

1 Introduction

1.1 Pollux: Life and works

The purpose of this volume is to re-examine the manuscript tradition of Pollux's *Onomasticon*. However, before exploring the awaiting crowd of manuscripts, scribes, and variants, it is necessary to say something about the author and the work we will be discussing.

Iulius Pollux,¹ the Latinised form of the name Ἰούλιος Πολυδεύκης, lived in the second half of the 2nd century CE, during the reigns of the emperors Marcus Aurelius and Commodus. He must have been a very famous grammarian and rhetorician in his time, but, with the exception of the *Onomasticon*, his oeuvre is now completely lost. The extant information on Pollux's life is scarce: a brief entry in the *Suda* (π 1951), drawn from the *Onomatologus* by Hesychius of Miletus (6th century CE), and a brief account by Flavius Philostratus in the *Lives of the Sophists* (VS 2.12, 96.2–97.22 Kayser), who does not seem to be very well disposed towards Pollux (see below). In both our sources he is called Ναυκρατίτης, 'from Naucratis' in Egypt, the same city where his near-contemporary Athenaeus was born. The *Suda* also preserves a nickname playfully given to him, Ἀρδουέννας, but its meaning remains obscure: although the *Suda* takes care to inform us that Arduenna was a city in Phoenicia, it does not clarify the relationship between this city and Pollux. His father – says Philostratus – was well versed in philological studies (τοὺς κριτικὸς λόγους εἰδότες) and took charge of the young Pollux's education. In Athens, he was later a pupil (ἀκροατής) of Hadrian of Tyre,² a rhetorician who had been a pupil of Herodes Atticus.³

Pollux worked as a teacher in Athens. According to Philostratus, not before 178 CE and probably in 180 CE, he attained the chair of rhetoric (τὸν Ἀθήνησι θρόνον) by 'enchanting' (θέλξας) the emperor Commodus with his sweet voice, μελιχρᾷ τῇ φωνῇ, whatever that means,⁴ when he declaimed.⁵ Naechster (1908, 21–46) hypothesised that this coveted post was awarded to Pollux after a competition with the other famous Atticist theorist and rhetorician of the age, Phrynichus. The differ-

1 On Pollux and the *Onomasticon*, see Bethe (1917), the entry in *DNP* 6.51–3, Tosi (1988, 88–113); Strobel (2005, 144–6); Dickey (2007, 96), with further bibliography; Bussès (2011, 3–16). See also the recent Costanza (2019); Conti Bizzarro (2021).

2 On this sophist, see *DNP* 5.57–8.

3 On his life, see *DNP* 5.463–4.

4 See Gleason (1995, 101–2).

5 On Pollux and the chair of rhetoric in Athens, see Avotins (1975, 320–2).

ing views of Phrynichus and Pollux on the Greek language are well known and well studied,⁶ but the assumption that there must have been an intense rivalry between the two has nevertheless been considerably, and probably correctly, tempered,⁷ since Naechster's reconstruction appears to be entirely conjectural, based on Phrynichus' unattested involvement in the matter and the fact that the two disagree in their respective Atticist doctrines. Besides, the sources we have do not provide any clear evidence in favour of this assumption. Pollux died at the age of 58, and his son was legitimate but – as Philostratus again informs us – ἀπαιδευτος ('uneducated').

The *Suda* preserves the titles of some of Pollux's works (the list ends with a καὶ ἕτερα, 'and others').⁸ Apart from the *Onomasticon*, they are all lost: Διαλέξεις ἤτοι λαλιάι ('Conversations or Common talks'), Μελέται ('Exercises'), Εἰς Κόμοδον Καίσαρα ἐπιθαλάμιον ('Epithalamium to the Caesar Commodus'), Ῥωμαϊκὸς λόγος ('Roman Oration'), Κατὰ Σωκράτους ('Against Socrates'), Κατὰ Σινωπέων ('Against the Citizens of Sinope'), Πανελλήνιον ('Panhellenic Oration'), Ἀρκαδικόν ('Arcadian Oration'), and Σαλπιγκτὴς ἢ ἀγὼν μουσικὸς ('Salpinx-player or Musical Contest').⁹

A final source on Pollux are the *scholia* to Lucian, his contemporary: the introductory material to the *Rhetorum praeceptor* (174.12–175.3 Rabe) explicitly suggests that Lucian's aim in his work is to mock none other than Pollux himself, the 'collector of words' who would pile up words without any criterion, using him as an example in his polemic against the vacuous sophists of his age. Although the

6 On Phrynichus and the different ideas he and Pollux had about Atticism, see Matthaïos (2015, 293–6), with further bibliography.

