

Eight More Conjectures on the *Cyranides*¹

DAVID BAIN

The text of the *Cyranides*² urgently requires re-editing. This is not just because of the technical inadequacies of the current edition, which was produced in 1976 by Dimitris Kaimakis.³ Important new material has become available since then in the shape of a Venetian manuscript (M), which contains several new chapters, additions to the chapters already known and also in many places interesting alternatives to the existing text.⁴ The problems for the editor are not exactly the same as those which confront the editor of, say, Galen. There can be no question of restoring or seeking to restore the *ipsissima verba* of a single author. The *Cyranides* is a compilation of a compilation of a compilation⁵ and it is therefore somewhat hazardous⁶ to make regularising emendations based upon observation of linguistic usage within the work. In addition, the *Cyranides* is the kind of

¹ Cf. D. Bain, "An Emendation in the *Cyranides* (2. 45. 6 Kaimakis)," *Sileno* 19 (1993) 383–85 and "Περγύινεσθαι as a Medical Term and a Conjecture in the *Cyranides*," in H. Hine, D. Innes and C. Pelling (eds.), *Ethics and Rhetoric* (Oxford 1995). Professors J. N. Adams and C. A. Faraone kindly read and commented on an earlier draft of this article. I am extremely grateful to them and also to Professor K.-D. Fischer, who located for me the paper by Kroll referred to in note 22 and sent me a copy.

² The *Cyranides*, despite its notoriety in the middle ages (see, for example, D. M. Nicol, *Church and Society in the Last Centuries of Byzantium* [Cambridge 1979] 102 f.), remains an obscure work and has largely been neglected by scholars working in the fields to which it relates. The article on the *Cyranides* in Pauly–Wissowa is out of date and in some respects misleading. I am at present engaged in preparing an entry for the *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* which will appear under the title "Koeranides." In the meantime, see my paper, "'Treading Birds': An Unnoticed Use of πατέω (*Cyranides*, 1. 10. 27, 1. 19. 9)," in E. M. Craik (ed.), "Owls to Athens": *Essays on Classical Subjects Presented to Sir Kenneth Dover* (Oxford 1990) 295–304.

³ D. Kaimakis, *Die Kyraniden*, Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 76 (Meisenheim am Glan 1976).

⁴ See A. Meschini, "Le Ciranidi nel Marc. Gr. 512," in *Atti dell'Accademia Pontaniana* 31 (Naples 1983) 145–77; see also D. Bain, "Marcianus Graecus 512 (678) and the Text of the *Cyranides*: Some Preliminary Observations," *RFIC* 121 (1993) 427–49 and "Some Unpublished Cyranidean Material in Marc. Gr. 512 (678): Three Addenda to Meschini," *ZPE* 104 (1994) 36–42.

⁵ See K. Alpers, "Untersuchungen zum griechischen Physiologus und den Kyraniden," *Vestigia Bibliae: Jahrbuch des Deutschen Bibel-Archivs Hamburg* 6 (1984) 13–87, 17 ff.

⁶ But not necessarily misconceived. Much of the work consists of highly formulaic recipes comparable to (and sometimes actually derived from) those found in Dioscurides and the pharmacologists quoted by Galen.

text which copyists felt free to tamper with by adding recipes and rephrasing existing ones.⁷ The principal activity of the editor will not lie in the field of emendation. He will be concerned more with problems of organization, with making decisions about orthography, with disentangling the various different versions of the work and endeavouring to present an apparatus more orderly and less unhelpful than that which is to be found in Kaimakis (cf. note 37). Nevertheless there are places where the transmitted text in one or more or all of the various branches of the tradition is demonstrably corrupt or at least questionable and where it is necessary for the editor to resort to conjecture. I discuss some of these below. Not all of my suggestions are intended for advancement further than the apparatus criticus of any future edition. The starting point on each occasion is either the text printed by Kaimakis (referred to by his book and chapter numbers and the line-number of the page on which the passage appears and sometimes tacitly corrected or repunctuated by me) or, with regard to the new material from Marc. Gr. 512, that of Anna Meschini. In the latter case, “M” is added to the reference (where more than one passage appears under that numeration I have added an “a” or “b” etc.). The Latin translation is cited by page and line number from Delatte (see note 21). For a description of the manuscripts of the *Cyranides*, the reader is referred to the introduction to Kaimakis’s edition and to my article in *RFIC* (see note 4), where I provide additional detail and bibliography. Anna Meschini has promised a complete collation of M, which is yet to appear. In the meantime I have made my own collation with the aid of photographs and from time to time I refer to the readings of M in passages not edited by Meschini. Where I do not cite M verbatim I make use of two symbols: “+M” indicates that M agrees with Kaimakis’s text; “+M*” indicates that M lends support to the reading of the text quoted but does not display exact verbal correspondence.

I. 2. 2. 33 f.

ὄδοϋς δὲ ἀλώπεκος περιαφθεῖς ἐσχάρας ὠφελεῖ καὶ παῖδας ἀνωδύνως ὀδοντοφυεῖ.

Recipes for (painless) teething are fairly common in the work and the verb regularly employed in them with reference to the condition of the infant is ὀδοντοφυεῖν: τῆς οὖν ρίζης τῆς βοτάνης μετὰ λίθου τοῦ ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς τοῦ ἰχθύος περιάπτε ἐν ράκει πρὸς ὀδύνας τῶν ὀδοντοφουσύντων παίδων (1. 22. 17–18); πώλου δὲ ὁ πρῶτος πεσῶν ὄδοϋς εὐρεθεῖς ἐν τῇ φάτνῃ καὶ περιαφθεῖς παιδίῳ ἀνωδύνως ποιεῖ ὀδοντοφυῆσαι (2. 24 [b] M); ὁ

⁷ Such texts have been categorised by Robert Halleux as “textes vivants” (see R. Halleux and J. Schamp, *Les lapidaires grecs* [Paris 1985] xvi). Compare also M. L. West, *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique* (Stuttgart 1973) 12 f.

ἐγκέφαλος περιτριβόμενος ὠφελεῖ ὀδοντοφυοῦσι παιδίοις (3. 34. 7 f. +M); τούτου οἱ ὀδόντες φοροῦμενοι ἀνωδύνως ποιοῦσιν ὀδοντοφυεῖν τὰ παιδιά (4. 3. 2 f.); οἱ δὲ ὀδόντες αὐτοῦ περιαιπτόμενοι παισὶν ὀδοντοφυοῦσιν ἀρμόδιοι (4. 15. 8 f. +M); τῆς οὖν ζυραίνης οἱ ὀδόντες ἀρμόζουσιν ὀδοντοφυοῦσιν παιδίοις περιαιπθέντες (4. 20. 8 f. [τούτου οἱ ὀδόντες ἀρμόδιοι τοῖς ὀδοντοφυοῦσι παιδίοις περιαιπθέντες M]); καὶ ὀδοντοφυοῦσι παιδίοις ἀρμόδιοι (sc. οἱ μάργαροι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν) (4. 39. 7 f. +M*); τούτου οἱ ὀδόντες παισὶν ὀδοντοφυοῦσι περιαιπτόμενοι ἀνωδύνως φύονται καὶ πᾶσαν ὀδονταλγίαν περιαιπτόμενοι ἰῶνται (4. 59. 2–3). Here, however, apparently we have a transitive/causative use.⁸ Ostensibly there is a parallel for this in the chapter on the eagle (2. 1. 10): οἱ δὲ ὀδόντες ὀδονταλγίαν καὶ περιαιπθέντες παιδίοις ἀνωδύνως ὀδοντοφυοῦσιν.⁹ But this is just as likely to be an anacoluthon (cf. below) so that there exists no secure parallel for the transitive use of the verb in this work.¹⁰

