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GRIGORIOS PAPAGIANNIS

QUISQUILIA AND METHODOLOGICAL SUGGESTIONS ON THE OCCASION OF THE EUSTATHIUS' LETTERS

In 2006 a new edition of the Letters of Eustathius, Archbishop of Thessaloniki, was published1, which replaced the previously available edition by Tafel2. New editorial practices were applied to this edition and, generally speaking, it was compiled according to modern requirements of the Byzantine Philology. It received some reviews, among which one by Polemis3 with numerous suggestions for improvements regarding the text as well as other issues. I also published an extensive article regarding the Letters4, in which, apart from several conjectures, which I believe further improve the text, I stand critically towards views that have been put forward by other byzantinologists, and also point out citations that were either ignored or falsely identified. A large part of that article deals with “secondary” issues such as accentuation, punctuation, indices.

In this paper I intend to deal with some of these issues, the “quisquilia”, as they are called by my beloved teacher A. Kambylis, and, prompted by these, I shall formulate some general methodological suggestions. Thus I


4. G. Papagiannis, Παρατηρήσεις στην έκδοση των επιστολών του Ευσταθίου Θεσσαλονίκης, Ροδόπη 2 (2013), 131-159. But see also at the end of this paper.
will first refer to editorial practices regarding the issues of accentuation, word-joining, orthographical variations and punctuation, and then I will offer some thoughts about two *indices* which, as we all know, accompany modern editions of byzantine texts: the *index verborum memorabilium* and the *index graecitatis*. These *indices* form the basis for the compilation of dictionaries of byzantine Greek, and are also used for several studies on the evolution of the Greek language.

A. The issues of the first group (accentuation, word-joining, punctuation, etc.) have been recently discussed by the academic society in special articles and scientific announcements⁵. They are too varied and complicated for detailed reference here. Therefore, the following remarks are only selected and fragmentary.

A.1. Accentuation

The accentuation rules or habits of the antiquity change in the byzantine era. However, we do not know when exactly each change takes place and what is valid for each author. We, as editors, do not obviously have the right to ‘normalize’ everything according to our concept, that is on the basis of the ancient rules of accentuation, since, by doing so, we run the risk to ‘correct’ the author themselves, which is not legitimate. A very distinctive example is the accentuation of the doubtful vowels in the penultimate syllable: δράμα, θλίψις, ἀκτίνες, πράξις, βρίθος, etc. In the manuscripts the accentuation of these vowels often varies from the standard. But is this accentuation wrong? Does it represent the copyists’ habits of a post-author era? How did the authors themselves accentuate the words? The answer is difficult for the editor, who is frequently forced to make a more or less arbitrary decision. Over the last few decades the prevailing tendency is to preserve such peculiarities of manuscripts in the edition⁶. I would argue that, while

---


⁶ Cf. Liverani review, 258: “l’editrice giustamente tende a conservare alcune peculiarità”.
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in the past we used to correct everything, we now run the risk of going to
the other extreme, that is, to easily accept every orthographical deviation.
However, as far as Eustathius is concerned, we have a safe guide for several
instances: his autograph of his Commentaries on the Iliad. Referring to this
and presuming that van der Valk, the editor of the text, has loyally followed
it, we can determine Eustathius’ viewpoint on matters of accentuation,
provided of course, that the word in question does occur in the mentioned
text of the Commentaries. It goes without saying that the particular forms
can be easily located with the use of the TLG.

In my article mentioned above I often made comparisons between the
practices of the editor of the Letters and those of the editors of other works
of Eustathius. I noticed that she often diverges from the habits encountered
in the autograph, a fact that gives us the right to doubt her claim that „es"
wird bei der Erstellung des Textes den Handschriften in den Punkten gefolgt,
in welchen sie den uns aus anderen Quellen bekannten Schreibgewohnheiten
des Eustathios entsprechen“.

So, several cases can be observed in the Letters, in which the wrong
accentuation has been adopted (though it is not always made clear whether
these are typographical errors or the exact ‘reading’ of the manuscript has
been maintained), without support by any evidence of such an accentuation
by Eustathius, or –even worse– against such a preference of his:
3, 70 (τὸν) δοτήγαρ
45, 122 λύσσον
19, 185 (= 3, 61) φάναι
(It is noteworthy here, that the TLG does not trace
any other instances of φάναι in Eustathius texts, while φάναι occurs 93 times).

7. It is generally accepted that the codices Marc. gr. 460 and Par. gr. 2702, which
contain the Commentaries on the Odyssey, are also autographs (in total or in part) (see D.
R. Reinsch, Bemerkungen zu byzantinischen Autorenhandschriften [1975], in: Griechische
Kodikologie und Textüberlieferung, ed. D. Harlfinger, Darmstadt 1980, 629-644, 636 and,
especially, E. Cullhed, The Autograph Manuscripts Containing Eustathius’ Commentary
on the Odyssey, Mnemosyne 65 (2012), 445-461. However, there is no reliable philological
edition of this text as yet, Cullhed’s dissertation (which includes a Proekdosis) remaining
unpublished. This is why I limit the comparison here to the Comm. on the Iliad.

