

Some Micro-Fragments of Menander Protector's *Histories*: The Evidence of the *Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν*

Philip Rance

BETWEEN the mid-ninth century and the late tenth, an unidentified lexicographer compiled a specialized lexicon designed to assist readers of four classicizing histories of the sixth century: Procopius' *Wars* and successive continuations by Agathias, Menander Protector, and Theophylact Simocatta. He assembled selected instances of words or verbal forms that, by implication, were likely to be unfamiliar to a Middle Byzantine readership and explained their meaning through glosses, in some cases illustrated by quotation of the relevant passage(s), along with notes on etymology and usage. Transmitted without a title or ascription in copies known to later Byzantine lexicographers and nineteenth-century scholars, this work is conventionally termed the *Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν*, after its initial lemma: αἰμωδεῖν ("to have one's teeth set on edge").¹ The compiler's

¹ Critical edition: A. R. Dyck, *Epimerismi Homerici* II (SGLG V.2, Berlin 1995) 825–1016, 1033–1034 ("Addenda et corrigenda"), hereafter cited as Dyck with page and line numbers. Of the three manuscripts, D and O contain no title. In G, the most recently identified, an excerpt bears the heading [Ἐτ]υμολογία[ι] Διάφοροι, which Dyck 846, 873, deems authentic. The conventional designation is not wholly modern: see citations εἰς τὸ Αἰμωδεῖν in *Etym.Magn.* 780.35–36, 789.11, 814.22 (εἰς τὸ Αἰ^μ). Gaisford. Dyck 867 re-edits these testimonia. The chronological termini ca. 850–994 depend on multistage, mutual interaction between the *Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν* and successive recensions of the *Etymologicum Genuinum*: Dyck 859–864 (with bibliography); K. Alpers, "Difficult Problems in the Transmission and Interrelation of the

decision to compose a glossary of uncommon vocabulary found in these four histories implies a perception of their intended interconnectedness in a literary-historiographic continuum, broadly in line with their categorization as a distinct quartet in modern scholarship. In compiling a new reading aid, the lexicographer presumably sought to meet perceived needs of certain users and to cater to concerns for language and style beyond historical content. This enterprise, in turn, points to renewed or enduring interest in these authors, and perhaps their educational and literary-cultural cachet, if not necessarily as curricular texts, then as compositional models. Such collective treatment seems uncharacteristic of their prior reception, insofar as it can be traced from the seventh to early tenth centuries, while the manuscript traditions of the four works offer no grounds for assuming conjoined transmission.² In contrast, the generic affiliation and quasi-canonical status of the four historians in palace-sponsored compilatory projects around the mid-tenth century may imply a connection between the *Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν* and Constantine VII's historical *Excerpta* and/or related court-centred literary historiography.³ In any case, the lexicographer's inferred objectives are consistent with the heightened appeal of late antique histories, especially Procopius and Agathias, during this period.⁴

Greek Etymologica,” in G. A. Xenis (ed.), *Literature, Scholarship, Philosophy, and History: Classical Studies in Memory of Ioannis Taifacos* (Stuttgart 2015) 293–314, at 309–310.

² See, with bibliography, P. Rance, “In the Margins of Strabo: Menander Protector on Persian Religion and the *Passio S. Isbozetae*,” *JÖB* 73 (2023) 125–150, at 127–131.

³ In the absence of comprehensive analysis, see provisional remarks in A. Németh, *The Excerpta Constantiniana and the Byzantine Appropriation of the Past* (Cambridge 2018) 18–19, 245–247; P. Rance, *JÖB* 73 (2023) 129; and n.39 below.

⁴ See recently Németh, *Excerpta* 158–161; M. Jankowiak, “Procopius of Caesarea and his Byzantine Successors,” in M. Meier et al. (eds.), *A Companion to Procopius of Caesarea* (Leiden 2021) 231–251, at 247–248; S. Kennedy, “A

Although the content, character, and potential value of the *Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν* were indicated as long ago as 1910, it has been almost entirely overlooked in studies of the text, transmission, and reception of the four authors, and most surprisingly of Menander's *Histories*, whose fragmentary survival, primarily via thematic excerpt collections, should pique interest in even the smallest scrap of evidence. To some extent, this oversight is understandable. Although a critical edition published three decades ago resolved many complexities, the sources, evolution, and textual tradition of the *Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν* are especially intricate issues even within this specialist field. Furthermore, with a view to managing expectations, one should clarify that most of the material in the *Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν* assignable to Menander comprises single words, i.e. the lemma or headword of a lexical entry, usually cited in the exact form in which that word was encountered in historian's text. Thirty-five such lemmata will be examined below. In addition, five entries adduce six short quotations; one of these partly coincides with an anonymously quoted passage in the *Suda*.

Overall, this Menander-derived content, mostly lacking historical context, may offer little of interest to historians, who have formed a majority of Menander's modern readers. Nevertheless, increasing attentiveness to the literary dimensions of late antique historiography, including linguistic, stylistic, and intertextual aspects, affords a less restricted forum in which these fragments can be discussed and acquire significance. In particular, Menander's long-recognized imitation of the style and vocabulary of Agathias,⁵ whose *Histories* Menander's work con-

Lost Classic: The Reception of Prokopios' *History of the Wars* in Byzantium," *Byzantinoslavica* 79 (2021) 5–40, at 28–33; Rance, *JÖB* 73 (2023) 129–130; A. Markopoulos, "Revisiting the Sources of Leo the Deacon. The Case of the *Excerpta Constantiniana*," *ζRVI* 60 (2023) 61–73.

⁵ M. Apostolopoulos, *Μένανδρος Προτέκτωρ μιμητής Αγαθίου* (Athens 1894), with B. Baldwin, "Menander Protector," *DOP* 32 (1978) 101–125, at 119–120; R. C. Blockley, *The History of Menander the Guardsman. Introductory*

tinues, reinforces some identifications of ‘Menandrian’ lemmata and provides an existing strand of literary inquiry that the present study can extend and augment. More generally, despite obvious limitations, selected lemmata and quotations might prove instructive to historical studies regarding the scope and content of Menander’s *Histories*. Accordingly, the following contribution seeks to present—or re-introduce—these ‘micro-fragments’ or lexical ‘splinters’, to elucidate their nature and transmission, and to tease out what might reasonably be inferred from them about Menander and his work.

1. *The Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν and the study of late antique historiography*

Although a relatively short work, the textual history of the *Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν* is complex. The direct tradition is imperfectly witnessed by three manuscripts containing: an abridged copy of the whole lexicon (D), an excerpt of the same abridged tradition (O), and an excerpt of an unabridged version (G).⁶ Subsequent compilers of etymological dictionaries, principally the late tenth-/eleventh-century *Etymologicum Gudianum* and the mid-twelfth-century *Etymologicum Magnum*, independently utilized the *Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν* as a source. As they typically had access to a fuller version of the text than is preserved in direct witnesses (DO), this more complete indirect tradition provides firmer foundations for a critical edition.⁷

Following the *editio princeps* by Friedrich Wilhelm Sturz in

Essay, Text, Translation, and Historiographical Notes (Liverpool 1985) 6–9, 287 n.333.

⁶ D = *Darmstad.* 2773, 92^v–101^v; O = *Oxon.Barocc.* 119, 142^v–143^v (ε 9–ζ 2); G = *Crypt. Za IX*, 60^r–64^v (to α 111). See Dyck 846–848, 850–851, 864–865, and updated description of D in *Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca et Byzantina*, <https://cagb-digital.de/id/cagb4977917>. In addition, MS. B of the *Etymologicum Genuinum* (*Laur.S.Marci* 304, dated 944) is treated *codicis instar* with respect to two dozen glosses interpolated from the *Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν*: Dyck 859–860, 868; Alpers, in *Literature* 309–310.

⁷ Dyck 848–851, 859–865, 996–997.

1818,⁸ lexicographical studies clarified aspects of textual transmission, but its character and purpose remained poorly understood. For the present investigation, two contributions shaped the agenda of future inquiry.

First, in 1910 Eduardo Luigi De Stefani distinguished the core component of the received text as a glossary of uncommon words in four classicizing histories written in the period from Justinian to Heraclius. Recognizing the implications, he observed that, although all lemmata and quotations are cited anonymously, as the works of Procopius, Agathias, and Theophylact are fully extant while Menander's alone is fragmentary, it follows that those lemmata and quotations not found in the other three authors or in surviving fragments of Menander, and which cannot otherwise be explained, must be assigned, by default, to lost sections of Menander's *Histories*. In short, "tutto ciò che non appartiene a quei primi tre, è di Menandro."⁹

De Stefani's wider objective was a critical edition of the *Etymologicum Gudianum*, a still uncompleted project that entailed editing lemmata derived from the *Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν*, including those originating in 'lost' Menander.¹⁰ With respect to extant

⁸ F. W. Sturz, *Etymologicum graecae linguae Gudianum et alia grammaticorum scripta e codicibus manuscriptis nunc primum edita* (Leipzig 1818) 617.30–631.2 (based on D). Dyck 845–846 reviews nineteenth-century scholarship.

⁹ E. L. De Stefani, "Per le fonti del lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν," *SIIt* 18 (1910) 433–444, quoting 435.

¹⁰ E. A. [L.] De Stefani, *Etymologicum Gudianum* (Leipzig 1909–1920) I (α-βωμολογία), II (βωμολοχοί-ζειαί). Regarding lemmata attributable to lost sections of Menander (distinct from those identifiable in extant excerpts), De Stefani published 13 lemmata that the compiler of the *Etym. Gud.* derived from the *Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν*: *Etym. Gud.* ἀμάρας I 107.2–5 (= *Lex. Αἰμ.* α 145 Dyck); ἀμβλωάττειν 110.1–3 (= α 144); ἀνεπαφρόδιτος 141.2–3 (= α 141); ἀφανυρά 239.7–10 (= α 146); γριφῶδες II 323.6–9 (= γ 13); γρυπός 324.1–4 (= γ 15); διακηρυκεύεται 356.18–22 (= δ 7); διασεσοβημένος 360.8–10 (= δ 10); ἐληλάται 452.8–453.2 (= ε 37); ἐλινύειν 457.4–7 (= ε 41); ἔναυλος 468.4–7 (= ε 39–40); ἐπιέζοντο 503.19 (= ε 35); ἐσκευωρήσθαι 537.1–3 (= ε 33). See Dyck 999–1002 for a full concordance. De Stefani alters his editorial format at II

sections of Menander's work, De Stefani identified one instance where this indirect tradition of the *Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν* transmits a reading superior to that preserved in manuscripts of the *Excerpta* and the *Suda*.¹¹ Over subsequent decades, historiographical scholarship seldom appreciated the logic and consequences of De Stefani's insight, partly owing to the obscurity of the *Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν* and the absence of a critical text.

Second, more than eighty years elapsed before the publication of Andrew Dyck's superb edition of the *Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν* in 1995. His collation of all direct and indirect witnesses, including an unexploited manuscript (G), and comprehensive investigation of transmission and source-relationships, allowed the text to be constituted on a more secure basis.¹² In reassessing the testimony of the *Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν* as an indirect witness to the four historians, Dyck affirmed De Stefani's deduction regarding residual fragments of Menander.¹³ Furthermore, with greater understanding of the sources and evolution of the transmitted text, Dyck was able to attribute additional lemmata and quotations to Menander and, conversely, to exclude others that De Stefani had assigned to Menander but which certainly or probably belong to one of the other three historians. In doing so, Dyck may have disregarded analytical criteria applied by De Stefani in light of the lexicographer's compositional method, while several lemmata discounted without argument merit re-evaluation.¹⁴

452.8–453.2 ἐληλάτει, in that only from this lemma is Menander cited as the ultimate source, though, as he argued in 1910, this is the case also with preceding lemmata listed here.

¹¹ *Etym. Gud.* ἐμβριμώμενοι (masc. nom. pres. part. pl. ἐμβριμάομαι) II 461.5. Although it is not found in the direct tradition of the *Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν* (DO), De Stefani derives this lemma, via a more complete indirect tradition, from Menander fr. 10,3.16–17. Manuscripts of *Exc. leg.* I 193.6 and *Suda* ε 963 transmit ἐμβριμούμενοι, thus all editions of Menander. See Dyck 996.

¹² See n.1 above, with Dyck 864–867 for editorial principles.

¹³ Dyck 851, 857–858, 998.

¹⁴ Dyck 998 (App. 4), "Possible New Fragments of Menander Protector,"

The *Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν* has gone largely unnoticed by scholarship on Procopius, Agathias, Menander, and Theophylact. Studies of their reception, even where alert to Middle and Late Byzantine lexicography, do not mention this author-specific compilation.¹⁵ With respect to *constitutio textus*, only Rudolf Keydell's meticulous edition of Agathias' *Histories* integrates the *Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν* into the critical apparatus. In at least two instances, the lexicon uniquely transmits a correct reading.¹⁶ When Jacob Haury edited Procopius' *Wars* (1905), he overlooked this indirect tradition. In a detailed review, De Stefani signalled the value of the *Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν* and derivative lexicography for confirming or correcting readings in the direct tradition.¹⁷ Following De Stefani's observations, and his further study of 1910, Gerhard Wirth incorporated these lexicography as *variae lectiones* in *Addenda et Corri-*

where emendations are necessary: correct ἐλινύειν ε 37 to 41, θρυλλοῦντες θ 2 to 3, θριγκῶ θ 3 to 4, θεοκλυτοῦσιν θ 5 to 6, ιαχνόν ι 8 to 9. For Dyck's supplements to De Stefani's catalogue see 677 below.

¹⁵ Surveys of Procopius-derived material in other lexicography: Jankowiak, in *A Companion to Procopius* 247–250; Kennedy, *Byzantinoslavica* 79 (2021) 16. In addition, Procopius and Agathias are cited alongside canonical Attic and later Atticizing authors in *Περὶ συντάξεως* (D. Petrova, *Das Lexikon "Über die Syntax": Untersuchung und kritische Ausgabe des Lexikons im Codex Paris. Coisl. gr. 345* [Wiesbaden 2006]) δ 14 δωροῦμαι (Procop. 1.10.17, 3.8.9, 3.9.5, 8.35.33; *Anec.* 4.27); σ 29 συρράξαι (Agath. 1.21.7) [= *Anecd. Bekk.* I 133.14–15, 174.3].

