AESCHYLUS FR. 486 RADT, TRAGIC HOMERISMS, AND ANCIENT SCHOLARSHIP ON SOPHOCLES

In his edition of Aeschylus' fragments, Stefan Radt includes the following single word among the *dubia* (A. fr. 486): μενοινᾷ (= ὀρέγεται).

The source is Schol. M *Od*. 13.381 Ludwich:

μενοινᾷ: φροντίζει, μεριμνᾷ, προθυμεῖται, καὶ παρ᾽ Αἰσχύλῳ ὀρέγεται.

No evidence of μενοινάω is found in Aeschylus' extant and fragmentary works. As far as can be ascertained from the available editions of the scholia to *Odyssey*[1], the scholium survives in this form only in ms. M = Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, gr. 613, a very important thirteen-century codex of the *Odyssey*[2]. The gloss is written in the interlinear space (f. 163v) by hand M[a], but is absent from V[o] (= Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. V.1.51), with which M has close affinities[3]. Most interlinear glosses in M overlap with the D-scholia to the *Iliad*[4], but a lot of material due to hand M[a] appears to originate from later works, such as Orion's lexicon and the *Etymologicum Genuinum*[5]. There is thus no way to know in advance whether this particular scholium preserves ancient scholarly material of any significance, but this is not unlikely *a priori*.

The verb μενοινάω is firmly attested in the Homeric poems (*Iliad* 9×, *Odyssey* 15×). It is also conspicuously represented in the D-scholia (ed. van Thiel 2014), some of which overlap with λέξεις Ὁμηρικαί (ed. van Thiel 2002), and in the V-scholia to the *Odyssey* (books 1-8: ed. Pontani 2007-2020; books 9-24: ed. Ernst 2004):

(1) Schol. *Il*. 10.101 μενοινήσωσιν: προθυμηθῶσιν ZYQX (προθυμήσωσι A[ti]) = λέξεις Ὁμηρικαί, μ 118;

(2) Schol. *Il*. 13.214 μενοίνα: ἐνεθυμεῖτο ZQX | μενοινᾷ: ἐνθυμεῖται Y;

(3) P.Ryl. 536 recto, i.10 on *Il*. 13.214 μενοινα· προθυ[[6];

(4) Schol. *Il*. 14.221 μέμονας (μενοινᾷς Hom.): προθυμῇ (προθυμεῖ Z), σπεύδεις. YX;

(5) Schol. *Il*. 14.264 μενοινᾷς: προθυμῇ, σπουδάζεις (προθυμεῖς σπουδάζει Z) YQX;

(6) Schol. *Il*. 15.82 μενοινήσει (μενοινήσειε Hom.): ἐνθυμηθῇ ἢ διανοηθῇ ZYQX; (= λέξεις Ὁμηρικαί, μ 137);

(7) Schol. *Il*. 15.293 μενοινῶν: προθυμούμενος ZYQX;

(8) Schol. *Il*. 19.164 μενοινᾷ: προθυμεῖται ZYQX (= λέξεις Ὁμηρικαί, μ 144).

(9) Schol. *Od*. 2.34d <φρεσὶν ᾗσι> μενοινᾷ: κατὰ διάνοιαν GHM[a]NPVs ἐνθυμεῖται. CGHNPV[s]

---

[1] Dindorf 1855, Ludwich 1871, 1888-90. I found no reference to the scholium in Pontani's ongoing edition, nor in Pontani 2005.

[2] On ms. M, see Ludwich 1871, 1-4 and esp. Pontani 2005, 242-265 (with full references).

[3] Pontani 2005, 253-255.

[4] Pontani 2005, 256: this suggests a common derivation from an exemplar equipped with *scholia minora* or λέξεις Ὁμηρικαί.

[5] Pontani 2005, 257.

[6] 3rd cent. CE: see Montanari 1993 = 1995, 137-146.

(10) Schol. *Od*. 2.34e μενοινᾷ] μεριμνᾷ H / λογίζεται HM¹P / προθυμεῖ Y / ἐπιθυμεῖ E² / δια-
νοεῖται I;
(11) Schol. *Od*. 2.36e μενοίνησε: προεθυμήθη CHMᵃVY;
(12) Schol. *Od*. 2.36f μενοίνησε] ἐλόγισεν P / ὥρμησε E²I;
(13) Schol. *Od*. 2.92d μενοινᾷ] διανοεῖται Mᵃ / προθυμεῖ IY / ἐπιθυμεῖ t / σκοπεῖ φροντίζει cz;
(14) Schol. *Od*. 2.248b μενοινήσει': προθυμηθῇ HMᵃPV;
(15) Schol. *Od*. 2.275h μενοινᾷς] προθυμῇ IMᵃY;
(16) Schol. *Od*. 2.285d μενοινᾷς] διανοῇ Mᵃ;
(17) Schol. *Od*. 4.480b μενοινᾷς] διὰ φροντίδος ἔχεις Mᵃ / προθυμῇ Y;
(18) Schol. *Od*. 11.532 μενοίνα: ἐλογίζετο ZM¹.

In none of these scholia ὀρέγομαι is an *interpretamentum* of μενοινάω.
Moreover, the scholia featuring third-person μενοινᾷ (nos. 8, 9, 10, 13) or
the paleographically comparable second-person μενοινᾷς (nos. 4-5, 15-17)
do not exhibit lists of *interpretamenta* fully or partially coincidental with the
one attested in Schol. M *Od*. 13.381 Ludwich. In particular, φροντίζω (Schol.
Od. 2.92d, no. 13) and μεριμνάω (Schol. *Od*. 2.34e, no. 10) are attested only
once and in different scholia[7]; the commoner προθυμέομαι is attested mostly
in isolation[8], although it is the only *interpretamentum* that consistently found
the way into lexicographic tradition[9]. Such evidence supports the view that
the connection between μενοινάω and ὀρέγομαι could have been made
outside Homeric scholarship.

The gloss μενοινάω = ὀρέγομαι is instead found in Hesychius μ 855 Cun-
ningham: μενοινᾷ: φροντίζει, μεριμνᾷ, προθυμεῖται, ὀρέγεται.

The verb form of the *glossandum* and the *interpretamenta* are identical to
those found in Schol. M *Od*. 13.381 Ludwich[10], but Hesychius does not cite
Aeschylus for μενοινᾷ = ὀρέγεται. The two last editors of Hesychius, Latte
and Cunningham, generically write "*Od*. 2.92…" as the source of this entry:
if this was the case, surely the gloss could not derive from Schol. *Od*. 2.92d.
The fact that φροντίζει, μεριμνᾷ and προθυμεῖται are attested in the Homeric
scholia, whereas ὀρέγεται is not, invites the conclusion that the source of
Schol. M *Od*. 13.381 and Hesychius' entry could at least partly diverge.

The easiest conclusion would be that Hesychius and the scholium drew
from a univocal source which mentioned Aeschylus' use of μενοινάω mean-
ing ὀρέγομαι. Aeschylus' name could have dropped out for whatever reason
from Hesychius' entry, but was preserved in the scholium. There is no

---

[7] Though see Apollonius' text cited at n. 9.

[8] See nos. 8 and 10 προθυμεῖται, no. 13 προθυμεῖ, nos. 4, 5, 15, 17 and possibly 3 προθυ-
μῇ, other verb forms at nos. 1, 7, 11, 14.

[9] See Apoll. Soph. 111.15-16 Bekker μενοινόω προθυμοῦμαι. τὸ δὲ "ἔνθ' εἴη ἔνθα, μενοι-
νήσειέ τε πολλά" ἀντὶ τοῦ μεριμνήσῃ, *EGud* μ 387.45-6 Sturz *EM* 595.45 Gaisford, Ps.-Zon.
μ 1353.7-12 Tittmann. Cf. also Eust. in *Od*. 1.430.28.

[10] On the frequent agreement between the *scholia minora* in M and Hesychius' lemmas,
see Latte 1953, xv n. 1, Pontani 2005, 95 with n. 209, referring to the data in Ludwich 1888-90.

shortage of "slices from great Homeric feasts"[11] in which Aeschylus could have used this Homerism and/or adapted it to one of the meanings of ὀρέγο-μαι, i.e. "grasp at", "yearn for" (see LSJ *s.v.* II and discussion below)[12]. But the way in which the information about Aeschylus is conveyed by Schol. M *Od*. 13.381 is anomalous compared to how Aeschylus is usually cited in the Homeric scholia. Aeschylus' presence there is not so ubiquitous as one might expect, although he remains among the most cited authors[13]. There are 35 "unique" citations of Aeschylus' name in the available editions of the scholia[14], predominantly in VMK-type or exegetical scholia (32 out of 35; the other 3 occur in D/V-scholia). In 27 out of 35 examples, citations of Aeschylus' name are followed by direct quotations from his works. Indication of the play's title is given in 17 out of 35 citations (12 out of the 27 with quotations), and in 5 more cases knowledge of the play's title is certain (3 quotations from *Prometheus*) or inferable from other citations of the same play elsewhere in the scholia (2 from *Palamedes*). Attributed citations cover extant plays (*Prometheus Bound*, *Agamemnon*) and a good range of fragmentary tragedies (*Aetnae*, *Edonoi*, *Glaucus*, *Xantriai*, *Palamedes, Prometheus Unbound*, *Proteus*, *Semele or Hydrophoroi*, *Philoctetes*, *Phrygians or The Ransom of Hector*, *Psychagogoi*, *Psychostasia*), including two whose title can be confidently restored from other sources (*Thracian Women*[15], *Niobe*[16]).