Instead of the indicative ὀδοντοφυεῖ five manuscripts have the infinitive ὀδοντοφυεῖν.¹¹ This suggests the existence of a version which

⁸ Compare the use of τριχοφυεῖν at 2. 24. 28, registered as new by G. Panayiotou, “Paralipomena Lexicographica Cyranidea,” *JCS* 15 (1990) 295–338, 324: αἱ δὲ τρίχες αὐτοῦ καυθεῖσαι καὶ λειωθεῖσαι καὶ ἐπιπασθεῖσαι τοῖς πυρκαύστοις ἔλκεσι καθαρὰν οὐλὴν ἐμποιοῦσι καὶ τριχοφυοῦσι (contrast 3. 19. 3 M, μυῖται κεκαυμένα μετ’ ἀκράτου <καὶ> μερῶν δύο μέλιτος λείαι ψιλοῦς τόπους τριχοφυεῖν ἀναγκάζουσιν, and 4. 55. 5 [not indexed by Kaimakis] τοῦτο καὲν καὶ λειοτριβηθὲν μετὰ ἱρίνου μύρου ἄλωπεκίας τριχοφυεῖν ἀναγκάζει).

⁹ Ὄδοντοφυοῦσιν IODN: ὀδοντοφυήσουσιν WKS: ὀδόντας φύουσιν AGHF. R has a different phraseology, in which ὀδοντοφυοῦσιν functions as a participle: ὀδοντοφυοῦσιν περιαιπθέντες ἀνωδύνως φύειν ποιοῦσιν. A passage similar to 2. 1. 10 is found at 4. 59. 2 f. τούτου οἱ ὀδόντες παισὶν ὀδοντοφυοῦσι περιαιπτόμενοι ἀνωδύνως φύονται (οἱ τῶν παίδων ὀδόντες L) καὶ πᾶσαν ὀδονταλγίαν περιαιπτόμενοι ἰῶνται, where again I would think in terms of an anacoluthon, although the coordination with ἰῶνται might be thought to make this more difficult. The Latin unusually is rather far from the Greek here and does not settle the matter: “synagridos dentes facit ad ortum dentium et ad omnem dolorem dentium” (199. 2 f.). Clearly de Mély takes φύονται as causative when he translates, “ses dents, suspendues au cou des enfants qui font leurs dents, les font sortir sans douleur et guérissent tous les maux de dents” (F. de Mély, *Les lapidaires de l’antiquité et du moyen âge* III [Paris 1902] 135). For the normal use of φύεσθαι in the work, compare ταύτης τὸ αἶμα ἐὰν ἐπιχρίσῃς προεκτίλας τὰς τῶν βλεφάρων τρίχας, οὐκέτι ἄλλαι φυήσονται (2. 28. 4 f.); ταύτης τὸ αἶμα ἐὰν ἐπιχρίσῃς τόπωι (? ἢ) ὡς προεκτίλας τὰς εὐρισκομένας τρίχας, οὐκέτι αὐθις ἕτεραι φυήσονται (3. 33. 4 f.); βδελλῶν καυθεῖσῶν τὴν τέφραν ὄξει λειώσας καὶ ἐκτίλας τὰς ἐν βλεφάροις τρίχας ἢ ἄλλου τινοῦς μέρους τοῦ σώματος οὐ βούλει, ὑπόχριε καὶ οὐκέτι φυήσονται (4. 8. 2 ff.).

¹⁰ AGHFR: this is a less impressive array than it at first sight appears since, as I shall argue elsewhere, GHF have no independent value. They are very closely related to A and, in view of their total non-contribution to the restoration of the text, it is unnecessary to cite them along with A.

¹¹ Ὄδοντοφυεῖν is found five times in the *Corpus Hippocraticum*, twice as an articular infinitive and three times as a participle agreeing with the word for child (understood). Of the seven occurrences of the verb in Galen—three in fact are from Archigenes cited by Galen and one (the infinitive) is found in a quotation from the Hippocratic *Aphorisms*—one is in the form of an infinitive, five are participial and agree with a word for child. The only indicative occurrence (from Archigenes) has as its subject τὰ βρέφη (understood).

contained a main verb which has subsequently dropped out. I would add therefore, either at the end of the sentence or directly before the infinitive, <ποιεῖ>: cf. 1. 14. 29 f. ἡ δὲ κεφαλὴ τοῦ ἰχθύος ἐπιθυμιωμένη καὶ μετὰ σμύρνης ἐνθουσιάζεσθαι ποιεῖ τοὺς ὄσφραϊνομένους, 2. 24 (b) M and 4. 3. 2 f. quoted above. Alternatively, read παρασκευάζει rather than ποιεῖ. The construction will then be the same as that found in ὄνυχες δὲ καυθέντες ἀλωπεκίας τριχοποιεῖν παρασκευάζουσι (2. 3 [b] M).¹² In suggesting this I do not intend to deny the possibility that other branches of the tradition contained ὀδοντοφρεῖν used causatively.

II. 2. 4 (d) M

In one of the new extracts from the *Cyranides* edited by Anna Meschini a further medicinal quality of the fox is described:

πλὴν δὲ ζῶσαν ἐὰν ἐλαίωι τις ἐψῆσῃ ἕως οὗ τὰ ὀστᾶ μόνα ὑπολειφθῶσι τοὺς ποδαλγούς¹³ καὶ ἀρθριτικούς ἀπαλλάττει ἀλειφόμενος. (This follows directly on 2. 2. 39–41 Kaimakis: ἡ δὲ κόπρος αὐτοῦ μετ' ὄξους λειουμένη λειχήνας θεραπεύει, σὺν δὲ στέατι ἐπιπασθεῖσα ἀλωπεκίας δασύνει.)

Πλὴν here cannot mean “except” or “except that.” As it stands it must be functioning as a progressive particle, a usage of πλὴν that can be illustrated