8. Kolovou, Briefe des Eustathios, 80*.
9. Kolovou, Briefe des Eustathios, 84*.
10. Kolovou, Briefe des Eustathios, 84*.
On the other hand, on at least two occasions the editor ‘corrects’ the received accentuation, against the classical rule (without being clear why she does so), and indeed despite the fact that similar passages from other works of Eustathius advocate the use of the classical accentuation (also preserved in the manuscripts):

6 passim μῦας11 (while in the app. crit. is noted that Tafel had put μῦας in all cases): The TLG search reveals a total of 24 occasions of use of the paroxytonic forms μῦες/μῦας in other works of Eustathius, while no case of μῦες/μῦας occurs. Furthermore, we possess the author’s opinion expressis verbis, that the nouns σῦς, δρῦς and μῦς, do have a long ν in the nominative singular, but they shorten it in all the other cases12.

A similar remark can be made about πτίλον (43, 55). In the edition it is written with a circumflex13, while in the other works of Eustathius it occurs four times (two of them in the autograph) with an acute, i.e., according to the ancient habit.

Of course, there are also some ambivalent cases:

βρίθος occurs twice in the Letters (7, 127 και 43, 190): We find βρίθος four times in other works of Eustathius, but it does not occur in the autograph at all. Generally speaking, according to TLG, βρίθος is much more common (40 times, and always in the antiquity) than βρῖθος, which occurs only eight times, all of them only since the 12th century.

Regarding the word ὀργυιά, we are not certain on which syllable did Eustathius accentuate it. In his works there are examples of both ὀργυιά and ὀργυία, while he expressly states that the word is usually accentuated on the penult!14 (Note that the word is already ambivalent in the antiquity).

11. Kolovou, Briefe des Eustathios, 84*.
12. Eust. in Iliad. 1148, 49-50 (= IV 197, 8-10 v. der Valk) ὅτι δὲ οὐδέποτε μονοσύλλαβον ὄνομα βραχυκαταληκτεῖ, δηλοὶ καὶ ἡ Τλῶς πόλις, καὶ ἡ Κρῶς, καὶ τὸ πάζ, καὶ μῦς, καὶ δρῦς, καὶ σῦς, καὶ λίς, καὶ θώς, καὶ Τρῶς and ibid. 1286, 10-11 (= IV 676, 24 - 677, 1 v. der Valk) τὰ εἰς τοιαῦτα ονοτέλλει τὸ ν ἐν ταῖς πλαγίαις, μῦς μῦας, δρῦς δρυός.
13. Kolovou, Briefe des Eustathios, 84*.
14. Eust. in Iliad. 1304, 9-10 (= IV 741, 5-6 v. der Valk) Τὸ δὲ ὀργυιά κάνταθα προπαροξύνεται, εἰ καὶ ἡ κοινή χρῆσις παροξύνει αὐτό (the editor notes in the app. font: “Eust. err. calami παροξύνει”).
A.2. Punctuation

I cannot refer here to specific instances, as I do not know the exact punctuation of Eustathius’ *Letters* in each manuscript. Rather I aim to comment on the opinion increasingly prevailing over the last years among byzantinologists, that in editing we should adopt at least some of the punctuation marks found in the manuscripts. Firstly, I do not believe that we can draw definite conclusions about the habits of the author on the basis of copies of their works produced at a later stage. However, my objection stands even in the case of the existing autograph: even then, it would not be wise, in my opinion, to adopt the medieval punctuation unchanged (e.g., middle dot, triple dot, disjunction of terms that, according to our sense, belong together, etc.), because of the simple fact that those marks do not mean anything to modern reader, or at least they do not always convey exactly the same notion that the byzantine author intended; on the contrary, nowadays a different punctuation system is established, and I strongly propose that we use the modern practice for the sake of clarity. Of course, one should always seriously consider the punctuation of the manuscripts, especially when a change in punctuation leads to different interpretation. However, it is one thing to consider the manuscript punctuation and quite another to adopt it as it stands. In the latter case, i.e., if we adopt the medieval punctuation, we demand from modern readers on the one hand that they ignore some very common and established conventions of modern typography, and on the other hand that they get acquainted with very special rules which, moreover, do not apply in the same way to every author (even the results of philological research on this issue are not absolutely persuasive or conclusive). As a compromise between the adoption of the medieval punctuation and its replacement by the modern one, Tocci has recently proposed that the editor should offer a ‘double’ punctuation (the


16. See D. R. Reinsch, *Stixis und Hören*, in: *Actes du VIe Colloque International de Paleographie grecque, Drama, 21-27 Septembre 2003*, ed. B. Atsalos – N. Tsironi, Athen, 2009, 259-269, 267 (includes additional relevant references). It is fair, however, to mention that this opinion is not unjustified: its purpose is to satisfy the need of viewing byzantine texts as rhetorical pieces, aimed to be read aloud and perceived by listeners.

17. See Kolovou, *Briefe des Eustathios*, 81* (and author’s n. 2-5).
medieval one in brackets)\textsuperscript{18}. Even though such a practice appears to satisfy both sides, I suspect it will soon be abandoned, since it will become obvious that its application would offer very minimal benefit, whereas it would grossly distort the text appearance.

