

schließlich von den drei Versen, die er umstellt, überhaupt nur den ersten berücksichtigt und die beiden anderen (1251f), die seiner Umstellung nicht günstig sind, ganz außer acht läßt.

Bonn

Adolf Köhnken

ON THE TEXT OF LEO MEDICUS: A STUDY IN TEXTUAL CRITICISM

At some time in the Byzantine period, probably not before the late ninth century, a certain Leo the Physician composed a *σύνοψις εἰς τὴν φύσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων*, a work which is almost entirely a series of excerpts from the similar work of Meletius Monachus (printed in Migne, *PG* 64.1075–1310). This little handbook of Leo's has been preserved in a single manuscript (*codex Scorialensis* Φ. – III. – 7) and has hitherto not been published. I have prepared an edition for the *CORPUS MEDICORUM GRAECORUM* and intend this paper to be an *apologia* for some of the readings there adopted. The passages discussed will, I hope, be of value to those interested in textual criticism, for they well illustrate the way in which a Byzantine compiler worked: Many of them are strictly ungrammatical or erroneous and would normally be obelized. However, by a comparison with the original passages in Meletius, it can often be demonstrated that the words in the manuscript are what Leo actually wrote.

First, some examples of anacolutha: *πόθεν μαστοί; παρὰ τὸ μασητοί, ἀφ' ἧς καὶ τὸ μάσημα.* (c. 1). The feminine relative has no antecedent and seems to be corrupt; Meletius, however, confirms it: *μαστοὶ δὲ κυρίως ἐπὶ τῶν γυναικῶν, οἷον μασητοί. οὗτοι γὰρ ἄλλοις τροφή; ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ τὴν μάστακα, τουτέστι τὴν τροφήν, τοῖς γεννωμένοις παρέχειν. ἀφ' ἧς καὶ τὸ μάσημα.* (1088 A). ἧς refers to *μάστακα*; Leo has abridged carelessly.

παρὰ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τὸ πλεονάζον ἐστὶν ἢ ἐλλείπον ἐν τοῖς μέρεσι. τοῦτο δὲ καὶ παρὰ τὸ μέγεθος. τὸ δὲ κολόβωμα παραπλήσιον αὐτοῦ

ἔστιν. τὸ δὲ παρὰ τὸ σχῆμα, ὡς ἐπὶ βλαισῶν καὶ ραιβῶν καὶ οἱ καλούμενοι στραβισμοί. τὸ δὲ παρὰ τὴν θέσιν, οἷον ἔντερον ἐν ὄσχεω ἢ μηρὸν ἔξω κοτύλης. (c. 20). There is no grammatical reason for the accusatives ἔντερον and μηρὸν, but it is clear from Meletius why Leo wrote them: ...ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ παρὰ τὸ σχῆμά τι ἔχων οἷον διαστρόφους τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἢ τοὺς πόδας, ἢ τὴν χεῖρα μείζονα τῆς ἐτέρας. ἔσφάλλαι δὲ λέγεται καὶ ὁ παρὰ τὴν θέσιν. οἷον ἔντερα ἐν ὄσχεω ἢ μηρὸν ἔξω κοτύλης κτλ. (1141 B). The accusatives in the original passage depended upon ἔχων.

A similar case occurs in c. 25, where various words for 'head' are listed along with fanciful etymologies: κεφαλή λέγεται παρὰ τὸ κάρφεσθαι, ὃ ἔστι ξηραίνεσθαι. ξηρὰ γὰρ καὶ ὀστώδης ἔστιν ἢ ἀπὸ τῆς κυφότητος ἢ κελυφῆν, διὰ τὸ σκέπειν τὸν ἐγκέφαλον. κάραν δὲ, ἐκ τοῦ <τε>τριχῶσθαι. κέρας γὰρ ἢ θρῶξ. ἢ κρᾶτα ἐκ τοῦ κράτους. ἢ κρατίον... In Meletius (1148 D–1149 A) we read in part ... τινὲς δὲ κελυφῆν αὐτὴν λέγουσι ... οἱ δὲ κάραν λέγουσιν ... ἢ κρᾶτα ... ἢ κρατίον ..., whence the accusatives in Leo.

δύο δὲ ὑμένης φυλάσσοι τὸν ἐγκέφαλον, παχεῖα καὶ λεπτή ... (c. 30). ὑμήν is masculine; why then the feminine adjectives? Because Meletius (1153 A–B) had used the synonym μῆνιγξ, which is feminine.

