

# *Leitourgia* and Related Terms

*Naphtali Lewis*

THE IDEA THAT THE MAN OF MEANS is obligated to expend some of his wealth and time in service to the community is common in almost all periods of history. The services performed vary with era and area. So does the nature of the compulsion: sometimes it is a statutory obligation, sometimes a less formal (though not therefore necessarily less effective) social requirement or expectation.

In the ancient world it was the Greek city-state which extended the concept of compulsory public service beyond military duty and menial labor. The Roman Empire, in its turn, perpetuated this Greek institution, expanding it into a full-fledged system of local administration.

The generic Greek term for such compulsory public service was *leitourgía*. Beginning in the fourth century B.C. (as we shall see below) the term was occasionally applied to religious service, and it is in that sense that the word survives in the modern languages of the Western world.

*Leitourgia* as an institution is discussed in the appropriate places in all the principal handbooks and encyclopedias of classical antiquity. But oddly enough, none of these customary reference works goes into very much detail on the semantic history of the term *leitourgía* and its compounds and derivatives. The only recent study of that kind — and this must surely come as a surprise to most classicists and ancient historians — is that by H. Strathmann (with a section on rabbinical literature by R. Meyer) in G. Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* IV, 4 (1938) 221-38. While this excellent presentation includes representative citations from Greek literature, inscriptions, and papyri, its emphasis is naturally on the Bible and related writings. With Strathmann's analysis as a base, the present article will examine the forms and semantic

history of the *leitourgia* word-group as it appears in secular Greek literature, inscriptions, and papyri of all periods; and will conclude with an inventory of all occurrences in the writers and inscriptions of the classical period, during which the semantic evolution began and was in essence completed.

## I. The *Leitourgia* Word Group

The following terms are found:

ἀλειτούργητος

λειτουργέω and compounds with ἀντι-, ἀπο-, κατα-, προσ-, συλ-, and perhaps ἐκ<sup>1</sup>

λειτούργημα

λειτουργησία and a compound with ἀ-

λειτουργήσιμος

λειτουργία and a compound with ἀ-

λειτουργιακός

λειτουργικός

λειτούργιον

λειτουργός and a compound with ὑπο-

## II. Etymology

The earliest pertinent text is Herodotus 7.197: λήιτον δὲ καλέουσι τὸ πρυτανήιον οἱ Ἀχαιοί.<sup>2</sup> There is nothing further on the subject in the ancient writers till we come to Plutarch, who connects Latin *licitor* with Greek λειτουργός (an erroneous but at the time apparently popular view), remarking ὅτι γὰρ λήιτον ἄχρι νῦν τὸ δημόσιον ἐν πολλοῖς τῶν Ἑλλήνων νόμων γέγραπται οὐδένα, ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, λέληθε.<sup>3</sup> The same definition of λήιτον (λη-, λη-) is found in three *grammatici* of the imperial period — Ammonius, a contemporary of Plutarch, who cites Didymus (first century B.C.) as his source; the second-century lexicographer Moeris; and Ulpi-

<sup>1</sup>Occurs only in Isaeus 7.40; "suspiciones movit" — Wyse (Cambridge 1904) *ad loc.*

<sup>2</sup>On the significance of this echo from Hellenic prehistory and later misunderstanding (e.g. Hesychius, *s.v.*; Bekker, *Anecd. gr.* I, p. 277), see C. Picard, *Rev. archéol.* 35 (1950) 124-25.