   Some 11 citations (9 of which with quotations) refer to plays whose title is doubtfully conjecturable or no longer identifiable. Nonetheless, in these cases the information provided by the scholia almost always receives external confirmation from other sources, connected or not with the scholium. The kind of information being carried relates to different strands of tradition, including paroemiography and gnomology (fr. 301 ἀπάτης δικαίας οὐκ ἀπο-στατεῖ θεός[17], 381 ὅπου γὰρ ἰσχὺς συζυγοῦσι καὶ δίκη, | ποῖα ξυνωρὶς τῶνδε

---

[11] On τεμάχη… τῶν Ὁμήρου μεγάλων δείπνων, see Athen. 8.347e, Eust. in *Il*. 4.721.15-16. On Homer in Aeschylus, see Sideras 1971.

[12] For example, in plays illustrating the exploits and downfalls of major Iliadic warriors (*Myrmidons*, *Nereids*, *Phrygians or The Ransom of Hector*, *Hoplon Krisis*, *Thracian Women*, *Salaminians*, *Memnon*, *Psychostasia*).

[13] See n. 65.

[14] By "unique" is meant not duplicated across different scholia (i.e. Schol. *Il*. 2.862a1+a2, Schol. *Il*. 13.198a1+a2, Schol. *Il*. 22.210a1+a2+b Erbse, Schol. *Il*. 23.34c1+c2/d2) and not making the same point or quoting a passage found in other scholia.

[15] See Schol. *Il*. 14.404-6 Erbse, on Aeschylus' treatment of Ajax's physical impenetrability on occasion of his suicide (relating to fr. 83), for which see Schol. Lycophr. 455 (explicitly naming *Thracian Women*) and Schol. S. *Aj*. 833 Christodoulou (no title given).

[16] Schol. *Il*. 9.158b Erbse = A. *Niobe* fr. 161 (title and quotation given in Stob. 4.51.1).

[17] Schol. *Il*. 2.114 Erbse: cf. *Dissoi logoi* 3.10 D-K, Stob. 3.3.13, etc.

καρτερωτέρα;[18], 385 οἵ τοι στεναγμοὶ τῶν πόνων ἰάματα[19]), mythography (fr. 312, a pun on ἄπτεροι Πελειάδες[20]), grammar (fr. 281a28 ἔτης with smooth breathing[21], 378 use of adjectival σπιδής[22], 451 ψιλῆτος as gen. of ψιλής[23]), and lexicography (fr. 379 ἀπείρων = "borderless", referring to a circle[24], 446 Φρύγες and Φρυγία meaning "Trojans" and "Troy"[25]).

In only two examples a completely "new" and not otherwise known information is provided. (1) Schol. *Il*. 9.593a Erbse = fr. 244 κύνες διημάθυνον ἄνδρα δεσπότην, from *Toxotides*, attests to the use of διαμαθύνω = διαφθείρω ("destroy"). No other source mentions this specific information, but the verb is found elsewhere in Aeschylus (*Ag*. 824: cf. *Eum*. 937 ἀμαθύνει), the information concerning Actaeon's dogs substantially repeats knowledge available from many different sources[26], and the attribution to Aeschylus is confirmed by fr. 245 = Poll. 5.47, reporting the names of the dogs in Aeschylus' version. (2) Fr. 380 = Schol. *Il*. 16.380 Erbse informs that in one of Aeschylus' plays Achilles was said to have jumped over the moat with his full armour, walking backwards and not showing his back to the enemies (Αἰσχύλος δὲ Ἀχιλλέα σὺν τῇ πανοπλίᾳ φησὶν ὄπιθεν ὁρμήσαντα πηδῆσαι τὴν τάφρον μὴ δείξαντα <τὰ> νῶτα τοῖς ἐχθροῖς). Even if unattested elsewhere, the piece of information presumably comes from plays on which we are relatively well-informed (*Myrmidons*, *Nereids* or *Phrygians*, forming the so-called *Achilleid*)[27] and makes use of language (τάφρος) otherwise known to be Aeschylean[28]. As is evident, therefore, both scholia can be fitted into a significant constellation of sources more or less directly concerning the play(s) being cited and/or the specific information being conveyed.

There is a world of difference between all other Aeschylean fragments transmitted by Homeric scholia and Schol. M *Od*. 13.381. The latter is

---

[18] Schol. *Il*. 16.542b Erbse: cf. Sol. fr. 36.15-17 *IEG*² with Noussia Fantuzzi *ad loc*.

[19] Schol. *Il*. 23.10 Erbse: cf. Schol. S. *El*. 286 Xenis (with ἐρείσματα for ἰάματα).

[20] Schol. *Il*. 18.486 van Thiel: cf. Athen. 11.491a = Asclep. Myrl. fr. 4 Pagani (with n.).

[21] Schol. *Il*. 6.239c Erbse, matching *P.Oxy*. 2256 fr. 9a.28: cf. Hdn. 2.55.22 Lentz.

[22] Schol. *Il*. 11.754a Erbse: cf. Hdn. 2.79.19-21 Lentz.

[23] Schol. *Il*. 5.9b Erbse: cf. Hdn. 1.63.2, 2.47.11, 2.614.7 Lentz.

[24] Schol. *Il*. 14.200 Dindorf ≈ Schol. *Od*. 1.98d Pontani: cf. Porph. *Quaest*. *Il*. 191.10-20 Schrader.

[25] Schol. *Il*. 2.862a1+a2 Erbse: cf. e.g. Strab. 12.8.7, Schol. E. *Hec*. 4 Schwartz, Schol. Ap. Rhod. 1.936-49f Wendel.

[26] See e.g. E. *Ba*. 1289, Acus. fr. 33 *EGM*, Ps.-Apollod. 3.30-32, Schol. E. *Pho*. 4.25-6 Schwartz, Davies-Finglass on Stes. fr. 295, with bibliography.

[27] See West 2000, 338-343, Sommerstein 2010, 242-249.

[28] Τάφρος features among Aeschylus' obscure expressions cited by "Euripides" in Ar. *Ran*. 928 and from Schol. Ael. *NA* 6.11.8-10 Meliadò = fr. 419 we additionally know that αὐλών was used as a synonym for it.

carried by an isolated and potentially unreliable source (a marginal gloss of uncertain chronology) and is neither certainly nor probably assignable to any extant of fragmentary play known to have been produced by Aeschylus. Individual Homeric scholia about Aeschylus hardly ever mention material that is not transmitted, presupposed or somehow alluded to in other sources: when this happens (e.g. Schol. *Il*. 9.593a Erbse = A. fr. 244), a quotation is supplied or other inferences are possible. But the gloss μενοινᾷ = ὀρέγεται is totally detached from any known tradition about Aeschylus. In addition, ὀρέγω/ὀρέγομαι, no less a *vox Homerica* than μενοινάω (*Iliad* 32×, *Odyssey* 8×)[29], is attested in Aeschylus only[30] at *Ag*. 1111 προτείνει δὲ χεῖρ᾽ ἐκ χερός ὀρεγομένα (Clytemnestra is imagined as laying her hands over Agamemnon), where its meaning, "stretch out", is incompatible with μενοινάω[31]. Even if one reckons with the possibility that the author or source of Schol. M *Od*. 13.381 read a larger body of Aeschylean texts than the one currently accessible, evidence of ὀρέγομαι in Aeschylus remains suspiciously flimsy. Furthermore, since the wording of the scholium coincides in all other respects with Hsch. μ 855, it is not impossible for the scholium to be later than Hesychius, although the contrary hypothesis remains likelier[32].

These uncertainties lead to a different, though not unlikely scenario: that the indication καὶ παρ᾽ Αἰσχύλῳ in Schol. M *Od*. 13.381, unsupported in Aeschylus' poetic text, may be incorrect, no matter its chronology. Either the words καὶ παρ᾽ Αἰσχύλῳ were added to the other *interpretamenta* by an incompetent critic, or a textual corruption obscured the name of another author.

A survey on the Archaic and Classical attestations of μενοινάω is required, and it is to the verb form μενοινᾷ or –allowing room for slight textual corruptions– to the paleographically similar μενοινᾷς and μενοίνα that we should turn first[33].

The hypothesis that the passage illustrating μενοινάω = ὀρέγομαι comes from Homer is unlikely. First of all, it fails to provide a convincing account for the addition of καὶ παρ᾽ Αἰσχύλῳ in Schol. *Od*. 13.381: the text behind the hypothetical corruption cannot have been καὶ παρ᾽ Ὁμήρῳ, and an an-

---

[29] See *LfgrE s.v*. ὀρέγω, ὀρέγνυμι, ὀριγνάομαι.

[30] See also ὄρεγμα (A. *Cho*. 426, 799); the adjective αὐτορέγμων at A. fr. 117, transmitted by Hsch. α 8459 Cunningham, more probably derives from ῥέζω (see Carrara *ad loc*.).

[31] See Medda *ad loc*.: ὀρεγομένα here intensifies προτείνει, as both verbs share the accusative χεῖρ᾽ (the reading of M^pc, preferable to the nom. χεὶρ in M^acFGT).

[32] On the derivation of lexicographic lemmas from *scholia minora*, see Tosi 1988, 123-127; on Hesychius and the V-scholia to the *Odyssey*, see Pontani 2005, 94-96.

