Musurus omitted this gloss, while Latte considered its emendation to διεπόντα: πληροί¹. We can definitely retain the reading of the Marcianus (as Schmidt did), regarding particularly διεπόντα. The accusative form indicates that Hesychius is citing here an actual passage. Moreover, Latte’s proposal disregards the fact that διέπων was an astrological terminus technicus, something that would render it appealing to a lexicographer. δ 1622 probably refers to the amply attested Greek phrase τὸν πολεύοντα καὶ διέποντα, current in astrological literature as well as in magical papyri². In this context, διέπων is the term ascribed to the planet (mostly called ἀστήρ) presiding over certain hours of the day, whereas the former term, πολεύων, is attributed to the planet presiding over the whole day³. According to our sources, an ἀστήρ can be πολεύων and διέπων at the same time: each of the seven planets (Κρόνος, Δίας, Ἀρης, Ἁλίας, Ἄφροδιτη, ἕρμης, Σελήνη; the order varies in our sources)⁴ succeeds the previous one as πολεύων for a specific day of the week; during that day all of them become in

¹) See Schmidt, Hesych. I δ 508 (gl. 1629) and Latte, Hesych. I 451.
³) From the rather meager testimonies we conclude that this was an important theme of the astrology of Late Antiquity. The Suda attributes to Trionianus a treatise bearing this title (τ. 957 Adler: Ἰριβωνιανός [. . .], ἀνὴρ πολυμαθῆς [. . .]. ἔγραφεν [. . .], Εἰς τὸν πολεύοντα καὶ διέποντα [. . .]). On διέπειν cf. also Hymn. Orph. 7.6–7 Quadt.
⁴) F. Boll, Hebdomas, RE VII² (1912) 2547–2578 [here: 2557 ff.].
their turn διέποντες, something that every seventh hour gives to the 
πολεύων (the dominant one) the additional status of διέπων. This 
theme has to do with the dominus diei of astrology (Paulus Alex., 
Anacephalaeosis 23.10–11 Boer: καὶ ὁ πολεύων καὶ διέπων 
αὐτὸς καὶ κύριος λέγεται τής ἡμέρας).

Regarding the transmitted form of δ 1622, it is possible that 
before being corrupted to πληροβιο τα the accusative 
πολεύοντα originally served as the glossema. The lexicographer could have had 
recorded the two words as they appear in our sources, separating 
them as synonyms (διέποντα· πολεύοντα)7. This hypothesis, how-
ever, presupposes a not easily explained palaeographical confusion. 
I am more inclined to think that πληροῖ is sound, but I have not 
been able to locate a text where the two words (διέποντα – πληροῖ) 
are used in the same context.8 Hesychius most likely never wrote 
the gloss as we have it, with the obvious grammatical and semasio-
logical incoherence between the lemma and its glossema9. It is

5) The method of determining the dominant planet is described by Paulus 
Alex., Elem. apotelesm. 41.16–45.9 Boer. For a different order of the planets cf. 
Joannes Camaterus (above, n. 2).
6) On the use of πολεύων in this context cf. H. G. Gundel, Weltbild und As-
trologie in den griechischen Zauberpapyri, München 1968, 41, 45, 51. ὁ κύριος τῆς 
ἡμέρας was important in magical practices; see especially PMG 13.378–79 Preisend-
danz: ἐπικαλοβ ὑπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας θεόν. Cf. PGM 4.546, 4.701–2, 4.994– 
5, 13.676 Preisendanz.
7) The fact that the word πολεύοντα always precedes διέποντα in the texts 
does not necessarily rule out this assumption. The διέπων ἀστήρ received additional 
attention in Serapion’s work (above, n. 2), where the theme of ὁ κύριος τῆς ὥρας 
becomes prominent. This could account for the use of διέποντα as the lemma in δ 
1622. Cf. also Ps.-Ptolemaeus (above, n. 2).

