

Luca Beltramini\*

## Scholia and marginalia as testimonia of earlier stages of the text of Lucian: three notes on the *Lexiphanes*

<https://doi.org/10.1515/phil-2023-0066>

**Abstract:** The rich apparatus of scholia and marginalia transmitted in Lucian's manuscripts can prove of vital help for the *constitutio textus* of his writings. On the one hand, their ancient and stratified origin makes it possible that they preserve traces of an earlier stage of Lucian's text, both directly, through explicit quotations of lost variants, and indirectly, through hints given in the explanations of lemmas. On the other hand, they may allow us to recognise as problematic passages that otherwise would go unnoticed, especially in the case of intruded glosses which convey a coherent and not suspect text. The *Lexiphanes*, with its deliberately absurd and confused vocabulary, represents a perfect case study for the peculiar situation where it is hard to state whether a text is corrupt or not. In the present article, three textual passages from this Lucianic dialogue (*Lex.* 1; 3; 6) will be analysed. In all three cases, hitherto unnoticed errors will be detected and new corrections will be proposed thanks to the direct or indirect help given by the scholia and marginalia found in manuscripts.

**Keywords:** Lucian, *Lexiphanes*, textual criticism, scholia, marginalia

The peculiar language of the *Lexiphanes*' eponymous character has always been a remarkable source of problems for copyists and philologists, and it is reasonable to think that a certain number of critical points in this Lucianic work has not even been detected yet. This is partially due, on the one hand, to the current lack of a thorough study of *Lexiphanes*' linguistic features and of a full commentary on this tricky dialogue.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, textual errors are not easy to spot in a text

---

<sup>1</sup> The only studies devoted to *Lexiphanes*' language are those of Doehring (1916) and Casevitz (1994). The first is a mere collection of lemmas without further elaboration, the second gives just a quick (though clever) overview of its main questions, focussing only on a selection of examples. See also the

---

\*Corresponding author: Luca Beltramini, Università Ca' Foscari Venezia, Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici, Dorsoduro 3484/D, 30123 Venezia, Italia, E-Mail: luca.beltramini@unive.it

written with the precise purpose of building a monster-language to mock, and where, therefore, linguistic mistakes and inconsistencies are intentional most of the time. Nevertheless, some unexpected (or rather: not much exploited yet) help for the *constitutio* of Lucian's text can sometimes come from its rich apparatus of scholia and marginalia. Indeed, even though they are transmitted together with Lucian's writings (whose most ancient surviving manuscripts date from the beginning of 10<sup>th</sup> century),<sup>2</sup> the oldest scholia (grouped in and identified as the first class in Rabe's edition) were composed in an earlier time between the 5<sup>th</sup> and the 9<sup>th</sup> century, and even those written between the late 9<sup>th</sup> and the first half of the 10<sup>th</sup> century by Basilius of Adada (only preserved in later manuscripts)<sup>3</sup>, Alexander of Nicaea (handwritten in Γ) and Arethas (handwritten in Ε) largely draw on older erudition.<sup>4</sup> This makes it possible that, on some occasions, the scholia may hide traces of an earlier version of Lucian's text, either through direct quotations or, indirectly, in their comments.<sup>5</sup>

As proof of this, three examples of this phenomenon will be examined in this article: new corrections will be proposed for portions of the text of Lucian's *Lexi-*

---

isolated notes in Bompaire (1958) 624, 629, 634–636; Jones (1972) 475–478; Baldwin (1973) 36–38, 50–57; Hall (1981) 279–291; Martin (2018). A separate reference must be made to the work of Weissenberger (1996), which has the indisputable merit of being the first complete study and the first partial commentary on this dialogue. However, even though Weissenberger makes several good observations on Lexiphanes' language, he analyses the *Lexiphanes* from the perspective of literary theory and does not try to give an overall description and interpretation of the language created by Lucian for his protagonist. Both *desiderata* (a full commentary and a comprehensive linguistic study of the *Lexiphanes*) will hopefully (and in a hopefully adequate way) be fulfilled by my forthcoming edition of this dialogue.