[33] The simultaneous occurrence of the third-person μενοινᾷ in the poetic text, in the lemma of the scholium and in Hesychius' entry makes us confident that this is not a case of "lemmatizzazione", i.e. deliberate alteration of the verb form of the *glossandum* to any of the default paradigm forms (see Bossi-Tosi 1979-80, 8-13, Tosi 1988, 120-123).

cient critic would have had no reason to add a similar specification if he found the desired meaning in Homer. Second, it is disconfirmed by the distribution of μενοινάω in Homer's text. No occurrence of μενοινᾷ, μενοινᾷς, μενοίνα or of any other verb form of μενοινάω in *Iliad* or *Odyssey* can be comfortably explained by ὀρέγομαι. When occurring in short relative clauses (*Od*. 2.275, 2.285, 4.480: see also *h. Merc*. 474 = 489) or in formulaic expressions with the preceding dative φρεσὶ(ν) (σ)ῇσι (*Il*. 14.221, 14.264, *Od*. 2.34, 6.180, 15.111, 17.355, 21.157), μενοινάω blandly indicate a wish or desire, without further specification[34], and the same holds true with *Il*. 12.59 and the occurrences including νόος (*Od*. 2.92, 13.381, 18.283)[35].

In the ten remaining occurrences, μενοινάω does not simply mark a desire, but emphatically designates the eagerness or strong impulse to perform some action. Apart from *Il*. 15.82 and *Od*. 2.36, in which the desire pertains to the verbal or imaginative sphere[36], μενοινάω always refers to the furious eagerness of fighting against and killing enemies, in which case the verb is often connected with other words deriving from the *μεν-root (e.g. μένος, μέμονα, μαιμάω, μαίνομαι) or with θυμός. Three attestations are relatively unmarked (*Il*. 10.101[37], 13.214[38], *Od*. 22.217[39]), whereas the emphasis is greater in the five remaining passages, in which the irresistible yearning expressed by μενοινάω is strengthened by other linguistic clues: *Il*. 15.293 (Hector's fury in the first lines of the army[40]), 19.164 (soldiers craving for battle, but hampered by hunger and thirst[41]), *Od*. 2.248 (Odysseus' yearning for revenge on the suitors and its potential consequences[42]),

[34] For later imitations, see [Opp.] *Cyn*. 1.22, Q.S. 1.786, 5.171, 10.408, 14.142, 14.310 (with σῇσιν ἐνὶ πραπίδεσσι), Man. 3.374.

[35] A combination of the φρεσί- and the νόος-formula is found at *h. Merc*. 62: see Thomas *ad loc*.

[36] In *Il*. 15.82, Hera's flight is compared to the mental journey of a human longing for many different places: note the juxtaposition of μενοινάω and φρεσὶ πευκαλίμῃσι νοήσῃ and *Il*. 15.83 ὣς κραιπνῶς μεμαυῖα (see Janko on *Il*. 15.80-83). In *Od*. 2.36, Telemachus is eager to speak out in the assembly of Ithaca: note his joy (35) and inability to remain seated (36).

[37] Note the repetition δυσμενέες (100) … μενοινήσωσι (101) and the negative insistence on the Trojans' μένος: see Hainsworth *ad loc*.

[38] Note ἔτι (214) and the redundant πολέμοιο μενοίνα | ἀντιάαν (214-5), creating an ascending threefold hexameter in 215, unusual in προσέφη-lines (see Janko *ad loc*.).

[39] Note οἷα … | ἔρδειν ἐν μεγάροις (22.217-8), highlighting (in the suitor's view) the negative connotation of Athena/Mentor's μενοινᾶν.

[40] Note ὧδε and the emphasis on Hector's position (πρόμος ἵσταται): cf. also *Il*. 15.298-9, with Janko on *Il*. 15.286-293.

[41] Note θυμῷ γε and εἴ περ, highlighting the special force of the conditional, which balances 165-6.

[42] Note, again, ἐνὶ θυμῷ, and the contrast between the if-clause with μενοινάω and the apodosis (2.249-50).

11.531 (Neoptolemus described as eager to fight Trojans from within the wooden horse[43]), and especially *Il*. 13.79 (Ajax describes the arousal of his μένος: see below). None suitably illustrates μενοινᾷ = ὀρέγεται: all except one feature μενοινάω in a different verb form than the required one, and even μενοινάᾳ at *Il*. 19.164 (as well as *Od*. 22.217 μενοινᾷς) does not work, since ὀρέγομαι + infinitive, unlike μενοινάω, is unattested in Homer with the meaning "yearn for"[44].

From the previous survey it should become clear that the gloss μενοινᾷ = ὀρέγεται cannot be an example of Ὅμηρον ἐξ Ὁμήρου σαφηνίζειν, but has to do with the use of μενοινάω (i.e. meaning ὀρέγομαι) by a different author. This provides a better rationale for the addition of καὶ παρ᾽ Αἰσχύλῳ in the scholium, which could have been an accidental error rather than a gratuitous intrusion. As for the omission of Aeschylus' name in Hesychius, this can be certainly ascribed to the processes of epitomisation that variously affected Hesychius' lexicon during its transmission[45].

The six pre-dramatic occurrences of μενοινάω are mostly unhelpful: in *H. Ap*. 116, μενοίνησεν retains some connection with Homeric μένος insofar as it indicates Leto's impulse to childbirth after Eilethyia's visit[46]; in [Hes.] *Scut*. 368, ἐμενοίνα means, quite simply, "wish", denoting Cycnus' unwillingness to obey Heracles' request[47]; in Thgn. 461, μήποτ᾽ ἐπ᾽ ἀπρήκτοισι νόον ἔχε μηδὲ μενοίνα | χρήμασι, although μήποτ᾽… μενοίνα means "(do not) seek for"[48], it still exhibits a strong connection with irrational impulse, as the quest for wealth is presented as ethically inconvenient[49]. In Pindar, μενοινάω occurs 3×, all in the participle[50]: in *Ol*. 1.58, μενοινάω ("wish") highlights Tantalus' abnormal effort to overcome his punishment (57-8 τὸν

---

[43] Note the enumeration ἱκέτευεν… ἐπεμαίετο… μενοίνα and the depiction of Neoptolemus as one who, unlike his fellows, does not shed a tear (11.528-30).

[44] At *Il*. 16.834 ὀρέγομαι means "stretch out"; for ὀρέγομαι + infinitive, see E. *HF* 16, Thuc. 3.42.6, Crit. fr. 6.6 *IEG*², Pl. *Prt*. 326a3.

[45] On epitomisation in Hesychius, see Latte 1953, xi-xvi, Bossi-Tosi 1979-80, 7, Tosi 2015.

[46] Note the co-ordinated τὴν τότε δὴ τόκος εἷλε (Richardson *ad loc*.).

[47] Cf. [Theoc.] 25.62 ὣς εἰπὼν ἡγεῖτο, νόῳ δ᾽ ὅγε πόλλ᾽ ἐμενοίνα, which Gow *ad loc*. would unnecessarily emend to πολλὰ μενοίνα to match *Od*. 2.92, 13.381, 18.283.

[48] Note the exceptional construction with the dative χρήμασι, by analogy with ἐπ᾽ ἀπρήκτοισι νόον ἔχε. *Contra*, van Groningen *ad loc*., following Bergk, takes μηδὲ μενοίνα as parenthetical and ἐπ᾽ ἀπρήκτοισι… χρήμασι as a single phrase. But a twofold division of 461 after the bucolic diaeresis is more elegant, and there is a significant difference between "turning one's mind toward unattainable things" and "wishing for riches to excess".

[49] Cf. Thgn. 227-32, 699-728, 1155-6, 1157-8.

[50] A fourth attestation might be *P.Oxy*. 2736 fr. 1 ii.14 (μενοινᾶν?), a severely damaged narrative of the sack of Oechalia, if the latter is to be ascribed to Pindar (thus Lobel 1968, Henry on *P. Nem*. 8.2), but the context is obscure.

[= λίθον] αἰεὶ <u>μενοινῶν</u> κεφαλᾶς βαλεῖν εὐφροσύνας ἀλᾶται[51]); in *Pyth*. 1.43, the poetic "I" emphatically states his "desire" to praise Hieron I of Syracuse but not beyond measure (42-5 ἄνδρα δ᾽ ἐγὼ κεῖνον | αἰνῆσαι <u>μενοινῶν</u> ἔλπομαι etc.[52]); in *Nem*. 11.45, humans are described as embarking in ambitious exploits (44 μεγαλανορίας ἐμβαίνομεν) and yearning for many accomplishments (45 ἔργα τε πολλὰ <u>μενοινῶντες</u>) because of their inclination to hope and lack of forethought (45-6), although Zeus gives no clear sign of success (43-4), and such desires are beyond reach and redolent with μανία (see 47-8 κερδέων δὲ χρὴ μέτρον θηρευέμεν | ἀπροσίκτων δ᾽ ἐρώτων ὀξύτεραι μανίαι)[53]. Only at *Nem*. 11.45 could μενοινάω be paraphrased with ὀρέγομαι, but the verb form μενοινῶντες is incompatible with μενοινᾷ in the scholium and Hesychius[54].

The survey of μενοινάω in drama texts other than Aeschylus is more promising, although μενοινάω occurs once in each of the three genres.

