Harpocation and the Συναγωγή

Ian C. Cunningham

1. The Problem

The only surviving work of Valerius Harpocation, Alexandrian ῥήτωρ 1 or γραμματικός 2 of the later second century, 3 is the Λεξικόν τῶν δέκα ρητόρων, an alphabetical elucidation of words and phrases and especially names of persons and places in the canonical Attic orators. 4 The full form of this text seems not to have been known in Byzantium till the thirteenth century. 5 But an epitome, perhaps made in late antiquity, was available. It is independently extant in three manuscripts: E of the thirteenth century, D of 1496, and T (a copy of E) of ca 1540. 6 Much earlier than any of these was the copy or copies used by one or more expanders of the Συναγωγή λέξεων χρησίμων.

This protean Συναγωγή (hereafter Σ) cannot be ascribed to any one compiler or to an exact period, but it belongs to the revival of interest in scholarly matters commonly known as the first Byzantine renaissance, i.e., to the very end of the eighth or the first half of the ninth century. 7 The terminus ante quem is the date of the lexicon of Photius, but that is by no means certain; 830 to 850 are the probable limits. 8 Σ began as an expanded version of the lexicon of Cyril, an elementary compilation of glosses on the Bible, Homer, Euripides, and other well-known texts, probably by the fifth-century archbishop of Alexandria. 9 In this form it exists in Paris Coisl.gr. 347 (A, 9th or

---

1 Suda A 4014.
2 Heading in mss. D and E (see infra).
3 E. G. Turner, JEA 38 (1952) 92; B. Hemmerding, REG 72 (1959) 107–09.
4 Edited by I. Bekker (Berlin 1833) and by W. Dindorf (Oxford 1853); citations are as is customary by Dindorf’s page and line, but the text and apparatus of both editions have been utilised. An edition was planned by Georg Wentzel, whose material was available for the RE article by H. Schultz (VII.2 [1912] 2412–16).
5 J. J. Keane, TAPA 100 (1961) 201–07.
6 The variations from the full text can be seen in Dindorf’s first apparatus. The substantial agreement of all the sources in selection of glosses, wording of abridgements, and textual details shows that one epitome is in question.
7 Cf. P. Lemerle, Le premier humanisme byzantin (Paris 1971).
8 For a convenient summary of the evidence and literature see K. Alpers, Das attisch-byzantinische Lexikon des Oros (Berlin 1981) 72 and n.23.
9 Unpublished. Cf. A. B. Drachmann, Die Überlieferung des Cyrillglossars (Copenhagen 1936), with edition of the sections βα, θα-θε, λα-λε. A version of this lexicon was incorporated into Hesychius; much information is given in K. Latte, ed., Hesychii
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10th cent.) and, apart from the letter α and a few additions elsewhere, in Paris Coisl.gr. 345 (B, 10th cent.), and also with later interpolations in Berlin gr.qu. 13 (C, 15th cent.; now in Cracow, Biblioteka Jagiellonska). It later underwent great expansion in several stages, by which glosses from the following sources were incorporated: Apollonius’ Lexicon Homericum, fuller versions of the rhetorical lexica printed as the fourth and fifth items in Bekker’s Anecdota graeca I, glosses on Plato from Timaeus and elsewhere, Atticist lexica (Aelius Dionysius, Pausanias, Phrynichus, the Antiatticist, perhaps Orus), Diogenianus, and Harpocration. It is not to be supposed that the original ancient works were utilised, but rather as with Harpocration epitomes, extracts, and compilations, and these probably gathered in only a few manuscripts. Each of our three sources for this “erweiterte Σ” (as Wentzel called it)—B, the Suda14 and Photius15—has a different selection of these additions: the principal groupings are B Suda Phot., Suda Phot., and B Phot. The most economical explanation of this is that there were three stages of expansion, Σ’, Σ'', and Σ''', the two latter being based on the first; Suda used Σ'', B used Σ''', and Phot. used both. This is clearer in the diagram at the top of page 207.16

The much smaller number of coincidences between B and Suda are to be explained by omission in Photius, either by Photius himself or (more likely) in the course of the transmission of his lexicon, as the

---

11 Berlin 1814. These are entitled, respectively, Δικών δόξατα [hereafter ‘Bekk. IV’] and Λέξεων ρητορικά [‘Bekk. V’].
12 Such as a precursor of B, which contains, in addition to Σ, Apollonius, Phrynichus, Timaeus, the Antiatticist, and Bekker IV and V.
13 α in the manuscript B.
14 Sudiae lexicon, A. Adler, ed. (Leipzig 1928–38).
15 Photii patriarchae lexicon, C. Theodoridis, ed. (Berlin 1982–).
manuscripts are relatively late and have been subjected to abbreviation.\textsuperscript{18} The possibility that glosses that now appear only in one of them came from one or other forms of $\Sigma$ and were omitted in the rest of the tradition is frequently present but can rarely be proved. All three also had other sources.

It is obvious that only in $\alpha$, where $\mathbf{B}$ is available, can this process be proved. Elsewhere $\Sigma''$ and $\Sigma'''$ can be separated only by analogical extension of the results obtained for $\alpha$.

Different views have been held as to the stage(s) at which Harpocration was added to $\Sigma$. Wentzel, writing before most of $\alpha$ in Photius was known, included Harpocration among the common additions.\textsuperscript{19} Reitzenstein, the first to have a clear view of the stages of expansion in $\Sigma$, likewise included Harpocration in $\Sigma'$.\textsuperscript{20} This was, however, denied by Adler;\textsuperscript{21} in order to explain why Harpocration glosses sometimes break the alphabetical sequence in Photius, and why they do not often appear in combination with other glosses, she supposed that Harpocration was used directly by the \textit{Suda} and Photius (one must suppose also by $\mathbf{B}$, though she does not say so). Erbse follows this without discussion.\textsuperscript{22} Alpers suggests a compromise: Harpocration may have been added to $\Sigma'$ but also used directly by the \textit{Suda} and Photius.\textsuperscript{23} Theodoridis in his marginal notes to Photius implicitly follows Wentzel.

