

CAN ΔΙΚΑΙΟΝ ΒΕ ὄσιον? A NOTE ON SCHOLL. PLAT. RESP. I 344A8 AND LEG. IX 857B5

Domenico Cufalo

Liceo Scientifico "F. Buonarroti", Pisa
University of Pisa "FileLi"

Abstract. *In this paper I will focus on a crux in two Platonic scholia, where manuscripts have the impossible διονύσιον, but Greene suggests δίκαιον. This amendment was made on the basis of a gloss of Photius' Lexicon, although the corresponding gloss of Suidas confirms the text of Platonic scholia. However the agreement with Photius is not so important, not only because it is impossible to prove that he reproduces the text of the glossary composed by the Atticist Aelius Dionysius without any modification (it is also the source of Suidas and other Byzantine lexica, and especially of the so called Erweiterte Synagoge, which the Platonic scholia derive from as well), but also because our scholia reveal elsewhere a major affinity with Suidas than with Patriarch's Lexicon. In the light of a careful review of the loci paralleli I therefore suggest the reading δημόσιον.*

Keywords: Plato, Scholia, Photius, Suidas, Lexicography, Synagoge.

In this paper I will reconsider a famous *crux* in two similar scholia to Plato, one to *Resp.* I 344a8 (A, f. 10r; T, f. 203r) and the other to *Leg.* IX 857b5 (A, f. 243-244v¹; O, f. 92r):

Resp. 1.344a8 ὅσια τὰ βέβηλα, εἰς ἃ ἔστιν εἰσιέναι, ὡς Ἀριστοφάνης Λυσιστράτη· “ὦ πότνι’ Εἰλήθια (εἰληθυῖα T), ἐπίσχεσ τοῦ τόκου, ἕως ἂν εἰς ὄσιον ἀπέλθω χωρίον” (Ar. *Lys.* 742-743)·καὶ ὅσια χρήματα τὰ μὴ ἱερά. λέγεται δὲ καὶ τὸ ἴδιονύσιον† ὄσιον. AT

Leg. 9.857b5 ὄσιόν ἐστι χωρίον τὸ βέβηλον καὶ μὴ ἱερόν, εἰς ὃ ἔξεστιν εἰσιέναι. Ἀριστοφάνης Λυσιστράτη· “ὦ πότνι’ Εἰλήθια (εἰλείθια O),

ἐπίσχεσ τοῦ τόκου ἕως ἂν εἰς ὄσιον ἀπέλθω χωρίον” (Ar. *Lys.* 742-743). καὶ ὅσια χρήματα τὰ μὴ ἱερά. λέγεται δὲ καὶ τὸ ἴδιονύσιον†. AO

Ruhnken and Hermann,² who knew only the scholium to *Respublica*, printed the text which they found in the manuscripts. Greene was the first to doubt the word διονύσιον and to suggest δίκαιον in apparatus, as in Photius's gloss ὄσιον χωρίον (o 553 Theodoridis), despite Suidas' reading λέγεται δὲ καὶ τὸ διονύσιον (o 688, vol. III, p. 568.11-14 Adler), which apparently confirms the text of scholia and especially the one to *Leges*.³

¹ The folium would be numbered as 243, but, since the next folium was given the number 245, a later hand added to our folium the number “-244”.

² Cf. Ruhnken 1800, 147; Hermann 1858, 334.

³ Cf. Greene 1938, 196 e 343. I don't know whether the amendment was proposed by Greene himself or by one of his forerunners, because, as he claims in the

My purpose is to demonstrate the inconsistency of this very popular reading and to suggest δημόσιον instead of διονύσιον.

This and other similar glosses are considered to come from the so called *Erweiterte Synagoge* (Σ''), a lost and hypothetically reconstructed lexicon, which is the main source for Photius, Suidas, *Lexicon Aίμωδεῖν*, *Etymologicum Genuinum* and scholia to Plato and Lucian, and represents an increased version of *Synagoge*, a glossary known in its relatively original form through Coislin. gr. 347 (A, ca. 900), and in another enlarged form through Coislin. gr. 345 (B, saec. X).⁴ The main source of additions for Σ'' is identified with the lexica of Atticists Aelius Dionysius and Pausanias. Based on this assumption, Hartmut Erbse referred our gloss to Aelius Dionysius (o 30). The German scholar, however, accepted Photius' reading δίκαιον in his edition of Aelius, because, according to him, the patriarch gathered Atticistic glosses from two sources, Σ'' and Σ^b (*scil.* the source of B-version of *Synagoge*), and therefore he can preserve a better text compared with the text of Suidas.⁵