The satyric attestation occurs in Euripides' *Cyclops*, a play with a clearly identifiable Homeric model[55]. At some point in the 2:2 stichomythia of E. *Cycl*. 440-50, while the Satyrs and Odysseus are discussing on how to get rid of the Cyclops, the Satyrs assume that Odysseus either wants to slay the monster by himself or push him down a cliff (447-8 ἔρημον ξυλλαβὼν δρυμοῖσί νιν | σφάξαι <u>μενοινᾷς</u> ἢ πετρῶν ὦσαι κάτα). The Homerism μενοινάω (448)[56], an epic touch to emphasize Odysseus' 'heroic' stature, is literally paraphrased in Odysseus' reply (449): οὐδὲν τοιοῦτον· δόλιος <u>ἡ προθυμία</u>, where προθυμία rephrases μενοινᾷς. Rather than being the *locus classicus* of μενοινάω = ὀρέγομαι, E. *Cyc*. 448-9 could have provided the source of μενοινάω = προθυμοῦμαι which so frequently occurs in scholia and lexica[57].

---

[51] Translations differ: "always *desiring* to cast this from his head" (Instone), "*in his constant eagerness* to cast it away from his head" (Race), "egli sempre *aspira* a stornarlo [i.e. il macigno]" (Gentili 2013).

[52] See Cingano in Gentili *et alii* 1995, Pfeijffer 2004, 23-25.

[53] See Verdenius, Henry *ad loc*.

[54] The passage might provide the *locus classicus* of μενοινᾷ = φροντίζει via Schol. P. *Nem*. 11.55.4 [= 11.43-5] Drachmann τὸ ἀποβησόμενον, τέλος ἐκ τοῦ Διός, φησίν, οὐ προγινώσκομεν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, ἀλλὰ μεγαληγοροῦμεν <u>μεγάλα τε μενοινῶντες καὶ φροντίζοντες ὑπὲρ ἑαυτούς</u>. Alternatively, the *locus classicus* could be one of the passages in Homer where μενοινάω co-occurs with φρένες, but μενοινάω is never glossed by φροντίζω in the scholia *ad locc*.

[55] On *Cyclops* and *Od*. 9, see now Hunter 2009, 53-77, Collard-O'Sullivan 2013, 41-56 (with further references at 41 n. 156).

[56] On the tolerance of satyr drama for "Homerisms, rare words and outdated and poetic forms", see López Eire 2003, 393-395.

[57] See the scholia cited above and n. 9. On the "coppia contigua" (coupling of lemma and *interpretamentum* on the basis of their co-occurrence in the *locus classicus*), see Marzullo 1968, Degani 1977-1978, 136-142, Bossi-Tosi 1979-80, 15-16, Tosi 1988, 92-93, 128-130. Euripides may obviously allude to either *Il*. 19.163 or *Od*. 2.247, in which μενοινάω and

The comic attestation of μενοινάω occurs in the *parabasis* of Aristophanes' *Wasps*. In their capsule-account of the Persian Wars[58], the Chorus refer to the barbarians' eagerness to destroy Attica (1078-80 ἡνίκ᾽ ἦλθ᾽ ὁ βάρβαρος | τῷ καπνῷ τύφων ἅπασαν τὴν πόλιν καὶ πυρπολῶν | ἐξελεῖν ἡμῶν μενοινῶν πρὸς βίαν τἀνθρήνια). As in most Homeric occurrences, μενοινάω is associated with war, so it cannot indicate a bland desire[59], but rather denotes the enemy's irrational hunger for destruction[60]. Although μενοινάω approaches the meaning of ὀρέγομαι insofar as it indicates the subject's ultimate goal, the emphasis is rather on the ways used by the Persians to attack the Athenians, and μενοινάω effectively highlights the intensity of the desire.

In tragedy, μενοινάω occurs only in S. *Aj*. 341, quoted below:

οἴμοι τάλαιν᾽· Εὐρύσακες, ἀμφὶ σοὶ βοᾷ.
τί ποτε μενοινᾷ; ποῦ ποτ᾽ εἶ; τάλαιν᾽ ἐγώ.

Lines 340-1 are spoken by Tecmessa in the first episode of Sophocles' *Ajax*, another play with evident epic background. Ajax repeatedly cries out from behind the *skēnē*-door, including a vague ἰὼ παῖ παῖ (339); Tecmessa takes this to be referred to Eurysaces (340 οἴμοι τάλαιν᾽· Εὐρύσακες, ἀμφὶ σοὶ βοᾷ) and speculates about Ajax's intent (341 τί ποτε μενοινᾷ;) and her child's whereabouts (ποῦ ποτ᾽ εἶ;). Scholars generally pass μενοινάω in silence[61] or simply acknowledge its Homeric and dramatic parallels[62]. At first glance, Tecmessa simply alludes to Ajax's intention, hence μενοινάω means "wish". But since Ajax's unclear intentions relate to his madness (discussed at length between Tecmessa and the Chorus at 263-330 and 331-9), μενοινάω retains its correlation with the *μεν-root, particularly μαίνομαι, for which cf. *Il*. 15.293, 19.164, *Od*. 2.248, 11.532, and especially *Il*. 13.79 cited above, on Ajax's μένος and eagerness to face Hector.

In a note following his edition of Schol. *Il*. 13[63], Ludwich suggested that μενοινᾷ = ὀρέγεται in Schol. M *Od*. 13.381 should refer to Sophocles, not Aeschylus, and precisely to this passage, and that καὶ παρ᾽ Αἰσχύλῳ ought to be emended to καὶ παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ. Ludwich does not justify his claim, but the hypothesis deserves consideration. What Ludwich did not see is that some interesting arguments strongly support his conclusion.

θυμός co-occurred.
   [58] See Austin 1973, 134, Biles-Olson on Ar. *Ve*. 1079-80.
   [59] Thus e.g. Henderson "intent upon", Biles-Olson *ad loc*. "intending". Better Mastromarco: "bramando".
   [60] Note the accumulation of participles (τύφων, πυρπολῶν, μενοινῶν), the emphasis on violence (πρὸς βίαν) and destruction (ἐξελεῖν), and on their completeness (ἅπασαν τὴν πόλιν).
   [61] Jebb, Stanford, Garvie *ad loc*.
   [62] Kamerbeek, Finglass *ad loc*.
   [63] Ludwich 1887, 475.

To begin with, in S. *Aj*. 341, as well as Schol. *Od*. 13.381 and Hsch. μ 855, μενοινάω occurs as μενοινᾷ. This might have prompted an ancient scholar or schoolteacher who was dealing with Homer's text to check for the usage of μενοινάω in the νεώτεροι, which would have directed him quite naturally to Sophocles, and to a play, *Ajax*, strongly connected with Homeric tradition and widely read in Antiquity (as well as Byzantine Age).

The only relevant scholium is a *supra lineam* gloss on ms. G (= Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Conv. Soppr. 152), Schol. S. *Aj*. 341a Christodoulou <μενοινᾷ·> προθυμεῖ<ται> (προθυμεῖ G[ac], προθυμῇ G[1]: *corr*. Christodoulou). Although this is of little help (ὀρέγομαι is not present), the origin of this gloss lies in the same strand of Homeric scholarship represented in the *scholia minora* listed above.

The search can go further than this. Tecmessa's μενοινᾷ appears to be another piece connecting Sophocles' *Ajax* with Homer[64]. The far-reaching relations between Sophocles and Homeric poems had been already sufficiently explored by ancient critics, who frequently attempted to elucidate Sophocles' text in the light of Homer. Some 34 explicit quotations of *Iliad* and *Odyssey* survive in the ancient scholia to the *Ajax,* covering several parts of the play[65]. Some 13 refer to the first episode (*Aj*. 201-595), which evidently provided a special focus of interest for ancient scholarship. This is especially due to the well-known intertextual relations between the scene with Ajax, Tecmessa and Eurysaces (S. *Aj*. 430-595) and the farewell scene by the Scaean gates between Hector, Andromache and Astyanax (*Il*. 6.369-502)[66].

The surviving *scholia vetera* to Sophocles' *Ajax* strongly invite the suspicion that a point-by-point comparison between the two scenes was made at some point in ancient scholarship Moreover, the analysis of the individual scholia reveals the existence of regular patterns of interpretation. (1) Schol. S. *Aj*. 499 compares Tecmessa's request that she and Eurysaces be not bereft of Ajax's protection (496-9 ἦ γὰρ θάνῃς σὺ ... | ... νόμιζε κἀμὲ τῇ τόδ' ἡμέρᾳ | ... | ξὺν παιδὶ τῷ σῷ δουλίαν ἕξειν τροφήν) with Andromache's comparable supplication to Hector (*Il*. 6.432 μὴ παῖδ' ὀρφανικὸν θείης χήρην τε γυναῖκα). The author of the comment did not pay attention to the differences between the two passages[67], but sought for a comparison (couched in terms

---

[64] On Sophocles' relation to the Homeric poems, Radt 1982, 197-202 (with bibliography) is a useful starting point. A wealth of material is also found in the references cited at n. 66.

[65] Homer is by far the most quoted author in the ancient scholia to Sophocles, even more than Sophocles himself: for statistics, see Montanari 1992, which makes the same point for the scholia to Euripides (cf. also Scattolin 2007, 233); moreover, Sophocles and Euripides are cited more frequently than Aeschylus in both Sophoclean and Euripidean scholia.

[66] Literature is vast: see esp. Perrotta 1935, 144-7, Easterling 1984, Möllendorff 2001.