<sup>3</sup>Plutarch, *Quaest. rom.* 67 (= *Mor.* 280a). Similarly in his *Romulus* 26.4: λήιτον γὰρ τὸ δημόσιον ἔτι νῦν Ἕλληνες καὶ λαὸν τὸ πλῆθος ὀνομάζουσιν.

anus, the third-century commentator on Demosthenes<sup>4</sup> — and it is recorded in the Byzantine lexicons,<sup>5</sup> one of which incorporates in its definition also the term *πρυτανεῖον*, culled presumably from the Herodotus text cited above.<sup>6</sup>

In short, it was the established view in antiquity that the words of the *leitourgia* group were compounded of the elements “public” + “work”, to signify “work for the people”, hence “service to the state”. Modern scholars find nothing to quarrel with in this. Most present-day etymologists, however, regard the origin of *ληός* (*λαός*) itself as undetermined.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>4</sup>Ammonius, *Περὶ ὁμοίων καὶ διαφόρων λέξεων*, s.v.: *λητουργεῖν διὰ τοῦ η, καὶ λιτουργεῖν διὰ τοῦ ι, διαφέρειν φησὶ Δίδυμος ἐν ὑπομνήματι δευτέρας (l. -έρω?) Ἰλιάδος. τὸ μὲν γὰρ λητουργεῖν, τὸ τῷ δήμῳ ὑπηρετεῖν· λήτον γὰρ φασὶ τὸ δημόσιον. λήϊτον ἀμφεπέροντο* [this is obviously a quotation from epic poetry — cf. Homer *Odyssey* 15.467]. *τὸ δὲ λιτουργεῖν, κατὰ λέγειν (λιτ- is here not the iotacized spelling of λειτ-, but a different word: cf. λαοργός, λεουργός (λεω-), λιτο(υ)ργός, λιωργός, on which see esp. Hesychius, s.vv.)*

Moeris, *Lexic.* s.v.: *λητουργεῖν διὰ τοῦ η Ἀττικοί, διὰ δὲ τῆς εἰ διφθόγγου Ἑλληνες λήϊτον γὰρ τὸ δημόσιον*

Ulpianus, *Schol. in Demosth.* 20, p. 512 Dindorf: *λείτον δὲ ἐκάλουον οἱ παλαιοὶ τὸ δημόσιον, ὅθεν λητουργεῖν τὸ εἰς τὸ δημόσιον ἐργάζεσθαι ἔλεγον.*

<sup>5</sup>Hesychius, s.vv.: *ληιτουργεῖν· ληιτουργεῖν· λήϊτον γὰρ δημόσιον. λήϊτον· δημόσιον.*

Zonaras, s.v.: *ληιτουργεῖν τὸ ὑπηρετεῖν, παρὰ τὸ λήϊτον, ὃ ἐστὶ τὸ δημόσιον. ἀπὸ οὖν τοῦ ἔργου καὶ λήϊτον ληιτουργεῖν, καὶ κατὰ συστολήν τοῦ η εἰς ε ληιτουργεῖν, καὶ κατὰ συναίρεσιν τοῦ ε καὶ ι ληιτουργεῖν.* Tittman (Leipzig 1808) brackets the last phrase: cf. n. 6.

Suidas: s.v.: *ληιτουργία· κυρίως ἢ δημοσία ὑπηρεσία· παρὰ τὸ λήϊτον καὶ τὸ ἔργον.*

Thomas Magister p. 227, 17 Ritschl: *οἱ μὲν λη(ι)τουργός διὰ τοῦ η, ἤτοι ὁ τὰ λήϊτα ἔργον ἔχων· λήϊτα γὰρ λέγεται τὰ δημόσια· οἱ δὲ διὰ διφθόγγου.*

Bekker, *Anecd. gr.* I, p. 277: *ληιτουργεῖν· οἱ παλαιοὶ Ἀθηναῖοι διὰ τοῦ η ἔλεγον ληιτουργεῖν· λητὸς (sic) γὰρ ἐστὶ δημόσιον ἀρχεῖον* [this word is intrusive: cf. *supra*, n. 2]. *οἱ οὖν ἐν τῷ λητῷ ἐργαζόμενοι οὗτοι ληιτουργοῦσιν, ὅπερ νῦν διὰ τῆς εἰ διφθόγγου λέγεται. διφθόγγου λέγεται.*

