

HESYCH. Π 1898, 2380, 2439, 2453, 2462 H.*

π 1898 περίσχοο φροντίδα ποιήσαι καὶ ἐπιμέλειαν· ἀντὶ τοῦ λαβοῦ καὶ ὑπερμάχησαι (A 393)

The modern editor considers gl. π 1898 flawless.¹ Nevertheless, the simplex λαβοῦ is unsuitable to describe the desired meaning. The context requires the middle composite ἀντιλαβοῦ, used in the sense “help, take part with, assist” (LSJ⁹ s.v. ἀντιλαμβάνω, Π.2; cf. E. Tr. 464 and Act. Ap. 20.35). Therefore, I would read the entry as: περίσχοο φροντίδα ποιήσαι καὶ ἐπιμέλειαν· ἀντὶ τοῦ (ἀντι)λαβοῦ καὶ ὑπερμάχησαι. This certain use of ἀντιλαμβάνομαι is prominently attested in the works of Early Christian writers, and remained current throughout the Byzantine period.² As regards especially the interpretamentum, the formula ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι καὶ ὑπερμάχεσθαι is actually attested in Theophanes Continuatus, Chronographia 85.14–15 Bekker τοὺς ἀντιλαβομένους καὶ τῆς βασιλείας ὑπερμάχησαντας ~ Joannes Scylitzes, Synopsis Historiarum (Theoph.) 1.15–16 Thurn τοὺς ἀντιλαβομένους καὶ τῆς βασιλείας ὑπερμάχησαντας. Regarding the mechanism of the corruption, it is obvious that the two consecutive ἀντὶ and ἀντι- (ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀντιλαβοῦ) made the copyist’s eye jump from the first ἀντὶ directly to the -λαβοῦ, a very common sort of visual confusion in Greek manuscripts.³ After ἀντι- had fallen out of the text, the rest

*) Thanks are due to Prof. G. N. Giannakis and Prof. C. N. Constantinides, who read earlier drafts and made valuable comments and suggestions, and to the editor and the referees of Rheinisches Museum.

1) Musurus corrected the transmitted ποιήσαι and ὑπερμάχησον to ποιήσαι and ὑπερμάχησαι respectively. Cf. Hansen, Hesych. III 93.

2) Cf. E. Kriaras, Λεξικὸ τῆς μεσαιωνικῆς Ἑλληνικῆς δημόδου γραμματείας (1100–1669), vol. 2, Thessalonica 1971, 258–259, s.v. ἀντιλαμβάνω, B. Cf. Euseb. Caes. Comm. in Psalmos, PG XXIII, col. 1384 Migne; Epiphanius, Liturgia Praesantificatorum 3.47, 3.53, 3.161 Moraites; Athanasius Theol. Expositiones in Psalmos, PG XXVII, col. 208 Migne. The formula ἀντιλαβοῦ, σῶσον, ἐλέησον etc. has been inserted in the liturgy of the Greek Orthodox Church, as regards the Synaxaria of the Virgin Mary.

3) In fact, such an error could have occurred both in the majuscule as well as in the minuscule stage of Greek writing. However, given the late testimonies of this formula’s use, we should be rather certain that this error occurred in the minuscule.

of the phrase seemed to make good sense, since λαβοῦ is grammatically a well-known Greek word.⁴

According to Hansen, the locus classicus of this specific entry is the Homeric II. 1.393.⁵ Given that this use of ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι + ὑπερμάχεσθαι is attested in Later Greek (see the sources referred to above), one could plausibly assume that the phrase ἀντι τοῦ ἀντιλαβοῦ καὶ ὑπερμάχησαι is a later addition (the original entry perhaps being περίσχεο· φροντίδα ποίησαι καὶ ἐπιμέλειαν). This is further validated by the absence of ἦ: the locution ἦ ἀντι τοῦ is sporadically used in this lexicon to introduce a second, or several other explanations,⁶ whereas the more regularly applied ἀντι τοῦ typically presents alternative grammatical forms or expressions,⁷ and not solely explanations, referring not only to the lemma, but occasionally to terms contained in the interpretamentum.⁸ The fact that the lexicographer did not also use the ἦ in this particular case is in my opinion a further indication that the phrase ἀντι τοῦ ἀντι-

4) In the transmitted form the incongruity produced escaped notice: the simplex λαβοῦ is to my knowledge always transitive; cf. LSJ⁹ s.v. λαμβάνω, B.1–6.

5) Noted also by Alberti, Hesych. II 937.

6) Cf. Hesych. α 6067 L. ἀπεσφακέλισεν· ἐσάπη. Ἀριστοφάνης Ὀλκάσιον (fr. 424). οἱ δὲ ἰατροὶ τὴν ἐκ τῆς σήψεως μελανίαν. ἦ ἀντι τοῦ προσεσπάσθη etc.; π 2084 H. πευκαλεῖται· ζηραίνεται. ἦ ἀντι τοῦ ζητεῖται; 3164 *ποῦ· ἐν ἴσῳ τῷ οὐδαμῶς. ἦ ἀντι τοῦ ποῦ πότε; π 4141 H. *πράϊον· κατ' ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν. οἱ δὲ πρό कारου, ταχύ. ἦ ἀντι τοῦ πρώην; τ 728 C./H. τέως ἕως, μέχρι... ἦ ἀντι τοῦ πρότερον.