¹² Cf. also 1. 2. 9 f. (quoted below), 2. 22. 18 τινὲς δὲ καὶ ἀνθρώποις παχύνεσθαι οὕτω παρασκευάζουσι (WKS simply have ἀνθρώπους παρασκευάζουσι [ποιοῦσι K]; it is worth considering emending ἀνθρώποις to ἀνθρώπους on the assumption that παχύνεσθαι οὕτω has accidentally been omitted in this branch of the tradition, a circumstance that may have led to the “correction” ἀνθρώπους), 4. 39. 5 ζῆρᾶ δὲ φορουμένη λαμπρῶς ἐσθίειν καὶ ἐνηδόνως παρασκευάζει (K+M*: for λαμπρῶς M has λαύρωσ, i.e. λάβρωσ = *fortiter* in the Latin translation, 194. 10; it omits καὶ ἐνηδόνως), and *Orphica Lithica Kerygmata* 7. 7 (p. 151 Halleux-Schamp) τούναντίον δὲ ψυχροῦ τυγχάνοντος ταχύτερον τοῦτον παρασκευάζειν ζέειν τε καὶ ἀναπαφλάζειν (sc. λέγουσι). The same construction figures in the difficult text 4. 5 (a) M: ἱκαναὶ δὲ <ἐν?> ἀγγείωι φρυγέισαι μετ' ὄξους καταχρισθεῖσαι μέλιτος πάχος (suspectum) τὰς ἐλκυσμένας τρίχας μηκέτι αὐθις ἐκβλαστῆσαι παρασκευάζειν. Παρασκευάζει is the reading of M. Is Meschini right to change it to the infinitive? I assume she construes it with ἱκαναί, which is not the most obvious way of interpreting the sentence, even allowing that ἱκαναί means “sufficient” here. Often in later texts ἱκανός means “lots of,” “plenty of,” rather than “sufficient” or “enough to” (see W. Bauer, *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neues Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur* s.v.). There are only two further examples of the adjective in the *Cyranides*: κεδρίας ἢ ῥοδίνου τὸ ἱκανόν (1. 21. 22), where it retains its original meaning, and, significantly perhaps, in a passage in M, κανθάρων εἶδη ἱκανά (2. 30. 2 M), where ἱκανά must be the equivalent of πολλά. Have we not here another case of lack of concord of the kind to which Meschini herself draws attention and which she defends (p. 151, on 2. 3 [a] 6 M καυθεῖσαι δὲ καὶ πίσσηι συμμιχθεῖσαι αἰμορραγίαν ῥινῶν ἴστησιν)?

¹³ For ποδαλγός, given by LSJ only from *Lycus* apud Oribas. 9. 43. 1, cf. *Cyr.* 2. 6. 8, 3. 1. 75, 3. 29. 5.

in prose from Aristotle onwards.¹⁴ The presence of the following δέ, which performs the same function as πλήν, is surprising. Πλήν followed by δέ (where πλήν functions as a particle rather than as a preposition) is not signalled as a combination by the lexica or mentioned in Blomqvist's discussion of the use of the particle in later Greek.¹⁵ With the help of the CD-ROM of the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* I have unearthed a single, apparent, example: ps.-Galen, *De urinis ex Hipp. Gal. et aliis quibusdam* 19. 615 Kühn, οὖρον μὲν οὖν ἄριστον ἐπὶ τῶν ἐν ὑγείαι καὶ εὐεξίαι διακειμένων ἀνθρώπων ὑπόπυρρόν τε ἢ ὑπόξανθον καὶ τῶι πάχει σύμμετρον κείμενον, τοιοῦτον τῆι χροιαὶ οἶον ἀπουρηθῆι, λείαν δὲ καὶ λευκὴν καὶ ὁμαλὴν ὑπόστασιν ἔχον παρὰ πάντα τὸν χρόνον, πλήν δὲ κατὰ λόγον τοῦ πινομένου. The two examples may be thought to protect each other, but I find that πλήν in the ps.-Galen is not as void of meaning as in the Cyranidean (it does connote the sense "except") and I remain suspicious about the collocation in the *Cyranides*. The most obvious solution would be to delete δέ. More speculatively, one might read πάλιν δέ, "and again," "and in turn."¹⁶ The corruption posited (the sense, however, being different) is to be found elsewhere in M, where, in the part of the chapter on the crane corresponding to 3. 11. 3 ff., M reads ὅταν γὰρ χειμῶνες βριαροὶ μέλλουσι (sic) γίνεσθαι καταλιπόντες τὰ βόρεια φεύγουσιν ἐπὶ τὴν Αἴγυπτον καὶ σπερμολογοῦντες διατρέφονται· πλήν δὲ τὸ ἔαρ ὑποστρέφουσιν εἰς πάσας τὰς χώρας οὗτοι ἰπτάμενοι. The other two manuscripts transmitting this passage have πάλιν δέ.¹⁷

Πλήν is found three times elsewhere in the work heading a sentence or clause, in each case in isolation introducing a statement or instruction which modifies what preceded: ἢ οὖν βοτάνη σὺν οἴνῳ πινομένη ὁδοποιήσει τὰ νεμόμενα. πλήν ὑποτεθεῖσα ἔμβρυα κατασπᾶι καὶ δυσουρητικούς αἷμα οὖρεϊν παρασκευάζει (1. 2. 9 f.); ἐὰν οὖν τις πρὸ ὄρας τῆς συνουσίας πάσῃ ἑαυτοῦ τὸ αἰδοῖον ἐκ τοῦ γινομένου ξηρίου ἀπὸ τῆς βοτάνης εἶθ' οὕτως συνέλθῃ τῆι γυναικί, συλλαβεῖν αὐτὴν ἐργάσεται· πλήν πρὸ τοῦ πάσαι τὸ αἰδοῖον, ὀφείλει χρῆσαι τοῦτο μέλιτι (1. 18. 15–17); εἴτα θύσαντες καὶ ὀπτήσαντες διδόασιν ἐσθίειν τῶι μέλλοντι παχυνθῆναι καὶ γίνεται παχύς. πλήν μηδὲν τῶν τῆς ὄρνιθος καταλειπτόν, μόνον δὲ τὰ ἐνδοθεν αὐτῆς σὺν τοῖς ἐντέροις ριπτόν ἵνα μὴ βλάβης γένωνται πρὸξενα (2. 22. 21–24).

¹⁴ See J. Blomqvist, *Greek Particles in Hellenistic Prose* (Lund 1969) 88 ff. I follow Blomqvist in referring to πλήν simply as a particle (rather than a conjunction or adverb) in cases where it is not a preposition.

¹⁵ Blomqvist (previous note) 91 finds single examples of πλήν ἀλλά and πλήν μέντοι, but in each instance πλήν is adversative.

¹⁶ Πάλιν δέ is common enough in technical writing, but I have been unable to find an instance where it simply moves us on to a new topic. It tends to head clauses containing verbs of adding or moving.

¹⁷ See my discussion in the *RFIC* article (above, note 4) 444.

III. 2. 20. 2–3 M (1. 18. 34, 2. 3. 24, 2. 6. 3)

Another new extract describes an additional way of curing colic by using deer's dung:

ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὴν κόπρον τοῦ ζώου ξηράνας κόψας σείσας, τὸ αὐτὸ δρᾶν φασι. (The passage follows 2. 11. 13 Kaimakis.)

The anacoluthon consisting of a nominative participial construction, τὴν κόπρον τοῦ ζώου ξηράνας κόψας σείσας, followed by a change of subject in the main clause is characteristic of the work and presents no problem,¹⁸ but what is the meaning of σείσας? Unless σείω is to be given an unattested meaning, we should write σήσας. The manuscripts are full of etacistic errors, although “errors” with reference to a work of this character is perhaps a misnomer.¹⁹ It is perfectly possible and even quite likely that the man who first committed this sentence to writing did indeed spell it in the way we find it spelt in the Venetian manuscript. What he meant by it, however, was certainly “having sieved,” not “having shaken.” The modern editor of a work like the *Cyranides* is constantly faced with difficult decisions regarding questions of orthography. Meschini makes it her practice to correct etacistic errors; Kaimakis has no stated policy and in practice is totally inconsistent.²⁰ The appearance in the text of a word like σείσας in this context can only confuse the reader and it ought, at the very least, to be pointed out in the apparatus that in effect it represents σήσας.