To endeavour to settle this matter is the aim of this paper. It seems that the best chance of doing so is by a detailed examination of the glosses in $\alpha$, where we have the benefit of three sources.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{17} This is the traditional view, formulated by Reitzenstein and elaborated by Erbse. Alpers, \textit{BZ} 64 (1971) 80, argued that Erbse does not prove the the existence of $\Sigma'$; this may be so for the Atticistic glosses, with which Erbse is concerned, but cannot be maintained in general; what is needed is an explanation of the numerous glosses that appear in $\mathbf{B}$ \textit{Suda} Phot., but not in $\mathbf{A}$ (C).
\item \textsuperscript{18} Theodoridis (\textit{supra} n.15) lxi–lxxi.
\item \textsuperscript{19} \textit{GGA} 155 (1893) 28; \textit{SitzBerlin} 1895, 480.
\item \textsuperscript{20} \textit{Supra} n.16: xxxiv–xxxix.
\item \textsuperscript{21} \textit{GGA} 185 (1923) 28; \textit{RE} (\textit{supra} n.16) 692f.
\item \textsuperscript{22} \textit{Supra} n.16: 24 n.3.
\item \textsuperscript{23} \textit{Supra} n.16: 73 n.25.
\end{itemize}


2. Data: Distribution of Glosses

The glosses of Harp. appear in B Suda Phot. almost in their entirety. For α there are 285 glosses in Dindorf’s edition, but of these 14 are totally omitted in the epitome,24 and hence in B Suda Phot. (with two exceptions, ἀγνείσται and ἀργυρίτις γῆ). Of the remaining 271 only 6 do not appear in any of them:

- ἀκανάκης (18.12) (Σ’ has another gloss, Bach.54.11, Sudaα882, Phot.α754)
- ἀμβλωθρίδων (25.13) (Σ has another gloss, Boysen XIa.18, Bach. 79.2, Sudaα1524, Phot.α1161)
- ἀμώκης (29.10) (Σ has another gloss, Boysen XIIIb.21, Bach. 82.5, Sudaα1645, Phot.α1391)
- ἀνατι (33.12) (Σ’ has another gloss, Bach.85.19, Sudaα2102, Phot. α1691)25
- ἀνήκει (37.3) (Σ’ has another gloss, Bach.96.25, Sudaα2405, Phot. α1917)
- ἄουκος (38.10)

It is noteworthy that in five of these cases a gloss from a different source is in Σ; although in general two or more glosses on the same word are seldom avoided in Byzantine lexica, this does occasionally happen,26 and may be operative here. ἄουκος is grossly out of place (presumably whoever first positioned it either read or was thinking of ἄνωκος), and from this an explanation of its omission may be found: it was to be restored to its proper alphabetical place but was overlooked at that point.

There remain 265. 162 of these are in all three of B Suda Phot. A total of 20 appear in only one of the sources, while 83 appear in only two. Before these are considered, it is necessary to note that in B the section from Αμ to Ανδ (middle) does not contain any addition from Σ’ or Σ’’.27 Glosses from that area in Suda and/or Phot. are there-
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24 These are 34.13 ἀνδραποδιώτης, 40.16 Ἄντιφων, 40.18 Ἄρτιστατος, 44.10 ἀπόλλεια, 46.15 ἀποκαί (omitted by D but not by Ε), 47.9 ἀπόληγες, 48.13 ἀπόλλων πατριώς, 49.3 ἀπό μαθηματών, 56.4 ἀγγείτις γῆ, 56.7 Ἀργεύνιται, 56.12 Ἀργαύως, 56.15 Ἀριοβαρζάνης (omitted by Ε according to Bekker, who does not give a full report of D; Dindorf is silent), 57.12 Ἀριστοτέλης, 68.18 Ἀσφαρέις. For a possible explanation of some of these omissions see J. J. Keaney, GRBS 14 (1973) 418.
25 The addition in Phot., which resembles Harp., is most likely from Diogenianus; cf. Hesychius α4636.
26 I am not aware of any general discussion of this, and I have not myself collected examples. One simple case that has come to my attention is this: the Σ gloss ἐμπίς·κώνος (Bach.218.5) is not in Suda, unlike the vast majority of Σ glosses. Instead Suda ε1020 has ἐμπίς·κώνος παραπληγίου from an Aristophanic scholium.
27 Reitzenstein (supra n.16) xxxiii.
fore not significant; this reduces the number to 12 in one source and 49 in two.

B: 
- 'Απατούρια (42.18; Bach.113.5)
- 'Αρθμος (57.10; Bach.143.3)
- αδ (67.6; Bach.162.25)

Suda:
- άδύνατον (11.12; Sudaα540; Bach.32.13, Phot.α393 from Bekk. v)
- αεί (12.6; Sudaα605; Bach.33.25, Phot.α405 from Phryn.)
- 'Ανθήνη (38.4; Sudaα2513)
- άντιγραφή (39.10; Sudaα2661)28
- άξον (41.17; Sudaα2833)29
- άποδεκτά (46.4; Sudaα3281; Bach.124.2, Phot.α2480 from Bekk. v)
- άποστολές (51.5; Sudaα3559; Bach.133.16, Phot.α2660 from Bekk. v)
- άργυρίτης γη (56.4, not in epitome; Sudaα3792)
- άτιμητος άγών (64.1; Sudaα4364; Bach.160.3, Phot.α3094 from Bekk. v)

Suda Phot.: άβως (3.1; Sudaα47, Phot.α38; Bach.6.3, Phot.α37 from ?)
- άγαθής τύχης νεώς (3.6; Sudaα111, Phot.α69)
- άγνωμόνως (6.3; Sudaα284, Phot.α218; Boysen VIIIb.2; Bach.13.21, Sudaα284, Phot.α217 from Cyr. + )
- άγοράσαν (6.11; Sudaα304, Phot.α230)
- άδήμαγοι τρημέρεις (10.12; Sudaα469, Phot.α343; Bach.30.10, Phot.α342 from Bekk. v)
- άδεστώ (13.4; Sudaα618, α103, Phot.α422)
- άειλογία (13.2; Sudaα628, Phot.α423)
- άετώς (14.3; Sudaα576, Phot.α426; Bach.35.10, Phot.α426 from Bekk. v)
- άζήτητον (15.1; Sudaα598, Phot.α437; Bach.35.18 from ?)
- αἰγόδες (16.3; Sudaα60, Phot.α523)
- Α&γιλενής (16.6; Sudaα47, Phot.α524)
- άλογοι έρανισταί (23.11; Sudaα1315, Phot.α1039; Bach.71.16, Phot.α1027 from Bekk. v)