For analogous cases where two synonyms have been recorded see gll. φ 478 
(φίλησα· ἐξένισα Schmidt) and τ 1025 (τλβε· ὑπομείνατε Schmidt). Cf. F. Bossi, 
Meccanismi e strutture nella lessicografia greca, Eikamos 10 (1999) 221–240 [here: 
223]. On “glosse sinonimiche” see E. Degani, Hesychiana, QIFG 1 (1966) 42–47 
[here: 46, with bibliography in n. 14].
8) See the following note. For examples see Bossi (above, n. 7 and below, n. 9).
9) Several entries in Hesychius suffer from this discrepancy and are in general 
considered corrupt. For an alternative explanation of their genesis cf. F. Bossi, 
Lexicographica, Eikamos 6 (1995) 249–266, and Bossi 1999 (above, n. 7); R. Tosi, 
La lessicografia e la paremiografia in eta’ Alessandrina ed il loro sviluppo successi-
vo, in: La philologie grecque à l’époque hellénistique et romaine, Fondation Hardt, 
Vandœuvres / Genève 1993, 143–209 [here: 177]; Degani (above, n. 7) 46. Cf. η 42 
ηγυνώτο· ὁ λαμβάνων Bossi: ἡγυνώτε ὁ λαμβάνων [ἡγετό] Latte (based on Photius, 
see Latte, Hesych. II 268). On this, and other similar lemmata, see Bossi 1995, 264– 
265 and Bossi 1999, 229.
more probable that the verb πληροῖ once formed part of a now mutilated interpretamentum, which dealt with the attributes of διέποντα. Our lexicographer’s source could have been a treatise on the subject similar to that of Tribonianus (Suda τ 957 Adler). At any rate, given the fact that the accusative διέποντα is amply attested in Greek, we should retain the lemma without the crux, in the form διέποντα: (…) πληροὶ (…).

638 † θονανία: ὀξεῖα

θονανία is a vox nihili. Meineke’s θοὰ ἀνία: ὀξεῖα vel θοὰν ἰάν: ὀξεῖαν are more probable than Wilamowitz’s θοὴ· ταχεία, ὀξεῖα. Meineke’s second conjecture in particular (θοὰν ἰάν) is a fine thought, but none of his proposals are attested in ancient sources. Ruhnken’s θηγανέα is also brilliant and, though it alters more drastically the transmitted form of 638, it is supported by Hesychius δ 455 θηγάνεον· ὀξύ [...]. In my opinion, however, closer to the original entry is Schmidt’s θοὴν νῆα· ὀξεῖαν, but I believe that θονανία was actually produced by the corruption of the Homeric θοὴν ἀνὰ νῆα (μέλαινα), attested once in the Odyssey 2.430 (δησάμενοι δ’ ὄρα ὀπλα θοὴν ἀνὰ νῆα μέλαινα), and also found in the Hom. Hymn to Dionysus 35–36 (οβιταλεσκος μὲν πρώτιστα θοὴν ἀνὰ νῆα μέλαιναν / ἡδύποτος κελάρυζ’ εὐώδης [...]12. Hesychius repeatedly lemmatized combinations of words and formulae, excerpted by himself or his sources in the grammatical form they appear in the texts, as in the case of the relevant here 617 (θοὴν διὰ νύκτα· θείαν. ταχείαν. ὀξεῖαν [Π. 10.394]) transmitted only a few lines above the gloss in question. 638 must have been transposed; probably, it was once recorded amongst 615 – 620, in a section of the Lexicon that includes entries dealing with the

---

10) Actually, there are two different entries regarding Tribonianus in the Suda, the first of which has to do with a contemporary of emperor Justinian (τ 956) who served as a high-ranked legislator and held public offices (magister officiorum, consul). The treatise in question is attributed to the second one (above, n. 3). Scholars presume that the two entries concern one and the same person, cf. B. Kübler, Tribonianus1, RE VI A2 (1937) 2419–2426 [here: 2421].