καὶ οἱ μὲν [sc. ὀδόντες] κογχωτοὶ εἴσιν, οἱ δὲ καρχαρόδοντες, οἷον λέοντος καὶ τῶν ὁμοίων. τὰ δὲ τῶν ζώων ἀμόφοδοντα, οἷον ἀνθρώπου καὶ τῶν ὁμοίων. τὰ δὲ συνόδοντα, οἷον πρόβατα καὶ ὄμοια. τὰ δὲ χαυλιόδοντα, οἷον χοίρου καὶ τῶν ὁμοίων. (c. 51). The anacoluthic structure of this passage is a good illustration of Leo's *incuria scribendi*, for nothing in the parallel passage in Meletius (1193 C), which is quite straightforward, prompted the irregularities. ἀνθρώπου καὶ τῶν ὁμοίων and χοίρου καὶ τῶν ὁμοίων were put in the genitive rather than the nominative case under the influence of οἷον λέοντος καὶ τῶν ὁμοίων, as if they were genitives dependent upon ὀδόντες, not ζῶα. The numerous instances of anacolutha in Leo argue against scribal corruption here.

ἢ μυλίτας ἢ σωφροιστήρας, διὰ τὸ φύεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ἄρχεσθαι φρονεῖν. (c. 51). Once again a condensation of Meletius leaving two accusatives without a construction: τοὺς δὲ μυλίτας τῶν ὀδόντων τινὲς σωφροιστήρας ἐκάλεσαν, διὰ τὸ φύεσθαι περὶ τὴν τοῦ ἄρχεσθαι φρονεῖν τοὺς παῖδας ὥραν. (1193 C).

τὸν δὲ ἀνθερεῶνα, ὃν καὶ λάρυγγα καλοῦμεν, ἢ ἐπιγλωττίς ἔστι. (c. 53). This is a difficult sentence; it seems to mean "and as for the throat, which we also call the larynx, it is the epiglot-tis". Few are the grammarians who would not be distressed by

this, and yet for once Leo is innocent. Whatever be the solution of this sentence, Leo has written down exactly what he found in his copy of Meletius (1196 C). (Some inferior manuscripts of Meletius read by conjecture here τὸν δὲ ἀνθερεῶνα . . . τὴν ἐπιγλωττίδα φασὶν εἶναι. This helps the grammar, but is still not satisfactory since the ἀνθερεῶν is *not* the ἐπιγλωττίς.)

λαιμός δὲ καὶ λάρυγγξ τοῖς ὀνόμασι διαφέρουσι μόνον· λαιμὸν διὰ τὸ ἀπολαυστικὸν εἶναι. (c. 53). We have seen above instances of bare accusatives to be explained by Leo's omission of λέγονσι, καλοῦσι or similar verbs which were in fact expressed by Meletius. Here Leo has gone one step further. λέγονσι *vel sim.* must be understood, *even though no such construction is to be found in the corresponding passage of Meletius* (1197 A).

ἡ δὲ χρεία αὐτοῦ [sc. τοῦ ὑπεζωκότος] ἵνα μὴ ἀμέσως ὁ πνεύμων ὀμιλῇ τῶν ὀστέων καὶ ἀνιᾶται. (c. 60). ὀμιλεῖν c. gen. is unparalleled; Meletius (1209 B) has here: ἐγένετο δὲ οὗτος ὁ ὑμῖν παρὰ τῆς προνοίας, ἵνα μὴ τῷ πνεύμονι ἀμέσως ὀμιλοῦσα τῶν ὀστέων ἢ οὐσία, σκληρὰ καὶ ἀντίτυπος οὔσα, ἀνιᾷ αὐτὸν καὶ ἐπιπλήσῃ τῇ προσψαύσει. Leo, in abbreviating the sentence and rearranging it so as to make ὁ πνεύμων subject, has neglected to change τῶν ὀστέων to the correct case – the dative. (Here too, in view of Leo's practices, I am reluctant to assume corruption and add τῇ οὐσία after τῶν ὀστέων.)