<sup>6</sup>*Etym. Magnum*, s.v.: *ληιτουργός, ὁ τοῖς διοικηταῖς ὑπουργῶν καὶ διακονῶν. τὸ γὰρ πρυτανεῖον, ἧγουν τὸ δημόσιον, λήϊτον ἐκαλεῖτο. ἐκ τοῦ λήϊτον οὖν καὶ το(ῦ) ἔργου γίνετα κατὰ συστολήν ληιτουργός· καὶ κατὰ συναίρεσιν τοῦ ε καὶ ι εἰς τὴν εἰ διφθόγγου. καὶ ληιτουργεῖν, τὸ ὑπηρετεῖν.*

<sup>7</sup>Thus E. Boisacq, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*<sup>4</sup> (Heidelberg 1950) and J. B. Hofmann, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Griechischen* (Munich 1949) s.v. *λαός* (so too L. Meyer, *Handbuch der griechischen Etymologie* IV [Leipzig 1902] 498). A. Juret, *Dictionnaire étymologique grec et latin* (Mâcon 1942) 178–79, associates *λαός* and *ληιτουργία* with *λέγειν* and other Indo-European words constituting the semantic category “assembler, groupe social, tas, multitude,” reasserting herein an antiquated view that dates back at least to the eighteenth century (cf. e.g. J. D. van Lennep, *Etymologicum linguae graecae* [Utrecht 1790]).

### III. Spelling

In *koïnē* Greek the spelling was  $\lambda\epsilon\iota\tau$ -, which vulgar speech iotacized to  $\lambda\iota\tau$ -. But postclassical writers were aware that classical Athens wrote  $\lambda\eta\iota\tau$ -.<sup>8</sup> When and how did the change take place?

Two views of the change are found in the ancient grammarians and lexicographers cited in notes 4-6. One view was that  $\eta\ddot{i}$  shortened to  $\epsilon\ddot{i}$ , which was then amalgamated into the diphthong  $\epsilon\iota$ . The other view appears to have been that the progression was  $\eta\iota > \eta > \epsilon\iota$ .<sup>9</sup>

In the light of epigraphical and papyrological evidence available to modern scholars, the processes of the vocalic and orthographic changes involved can be reconstructed more completely, *viz.*: presumably original disyllabic  $\eta\ddot{i}$  > diphthong  $\eta\iota$ , which came to be pronounced  $\bar{\epsilon}$ , then written  $\eta$  or  $\epsilon\iota$ , later pronounced  $\bar{i}$  and sometimes written  $\iota$  (iotacism). Before dealing specifically with the *λειτουργία* word-group, it will be useful to summarize the evidence on these vowel changes in general.<sup>10</sup>

#### $\eta\iota > \eta$

Inscriptional evidence for the silencing of the iota in  $\eta\iota$  begins, at least in Ionic, as early as the sixth century B.C.<sup>11</sup> The change is in evidence in Attica in the fifth century, and in Thessaly in the fourth century. Subsequently it is visible also in inscriptions from Pergamum and Magnesia, and in papyri from Ptolemaic Egypt.

#### $\eta\iota > \epsilon\iota$

Inscriptions from Athens and elsewhere (e.g. Amphipolis, Eretria, Olynthus, Oropus) show signs of this change from *ca.* 400

<sup>8</sup>Cf. *supra*, nn. 5 and 6. There was also minor dialectal variation in the vowel of the second syllable. *IG* VII, 3083 (Boeotia, third century B.C.) has  $\omega$ . *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 1140 and 1147 (Attica, fourth century B.C.) have  $\omicron$ , but omicron frequently represented  $ov$  in inscriptions of that period.

<sup>9</sup>For a brief summary on these transformations of  $\eta\iota$ , cf. M. Lejeune, *Traité de phonétique grecque*<sup>2</sup>, (Paris 1955) 196. The essential evidence is cited below.