[67] No mention of enslavement is made in the *Iliad* parallel (but see Hector at *Il*. 6.462-3,

of moral teaching: note the scholiast's use of διδασκαλία) that would juxtapose Tecmessa's and Andromache's speeches. (2) Schol. S. *Aj*. 501b compares the τίς-*Reden* included in the two passages[68], and particularly Tecmessa's ἴδετε τὴν ὁμευνέτιν | Αἴαντος (S. *Aj*. 501-2) with Hector's Ἕκτορος ἥδε γυνή (*Il*. 6.460)[69]. The overlap, once again, is limited to the pragmatics of the sentences and perhaps to the ethical view implied in the onlooker's evaluation of the widowed woman[70]. Similarly, (3) Schol. S. *Aj*. 514 compares Tecmessa's 514-7 ἐμοὶ γὰρ οὐκέτ' ἔστιν εἰς ὅ τι βλέπω | πλὴν σοῦ (followed by a reference to the death of Tecmessa's parents) with Andromache's statements at *Il*. 6.413 οὐδέ μοί ἐστι πατὴρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ and 429 Ἕκτορ· ἀτὰρ σύ μοί ἐσσι πατὴρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ to make the same point in terms of family values and ethics. (4) = Schol. S. *Aj*. 550 compares the prayers made by Ajax for Eurysaces (550-1) and by Hector for Astyanax. Although the similarity is explicitly stated (ἡ δὲ ὁμοία εὐχή), it is strictly limited to the identity of speaker (a father) and addressee (his child) and to the form of the speech act (a prayer), whereas the content, as Eustathius foresaw[71], is diametrically opposite[72]. (5) Schol. S. *Aj*. 577, finally, compares Ajax's request that his weapons (except the shield) be buried with his corpse (*Aj*. 577)[73] with Andromache's report about Achilles' decision to bury his father Eetion's weapons along with the corpse as a sign of honour toward the defeated king (*Il*. 6.416-9)[74]: the similarity is generically thematic (οἶδεν Ὅμηρος ὅπλα συγκαιόμενα) to the expense of other aspects such as the motif (inhumation vs. cremation), the diverging moral character of Ajax and Achilles[75] and, again, the linguistic form.

including the phrase δούλιον ἦμαρ, similar to S. *Aj*. 499 δουλίαν τροφήν), whereas Tecmessa's widowed and Eurysaces' orphaned status is mentioned again at 510-3 and 652-3.

[68] See in general Wilson 1979, de Jong 1987, and Finglass on S. *Aj*. 500-4 for a comparison.

[69] On the epigrammatic nature of *Il*. 6.460-1 (a definition which equally fits Sophocles' passage) see Graziosi-Haubold *ad loc*. See also Stoevesandt on *Il*. 6.459-63.

[70] Incidentally, the similarity extends beyond the selected portions of text: cf. *Aj*. 502 ὃς μέγιστον ἴσχυσε στρατοῦ ~ *Il*. 6.460-1 ὃς ἀριστεύεσκε μάχεσθαι | Τρώων ἱπποδάμων, 504 τοιαῦτ' ἐρεῖ τις ~ *Il*. 6.462 ὥς ποτέ τις ἐρέει.

[71] See Eust. in *Il*. 2.367.18-23, Brown 1965, 120, Finglass *ad loc*.

[72] Hector prays that Eurysaces may be better than he (*Il*. 6.476-8), rule over Troy (6.478), kill the enemies (6.480-1), and make Andromache rejoice (6.481); Ajax only prays that Eurysaces may be equal to him but with better luck (*Aj*. 550-1), *requires* that he stand up to his father's reputation (556-7), and says that he will give joy to her mother *before* he grows up (558-9).

[73] See Finglass *ad loc*.

[74] See Kirk on *Il*. 6.417-20, Graziosi-Haubold on *Il*. 6.418-9.

[75] Indeed, the scholiast speculates approvingly about Ajax' decision to leave the shield to Eurysaces (τὸ μὲν σάκος διὰ τὸ ἐξαίρετον τῷ παιδὶ φυλάσσειν κελεύει) and not leave his weapons free to be plundered or disputed in a future contest (τὰ δὲ ἄλλα τεύχη συνθάψαι

All these scholia mostly revolve around Ajax's legacy (compared to Hector's) and the grim future awaiting Tecmessa and Eurysaces. Each consists of a single comparison between the Sophoclean and the Homeric wording, with little or no comment added. This shows, *inter alia*, that ancient critics were keen to engage in close readings of two extended passages from different authors in order to establish similarities and differences between them or the indebtedness of one to the other.

The gloss μενοινᾷ = ὀρέγεται, I submit, is part of the broader comparison between S. *Aj*. 330-595 and *Il*. 6.369-502 outlined above, hence it can be shown to refer to Sophocles' use of μενοινάω at *Aj*. 341 in the meaning of the Homeric ὀρέγομαι.

As noted above, Tecmessa identifies the intended addressee of Ajax's ἰὼ παῖ παῖ with Eurysaces (340 Εὐρύσακες, ἀμφὶ σοὶ βοᾷ). Even if Tecmessa were wrong and Ajax were addressing Teucer[76], it is undeniable that Tecmessa so understands Ajax's cry. Indeed, the fact is explicitly stated and accounted for in Scholl. S. *Aj*. 339, 340b and 342b, although the three disagree between them in points of detail. On the one hand, Schol. S. *Aj*. 340b suggests that Tecmessa's reason for identifying Ajax's addressee with Eurysaces is her fear that Ajax could accidentally kill his son in another fit of madness (ἐδεδίει γὰρ μὴ ἀνέλοι αὐτὸν μαινόμενος: cf. S. *Aj*. 533); on the other hand, Schol. S. *Aj*. 342b claims that Ajax calls on Teucer at 342-3 because he wants to entrust Eurysaces to his half-brother's care (ἐπιζητεῖ Τεῦκρον, ἵνα παράθηται αὐτῷ τὸν παῖδα), which implies the view that Tecmessa was right and Ajax called on Eurysaces at 339 —a possibility rejected by Schol. S. *Aj*. 339 (ἡ δὲ Τέκμησσα ἐνόμισεν αὐτὸν τὸν παῖδα καλεῖν)[77].

Despite their differences, all scholia aim at explaining the content of Ajax's μενοινᾶν, and all conceive it as related to his (no matter if real or alleged) desire to see Eurysaces —a request which Ajax will make later in the episode (*Aj*. 530) so as to give Eurysaces his final recommendations (*Aj*. 545-82). In *Iliad* 6, Hector interrupts his visit to Paris and Helen because he wants to see his wife and child for one last time (or so he thinks: *Il*. 6.367-8) before going to war (*Il*. 6.365-6 καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼν <u>οἶκόνδ᾽ ἐσελεύσομαι, ὄφρα ἴδωμαι</u> | οἰκῆας <u>ἄλοχόν τε φίλην καὶ νήπιον υἱόν</u>). Since Ajax's and Hector's speeches to their children are profusely compared in the ancient scholia to

φησίν. ἐπίσταται γὰρ καὶ αὐτὰ περιμάχητα ἐσόμενα).

[76] Thus Catrambone forthcoming, arguing (from stagecraft and pragmatics) that Ajax addresses Teucer at 339 and corrects Tecmessa's guess at 342 (see Campbell on S. *Aj*. 339, Fraenkel 1977, 12-13, Lloyd-Jones - Wilson 1990, 17) as against the view of many scholars (esp. Jebb, Finglass *ad loc*.) arguing that Ajax addresses Eurysaces at 339 and Teucer at 342-3.

[77] On the aorist ἐνόμισεν to indicate a guess which later proves wrong, cf. Schol. E. *Alc*. 1104 Schwartz ἐνόμισε διὰ τὴν φιλίαν εἰρηκέναι αὐτὸν μετέχειν τῆς νίκης.

Sophocles, this incident would likely have been in the mind of Sophocles as well as of the ancient critics who dealt with *Ajax*[78].

What is the exact relation between μενοινᾷ in *Ajax*, the gloss μενοινᾷ = ὀρέγεται, and *Iliad* 6? In itself, the Homerism μενοινάω at S. *Aj.* 341 may have been borrowed from any of the Homeric parallels discussed above: a very good candidate would be Ajax's speech at *Il.* 13.77-80, in which the speaker's μένος is at the forefront: οὕτω νῦν καὶ ἐμοὶ περὶ δούρατι χεῖρες ἄαπτοι | μαιμῶσιν, καί μοι μένος ὄρορε, νέρθε δὲ ποσσὶν | ἔσσυμαι ἀμφο-τέροισι· μενοινάω δὲ καὶ οἶος | Ἕκτορι Πριαμίδῃ ἄμοτον μεμαῶτι μάχε-σθαι[79]. As to the meaning of μενοινάω, S. *Aj.* 341 may be connected precise-ly with the scene in *Iliad* 6, and in a way that could persuasively explain the birth of the gloss μενοινᾷ = ὀρέγεται. As noted above, Tecmessa's τί ποτε μενοινᾷ; refers to Ajax's desire to see Eurysaces; similarly, the only occur-rence of ὀρέγω/ὀρέγομαι in *Iliad* 6 refers to Hector's wish for physical con-tact with Astyanax (*Il.* 6.466): ὣς εἰπὼν οὗ παιδὸς ὀρέξατο φαίδιμος Ἕκτωρ.