Moreover, the exclusive adoption of the medieval punctuation practice in critical editions would mean that one would not be allowed to use the modern marks at all: inverted commas, brackets, dashes, etc. Already we do not use the exclamation mark (!) in our editions. But is its use really illegitimate simply because the medieval copyists (and authors) did not use it? In such a case, the use of the other marks mentioned above would be equally wrong. Likewise, it would analogically be erroneous to posit an acute (instead of a gravis) on the ultimate, when a punctuation mark follows, since we do not find this kind of practice in the manuscripts. But let us be more realistic: Punctuation should be an absolute editorial privilege, and the editor’s choices should be expressed with the established punctuation marks and according to the modern rules or conventions. For example, there is no point in maintaining the “colon plus dash” (:-) because it means nothing to today’s reader. Preservation of the middle dot in every case that it occurs in the manuscripts will only cause confusion, because it may represent either the full stop or the comma of today. The extensive use of the comma, in cases where this is not necessary, will be useless: thus, we will avoid τὸ, γνῶθι σαῦτὸν and prefer τὸ «γνῶθι σαῦτὸν».

A.3. Word-joining

This is another common phenomenon in the manuscripts. Writing habits do change in this issue also, but what matters is to find out the habits of the author, whose text we are about to critically edit:

11, 33 ἐς τομετέπειτα ed.: TLG records μετέπειτα many times in Eustathius (also in the Comm. on the Iliad), often preceded by the article in various grammatical cases (τὸ μ., τὰ μ., τῶν μ., τοῖς μ.), always written separately as two words, while the joining occurs only at this very passage of the Letters. The same applies to several word-joinings adopted by the
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editor, e.g., διατοῦτο, διαταῦτα, καθεκάστην, μετατοῦτο, μεταταῦτα, τοεντεῦθεν, ἐσύστερον, κατίχνος, etc. (even though some of them are already attested in the antiquity).

The manuscript texts abound with such phenomena. It is not possible to prove that they originate from the author, unless we have an autograph manuscript. Indeed, we do know Eustathius’ usus scribendi in regard to all the joinings mentioned above: he always wrote two separate words! Thus, by adopting such joinings as conveyed in the (later) manuscripts the editor once again contradicts her promise that she will follow Eustathius’ usus, when this is known. A characteristic example:

30, 24 ὁ καθένα: A search in Eustathius’ texts (using the TLG) reveals 20 passages (13 in the Comm. on the Iliad20, six in the Comm. on the Odyssey21, one in the De Thess. capta), where the word is edited as καθ’ ἑνα, while, conversely, only eight passages are found (four of them in this very Letter[!], one in the De emend. vita mon. and one in a homily of Eustathius22) where the editors (Kolovou, Metzler and Schönauer, respectively) prefer καθένα. Conversely, van der Valk, Stallbaum, and Kyriakidis edited καθ’ ἑνα. I consider for sure that van der Valk, who has studied Eustathius’ autograph very carefully, would have maintained the joining καθένα, had he found it in the autograph. Thus, καθένα must be considered as a preference of some copyists, but not of Eustathius himself.

B.1. On the index verborum

Now I would like to offer some thoughts about the indices, and first of all to the index verborum memorabilium, which is especially interesting, because it has become customary to mark in it with a special symbol words that may be hapax legomena, as well as rare or later (not classical) words, and sometimes terms attested only or for the first time in the works of the author-in-edition. In the case of Eustathius the contents of this index become even more interesting.

19. Kolovou, Briefe des Eustathios, 80*. (See also n. 8 above).
20. Among them there are two passages where καθ’ ἑνα is accompanied by the article (τοκτο καθ’ ἑνα), similarly to the passage discussed here.
21. καθένα is also found twice. But in this edition not much consequence is expected.
22. For the other two instances see n. 21 above.
When the edition of the *Letters* was published, the first volume (letters A-K) of the *Lexikon zur Byzantinischen Gräzität* (*LBG*) by E. Trapp and his collaborators had already been issued. Consequently, in this volume (almost half of the lexicon) only Tafel's edition of the *Letters* was taken into account. In the subsequent volumes, of course, it was the new edition (by Kolovou) that was used. Neither the data of the first volume of the lexicon can be updated on the basis of the new edition (as far as the *LBG* is only published in traditional print book form), nor the *index verborum* of the new edition, which has several serious deficiencies and errors, can be supplemented in a way that would be handy to its reader.

Here are some categories of words that have not been registered in the index:

**Rare words:**
- αὐτοπραότης (9, 74), διακελής (23, 21), δουλόσυνος (8, 43), ἐπανα-διπλάξω (7, 159), ἑπικαταρφήγνυμαι (6, 95), εὐδιάρθρωτος (30, 248), εὐανακόμιστος (30, 248), ἐπικατάρθρωτος (6, 86), ἐμνιής (46, 30), ἐμνιής (4, 12), καλλιμός (19, 218), κατατοξάζομαι (18, 27), μεγαλοδοξίτης (9, 3, 49, 55), οσκονθύλλω (48, 31 ἐσκονθυλκώς!)

