

## HESYCHIANA δ 1622, ϑ 638, ν 447 L.

δ 1622 † διέποντα· πληροῖ

Musurus omitted this gloss, while Latte considered its emendation to διαπόντια· πλοῖα<sup>1</sup>. We can definitely retain the reading of the Marcianus (as Schmidt did), regarding particularly διέποντα. 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 papyri<sup>2</sup>. 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 day<sup>3</sup>. According to our sources, an ἀστήρ can be πολεύων and διέπων at the same time: each of the seven planets (Κρόνος, Δίας, Ἄρης, Ἥλιος, Ἀφροδίτη, Ἑρμῆς, Σελήνη; the order varies in our sources)<sup>4</sup> 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.

2) Cf. Paulus Alexandrinus, *Elementa apotelesmatica*, p. 15.7, 15.12, 41.16–45.9 (καὶ Περὶ τοῦ πολεύοντος καὶ διέποντος) Boer; Manetho, *Apotelesmatica* 6.26 Koechly; Ps.-Ptolemaeus, *Fructus sive centiloquium* (Ὁ καρπός) 90.4–5 Boer; Serapion, in: CCAG 1.99.3, 1.100.5, 1.101.20, 1.102.13 Olivieri, 5.2.180.8 Boll / Cumont; Joannes Camaterus, *Εἰσαγωγή ἀστρονομίας* vv.2042–2049 Weigl; Papyri Graecae Magicae 4.904–5, 13.216,676 al. Preisendanz; Iamblichus, *De mysteriis* 3.30.3, 8.8.1 des Places. The testimonies include the mediaeval Greek version of the Arab astronomer Apomassar's (Abū Ma'shar Dj'afar b. Muhammad al. 'Umar al Balkhi, 9<sup>th</sup> cent.), *De revolutionibus nativitatum*, p. 20.14, 21.2, 21.8, al. Pingree ≡ Anonymi, [Hermippus] *De astrologia dialogus* 22.27 f. Kroll / Viereck.

3) From the rather meager testimonies we conclude that this was an important theme of the astrology of Late Antiquity. The Suda attributes to Tribonianus a treatise bearing this title (τ 957 Adler: Τριβωνιανός [...], ἀνήρ πολυμαθῆς [...], ἔγραψεν [...]). Εἰς τὸν πολεύοντα καὶ διέποντα [...]). On διέπειν cf. also Hymn. Orph. 7.6–7 Quadt.

4) F. Boll, *Hebdomas*, RE VII<sup>2</sup> (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<sup>5</sup>. This theme has to do with the *dominus diei* of astrology<sup>6</sup> (Paulus Alex., Anacephalaeosis 23.10–11 Boer: καὶ ὅτι ὁ πολεύων καὶ διέπων αὐτὸς καὶ κύριος λέγεται τῆς ἡμέρας).

Regarding the transmitted form of δ 1622, it is possible that before being corrupted to πληροῖ 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)<sup>7</sup>. This hypothesis, however, 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<sup>8</sup>. Hesychius most likely never wrote the gloss as we have it, with the obvious grammatical and semasiological incoherence between the lemma and its glossema<sup>9</sup>. 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 Astrologie in den griechischen Zauberpapyri*, München 1968, 41, 45, 51. ‘ὁ κύριος τῆς ἡμέρας’ was important in magical practices; see especially PMG 13.378–79 Preisendanz: ἐπικαλοῦ τὸν τῆς ὥρας καὶ 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 (τλήτε· ὑπομείνατε Schmidt). Cf. F. Bossi, *Meccanismi e strutture nella lessicografia greca*, Eikasmos 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*, Eikasmos 6 (1995) 249–266, and Bossi 1999 (above, n. 7); R. Tosi, *La lessicografia e la paremiografia in età Alessandrina ed il loro sviluppo successivo*, in: *La philologie grecque à l’époque hellénistique et romaine*, Fondation Hardt, *Vandoeuvres / Genève* 1993, 143–209 [here: 177]; Degani (above, n. 7) 46. Cf. η 42 ἡγγυάτο· ὁ λαμβάνων Bossi: ἡγγυάτο ὁ λαμβάνων [ἦγετο] 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 διέπων. Our lexicographer's source could have been a treatise on the subject similar to that of Tribonianus (Suda τ 957 Adler)<sup>10</sup>. 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: ⟨...⟩ πληροῖ ⟨...⟩.

ϑ 638 † θονανία· ὄξεια

θονανία is a vox nihili. Meineke's θοὰ ἀνία· ὄξεια vel θοὰν ἰάν· ὄξειαν are more probable than Wilamowitz's θοή· ταχεία, ὄξεια<sup>11</sup>. 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 ϑ 638, it is supported by Hesychius ϑ 455 θηγάνεον· ὄξυ [...]. In my opinion, however, closer to the original entry is Schmidt's θοῖν νῆα· ὄξειαν, but I believe that †θονανία was actually produced by the corruption of the Homeric θοῖν ἀνὰ νῆα (μέλαινα), attested once in the Odyssey 2.430 (θησάμενοι δ' ἄρα ὅπλα θοῖν ἀνὰ νῆα μέλαινα), and also found in the Hom. Hymn to Dionysus 35–36 (οἶνος μὲν πρώτιστα θοῖν ἀνὰ νῆα μέλαιναν / ἠδύποτος κελάρυζ' εὐώδης [...])<sup>12</sup>. 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 ϑ 617 (θοῖν διὰ νύκτα· θείαν· ταχείαν· ὄξειαν [Il. 10.394]) transmitted only a few lines above the gloss in question. ϑ 638 must have been transposed; probably, it was once recorded amongst ϑ 615 – ϑ 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, Tribonianus<sup>1</sup>, RE VI A<sup>2</sup> (1937) 2419–2426 [here: 2421].