7 See Slater (1977, 261); Bussès (2011, 10); Matthaïos (2013, 71–8). On the other hand *DNP* 6.52; Tosi (2007, 5); Zecchini (2007, 17); Tosi (2013, 141); Conti Bizzarro (2014, 39) accept Naechster's thesis.

8 Su. π 1951: Πολυδεύκης, Ναυκρατίτης. τινὲς δὲ Ἀρδουέννας σοφιστὴν γράφουσι, παίζοντες πόλις δὲ Φοινίκης ἢ Ἀρδουέννα. ἐπαίδευσε γὰρ ἐν Ἀθήναις ἐπὶ Κομόδου τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ ἐτελεύτησεν ἐτη βιοῦς ἡ' καὶ ν', συντάξας βιβλία ταῦτα· Ὀνομαστικὸν ἐν βιβλίοις ι'· ἔστι δὲ συναγωγὴ τῶν διαφόρων κατὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ λεγομένων· Διαλέξεις ἤτοι λαλιάς, Μελέτας, Εἰς Κόμοδον Καίσαρα Ἐπιθαλάμιον, Ῥωμαϊκὸν λόγον, Σαλπιγκτὴν ἢ ἀγὼνα μουσικόν, Κατὰ Σωκράτους, Κατὰ Σινωπέων, Πανελλήνιον, Ἀρκαδικόν· καὶ ἕτερα.

9 The topic of the last of these works, namely *salpinx* and contests, is reminiscent of what Pollux inserts in a digression in Book 4 (4.86–90). To distract his student from the boredom of grammar, Pollux begins one of his digressions by telling the story of an actor called Hermon and on the reason why the *salpinx* 'is played at every summoning of the contestants'. Even if only on a conjectural basis, one can wonder whether such an affinity is due to chance, or whether this was a topic Pollux was particularly fond of, or whether he was perhaps reusing or rewriting his own material in this section of the *Onomasticon*.

*scholia*¹⁰ seem reasonably certain about the identification of the teacher in Pollux, the matter seems far from settled. Here are follow the introductory *scholia* to *Rh.Pr.*¹¹

τινές φασιν ὡς εἰς Πολυδεύκη τὸν ὀνοματολόγον ἀποτεινόμενον Λουκιανὸν τοῦτον γράψαι τὸν λόγον, τέχνην μὲν οὐδ' ἦντινα λόγων παραδιδόντα, σωρὸν δὲ λέξεων ἀδιάκριτον ὑφιστάντα. καὶ ἴσως οὐκ ἀπὸ σκοποῦ ταῦτα τοῖς φήσασιν εἴρηται, ἐπεὶ καὶ σύγχρονοι ἄμφω, Λουκιανὸς καὶ Πολυδεύκης· ἐπὶ γὰρ Μάρκου τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος. **VMSΩ**

Some suggest that Lucian wrote this work in allusion to Pollux the ‘collector of words’ (ὀνοματολόγος), who provided no rhetorical art whatsoever, but offered a confused heap of words. And perhaps this has been said without missing the mark, for both Lucian and Pollux were contemporaries, for [they lived] in the time of the emperor Marcus [Aurelius].

τινές φασιν ὡς εἰς Πολυδεύκη τὸν ὀνοματολόγον ἀποτεινόμενον Λουκιανὸν τοῦτον γράψαι τὸν λόγον, τέχνην μὲν οὐδ' ἦντινα λόγων παραδιδόντα, σωρὸν δὲ λέξεων ἀδιάκριτον ὑφιστάντα, ὥσπερ ἐν λέξεσιν ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν διανοίᾳ τῆς ῥητορικῆς τὸ κράτος ἐχούσης· καὶ ἴσως ἀληθές, ἐπεὶ καὶ σύγχρονοι ἦσαν ἐπὶ Μάρκου τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος· ὁ γὰρ Πολυδεύκης ἐπαγωγότερος ἦν τοῦ αὐχημοῦ καὶ κατακόρου διαναπαύων τὸν λόγον· ἐχρῆτο γὰρ διηγήμασιν, οὐ μέντοι καὶ τέχνην παρεδίδου λόγου, ὅπως ἡ διήγησις διαχέῃ τὴν αἴσθησιν καὶ τὸ τῶν λέξεων καινότερον, ὡς ἐν ταύταις μόναις τοῦ παντὸς ἔργου κειμένου τοῖς λόγοις. **Vat.86**