That σήσας represents a form of σήθω and means “having sieved” can be established by consideration of three parallel passages, one from Book 1 and two from Book 2:

1) A recipe for dry myrrh is given: κόστου οὐγ. γ', νάρδου στάχυος οὐγ. ἡμίσειαν, καρπὸν βαλσάμου οὐγ. γ', ἀμάμου οὐγ. ἡμίσειαν, καρυοφύλλου οὐγ. β', κασσίας οὐγ. β' ἡμισυ, στύρακος οὐγ. ε', μόσχου καλοῦ γραμμάρια β', ρόδων ἐξονυχισμένων οὐγ. δ' · ταῦτα ξηρά κόψων καὶ σείσον καλῶς (1. 18. 30 ff.). The Latin translator²¹ renders ταῦτα

¹⁸ 2. 1. 10 is a good example if the interpretation of ὀδοντοφουοῦσιν offered above is correct. (Cf. also 4. 9. 10 f., quoted above: a participial phrase containing μίξας is followed by a main clause containing the verb δόξουσιν.) I discuss the phenomenon in the study mentioned in the following note.

¹⁹ A comprehensive discussion of the phonology and orthography of the *Cyranides* will form part of an extended study of the work which I hope to publish in the near future.

²⁰ See Meschini (above, note 4) 151. On Kaimakis, see the work referred to in the previous note. He is equally inconsistent regarding the confusion of ο and ω and of ου and ω.

²¹ The text of the Latin version, an extremely important witness for the text, totally and unaccountably neglected by Kaimakis, is to be found in L. Delatte, *Textes latins et vieux français relatif aux Cyranides* (Liège and Paris 1942). In this same chapter, in a passage preserved by only two manuscripts, these divide between συνθεις and σείσας (1. 18. 38). The Latin here supports the former: *et omnibus permixtis* (79. 1). The text of this passage as printed by Kaimakis differs quite radically in several respects from the Latin and demands a separate discussion.

ξηρὰ κόπων καὶ σείσον καλῶς by “tere arida tenuissime et *cribra* diligenter” (78. 15). Clearly he took σείσον to be σήσον.

2) In the chapter on the mole a recipe for a special magic potion reads as follows: σκευάζεται δὲ ἐκ τούτου καὶ γευστόν, μεγάλην ἐνέργειαν ἐμποιοῦν τῷ γευσσαμένῳ. ἐὰν γάρ τις ἀπογεύηται τοῦ ἡλίου ἀνατέλλοντος δάκτυλον ἓνα, προγνώσει τὰ γινόμενα ἕως οὗ δύσει ὁ ἥλιος. ἔστι δὲ ἡ σκευὴ τῆς ἀπογεύσεως αὕτη· λαβὼν ζῶντα τὸν ἀσφάλακα ἀπόπνιξον ἐν ὕδατι ὀμβρίῳ κοτύλας γ´· εἶτα ἔψε ἕως οὗ τακῆι καὶ κηρωθῆι. εἶτα διυλίσας τὸ ὕδωρ ἔψε ἐν χαλκῷ ἀγγεῖῳ ἐπιβαλὼν εἶδη ταῦτα. εἶτα σκεύαζε οὕτως· θεογόνου ρίζης (ἐν ἄλλῳ γράφει²² θεόπνου) οὖγ. δ´, ἀρτεμισίας μονοκλῶνου οὖγ. δ´, στύρακος καλαμίτου οὖγ. δ´, σμύρνης τρωγλοδυτικῆς οὖγ. δ´, βδελλίου οὖγ. δ´, σφαιρίου οὖγ. δ´, λιβάνου ἄρρενος οὖγ. η´, ταῦτα κόψας, σείσας καὶ ἐνώσας τῷ ἐψηθέντι ἀσφάλακι ἐπίβαλλε μέλιτος πρώτου κοτύλην α´ καὶ πάλιν ἔψε ἕως οὗ γένηται μέλιτος πάχος καὶ οὕτως ἀνελόμενος ἀπόθου ἐν ὑελίνῳ ἀγγεῖῳ καὶ χρῶ ὡς εἴρηται (2. 3. 15 ff.). Here the Latin translator renders ταῦτα κόψας, σείσας καὶ ἐνώσας by “tere et *cribra*.” Clearly once more he took σείσας to be σήσας.

3) In the chapter on the cow a further recipe involving dung is set out: ταύτης τὴν κόπρον λαβὼν ξηρὰν λείωσον καὶ σείσας (+M) στήσον λίτρον α´, κηροῦ οὖγ. ζ´, κράμβης χυλοῦ οὖγ. ζ´ (ἢ γ´ ὡς ἐν ἄλλῳ), ὡὰ ὡὰ γ´, ἐλαίου καλοῦ λίτρον α´, λείωσον τὰ ξηρὰ καὶ τῆξον τὰ τηκτά· εἶτα καθελὼν καὶ χλιάνας βάλλε τὰ ὡὰ καὶ συλλείῳ καλῶς· καὶ ἐκ τούτου κατάπλασσε σπληνικούς, ἡπατικούς, ὕδρωπικούς, ὁμοίως καὶ ὕδροκοίλους καὶ ποδαλγούς, καὶ πάραυτα μεγάλως ὠφελήσεις. τοῦτο κρύβε ὡς μέγα δῶρον (2. 6. 3 ff.). Here the Latin runs: “huius stercus acceptum siccum tere, *cribra*, pensa libram unam” etc. (100. 12 f.). Once again it is clear that the translator regards σείσας as the aorist of σήθω. Note that this passage also contains a reference to drying the dung (ξηρὰν). This corresponds to ξηράνας in the passage under discussion.

Unfortunately there is nothing in the Latin to match the new Venetian extract.²³ It is noticeable that in all three parallel passages the translator apparently renders the imperative of κόπτω with “rub.” (It may be, however, that he had before him a verb other than κόπτω, τρίβω for instance. However that may be, the argument concerning σείσας is not affected.) For the collocation of κόπτω and σήθω, compare e.g. *Cyr.* “5” (see note 35). 1. 8 κοπεῖσα καὶ σεισθεῖσα (sic), Dioscurides 5. 49 (3. 30.

²² Cf. below in the same chapter ἐν ἄλλῳ γράφει τὴν ἐπ’ αἰώνων (2. 3. 38 f.), where W. Kroll reasonably suggests reading γράφεται (“*Analecta Graeca*,” *Wissenschaftliche Beilage zum Vorlesungsverzeichnis der Universität Greifswald* [1901] 14). Should we not also read γράφεται here?

²³ None of the new material concerning land animals or quadrupeds (that is to say the parts that correspond to Book 2 of the *Cyranides*) is reflected in the Latin version. On the other hand, the new material found in the sections dealing with birds and fish has presented us with the Greek text of passages hitherto known only from the Latin.

13 Wellmann) θύμου κεκομμένου καὶ σεσημένου, 5. 69 (3. 35. 8 Wellmann) κόψας καὶ σήσας, *Hipp. Berol. Appendix* 8 (Oder–Hoppe 1. 448. 5 f.) σκευάζεται δὲ τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον· τὰς βοτάνας καὶ τὰ σπέρματα καὶ τὰ ἀρωματικά πάντα κόπτε καὶ σῆθε λεπτῶι κοσκίνωι, Olympiodorus 75. 9 Berthelot κόψας, σείσας (sic: 1. σήσας), and Symeon Seth, *De alimentorum facultatibus* 84. 8 Langkavel κόψας καὶ σείσας (sic).²⁴

IV. 2. 31. 25

A malicious use of the donkey's rump-hairs is described:

τρίχας δὲ ἐκ τῆς πυγῆς τοῦ ὄνου ἐὰν καύσης καὶ λειώσας δώσης ἐν ποτῶι γυναικί, οὐ παύσεται πέρδεσθαι.²⁵ λύσις δὲ αὐτῆς· ὄνου θηλείας τρίχας καύσας δίδου πιεῖν ὁμοίως.

