HAPAX LEGOMENON ΕΠΙΨΕΥΔΗΣ (IL. 4. 235)?

The lexical-semantic field 'truth and lie' is among the richest in Homer and in the early Greek poetry.[1] In Homer, the majority of words in the group 'lie' belongs to its periphery and has occasional or metaphorical meaning; some of them are *hapax legomena*.[2] Even the word ψεύστης, which later has a broad meaning 'liar' with numerous connotations, such as 'cheat', 'deceiver', 'fraud',[3] in Homer is used only twice, and always as a term of abuse.[4]

In the present article I would like to show that one of these peripheral words occurs in *Il.* 4. 235.

234 Ἀργεῖοι, μή πώ τι μεθίετε θούριδος ἀλκῆς·
οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ ψευδέσσι πατὴρ Ζεὺς ἔσσετ' ἀρωγός,
ἀλλ' οἵ περ πρότεροι ὑπὲρ ὅρκια δηλήσαντο
τῶν ἤτοι αὐτῶν τέρενα χρόα γῦπες ἔδονται,
ἡμεῖς αὖτ' ἀλόχους τε φίλας καὶ νήπια τέκνα
239 ἄξομεν ἐν νήεσσιν, ἐπὴν πτολίεθρον ἕλωμεν.[5]

Ye Argives, relax ye no whit of your furious valour; for father Zeus will be no helper of lies; nay, they that were the first to work violence in defiance of their oaths, their tender flesh of a surety shall vultures devour, and we shall bear away in our ships their dear wives and little children when we shall have taken their citadel.[6]

---

[1] J.-P. Levet, *Le vrai et le faux dans la pensée grecque archaïque* (Paris 1976).

[2] ἀγκυλομήτης, αἱμύλιος, δόλιος, δολόμητις, ἐπίκλοπος, ἐπίορκος, ἠπεροπεύς (*Od.* 11. 364), κερδαλέος, κερδαλεόφρων, κέρτομος, κλόπιος (*Od.* 13. 295), ποικιλομήτης, πολυκερδής, πολυμήχανος, πολυπαίπαλος (*Od.* 15. 419), πολύτροπος, σκολιός, τρώκτης, φιλοψευδής (*Il.* 12. 164), ψευδάγγελος (*Il.* 15. 159).

[3] *The Iliad: A commentary.* Gen. ed. G. S. Kirk. I (Cambridge 1985) 356; *The Iliad*. Ed. with apparatus criticus, prolegomena notes and append. by W. Leaf. I (London ²1900) 235: "The Homeric word for liar is ψεύστης".

[4] *Il.* 24. 261; 19. 107 (v. l.). See Е. Ермолаева [E. Ermolaeva], "*Il.* XIX, 107: ψευστήσεις versus ψεύστης εἰς, или Могла ли Гера сказать Зевсу: 'Ты лжец'?", *Hyperboreus* 7 (2001): 1–2, 60–71.

[5] *Homeri opera.* Ed. Th. W. Allen. II (Oxonii 2000).

[6] Homer, *The Iliad*. Transl. by A. T. Murray (London – Cambridge, Mass. 1946): Murray reads ἐπὶ ψεύδεσσι.

Although the reading in 235 ἐπὶ ψευδέσσι 'on the side of liars'
seems appropriate at the first sight, there is a difficulty, as the adjective
ψευδής is attested in Greek texts comparatively late[7] and is not attested
in Homer. As for *variae lectiones* in 235, I would call them diagnostic,
as they replace one difficulty by another. For example, the reading ἐπὶ
ψεύδεσσι ἀρωγός accepted by W. Leaf (1900) and M. West (1998) uses
a Homeric noun ψεῦδος[8] instead of the non-Homeric adjective ψευδής.
However, it breaks the pattern that exists in Homer between the word
ἀρωγός *helper* and the *dativus personae* (to whom or for whom)[9] that
regularly accompanies it. Besides, the construction ἀρωγός + ἐπί with
a dative[10] is not attested anywhere in Homer.

