Philagrios were Theodorus' source, we still could not rule out a scenario in which Philagrios used Rufus of Ephesus.

To summarize: if Rufus of Ephesus is the original source for the bibliotherapy of genital dysfunction shared among Theodorus Priscianus, the *Liber Esculapii* and Paulos of Nicaea, then we can place Philippos of Amphipolis between Aristides of Miletus and Rufus (that is, second century B.C.E.–late first century C.E.). If Philagrios is the original source independently of Rufus, then we can move the *terminus ante quem* for Philippos of Amphipolis forward to the third or early fourth century C.E.

University of Cincinnati BRENT AREHART
areharbf@mail.uc.edu
doi:10.1017/S0009838821000562

PSEUDO-APULEIUS' *DE FATO*

ABSTRACT

The note presents the discovery of a spurious Apuleian work entitled De fato *from MS n° 1040 at the Bibliothèque patrimoniale Villon in Rouen. This work is, in fact, a series of excerpts from Firmicus Maternus*, Mathesis *Book 1.*

Keywords: pseudepigrapha; Apuleius; Firmicus Maternus; manuscript

A twelfth-century manuscript conserved at the Bibliothèque patrimoniale Villon in Rouen (shelfmark n° 1040) preserves, alongside some writings of Cicero and Claudianus and the letters of Symmachus, a work entitled *De fato* from fol. 49v to fol. 54v. Both the *incipit* and the *explicit* ascribe it to the second-century rhetorician and Platonist Apuleius of Madauros.[1] However, after inspecting the eleven leaves transmitting this otherwise unknown work that is allegedly by Apuleius, it becomes apparent that this is a series of excerpts from Firmicus Maternus' *Mathesis* Book 1.[2] More precisely, fol. 49v = *Math.* 1.6.2–1.7.1; fol. 50r = *Math.* 1.7.2–9; fol. 50v = *Math*. 1.7.9–17; fol. 51r = *Math.* 1.7.17–26; fol. 51v = *Math*. 1.7.26–35; fol. 52r = *Math*. 1.7.35–1.8.2; fol. 52v = *Math.* 1.8.2–1.9.1; fol. 53r = *Math.* 1.9.1–1.10.8; fol. 53v = *Math*. 1.10.8–14;

[1] Apuleius' name is misspelt in both cases: cf. fol. 49v, col. 2, line 13: *incipit Apuleus de fato*; fol. 54v, col. 2, lines 6–7: *explicit Apuleus de fato*. L.D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission. A Survey of the Latin Classics* (Oxford, 1983), 67 mentions the Rouen MS in the context of Cicero's speeches and gives a reference in passing to the *De fato* therein preserved, without discussing or disputing the Apuleian authorship.

[2] The manuscript is written in an early Northern Textualis and was likely produced in a French scriptorium; on this script, see A. Derolez, *The Palaeography of Gothic Manuscript Books* (Cambridge, 2003), 72–101. The parchment leaves are ruled with a sharp point and divided into two columns, each of 40 lines. The folios I inspected (via high-resolution digitizations) show the intervention of a second hand—contemporaneous to the scribe—correcting small lacunae interlinearly or wider *sauts du même au même* in the margins. Later, a humanistic hand added a few variants in the margins.

© The Author(s), 2021. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Classical Association.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838821000550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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.[3]

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.[4] Therefore, the *De fato* may now be added to the list of Apuleius' pseudepigrapha.[5]

University of Bristol LEONARDO COSTANTINI
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

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

[4] 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.

[5] 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'Keeffe 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.

© The Author(s), 2021. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Classical Association. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838821000550 Published online by Cambridge University Press