11) Philologus 12 (1857) 602–633 [here: 610] and Kleine Schriften 4.580 respectively.

12) Cf. also Scholia in Odysseam 2.430.2 Dindorf and Eustathius 1.106.35 Stallbaum. See Schmidt, Hesych. II 320. In Hesych. V 31, however, Schmidt adopts Meineke's θοὰ ἀνία.

Homeric *θεός* (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 *θε(ῆ)ν ἀ(νὰ) νῆα· ὄξει(α)ν*, and was easily simplified by a copyist as *θονανία*. Regarding its genesis, the corruption of *ΘΟΗΝΑΝΑΝΗΑ* to *ΘΟΝΑΝΙΑ* is readily understandable, especially in the uncial – the so-called ‘scriptio continua’ –, due to the omission of some letters (the first H dropped out, then mechanical lipography followed: the copyist’s eyes jumped from the first -NA- to the second), aided by the fact that H and I (in NHA) came to be pronounced identically in later Greek. At this linguistic stage, the accumulative sequence of N and A (*ΘΟΗΝΑΝΑΝΗΑ*), and the rhythm they produce when these three words are being read as one, made the original lemma sound almost like the corrupt *θονανία*. 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 † νῆρη· νόσος † Ag

Latte’s hypothesis “*αν διερη· νοτερα?*” (Hesych. II 709) could hardly be accepted. What is interesting here is that Marcianus’ *νῆρη* is coupled by *νῆρι*, transmitted in some MSS of the Cyril glossary (namely A [= Vall. E II], and in the family g)<sup>13</sup>. Following the prevailing opinion would mean that †νῆρη could serve as a further example that Hesychius was interpolated from the Cyril glossary, and that the error probably originated in the latter<sup>14</sup>. This assumption would make the interpolator of Hesychius (or even a scribe) responsible for the final -η of †νῆρη, 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.

13) See Latte’s note (Hesych. II 709). The editor based his remarks on A. B. Drachmann, *Die Überlieferung des Cyrillglossars*, Det. Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, historisk-filologiske Meddelelser 21,5, København 1936.

14) Latte believed that certain manuscripts of the Cyril glossary were interpolated from Hesychius at the end of the 12<sup>th</sup> and at the beginning of the 13<sup>th</sup> cent. (“Prolegomena”, XII, XXV, XLVII). However, it is generally accepted nowadays that Hesychius was interpolated from Cyril (codd. AS). Cf. K. Alpers, *Corrigenda et Addenda to Latte’s Prolegomena to Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon Vol. I: A–Δ*, in: *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon, Vol. III: Π–Σ*, ed. P. A. Hansen, Berlin / New York 2005, XV–XXIII (here: XVIII–XIX).

Leaving aside for a moment the matter of the origin of  $\nu$  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 (νείαιρη γαστήρ, i. e. κάτω κοιλία, underbelly, hypogastrium) is quite common in the Hippocratic corpus<sup>15</sup>. This probably contributed to the formation of the transmitted  $\nu$  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 ( $\nu$  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<sup>16</sup>. Also, neither a mutilated gloss νείαιρη (γαστήρ): νόσος, nor a lemma νείαιρη νόσος (bereft of its interpretamentum) seem plausible enough<sup>17</sup>.

$\nu$  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<sup>18</sup> of  $\vartheta$  164  $\vartheta$ εανὴ νόσος: ἢ ἐκ  $\vartheta$ εοῦ,  $\vartheta$ εία. Σοφοκλῆς Τυροῖ α' Latte (Soph. fr. 589 Radt). The word ἴνηρη 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: < $\vartheta$ εα>νή: <ι>ερὴ νόσος. The corruption was triggered by the loss of the initial  $\vartheta$ εα- (lipography)<sup>19</sup>. Being

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, Vocum Hippocraticarum Collectio 97.9 (gl. N 1) Nachmansohn; Aretaeus, De causis et signis morborum 2.10.1.6 Hude; Rufus, De corporis humani appellationibus 170.3 Daremberg / Ruelle.

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.

17) Naturally, a gloss νείαιρη (γαστήρ): νόσος would hardly make any sense, given the use of νείαιρη δ' ἐν γαστρὶ and νείαιραν κατὰ γαστέρα in Homer (Il. 5.539, 5.616, 16.465). The word νείαιρη, however, is preserved in the grammatical tradition; cf. Pollux 2.209.4 Bethe, Suda  $\nu$  282 Adler, EM 598.58 Gaisford, E. Gud.  $\nu$  404.6 Sturz, Scholia in Nic. Alex. 20a Geymonat.

18) Latte XXIX.

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 *ἱερή* (haplography). After that, the newly formed *νηέρη(-ι)* was separated from *νόσος*. The confusion was inevitable, especially in the uncial scriptio continua: *ΘΕΑΝΗ·ΙΕΡΗΝΟCOC* → *(ΘΕΑ)ΝΗ·ΙΕΡΗΝΟCOC* → *ΝΗΕΡΗ·ΝΟCOC*. 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 *ἱερή*, as in the Hippocratic *Περὶ ἱερῆς νόσου*, 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<sup>20</sup>. This fact, along with the existence of ϑ 164 in this Lexicon seems to indicate that ν 447 has originated there as a glossa ditographa 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<sup>21</sup>.

We must then assume that ν 447 was initially not connected at all with Hesychius ϑ 164. Instead, it originated independently in the Cyril glossary as *θεανή· ἱερή νόσος*, which was corrupted to *νηερί· 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 *>αλξέων· τευχέων* (*ἐπάλξέων* Salm. Latte); δ 234 *>δάντα· ζυγά* (*τάλαντα* Latte).

21) Cf. Alpers (above, n. 14) XVIII–XIX (with his n. 16–21).