The Polemics about interpretation of line 235 – ἐπὶ ψεύδεσσι versus
ἐπὶ ψευδέσσι – are ancient and are attested in the *scholia*: Hermappias
read the noun ἐπὶ ψεύδεσσι ὡς "τείχεσσιν" (H 135), because in his
opinion Homer had never used ψευδής on its own, only in compounds
Ἀψευδής (personal name) *Il.* 18. 46 and φιλοψευδής *Il.* 12. 164.[11]

The *scholia* that quote Herodian refer to Aristarchus' reading ἐπὶ
ψευδέσ(σ)ι ἀρωγός: Ἀρίσταρχος ἀναγιγνώσκει "ψευδέσσι" ὡς
σαφέσσι·[12] τοῦτο γάρ φησι θέλει δηλοῦν· οὐ γὰρ τοῖς ψεύσταις
Τρωσὶ βοηθεῖ ὁ Ζεύς).[13] Instead of bringing supporting arguments,

---

[7] The first evidence of the ajective ψευδής is in an Attic epigram *IG* I² 700 in
the first half of the 5th century BC: hοί τε λέγοσι λόγος ἀδίκος φσευδᾶς κατ'
ἐκένο. See P. Maas, "Zum griechischen Wortschatz (ἐπιψευδής, πατερίων,
ὤρα)", in: *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves* 6
(Mélanges Boisacq 1938) 129–130 = idem, *Kleine Schriften* (München 1973) 197–
198. As for Hes. *Th.* 229, I agree with those who accept the reading with the noun
ψεύδεα (and not the adjective ψευδέας). See M. L. West, *Hesiod. Theogony.* Ed.
with prolegomena and commentary (Oxford 1966) 231.

[8] It occurs another 11 times in Homer.

[9] Leaf admits that the use of an abstract noun instead of a *dativus personae* is
strained: "It is true that ἀρήγειν and cognate forms are elsewhere only used by
H. with personal datives, not with abstract words like ψεῦδος: but the idea of
being 'a helper for lies' is not impossibly bold": Leaf (n. 3) 235.

[10] Another five times: *Il.* 8. 205 Δαναοῖσιν ἀρωγοί; 18. 502 ἀμφοτέροισιν...
ἀρωγοί; 21. 371 = 428 Τρώεσσιν ἀρωγοί; *Od.* 18. 232 ἐμοὶ... ἀρωγοί.

[11] *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem.* Ed. H. Erbse. I (Berolini 1969) 493.
Hermappias, who is known to have lived after Aristrarchus, is quoted only three
times in scholia *(Il.* 4. 235; 9. 326; 13. 137), though R. Gudemann ("Hermappias",
RE 8 [1912] 721) believes that Hermappias' contribution to Homeric scholarship
must have been important, judging by the weight attributed to him in those three
places.

[12] Homer does not use an adjective σαφής, only an adverb σάφα.

[13] Erbse (n. 11) 493.

Herodian simply writes <Ἀρίσταρχος> θέλει. Although he admits that Hermappias is probably right, he gives in to *Aristarchomania*[14] and recommends following Aristarchus' authority: καὶ μᾶλλον π<ε>στέον Ἀριστάρχῳ ἢ τῷ Ἑρμαππίᾳ, καὶ δοκεῖ ἀληθεύειν (A).

The majority of manuscripts[15] as well as editors of the *Iliad*, such as Ludwich, Ameis – Hentze,[16] Kauer, Allen etc., follow Aristarchus, whereas Nauck,[17] Leaf, Mazon,[18] van Thiel[19] and West follow Hermappius' ἐπὶ ψεύδεσσι (A¹CᵃDG).

To this discussion I would add some observations, following J. Wackernagel and E. Risch.[20] In Homer, the adjectives on -ης, -ες (like ψευδής) do not occur, unless they are compounds (μένος –δυσμενής, νέφος – κελαινεφής, ψεῦδος – ἀψευδής; σφάλλω – ἀσφαλής, λήθω – ἀληθής etc.).

Still, whether we accept the reading ἐπὶ ψεύδεσσι or ἐπὶ ψευδέσσι, the problem of the unusual construction (ἐπί + dat.) with ἀρωγός remains. D. Monro in his grammar of Homeric dialect in the section on ἐπί treats *Il.* 4. 235 as a special case where (ἐπί + dat.) with ἀρωγός means *"will be a helper with (on the side of) falsehood* (or *false men*, reading ψευδέσσι)".[21] There were attempts to resolve this difficulty since the antiquity: the scholia mention as hypothesis the tmesis ἐπαρωγός: ἐπί and ἀρωγός (ἡ δὲ ἐπὶ πρὸς τὸ ἀρωγός b T). This hypothesis is considered by K. Ameis and C. Hentze,[22] yet it is difficult to prove, as ἐπαρωγός occurs only once in *Od.* 11. 498.[23]

---

[14] For literature on *Aristarchomania*, see the above mentioned article of Ермолаева (n. 4), which shows the randomness of the so-called ethical corrections by Aristarchus.