12) Cf. also Scholia in Odysseam 2.430.2 Dindorf and Eustathius 1.106.35 Stallbaum. See Schmidt, Hesych. Π 320. In Hesych. V 31, however, Schmidt adopts Meineke’s θοὰ ἀνία.
Hesychiana δ 1622, θ 638, ν 447 L.

Homer’s θοός (Il. 1.12, 1.308, 2.17, 11.111, 12.463, Od. 1.303, 4.255, 12.284 al.) and its allegorical interpretation. The gloss must have had the form θο(η)ν ὀ(νό)κ νη(α) ὀξεία(ν), and was easily simplified by a copyist as νοσανία. Regarding its genesis, the corruption of ΘΟΗΝΑΝΑΗΑ to ΘΟΝΑΝΙΑ is readily understandable, especially in the uncial – the so-called ‘scriptio continua’ –, due to the omission of some letters (the first Η dropped out, then mechanical lipography followed: the copyist’s eyes jumped from the first -NA- to the second), aided by the fact that Η and Ι (in NHA) came to be pronounced identically in later Greek. At this linguistic stage, the accumulative sequence of Ν and Α (ΘΟΗΝΑΝΑΗΑ), and the rhythm they produce when these three words are being read as one, made the original lemma sound almost like the corrupt νοσανία. This in turn would add an aural confusion to the visual I have just described. Concurrent factors of confusion are often observed in palaeography.

ν 447 † νηέρη· νόσος † Ag

Latte’s hypothesis “αν διερη· νοτερα?” (Hesych. II 709) could hardly be accepted. What is interesting here is that Marcianus’ νηέρη is coupled by νηερι, transmitted in some MSS of the Cyril glossary (namely A [= Vall. E II], and in the family g)13. Following the prevailing opinion would mean that †νηέρη could serve as a further example that Hesychius was interpolated from the Cyril glossary, and that the error probably originated in the latter14. This assumption would make the interpolator of Hesychius (or even a scribe) responsible for the final -η of †νηέρη, perhaps in an attempt to make the vitiated word agree with the feminine νόσος. All these are highly probable; nevertheless, one has to be sceptical about the textual tradition of these texts and their assumed interrelations.


Leaving aside for a moment the matter of the origin of ν 447, I proceed with my note considering that the relation between the two concurrent lemmata is self-evident.

The description of women's diseases localized in the lower part of the belly (νειαίρη γαστήρ, i.e. κάτω κοιλία, underbelly, hypogastrium) is quite common in the Hippocratic corpus\textsuperscript{15}. This probably contributed to the formation of the transmitted ν 447. We must dismiss the possibility that the original lemma was actually NEIAIPH, and that the corruption of EI to H and of AI to E produced the form that has come down to us. The entry exists in Hesychius (ν 216 Latte) having nothing to do with Hippocratic terminology. Besides that, this adjective could not be mistaken as a disease’s name; it accompanies almost invariably the noun γαστήρ in medical texts\textsuperscript{16}. Also, neither a mutilated gloss νειαίρη (γαστήρ)- νόσος, nor a lemma νειαίρη νόσος (bereft of its interpretamentum) seem plausible enough\textsuperscript{17}.

ν 447 is a typical example of the varied corruption to which the Greek Lexica have been subjected. I think that it does not concern the name of an otherwise unknown illness, but it could be considered, before its corruption and as regards specifically Hesychius, as the extra ordinem inserted glossa dittographa\textsuperscript{18} of θ 164 θεανή νόσος· ἡ ἐκ θεοβουπς, θεία. Σοφοκλής Τυροίς ά’ Latte (Soph. fr. 589 Radt). The word †νηέρη was probably formed by the last two letters of the original lemma and the first word of its interpretamentum. Supplementing what I think has fallen out, I propose the following emendation: ⟨θεα⟩νή· ⟨ἱ⟩ερὴ νόσος. The corruption was triggered by the loss of the initial θεα- (lipography)\textsuperscript{19}. Being

