

MOSCHOPOULOS AND HARPOCRATION

JOHN J. KEANEY

Princeton University

The *Lexicon* of Harpocraton exists in two recensions, an Epitome made sometime before ca. 850, and a full recension, the earliest extant manuscripts of which are to be dated to the fourteenth century.¹ G. Kalkoff² pointed out that knowledge of the *Lexicon* seems to have been restricted to the Epitome for some centuries after it was made. With this hint, H. Schultz³ suggested that the full recension descended from a manuscript belonging to a *Gelehrter* of the thirteenth or fourteenth century. I propose to argue that the suggestion is correct and that the *Gelehrter* can be identified as Manuel Moschopoulos. The discussion will be based on certain interpolations in the text of the full recension: it will be argued that Moschopoulos inserted some of these passages into a manuscript of Harpocraton which he was using in the composition of works of his own.

In his edition of 1853, W. Dindorf excised as interpolations six⁴

¹ For brief accounts of the transmission of the *Lexicon*, cf. *Historia* 17 (1968) 507 note 1, and *TAPA* 98 (1967) 205 note 2.

² G. Kalkoff, *De codicibus epitomes Harpocratoneae = Dissertationes philologicae Halenses* 8 (1887) 161.

³ *RE* 7.2413, s.v. "Harpokration."

⁴ He actually excised several other passages, but wrongly. The first (s.v. "Ἄττα") is a trimeter, printed by Kock as Chionides F 8. Although the text in Harpocraton is defective, the trimeter is found in parallel glosses (cf. Aelius Dionysius A 193 Erbse) and should be retained.

Dindorf also excised two references to Strabo (s.vv. *Λευκάς, Λέχαιον*): the excisions were based on Meineke's (*Vindiciarum Straboniarum liber* [Berlin 1852] vii–ix) contention that, with the single exception of Athenaeus, Strabo was not known to pre-Byzantine authors. As W. Aly pointed out (*RE*, Zweite Reihe, vii Halbband, s.v. "Strabon," 151), the title of Strabo's work which Harpocraton used, *Γεωγραφούμενα*, is different from that in the medieval mss. The same title is also used in Athenaeus 657F and schol. Ap. Rhod. 2.942. Since this scholion, rather than being late Byzantine, as Meineke assumed, belongs to a collection of scholia which had its origin no later than the second

passages (glosses or parts of glosses) which are found in all manuscripts⁵ of the full recension⁶ and were thus in its last archetype. I print these in alphabetic order:

(1) *s.v.* Ἀγελαιών, *ad fin.* ἡ εὐθεία ὁ ἀγελαῖος.⁷

(2) *post* Γνωσις, Γναφεύς· τοῦτο οἱ παλαιοὶ Ἀττικοὶ διὰ τοῦ κ ἔλεγον, κοινὸν δὲ διὰ τοῦ γ. κνάφος δὲ ἐστὶν ἀκανθῶδές τι, ᾧ ξύουσι τὰ ἱμάτια. τοῦτο οἱ νεώτεροι διὰ τοῦ γ λέγουσι παρὰ τὴν γνάψιν· κναφεὺς μὲν οὖν παρὰ τὸ κνῶ, ὃ σημαίνει τὸ ξύω. καὶ Ὁμηρος (Α 639–640)

ἐπὶ δ' αἷγιον κνῆ τυρόν
κνήσσι χαλκείῃ.

γναφεὺς δὲ παρὰ τὴν τοῦ φάρους γνάψιν, ἥτις ἐστὶ παρὰ τὸ γάνος
τὸ λαμπρόν = schol. Aristophanes *Plutus* 166.⁸

century after Christ (C. Wendel, *Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium vetera* [Berlin 1936] xviii) and since Strabo was known to Athenaeus (or his source), there is no reason to assume that he was unknown to Harpocration.

Dindorf's excision *s.v.* *Ναυκραρικά* is baseless, for there Harpocration is citing Aristotle, *AP* 21.5, in which the excised words occur. For arguments against his excision of Aristophanes, *Nub.* 41 (*s.v.* Ἐπαιρόμενος), see Kalkoff, 190–91.

⁵ These are to be distinguished from interpolations in a single ms. (for interpolated material in Marc. Gr. 444 [K], cf. *TAPA* 98 [1967] 205–19) or in a sub-group of mss. of the *E*-family (for which cf. Dindorf, vi–ix). The interpolations in L = Marc. Gr. 490 (Dindorf, viii) come from marginal additions in L's exemplar, P.

