Francesca Schironi

Aristarchus and his Use of Etymology*

The study of etymology, far from belonging exclusively to the scholars of Pergamum and serving as a tool for their allegorical exegesis, was also practised by the Alexandrian grammarians and in particular by Aristarchus. Aristarchus' use of etymology of course differs from that of Crates and his school in Pergamum in many respects. The object of this paper will be to analyse his approach to etymology and to show how different it was from that of Crates and other ancient *philologoi*. I would also like to show how Aristarchus employed etymology in his scholarly work, especially in his editions of the Homeric poems, and how etymological study is perfectly in keeping with his main principles, which are analogy in the fields of grammar and phonology and Homeric usage (Ὁμηρικὴ συνήθεια) in the field of philology. My article will be based on examples illustrating his etymological analysis of the Gods' epithets.

One of the most important aims of Aristarchus' work was to trace the difference between Homeric and post Homeric usage; and etymology could provide an excellent means of doing this. The epithet Argeiphontes is a case in point.[1] The EGud. reports the etymology of Aristarchus, which was also adopted by his pupils Alexion and Archias:

> EGud. 185, 8 De Stef. Ἀργειφόντης (B 103), παρὰ τὸ ἐναργεῖς τὰς φαντασίας ποιεῖν, ὥς φασιν Ἀλεξίων (fr. 4 B.) καὶ Ἀρχίας καὶ Ἀρίσταρχος

Aristarchus thus etymologised the name Ἀργειφόντης saying that it was formed from ἀργός, an adjective signifying 'shining', 'gleaming', and φαίνω, 'to show'; more precisely, he paraphrased this epithet as follows: παρὰ τὸ ἐναργεῖς τὰς φαντασίας ποιεῖν, i. e. 'making the images clear', referring

---

[1]   On this epithet cf. Scherer (1886-1890: 2384-2385); Jessen (1895); Kretschmer (1920: 45-49); Chantraine (1935); Chittenden (1948: in part. 25-28); Carpenter (1950); Davis (1953); Heubeck (1954); Koller (1976); West (1978: 368-369).

---

to the prerogatives of Hermes as the god of dreams. The same etymology recurs in EGud. 186, 16 De Stef. Ἀργειφόντης: παρὰ τὸ ἐναργεῖς τὰς φαντασίας ποιεῖν οὕτως εὗρον ἐν Ὑπομνήματι τοῦ Ἡσιόδου ..., where it is expressly said that this etymology was taken from a commentary (*hypomnema*) on Hesiod. We know that Aristarchus wrote an ὑπόμνημα on Hesiod[2] and there are good reasons to think that the commentary quoted in this gloss is that of Aristarchus.[3] This supposition is confirmed by Sch. Hes. Op. 77 d, which analyses the epithet Argeiphontes, and, after providing other etymologies, notes: οἱ δὲ νεώτεροι ὅτι Ἄργον ἐφόνευσε τὸν πανόπτην. Here the name of Aristarchus does not appear, but the use of the expression οἱ νεώτεροι, the post-Homeric poets, is a typical Aristarchean expression.[4] In addition to the reference to the *hypomnema* on Hesiod in the gloss of the EGud., this expression points to Aristarchean authorship. In this case, analysing the epithet Argeiphontes in Hesiod, Aristarchus noticed the usage of the νεώτεροι, who had interpreted this Homeric epithet as signifying 'the murderer of Argos'. This was the most common etymology in ancient times[5] and it was based on the well known myth of Io and the killing of Argos, her guard, by Hermes,[6] who was hence called Argeiphontes for this reason: from Ἄργος plus φονεύω, 'to kill' (similar to ἀνδρειφόντης and Βελλεροφόντης). But in Aristarchus' opinion this etymology was not correct, as — he argued — the myth of Io and Argos was posterior to Homer.[7] Despite having no knowledge of this myth, Homer nevertheless used this epithet.[8] Therefore in Aristarchus' opinion Ἀργειφόντης had to be etymologised in a different way; he derived it from τὸ ἐναργεῖς τὰς φαντασίας ποιεῖν. Hermes was in fact the god of dreams and this epithet was related to the activity of the god. Aristarchus was able to find evidence for his etymology in Homeric poetry. In Ω 445[9] and in ω

---

[2] Cf. Pfeiffer (1968: 220).

[3] Cf. also La Roche (1866: 202).

