

[HOME](#) / [About the Journal](#)

About the Journal

Focus and Scope

GRBS (ISSN 2159-3159) is a scholarly journal devoted to the culture and history of Greece from Antiquity to the Renaissance.

Significant research articles are invited on all aspects of the Hellenic world from prehistoric antiquity through the Greek, Roman, and Byzantine periods, including studies of modern classical scholarship. Articles concerned primarily with Latin or the western Mediterranean are excluded. *GRBS* does not publish book reviews or archaeological reports. Only in unusual cases can submissions longer than ca. 10,000 words (including notes) be considered. No submission or publication fees are charged to authors.

Section Policies

Articles

Open Submissions Indexed

Peer Reviewed

Peer Review Process

GRBS is a peer reviewed journal. Texts containing no indication of authorship will be refereed anonymously.

Publication Frequency

GRBS is a quarterly publication (March, June, September, December).

Open Access Policy

This journal provides immediate open access to its content on the principle that making research freely available to the public supports a greater global exchange of knowledge.

Archiving

This journal utilizes the LOCKSS system to create a distributed archiving system among participating libraries and permits those libraries to create permanent archives of the journal for purposes of preservation and restoration. [More...](#)

Open Journal Systems

INFORMATION

For Readers

For Authors

For Librarians

Platform &
workflow by
OJS / PKP

HOME / ARCHIVES / Vol. 62 No. 3 (2022)

Vol. 62 No. 3 (2022)

PUBLISHED: 2022-12-01

ARTICLES

Homeric δέχαται (Il. 12.147) Reconsidered

Ruobing Xian

255-262

 PDF

Euripides' *Phoenissae* and Summoned Entrances in Greek Tragedy

James T. Clark

263-279

 PDF

Notes on Magical Texts and Gems

Christopher A. Faraone

280-308

 PDF

A Contribution to the Study of *P.Oxy. 1803* (Atticist Lexicon)

Federico Favi

309-327

 PDF

The Artistic Object as μάρτυς and the Formula μάρτυρές εἰσι πόνων in Late Antique Epigrams for Public Monuments

Arianna Gullo

328-340



Λέξεις ῥωμαῖαι κατὰ στοιχεῖον in *Barocci* 50 and *Burney* 124: On Greek Lexicographical Sources and the *Suda*

Stephanie Roussou

341-364



The Historical Present in the Grottaferrata and Escorial Versions of *Digenis Akritis*: A Narratological Insight

Zuzana Dzurillová, Markéta Kulhánková

365-384



Open Journal Systems

INFORMATION

For Readers

For Authors

For Librarians

Platform &
workflow by
OJS / PKP

A Contribution to the Study of *P.Oxy.* 1803 (Atticist Lexicon)

Federico Favi

A SHEET OF A PAPYRUS CODEX from the sixth century CE, written in a sloping ogival majuscule, contains twelve entries of an Atticist lexicon, some only partially preserved from damage, all of which begin with sigma. The *editio princeps* is by Hunt.¹ Physical and palaeographic features are discussed by him and, more recently, by Esposito,² who also comments on the *mise en page* and the use of paragraphematic signs.³

As Hunt notes (163), the purpose of the lexicon is “rather scholastic than scientific.” Unlike general lexica (like Diogenianus, Cyrillus, Hesychius, etc.), the specific aim of *P.Oxy.* 1803 is to teach its readers how to use Attic correctly.⁴ To this end, most of its entries are provided with references to fifth- and fourth-century BCE writers who exemplify the approved Attic

¹ A. S. Hunt, “1803. Glossary,” *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* XV (1922) 163–166 (TM 65081 = LDAB 6322 = MP³ 2124.300).

² E. Esposito, “Fragments of Greek Lexicography in the Papyri,” *Trends in Classics* 1 (2009) 251–297, at 294–295, and “Aristophanes 8. P.Oxy. XV 1803, fol. 1r, 9–16,” *Commentaria et lexica Graeca in papyris reperta*² I.1.4 (Berlin 2012) 68–69, at 68 n.1.

³ Previous bibliography is collected by E. Esposito, *Trends in Classics* 1 (2009) 294. The only contributions which have appeared after 2009 are his in *Commentaria et lexica Graeca in papyris reperta*² I.1.4 (2012) 68–69 and 75–76 (“Aristophanes 10. P.Oxy. XV 1803, fol. 1v, 1–4”; first edition in 2006).

⁴ For a distinction in the typologies of lexica depending on their scope see further R. Tosi, “Typology of Lexicographical Works,” in F. Montanari et al. (eds.), *Brill’s Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship* (Leiden 2015) 622–636, at 627–628.

Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies 62 (2022) 309–327

Article copyright held by the author(s) and made available under the
Creative Commons Attribution License

CC-BY <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

usage. Some of these authors, like Aristophanes, Eupolis, Thucydides, and Demosthenes, are uncontroversial models of good Attic, and they are regularly included in the Atticist canon by all lexicographers. However, this is not the case with two other quoted authors, Menander and Xenophon, whose inclusion in the Atticist canon was often regarded as controversial in antiquity.

No clear evidence allows us to say when the lexicon contained in *P.Oxy.* 1803 was originally compiled, nor do we know anything about its earlier textual history. Some of the linguistic phenomena discussed in the entries of this lexicon are paralleled in late texts, which suggests that the lexicon too is late in date, but one must handle this evidence with the necessary caution.⁵

The aim of this paper is twofold. In the first section I discuss the high number of quotations from Menander in *P.Oxy.* 1803 and outline the profile of the compiler against the background of Menander's reception in Atticist lexicography. In the second section I examine two entries that have received little or no attention after the *editio princeps* and suggest new interpretations based on linguistic and lexicographical analysis.

1. *Menander's reception in Greek lexicography and the position of P.Oxy. 1803*

Menander is quoted in five of the twelve extant entries in *P.Oxy.* 1803. This is a surprisingly high figure. By way of comparison, Aristophanes and Xenophon are quoted twice, Demosthenes, Eupolis, and Thucydides once. Although the surviving evidence is limited, it seems reasonable to infer that Menander received sustained attention by the compiler.⁶ This fact is worthy of detailed examination.⁷

⁵ See in §2 below the discussion of *P.Oxy.* 1803 fol. 1, *recto*, 35.

⁶ We shall see that in several of the entries that quote Menander other more canonical fifth-century BCE authors could readily have served the compiler.