<sup>10</sup>Bibliography: E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft II.1) I (Munich 1939) 193, 200-2; E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit* I (Berlin and Leipzig 1923) 74-80, 87-92, 122-28; L. R. Palmer, *A Grammar of Post-Ptolemaic Papyri* I (London 1946) 1-3. These standard works give summaries of the relevant data and bibliographies of earlier specialized studies; to the latter should be added B. Bondesson, *De sonis et formis titulorum Milesiorum Didymaeorumque* (Lund 1936), esp. pp. 55-59.

<sup>11</sup>Linguistic evidence points to the disappearance of the iota in "Inlaut" already in prehistoric times: cf. Schwyzer, *op. cit.* 200.

B.C. It is impossible to tell how much earlier the change actually began, because in the earlier period E represented both  $\epsilon$  and  $\eta$  in most Greek inscriptions. The earliest clear case is *IG II*<sup>2</sup>, 1414, which has  $\kappa\lambda\eta\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  in line 44 and  $\kappa\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma$  in line 47.

$\eta = \epsilon\iota$

Inscriptions and papyri show the equivalence of these two sounds and the interchange of these spellings from the third century B.C. on.

$\epsilon\iota = \iota$

Argive and Boeotian inscriptions show signs of iotacism as early as the fifth century B.C. Attic inscriptions and papyri show the tendency fully established in the third century B.C., as do inscriptions of the second century B.C. from Delphi, Magnesia, and Pergamum.

The above changes are well exemplified by the *leitourgia* word-group, as can be seen at a glance from the following chart:

SPELLING	EARLIEST OCCURRENCE		LATEST OCCURRENCE	
	DOCUMENT	PLACE AND DATE	DOCUMENT	PLACE AND DATE
$\lambda\eta\iota\tau-$	<i>IG II</i> <sup>2</sup> , 1140	Athens, 386 B.C.	<i>PSI</i> 435	Egypt, 258/7 B.C.
$\lambda\eta\tau-$	<i>SIG</i> <sup>3</sup> , 344 = Welles, <i>Royal</i> <i>Corr.</i> 3	Teos, 303 B.C.	Sardis VII, 2	Sardis, ca. 225/175 B.C.
$\lambda\epsilon\iota\tau-$	<i>IG II</i> <sup>2</sup> , 305	Athens, before 336 B.C.		**
$\lambda\iota\tau-$	<i>PPetrie</i> II, 4(9) = III, 42C(2)	Egypt, 255 B.C.		**

\*\* These spellings continued through antiquity to modern times.

In order to illustrate the spelling variations which took place in the living language, the chart above is compiled exclusively from contemporary documents — *i.e.* inscriptions and papyri. It is clear from these that  $\lambda\epsilon\iota\tau-$  was the standard spelling from about 300 B.C. on, and that  $\lambda\eta\iota\tau-$  and  $\lambda\eta\tau-$  disappeared from ordinary usage in the next hundred years or so. But copyists continued for a few centuries longer to reproduce the older spelling in works of literature. The latest such survivals<sup>12</sup> are found in the papyrus MS of Aristotle's

<sup>12</sup>Not counting, of course, the Byzantine lexicographers, who record these long-vanished forms as a matter of philological history.

*Constitution of Athens*, a copy made *ca.* 100 A.D., which has ληιτ- in all occurrences (once, in § 56, corrected from λειτ-); and in British Museum Papyrus 132, a first-century copy of Isocrates *Or.* 8, which has λητ-,<sup>13</sup> as well as λειτουργιων corrected from λιτουργειων, and probably λιτ-.<sup>14</sup> A fragment of Hyperides written in the late second or early third century shows only λειτ-,<sup>15</sup> and an early-third-century copyist of Demosthenes *Or.* 21 consistently writes λιτ-.<sup>16</sup>