[4] Cf. Severyns (1928: 31-61, in part. 45-47).

[5] Cf. EGud. 185, 14. 19 De Stef.; EGen. *a 1124* L-L = EGen. *a 1578* L-L; ESym. *a 1326* L-L; EM *a 1741*; Sch. D ad *B 103* = Sch. A ad *B 103* (D); Sch. HMQE ad *a 38*; Sch. D ad *a 38*; Ap. Soph. 42, 10; Ep. Hom. *a 356*; Eust. 182, 22; 1809, 37; Sch. Eur. Phoen. 208.

[6] Io, priestess of Hera at the Heraion of Argos; beloved by Zeus, was transformed into a white cow by Hera, who gave her Argos πανόπτης as guard. Hermes killed Argos and released her. But Hera inflicted a gadfly upon Io, who, after wandering around the world, finally came to Egypt, where she generated Epaphus.

[7] The first trace of the myth of Io is in fact to be found in the Hesiodic *Catalogue* (frr. 124; 125; 126; and frr. 64, 18; 66, 4) and in the *Aigimios*, a work attributed to Hesiod or to Kerkopes (frr. 294. 296). Cf. Severyns (1928: 179-180). Hypponax (fr. 3a W.) calls Hermes κυνάγχα, but the reference to Argos' myth is not certain.

[8] Cf. *B 103. P 181. F 497. W 24.106.153.182.345. a 38.84. e 43.49*, etc.

[9] *Ω 443-445*: ἀλλ᾽ ὅτε δὴ πύργους τε νεῶν καὶ τάφρον ἵκοντο, / οἱ δὲ νέον περὶ δόρπα φυλακτῆρες πονέοντο, / τοῖσι δ᾽ ἐφ᾽ ὕπνον ἔχευε διάκτορος Ἀργειφόντης.

3-4[10] Hermes is in fact seen as the god of sleep, and in H. Hy. 14 he is expressly defined as ἡγήτωρ ὀνείρων, the leader of the dreams.[11]

Even in the field of etymology, Aristarchus analyses words following analogical criteria. He is very attentive to the phonetic and morphological aspects of words and attempts to give the correct etymologies for them. Let us now consider a case in which this attitude is well developed. Aristarchus' arguments about the epithet Ἑλικώνιος applied to Poseidon exhibit a certain methodological precision.[12] Sch. D ad E 422 (≅ EM 546, 17) analyses the name Κύπρις and other epithets of gods and is taken from the Περὶ θεῶν of Apollodorus (FGrHist 244, fr. 353). This pupil of Aristarchus was the first to devote an entire work to etymologies, the Περὶ ἐτυμολογιῶν.[13] In the Περὶ θεῶν he analysed the names of the Greek gods and his main thesis was that the epithets of the gods cannot derive from their cult place, but only from their moral and physical qualities (ibid.: ... καὶ τἄλλα δὲ τῶν ἐπιθέτων ἐπιοῦσιν ἡμῖν πάρεστιν ὁρᾶν, οὐκ ἀπὸ τῶν ἱερῶν τόπων ὠνομασμένα, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν ἐνεργειῶν τῶν ψυχικῶν, ἢ διὰ συμβεβηκότων τῶν περὶ τὸ σῶμα). There is only one exception, the name Heliconius, which is derived from a place. Apollodorus goes on to report the opinion of Aristarchus, who preferred to connect the epithet with Helicon, the mountain in Boeotia:

> Sch. D ad E 422 (≅ EM 546, 17) [...] καὶ γάρ, εἰ σπανίως, "Ἑλικώνιον" τὸν Ποσειδῶνα εἴρηκεν (U 404) ἀπὸ Ἑλικῶνος, ὡς Ἀρίσταρχος βούλεται· ἐπεὶ ἡ Βοιωτία ὅλη ἱερὰ Ποσειδῶνος. οὐ γὰρ ἀρέσκει ἀπὸ Ἑλίκης, ἐπεὶ φησίν, "οἱ δέ τοι εἰς Ἑλίκην τε καὶ Αἰγὰς δῶρ' ἀνάγουσιν" (Θ 203). Ἑλικήιϝον γὰρ ἂν εἶπε, συγχωροῦντος τοῦ μέτρου.