Some suggest that Lucian wrote this work in allusion to Pollux the ὀνοματολόγος (‘collector of words’), who provided no rhetorical art whatsoever, but offered an indistinguishable heap of words, as if rhetoric had strength in words but not in intellectual capacity. And this may be true, because they were contemporaries during the reign of the emperor Marcus [Aurelius]. For Pollux was more interested in freeing the speech from dryness and excess: he used narrative techniques (yet he did not provided any art of speech), so that the perception might be distracted by the narrative and by the unusual words, as if the task of [making] speeches lay only in these [i.e. the words]

Whatever the modern doubts about the identification, these *scholia* offer an interesting view of Pollux and his rhetorical teaching. Upon reading the latter scholium, one cannot help but think of Poll. 1.30, where the lexicographer, in introducing his first digression in the *Onomasticon*, says:

¹⁰ Pollux is mentioned a few times in the scholia to Lucian, i.e. ΓCVOΩΔ *JTr* 25 (78.10–6 Rabe), VCΩΔ *JTr* 46 (78.13–6 Rabe). In the latter case he is also called again ὀνοματολόγος. On these scholia, see Dickey (2007, 69), with further bibliography; Russo (2012).

¹¹ This identification is supported by Bethe (1917, 775); Hall (1981, 273–8); Tosi in *DNP* 6.52. Much more cautious are Jones (1986, 107–8); Zweimüller (2008, 170–1); Gil (1979–80) proposes Apuleius.

ἵνα δὲ καὶ ἀναπαύσω σε πρὸς μικρόν, ἐπεὶ τὸ διδασκαλικὸν εἶδος αὐχμηρόν ἐστι καὶ προσκορές, οὐδὲν ἂν κωλύοι προσθεῖναι καὶ μύθου γλυκύτητα εἰς ψυχαγωγίαν.

To give you a little respite, since the task of teaching is dry and nauseating, nothing would prevent one from adding the sweetness of a story to pass the time.

The scholiast is clearly talking about the *Onomasticon* rather than Pollux's rhetorical work, which he probably did not know. So, this passage could be regarded as a criticism of the *Onomasticon* as a tool for teaching rhetoric: it offered a student the knowledge of many words, but not the τέχνη, which is roughly what was said above. Concerning Pollux's style, Philostr. VS 2.12 (96.12–3 Kayser) also asserts that he did not use τέχνη, but relied on his natural talent, which suggests that among Pollux's critics, the accusation of lack of or disinterest in the τέχνη must have been frequent:

τοὺς δὲ σοφιστικούς τῶν λόγων τόλμη μᾶλλον ἢ τέχνη ξυνέβαλλε θαρρήσας τῇ φύσει, καὶ γὰρ δὴ ἄριστα ἐκπεφύκει.

He arranged the sophistic speeches with recklessness rather than art, trusting in [his] nature, for he was naturally very capable.

Since Pollux's rhetorical works are lost, an assessment of his style is difficult, so we can dispense with this controversy. Philostratus describes Pollux as both learned (παιδευμένος) and ignorant (ἀπαιίδευτος, the same adjective reserved for his son), since he had become very expert in the Atticist style (ἐγγεγύμναστο τὴν γλῶτταν τὴν Ἀττικίζουσης λέξεως), but he was no better than the others in using it (οὐδὲν βέλτιον ἐτέρου ἡττίκισεν). The author of the VS then says that Pollux does not share his teacher's qualities and defects, suggesting that he was a mediocre writer (ἥκιστα μὲν γὰρ πίπτει, ἥκιστα δὲ αἵρεται 'he falls the least, but elevates himself the least'), although some 'stream of pleasure' (ἡδονῶν λιβάδες) could be found in his speeches. The last remark has the nuance of an unspoken statement that implies quite a lot about the supposedly unfavourable, yet not clearly expressed, opinion that Philostratus held about Pollux:

ταῦτα μὲν δὴ ὅποια τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τούτου σκοπεῖν ἔξεστι τοῖς ἀδεκάστως ἀκροωμένοις.

Of what quality this man's [speeches] are, may be evaluated by an impartial audience.