τὸ δὲ περικαλύπτρον αὐτὴν [sc. τὴν βάλανον] δέρμα πόσθη καὶ πρόσθημα καλεῖται· ἢ διὰ τὸ ἐμπροσθεν εἶναι. (c. 74). The ἢ is superfluous, as only one etymology is given. Meletius (1237 D) has: τὸ δὲ περικαλύπτρον αὐτὴν δέρμα πόσθη καὶ πρόσθημα καλεῖται. πόσθη μὲν διὰ τὸ οἶον ἐπικεῖσθαι καὶ προσεθίσθαι δοκεῖν. πρόσθημα δὲ παρὰ τὸ ἀλλήλοις ἐν ταῖς συνουσίαις προστίθεσθαι ἢ διὰ τὸ ἐπὶ τὰ ἐμπρόσθια μέρη εἶναι. Nothing has fallen out of Leo's manuscript here; as often, he has not bothered to take over all the etymologies which Meletius gives. Here he recorded only one – and even that in a shortened form – and in so doing failed to notice that ἢ no longer made any sense.

I wish now to discuss certain passages in which either the sense is erroneous or the reading is a corruption of what Meletius wrote, and attempt to demonstrate that, despite these defects, our manuscript has faithfully preserved the *ipsissima verba* of Leo.

πόθεν ἔμβρον; . . . ἢ διὰ τὸ ἔνδον εἶναι βροτόν. (c. 1). The correct version of this etymology may be seen from Orion (56. 6–7 Sturz): ἔμβρον· ἀπὸ τοῦ . . . ἔνδον εἶναι βροτοῦ. The β

family of Meletius has here (1084 D), correctly, *διὰ τὸ ἔνδον εἶναι βροτοῦ*. The *a* family, however, reads *βροτόν* and, since where the *a* and *β* families disagree, Leo usually agrees with *a*, I have concluded that Leo found *βροτόν* in his copy of Meletius and so have retained it. Sense can be forced from the words: “Embryo is so called because a mortal being (sc. the embryo) is within (sc. the womb)”.

πόθεν τρέφεται τὸ ἔμβρυον; καὶ πόθεν ἀναπνεῖ; τρέφεται ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀμφαλοῦ, ἀναπνεῖ δὲ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος καὶ τῶν ῥινῶν. πόθεν ὀμφαλός; παρὰ τὸ ὀμπνεῖν, ὃ ἐστὶν ἀναπνεῖν. (c. 1). Meletius (1085 B) wrote: *τρέφεται δὲ ἐν τῇ μήτρᾳ τὸ ἔμβρυον, καὶ ἀναπνεῖ οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος, ἀλλ’ ἐκ τοῦ ὀμφαλοῦ, ἐξ αἱματικῶν μητρῶων περιπτωμάτων. ὅθεν καὶ ὀμφαλός παρὰ τὸ ἐμπνεῖν εἴρηται, ὃ ἐστὶν ἀναπνεῖν*. Leo, therefore, not understanding the manner in which foetuses breathe consciously “corrected” Meletius – yet he retained an etymology of *ὀμφαλός* which is no longer intelligible after the change!

πληρωθὲν δὲ κατὰ ὠρισμένον χρόνον, ἐγείρεται πρῶτον ἡ κεφαλή καὶ σὺν τὰ βαρύτερα μέρη ῥέπει κάτω τὴν κατὰ φύσιν κήσιν. μετὰ δὲ τὴν τοῦ ὀμφαλοῦ ἐκπλήρωσιν τρέφεται καὶ ἀναπνεῖ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος. (c. 1). A difficult passage; Meletius (1085 C–D) reads: *καὶ ὅταν τὸν τεταγμένον τῆς κνήσεως ἐκπληρώσῃ χρόνον, πρὸς ὄγκον ἢ γαστήρ διεγειρομένη ὠθεῖ τὸ ἔμβρυον εἰς τὸ ἔξω. καὶ πρῶτον τῆς κεφαλῆς ἀπολνομένης ῥέπει κατὰ τὴν κήσιν τὰ βαρύτερα καὶ ὄγκωδέστερα τοῦ σώματος ἐπισυρομένη. ταῦτα δὲ ἐστὶ τὰ περὶ τὸν ὦμον καὶ τὸν θώρακα μέρη. καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπὶ τοῖς κατὰ φύσιν τικτομένοις ἐπ’ εὐθείας ὁδός ... μετὰ γοῦν τὴν χειρουργίαν τοῦ ὀμφαλοῦ μετὰγεται ἡ τροφή καὶ ἀναπνοὴ ἐν τῷ στόματι.*

τῆς κεφαλῆς ἀπολνομένης: ἡ κεφαλὴ ἀπολνομένη α.