⁶ The fact that items 2 and 6 are also in one ms. of the Epitome, D = Par. Gr. 2552 (written in 1496), is no objection to the argument which will be offered about the date of the interpolations, since D (or, given its late date, its ancestor, d) was collated with and received additions from a (lost) ms. of the full recension. For a discussion, inadequate because it is based on too limited evidence, cf. Kalkoff (above, note 2) 143–76.

⁷ The addition refers to the Byzantine (cf. Suda Α 186 Adler) distinction between ἀγελαῖος and ἀγέλαιος.

⁸ In the only other discussion of the matter, Kalkoff (above, note 2) 188–91, objected that the appearance of the same material in the scholia to Aristophanes is not an argument that the text of Harpocration is interpolated, for the same phenomenon obtains *s. vv.* *Βαλβίσιν* (= schol. *Eq.* 1159), *Δήμαρχος* (= schol. *Nub.* 37), and *Κεραμεικός* (= schol. *Eq.* 772). He was nevertheless willing to accept the excision of items 4 and 6, because they break the alphabetic order (as, indeed, does item 2) and because they are both taken from the same scholion.

However, matters are more complicated. The first and third scholia above share readings with the Epitome of Harpocration (*Βαλβίσιν* . . . τὸ ἐπ' αὐτῆς Ep and schol. *Eq.*, τὸ ἐπὶ ταύτης II [= full recension]; *Κεραμεικός* . . . ὁ μὲν ἐνδον τῆς πόλεως, ὁ δὲ ἔξω Ep and schol. *Eq.*, ὁ μὲν ἐνδον ἐν τῇ πόλει, ὁ δὲ ἕτερος ἔξω τῆς πόλεως II). This can only mean that these scholia were taken from the Epitome. Of the long scholion to *Nub.* 37, Dindorf (*apud* Dübner, *Scholia Graeca in Aristophanem*, 420) commented "partim ex Harpocrati illata partim aliunde." If he is correct, the scholiast will

(3) the first gloss of the *E*-series (Ἐάν τις γραψάμενος κτλ.) is prefixed in the mss. by the phrase ἰστέον ὅτι, and the whole gloss is treated as part of the last gloss of the *Δ*-series (Δώρων γραφή).

(4) *post* Κοτύλαιον ὄρος, Κόβαλοι· δαίμονές εἰσὶ τινες σκληροὶ περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον = schol. Pl. 279.

(5) *s.v.* Λικνοφόρος, *ad fin.* λίκνον τὸ πτύον.

(6) *post* Μόλπις, Μόθων· φλύαρος, φορτικός, ἄτιμος, αἰσχρός. λέγουσι γὰρ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους χειρωσαμένους τοὺς μόθωνας δουλικῇ καὶ ἀγεράστῳ περιστῆσαι τυχεῖ. ὅθεν καὶ Ἀττικοὶ μόθωνες ἢ ἀπὸ Μόθωνός τινος αἰσχρὰ ποιοῦντος καὶ αἰεὶ ἐν τοῖς πότοις ὄρχουμένου. μόθωνας δὲ καλοῦσι Λάκωνες τοὺς παρατρεφόμενους τοῖς ἐλευθέροις παῖδας. ἢ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀνότητος. ἄλλοι δὲ λέγουσι δουλοπρεπεῖς σπερμολόγους = schol. Pl. 279.

Beyond pointing out that 5 was apparently taken from the Suda⁹ (A 535 Adler), and 2, 4, and 6 from the scholia to Aristophanes, Dindorf did not concern himself with how or when these items were interpolated into the text. For the first, it is likely that all the items were originally marginal additions which later crept into the text.¹⁰ It is noticeable

have had to combine two Harp.-glosses (Δήμαρχος, Ναυκραρικά). Further, the text of the scholion sometimes (a) agrees with the full recension, sometimes (b) is closer to the Epitome, and sometimes (c) is unique: e.g. (a) τῶν ἐν ἐκάστῳ δήμῳ Π schol., τῶν προσόντων ἐκάστῳ δήμῳ Ep; (b) ἐπιδίδοσαν καὶ ἡνεχυρίαζον (*vel* ἐνεχυρίαζον) schol., ἐδίδοσαν καὶ ἐνεχυρίαζον δὲ οὗτοι Ep, ἐδίδοσαν Π; (c) ὅποτε δέοι schol., ὅποτε δεήσειεν Π Ep. Since it cannot be shown that the scholion is derived from the Epitome or from the full recension, the easiest solution is to assume a source common to the scholion and to Harpocration.