2 Γ (*Vat. gr.* 90), Ε (*Harl.* 5694), Φ (*Laur. conv. soppr.* 77), Ω (*Marc. gr. Z.* 434). For an insight into Lucian's manuscript tradition see Nilén (1907); Mras (1911); Wittek (1953); Macleod (1972) xii–xix; Coenen (1977) xi–cl; Bompaire (1993) li–cxxxii; for the peculiar situation of Lucian's texts *à tradition simple* (a rich group which includes also the *Lexiphanes*) see Marquis (2013). An overview of the transmission of the scholia to Lucian and a partial list of their most important manuscripts can be found in Rabe (1902) and (1906) iii–vi, but they would need to be updated and expanded (cf. Bompaire 1993, cli–clvi). However, in Wittek's list notice is given for each manuscript whether it contains scholia or not. For a deeper study on the specific tradition and nature of Arethas' scholia see Rabe (1903); Nilén (1925); Russo (2002) 137–150 and (2011) 1–9.

3 The first codex to report Basilius' scholia (which consist of only four notes) is Δ (*Vat. gr.* 1322); however, none of his *scholia* comment on the *Lexiphanes* (see Mras 1911, 231–232; Bompaire 1993, cliii).

4 On the dating and sources of the scholia to Lucian see Helm (1908); Winter (1908); Schneider (1994) 196–199; Dickey (2007) 69. For the sake of clarity, it must be pointed out that the scholia of these three authors (both those of Basilius and the handwritten ones of Alexander and Arethas) are reported by several other manuscripts besides Δ, Γ and Ε.

5 Some examples of this possibility have already been highlighted by Rothstein (1888) 39–40, who drew attention to some corrections to the text of the *Nigrinus* found in the marginalia of Γ.

*phanes* which are transmitted without variants by the whole manuscript tradition and have not been recognised as corrupt (with few barely relevant exceptions) in the previous editions of this work, but whose problematic status can now be highlighted thanks to (hitherto ignored) hints found in the scholia and marginalia, which quote or refer to an alternative, better, and arguably older version of the text.

## 1.

The first example comes from the final part of § 1, where Lexiphanes invites Lykinos (Lucian's fictional *alter ego* in this and other dialogues) to pay attention to the reading he is about to give of his latest 'masterpiece'. Lykinos is asked, more precisely, to verify whether this writing will meet certain criteria in terms of vocabulary and structure. The manuscripts agree in transmitting the following text:

σκόπει δὴ μεταξύ, ὅπως διαπεραίνομαι, ὦ Λυκίνε, τὸν λόγον, εἰ εὐαρχὸς τέ ἐστι καὶ πολλὴν τὴν εὐλογίαν ἐπιδεικνύμενος καὶ εὐλεξίς, ἔτι δὲ εὐώνυμος.

τε Jacobitz Dindorf Bekker Sommerbrodt Harmon : γε codd., Hemsterhuis Macleod Mestre-Gómez

The sequence of qualities is clearly mocking in tone, especially if compared to the linguistic and literary disaster that will follow in §§ 2–15. A hint in favour of this interpretation comes also by the observation that none of the transmitted adjectives (εὐαρχος, εὐλεξίς, εὐώνυμος) is unproblematic. Two of them (εὐαρχος, εὐώνυμος) undergo a process of resemantisation which generates a comic and ridiculous effect: εὐαρχος is meant as 'with a good introduction' instead of 'governing well' or 'easily governed'; εὐώνυμος as 'with good words' instead of 'of good name'.<sup>6</sup> The other adjective (εὐλεξίς) is a neologism coined by Lexiphanes (i.e. Lucian) himself and criticised elsewhere (Luc. *Rh. Pr.* 17) as an odd form. The only seeming exception to this picture consists in the participial expression πολλὴν τὴν εὐλογίαν ἐπιδεικνύμενος, which breaks the sequence of εὐ- misused adjectives and gives such a clear meaning that it appears somehow suspect. Indeed, a formulation such as πολλὴν τὴν εὐλογίαν ἐπιδεικνύμενος recalls the *interpretamenta* of obscure lemmas usually found in lexica and scholia, and a look at a scholion to this passage only confirms this doubt:

<sup>6</sup> Resemantisations of this kind represent one of the most typical features of Lexiphanes' language. There still is no comprehensive study of this device of humour in the *Lexiphanes*, but an overview of this phenomenon with some good examples can be found in Casevitz (1994) 84–86, where such misused forms are called 'hapax de sens'.