“Hapax legomena”:
- ἐπεγκάθημαι (7, 210), εὐθύρρους (7, 37), κατάσιτος (6, 25), καχυπό-πτως (48, 15), προσαναδιπλάξω (7, 161)

Words found for the first time in Eustathius:
- γνωμάτευμα (8, 106), ταμιουχία (46, 38)

Words used in Eustathius’ work with a special meaning:
- λεκτική (6, 63): dialect, personal diction of an author
- στρυφνότης (19, 70) (in a positive sense): rhetorical acuteness
- συνοχέω (45, 123): participate, sympathize

**Verba ad res byzantinas spectantia:**
- σχεδικὸν νόημα (7, 190), σχεδικὸς ἐλιγμός (7, 197)

Rare expressions:

---


24. The degrees of the adjectives and the adverbial derivatives from adjectives should, in my opinion, be considered as separate lemmas: καχυπόπτως is common, but καχυπόπτως is a hapax legomenon! Usual is εὐφοιξός, but not also εὐφοιξίτατος.
πρὸ τρίτης (6, 46), δουλόσυνα φρονῶ εἰς τινά (8, 43), ἐπὶ λαιᾷ (8, 123) (= offhanded, opp. to ἐπιδέξιος. [I have restored ἐπὶ λαιᾷ, Tafel had changed it into παλαιᾷ25]).

Also there are several words which, after the corrections proposed in the reviews, either no longer appear in the text, and therefore must be removed from the index as well, or have emerged only after the corrections and are possibly worthy of inclusion in the index:

to be removed: ἀφερεπόνως26, ἐπίκλαυστος27
to be added: ἀπεκμυζῶν (6, 69: hapax!)28, ἐπίκλαυτος (7, 10), νυκτηγρεσία (νυκτηγρετῶ) (6, 89), περιηχέομαι (30, 248)29, ὑποτραυ λίζω (10, 5), φερεπόνως (27, 8)

Words/Data that must be supplemented in LBG:
ἀναπόπλυτος (19, 158)30

the Letters passage for the very rare words ἀποκυκλίζω (30, 55)31, ξενκτήριον (6, 86)32, καλλιβόας (19, 218)33, νυκτηγρεσία (with reservation) (6, 89)34.

Since there is the slightest possibility for a reading to be genuine, it should appear in the index (with a “?”), especially when the word is so rarely attested. The problem is a more general one: In the apparatus criticus of every edition one may find peculiar forms/words/spellings, bound to be forgotten, without certainty that they are erroneous. Besides, even if it was certain that they are not genuine readings of the particular text, this would not mean that these words had not existed at all. Yet, they are ignored and left out of the lexicons by their compilers, who commonly index the text and the indices, but not the apparatus criticus. Thus, it would be appropriate to include such words too, perhaps with a special symbol, first in the index verborum and then in the lexicons.

25. Παπαγιάννης, Επιστολές Ευσταθίου, 141.
26. Παπαγιάννης, Επιστολές Ευσταθίου, 150.
27. Παπαγιάννης, Επιστολές Ευσταθίου, 138.
28. Παπαγιάννης, Επιστολές Ευσταθίου, 137.
29. Παπαγιάννης, Επιστολές Ευσταθίου, 152.
30. Παπαγιάννης, Επιστολές Ευσταθίου, 148.
31. Παπαγιάννης, Επιστολές Ευσταθίου, 151-152.
32. Παπαγιάννης, Επιστολές Ευσταθίου, 137.
33. Παπαγιάννης, Επιστολές Ευσταθίου, 148.
34. Παπαγιάννης, Επιστολές Ευσταθίου, 137.
Finally, there are some words that might seem interesting to scholars, which, however, should not really appear in the text of the *Letters* as they have been edited out by the reviewers, e.g., ἀναλαγχάνω, παρατραυλίζω, περι η γέομαι. Thus, these should be ignored in a future revised edition of *LBG*.

B. 2. On the index graecitatis

The comments stated in the previous part of this paper are also valid here: there are grammatical phenomena which do not appear in the present *index*, whereas others should be removed, because of the changes in the text that have been meanwhile proposed:

Verb forms:

ἀνεσταλοῦντο (8, 140-141): It has already been corrected into ἀνεστηλοῦντο.

ἐμπλατυνάμενος (8, 88): The verb ἐμπλατύνομαι is, generally, common, but similar forms (of the middle Aorist: ἐμπλατυνάμενος, ἐμπλατύνασθαι) occur (according to the TLG) only in Eustathius (12 times in total). ἐμπλατυνάμενος is therefore worthy of inclusion in the *index graecitatis*.

παρεσπονδήθη (7, 190): This is unique instance of the Indicative of the passive Aorist (and indeed, in impersonal syntax) of this particular verb. Even though it is normally formed, it is worthy registering in the *index graecitatis*.

Adjective/noun forms:

The feminine forms πανσεβάστη and παγκάλη are attested (though not always unanimously) in several Eustathius passages (but also in M. Choniates). No matter how improbable it appears that Eustathius used them, we cannot consider them all as copyist’s errors. About παγκάλη, furthermore, we possess the testimony of Eustathius himself: in *Iliad*. 992, 55 (= ΠΙ 664, 4-5 V. DER VALK) ὡς γὰρ καλὸς πάγκαλος, κακός πάγκακος, οὔτως αἰθός πάναιθος, οὔθ ἥλικνὸν ἢ παναιθῆ, ὡς ἡ παγκάλη. Should these forms not be included in the *index graecitatis*?