Λύσις δὲ αὐτῆς would have to mean “the release of her,” “to release her” (the woman), but this expression raises suspicion. One expects in a magical prescription the technical term λύσις to be used not with a dependent genitive denoting the victim of a spell, but one which denotes the spell itself or the condition of the victim. In other words one expects a separative rather than an objective genitive.²⁶ There are two clear examples in the magic papyri of λύσις used of the breaking of a spell. Neither of these supports λύσις αὐτῆς: ἐὰν πρὸς λύσιν φαρμάκων (*PGM* 13. 253);²⁷ γραφέτω δὲ τὴν λύσιν αὐτοῦ ὀπίσω πετάλου²⁸ (*PGM* 13. 1007).²⁹

²⁴ The language of Greek medical recipes is extremely conservative. For the use of σῆθω in the Hippocratic Corpus, see D. Goltz, *Studien zur altorientalischer und griechischer Heilkunde: Therapie, Arzneibereitung, Rezeptsstruktur*, Sudhoffs Archiv, Beiheft 16 (Wiesbaden 1974) 183, where she notes its tendency to follow κόπτει.

²⁵ Πέρδειν R: πέρδουσα I (a regularising conjecture attempting to restore more classical syntax?). I shall be arguing elsewhere that it is unnecessary to regularise by emending πέρδειν to its normal middle form, πέρδεσθαι, as Kaimakis does. Compare *ZPE* 63 (1986) 104.

²⁶ Λύω does not appear to be used with a direct object of releasing someone from a spell (or at least the lexica do not single out this usage). C. A. Faraone, however, points out that ἀναλύω is used in this way, adducing *Men. Her.* fr. 5 (curiously misinterpreted in Gomme–Sudbach) and Lucian, *Vit. auct.* 25.

²⁷ Panayiotou (above, note 8) appears to be unaware of these passages since he registers (322) the meanings “counterspell,” “spell-breaker,” “antidote” for λύσις as “new.”

²⁸ “The spell to annul this spell should be written on the reverse of the lamella” (M. Smith in H. D. Betz [ed.], *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation*, 2nd ed. [Chicago 1992] 194).

²⁹ At 7. 178 (from the παίγνια of “Democritus”) we find the expression λύσις ἐλαίωι with no genitive depending on λύσις. This has been rendered “to relieve him” (R. Kotansky in *The Greek Magical Papyri* [previous note] 120). Perhaps, in view of the absence of a parallel for the objective genitive following λύσις, it is better to offer a more non-committal translation such as Preisendanz’s “Mittel zur Erlösung.” Λύσις ἐλαίωι recurs in P. Oxy. 3835 (= *Supplementum Magicum* II, edited with translations and notes by R. W. Daniel and F. Maltomini [Opladen 1991] no. 86) fr. A. ii. 7, where again the editor understands a genitive referring to the victim of the spell (in this case a thief). I do not fully understand a further passage in which λύσις is to be found (15. 2); compare *The Greek Magical Papyri* 251 n. 1.

Compare also *Hipp. Berl.* 33. 9, *CHG* 1. 170. 4 ff. (drawn to my attention by J. N. Adams): τοιούτων γὰρ προσφερομένων, λύσις γίνεται τοῦ κνησμοῦ . . . (λύσις γίνεται τοῦ κνησμοῦ is translated in the *Mulomedicina* 459 by *solutio fit vulsionis*).

In our work we may contrast the two other places where we meet λύσις:

1) 1. 24. 113 ἐὰν δὲ τῆς μαινίδος τὴν γλῶσσαν νεαρᾶς οὔσης δώης τινὶ λειανθεῖσαν μεθ' ὕδατος, βαλὼν δὲ τὸν δακτύλιον κάτω δώης πιεῖν μαινομένοι, σωθήσεται· εἰ δὲ νήφοντι,³⁰ μανήσεται. τούτου λύσις· μαινίδα ὀπτὴν δὸς φαγεῖν· μανήσεται ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἀγνοῶν τὰ λεχθέντα ἅπαντα, ὡς φράζει Κυρανὶς θεία βροτοῖς.

2) 3. 50. 9 εἰ δὲ καὶ δώης πιεῖν ἐκ τῆς τέφρας (sc. τοῦ χελιδόνος), μανήσεται ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔρωτος. λύσις δὲ τούτου· λαβὼν ἐκ τῆς τέφρας τῶν νεοσσῶν τῶν ἀποστρεφομένων ἄλειψον ἢ πότισον, καὶ ἀποστραφήσεται ὁ ἔρωτος ὁ πολὺς.

Further suspicion attaches to the text under discussion when one looks at the Latin version: “*solutio autem eius rei est, si asinae feminae pilos combusseris et ad potandum dederis*” (123. 13–24. 2).

In fact λύσις δὲ αὐτῆς is weakly attested. Six of the nine manuscripts transmitting this chapter omit its last sixteen lines and one the last fifteen. Only one of the two remaining manuscripts (I) transmits λύσις δὲ αὐτῆς. The other (R) has ἐὰν ἔστι ἡ θριξ ὄνου θηλείας following πέρδειν. Wellmann,³¹ apparently without access to the reading of I and starting from the Latin and R, assumes that R omits λύσις by accident and reads accordingly: λύσις δὲ ἔστιν ἡ θριξ ὄνου θηλείας καυθεῖσα καὶ ἐν ποτῶι δοθεῖσα. I think he may be correct to assume the existence of a lacuna in R, but this is a clear instance, typical of the transmission of this work, where scribes present us with alternative versions and where a single, original, authentic text cannot be restored with certainty. All the editor can do is correct each version where it is corrupt. In this instance I believe that the text of I offers a corruption of λύσις δὲ τούτου³² ὄνου θηλείας τρίχας καύσας δίδου πιεῖν ὁμοίως. This would be extremely close to the Latin version, in which too we find a second person verb, albeit in the form of a conditional clause: “*solutio autem eius rei est, si asinae feminae pilos combusseris et ad potandum dederis.*”

³⁰ For νήφω meaning “sane,” cf. *Cyr.* 2. 4. 4.

³¹ M. Wellmann, *Marcellus von Side als Arzt und die Koiraniden des Hermes Trismegistos*, *Philologus* Suppl. 27.2 (Leipzig 1934) 31 n. 90.

³² It is also conceivable that the scholar-scribe in question, Constantine Laskaris, rather than corrupting his exemplar or faithfully transcribing a corrupt exemplar, mistakenly “corrected” τούτου to αὐτῆς, basing himself on the context rather than on usage. Laskaris copied I in 1474 in Messina, whence it travelled to Madrid. See J. M. F. Pomar, “La colección de Uceda y los manuscritos griegos de Constantino Láscaris,” *Emerita* 34 (1966) 211–88, 233.

V. 3. 23. 4

τούτου ἡ καρδία φορουμένη μετὰ κισσοῦ ρίζης τὰς σπωμένας γυναικὰς παύει. ὁμοίως δὲ θεραπεύει καὶ δυσουρίαν.