Although Philostratus does not seem to be very impartial in his opinion, he has the merit of providing two brief passages from Pollux's works: the first from a speech (αὐτοῦ διαλεγομένου; maybe from the Διαλέξεις?) on the metamorphosis of Proteus, another perhaps from a μελέτη (μελετῶντος δὲ αὐτοῦ) in which he imper-

sonates an inhabitant of an island who is forced to sell his son to pay taxes. In addition to these passages from Philostratus, the prefatory letters¹² and some rather long digressions found in the *Onomasticon* must also be added to the list of Pollux's 'fragments', scattered shreds that might give us an idea of his writing style, e.g. 1.30–1 on Heracles Μήλων ('of the Apple'), 1.45–9 on purple, 4.87–90 on the salpinx, and 5.42–8 on famous dogs.

Philostratus does not seem to mention it, but Pollux's most remarkable work was indeed the lexicon called *Onomasticon*.¹³ It consists of ten books, as confirmed by the *Suda*, all dedicated to Commodus, whose Greek teacher Pollux was appointed. They were not all written at the same time. Since Commodus is called Καῖσαρ ('Caesar') in the prefatory letters, the first two books can be dated after the year 176 CE and before 180, when Marcus Aurelius died; from Book 3 onwards, Commodus is also greeted as κύριος,¹⁴ and this may indicate that he had become emperor, so that Books 3–10 could be dated after 180 CE.¹⁵

1.2 The *Onomasticon*

Pollux's *Onomasticon* is the only surviving onomastic lexicon of antiquity: it is arranged according to a horizontal structure, i.e. by topics and semantic fields.¹⁶ In its own way, it can also be considered an encyclopaedia of Greek culture.¹⁷ Each book covers a specific subject (although there are some detours from the main topic in almost all of them) and begins with a short dedicatory letter to Commodus, followed by an index of the contents, a feature which was probably absent in the original work and was therefore disregarded by Bethe, who nevertheless included

12 On the prefatory letters in each book of the *Onomasticon*, see Radici Colace (2013); Tribulato (2018), with further bibliography.

13 Three miscellaneous volumes have recently been published: Bearzot, Landucci, Zecchini (2007); Mauduit (2013); Cirone, Radici (2018); they contain several contributions on various topics concerning the *Onomasticon*.

14 The greeting formulas in the letters are problematic from a strictly philological point of view. They are not transmitted by the entire textual tradition, so the suspicion that they may have been interpolated or inserted by analogy must carefully be considered.

15 On the dating of Pollux's lexicon, see Matthaïos (2013, 71–3); Maudit, Moretti (2010, 523); Tribulato (2018, 249), with further bibliography.

16 On the structure of the *Onomasticon*, see *DNP* 6.51–3; Matthaïos (2015, 294–5); Tosi (2015, 623); on its evaluative terminology, see Bussès (2011, 33–82); Matthaïos (2013, 78–129); Valente (2013); Radici (2016); Conti Bizzarro (2018).

17 On this topic and definition, see König (2016, 298–304).

these indexes in an appendix.¹⁸ Such indexes were most probably already present in the archetype Ω of the epitome, and I think that they may have been composed precisely during the epitomisation process. So, since the indexes were present in the epitome and the epitome is the earliest stage we can reconstruct, such indexes must be included in any future edition and should retain the place that the textual tradition assigns to them.

Since the subject has come up, I think it might be useful to provide a brief overview of the rich and varied content of each of the books in the *Onomasticon*.

Book 1. Pollux explains in the prefatory letter that he will begin with the gods and then will deal with other topics in no particular order, except that they are all related to what a sovereign should know about his rule. Chapters 5–39 focus on deities, their names, festivals, rites, priests, songs, pious and impious men, and related verbs. Pollux then moves on to various spheres of human life: royalty (40–2), swiftness and slowness (43), dying (44–9), merchants and artisans (50), good and bad seasons (51–53), time and activities to be done at the right time (54–72), household (73–81), ships and related activities and places (82–125), warfare (126–49),¹⁹ friends and foes (150–4), things that can happen in war (155–80), horses and related activities (181–220), and agriculture (221–55).

Book 2. The second book focuses on the human body and related topics: terms for humanity (5), generation (6), the names of human ages (8–18), verbs indicating delivery (19) and related to ages (19–21), and body parts treated individually and in great detail (22–225):²⁰ nouns, verbs, medical nomenclature, expressions, attestations in ancient writers, and an exhaustive list of possible illnesses are provided by the lexicographer. The end is devoted to the two parts of which human beings are made: soul (226–31) and body (232–5); at the end there is a short description of the five senses (236).