⁹ In this view he may have been influenced by the fact that the Aldine edition (the *editio princeps* and the basis of all editions until Bekker's of 1833) was interpolated from the Suda, though based on a (lost) ms. of the *Γ*-family. At any rate, the interpolation does not resemble very closely the relevant part of the Suda-gloss which begins Λίκνον· κόσκινον, ἢ πτύον.

¹⁰ It cannot be determined whether the process from margin to text was completed by the time Borbonicus 118 II D 22 (*saec.* xiv) was written; this contains a reference to item 2 as being from Harpocration (οὕτως Ἀρποκρατίων). The reference is in a school-edition of Aesop's fables, the commentary to which was partially published by A. Hausrath, "Die Äsopstudien des Maximus Planudes," *ByzZ* 10 (1901) 90-105, esp. 98. Hausrath's arguments that the commentary is Planudean were correctly refuted by B. E. Perry, *Studies in the Text History of the Life and Fables of Aesop* (Lancaster 1936) 217-18. Some support for Perry's position is provided by the fact that, so far as I have been able to discover, Planudes did not use the *Lexicon* of Harpocration (his occasional references to a Harpocration [cf. C. Walz, *Rhetores Graeci* 9, 635] are to a rhetorician). Further, although the commentary is not Moschopulean, some of the

that the full glosses (2, 4, 6) break the alphabetic order. Such dislocations are characteristic of marginal insertions in this text-tradition. An analogous situation exists with some glosses of the *A*-series; omitted from the text at some stage in the transmission, they were replaced in the margin; they were then wholly omitted when the Epitome was made, and reinserted into the text of the full recension but in the wrong order.¹¹

Since the interpolations are not in the Epitome (cf. above, note 6), they will fall sometime between 850 and the date of the last archetype of the full recension, i.e. in or prior to the fourteenth century. Further, to underscore the obvious, they were made by someone who was familiar with the scholia to the *Plutus* and with Harpocration. Finally, it is convenient to assume, they were made by someone whose (briefly) annotated manuscript could become authoritative for the succeeding tradition.¹²

All these qualifications are met by only one man, Manuel Moschopoulos, the pupil of Maximus Planudes. In recent years, special studies have been devoted to Moschopoulos' editions of Greek poets,¹³ for these became widely influential in individual text-traditions. Equally influential, in Byzantine and Western education,¹⁴ were his major grammatical works, the *Erotemata* and the *schedographia*¹⁵

material in it is influenced by his work: compare e.g. (p. 97 Hausrath) καὶ κόπτω τὸ ἀπλῶς κρούω ὡς καὶ παρὰ Ἀριστοφάνει (*Nub.* 133) "τίς ἐστὶν ὁ κόψας τὴν θύραν" with Περὶ σχεδῶν (omitted by Stephanus) κόπτω τὸ τέμνω καὶ τὸ κρούω ὡς ἐν τῷ "τίς ἐσθ' ὁ κόψας τὴν θύραν."

¹¹ Cf. *Historia* 19 (1970) 3 note 8.

¹² The hypothesis that the interpolations were made at the same time and by the same man would seem to follow from the fact that three of them are from the scholia to the *Plutus*, and will be further supported in the argument.

¹³ Cf. R. Aubreton, *Démétrius Triclinius et les recensions médiévales de Sophocle* (Paris 1949) 17–18 and 79–86; A. Turyn, *Studies in the Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Sophocles* = *Illinois Studies in Language and Literature* 36 (Urbana 1952) 16–30; *The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Euripides* = *Illinois Studies* . . . 43 (Urbana 1957) 83–164; H. Irigoin, *Histoire du Texte de Pindare* (Paris 1952) 27–86; C. Gallavotti, *Theocritus quique feruntur bucolici Graeci* (Rome 1946) 273–79.

¹⁴ Cf. I. Sevcenko, *Speculum* 27 (1952) 133, and R. R. Bolgar, *The Classical Heritage and its Beneficiaries* (Cambridge 1954) 84.

¹⁵ On *schedographia*, cf. K. Krumbacher, *Geschichte der Byzantinischen Litteratur*² (Munich 1897) 590–93, and F. Fuchs, *Die höheren Schulen von Konstantinopel im Mittelalter* = *ByzArchiv* 8 (Berlin 1926) 44–49. I hope to show elsewhere how Moschopoulos adapted a traditional collection of *σχέδη* (found e.g. in Vat. Gr. 18 and 1527) in the composition of his own work.

which, since Stephanus' edition (Paris 1545), has traditionally been entitled *Περὶ σχεδῶν*.