Several phrases in this passage must be examined. *πληρωθὲν κατὰ τὸν ὠρισμένον χρόνον* corresponds to line 1 of Meletius and is apparently an impersonal absolute construction. *σὺν τὰ βαρύτερα μέρη ῥέπει κάτω τὴν κατὰ φύσιν κήσιν* presents several problems. *σὺν* here may be a preposition governing the accusative, as it sometimes does in later Greek. For example, Nilus of Ancyra (died about 430 A.D.) has the following sentence: *ἀναγίνωσκε δὲ τὴν Νέαν Διαθήκην μαρτυρικὰ δὲ (τε?) καὶ τοὺς βίους τῶν πατέρων σὺν τὰ γεροντικά, καὶ πολλὴν ὠφέλειαν καρπώσῃ* (Migne, PG 79. 544 D–545 A). Or else it may be adverbial, thus making *τὰ βαρύτερα μέρη* the subject of *ῥέπει: non liquet*. In either event the sense will be the same. *τὴν κατὰ φύσιν κήσιν* seems to be a loose cognate accusative with *ῥέπει*. Line 3 of Meletius at

first suggests the conjecture *κίνησι* for *κώησι*, but *κώησι* is supported by line 1 *κνήσεως* and lines 5–6 *ἐπὶ τοῖς κατὰ φύσιν τικτομένοις*. (Note that Meletius speaks of *birth*, not *motion*, *κατὰ τὴν φύσιν*.) Leo has, in accordance with his practice, taken over key words and rearranged them in his abridgment; similarly, Leo adapts *διεγειρομένη* (l. 2), which modifies *ἡ γαστήρ*, and writes *ἐγείρεται* with *ἡ κεφαλή* as subject. Again, under the influence of *ἐκπληρώση* (l. 1), Leo altered *μετὰ τὴν χειρουργίαν τοῦ ὀμφαλοῦ* (ll. 6–7) to *μετὰ τὴν τοῦ ὀμφαλοῦ ἐκπλήρωσιν*, which must mean “after the fulfillment of its function on the part of the umbilical cord”. Observe that Leo has failed to notice that this last sentence contradicts p. 16, 20 of his work (discussed above): *τρέφεται ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀμφαλοῦ, ἀναπνεῖ δὲ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος*.

ταύταις δὲ ταῖς ἐπτά [sc. πλευραῖς] ὑποζώννυει καὶ ὑπαλείφει τις ὑμῖν κοινός, ὃς ἀπὸ τῆς χρείας ὀνομάζεται ὑπεζωκός. (c. 60). *ὑπαλείφω* and *ὑποζώννυμι* govern the accusative case, not the dative; see, for example, Galen 2. 170 (*ὁ γὰρ ἔνδον χιτῶν τῆς γαστρὸς ... ὁ καὶ τὸν στόμαχον ὑπαλείφων καὶ τὸ στόμα...*) and 2. 591 (*ὀνομάζεται δ' ... οὕτω τοῦθ' ὑπεζωκός, ἐπειδὴ τὰς πλευρὰς ὄλας ἔσωθεν ὑπέζωκεν*). The β family of Meletius (1209 A–B) has *ταύτας δὲ τὰς ἐπτά* but the α group read *ταύταις δὲ ταῖς ἐπτά* and it was this lection that Leo found in his copy and faithfully transcribed. *Nil mutandum*.

λέγουσι δὲ τινες [ὅτι] τὴν ἀρρενότητα τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἐν τοῖς ὄρχεσιν ἔχειν. (c. 77). The corresponding passage in Meletius (1244 B) is as follows: *λέγουσι δὲ τινες τὴν ἀρρενότητα τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἐν τοῖς ὄρχεσιν ἔχειν*. (I have deleted *ὅτι* as an unconscious interpolation suggested by *λέγουσι*, a verb very frequently followed by *ὅτι* – I do not think that *ὅτι* here may be defended by Kühner–Gerth II. ii. 357 Anmerk. 3 b – and corrected in Leo the corruption *ὄρχεις* to *ὄρχεσιν*.) The meaning of this sentence is quite patent, the grammar hardly so. What is wanted is not *ἔχειν* but *εἶναι*; these two infinitives are sometimes confused in manuscripts and in fact one manuscript of Meletius, the *codex Upsaliensis bibl. acad.* 30, has *εἶναι* (by conjecture?). The corruption is clearly an old one, and once more Leo has cheerfully welcomed a solecism.

Now some passages in which I have introduced conjectures of my own and a few sentences which require exegesis must be considered.