28 Perhaps to be removed. Phot.α2090 may be an abbreviated version of the Harp. gloss, while Bach.104.26 may be a contamination of it and Bekk. v.
29 This may belong below: Bach.108.15, Phot.α2183 are from Bekk. v, but Bach. seems to be contaminated with Harp.
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αὐθέντης (66.5; Suda α4426, Phot.α3161; Bach.163.18, Phot.α3160 from Ael.Dion.α194)
αὐλέως (66.8; Suda α4443, Phot.α3176)
Αὐτοκλείδης (67.3; Suda α4498, Phot.α3324)
άφεις τὴν ὑπέραν ... (69.9; Suda α4599, Phot.α3320)
ἀφ' Ἔστιας μνείσθαι (69.13; Suda α4590, Phot.α3322)

B Phot.: ἀγνεῖστα (5.7; Bach.24.1, Phot.α205)
ἀδέητος (9.8; Bach.27.9, Phot.α329; Suda α435 from Bekk. iv)

'Ἀλεξανδρὸς (21.3; Bach.66.6, Phot.α916)
'Αλκαβάδης (22.13; Bach.69.19, Phot.α985)
'Ἀντιγενίδας (39.3; Bach.104.19, Phot.α2082)

B Suda: ἄγραφον (6.12; Bach.15.24, Suda α343; Phot.α253 from Bekk. v)
ἀδελφόν (9.9; Bach.27.29, Suda α441; Phot.α333 from ?)
ἀδημονούντης (10.1; Bach.27.31, Suda α459; Bach.27.11, Phot.α334 from ?)

"Ἀνδρὼν (35.5; Bach.86.23, Suda α2193)
'Ανεμύτας (36.5; Bach.90.31, Suda α2267)
'Αξιόχος (41.15; Bach.108.6, Suda α2822)
ἀπαθή (42.13; Bach.109.29, Suda α2873)
ἀπαρτηλογία (42.16; Bach.111.29, Suda α2929)
ἀπογραφή (45.11; Bach.122.25, Suda α3273)
ἀποστασίων (50.10; Bach.132.6, Suda α3546; Bach.132.12, Suda α3546, Phot.α2640 from Bekk. iv)
ἀποστασίων (53.12; Bach.138.28, Suda α3703)
ἀπρότων (53.16; Bach.139.1, Suda α3704)
'Αρασφήνος (54.4; Bach.140.5, Suda α3746)
ἀργάς (54.6; Bach.141.14, Suda α3760; Phot.α2768 from Bekk. v)

"Ἀργουσα (55.9; Bach.142.6, Suda α3784)
ἀρμοσται (58.16; Bach.145.2, Suda α3979; Bach.145.4, Phot.α2838 from Bekk. v)
ἀρρην(νο)οφείν (59.1; Bach.145.23, Suda α3848; Bach.146.3, Phot.α2876 from ?)

'Αρτεμίσιον (59.13; Bach.147.21, Suda α4031)
ἀρχαὶ(ρεπε)σίαζεν (60.3; Bach.149.11, Suda α4079; Bach.149.13, Phot.α2923 from Diogenianus)
'Αρχάδεμος πόλεμος (61.6; Bach.149.18, Suda α4108)
ἀστράβη (62.18; Bach.154.16, Suda α4248; Suda α4248, Phot.α3017 from ?)
ἀχαριστεῖν (70.7; Bach.174.13, Suda α4675; Suda α4674, Phot.α3428 from Timaeus)

Here again there are a fair number of double glosses from other sources.
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Harp. in B

It is well known that the Σ' and Σ''' series in B are in general distinguishable. The Harp. glosses for the most part appear in the Σ' series; there are a few short runs:

Bach.27.29–28.8 ἄδελφίζειν, ἄδημονούσης, (ἀδύνητον Сμт.), ἀδι- állατον, ἀδικίον, ἀδοκίμαστος
Bach.37.14–16 ἀδέωρητος, Ἀθηνόδωρος, Ἀθόμνεις
Bach.65.31–66.6 ἀλαβαστοθήκος, Ἀλαείς, Ἀλέας, Ἀλέανδρος
Bach.69.17–22 Ἀλκέτας, Ἀλκαβάδης, Ἀλκάμαχος
Bach.72.26–73.3 Ἀλώα, Ἀλωπεκήθεν, Ἀλωπεκόννησος
Bach.97.18–23 Ἀνθεώι, Ἀνθομόκριτος, Ἀνθοστήριν
Bach.135.8–27 ἀπόταφος, ἀποτυμα, ἀποτειχίσα, ἀποτήμησις, (ἀποτήμησις Σ), ἀπὸ τοῦ πράγματος
Bach.138.24–139.1 ἀπρόσκλητον, ἀπροβούλευτον, ἀπροστασίον, ἀπρότων
Bach.141.23–142.6 ἀργυρίς θήκη, ἀργυροκοπεύον, ἀργυρόποδα δή- φρον, (ἀργυρίων δίκη Bekk. v), Ἀργυσσα
Bach.161.17–22 ἀττα, Ἀττης, Ἀττικὸς γράμμασιν

and one long one:

Bach.103.24–105.16 Ἀντιοχίς, (Ἀντιοχοῦ Σ'), 'Ἀντρωνε, (Ἀντομοσία Tim.), Ἀντωμοσία, (Ἀντωμοσία Σ'), Ἀντωμίτας, Ἀντι- βληθέντας, Ἀντιγενίδας, Ἀντιγραφίς, Ἀντιγραφή, (Ἀντίθετον Phryn.), Ἀντιθέσις, (Ἀντίθετον ?), Ἀντικύρα, Ἀντισα.