7) Occasionally, the locution ἀντι τοῦ introduces a grammatical form following after a glossema (see α 2234, 4553, 7117, β 87, ε 4050, 4362, ζ 10, η 959, κ 2583, 4127, 4551, λ 716, ο 168, 1464 L., π 100, 2706, 3154, 3164, 3299, σ 172, 2849 H., τ 1210, υ 499, Η. / C.).

8) In some cases the lemma is a quotation, sometimes comprising of more than one word. Cf. α 238, 239, 479, 854.3, 934.3, 1652, 1715, 2031, 2066, 2213.3–4, 2234, 2275, 2279, 2377, 3118, 3183, 4553.1–3, 5993, 6683, 6753, 7117, 7534, 7890.3, 7900, 8003, 8417, β 928, δ 325, 839.4, 947, 1016, 1304, 1532, 1796, 1874, 2122, 2136, 2210, ε 763, 1167, 1195, 1221, 1517.2, 2056, 2090, 2367.4, 2579, 2689, 4050, 4362, 4872, 6240, 6627, 6969, ζ 10, 233, η 4.3, 102, 171, 577, 703, 841, 875, 959, θ 721, 813, 871, 954, ι 172, 580, 806, κ 260, 955, 1005, 2567, 2583, 4127, 4551, λ 716, 1355, μ 3, 245, 374, 424, 1134, 1299, 1915, ν 24, 419, 430, 432, 601, 686, 728, 731, 732, ο 1, 58, 168, 829, 851, 1464, 1557, 1559, 1758 L., π 100, 401, 1079, 1288, 1824, 1952, 2706, 2815, 3154, 3164, 3274, 3299, 3593, 3651, 4131, 4359, 4504, ρ 88, 88.3, 258, 584, σ 79, 125, 172, 230, 667, 766, 967.2, 1148, 1933, 2102, 2322, 2379, 2639, 2763, 2849 H., τ 169, 287, 371, 408, 473, 948, 957, 1040.2, 1053.2, 1173, 1210, 1334, 1338, 1500, 1517, 1700, 1706, 1748, υ 233, χ 416, 499, 645, φ 194, 329, 347, 490, 547, 892, χ 442, 456, 509, 553, 779, 808, ω 83, 476, 530.29 H. / C.

λαβοῦ καὶ ὑπερμάχησαι was added by a later hand, perhaps by the Hesychian interpolator.⁹

π 2380 *†πίσω†· πράζω A⁹

The entry was interpolated into Hesychius by the Cyril glossary being already corrupt. Hansen (Hesych. III 116) notes Drachmann's hypothesis on Cyril's gloss (A⁹): "an πείσω". Turning to Hesychius proper, Schmidt's attempts (especially the first) were certainly plausible: "L. π(ο)ήσω aut πίσω· τὰράζω (κόψω)".¹⁰ I disagree, however, with all proposals, those pertaining to Hesychius as well as to Cyril. Instead of the transmitted πίσω, what was meant in π 2380 is the lemma ποίσω,¹¹ the syncopated form of the future ποιήσω. Based on Theognostus' *Canones* (*De orthographia*) 892.5–7 Cramer εἰ δὲ τὸ ποίσω παρὰ τοῖς παλαιοῖς καὶ τῇ συνηθείᾳ λέγεται, συγκοπὴν πέπονθεν τοῦ η, we may furthermore infer that ποίσω was used in times older than this 9th cent. A. D. grammarian. Although Theognostus does not cite an earlier author, the form ποίσω is abundantly attested in Greek, regardless of the fact that Hesychius probably antedates most of the relevant sources. Specifically, the word was prominently used in poetical texts of the so-called Medieval Greek Vernacular Literature.¹² The morphological soundness of ποίσω, and further-

9) 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: XVII–XIX).

10) Cf. Schmidt, *Hesych. III 338* (Schmidt placed gl. π 2380 in rectangular brackets). The word ποιήσω is recurrently used in the Attic Drama, especially in Sophocles' and Menander's plays, and continued to be used even in Byzantium. The fact that the intervocalic iota (in this case in the diphthong οι) is often omitted in inscriptions (especially in the period ca. 450–200 B. C.) speaks against the supposition that its morphology was due solely to metrical reasons. For the sources of this category cf. L. Threatte, *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions*, Vol. I: Phonology, Berlin / New York 1980, 326–330, and Vol. II: Morphology, Berlin / New York 1996, 454, 511–512, 565, 579–580. For the scansion of this verb in metrical texts cf. Threatte I 211 and 330.