¹⁶ R. Keydell, *Agathiae Myrinaei historiarum libri quinque* (CFHB 2: Berlin 1967) xx–xxi, xxxiii–xxxiv, 2 (siglum: Etym). Keydell cited quotations from Agathias in the *Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν* via derivative entries in De Stefani's edition of the *Etymologicum Gudianum* (n.10 above) up to Z, and thereafter from Sturz's *editio princeps* (1818). In two cases, Keydell (xxi) preferred a reading in the *Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν*: δ 3 (Dyck 924.9) quotes δηπαθείας in Agath. 3.1.4, where the manuscripts read δυσπαθείας (Keydell 84.20 app. crit.); ε 10 (Dyck 931.36) quotes ἐνερόχρωτες in Agath. 2.23.6, where the manuscripts read ἐτερόχρωτες (Keydell 71.3 app. crit.). Reporting only the first of these two cases, Dyck 858 considers another possibility at φ 4 ἐμβριθέστατον (986.15 app. crit., 987.21) in a quotation of Agath. 4.22.6, where Keydell (151.1 app. crit.) favoured ἐμβριθέστερον in the direct tradition.

¹⁷ E. L. De Stefani, "Besprechungen: J. Haury (ed.), *Procopii Caesariensis Opera omnia* I–II (Leipzig 1905)," *ByzZeit* 14 (1905) 636–643, at 639–640.

genda appended to his revised edition of Haury's text.¹⁸ Considering that the *Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν* predates the oldest surviving manuscripts of *Wars* by at least three centuries, it is unremarkable that De Stefani could identify two readings where the lexicon arguably preserves a superior tradition, though Procopius' broader lexical usage undermines one of these cases.¹⁹ In contrast, the *Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν* offers no improvements to the critical text of Theophylact's *Histories*, despite the tenuity of its direct tradition.²⁰

¹⁸ *Procopii Caesariensis Opera omnia* (Leipzig 1962–1964) I 552–572; II 679–699 *passim*, citing Sturz's edition of *Lex.Αἰμ.* (under "EGud") at I 553, II 679.

¹⁹ De Stefani, *ByzZeit* 14 (1905) 639–640; Wirth in Haury/Wirth I 564 (ad 233.2), 570 (ad 453.2); Dyck 858. Manuscript tradition of *Wars*: Haury/Wirth I xxii–liv. First, De Stefani observes that *Lex.Αἰμ.* ε 17 (= *Etym.Gud.* II 536.16–17; *Etym.Magn.* 385.15, 717.20) transmits ἐσκαλευκότες, where Procop. 2.19.10 (Haury I 233.2) reads ἐσκυλευκότες based on two fourteenth-century MSS. (VG). De Stefani sees ἐσκαλευκότες as "la lezione genuina." Similarly, Dyck notes that ἐσκαλευκότες in *Lex.Αἰμ.* is "now the earliest attested reading, is *lectio difficilior* and yields good sense." They do not acknowledge that σκυλεύω occurs in five other instances in *Wars* (1.14.26, 1.18.50, 2.11.10, 5.25.9, 7.24.26), including twice likewise as masc. acc. perf. part. act. plural ἐσκαλευκότες (1.18.50, 5.25.9). Second, a more persuasive case concerns *Lex.Αἰμ.* ε 21 (= *Etym.Gud.* II 447.6–7, *Etym.Magn.* 323.48), which quotes Procop. 4.8.7 as ἔκπυστα ἐποίησε τὰ πρασσόμενα, where direct witnesses diverge: Haury I 453.2 app. crit. prefers ἐποίει in V to ἐποίησε in PO. De Stefani favours ἐποίησε in the indirect tradition. Dyck suggests that the reading in *Lex.Αἰμ.* "tips the weight of evidence decisively in favor of the aorist," which is preferable contextually. Support for this view is found in later instances of the same phrase at Procop. 4.25.19 and 7.11.27, where Haury I 534.25, II 344.19–20, reports the aorist without variants.

²⁰ Although the *Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν* includes many lemmata drawn from Theophylact, the received text preserves only four quotations: *Lex.Αἰμ.* α 150 ἀκκίζεται (Th. Sim. 4.4.14); κ 1 κατασιλάζοντες (4.5.10); σ 21–23 στιβίζουσι (pref. 11); φ 6 φλήναφος (2.2.1). Dyck 857 n.57 notes that the sole divergence from the direct tradition is corrupt: φ 6: ὅσπερ for ὡς περ(ὶ) (987.27 app. crit.). The transmission of Theophylact's *Histories* becomes more tenuous than Dyck supposes, if the *codex unicus*, tenth-century *Vat.gr.* 977 (not, as Dyck, "twelfth century"), is the exemplar used by the Constantinian excerptors: thus P.

Most significantly, no editor or researcher of Menander's fragmentary *Histories* has yet consulted the *Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν*.²¹ Three older editions long antedate De Stefani's revelatory research.²² His 1910 study makes a single appearance in Barry Baldwin's survey of possibly Menander-derived anonymous quotations in the *Suda*: noting—and dismissing—De Stefani's attribution of a three-word phrase in *Suda* φ 715 (= *Lex.Αἴμ.* φ 5) to Menander, Baldwin does not refer to the *Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν* or explain De Stefani's rationale, leaving readers to assume pure conjecture. Baldwin thus misjudges one of the strongest cases for assigning an anonymous quotation in the *Suda* to Menander.²³ The most recent presentation of Menander's fragments by Roger Blockley, essentially a composite of prior editions incorporating published *variae lectiones*, neither mentions the *Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν* nor cites De Stefani.²⁴

2. *The Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν: textual history and compositional principles*

A preliminary review of the *Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν* will clarify its format, sources, and purpose.²⁵ A glossary of the four classicizing

Schreiner, "Die Historikerhandschrift Vaticanus Graecus 977: Ein Handexemplar zur Vorbereitung des konstantinischen Exzerptenwerkes?" *JÖB* 37 (1987) 1–29; with Németh, *Excerpta* 59, 102.

²¹ See briefly Rance, *JÖB* 73 (2023) 129, 139 n.62. A new edition by Bruno Bleckmann and Markus Stein will address this neglect: B. Bleckmann, "Zu den Fragmenten des Menandros Protektor im Projekt KFHist," in E. Amato, et al. (eds.), *Les historiens fragmentaires de langue grecque à l'époque romaine impériale et tardive* (Rennes 2021) 61–69, at 66–67.

²² I. Bekker and B. G. Niebuhr, *Dexippi, Eunapii, Petri Patricii, Prisci, Malchi, Menandri historiarum quae supersunt* (CSHB 14: Bonn 1829) 279–444; C. Müller and T. Müller, *FHG IV* (Paris 1851) 200–269; L. Dindorf, *Historici graeci minores II* (Leipzig 1871) iii–x, 3–131.

²³ Baldwin, *DOP* 32 (1978) 125: "There is obviously no real clue to be had from such a snippet." Dyck 845 n.3 notes Baldwin's dismissal "without coming to terms with De Stefani's argument." See 693 below.

²⁴ Blockley, *The History of Menander*, with editorial remarks at [vii]. Blockley's numbering of fragments and lines is used in what follows.

²⁵ Dyck 845–867 for detailed argumentation and bibliography.

histories is the main and earliest component, which became a nucleus for subsequent expansions. Each typically one-word lemma is ordinarily cited in the form (case/tense, number, gender) in which it appears in the historian's text. One or more glosses and other explanatory material follow, which the compiler drew from mostly identifiable lexical and exegetical sources.²⁶ Some entries quote the passage in which the lemma occurs. It is assumed that this was originally a more prevalent or universal feature, but many quotations have been lost in all textual traditions, a common trait in the transmission of Byzantine lexica.²⁷ For most lemmata, Dyck's edition supplies an in-text reference to the relevant passage(s), though several additions and adjustments are warranted.²⁸ Sometimes a lemma or quota-

²⁶ Dyck 1007 for an amalgamated Index fontium.

²⁷ S. Valente, "Byzantine Greek," in J. Considine (ed.), *The Cambridge World History of Lexicography* (Cambridge 2019) 247–266, at 247–248.

²⁸ For some lemmata Dyck gives no reference to the cited passage. Occasionally, a lemma occurs in two or more of the historians, while its form and sequence do not distinguish a particular *locus*: e.g. γ 10 Γήπαιδες; γ 11a γλιχόμενοι / 11b γλιχόμενος. Elsewhere, the source can be more confidently identified. Lemma μ 4 μῶν, without reference in Dyck 954.13, is cited from Agath. 2.10.5. Alternative Th. Sim. pref. 8 would be detached from other Theophylact-derived lemmata at μ 9–μ 13. Accordingly, for the sequence of Agathias-derived lemmata to be correct, following μ 5 μειονεκτεῖσθαι is cited from Agath. 3.9.3 rather than pref. 4; Dyck 954.17 adduces both passages. Lemma ν 3 νηποινεί, unreferenced in Dyck 958.14, is cited from Th. Sim. 1.15.10, where the direct tradition transmits the form νηποινί (69.18 de Boor). This is in sequence with following ν 5 νηπενθέξ from Th. Sim. 2.11.7. For ο 10 ὀρεῦσιν, Dyck 963.33 does not adduce Agath. 4.11.3, see 669 below. Lemma σ 15a στέργων, unreferenced in Dyck 954.13, must be cited from Agath. 4.3.3. For σ 16 σεμνῶς, Dyck 976.61 does not adduce Agath. 4.9.9 and 4.22.2, see 669 below. For τ 10 τενάγη, Dyck 982.39–41 does not adduce Th. Sim. 6.8.10. Lemma υ 1 ὑπόγυον De Stefani, *StIt* 18 (1910) 440, and Dyck 983.2 refer to Procop. 8.29.6 ὑπόγυον, though likewise acc. at 8.22.16. For υ 2 ὑπετόπαζεν De Stefani 440 and Dyck 983.6 adduce Agath. 2.4.9, but seemingly muddled sequencing of υ 1–υ 4 allows the possibility of citation from Procop. 1.25.19 (cf. 2.5.15, 3.5.1, 7.4.26). Occasional supplementary lem-

tion differs slightly from the direct tradition. Certain divergences are explicable as transcriptional errors in copying the *Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν*. In other cases, the lexicographer purposely modified lemmata, often where he preferred the form of a headword found in those earlier lexica that he consulted for definitions and synonyms, and thus a lemmatic form in the *Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν* instead reflects that lexicographical tradition.²⁹

After the compilation of the glossary, the lexicographer or a posterior editor appended to some entries guidance on syntactical usage, apparently to enhance understanding of this ancient idiom.³⁰ Later still, in a multistage process, new entries were interpolated from diverse lexica, scholia, and epimerismi, often via intermediary compilations, with the effect of transforming a specialized wordlist into a general-purpose lexicon. For reasons that are unclear, this development was restricted to letter-section alpha, which is disproportionately swollen to comprise one-third of the current text. These successive augmentations were largely completed before the *Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν* became a source for eleventh- and twelfth-century lexicographers.³¹ In letter-sections other than alpha, no interpolation of additional entries has been demonstrated. As most lemmata, in form and sequence, can be cross-checked with the texts of Procopius, Agathias, Theophy-

mata, cited as an additional example of a headword, pose separate interpretative challenges. Lemma ε 40 ἐναυλιζόμενον, despite the implication of Dyck 942.93 app. font., lacks a lexicographical antecedent and must be cited from Agath. 3.16.2, the unique instance in historiography. Lemma λ 8 λαϊὰ χεῖρ, which neither De Stefani, *StIt* 18 (1910) 440, nor Dyck 952.20 recognized as a citation from one of the historians, has multiple instances in Procop. 3.23.18 (gen.), 4.13.15 (dat.), 4.28.11 (acc.), 7.24.24 (acc.), 8.35.27 (dat.); cf. *Aed.* 1.2.11. In the absence of a lexicographical source (Dyck 983.6 app. font.), lemma υ 3 ὑποτοπάζειν could be cited from Procop. 5.6.8, 7.26.17.

²⁹ Such editorial interventions, where relevant, are noted below.

³⁰ Dyck 851 identifies the source of these interpolations as “a syntactic lexicon”; see 1007, Index fontium, s.v. “Lex. synt.,” and marginal annotation “synt.” throughout the edition.

³¹ See analysis in Dyck 851–855, 861–862, with Index fontium at 1007.

lact, or extant Menander, questions of provenance, in theory, affect only lemmata attributable by default to lost sections of Menander, the material of interest here. The following analysis found no grounds for excluding any such lemma. Even in a handful of cases where position, form, and/or content might be puzzling, the received text of the lexicon provides parallels where authenticity is undoubted, while the cited headword variously coheres with Menander's known lexical tastes, stylistic practice, and/or literary antecedents.³²

Beyond its arrangement in letter-sections, the *Lexicon Aίμωδεῖν* has no alphabetic dimension. Under each letter, a basic organizational principle groups lemmata by author, often in the chronological sequence Procopius-Agathias-Menander-Theophylact, though sometimes Agathias is first or the order otherwise varies. As a rule, excepting occasional and minor displacements, lemmata cited from each author are arranged sequentially according to their occurrence in his work. In only a small number of isolated cases is a lemma demonstrably belonging to one author misplaced among lemmata cited from another.³³ Lemmata in epsilon, one of the longer letter-sections, illustrate this scheme and some of its interpretative challenges:

ε 1[-2]	ἐμπεδῶσαι (Agath. 1.1.6)
ε 3	ἐνέρσει (Agath. 1.3.4)

³² I considered and rejected the possibility of interpolation at ζ 1 ζαμενής, ζ 3 ζάκορος, μ 14 Μαμερτῖνοι, π 26 πέμπελος, σ 1 συνασμένιζε, τ 9 τελχίνες, ω 4 ὄρω. An interpolator's rationale for inserting some or all of these items would be no less (and arguably more) puzzling.

³³ Letter-section alpha, uniquely containing many interpolations, has suffered exceptional disarrangement and should be treated as atypical. From beta to omega, a handful of such displaced individual lemmata occur, often at the beginning or end of letter-sections: δ 9 δαιταλεῦσιν (if correctly identified as Th. Sim. 5.5.9 and not lost Menander: see 675 below); μ 14 Μαμερτῖνοι (685 below); ξ 4 ξυνίστωρ (686 below); σ 1 συνασμένιζε (687 below); σ 21 στιβίζουσι; τ 10 τενάγη. Only towards the end of letter pi is more extensive disruption found: π 1-11 Agathias, 13-18 Procopius, 19-20 Agathias, 21-23 Menander, 24 Theophylact, 25 Agathias, 26 Menander (see 669 and 687).

