The Classical Quarterly

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAQ>

Additional services for *The Classical Quarterly*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Dorothevs of Sidon

A. E. Housman

The Classical Quarterly / Volume 2 / Issue 01 / January 1908, pp 47 - 63

DOI: 10.1017/S0009838800025271, Published online: 11 February 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009838800025271

How to cite this article:

A. E. Housman (1908). Dorothevs of Sidon. The Classical Quarterly, 2, pp 47-63 doi:10.1017/S0009838800025271

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

DOROTHEVS OF SIDON.

THE 86 verses of Dorotheus printed at the end of Koechly's *Manetho*, 33 of which had already been published by Salmasius in his *exercitationes Plinianae* or his *diatribae de annis climactericis*, were edited by Iriarte from a scrap of manuscript at Madrid, into which they had been copied, as we now know, from the first book of the astrological treatise of Hephaestion of Thebes, who took Dorotheus for his chief authority. To these 86 verses nearly 300 more, by far the most of which are preserved in the second and third books, still unpublished, of Hephaestion's work, have now been added, in the *catalogus codicum astrologorum Graecorum* vol. vi (1903) pp. 67 and 91-113, by Mr W. Kroll, the best editor they could have found; a scholar who combines critical talent, knowledge of Greek, and knowledge of astrology, more happily than any of his associates, and who has emended much of the very corrupt text with conspicuous ability and success. A good many additional corrections, chiefly grammatical and metrical, have been made by Mr Ludwich in the *Rheinisches Museum* for 1904, pp. 42-54.

The text of Hephaestion depends at present upon two Parisian MSS employed by Mr A. Engelbrecht in the edition of the first book which he published in 1887 and by Mr Kroll in his collection of the fragments of Dorotheus: Par. gr. 2417 (P) of the 14th century and Par. gr. 2841 (A) of the 13th, from the latter of which the Madrid MS appears to have been copied. Of these two, P is the more complete but also the more corrupt: A, which is less negligently written, omits large portions of the text. What those portions are, is a question which the reader naturally and immediately asks, but which neither Mr Kroll nor Mr Engelbrecht answers. Mr Kroll says on p. 91 'in libri tertii capite quinto deficit', and you infer that it contains i 1—iii 5: Mr Engelbrecht on p. 8 of his preface reveals that this is not so, and that it omits the greater part of the second book; but at what chapter of that book it breaks off he does not reveal. However, by combining the inadequate information of Mr Engelbrecht's preface with the obscure indications of Mr Kroll's apparatus criticus, I have come to the conclusion (which may be wrong) that A contains those verses of Dorotheus which Mr Kroll numbers 1-90 and 121-127, and omits those which he numbers 91-120 and 128-358. Mr Kroll again conceals the fact, which Mr Engelbrecht divulges,

that P too omits a portion of the text, comprising Heph. i 3-19 and therefore comprising those verses of Dorotheus which Mr Kroll numbers 63-86. The following table gives, so far as I can ascertain it, the MS authority on which the text of the citations from Dorotheus reposes; and it may enable a reader to determine, what he will never find out from Mr Kroll's apparatus, whether Mr Kroll's text, when it differs from the lection of the one MS recorded in his note, presents the lection of the other MS, or is merely conjectural:

1-62 AP. 63-86 A. 87-90 AP. 91-120 P. 121-127 AP. 128-358 P.

Apart from these defects Mr Kroll's apparatus criticus has several smaller inaccuracies, whether its dissensions from Engelbrecht deserve that name or no.¹ p. 91 l. 4, text ἐπὴν . . . εὖρη, note 'ἐπεὶ . . . εὖροι codd.': from *cat. cod. astr. Graec.* iv p. 105 and *Rhein. Mus.* 1900 p. 332 we learn that both ἐπὴν and εὖρη are in most of the MSS. p. 91 footnote 'A (Paris. 2841) . . . et P (Paris. gr. 2417)', as if P belonged to the Greek series and A did not. p. 92 u. 13, text δέ <θ'> ἔξ, no note: the addition is Ludwig's. p. 92 u. 15, text ἔλαχεν Κρόνος, no note; though Engelbrecht records that A has ἔλαχε, which may well be right. p. 92 u. 20, note 'μετ' Ludwig': the emendation is not Ludwig's but Koechly's. p. 92 u. 21, text πυμάτας δύο δ' ἔλλαχε Φαίνων, no note: Engelbrecht says that AP omit δ. p. 92 u. 24, note '24 λαχαίνα P': according to Engelbrecht it is in u. 25 that P has this lection. p. 92 u. 33, text ἐπτα δὲ τὰς, no note: according to Engelbrecht δὲ is omitted by the MSS and was added by Iriarte. p. 93, '37 μοίρας om. A ut uid.': 37 should be 39, as a reference to Engelbrecht will show. p. 94 u. 66, text καὶ, no note: Engelbrecht and Koechly record that the MSS have τε καὶ. p. 95 u. 76, text Ὑδροχοῆϊ, note 'ὕδρηχώ A': nothing to say that Ὑδροχοῆϊ is a conjecture of Ludwig's. p. 96 l. 5, text κὰν (which is ungrammatical), no note: Engelbrecht p. 38 prints καὶ and mentions no variant. p. 107 footnote: 'cod. 3' should be 'cod. 1'. p. 108 l. 26, text βεβαῶς, note '26 βεβαῶς P': probably 26 should be 27, where we have βεβῶς.

