

fol. 54r = *Math.* 1.10.14, followed by 1.5.6–11 and then by 1.2.2–3; fol. 54v = *Math.* 1.2.3–8, followed by 1.1.1.<sup>3</sup>

The reference to Socrates at the outset of the text (*uir diuinae sapientiae Socrates docuit nos ut confirmata animi nostri diuinitate ex aliqua parte stellarum uiolenti decreto et earum potestatibus res<is>tamus. nam cum quidam [...]*, a free reworking of *Math.* 1.6.2–3) likely accounts for its spurious attribution, given the presence of comparable expressions in *De deo Socratis* 17.1 and 19.2 (*Socrates, uir apprime perfectus*) and the fortunes of Apuleius' philosophical works in Northern Europe, probably stimulated by the abundant references to the *philosophica* in Augustine.<sup>4</sup> Therefore, the *De fato* may now be added to the list of Apuleius' pseudepigrapha.<sup>5</sup>

University of Bristol

LEONARDO COSTANTINI

[eu20184@bristol.ac.uk](mailto:eu20184@bristol.ac.uk)

doi:10.1017/S0009838821000550

## AN EMENDATION IN HESYCHIUS π 196\*

### ABSTRACT

*The entry π 196 of Hesychius is textually corrupt. This note challenges the traditional way of explaining the corruption and emending the text, which goes back to Marcus Musurus (1514), and replaces it with a simpler and more economical approach.*

**Keywords:** Hesychius; lexicon of Cyril; textual criticism; ancient Greek lexicography; ancient Greek scholarship

<sup>3</sup> These different sections of the *Mathesis* in fols. 54r and 54v are introduced by enlarged capitals in red or blue ink.

<sup>4</sup> Text and paragraph subdivision of *De deo Socratis* after G. Magnaldi, *Apulei opera philosophica* (Oxford, 2020). On the medieval circulation of Apuleius' *philosophica*, see Reynolds (n. 1), 16–18; R. Klibansky and F. Regen, *Die Handschriften der philosophischen Werke des Apuleius. Ein Beitrag zur Überlieferungsgeschichte* (Göttingen, 1993), 46–52; R.H.F. Carver, *The Protean Ass. The Metamorphoses of Apuleius from Antiquity to the Renaissance* (Oxford, 2007), 59–60. For Apuleius' presence in Augustine's works, see H. Hagendahl, *Augustine and the Latin Classics*, 2 vols. (Göteborg, 1967), 1.17–28, 2.680–7.

<sup>5</sup> For a handy overview, see S.J. Harrison, *Apuleius. A Latin Sophist* (Oxford, 2000, repr. with rev. 2008), 13–14 and n. 57. To this list we may add a spurious prognostic text transmitted under the title *Sphaera Apulei Platonici de uita et morte*, or *Ratio sphaerae Pythagorae philosophi quam Apuleius descripsit*, on which see R.M. Liuzza, 'The sphere of life and death: time, medicine, and the visual imagination', in K. O'Brien O'Keefe and A. Orchard (edd.), *Latin Learning and English Lore*, 2 vols. (Toronto, 2005), 2.28–52; L.S. Chardonnens, *Anglo-Saxon Prognostics, 900–1100* (Leiden, 2007), 181–222.

\* Ian C. Cunningham, Georgios A. Christodoulou, *CQ*'s anonymous reader and *CQ*'s editor Bruce Gibson helped me to improve this note. I thank them all.

Hesych. π 196:

\*παλινδ[ε]νία: [πάλιν γεννήσαι] ἢ ἐξ ὑποστροφῆς ὑδάτων A<sup>52</sup>

παλινδεινία H = A: HSt. | πάλιν γεννήσαι H = A: del. Mus. | ἢ H = A: Mus.

παλινδ[ε]νία (means) ['begetting again'] '(the eddy that is formed) from the turning of water backwards'

The above are Hansen's text and a revised version of his critical apparatus.<sup>1</sup> The translation is mine.<sup>2</sup>

The gloss derives from Cyril,<sup>3</sup> and it is already corrupt in MS A (Vallicellianus E 11, early tenth century), which is the only one of the principal Cyrillic manuscripts to include it. What is the original version of this gloss?