⁷ Cf. A. Körte, "Literarische Texte mit Ausschluss der christlichen," *ArchPF* 7 (1924) 225–258, at 247: "daß Menander in einem attizistischen Lexikon für

Menander's inclusion in the Atticist canon was a notorious matter of contention among Atticists. Even though he was widely read in antiquity, or perhaps precisely because of his popularity, his language attracted the criticism of purists. Particularly famous are Phrynichus' violent attacks, especially in the *Eclogê*.⁸ Several modern scholars have assumed that Phrynichus' views are representative of the general attitude towards Menander in Atticist lexicography; these same scholars have concluded that because of this Atticist condemnation his comedies were no longer copied after late antiquity.⁹

This view, though still widely held, has not met with unanimous approval.¹⁰ Some have convincingly argued that Menander's comedies were no longer transmitted after late antiquity for more complex and multi-layered reasons;¹¹ the controversial status of his Attic language might be just one of

den Schulgebrauch des VI. Jahr. noch so stark herangezogen wird, ist bemerkenswert."

⁸ The most famous case is *Ecl.* 394 Fischer. See too *Ecl.* 170, 304, 341, 367, 390, 391, 392, 393, 397, 402, 408, 410, and 411.

⁹ See A. Blanchard, "Destins de Ménandre," *Klèma* 22 (1997) 213–225, at 222–224; W. G. Arnott, *Menander*² I (London 1997) xxiii–xxiv; H. D. Blume, *Menander* (Darmstadt 1998) 22; M. Lamagna, "Il lessico di Menandro nella disputa sull'atticismo," in J. A. López Férez (ed.), *La lengua científica griega* III (Madrid 2004) 195–208, at 198; F. Montana, "Menandro (e Aristofane) ad Alessandria: qualche riflessione," in E. Dettori et al. (eds.), *La cultura letteraria ellenistica. Persistenza, innovazione, trasmissione* (Rome 2007) 257–269, at 261–262; and E. W. Handley, "The Rediscovery of Menander," in D. Obbink et al. (eds.), *Culture in Pieces. Essays on Ancient Texts in Honour of Peter Parsons* (Oxford 2011) 138–159, at 146.

¹⁰ For an early refutation see G. Zuntz, "Die Aristophanes-scholien der Papyri. Teil III. Schlussfolgerungen," *Byzantion* 14 (1939) 545–614 and 704, at 547 n.1.

¹¹ See especially P. E. Easterling, "Menander: Loss and Survival. ζῳεις εἰς αἰῶνα (*AP* 9.187)," in A. Griffiths (ed.), *Stage Directions. Essays in Ancient Drama in Honour of Eric W. Handley* (London 1995) 153–160.

them, certainly not the only one.¹² Furthermore, Menander's reception in Atticist lexicography is more nuanced than is generally thought. The attitudes represented range from the open rejection of Menander from the approved canon (Phrynichus) to his full inclusion (Aelius Dionysius, the Antiatticist, Orus). The middle ground was occupied by lexicographers who accepted Menander, not always wholeheartedly, and judged his linguistic choices on a case-by-case basis (Pollux).¹³

How does *P.Oxy.* 1803 fit into this picture? The relatively high number of quotations from Menander suggests that his comedies were still valued in late-antique education, not just for their

¹² A brief, though nuanced and far-reaching, discussion is provided by G. Cavallo, "Conservazione e perdita dei testi greci: fattori materiali, sociali, culturali," in A. Giardina (ed.), *Società romana e impero tardoantico IV Tradizione dei classici. Trasformazioni della cultura* (Rome 1986) 83–172 and 246–271, at 119 (repr. G. Cavallo, *Dalla parte del libro. Storie di trasmissione dei classici* [Urbino 2002], at 102): "il suo [i.e. Menander's] naufragio è dovuto al fatto che o non vi furono mai interventi che ne confortassero la conservazione o se qualche intervento vi fu, questo non riuscì a proiettarsi fino alle soglie della rinascenza macedone." L. Del Corso, "Aristofane in Egitto. Osservazioni sulla documentazione papirologica (e non)," in G. Mastromarco et al. (eds.), *La commedia attica antica. Forme e contenuti* (Bari 2017) 231–279, provides a valuable and far-reaching discussion of the circulation of Aristophanes in Egypt, which is relevant to Menander's case. Cf. also F. Montana, "Aristophanes," *Commentaria et lexica Graeca in papyris reperta*² I.1.4 (2012) 3–12, and E. Esposito, *Tra filologia e grammatica. Ricerche di papirologia e lessicografia greca* (Bologna 2017) 6–7. A thorough investigation of Menander's manuscript tradition and the processes which determined its fate is provided by R. Carlesimo, *Il testo di Menandro: verso un riesame critico delle fonti* (diss. Univ. Basilicata 2019).

¹³ The most up-to-date and thorough discussion of Menander's presence in Greek lexicography is O. Tribulato, "Not even Menander would use this word!": Perceptions of Menander's Language in Greek Lexicography," in A. H. Sommerstein (ed.), *Menander in Contexts* (New York 2014) 199–214 (from which I adopt the tripartite view of Menander's reception in lexicography). Tribulato emphasizes that against the general background of Atticist lexicography Phrynichus appears extreme and comparatively marginal. S. Nervegna, *Menander in Antiquity. The Contexts of Reception* (Cambridge 2013) 257–258, offers a multi-focal approach to the loss of Menander that de-emphasizes the role of Atticist lexicography and Phrynichus.

moral content, but also as models of Attic diction. Even if the original compilation of the lexicon transmitted in *P.Oxy.* 1803 were older than the date of the papyrus,¹⁴ its canon of approved authors must still have been acceptable when the papyrus was copied. Menander's name, moreover, is left out in two of the entries and only the title of the play is provided.¹⁵ Given that authorship is a crucial piece of information in Atticist lexicography, *P.Oxy.* 1803 presupposes familiarity with the comedian's output. The name's absence may also be the result of earlier epitomizing, although one would expect the omission of the play's title sooner than the author's name. The plays quoted without authorship are Ἐγχειρίδιον and Φιλιάδελφοί. Mosaics at Mytilene that include scenes from the former attest to its fame as late as the fourth century CE.¹⁶ This is consistent with what we know about the circulation of Menander's text, whether in full or excerpted, in late antiquity and early Byzantine times, as well as in the context of education at various stages of the curriculum.¹⁷ I am not claiming that the Menandrian quotations in *P.Oxy.* 1803 presuppose direct access to the actual text of the corresponding plays. It is likely that the compiler of the lexicon drew some of his material from previous lexicographical (arguably Atticist) compilations, and that his readers relied on the lexicon and not on the quoted sources. But the fact that diction

¹⁴ See in §2 below the discussion of *P.Oxy.* 1803 fol. 1, *recto*, l. 35.