*schol. Luc. Lexiph.* 1 (p. 191 R.) τὸ μὲν εὐαρχος τὸ καλὴν ἀρχὴν ἔχειν, εὐλογος δὲ τὴν συνθήκην εὐάρμοστος, εὐλεξις δὲ καὶ εὐώνυμος τὸ εὐπρεπέσιν ὀνόμασι καὶ λέξεσι κεχρησθαι.<sup>7</sup>

Remarkably, the scholiast does not refer to the expression transmitted by the manuscripts, but comments, instead, on the adjective εὐλογος. This form, in turn, shares with the other surrounding attributes both the same εὐ- prefix and an anomalous meaning. Indeed, the true definition of εὐλογος is ‘reasonable’, ‘sensible’, ‘probable’, which definitely does not match the literary qualities here required. But if we accept to see in εὐλογος another case of resemantisation, through which the compound is given a new meaning (‘with a good logic’, i.e. ‘well structured’, as the scholion, even if not without problems, suggests),<sup>8</sup> the whole sequence gains a new, more coherent and more effective (and almost bombastic) consistency. Therefore, my suggestion is to consider that the original text was εὐαρχός τε ἐστὶ καὶ εὐλογος καὶ εὐλεξις, ἔτι δὲ εὐώνυμος, and that scholiast based his comment on previous notes which preserved this earlier version of the text. The transmitted πολλὴν τὴν εὐλογίαν ἐπιδεικνύμενος, instead, probably corresponds to a gloss originally explaining the anomalous use of εὐλογος which, some time before the redaction of the earliest surviving manuscripts (early 10<sup>th</sup> century), intruded into the text of the archetype (or even one of its ancestors) and replaced the original reading, which by then was regarded as obscure and superfluous.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>7</sup> This scholion is transmitted with this text by several valuable manuscripts (including E, whose scholia are handwritten by Arethas himself). Only Δ contains the reading εὐλογίαν δὲ τὴν συνθήκην εὐάρμοστον, but it is at least two centuries later than the others and, above all, often presents inaccurate variants (as showed in Rabe 1906, vi–viii). For a brief comment to this scholion see Russo (2011) 227–228.

<sup>8</sup> In fact, εὐλογία itself does not mean this, but it is reasonable to think that the scholiast had in mind the following (and exceptional) passage of Plato: *Resp.* 3.400d–e εὐλογία ἄρα καὶ εὐαρμοστία καὶ εὐσχημοσύνη καὶ εὐρυθμία εὐηθεία ἀκολουθεῖ, οὐχ ἦν ἄνοιαν οὖσαν ὑποκοριζόμενοι καλοῦμεν εὐήθειαν, ἀλλὰ τὴν ὡς ἀληθῶς εὖ τε καὶ καλῶς τὸ ἦθος κατεσκευασμένην διάνοιαν.

<sup>9</sup> A similar case of an intruded gloss (which, anyway, did not end up replacing the original text) can be found, for instance, in *Pseudol.* 24 (σὲ δὲ οὐδεὶς ἠτιάσατο ἡμῶν βρωμολόγους λέγοντα καὶ τροπομάσθητας καὶ ῥησιμετρεῖν καὶ ἀθηνῶ [τὸ Ἀθηνῶν ἐπιθυμῶ] καὶ ἀνθοκρατεῖν καὶ σφενδικίζειν καὶ χειροβλιᾶσθαι), where all the manuscripts transmit, next to an (intentionally) obscure word, an explanation which was with all evidence an ancient note of comment, written in relatively ancient times and intruded into the text before the copying of the archetype.

## 2.

In § 3, in the context of the ‘*Symposium*’ read by Lexiphanes, one of the characters (corresponding to Lexiphanes himself) describes the arrival of his servant, who was previously ordered to buy some food for the party. The scene is described as follows by all the manuscripts:

εἰς καιρὸν οὗτος αὐτὸς ἐμπολήσας γε, ὡς ὀρῶ, πυριάτην τέ τινα καὶ ἐγκρυφίας κτλ.

These words inaugurate a list of the products the servant has bought, made up by rare, improper, or newly built words, which the scholiasts tried to explain one by one.<sup>10</sup> Let us consider the scholion to this passage:

*schol. Luc. Lexiph.* 2–4 (p. 192 R.) ἄρτοι εἰσὶν ὁ μὲν ἐν κλιβάνῳ, ὁ δὲ ἐγκρυφίας ἐπὶ τῇ σποδῷ ὡπτημένος.