11) Nevertheless, I would not necessarily correlate this form with the transmitted *Hesych. π 2744 ποίσει· φθερεῖ*. On this last gloss cf. Hansen, *Hesych. III 136*, and Schmidt, *Hesych. III 352* (with the note "infra πύσει· σήψει").

12) Some of these texts are characterized by their undetermined ancestry and authorship. Cf. *Historia Alexandri Magni, Recensio poetica* (R) 219, 267, 827, 1147 al. Holton; *Bellum Troianum* 397, 556, 397 al. Jeffreys / Papatomopoulos; *Digenis Acritas* (Escorial) 670, 1265 Jeffreys; *Ilias Byzantina* 256 (νὰ ποίσω καὶ νὰ πράζω) Nørgaard / Smith; *Achilleis Byzantina* 1124 Agapitos / Hult / Smith; *Historia Belisarii* (Recensio x) 167 (νὰ πράζω καὶ νὰ ποίσω) Bakker / van Gemert; *Andronicus Palaeologus, Callimachus et Chrysorrhoe* 1064n, 1255, 1692 Pichard; *Phlorius et*

more its ancestry, is certified by the fact that it was already current from the Hellenistic period onwards: the corpus known as the “*Serapeum papyri*” preserves what is probably the earliest testimony of its use. I refer to the Epist. 39.4–6 Witkowski (Pap. Lond. [I] 28 of the British Library, c. 162 B.C.): *καλῶς οὖν ποίσης ἢ φροτίσαι μοι σιτάρι-λον*.¹³ We may assume, then, that the form in question was a vernacular one of the Koine;¹⁴ that following the Hellenistic period it survived during the Imperial times and Late Antiquity well into the Byzantine era.¹⁵ And finally, we are perhaps allowed to conclude that the original entry in the Cyril glossary was actually *ποίησῶ πρόξω*; this was later corrupted due to the lemma’s unusual form of the future tense, and finally interpolated into Hesychius.¹⁶

Platzia Phlora 892 al. Ortolá Salas; Belthandrus et Chrysantza 970, 1171 Egea; Libistrus et Rhodamne 2958 Agapitos; Chronicon Moreae (recensio II) 274, 2736, 4266 al. Schmitt. For the vernacular / learned character of these texts cf. G. C. Horrocks, *Greek: A History of the Language and Its Speakers*, Longman 1997, 205 ff.; R. Browning, *Medieval and Modern Greek*, Cambridge²1983, 73–75. This form of the future was also used in prose by Leontios Machairas, *Chronikon Kyprou*, p. 129, 133, 177, 355 al. Miller / Sathas. I would like here to thank Assistant Prof. Ms. E. Kinga for discussing with me the linguistic aspects of this phenomenon.

13) This collection of texts dates from the Hellenistic period onwards. For this specific epistle cf. S. Witkowski, *Epistulae privatae Graecae quae in papyris aetatis Lagidarum servantur*, Lipsiae 1911, (Part C) 73, with this scholar’s brief commentary; cf. also F. G. Kenyon, *Greek Papyri in the British Museum*, vol. I, London 1893, 43 (No. 28). However, other grammatical forms of the same verb, attesting the omission of vowels, appear in Attic inscriptions. See above, n. 10.

14) Such forms were certainly produced via the simplification of the sequence of two like vowels, probably associated with a regression of the accent if the first of the two vowels was stressed; cf. Horrocks (above, n. 12) 215: “*ἐποίηκα* [e’piika] «I made / did» (a new aorist built on the old perfect stem [...] > *ἐποίηκα* [(e’)pika] or *ἐποίκα* [’epika]”. It is interesting that the example Horrocks adduces concerns once more the verb *ποιεῖν*. In this case, however, the phenomenon in question belongs to later phonetic and phonological developments that took place from the seventeenth century onwards. Cf. also Browning (above, n. 12) 57 ff. Nevertheless, the form *ἐποίηκα* was used by the 15th cent. Leontios Machairas, *Chronikon Kyprou*, p. 128, 132, 210, 353 al. Miller / Sathas.

15) Experts generally accept that certain linguistic phenomena were first generated in the phase of the Koine, be it of the Hellenistic period or at least of Late Antiquity, and were later fully established in the stage of Medieval Greek; cf. G. Babiniotis, *Συνοπτικὴ ἱστορία τῆς ἐλληνικῆς γλώσσας*, Athens 1985, 156–158 (as regards especially the phonological changes of the vowels); Horrocks (above, n. 12) 205–216; Browning (above, n. 12) 29 ff., 53 ff.

16) For a similar case cf. the entry *ἦνῆρι*, transmitted in some MSS of the Cyril glossary, and Hesych. ν 447 *ἦνῆρη νόσοϛ†* (for the corruption of this gloss cf. C. Avgerinos, *RhM* 152 [2009] 99–101).