Book 3. The third book begins by seamlessly picking up the thread of the previous one. It deals with family, kinship, marriage, and relationships with family and friends (5–64); relationships within the city (65–7); love (68–72); and masters and slaves (73–83). This is followed by a section on bank and money (84–8).²¹ The next part is devoted to the experiences a person might have in their life (89–139), such

¹⁸ At the end of the second volume of the edition, Bethe (1931, 249–56).

¹⁹ On warfare in the *Onomasticon*, see Bettalli (2007).

²⁰ On how Pollux discusses the anatomy of the human spine, see Olson (2022).

²¹ On coinage in Pollux, see Parise (2007).

as travel, joy, good luck, illness or death, whereas the last part deals with athletic contests and disciplines.²²

Book 4. Focusing on the liberal arts, it begins with a general introduction on knowledge (7–10), and the list of the virtues that education can provide and their opposites (10–5). The book then goes on to deal with matters relating to each liberal art: grammar (18–9), rhetoric (20–38), philosophy (39–40), sophists (41–51), poetry (52–6), music and instruments (57–90), heralds (91–4), dancing and choreography (95–112), acting (113–20), theatre (121–32) and masks (133–154), astronomy (155–9), geometry (160–1), arithmetic (162–5), measurement (166–70), weighing (170–6), medicine, instruments and diseases (177–207), and midwifery (208).

Book 5. Pollux here tackles the topic of hunting, an activity associated with the upper classes, and wild animals. As in Book 4, the opening defines the topic with the keyword θήρα ('hunting') and provides synonyms, expressions, and related verbs (9–14); the focus then shifts to hunting grounds (14–5), the names of the offspring and hides of wild beasts (16), helpers, equipment, and the activities of a hunter (17–41). An extensive discussion of dogs occupies Chapters 42–65, then it is the turn of the detailed descriptions of wild beasts (66–85), animal calls and human voices (86–90), places used for excretion and terms for faeces (91–2), and animal breeding (92–4). The next topic is quite different: the names of women's ornaments (95–102). Chapters 103–70 are, by Pollux's own design, a continuous list of numerous terms with their synonyms and opposites (e.g. courage, fear, praise, reproach, daemons' names, abundance, damage, experience...), ending with a section on Plato's use of ταῦτόν and θάτερον (169–70).

Book 6. It deals with the symposium and food in general. The usual list of synonyms and terms related to symposium (7–13) is followed by sections on wine (14–26), how to define a symposiast (26–29), the different types of food and containers (32–87), the cook's equipment (88–100), meals (101–2), tools that can be used in a symposium (103–5), and games and amusements (106–111). After the chapter on the verb for dismissing a symposium (112), Pollux again introduces some topics not directly related to the main one (113–290). Chapters 155–74 are especially interesting: here Pollux collects nouns and verbs according to their prefix (e.g. ὁμο-, συν-, ἡμι-, παν-, etc.).

Book 7. This book deals with crafts, trades (8–17), and artisans (6–7; 17–201). Pollux discusses many professions, e.g. in relation to food (21–7), textiles and clothing (28–

22 On Book 3, and especially on athletics in Pollux, see König (2016, 304–15).

96), metallurgy (97–108), woodcutting (109–10), building (111–25), and many others (126–200). Chapters 201–6 are devoted to the less respectable (αἰσχίους) professions, such as prostitution and dice-gaming. Like Book 5, Book 7 ends by explicitly referring to Plato: *Plt.* 279d–283a is used to quote a list of names of professions (206–10). It ends with terms related to books and libraries (210–1).²³

Book 8. It can be roughly divided into two parts. The first discusses justice (6–7), judges (8–20), and verbs and nouns related to legal matters (21–81). The second, starting with ἀρχή ('power, office') and its derivatives (82–4), deals with Athenian offices and institutions (85–157).²⁴

Book 9. It provides an introduction to the city, the various parts and buildings that make it up, and what can be found in the surrounding area (6–50). Then there is a considerable digression (although Pollux calls βραχεία 'brief') on coins, goods, and precious metals (51–93); this is followed by an equally extensive section of a very different nature, on children's games (94–129). Then, again and for the last time, 'in order' – he says – 'to complete the book', Pollux adds lists of words (130–62) connected by synonymy or similarity (κατὰ συνωνυμίαν ἢ ὁμοιότητα).