Indeed, I have some concerns about the fact that Aelius Dionysius really had δίκαιον, but surely the comparison with Photius does not allow to accept his δίκαιον into our scholia: we have to remember, in fact, that the patriarch could

have had access to another version of Σ'' or that this reading can be the result of a conjecture made by a scribe at any level of the manuscript tradition of Aelius' or Photius' *Lexica*.⁶

On the contrary, the agreement between scholium and Suidas, not new in our corpus, would need closer attention, especially because it is known that Platonic scholia are much closer to Suidas than to Photius.⁷ Now it is not possible to examine the entire corpus, but let me consider a similar case in another scholium, near to ours (sch. *Resp.* 1.343a7; A, f. 9v; T, f. 203r), which shares with Σ^b (κ 419) and Suidas (κ 2119-2120) an addition from Timaeus (κ 22 Valente),⁸ missing in Photius' corresponding gloss (κ 986). Surely, this is not an Atticistic gloss, but this case demonstrates that the agreement with Suidas against Photius can take place also in glosses penetrated into *Synagoge* at a very early level, probably already in Σ' , but perhaps omitted by Patriarch due to a mere omission.⁹

Further, there is no reason to refer the whole scholium to Atticists and therefore we cannot exclude the fact that at least its final sequence has other sources. To support this opinion, we can perhaps adduce the strict connection between our scholia and the text of Plato: both in *Resp.* 1.344a-b and

preface, he has only put the materials collected by J. Burnet, F. D. Allen and C. P. Parker in order: cf. Greene 1938, XII-XIV and Cufalo 2007, XVII-XIX.

⁴ On the *Erweiterte Synagoge*, see Erbse 1950, 23 and 34 (with *stemma codicum*); Cunningham 2003, 13-14. For the sake of simplicity, I don't take into account the other two recent manuscripts, C (Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellonska, inv. nr. 2626, saec. XIV) and D (Paris. Suppl. gr. 1243 I, saec. XIV), on which see Cunningham 2003.

⁵ Cf. Erbse 1950, 28.

⁶ Photios, as we know, had direct access to the text of Atticists: cf., for example, Theodoridis 1982, LXXIII.

⁷ Cf. the *stemma* printed by Cunningham 2003, 14.

⁸ Cf. Valente 2012, 159.

⁹ We could suppose that this omission was encouraged by the fact that in Σ' there were two glosses, as now in Suidas, although joined into one by Σ^b . If this opinion is correct, the fact that our scholium also joined these glosses becomes noteworthy. Cunningham 2003, 306, refers the second part of Σ κ 419, the one attested only in B, to « Σ' vel Σ^b » and in apparatus writes «fort. recta e Tim. sumpsit Su.», but probably he was led to this conclusion by the status of the gloss in Suidas.

in *Leges* 9.857b, the word ὄσια is opposed to ἱερά, and in both passages, although with a slight difference, it is a matter of stealing; only in *Republic*, besides the ὄσια–ἱερά pair, we read the second pair, καὶ ἴδια καὶ δημόσια. Therefore, after had given the definition of the concept ὄσιον in implicit contrast with ἱερόν, the scholiastes takes care to define ὄσια χρήματα as μὴ ἱερά in consistency with platonic passages.

This topic leads us to the final consideration, the one devoted to the general quality of Photius' δίκαιον.