The phrase *παρὰ τοῖς παλαιοῖς* could refer to lexica such as the Cyril glossary, or even to Hesychius.¹⁷ In fact, the supposition that the latter served as Theognostus' source in his treatise on orthography was proposed by scholars such as Lobeck and Schmidt,¹⁸ but it was more recently decisively refuted.¹⁹ Therefore, the Cyril glossary, a known source of the *Περὶ ὀρθογραφίας*, is the origin of *ποιῶ* for both the Byzantine scholar as well as for Hesychius' lexicon.

π 2439 *πλάκα ἡλιακή(ν): τὴν ἀνατολικὴν γῆν ἢ *τὴν ἡλιακὴν (περιφέρειαν) A²³. πλάκα καὶ τὴν ὅλην χώραν, καὶ τὴν ἴκκοινην†, ἢ τὴν γῆν (Aesch. Prom. Solut.?)*

Schmidt's *κοιλίαν* for the transmitted *κοινήν*²⁰ seems readily supported by Hesych. π 2457 *πλάξ· ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ... ἢ πλάκας τὰς κοιλίας. καὶ ἡ γαστήρ H*. This editor's attempt would supposedly restore the corrupt part of π 2439 in the form *καὶ τὴν κοιλίαν, ἢ τὴν γῆν*, making this entry quite similar to what π 2457 attests. There is also some palaeographical resemblance that the words *κοιλίαν* and *κοινήν* share (KOILIAN: KOINHN). Nevertheless, I have several objections against Schmidt's conjecture. Being at some stage interpolated from the Cyril glossary, the gl. π 2439 is not the glossa ditto-grapha of π 2457. We should also take into account that in π 2457 the particle ἢ introduces the alternative, and to some extent synonymous, explanations *κοιλίας* and *γαστήρ*; both are totally irrelevant to the word *γῆ*, the first of the transmitted glossemata. On the contrary, in π 2439 Schmidt's suggestion would separate two conceptually relevant explanations (*πλάκα καὶ τὴν ὅλην χώραν ... ἢ τὴν γῆν*) inserting between them the glossema *κοιλίαν*. Perhaps, a dif-

17) On Theognostus' sources cf. K. Alpers, *Theognostos Περὶ ὀρθογραφίας. Überlieferung, Quellen und Text der Kanones 1–84*, Hamburg 1964, 27–60.

18) Cf. Alpers (above, n. 17) 28–30; also, R. Browning, *Hesychios, ODB II* (1991) 1221. If this opinion was valid, the existence of the same gloss (*ποιῶ*) in Hesychius and Theognostus would have made us accept that the former was interpolated by the Cyril glossary in the 9th cent. A.D., since the gloss originated in Cyril. We can assert that Hesychius was already interpolated by the early 10th century. Cf. Alpers (above, n. 9) XVIII, XX–XXI (with n. 29). See however the next note.

19) Alpers (above, n. 17) V, dismisses this opinion categorically (“Hesych ist nicht die lexikographische Quelle des Theognost”), using plenty of examples from the relevant sources; cf. Alpers (above, n. 17) 40 ff.

20) See his Hesych. III 240.

ferent arrangement of the transmitted words, as well as of the attempted κοιλίαν, would be more apposite, e. g. πλάκα καὶ τὴν ὄλην χώραν, ἢ τὴν γῆν. καὶ τὴν κοιλίαν.²¹ Furthermore, in π 2439 κοιλίαν has nothing to do with the rest of the entry. Actually, the lemma here is πλάκα ἡλιακὴν, and not πλάξ as in the gl. π 2457, something that renders the attempt κοιλίαν rather inapposite.²² Therefore, Schmidt's proposal does not seem to be convincing. On the other hand, Heinsius' οἰκουμένην is certainly preferable, although modern editors do not generally include the word in their notes.²³

I am inclined to regard the corruption as the product of misreading of commonly used abbreviations in the manuscripts. I refer to the transmitted κοινήν, considered corrupt by the editor; it is probable that the lexicographer recorded the adverb κοινῶς.²⁴ In this case, the following ἢ τὴν could be either a conscious 'correction', produced by someone who misread the text, or an addition; in the first case, I would attempt here λεγομένην. This would give to the text in question the form καὶ τὴν κοινῶς λεγομένην γῆν. On this line of thinking, the ἢ excepted would also restore sense in the interpretamentum (thus making one of the two τὴν a dittography). I would read, exempli gratia, the entry as: πλάκα ἡλιακὴν· τὴν ἀνατολικὴν γῆν ἢ τὴν ἡλιακὴν περιφέρειαν. πλάκα καὶ τὴν ὄλην χώραν, καὶ τὴν κοινῶς (λεγομένην) γῆν (vel καὶ κοινῶς τὴν γῆν vel καὶ τὴν κοινῶς γῆν).

π 2453 πλανῆται· ἀστέρες ἤτρεχουσιν ἐπισήμοις†. ἤτοι μετανάστ[ε]ραι
(e. g. Hos. 9,17)

The word ἀστέρες perhaps triggered the confusion in π 2453. This term (ἀστήρ) was sometimes invariably used both for the fixed stars as well as for the planets, cf. Ach. Tat. De univ. 18.10 Di Maria. As regards specifically the entry in question, its use is abundantly attest-

21) Cf. Phot. π 432.3 πλάκα· τὴν χώραν ἢ τὴν γαστέρα. See also the full note of Alberti, Hesych. II 970.