πατέρος (19, 272-273 τοῦ μεγάλου τῶν φώτων πατέρος): Eustathius uses the form πατέρος, but only when he quotes the Homeric text (e.g., λ

---

35. Papagiannis, Επιστολές Ευσταθίου, 140.
36. Papagiannis, Επιστολές Ευσταθίου, 142.
37. Papagiannis, Επιστολές Ευσταθίου, 152.
38. The correction was suggested by Polemis, review [as in n. 3], 318.
501) or in order to explain the form πατρός. However, it does not appear likely that he used it in his personal speech; actually, it becomes even more unlikely, because the phrase under discussion is a biblical quotation: Iac. 1, 17 πᾶν δόφιμα τέλειον ἀνωθέν ἐστιν, καταβαίνων ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρός τῶν φώτων which has been integrated in St John Chrysostom’s Liturgy (in the final prayer: ὁσιοθάμμωνος εὐχή’): ... ἐκ σοῦ τοῦ πατρός τῶν φώτων, and therefore must have been very familiar to the Bishop. Thus, πατέρος has no place either in the text or in the indices.

ὄκυπεται (45, 17-18 ἀετοὶ ὄκ.): The manuscript reading is ὡκυπέτεις, while ὡκυπέτειοι is a correction proposed by Reinsch. A search (in the TLG) for words ending in -πέτεις or -πετεῖς traces, among others, the following: ταχυπετεῖς, ὑπερπετεῖς, υψιπετεῖς, υψιπέτεις, χαμαιπετεῖς, etc. Indeed, the term υψιπέτεις defines (in the unique passage where it occurs) the noun ἀετοῦς (as here): Theodoret. Cyr. De provid. or. V, PG 83, 629, 8-9 ἀετοὺς ... τοὺς υψιπέτεις. Thus, I suggest that we should either accept the form ὡκυπέτεις (as we do for so many other unique forms) or, at most, to correct it into ὡκυπετεῖς (note that the form ὡκυπετεῖς is also once attested in an anonymous epic fragment). In either case, the form ὡκυπέτεις/ὡκυπετεῖς should be shown up in the index graecitatis.

Grammatical gender:

ὁ ἐπῳδός (4, 124): If we were to accept the masculine gender as genuine, it would be a unique instance, and thus it should be included in the index graecitatis. However, in the article mentioned above I have proposed that the article ὅ should be corrected to the pronoun ὃς.

The use of the Subjunctive followed by the particle ἄν is attested at least three times, without being commented in the index graecitatis:

8, 52-53 καθὰ καὶ βροντῆς βόμβος ὑπερφωνήσῃ ἂν πάντας κτύπους τοὺς ἀπὸ γῆς

19, 22 εἴπη ἂν Ὅμηρος. instead of the Subjunctive with ἄν, one would expect, especially in a main clause, the Optative εἴποι, which sounds the same (according to the TLG, in Eustathius εἴπη ἂν occurs only ten times, while εἴποι ἂν occurs about 180 times). An instance like this should be included in the index graecitatis.

οὐ γὰρ ἄλλο τι αἰτιάσωμαι (cf. Theod. Stud. Epist. 82, 3-4
οὐ γὰρ ἄλλο τι αἰτιάσωμαι).

I cannot decide whether the Subjunctive (preserved in P) or the Indicative (preserved in S) is better. In any case, this point would be worth commenting upon in the index graecitatis.

nomina tivus pro vocativo (p. 152):

Almost all the instances in this paragraph should be deleted, because they require the exclamatory οὐ and not the vocative οὐ, and therefore the Nomina tivus is normal.

Use of prepositions (p. 153):

ἀνά (43, 147-151): καὶ μήποτε ... οὐδὲ εἰς τροφὴν ἀποχρήσεθαι χρὴ τῇ μοναδί ταυτή ἀνά τὸ φύσει τίμιον αὐτή περίποιησθαι: This instance should be removed from the index graecitatis, since the meaningless ἀνά τὸ φύσει τίμιον has been corrected into ἀλλὰ τὸ φύσει τίμιον 40.

Syntax of verbs:

45, 17 χειρίσασθαι ἐπιστολῶν: The syntax of χειρίζομαι with the Genitive would be worth mentioning, but it is not actually attested: in the sole existing manuscript only ἐπιστο is preserved, and Tafel has completed the ending. Obviously, the original reading was ἐπιστολήν 41 (cf. ibid. 27 χειρίσσεθαι γράμμα). 42.

Orthographical ‘variations’:

The word ὄφωμαλεότητα (8, 63) is included in the index verborum as a rare one, which is not true, because, according to the TLG, there exist at least four other instances of this peculiar spelling (a hymnographical text, Theod. Raulena, an anonymous rhetorical text and Genn. Scholarios). However, it is not very wise to accept such an erroneous spelling as genuine, especially for Eustathius, since he uses the word in the standard spelling in his Commentaries about 18 times. Furthermore, in another Letter (13, 18) the standard form χρωμαλεότητα is used. Thus, we should not be very hasty to consider every peculiarity of the manuscripts as authentical.