τί ἐστιν ἀνθρώπος; ζῶν λογικὸν <θνητὸν> νοῦ καὶ ἐπιστήμης δεκτικόν. (c. 1). I have added *<θνητὸν>* from Meletius (1084 A):

ἄνθρωπος γάρ ἐστι, φησί, ζῶον λογικὸν θνητόν, νοῦ καὶ ἐπιστήμης δεκτικόν. It is, of course, possible that the word was already missing in Leo's copy of Meletius, but this definition of ἄνθρωπος was so well-known that I have chosen to give Leo the benefit of the doubt. A few examples will illustrate its wide currency: *τί γάρ ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος; ζῶον, φησί, λογικὸν θνητόν* (Epictetus 2. 9. 2; compare 3. 1. 25). Note the idiomatic singular *φησί* here and in Meletius; it is equivalent to *φασί*, "people say". *ἄνθρωπος ἐστὶ ζῶον λογικὸν θνητόν νοῦ καὶ ἐπιστήμης δεκτικόν* (Ps. Galen 19. 355 K); *δι' ὃ καὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὀρίζονται ζῶον λογικὸν θνητόν νοῦ καὶ ἐπιστήμης δεκτικόν* (Nemesius p. 55, 13–14 Matthaei).

τί ἐστὶ σφυγμός; κίνησις καρδίας καὶ ἀρτηριῶν τῆς ζωτικῆς δυνάμεως κατὰ διαστολὴν καὶ συστολὴν τοῦ πνεύματος. (c. 10). There corresponds to this in Meletius (1108 D–1109 A) the following: *οὐδὲν γάρ ἐστι σφυγμός ἢ κίνησις καρδίας καὶ ἀρτηριῶν ὑπὸ ζωτικῆς δυνάμεως φυσικῶς γινομένη κατὰ διαστολὴν καὶ συστολὴν τοῦ πνεύματος...* For *τῆς ζωτικῆς δυνάμεως* some would perhaps restore Meletius' *ὑπὸ ζωτικῆς δυνάμεως φυσικῶς γινομένη*. Leo's sentence, however, though concise, is sound (note the article *τῆς*, absent in Meletius, which suggests a conscious revision); the construction is the common "double genitive" one: "What is pulsation? A motion of the vital faculty of the heart and arteries according to the expansion and contraction of the lung." For the word-order compare Headlam on *Herodas* 3. 16: "...the first genitive depends upon the second, as usually in good Greek...".

τὸ δὲ ὀπισθεν ἰνίον ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐν τῇ καταβάσει <τῇ ἀπὸ τῆς κορυφῆς κάτω ἰέναι> ἢ ἀπὸ τούτου ἐξέρχασθαι τὰς ἴνας ἦτοι τὰ νεῦρα. (c. 28). The derivation of *ἰνίον* appears as follows in Meletius (1152 B): *τὸ δὲ ὀπισθεν ἰνίον ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐν τῇ καταβάσει τῇ ἀπὸ τῆς κορυφῆς κάτω ἰέναι ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐντεῦθεν ἄρχεσθαι τὰς ἴνας ἦγονν τὰ νεῦρα*. It is clear from Leo's *ἦ* that he is here giving two alternate etymologies and equally clear that the bare *ἐν τῇ καταβάσει* alone cannot be the first one; hence my restoration from Meletius. The words dropped out through lipography: the eye of the scribe was deceived by the similarity of *καταβάσει* and *κάτω ἰέναι*. In the second derivation Leo has omitted the introductory *ἀπὸ τοῦ* and substituted *ἀπὸ τούτου ἐξέρχασθαι* for *ἐντεῦθεν ἄρχεσθαι*. For the omission of the second *ἀπὸ τοῦ* compare below, c. 72: *ἐντερα δὲ λέγεται ἀπὸ τοῦ εἰλεῖσθαι, οἷον ἐντελα, τὰ ἐντός εἰλούμενα, ἢ δι' αὐτῶν ῥεῖν τὰ τῆς τροφῆς περισσά*. Here Meletius (1232 D) has *ἐντερα δὲ λέγεται ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐντός εἰλεῖσθαι... ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ δι' αὐτῶν ῥεῖν...* This same failure to repeat *ἀπὸ τοῦ* before additional etymologies

may be seen, for example, in Orion, p. 56.5 (Sturz). *ἐξέρχασθαι* is *not* to be altered to *ἐξάρχασθαι*; it is true that *ἐρχασθαι* and *ἀρχασθαι* are often confused in manuscripts, but 1) *ἀπὸ τούτου ἐξέρχασθαι*, “to come out from this [*ίνιον*] and *ἐντεῦθεν ἀρχασθαι*, “to begin from there”, come down to the same thing, and 2) *ἐξάρχασθαι* would mean something quite different (v. *LSJ* s. v. *ἐξάρχω*). What motivated Leo to make such pointless revisions as the ones we have just seen? The only answer can be Hermann Diels’ question – “*Quis enim Byzantini hominis tricas enodaverit?*”