This last comes between the Σ (some Σ') αντ- series and the Σ''' one. Apart from these most of the Harp. glosses are not grouped in any significant way. There are, however, a handful that appear in distinctly Σ''' contexts:

ἀγνεύεται (Bach.24.1) in its correct alphabetic place in the long
(about 75 glosses with scarcely an interruption) Σ''' αγ- series
'Ἀριστεύς (Bach.143.8) in a small group of four glosses
ἀρρηφορεῖν (Bach.145.24) near the beginning of nine αρρ- glosses
mostly from Σ'''
'Ἀρχιδάμεως πόλεμος (Bach.149.18) in a run of about the same length
ἀσταθμητότατον, ἀστικτόν χωρίον, ἀστυνόμοι (Bach.155.16, 19, 23) near the beginning of a group of a dozen.

Of these ἀγνεύεται is in Phot. but not in Suda or in the epitome of Harp.; 'Ἀριστεύς is in Phot. but not in Suda; ἀρρηφορεῖν and 'Ἀρχι-
δάμεως πόλεμος are in Suda but not in Phot.; and the other three are in both Suda and Phot.

30 Reitzenstein (supra n.16) xxxiii–xlii.
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Order in Phot.

The breaking of alphabetical order by Harp. glosses in Phot. was, as already noted, one of Adler’s reasons for thinking that they were added directly by Phot. Reitzenstein remarked briefly on the alphabetical order that “kein Verständiger wird darauf verzichten, aus der Stellung bei ihm ab und an auf den Ursprung der Glossen Schlüsse zu machen—immerhin aber so, dass eine nur von ihm ausgehende Untersuchung nie zu klaren Ergebnissen kommen kann.”31 The analysis begun by him (xlii–xliv) can now be extended.


Of the Harp. glosses that disturb the alphabetical order many come into the category of words from the same root:

73 Ἀγάθαρχος, 69 Ἀγαθής τύχης νεώς, 226 Ἀγοράς, 230 Ἀγοράσας, 260 Ἀγρίους, 279 Ἀγυνας, 318 Ἀγωνιάν, ὤντες, 521 Ἀλυεῖα, 522 Άλυεία, 534 άλλες ακατάστασιν. 587 άλλες, 716 άλλο, 1090 Ἀλωπεκύθεν, 1091 Ἀλωπεκύνθησος, 1400 Ἀναβάλλει, 1472 Ἀναθέσθαι (1473 is a later insertion), 1493 Ἀναίνεσθαι, 2089 Ἀντιγραφός, 2422 Ἀπόκειται, 2570 Ἀπόμαχος, 2608 Ἀποπομπαίος, 279 Ἀργυροκοπέιον, 2815 Ἀρσεῖα, 2825 Ἀρκτεύται (or 2824 may be out of place), 2929 Ἀρχη Ἀνδρα δείκνυσι, 2953 Ἀσήμαντα, 3094

31 Supra n.16: xxxi.
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Others, despite initial appearances, do not in reality disturb the order:

- 223 ἀγων (221f have been added), 269 Ἀγροιλήθεν (267f are out of place), 1098 Ἀμάδοκος, Ἀμαζόνων (1097 is out of place), 2082 Ἀμτυγινίδας (2083–85 are out of place), 2196 ἄσπτα (2195 is out of place), 2350 ἀπεργασάμενος (2349 is out of place), 2675 ἀπόταξις (2674 is out of place) and 3234 αὐτομαχεῖν (3233 is out of place).

The following do disturb the order:

- 130 Ἀγασικής, 285 Ἀγύρρως, 354 ἀδιάστατον (cf. above), 374 ἀδοκίμαστος, 422 ἀειετω, ἀειλοία (with 420f a separate Σ’’ block), 468 Ἀθμονεός (467 is the previous Harp. gloss), 605 Ἀνίνας, 744 "Ἀκη, 893 Ἀλαείνας, 915 Ἀλέας (916 is the next Harp. gloss), 984–86 Ἀλκέτας, Ἀλκιβιάδης, Ἀλκίμαχος, 1039–42 ἄλογοι ἐρανιστά, ἀλοίγαν, Ἀλοίνητος, Ἀλόπη, 1171 Ἀλμβρακία, 1213 ἀμπλευ (cf. 1212 ἀμππον), 1316 ἀμφίδεξας (1317 is the next Harp. gloss), 1500 Ἀνακαίσαν (1499 may be a later addition), 1610 ἀναποδιζόμενα, 1879 ἀνεσκενάσαντο, 1946 Ἀνθεία (1947 is the next Harp. gloss), 2135 Ἀντιοχίς, Ἀντισσα, 2150 ἄντωμοσία, 2484 ἀποδιδόμενοι, 2631 ἀποσάξαντα, 2660 ἀποσττη‐σάμενον (in a confused area), 2687 ἀποτελίσσαι (in a confused area), 2703 ἀπόφασις, 2715 ἀποφορᾶν (in a confused area), 2746 ἀπροβούλευτον (cf. 2745 ἀπροβολία), 2795 Ἀρδηττου (the Bekk. v gloss on the same word is correctly placed), 3130 Ἀττις (in a confused area), and 3322 ἂφ' Ἐστίας.

That is, a maximum of 38 glosses out of 227 are out of place. Given the character of the lexicon that does not appear an excessive number.

Combined glosses

The manner in which similar glosses of different origin are combined is a further means of establishing relationship. The Harp. glosses concerned are these:

- ἀγελαίος/ἀγελαίων. There are four glosses: (1) ἀγελαίος: ἰδιωτής. η ὁ ἐν ἀγέλη διάχων (Σ: Cyr. + Ael.Dionys.a17), (2) ἀγελαίοις: ἰδιωτῶν … (Σ': Cyr. + ?), (3) ἀγελαίοις τῶν πολλῶν καὶ τυχόν‐των … (Harp.4.10), (4) ἀγελαίος: ἀντί τοῦ ἰδιωτῆς, ῥεμβώδης, καὶ εὐτελῆς … (Σ’’: Paus.a12). These are combined as follows: B (Bach.8.25f) (2)/(1) + (3) + (4); Suda187 (1) + (2) (+Julian) + (3); Phot.a134, 141 (2) + (3)/4.