The spelling and accentuation of his text are also rather careless. Some errors have been corrected explicitly or tacitly by Mr Ludwig,—u. 45 ἡ δὲ (for ἡδὲ), 158 εἰ γέ μεν, 212 γέ μεν, 220 and 221 ὅτε (for ὅτῃ), 236 δὲ ἐ, 280 φάεσσι (for φαέεσσι),—but others remain: 32 δὲ ὑπολειπομένας, 50 τῇ δ' ὕπο (but 48 and 62 τῷ δ' ὑπό), 74 ἡματίη, 94 δὲ ἐν, 142 φαυλοῖσι, 192 εὔτε, 243 ὑπέρθ', 302 ζωοῖς (for ζώοις), 317 δὲ ὅμοια, 341 κίχησι. No such veneration is due to our late and corrupt MSS as would justify the retention of the forms μοιράσατο (already corrected by Koechly) in u. 72 or φιλίας (gen. sing.) in u. 192. In u. 30 Mr Kroll prints τρίτατος Στίλβων μετὰ τούσδε | τέσσαρας Ἑρμείας ἔλαχεν where Koechly rightly has the adjective στίλβων, and on the other hand in u. 145 he prints Παφίην ὁπότεν βροτολογὸς ἰδῆσι | ἡ Φαίνων κρύοις where the sense requires the name

¹ I omit those places where Mr Kroll plainly contradicts Mr Engelbrecht's statements about P; for he tells us that he has himself collated this MS,

and therefore when at p. 93 u. 43 he says 'ὑστατος P' I assume that he is deliberately correcting the 'ὑστατον P' of Mr Engelbrecht.

Βροτολογιός. Here I will turn aside for a moment to correct a similar mistake in the texts of Manetho iii 277–80 :

Ἄφρογενεὶ δὲ συνὼν Φαίνων ἡδ' ἀντιπέρηθεν
 πρεσβυτέρας στείρας τ' ἀλόχους καὶ ἀεικέας αἰνῶς
 δῶκεν. καὶ τετράγωνος ἀεὶ χαλεπὸς κυθερείη. 279
 δεινὸς γάρ τε γάμους καὶ εὐφροσύνης ἄτερ ἔρδει.

The Latin version in the Firmin-Didot edition renders u. 279 'et quadratus semper grauis est ueneri' : Manetho however is not talking about *uenus* or *κυθήρεια* but about *coniubium* or *γάμος*. *κυθερείη* should be *Κυθερείη*, and the dative depends on *τετράγωνος*, 'quadratus Veneri' : so vi 278 ἀλλήλαις . . . τετράγωνοι, i 341 Ἡελίφ τετράγωνος Ἄρης.

Is it a rule of etiquette, or pure vanity, or irrepressible originality of genius, which ordains that each successive editor of a collection of fragments shall complicate our studies by changing the sequence and numeration established by his predecessor ? The first 62 verses of Dorotheus deal with the *χῶραι* and the *δρια* of the twelve zodiacal signs, and in Koechly's edition the 21 verses about the *χῶραι* were placed before the 41 verses about the *δρια* ; which was not indeed the order observed by Hephaestion, who quotes *χῶραι* and *δρια* alternately, but yet so far agreed with it that the *χῶραι* came first and the *δρια* second. Mr Kroll has not recurred to Hephaestion's arrangement, but he has inverted Koechly's, and has placed the *δρια* before the *χῶραι* ; so that all the first 62 lines have now a double reckoning, and whenever I refer to any of these verses I must use two numbers instead of one.

5 Kroll (= 26 Koechly).

ὀκτὼ δ' ἔλαχε πρώτας ὀρίων μοίρας Κυθήρεια.

To repair the metre of this verse Mr Ludwich formerly proposed *ὀκτὼ ἔχει* ; but every one of these twelve excerpts touching the *δρια* of the constellations is introduced by the conjunction *δέ*. He now, *Rhein. Mus.* 1904 p. 43, ejects *ὀρίων* and transposes *ἔλαχε* : *ὀκτὼ δὲ πρώτας ἔλαχεν μοίρας Κυθήρεια*. But it suffices simply to strike *ἔλαχε* out. Perhaps the reader thinks that the verb cannot be spared : the scribe thought so too, and that is why he inserted it. The sentence however is completed as follows,