Musurus,<sup>4</sup> Hesychius' first editor, deleted πάλιν γεννήσαι and changed ἦ to ἡ: παλινδεινία: ἡ ἐξ ὑποστροφῆς ὑδάτων. His assumption seems to have been that in this gloss two separate notes had become mixed up at some point in the transmission, that is, that πάλιν γεννήσαι is an intrusion from elsewhere.<sup>5</sup> His approach has been adopted by all subsequent editors (J. Alberti, N. Schow, M. Schmidt, P.A. Hansen), while recently Ch. Avgerinos, rightly I think, finds the ellipsis in the *interpretamentum* rather awkward, and adds the noun δίνη to Musurus's text: παλινδινία. <δίνη> ἡ ἐξ ὑποστροφῆς ὑδάτων or παλινδινία. ἡ ἐξ ὑποστροφῆς ὑδάτων <δίνη>.<sup>6</sup> He compares such entries as Hesych. π 191 παλινάγγελος ὁ ἐξ ὑποστροφῆς ἄγγελος, etc.; π 205 παλινδία (*sic pro* παλινδικία) ἡ ἐξ ὑποστροφῆς λεγομένη δίκη; π 225 \*παλιώξις ἡ ἐξ ὑποστροφῆς διωξις; cf. also Hesych. π 198 παλινδικία ἡ ἐξ ἄρχῆς δίκη.

<sup>1</sup> P.A. Hansen (ed.), *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*, vol. 3: Π–Σ (Berlin and New York, 2005). Hansen misattributes the deletion of πάλιν γεννήσαι to Salmasius and omits the information in relation to ἦ in A. In this note I follow the practice of modern editors of Hesychius in placing an asterisk before Hesychian glosses that were interpolated from Cyril's lexicon: see Hansen (this note), xxv with n. 1.

<sup>2</sup> It is not absolutely clear what the lexicographer means by this explanation. I assume that he means that a παλινδ[ε]νία, i.e. second eddy or new eddy, is that eddy which is formed from the rotating of water in the opposite direction, and not in the same direction as the initial eddy. Of course, it is too much to expect from ancient lexicographers to have our state of knowledge in relation to the direction of the rotation in eddies.

<sup>3</sup> On Hesychius' interpolation from Cyril, see K. Alpers, 'Corrigenda et addenda to Latte's prolegomena to *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon* vol. I: A–Δ', in P.A. Hansen (ed.), *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*, vol. 3: Π–Σ (Berlin and New York, 2005), xviii–xix.

<sup>4</sup> *Ἡσυχίου Λεξικόν*, *Hesychii Dictionarium* (Venice, 1514), col. 570.

<sup>5</sup> Later critics elaborated on Musurus's assumption, speculating on the origins of πάλιν γεννήσαι: e.g. N. Schow, *Hesychii Lexicon ex codice ms. Bibliothecae D. Marci restitutum et ab omnibus Musuri correctionibus repurgatum sive Supplementa ad editionem Hesychii Albertinam* (Leipzig, 1792), 612 n. 10 notes: 'infinitivum πάλιν γεννήσαι paralipomenis ex margine accensendum videtur. Male huc inductum fuit, nam ex serie vocem παλινδεές praecedere debebat.' See also Ch. Avgerinos, 'Hesych. π 143, 145, 167, 660, 1132, 1515 Hansen', *ΒΕΛΛΑ. Επιστημονική Επετηρίδα* 8 (2017–19), 225–47, at 236 (by an oversight Avgerinos fails to include '196' in the title of his chapter). G.A. Christodoulou (*per litteras*) refers the *interpretamentum* to a lost lemma πάλιν φυτεύσαι, comparing e.g. Hesych. φ 1069 φυτεύει κατασκευάζει. γεννᾷ; schol. (vet.) Eur. *Or.* 11.03 Mastronarde (φυτεύει): ἀντι τοῦ γεννᾷ, μεταφορικῶς ἀπὸ τῶν δένδρων. Such attempts unavoidably take speculation a long way.