\textsuperscript{15} De morbis 2.40.12, 2.69.5, al. Littré ; De natura muliebri 2.7, 5.12, 18.1, al. Littré ; De mulierum affectibus 3.1, 35.11, 57.6, 63.3, al. Littré. Cf. Erotianus, Vocab Hippocraticarum Collectio 97.9 (gl. N 1) Nachmanson; Aretaeus, De causis et signis morborum 2.10.1.6 Hude; Rufus, De corporis humani appellationibus 170.3 Darenberg / Ruelle.

\textsuperscript{16} See J.-H. Kühn / U. Fleischer, Index Hippocraticus, Göttingen 1989, 525. Only one exception is found in the Hippocratic Coa Praesagia 579.2 Littré.

\textsuperscript{17} Naturally, a gloss νειαίρη (γαστήρ)- νόσος would hardly make any sense, given the use of νειαίρη δ’ ἐν γαστρί and νειαίρην κατὰ γαστέρα in Homer (I.5.539, 5.616, 16.465). The word νειαίρη, however, is preserved in the grammatical tradition; cf. Pollux 2.209.4 Bethe, Suda ν 282 Adler, EM 598.58 Gaisford, E. Gud. ν 404.6 Sturz, Scholia in Nic. Alex. 20a Geymonat.

\textsuperscript{18} Latte XXIX.

\textsuperscript{19} If the gl. had originated in Hesychius, one could acceptably assume that the error was due to the rubricator’s negligence. Cf. Latte XXV.
pronounced as iota (ι) long before, the final -η of θεανή contributed to the slip causing the loss of the initial ι- of the word ιερή (haplography). After that, the newly formed νηέρη(-ι) was separated from νόσος. The confusion was inevitable, especially in the uncial scriptio continua: ΘΕΑΝΗ·ΙΕΡΗΝΟCΟC → (ΘΕΑΝΗ·ΙΕΡΗΝΟCΟC) → NHEPH·ΝΟCΟC. Behind all that must have lain the mental associations which a scribe (unconsciously) made with the aforementioned Hippocratic word. There is no need to change ⟨ἱ⟩ερή to ⟨ἱ⟩ερά, although this type of error (α→η) could easily have occurred after the creation of νηέρη. The existence of the form ιερή, as in the Hippocratic Περὶ ιερῆς νούσου, combined with the medical context that ν 447 probably relates to, weighs against such an emendation.

Lipography affecting the opening letters of Hesychian entries may account for several corruptions in the cod. Marcianus gr. 622. This fact, along with the existence of δ 164 in this Lexicon seems to indicate that ν 447 has originated there as a glossa dittothephras and was introduced, after its corruption, into the Cyril glossary. This would fit in with Latte’s suggestions that some of the glossary’s MSS (namely AS and the family π) were interpolated from Hesychius. But the editor’s opinion did not concern the family g, and as regards cod. A, which also interests us here, it has been decisively refuted.

We must then assume that ν 447 was initially not connected at all with Hesychius δ 164. Instead, it originated independently in the Cyril glossary as θεανή· ιερή νόσος, which was corrupted to νηερη· νόσος. The interpolator of Hesychius probably mistook this unintelligible entry for yet another medical term and inserted it in the Lexicon.

Nicosia Charilaos E. Avgerinos

20) Latte XXV. This phenomenon concerns the initial two or three letters of some entries. Cf. α 2856 αλέκτο· ἐκοιμήθη (κατάλεκτο Latte); α 3205 >αλξεων· τειχέων (ἐπάλξεων Salm. Latte); δ 234 >δάντα· ζυγά (τάλαντα Latte).
21) Cf. Alpers (above, n. 14) XVIII–XIX (with his n. 16–21).