Book 10. The last book is devoted to the names of objects, instruments, and tools of everyday life, craftsmanship, seamanship, agriculture, husbandry, and so on, often incorporating terms used in the previous books.²⁵

1.3 Approaching the textual transmission of Pollux

Today, if one needs to consult the *Onomasticon*, they must use the edition published by Erich Bethe in the years 1900–1937, in three volumes: 1 (Books 1–5), 2 (Books 6–10), and 3 (indexes). The German scholar's edition was indeed an important achievement: he succeeded in identifying the main families of manuscripts and basing his edition on reliable witnesses. However, considering that Bethe's second volume was published in 1931, a comprehensive revision of the textual tradition of the *Onomasticon* is necessary after almost a century. This preliminary study focuses mainly on the following issues:

²³ On this topic, see Radici (2018).

²⁴ Several articles deal with various topics of this Book, see e.g. Bearzot (2007); Maffi (2007); Tuci (2007a); Tuci (2007b); Amaraschi (2015).

²⁵ On the *Realien* in Pollux, see Cirone (2018).

- (1) Study of the manuscripts. In Bethe's time, codicology and palaeography were still in their infancy, and he did not have the benefit of the databases and online reproductions available to us today. Chapter 2 will be devoted to the examination of every extant manuscript containing the *Onomasticon* from a palaeographic and codicological point of view. Based on this examination, a list of manuscripts is provided. It contains the main information on each manuscript, with recent bibliography; suggestions for correcting or updating the dating provided in Bethe and later studies (which is often incorrect); an examination of the context in which they were written; and, finally, an attempt to identify the manuscripts neglected by Bethe. Each witness will be given its unique *siglum*, if it does not already have one. The *sigla* identifying each family have also been modified to make them more legible in the apparatus: instead of the Roman numbers I–IV, I adopt the italic letters *a–d*. For the time being, I have only omitted most of the manuscripts which only contain excerpts from Pollux.
- (2) Textual tradition. After identifying the manuscripts of the *Onomasticon*, I proceeded to collate them all in order to gain the most comprehensive understanding of their distribution among manuscript families and sub-groups. This collation was carried out on the initial sections of each Book, with particular attention to Books 1, 2, 5, and 10. Notwithstanding the obvious similarities, each of these books offers a different arrangement of the text, as we will see. This may concern, for instance, the number of families, or whether there is only one redaction, or perhaps two. The aim is to explore the evolution of the manuscript tradition, with particular emphasis on areas overlooked by Bethe, such as the Palaeologan Age and the Renaissance, in order to determine the position of each manuscript within this textual tradition. This study is preliminary in nature: it covers only a limited part of Pollux's work, and involves numerous witnesses. It is undeniable that a more comprehensive analysis focusing on specific families or individual codices may reveal additional details, including significant ones, that are not addressed in this volume. In the future, I also plan to undertake the collation of the Aldine *editio princeps*, which, with the exception of Book 1, is not included here.
- (3) The marginal material (see Chapter 3). During the collation, especially of Book 1, it was also possible to consider the textual tradition of the material preceding or following Pollux's text, such as the 'scholium' (actually, most likely a subscription of some sort) and two short Byzantine poems composed to accompany the work.
- (4) Future perspectives. Based on the collations and the examination of Pollux's text, the final chapters provide some suggestions and a sample for a perspective future edition of the text, by expanding the *recensio*, taking into account both the redaction of the text (see Section 4.2), and providing more comprehen-

sive apparatuses of sources, *loci similes*, and a critical apparatus. This will be discussed in Chapters 9 and 11.

Finally, the reader should note that some special symbols are used throughout the volume. In some cases, it was necessary to provide the edition of some passages of the *Onomasticon*. I have chosen not to use Bethe's complex – and admittedly difficult to replicate – system, which aims to indicate the text omitted by one or more manuscripts. Instead, I have chosen to indicate when a manuscript or a family adds material that is not present in the other *testimonia*. These non-standard symbols have therefore been adopted:

θεός ^A / θεός ^a	The individual word is found only in the manuscript or family indicated by the superscript abbreviation.
[θεός καὶ θεοί] ^A	The words within brackets are found only in the manuscript indicated by the superscript abbreviation.
‘θεός’	A word or passage in the text for which a significant variant reading has been preserved.

The first item of this list essentially aims to prevent a single word from being enclosed in parentheses, as is the case with the second item. This was done in an attempt to enhance the readability of the text.