[15] See apparatus criticus of the editions in question: Homerus, *Ilias*. Ed. M. L. West. I (Stuttgart – Leipzig 1998); *Homeri Ilias*. Rec. A. Ludwich. I (Lipsiae 1902).

[16] *Homers Ilias*. Hg. K. F. Ameis, bearb. von C. Hentze. II (Leipzig – Berlin ⁴1908).

[17] *Homeri Ilias*. Ed. A. Nauck. I (Berolini 1877).

[18] Homère, *Iliade*. Ét. et trad. par P. Mazon. I (Paris 1938).

[19] *Homeri Ilias*. Rec. H. van Thiel (Hildesheim – Zürich – New York 1996).

[20] J. Wackernagel, "Das Dehnungsgesetz der griechischen Komposita", in: idem, *Kleine Schriften* II, hrsg. von B. Forssman (Göttingen ²1969) 37; E. Risch, *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache* (Berlin ²1974) 80–81. Risch mentions ἐπὶ ψευδέσσι among exceptions as a v. l. to ἐπὶ ψεύδεσσι, but prefers the reading with the noun.

[21] D. B. Monro, *A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect* (Oxford ²1891) 179.

[22] *Homers Ilias* (n. 16).

[23] As for the possibility of tmesis ἐπιέσσεται, only one instance (θεοὶ δ' ἐπὶ μάρτυροι ἔστων, *Od.* 1. 273) can serve as a parallel. Still, it is difficult to decide

I believe it is the conjecture of P. Maas that solves all the difficulties: the *dativus personae* with ἀρωγός, the unusual ἐπί, the need to choose between ἐπὶ ψεύδεσσι and ἐπὶ ψευδέσσι.[24] Maas suggests the reading ἐπιψευδέσσι, without word division between ἐπὶ and ψευδέσσι. He sees the adjective ἐπιψευδής as a synonym to ἐπίορκος 'perfidious'. The only serious disadvantage of Maas' conjecture[25] is that the adjective ἐπιψευδής is a hapax: it does not occur either in literary texts or in inscriptions.

M. Leumann accepts Maas' conjecture as making sense; he believes that the adjective ἐπιψευδής could have been formed from τὸ ψεῦδος following the same pattern as in the pair ἐπικρατής and τὸ κράτος.[26] Likewise, I would accept ἐπιψευδέσσι *ex coniectura*, and would add that the verb ἐπιψεύδομαι[27] is well attested after Homer.

In addition, I would like to mention a treaty *De trinitate* of a Christian author of the 4th century Didymus Caecus in the edition by I. Seiler, where a citation from Homer – precisely our verse *Il.* 4. 235 – is given with the reading ἐπιψεύδεσσι: *De trinitate*, 540 B 8 (6. 13, 1. 7). Neither Maas nor anyone else refers to this citation in Didymus; Seiler does not comment on the verse in her apparatus criticus.[28] *De trinitate* is edited from one manuscript (Codex Vaticanus Angelic. 116, 10th century), but the manuscript reads the two words separately, and places an *accentus gravis* on the ἐπὶ.[29] The question, whether it was Seiler herself, who adopted the reading ἐπιψεύδεσσι

---

between ἐπὶ μάρτυροι and ἐπιμάρτυροι, see: *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey* I (Oxford 1990) 109.

[24] Maas (n. 7) 197–198.

[25] The two caesuras in this verse – κατὰ τὸν τρίτον τροχαῖον and ἐφθημιμερής – do not prevent the conjecture.

[26] M. Leumann, *Homerische Wörter* (Basel 1950) 136–137.

[27] The *TLG* brings the following instances: Xen. *Hier.* 2. 16, 3 ἐπιψεύδονται; Arist. *EE* 1229 b 22 ἐπιψεύδονται; Philo Jud. *LA* 3. 61. 9 ἐπιψεύδεται, *Flac.* 170. 2 ἐπιψεύδονται; A. R. 3. 381, Plut. *Mor.* 16. 4. 1 ἐπιψεύδεσθαι; Flavius Ios. *AJ* 18. 209. 2 ἐπιψευδομένων etc. (In Lucianus the verb occurs six times, often with a second prefix.)