- ε 4 ἐγγρίπτουσα (Agath. 1.12.6)
 ε 5 ἐπεκερτόμει (Agath. 1.20.10)
 ε 6 εἰσήρρησεν (Agath. pref. 28)
 ε 7 ἐς νέωτα τὸν πόλεμον μεταθέσθαι (Agath. 1.19.3)
 ε 8 ἐπίσ(σ)ωτρα (Agath. 2.4.5)
 ε 9 ἐρυμνώσας (Agath. 2.4.6)
 ε 10 ἐνερόχρωτες (Agath. 2.23.6)
 ε 11 ἐωλοκρασία (Agath. 2.29.8)
 ε 12 ἔστεργεν (Agath. 2.31.2 or 5.12.6)
 ε 13 ἐπέσκηψεν (Procop. 1.2.7)
 ε 14 ἐτώθαζον (Procop. 1.7.17 or 2.8.6)
 ε 15 ἐπιθειάσας (Procop. 2.11.1)
 ε 16 εἴση (Procop. 1.14.8 or 2.3.38)
 ε 17 ἐσκαλευκότες (Procop. 2.19.10)
 ε 18 ἐκεχειρία (Procop. 2.28.7 et al.)
 ε 19 ἐρεσχηλῶ (Procop. 3.12.8)
 (ἐθελοκακήσας (Procop. 3.6.10))³⁴
 ε 20 ἐνεόχμωσεν (Procop. 3.7.22)
 ε 21 ἔκπυστα (Procop. 4.8.7)
 ε 22 ἐπιθρυλοῦντες (Procop. 4.21.2)
 ε 23 ἔρανος (Procop. 5.8.30)
 ε 24 ἐγκάρσιον (Procop. 5.21.20–21)
 ε 25 εἰρωνεύεσθαι (Procop. 5.22.3)
 ε 26 εὐήθεια (Procop. 5.22.9)
 ε 27 ἔπαλξις (Procop. 5.22.10 et al.)
 ε 28 ἐφείντο (Procop. 6.20.32)
 ε 29 ἐναβρύνεσθαι (Procop. 7.24.25)
 ε 30 ἐπεβάτευσεν (Procop. 7.34.21)
 ε 31 ἐάλω (Procop. 7.35.2)
 ε 32 ἔξωρος (Procop. 8.11.40)
 ε 33 ἐσκεωρήσθαι (lost Men.)
 ε 34 ἐπιτροχάδην (cf. Men. fr. 10,3.84)
 ε 35 ἐπιέζοντο (lost Men.)
 ε 36 ἐφειμένον (cf. Men. fr. 8.10)
 ε 37 ἐληλάται (lost Men., cf. fr. 21.13 λεηλατεῖν)
 ε 38 ἐκμαγεῖον (cf. Men. fr. 6,1.413)

³⁴ A lacuna at Dyck 936.2–3 app. crit. (cf. *Elym.Gud.* ἐθελοκακήσας [Π 404.1]) is recognized by C. Theodoridis (review of Dyck), *JÖB* 50 (2000) 378–385, at 385 (citing Procop. 4.20.6; cf. 3.6.10, 4.27.29).

- ε 39[–40] ἔναυλος (lost Men.)³⁵
 ε 41 ἔλινύειν (lost Men.)
 ε 42 εὐτραπελία (Th. Sim. 1.10.11)
 ε 43 ἐνείρω (Th. Sim. 1.11.8)
 ε 44 ἐσύκαζεν (Th. Sim. 3.7.8)

Within this sample, a few lemmata are out of sequence (ε 6, 7, 16, 19–20), mostly, it seems, due to accidental transposition. Several diverge from the direct tradition, owing to editorial intervention or transmissional error: ε 11 ἑωλοκρασία < Agath. 2.29.8 ἑωλοκρασία; ε 17 ἑσκαλευκότες < Procop. 2.19.10 ἑσκαλευκότες;³⁶ ε 18 ἐκεχειρία < Procop. 2.28.7 et al. ἐκεχειρίαν; ε 19 ἐρεσχηλῶ < Procop. 3.12.8 ἐρεσχηλοῦντα;³⁷ ε 23 ἔρανος < Procop. 5.8.30 ἔρανον; ε 24 ἐγκάρσιον < Procop. 5.21.20–21 ἐγκάρσια (neut. pl.); ε 26 εὐήθεια³⁸ < Procop. 5.22.9 εὐήθειαν; ε 27 ἑπαλξίς < Procop. 5.22.10 et al. ἐπάλξεις; ε 30 ἐπεβάτευσεν < Procop. 7.34.21 ἐπεβάτευσαν; ε 42 εὐτραπελία < Th. Sim. 1.10.11 εὐτραπελίας.

This author-citational scheme presumably reflects the lexicographer's methodology of working through the four histories and recording, under the relevant letter, any word he encountered

³⁵ See n.28 above for supplementary lemma ε 40.

³⁶ See n.19 above.

³⁷ The entry ε 19 ἐρεσχηλῶ : τὸ φλυαρῶ. | {...} is irregular in multiple respects and, besides a terminal lacuna (n.34 above), transmissional difficulties can be suspected. Found in the direct tradition (DO) but not in derivative lexica, ε 19 is evidently abridged, perhaps severely (cf. ε 12b, 13b, 17b). In no other lemma cited from an extant passage of the four historians (Procop. 3.12.8 ἐρεσχηλοῦντα, var. lect. ἐρεσχηλοῦντα) is a verb changed to the first-person singular (692 below). If a deliberate alteration, and not textual corruption, the motive for this intervention is obscure, not least because prior lexicographical traditions known to the compiler already contained a lemma in precisely the required form ἐρεσχηλοῦντα (*Synagoge* ε 822 Cunningham; Phot. *Lex.* ε 1907; cf. *Suda* ε 2936).

³⁸ Accented εὐηθεία Dyck 938.35; correctly εὐήθεια *Lex.Aig.* Sturz 624.38; *Etym.Gud.* II 555.4.

in need of explanation.³⁹ Awareness of this compositional process can assist in recognizing the provenance of unattributed material: accordingly ε 33, 35, 37, 39, and 41, owing to their sequential placement and/or absence from extant texts, have been assigned to lost parts of Menander's *Histories*. Occasional disruptions in the sequencing of citations may be due to authorial muddle, copyist's error, or editorial intrusion (especially in alpha), but ostensible disarrangement might arise if two historians used the same word/form, as when Menander imitates Agathias' wording (see below). If the design of the lexicon is comprehensible, the content of the received text seems unbalanced. Agathias is by far the favoured author. Even allowing for differing frequency of initial letters, some sections are very short, comprising a couple of lemmata. Some longer letter-sections contain no lemmata from one or more of the historians.

³⁹ Németh, *Excerpta* 18–19, 245–247, proposes that the lexicographer did not consult the four histories directly but relied on (hypothetical) “draft copies” of several now-lost volumes of the Constantinian *Excerpta*. Németh does not acknowledge that prior scholarship derives the *Excerpta* and *Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν* from separate textual traditions: Keydell ed. xxxiii–xxxiv, with Rance, *JÖB* 73 (2023) 129 n.21; and n.11 above. Moreover, the number, range, and sequence of lemmata do not favour Németh's proposition. In the case of Agathias, if the lexicographer extracted lemmata from excerpts dispersed across multiple topic-based volumes of the *Excerpta*, he took the trouble to rearrange those lemmata so as to reconstitute their original sequence in the complete text of Agathias' *Histories*. This does not seem a logical or likely scenario. See e.g. Agathias-derived lemmata in epsilon: ε 1 (Agath. 1.1.6: treaty obligations), ε 3 (1.3.4: Frankish and Avar hairstyles); ε 4 (1.12.6: polioretic stratagem); ε 5 (1.20.10: jeering at the enemy); ε 6 (pref. 28: Procopius' account of the plague); ε 7 (1.19.3: dismissing troops into winter-quarters); ε 8 (2.4.5: encampment defences); ε 9 (2.4.6: ditto); ε 10 (2.23.6: Persian funerary customs); ε 11 (2.29.8: a philosopher's gluttony); ε 12 (2.31.2: Roman philosophers exiled in Persia / 5.12.6: Roman-Utigur diplomacy). More generally, although important issues remain unresolved, one might legitimately question the wisdom or utility of compiling an author-specific glossary of four histories after they have been excerpted, dismembered, and allocated to multiple volumes containing excerpts extracted from a dozen or more other histories.

It is unclear to what extent these peculiarities reflect defective transmission, the compiler's caprice, or undefined compositional factors.

The task of isolating Menander-derived content requires careful assessment of anomalies and ambiguities. This process is unavoidably technical (readers more interested in results than method may prefer to proceed to section 3). First, several incorrect or dubious cases must be eliminated from the inquiry. Four lemmata that De Stefani attributed to Menander should—or can—be assigned to Agathias.⁴⁰ Attribution of λ 9 λιγνῶδες (neut. sg.) to Menander is unsound when this word occurs at Agathias 5.8.1 (though λιγνῶδη neut. pl.), as De Stefani acknowledged and Dyck (952.23) affirms, and this passage is correctly placed in a series of Agathias-derived lemmata. An earlier instance at Agathias 2.15.9 (λιγνῶδεις fem. pl.) would disrupt the sequence. De Stefani assigned ο 10 ὀρεῦσιν to Menander, without noting its occurrence at Agathias 4.11.3, a reference Dyck (963.33) also omits. This would be slightly out of sequence with preceding ο 9 ὀθνεῖον, if that lemma cites Agathias 4.15.3, as De Stefani and Dyck (963.30–32) believe, though the form at 4.15.3 is dat. ὀθνεῖῳ (cf. 4.26.6), whereas ὀθνεῖον occurs at 3.14.3 (cf. 1.5.5). Lemma π 25 πρῶρα (nom. sg.), the penultimate in pi, which De Stefani assigned to Menander, is most plausibly explained as a displaced but broadly in-sequence citation from Agathias 5.21.8 (at 192.5): πρῶρας (gen. sg.). This view is circumstantially supported by τ 4 τολύπαις, a lemma cited from the same account of improvised boats at 5.21.7 (at 191.23).⁴¹ Finally, De Stefani's tentative attribution of σ 16 σεμνῶς to Menander overlooked two instances at Agathias 4.9.9 and 4.22.2, not refer-

⁴⁰ De Stefani, *StIt* 18 (1910) 440, 442.

⁴¹ Within letter-section pi, Agathias-derived lemmata are sequential but not contiguous: π 1 (1.8.6)–π 11 (5.3.11), π 19 (5.14.7)–π 20 (5.22.1). Displaced π 25 (5.21.8) would be only slightly out of sequence. Instances of πρῶρα in Procop. 7.30.13 (dat. pl.) and 8.22.11 (acc. sg.) lack comparable supporting arguments.

enced by Dyck (976.61–64), even if σ 17 στῆφος, from Agathias 3.20.5 (cf. 3.28.6), would thus be out of sequence.

Challenges arise in demarcating Menandrian material even when ostensibly cited from extant excerpts. In some cases, such lemmata follow an expected sequence, based on their relative positions in the Constantinian *Excerpta*, in which excerpts typically retain their original order.⁴² In one case, however, the received text of the *Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν* is more problematic than prior studies indicate:

- ε 34 ἐπιτροχάδην (Men. fr. 10,3.84 = *Exc.leg.* I 195.5)
- ε 36 ἐφειμένον (Men. fr. 8.10 = *Exc.leg.* II 445.7)
- ε 38 ἐκμαγεῖον (Men. fr. 6,1.413 = *Exc.leg.* I 182.34 ἐκμαγεῖοις)

Although De Stefani and Dyck confidently located each lemma in an excerpt, these three citations would thus be in reverse order.⁴³ The issue is not confined to Menander: several lemmata taken from Procopius and Agathias occur more than once in their works, even in the same form. While it is logically assumed that a headword is cited from its first instance, this is sometimes unclear or demonstrably not so.⁴⁴ For lemmata cited from Menander's *Histories*, fragmentary preservation exacerbates uncertainty about their original positioning. In some cases, the form of a lemma confirms beyond doubt that it does not derive from the surviving textual sample: θ 6 θεοκλυτοῦσιν (pres. ind. act. 3rd pl.) cannot be cited from θεοκλυτεῖν (pres. inf. act.) in fr. 6,1.403 (*Exc.leg.* I 182.25), but must cite another instance of this verb in a lost section.⁴⁵ Likewise ε 37 ἐληλάτει (imperf. ind. act. 3rd sg.) is not cited from ληλατεῖν (pres. inf. act.) in fr. 21.13 (*Exc.leg.* I 208.22–23), nor π 22 παγιωθεῖσα (fem. nom. aor. part.

⁴² Correct sequence of lemmata cited from excerpts of Menander's *Histories*: e.g. τ 7 τερθρεία (Men. fr. 6,1.45 = *Exc.leg.* I 172.23); τ 8 τρακταΐσαι (Men. fr. 6,1.193 = *Exc.leg.* I 176.26). See likewise α 142 ἀποχρόντως (Men. fr. 6,1.18 = *Exc.leg.* I 171.30); α 143 ἀποφλαυρίζοντες (Men. fr. 6,2.20 = *Exc.sent.* 20.4).

⁴³ De Stefano, *StIt* 18 (1910) 441–442; Dyck 941.73, 941.80, 942.89.

⁴⁴ E.g. θ 7 θωπεία with multiple references cited n.56 below.

⁴⁵ Dyck 947.18; Rance, *JÖB* 73 (2023) 139 n.62. See 683 below.

pass. sg.) from ἐπαγιώθη (aor. ind. pass. 3rd sg.) in fr. 6,1.365 (*Exc. leg.* I 181.22).⁴⁶ Correspondingly, it is possible that ε 38 ἐκμαγεῖον (neut. nom./acc. sg.), distinct from ἐκμαγεῖοις (neut. dat. pl.) in its posited source at fr. 6,1.413, is in fact cited from a later, now-lost passage, which would explain the position of ε 38 relative to preceding lemmata. Other factors may weigh against this inference. In a handful of lemmata, the lexicographer modified both the case and number of a cited noun. He might have done so in ε 38.⁴⁷ Moreover, as fr. 6,1 is the source of other lemmata, he is likely to have read ἐκμαγεῖοις here, even if he encountered ἐκμαγεῖον elsewhere.⁴⁸ Similar ambiguity affects ε 34 ἐπιτροχάδην and ε 36 ἐφειμένον: the headwords find precise correspondents in excerpts, but could also have occurred in lost sections. Ultimately, while questions remain open, the ‘incorrect’ sequence of citations in epsilon may merely reflect the partial survival of Menander’s work.

