

late imperial) or its Homeric model that suggested the Helen motif to Constantine, the reference in his own poem to the mixing of the *φάρμακον* in a cup of wine puts it beyond doubt that it was a drug like Helen's he had in mind, something to make him forget his pain. No reference then to love potions or witches—and no lost Hellenistic poem.

The other parallels between Propertius and Constantine adduced by Cairns add up to no more than commonplaces: a warning for others to beware of love, and the benefits of travel as a cure for it. Cairns himself draws attention to "marked differences between the treatment of some of the themes in the two texts" (p. 110). With the disappearance of the most striking of the supposed coincidences, the idea of a common "learned tradition of erotic poetry" behind both Propertius and Constantine is probably best abandoned.

ALAN CAMERON
Columbia University

MOSCHOPOULOS AND THE SCHOLIA TO THE *BATRACHOMYOMACHIA*

There is contained in two manuscripts¹ of the *Batrachomyomachia*, U = Ambrosianus H 22 (saec. xv) and P^o = Ottobonianus Gr. 150 (saec. xv/xvi), a set of scholia (to verses 1–208) which is attributed in P^o (fol. 110r) to Moschopoulos: 'Ομήρου Βατραχομυομαχία μετ' ἐξηγήσεως ὠφελιμωτάτης τοῦ Μοσχοπούλου.² The attribution has not, to my knowledge, been questioned; but, in their text tradition and contents, these scholia present so many anomalies when compared with the texts and practices of Moschopoulos that their cumulative effect makes it almost certain that they were not composed by him.

THE TEXT

It is certain that the *Batrachomyomachia* was never part of the poetic *sylloge* of Moschopoulos (*Iliad* 1–2. 493, Hesiod *Opera et dies*, Pindar *Olympians* 1–8, the Byzantine triads of Sophocles [*Aj.*, *El.*, *OT*] and Euripides [*Hec.*, *Or.*, *Phoen.*], and Theocritus *Idylls* 1–8).³ The text of the *Batrachomyomachia* is not found in any MS containing the whole, or the majority of the components, of the *sylloge*, although it is occasionally found in a MS which contains part of the *sylloge* (e.g., Baroccianus 46: Hesiod with scholia of Tzetzes and Moschopoulos; Ambrosianus L 73: Moschopoulos' commentary on the *Iliad*; Casanatensis G IV 16: Hesiod, Moschopoulos' commentary on Theocritus). No component of the *sylloge* and no other work of Moschopoulos is in U or P^o.

1. The first three scholia are found without attribution in U* (Ambr. H 22, foll. 184 ff.). I use the sigla and edition (pp. 198–308) of A. Ludwich, *Die Homerische Batrachomachia des Karers Pigres* (Leipzig, 1896), cited hereafter as Ludwich.

2. E. Miller, *Catalogue des manuscrits grecs de la bibliothèque de l'Escurial* (Paris, 1848), p. 330, no. 41, listed a MS containing *Batr.* with the scholia of Moschopoulos, scholia of Tzetzes to Hesiod, and Apollodorus' *Bibliotheca*. The MS came into the possession of Cardinal Ottoboni in Rome and was later incorporated in the Vatican's holdings by Benedict XIV (Miller, p. 305). It is tempting to identify the Escorial MS with P^o; but, if Miller's description is correct, the identification is not possible (Ludwich, p. 119).

3. For bibliography see "Moschopoulos and Harpocration," *TAPA* 100 (1969): 204, n. 13, and "Moschopulea," *ByzZ* 64 (1971): 303, n. 1.