¹⁵ See the quotations from Ἐγχειρίδιον ("The Dagger"), fol. i, *verso*, 8–10, and Φιλιάδελφοί ("Siblings in Love"), fol. i, *recto*, 20–26. Aristophanes' name is left out as well in a quotation from *Knights* (fol. i, *recto*, 27–34). The failure to note the author's name may betray a lack of accuracy on the copyist's part.

¹⁶ See E. G. Csapo, *Actors and Icons of the Ancient Theatre* (Chichester 2010) 140–167; and Nervegna, *Menander in Antiquity* 136–169 and 264.

¹⁷ Fourteen papyri of Menander's plays date between the fifth and seventh century (see the list in Nervegna, *Menander in Antiquity* 271–279). K. Alpers, *Das attizistische Lexikon des Oros* (Berlin 1981) 104–105, and Arnott, *Menander I* xxiii–xxiv, collect passages that attest to the circulation of Menander's plays in late antiquity and early Byzantine times. See Nervegna 201–251 on the circulation and use of Menander in schools.

from the comedies of Menander is considered in the context of linguistic education shows that in the sixth century, when the papyrus was copied, his plays were famous and he was well regarded at least by some who aspired to good Attic.¹⁸

I will now take a closer look at the ways in which Menander is used in our lexicon. In all cases he illustrates uncontroversial and uncontested classical Attic diction:¹⁹

1. Fol. i, verso, 1–7:

στιφρόν· ὃ οἱ πολλοὶ στριφνό(ν), / ὡς Ἄριστοφάνης Γήραι· “καὶ /
μῆ(ν) ὑπόστιφρόν γε τῆ(ν) / φωνὴν ἔχεις” (Ar. fr.134 *PCG*). καὶ
Μένα/νδρος ἐν Συναριστώσαις· “ὡς / ἀεὶ στιφρὰς²⁰ ἐσομένας /
καὶ νέας, ταλάντατος” (Men. fr.343 *PCG*).²¹

The entry indicates that στιφρός is good Attic, as proven by Ari-

¹⁸ Whether people could read Menander’s plays in full is not relevant to his inclusion in the canon. Eupolis and Cratinus, who are regularly included, did not survive late antiquity, but they were revered in late-antique and Byzantine lexicography.

¹⁹ Throughout this paper I use a slash / to indicate line end in the papyri; and two vertical lines || to indicate verse end in poetic quotations.

²⁰ The transmitted reading is στεφρᾶς, which from a linguistic point of view is an interesting slip. The copyist is already influenced by the later vocalism with [e] in the middle syllable, attested in adverbial στερπνά and στρεφνά (“tightly,” a formulaic use for people embracing one another) in the *Digenis Akritis* (στερπνά in the Grottaferrata version, ms. *Crypt. Z.α.XLIV* (444), at 2.280; στρεφνά in the Escorial version, MS. *Escorial.gr.* 496 (Ψ.IV.22), at 481, 915, and 1594); and by the variant reading στεφρός in place of στιφρός at Xen. *Cyn.* 9.13 (see F. Ruehl, *Xenophontis scripta minora* [Leipzig 1912] 174). This change in the vocalism of unstressed [i] is most likely due to [r] in the neighboring syllables (see D. Holton et al., *Cambridge Grammar of Medieval and Early Modern Greek I* [Cambridge 2019] 68–71, who trace this development back to the late koine and describe /i/ > /e/ as one of the most consistent and widespread phonetic changes of medieval Greek).

²¹ “στιφρόν (“firm/solid”), which common people spell στριφρόν: so Aristophanes in *Old Age*: ‘Indeed, you have a really strong voice’. So also Menander in *The Women who have Breakfast Together*: ‘(Women) who will always have a firm body and who will always be young, poor man’.” The adjective στιφρός also occurs in Ar. fr.148.3.

stophanes and Menander, whereas στριφνός is the common post-classical form, the one used by οἱ πολλοί.²² The same doctrine is in Moer. σ 10 Hansen στιφρόν Ἀττικοί· στριφνόν Ἑλληνες.²³ Another instance of στιφρός in Menander is in a passage of *Epitrepontes*.²⁴ The deprecated form στριφνός is attested in early treatises of the *Corpus Hippocraticum* (*VM* 15.11, 15, 16 Littré; *De carnibus* 3.29),²⁵ but it is not attested in Attic before Theophrastus.²⁶

²² On the category οἱ πολλοί in Pollux see S. Matthaios, “Pollux’ Onomastikon im Kontext der attizistischen Lexikographie. Gruppen ‘anonymer Sprecher’ und ihre Stellung in der Sprachgeschichte und Stilistik,” in C. Maudit (ed.), *L’Onomasticon de Pollux. Aspects culturels, rhétoriques et lexicographiques* (Lyon 2013) 67–140, at 95–105, who points out that in the *Onomastikon* this category of speakers must be taken primarily in a quantitative sense.

²³ “Those who speak Attic Greek (say) στιφρόν, (while) those who speak common Greek (say) στριφνόν.”

²⁴ Men. *Epit.* 384–385 [οὐκ]οὖν οὕτωσὶ μὲν φαίνεται ἢ ἀλεκτρῶν τις καὶ μάλα στιφρός (“This one here looks like a cock, a really meager/solid one”); on the meaning of στιφρός in this passage see W. Furley, *Menander. Epitrepontes* [London 2009] 162). The reading στιφ[]ς in *P.Oxy.* LX 4022 fr.2 should be preferred over στριφνός in the Cairo codex (and in fact, the last editors print στιφρός: see Furley 52; A. Blanchard, *Ménandre II* [Paris 2013] 91; and R. Kassel and S. Schröder, *PCG VI.1 Menander* (Berlin 2022) 151; Furley 162 also comments on the metathesis of /r/). Notice that A. W. Gomme and F. H. Sandbach, *Menander. A Commentary* (Oxford 1973) 321, though they did not yet know the reading in *P.Oxy.* 4022 (published in 1994), already suspected that the reading of the Cairo codex may be a trivialisation. On στιφρός and στριφνός in later comedy see also W. G. Arnott, “Some Orthographical Variants in the Papyri of Later Greek Comedy,” in A. Willi (ed.), *The Language of Greek Comedy* (Oxford 2002) 191–218, at 214.

²⁵ Both treatises are usually dated to the late fifth century BCE: M. J. Schiefsky, *Hippocrates. On Ancient Medicine* (Leiden 2005) 63–64; E. M. Craik, *The ‘Hippocratic’ Corpus. Content and Context* (London 2015) 48. But στιφρός and στριφνός occasionally alternate in the manuscripts, as in *De salubri diaeta* 2 and 3; cf. J. Jouanna, *Hippocratis de natura hominis* (Berlin 1975) 208 and 210.

