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P. Berol. inv. 9780 is a second-century C.E. copy of a commentary on select passages from Demosthenes’ orations 9-11 and 13, composed by the Alexandrian scholar Didymus in the first-century B.C. 1 Columns 11.52-12.33 of the papyrus contain a discussion of the word σκορακίζειν in Dem. 11.11. Didymus derives the verb from the expression “to the crows” (ἔς κόρακας), quoting from Aristophanes’ Birds and from the collection of proverbial expressions made by the fourth-century B.C. author Demon (FGRh 327) to illustrate his view.

The scribe, perhaps with the help of a second hand, 2 notes a textual problem in the Demon passage. In col. 12.3, the scribe seems first to have written νεομοένους, and then to have corrected it to νεομοένους with the aid of an antisigma. 3 This antisigma is keyed to another antisigma written in the margin above col. 12, followed in all editions by the words ἰδὲ μὴ νεομοένους. All editions thus take the word ἰδὲ as an aorist imperative of ὄρω (see indices verborum). However, the subsequent word μὴ does not readily construe, and the phrase as a whole has never been satisfactorily explained. 4

Editors have followed the apparent correction in the upper margin and printed νεομοένους in line 3. I would not dispute that decision. However, I would suggest that the ἰδὲ of the papyrus is not ἰδὲ μὴ, but rather ἰδὲ μὴ ὧν ἰδὲ is correctly read here, the spelling of ἵδὲ as ἰδὲ could be due to iotacism. 5

This regularly occurs in documentary papyri: In P. Lond. III 988.9 (third century C.E.), ἰδὲ δ’ οὐ(ν) is written as ἰδὲν. Iotacism of the word ἰδὲ in the phrase ἰδὲ μὴ occurs in four documentary papyri: P. Graux II 27.15 (third century C.E.); P. Muench III 58.3 (second century C.E.) and 120.12 (second century C.E.); and P. Oxy. LIX 4000.22 (fourth century C.E.).

The Greek in the margin above col. 12 should, I propose, be rendered as follows: ἰδὲ μὴ, νεομοένους. Observing the difficulty with νεομοένους and ναομοένους in col. 12.3, someone (perhaps not the original hand) proposes the following: “but if not (νεομοένους/ναομοένους, then) νεομοένους”. 6
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1 Edited most recently by L. Pearson and S. Stephens, Didymi in Demosthenem Commenta (Stuttgart, 1983). Two earlier editions by H. Diels and W. Schubart, Didymos Kommentar zu Demosthenes, Berliner Klassikertexte I (Berlin, 1904); and later in that year, Volumina Aegyptiaca Ordinis IV, Grammaticorum Pars I: Didymi de Demosthene Commenta cum Anonymi in Aristocratem Lexico (Leipzig, 1904).

2 Diels-Schubart (first edition), x-xi, suggest that the comments above some of the columns in the papyrus may have been written by a different hand from that of the main text.

3 According to Pearson-Stephens, ad loc., who follow Diels-Schubart. A correction of some kind is visible in Diels-Schubart (first edition), Tafel I, following pg. 95, but it is difficult to discern the proposed ατ from the plate (I have not had the opportunity to examine the papyrus first-hand). Diels-Schubart notes an additional problem in lines 3 and 12 of col. 12. They suggest that in both lines the scribe mistakenly wrote τὴν γῆν for Ἄρνην. Stephanus of Byzantium (ed. A. Meineke) knows of four cities by this name. The relevant one is the “city of Thessaly, a colony of Boeotia, concerning which is the oracular response: ‘Widowed Arne awaits a Boeotian man’” (πόλις Θησασσίας, ἄποικος τῆς Βοιωτίας, περὶ ἕς ὁ χρησμὸς· Ἄρνη χρῆσεται μὲνε Βοιωτίαν ἄνδρα).

4 On this symbol, see K. McNamee, Sigla and Select Marginalia in Greek Literary Papyri, Pap.Bruxl. 26 (Bruxelles, 1992), 14-15.

5 Diels-Schubart do not offer an explanation. Pearson-Stephens comment: “Quaerit librarius de l. 3,” which may indicate that they interpret the note to mean something like, “See if νεομοένους (is) not (better).”


7 For the independent or elliptical use of ἰδὲ μὴ, see H.W. Smyth, Greek Grammar (Cambridge, Mass., 1920) 2346d. D. Hagedorn has kindly suggested another possibility to me: If the τ of ἰδὲ is in error for τ (for which see Mayser, vol. 1, pt. 1, 51-52, and Gignac, vol. 1, 236-37), then the scribe’s note could read: ἰδὲ ἐμὴ νεομοένους, “But my (copy?) has νεομοένους.” If this suggestion is correct, the scribe’s proposal of νεομοένους would be the result of collation with a better text of Demon or Didymus, rather than simply the result of educated guesswork, as I have suggested here.