Ὅμοίως δὲ καὶ is a common collocation in the work (as is ὁμοίως καί). Only here, however, do we find a sentence or clause opening with ὁμοίως δέ³³ in which the collocation is broken up by another word. For ὁμοίως δὲ καί, see ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ αἰμοχύτους (sc. ἀπαλλάξει) (1. 1. 12); ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἡ κόπρος τοῦ ἀετοῦ περιχρισμένη ἀπαλλάσσει καὶ ὁ λίθος περιαφθεις ἢ τὸ στέαρ τοῦ ἰχθύος διαχρισόμενον διασώζει³⁴ (sc. μυρμηκίας) (1. 1. 49 f.); ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἡ θήλεια τὸ αὐτὸ ποιεῖ (1. 2. 15 f.); ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ οἱ ὄνυχες μετὰ ῥοδίνου λειωθέντες ὠταλίαν ἰώνται (2. 4 [c] M); ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν εὐώνυμον (sc. περίαψον) (2. 24. 32 f.); ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ οἱ σιτοφόροι ἀρουραῖοι τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν (2. 25. 11 f.); ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἡ αἰξ κέρας μὴ ἔχουσα τὸ αὐτὸ δρᾶν ἐὰν αὐτὸ φορῆι (2. 39. 10 f.); ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τῶν πτερύγων ἀπὸ τῶν ὤμων (sc. λαβῶν τὰ πτερὰ) (3. 1. 33; δέ om. M); ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἰσχία θεραπεύει (3. 24. 5); ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἐπαλειφόμενον θηριοδῆκτους ὠφελεῖ (3. 31. 5); ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τῶν πελαγῶν καὶ τῶν πελεκάνων οὐκ ὀλίγους καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἄλλων ὀρνέων (sc. ἴδοις ἄν) (3. 36. 18–19); ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὰ τοῦ χηνὸς καὶ τοῦ ταῶνος (sc. ποιεῖ πρὸς χρυσοποιάν) (3. 55. 14); ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὰ τῆς χελιδόνος καὶ μελαίνουσι τρίχας καὶ λευκώματα (3. 55. 17); ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ὕδωρ θαλάσσιον μίξας δόξουσιν θάλασσαν ὀρᾶν (4. 9. 10–11). In view of these examples it is perhaps worth considering the possibility that something is missing before θεραπεύει; read, for example, ὁμοίως δὲ <καὶ λιθουρίαν> θεραπεύει καὶ δυσουρίαν (cf. 3. 46. 5, where λιθουρία and δυσουρία are coupled).³⁵ The word-order, object + verb of healing +

³³ According to E. Gherro, "L'Aquila nella farmacopea medioevale e Bizantina. Con testi inediti dal Marc. gr. 512," *Atti e memorie dell'Acc. Patavina di Scienze, Lettere e Arti, Memorie* 88 (1975–76), III, 125–35, 130, M, at the equivalent of 3. 1. 33 Kaimakis, reads ὁμοίως δέ tout court. This is incorrect. What it has is clearly the ligature symbolising καί. In Dioscurides there are four examples of sentences or clauses beginning ὁμοίως δὲ καί, two with simply ὁμοίως δέ. These two are Dioscurides 1. 34 (1. 38. 13–15 Wellmann) ὁμοίως δὲ σκευάζεται τοῖς προειρημένοις τό τε σησάμινον ἐκ τοῦ σησάμου καὶ τὸ καρύνιον ἐκ τῶν βασιλικῶν καρῶν συντιθέμενον and 5. 32. 2 (3. 24. 8–10 Wellmann) ὁμοίως δὲ ἐκ διαστημάτων ἐκλαμβάνεται τὸ τέταρτον καὶ πέμπτον ἀπόβρεγμα ὀξίζον, ὧν ἀντὶ τοῦ ὄζουος χρῶνται. In the latter instance, Wellmann's apparatus indicates that the manuscript E reads ὁμοίως δὲ καί.

³⁴ I suspect διασώζει. Who wants to *preserve* warts? I would delete and understand ἀπαλλάσσει.

³⁵ Or, possibly, στραγγουρίαν; compare 4. 14. 16, 4. 28. 24, "5." 15. 5 (quoted at the end of the following note), "5." 17. 9 (in the two central examples στραγγουρία is coupled with δυσουρία). "5" indicates that I do not accept the attribution to Book 5 of the *Cyranides* of the extracts on the curative powers of plants found in the manuscripts D and N under the heading ἕτερον περὶ βοτανῶν κατὰ στοιχείον ἐκ τοῦ Ἄετιου. I hope shortly to publish my reasons for this. In the meantime, see Halleux-Schamp (above, note 7) xxviii n. 1.

second object introduced by καί, is common enough in the work, though with ἰάται³⁶ rather than θεραπεύει. For an example with θεραπεύει, see Dioscurides 1. 105 (= 1. 99. 5–7 Wellmann): ἀναγράφεται δὲ καὶ ἐν τοῖς φθαρτικοῖς, ἄγει δὲ καὶ ἔμβρυα καὶ λειχήνας θεραπεύει καὶ λέπραν.

VI and VII. 3. 34. 21 ff.

In the section on the domestic fowl, περὶ ὄρνιθος, the last sentence is preserved in a single manuscript (K):³⁷

ἐν φρενίτιδι δὲ ἡ ὄρνις σφαγεῖσα καὶ ἔτι ζέουσα σχισθεῖσα τῶν ἐγκάτων αὐτῆς πάντων ῥιφθέντων αὐτῇ δὲ ἐπιτιθεμένη τῇ κεφαλῇ τοῦ πάσχοντος μεγάλως ὀνίνησιν.

There are two puzzles here. 1) Why should a creature that has had its throat cut be described as “still boiling”? 2) What is the significance of αὐτῇ? Why stress that the bird be placed on the “very head” of the patient?

The second puzzle is easily resolved. We should read αὐτή, the bird itself being contrasted with the parts of it which have been thrown away (ρίπτω is regular in this meaning in the *Cyranides* and elsewhere in works containing prescriptions).³⁸ This use of the pronoun αὐτός to distinguish the creature from its body parts (or to indicate one of the ingredients of an amulet being used on its own rather than in conjunction with other elements) is widespread in the work (sometimes in combination with καθ' ἑαυτόν/ -ήν/ -ό): λίθος δὲ ἐκ τοῦ ἐχίνου μετὰ ἐνὸς κόκκου σατουρίου