γλαυκὸς δὲ ὀφθαλμὸς γίνεται ἢ διὰ τὴν ὀλιγότητα ἢ διὰ τὴν καθαρότητα τῆς ὠειδοῦς ὑγρότητος ἢ διὰ τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν καθαρότητα τοῦ κρυσταλοειδοῦς. τὸν δὲ ἐναντίως ἔχοντα μέλαινα αὐτόν. τὸ δὲ πολὺ ὑγρὸν, εἰ καὶ καθαρὸν ἐστὶ, μέλαινα τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν κτλ. (c. 39). This passage is a considerable abridgment and rewriting of Meletius 1169 B–C; the words *τὸν δὲ ἐναντίως – μέλαινα τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν* are certainly corrupt. I would write the passage as follows: ... *τὰ δὲ ἐναντίως ἔχοντα μέλαινα αὐτόν. τὸ δὲ πολὺ ὑγρὸν, εἰ καὶ καθαρὸν ἐστὶ, μέλαινα τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν κτλ.* “... but if conditions are the opposite, they make the eye black; and a large quantity of humor, even if it is clear, makes it black...” *τὰ δὲ* could easily have corrupted to *τὸν δὲ* under the influence of *ἔχοντα* and perhaps of *αὐτόν*; the phrase *τὰ ἐναντίως ἔχοντα* derives from Meletius’ ... *εἰ δὲ ἐναντία τούτων, γίνεται μέλας* (1169 C). The confusion of *μέλαινα* and *μέλαινα* in a sentence as obscure as this is quite easy. *ποιεῖ* is to be understood as the predicate of *τὰ ἐναντίως ἔχοντα* and *τὸ πολὺ ὑγρὸν*; compare Meletius, 1169 B: *εἰ μὲν οὖν πολὺ ἐστὶ τὸ ὠαδες ὑγρὸν, ποιεῖ τὸν γλαυκὸν ὀφθαλμὸν*. We have already seen with what abandon Leo executes such ellipses, unthinkable for a correct writer.

αἰδὲ περὶ αὐτὸ [sc. τὸ βλέφαρον] τρίχες βλεφαρίδες προσαγορεῦνται. οὐ μόνον γὰρ κόσμον πορέχουσιν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ προσπίπτοντα τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἔξωθεν ἀποκρούονται. ἐρεθίζουσι γὰρ τὸ βλέφαρον μύει (c. 41). The original passage in Meletius (1173 C) has nothing answering to *ἐρεθίζουσι γὰρ τὸ βλέφαρον μύει* which is an explanatory addition of Leo himself. Sense is restored to the sentence by correcting *μύει* to *μύειν* “For they cause the eyelid to close by their irritation [thereby protecting the eye from *τὰ προσπίπτοντα*].” Confusion of *εἰ* and *εἰω* is not unusual, and the construction is on the analogy of *ποιεῖν c. acc. et inf.* (v. *LSJ* s. v. *ποιέω* A. II. b.). *μύω* is used commonly enough of the eyes, and is, indeed, as old as Homer in this meaning: *οὐ γάρ πω μύσαν ὄσσε ὑπὸ βλεφάροισιν ἐμοῖς* (Il. 24. 637).

ἄσφρησίς ἐστιν ὁρμή τινος φυσικῆς ἐνεργείας ἢ ἀποτελουμένη διὰ τοῦ ἐν ταῖς ῥίσι πνεύματος, διὰ τῶν ἐμπροσθίων κοιλιῶν τοῦ ἐγκεφάλου εἰς τὰ ἰσθμοειδῆ ὅστέα· δι' αὐτοῦ τὴν αἴσθησιν λαμβάνον, οὐ διὰ νεύρου. (c. 44). (τὰ ἰσθμοειδῆ should be τὰ ἡθμοειδῆ, but the error seems to go back to Meletius – or his manuscripts; the confusion is common.) The final words δι' αὐτοῦ – νεύρου are not sound; Meletius (1180 C) reveals what they ought to mean: οὐ γὰρ μετὰ νεύρου ἢ ῥίς τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτῆς γνωρίζει τῷ ἐγκεφάλῳ, ὡσπερ καὶ αἱ λοιπαὶ τῶν αἰσθήσεων, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ἐκεῖνος δι' ὅπῳ τῶν τῆν αἴσθησιν δέχεται. I therefore conjecture δι' αὐτοῦ τὴν αἴσθησιν λαμβάνων, οὐ διὰ νεύρου: “the brain receiving the sensation directly (*lit.* “through itself”), not by means of a nerve”. Palaeographically, αὐτοῦ for αὐτοῦ is hardly a change at all, and perhaps no confusion is commoner than that between *o* and *ω*. The construction is an anacoluthic nominative absolute, quite possible for Leo.