²⁶ Theophrastus not only uses στριφνός (*Hist.pl.* 3.11.4, unless it is a corruption, see n.24 above) but also στιφρός (*Sens.* 44 and 50) and its comparative στιφρότερος (*Hist.pl.* 3.12.5 and 5.1.11).

2. Fol. i, *verso*, 8–10:

Σάραπιν διὰ τοῦ ᾱ, ὡς ἐν Ἐγχιριδίῳ· “ὡς σεμνὸς ὁ Σάρα/πις θεός” (Men. fr.4 PCG).²⁷

Menander’s fragment is one of the earliest attested mentions of Sarapis in Greek. The aim of this entry was to defend Σάραπις against forms of the theonym with a different vocalism in the first syllable (see §2).

3. Fol. i, *recto*, 20–26:

συναγαγεῖν τὸ συναθροῖσαι. καὶ συλλέξει δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ / τοῦτο, ὡς ἐν Φιλαδέλφοις· / “(A) χωρίδιον πρῶν συνα/γαγῶν πάνθ’ ὅσα ἢ ἔχεις, / τὸ δ’ ἐγὼ δώσω. (B) σχολῆ / μοι σύλλεγε” (Men. fr.394 PCG).²⁸

This entry is concerned with the synonyms συνάγω, συναθροίζω, and συλλέγω (“to bring together/collect/assemble/gather together”), which are offered as equivalents. Menander’s quotation, where συνάγω and συλλέγω appear in the same context, provides direct evidence for this semantic proximity. The compiler might have also quoted Ar. *Lys.* 584–585 κᾶτ’ ἀπὸ τούτων πάντων τὸ κάταγμα λαβόντας ἢ δεῦρο ξυνάγειν καὶ ξυναθροίζειν εἰς ἓν²⁹ (note here too the *coppia contigua*). Poll. 4.29 offers a comparable use of these verbs to indicate gathering or collecting money or goods (as in Menander): δι’ ὧν ἔστι πόρους ἐξευρεῖν, ἀργυρολογῆσαι, φορολογῆσαι, χρήματα συναθροίσασθαι, συλλέξει, συστήσαι συστήσασθαι, συναγαγεῖν.³⁰ There are many more

²⁷ “(One must say) Σάραπις with *alpha*, as in *The Dagger*: ‘How venerable (is) the god Sarapis.’”

²⁸ “συναγαγεῖν (means) συναθροῖσαι (‘to collect’). συλλέξει too (means) this same thing, as in *Siblings in Love*: ‘(A) Buy yourself a small piece of land, gathering all the things you have. I will give it. (B) Gather (them) for me slowly.’”

²⁹ “And so, taking the wool from all these cities, (it is necessary to) gather them here and assemble them in one mass.”

³⁰ “With these, one can πόρους ἐξευρεῖν (‘to procure financial provisions’), ἀργυρολογῆσαι (‘to collect money’), φορολογῆσαι (‘collect the tribute’), χρήματα συναθροίσασθαι, συλλέξει, συστήσαι συστήσασθαι, συναγαγεῖν (all

parallels in erudite literature where συνάγω, συναθροίζω, and συλλέγω appear in the same context or gloss one another.

4. Fol. ii, *recto*, 36–37:

Ἰωργῶι (*lege* e.g. Μένανδρος ἐν Γε]ωργῶι)· “ὡς σχολῆ πορεύ/εθ’ οὔτοσί” (Men. fr. 6 *PCG*).³¹

Regarding this entry, Hunt writes (165): “this is no doubt part of a note on σχολῆ with the sense of βραδέως or οὐδαμῶς,” for which he compares *Suda* σ 1803 σχολῆ γ’ ἄν· ἀντὶ τοῦ οὐδ’ ὅλως, βραδέως, οὐδαμῶς. Σοφοκλῆς (*OT* 433–434)· “ἐπεὶ ἢ σχολῆ σ’ ἄν οἴκους τοὺς ἐμοὺς ἐστειλάμην.”³² In the context of Atticist lexicography, one may also compare Poll. 3.93 σχολῆ περιπατεῖ.³³ There is abundant fifth-century Attic evidence for this use of σχολῆ.³⁴

5. Fol. ii, *verso*, 60–69:

σιωπήσομαι ἀντὶ τοῦ σιωπήσω καὶ σιωπήσει καὶ / σιωπήσεται ὡς ἐν τῷ περὶ τοῦ στεφάνου· “κάγὼ στέρ/ξω καὶ σιωπήσομαι” (Dem. *De cor.* 112). καὶ / Μένανδρος ἐν Φανίῳ· / “σιωπήσ(ε)ι πάλιν ἢ ἐν τῷ μέ/ρει” (fr.392). κατὰ τ[α]ῦτα δὲ καὶ ἀ/κούσομαι καὶ ἀκούσει καὶ / ἀκούσεται καὶ πηδήσομαι.³⁵

The form σιωπήσει, like ἀκούσει in the last sentence of the entry, must be the 2nd person singular future indicative.³⁶ This entry

synonyms for ‘to collect money’.” Pollux is referring to diplomatic missions, which are discussed at the end of his preceding paragraph.

³¹ “(In) *The Farmer*: ‘How slowly this man walks’.”

³² “σχολῆ γ’ ἄν: meaning ‘not wholly’, ‘slowly’, ‘not at all’. So Sophocles: ‘I would not have summoned you to my house at all’.”

³³ “(He/she) walks about slowly.”

³⁴ See LSJ⁹ s.v. σχολή B.

³⁵ “(One should use) σιωπήσομαι instead of σιωπήσω, and also σιωπήσει and σιωπήσεται, as in *On the Crown*: ‘And I will be content and remain silent’. So also Menander in *Phanion*: ‘You will remain silent again in your turn’. Like these (verbs), (one should use) ἀκούσομαι and ἀκούσει and ἀκούσεται and πηδήσομαι.”

³⁶ The evidence for this spelling is discussed by W. G. Arnott, “Some Orthographical Problems in the Papyri of Later Greek Comedy II: -ει or -η(ι)

points out that, in the future tense, verbs like *σιωπάω*, *ἀκούω*, and *πηδάω* are always middle, never active.³⁷ This topic is often the object of interest by Atticist lexicography (particularly in Moeris' lexicon).³⁸ The occurrences of *ἀκούσομαι*, *σιωπήσομαι*, etc. in fifth-century BCE Attic are legion.³⁹

The evidence reviewed proves that Menander is a central figure in the compiler's canon of approved authors.⁴⁰ This is an important point: Menander was not just one more author, he was the object of special consideration. To illustrate proper Attic usage, the compiler readily turned to Menander.⁴¹ And whatever the date of the original compilation of this lexicon, it seems fair to conclude that when *P.Oxy.* 1803 was copied and circulated

as the Ending of the Second Person Singular Middle and Passive in the Present and Other Tenses of Verbs in -ω," *ZPE* 135 (2001) 36–40.