Second, it is normal for MSS containing Moschopoulos' scholia to carry the same text⁴ of the work on which the scholia comment. The texts of the *Batrachomyomachia* in P^o, U, and U^a belong to different recensions: P^o to A. Ludwich's⁵ class III³, U to I², and U^a to I³. Further, the scholia in U comment upon a recension different from the one in U.⁶

THE CONTENTS

The contents⁷ of the scholia in U and P^o show even more anomalies by the standards of Moschopoulos' usual practice. Each of these anomalies is, perhaps, not of much weight by itself, but again I stress their cumulative effect. The criteria I use are (a) manner of citation, (b) authors cited, (c) works used, (d) faulty quotations, and (e) comparison of the content of the scholia with analogous passages in Moschopoulos' *Περὶ σχεδῶν*.⁸

(a) *Manner of citation.* The scholiast frequently refers to Homer as οὗτος ὁ ποιητής (28; cf. 2 ὁ ποιητής οὗτος, 4 παρὰ τῷ ποιητῷ τούτῳ). The standard mode of reference in Moschopoulos is παρ' Ὀμήρῳ; and he would not have used the scholiast's expression, for the demonstrative pronoun so used is superfluous.⁹ When Moschopoulos quotes Scripture, the quotation is anonymous.¹⁰ The scholiast, on the other hand, cites Δαβὶδ (2: Ps. 5:3) and ὁ Ψαλμῶδός (165: immo 1 Kings 2:10).

(b) *Authors cited.* The scholiast uses Eustathius and frequently (7, 8, 30, et alibi) refers to him as ὁ Θεσσαλονίκης. Moschopoulos also uses Eustathius,¹¹ but never cites him by name—he also never cites Tzetzes and the scholiast does (1). In his scholia to Homer and Hesiod,¹² Moschopoulos cites Porphyry and Proclus but, with a single exception,¹³ never elsewhere cites an ancient scholarly source. In contrast, the scholiast refers (usually, if not always, from an intermediate source like Eustathius or the *Etymologicum magnum*) to Theodosius and Herodianus (124: from Eustathius), Choireboscus (13, 24), Aristophanes ὁ γραμματικός (98: from Eustathius), and to Aristocles' *Περὶ διαλέκτων* (69: from Eustathius). Finally, citations of Kornutos are unexampled in Moschopoulos, but he is quoted by the scholiast (171: *Κορνοῦτος ὁ ἱστορικός*): the quotation is fictitious and seems to be a garbled reminiscence of a passage in Tzetzes.¹⁴

4. I avoid the phrase "Moschopouleian recension" because of the doubts recently expressed by R. D. Dawe, *Studies on the Text of Sophocles* (Leyden, 1973), pp. 55–57.

5. Ludwich, p. 56.

6. Cf. Ludwich, *Index lectionum in Regia Academia Albertina* (Königsberg, 1891–92), p. 25, where O is Ludwich's earlier *siglum* for U.

7. In what follows, numbers, unless otherwise specified, refer to lines of *Batr.*

8. *Περὶ σχεδῶν* = *Manuelis Moschopuli "De ratione examinandae orationis libellus"* (Paris, 1545). On this work, see "Moschopulea," pp. 303 ff.

9. Π. σχ. 17. 29: ὡς θταν εἴπω "ὁ ποιητής" εὐθὺς γὰρ τὸν "Ὀμηρον ἐξόχως νοεῖν δίδωμι.

10. Π. σχ. 5. 26: ὡς τὸ "ἃ ὁ θεὸς ἐκάθηρε, σὺ μὴ κοινοῦ" (Acts 10:15 = 11:9); 7. 27: ὡς τὸ "δανεῖται ὁ ἁμαρτωλὸς καὶ οὐκ ἀπορίσει" (Ps. 36:21). Sometimes Moschopoulos makes general reference to Scriptural usage (Π. σχ. 25. 23: παρὰ τῇ συνηθείᾳ τῆς θέας γραφῆς; ad Pind. *Ol.* 1. 1 [52. 13 Abel]: παρὰ τῇ θέᾳ γραφῇ).

11. Compare especially the discussion of Σμινθεῦ (Π. 1. 39) in Moschopoulos (L. Bachmann [ed.], *Manuelis Moschopuli Scholiorum Homericorum, particula prima* [Prog. Rostock, 1835], p. 10) with Eustathius ad loc. (1:56 Van der Valk).

