# Lexical Notes on St Gregory Nazianzen 

John T. Cummings

The present study ${ }^{1}$ has grown out of a new critical edition of the Carmen de vita sua of St Gregory (Carm. 2.1.11; PG 37.1029-1166), based on a study of fifteen Greek manuscripts and the readings of the scholiast (Cosmas of Jerusalem). ${ }^{2}$ The words to be discussed all occur in this poem; citations are drawn from my revised text, which departs from that printed in Migne in some 300 instances. The order of discussion will be that of relative importance of the words under

[^0]```
C Oxon. Clark. 12 s.x (f. 9)
L Laur. plut. 7, 10 s. xi (f. 135)
A Paris. Gr. 1277 s. xIII (f. 202)
B Paris. Gr. 2875 s. xIII (f. 307)
S Oxon. Barocci. }96\mathrm{ s. xIv (f. 134b)
T Oxon. Barocci. }96\mathrm{ s. xiv (f. 150) frag.
D Paris. Gr. Cois. 56 s. xiv/xv (f. 169)
K Bibl. Móv\etas Ka\rho\alpha\kappa\alphá\lambda\ov 74 s. xiv (f. 399)
O Lavra 170 s. xIv (f. 64)
G Laur. plut. 7, 2 s. xv (f. 1)
E Ambros. Z }78\mathrm{ sup.s. xv (f. 99)
P Pav. }80\mathrm{ (Aldini) s. xv (f. 49)
N Neapol. II, A 24 s. xv (f. 212)
W Vindob. Theol. Gr. }43\mathrm{ (olim 101) s. xvI (f. 1)
M Monac. Gr. }582\mathrm{ s. xvr (f. 188)
R Monac. Gr. 582 s. xvi (f. 188) [a marg. recension]
F Vat. Gr. }480\mathrm{ s. xvi med. (f. 95)
```

The manuscripts are divided into two families. LAWR constitute the superior family $\Psi$. The other manuscripts form the inferior family $\Omega$. Within $\Omega$ a closely related group $\delta$ is formed by PMEF. This group $\delta$ is highly mendacious. Unfortunately its readings predominate in the Benedictine text printed in Migne. A fragmentary Syriac version is preserved in Brit. Mus. Add. 18821. I am indebted to Dr Andreas Spira of the U. of Mainz for comparison of the Greek and Syriac text for the readings discussed in this article. For a fuller discussion of the manuscripts see Cummings, $S P$ and Diss. pp.1-25. The edition of the Greek text along with an English translation and notes is to be published shortly by Dumbarton Oaks.
consideration. If in the course of the discussion I have frequent occasion to refer to Lampe's Lexicon, ${ }^{3}$ it is with no intent of criticising that painstaking work of scholarship, which I have found invaluable, but only of supplementing or improving it in a small way.

## 1. коу $\omega \dot{\omega} \delta \eta s$



The word is a hapax. It does not occur in the printed editions nor consequently in the lexica. The reading at this point is certain. It is attested by L, the best manuscript of the superior family, ${ }^{4}$ and by the lemma of the scholiast. The evidence of the lemmata of the scholiast is particularly important, since the scholia were composed in the first half of the eighth century and thus antedate the extant Greek manuscripts. ${ }^{5}$ Although preserved in a single manuscript of the twelfth century, ${ }^{6}$ they were transmitted independently of the text and show no sign of contamination but rather preserve a genuinely ancient tradition. The variant reading $\kappa \eta \tau \omega \delta \epsilon \epsilon$ given in the margin of L and found in all the other manuscripts is definitely a lectio facilior ('whalelike', 'monstrous').

The word is to be interpreted as 'pertaining to or connected with the кovtós'. кovtós here is clearly being used in its second meaning of a 'pike', rather than in its primary meaning 'boat pole'. The meaning is evidenced by Luc. Tox. 55 and Arr. Tact. 43.2, and further supported
 in Lampe. We may further adduce the evidence of the loan word contus in Latin, which has the same meaning of 'pike' in Tac. Ann. 6.35 and Hist. 1.44 and 79, and is the more probable meaning in Verg. Aen.9.510. ${ }^{7}$

Cosmas in his scholion contents himself with interpreting the word simply as indicative of the warlike character ( $\boldsymbol{o}$ $\pi о \lambda \epsilon \mu \kappa \delta o v)$ ) of Ares, although his attendant citation of Il. 5.594,

[^1]may indicate that he thinks it a spear, a meaning carried by the diminutive коут́́ $\rho \circ \frac{\nu}{}$ and its compounds.