The first two items here listed are identified by the scholion as types of bread. This makes perfect sense in light of the surrounding context (the list continues with curious names of onions, sausages, and other cuts of meat), and the second product mentioned fits well in the description: other mentions of an ἐγκρυφίας (ἄρτος), a particular kind of bread baked in the ashes, can be found from Hippocrates onwards (also Lucian himself uses it in *Dial. Mort.* 6.4), and the explanation given by the scholion corresponds to that of other sources.<sup>11</sup> However, the same cannot be said for πυριάτη.

The meaning of this uncommon noun (sometimes also spelled πυριάτης/πυριάτος/πυριάτης), attested only in three comic verses and in a few lexica and other erudite sources, is that of ‘heated colostrum’, i.e. the first milk secreted by the mammary glands of animals after giving birth which has been boiled or curdled.<sup>12</sup> It is clear that this meaning does not fit at all in this passage, but it is also true that such an inconsistency would not be out of place in Lexiphanes’ writing. Nevertheless, the precise interpretation given in the scholion – which, remarkably, does not quote the

<sup>10</sup> For an overall explanation of the other items of the servant’s grocery shopping see Weissenberger (1996) 185–187.

<sup>11</sup> Hippoc. *Epid.* 7.1.3; *Vict.* 42, 79; *Mul.* 34, 121; cf. *Erot.* 56.2–4 Nachm.; *Hesych.* ε 267 Cunn.; *Suda* ε 131 A. The ἐγκρυφίας is mentioned also in the long section of the *Deipnosophistae* devoted to the typologies of bread (Ath. 3.108f–116a; 3.110a–110b). An exhaustive overview of different types of bread in ancient Greece, grouped on the basis of various criteria (including, as here, the baking techniques) is given by Blümner (1912) 68–77 and Battaglia (1989) 73–99, 140–161.

<sup>12</sup> *Ar. Vesp.* 710; *Crat.* fr. 149 K.-A.; *Eub.* fr. 74 K.-A.; cf. *Ael. Dion.* π 76–77 Hans.; *Gal. Alim. Fac.* 15; *Poll.* 1.248; 6.54 Bethe; *Phot. Lex.* π 1558 Theod.; *schol. vet. Ar. Vesp.* 710a. From an etymological point of view, πυριάτη derives from πυρία (‘application of heat’, see *DELG* 957 and *EDG* 1260 s.v. πῦρ) and is often associated to the analogous πυρίεθρον.

exact noun it comments on, as it does instead with ἐγκρυφίας – induces us to extend the analysis. The bread baked in the κλίβανος (a peculiar kind of cooking vessel, whose Attic spelling was κρίβανος, see Ath. 3.110c) is elsewhere named κλιβανίτης/κριβανίτης (see e.g. Ar. *Ach.* 1123, fr. 129 K.-A.; Amips. fr. 5 K.-A.; Hippoc. *Vict.* 42; Poll. 6.33 Bethe; Ath. 3.109f) and this, in turn, is sometimes described as πύρνον, πύρινος ἄρτος, or ἄρτος ἐκ (τῶν) πυρῶν, i.e. a bread made of wheat (πυρός).<sup>13</sup> Following this path, opened by the scholion, it only takes a small step to get from here to πυρίτης. This term (extremely close to and easily mistakable with πυριάτη/πυριάτης) is a very rare (and only lately attested) homograph of the more common πυρίτης (usually associated to λίθος, indicating the ‘iron pyrite’), it means ‘made of wheat’ and refers precisely to bread.<sup>14</sup> The correctness of this unusual form is confirmed by the compound αὐτοπυρίτης (‘of whole wheaten flour’), first attested in a comic fragment (Phryn. Com. fr. 40 K.-A.) quoted by Athenaeus in his already mentioned list of bread types (3.110e) and known to Lucian himself, who uses it in *Pisc.* 45.<sup>15</sup> Nevertheless, correct though it might be, πυρίτης would have been anyway perceived, at first, as the common ‘iron pyrite’, rather than as a kind of bread. This is totally consistent with Lexiphanes’ linguistic style (always generating confusion by playing with such ambiguities) and supports the hypothesis of a copyist’s error. In light of all this, I suggest that the original reading was πυρίτην, and that the ancient scholiast read this version of the text and tried to explain it as a bread baked in the κλίβανος by analogy with the more common πύρινος. The reading πυριάτην, clearly not fitting, must then be considered an error, presumably due to the obscurity of the original term, and it is thanks to the hint indirectly given by the scholion that this error could be detected.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>13</sup> Gal. *Vict. Att.* 54 (= Orib. 3.2.5; Aët. 2.240); Poll. 6.72–73 Bethe; Orib. 1.8.1; cf. Xen. *An.* 4.5.31; Hippoc. *VM* 13; 16; 20, D. Chr. 6.57; Gal. *Alim. Fac.* 12, Eust. *Od.* 1782.60–62.