12. In the scholia to Hesiod, he is especially reliant on Proclus: cf. M. R. Dimitrijevič, *Studia Hesiodica* (Leipzig, 1899), pp. 46–48.

13. The exception is the citation of Gorgon of Rhodes (*FGrHist* 515 F 18) ad Pind. *Ol.* 7. 1 (214. 7 Abel), which he got from the *scholia vetera*.

14. Cf. Ludwich, p. 275: "Freilich steht in der 'Επιδρομή τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν θεολογίαν παραδεδομένων des Kornutos nichts davon, dass er die Kentauren für Thessalien erklärte."

(c) *Works used.* Moschopoulos never refers to or quotes the Hesiodic *Scutum*, as the scholiast does (141), nor the *Batrachomyomachia* itself. A large number of the scholia contain the kind of etymologizing familiar in (and in many cases drawn from¹⁵) the *Etymologicum magnum*. I would not affirm that Moschopoulos never dipped into that farrago, but he does not make the kind of systematic use of it evident in the scholia.

(d) *Faulty quotations.* When Moschopoulos quotes from memory, as I assume he does at least occasionally for Homer and Scripture, the quotations are either accurate or slightly (but not misleadingly) inaccurate.¹⁶ Quotations of more difficult authors—Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes—are precise. No one will claim precision for the scholiast. Doubtless some of the faulty quotations are the result of the oral nature of the scholia,¹⁷ and it is probably the fault of a “wenig achtsam Zuhörer”¹⁸ that we find errors like *σαυτῆς* for *σ’ αὐτῆς* (4, quoting *Il.* 6. 490). For the majority of errors, however, blame must be assigned to the scholiast himself. Examples need not be multiplied. I point to 2, where *εὔχετο δ’ Ἀπόλλωνι ἀνακτι* is a conflation of *Iliad* 4. 119 and 1. 35–36; to 94, where Euripides *Orestes* 5–7 (*Τάνταλος / κορυφῆς ὑπερτέλλοντα δειμαίωνν πέτρων / ἄερί ποτᾶται*) is rendered *ὃς προσδειμαίωνν πέτρων ἄερί ποτᾶται*; and to 152, where *τόθ’ εἶναι καὶ δέισαντες* is apparently a corruption of Aristophanes *Ranae* 133 *τόθ’ εἶναι καὶ σὺ σαῦτόν*.

(e) *Moschopoulos’ Περὶ σχεδῶν.* For the sake of convenience, Moschopoulos uses the same explanatory material in different contexts; and it is worth noting that the kind of correspondence which can be observed between his scholia and the *Περὶ σχεδῶν* cannot be paralleled in the *Batrachomyomachia* scholia. I begin with the latter.

Scholia 1: *χόρος σημαίνει δύο· χόρος ὁ τοῦ κύκλου· καὶ ἐτυμολογείται ἀπὸ τοῦ τὴν χεῖρα ὀρέγειν καὶ παρέχειν. ἢ παρὰ τὸ χάρα. ἢ, ὃ καὶ κρείττον, παρὰ τὸ κόρος ἢ χόρτασις. γίνεται κόρος κατὰ τροπὴν τοῦ ἄ εἰς χ, μεταπεσόντος καὶ τοῦ τόνου· κορεσθέντες γὰρ οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἀνίστανται εἰς τὸ παίζειν καὶ χορεύειν. καὶ χόρος τὸ πλήθος.*

II. σχ. 76. 17–18: *χόρος, πλήθους κατὰ κύκλον στροφὴ ἐναρμόνιος.*

Scholia 10: *γένειον ἐνταῦθα τὸν πώγωνά φησι. διὰ διφθόγγου δὲ γράφεται, ὡς περιεκτικὸν δὲ τῶν τριχῶν, ὡς τὸ βαλανεῖον, νοσοκομεῖον, ἱατρεῖον, ξενοδοχεῖον καὶ ἄλλα.*