<sup>6</sup> J. Alberti (ed.), *Ἡσυχίου Λεξικόν*, *Hesychii Lexicon*, 2 vols. (Leiden, 1746–66); M. Schmidt (ed.), *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*, 5 vols. (Jena, 1858–68); Schow (n. 5); Hansen (n. 1); Avgerinos (n. 5), 236 with n. 40.

However, the required meaning, as reflected in Avgerinos's text, can be obtained by less drastic and less complicated textual changes. The traditional hypothesis of the conflation of two distinct notes is unnecessary; we can treat the text more economically as a *single* gloss. We can also dispense with Avgerinos's addition of δίνη. I suggest that the original version of this gloss was as follows:

παλινδεινία: <τό> πάλιν δεινήσαι [ἦ] ἐξ ὑποστροφῆς ὑδάτων.

παλινδεινία (means) 'whirling about again [or] owing to the turning of water backwards'.

A few remarks are required in relation to the new constitution of the text: (i) The explanation of a noun through an articular infinitive is well attested both in the Cyrillic and in the non-Cyrillic glosses of Hesychius: for example α 3258 ἄλουσία· τὸ μὴ λούεσθαι. καὶ ἰάλουτεῖν ὁμοίως; α 3721 \*ἀμνηστία τὸ μὴ μμνήσκεσθαι; δ 2737 \*δωροδοκία τὸ λαβεῖν ἢ δοῦναι δῶρα; ε 6561 \*έτεροδοξία τὸ ἄλλως δοξάζειν ἤπερ ἔχει ἢ ἀλήθεια; π 199 \*παλιγγενεσία· τὸ ἐκ δευτέρου ἀναγεννηθῆναι ἢ ἀνακαινισθῆναι; π 2529 πλεονεξία τὸ πλεον τοῦ δέοντος ἔκτινος λαμβάνειν. (ii) δεινήσαι is here intransitive; see LSJ s.v. δινεύω II. (iii) It is not necessary to follow Henricus Stephanus<sup>7</sup> in correcting παλινδεινία to παλινδινία (or δεινήσαι to δινῆσαι), since the forms with epsilon iota (δειν-) are as common as those with iota (διν-) in Cyril and/or Hesychius: for example Hesych. δ 494 \*δεῖναι αἱ τῶν ὑδάτων συστροφαί; δ 496 \*δείνας κινήσεις ...; δ 497 δεινεύει κυκλεύει; δ 499 \*δείνη συστροφή; δ 501 δεινήσιν κινήσιν ...; δ 517; δ 518. Examples of forms with iota include: Hesych. δ 1849 \*δίνη· συστροφή ὑδάτων; δ 1852 δίνεον· ἔστρεφον ...; δ 1853; δ 1854 \*δινήεντος [τὸ] συστροφᾶς τῶν ρευμάτων ἔχοντος; δ 1856 \*δινήσας στρέψας ...; ε 476; ε 477; ε 478.

With regard to the mechanism of corruption: it is easy for the article τό to have fallen out. For example, in interpolating the glosses α 4865, α 7301, ε 7202 from Cyril, the copyists of Hesychius failed to reproduce this tiny word. The loss of τό has also affected Hesych. ε 1318; κ 2003; κ 3202; κ 4074; ρ 243, etc. The remainder of the transmitted gloss is a product of a two-stage corruption: the original δεινήσαι was changed to the much commoner γεννήσαι<sup>8</sup> and the ἦ was then added to distinguish the two unrelated explanations.

University of Cyprus

GEORGIOS A. XENIS

[gxenis@ucy.ac.cy](mailto:gxenis@ucy.ac.cy)

doi:10.1017/S0009838821000331

<sup>7</sup> *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae*, 1.1572, col. 1019, section g.

<sup>8</sup> The two words differ only in a couple of letters; the corruption may also have been facilitated by the *potential* immediate context in which the παλινδεινία was originally placed in Cyril: was it near e.g. παλιγγενεσία? We have no means to answer this question.