An unfortunate by-product of recent times is worth noting. Ever since it became apparent that the older spelling persisted in Attic inscriptions through most of the fourth century,<sup>17</sup> modern editors of classical authors earlier than Aristotle have generally printed λητ- where the codices, being of late date, have λειτ-. Whether this is necessary or even justifiable in all cases is, to begin with, questionable, since (as we have seen) in the same body of Attic inscriptions the spelling λειτ- appears already in the mid-fourth century and other instances of ηι > ει go back at least to *ca.* 400 B.C. But, what is worse, some editors have not always been consistent in emending to λητ-. The result — most apparent in the Attic orators, who use the *leitourgia* terminology most frequently — has been to deposit a legacy of enormous confusion in the editions of the last seventy-five years. To cite but a few examples among many: In his *Andocides*, Blass prints λητουργεῖν in 1.132 (codd. λειτ-), but leaves λειτουργίαι in 4.42. In his *Isocrates* he has changed the spelling in some places and left λειτ- in others, without explanation; and Preuss' *Index Isocrateus* faithfully reproduces Blass' spellings. In his *Demosthenes* Blass consistently prints λητ- (but κλείς, not κλής!), but in only five of the more than one hundred occurrences does he indicate in the apparatus that the codices have λειτ-; the unwary or unwarned reader is thus left with the false impression

<sup>13</sup>Similarly, λησταις in a first-century copy of Hyperides (*British Museum Papyrus* 108 + 115), but ληιστον in the second-century Didymus scholia (*PBerol.* 9780). Cf. the first- and second-century authors quoted in note 4, and Quintilian 1.7.17: [iota] quibusdam etiam interponunt, ut in ΔΗΙΣΤΗΙ, quia etymologia ex divisione in tris syllabas facta desideret eam litteram.

<sup>14</sup>*Journal of Philology* 30 (1907) 6, 11, 74.

<sup>15</sup>*POxy* 1607, line 20.

<sup>16</sup>*POxy* 1378, lines 8, 18, 19.

<sup>17</sup>The latest is *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 417, which dates from some time after 330 B.C.

that in the other instances the codices have  $\lambda\eta\tau$ -. In the Budé edition of Isocrates, Mathieu and Brémond mostly printed  $\lambda\eta\tau$ - in Volume I (1928), but in Volumes II (1938) and III (1942) they abandoned this practice, apparently deeming it unnecessary, and reverted to the  $\lambda\epsilon\iota\tau$ - of the codices.

#### IV. Semantics

When the term *leitourgia* first appears in Greek literature it refers to specific state services required of wealthy citizens and residents. At Athens, to which most of the evidence of the classical period pertains, the major liturgies were equipping and manning a trireme of the fleet (*trierarchia*), and providing a chorus for a dramatic festival (*choregia*); less important — and less expensive — were a number of other functions, mainly in connection with religious ceremonies (e.g. *gymnasiarchia*, *lampadarchia*).

From this original use as a political *terminus technicus* (a),<sup>18</sup> the term began, toward the end of the fifth century and increasingly in the fourth,<sup>19</sup> to be used in the broadened sense (b) of any service to the community. The line of distinction between meanings a and b is sometimes difficult to discern, especially in the rhetorical language of the orators; examples will be noted below.

From meanings a and b *leitourgia* began in the fourth century to be used in a still more generalized sense (c), *viz.* to designate a service of any kind, for any beneficiary, not necessarily for the benefit of the community.<sup>20</sup>

Within the generalized sense c, there developed two important specializations of meaning:

**d** — cultic service to divinity. This meaning, which also makes

<sup>18</sup>The designations a-d used in this section correspond to those of Strathmann, *loc. cit.* 223-25.

<sup>19</sup>Strathmann's generally excellent analysis is defective on this point. Finding meaning b "ganz besonders . . . in den Papyri" (p. 224), he cites examples only from papyri, none earlier than the second century B.C.

<sup>20</sup>As Strathmann expresses it (*ibid.*), the  $\lambda\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$  element becomes "völlig verblasst" in popular usage. The verb  $\chi\omicron\rho\eta\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\omega$  underwent similar generalization: cf. Liddell-Scott-Jones, *s.v.*

its first appearance in fourth-century literature,<sup>21</sup> was carried through the Septuagint into Christian usage, where it still remains today.