II. σχ. 67. 16–17: *γένειον, αἱ κατὰ τὰς σιάγους τρίχες.*

For contrast, we may adduce:

Mosch. ad¹⁹ *Il.* 1. 151: *ἢ ὁδὸν ἐλθόμεναι] ἤγουν εἰς λόχον· καὶ παρὰ τοῖς ῥήτορσιν ἔστι τοῦτο ἐν χρήσει. Δημοσθένης “ἢ ἐν ὁδῷ καθελὼν”²⁰ ἤγουν ἐνέδρα. εἰ δὲ ψιλωθείη, φασι, ἢ προτέρα, τὸν βάθμον σημαίνει.*

II. σχ. 132. 7–10: *ὁδός, ἡ πορεῖα καὶ ὁ λόχος, ὡς παρὰ Δημοσθένει “ἢ ἐν ὁδῷ καθελὼν.” τοιοῦτον εἶναι, φασί, καὶ τὸ Ὀμηρικόν “ἢ ὁδὸν ἐλθόμεναι.”*

15. Cf., e.g., Ludwig’s comments at 11 and 69. The phrase *ἐτυμολογείται ἀπὸ* is a favorite of the scholiast, but I have noted only one instance of it in Moschopoulos (II. σχ. 109. 20).

16. For example, the proper reading in Acts 10 and 11 (cf. n. 10) is *ἐκαθάρισεν*; at II. σχ. 29. 15, *μετὰ τοῖσιν ἔβη* is a mistake for *μετὰ δὲ σφιν ἔβη*.

17. Cf. 8: *ἐν θνητοῖσι* τοῦτο τὸ πάθος προσχρηματισμὸς λέγεται, ὡς πρῶν ἐν ἐρήκαμεν ἐν τῷ “δέλτοισι” (3).

18. Ludwig, p. 121.

19. Bachmann, *Moschopuli Scholia Homerica*, p. 19.

20. From Harpocration, s.v.

Mosch. ad²¹ *Il.* 1. 179: καὶ σοῖς ἑταροῖσιν] ἑταῖροι, οἱ προσοικειωθέντες κατὰ φιλίαν· φίλοι, οἱ οἰκεῖοι καὶ κατὰ γένος προσηκόντες· ἔται, οἱ συνέστιοι φίλοι· γείτονες, οἱ πλησίον μένοντες.

Π. σχ. 121. 1–9: φίλος, ὁ οἰκεῖος καὶ κατὰ γένος προσήκων, ὡς παρ' Ὀμήρῳ . . . διαφέρει δὲ τοῦ ἑταίρου ὅπερ (ὥσπερ?) ὁ ἔτης τοῦ γείτονος. φίλος μὲν γὰρ αὐτό, ὅπερ εἴρηται, ἑταῖρος δ' ὁ προσοικειωθείς κατὰ φιλίαν, ἅπερ Ὀμηρος διακρίνων λέγει . . . ἔτης δὲ συνέστιος φίλος, γείτονες δὲ οἱ πλησίον μένοντες.

I subjoin two smaller pieces of evidence to add to the cumulative effect. The *Lexicon* of Harpocration is used occasionally in the Moschopoulos scholia to the *Iliad*²² but is not one of the sources of this scholiast. The Συλλογὴ Ἀττικῶν ὀνομάτων, usually²³ but wrongly²⁴ attributed to Moschopoulos, does contain material drawn from his commentaries: it does not, I think, contain material from these scholia.

I conclude, then, that the attribution of these scholia to Moschopoulos in P^o is wrong. Presumably the conjectural attribution was based on the analogy of Moschopoulos' scholia to Homer and Hesiod.

JOHN J. KEANEY
Princeton University

21. Bachmann, *Moschopuli Scholia Homerica*, p. 20.

22. Cf. "Moschopulea," p. 318, n. 45.

23. Still so by Dawe, *Sophocles*, p. 58.

24. Cf. "Moschopulea," pp. 314–15.