³⁶ See ποδάγραν ἰώνται καὶ δυσουρίαν (1. 21. 51); ἐν ὀλίγωι δὲ ροδίωι ἢ νάρδωι συνεψηθεῖς ὠταλίαν ἰάται καὶ ραγάδας τὰς ἐν τοῖς ποσίν (2. 16. 8 f.); τῆς δὲ θηλείας ἡ κόπρος σὺν μέλιτι καταχρισμένη λεία χοιράδας ἰάται καὶ πᾶσαν σκληρίαν μαστῶν (2. 35. 13 f.); σὺν ὄξει δὲ καὶ κιμαλίαι σμηγομένη ἀλφους μελανούς ἰάται καὶ φακούς ὄψεως (2. 39. 4 f.); τὸ δὲ ἦπαρ αὐτῆς ξηρὸν ἐσθιόμενον τεταρταίζοντας ἰάται καὶ τρομικούς καὶ καρδιακούς (2. 40. 32 f.); καὶ ὁ πνεύμων καὶ ὁ σπλὴν ξηρὰ ἐν ποτῶι ἐπιπασσόμενα τὰ ὅμοια ἰώνται καὶ πᾶν πάθος (2. 41. 22 f.); τὸ δὲ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἐρυσιπέλατα καὶ χίμετλα ἰάται καὶ τοὺς θαλάσσιον λαγῶ φαγόντας (3. 3. 6 f.); ὅσα ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ περιεφθέντα ἐν μίτωι πορφυρῶι περὶ τὸν ἀγκῶνα κεφαλαλίαν ἰάται καὶ χρονίαν σκότωσιν κεφαλῆς (3. 9. 3 ff.); ὁ δὲ ἐγκέφαλος αὐτοῦ λειωθείς σὺν κεδρίαι καὶ ἐλαίωι παλαιῶι καὶ περιχρισθεῖς τοὺς κροτάφοις πᾶσαν κεφαλαλίαν ἰάται καὶ κάρωσιν (3. 9. 6 f.); τούτου οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ περιεπιτόμενοι ὀφθαλμίαν ἰώνται καὶ τριταῖον καὶ τεταρταῖον (3. 35. 2 f.); λειωθείσα καὶ καταχρισθεῖσα μετώπωι κεφαλαλίαν ἄκρωι ἰάται καὶ χίμετλα καὶ πυρίκανυστα καὶ τὰ ἐξ ἡλίου (3. 37. 20 f.); ἡ δὲ τοῦ ἀγρίου χηνὸς κόπρος θυμωμένη δαίμονας ἀπελαύνει καὶ λήθαρον ἰάται καὶ ὑστερικὴν πνιγάδα (3. 51. 20 f.); ταύτης ἡ τέφρα ἐπιπασσομένη ἔλκους σπηπέδονας ἰάται καὶ στόματα (4. 38 M). Compare also “5.” 15. 5 καὶ ἐφθῆ δὲ πινομένη δυσουρίαν παύει καὶ στραγγουρίαν . . .

³⁷ The way this information is conveyed in Kaimakis's apparatus is unfortunately all too characteristic: “ἐν . . . ὀνίνησιν om. AGHFOTDNWS.”

³⁸ 1. 12. 9, 1. 21. 25, 2. 13. 4, 2. 22. 24; cf. also Dioscurides 5. 17. 1 (3. 17. 7 Wellmann) αὐτὴν (sc. τὴν σκίλλαν) μὲν ῥίψον, τὸ δὲ ὄξος ὑλίσας κατάγγιζε καὶ ἀποτίθεσο and P. Holm. 759 (R. Halleux, *Les alchimistes grecs I* [Paris 1981] 138) αὐτὰ μὲν ῥίψον, τὰ δὲ ἔρια ἐστμμένα χαλάσας ποίησον.

κεκλασμένοι καὶ διδόμενοι ἐν πόσει ἢ βρώσει μεγίστην ἔντασιν ποιεῖται, μάλιστα τῶν μὴ δυναμένων συνουσιάζειν μήτε ψυχὴν ἀντὶ ψυχῆς κτίζειν. αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ λίθος καθ' ἑαυτὸν περιαιπτόμενος μεγίστην εὐπεισίαν παρέχει καὶ ἔντασιν τοῖς μὴ δυναμένοις συνουσιάζειν (1. 18. 45 ff.); ἀράχνης πέτασος εἰς πᾶν ἔναιμον ἐπιτιθέμενος ἐπισχετικός ἐστιν, μάλιστα δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν περὶ τοὺς δακτύλους προσκρουμάτων. αὐτῇ (αὐτῆ M: согрехи) δὲ ἀλειφθεῖσα κηρῶι, καὶ μάλιστα ὁ καλούμενος λύκος, καὶ ἐπιτεθεῖσα ἐπὶ τοῦ κροτάφου, τριταίου ἀπολύει (2. 5. 2 ff. M); τούτου (sc. τοῦ βατράχου) τὴν γλῶσσαν ἕαν τις κόψηι, αὐτὸν δὲ ἀπολύσει ζῶντα . . . (2. 5. 3–4); τοὺς δὲ ὄρχεις αὐτῆς ἀπότεμνε ἐν ἀποκρούσει, αὐτὴν δὲ ζῶσαν ἄφες (2. 7. 19 f.); ὁ δὲ σίελος τῶν κοχλιῶν ἀνακολλᾷ τρίχας βλεφάρων, αὐτὸς δὲ σὺν τοῖς ὀστράκοις λείος τριφθεῖς μετὰ οἴνου καλοῦ καὶ σμύρνης καὶ φοινίκων σαρκὸς καὶ ποθεῖς κωλικούς θεραπεύει (2. 31. 11 ff. M); τὰ δὲ ἐντὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ κόπρος θυμιώμενα πᾶν φαῦλον ἀποδιώκουσι καὶ μαγίαν. αὐτὸς δὲ ἐσθιόμενος δυσεντερικούς θεραπεύει (3. 42. 11–12); τὸ δὲ αἷμα αὐτῆς θερμὸν ἐνσταζόμενον ὀφθαλμῶν ὑποσφίγματα (l. ὑποσφάγματα?) ἰᾶται καὶ ἡ ἄφοδος σὺν ῥοδίῳ λειουμένη καὶ χριομένη ὑστέραν θεραπεύει. τρυγῶν δὲ αὐτῇ ἐσθιομένη σωφροσύνην καὶ ἀνδράσι καὶ γυναιξὶν ἀλλήλοισ ἐργάζεται <καὶ> ἀλφούς μελαίνας ἰᾶται (3. 43. 6 f.); ἡ δὲ τέφρα αὐτῶν τε καὶ τῶν μητέρων σὺν μέλιτι διαχριομένη συναγκικούς ἰᾶται καὶ βρόγχων ἔλκη σὺν μελικράτῳ πινομένη. αὐτῇ δὲ ἡ χελιδὼν συνεχῶς ἐσθιομένη ἱερὰν νόσον θεραπεύει (3. 50. 12 ff.); ταύτης τὸ ἦπαρ ὅλον σὺν τῇ χολῆι ἕαν λειώσας σὺν οἴνῳ δώηις πιεῖν λάθρα τινί, οὐδέποτε δυνήσεται πιεῖν οἶνον. αὐτὴν δὲ ὅλην ζῶσαν εἰς οἶνον ἐμβληθεῖσαν . . . (4. 16. 4 ff.); ἐχίνου θαλασσίῳ ἢ σὰρξ ἐσθιομένη κοιλίαν μαλάσσει καὶ νεφροὺς καὶ λιθουρίαν ἄκρως θεραπεύει σὺν κονδίῳ λαμβανομένη. αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ ἐχίνος καυθεῖς καὶ λειωθεῖσης τῆς τέφρας καὶ σηχομένης λέπραν ἰᾶται (4. 17. 3 ff. +M); τούτου (sc. τῆς ζμυραίνης) οἱ ὀδόντες ἀρμόδιοι τοῖς ὀδοντοφυοῦσι παιδίῳς περιαιφθέντες. αὐτῇ (αὐτῆ M: согрехи) δὲ μετὰ πεπεροζώμου ἐσθιομένη νεφροὺς ἰᾶται καὶ ἐλεφαντίασιν καὶ τὰ ψωρῶδη πάθη (4. 20. 8 ff.: M's reading); τρίγλης δὲ εἴ τις τὸ γένειον κείρηι ἔτι ζώσης αὐτῆς, αὐτὴν δὲ ζῶσαν ἀπολύσει ἐν τῇ θαλάσσει ἀπελθεῖν . . . (4. 62. 8 f.); ὁ δὲ ζωμός αὐτῆς πινόμενος ὁμοίως καὶ αὐτῇ ἐσθιομένη τοῖς δηλητήριον πεπωκόσι βοηθεῖ (4. 63. 6 f.).