**e**<sup>22</sup> — engineer or sapper service in the military forces. The earliest extant examples of this meaning are in *PCairo Zenon* 59015 verso (= *Sammelbuch* 6782) and *PHibeh* 96, both of 259/8 B.C.

The following list shows the distribution of the different meanings in the extant occurrences of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.<sup>23</sup> Under **a** and **b** the texts refer to Athens unless otherwise noted; instances of general language, specific to no particular city, are indicated by the symbol \*. Passages which illustrate the broadening in sense from **a** to **b** are identified thus:

† — The passage uses the term in sense **a** with an overtone of **b**, or vice versa.

‡ — The same passage uses the term once in sense **a** and again in sense **b**.

### Sense a

#### FIFTH CENTURY

Antiphon 5.77† (Mytilene and Athens)  
Isocrates 18.58, 60, 64  
Lysias 20.23; 21.5, 12, 13, 16, 19‡, 23; 32.24

#### FOURTH CENTURY

Aeschines 1.97, 101  
Andocides 1.132†; 4.42  
Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 27.3, 56.3; *Oec.* 1347 a 12, 14, 1352 a 4(Caria); *Pol.\** 1309 a 18, 1320 b 4†; *Rhet.* 1399 a 34<sup>24</sup>

<sup>21</sup>Here again as in **b** (cf. *supra* n. 19), Strathmann cites no occurrences earlier than the second century B.C. He appears to regard Aristotle, *Politics* 7, 1330a8-13 as a mixture of meanings **a** and **d**. He ignores Demosthenes 21.56. There is also a clearcut case in *PSI* 435 of 258/7 B.C., on which cf. A. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East* (London 1927) 154-158 = *Licht vom Osten*<sup>4</sup>, pp. 123-125.

<sup>22</sup>Strathmann does not make a separate category of this meaning, though he remarks (p. 224) that it, like **d**, is a "Spezialfall" of **c**.

<sup>23</sup>The material of the Hellenistic and Roman periods, already collected, will be the subject of a separate article. In searching the sources I had the welcome assistance of Dr. M. Reinhold for the literature and Dr. R. K. Sherk for the inscriptions. Their assistance was made possible by a grant from the American Philosophical Society, which is here acknowledged with gratitude.

<sup>24</sup>Cf. the anonymous commentator, Berlin ed. Vol. XXI (2), pp. 323 §15, 325 §17.

Demosthenes 5.8; 18.91 (Byzantium, Perinthus), 104, 108, 267; 19.282; 20.1, 8, 18–23, 28<sup>25</sup>, 40, 126–130, 151; 21.11, 14, 56<sup>26</sup>, 61, 108, 126, 151–155, 158, 165, 167, 169, 171, 189, 225; 25.29, 76, 78; 27.64; 28.3, 17, 19, 24; 29.24; 36.39–40, 42; 38.25–26; 39.9; 42.3, 21–23, 25; 45.66, 78; 47.48, 54; 50.9, 21, 31, 39–40, 58, 66; 51.7, 17; 52.26; 59.117; prooem. 48.3<sup>27</sup>  
 Isaeus 3.80; 4.27; 5.29, 36, 39, 45; 6.38, 60–61, 64; 7.5, 38, 40, 42; 11.40, 48–50; fragg. 22 Thalheim (= 1 Sauppe), 29 Thalheim (= 34 Forster = 130 Sauppe)  
 Isocrates 8.13†, 20†, 128; 12.145; 15.5, 145–146, 150, 154, 158; 16.32, 35; 19.36 (Siphnus)  
 Lycurgus, *Leocr.* 139  
 Lysias 3.47†; 7.31; 18.7‡; 19.58; 25.12; 26.3–4; 29.4  
 Theophrastus, *Char.* 23.7; 26.6  
 Xenophon, *Mem.* 2.7.6  
 IG II<sup>2</sup>, 305<sup>28</sup>, 417, 1140, 1147