22) This is validated by Phot. π 432.1 πλάξ· καὶ ἡ γαστήρ καὶ τὸ ἐν τῷ πλάκωντι ῥύμμα.

23) With the exception of Alberti (above, n. 21).

24) This word appears six times in Hesychius, namely in α 2859 ἀλεκτρούνες· κοινῶς οἱ παλαιοὶ καὶ τὰς θηλείας ὄρνις οὕτως ἐκάλουσαν, γ 402 γεραραὶ· ἰέρειαι κοινῶς etc., ε 2170 ἐλλόπιδας· ... καὶ λέγει κοινῶς τοὺς νεβροὺς etc., η 309 ἡλικάτη· ... ἐνιοὶ δὲ κοινῶς τὰ γόνατα ἔχοντα etc., μ 1182 μῆλα· κοινῶς μὲν πάντα τὰ τετράποδα etc. L., π 2655 *πόα· ... καὶ κοινῶς τὸ ἀπὸ ρίζης φυλλοβολοῦν φυτόν H. Obviously, the last entry proves that the reading κοινῶς, if it actually ever existed in π 2453, could have been inserted by the Hesychian interpolator.

ed for the planets, starting with Aratus, Phaen. 454–5 οἱ δ' ἐπιμιξ ἄλλοι πέντ' ἀστέρες οὐδὲν ὁμοῖοι / πάντοθεν εἰδώλων δυοκαίδεκα (sc. the twelve signs of the Zodiac, the constellations) δινεύονται.²⁵ Concerning the part of the interpretamentum considered corrupt (τρέχουσιν ἐπισήμοις), the verb τρέχειν is regularly attributed to these celestial bodies. In fact, verbs of motion, sometimes implying the existence of a divine persona or personifying the πλανῆται, are often used by ancient mathematicians and astronomers / astrologers. Examples are abundant, but it may suffice here to quote only a few: ἀποκαθίστασθαι (Ach. Tat. De univ. 18.1.9–10 Di Maria ἀπὸ δὲ σημείου ἐπὶ σημείον ἀποκαθίσταται, cf. also 18.2.13–14); ἀφικνεῖσθαι (Autol. De ortibus et occasibus 2.6.29–30 Mogenet ἕως ἂν ὁ ἥλιος ἀφίκηται ἐπὶ τὸ ζ' σημείον); γίνεσθαι and παραγίνεσθαι (Autol. De ortibus et occasibus 2.6.31 Mogenet καὶ γενομένου [sc. τοῦ ἡλίου] ἐπὶ τὸ ζ' [sc. σημείον], and Ach. Tat. De univ. 18.2.12 Di Maria ὁ δὲ τοῦ Διὸς ἀστήρ ... παραγίνεται ἀπὸ ζῳδίου ἐπὶ ζῳδιον); δινεύεσθαι (Arat. Phaen. 455 πέντ' ἀστέρες οὐδὲν ὁμοῖοι | ... δινεύονται); περιέρχεσθαι²⁶ (Ach. Tat. De univ. 18.3.14–15 Di Maria ὁ δὲ τοῦ Ἄρεος περιέρχεται ... καὶ ἀπὸ σημείου ἐπὶ σημείον; cf. Astrologica De novem caelis, in: CCAG 12.108.34 Sangin); πορεύεσθαι (Autol. De ortibus et occasibus 2.6.20 Mogenet πορεύεται ὁ ἥλιος) and διαπορεύεσθαι (Astrologica De septem mundi aetatibus, in: CCAG 4.118.1 Cumont διαπορεύεται ἡ αὐτὴ Σελήνη ... ἀπὸ σημείου ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ σημείον); τρέχειν (Vett. Val. Anthol. 3.4.25 Kroll πότερον Ἥλιος ἢ [ἡ] Σελήνη ἢ ὠροσκόπος ... τρέχει; 3.4.30 ἐὰν δὲ τις τῶν ἀστέρων ... τρέχη; cf. 9.19.60 al.), ἀνατρέχειν (Cleom. Met. 1.2.63 Todd ἐπὶ τὸν βόρειον [sc. ζῳδιακόν] ἀνατρέχοντες [sc. οἱ λοιποὶ πλάνητες]; 1.2.67 ἀνατρέχοντες δὲ πάλιν; 1.3.84 ἐπὶ τὰ ὑψηλότερα τοῦ κόσμου ἀνατρέχων [sc. ὁ ἥλιος]; cf. 1.3.90), παρατρέχειν (Cleom. Met. 1.4 Todd).

Some of the above sources may help us deal with the corruption of π 2453. Beginning with the problematic ἐπισήμοις I suspect that the original entry read here ἐπὶ σημεία.²⁷ Cf. Ach. Tat. De univ.