Aristarchus was against the derivation from Helice, a city in Achaia, famous for an old cult to Poseidon.[14] The derivation from Helice was common in antiquity, dating back to Cleitophon from Rhodes, according to whom this ancient cult of Poseidon in Helice was later inherited by the Ionians of Miletus and Caria.[15] But Aristarchus opposed this etymology on the grounds that it was not

---

[10] ω 1-4: Ἑρμῆς δὲ ψυχὰς Κυλλήνιος ἐξεκαλεῖτο /ἀνδρῶν μνηστήρων· ἔχε δὲ ῥάβδον μετὰ χερσὶ / καλὴν χρυσείην, τῇ τ' ἀνδρῶν ὄμματα θέλγει, / ὧν ἐθέλει, τοὺς δ' αὖτε καὶ ὑπνώοντας ἐγείρει· Cf. also Athen. I 16 b.

[11] Cf. Eitrem (1912: 788-789).

[12] On this epithet cf. Jessen (1912: 9-11); Wilamowitz (1931: 212-13); Schachermeyr (1950: 34. 39. 45); Nilsson (1961³: 446-447); Chirassi (1968: 979-982).

[13] Cf. Pfeiffer (1968: 260-263).

[14] Cf. also Call., hy. 4, 101. This etymology was also taken over by Pausanias (7, 24, 5) and Strabo (8, 7, 2).

[15] Sch. D ad Υ 404: ὡς δ' ὅτε ταῦρος "Ἑλικώνιον ἀμφὶ ἄνακτα| τὸν Ποσειδῶνα, ἤτοι ὅτι ἐν "Ἑλικῶνι ὄρει τῆς Βοιωτίας τιμᾶται, ἢ ἐν Ἑλίκῃ· μᾶλλον οὖν παρὰ τὸν ἐν Ἑλίκῃ θεόν (≅ EM 547, 15). διαφέρει γὰρ Ἑλικὼν καὶ Ἑλίκη, ὅτι Ἑλικὼν μὲν Βοιωτίας ὄρος, Ἑλίκη δὲ νῆσος Ἀχαΐας ἱερὰ Ποσειδῶνος. ἡ δὲ ἱστωρία αὕτη.

phonologically correct. In his opinion, if the epithet had derived from Helice, it should have been Ἑλικήϊϝος, which would have been analogically correct (as it would be formed from Ἑλίκη plus the suffix -ιος) and would have fitted the metre. On the contrary, the form Ἑλικώνιος could not derive from Ἑλί-κη, as the infix -ων- before the adjectival ending -ιος would be left unexplained. The epithet was thus formed from Ἑλικών plus -ιος and therefore had to derive from the mountain Ἑλικών in Boeotia, a region sacred to Poseidon.

In this case even the criterion of Homeric usage comes into question. In fact the supporters of the etymology from Helice could quote a passage from Θ 203, where Hera exhorts Poseidon to help the Greeks, "οἵ δέ τοι εἰς Ἑλίκην τε καὶ Αἰγάς δῶρ' ἀνάγουσι". But this passage in the Iliad did not stop Aristarchus from refusing this etymology, which he had already discarded on grammatical grounds. Grammar and correctness in spelling were therefore the main features of his etymological analysis, and only when an etymology could fulfil these criteria, was it acceptable and eventually confirmed through the *usus Homericus*.[16]

A similar case is that of Alalkomeneis, epithet of Athena.[17] It was generally derived from Ἀλαλκομένιον, a city founded by a certain Ἀλαλκομενεύς, where there was a temple dedicated to Athena, as Stephanus of Byzanzium states in his dictionary of *Ethnikà*:

> Steph. Byz. 68, 12: Ἀλαλκομένιον· πόλις Βοιωτίας, ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀλαλκομε-νέως, ὅς καὶ ἵδρυσε τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν Ἀλαλκομενηΐδα. οὐ γὰρ παρὰ τὸ ἀλαλ-κεῖν, ὡς Ἀρίσταρχος· ἦν γὰρ ἂν καὶ Ἀλαλκηΐς.