<sup>14</sup> *Suda* π 3222 A. πυρίτης ἄρτος· ὁ τοῦ σίτου, cf. Anon. *Med. De alimentis* 12 (= Ideler 1842, 264) οἱ πυρίται τῶν ἄρτων. The present form derives from πυρός (‘wheat’), while the more common homograph comes from πῦρ (‘fire’): see *DELG* 957; 959; *EDG* 1260; 1263.

<sup>15</sup> The same compound can also be found in Hippoc. *Int.* 20; 22; 30. For further references see Blümner (1912) 72; Battaglia (1989) 80; Stama (2014) 248–249. In the same passage, Athenaeus also quotes the analogous form αὐτόπυρος, used by the comic playwright Alexis (fr. 126 K.-A.) and borrowed into Latin as *autopyros panis* (see e.g. Plin. *HN* 22.138; Cels. 2.18; Petron. 66).

<sup>16</sup> It must be pointed out that, in the apparatus of his *editio maior* (1838) 244, Jacobitz already wondered if πυρίτην could be a better reading, and it is not clear whether he was thinking of the scholion or if it was a simple correction *ope ingenii*. Anyway, he eventually decided to prefer the transmitted text and to print πυριάτην.

## 3.

The third and last example also comes from one of the various lists that dot Lexiphanes' reading. In § 6 Lexiphanes' narrating voice describes the different courses of the banquet:

ἄρτοι μέντοι ἦσαν ... καὶ λάχανα τὰ τε ὑπόγεια καὶ τὰ ὑπερφυῆ· οἶνος δὲ ἦν κτλ.

Among bread (once again!) and wine some vegetables are mentioned, but if the noun λάχανον is perfectly regular, the two adjectives qualifying it instead hide two typical Lexiphanic resemantisations. Indeed, what Lexiphanes means by them is 'growing both underground and overground', but these are not the real meanings of ὑπόγειος and ὑπερφυῆς. The latter means 'overgrown' (mostly with the further nuance of 'monstrous'),<sup>17</sup> while the former (also spelled ὑπόγαιος) means indeed 'subterraneous' but is usually said of places and things located underground (like caves, springs, or treasures) or of the chthonic gods. From this perspective, if on the one hand it must be admitted that only in the case of ὑπερφυῆς the comic nonsense is successful (while ὑπόγειος appears somehow dull), on the other hand nothing would suggest the presence of an error in the textual transmission of this passage. Nevertheless, in the right margin of Γ (f. 203r), next to ὑπόγεια it is possible to read the note (not reported in Rabe's edition of the scholia but mentioned in Macleod's apparatus) ἔγγεια ἐν ἄλλῳ, which seems to suggest that, in a different manuscript, the annotator read ἔγγεια instead of the weak ὑπόγεια.<sup>18</sup> The form indicated by the

<sup>17</sup> A warning must be issued about the entry ὑπερφυῆς of the Liddell-Scott-Jones lexicon (LSJ<sup>9</sup> 1870). The first meaning there reported, indeed, is "literally, growing above the ground", relative to this precise passage (it also quotes Dsc. 4.73.1, where, however, ὑπερφυῆς is actually said of the stalk of a particular plant growing upwards), but this choice is questionable and, above all, misleading: as on many other occasions, the editors took the isolated and deliberately irregular interpretation given by Lexiphanes as a further (here even as the first!) meaning of this term, without clarifying its exceptional nature of consciously wrong resemantisation.