25) Cf. Pl. Epin. 987b–c; see also the relevant text of Ach. Tat. De univ. 17.1–2, and 18.1 Di Maria ὁ τοῦ Κρόνου ἀστήρ.

26) The verb περιτένειν is mostly used concerning the revolving periods of the year (cf. Hdt. 4.155, 2.4; Th. 1.30), whereas περιέρχεσθαι is used for the heavenly bodies or the sky (cf. Pl. Ti. 39c; Arist. Cael. 272b14).

27) Along with μετανάσται (for the μετανάσται transmitted in the Marcianus gr. 622) Musurus corrected the word to ἐπίσημοι.

18.1.9–10 and 18.3.14–15; Autol. De ortibus et occasibus 2.6.29–30 and 2.6.31; Astrologica De septem mundi aetatibus, in: CCAG 4.118.1. We should probably disregard the supposition that the transmitted ἀστέρες and ἐπισήμοις is the product of corruption of the terminus technicus ἐπίσημος ἀστήρ. One should take into account that the locution ἐπίσημος ἀστήρ was attributed to the bright chief star of a constellation (cf. LSJ⁹ s.v. ἀστήρ).²⁸ Since it invariably refers to the ἀπλανεῖς ἀστέρες, its use for the planets would be totally inapt here. Most probably, the word ἐπισήμοις is one's attempt to 'correct' the unintelligible ἐπὶ σημεία; in this case, the corruption was actually facilitated, through mental predisposition, by the existence of the locution ἐπίσημος ἀστήρ in relevant texts. Probably, something fell out of the text thus triggering a series of mental associations that corrupted the entry.

Among several approaches concerning τρέχουσιν, Bielius' τρέχοντες could offer a satisfactory meaning only combined with the reading ἐπὶ σημεία proposed here:²⁹ the entry would thus read πλανῆται· ἀστέρες τρέχοντες ἐπὶ σημεία etc. But in this case the corruption would be difficult to explain, since the text makes good sense. Probably, we should also disagree with Schmidt: "confundi videtur πλάνητες et πλανήταις, nec opus est ἀστράσι corrigatur."³⁰ This is an intelligent remark, but its acceptance would lead us to the consideration of the alteration of the case of almost all of the transmitted words into the dative. Although this is supported by the 'corrupt' τρέχουσιν ἐπισήμοις and would be easy to accept for πλανῆται (πλανήταις → πλανῆται), it would be rather forced in the case of ἀστέρες and μετανάσται. Furthermore, this line of thinking is based on the corrupt part of the entry, something that renders all further inferences less reliable.

Without tampering with the transmitted τρέχουσιν, I would attempt here πλανῆται· ἀστέρες (οἱ) τρέχουσιν ἐπὶ σημεία. ἤτοι μετανάσται. The reading οἱ τρέχουσιν ἐπὶ σημεία makes the confusion

28) Not connected at all with the terminus technicus ἐπισημαίνειν. On the ἐπίσημος ἀστήρ cf. Gemin. 3.9.4 Aujac; Jo. Lydus, Ost. 15.2 Wachsmuth; Scholia in Arat. 336.2 Martin; Ptol. Phaseis 2.424 Heiberg; Porph. Introductio in Tetrabibulum Ptolemaei, in: CCAG 5.4.193.9, 5.4.195.6 Boer / Weinstock.

29) Alberti, Hesych. II 972; Hansen, Hesych. III 120.

30) Schmidt, Hesych. III 340. On the locution πλάνητες ἀστέρες cf. X. Mem. 4.7.5, Arist. Mete. 342b28, Cael. 290a19.

readily explicable: probably, first the οὐ fell out of the text, thus rendering the rest of the interpretamentum incoherent. The original ἐπὶ σημεῖα was then erroneously ‘corrected’ to ἐπισήμοις in one’s attempt to make it grammatically compatible with τρέχουσιν. As mentioned above, a psychological predisposition, concerning the locution ἐπίσημος ἀστήρ, is not to be excluded.

The whole entry, but mostly the glossema μετανάσται, seems to indicate that π 2453 is related to the Aratean *Phaenomena*, having no special relevance to Hos. 9.17. In the extant Greek literature this term was used solely by Aratus in the same context as the word ἀστέρες mentioned above.³¹ Therefore, the rarity of μετανάσται makes its use as a glossema rather problematic, as regards the planets:³² the term needs also to be glossed. Nevertheless, we should not be too ready to discredit it, given the loss of a huge part of the Ancient Greek literary production. Since Hesychius was once epitomized, it is also possible that more words, apart from the proposed here <οῖ>, are missing in the transmitted text.

π 2462 πλάστιγγι· ἥισχιά† (Aesch. Cho. 290? Plat. rep. 550e?)