Evidence of disrupted transmission in this part of epsilon further complicates analysis. The *Etymologicum Gudianum* contains two lemmata that, though cited from Menander and Theophylact, are absent in the direct tradition of the *Lexicon Aίμωδεῖν* (DO), and were evidently transmitted via a more complete version available to the tenth-/eleventh-century compiler.⁴⁹ First, rare ἐμβριώμενοι (*Etym. Gud.* II 461.5) is cited from Menander fr. 10,3.16–17 (*Exc. leg.* I 193.6), the excerpt in which the extant instance of ε 34 ἐπιτροχάδην occurs (fr. 10,3.84 = *Exc. leg.* I 195.5).⁵⁰ Second, ἔμβιοι (*Etym. Gud.* II 461.1–2) derives from Theophylact 1.5.15, which is quoted in the gloss. This lemma, preceding ε 42 εὐτραπελία (Th. Sim. 1.10.11), originally would have begun the

⁴⁶ Dyck 941.84–85, 970.82.

⁴⁷ Cf. ε 42 εὐτραπελία < Th. Sim. 1.10.11 εὐτραπελίας (acc. pl.); σ 14 σισύρα < Agath. 3.16.7 σισύρας; τ 2 τάρπη < Procop. 1.18.52 τάρπας.

⁴⁸ Cf. α 142 ἀποχρόντως (fr. 6,1.18 = *Exc. leg.* I 171.30); τ 7 τερθρεία (fr. 6,1.45 = *Exc. leg.* I 172.23); τ 8 τρακταΐσαι (fr. 6,1.193 = *Exc. leg.* I 176.26).

⁴⁹ See 657 above, and specifically Dyck 996.

⁵⁰ See n.11 above.

Theophylact series.

For the present study, these various grounds for doubt and signs of disarrangement, combined with Menander's known imitation of Agathias, have an important consequence: one cannot entirely rule out the possibility that at least some of the lemmata in epsilon that editors have assigned to Menander are in fact a displaced series of Agathias-derived lemmata, especially as they replicate the sequential occurrence of those headwords in Agathias' *Histories*: ε 33 ἐσκευωρήσθαι (3.3.7), ε 34 ἐπιτροχάδην (4.1.2), ε 35 ἐπιέζοντο (4.20.4). This could also be the case with ε 36 ἐφειμένον (1.20.5, 3.27.1, 4.5.8) and ε 37 ἐληλάτει (4.29.8), though considerations of sequence, together with Menander's proven usage of both words (fr. 8.10 ἐφειμένον, fr. 21.13 ληλατεῖν), more firmly anchor these two lemmata in a Menander series.⁵¹ In the case of ε 33–35, however, as no arguments can tip the balance in favour of Menander or Agathias, these lemmata will be excluded from the sample analysed below.

Other disruptions of sequence may reflect vagaries of composition or transmission, but again linguistic affinities between Agathias and Menander lead to uncertainty. Letter-section theta serves as an example:

- θ 1[–2] θαμίζειν (Agath. pref. 10 or Men. fr. 1,1.9)⁵²
- θ 3 θρυλλοῦντες (lost Men.)
- θ 4 θριγκῶ (Agath. 4.14.3 or lost Men.)
- θ 5 θητικόν (Agath. 3.16.4, 4.21.6, cf. 2.8.2 θητικοῦ; or lost Men., cf. fr. 5,4.25 θητικοῦ)
- θ 6 θεοκλυτοῦσιν (lost Men., cf. fr. 6,1.403 θεοκλυτεῖν)
- θ 7 θωπεία (Procop. 1.25.4 et al.; Agath. 4.28.4; Men. fr. 6,2.17)

Indicative of conscious mimesis, θ 1 θαμίζειν occurs in the initial

⁵¹ If the lexicographer cited ε 36 ἐφειμένον from Agathias, he overlooked two prior instances (1.20.5, 3.27.1) and cited a third (4.5.8), which is still out of sequence with preceding ε 35 ἐπιέζοντο (4.20.4). If ε 37 ἐληλάτει is cited from Agathias (4.29.8), the lexicographer likewise passed over a prior instance (4.22.6 ληλατουμένον).

⁵² θ 2 καὶ θαμίζει, a supplementary lemma to θ 1 θαμίζειν, derives from a lexicographical source: Dyck 945.3 app. font. (add Hsch. θ 81).

sections of both Agathias and Menander. Lemma θ 3 $\theta\rho\upsilon\lambda\lambda\omicron\upsilon\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$, unattested in the other three historians, by default originates in a lost part of Menander, likewise θ 6 $\theta\epsilon\omicron\kappa\lambda\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu$, especially as an excerpt verifies Menander's usage. Given this sequence, intervening θ 4 $\theta\rho\iota\gamma\kappa\hat{\omega}$ and θ 5 $\theta\eta\tau\iota\kappa\acute{\omicron}\nu$ should also derive from Menander. If so, as $\theta\rho\iota\gamma\kappa\hat{\omega}$ occurs in Agathias 4.14.3, the lemma is cited from another, now-lost passage of Menander that imitated Agathias.⁵³ The source of θ 5 is more ambiguous. De Stefani and Dyck adduce Menander fr. 5,4.25, though this excerpt contains genitive $\theta\eta\tau\iota\kappa\omicron\upsilon$, replicating Agathias 2.8.2.⁵⁴ Nominative $\theta\eta\tau\iota\kappa\acute{\omicron}\nu$ occurs at Agathias 3.16.4 and 4.21.6. Yet, again, the lexicographer could have found the headword in a lost part of Menander. Of potential relevance, *Suda* θ 376 illustrates $\theta\eta\tau\iota\kappa\acute{\omicron}\nu$ (acc.) by quoting an unascribed military narrative, which, as argued below, is most likely to be Menander's *Histories*.⁵⁵ Finally, while θ 7 $\theta\omega\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$ occurs in Procopius, Agathias, and extant Menander, circumstantial evidence slightly favours Procopius.⁵⁶ Accordingly, the Menandrian origin of θ 3 and 6 is secure. On the grounds of sequence and external evidence, θ 5 is attributable to Menander, but a section other than fr. 5,4.25. Unless

⁵³ De Stefani, *StIt* 18 (1910) 444, and Dyck 946.8–9, 998, by not registering $\theta\rho\iota\gamma\kappa\hat{\omega}$ in Agath. 4.14.3, imply that attribution to Menander is more straightforward than is the case.

⁵⁴ Men. fr. 5,4.25 $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\theta\eta\tau\iota\kappa\omicron\upsilon$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\omicron\iota\kappa\epsilon\tau\iota\kappa\omicron\upsilon$; cf. Agath. 2.8.2 $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\tau\epsilon$ $\theta\eta\tau\iota\kappa\omicron\upsilon$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\omicron\iota\kappa\epsilon\tau\iota\kappa\omicron\upsilon$. See De Stefani, *StIt* 18 (1910) 444 (also noting Agath. 3.16.4); Dyck 946.10.

⁵⁵ See 673 below.

⁵⁶ The transmitted lemma is nom. sg. $\theta\omega\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$. Dyck 947.21–22 cites Men. fr. 6,2.17 $\theta\omega\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$ (acc. sg.) and Procop. 1.4.21 $\theta\omega\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ (dat. pl., cf. 8.18.6), the first instance in *Wars*. Both citations assume that the lexicographer modified the lemma or it is corrupted. If, however, the lemma was once barely distinguishable dat. sg. $\theta\omega\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$, parallels are found at Agath. 4.28.4 and Procop. 1.25.4, also Procop. 4.1.9, 4.18.5, 4.26.22, 8.7.4, 8.16.23 (see the same transition from original dat. sg. fem. to a nom. sg. lemma at α 115 $\acute{\alpha}\beta\epsilon\lambda\tau\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$ < Procop. 2.15.8 $\acute{\alpha}\beta\epsilon\lambda\tau\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$; β 4 $\beta\omicron\lambda\omega\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ < Procop. 8.22.29 $\beta\omicron\lambda\omicron\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$; ϵ 11 $\acute{\epsilon}\omega\lambda\omicron\kappa\rho\alpha\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ < Agath. 2.29.8 $\acute{\epsilon}\omega\lambda\omicron\kappa\rho\alpha\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$). In favour of Procop. 1.25.4 is its proximity to the unique source of α 112 $\acute{\alpha}\iota\mu\acute{\omicron}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ at 1.25.2.

displaced, θ 4 too should be assigned sequentially to a lost Agathias-inspired passage of Menander. An alternative deduction that θ 1–6 comprise two intermixed series of lemmata cited from Agathias (1[–2], 4, 5) and Menander (3, 6) is unnecessary and otherwise problematic.⁵⁷ In these circumstances, while the soundest method of isolating citations from lost parts of Menander's *Histories* would be to admit only lemmata that nowhere occur in the other three authors, given Menander's mimesis of Agathias, analysis should take into account those few lemmata, like θ 4 and 5, where relative sequence and/or other criteria point to a citation from Menander, even when the word/form is found in Agathias.

Similar ambiguities occur in the second half of gamma. Following nine lemmata (γ 1–9) cited in sequence from Agathias (up to 5.22.4), a pattern becomes hard to discern:

- γ 10 Γήπαιδες (all four authors)
- γ 11a γλιχόμενοι | γ 11b γλιχόμενος (all four authors)
- γ 12 γέρρα (lost Men.? Cf. Th. Sim. pref. 5 γέρρον)
- γ 13 γριφῶδες (lost Men.)
- γ 14 γεγωνότερον (Agath. 4.2.2 or lost Men.?)
- γ 15 γρυπός (lost Men.)
- γ 16 γωρυτούς (Agath. 3.28.5 or lost Men.?)

Not found in the other three histories, γ 13 and 15 by default cite lost sections of Menander. Accordingly, if in correct sequence, γ 14 and 16, even though both lemmata occur in Agathias, could also be citations from Agathias-inspired passages of Menander.⁵⁸ Alternatively, if in fact cited from Agathias, and thus now in

⁵⁷ This proposition requires both (1) θ 3 $\theta\rho\upsilon\lambda\lambda\omicron\upsilon\delta\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ is displaced from a Menander series into a preceding Agathias series; (2) if θ 4 $\theta\rho\iota\gamma\kappa\omega$ derives from Agath. 4.14.3, then θ 5 $\theta\eta\tau\iota\kappa\acute{o}\nu$ should be cited sequentially from Agath. 4.21.6 (a chapter not otherwise cited), in which case the lexicographer deemed it necessary to explain this third occurrence of $\theta\eta\tau\iota\kappa\acute{o}\nu$ but not two earlier instances at 2.8.2 and 3.16.4, even though he glossed other words in those chapters (α 132 < Agath. 2.8.7, σ 8 < Agath. 2.8.8, \omicron 8 < Agath. 3.16.8).

⁵⁸ De Stefani, *StIt* 18 (1910) 442, assigns all four lemmata γ 13–16 to Menander, but observes that γ 14 $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\omega\nu\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu$ occurs at Agath. 4.2.2.

reverse sequence, γ 14 and 16 have been displaced from the preceding block of Agathias-derived lemmata at γ 1–9.⁵⁹ In the absence of additional evidence, this question remains open. Separately, γ 12 γέρρα finds an inexact match in singular γέρρον in Theophylact's preface 5, while this noun is absent from Procopius and Agathias, but, as De Stefani observed, the occurrence of plural γέρρα in a lost part of Menander is possible.⁶⁰

Another debatable case occurs in delta: with initial δ 1–6 cited sequentially from Agathias, and concluding δ 12–13 from Procopius, intervening δ 7–10 all derive from Menander, extant and lost, with one apparent aberration:

- δ 7 διακηρυκεύεται (lost Men.)
- δ 8 διφθέραν (Men. fr. 6,2.31)
- δ 9 δαιταλεῦσιν (Th. Sim. 5.5.9; thus Dyck 926.33)
- δ 10 διασεσοβημένος (lost Men.)

The liminal position of δ 11 διαρρήδην equally permits that it is the last lemma cited from Menander (fr. 27,2.27) or the first from Procopius (1.5.20).⁶¹ From this sequencing, unless δ 9 is transposed, δαιταλεῦσιν could also have occurred in Menander, as De Stefani inferred.⁶² Although these cases in gamma and delta are insufficiently secure to be admitted into the selection of Menandrian fragments below, they should not be entirely discounted as potential evidence.

One last example must be excluded. Dyck (859) places ξ 5 ξυνερρώγει (Attic pluperf. ind. act. 3rd sg. συρρήγνυμι) among

⁵⁹ If this were the case, γ 16 γωρυτούς (Agath. 3.28.5) and γ 14 γεγωνότερον (Agath. 4.2.2) were originally placed before or after γ 3[–8] γεγωνόμενος, depending on which of two possible passages is cited in this lemma (Agath. 2.28.4 or 5.3.4).

⁶⁰ De Stefani, *StIt* 18 (1910) 442. It is equally plausible that the lexicographer pluralized γέρρον in Th. Sim. pref. 5, owing to the prevalence of γέρρα as the lemmatic form in his lexical sources: De Stefani, *Elym. Gud.* II 303.12–15 app. font.; Dyck 921.26–30 app. font. This interpretation may be supported by lemma ι 5 ἕγγι, undoubtedly cited from adjacent Th. Sim. pref. 4.

⁶¹ Dyck 927.40–41.

⁶² De Stefani, *StIt* 18 (1910) 440.

“lemmata drawn from one of the historians,” but his edition (960.18–20) gives no source. In fact, *ξυνερρώγει* is unattested in the other three histories and Menander’s fragments. The word is preceded in Thucydides (1.66.1) and thence imitated by Atticizing authors (e.g. Cass. Dio 38.47.4) and cited in lexicography (e.g. Hsch. σ 2538). While it might be tempting to derive *ξυνερρώγει* from a lost part of Menander, this case is not straightforward. The sequence of lemmata offers no firm assistance:

- ξ 1 *ξυνεδεδέατο* (Procop. 2.8.15)
- ξ 2 *ξυνάρασθαι* (Procop. 5.13.14)
- ξ 3 *ξυναλιζόμενοι* (Agath. 2.29.4)
- ξ 4 *ξυνίστωρ* (lost Men.)
- ξ 5 *ξυνερρώγει*
- ξ 6 *ξύγκλυδες* (Agath. 1.6.3)

De Stefani assigned unattributed ξ 4 and 5 to Menander. He placed also ξ 6 in this category, without acknowledging that the lemma occurs in Agathias.⁶³ However, ξ 5 can be linked to Agathias indirectly. The first gloss of *ξυνερρώγει* is *συνερράγη*, albeit the aorist of the same verb. This form is found in Agathias at 1.6.4 (at 17.19), as Atticized *ξυνερράγη*, a hapax. Moreover, it occurs within a few lines of the source of ξ 6 *ξύγκλυδες* at Agathias 1.6.3 (at 17.14). The close proximity of the two lemmata within Agathias’ text cannot be accidental and conforms to the lexicographer’s method. Irrespective of the sequential disarrangement of these lemmata, therefore, and whatever the reasons for the lemmatic form of ξ 5 (where *ξυνερρώγει* may reflect the influence of prior lexical literature), there are no grounds for attributing ξ 5 to Menander.⁶⁴

3. *Lemmata and quotations attributable to lost sections of Menander’s Histories*

The foregoing analysis permits compilation of a dossier of material attributable to Menander’s *Histories*, but not found in

⁶³ De Stefani, *StIt* 18 (1910) 440 (with editorial difficulties at ξ 5).