Like μενοινᾷ in S. *Aj.* 341, ὀρέγομαι (here introduced by the narrator) is used in the third person. If, as I assume, an ancient critic glossed μενοινᾷ at S. *Aj.* 341 with ὀρέξατο at *Il.* 6.466, he would certainly have parsed ὀρέγο-μαι according to the verb form of μενοινάω attested in Sophocles' text, in keeping with the normal practice observed in scholiastic and lexicographic tradition: hence, the aorist ὀρέξατο would have been changed to the present ὀρέγεται. In *Iliad* 6, ὀρέξατο immediately follows Hector's highly emotional speech to Andromache (6.441-65), which the scholia to the *Ajax* quote in relation to Tecmessa's speech (Schol. S. *Aj.* 501b), and closely precedes the scene of the helmet (*Il.* 6.467-75, refashioned in a darker light by Sophocles at *Aj.* 545-9[80]) and Hector's speech to Astyanax (*Il.* 6.476-81), quoted in the

---

[78] Moreover, Tecmessa's agitated mood (see Schol. *Aj.* 340b) mirrors Andromache's ap-prehension in *Iliad* 6, which makes her run to the rampart μαινομένη εἰκυῖα (6.389: cf. 22.460 μαινάδι ἴσῃ, referring to Andromache's similar running after Hector's death).

[79] See Janko *ad loc.*: "Ajax's words are full of μένος, since μαιμάω, μενοινάω, ἄμοτον and μεμαώς are all from that root". This passage could also have influenced S. *Aj.* 50 καὶ πῶς ἐπέσχε χεῖρα μαιμῶσαν φόνου; (cited in *Suda* μ 327 Adler *s.v.* μαιμόωσα, μαιμῶσα; see Fing-lass *ad loc.*). On μένος in Homer, see especially Dodds 1951, 8-10, Bremmer 1983, 57-60, Claus 1981, 24-26, 35-37, Jahn 1987, 39-45 and *LfgrE s.v.* μένος (with further bibliography).

[80] At *Il.* 6.467-70, Astyanax is afraid of his father because of the plume of his helmet (ἂψ δ᾽ ὁ πάϊς πρὸς κόλπον ἐϋζώνοιο τιθήνης | ἐκλίνθη ἰάχων, πατρὸς φίλου ὄψιν ἀτυχθείς, | ταρ-βήσας χαλκόν τε ἰδὲ λόφον ἱππιοχαίτην, | δεινὸν ἀπ᾽ ἀκροτάτης κόρυθος νεύοντα νοήσας), which prompts his parents' laughs (6.471) and the removal of the helmet (6.472-3). Contrari-wise, at S. *Aj.* 545-7, while holding the baby in his arms, Ajax boastfully claims that Eurysa-ces, if he is really his own son, will not be frightened by the sight of the blood (αἶρ᾽ αὐτόν, αἶρε δεῦρο· ταρβήσει γὰρ οὔ, | νεοσφαγῆ †τουτονδε† προσλεύσσων φόνον, | εἴπερ δικαίως ἔστ᾽ ἐμὸς τὰ πατρόθεν; see Finglass *ad loc.*).

scholia to the *Ajax* (Schol. S. *Aj*. 550) and evidently reworked by Sophocles under the influence of the Homeric model.

Given the similarity of the contexts in which μενοινάω and ὀρέγομαι feature, it would have been an easy step for an ancient critic or grammarian to explain Ajax's μενοινᾶν with Hector's ὀρέγεσθαι. Such gloss would find its *raison d'être* in the fact that both μενοινάω and ὀρέγομαι are neither deployed in their usual meaning nor in familiar contexts. As for μενοινάω at S. *Aj*. 341, not only was the term unfamiliar to tragedy (and as such it would have been perceived by ancient critics), but also occurs with an indeterminate object (τί) —two circumstances which would invite explanation via a more transparent *interpretamentum*. As for ὀρέξατο at *Il*. 6.466, it equally does not fall in any of the attested Homeric meanings and/or constructions of ὀρέγω/ὀρέγομαι, that is, (1) "stretch out" (with χείρ or other body parts and/or physical extensions) in either (a) active[81] or (b) middle and passive[82], or (2) "give", "hand", "hold out"[83].

True, ὀρέξατο at *Il*. 6.466 has some remote connection with meaning (1b) insofar as it indicates Hector's stretching of his hands toward Astyanax (cf. *Il*. 23.99, where the hands are mentioned), but in those examples ὀρέγομαι (always in the middle) is construed absolutely[84], whereas at *Il*. 6.466 it governs the obligatory genitive οὗ παιδός. This leaves *Il*. 6.466 as the only epic attestation of ὀρέγομαι for which a meaning compatible with μενοινάω (i.e. "seek for", "aim at", "grasp at" + obligatory genitive) can be suggested. Though attested only here in Homer, this meaning and collocation of ὀρέγομαι gained currency in Late Archaic and Classical Attic texts (tragedy, oratory, historiography, and philosophy) until it became the predominantly or exclusively attested use of ὀρέγομαι[85]: see Tyrt. 12.12 *IEG*², E. *Ion* 842, *Or*. 303, 327, *Archelaus* fr. 240 *TrGF*, Antipho 2.2.12.4, all of the 17 occur-

---

[81] See *Il*. 1.351, 15.371, 22.37, *Od*. 9.527, 12.257, 17.366, 24.743, P. *Pyth*. 4.240, A. *Ag*. 1111, E. *Med*. 902, *Hcld*. 844, *Pho*. 103, 1710, S. *OC* 843, 1130, Ar. *Av*. 1760, Hdt. 2.2.18.

[82] See *Il*. 4.307, 5.851, 11.26, 13.20, 13.190, 16.314, 16.322, 16.834, 23.99, 23.805, 24.506, *Od*. 11.392, 21.53, Hes. *Th*. 178, *h. Cer*. 15, [Hes.] *Scut*. 456, E. *Hel*. 353b, 1238, Emp. 31 B 129.4 D-K.

[83] See (+ κῦδος = "give glory") *Il*. 5.33, 5.225, 5.260, 11.79, 12.174, 15.596, 15.602, 17.453, 22.57, *Od*. 4.275, Hes. *Th*. 433; (+ εὖχος = "give pride") *Il*. 12.328, 13.327, 22.130, S. *Ph*. 1203; (+other objects) *Il*. 23.406 (τάχος), 24.102 (δέπας), *Od*. 15.312 (κοτύλην καὶ πύρνον), *Od*. 17.407 (τόσσον), and also *h. Merc*. 496, P. *Pyth*. 3.110, *Nem*. 7.58, Bacchyl. 5.114, Ar. *Av*. 1102.

[84] At *Il*. 16.314, 16.322 and 23.805, although ὀρέγομαι and φθάνω appear to share the same direct object, the relevant accusatives are governed, strictly speaking, by φθάνω. See Richardson on *Il*. 23.805-6.

[85] For ὀρέγομαι + infinitive, a further development of ὀρέγομαι + genitive, see n. 44.

rences in Isocrates[86], 9 out of 10 in Thucydides[87], 22 out of 27 in Xeno-phon[88], 7 out of 14 in Plato[89], 5 out of 5 in the Demosthenic corpus[90].

Evidently, if ὀρέγομαι had to be used as an *interpretamentum* in technical works devoted to the explication of high poetry, its "Attic" meaning ("seek for") and collocation (with obligatory genitive) would have been selected in the first place. In the case under discussion, there was one more reason to do so, namely that this meaning and construction were attested in Homer, even if once. The semantic and syntactical overlap between μενοινάω and ὀρέ-γομαι, combined with the similarity of the two contexts, would have assisted the connection.

Two different scenarios could explain the formation of the gloss μενοινᾷ = ὀρέγεται. In the simpler hypothesis, the gloss independently blossomed in school practice or in scholarly works on Homer and/or Sophocles in order to explain what was certainly felt as a hard Homerism or to register another sign of Homer's persistence in Sophocles' text. Alternatively, and more interestingly, the gloss μενοινᾷ = ὀρέγεται could itself be the relic of a more extended note comparing Ajax's longing for Eurysaces with Hector's desire to embrace Astyanax. This view is encouraged by the extended comparison between *Ajax* and *Iliad* 6 attested in the *scholia vetera* to *Ajax* discussed above, which even suggest that a good deal of attention was devoted pre-cisely to Ajax's and Hector's fatherly role and approaches to their children: there would have been every reason to push this comparison further than the meagre remnants surviving in the scholia[91]. Over time, an exegetical note so drafted could easily have been reduced to a gloss, retaining its basic infor-mation –Sophocles' (possibly exceptional?) use of μενοινάω + accusative ("seek for") as a synonym of ὀρέγομαι + genitive ("yearn for")– and losing all the rest (e.g. original quotations, paraphrases of the two passages, schol-arly considerations on the parallel, etc.). The modifications would have af-fected the indication of the author's name (Sophocles), which could have been confused with another one (Aeschylus) in the scholium[92] and omitted

---

[86] See Isoc. 1.2, 1.5, 1.38, 1.46, 1.51, 1.52, 13.4, 2.2, 9.80, 6.105, 8.7, 8.23, 8.62, 8.144, 15.217, 5.134, 2.18.

[87] See Thuc. 2.61.4, 2.65.10, 4.17.4, 4.21.3, 4.41.4, 4.92.2, 6.10.5, 6.16.6, 6.83.1.

[88] See Xen. *Hell*. 4.4.6, 6.5.42, *Mem*. 1.2.15, 1.2.16, 3.1.1, 4.2.23, *Smp*. 4.43, 8.23, 8.35, *Cyr*. 2.4.21, 8.2.22, *Hier*. 7.1, 7.3, 9.7, *Ages*. 1.4, 1.35, *Lac*. 2.13, 7.3, *Vect*. 2.7 (bis), 3.11, *Eq. mag*. 1.23.

[89] See Plat. *Phd*. 65c9, 75b1, *Resp*. 439b1, 572a2, *Leg*. 714a4, 757c7, 807c6.