The phrase $\kappa о \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \delta \epsilon s \tau^{\prime} \rho \alpha \alpha_{s}$ may be translated in context simply as 'an armed monster'.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 2. } \sigma \tau \tau \omega \nu
\end{aligned}
$$

The reading again is certain. It is attested by all the manuscripts except the four manuscripts of group $\delta$, which have corrupted it to $\sigma i \tau \omega \nu$, meaningless in context. The word $\sigma \iota \tau \omega \dot{\nu}$ is extremely rare. The only other recorded instances are Plut. Mor. 524a and Mél. Navarre 375 (Cyrenaica), where it is defined as a 'wheat field', and Anna Comnena, where it means a 'granary'. ${ }^{8}$ The meaning 'granary' is clearly that required in our passage, both in connection with $\not \approx \sigma \omega$ and in terms of the logical progression of the entire metaphor. Consequently 'granary' must now be regarded as at least a good fourthcentury meaning of the word and not restricted to the Byzantine period.
Comparison of the form should also be made with v. $27 \chi \alpha \rho \alpha \delta \rho \epsilon \omega \dot{\nu}$, 'a place of $\chi \alpha \rho \alpha \dot{\delta} \rho \alpha \alpha$ ', and Ep. $4.6 \chi \alpha \rho \alpha \delta \rho \epsilon \dot{\omega} \nu$ and $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \alpha \nu \theta \epsilon \dot{\omega} \nu$, 'torrentridden terrain' and 'bramble-ridden terrain'. 9

## 3. $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \epsilon \pi i \sigma \kappa о \pi о \varsigma$

 $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha i \chi \chi \omega \nu \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \nu \tau^{\prime} \epsilon \epsilon \pi \iota \sigma \kappa o ́ \pi \omega \nu$ dúo тov̂т' $\hat{\eta} \nu, .$.

The word ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \tau \epsilon \pi i \sigma \kappa о \pi$ оs listed in the lexica ${ }^{10}$ on the basis of the printed texts as a hapax should be deleted. It is supported by only three manuscripts (A D E) and the Syriac; the others read $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \kappa o ́ \pi \omega \nu$, 'facing toward'. Whether $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau$ ' ( $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau i)$ is the correct form or $\tilde{\alpha}^{\alpha} \nu \tau^{\prime}(\ddot{\alpha} \nu \tau \alpha)$

[^2]is a difficult question. $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau i ́$ is attested as a preposition involving place with the genitive by Xen. An. 4.7.6, Hero Mech. Belopoeica 97.5, Leg. Gort. 1.40, Eudoxus Astr. Ars Astron. 18. The construction is, however, basically Homeric-epic. Here too opinion was already divided in antiquity, with Aristarchus maintaining the correctness of $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau\left({ }_{\alpha} \nu \theta^{\top}\right)$, and Demetrius ó yovínecos, Herodian Grammaticus and Eustathius supporting $\tilde{\alpha}^{\alpha} \nu \tau^{\prime}\left(\tilde{\alpha}^{\alpha} \nu \theta^{\prime}\right)$. The consensus of modern Homeric scholarship from the time of Spitzner (Excursus xvi) has recognized $\check{\alpha} \nu \tau^{\prime}\left({ }^{\alpha} \nu \theta^{\prime}\right)$ as the correct form. ${ }^{11}$ Since it is more likely that Gregory here, as in so many other instances, has been influenced by an Homeric-epic model, I have accordingly emended the text to ${ }_{\alpha} \nu \tau^{\prime}$, while at the same time admitting the very strong possibility that Gregory may have approved the reading of Aristarchus and himself written $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau^{\prime}$.