⁶⁴ Other examples of a verb altered in the lemma: ξ 1 *ξυνεδεδέατο* < Procop. 2.8.15 *ξυνδεδέατο*; ω 2 *ώστίζοντο* < Agath. 3.7.9 *ώθίζοντο*.

surviving excerpts and thus missing from all editions. This endeavour revises and elaborates preceding research. With varying degrees of confidence, De Stefani (1910) ascribed 44 such entries (lemmata and/or quotations) to Menander, on the basis that whatever did not belong to the other three historians must be his, but without detailed argumentation. Dyck (1995) affirmed this interpretative logic, with adjustments, some explicit, others unsignalled. He added four items (lemmata: κ 2 καταγνόναι, μ 1 μαπία; lemma with quotation: μ 2 μετωπηδόν; quotation alone: χ 1 χιλός). Some lemmata that De Stefani deemed Menandrian Dyck reassigned to another author (γ 12 γέρρα, γ 14 γεγωνότερον, γ 16 γωρυτούς, δ 9 δαιταλεῦσιν, λ 9 λιγνυῶδες, ξ 6 ξύγκλυδες). Dyck culled a larger number of lemmata from De Stefani's selection without comment. Some of these I too reject as certainly or more plausibly cited from one of the other histories, though Dyck did not supply an alternative reference (ξ 5 ξυνερρώγει, ο 10 ὀρεῦσιν, π 25 πῶρα, σ 16 σεμῶς, τ 10 τενάγη). Dyck's final list comprises 20 lemmata and six quotations (two from φ 5). It is unclear why Dyck includes only lemmata in alpha–mu and phi–psi. I find no grounds for excluding ten lemmata in nu–upsilon and omega, all previously identified by De Stefani, insofar as they conform to the same criteria as those lemmata Dyck admits (ν 6 νεοχμῶντες, ξ 4 ξυνίστωρ, ο 12 οὐριοδρομήσαντες, ο 13 ὀχμάσας, π 21 πιαλέα, π 22 παγιωθείσα, σ 18 σκυταλωτοὺς τροχοῦς, τ 11 τούδουνοι, υ 7 ὑπουλος ἄνθρωπος, ω 4 ὠρύω). One lemma in alpha selected by De Stefani but omitted by Dyck is cautiously readmitted (α 149 ἄτρυα). A lemma that De Stefani and Dyck derive from an excerpt of Menander is reassigned to a lost section, based on form and external evidence (θ 5 θητικόν). Other lemmata may belong to this category (ε 36 ἐφειμένον, ε 38 ἐκμαγεῖον). A few doubtful cases are not admitted, even if they cannot be definitively rejected (γ 12 γέρρα, γ 14 γεγωνότερον, γ 16 γωρυτούς, δ 9 δαιταλεῦσιν, ε 33 ἐσκευωρήσθαι, ε 35 ἐπιέζοντο).

For organizational purposes, lemmata are listed first, then quotations. The lemma and gloss(es) are quoted, etymologies and syntactical notes omitted. Some entries allow limited com-

mentary, of others little can be said. Occurrences of a headword also in Procopius, Agathias, and/or Theophylact are recorded; the absence of cross-references indicates that the word, in any form, is not found in these three historians. Overall, the listed lemmata exhibit affinities with the vocabulary and usage in Agathias' *Histories*, consistent with Menander's well-documented linguistic-stylistic mimesis of his predecessor. Some words reflect recognized traits in Menander's diction, including a penchant for poetic vocabulary (ζ 1 ζαμενής, ο 13 ὀχμάσας, τ 9 τελχίνες, and quotation in ψ 1)⁶⁵ and a taste for outré compound words (α 141 ἀνεπαφρόδιτος, σ 1 συνασμένιζε).⁶⁶

3a. *Lemmata*

α 141 ἀνεπαφρόδιτος (masc. nom. sg.): ὁ μὴ ἐπιχαρῆς καὶ ἀηδής, ὡς ἐπαφρόδιτος ὁ ἐπιχαρῆς καὶ ἡδύς, "unfavoured by Aphrodite: one who is not charming and unpleasing, as favoured by Aphrodite is one who is charming and pleasing." Menander's choice of this *recherché* adjective was presumably inspired by the prominent occurrence of ἐπαφρόδιτος in Agathias' opening comparison of History and Poetry: pref. 9 λίαν ὠδίνουσιν ἐπαφρόδιτα, "give birth to [offspring] of exceeding loveliness."⁶⁷ The placement of α 141 first in the series of Menander-derived lemmata in alpha may reflect similar prefatory use of ἀνεπαφρόδιτος, while his selection of this cumbersome antonym perhaps signals competitive inversion of Agathias' wording.⁶⁸

α 144 ἀμβλυώττειν (Attic pres. ind. act. inf.): τὸ τυφλώττειν καὶ βαρύνεσθαι τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς, "to be weak-sighted: to be blind and beset with eye troubles." Cf. Procop. *Anec.* 4.12 ἐνθένδε ἀεὶ ἀμβλυώττειν, "thereafter always weak-sighted." See cognate ἀμβλύνω in Procop. 8.11.40; Agath. 1.16.3, 5.8.4 ἀμβλύνεσθαι τὰς ὄψεις, "dulled the sight," 20.7.

α 145 ἀμάρας (gen. sg. ἀμάρα): ὀχετοῦ ἢ τάφρου ἢ ὑδρορ(ρ)οῆς· διὰ τὸ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ ὄντα φυτὰ ἀμάραντα εἶναι, "conduit: channel or ditch or

⁶⁵ Baldwin, *DOP* 32 (1978) 120; Blockley, *The History of Menander* 7 n.27, with Rance, *JÖB* 73 (2023) 139–141, for Menander's interest in poetry.

⁶⁶ Blockley, *The History of Menander* 7 n.30.

⁶⁷ See A. Kaldellis, "Agathias on History and Poetry," *GRBS* 38 (1999) 295–305.

⁶⁸ See generally Blockley, *The History of Menander* 2–3 n.9, 13.

watercourse; on account of the fact that those plants in it do not fade.” This term apparently occurred in a description of a well-watered landscape. Excerpts of Menander’s *Histories* include reports of such rural landscapes within the ‘travelogues’ of Roman envoys: e.g. fr. 19,1.21–26. See below π 21 and χ 1. More specifically, fr. 9,1.19–21 records that an envoy at Dara τὸν κατὰ πόλιν ὄλκον τοῦ ὕδατος ἐπεσκεύασε καὶ ὑδροχεῖα ἐπενόησε, “repaired the city’s water supply and attended to cisterns.”

- α 146 ἀφαυρά (fem. nom. sg. or neut. nom./acc. pl. ἀφαυρός): ἀσθενέστερα, ἀμαυρότερα, ἢ κουφότερα, “feeble: weaker, fainter or slighter.” This adjective typically occurs in the comparative or superlative.⁶⁹ The only instance in late antique historiography is Agath. 2.15.5 ἀφαιροτάτη, describing earth tremors.⁷⁰
- α 149 ἄτρυντα (neut. nom./acc. pl. ἄτρυντος): ἀκάματα, σκληρὰ καὶ ἰσχυρά: σημαίνει δὲ καὶ ἀβλαβή, οἶον ἄτρητα, “unwearied: untiring, hardy and strong. It means also undamaged, like unperforated.”
- γ 13 γριφῶδες (neut. nom./acc. sg. adj. γριφώδης): σημαίνει τὸ δύσκολον καὶ συμπλεγμένον λόγιον, “riddle-like: it means the difficult and complicated saying.”
- γ 15: γρυπός (masc. nom. sg.): ὁ ἐπικεκαμμένην ἔχων τὴν ρίνα, “hook-nosed: one who has a nose at a curved angle.” No suitable context or personage has been identified.⁷¹
- δ 7 διακηρκεύεται (pres. ind. 3rd sg. διακηρκεύομαι): διὰ κηρκόων συνθήκας ἢ πρεσβείας ποιεῖται, “negotiates by herald: through heralds makes agreements or embassies.” Although preceded in Thuc. 4.38.2, the verb is rare in late antique historiography: see only Zos. 4.44.1. Doubtless the cited context was diplomatic.
- δ 10 διασσοβημένος (masc. nom. perf. part. pass. sg. διασσοβέω):

⁶⁹ LSJ⁹ s.v. ἀφαυρός. The three comparative glosses are a reflex of the compiler’s lexical sources: Dyck 915.41 app. font.

⁷⁰ By way of comparison, σ 11 στομύλος is cited from Agath. 2.30.1 στομυλώτατος, where the lexicographer altered a masc. sg. superlative adj. in the source-text into a masc. sg. positive adj. as the lemma, following a persistent lexicographical tradition of στομύλος (Dyck 976.50 app. font.). I have discounted the possibility that α 146 ἀφαυρά is likewise adapted from Agath. 2.15.5 ἀφαιροτάτη (and not cited from a lost section of Menander), as there is no corresponding development with ἀφαυρά in the compiler’s lexical sources that might have motivated this intervention.

⁷¹ See Dyck 860 on a possible lost source of the gloss (distinct from the lemma).

τεταραγμένος, ἄτακτος, τεθορυβημένος, “having been scared away (or agitated): thrown into confusion, disorderly, set in turmoil.” The verb is rare. The sole use in extant ancient historiography is Agath. 3.11.1 αὐτοὺς ἀνεκίνηει καὶ διεσώβει, “stirred up and agitated them,” regarding a crowd’s reaction to a speech. Another instance occurs in an unidentified anonymous quotation from a battle description in *Suda* ρ 218 οἱ δὲ διεσοβήθησαν.

ε 37 ἐληλάτει (imperf. ind. act. 3rd sg. ληλατέω): ἠχμαλώτευεν, ἐλήστευεν, ἤρπαζεν, “(he/it) was plundering: was taking captives, robbing, snatching.” This verb occurs in a different form (pres. inf. act.) in Menander fr. 21.12–13 παύσαιντο μὲν τοῦ τὴν Ῥωμαϊκὴν ληλατεῖν, “(they) would cease to plunder Roman territory,” concerning raiding Sklavenes around 578. Widely used in classical historiography, though not in Thucydides, ληλατέω is relatively uncommon in the sixth century. Procopius’ oeuvre has one instance: *Anc.* 2.28 ληλατήσῃε. Exceptionally, it is favoured by Agathias, including in the cited form: 4.22.6 τῶν ληλατουμένων, 29.8 ἐληλάτει, 5.1.2 ἐληλάτουν, 11.7 ληλατήσονται, 13.1 ἐληλάτουν, 23.9 ληλατοῦντες.

ε 39 ἔναυλος (nom. sg.): ἔμπρους· σημαίνει δὲ καὶ ῥοῦν καὶ χαράδραν καὶ χειμάρρουν, “still fresh: alive; it means also a stream and mountain-torrent and winter-flow.” The lexicographer registers two of several meanings, one adjectival, the other nominal. The priority accorded to the adjective implies that this usage was found in Menander. Correspondingly, ἔναυλος occurs in the other three historians only in this sense, variously in relation to still-audible sound, persistent fears and suspicions, or fresh memories: Procop. 5.10.10 πάταγος ἔναυλος, Agath. 5.5.6 ἔναυλον ... τὸ δέος, 9.1 ἔναυλον ... τὸ πάθος καὶ ἡ ὑποψία; Th. Sim. 4.6.5 ἔναυλον τὴν μνήμην.

ε 41 ἐλινύειν (pres. act. inf.): ἀργεῖν, σχολάζειν, “to rest: to be unoccupied, to be at leisure.” Despite instances in canonical historians, including Herodotus and especially Arrian, ἐλινύω is rare in later historiography: see only Evagr. *HE* 5.24 (219.23 Bidez/Parmentier), 6.13 (231.12), in both cases referring to individuals who do not “remain inactive” in response to events.

ζ 1 ζαμενής (masc./fem. nom. sg. adj.): εὐψυχος, μέγα μένος ἔχων, τουτέστι ψυχὴν ἢ προθυμίαν. ἢ ζαμενής, ὁ ἄγαν ὀργίλος, “forceful: of good spirit, having great force, that is spirit or morale. Or ... one

much inclined to anger.”⁷² The lengthy definition acknowledges potential nuance. The headword previously occurs only in verse, and dependent scholia and lexica, and is unattested in prose before the Late Byzantine era. Well-known instances include Pindar and Sophocles.⁷³ Menander’s choice of this adjective may reflect his poetic interests,⁷⁴ though concern for distinctive lexical *variatio* is discernible; for example, in the same semantic field, adj. ὀργίλος, “enraged” (fr. 9,3.82, 21.47), verb νευεσιζῶ “feel indignation” (15.17), and noun μῆνις “wrath” (25,1.79), none of which are found in the other three histories.

ζ 3 ζάκορος (nom. sg. noun): νεώκορος, “sacred warden: temple attendant.”⁷⁵ The evidence permits only conjecture. A possible context is Menander’s fascination with the story of the apostate magus Isaozites/Isbozetes (Yazdbōzēd), whose public profession of Christianity, as martyrial acta report, occurred during his participation in a Zoroastrian fire ceremony at Dvin.⁷⁶

θ 3 θρυλλοῦντες (masc. nom. pres. part. act. pl. θρυλλέω): τουτέστι θόρυβον ἐγείροντες, “making a commotion ... that is raising tumult.” No formal gloss is provided, but the etymological notice concludes with this definition. Classicizing orthography prefers θρυλέω, though variation occurs between and within codices and editions.⁷⁷ Besides compounds and cognates, Procopius and Agathias use θρυλ(λ)έομαι in a distinct sense of information “noised about” or “tales told”: Procop. 8.20.48 θρυλλοῦμενα (cf. *Anec.* 25.19); Agath. 2.24.8 θρυλουμένου, 4.23.4 τὰ ... θρυλούμενα, 5.11.3 τὸ θρυλούμενον. Excerpts of Menander attest only διαθρυλ(λ)έω, similarly of news “spread

⁷² Dyck 943.2–944.5 app. font.