Stephanus of Byzantium rejects the etymology of Aristarchus, who linked the epithet with the verb ἀλαλκεῖν (epic aorist of ἀλέξω), 'to drive back'. He claims that this etymology is not correct in terms of phonetic analysis, arguing that in such a case it should have been Ἀλαλκηΐς and not Ἀλαλκομενηΐς. But we can find something more in Sch. D ad E 422 (≅ EM 546, 17), where the epithet of Athena is also analysed:

Νηλεύς ὁ Κόδρου χρησμὸν λαβὼν ἀποικίαν ἔστειλεν εἰς Μίλητον καὶ τὴν Καρίαν ἐξ Ἀθηνῶν καὶ τῆς Ἀχαϊκῆς Ἑλίκης. παραγενόμενος δὲ εἰς τὴν Καρίαν ἱερὸν Πο-σειδῶνος ἱδρύσατο, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐν Ἑλίκῃ τεμένους Ἑλικώνιον προσηγόρευσεν. δο-κεῖ δὲ ἐπὰν θύωσιν τῷ θεῷ βοησάντων μὲν βοῶν προσδέχεσθαι τὸ θεῖον τὴν θυ-σίαν, σιγώντων δὲ λυποῦνται μηνίειν νομίζοντες. ἡ ἱστορία <παρὰ> Κλειτοφῶντι (F.H.G. IV. 368 fr. 5). On this cult cf. Hdt. 1, 148; Diod. 15, 49; Strab. 14, 1, 20; Ael., NA 11, 19; Polyaen., 8, 46.

16) In this case Aristarchus could perhaps find other instances in which Homer refers explicitly to Helicon as a mountain sacred to Poseidon; for example Hy. Hom. 22, 3 to Poseidon: ὅς θ' Ἑλικῶνα καὶ εὐρείας ἔχει Αἰγάς and the Hom. Ep. 6, 1-2: κλῦθι Ποσειδάων μεγα-λοσθενὲς ἐννοσίγαιε, / εὐρυχόρου μεδέων ἠδὲ ξανθοῦ Ἑλικῶνος. Even Pindar, I 8, 57 calls the Muses "Ἑλικώνιαι παρθένοι", with a clear reference to the Helicon.

17) Cf. Wentzel (1893); Usener (1929: 235-238).

Sch. D ad E 422 [...] "καὶ Ἀλαλκομενηὶς Ἀθήνη" (D 8. E 908) παρὰ τοῖς εὖ λογιζομένοις ἀπὸ τῆς ἐνεργείας, ἡ ἀπαλέξουσα τῷ ἰδίῳ μένει τοὺς ἐναντίους. οὐ γὰρ πειθόμεθα τοῖς νεωτέροις, οἵ φασιν ἀπὸ Ἀλαλκομενίου <τόπου> τινὸς εἰρῆσθαι.

Once again the name of Aristarchus is not mentioned, but I would nevertheless attribute this note to him, since the etymology is very similar to the one that Stephanus ascribes to him and the *Wortlaut* is typically Aristarchean, containing a reference to the νεώτεροι.[18] Aristarchus thus noticed that the νεώτεροι derived the name Alalkomeneis from Ἀλαλκομένιον, the etymology which is also accepted by Stephanus of Byzantium.[19]

But if we compare what Stephanus says about the Aristarchean etymology with the gloss in the D scholium, we find that Stephanus' criticism probably misrepresents Aristarchus' view. Aristarchus did not derive Ἀλαλκομενηὶς only from ἀλαλκεῖν, as Stephanus claims, but he also took into account the last part of the epithet, that is -μενηίς, deriving the epithet from ἀπαλέξειν + μένος, i.e. ἡ ἀπαλέξουσα τῷ ἰδίῳ μένει τοὺς ἐναντίους, 'the goddess who drives back the enemies with her force'. This precise analysis of the different parts of a word in order to discover its etymology was also present in the case of Ἑλικώνιος and is typical of Aristarchus.

The main target of Aristarchus' criticism was Crates, with whom he also had occasion to disagree in the field of etymology. Crates interpreted Homeric poetry allegorically and used etymology to support his interpretation; whereas Aristarchus used etymological analysis to show how misleading allegory could be and therefore to serve his *philological* and rational interpretation of Homer. Typical in this sense is the discussion of Apollo's epithet ἰήιος / ἤιος[20] in the Iliad scholia and in the EGen.:

Sch. A ad O 365a (Hrd.) {ὥς ῥα σύ} ἤιε| Ἀρίσταρχος δασύνει, ἀπὸ τῆς ἔσεως τῶν βελῶν. οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Κράτητα (fr. 55 M.) ψιλῶς, ἀπὸ τῆς ἰάσεως· [...]