40. Papagiannis, Ἐπιστολές Ἐυσταθίου, 155.
41. Polemis (review, 319) has suggested ἐπιστολήν.
42. Also this syntax is to be referred in in the index graecitatis.
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(= IV 845, 2-4 v. der Valk) ἡ δέ γε αὐτόροφον ἑστία ἡ τοῦ Χείρωνος ἀλλοίαν ἔχει τὴν σύνθεσιν. δηλοὶ γὰρ τὴν αὐτοφυὴ καὶ σπηλαιώδη, ἣν ἔτερος τις λέγει αὐτόροφον and in Od. 1743, 53-54 (= II 52, 17-18 Stallbaum) Ἐπηρεφὲ δὲ, κοινότερον μὲν, τὸ αὐτόροφον. οἱ δὲ παλαιοὶ γράφουσι καὶ τὸ χθαμαλὸν. There are only two cases in total where αὐτόροφος occurs, but other words compound with ὅροφος are not rarely spelt with an ὀς διώροφος, τριώροφος, τετραώροφος, πεντώροφος, ἄνωροφος, ὑπώροφος, etc. And in Eustathius' works (and, indeed, in his autograph!) we often find: πολυώροφος, ὑπωρόφιος, ὀμωρόφιος. A 'comment' on this issue should have been made in the index graecitatis.

ἀκαρῆ (26, 24): I believe that the correction into ἀκαρεί, which is only reluctantly suggested by the editor in the app. crit., is required. However, we should note that in all the other works of Eustathius (according to the TLG) the expression appears in the form ἐν ἀκαρεί (χρόνω).

μαυροκαλόγηρον (36, 46): The ending has been changed by the editor, whereas μαυροκαλόγηρων is preserved in P. The medieval Grammarians, but also Eustathius himself, prefer expressis verbis the spelling of the ending with ω, e.g., Ael. Herod. Epimer. 205, 13-16 Τὰ παρὰ τὸ γῆρας συγκείμενα, καὶ ἐπὶ τέλους ἔχοντα τὸ ὦ μέγα, διὰ τὸ ὦ μεγάλον γράφονται-οῖον ὑπέργηρως· εὔγηρως· κακόγηρως· καλόγηρως καὶ τὰ ὅμοια. Similar passages are found in Theodosius the Grammarian and Thomas Magister. Eustathius writes ἐσχατόγηρως, ὑπέργηρως/-ον, ἄγηρως. Of course, I do recognize the possibility that the correction is right, because here it is about a folk word (although the third part of the word has the literary form γηρ- and not γερ-). However, the ending -ων (which is also preserved) is the lectio difficilior.

Suggestions

After the above sporadic remarks which, I believe, have highlighted the overall problem, I would like to conclude with two general methodological suggestions.

The first regards the critical editions: In several cases in the Letters we have observed that Tafel's text had been better, that is, more accurate, than the text of the recent edition (due either to inappropriate choices/corrections/ changes or to errors/oversights of the editor). However, it would not be fair to completely reject the new edition and restore the old one in use; neither can
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one demand from the reader to use both editions. In addition, the reviewers of the edition have contributed more or less to a better constitution not only of the text (after the publication of the edition), but also of other parts of the book (e.g., of the indices). Consequently, the user of the new printed edition will read a text, which, in several points, will be inaccurate/invalid or in a form that has never existed; they thus might reach false conclusions based on such a text, e.g., regarding the language of the author. How should we tackle this problem?

My suggestion is that if our critical editions are electronic (rather than printed) and tentative rather than definitive, they will be open to continuous improvement. Not only the text, but the whole edition (prolegomena, commentary, indices) should be uploaded on the “net” (perhaps with each part as a separate web page in the same ‘core site’), where any philologist (after the edition proper) could publish comments, remarks, criticism, or corrections. At certain intervals, if deemed necessary, the text of the edition could be updated, integrating corrections, readings and conjectures, that in the meantime would have been recognized to be correct (after public discussion). A similar updating process would be possible for all parts of the edition: indices, apparatus, commentary. Even the theoretical chapters of the prolegomena could be enriched with new bibliographical citations even from later publications. New bibliography could be added either in bulk (in the general bibliographical list of the edition) or as necessary in the footnotes. Such a website would be the most natural place for the collection of the bibliography relevant to the text. Related articles could continue to appear in the traditional (i.e., printed) form in journals – in this case only references can be given in the site–, but they could also be published directly in the site, so that they would be more easily accessible to the reader. Finally, the whole site could also be linked with TLG-online, so that the latter would always include the updated form of the text and not an outdated one which would not meet the latest demands of philological research.

Thus, on the web it would be possible for every interested reader to view either the original edition or the text as revised by a given reviewer or as it stood at some defined period of editing, or the final version. Nobody’s contribution would be in vain or misappropriated. The editor themselves would have the chance to modify their edition, without being compelled to
make a thoroughly new one. The user would be in a position to see either the processing or the final result.