⁷³ LSJ⁹ s.v. ζαμενής.

⁷⁴ See 695 below.

⁷⁵ Dyck 861, 944.8–10 app. font., shows that the lexicographer drew the gloss and subsequent etymological notice from *Etym.Gen.* K. Alpers, “Beobachtungen zur Überlieferung und zum Text des Platonlexikons des Timaios,” *ZPE* 166 (2008) 85–99, at 98 n.82, “mit Sicherheit,” brands ζ 3 a later interpolation from *Etym.Gen.*, though on doubtful grounds, while his view of the chronology and editorial process is less certain in *Literature* 302 n.52, 309–310 nn.84–85.

⁷⁶ Men. fr. 13.3–4; *Anth.Pal.* 1.101, with Men. T3 (schol. Strab. 15.3.15), and discussion in Rance, *JÖB* 73 (2023) 133–147.

⁷⁷ Procopius: e.g. 2.8.17 ἐπιθρυλοῦντες (Haury I 187.1 app. crit.), 4.21.2 ἐπιθρυλλοῦντες (I 518.5). Agathias: Keydell ed. xxxv–xxxvi.

abroad”: fr. 10,4.1 διαθρυλληθέν, 20,2.34 διεθρυλήθη. Preceding lemma ε 22 ἐπιθρυλοῦντες, citing Procop. 4.21.2, is glossed ἐνοχλοῦντες, θορυβοῦντες, “being a nuisance, causing tumult,” whereas here Procopius clearly means “spreading the report that...” The lexicographer may have likewise misconstrued θ 3 θρυλλοῦντες.

θ 4 θριγκῶ (dat. sg. θριγκός): τῷ τροχώματι, “(by/to/on) a parapet: the circuit.” The gloss is significantly rarer than the headword.⁷⁸ The original sense of an uppermost course of masonry or coping stones metonymically came to mean an entire circuit-wall. The lemma occurs in Agath. 4.14.3 αὐτοῖς ... τῷ θριγκῶ περιεχομένοις, “being enclosed by the circuit-wall.” This passage presumably inspired Menander’s usage.⁷⁹

θ 5 θητικόν (masc. acc. or neut. nom./acc. sg. adj. θητικός): θεραπευτικόν, ὑποχείριον, ἐργαστικόν τῶν δεόντων, μισθαρνικόν, “menial: at one’s service, at hand, performing necessary tasks, working for hire.” In sixth-century historiography, neuter substantive θητικόν, relatively rare in all eras, becomes a collective designation for the household servants or staff of military personnel, and, by extension, “camp-followers” in general.⁸⁰ Initially, this expression is particular to Agathias and, in imitation, Menander. Agathias uses θητικόν to denote a domestic retinue: 2.8.2 θητικοῦ, 3.16.4 θητικόν (nom.), 4.21.6 θητικόν (nom.). In Menander fr. 5,4.25 τοῦ θητικοῦ καὶ οἰκετικοῦ the term possibly extends to armed retainers. In any case, Menander reprises Agathias’ wording (2.8.2) τοῦ τε θητικοῦ καὶ οἰκετικοῦ.⁸¹ As the sequence of lemmata implies that θ 5 is cited from Menander rather than Agathias, De Stefani and Dyck identify fr. 5,4.25 as the source, despite genitive θητικοῦ.⁸² However, as the gloss is not obviously indebted to any lexicographical tradition that might have induced the lexicographer to regularize the headword from genitive to nominative,⁸³ the possibility that θ 5 cites θητικόν from another, lost passage of Menander should be considered. In support of this proposition can be adduced *Suda* θ 376, which exemplifies use

⁷⁸ *LBG* s.v. τροχώμα.

⁷⁹ See 672–673 above.

⁸⁰ A distant antecedent is found in Arr. *Tact.* 2.1. See Middle Byzantine usage in *LBG* s.v. θητικόν.

⁸¹ Blockley, *The History of Menander* 253–254 n.29; *PLRE* IIIA 241, “Bonus 4.”

⁸² See 673 above. De Stefani, *StIt* 18 (1910) 444; Dyck 946.10.

⁸³ Dyck 946.10–11 app. font.

of θητικόν with a quotation from an unidentified classicizing history: καὶ θητικὸν ἐπήγοντο οἱ αὐτοὶ ἐς τὸν πόλεμον οἱ Πέρσαι πλείστον ὅσον καὶ παιδία καὶ γυναῖκας, οὓς κατὰ τινὰ δὴ πάτριον νόμον ἐς τοὺς κινδύνους θεατὰς οἰκείας ἀλκῆς ἤγον, “And a body of camp-followers the Persians themselves brought forth into battle, of so great a number, and children and women, whom, doubtless in accordance with some ancestral custom, they brought into danger as observers of their own prowess.” Leaving aside prior conjectures, as the compiler(s) of the *Suda* drew this category of historical citation from selected volumes of the Constantinian *Excerpta*, the range of possible authors is confined to the canon of historians excerpted in that project.⁸⁴ More specifically, of the handful of those historians who record—or, if fragmentary, could have recorded—“Persian” military operations, only two are known to have employed the key-term θητικόν: Agathias and Menander. Other stylistic features also point to Menander.⁸⁵ At the very least, Menander must be considered the most likely candidate, enhancing the prospect that his use of θητικόν need not be restricted to extant fr. 5,4,25.

Θ 6 θεοκλυτοῦσιν (pres. ind. act. 3rd pl. θεοκλυτέω): ὡς θεοὺς ἐπικαλοῦνται, “they pray to God(s): they invoke them as gods.” The gloss excludes the possibility that θεοκλυτοῦσιν is alternatively neut./masc. dat. pl. pres. participle. In sixth-century historiography, the verb (pres. act. inf.) occurs uniquely in Menander fr. 6,1.403 μήτε μὴν θεοκλυτεῖν ἀκουσίως τοὺς παρὰ Μήδοις νενομισμένους θεοὺς, “nor against their will pray to the gods in whom the Medes believe,” in a protocol appended to the peace treaty of 561/2, guaranteeing liberties to Christian inhabitants under Sasanian rule. The lemma θεοκλυτοῦσιν must be cited from another, now-lost passage, pre-

⁸⁴ Németh, *Excerpta* 238–255, with bibliography. Previously, H. Valesius, *Ammiani Marcellini Rerum gestarum ... libri XXVIII* (Paris 1636) 278–279, assigned the quote to Cassius Dio. A. Adler, *Suda Lexicon* II (Leipzig 1931) 718.7–9 app. font., dismissing Valesius’ proposal, tentatively suggests Anon. *FGrHist* 151: Anonyme Alexander-geschichte (Fragm. Sabbaiticum). Neither conjecture has merit.

⁸⁵ E.g. πλείστον ὅσον: exceptionally rare in late antique secular historiography, the construction πλείστ- ὅσ- is common in Agathias (Keydell ed. 229, Index graecitatis, s.v. ὅσος *adiectivis subiectum*) and imitated by Menander: fr. 12,2.28 πλείστα ὅσα κατηγόρησαντες, 19,1.132 ἕτερα πλείστα ὅσα διαλεχθεῖς, 20,1.48 πλείστων δὲ ὅσων ῥημάτων, 23,1.9 πλείστας ὅσας κόμας, 23,9.61–62 πλείστας ὅσας ἡμέρας.

sumably also concerning religious matters.⁸⁶

- ι 9 *ισχνόν*: *θαλπεινόν* ἢ *σαπρόν*. The transmission of the headword is unsure: *ισχνόν* *Etym.Gud.* (MSS. CZ: Sturz 626.60) : *ισχνόν* *Lex.Aίμ.* (D), *Etym.Magn.* (479.22). The lexicographer apparently derived the glosses from Hsch. ι 107 *ιάχεον*: *θαλπεινόν*. *σαπρόν*, where also the transmitted headword is doubted.⁸⁷ If *ισχνόν* is correct, as edited by Dyck (949.25), the word is attested only in this lemma and derivative lexica. The glosses indicate masc. acc. or neut. nom./acc. sg. adjective *ισχνός*. The given meanings “warm(ing) or fetid” offer no scope for comment. If *ισχνόν* is preferred, adjective *ισχνός* occurs in Procopius and Agathias, but has a different semantic range, variously “thin, lean, withered,”⁸⁸ which does not easily accommodate the glosses supplied, unless the lexicographer erred.
- κ 2 *καταγνύναι* (pres. inf. act. *κατάγνυμι*): *κατάσσειν*, *κατακλᾶν*, *συντρίβειν*, “to break apart, to break down, shatter.” The first gloss is a late form of the headword. The verb occurs in Agath. 3.25.5 *καταγνύντες* (masc. nom. pres. part. act. pl.), of large stones, hurled by a city’s defenders, “crushing” the besiegers’ mantlets. The form *καταγνύναι* is uncommon but preceded in Thuc. 4.11.4.⁸⁹
- μ 1 *μαπία*: *σπογγίστρια*. Both the headword and the gloss, apparently fem. nom. sg. nouns, are unattested beyond derivative lexica. *LBG* construes a female cleaner or servant, plausibly on the grounds that verb stem (*σπογγίζω*) + suffix *-τρια* commonly denominates a feminine agent. A partial correspondent in Modern Greek suggests

⁸⁶ Rance, *JÖB* 73 (2023) 139 n.62.

⁸⁷ Dyck 949.25 app. crit. and font. Cf. Hsch. ι 107 ed. Latte II 345.107 (app. crit.), who marks *ιάχεον* with a crux and conjectures *ισχνόν* on the basis of *Etym.Magn.*; thus rev. ed. Cunningham II.1 (2020). See Theodoridis, *JÖB* 50 (2000) 385.

⁸⁸ Procop. 4.13.13 *ισχνός*, 6.20.23 *ισχνοί* (cf. *Anec.* 8.12 *ισχνός*, *Aed.* 4.10.6 *ισχνόν*); Agath. 2.23.6 *ισχνοί*.

⁸⁹ As letter-section kappa contains only two lemmata, with κ 1 *κατασπιλάζοντες* (Th. Sim. 4.5.10), sequence provides no assistance in identification. I considered but rejected the proposition that lemma κ 2 *καταγνύναι* (pres. inf. act.) might be a ‘standardization’ of *καταγνύντες* (pres. part. act.) in Agath. 3.25.5. The lexicon contains no other case of a verbal form in the cited text changed to infinitive, while the most likely basis for such an intervention, namely the lexicographer’s preference for the lemmatic form in a lexicographical tradition or harmonization of the lemma with glosses imported from lexical sources, does not appear to apply here (Dyck 950.6 app. font.).

rather an implement such as a mop.⁹⁰

μ 14 Μαμερτῖνοι: Μάμερτος ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ ὁ Ἄρης, ὅθεν καὶ οἱ ἐν Σικελίᾳ οἰκίσαντες στρατιῶται Μαμερτῖνοι ὠνομάσθησαν, “Mamertinoi: Mamertos in Italy [is] the [name of] Ares, whence also the soldiers who dwelt in Sicily were called Mamertinoi.” While attribution of μ 14 to Menander has never been questioned,⁹¹ it is perhaps the most baffling entry in the *Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν*. Certain aspects could signal interpolation. It is seemingly tacked on to the end of letter-section mu, widely separated from preceding Menander-derived lemmata (μ 1–2). The lemma is unique in being the proper name of a people or group. The reference to Italic mercenaries in Sicily in the third century B.C. finds no obvious place in the historical and geographical coverage of Menander’s *Histories*. In contrast, similar displacement is found in sigma (σ 1, 18[–20], 24), without controversy (see below). Dyck persuasively derives the definition (Μάμερτος ... ὠνομάσθησαν) from an early recension of the *Etymologicum Genuinum*, a source the lexicographer used in other entries of undisputed authenticity.⁹² In any case, positing interpolation does not resolve the incongruity: a posterior editor’s decision to insert this entry would be no less puzzling. Judging by surviving fragments, Menander’s narrative occasionally touched on events in Italy during the 560–570s, particularly Roman-Lombard warfare and diplomacy, though this was an explicitly peripheral, low-priority theatre, seemingly never treated in detail (fr. 22 and 24). The wider historical record attaches no significance to Sicily nor hints at why it might have been mentioned. A context for “Mamertinoi” can only be speculated. Perhaps Menander’s reports of Roman efforts to hire Lombard chieftains to fight the Persians in Oriens (fr. 22.9–15, 24.11–16) prompted a strained and arcane allusion to ancient mercenaries “from Italy.” Alternatively, notwithstanding the transmitted lemma, the object of interest may have been Μάμερτος, adduced as an erudite synonym of Mars/Ares or personified War.⁹³ Neither proposal is compelling.

⁹⁰ *LBG* s.v. μαπία, “die aufwischt, Putzfrau.” See Λεξικό της κοινής νεοελληνικής (Thessaloniki 1998) s.v. μάπα³, “εἶδος σφουγγαρίστρας.”

⁹¹ De Stefani, *SHI* 18 (1910) 443 (cited as Μεμερτινός); Dyck 998 (as Μαμερτῖνος, correctly 957.49 Μαμερτῖνοι); Bleckmann, in *Les historiens fragmentaires* 67.

⁹² Dyck 861–862, 957.49–51 app. font.

⁹³ Cf. Hsch. μ 214 Μάμερτος: Ἄρης; schol. Lycoph. *Alex.* 937–938, 1409–1410 (II 307, 386 Scheer).

ν 6 νεοχομῶντες (masc. nom. pres. part. act. pl. νεοχομῶ): μετακοσμοῦντες, “making changes: rearranging.”⁹⁴ This verb occurs in two excerpts of Menander: fr. 6,1.388 (*Exc. leg.* I 182.11) τῷ δὲ ἀπατηλῷ τῶν τε ἐμπεδοθέντων νεοχομῶσαί τι βουλομένῳ, “if someone deceitful wishes to change anything that had been ratified”; fr. 7,6.6 (*Exc. sent.* 21.3) ἡ περιφορὰ νεοχομῶσα τοῦ χρόνου, “the passage of time producing changes.” See also Procop. 3.7.22, 8.1.11 (cf. *Anec.* 6.21, 30.21; *Aed.* 2.7.7, 2.10.8, 3.5.5, 6.5.7); Th. Sim. 8.12.13. The verb is not uncommon. Nonetheless, the lexicographer cites another form (aor. ind. act. 3rd sg.) at ε 20 ἐνεόχμωσεν (Procop. 3.7.22), a rare case of such duplication.⁹⁵

ξ 4 ξυνίστωρ (Attic masc./fem. nom. sg.): συμπράκτωρ, σύμβουλος, συγγνώστης. Without context, the glosses leave Menander’s meaning uncertain: “accomplice, counsellor, confidant.” The headword is otherwise unattested in late antique historiography. The Attic form is rare, though preceded in Thuc. 2.74.2 with the sense of “witnesses,” while Koine συνίστωρ occurs in diverse genres.