32 2716f appear to be placed according to the antistoechic order used in Suda, of which there are traces elsewhere; cf. Adler (supra n.16) 679.
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άγορανόμος. Β (Bach.14.7) and Suda 302 have the Harp. (6.8) gloss by itself, Phot.a229 adds a sentence from Bekk. v.

Αίνιοις. The epitome of Harp. (17.9), by omitting the citation from Demosthenes (23.119) that followed the lemma, produced the rather odd-looking gloss Αίνιος: Αίνιος πόλις ἐστὶ τῆς Θράκης.... This is reproduced by Β (Bach.47.4) and Phot.a605. Suda misunderstood it and (combining it with another source) produced (ai224) Αίνιον καὶ Αίνιον: πόλεις, (ai225) Αίνιος: πόλις ἐστὶ τῆς Θράκης....

ἀκροασθαναί. Suda 993, Phot.a849 have from Harp. (19.11) ἀντὶ τοῦ ὑπακούειν. οὕτως 'Αντιφών (fr.62 Th.). For οὕτως Β (Bach. 56.12) substitutes καὶ ὑποτεθάβατο Πλάτων (Gr. 488c) καὶ from Phrynichus (Praep.Soph. 38.6).

ἀλαστωρ. There are three glosses: (1) φονικός δαίμων, τιμωρῶν καὶ ἀνέλπαται ποιῶν (Σ), (2) ὁ τουκτά τολκήσας ὦν μὴ ἔστιν ἐπιλαβέσθαι (Harp.20.9), (3) ὁ ἀμαρτωλός, κατὰ μὲν Χρήσιππον.... (Paus.a61). Phot. (α903, 902, 896) has them separate. Β (Bach.65.7) inserts part of (1) and all of (2) near the beginning and end respectively of (3). Suda 1082 has (1) with πικρός καὶ inserted from Δ + extract from Polybius + (2).33

ἀλπιδεύν. Two glosses (Σ and Harp.21.18) in Phot.a955f are combined by insertion of Ðε in Β (Bach.67.5) and Suda 1240.

ἀνδραισποδοκάτηλος. Two glosses (Σ and Harp.34.10) are combined by insertion of καὶ in Phot.a1746, of οὕν (with an Aristophanic scholium and an excerpt of Procopius) in Suda 2155.

Ἀνθεστριῆσιν. In the gloss from Harp. (38.1), Suda 2500, Phot. α1955, there is one etymology of the word: Β (Bach.97.23) inserts an alternative.

ἀπαγωγή. Two glosses (Σ and Harp.42.8) are grouped in one of the Suda’s characteristic paragraphs, preceded by the Σ gloss ἀπαγωγάς and separated by an excerpt from Philostorgius (Suda 2869). In Phot.a2208f they are separate, but the former has an addition λέγεται ἀπαγωγή καὶ η ἀἰχμαλωσία καὶ η τινος κομβη, οὗν η ἀγωγή. In Β (Bach.109.20, 24) this is added to the Harp. gloss, whose last sentence is transferred to the other.

ἀπαρτιολογία. Two similar glosses in Β (Bach.111.23 ὁ ἀπαρτισμένος ἀριθμὸς καὶ λόγος. Ἡρόδωτος ἐβδόμῳ [7.29.2]: λέγει δὲ Ξέρετς....; 111.29 ἀντὶ τοῦ ἄπαρτισμένος καὶ πλήρης ἀριθμός. οὕτως Λυσίας [p.334 Th.] καὶ Ἡρόδωτος), the latter from Harp. (42.16), are combined in Suda 2929 ἀπαρτισμένος καὶ πλήρης ἀριθμὸς καὶ λόγος. οὕτως Λυσίας. Ἡρόδωτος δὲ τοῦτο λέγει δὲ Ξέρετς....

33 I need not consider the vexed question of Etym.Gen.; see Alpers (supra n.16) 76; Theodoridis (supra n.15) xl–xlv.
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ἀπειπεῖν. Phot.α2311 has the Harp. (43.7) gloss ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀποκαμεῖν καὶ ἀδυνατήσας ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀπαρνηθῆσας. Sudaα3124 has it with ἣ ἀπειπεῖν' substituted for ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ. In B (Bach.116.7) it has the same form as in Phot., but ἥ καὶ ἀπιστεῖν is inserted after ἀδυνατήσας (by confusion with the gloss Sudaα3116, Phot.α2311 ἀπειπεῖν' ἀπιστεῖν).

ἀπεστειλημένος. B (Bach.118.26) has the Σ gloss ἀπεστειλημένων· ἀποκεκλεισμένων. The epitome of Harp. (44.3) has ἀπεστειλημένος· Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ κατ' Ἀριστογείτονος (25.28) ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀποκεκλεισμένος. Phot.α2375 seems to be this, with the citation omitted. Sudaα3079 combines the two: ἀπεστειλημένος· ἀποκεκλεισμένος. Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ κατ' Ἀριστογείτονος ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀποκεκλεισμένος.

ἀπογραφή. B (Bach.122.25) prefixes the Σ (Cyr.) gloss to that of Harp. (45.11). Sudaα3273 has them in reverse order. Phot.α2468 has only the former.

ἀποτεθασμένων. B (Bach.130.14) and Sudaα3475 join the Σ (Cyr.) and Harp. (49.11) glosses with ἥ. Phot.α2604 has only the latter.

ἀποστολεῖς. Sudaα3559 has the Harp. (51.5) gloss οἱ ἐπὶ τῆς ἑκπομπῆς τῶν τριήρων ἀποδεδειγμένοι. Phot.α2660 has the Bekk. ν (203.22) gloss ἵ ἐν τοῖς ἀριθμοῖς ἦσαν ἀρχοντες ἐπὶ τῶν ἐκπλευσών τριήρων καὶ τῶν ἀναγομένων στόλων, ἀποστολεῖς δὲ παρὰ τὸ ἀποστέλλειν τὰ πλοῖα. B (Bach.133.16) also follows Bekk. ν in essence, but inserts material from Harp. with οἱ ἐπὶ τῆς ἑκπομπῆς τῶν πλευστῶν τριήρων καὶ τῶν ἀναγομένων στόλων ἀποδεδειγμένοι.