³⁷ For a list of Greek verbs with a middle future see R. Kühner and F. Blass, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache* I.2 (Hannover 1892) 244–245.

³⁸ Cf. Moer. α 81, α 83, β 33, β 36, θ 7, ο 8, π 2, and π 3; and George Lacapenus *Epistula* 8 p.67.14–17, discussing p.63.26–27 (ed. S. Lindstam, *Georgii Lacapeni et Andronici Zariadae Epistulae XXXII* [Göteborg 1924]).

³⁹ For these forms in Ptolemaic papyri see E. Maysers, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit* I.2 (Berlin 1970) 130.

⁴⁰ There would have been some (for no. 3) or many other occurrences (for nos. 4 and 5) in fifth-century Attic authors to choose from. For the other two cases (in particular, for no. 1), the existence of quotable fifth- and fourth-century alternatives seems plausible, even if we know of none.

⁴¹ Cf. Pollux' criteria for quoting evidence in support of common and less-than-common usages as formulated in his prefatory letter to Book 3 of the *Onomastikon*: "In selecting the words which were used by the authors whose language is approved, I deemed it unnecessary to provide an indication of those who employed such a word, if those who used it are many; but when those who used a certain form are few, I selected only one, the one who uses the most beautiful language, just as in court cases, where a single trustworthy witness is enough in place of many witnesses" (οἷς μὴν τῶν ὀνομάτων οἱ δόκιμοι τὴν γλῶτταν κέχρηται, ταῦτα παρ'αὐτῶν λαβὼν, εἰ μὲν πλείους ἦσαν οἱ χρῆσάμενοι, τὸ μηδὲν ἐπισημήνασθαι περὶ τῶν εἰπόντων ῥήθην ἀπαρκεῖν, ἐλαττόνων δ' ὄντων ἕνα τὸν καλλιφωνότατον αὐτῶν ἐπελεξάμην, ὥσπερ ἐν ταῖς δίκαις εἷς ἀξιόχρεως ἀντὶ πολλῶν μαρτύρων ἀρκεῖ).

as a pedagogical tool, Menander was still familiar and valued for language instruction. If it is true that Menander eventually fell out of favor for its language, this process was hardly far along, much less completed, by the sixth century CE.

The approach in *P.Oxy.* 1803 may be compared with other forms of Atticist lexicography. That the compiler often quotes Menander as a source aligns him with Atticists like Aelius Dionysius, the Antiatticist, and Orus, who are invariably in favor of including Menander in the canon and who often quote from his plays.⁴² Furthermore, he pursues a comparatively mild Atticism. Besides his tolerating γί(γ)νομαι and γι(γ)νώσκω,⁴³ the appearance

⁴² For Aelius Dionysius see Tribulato, in *Menander in Contexts* 212 nn.25–27. According to S. Valente, *The Antiatticist. Introduction and Critical Edition* (Berlin 2015), ten entries in the Antiatticist explicitly go back to Menander, and in many more cases the lexicon comments on forms and constructions used by Menander. See further Tribulato 205–211, who envisages the possibility that the Antiatticist programmatically aims to rehabilitate Menander as a suitable model of good Attic. On Orus see Alpers, *Das attizistische Lexikon des Oros* 100: “In seiner attizistischen Schrift löst er sich von dem allmächtigen Dogma des Analogismus und vertritt einen anomalistischen Standpunkt. Sein Kanon mustergültiger Autoren, die ihm die Maßstäbe des Ἑλληνισμός verbürgen, ist durchaus unabhängig von dem des Phrynichos, und zwar teils weiter (Oros läßt z.B. Menander, Lysias und Xenophon gelten), teils aber auch enger: Aischylos und Sophokles fehlen!”

⁴³ See fol. i, verso, 11–15: συγγίγνεσθαι λέγεται κατ’ ἐπένθεσιν τοῦ τ (lege τοῦ γ) καὶ γιγνώσκειν. μάλι[ον]στα οἱ παλαιοί. ἀξιούσι δὲ καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ (“With the addition of *gamma*, one says συγγίγνεσθαι and γιγνώσκειν. The ancients especially (say this). But (scholars) also approve of the form without it (i.e. *gamma*”). As evidence of a stricter position, one may compare Moer. γ 3: γίγνεται Ἀττικοί· γίνετα Ἑλληνας (“Those who speak Attic Greek (say) γίγνεται, (while) those who speak common Greek (say) γίνετα”). Imperial Atticizing writers show the full range of different practices, in that some use only γιγν- (Aristides), some alternate γιγν- and γιν- (Lucian), some use only γιν- (Aelian); see R. J. Deferrari, *Lucian’s Atticism. The Morphology of the Verb* (diss. Princeton 1916) 36–39. The spelling γιγν- rarely appears even in those papyri of the Imperial age which otherwise display a more pretentious language, and in most cases γιν- was clearly regarded as an acceptable spelling even in openly Atticizing texts: see R. Luiselli, *A Study of High Level Greek in the Non-*

of Xenophon twice (and in cases for which he cannot have been the only available evidence)⁴⁴ marks a clear difference from the canon of approved authors adopted by strict Atticists. One need only think of Phrynichus (in the *Eclogé*, but not equally so in the *Praeparatio sophistica*) and Moeris.⁴⁵ There is, however, some continuity between *P.Oxy.* 1803 and Pollux. Although he too in-

Literary Papyri from Roman and Byzantine Egypt (diss. UC London 1999) 157, 160–162. One may also compare the absence of γιν- in the Petra papyri, which otherwise adopt classicizing spellings: M. Vierros, “The Greek of the Petra Papyri,” in A. Arjava et al. (eds.), *The Petra Papyri V* (Amman 2018) 8–34, at 13. While γιν- is the normal spelling in papyri of Roman times, γιγν- enjoys a revival in papyri dating to the Byzantine period: F. T. Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods I* (Milan 1976) 176.

⁴⁴ For σῆτος indicating an army’s provisions, *P.Oxy.* 1803 fol. 2, *recto*, 39–44 quotes Xen. *An.* 2.1.6, but there are innumerable other examples in a variety of authors for this generic use of σῆτος in military and non-military contexts. See, e.g., Thuc. 2.6.4: καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι στρατεύσαντες ἐς Πλάταιαν σῆτόν τε ἐσήγαγον καὶ φρουροὺς ἐγκατέλιπον (note that Thucydides is quoted in *P.Oxy.* 1803 at fol. 2, *verso*, 53–55).

