably due to the very succinctness with which Pollux refers to the anonymous exegetical work on Xenophon. In my opinion, this succinctness is not casual, but depends on the fact that Pollux' real concern was to prove that the Σκευογραφικός, the work of an important Hellenistic erudite, was not as good a source as his *Onomasticon*. In these lines Pollux describes how he felt the desire to make use of this text by Eratosthenes, but was disappointed: the sentence διά τώ προσαγωγόν τής χρήσεως therefore plays a key role because, by creating a contrast, it is used to highlight the merits of the lexical selection of book X of the *Onomasticon*, according to a comparative procedure that Pollux already used in relation to the onomastic lexicon of the rhetor Gorgias in letter IX.

It is precisely the way in which Pollux describes his use of Eratosthenes that clarifies – in my view, beyond all reasonable doubt – that he was not yet familiar with the Σκευογραφικός and that therefore he never used it before he started working on book X of the *Onomasticon*. Note, in particular, the enthusiasm with which he set out to look for Eratosthenes' text (ζητεΐν here means ‘to search for, discover’ rather than ‘to consult’) and the statement of disappointment that follows: ώς δ' εύρον μόλις, οΰδέν είχεν ών ήλπισα.

³² Bekker (1846) 401.

All this does not help solve the long-standing question of whether the *Σκευογραφικός* was part of Eratosthenes' *Περὶ τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμωδίας*.³³ There is no clear evidence that Pollux made use of this better-known text when writing his previous books: the only direct quotation of the *Περὶ τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμωδίας* occurs precisely in 10.60.³⁴ The question, therefore, is destined to remain open; but while it is true that Pollux did not directly draw upon the *Περὶ τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμωδίας* before book X, it would certainly be odd for him to refer to the same work by Eratosthenes in two different ways within the same book: once as *Σκευογραφικός* – a work unknown to him until then, but which he claims to have then made first-hand use of – and once as *ἐν τοῖς περὶ κωμωδίας* (10.60). In consideration of this, I would be inclined to conclude that for Pollux the *Σκευογραφικός* was a self-standing work, and that perhaps it was so from its very conception.

Acknowledgments: I wish to thank Federica Benuzzi, Lucia Prauscello and Francesco Valerio for advice on some aspects of this article and the Seeger Center for Hellenic Studies of Princeton University for electing me to a Visiting Fellowship in summer 2017, during which this article was written.

Bibliography

- Eratosthenes, *Eratosthenica*, composuit G. Bernhardt, Berlin 1822.
 Iulius Pollux, *Onomastikon en bibliois deka. Onomasticon, decem libris constans*, ed. W. Seber, Frankfurt a.M. 1608.
 Iulius Pollux, *Onomastikon en bibliois deka. Onomasticum Graece & Latine, cum commentariis Jungermannii, Kühnii, Seberi et aliorum*, edd. J. H. Lederlin/T. Hemsterhuis, Amsterdam 1706.
 Iulius Pollux, *Onomasticon*, ed. I. Bekker, Berlin 1846.
 Iulius Pollux, *Onomasticon*, ed. W. Dindorf, Leipzig 1824.

³³ From Bernhardt (1822) 205–206 onwards, scholars have argued that *Σκευογραφικός* is the title of a particular section of *Περὶ τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμωδίας* devoted to the objects used in the theatre. Some scholars have further suggested that this larger work also contained the *Ἀρχιτεκτονικός* mentioned in a scholium to Apollonius of Rhodes 1.566 (cf. Geus 2002, 301). On the whole issue, see Knaack (1907) 384 and the up-to-date overview by Geus (2002) 291 n. 8. The independence of the *Σκευογραφικός* (and of the *Ἀρχιτεκτονικός*) from the *Περὶ τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμωδίας* has been supported by other scholars, including Strecker (1884) 13–14, Latte (1925) 163 and Geus (2002) 290 and 302.

³⁴ Pollux only quotes Eratosthenes another two times. The first is in 1.145, a quote that Geus (2002) 302 n. 102 suggests we trace back precisely to the *Σκευογραφικός*, despite the fact that scholars from Bernhardt (1822) 205 onwards have always referred to the *Ἀρχιτεκτονικός*: see Althaus (1874) 22. The second mention occurs in 7.90 (a direct quote from the *Hermes*).