ἀργάς. B (Bach.141.14) and Sudaα3760 have the Harp. (54.6) gloss at the end: Δωρεῖς καὶ μᾶλλον Ἀργάς, οὕτως ἐλευθεροποιύμενοι καὶ τοῖς ἐν τῇ ἱκανίᾳ ἀργάς καλεῖται, οὕτως ἐλευθεροποιύμενοι καὶ τοῖς ἐν τῇ ἱκανίᾳ ἀργάς καλεῖται. Before this B has ὁ δεινότατος παρὰ ἐν τῇ ἱκανίᾳ ἀργάς καλεῖται. Suda has ὁ δ. παρὰ τῇ ἱκανίᾳ ἐλευθεροποιύμενοι καὶ τοῖς ἐν τῇ ἱκανίᾳ ἀργάς καλεῖται. B has clearly incor-porated material from the Bekk. ν (206.7) gloss in Phot.α2768, οἱ μὲν οἱ τούτων κακόν ποιητήν γεγονόντα (then the inept linking phrase οἱ καὶ τοῖς οἱ μὲν οἱ τούτων κακόν ποιητήν γεγονόντα (then the inept linking phrase οἱ καὶ τοῖς ἐν τῇ ἱκανίᾳ ἀργάς καλεῖται). The origin of the main insertion is not known.34

ἀρμοσταί. As with ἀποστολεῖς, Sudaα3979 has the Harp. (58.16) gloss (οἱ ὑπὸ τῶν Λακεδαμιώνων ἐς τὰς ὑπηκόους πόλεις ἀρχοντες ἐκπεμπόμενοι), Phot.α2838 the Bekk. ν (206.16) gloss (οἱ ὑπὸ τῶν Λακεδαμιώνων ἐς τὰς ἑκατοντάς πόλεις, pará τὸ ἀρμοῖειν καὶ καθιστᾶν τὰς ὑπ’ αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ ἱκανίᾳ ἀνεχθέντας πόλεις).
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145.2) combines the two (οἱ ὑπὸ τῶν Λακεδαίμονών εἰς τὸς ὕπηκόους πόλεις ἄρχοντες καὶ φροντισμοὶ ἐκπεμπόμενοι, παρὰ τὸ ἀρμόζειν κτλ.).

ἄρχαιος. Here two glosses, ἄρχαιος· ἀντὶ τοῦ εὐθήθης Πλάτων (Hp.Mi. 371d; perhaps from Phrynichus fr.263), and ἄρχαιος· Ἰσοκράτης μὲν ... (from Harp.60.5), are differently treated. Phot.a2920f has them separate; Sudaa4074f has them separate but in reverse order, with the latter preceded by the Ambrosian ὁ παλαιός. B (Bach.148.14) runs the two together. It is to be noted that all three have, explicitly or implicitly, the lemma ἄρχαιος in Harp., for the original ἄρχαιος.

ἄστραβηθ. Phot.a3017 has the gloss τὸ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐφάπτεσθαι ξύλον, δὲ κρατούσιν οἱ καθεξῆς καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ νυστοφόρον ύποκύνην. ὁι δὲ τὸν σωματηγὸν ἡμῖν αὔστραβην ἐκάλεσαν. Sudaa4248 runs together the Σ gloss ήνος, the Harp. (62.18) gloss ἡ ἡμίωνος, ὡς Δημοσθένης κατὰ Μειδίου (21.133). τάχα δὲ καὶ πᾶν ὑποκύνην, ἐφ’ οὐ οἱ ἀνθρωποὶ χοῦνται, οὕτως ἐκαλεῖτο, and the gloss found in Phot., interposing between the two sentences of the latter ἄστραβηλήθης· ὁ ήνοχος from the Ambrosian lexicon. B (Bach.154.14) joins the gloss in Phot. with Harp.: τὸ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐφάπτεσθαι ξύλον ... ὑποκύνην. καὶ πᾶν ὑποκύνην ἐφ’ οὐ οἱ ἀνθρωποὶ χοῦνται οὕτως ἐκαλεῖτο, ὡς καὶ Δημοσθένης κατὰ Μειδίου.

**Abbreviated glosses**

A few glosses appear in one source or another in an abbreviated form. In B:

'Ἄλαμος. Harp.1.1, Sudaa18, Phot.a29 have a long narration of his history. B (Bach.5.15) has only the opening words ὁνομα κύριον.

'Ἀβρόκομας. B (Bach.5.2) again has only ὁνομα κύριον. Harp. epit. and Phot.a54 add σατράπης δ’ ἦν Ἀρταξέρξης του Περσῶν βασιλέως. The full Harp.3.3 and Sudaa83 have οὕτως σατράπης ἦν κτλ.

'Ἀγάπαρχος. The final phrase τὸ δὲ γένος Σάμως in Harp.3.4, Sudaa109, Phot.a73 is omitted by B (Bach.6.20).

In Phot.:

ἀνεπόπτευτον. Phot.a1862 omits the citations from Philochorus (FGrHist 328f69f) that are given by Harp.36.7, Sudaa2303, and B (Bach.91.11).

ἀντιγραφέας. Harp.39.5, Sudaa2661, and B (Bach.104.21) have ὁ καθιστάμενος ἐπὶ τῶν καταβαλλόντων τινὰ τῇ πόλει χρήματα, ὥστε ἀντιγραφέας αὐτά. οὕτω δὴ θησαυρεύεται κατὰ Ανδροτίως (22.70). ἀλλὰ καὶ Δικτύνης ἐν τῷ κατὰ Κτησιφώτους (3.25). δὺ δὲ ἦσαν, ὁ μὲν τῆς διωκήσεως, ὁ δὲ τῆς βουλής.
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Phot. α2089 has only the last sentence, with the addition ὡς φησι Δημοσθένης καὶ Αἰσχίνης.
ἀπεσεχουσμένος. See above (215).
ἀπλάς. Phot. α2435 omits mention of Callistratus from Harp. 45.1, Sudaα 3223, and B (Bach. 121.22).
ἀρετή. Harp. 57.9, Sudaα 3831, and B (Bach. 142.21) have Ἀνδρο-
κίδης (fr. 6) καὶ Θουκυδίδης (1.33.2) ἀντὶ τοῦ εὐδοξία. Phot.
α2802 alters this to εὐδοξία. οὕτως Ἀνδροκίδης καὶ Θουκυδίδης.