[28] Didymus Caecus. *De trinitate*. Ed. I. Seiler (Meisenheim 1975). The edition is used in the *TLG*. In *Patrologiae cursus completus* 39 (1858) the verse is quoted from an edition of Homer: ἐπὶ ψεύδεσσι. The Latin translation given in *Patrologia* reflects rather the reading ἐπιψευδέσσι than ἐπὶ ψεύδεσσι: "nec enim *mendacibus* pater Deus erit auxiliator". I thank Nina Almazova and Dmitry Bumazhnov for facilitating access to Seiler's edition.

[29] I thank Natalie Tchernetska for checking the manuscript and for help editing this article.

following Maas' ἐπιψευδέσσι and who thus corrected the manuscript,[30] remains open.

Didymus, who was blind and was likely to *listen* to Homeric verses, must have perceived the ἐπιψευδέσσι as the only meaningful variant, connected to the well-known verb ἐπιψεύδομαι. In the Christian literature of the 4th century, the verb ἐπιψεύδομαι is used more often than before: according to the *TLG*, it occurs 14 times, which is more frequently than from Xenophon to Lucian inclusive. Didymus himself uses a participle ἐπιψευδόμενοι twice (*Comm. in Zachariam* 3. 158. 7; 3. 245. 4).

Thus, if Maas' conjecture is correct and the word ἐπιψευδής existed in Greek alongside Homeric *hapax legomena* ᾿Αψευδής and φιλοψευδής, it could have belonged to the periphery of the group 'lie' as a poetic synonym to ἐπίορκος 'perfidious'.[31]

Elena Ermolaeva
St Petersburg University

Статья написана в поддержку конъектуры П. Мааса (1938 г.) в стихе *Il.* IV, 235 οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ ψευδέσσι πατὴρ Ζεὺς ἔσσετ᾽ ἀρωγός. Текст схолиев отражает возникшую уже в античности полемику: ἐπὶ ψευδέσσι versus ἐπὶ ψευδέσσι. Гермаппий читал ἐπὶ ψευδέσσι, опираясь на наблюдения над гомеровской лексикой: поэт употребляет прилагательное ψευδής лишь в составе сложных слов – ᾿Αψευδής (имя нимфы) *Il.* XVIII, 46, φιλοψευδής *Il.* XII, 164. Однако большинство рукописей и издателей под влиянием

---

[30] See Seiler (n. 28) XIV: "Anscheinend ist der Text von seinem Schreiber noch einmal durchkorrigiert worden, denn die Randkorrekturen zeigen dieselbe Hand wie der übrige Text".

[31] M. Schmidt treats ἐπιψευδής as a synonym to ἐπίορκος in his article on ἐπίορκος in *LfgrE*. Lief. 12. The adjective ἐπιψευδής as a variant is mentioned in etymological dictionaries: H. Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* II (Heidelberg 1970) 1132; P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la lanque grecque. Histoire de mots* IV (Paris 1980) 1287. See also *Greek-English lexicon. A supplement.* Ed. E. Λ. Barber (Oxford 1968): ἐπιψευδής = ἐπίορκος, proba. in *Il.* 4. 235. Michael M. Kumpf, author of the dissertation *The Homeric Hapax Legomena and their Literary Use by Later Authors, especially Euripides and Apollonius Rhodius* (Ohio State University 1974), did not mention ἐπιψευδής in his *Four Indices of the Homeric Hapax Legomena* (Hildesheim – Zürich – New York 1984) as he used Allen's edition, who adopts the reading of the verse with two words separated.

Aristarchomania принимает чтение ἐπὶ ψευδέσσι. Прилагательное ψευ-δής, засвидетельствованое в текстах сравнительно поздно, у Гомера дей-ствительно не встречается. Так, чтение ἐπὶ ψεύδεσσι ἀρωγός 'помощник при лжи, на стороне лжи', которое принимают, в частности, Лиф (1900) и Уэст (1998), использует обычное для Гомера существительное ψεῦδος. Однако оно нарушает другую закономерность, в соответствии с которой ἀρωγός в гомеровских поэмах всегда сопровождается дативом лица.