Hansen is uncertain regarding the locus classicus. Actually, Aesch. Cho. 290 and / or Plat. Rep. 550e can only with reservation be taken as relevant to this entry. As transmitted, the dative of the lemma could indicate that the lexicographer had an actual passage in mind;³³ at the same time, the glossema is incoherent to the lemma,

31) See Arat. Phaen. 454–461. This was a renowned (and therefore appealing) part of the poem referring to the poet’s ‘refusal’ to describe the erratic movements of the planets. Cf. M. Erren, *Die Phaenomena des Aratos von Soloi: Untersuchungen zum Sach- und Sinnverständnis*, Wiesbaden 1967, 154–158; J. Almirall, *Arat. Fenòmens*, Barcelona 1996, 136; D. A. Kidd, *Aratus Phaenomena*, Cambridge 1997, 343, 346; J. Martin, *Aratos. Phénomènes*, vol. II, Paris 1998, 331–332; R. Hunter, *Written in the Stars: Poetry and Philosophy in the Phaenomena of Aratus*, *Arachnion* 2 (1995) 1–34 (here: 8); C. Fakas, *Der Hellenistische Hesiod: Arats Phaenomena und die Tradition der antiken Lehrepik*, Wiesbaden 2001, 70. Cf. Hyg. 4.8.2; Avienus, *Phaen.* 927–929. On the need to describe the movements of the planets, a theme that puzzled ancient astronomers for religious purposes (see Kidd, *ibid.*), cf. Pl. Ti. 38c, Leg. 821b–822c.

32) The word is regularly applied to persons, cf. LSJ⁹ s.v. μετανάστης, I.

33) In certain cases, the lexicographer lemmatized entries changing the case of the locus classicus, as in δ 170, 2618, ξ 110, ρ 559 etc. For this phenomenon in Hesychius cf. F. Bossi / R. Tosi, *Strutture lessicografiche grece*, BIFG 5 (1979–1980) 7–20 (here: 8 and 13).

and therefore evidently corrupt.³⁴ Though I do not entirely agree with Schmidt's supposition that ἰσχία belongs to the preceding "π[λ]αστηρία· (σ)πλάγχνια",³⁵ his attempt might have a bearing on π 2462; I will comment on this below. In my opinion, the entry initially recorded here was πλάστιγγι (vel πλάστιγγ'): ζυγίους, gleaned from the Scholia vetera in Aristoph. Ranas 1378 Chantry παρὰ τῷ πλάστιγγ': παρὰ τοῖς νῦν λεγομένοις ζυγίους.³⁶ Given the original form of the word in Aristophanes and the Scholia, the lexicographer could actually have recorded either the original dual πλάστιγγ' or the dative πλάστιγγι transmitted in the Marcianus gr. 622. Accepting the first alternative would mean that, besides the glossema, the lemma is also corrupt. In this case, the original entry would be πλάστιγγ' glossed by ζυγίους; this would be gradually corrupted to πλάστιγγι,³⁷ thus triggering the glossema's confusion that led to the transmitted ἰσχία. On the other hand, the lexicographer could have written πλάστιγγι taken over from the afore-mentioned Scholia; in fact, a witness of this last text's manuscript tradition attests here the dative instead of the correct dual (παρὰ τῷ πλάστιγγι· etc.).³⁸ It is actually not uncommon to have in Hesychius entries that either their lemmata or their glossemata attest an anomalous form that goes back to a certain locus classicus.³⁹ Therefore, π 2462

34) However, since we cannot be certain regarding the locus classicus, one could readily consider that things might as well be the other way round: namely, to accept that the glossema is sound and assume that the confusion is to be found in πλάστιγγι.

35) See Schmidt's note (Hesych. III 341): "Separavi. ἰσχία ad 61 pertinere videtur; nescio an ex ἐντόσθια, κοιλία corruptum." Cf. also Hansen, Hesych. III 121: [πλαστηρία· πλάγχνια]. According to Hansen, this entry is the "v.l. gl. 1086" (παστήρια· σπλάγχνα. τὰ ἐντοσθίδια. κοιλία).

36) On the close relation between Scholia and Lexica cf. Bossi / Tosi (above, n. 33) 8 and 13.

37) Though tentative, we shouldn't entirely exclude that someone misunderstood the apostrophe (ἀπόστροφος) for a iota (ι), even in the uncial stage of the text. On this sign in Greek writing cf. E. M. Thompson, A Handbook of Greek and Latin Palaeography, London 1901 (repr. Chicago 1966, 1975), 72–73.

38) The variant is attested specifically in cod. M (Ambrosianus gr. L 39 sup., catalog. 479), a manuscript that contains the so-called 'Byzantine triad' of Aristophanes. Cf. M. Chantry (ed.), Prolegomena, in: Scholia vetera in Aristophanis Plutum, Groningen 1994, xvi. The lemma was prone to confusion; cf. Scholia Tzetzae in Aristoph. Ranas 1378 Koster τῷ πλάστιγγε (sic): πλάστιγγές εἰσι etc. (see the editor's note ad loc.).