[90] Dem. 4.42, 16.22, [Dem.] 61.20, 61.41, 61.52. See also Antisth. fr. 117.53 Decleva Caizzi = 82.42 Prince (with n. *ad loc*.).

[91] Further topics for comparison might have been οἰκονομία and narrative coherence (see Nünlist 2009, 23-34, with references) or characterization (see Nünlist 2009, 246-254).

[92] A source of confusion could have been Hsch. μ 71 Cunningham μαιμᾷ· ἐνθουσιᾷ καὶ

from Hesychius' lexicon for reasons inherent to the textual transmission of that work[93]. Comparable scenarios, in which the original *loci classici* have been obscured in textual transmission, can be envisaged for each of the *interpretamenta* attached to Schol. M *Od*. 13.381 and Hsch. μ 855 —φροντί-ζει, μεριμνᾷ, and προθυμεῖται[94]— and the process could have been assisted by the very fact that all four *interpretamenta* were joined together at some point in our sources.

Speculations on the source(s) and chronology of Schol. M *Od*. 13.381 and Hsch. μ 855 will not get us too far. It has been observed that all four of the *interpretamenta* attached to μενοινᾷ may come from *loci classici* of different yet widely-read authors (Pindar, Euripides, Sophocles, and Homer himself) and/or to exegetical works dealing with their works[95]. The fact that two of these, προθυμεῖται and μεριμνᾷ, are juxtaposed in the lexicon of Apollonius the Sophist (1st century CE) and that all four appear, separately or in combination, in the *Odyssey* manuscripts supposedly preserving vestiges of Alexandrian scholarship (H and M)[96] might suggest a Hellenistic or early

ὀξέως ὁρμᾷ, ἢ ὀρέγεται, προθυμεῖται (cf., with minor variations, Hsch. μ 75, 81 and 83). Even if the *locus classicus* of the *interpretamenta* is very likely *Il*. 13.75 (μαιμώωσι co-occurs with 13.73 θυμός and 13.74 ἐφορμᾶται: cf. Scholl. *Il*. 5.661 and 13.75 van Thiel, Apoll. Soph. 109.31 Bekker), μαιμάω is certainly attested in A. *Supp*. 895 μαιμᾷ πέλας δίπους ὄφις (see Sideras 1971, 90, FJ/W *ad loc*.) and may be the *locus classicus* of μαιμᾷ … ὀρέγεται. If so, the attribution of the *interpretamentum* ὀρέγεται to Aeschylus could have been inadvertently transferred to μενοινᾷ = ὀρέγεται and the process could have been assisted by the regular use of προθυμοῦμαι as *interpretamentum* of μενοινάω, μαιμάω and μέμονα (see e.g. Schol. T *Il*. 13.155 Erbse μένος· τὴν προθυμίαν, παρὰ τὸ μένω τὸ προθυμοῦμαι ὅθεν καὶ ὁ μέμονα παρα-κείμενος, Schol. *Il*. 1.590 van Thiel, Schol. *Od*. 4.416c, 4.700a, Schol. A. *Sept*. 686d Smith, etc.).

   [93] See above with n. 45 and Tosi 2015.

   [94] For προθυμεῖται and μεριμνᾷ see above on E. *Cyc*. 447-9 and P. *Nem*. 11.45 respec-tively. As to μενοινᾷ = μεριμνᾷ, the origin of the gloss might be etymological: the *interpreta-mentum* in Schol. *Od*. 2.34e Pontani (cited above: cf. Schol. Ap. Rhod. 1.894 Wendel) is also found in P.Amh. 18 vii.96 μερμη[ρι]ξεν· διεμεριμναι and P.Strasb. inv. G. 33 iii.27 μερμηρι-ξεν· ε[μ]ερι[μνησε]ν, and might refer to *Il*. 15.82 (cf. Apoll. Soph. 111.15-16 Bekker, cited at n. 7). Even if no *locus classicus* can be suggested (nor is one strictly needed: Tosi 1988, 34-35, 117), the gloss μενοινήσειε = μεριμνήσῃ in Apollonius the Sophist is mirrored in Schol. T *Il*. 15.82d1 Erbse μενοινήσειέ τε πολλά· ὁ ἀνὴρ δηλονότι πολλὰ μέρη τῆς γῆς ἐννοήσεται and Schol. BCE³E⁴ *Il*. 15.82d2 Erbse (for the etymological derivation of μεριμνάω from μερμερί-ζω, μερίζω and μέρος, see Schol. HMᵃV *Od*. 1.427e1 Pontani, Schol. BCE³E⁴T *Il*. 2.3c Erbse, *EM* 580.16-18, 25-8 Gaisford). Alternatively, but less likely, μεριμνᾷ could have been added next to φροντίζει because of their regular co-occurrence in scholia and lexica: see e.g. Schol. Ar. *Eq*. 638 Jones, Schol. H E. *Med*. 61mi.4 Daitz, Schol. S. *Ant*. 20.11-12 Papageorgius.

   [95] See Pontani 2005, 100-103 on the relations between the *Odyssey* scholia and other scholiastic corpora.

   [96] On the sources of Apollonius (Apion, the ancestors of the D-scholia, Aristarchus) see Erbse 1960, 407-432, Schenck 1974, Haslam 1994. On M, see n. 2; on H = London, British

Imperial chronology. In particular, the possible derivation of the individual *interpretamenta* from ancient exegetical works on Sophocles (μενοινᾷ = ὀρέγεται), Euripides (μενοινᾷ = προθυμεῖται) and Pindar (μενοινᾷ = φροντίζει) univocally points to the activity of Didymus, who was credited, apart from ὑπομνήματα on Homeric poems, with the composition of commentaries on Pindar, Sophocles and Euripides, and a lexicon on tragedy (λέξις τραγική)[97], cited by Hesychius among the sources which Diogenianus, Hesychius' source, had epitomized[98]. The evidence is obviously inconclusive, and different scenarios cannot be ruled out, including a possible derivation from works roughly contemporary with Didymus, e.g. Apion's *Γλῶσσαι Ὁμηρικαί* (a source of both Apollonius the Sophist and Hesychius)[99], or from the activity of pre-Alexandrian γλωσσογράφοι[100].

Whatever the truth, the gloss μενονᾷ = ὀρέγεται, doubtfully edited by Radt as Aeschylus fr. 486, is not Aeschylean at all: if my argument is sound, the gloss should be removed from any future edition of Aeschylus. At the same time, since the *locus classicus* of the gloss is very probably S. *Aj*. 341, the gloss should find a place among the ancient *testimonia* of Sophocles' *Ajax*, possibly as part of the broader exegetical comparison outlined in the Sophoclean *scholia vetera* between S. *Aj*. 333-595 and *Il*. 6.369-502.

Pisa, Scuola Normale Superiore   MARCO CATRAMBONE

Library, Harl. 5674, see Pontani 2005, 208-217, esp. 213-215.

[97] See Braswell 2013, 46-47, Montana 2015, 175. On the preservation of Didymus' activity in Hesychius and the *Suda*, see Tosi 2003, Scattolin 2013.

[98] Hsch. *Epistula ad Eulogium* 3-4 Cunningham; on Diogenianus, see Bossi 2000, Schironi 2009, 47-52.

[99] On Apion's "translation" of Homer, for which he drew from Aristarchus' and other scholars' material, see Neitzel 1977, 202-207.

[100] See Dyck 1987.

Bibliographical References

C.F.L. Austin, rev. D.M. MacDowell, *Aristophanes. Wasps*, "CR" 23, 1973, 133-135.

Z.P. Biles - S.D. Olson, *Aristophanes. Wasps*, Oxford 2015.

F. Bossi, *Sui Περιεργοπένητες di Diogeniano*, "Eikasmos" 11, 2000, 267-268.

F. Bossi - R. Tosi, *Strutture lessicografiche greche*, "BIFG" 5, 1979-1980, 7-20.

B.K. Braswell, *Didymos of Alexandria. Commentary on Pindar*, Basel 2013.

J.N. Bremmer, *The Early Greek Concept of the Soul*, Princeton NJ 1983.

W.E. Brown, *Sophocles' Ajax and Homer's Hector*, "CJ" 61, 1965, 118-121.

L. Campbell, *Sophocles*, vol. 2, Oxford 1881².

L. Carrara, *L'indovino Poliido. Eschilo, Le Cretesi; Sofocle, Manteis; Euripide, Poliido*, Roma 2014.

M. Catrambone, *Ajax Behind the skēné: Staging, Address and Word Order at Sophocles, Ajax 339-343*, "Mnemosyne", forthcoming.

D.B. Claus, *Toward the Soul. An Inquiry into the Meaning of ψυχή before Plato*, New Haven/London 1981.

C. Collard - P. O'Sullivan, *Euripides: Cyclops and major fragments of Greek satyric drama*, Oxford 2013.

M. Davies - P.J. Finglass, *Stesichorus. The Poems*, Cambridge 2014.

E. Degani, *Problemi di lessicografia greca*, "BIFG" 4, 1977-1978, 135-146.

W. Dindorf, *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Odysseam*, 2 vols., Oxford 1855.

E.R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the irrational*, Berkeley 1951.

A.R. Dyck, *The Glossographoi*, "HSCP" 91, 1987, 119-160.

P.E. Easterling, *The tragic Homer*, "BICS" 31, 1984, 1-8.

H. Erbse, *Beiträge zur Ueberlieferung der Iliasscholien*, München 1960.

N. Ernst, *Die D-Scholien zur Odyssee. Kritische Ausgabe*, PhD Diss. Universität zu Köln https://kups.ub.uni-koeln.de/1831, 2004.