The *Περὶ σχεδῶν* is a text-book, consisting of twenty-two passages (σχέδη), each followed by an analysis which is partly syntactical, partly lexical. This latter aspect of the analysis takes the form of a list of words beginning with the same two or three letters as the word in the passage; many of these are accompanied with explanations. It is in these explanations that the combination of Aristophanes-scholia and Harpocration is especially to be found. W. J. Koster has shown that at least one scholion to the *Plutus* is Moschopulean.¹⁶ It can also be shown that the scholia to Aristophanes were one of the major sources of the *Περὶ σχεδῶν*;¹⁷ in that work, Moschopoulos also cited more than two hundred glosses from Harpocration. The other work in which he used Harpocration most extensively is a (largely schedographic) commentary to a Byzantine scholastic anthology,¹⁸ which comprised Philostratus' *Imagines* 1.1-26,¹⁹ extracts from Marcus Aurelius and Aelian, *NA*,²⁰ the poem in *thermas Pythias* of pseudo-Paulus Silentarius,²¹ and the *Sylloge Vaticana* of the Planudean anthology.²²

¹⁶ *Mnemosyne*, Ser. 4, 7 (1954) 152-55.

¹⁷ E.g. the gloss (p. 60 Stephanus) *Τριτῷ ἡ κεφαλὴ κατὰ διάλεκτον, ἀφ' οὗ Τριτογένεια ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ*, absent from the comparable list in Moschopoulos' model, is taken from the scholion to *Nub.* 989, . . . *τριτῷ γὰρ ἡ κεφαλὴ παρ' Αἰολεῦσιν κτλ.*

¹⁸ That it is a scholastic anthology was first recognized by C. Gallavotti, *BPEC*, n.s. 8 (1960) 14.

¹⁹ There are two commentaries to Philostratus as well as to the other components to the anthology, one written in the margin, the other in the text after individual passages. S. Lindstam, "Die Philostratoskommentare und die Moschopoulos-Syllogia," *GHA* 31 (1925) 173-84, showed that the marginal commentary was basically Planudean and the other Moschopulean, but did not recognize (as will be shown elsewhere) that some of the marginal commentary is also Moschopulean. In the text, I use *post* to refer to the second commentary and *ad* to refer to the first.

²⁰ These extracts are listed by F. De Stefani, *SIFC* 12 (1904) 152-53.

²¹ The poem is printed in E. Cougny, *Epigrammatum Anthologia Palatina* 3 (Paris 1890) 408-12. It was actually composed by Leon Choirosphaktes: cf. S. G. Mercati, "Intorno all' autore del carme *εἰς τὰ ἐν Πυθίοις θερμιά*," *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 10 (1924) 210-48.

²² Cf. Gallavotti (above, note 18) 11-16. Only the commentaries to the *Sylloge Vaticana* have been edited and the edition does not observe the distinction between the two types: cf. A. Luppino, "Scholia Graeca inedita in Anthologiae epigrammata selecta," *Atti della Accademia Pontaniana*, n.s. 9 (anno 1959-60; publ. 1961) 25-62.

To return to the interpolations in Harpocration, I point to the following items from these works of Moschopoulos:

(1) *post Phil. Imag.* 1.16 (*ad ἀγελαία βοί*, p. 317, 23 Kayser) ἀγέλη λέγεται ὅταν πολλὰ πρόβατα ὁμοῦ βόσκεται, ἢ πολλοὶ χοῖροι ἢ βόες ἢ τοιοῦτόν τι, ἐφ' ὧν λέγεται ὁ ἀγελάτης. ἀγελάτης γὰρ ὁ μετὰ ξίφους ἐλαύνων ἀγέλην ζώων. ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀγέλη ἀγελαῖον ζώων τὸ τῆς ἀγέλης καὶ ἀπὸ τούτου ἀγελαῖος ἄνθρωπος ὁ τοῦ πλήθους καὶ ὁ χυδαῖος, καὶ ἀγεληδὸν ἐπίρρημα ἀντὶ τοῦ κατὰ ἀγέλας διὰ τοῦ η. The same passage includes a list of words ending in -τήρια (*ad ἐργαστήριον*, p. 317, 27 Kayser) in which one gloss (Ἀνακαλυπτήρια) from Harpocration's *A*-series is cited.

(5) *Περὶ σχεδῶν* (p. 155 Stephanus), a list of words in λι-: λίκνον τὸ πτύον, ᾧ ἐχρῶντο πρὸς πᾶσαν τελετὴν καὶ θυσίαν οἱ Ἕλληνες, ἀφ' οὗ λικνοφόρος παρ' αὐτοῖς ὁ τοῦτο δηλονότι φέρων = Harp. *s.v.* Λικνοφόρος. The same list of words includes the only other glosses (Λίθος, Λιπάρα) from Harpocration which begin with λι-. The following series of words in λη- includes all three of the relevant Harpocration-glosses (Ληξιαρχικὸν γραμματεῖον, Λῆξις, Λήτη).