The first question is less easy to answer. Ζέουσα could, I suppose, be explained as a combination of metaphor and metonymy. Just as blood can be said to boil, so the creature itself in its death throes might be described as boiling.³⁹ But, since most of the last three books of the *Cyranides* is written

³⁹ Compare 3. 43. 6, quoted above, where hot blood is demanded (cf. also 1. 21. 119) and note 2. 20. 8 f. σπλῆνα δὲ κυνὸς θερμὸν ἐπιθεῖς σπληνικῶι ἐν τῷ σπληνί, ἰαθήσεται, where

in highly formulaic language, such boldness would be unparalleled and surprising. An easy correction from the point of view of palaeography would be to read ζῶσα. Living animals play an important part in magic⁴⁰ and there are many prescriptions in this work which involve seizing and slaughtering or mutilating, or in some other way making use of the *live* animal;⁴¹ cf. 1. 21. 103; 2. 2. 4; 2. 2. 18 f.; 2. 3. 18; 2. 3. 31; 2. 4 (d) M; 2. 5. 5 M; 2. 7. 22–23; 2. 8. 44; 2. 10. 5; 2. 12. 3; 2. 12. 4 M; 2. 14. 8; 2. 16. 6; 2. 22. 28 ff.; 2. 24. 10; 2. 26. 6; 2. 26. 15; 2. 31. 14 f.; 2. 31. 7 M (live sheep's ticks); 2. 40. 35; 2. 42. 4 f.; 3. 1. 18; 3. 4. 7 f.; 3. 18. 6 f.; 3. 21. 2 f. 3. 22. 15; 3. 29. 2 f.; 3. 36. 41; 3. 41. 4; 3. 51. 3; 4. 8. 9 f.; 4. 18. 5; αὕτη (sc. ἡ νάρκη) τοῖς κεφαλαλοῦσιν ἔτι ζῶσα προστεθεῖσα ἐπὶ χρονίων νοσημάτων τῶν περὶ κεφαλῆς πράννει τὸ σφοδρὸν τοῦ ἀλγήματος (4. 44. 2 ff.); ἐν ἐλαίῳ δὲ ζῶσα ἐψηθεῖσα ἕως οὗ τοκῆι (4. 44. 4 f.); τοῦτον (sc. τὸν ὄνον θαλάσσιον) βαλὼν ἐν καινῇ χύτραι ἔτι ζῶντα ἔκζεσον (4. 48. 3 f.); τρίγλης δὲ εἴ τις τὸ γένειον κείρηι ἔτι ζώσης αὐτῆς (4. 62. 8).⁴² It might be objected that it would be illogical to have “still living” following σφαγεῖσα. But here we are dealing with a dying creature. Compare τὰ δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν ὄφεων γινόμενα δῆγματα ἰάται βάτραχος ὑδρίτης ζῶν, σχισθεὶς καὶ ἐπιτεθεὶς καὶ δεθεὶς (2. 30. 15 f.). How long would the creature remain alive? The stress is on the fact that whatever operation is required it is not to be performed on a *dead* animal and that immediate action is to be taken directly after the death blow.⁴³

VIII. 4. 28. 16

καρκίνων ποταμίων καέντων ἢ τέφρα κοχλιαρίων δυοῖν πλῆθος σὺν γεντιανῆς ρίζης κοχλιαρίῳ ἐνὶ καὶ οἴνῳ ποθεῖσα ἐπὶ ἡμέρας τρεῖς βοηθεῖ λυσοδοῦσιν ἐναργῶς.

This comes from a passage found in the margin of a single manuscript (K). Ἐνεργῶς should be read for ἐναργῶς: cf. 2. 4. 13 καὶ τοὺς τὰ τοξικά φάρμακα πίνοντας σώζει ἐνεργῶς (ἐναργῶς IR) = “*efficaciter sanat*” 99. 2.

in one manuscript (R), instead of θερμόν, we find ζέουσαν (agreeing with a feminine σπλῆνα; for σπλῆν as a feminine elsewhere in the work, compare the reading of O at 1. 9. 9 and 2. 4. 16 and the majority reading τῆς, which is actually accepted by Kaimakis at 2. 4. 27).

⁴⁰ See G. Björck, *Apsyrtyus, Julius Africanus et l'hippiatrique grecque*, Uppsala Årskräft, 1944 no. 4 (Uppsala and Leipzig 1944) 60 f.

⁴¹ In the case of the former the use of the participle “living” is formulaic and, strictly speaking, redundant.

⁴² Cf. also some of the passages quoted above in connection with the use of αὐτός / αὐτή of the animal as distinct from its parts: 2. 5. 3–4; 2. 7. 19 f.; 4. 16. 4 ff.; 4. 62. 8 f.

⁴³ Compare the prescriptions which require the use of a still beating heart: τὴν τούτου καρδίαν ἔτι σπαίρουσαν καὶ ζῶσαν (1. 7. 55; n.b. the variant in DN καὶ ζῶσαν καταπίη); καρδίαν ἔτι θερμὴν καὶ σπαίρουσαν (1. 21. 119); κατάπιε ἔτι σπαίρουσαν (1. 21. 121); εἴ τις τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ ἔτι σπαίρουσαν . . . (2. 3. 37); ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῆς ἔτι σπαίρουσα περιαφθεῖσα μῆρῳ ὠκυτόκιον ἔστιν ἄριστον (3. 34. 9).

At the end of the same chapter, where the other manuscripts read καὶ αἱ τρίχες καπνίζόμεναι τὰ αὐτὰ ποιῶσι κατ' ἐνέργειαν,⁴⁴ I has ἐναργῶς instead of κατ' ἐνέργειαν. At 4. 18. 2 Kaimakis wrongly prefers the reading of I against the reading of the majority of Greek manuscripts and the Latin version: ἐχενηὶς ἰχθύς ἐστὶν ἐναργής, οὗτος τοιαύτην φυσικὴν δύναμιν ἔχει . . . Clearly ἐναργής is a corruption of ἐνεργής. (For the adjective, cf. 2. 3. 13 f. ἡ γὰρ δύναμις τούτου ἐνεργής.) It is in fact transmitted only by one manuscript (I). Of the other eight manuscripts three omit it (WKS), the rest (AGHFO) have ἐνεργής. In effect we have a situation where the manuscripts are two to one in favour of the correct reading (on GHF, see note 10). They are supported by the Latin version, which reads "echeneis piscis est efficacissimus" (186. 13: οὗτος τοιαύτην φυσικὴν δύναμιν ἔχει is not translated; there is a corresponding omission in AGHFIO).

University of Manchester

⁴⁴ There is no equivalent for κατ' ἐνέργειαν in the Latin version, which reads "et pili suffumigati idem praestant" (100. 8 f.). Reference to the ἐνέργεια of particular ingredients pervades the work.