<sup>18</sup> It is not possible to identify with certainty the hand that wrote this note. It is surely not that of Isidore of Kiev (who copied some Lucianic dialogues and added scattered notes in the early 15<sup>th</sup> century), but it is difficult to state whether it is that of the copyist of the manuscript (probably to be dated to the early 10<sup>th</sup> century), that of Alexander of Nicaea (who annotated Γ in the second quarter of the 10<sup>th</sup> century), or a third one (we know, for instance, that Alexander was helped with his annotations by other people, including his brother Jacob, metropolitan of Larissa), even though it must be pointed out that it was typical for both the copyist and Alexander to recur to indications such as ἐν ἄλλῳ and ἐν ἑτέρῳ in their annotations, which imply that they had access to more than one copy of the text. The identification is made even harder by the fact that the ink of this note is partially faded; nevertheless, it seems reasonable to consider the hand which wrote it as not (or not much) later than the one which copied the text. For further discussion on the hands of Γ see Rothstein (1888) 57–60; Rabe (1902) 719–

note could in turn be easily resemantised with the meaning ‘in the ground’ as well, and it appears more consistent with Lexiphanes’ style in every respect. First of all, ἔγγειος (sometimes spelled ἔγγαιος) is much rarer than ὑπόγειος (the number of its occurrences is only about a quarter of that of ὑπόγειος). The latter, moreover, is mostly (with more than 90 % of the occurrences) used in the Imperial and Byzantine age (its only classical occurrences are Aesch. fr. 57.10 R.; Hdt. 2.100.3; 2.148.4; 4.200.2), while ἔγγειος is better attested in classical and canonical authors (especially in Plato, Lysias, and Demosthenes), whom Lexiphanes claims to imitate. Furthermore, ἔγγειος shows a more specific and technical meaning: along with the marginal values of ‘native’ (Aesch. *Pers.* 922; *Supp.* 59), ‘earthly’ (Pl. *Resp.* 6.491d; *Ti.* 90a), and ‘chthonic’ (Plut. *Frig.* 17 p. 953a; Them. 13.168b), it is mostly associated with economical terms like οὐσία, τόκος, κτήμα, δάνεισμα etc., to denote properties or interests based on or consisting in land (see e.g. Lys. fr. 91 Th.; Dem. 34.23; 36.5; Diod. Sic. 31.21.1; [Hdn.] *Philet.* 200 Dain; *Synag.* ε 6 Cunn.). Lastly, ἔγγειος can be found in several passages of contemporary Atticist lexica (Harp. α 275 Keaney; Paus. ε 54 Erbse; Poll. 10.11 Bethe; Phryn. *Ecl.* 264 Fisch.), which on many other occasions appear to be very plausible sources for Lexiphanes’ rare vocabulary.<sup>19</sup> ὑπόγειος also occurs in different passages of Pollux (1.24; 1.115; 5.150; 7.124 Bethe) and in one *interpretamentum* of Phrynichus (PS 110.21 Borr.), but never with a meaning near to ‘(growing) in the ground’. Let us consider, instead, the already mentioned passage of Phrynichus:

*Ecl.* 264 Fisch. ἔγγιον ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐγγύτερον μὴ λέγε, ἀλλ’ ἐγγύτερον· ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ ἐν τῇ γῆ, οἶον ‘ἔγγειον κτήμα’, εἴ τις χρῶτο, ἄριστα ἂν χρήσαιτο, ὡς καὶ Δημοσθένης ‘ἔγγειον τόκον’ λέγει.

The Atticist lexicographer is here discussing ἔγγιον as an improper comparative form for ἐγγύτερον, but at the same time he recommends (inasmuch as it is found in Demosthenes) the use of the almost homographic adjective ἔγγειος in relation to κτήμα or similar nouns, with the already mentioned meaning of ‘based on/consisting in land’ (ἐν τῇ γῆ). A similar explanation, especially if decontextualised, could also lead to misunderstandings. See, as a proof for this, the following lexicographical entry of Photius:

721; Nilén (1907) 48–51; Macleod (1972) xiii, xviii–xix; Bompaire (1993) lxxxvii–lxxxix; Orsini (2005) 240–243; Kavrus-Hoffmann (2010).

**19** As in the case of resemantisations, a full analysis of the coincidences between Lexiphanes’ vocabulary and the entries of Atticist lexica (which, in most of the cases, are misunderstood and used in a wrong and often hilarious way: see *infra*) is still missing. Consider, for instance, the number of rare words with parallels in the coeval Atticist lexica found in § 3 alone: γέλη, ἐμπολεῖν, ἰλλός, κάρδοπος, ξηραλοφεῖν, φύσκη, ψύττα (to which one may add, even though they are not properly rare, ἡδύνω, μῶν, and σμάω).



*Lex.* ε 26 Theod. ἔγγιον· ἐγγύτερον· οἱ ῥήτορες δέ, ὅταν τὸ ἐν γῆ θέλωσι δηλώσαι, ἔγγειον λέγουσι.