ο 12 οὐριοδρομήσαντες (masc. nom. aor. part. act. pl. οὐριοδρομέω): ἀντὶ τοῦ φορῶ ἀνέμῳ πλεύσαντες, “having run with a fair wind: instead of: having sailed with a favourable wind.” Use in prior or contemporary historiography is rare, though see Evagr. *HE* 2.5 (51.15 Bidez/Parmentier = Priscus fr. 22.15–16 Carolla / fr. 28.14–15 Blockley) οὕτω πνεύματος ἐπιτυχόντας οὐριοδρομήσαι, “chancing upon so fair a wind,” regarding troop shipments in the eastern Mediterranean. Cf. Diod. 3.34.7 οὐριοδρομούσαις ναυσὶ φορτίσιν, “merchant vessels sailing with a fair wind.” Menander fr. 19,1.18 shows that he included such content: χρησάμενος δὲ ταῖς ταχυπλόοις τῶν ὀλκάδων, “using the fast-sailing merchant vessels,” regarding Roman envoys to the Turks in 575/6.

ο 13 ὀχμάσας (masc. nom. aor. part. act. sg. ὀχμάζω): σημαίνει τὸ κρατήσας καὶ κόψας, “having held fast: it means having laid hold of and checked.” Exceptionally rare in prose, the sole instance of the cited form is Lycoph. *Alex.* 41. Apart from lexica, the only late antique use is by another Constantinopolitan author and close contemporary: Paul Silentarius, *Descriptio ambonis* 237 μιῆς δ’ ἀπὸ δέσμιον / ἀρχῆς

⁹⁴ Dyck 859 includes ν 6 νεοχομῶντες among “lemmata drawn from one of the historians,” and at 959.20 app. crit. signals two instances of νεοχομῶ in Menander’s excerpts, but he refrains from explicitly attributing the lemma to Menander. See De Stefani, *StIt* 18 (1910) 413.

⁹⁵ The only other instance is ε 12 ἔστεργεν and σ 15α στέργων.

- ὀχμάζων, “by a bond at one point holding fast.”
- π 21 *πιαλέα* (fem. nom. sg. or neut. nom. /acc. pl. *πιαλέος*): *κάθυγρος, λιβάδα ἔχουσα*, “...well-watered/waterlogged, having meadows/marshes/springs.” This adjective, a late prose equivalent to *πίων*, has a wide semantic and contextual range denoting richness, fertility, abundance, plenitude. The glosses lack obvious antecedents in lexical literature.⁹⁶ If specific to the cited context, they place *πιαλέα* in a description of landscape. Compare Menander fr. 19,1.22–26 *ἐκεῖνα δὴ οὖν τὰ ἐκ τῶν λιμναίων ὑδάτων περιθεόμενα πεδία ... ἵππασάμενοι καὶ ἑτέρους δὲ πλείστους δονακώδεις τε καὶ λοχμώδεις ἔτι τε καὶ ὑδατώδεις διεληλυθότες χώρους*, “having ridden over those plains bounded by marshy waters and traversed many other locations covered with reeds and thickets and wetlands.”⁹⁷ Cf. α 145 and χ 1.
- π 22 *παγιωθείσα* (fem. nom. aor. part. pass. sg. *παγιόω*): *ἔδραιωθείσα, βεβαιωθείσα, πιστωθείσα*, “having been resolved: having been established, confirmed, bound with pledges.” This rare verb occurs in fr. 6,1.365 (*Exc. leg.* I 181.22) *ἐπαγιώθη* (aor. ind. pass. 3rd sg.), “it was resolved,” in the provisions of the Roman-Persian treaty of 561/2. The differing form *παγιωθείσα* must be cited from another, now-lost passage, probably in a corresponding context. See similarly Theophanes *Chron.* A.M. 6179 (364.6 de Boor): *τὴν μετὰ τῶν Βουλγάρων παγιωθείσαν εἰρήνην*, “the peace that had been agreed with the Bulgars.”
- π 26 *πέμπελος*: (nom. sg. noun): *ὁ γέρων παρὰ τὸ εἶναι πλησίον τοῦ{τέστι} πέμπεσθαι εἰς Ἄδην*, “...the old man; [derived] from being close to being sent to Hades.”⁹⁸ An approximate English expression might be “a goner.” This noun is a lexical curiosity; except for lexicographical and exegetical sources, prior use is restricted to Lycophron and Galen,⁹⁹ authors in entirely different genres, though its currency widens in later Byzantine literature. A semantic parallel may be drawn with Procopius’ fondness for *τυμβογέρον*, “grave dodger” (8.12.33, *Anec.* 6.11), a possibly Aristophanic coinage (fr. 55 Demianczuk; *Com. adept.* 1172 Kock), rarer than *πέμπελος* and otherwise unknown in ancient historiography.
- σ 1 *συνασμένιζε* (pres. imperat. act. 2nd sg. *συνασμενίζω*): *συνευφραίνου*, “be glad with: rejoice with.” As this verb nowhere occurs in the

⁹⁶ Dyck 970.80 app. font.

⁹⁷ Apostolopoulos, *Μένανδρος* 16, draws parallels with Agath. 2.19.4.

⁹⁸ See Dyck 971.94–97 app. crit. and app. font. on the source of the gloss and textual transmission.

⁹⁹ LSJ⁹ s.v. *πέμπελος*.

three extant historians, the lemma should be assigned to Menander, even if its detachment from other Menander-derived lemmata in sigma (σ 18[–20], 24) defies explanation and has elicited tacit hesitation.¹⁰⁰ While cognates are lacking in Procopius and Agathias, Theophylact favours simplex ἀσμενίζω (3.2.6, 3.7.6, 3.9.8, 3.14.1, 5.4.13, 5.7.3, 6.11.20) and once prefers compound κατασμενίζω (4.16.20 κατησμενίσειν). Use of συνασμενίζω is exceptionally rare in any period and unknown in historiography; no earlier instance is firmly attested.¹⁰¹ Yet, scarcer still is Theophylact's choice of κατασμενίζω, reportedly a hapax.¹⁰² Attribution to Menander is consistent with his taste for unusual συν- compound verbs: συναναζωπυρεῖ (fr. 6,1.483), συνεπαμύνων (9,3.66–67), συνεκπολεμῶσαι (13,5.5), συνεψεύδετο (26,1.90), συναιχμαλωτισθῆναι (27,3.17). Imperative συνασμένιζε suggests a speech episode. In formal exchanges between envoys and rulers the imperative plural is typical, while the singular seldom occurs.¹⁰³ Nonetheless, certain diplomatic protocols included invocations to “rejoice together.”¹⁰⁴

σ 18 σκυταλωτοὺς τροχούς (acc. pl.), “cogged(?) wheels.” One of a handful of two-word lemmata (see υ 7 below), clearly its context was specific, if enigmatic. Adjective σκυταλωτός otherwise occurs only in mechanical treatises in reference to a “toothed” or “cogged” wheel or drum (σκυταλωτὸν τύμπανον) within a mechanism: Hero *Dioptra* 34, 36 (III 294.9–11, 296.8, 298.12 Schöne), whence derivative Pappus *Synagoge* 8 (1028.27 Hultsch). The single-word gloss supplied, adjective ῥαβδωτοῦς, variously signifies “made or plaited with rods,”

¹⁰⁰ De Stefani, *StIt* 18 (1910) 439, “da me non identificata,” though σ 1 otherwise meets his criteria for attribution to Menander. Dyck 972.2 gives no in-text reference.

¹⁰¹ Philo *De specialibus legibus* 1.316 (V 76.10 Cohn): συνασμενίζειν is an (uncompelling) editorial conjecture. The earliest secure occurrence is otherwise eighth-/ninth-century Cosmas Vestitor *Vita Joannis Chrysostomi*, ed. F. Halkin, *Subsidia hagiographica* 60 (1977) 434.9. Lexical sources: Dyck 972.1–3 app. font.

¹⁰² *LBG* s.v. κατασμενίζω.

¹⁰³ I note two instances of imperative singular: fr. 26,1.131 πρῶττε, 12,5.54 νόμιζε.

¹⁰⁴ E.g. Men. fr. 19,1.37–38 συνησθῆναι φράσας τῷ Καίσαρι Ῥωμαίων, “declaring that [a Turkish ruler] rejoice with the Roman Caesar”; cf. Procop. 8.24.7 χρῆν μάλιστα βασιλέα Ἰουστινιανὸν συνηδεσθαι Φράγγους, “Emperor Justinian ought certainly to rejoice with the Franks.”

“wicker,” or somehow “ribbed.”¹⁰⁵ Evidently the cited passage concerned some kind of device. Most likely is a description of poliorcetic machinery, as found in unplaced Menander fr. 40 (*Suda* σ 901), concerning *spaliones*, portable hide-covered wicker and/or timber mantlets employed by sappers during tunnelling operations (cf. Agath. 3.5.9–11 on the same contrivance). It may be no coincidence that following σ 24 σήραγγες seems to be cited from this fragment (40.9 τοὺς σήραγγας).¹⁰⁶ This opens the possibility that σ 18 and 24 derive from a single siege narrative. Alternatively, Agathias’ digression on Anthemius of Tralles’ experiments in hydraulics, catoptrics, and acoustics (5.7–8) supplies another scenario for such technical vocabulary, though there is no evidence that Menander imitated his forerunner in this respect.

τ 9 τελχῖνες (nom. pl. τελχίς, later τελχίν): οἱ φθονεροὶ καὶ βᾶσκανοὶ δαίμονες, “*telchines*: the envious and malevolent spirits.”¹⁰⁷ In Greek mythology, the Telchines were a primordial race of minor deities with particular destructive attributes. This appellation was extended to a wider notion of a malign or mischievous spirit(s) or evil sorcerer, and, more generally, a spiteful person or slanderer.¹⁰⁸ Although τ 9 ostensibly distinguishes the intended sense, as the lexicographer drew this definition from one or more of his usual lexical sources (and possibly even adapted the lemma accordingly), the form and meaning of τελχίς, -ῖνος in Menander’s text are not beyond doubt.¹⁰⁹ In late antiquity, use is mostly restricted to oratory, epic verse, and lexicography, and unknown in historiography. Beyond lexica and scholia, the few sixth-century instances illustrate semantic range. Menander’s contemporary, Paul Silentarius, *Descriptio S. Sophiae* 195 Τελχίνας κακοεργέας, rhetorically implicates “maleficent Telchines” in the collapse of the dome of Hagia Sophia in 558, presuming his audience’s familiarity with this classical allusion. A few decades

¹⁰⁵ LSJ⁹ s.v. ῥαβδωτός.

¹⁰⁶ De Stefani, *StIt* 18 (1910) 439; Dyck 978.85. Nom. pl. σήραγγες occurs in Procop. 8.1.9 and Agath. 1.10.8, but the sequence of σ 24 σήραγγες favours citation from Men. fr. 40.9, despite acc. pl. σήραγγας, as the case of the lemma merely reflects the compiler’s adherence to a long-term lexicographical tradition: Dyck 978.85–88 app. font.

¹⁰⁷ See Dyck 865, 981.38 app. crit. on the textual transmission of τ 9.

¹⁰⁸ LJS⁹ s.v. Τελχίς.

¹⁰⁹ Dyck 981.38 app. font. (where Σ is now *Synagoge* τ 85 Cunningham), 1007 Index fontium.

earlier, Simplicius employs *τελχίν* in philosophical discourse as a pejorative metaphor for a harsh critic of his writings.¹¹⁰ While a specific pagan-mythological reference to Telchines may seem incongruous, Menander's generic usage would be broadly consistent with the language and causational concept of 'daemons' (*δαίμονες*) and 'envy' (*φθόνος, βασκανία*) in the works of Procopius and Theophylact, less so Agathias.¹¹¹ In addition, Menander's fondness for ethnographical exotica, especially arcane religious rituals of barbarians, offers potential contexts particular to his *Histories*.¹¹²

τ 11 τούδουνοι: οἱ τοποτηρηταὶ παρὰ Τούρκους, "toudounoi: the *topotērētai* among Turks."¹¹³ Ordinarily prosaic administrative jargon, *τοποτηρητής* variously denotes a representative, deputy officer-holder, district overseer, or local commandant. As use in literary works is scarce, whether Menander utilized this explanatory term remains uncertain.¹¹⁴ In Greek sources, *τούδουνος* is attested only as the title (albeit misconstrued as a personal name) of a governor of Kherson in 710/1, whom the Khagan of the Khazars had appointed as his representative.¹¹⁵ The etymon is Turkic *tudun*. Old Turkic inscrip-

¹¹⁰ Simplicius *In Aristotelis de caelo commentaria* (J. L. Heiberg, *CAG* VII [Berlin 1894]) 66.10; *In Aristotelis physicorum libros octo commentaria* (H. Diels, *CAG* X [Berlin 1895]) 1117.16

¹¹¹ D. Brodka, *Die Geschichtsphilosophie in der spätantiken Historiographie. Studien zu Prokopios von Kaisareia, Agathias von Myrina und Theophylaktos Simokattes* (Frankfurt 2004) 31–39, 196–200.

¹¹² E.g. Men. fr. 10,3.9–20, shamanistic rituals of Göktürks; 19,1.118–131, their funerary rites and facial scarification; 25,1.67–89, Avar khagan swearing oaths. See Baldwin, *DOP* 32 (1978) 118–119, "addicted to the exotic"; Blockley, *The History of Menander* 13, "indulge a taste ... for exotic details"; B. Bleckmann, "Christentum und nichtchristliche Religionen in nachjustinianischer Zeit: Das Zeugnis des Menandros Protektor," in S. Ratti (ed.), *Une Antiquité tardive noire ou heureuse?* (Besançon 2015) 227–250, at 241–243, "Unbekannte exotische und auch primitive religiöse Vorstellungen"; further remarks in Rance, *JÖB* 73 (2023) 139, 143–146.

¹¹³ Dyck 982.42 app. crit. prefers the indirect tradition (*Etym. Gud.* and *Etym. Magn.*). The direct tradition (D) reads singular *τούδουνος: ὁ τοποτηρητής*.

¹¹⁴ In late antique historiography, see only Evagr. *HE* 2.18 (91.3, 13–14 Bidez/Parmentier), regarding papal deputies. See *LBG* s.v. *τοποτηρητής*, with older literature.