We should note here that even Eustathius must have followed a similar practice. His autograph of the Commentaries carries numerous improvements or addenda, either written in the text margins or on fragments of parchment added on the original codex.

However, there is also much about our lexicons that can and should be changed. As we mentioned above, even the most recent lexicons are not totally up-to-date and in full synchronism with the latest data of philological research. They actually cannot be updated, but are already out-of-date at the time of print. What would be the solution to this problem?

In the Democritus University of Thrace we have produced a web application, in which the user can find, in a fully digitized form (and not simply scanned), an ever increasing number of scientific dictionaries of the Greek language: *LSJ* and its Revised Supplement, *LS intermediate*, Sophocles, the Greek version of the *LS* along with its *Supplement*, Lampe’s *Patristic Lexicon*, Koumanoudes’ Συναγωγή λέξεων ἄθησαυρίστων, Autenrieth’s Homeric Dictionary, Demetrakos’ Μέγα Λεξικόν, Stamatakos’ Λεξικόν Αρχαίας Έλληνικῆς γλώσσης (some of them are already available and accessible to every user, while others are either about to get “uploaded” or their digitization is ongoing). We even plan to digitize the great *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae*, and also other dictionaries from any era of the Greek language. In fact we can upload any existing lexicon as long as the necessary permission is obtained.

The user of our application (called “dialG”: diachronic inter-active lexicon of Greek) types the Greek word in the “search” field and can immediately see in which (printed) lexicons the word is included/interpreted. One can then choose one or more lexicons to look up the word in, always through the same application.

But the major advantage of the dialG –apart from the availability of several dictionaries– is that there is a pool of data, in which anyone can add, either systematically or occasionally, lexicographical observations for any lemma. Such comments may have already been published, or they may be presented here for the first time. Thus, the user need not wait either for the completion of *LBG* or Kriaras’ lexicon in order to see the latest data about a word which belongs to a volume not yet published, or for an improved
edition of the printed lexicon. Furthermore, the user will be able to read there any existing contributions about words which emerge from the newly edited byzantine texts, whose editions were not available when the usual lexicons were compiled. Also, one can find there words/meanings/forms, about which data has changed through academic discussion in the recent bibliography. In general, it is meant to be a ‘living’ lexicon, for as long as the web exists and there are people willingly to manage the site.

One can see our lexicographical attempt at the following website dialg.helit.duth.gr and verify its usefulness.

As an example of implementation of my suggestions, my critical observations on the new edition of Eustathius’ Letters, not in the redaction as published (s. above n. 4), but in an updated web redaction, are available via Dropbox at the following link:

https://www.dropbox.com/s/q04hsqramcdosjw/Eustathios.pdf?dl=0
Index of names

Autenrieth, G. 361 Metzler, K. 353
Bourbouhakis E. 347 n. 3 Michael Choniates 356
Cullhed, E. 349 n. 7 Polemis, I. 347 and n. 3, 356 n. 38, 358
Demetrakos, D. 361 n. 41
Democritus University of Thrace 361 Reinsch, D. R. 351, 353, 356, 358, 359
Ioannes Chrysostomus 357 Schiffer, E. 348 n. 5
Gennadios Scholarios 358 Schönauer, S. 353
Harlfinger, D. 349 n. 7 Stallbaum, G. 353, 359
Giannouli, A. 348 n. 5 Stamatakis, I. 361
Kambylis, A. 347
Kolovou, F. 347 n. 1, 3, 349 n. 8-10, 350 355, 358-359
n. 11, 13, 351 n. 17, 353 n. 19, 354.
Koumanoudes, St. 361 Theodora Raulena 358
Kriaras, E. 361 Theodosius Grammaticus 359
Kyriakidis, St. 353 Thomas Magister 359
Lampe, G. W. H. 361 Tocci, R. 351, 352 n. 18
Liverani, I. A. 347 n. 3, 348 n. 6, 351 n. 15 Trapp, E. 354 and n. 23
van der Valk, M. 349, 350 n. 14, 353

Index of passages

Ael. Herod. Epimer. 205, 18, 4 358
13-16 359 19, 185 (= 3,61) 349
Eust. Epist. 3, 70 349 19, 272-273 356
4, 124 357 25, 8-9 358
6 passim 350 26, 24 359
6, 89 355 30, 24 353
6, 99 36, 46 359
7, 127 350 43, 55 350
7, 190 356 43, 147-151 358
8, 52-53 357 43, 190 350
8, 63 358 45, 17-18 357
8, 123 355 45, 17 358
8, 140-141 356 45, 27 358
8, 88 356 45, 122 349
11, 33 352 Comm. in Iliad. 992, 55 356
13, 18 358 1148, 49-50 350 n. 12
1286, 10-11 350 n. 12 Hom. λ. 501 356-357
1304, 9-10 350 n. 14 Iac. 1, 17 357
Comm. in Od. 1743, 53-54 359 or. V, PG 83, 629, 8-9 357
(PG 37, 1439, 9-10) 358