αἱ δὲ ὀφρῦες αἱ ἐπ' εὐθείας κείμεναι χρηστὸν καὶ πρῶον καὶ συμπαθεῖς ἦθος σημαίνουσιν. αἱ δὲ προσεπικεκαμμένοι καὶ τῇ ῥίνι προσεπικείμεναι καὶ καμπυλώδεις εἰσὶ, στυφὸν ἦθος καὶ βλοσυρὸν καὶ καταπληκτικόν. (c. 48). As the sentence now stands, *στυφὸν ἦθος* is in quasi apposition to *αἱ δὲ [ὀφρῦες]*; this is awkward. Meletius (1188 A) does not have *εἰσὶ* and this should perhaps be deleted as a dittography after *καμπυλώδεις*. *ἦθος* would then be governed by *σημαίνουσι*, understood from above (as in Meletius).

ἔστι δὲ ὁ τράχηλος ὄλος ὀστώδης· ὁ σπόνδηλος ἀπὸ τοῦ ἰνύας ἔχοντος ὑπὸ μυῶν καὶ νεύρων καὶ συνδέσμων συνεχόμενος. (c. 58). It is clear that this passage has suffered some corruption; Meletius (1205 D–1208 A) has: ἔστι δὲ ὄλος ὁ τράχηλος ὀστώδης· σπονδύλους ἀπὸ τοῦ ἰνίου ἔχων ὑπὸ μυῶν καὶ νεύρων καὶ συνδέσμων περιεχομένους. Leo should therefore be restored as follows: ἔστι δὲ ὁ τράχηλος ὄλος ὀστώδης· [ὁ] σπονδύλους ἀπὸ τοῦ ἰνίου ἔχων ὑπὸ μυῶν καὶ νεύρων καὶ συνδέσμων συνεχομένους. The corruption of *ἔχων* to *ἔχοντος* was due to the influence of the preceding *ἀπὸ τοῦ*; this left *ἰνίου* in the wrong case and meaningless, and *ἰνύας* (an itacism for *ἠνίας*) looks suspiciously like a conjecture made by someone who remembered an elaborate comparison made above, c. 31: ...οὕτως καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἡμετέρου σώματος. ἠνίοχος μὲν αὐτὸς ὁ ἐγκέφαλος, ἠρία δὲ αὐτὰ τὰ νεῦρα, χαλνοὶ δὲ αὐτοὶ οἱ μύες, ἱπποὶ δὲ αὐτὰ τὰ λοιπὰ μόρια. Note that *μύες* and *νεῦρα* occur in both passages and answering to *σύνδεσμοι* we find just above in c. 31 *συνδεδεμένος*. The *ὁ* before *σπονδύλους* is puzzling and should perhaps be retained, for 1) the corruption

σπόνδυλος is more easily understandable as an accommodation to *δ*, and 2) in two other places in Leo *δ* is found where it does not seem to belong and where Meletius does not have it: *ἔστι δὲ ὁ ἐγκέφαλος <λευκός>, [δ] μαλθακός, ὡσπερ ἐξ ἀφροῦ τινος πεπηγώς, ὑγρὸς καὶ ψυχρὸς* c. 26; *ὁ ἀμφιβληστροειδῆς στήριγμά ἐστιν ἔνδοθεν τοῦ παντός σώματος τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ. ὁ δὲ ἐπιπεφυκὼς [δ] ἔξωθεν* c. 36. The reason for these interpolations – if interpolations they be – escapes my wit.

οὕτως μὲν οὖν ἡ ὄρεξις γίνεται, ἣν καὶ πεῖναν ὠνόμασε. (c. 66). *βουβῶνας δὲ ὠνόμασε τὸν εἰρημένον τόπον.* (c. 72). In both places Meletius (1220 D and 1233 D) has *ὠνόμασαν*. The change of number, occurring twice as it does, seems to be a conscious one rather than a corruption, for which there is no obvious reason. I have therefore retained the singulars and would put them in the same class as *φησί = φασί*, an idiom which was illustrated above.