EGen. AB ἤιος: "ὥς ῥα σύ ἤιε Φοῖβε". Ἀρίσταρχος δασύνει, ἐπεὶ παρὰ τὸ ἵημι ἐγένετο· ἀπὸ γὰρ τῆς ἔσεως τῶν βελῶν ἐκλήθη ἤιος, οἱ δὲ ψιλοῦσιν ἀπὸ τῆς ἰάσεως· [...]

According to Aristarchus the epithets ἰήιος / ἤιος have to be pronounced with rough breathing as they derive from the verb ἵημι and refer to the activity of

---

18) Cf. Severyns (1928: 93. 200).

19) Cf. also EGen α 395 L-L ≅ ESym. α 463 L-L ≅ EM α 758 L-L; Sch. D ad Δ 8; Ap. Soph. 22, 7; Hsch. α 2755; Ep. Hom. α 317; Eust. 439, 33; Corn. 38, 10; Paus. 9, 33, 5; Strab. 9, 2, 36, C 413; Sch E ad δ 766; Sch. T ad Ψ 783 b (ex.); Porph., ad Il. 316, 11.

20) On the different interpretations of this epithet, cf. Meyer (1914).

Apollo as an archer. In giving this etymology Aristarchus probably referred to Callimachus, who in his Hymn to Apollo told the story of the killing of Python at Delphi;[21] Apollo was exhorted to kill the snake Python by the people who cried: ἵει, ἵει βέλος, 'hurl, hurl the dart'.[22] Instead Crates read ἰήιος / ἤιος with a smooth breathing and took the words from ἰάομαι, on the ground that Apollo was also a beneficent god, able to cure the sick and injured.[23] Aristarchus opposed this etymology because in his opinion Apollo was not a ἰατρός but rather this was an invention of the νεώτεροι, who identified Apollo with Paeon. Some scholia assigned to the follower of Aristarchus Aristonicus insist on the fact that in Homer it was Paeon and not Apollo who was the physician among the gods:

Sch. A ad E 899 (Ariston.) ὡς φάτο καὶ Παιῆον'| ὅτι ἰατρὸν τῶν θεῶν ἕτερον παρὰ τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα παραδίδωσι τοῦτον.

Sch. MTV ad δ 232 (Ariston.) Παιήονοςb Παιήων ἰατρὸς θεῶν, οὐχ ὁ αὐτὸς τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι, ἀλλὰ κεχωρισμένος. παρὰ μέντοι τοῖς νεωτέροις ὁ αὐτὸς νομίζεται εἶναι. καὶ Ἡσίοδος (fr. 307 M.-W.) δὲ μάρτυς ἐστὶ τοῦ ἕτερον εἶναι τὸν Παιήονα τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος, λέγων "εἰ μὴ Ἀπόλλων Φοῖβος ὑπὲκ θανάτοιο σαώσαι, ἢ καὶ Παιήων, ὃς ἁπάντων φάρμακα οἶδεν."

In Homer and in Hesiod Apollo and Paeon are clearly distinguished. Only the νεώτεροι identified them as one and the same.[24]

The different aspiration of the epithet, written by Aristarchus with rough breathing, was thus also conceived as a means to point out the difference between Homeric and later poetry and, above all, to argue against Crates. In this respect we can perhaps go even further. In his allegorical reading of Homer Crates identified Apollo with the sun (cf. Sch. A ad Σ 240 b (Porph.): ... Κράτης (fr. 29a M.) μὲν τὸν αὐτὸν Ἀπόλλωνα εἶναι καὶ ἥλιον). Crates'

---

21) Call., Hy. 2, 97-104: ἰὴ ἰὴ παιῆον ἀκούομεν, οὕνεκα τοῦτο / Δελφός τοι πρώτιστον ἐφύμνιον εὕρετο λαός, / ἦμος ἐκηβολίην χρυσέων ἐπεδείκνυσο τόξων. / Πυθώ τοι κατιόντι συνήντετο δαιμόνιος θήρ, / αἰνὸς ὄφις. τὸν μὲν σὺ κατήναρες ἄλλον ἐπ' ἄλλῳ / βάλλων ὠκὺν ὀϊστόν, ἐπηΰτησε δὲ λαός· / "ἰὴ ἰὴ παιῆον, ἵει βέλος, εὐθύ σε μήτηρ / γείνατ' ἀοσσητῆρα"· τὸ δ' ἐξέτι κεῖθεν ἀείδῃ. μήτηρ / γείνατ' ἀοσσητῆρα"· τὸ δ' ἐξέτι κεῖθεν ἀείδῃ. Cf. also Call. Aet. 4, fr. 88. This aition was taken over by Apollonius Rhodius; cf. Schreiber (1879: 17-18); Radermacher (1901: 500-501); Hunter (1986: 59-60).