The relation of this passage to Phrynichus' entry is patent (and indeed it is well known that Photius used – both directly and indirectly – several Atticist lexica as sources for his lexicon, including Harpocration, Aelius Dionysius, and Phrynichus)<sup>20</sup> but, remarkably, here there is no mention of κτήμα or other nouns implying this specific use of ἔγγειος, which is simply referred to τὸ ἐν γῆ. This means that, based on a source like this, an ignorant reader would have understood that ἔγγειος could describe anything as '(being) in the ground', which is exactly what Lexiphanes did by applying it to λάχανα.<sup>21</sup> I am not suggesting that Lucian drew directly on Phrynichus, but it is plausible that he found a similar definition in some coeval lexicon and made his poor Lexiphanes interpret it in a basic and erroneous manner, as he does on many other occasions. If we consider all these single aspects together (higher rarity, wider diffusion in canonical authors, more technical and unsuitable meaning, presence in Atticist lexica with ambiguous definitions) and compare them with the weakness of ὑπόγεια, it appears reasonable to assume that the variant ἔγγεια reported in the margin of Γ corresponds to the authentic reading found by the anonymous commentator in an older manuscript, and that ὑπόγεια, exactly as the previous πολλήν τὴν εὐλογίαν ἐπιδεικνύμενος, was originally a gloss commenting on the rare ἔγγεια (*lectio difficilior* in all respects), which later intruded into the text of the archetype replacing the original form.

## Conclusions

The preceding examination of three passages from the *Lexiphanes* has shown different ways in which the scholia and marginalia can help in recognising and correcting errors in the text of Lucian. In the first case (§ 1 εὐλογος) it has been shown that the scholion, whose first attestation was written by Arethas in E, but which most likely derives from a more ancient source, commented on (and thus indirectly preserved) an older version of the text, which can be restored thanks to this comment. In the second case (§ 3 πυρίτην) the scholion did not directly transmit a different textual variant, but the explanation that it gave of an obscure lemma made it

<sup>20</sup> For an overview of Photius' sources, with further references, see Theodoridis (1982) lxxii–lxxvi.

<sup>21</sup> The very same process of simplification for ἔγγειος can be found in other later lexica and erudite works, see [Theodos. Gr.] *Gramm.* 70.8–10 Gött.; Hesych. ε 140 Cunn.; *Suda* ε 55 A.; *Etym. Magn.* 309.15–18 G.

clear that it was commenting on a different text than the one transmitted by the extant manuscripts; starting from there, further enquiry and literary parallels have allowed us to find out the original text. Finally, the third example (§ 6 ἔγγραφα) consisted in the case of an unedited marginal note where an anonymous commentator directly and explicitly gave notice of a textual variant found in a different (and not preserved) manuscript.

In all three cases the scholia and the marginal notes enable us to recognise as problematic and therefore to question (and finally correct) portions of the text that, otherwise, because of the intrinsic ambiguous and irregular nature of Lexiphanes' language, would have gone unnoticed: this confirms once more the crucial help that this exegetical apparatus can give for the edition of Lucian's texts and for our understanding of the history of their transmission.

**Acknowledgements:** I wish to express my sincere gratitude to Prof. Olga Tribulato and Prof. Heinz-Günther Nesselrath for their kind remarks and fruitful discussions during the writing of this article. Special thanks to Prof. Paola Degni for her palaeographical advice, to Paola Carmela La Barbera for her friendly help and to the anonymous referees for their useful comments.