- Iulius Pollux, *Onomasticon*, tom. I, ed. E. Bethe, Leipzig 1900.
- Iulius Pollux, *Onomasticon*, tom. II, ed. E. Bethe, Leipzig 1931.
- Xenophon, *Opuscula politica, equestris et venatica, cum Arriani libello de venatione*, ed. J. G. Schneider, Oxford 1817.
- Xenophon, *Opuscula politica, equestris et venatica, cum Arriani libello de venatione*, ed. G. A. Sauppe, Leipzig 1838.
- Xenophon, *Scripta minora*, tom. II, ed. F. Ruehl, Leipzig 1912.
- Xenophon, *Opera omnia*, tom. V: *Opuscula*, ed. E. C. Marchant, Oxford 1920.
- Xenophon, *Scripta minora*, ed. E. C. Marchant, London/New York 1925.
- Xenophon, *Opuscula*, ed. G. Pierleoni, Roma ²1937.
- Xenophon, *De l'art équestre*, ed. and French translation by E. Delebecque, Paris 1950.
- Xenophon, *De re equestri*, ed. K. Widdra, Leipzig 1964.
- Xenophon, *Scripta minora*, edd. E. C. Marchant/G. W. Bowersock, Cambridge MA 1968.
- Xenophon, *Ipparchico: Manuale per il comandante di cavalleria*, Italian translation by C. Petrocchi, Bari 2001.
- Xenophon, *De l'art équestre*, ed. and French translation by E. Delebecque, Paris ²2002.
- Xenophon, *Le commandant de la cavalerie*, ed. and French translation by E. Delebecque, Paris ²2003.
- Xenophon, *L'intégral de l'oeuvre équestre*, ed. and annotated by A. Blaineau, Arles 2011.
- E. Althaus, *Quaestionum de Iulii Pollucis fontibus specimen*, Berlin 1874.
- E. Bethe, "Iulius Pollux", *RE* 10.1, 1917, 773–779.
- H. R. Breitenbach, "Xenophon von Athen", *RE* 9 A.2, 1967, 1567–2052.
- M. Dubischar, "Typology of Philological Writings", in: F. Montanari/S. Matthaios/A. Rengakos (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship*, vol. 1, Leiden/Boston 2015, 545–599.
- H. Erbse, "Überlieferungsgeschichte der griechischen klassischen und hellenistischen Literatur", in: H. Hunger et al. (eds.), *Geschichte der Textüberlieferung der antiken und mittelalterlichen Literatur*, vol. 1, Zürich 1961, 207–283.
- K. Geus, *Eratosthenes von Kyrene: Studien zur hellenistischen Kultur- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte*, München 2002.
- D. F. Jackson, "A New Look at the Manuscripts of Xenophon's *Hipparchicus*", *CQ* 40.1, 1990, 176–186.
- W. A. Johnson, *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus*, Toronto 2004.
- G. Knaack, "Eratosthenes (4)", *RE* 6.1, 1907, 358–388.
- K. Latte, "Glossographika", *Philologus* 80.1, 1925, 136–175 (= K. Latte, *Kleine Schriften zu Religion, Recht, Literatur und Sprache der Griechen und Römer*, ed. O. Gigon/W. Buchwald/W. Kunkel, München 1968, 631–666).
- R. Luiselli, "Hellenistic Astronomers and Scholarship", in: F. Montanari/S. Matthaios/A. Rengakos (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship*, vol. 2, Leiden/Boston 2015, 1216–1234.
- R. Michaelis, *De Iulii Pollucis studiis Xenophonteis*, Halle a.S. 1877.
- K. Münscher, *Xenophon in der griechisch-römischen Literatur*, Leipzig 1920.
- H.-G. Nesselrath, *Die attische mittlere Komödie. Ihre Stellung in der antiken Literaturkritik und Literaturgeschichte*, Berlin/New York 1990.
- L. Pernot, "La réception antique de Xénophon", in: P. Pontier (ed.), *Xénophon et la rhétorique*, Paris 2014, 281–294.

- A. W. Persson, *Zur Textgeschichte Xenophons*, Lund 1915.
- R. D. Peters, *The Greek Article: A Functional Grammar of ó-items in the Greek New Testament with Special Emphasis on the Greek Article*, Leiden/Boston 2014.
- G. Pierleoni, *Analecta critica*, Napoli 1932.
- E. Puglia, “Il catalogo di un fondo librario di Ossirinco”, *ZPE* 113, 1996, 51–65.
- C. Strecker, *De Lycophrone, Euphronio, Eratosthene comicorum interpretibus*, Greifswald 1884.
- V. Tommasini, “Prolegomena ad Xenophontis *De re equestri*”, *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 10, 1902, 95–119.
- S. West, *The Ptolemaic Papyri of Homer*, Köln/Opladen 1967.