¹¹⁵ Theophanes *Chron.* A.M. 6203 (378.3–5 de Boor): Τουδούνων δέ, τὸν ἄρχοντα Χερσώνως ὡς ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ Χαγάνου ὄντα (also 379.1–2, 7–10);

tions and Arabic and Chinese sources document this office or rank among the Göktürks by the early eighth century, and it is also reported among the eighth-/ninth-century Avars. Turkological scholarship has not appreciated the potential significance of τ 11.¹¹⁶ Menander's detailed accounts of diplomatic relations between Constantinople and the Khaganate of the Göktürks ca. 568/9–576 provide an obvious and unique setting for this lemma. Information in surviving excerpts, particularly details of Turkish titles and dignities, strengthens this inference.¹¹⁷

υ 7 ὑπουλος ἄνθρωπος (nom. sg.), “treacherous man.” Menander's use of adjective ὑπουλος is confirmed in fr. 12,6.75 (*Exc. leg.* I 197.34) φιλίας ὑπούλου καθεστῶσης, “[the Avars] friendship being treacherous.” Some features of υ 7 call for caution. Only four other lemmata are a two-word phrase, and in one instance the nominative case is due to editorial interference.¹¹⁸ No gloss is supplied. A partly corrupted etymological notice, drawn from Orion *Elym.* s.v. ὑπουλος (156.13–14 Sturz), explains a metaphorical extension of a term for a festering sore hidden beneath healthy tissue.¹¹⁹ While the exact phrase ὑπουλος ἄνθρωπος may have occurred in a lost section of Menander's *Histories*, one might suspect the lexicographer of harmonizing the lemma with nominative ὑπουλος in his lexical source(s) and, perhaps, of inserting ἄνθρωπος to distinguish specific application to a human character trait. Although the other three historians also employ ὑπουλος, none applies this word to a person: Procop. 7.16.11 ὑπούλων ... ῥημάτων; Agath. 1.15.7 ὑπουλον ... εἰρήνην,

Nicephorus Patr. *Brev.* 45 (108.16–17, 40–42; 110.47–49 Mango). See *PMBZ* 10833 Anonymus; *LBG* s.v. τοῦδουος.

¹¹⁶ G. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*² (Berlin 1958) II 317–318; P. G. Golden, *Khazar Studies. A Historico-Philological Inquiry into the Origins of the Khazars* (Budapest 1980) I 215–216.

¹¹⁷ Roman-Turkish diplomacy: fr. 10,1–5, 19,1–2. Cf. especially fr. 10,3.93–101 regarding Turkish dignities, specifically that of Tarkhan (Ταρχάν). See Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*² II 299–300.

¹¹⁸ Besides acc. pl. σ 18 σκυταλωτοὺς τροχούς (688 above), there are three nominative two-word lemmata. In μ 6 Μελιτιά κινίδια (Agath. 5.8.2) and π 19 ποῖα παράλογοι (Agath. 5.14.7) the original text is also nominative. In supplementary lemma λ 8 λαϊὰ χεῖρ, however, none of the five instances in Procopius' *Wars* is nominative (n.28 above) and the lexicographer evidently standardized the lemma.

¹¹⁹ Dyck 985.31–32 app. crit. and app. font.

3.9.12 τὸ ... ὑπουλον ἐκεῖνο τοῦ τρόπου, 12.9 τὴν εὐνοίαν ... ὑπουλον; Th. Sim. 4.15.9 τοῦ Περσικοῦ δόλου ... τὸ ὑπουλον. In any case, υ 7 must cite ὑπουλος from a passage of Menander other than fr. 12,6.75, where it qualifies φιλία.

ω 4 ὠρύω (pres. act. 1st sg.): σημαίνει τὸ κλαίω, “I howl: it means I bewail.”¹²⁰ A first-person verbal lemma is unusual. Excluding demonstrable interpolations in alpha, the only parallels are ε 43 ἐνείρω, “I insert,” citing Theophylact’s authorial aside (1.11.8), and ε 19 ἐρεσχηλῶ, which diverges from cited participial ἐρεσχελοῦντα in Procopius (3.12.8), possibly owing to a standardizing intervention, though this entry is otherwise lacunose and corrupt.¹²¹ Whether or not the lexicographer thus intervened here, the apparent purpose of the lemma is to register a rare instance of active ὠρύω rather than unremarkable middle ὠρύομαι.¹²² If cited precisely, a speech-episode must be assumed (as σ 1 and χ 1), perhaps a Roman emperor’s furious tirade (fr. 9,3.82–85) or a barbarian’s bombast (fr. 19,1.50–90). Elsewhere Menander employs another exceptionally rare verb in this context: fr. 26,6.5–6 ὑπολοφύρονται τὰς ξυμφοράς, “they bewail their misfortunes.”¹²³ More generally, he records the Avars’ pre-battle “howling” (fr. 12,3.3 ἀλαλάγματι).

3b. Quotations

μ 2 μετωπηδόν: ‘τὰς φάλαγγας μετωπηδόν στησάμενος’, “in line: ‘having stationed the formations in line.’” The quotation evidently derives from a battle description. Although adverb μετωπηδόν occurs in canonical histories (e.g. Thuc. 2.90.4; Hdt. 7.100.3; Polyb. *passim*), use is generally uncommon. In late antiquity, it is found solely but often in Procopius, typically in formulaic phrases with ἵστημι: 1.13.23 ἴσταντο, 1.14.29 ἔστησαν, 1.18.26 ποιησάμενος, 4.17.4 στήσας, 8.8.31 ἔστησαν, 8.23.30 στήσαντες, 8.23.34 στήσαντες, 8.31.1 ἔστησαν, 8.35.19 ἔστησαν. By comparison, the lexicographer’s intention in citing Menander instead is not obvious. One might even wonder whether the quotation is an editorial modification of *Wars* 1.18.26 τὴν φάλαγγα μετωπηδόν ποιησάμενος. Such a multifaceted intervention, however, would be both unusually intrusive and motiveless, while divergence from typical Procopian diction, in more than one respect, may in fact account for the lexicographer’s interest.

¹²⁰ Dyck 991.16–19 ap. crit. and app. font.

¹²¹ See n.37 above.

¹²² LSJ⁹ s.v. ὠρύομαι.

¹²³ LBG s.v. ὑπολοφύρομαι.

Quoted middle *στησάμενος* contrasts with active verbal forms in all instances in *Wars*; indeed participial *στησάμεν-* occurs nowhere in Procopius' oeuvre. Plural *τὰς φάλαγγας* is also alien to Procopius' style insofar as he invariably uses single *φάλαγξ* to denote a battle line in its entirety, rather than, as apparently here, its constituent "formations." In this scenario, *μετωπηδόν* entails a particular sense of "aligned" components, rather than, more simply, troops arrayed "in a line, along a front."

φ 5 'φριμασσόμενοι τε τῷ ταράχῳ ἀποφυσῶντες'· καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ· 'ὀπισθόρμητα φριμασσόμενοι ἐχώρου', "snorting and puffing in the turmoil"; and elsewhere: 'snorting, they came hastening back'. The missing lemma is obviously *φριμασσόμενοι* (masc. nom. pres. part. pl. *φριμάσσομαι*). Two quoted instances attributable to Menander follow, probably from military contexts. Menander's use of this rare verb was undoubtedly inspired by its unique occurrence in extant ancient historiography—and in the same form—in Agath. 3.27.4 *πνευστιῶντες θαμὰ καὶ φριμασσόμενοι*, "with much blowing and snorting," describing Persian cavalry mounts panicked by a wounded war-elephant. Neither author prefers Atticizing *φριματτ-*. The second three-word quote partly coincides with a longer anonymous quotation in *Suda* φ 715 ἡ δὲ ἵππος ὀπισθόρμητα φριμασσομένη ἐχώρει καὶ ἀδύνατα εἶχεν ἐς τὰ ἄδενδρα ἐπιβῆναι, "the horse, snorting, came hastening back and was unable to get up onto the treeless terrain." The textual parallelism leaves no reasonable doubt that the compiler of the *Suda* also cites Menander's *Histories*, via a now-lost volume of the Constantinian *Excerpta*.¹²⁴ The attribution of *Suda* φ 715 is reinforced by the exceptionally rare construction *ἀδύνατα εἶχεν* (with neut. pl. adj.), which occurs also in Menander fr. 18,4.7 εἰ δέ γε ἀδύνατα ἔχοιεν, "if this were impossible."¹²⁵ Whether ἡ ἵππος denotes an individual mare or collective "horse" in the sense of cavalry remains unclear, though the sole instance in the excerpts of Menander (fr. 2.30 τὴν ἵππον) refers to the herds of the Kutrigurs. In any case, it seems that singular *φριμασσομένη ἐχώρει* represents the

¹²⁴ De Stefani, *StIt* 18 (1910) 439; Adler, *Suidae Lexicon* IV (1935) 761.26–27 (marginal "E" = *Excerpta*), with V (1938) 37 Addenda et corrigenda. Contra Baldwin, *DOP* 32 (1978) 125; see n.23 above. Blockley, *The History of Menander* 297–298, omits the fragment.

¹²⁵ This construction occurs also in a quotation from an unidentified historical source at *Suda* α 537 ἀδύνατα ἔχοντος τοῦ στρατηγοῦ κύβον ἀναρρίψαι πολέμου τοσοῦτον, "the general being unable to take such a risk in war," repeated with a slightly different word order at κ 2106.

authentic tradition, while the compiler of the *Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν* chose to harmonize the two quotations under a plural lemma φρῖμασσόμενοι.

χ 1 χιλός: ‘ἐφοίτα χιλοῦ τε ἔνεκα καὶ τῆς λείας’· ἀλλαχοῦ· ‘φύουσι γὰρ καὶ χιλὸν καὶ ἐλύμαν καὶ χόρτον’, “forage: ‘was roaming about for forage and plunder’ [Agath. 1.17.4]; elsewhere: ‘for they bring forth forage and millet and grass/fodder’.” A quotation from Menander supplements one from Agathias.¹²⁶ As the nom. pl. subject of φύουσι is presumably specified regions or topographical features, a description of landscape is again a likely context: see α 145 and π 21. While ἐλύμα is elsewhere unattested, *LBG* s.v. construes ἐλύμαν as acc. of ἐλύμη (rather than expected ἐλύμη), ostensibly a late form of classical ἔλυμος, though found only in a seventh-century anonymous *De cibis*.¹²⁷ Emendation of ἐλύμαν to ἔλυμον is tempting, especially given its similarly precise occurrence in Agath. 2.21.2 (p.68.2 app. crit.) ἀφαιρουμένους ἔλυμόν (V^bRO : σέλυμόν L : σέλυμά W) τε καὶ ζειάς καὶ ἄλλα ἄττα τῶν ἐδωδίμων, “carrying off millet and spelt and other kinds of victuals”; and previously Procop. 1.12.17, 8.13.18. The near-contemporary *Strategikon* singles out millet as a crop “especially” grown by transdanubian Slavic communities, μάλιστα κέγγχρου καὶ ἐλύμου (11.4.14 Dennis). *LSJ*⁹ s.v. defines κέγγχρος as common millet (*Panicum miliaceum*) and ἔλυμος (s.v. μελίνη) as Italian millet (*Setaria italica*), widely known as foxtail millet. Used for human and animal consumption, these coarse-grained, fast-maturing cereals, typically cultivated in harsher environments where other cereals yield poorly, were of military-logistical significance.

χ 3 χλιδή: ‘ἐξουσιαστικῆ χλιδῆ ἥκιστα ἔχαρες’, “luxury: ‘you were not at all pleased by unrestrained luxury’.” The 2nd sg. verb and moralizing rhetoric guarantee a speech-episode. Unnoticed by previous scholarship, the headword occurs in Menander fr. 10,3.64 (*Exc.leg.* I 194.18–19 = *Suda* χ 340) οὕτω μὲν οὖν τῷ τῶν Τούρκων ἡγεμόνι ἔνεστι χλιδῆς, “such is the luxury available to the leader of the Turks.” This noun is otherwise unattested in the sixth century. Furthermore, the same verbal phrase is found in preceding fr. 10,1.25–26 (*Exc.leg.* II 450.27) τῷ γεγεννημένῳ ἥκιστα χείροντες, “not at all pleased by what had happened.” This formula has precedents (e.g. Isoc. *Areopag.* 50; Jul. *Or.* 2.28; Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 75.1), but no contemporary parallels.

¹²⁶ Keydell ed. xxx, 32.13 app. crit. prefers ἐφοίτων in L to ἐφοίτα in all other codices (WAV^aRO) and the indirect tradition (S = *Suda*). He omits the testimony of *Lex.Αἴμ.* χ 1.

¹²⁷ *De cibis* 14, ed. F. Z. Ermerins, *Anecdota medica graeca* (Leiden 1840) 261.5.

ψ 1 ψιθύρισμα: ἡδύ τι {τὸ} ψιθύρισμα τῶν δένδρων ἠκούετο’, “rustling: ‘like something sweet was heard the rustling of the trees’.” Context is wholly obscure. The mystery deepens with the realization that the initial words reprise the well-known opening of Theocritus’ *Idyll* 1.1–2 Ἄδύ τι τὸ ψιθύρισμα καὶ ἅ πίτυς ... τήνα / ... μελίσδεται, “Something sweet is the rustling the pine tree yonder ... makes like song.”¹²⁸ While it may seem fanciful to infer that Menander indulged in a ‘bucolic’ passage, his poetic sensibilities are documented. His lexis otherwise features poetic words. He inserted into his *Histories* an epigram he had composed (fr. 13,3), which is also transmitted independently (*Anth. Pal.* 1.101). He reports that Emperor Maurice, who encouraged him to pursue historiography, was especially enthused by history and poetry (fr. 1,1.18–28).¹²⁹ Emulation of Agathias, as poet-historian, affords a likely literary-cultural setting, even if Menander was never part of his predecessor’s circle or matched his achievements in either sphere.¹³⁰

August, 2024

Freie Universität Berlin
Friedrich-Meinecke-Institut
rance@zedat.fu-berlin.de
philip.r.rance@gmail.com

¹²⁸ De Stefani, *StIt* 18 (1910) 444, “reminiscenza Teocritea (*Idyll* 1, 1) da attribuire certamente a Menandro”; Dyck 861 n.69, 989.22 app. font.

¹²⁹ Rance, *JÖB* 73 (2023) 139–141, with bibliography.

¹³⁰ I express my deep gratitude to the anonymous peer reviewer for extensive, meticulous, and insightful comments, which significantly improved and enriched this paper.