## 4. $\mu \iota \gamma \alpha{ }^{\prime} s$

$302{ }^{\text {' } O \rho \omega ̂ \nu ~ \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho ~ o v ̋ s ~} \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ \pi \rho \alpha к \tau \iota к o ̀ s ~ \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \pi \epsilon \iota ~ \beta i o o s, ~$



 $\kappa \alpha \grave{\imath} \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \Theta \epsilon o ̀ \nu ~ \beta \lambda \epsilon ́ \pi о \nu \tau \alpha s$ ท̀ $\sigma{ }^{\prime} \chi \omega$ vot̂,
 $\kappa \alpha i \zeta \omega ิ \nu \tau \alpha s{ }_{\epsilon}{ }^{\prime} \xi \alpha \lambda \lambda o ́ \nu \tau \epsilon \kappa \alpha i ̀ \tau \rho \alpha \chi \grave{v} \nu \beta i o \nu$, $\mu \epsilon ́ \sigma \eta \nu \tau \iota \nu ’ \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta o \nu \epsilon \subset \rho \eta \mu \iota \kappa \omega ิ \nu \kappa \alpha i \mu \iota \gamma \alpha ́ \delta \omega \nu .$.











 $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \nu \tau \rho \in ́ \chi \omega \sigma \iota$.
${ }^{11}$ In Homeri Ilias I.m (Gotha \& Erfurt 1835) pp. lxi-lxvi.
${ }^{12}$ Cited from the edition by F. Boulenger, Les Orations Funèbres (Paris 1908).

Lampe defines $\mu \iota \gamma \alpha$＇s as＇mixed＇，hence＇in the world＇；then，citing the above passage from Or． 43 ，＇opposite to monastic＇．Yet the true gist of both passages is not＇opposite to monastic＇but rather＇opposite to eremitical＇and the opposite to＇eremetical＇here is＇cenobitic＇．Thus $\epsilon \in р \mu \iota \kappa о i$ are hermits and $\mu \iota \gamma \alpha ́ \delta \epsilon s$ are cenobites．Or more precisely they are pre－Basilian cenobites，for Or． 43.62 makes clear that the pre－ cise aim of the Rule of St Basil was to reconcile the best features of both，thereby producing a new type of monasticism．

The meaning＇cenobitic＇is attested by DuCange＇s Glossarium：${ }^{13}$


 ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \theta \rho o \iota \sigma \mu \alpha$ ．X．Hürth in his study，＂De Gregorii Nazianzeni orationibus funebribus，＂writes：$:^{15}$＇opponuntur enim $\mu \iota \gamma \alpha \delta \delta \epsilon$ et $\mu o \nu \alpha \sigma \tau o i$. Sunt $\mu \iota \gamma^{\prime} \delta \epsilon \in$ ii，qui in coenobiis vitam degunt．＂

Confusion over the word seems principally due to F．Boulenger， who in his edition and French translation of Or． 43 failed to see that $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \eta \tau \eta \rho \iota \alpha$ is synonymous with $\mu о \nu \alpha \sigma \tau \eta \eta_{\rho} \iota \alpha$ ，and $\mu \iota \gamma \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \omega \nu$ with $\kappa о \iota \nu \omega \nu \iota \kappa \omega \nu$ （in the pleonastic fashion characteristic of Gregory＇s style）．Boulenger therefore posits three groups：hermits，cenobites and＂les migades．＂ He then defines the last as＂$\alpha \sigma \kappa \eta \tau \alpha i$ vivant dans le monde pour donner au monde l＇exemple de la vertu．＇${ }^{16}$

The very passage which Boulenger cites in support of his view（Or． 21．19）actually militates against it：oi $\mu \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \pi \alpha ́ ⿱ ㇒ 日 勺 \nu \tau \eta ~ \mu o \nu \alpha \delta ı к o ́ \nu ~ \tau \epsilon ~ к \alpha i$






 $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \eta \mu \iota \grave{\partial} \nu \beta i o \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \kappa о \iota \nu \omega \nu \iota \kappa \hat{\varphi} \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha \prime \tau \tau \epsilon \iota$ ．

We are not dealing here with three categories but two：oi $\mu \epsilon \in \nu .$.
 an oxymoron as＂at one and the same time living apart and living

[^3]together," i.e. apart from the world and with each other. So too in $\S 10$ of the same oration we have oi $\mu$ ov $\alpha \delta \kappa \kappa o i$ к $\alpha i \mu \tau \gamma \alpha \delta \epsilon s$ balanced by


Finally we may adduce the evidence of $\mu \iota \gamma \alpha \delta \iota \kappa$ ós defined in Lampe as 'cenobitic'. Hence $\mu \iota \gamma^{\alpha} s$ in Gregory means 'mixed', i.e. living together, 'cenobitic'; (as subs.) 'cenobite'.