In Suda Phot.:
ἀπαγε. Harp. 42.8 and B (Bach. 109.14) have ἀντὶ τοῦ χρῶ τῇ ἀπαγω-
γῇ οὕτως Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ κατὰ Ἀνδροτίνος (22.26). ἔστι δὲ
dίκης εἶδος. Sudaα 2861, Phot. α2201 omit all after Δημοσθένης.

Textual variations

The relation of the Σ sources to the epitome of Harp., plain from
the selection and wording of the glosses, is confirmed by the textual
variations.

B Suda Phot. Harp.epit.: Harp.plen.

ἀγνᾶς (Harp. 7.8, Bach. 16.8, Sudaα 383, Phot. α279) σταλαγμοῦς,
βαρβάρους: σταλαγμοῖς, βαρβάρων
Ἄδραστεα (Harp. 10.16, Bach. 28.15, Sudaα 524, Phot. α385) ταὐ-
τον: τὴν αὐτὴν; αὐτὴ: αὐτὴν
ἀέρκτον (Harp. 14.1, Bach. 34.10, Sudaα 560, Phot. α424) ὀρώμενον:
καθορώμενον
αιῶς (Harp. 17.5, Bach. 44.9, Sudaα 169, Phot. α587) πληγάς: πλη-
γῆς
Αἰνίου (Harp. 17.9, Bach. 47.4, Sudaα 225, Phot. α605) ἐπηγάγοντο
post Κύμης: post Μετυλήνης
Ἀιζωνήσων (Harp. 18.1, Bach. 47.7, Sudaα 242, Phot. α609) λέγεσ-
θα: λέγειν
ἀκάρ (Harp. 18.11, Bach. 53.10, Sudaα 800, Phot. α716) ἀκαρ: ἀκαρὴ
vēl ἄκαρεί
Ἀκτή (Harp. 19.12, Bach. 60.4, Sudaα 1036, Phot. α876) ἰδίως: om.;
πλέω: πλέω μοῖραν
Ἀκτια (Harp. 20.2, Bach. 64.11, Sudaα 1037, Phot. α877) τῷ περὶ
tῶν: ἐν τῷ περὶ
Ἀλέξανδρος (Harp. 21.3, Bach. 66.6, Phot. α916) καὶ: εἶ

There are, however, a handful of cases where one or more of them
agrees with the full version against the other(s) and the epitome.

Phot. Harp.epit.: B Suda Harp.plen.

Αἰγείδαι (Harp. 15.11, Bach. 42.10, Sudaα 32, Phot. α522) γνήσιως
ἔστιν: γνήσιος
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Suda Phot. Harp.epit.: B Harp.plen.

ἀντιγραφὴ (Harp.39.10, Bach.104.26, Suda a2661, Phot.a2090) lemma om.: hab.; τα' ανε ἐν: ante τών; πράγματος περὶ τοῦ πράγματος

῾Αρκτούρος (Harp.58.10, Bach.144.20, Suda a3961, Phot.a2827) ἰὲ καὶ: ἰὲ

῾Αφύς (Harp.70.5, Bach.173.25, Suda a4659, Phot.a3406) ὄνομα- 

Suda Harp.epit.: B Phot. Harp.plen.

ἀστικόν χώριον (Harp.62.14, Bach.155.19, Suda a4226, Phot.a3015)

There are also cases where they all agree against Harp. (generally both versions):

B Suda Phot.: Harp.

῾Αγησάλαος (Harp.5.3, Bach.12.25, Suda a229, Phot.a171) ἰὲ: ἰὲ καὶ ἰγοῦ (Harp.4.3, Bach.13.23, Suda a381, Phot.a223) ἰγοῦ: ἰγοῦ τοῦ- 

ἀνελοῦσα (Harp.35.9, Bach.90.1, Suda a2248, Phot.a1836) αὐτήν: 

῾Αντυγενίδας (Harp.39.3, Bach.104.19, Phot.a2082) Διονύσου: Διο- 

νυσίου ἀντιγραφεῖς (Harp.39.5, Bach.104.21, Suda a2661, Phot.a2089) ἰγα: ἰγα ἀντιγραφεῖς ἀντωμοσία (Harp.41.4, Bach.104.1, Suda a2759, Phot.a2150) γρα- 

ψάντων: γράψαντες ἀνωφθήιαξον (Harp.41.8, Bach.107.3, Suda a2598, Phot.a2167) ἀνωφθήιαξον: ἀνωφθίαξον; ὀρθοὶ: ὀρθοὶ (epit.: ὀρθοὶ plen.) ἀπροστασίου (Harp.53.12, Bach.138.28, Suda a3703) ἧρειτο: ἧρει- 

το ἄργυροκοπίει (Harp.56.5, Bach.141.27, Suda a3796, Phot.a2790) ἰμαντήρων: σημαντήρων ἀρκτεύσαι (Harp.58.4, Bach.143.23, Suda a3959, Phot.a2825) παρ- 

θέντω: παρθένον ἀρκτοῦ ἄρρησφορεῖν (Harp.59.1, Bach.145.23, Suda a3848) ἄρρησφορεῖν: 

ἄρχαῖος (Harp.60.5, Bach.148.14, Suda a4074, Phot.a2921) ἄρχαῖ- 

ος: ἄρχαῖος Ἱ. Ἀρχεδάμειος πόλεμος (Harp.61.6, Bach.149.18, Suda a4108) τοῦ 

Πελοποννησιακοῦ: om. epit. (hab. plen.)

35 B perhaps took these readings from the related gloss Bekk. v 200.9 (Bekk. v and Harp. share a source in the so-called Ονομαστικόν: Wentzel, GGA 159 (1897) 618).
Errors peculiar to only one of the Σ sources are obviously of no significance here (even less, variations within Suda or Phot.). But there are some that occur in two of them.