(6) *post Phil. Imag.* 1.26 (*ad μόνον*, p. 331, 21 Kayser), a list of words in μο-/μω- plus consonant: μόθων ὁ ἀνόητος ἢ ὁ φλύαρος καὶ φορτικός.

I have found no comparable evidence for items 2 and 4, although Moschopoulos did use the single relevant Harpocration-gloss (*Γνώσις*) in a γν-series (*Περὶ σχεδῶν*, p. 124 Stephanus), and in a κο-plus-consonant-series (pp. 61–62 Stephanus) used three glosses (*Κοβαλεία*, *Κολωνάιτας*, *Κορδακισμός*) out of a possible ten. The combination of all this evidence, viz. that Moschopoulos used both Harpocration and the scholia to Aristophanes and that three of the interpolated items occur in Moschopoulos' works, makes it certain that it was he who was responsible for the interpolations.²³

I stated initially that, since these interpolations are in all manuscripts of the full recension, they must have been in the last archetype. It is characteristic of archetypes that the text they contain is superior

²³ If this conclusion is correct, it leads to a possible solution of item 3. *ιστέον ὅτι* is regularly used by Moschopoulos (and, of course, by other Byzantine scholars) to introduce grammatical or exegetical notes. To account for 3, I can only conjecture that the phrase introduced one of these notes in a marginal comment, that the rest of the note was lost, and that the preserved initial phrase was (stupidly) incorporated into a gloss.

to that of any of their descendants. If the argument is correct that Moschopoulos made marginal interpolations in the last archetype, it should follow that the manuscript he used was superior to any of the extant manuscripts. In this case, the proof is in the fact that Moschopoulos and the Epitome share good readings which are in no manuscripts of the full recension.²⁴ The evidence:²⁵

(i) *post Phil. Imag.* 1.7 (*ad σκηνάς*, p. 304, 26 Kayser): *Σκιάποδες* (= Harp. s.v.): *ἔθνος Λιβυκόν, οἷ φασί, τοῦς πόδας κτλ.*

οἷ Ep ὄνομα Π

(ii) *post Phil. Imag.* 1.9 (*ad ἔρωτες*, p. 307, 27 Kayser): *Ἐρκειος Ζεῦς* (= Harp. s.v.): *ἀπὸ τοῦτου ᾧ βωμοὶ ἐντὸς ἔρκους ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ κτλ.*

ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ Ep, ἐν τῇ βουλῇ Π

(iii) *ad Aelian NA* 1.13, *κακώσεως δίκην* (p. 10, 26 Hercher): *κακώσεως δίκη* (= Harp. s.v.) *ἐστὶ ταῖς τε ἐπικλήροις κατὰ τῶν γεγαμηκότων κτλ.*

κατὰ Ep, καὶ κατὰ Π

In sum, I conclude that Moschopoulos used Harpocraton for his schedographic works; that, while composing these, he made casual annotations in the manuscript of Harpocraton which he was using; and that this manuscript became the archetype of the full recension of the *Lexicon*.²⁶

²⁴ These coincidences cannot be explained on the assumption that Moschopoulos used the Epitome, because he shares readings with *Π* against *Ep* (e.g. *Σκιάποδες* ... *οἷους οἱ χῆνες Ep, ὥσπερ οἱ χῆνες Π Mosch.*).

²⁵ I relegate one doubtful item to a footnote: *post Phil. Imag.* 1.23 (*ad συμπεφραγμένην*, p. 304, 26 Kayser): *φρυκτωρεῖν* (= Harp. s.v. *Φρυκτωρῶν*): *κυρίως μὲν τὸ διὰ πυρσῶν ἀνατεινομένων κτλ.* [(*Ep*): *πυρσῶν Su* (cod. G) *πυρῶν ED Su* (cod. V) *πυρσοῦς Su* (codd. AM) (*Π*): *πυρσῶν P πυρῶν cett.*] Since the correct reading *πυρσῶν* may have been independently conjectured where it occurs or may have been a variant reading (for instances of variants, cf. *AJP* 88 [1967] 83 note 4), the agreement in the reading here does not have as much weight as any of the others.

²⁶ It is once again a pleasure to record my gratitude to the Association's referee for his helpful criticisms.