⁴⁵ Phrynichus quotes Xenophon only twice in the *Eclogé*, and both times he criticizes his language choices (*Ecl.* 62 and 93). Moeris often quotes Xenophon and frequently points out that he is an isolated source for rare forms: α 149: Xenophon is the only Attic author who uses ἀκμήν with the meaning ἔτι “still,” as the Ἕλληνες do; γ 25: Xenophon (alone) uses γνωστήρ “surety,” cf. Poll. 9.151; δ 45: Xenophon uses dative δένδροις from τὸ δένδρον “tree,” a neuter noun of the thematic declension, rather than δένδρεσι from τὸ δένδρον, a neuter *s*-stem (cf. Aelius Dionysius δ 6 Erbse); ε 39: only Plato and Xenophon use the rare form εὐμορφία “beauty of form”; ε 43: Xenophon alone uses ἐθέλεχθρος “bearing one a grudge”; ε 67: the adjective ἐπιτήδειος “convenient/necessary/friendly” should not be used only for the relatives, as Xenophon does, but also for the friends, as in Plato; μ 31: Xenophon used μεριμνάω “to care for” with the meaning φροντίζω “to consider/reflect”; ν 6: Xenophon alone used ὑπομαχέω “to withstand sleep.” For Xenophon’s reception in ancient and Byzantine lexicography see L. Gautier, *La Langue de Xenophon* (Paris 1911) 17–18; A. Sgobbi, “Lingua e stile di Senofonte nel giudizio degli antichi,” in G. Daverio Rocchi et al. (eds.), *Il Peloponneso di Senofonte* (Milan 2004) 219–255; I. Pérez Martín, “The Reception of Xenophon in Byzantium: The Macedonian Period,” *GRBS* 53 (2013) 812–855, at 849–851. The most complete general treatment remains that of K. Münscher, *Xenophon in der griechisch-römischen Literatur* (*Philologus* Suppl. 13.2 [1920]).

cludes Menander in his larger canon and quotes him a few times (but far less often than the poets of Old Comedy),⁴⁶ Pollux does not always regard Menander a model of good Attic. More than once he openly reproaches him when he makes use of post-classical forms.⁴⁷ That *P.Oxy.* 1803 quotes Menander only as evidence for uncontested Attic usage, while it condemns fourth-century, and more generally post-classical, usage (as happens with *στυφρός/στριφνός*) shows that the compiler was disinclined to approve post-classical forms and did not espouse any ‘anti-puristic’ agenda.

Finally, I draw attention to the fact that there is no mention of tragedy in *P.Oxy.* 1803. This may be just a matter of chance, but it may also reflect the compiler’s canon. The exclusion of tragedy from the canon is common in Atticist lexicography, the more eminent examples being the scarce attention given to, and general criticism of, tragic language in Phrynichus’ *Eclogê*⁴⁸ and the exclusion of Aeschylus and Sophocles from Moeris’ and Orus’ canon. But the fragmentary nature of the papyrus precludes a definitive conclusion.

2. *A reconsideration of two neglected entries*

A small number of entries in *P.Oxy.* 1803 have received attention after Hunt’s *editio princeps*. Here I discuss two understudied

⁴⁶ For general data on quotations of Old and New Comedy in Atticist lexicography see M. Sonnino, “I frammenti della commedia greca citati da Prisciano e la fonte del lessico sintattico del libro XVIII dell’*Ars*,” in L. Martorelli (ed.), *Greco antico nell’Occidente carolingio. Frammenti di testi attici nell’Ars di Prisciano* (Zurich 2014) 163–204, at 191–192.

⁴⁷ Poll. 1.79, 2.82, 3.29, 6.26, 6.38, 6.161, 9.139, 10.98. Although Menander is not openly criticized in several other cases, the fact that forms he uses are contrasted with those of fifth-century BCE comic poets or treated as examples of new Attic betrays a more cautious attitude towards his language and the language of Middle and New Comedy as a whole.

⁴⁸ See especially *Ecl.* 157, 200, 318, and 401. The *Praeparatio sophistica* is a different case: tragic materials abound, perhaps because of this lexicon’s more pronounced focus on matters of style.

cases for which I suggest a new interpretation. The entries are cited in the order they appear in the papyrus.

The first, cited above, is fol. i, *verso*, 8–10 (Men. fr.4 PCG):

Σάραπιν διὰ τοῦ ᾱ, ὡς ἐν Ἐγχιριδίῳ· “ὡς σεμνὸς ὁ Σάρα/πις θεός”

Hunt argued that this is an orthoepic prescription indicating that [a] in the middle syllable is long.⁴⁹ However, not only could Hunt provide only Latin evidence for the sanctioned prosody with a short middle syllable, but the available evidence is limited to a single occurrence, Prudentius *C. Symm.* 2.531: *nil potuit Serapis deus et latrator Anubis* (hex.).⁵⁰ There are further reasons beside the lack of parallels to doubt Hunt’s interpretation. For a start, though it may seem familiar to us, a formulation like διὰ τοῦ ᾱ is an odd way to indicate [a:]. Ancient lexicographers normally spell out the orthoepic prescriptions with verbs like ἐκτείνω/μηκύνω (“to lengthen”) or βραχύνω/συστέλλω (“to shorten”) or by indicating that a vowel is μακρόν or βραχύ.⁵¹ Menander’s fragment, moreover, would hardly provide evidence in support of the allegedly prescribed Σάραπις, given that the middle syllable occurs in an anceps position.

A more suitable interpretation makes this entry proscriptive, not prescriptive: it rejects alternative, mostly (though not always) later, forms of the theonym, like Σέραπις/Σείραπις, Σόραπις/Σώραπις, and Ὀσάραπις/Ὀσέραπις/Ὀσόραπις.⁵² Given that Σέραπις is by far the most widely attested of these alternatives (*Serapis* is almost the standard form in Latin), it seems likely that the entry

⁴⁹ Hunt 165. This explanation is accepted without comment by Arnott, *Menander* I 373, and the notion, based on Hunt’s explanation, that *P. Oxy.* 1803 is concerned with prosody is repeated in later bibliography on this papyrus.

⁵⁰ “The god Sarapis and barking Anubis could do nothing.”

⁵¹ A thorough exemplification of this terminology is found in C. Vessella, *Sophisticated Speakers. Atticistic Pronunciation in the Atticist Lexica* (Berlin 2018) 269–277.