22) The same story is found in EGen. AB s.v. ἰήϊε ≅ EM 469, 41, which also reports another tradition supported by the historians Douris (FGrHist 76, 79); he claimed that it was his mother Leto who urged Apollo to kill Python (ibid.: ... ἰήϝος δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἀπόλλων λέγεται, ὡς μὲν Δοῦρις, ὅτι ἐν ἀγκάλαις βαστάσασα τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα ἡ Λητὼ ἐνεκελεύσατο εἰποῦσα, ἰήϊε παιῆον).

23) Cf. also EGen. AB s.v. ἰήϊε ≅ EM 469, 41: ... τινὲς δὲ ψιλοῦσιν· ἐπεὶ ἰάσεως αἴτιος ὁ θεός.

24) The first poet we know to have done so is Sophocles, OT, 154, who referring to Apollo, invokes him as ἰήϊε Δάλιε Παιάν. Cf. Severyns (1928: 197-198); Usener (1929: 152-155).

---

etymology, ἰήϊος / ἥϊος from ἰάομαι, could support this allegorical interpretation: the sun in fact is a beneficent star, which favours human life with its heat. Therefore, by opposing Crates' etymology from ἰάομαι, Aristarchus is also signalling his stand against allegorical interpretation.[25]

In conclusion, this brief analysis of some Aristarchean etymologies has shown that the Alexandrian scholar follows his main criteria in this field too: analogy in analysing the structure of words and Homeric usage to confirm his etymologies. The first consideration is always grammatical correctness (ὀρθό-της). Other occurrences in Homeric poetry and the Ὁμηρικὴ συνήθεια can only confirm an etymology, but are not a secure means of determining it.

Etymologies are phenomena related to grammar and sound, which cannot be investigated by a purely semantic or philosophical approach. As we have seen in the previous examples, Aristarchus is very attentive to phonetic rules in order to give the most accurate analysis of a word. In so doing, however, he seems to have no awareness of the theory of the πάθη. This theory (patho-logia in Latin) aims to explain the present form of a word through a series of phonetic developments undergone by the original form. The analysis of the πάθη is already present in Plato's Cratylus[26] and will be developed later, in the Ist century BC, by Trypho, in his Περὶ παθῶν,[27] and, in the second century AD, by Herodian. While the latter subjects etymology to grammatical rules as the only criteria able to determine the orthography of a word, Aristarchus is not interested in explaining all the changes in letters and syllables, but aims just to connect a word, or in the cases we have considered an epithet, with another, more common word, which is phonetically close to the first and which clearly pertains to the same semantic field. He uses etymology to confirm the coherence and the specificity of Homeric usage as opposed to that of later poets, carefully noticing the differences between these two distinct worlds. He also turns etymology away from Crates and allegorical interpretation. Etymology, in his opinion, does not seek to discover the intimate, intrinsic essence of reality, as Stoic philosophers, and Crates, thought. And we have seen that Aristarchus prefers to interpret god's epithets as referring to a quality or to a particular activity of the divinities. He excludes any etymology that

---

[25] Both interpretations are present to Macrobius 1, 17, 19. The source of EGen., s.vv. ἥϊος and ἰήϊε is Herodian. He probably agreed with Aristarchus' etymology (cf. EGen., s.v. ἥϊος:... ἥϊος δὲ λέγεται ὁ τοξικός, παρὰ τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν βελῶν). Nevertheless, according to Herodian (cf. Sch. A ad O 365a), the epithets ἰήϊος/ ἥϊος have in any case to be written with a smooth breathing as the letter η before a vowel is always pronounced with a smooth breathing, as the case of ἠώς, ἦια and others prove. The etymology therefore has nothing to do with orthography, which is subject to other grammatical rules.

[26] Cf. Crat. 432 a 4.

[27] Cf. Wackernagel (1876).

goes beyond analogy in grammatical and phonetic rules, or goes outside the textual data, leaving allegorical and extra Homeric interpretation to others.