5. ví $\pi \epsilon \rho \tau \epsilon \iota \chi \epsilon ́ \omega$ (-ó $\omega$ ) for $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \tau o \iota \chi \epsilon ́ \omega$ (-ó $\omega$ )

The manuscript evidence is not as strong as could be desired. The reading is supported by only B and O. (The Syriac would support $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \tau o \check{\chi o v \nu \tau o s .) ~ B o t h ~ m a n u s c r i p t s ~ b e l o n g ~ t o ~ t h e ~ i n f e r i o r ~ f a m i l y, ~ b u t ~}$ O is one of its better representatives. The reading was already known to the seventeenth-century French Dominican scholar of patristics Combesis, as is reported by the Benedictines, who used his handannotated text of Billius' edition in preparing their own: "Combes. legit $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \tau \epsilon \subset \chi \circ \hat{\nu} \nu \tau o s$, et vertit: Aqua altiore muro obcingente navim et obvolvente."
The reading would also be more consonant with Gregory's practice of coining a new word by simply adding a suffix to an already existing word (e.g. $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \zeta v \gamma \mathcal{\epsilon}^{\prime} \omega$ 401, $\dot{v \pi \epsilon \rho \kappa \tau v \pi \epsilon ́ \omega ~ 168, ~ o ́ \mu o ́ \sigma \tau \epsilon \gamma o s ~ 477, ~ \mu о \nu o ́ \theta \rho o v o s ~}$ 1586). A verb тoххє́ $(-o ́ \omega)$ is nowhere attested, although тохо́о $\mu \alpha \iota$ is found. The form $\tau \epsilon \chi^{\epsilon} \epsilon \omega$ is, however, found in Herodotus for Attic $\tau \epsilon \chi \chi^{i} \zeta \omega$. Definition: 'to build a rampart above'.

## 6. $\pi \alpha \nu \tau \epsilon \xi o v \sigma i a$

$1881 K \dot{\gamma} \gamma \dot{\omega} \tau \iota \nu^{\prime}, \epsilon \hat{i} \pi o \nu, \hat{\omega} B \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \hat{v}, \alpha i \tau \omega \hat{\omega} \chi^{\alpha} \rho \nu \nu$ $\tau \eta \grave{\nu} \sigma \grave{\eta} \nu \mu \epsilon \gamma \alpha \lambda o ́ \delta \omega \rho o \nu \tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau^{\prime} \epsilon \xi \xi=v a i \alpha \alpha \nu$.
Not listed in Lampe, this form should be deleted from the other lexica. ${ }^{17}$ All of the manuscripts except $\delta$ support the reading given
 bestow all things', or understand as an accusative of respect.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 7. } a^{\alpha} \mu \dot{\phi} \dot{\delta} \delta o \xi o s
\end{aligned}
$$

${ }^{17}$ Also from the list of honorary titles given in Hauser-Meury, Prosopographie $z^{u}$ den Schriften Gregors von Nazianz (Bonn 1960).
$\mu \epsilon ́ \sigma o \iota ~ \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ o ̋ \nu \tau \epsilon S, ~ \dot{\alpha} \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \iota \sigma \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \delta^{\prime} \epsilon i ̉ \mu \epsilon ́ \sigma o \iota$,

Not found in Lampe; the $L S^{8}$ definition of doubtful or dubious opinions' will not suffice here. As 1710-11 make clear, Gregory is here referring to a compromise party at the Council of $381 ; 18$ the word is being employed with irony and should be rendered 'adherents of both beliefs or opinions', i.e. 'fence-straddlers'.

## 8. $\pi \epsilon \mu \pi \tau \eta \eta^{\prime} \stackrel{\text { ® }}{ }$



The passage in question is not listed in Lampe and the definition there found, 'in dismissal, hence as parting gift', will not suffice here. Unsatisfactory also is the rendering 'conductor' offered in $L S^{8}$. The passage is listed in Soph. Lex., where it is defined as 'pertaining to sending away or parting'. I would render the sentence "Let this church be the site of your dismissal from this life." The formation of the word has undoubtedly been influenced by the liturgy for the dead and dying. So too in the Roman rite today runs the prayer "Proficiscere Anima Christiana" for the commendation of a departing soul.