P.J. Finglass, *Sophocles. Ajax*, Cambridge 2011.

E. Fraenkel, *Due seminari romani di Eduard Fraenkel. Aiace e Filottete di Sofocle*, Roma 1977.

A.F. Garvie, *Sophocles. Ajax*, Warminster 1998.

B. Gentili - P. Angeli Bernardini - E. Cingano - P. Giannini, *Pindaro. Le Pitiche*, Milano 1995.

B. Gentili - C. Catenacci - P. Giannini - L. Lomiento, *Pindaro. Le Olimpiche*, Milano 2013.

A.S.F. Gow, *Theocritus*, 2 vols., Cambridge 1952².

B. Graziosi - J.H. Haubold, *Homer. Iliad Book VI*, Cambridge 2010.

B.A. van Groningen, *Theognis. Le premier livre*, Amsterdam 1966.

J.B. Hainsworth, *The Iliad. A Commentary. Vol. 3: Books 9-12*, Cambridge 1993.

M.W. Haslam, *The Homer lexicon of Apollonius Sophista: I, Composition and constituents*, "CP" 89, 1994, 1-45.

J. Henderson, *Aristophanes. Clouds, Wasps, Peace*, Cambridge, MA/London 1998.

W.B. Henry, *Pindar's Nemeans: a selection*, München 2005.

R.L. Hunter, *Critical moments in classical literature: studies in the ancient view of literature and its uses*, Cambridge 2009.

S. Instone, *Pindar. Selected odes: Olympian one, Pythian nine, Nemeans two & three, Isthmian one*, Warminster 1996.

T. Jahn, *Zum Wortfeld "Seele-Geist" in der Sprache Homers*, München 1987.

R. Janko, *The Iliad. A Commentary. Vol. 4: Books 13-16*, Cambridge 1992.

R.C. Jebb, *Sophocles. The Plays and Fragments. Part VII: The Ajax*, Cambridge 1896.

I.J.F. de Jong, *The voice of anonymity. τις-speeches in the Iliad*, "Eranos" 85, 1987, 69-84.

J.C. Kamerbeek, *The plays of Sophocles. Commentaries, I: The Ajax*, Leiden 1953.

G.S. Kirk, *The Iliad. A Commentary. Vol. 2: Books 5-8*, Cambridge 1990.

K. Latte, *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon, vol. I: A-Δ*, København 1953.

H. Lloyd-Jones - N.G. Wilson, *Sophoclea. Studies on the Text of Sophocles*, Oxford 1990.

E. Lobel, *2736. Choral Lyric (?Pindar)*, in E. Lobel (ed.), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, XXXV, London 1968, 32-38.

A. López Eire, *Tragedy and satyr-drama: linguistic criteria*, in A.H. Sommerstein (ed.), *Shards from Kolonos. Studies in Sophoclean fragments*, Bari 2003, 387-412.

A. Ludwich, *Scholia ad Odysseae l. xiii ex codicibus MSS. Veneto et Monacensi edita*, Regimonti 1871.

–, *Zu Aeschylos Eumeniden*, "RhM" 42, 1887, 474-475.

–, *Scholia in Homeri Odysseae A 1-309 auctiora et emendatoria*, Königsberg 1888-1890.

B. Marzullo, *La coppia contigua in Esichio*, "QIFG" 3, 1968, 70-87.

G. Mastromarco, *Aristofane. Commedie*, vol. 1, Torino 1983.

E. Medda, *Eschilo. Agamennone*, 3 vols., Roma 2017.

P.v. Möllendorff, *Die Konstruktion von Helden: Rezeptionslenkung durch Intertextualität im Aias des Sophokles*, in R.v.d. Hoff - S. Schmidt (edd.), *Konstruktionen von Wirklichkeit: Bilder im Griechenland des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, Stuttgart 2001, 261-279.

F. Montana, *Hellenistic scholarship*, in F. Montanari - S. Matthaios - A. Rengakos (edd.), *Brill's companion to ancient Greek scholarship*, Leiden 2015, 60-183.

F. Montanari, *Scoliografia e teatro greco: qualche appunto*, in L. De Finis (ed.), *Dal teatro greco al teatro rinascimentale: momenti e linee di evoluzione*, Trento 1992, 73-87.

–, *Nuova edizione di P. Ryl. 536: scholia minora a Iliade N 198-562*, in S. Feraboli (ed.), *Mosaico: studi in onore di Umberto Albini*, Genova 1993, 135-146.

–, *Studi di filologia omerica antica. II*, Pisa 1995.

S. Neitzel, *Apions Γλῶσσαι Ὁμηρικαί*, in K. Linke - W. Haas - S. Neitzel (edd.), *Die Fragmente des Grammatikers Dionysios Thrax. Die Fragmente der Grammatiker Tyrannion und Diokles. Apions Γλῶσσαι Ὁμηρικαί*, Berlin 1977, 185-328.

M. Noussia Fantuzzi, *Solon the Athenian: the poetic fragments*, Leiden/Boston 2010.

R. Nünlist, *The ancient critic at work: terms and concepts of literary criticism in Greek scholia*, Cambridge 2009.

G. Perrotta, *Sofocle*, Messina 1935.

I.L. Pfeijffer, *Propaganda in Pindar's First Pythian Ode*, in I.L. Pfeijffer - K.A.E. Enenkel (edd.), *The Manipulative Mode. Political Propaganda in Antiquity: A Collection of Case Studies*, Leiden 2004, 13-42.

F. Pontani, *Sguardi su Ulisse. La tradizione esegetica greca all'Odissea*, Roma 2005.

–, *Scholia Graeca in Odysseam*, 4 vols., Scholia ad libros α-β, γ-δ, ε-ζ, η-θ, Roma 2007-2020.

W.H. Race, *Pindar. Olympian Odes, Pythian Odes*, Cambridge, MA/London 1997.

S.L. Radt, *Sophocles in seinen Fragmenten*, in J. De Romilly (ed.), *Sophocle. Sept exposés suivis de discussions*, Vandœuvres 1982, 185-231.

N.J. Richardson, *The Iliad. A Commentary. Vol. 6: Books 21-24*, Cambridge 1993.

–, *Three Homeric hymns to Apollo, Hermes, and Aphrodite: hymns 3, 4, and 5*, Cambridge 2010.

P. Scattolin, *Sui meccanismi delle citazioni negli scolî antichi a Sofocle ed Euripide*, in R. Pretagostini - E. Dettori (edd.), *La cultura letteraria ellenistica*, Roma 2007, 233-245.

–, *Tra Didimo ed Esichio: tre casi di tradizione indiretta dell'Edipo a Colono (vv. 312, 390, 900)*, "Prometheus" 39, 2013, 25-43.

H. Schenck, *Die Quellen des Homerlexikons des Apollonios Sophistes*, Hamburg 1974.

F. Schironi, *From Alexandria to Babylon: Near Eastern languages and Hellenistic erudition in the Oxyrhynchus Glossary (P.Oxy. 1802 + 4812)*, Berlin/New York 2009.

A. Sideras, *Aeschylus Homericus: Untersuchungen zu den Homerismen der aeschyleischen Sprache*, Göttingen 1971.

A.H. Sommerstein, *Aeschylean Tragedy*, London 2010[2].

W.B. Stanford, *Sophocles. Ajax*, Toronto 1963.

M. Stoevesandt, *Homer's Iliad. The Basel commentary: Book VI*, Berlin/Boston 2016.

H. van Thiel, *Λέξεις Ὁμηρικαί. Proecdosis*, Köln http://kups.ub.uni-koeln.de/1815/ 2002.

–, *Scholia D in Iliadem. Proecdosis aucta et corr.*, Köln http://kups.ub.uni-koeln.de/5586 2014.

O.R.H. Thomas, *The Homeric hymn to Hermes*, Cambridge 2020.

R. Tosi, *Studi sulla tradizione indiretta dei classici greci*, Bologna 1988.

–, *Osservazioni sulla tradizione indiretta dell'Edipo a Colono*, in G. Avezzù (ed.), *Il dramma sofocleo: testo, lingua, interpretazione*, Stuttgart 2003, 357-369.

–, *Esichio e la semplificazione di strutture complesse nella trasmissione dei lessici*, in M. Tziatzi - M. Billerbeck - F. Montanari - K. Tsantsanoglou (edd.), *Lemmata: Beiträge zum Gedenken an Christos Theodoridis*, Berlin/Boston 2015, 411-417.

W.J. Verdenius, *Commentaries on Pindar: Olympian Odes 1,10,11; Nemean 11; Isthmian 2*, Leiden 1988.

M.L. West, *Iliad and Aethiopis on the stage: Aeschylus and son*, "CQ" 50, 2000, 338-352.

J.R. Wilson, *Καί κε τις ὧδ' ἐρέει. An Homeric device in Greek literature*, "ICS" 4, 1979, 1-15.

ABSTRACT

The paper contends that the gloss μενοινᾷ … ὀρέγεται attributed to Aeschylus (fr. 486) by Schol. M *Od*. 13.381 actually refers to Sophocles *Ajax* 341, as once suggested by Ludwich. The gloss was probably meant to explain μενοινᾷ by means of ὀρέξατο (*Il*. 6.466) and may be another relic of a broader comparison between S. *Aj*. 333-595 and *Il*. 6.369-502 attested in the *scholia vetera* to Sophocles.

KEYWORDS

Homeric scholarship and *scholia*, Hesychius, lexicography, *Iliad*, *Odyssey*, Aeschylus, Sophocles.