На наш взгляд, конъектура П. Мааса остроумно разрешает все проблемы. Маас предлагает не делать словораздела между ἐπὶ и ψευδέσσι и читать ἐπιψευδέσσι. Прилагательное ἐπιψευδής он расценивает как синоним к гомеровскому ἐπίορκος 'нарушитель клятвы'. Единственный серьезный недостаток этой конъектуры заключается в том, что Маас предлагает гапакс: прилагательное ἐπιψευδής не встречается ни в литературных текстах, ни в надписях.

Мы ввели в существующую полемику дополнительные наблюдения. В гомеровских поэмах нет не только ψευδής, но и вообще прилагательных на -ης, -ες, если это не композиты (μένος – δυσμενής, νέφος – κελαινεφής, ψεῦδος – ἀψευδής; σφάλλω – ἀσφαλής, λήθω – ἀληθής etc.). Об этом явлении пишут Вакернагель и Риш. Лойман принимает конъектуру Мааса, находя, что она дает хороший смысл и что ἐπιψευδής образовано от τὸ ψεῦδος по той же словообразовательной модели, что ἐπικρατής от τὸ κράτος. Мы также склоняемся к тому, чтобы принять ἐπιψευδέσσι *ex coniectura,* отмечая, что после Гомера хорошо засвидетельствован глагол ἐπιψεύδομαι. И кроме того, предлагаем обратить внимание на сочинение христианского автора IV в. Дидима Слепого *О Троице* в издании Ингрид Зайлер (1975; именно это издание использует *TLG*), где цитата из Гоме-ра – стих *Il.* IV, 235 – приводится с чтением ἐπιψεύδεσσι (*De trinitate*, 540 В 8 [6. 13, 1. 7]).

Итак, если предположение Мааса верно и слово ἐπιψευδής, наряду с гомеровскими гапаксами Ἀψευδής и φιλοψευδής, существовало в языке, то, исходя из контекста, оно могло служить поэтическим синонимом к ἐπίορκος – perfidus ('вероломный').

legendum:

p. 6,	*n.* 11		Aristarchus
7,	*l.* 3		π<ε>ιστέον
7,	*l.* 4		εἰ καὶ δοκεῖ
8,	*l.* 4 *a fine*		Codex Angelic.
8,	*n.* 23		see S. West in:
8,	*n.* 27		A. R.
12,	*n.* 4		*tome* [...] établi
13,	*l.* 3		quarum utramque nihil
14,	*l.* 2–4		gewöhnliche [...] enthält [...] Rücksicht
16,	*n.* *, *l.* 4		Charalambos
16,	*n.* 1, *l.* 3		Archaïsme
16,	*n.* 2, *l.* 4		*Inscriptions*
19,	*n.* 9, *l.* 2		*Athènes et Chypre à*
21,	*n.* 20, *l.* 2		*d'Achoris à Karnak*
22,	n. 26		archaïque
25,	*n.* 41		nachlässig [...] glückliche
26,	*n.* 55, *l.* 1		à l'étude
26,	*n.* 55, *l.* 4		ΑΠΑΡΧΑΙ
33,	*n.* 15, *l.* 7		in this same note
33,	*n.* 16, *l.* 3 *a fine*		μὲν
43,	*n.* 6		$\Rightarrow d^2 = (r+h) \times (h+x)$
51,	*l.* 8 *a fine*		diminuant
55,	*l.* 7		« vice
56,	*l.* 9		le cas
91,	*n.* 1, *l.* 3		πρακτικὴ
94,	*n.* 2, *l.* 6–7		πλῆθος [...] Χριστός
102,	*n.* 28, *l.* 2		αὐτὸν
103,	*n.* 29, *l.* 20		οἱ
103,	*n.* 29, *l.* 3 *a fine*		βεβαιούμενοι
104,	*n.* 30, *l.* 4 *a fine*		*Refutatio*
108,	*l.* 6		ἐναντίον
109,	*n.* 47, *l.* 5		ἄγνωστον
112,	*n.* 59, *l.* 5		что Ириней мог
113,	*n.* 59, *l.* 6		etwa
144,	*n.* 4, *l.* 5–6 *a fine*		изначально
145,	*n.* 7, *l.* 4		Zürich
146,	*n.* 9, *l.* 3		и "богословие"
147,	*n.* 12		d'où [...] systèmes [...] *siècles*