## 



 ôv ov̈ $\tau \epsilon \kappa \eta \dot{\eta} \rho \nu \gamma \mu$ ', ouv $\theta^{\prime}$ v́ $\pi o ́ \sigma \chi \epsilon \sigma \iota s ~ \kappa \rho \alpha \tau \epsilon \hat{\imath}$.
The words are used here in their usual sense of 'proclamation' and 'solemn pledge'. Their particular interest lies in their technical sense, a sense clear from the passage, namely that these are prerequisites for a canonical occupation of a see. The same position is set forth in

 $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \eta^{\prime} \kappa о v \sigma \alpha \nu \nu \eta \delta^{\prime} \epsilon ่ \pi \iota \kappa \eta \rho v \chi \theta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \sigma \alpha \nu \quad \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu, \dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \dot{\theta} \theta v v o \iota$.

- The contemporary canons extant make no reference to either practice.
${ }^{18}$ Intent here on reconciling the Nicaeans and the adherents of the Macedonian Heresy. See Adolf-Martin Ritter, Das Konzil von Konstantinopel (Göttingen 1965) 253-70 and Cummings, Diss. 157-62.

LEXICAL NOTES ON ST GREGORY NAZIANZEN

## 10. そ'́vos


 $\epsilon \dot{v} \rho o ́ \nu \tau \alpha \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho i \nu \pi \rho о \sigma \tau \alpha \tau \hat{\omega} \nu{ }^{\prime} Е_{\kappa \kappa} \lambda \eta \sigma i \alpha \alpha s$,
 $\sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \xi \alpha \iota, \xi \epsilon \in \nu o \nu \tau \epsilon \mu \eta \delta o ́ \lambda \omega s$ $\lambda \alpha \beta \epsilon i ̂ \nu \tau \iota \nu \alpha$,


Billius ${ }^{19}$ comments on the line: "Negat enim Gregorius se animum inducere potuisse, ut externum aliquem, qui exigendis huiusmodi rationibus operam daret, adhiberet." The Benedictines observe: "Possis intelligere de saecularibus judicibus ad quorum tribunal reos de rationibus reddendis traducere noluit Gregorius, ut quidam suadebant."

We are dealing here with what is essentially a financial matter. Yet Gregory mentions as the responsible persons only himself (the bishop) and the $\tau \alpha \mu i \alpha \iota$. It may therefore be inferred that the office of oeconomus did not at this time exist at Constantinople. I would further suggest that the proposal in question was the establishment of such an office with a layman is its incumbent. That laymen did frequently hold the position can be seen from Canon IX Hispalense: ${ }^{20}$ Indecorum est enim laicum vicarium esse episcopi et saeculares in ecclesia judicare.

The word should then be defined here as: 'extern', i.e. 'laic'.
11. $\delta \hat{\eta} \theta \epsilon(813)$

The point at issue here is the form. It is the reading of $L$ and is to be preferred for metrical reasons (avoidance of two longs in the fourth foot). The form itself was at one time excised from $L S$ on the basis of Elmsley's emendation of Eur. Electra 268, but has been restored in $L S J$, where it is supported by the Euripides passage and a conjecture in Eupolis. We may now add the evidence from Gregory in its favor.
12. $\dot{\eta} \lambda \iota o ́ \phi \rho \omega \nu$

1803 Toîs $\delta^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \epsilon \pi \eta \dot{\eta} \epsilon \iota \delta \hat{\eta} \mu \circ$ о $\dot{\eta} \lambda \iota \circ \phi \rho o ́ v \omega \nu . .$.
Dindorf conjectured $\dot{\eta} \lambda \epsilon \sigma \phi \rho o ́ v \omega \nu$ and proceeded to substitute it for

[^4]$\dot{\eta} \lambda \iota o ́ \phi \rho \omega \nu$, which he brackets in his revision of Stephanus. The Mss are unanimous in reading $\dot{\eta} \lambda \iota \circ \phi \rho o ́ v \omega \nu .{ }^{21}$
13. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon \kappa \tau о ́ \rho \iota o \nu$

Diminutive of $\dot{\alpha}^{\prime} \lambda \epsilon \in \tau \omega \rho$.