The ὄσιον=δίκαιον equivalence is well attested in the erudite literature and appears, for example, in Hesych. ο 1404 ὄσιος: καθαρός, δίκαιος, εὐσεβής, εἰρηνικός, ἀγνός, in the Cyrillian gloss Hesych. ο 1407 ὄσιως: πρεπόντως, δικαίως, and, inside the scholastic tradition, in scholia to Thuc. 3.56.2 (p. 199.13 Hude), Aeschyl. *Sept.* 1010f ὄσιος: δίκαιος, in Tryclinian scholium to Aeschyl. *Ag.* 779a, and in the so called *Scholia Anonyma Recentiora* to Ar. *Nub.* 1439c.¹⁰ Elsewhere, on the contrary, the two words are definitely distinct, as in EGud. 437.48-52 Sturz ὄσιος: ἀγνός, ὁ τὰ θεμιτὰ πρὸς θεὸν πράσσων· τὸ ὄσιον λέγουσί τινες ἐπίτασίς ἐστι τοῦ δικαίου· κρεῖττον δὲ εἰπεῖν, ὅτι διαφέρει ὄσιον δικαίου· καὶ γὰρ δίκαιος μὲν λέγεται ὁ τὴν ἰσότητα τοῖς ὁμοειδέσι φυλάττων· ὄσιος δὲ ὁ περὶ τὰ θεῖα ἐσπουδακώς, in Tzetzes' scholium to Eur. *Hipp.* 656 Ἀριστοτέλης φησὶν δίκαιον καὶ ὄσιον διαφέρειν, δίκαιον λέγων τὸ εἰς ἀνθρώπους, ὄσιον δὲ τὸ εἰς θεούς. Τζέτζης δὲ φησιν διαφέρειν ὄσιον δίκαιον εὐσεβές, δίκαιον εἰς ζῶντας

ἀνθρώπους, εὐσεβές εἰς θεούς, ὄσιον εἰς νεκρούς, and in the so called *Fragmentum Lexici Graeci* nr. 191 τὸ τὰ προσήκοντα πρὸς ἀνθρώπους ποιεῖν λέγεται δίκαιον· ὄσιον δὲ τὸ τὰ προσήκοντα πρὸς τὸν θεόν.¹¹

The vagueness of the word δίκαιον, both *per se* and if considered in relation with the lemma that the above cited *loci* refers to, is evident. The reading δημόσιον, on the contrary, as we have seen, fits very well with Platonic context and can easily explain the corruption to διονύσιον on paleographical grounds, if we consider the *homoeoteleuton* -οσιον and the well known tendency of the scribes of lexica to abbreviate the words. Even in support of the ὄσιον=δημόσιον equivalence a very strong parallel is Harp. ο 38 ὄσιον· Ὑπερείδης ἐν τῷ πρὸς Ἀριστογείτονά φησι “καὶ τὰ χρήματα τὰ τε ἱερά καὶ τὰ ὄσια”. ὁ τε Ἰσοκράτης Ἀρεοπαγίτικῳ “καὶ τοῖς ἱεροῖς καὶ τοῖς ὄσιος”. ὅτι δὲ τὰ ὄσια τὰ δημόσια δηλοῖ Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ κατὰ Τιμοκράτους σαφῶς διδάσκει περὶ τούτων· “καὶ τὰ μὲν ἱερά, τὰς δεκάτας τῆς θεοῦ καὶ τὰς πεντηκοστὰς τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν, σεσυληκότες” καὶ μετ’ ὀλίγα “τὰ δὲ ὄσια ἃ ἐγένετο ἡμέτερα κεκλοφότες”. Δίδυμος (cf. fr. 16 p. 40 et fr. 25 p. 316 Schmidt) δὲ “διχῶς” φησὶν “ἔλεγον τὸ ὄσιον, τὸ τε ἱερόν καὶ τὸ ἰδιωτικόν”, which presumably derives from Didymus and which cites Hyperides (fr. 32 Jensen), Isocrates (7.66) and Demosthenes (24.120),¹² but we could mention also sch. (aVxLSf) Aeschin. 1.23 (55 Dilts) ὄσια καλεῖ τὰ δημόσια, sch.

¹¹ Cf. Hermann 1801, 351.

¹² This is the text printed by both Dindorf 1853, vol. I, 226-227 and Keaney 1991, 195, but the sequence ὅτι δὲ τὰ ὄσια τὰ δημόσια δηλοῖ Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ κατὰ Τιμοκράτους σαφῶς διδάσκει περὶ τούτων is not very perspicuous, at least for me. From Harpocration' gloss derive Phot. ο 554 and Suid. ο 687.

¹⁰ Suid. α 4639 (vol. I p. 433.13-14 Adler) ὄσια δὲ λέγεται ἄλφια, δεδευμένα ἐλαίῳ καὶ οἴνῳ· καὶ κύρια καὶ δίκαια is very doubtful, because here δίκαια (and κύρια) seems a gloss to the type of ἄλφια described shortly before.