**Suda Phot.: B Harp.** (prima facie error in Σ’’’)

- Αθμονεύς (Harp.15.7, Bach.37.16, Sudaα743, Phot.α468) Αθμον-: Αθμον-
- Άκη (Harp.19.1, Bach.53.29, Sudaα858, Phot.α744) καλομενην: νυν καλομενην
- ἀπόφασις (Harp.52.15, Bach.136.24, Sudaα3629, Phot.α2703) καλείται . . . ἀπογραφή: καλεί . . . ἀπογραφή
- Αττης (Harp.65.4, Bach.161.20, Sudaα4354, Phot.α3130) Αττης: Αττης
- ἀφορμή (Harp.69.15, Bach.172.30, Sudaα4638, Phot.α3378) δῶσει: δῶση (δό Harp.plen.)

**B Phot.: Suda Harp.** (prima facie error in Σ’’’)

- Αξιμεύς (Harp.14.6, Bach.35.19, Sudaα594, Phot.α436) Αξιμεύς:
- Αξιμεύς
- Αινίος (Harp.17.9, Bach.47.4, Sudaα225, Phot.α605) κατώκησαν: κατώκησαν
- ἀπεργασάμενος (Harp.44.1, Bach.117.19, Sudaα3036, Phot.α2350) 
  -: ἐν τῷ πρὸς Ἀπολλόδωρον
- ἀπηληξάμενος (Harp.44.6, Bach.121.3, Sudaα3156, Phot.α2408) 
  -: ἐν τῷ πρὸς Φαίνου
- ἀργυρῆς θήκη (Harp.55.12, Bach.141.23, Sudaα3792, Phot.α2786) 
  τὰ κυβώτα: κυβώτα
- αὐτολήκυθοι (Harp.67.7, Bach.166.4, Sudaα4505, Phot.α3227) ἔτοιμος: ἔτοιμος 36

**B Suda:** Phot. Harp.

- ἀγελαίος (Harp.4.10, Bach.8.26, Sudaα187, Phot.α134) ρίβην: ρύ-
  δην
- ἀπολελειπότες (Harp.47.6, Bach.127.19, Sudaα3383, Phot.α2543)
  Σωκράτης: Ἰσοκράτης

3. Conclusions

It should be immediately apparent from the above data that simple solutions will not suffice. If Harpocration had been incorporated in Σ

36 This is not quite the same as the other cases: the correct ἔτοιμος is also in Harp. plen., so that the error is due to Harp.epit. and was taken over by Σ’ but corrected by Σ’’’. 
at only one point, which would have to be Σ', several difficulties arise. The considerable number of glosses in Suda Phot. but not in B has to be explained; B may abbreviate on occasion and combine freely, but cannot be shown to have omitted on any scale. Phot. is different in this respect (supra 207 and n.17), so that glosses in B Suda but not Phot. can be readily explained by omission in the latter. Further, the few glosses in B Phot. but not Suda—especially those in Σ''' contexts in B—call for explanation. Next there is the lack of common combinations noted by Adler: only the simplest are found, in ἀλίπεδου and ἁποπεφασμένον. Finally, there are the textual alterations in B Suda: Ἰσοκράτης s.v. ἀποκέλευστες might easily be a conjecture by Photius, but that in ἀγελαίος is more recalcitrant.

But converse problems are raised by Adler’s proposal of independent introduction to the sources. There are considerable overlaps in the glosses included by each, and the errors shared by two of the three are an almost insuperable objection (it will be recalled that Adler fails to mention that Harpocration is included in B). Alpers’ suggested compromise of incorporation by Σ', Suda, and Phot. independently does not fully meet the facts either: the glosses found only in B or B Phot. (with a Σ''' context in B) and the errors common to B Phot. remain unexplained.

There is no conclusive evidence that B used Harpocration.37 Given that Phot. is extant in an abbreviated state, the three glosses found only in B may have been in Σ''' and omitted in Phot. The larger number in B Suda might be explained by independent use of Harp. by each, but in view of the conjunctive errors in B Suda it is easier again to suppose them to have been in Σ' and omitted in Phot.; or to have been in Σ''', omitted in Phot., and added independently by Suda. The handful of cases where B (sometimes with Suda) has a reading also in the full version of Harpocration, while Harp.epit. has another, may also be otherwise explained: s.vv. Αἰγείδαυ, Ἄρκτοῦρος, and Ἀφόνος the variations are trivial and may be coincidental, while s.v. ἀντιγραφή B may be contaminated with Bekk. v.

Equally it is not clear that Phot. used Harpocration: Phot. by itself has no glosses outside the αμilitary and αν- sections where Σ''' is not represented also by B. The reading ὑδύν s.v. ἀγελαίος is the best evidence.

For Suda the case is much stronger: nine glosses not also in B or Phot., and one of these, ἀργυρώτης γη, not in the epitome of Harp.

37 There is no distinction to be drawn here between B itself and any intermediary there may have been between it and Σ'''. The same applies, mutatis mutandis, to what is said below about Phot. and Suda.
The glosses that appear in B in Σ''' contexts and are also in Suda are probably to be regarded likewise as separate additions to the latter. Textual agreements with the full version of Harp. are, as already noted, trivial. When Suda agrees with Harpocratin, and B Phot. have a variant, the possibility of Suda having by direct use of Harpocratin corrected an error of Σ' cannot be excluded; but error by Σ''' is at least equally likely.

Use of Harpocratin by Σ''' is virtually certain from the occurrence of ἀγνεύεται only in B Phot. and decisively in a Σ''' run in B, along with several conjunctive readings. For Σ" there can be no doubt at all: 22 unique glosses and several conjunctive readings. Equally so for Σ', with the great majority of Harp. glosses common to all sources, and again with conjunctive readings.

It appears therefore that Harp.epit. was used by Σ', which incorporated most of its glosses. Many of those omitted (for whatever reason) were added by Σ'', some others by Σ''''. Consultation by Suda (and of a different version) is probable, by B and Phot. no more than possible. This complicated picture of the repeated use of the same source at several stages in the development of Σ cannot be regarded as inherently unlikely. It is similar to the process Erbse has depicted for the Atticistic lexica. The historical circumstance to be imagined probably involved several scholars producing their own version of this collection of useful words, all working at roughly the same period in Constantinople and using the same limited number of sources.
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