Greek words commended

ἀκαρῆ /-εί 359 ἰμβίος 354
ἀναλαγχάνω 356 ἰμίνεκος 354
ἀναπόπλυτος 355 καλλιβόας 354, 355
ἀνεσταλοῦντο / ἀνεστη λοῦντο 359 καλόγηρος 359
ἀνώροφος 359 κακόγηρος 359
ἀπεκμυζῶν 355 κατάσιτος 354
ἀποκυκλίζω 355 κατατοξάζομαι 354
ἀπομυζῶν 355 καχυπόπτως 354
αὐτοπραότης 354 λεκτική 354
αὐτόροφος/αὐτώροφος 358-359 λύσον/λύσον 349
ἀφερεπόνως 355 μαυροκαλόγηρος/-ως 359
βρίθος / βρῖθος 350 μεγαλοδοξότης 354
δισκελής 354 νυκτηρεσία (νυκτηρεσί)355
διώροφος 359 νυκτηρεσία (νυκτηρεσί)355
δοτήρα / δοτῆρα 349 ὀργυιά / ὀργυιά 350
δουλόσυνος 354 παγκάλη 356
δρῦς 350 παναϊθ 356
ἐμπλατυνάμενος, ἐμπλατύνασθαι 356 πανεσβάστη 356
ἐπαναδιπλάζω 354 παρατραυλίζω 356
ἐπεγκάθημαι 354 παρεσπονδήθη 356
ἐπικαταρχήγυμναι 354 πατέρος 356
ἐπίκλαυστος/ἐπίκλαυτος 355 πεντώροφος 359
ἐσχατόγηρως 359 περιηχέομαι 355
εὐανακόμιστος 354 πολυώροφος 359
εὐδιάρθρωτος 354 προσαναδιπλάζω 354
εὐθύρρους 354 πτίλον/πτῖλον 350
ἐσχάτογηρως 359 ρωμαλαιότης/ρωμαλεότης 358
ἐσχάτογηρως 359 ρωμαλαιότης/ρωμαλεότης 358
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QUISQUILIA AND METHODOLOGICAL SUGGESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Expression</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>σκονθύλλω</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>στρυφνότης</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συνοχέω</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σῦς</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σχεδικάς</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ταμιουχία</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ταχυπετεῖς</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τετραώροφος</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τριώροφος</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑπέργηρως/-ων</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑπερπετεῖς</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δουλόσυνα φρονώ</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἰς τινά</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπὶ λαιᾷ</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πρὸ τρίτης</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διαταῦτα</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διατότο</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐνάστετρον</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καθεκάστην</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καθένα</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατίχνος</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατήνος</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατατάυτα</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατατότο</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατευθυνθην</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατέθεν</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατεύθετα</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rare Greek expressions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Expression</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἐπὶ λαιᾷ</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Word-joinings commended

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Expression</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>διαταῦτα</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διατότο</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐνάστετρον</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καθεκάστην</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καθένα</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Λεπτομερείες και Μεθοδολογικές Προτάσεις σχετικά με τις Επιστολές του Ευσταθίου

Με αφορμή την έκδοση των Επιστολών του Ευσταθίου, αρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης, στο πρώτο μέρος (Α) του άρθρου διατυπώνονται σκέψεις για τον τρόπο χειρισμού των «δευτερευόντων» ζητημάτων κατά την κριτική έκδοση ενός βυζαντινού κειμένου: του τονισμού, της στίξης, της συνένωσης των λέξεων. Σχετικά με τον τονισμό και την συνένωση των λέξεων τονίζεται ότι θα ήταν ασφαλές να λαμβάνονται υπόψη οι προτιμήσεις του συγγραφέα, όπως αυτές φαίνονται στα αυτόγραφά του. Αντίθετα, στο ζήτημα της στίξης προτείνεται να ακολουθούνται οι σύγχρονες πρακτικές και συμβάσεις, καθώς αν υιοθετηθεί η στίξη των μεσαιωνικών χειρογράφων (ακόμη και των αυτογράφων), θα προκληθεί σύγχυση στον σύγχρονο αναγνώστη, χωρίς ιδιαίτερο οφέλος. Στο δεύτερο μέρος (Β) επισημαίνονται «αλλαγές» που θα έπρεπε να γίνουν στα ευρετήρια της έκδοσης των Επιστολών (αλλά και στο λεξικό LBG) με βάση την έρευνα που έχει μεσολαβήσει από την έκδοση μέχρι σήμερα. Τέλος, ύστερα από τη διαπίστωση ότι και οι εκδόσεις και τα επιστημονικά λεξικά πρέπει να μπορούν να αναθεωρούνται συνεχώς, προτείνεται η δημιουργία ηλεκτρονικών εκδόσεων στο διαδίκτυο, που θα παρέχουν ακριβές αυτή τη δυνατότητα, ενώ για τα λεξικά δίνεται το παράδεigma μιας διαδικτυακής «εφαρμογής» του Δημοκριτείου Πανεπιστημίου Θράκης, στην οποία ψηφιοποιούνται και αναρτώνται σταδιακά όλα τα επιστημονικά λεξικά της Ελληνικής, αλλά και όπου μπορούν να δημιουργούνται και στοποδημοκρατικές λεξικολογικές παρατηρήσεις, με απώτερο στόχο την δημιουργία ενός «ξωντανού» διαχρονικού λεξικού της Ελληνικής.