(f) Aeschin. 3.246 (534 Dilts) δημόσια κηρύγματα· δίκαια and Lex.Rhet. 288.3-5 Bekker ὅσιον: τὸ ἰδιωτικὸν καὶ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον, οἷον πρὸς ὃ ἐφίεται βαδίζειν, οἷον ἔσιον καὶ παρ' ὃ βέβηλον καλεῖσθαι τὸ βάσιμον. ἄλλοι δὲ τὰ δημόσια.¹³

¹³ A later scholiast of Vindob. Suppl. gr. 7 (W), a ms. of XI cent., but where the *Republic* was transcribed around 1200 (cf. Hunger & Hannick 1994, 12-16), to the margin of our passage added the note Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ κατὰ Τιμοκράτους τὰ μὲν τῶν θεῶν χρήματα ἱερά, τὰ

In conclusion, can δίκαιον be ὅσιον? Surely, yes and I hope no one would deny that holiness is right! But this is not the case for our scholia, where a more careful analysis of Plato's words and a more accurate selection of *loci paralleli* induce to emend the corrupt διονύσιον to δήμοσιον, whose holiness should probably be not less important.

δὲ κοινὰ τῆς πόλεως ὅσα ὀνομάζει, evidently derived from Harpocration.

REFERENCES

Cufalo, Domenico. 2007. *Scholia Graeca in Platonem*. Pleiadi 5.1. Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.

Cunningham, Ian Campbell. 2003. *Synagoge. Συναγωγή λέξεων χρησίμων*. S.G.L.G. 10. Berlin – New York: Walter De Gruyter.

Dindorf, Wilhelm. 1853. *Harpocratonis Lexicon in decem oratores atticos*. 2 vol. Oxonii: e Typographeo Academico.

Erbse, Hartmut. 1950. *Untersuchungen zu den attizistischen Lexica*. «Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Philos.-histor. Klasse» Jahrgang 1949 Nr. 2. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Greene, William Chase. 1938. *Scholia Platonica*. Haverfordiae: Societas Philologica Americana

Hermann, Johann Gottfried Jakob. 1801. *De emendanda ratione Graecae grammaticae*. Pars Prima. Accedunt Herodiani aliorumque libelli nunc primum editi. Lipsiae: apud Gerardum Fleischerum.

Hermann, Karl Friederich. 1858. *Platonis Dialogi secundum Thrasylli tetralogias dispositi*. VI. Lipsiae: B. G. Teubner.

Hunger, Herbert & Christian Hannick. 1994. *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek*. Teil 4: Supplementum Graecum. Wien: Verlag Hollinek.

Keaney, John Joseph. 1991. *Harpocraton Lexeis of the Ten Orators*. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert.

Ruhnken, David. 1800. *Scholia in Platonem ex codicibus mss. multarum bibliothecarum primum collegit*. Lugduni Batavorum: apud Sam. et Joann. Luchtmans.

Theodoridis, Christos. 1982. *Photii Patriarchae Lexicon*. I. Berlin – New York: Walter De Gruyter

Valente, Stefano. 2012. *I lessici a Platone di Timeo Sofista e Pseudo-Didimo*. S.G.L.G. 14. Berlin – Boston: Walter De Gruyter.

AR GALI ΔΙΚΑΙΟΝ ΒŪTI ὍΣΙΟΝ? PLATONO VALSTYBĒS IR ĮSTATYMU SCHOLIJU KOMENTARAS (PLAT. RESP. I 344A8; LEG. IX 857B5)

Domenico Cufalo

S a n t r a u k a

Straipsnyje nagrinėjamas Platono *Valstybės (Resp. I 344a8)* ir *Įstatymų (Leg. IX 857b5)* scholijų (A, f. 10r; T, f. 203r ir A, f. 243-244v; O, f. 92r) *crux*

ir vietoj rankraščiuose teikiamos glosos διονύσιον, kurią W. Ch. Greenas siūlė keisti į δίκαιον, siūlomas skaitymas δημόσιον.

Gauta: 2015-10-05

Priimta publikuoti: 2015-11-05

Autoriaus adresas:

Domenico Cufalo

Via Contessa Matilde 14, 56123 Pisa (PI)

El. paštas: cufalo@gmail.com