⁵² On the etymology of Sarapis and its variant forms see the discussion and bibliography in G. Renberg, *Where Dreams May Come. Incubation Sanctuaries in the Graeco-Roman World* (Leiden 2017) 404–405 n.29.

was specifically aimed against it.⁵³ If one accepts this interpretation, διὰ τοῦ $\bar{\alpha}$ would then mean “with the letter α ,” a very usual formulation which is also paralleled at fol. i, *recto*, 35 συνεθίζεσθαι διὰ τοῦ $\bar{\iota}$ (i.e. συνεθίζεσθαι).⁵⁴ For the σύμμα above a letter one may compare fol. i, *verso*, 11–12 κατ’ ἐπένθεσιν τοῦ $\bar{\tau}$ (*lege* $\bar{\gamma}$).⁵⁵

The second entry appears at fol. 1, *recto*, 35:

συνεθίζεσθαι διὰ τοῦ $\bar{\iota}$ καὶ⁵⁶

This entry is interrupted where the papyrus breaks off and its aim remains elusive. Various interpretations have been advanced.

Hunt (165) argued that διὰ τοῦ $\bar{\iota}$ “presumably refers to the spelling εἰθίζειν.” This proposal is likely, even though διὰ τοῦ $\bar{\iota}$ is not how one would have expected the spelling εἰ- to be indicated: διὰ τοῦ εἰ would have been the usual formulation. However, evidence that supports Hunt is provided by cases like *Ecl.* 22 (πιούμαι· σὺν τῷ υ λέγων οὐκ ὀρθῶς ἐρεῖς· πίομαι γάρ ἐστι τὸ ἀρχαῖον καὶ πίομενος ἄνευ τοῦ υ. Δίων δὲ ὁ φιλόσοφος σὺν τῷ υ λέγων ἀμαρτάνει)⁵⁷ and 28 (ποῖ ἄπει· οὕτω συντάσσεται διὰ τοῦ ι· ποῦ δὲ

⁵³ A hint in this direction was already made by K. F. W. Schmidt, review of *P. Oxy.* XV, *GGA* 186 (1924) 1–17, at 15 n.5. For some examples where the later spelling Σέραπ- is corrected into the older one Σάραπ- on Hellenistic inscriptions see P. Bruneau, *Le Sanctuaire et le culte des divinités égyptiennes à Érétrie* (Leiden 1975) 78–79.

⁵⁴ “συνεθίζεσθαι with *iota* (i.e. συνεθίζεσθαι).”

⁵⁵ “With the addition of *gamma*.” On this use of the horizontal bar above the letters in grammatical and lexicographical papyri see E. Dickey, *Ancient Greek Scholarship* (Oxford 2007) 122–123. For the analysis of a concrete example one may also compare Esposito, *Tra filologia e grammatica* 135–136.

⁵⁶ “συνεθίζεσθαι with the addition of *iota* and”

⁵⁷ “πιούμαι: if you say (it) with *upsilon*, you will not say (it) correctly. For πίομαι is the ancient (form), as is πίομενος (too), without *upsilon*. The philosopher Dion, who uses (the form) with *upsilon*, is wrong.”

ἄπει, διὰ τοῦ υ, ἀμάρτημα. εἰ δὲ ἐν τῷ υ, ποῦ διατρίβεις).⁵⁸

Hunt then compared this spelling εἰθίζ- with the *metri causa* use of εἰθίζου in the Pythagorean *Carmina aurea* (35 εἰθίζου δὲ δίαιταν ἔχειν καθάρειον, ἄθρυπτον; but see also εἰθίζεο in *Carmina aurea* 9 ταῦτα μὲν οὕτως ἴσθι. κρατεῖν δ' εἰθίζεο τῶνδε), and he pointed out that συνειθίζω is unattested (this is not so, see below). Finally, comparing fol. i, *verso*, 14–15 ἀξιοῦσι δὲ καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ (i.e. the second γ in γί(γ)νομαι and γι(γ)νώσκω),⁵⁹ Hunt cautiously suggested that this entry could have gone on to say something like καὶ / [χωρὶς αὐτοῦ] (“and (without it)”). In sum, he believed that the compiler considered συνειθίζεσθαι and συνειθίζεσθαι equally legitimate spellings. This proposal is implausible. The alternative forms εἰθίζω/-εἰθίζω and εἰθίζομαι/-εἰθίζομαι are late variants attested in imperial and especially late-antique and Byzantine texts (see below). One would not expect them to be treated on an equal footing with ἐθίζω/-εθίζω and ἐθίζομαι/-εθίζομαι and to be recommended to an aspiring Atticist.

An alternative interpretation by Schmidt⁶⁰ suggests the supplement συνειθίζεσθαι διὰ τοῦ ι καὶ <παρατατικῷ καὶ ἀορίστῳ καὶ συντελεστικῷ χρόνῳ λέγεται>.⁶¹ The sense would then be that while ἐθίζω/-εθίζω and ἐθίζομαι/-εθίζομαι are the correct spellings in the present tense, augmented and reduplicated forms with initial εἰ-/εἰ- are correct in the imperfect, aorist, and perfect. There are two difficulties with this interpretation. First, the presence of καὶ before the list of tenses with initial spelling εἰ-/εἰ- is otiose and odd. Second, it is puzzling that the compiler would make a list of all the other tenses in which εἰ-/εἰ- is the correct

⁵⁸ “Whither are you going away?”: it is construed like this, (using the form with *iota* (i.e. ποῖ). But ‘Where are you going away’, with *upsilon* (i.e. ποῦ), is a mistake. If (one uses the form) with *upsilon* (i.e. ποῦ), (the correct usage would be) ‘Where are you spending time?’”

⁵⁹ “But (scholars) also approve of the form without it (i.e. *gamma*).”

⁶⁰ Schmidt, *GGÄ* 186 (1924) 15.

⁶¹ “One says συνειθίζεσθαι with *iota* in the imperfect, the aorist, and the perfect.”

spelling, instead of stating that ἐθίζω/-εθίζω and ἐθίζομαι/-εθίζομαι are the correct spellings in the present. Finally, consideration of the spelling of augmented and reduplicated verbs beginning with *epsilon* is hardly connected specifically with ἐθίζω/-εθίζω and ἐθίζομαι/-εθίζομαι. It is therefore unclear why it should be applied to συνεθίζομαι.