I may be permitted here to demonstrate by several examples how little Leo understood the bizarre etymologies which he was so fond of adducing.

χαρά ἐστὶν ὅσα τῆς λύπης ἐναντία προεῖρηται· παρὰ τὸ τὰ γυῖα λύειν, τουτέστι τὰ μέλη. (c. 19). (*παρὰ τὸ* is my correction for *χαρὰ τοῦ* of the manuscript.) Meletius does not have this etymology, but it is found in the *Etymologicum Magnum* (224. 31–2 Gaisford) – where it is correctly applied not to *χαρά*, but to *γέλως*!

λέγεται δὲ ἦπαρ ... παρὰ τὸ ἀρδεύειν τὸ σῶμα ὄλον αἵματι. (c. 67). For *ἀρδεύειν* Meletius (1224 B) has *ἐπαρδεύειν*, and it is only with this reading that the etymology makes sense (i.e. *ἐπαρ* from *ἦπαρ*).

In another etymological passage, Leo's obscure abridgment of his source has been further complicated by scribal corruption:

Πόθεν μέρος; παρὰ τὸ μερίζεσθαι καὶ διαφέρειν ἕτερον ἑτέρον· μέλη δὲ ἐκ μεταφορᾶς τοῦ μέλους τῶν μουσῶν, ἐπεὶ καὶ τὰ μέλη ἀρμονίας ἔχουσι· +χόρια+ δὲ ὡς ὄρια τινὰ διηρημένα· +τόπος+ δὲ ὡς καὶ αὐτὰ ἀυξόμενα κατὰ τὰς τρεῖς διαστάσεις καὶ ὡς περιεκτικά· τόπος δὲ κατὰ δύο μόνας διαστάσεις, ὅπερ ἐστὶ πλάτος καὶ μήκος. (c. 23)

For *+χόρια+* we must read *μόρια*; the correction is confirmed by the parallel passage in Meletius (1148 A). *+τόπος+* is clearly an unconscious anticipation of *τόπος* in the next clause; it has ejected a neuter plural noun as the words ... *αὐτὰ ἀυξόμενα* ... *περιεκτικά* show. What is the noun? Meletius is of no help here,

for he has nothing corresponding to ${}^+\tau\acute{o}\pi\omicron\varsigma^+$ δὲ ὡς – περιεκτικά; Leo has borrowed from an unknown source. Nevertheless, the noun is still recoverable. Read *χωρίον*. This word may mean “place, part of the body”; see *LSJ* s.v. *χωρίον* 7 and compare *LSJ* s.v. *τόπος* I. 3. The clause ὡς καὶ αὐτὰ – περιεκτικά offers two fanciful etymological explanations of *χωρίον* which derive the word from the verb *χωρεῖν*. One common meaning of *χωρεῖν* is “contain,” “hold” (*LSJ* s.v.. III) and the larger parts of the body “contain” or “enclose” the smaller parts; *περιεκτικά* looks to this meaning of *χωρεῖν*. When parts of the body grow, they in a sense “go forward”, “spread abroad”, and it is to this meaning of *χωρεῖν* that the words ὡς καὶ αὐτὰ – διαστάσεις refer. Whatever the source whence Leo borrowed this etymology, it undoubtedly made the derivation clear by an explicit statement: *χωρίον παρὰ τὸ χωρεῖν* or the like. That *χωρία* is the correct reading here is confirmed by the preceding ${}^+\chi\acute{o}\rho\iota\alpha^+$. Just as ${}^+\tau\acute{o}\pi\omicron\varsigma^+$, by an unconscious anticipation of the following *τόπος*, ejected *χωρία*, so ${}^+\chi\acute{o}\rho\iota\alpha^+$ ejected *μόρια* at a time when *χωρία* had not yet corrupted to *τόπος*.

Finally, a note on the orthography. In a few cases where the evidence indicated that inferior spellings had some currency I have followed the manuscript authority (a practice which would be rash in the case of a classical author, less so for a late Byzantine compiler). Thus I have retained *κρύσταλος* and *κρυσταλοειδής*, *μαλός* (for *μαλλός*), *παραστάτες* (for *παραστάται*), and *ἐρυντροειδής* (for *ἐλντροειδής*). It is a mistake to assume that only copyists failed to subscribe to the orthography approved in the best circles.

Boston College

Robert Renehan