## Bibliography

- Luciani *Opera*, tom. I–IV, ed. M. D. Macleod, Oxford 1972 (I), 1974 (II), 1980 (III), 1987 (IV).  
 Lucianus, tom. II, rec. C. Jacobitz, Leipzig 1838.  
 Lucien, *Œuvres*, tom. I, texte établi et traduit par J. Bompaigne, Paris 1993.  
 Photii Patriarchae *Lexicon*, tom. I–II, ed. C. Theodoridis, Berlin/New York 1982 (I), 1998 (II).  
 Die *Ekloge* des Phrynichos, herausgegeben v. E. Fischer, Berlin/New York 1974.  
*Physici et medici Graeci minores*, tom. II, ed. I. L. Ideler, Berlin 1842.  
*Platonis Rempublicam*, ed. S. R. Slings, Oxford 2003.  
*Scholia in Lucianum*, ed. H. Rabe, Leipzig 1906.  
*Suidae Lexicon*, tom. IV, ed. A. Adler, Leipzig 1935 (repr. München/Leipzig 2001).
- B. Baldwin, *Studies in Lucian*, Toronto 1973.  
 E. Battaglia, 'ARTOS'. *Il lessico della panificazione nei papiri greci*, Milano 1989.  
 H. Blümner, *Technologie und Terminologie der Gewerbe und Künste bei Griechen und Römern*, I, Leipzig<sup>2</sup>1912.  
 J. Bompaigne, *Lucien écrivain. Imitation et création*, Paris 1958.  
 M. Casevitz, "La création verbale chez Lucien. Le Lexiphanes, Lexiphane et Lucien", in: A. Billault (ed.), *Lucien de Samosate. Actes du colloque international de Lyon organisé au Centre d'études romaines et gallo-romaines les 30 septembre–1<sup>er</sup> octobre 1993*, Lyon/Paris 1994, 77–86.  
 J. Coenen, *Lukian. Zeus tragodos. Überlieferungsgeschichte, Text und Kommentar*, Meisenheim am Glan 1977.

- E. Dickey, *Ancient Greek Scholarship. A Guide to Finding, Reading, and Understanding Scholia, Commentaries, Lexica, and Grammatical Treatises, from Their Beginnings to the Byzantine Period*, Oxford 2007.
- P. Doehring, *De Luciano Atticistarum irrisore*, Diss. Rostock, Berlin 1916.
- J. A. Hall, *Lucian's Satire*, New York 1981.
- R. Helm, *De Luciani scholiorum fontibus*, Marburg 1908.
- C. P. Jones, "Two enemies of Lucian", *GRBS* 13, 1972, 475–487.
- N. Kavirus-Hoffmann, "From pre-bouletée to bouletée: scribe Epiphanius and the codices *Mosq. Synod. Gr.* 103 and *Vat. Gr.* 90", in: A. Bravo García/I. Pérez Martín (eds.), *The Legacy of Bernard de Montfaucon. Three Hundred Years of Studies on Greek Handwriting. Proceedings of the Seventh International Colloquium of Greek Palaeography (Madrid-Salamanca, 15–20 September 2008)*, Turnhout 2010, 55–66.
- É. Marquis, "Les textes de Lucien à tradition simple", *RHT* 8, 2013, 1–36.
- P. Martin, "Cleansing the Palate: Vomit and Satire in Lucian's *Lexiphanes*", *ICS* 43/2, 2018, 507–520.
- K. Mras, *Die Überlieferung Lucians*, Wien 1911.
- N. Nilén, *Lucianus. Prolegomena*, Leipzig 1907.
- N. Nilén, "Excerpta Luciana", *SO* 3, 1925, 26–36.
- P. Orsini, "Quale coscienza ebbero i Bizantini della loro cultura grafica?", *MEG* 5, 2005, 215–248.
- H. Rabe, "Die Überlieferung der Lukianscholia", *NAWG*, 1902, 718–736.
- H. Rabe, "Die Lukianstudien des Arethas", *NAWG*, 1903, 643–656.
- M. Rothstein, *Quaestiones Lucianae*, Berlin 1888.
- G. Russo, "Gli scolii di Areta a Luciano: questioni critiche", *AFLB* 45, 2002, 137–161.
- G. Russo, *Contestazione e conservazione. Luciano nell'esegesi di Areta*, Berlin/Boston 2011.
- J. Schneider, "Les scholies de Lucien et la tradition paroemiographique", in: A. Billault (ed.), *Lucien de Samosate. Actes du colloque international de Lyon organisé au Centre d'études romaines et gallo-romaines les 30 septembre–1<sup>er</sup> octobre 1993*, Lyon/Paris 1994, 77–86.
- F. Stama, *Fragmenta comica. Kommentierung der Fragmente der griechischen Komödie*, VII, *Frinico. Introduzione, traduzione e commento*, Heidelberg 2014.
- M. Weissenberger, *Literaturtheorie bei Lukian. Untersuchungen zum Dialog Lexiphanes*, Stuttgart/Leipzig 1996.
- R. Winter, *De Luciani scholiis quaestiones selectae*, Diss. Leipzig 1908.
- M. Wittek, "Liste des manuscrits de Lucien", *Scriptorium* 6/2, 1952, 309–323.