### Sense b

#### FIFTH CENTURY

Lysias 21.19‡; 31.12, 15

#### FOURTH CENTURY<sup>29</sup>

Aeneas Tacticus 13\*

Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 29.5†; *Eth. Nicom.* 1167 b 12; *Eth. Eudem.* 1242 b 30; *Pol.* 1272 a 20<sup>30</sup> (Crete); *Pol.\** 1278 a 12<sup>31</sup>, 1279 a 11, 1291 a 33–38<sup>32</sup>, 1305 a 5<sup>32</sup>, 1314 b 14<sup>32</sup>, 1321 a 33

Aristoxenus, frag. 35 Wehrli

Demosthenes 10.28†; 22.65; 24.172; prooem. 14.2

Isaeus 4.29<sup>32</sup>; frag. 30 (= 35 Forster = 131 Sauppe)

Isocrates 3.56; 7.25

Lysias 18.7‡

Plato, *Laws* 12, 949C\*

<sup>25</sup>In some codices.

<sup>26</sup>Double *entendre* with sense d: cf. Pollux, *Onom.* 3.143, which refers to this passage: ἐπὶ τῶν μουσικῶν (sc. ἀγώνων) ἴδιον, ὃ φησι Δημοσθένης, τὸ λειτουργεῖν τῷ θεῷ.

<sup>27</sup>The terms *leitourgia*, etc., are commented on frequently by the scholiasts to Demosthenes, viz.: Schol. ed. Dindorf, pp. 72, 108–10, 155–56, 233, 458†–59, 462, 466–69, 471, 473–75, 480–81, 483–84, 488, 512–14, 579–80, 627–29, 631 (line 14), 636, 645; Schol. Patmiaka, in *BCH* 1 (1877) 147; also *hypotheses oratt.* 20 and 42.

<sup>28</sup>This inscription is too mutilated for a definite determination, but since the stone contains a state decree the sense is probably a rather than b.

<sup>29</sup>Cf. also Schol. Demosth. ed. Dindorf, p. 591, lines 10–12 (τὴν ἐπιβάλλουσαν πένησι λειτουργίαν ἐπλήρωσε· λειτουργία δὲ πένητος ἢ διὰ τοῦ σώματος εἰσφορά), and p. 631, lines 17ff.

<sup>30</sup>Possibly sense d here: cf. 1330 a 12.

<sup>31</sup>Sense c followed by b.

<sup>32</sup>Erroneously listed by Strathmann under sense a.

*Sense c*

## FOURTH CENTURY

Aristotle,<sup>33</sup> *Animal. incessu* 711 b 30; *Eth. Nicom.* 1163 a 29; *Eth. Eudem.* 1242 b 17; *Iuv. et senect.* 469 a 3; *Oec.* 1343 b 20; *Part. animal.* 650 a 9, 674 b 9, 20, 689 b 29; *Pol.* 1278 a 12<sup>31</sup>, 1335 b 28

[Demosthenes] 50.35<sup>34</sup>

Hyperides, *Lycophr.* App. frag. 1 Colin = *POxy* 1607, lines 20–21

Isocrates 15.156

*Sense d*

## FOURTH CENTURY

Aristotle, *Pol.* 1330 a 13<sup>\*35</sup>

Demosthenes 21.56<sup>36</sup>

BROOKLYN COLLEGE

*September 1960*

<sup>33</sup>Cf. also the anonymous commentator, Berlin ed. Vol. XXI (2), p.19.

<sup>34</sup>Denouncing a well-paid and well-treated trireme crew as *ειωθὸς . . . ἀτελείας ἀγειν τῶν νομιζομένων ἐν τῇ νηὶ λειτουργιῶν*, the language (note especially the underlined words) has all the solemnity of sense a, but it is used here perhaps in sense b, more likely in sense c with possibly an overtone of b.

<sup>35</sup>Cf. note 30.

<sup>36</sup>Cf. note 26.