14. $X \rho \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \mu \pi о \rho о$ s

'Christ-monger'. ${ }^{22}$ The word is rare. The only other instance I know of is in the Didache $\oint 12$.
15. $\lambda o ́ \gamma \omega \nu \kappa \rho \alpha ́ \tau о s$

The phrase is equivalent to $\lambda o^{\prime} \gamma \omega \nu \beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon v^{\prime}$ (Emperor of Letters). ${ }^{23}$ See entry L s.v. $\beta \alpha \sigma \tau \lambda \epsilon v_{s}$ in Lampe; cf. further L. Robert, Hellenica IV (1956) 95-96. See also Ep. 24.
16. $\pi \rho o ́ \epsilon \delta \rho o s$

Presiding official or position. Used at 30, 1510, 1546, 1586 of bishops; at 1514 of the president of the Council of 381 (Meletius); at 571 of the See of Rome ( $\left.\pi \rho \rho_{o} \epsilon \delta \rho o s \tau \hat{\omega} \nu{ }_{\nu}^{\circ} \lambda \omega \nu\right)$.
17. $\sigma v ́ \sigma \tau \eta \mu \alpha$

'Collegium nostrum', not 'ordo noster' as rendered by Billius and the Benedictines. It is a reference to episcopal collegiality.

Michigan State University
March, 1968

[^5]
[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Originally presented as a communication to the 13th International Congress of Byzantine Studies at Oxford University, September 1966. I am grateful to Professor P. De Lacy for his suggestions for revising the paper for publication.
    ${ }^{2}$ Doctoral Diss. Princeton University 1966; Univ. Microfilms (Ann Arbor) 66-13, 302. An earlier study, "A Manuscript Study of St. Gregory Nazianzen," appeared in Studia Patristica 7 (Berlin 1966) 52-59. These are cited hereafter as Cummings, Diss. and Cummings, $S P$. The manuscripts studied are:

[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ G. W. H. Lampe, Lexicon of Patristic Greek, fascs. 1-4 (Oxford 1961-65), cited hereafter as Lampe.
    ${ }^{4}$ Manuscripts are cited throughout by their sigla given above in n.2.
    ${ }^{5}$ On the scholiast see Lefherz, Studien zu Gregor von Nazianz (Bonn 1958) 157-60 and Cummings, Diss. 15-17.
    ${ }^{6}$ Vat. Gr. 1260 s. xII.
    ${ }^{7}$ See the Connington-Nettleship commentary in P. Vergili Maronis Opera III (London 1881) p.207. Lewis and Short assign the passage without more ado to the second meaning 'pike'.

[^2]:    ${ }^{8}$ See Stephanus-Dindorf, Thesaurus Linguae Graecae (Paris 1831-65). Cited hereafter as Stephanus.
    ${ }^{9}$ For Epistles $1-100$ see the new Budé edition, St. Grégoire de Nazianze, Lettres (Paris 1964) by P. Gallay. 'Wheatfield' is the preferable meaning in the Plutarch passage.
    ${ }^{10}$ Lampe, Stephanus, Sophocles' Lexicon of Byzantine Greek, and Liddell \& Scott ${ }^{8}$. Patristic words and meanings were excised from LSJ in anticipation of the publication of Lampe.

[^3]:    ${ }^{13}$ vol．II，Addenda p． 132 （Lyon 1688）．
    ${ }^{14}$ Cited from the Teubner text by A．Adler（Lex．Graec．I，pt．I－v）．The entry is missing from the edition by Gaisford．
    ${ }^{15}$ Dissertationes Argentoratenses selectae t．XII（Strassburg 1907） 140.
    ${ }^{16}$ op．cit．（supra n．12）p．cvi．

[^4]:    ${ }^{19}$ S. Gregorii Nazianzeni Opera Omnia II (Paris 1611) col. 1336 n. 108.
    ${ }^{20}$ Bruns, Canones Apostolorum et Conciliorum saec. IV-VII, II (Berlin 1839) p.72. On the oeconomus see A. H. M. Jones, The Later Roman Empire II (Norman 1964) 902 and 1376 n. 74.

[^5]:    ${ }^{21}$ The Scholiast reads 'İıoф $\rho o ́ v \omega \nu$, which he manfully attempts to interpret.
    
    ${ }^{23}$ The phrase is not dead. André Gide has termed Henry de Montherlant a "seigneur des lettres."