Once again, I believe that a more convincing interpretation emerges if the aim of the entry is proscriptive: the compiler deprecates συνεθίζεσθαι as a variant form of συνεθίζεσθαι. Besides the evidence for εἰθίζου/εἰθίζεο in the late Pythagorean *Carmina aurea*,⁶² one should note that συνεθίζεσθαι is attested only once in Galen (unless it is a copying mistake)⁶³ and then more frequently in Byzantine texts written in medieval and early-modern Greek.⁶⁴ Hence, the available evidence supports the notion that συνεθίζομαι was an emerging variant of συνεθίζομαι in late Greek, and it is plausible that it may have been condemned as non-Attic by the compiler of our lexicon.⁶⁵

⁶² The dating of the Pythagorean *Carmina aurea* is a thorny issue that exceeds the scope of this article. For a fourth-century BCE date see J. C. Thom, *The Pythagorean Golden Verses* (Leiden 1995) 35–58. For a critique of this new dating see, e.g., the reviews by P. W. van der Horst, *Mnemosyne* 49 (1996) 351–352, and J. Bussanich, *BMCR* 1995.12.01. Following LSJ⁹ s.v. ἐθίζω (where one reads that εἰθίζω is poetic for ἐθίζω), Thom notes (45): “the lengthened form [...] is used *metri causa*.” This view is unpersuasive given that ἐθίζω is a prosaic verb and that these two would be the sole instances of εἰθίζ-*metri causa*. The evidence collected above for the spellings εἰθίζω/-εἰθίζω and εἰθίζομαι/-εἰθίζομαι suggest that the *Carmina aurea* date to late Imperial times, in line with the traditional view of earlier scholarship.

⁶³ *De humero iis modis prolapsio*, XVIIIa 407.1 Kühn (συνεθιζομένους).

⁶⁴ See especially the thirteenth-century *Assisiae regni Hierosolymitani* (ed. Sathas 40 and 41 συνεθίζει, 245 συνεθίζου). For what it is worth, συνεθίζω is also used in early modern texts such as Nicodemus the Hagiorite and Procopius of Nazianzus (eighteenth century).

⁶⁵ The form ἐνεθίζεσθαι also occurs in *Suda* κ 1254: κεκονιμένος· σπουδάζων πάνυ, καὶ σχεδὸν κόνεως πεπληρωμένος. [...] “πρὸς γὰρ τὴν τοιαύτην δίαίταν ἔλεγον οἱ ἄγιοι τρεῖς παῖδες κεκονίσθαι τὴν τῶν ὀσπρίων.” ἀντὶ τοῦ

If one accepts this interpretation, it is reasonable to infer that after *συνειθίζεσθαι* the entry went on to condemn the spelling *συνηθίζεσθαι*. Indeed, *ἠθίζομαι/-ηθίζομαι* too are later, minor alternative forms of *ἐθίζομαι/-εθίζομαι*. Not only does a form *συνηθίζω* occur in the sixth-century Platonic and Aristotelian commentator Olympiodorus,⁶⁶ but it is also attested in Byzantine texts written in medieval Greek,⁶⁷ the simple verb *ἠθίζω* too is equally documented in early Byzantine texts.⁶⁸ To conclude, one may envisage that the text, after the papyrus breaks off at line 35, was originally along the lines of *καὶ / [διὰ τοῦ ἠ]* (“and [with *heta*]”), followed by a caveat indicating that *συνειθίζεσθαι* and *συνηθίζεσθαι* are incorrect and should be avoided by the aspiring Atticist (e.g. *ἀδόκιμα* “unapproved (forms),” *φυλάττου* “abstain from (these forms),” *χρῆ φεύγειν* “you should avoid (these forms),” *vel sim.*).⁶⁹

Such attention to developments in late Greek suits the chronological placement of *P.Oxy.* 1803 at the threshold of the Byzantine age. If my view of this entry is correct, this interest in

ἐνειθίζεσθαι (“*κεκοιμημένος*: one who is in great haste and almost covered in dust. [...] ‘Regarding such a way of life, the three holy youths said that they were dusted with a (diet) of pulses’, meaning that they were accustomed (to it)”).

⁶⁶ *In Platonis Phaed.* 8.2 (*συνηθίζεσθαι*). Cf. *ἀποσυνηθίζειν* in the sixth-century medical writer Aëtius, *Iatricorum liber iv* 28.7–8.

⁶⁷ *Historia Alexandri Magni* (recensio φ) 23.9 Veloudis (*ἐσυνῆθίζαν*); because the augment is placed before the preverb, the corresponding present stem is *συνηθίζω*.

⁶⁸ The first occurrence is in Stephanus of Athens, the sixth/seventh-cent. commentator on Hippocrates: *In Hippocratis aphorismos commentaria III–IV*, comm. 4.60.89 (*ἠθίζουσιν*).

⁶⁹ If I am right, the entry would feature first the proscribed, not the prescribed, usage. One may compare, e.g., Phryn. *Ecl.* 21: *ἀνειλεῖν βιβλίον διὰ τοῦ ἑτέρου λ κάκιστον, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῶν δύο, ἀνείλλειν* (“*ἀνειλεῖν βιβλίον* (“to unroll a book”) with just one *lambda* is very bad, but rather (there should be) two *lambdas*, i.e. *ἀνείλλειν*”); *Ecl.* 22 *πιούμαι· σὺν τῷ ν λέγων οὐκ ὀρθῶς ἐρεῖς* (“*πιούμαι*: if you say it with *upsilon*, you will not say it correctly”). Cf. further *Ecl.* 26, 36, 110, 153.

the late spellings εἰθίζομαι/-εἰθίζομαι and (possibly) ἡθίζομαι/-ἡθίζομαι suggests that the lexicon need not be many centuries earlier than the date of *P.Oxy.* 1803. Galen's συνειθίζεσθαι may well be the earliest evidence of εἰθίζομαι/-εἰθίζομαι, unless it is a Byzantine copying mistake.⁷⁰ As observed above, the spelling ἡθίζομαι/-ἡθίζομαι is not attested before the sixth century. Yet one must be cautious when inferring a date for the lexicon from this kind of evidence, for it is possible that εἰθίζομαι/-εἰθίζομαι and ἡθίζομαι/-ἡθίζομαι were already in use before they surface in extant texts. And we cannot be sure that modern critical editions faithfully report this kind of variant readings, which are easily (and often tacitly) amended and relevant only for linguistic studies. Finally, we cannot rule out the possibility that the entry on the spellings εἰθίζομαι/-εἰθίζομαι and (possibly) ἡθίζομαι/-ἡθίζομαι was only added to the lexicon at a later stage, when these spellings had made their appearance.⁷¹

October, 2022

Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici
Università degli Studi del Piemonte
Orientale “Amedeo Avogadro”
federico.favi@uniupo.it

⁷⁰ For the late date of the Pythagorean *Carmina aurea* see n.62 above.

⁷¹ I wish to thank Elena Esposito, Lucia Prauscello, Olga Tribulato, and Giuseppe Ucciardello for discussing earlier drafts of this article with me. I am grateful to the anonymous reader of *GRBS* for useful suggestions. I also wish to thank Tom Nelson and Theodore Hill, who have kindly improved the English of this piece. This article is part of a project that has received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program (Grant agreement No. 865817).