39) Cf. e.g. Hesych. α 2200 αἶχματα (i. e. ἔχματα, cf. Hymn. Merc. 37 v.l. αἶχμα), α 3893 ἀμφ' Ἀκίριος ροάς (cf. Archil. fr. 22,2 W. ἀμφι Σίριος ροάς), α 4959

could belong to this certain type of glosses which were lemmatized based on erroneous or approximate readings.⁴⁰ Moreover, this approach makes the mechanism of the corruption readily explainable. Probably, this began in the uncial (ΠΛΑΚΤΙΓΓΙ·ΖΥΓΙΟΙΣ), when someone misread the zeta (Z) of ζυγίους as a sigma (C)⁴¹ and joined it to the adjacent iota (I) of the lemma πλάστιγγι, thus duplicating this certain letter. At the same time he also misread the following upsilon (Y) as X. He thus produced the form ICXΓΙΟΙΣ, and from that point on he easily arrived at ἰσχία (ΠΛΑΚΤΙΓΓΙ·ICXΓΙ·ΟΙΣ→ΠΛΑΚΤΙΓΓΙ·ICXΙΑ). I would suspect a psychological predisposition caused by the preceding entry,⁴² meaning that the visual confusion was aided by the glossemata the scribe's mind had kept from the previous line.

At any rate, in grammatical texts and Scholia the word πλάστιγγιξ was occasionally taken as a synonym of ζυγός: cf. *Lex. in carmina Greg. Naz.* (e cod. Paris. Coislin. 394) π 97 Κalamakis πλάστιγγα· τὸν ζυγόν etc., π 105 Κ. πλάστιγγα· δίκην, ζυγόν; *Scholia et glossae in Sophoclis Ajacem 249a* Christodoulou (ζυγόν:) ζυγός σημαίνει τρία· τὴν πλάστιγγα etc.; *Scholia in Orpiani Halieutica 1.734.6–7* Bussemaker καὶ ζυγός ἐστὶν ὁ τῶν βοῶν ... καὶ ἡ τῆς πλάστιγγος etc.⁴³ As regards specifically the Hesychian gloss, it will

*ἀνέρσει (cf. Thuc. 1.6.3 ἐνέρσει, v.l. ἀνέρσει) etc. The paradigms are taken over from Bossi / Tosi (above, n. 33) 13–14, who cite more examples.

40) Bossi / Tosi (above, n. 33) 13.

41) With the term 'uncial' I do not refer to the style known as 'Biblical', but rather to the 'plain sloping hand' or to the so-called 'Coptic-type uncial'. Especially the second was more current and had the tendency to join letters together. Cf. R. Barbour, *Greek Literary Hands. A.D. 400–1600*, Oxford 1981, xvi–xviii. If the zeta (Z) found in his prototype was written with its lower horizontal stroke elongated, more vertical and descending from left to right, and with a small upper horizontal line, then it could perhaps resemble a sigma (C). Moreover, the diagonal line descending from right to left sometimes does not reach the baseline, making the letter look like an angular sigma. For such a specimen cf. G. Cavallo / H. Maehler, *Greek Bookhands of the Early Byzantine Period (BICS Suppl. 47)*, London 1987, 82–83 (pl. 37), a late 6th cent. example of the 'Alexandrian majuscule'. The letter sigma (C) occasionally exhibits a ligature with the following letter (cf. Cavallo / Maehler 14 [pl. 4a, 4b]), something that could also contribute to the scribe's confusion.

42) See above and n. 35.

43) Cf. also *Lex. in carmina Greg. Naz.* π 106 Κal. πλάστιγγι· φιάλη ζυγοῦ; *Scholia in Nicandri Theriaca 651a* Crugnola πλάστιγγιξ δὲ τὸ τοῦ ζυγοῦ, ἦτοι στάθμης, μέρος, and 651b *πλάστιγγα· πλάστιγγιξ ἡ τοῦ ζυγίου χύτρα; *Scholia Tzetzae in Aristoph. Nubes 1073a2–3* Holwerda περὶ δὲ πλάστιγγα τοῦ ζυγοῦ.

have to remain uncertain whether the lexicographer originally recorded here the correct *πλάστιγγ'*,⁴⁴ which a later scribe turned into the attested dative, or if he wrote the erroneous⁴⁵ *πλάστιγγι* found in his authority (that would thus belong to the tradition of Ambrosianus gr. L 39 sup.). The transmitted *πλάστιγγι* should be retained, whether the lexicographer followed here the erratic tradition of the Scholia or whether he introduced the dative himself. Either way, the locus classicus of π 2462 is in my opinion the Schol. vet. in Aristoph. *Ranas* 1378.

Ioannina

Charilaos E. Avgerinos

44) On this reading's soundness cf. Scholia vetera in Aristoph. *Ranas* 1378c Chantry: τὸ πλάστιγγ'] τὸ σχῆμα ἀττικόν, ὡς «τὸ χεῖρε» καὶ «νὴ τὸ σιῶ».

45) Obviously, the terms 'correct' and 'erroneous' refer exclusively to the textual tradition of the Scholia vetera in Aristophanem.