ὀκτὼ δὲ πρωτας ὀρίων μοίρας Κυθήρεια
 ἐν τούτῳ, Στίλβων δὲ μετ' αὐτὴν ἔλλαχε μοίρας
 δις τρεῖς,

and *ἔλλαχε* is to be supplied from the second clause. Just as Dorotheus here postpones the verb, so in 36 (= 57) sq. does he postpone the object : *ἐπτα δὲ τὰς προτέρας Ἑρμῆς λάχεν, εἴτα μετ' αὐτὸν | ἕξ μοίρας Κύπρις* ; and there is a similar distribution of words in 76 sq. *μᾶλλον Κρόνος Ἵδροχοῆι, | Ζεὺς δ' ἐνὶ Τοξευτῇ, καὶ Σκορπίῳ ἡδεταὶ Ἄρης* and 98 *Σκορπίου εἰσαφίκεται ἢ ἐς δέμας Ἀρνειοῖο*. The construction *ἀπὸ κοινοῦ* often gives editors more trouble than it ought : thus in Maximus 127, *εἰ δὲ τε δεύτερον ἡμαρ ἢ ἐς τρίτον ἰθύσειεν*, Mr Ludwich alters *εἰ δὲ*

τε to εἰ δ' ἐς and all the other editors alter ἡ ἐς to ἡὲ ; yet the MS text is quite right and means ἐς δεύτερον ἢ τρίτον ἡμαρ.

28 (=49).

πέντε Ζεὺς φαέθων, πυμάτας δ' ἔξ ἔλλαχε Φαίλων.

It is the only dark blot on Dorotheus' fair fame as a metrist that he habitually allows a short final vowel to remain short before an initial ζ ; not, like Homer, in words which must enjoy this licence if they are to be used at all, Ζάκυνθος and Ζέλεια, but, like Opp. *cyn.* i 92 μεσσόθι ζώνης and Maneth. i 16 Ἑρμέα Ζῆνα, in words which can easily be brought into the verse without it, Ζεὺς, Ζυγός, and ζῶν. Three examples are presented by his MSS, 24 (45) ἐπτὰ δὲ Ζεὺς φαέθων, 185 ἐν τινι ζῶφ, 246 ἀμφὶ Ζυγῷ δέ, and five more have been added by emendations which are practically certain, 70 ἐν Διδύμοισι Ζυγῷ τε, 82 εἰκοστῇ δὲ μιῇ τε Ζυγοῦ, 189 ἀκουόντων ἐπὶ ζῶων, 259 εἰ δ' ἐνὶ ζῶφ, 304 εἰν ἐνὶ ζῶφ. Mr Ludwich does not believe that the author of these verses would have allowed the ε of πέντε in 28 (49) to be lengthened ἐν ἄρσει, in the second half of the foot, before the ζ of Ζεὺς ; and he proposes to write πέντε <δὲ> Ζεὺς as in 24 (45).

The change is easy, for δέ has again disappeared from the MSS and was restored by Iriarte in 33 (54) ἐπτὰ <δὲ> τὰς πρώτας ; but I do not admit that it is necessary or even probable, and surely it is rather wanting in charity. When the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness that he hath committed, and doeth that which is lawful and right, it seems hard that he should have no better welcome than ἀλλά μοι ἔρρε δόμοιο καὶ εἰς Ἑλένην ἀφίκανε. Let us reason from analogy. Dorotheus, like Homer himself, often lets a short final vowel remain short before an initial mute followed by ρ ; not only in words which render the licence necessary, τρίγωνος, τριγωνίζων, προσώποις (261, 305, 357, p. 91 ll. 18, 19), but in 84 ἐννέα τρισσάκι, p. 91 l. 3 σχήμασι τριπλεύροις, u. 38 (59) πυμάτας δὲ Κρόνος (65, 269, 315, 357), 316 ἔκ τε χρόνοιο, 326 εὔτε δὲ βρυχητήρος, 170 πλησιφέεσσα δρόμον. Yet this does not prevent him from lengthening a short vowel before χρ in 124,

καὶ λάθρη πρήσσοντι καὶ ὅσσα χρῆξε σιωπῆς,

even ἐν ἄρσει and even at the bucolic diaeresis. Again, Maximus ends u. 342 of his περὶ καταρχῶν with ἄλσει δμῶα, which is hardly less reprehensible than the ἐν τινι ζῶφ of Dorotheus ; yet he mends his ways and begins u. 434 with καί τε δμῶς προφύγησιν, and Mr Ludwich does not send him back to his sins. The truth seems to be that Dorotheus, in this long and dull enumeration of the ὅρια, has caught at every change of phrase which occurred to him ; and I willingly trust the MSS when they offer these three variations : 24 (45) ἐπτὰ δὲ Ζεὺς φαέθων, 28 (49) πέντε Ζεὺς φαέθων, 34 (55) ἐπτὰ δέ τοι Φαέθων.

48 (=7).

τῷ δ' ὑπὸ Θρηϊκίων καὶ Αἰθιόπων κλίμα κεῖται.

Examples of καί thus left unshortened ἐν ἄρσει when a vowel follows are pretty common in Mr Kroll's text of Dorotheus, and also in Mr Olivieri's text of

the fragments of Antiochus of Athens, *C.C.A.G.* i pp. 108–113. The examples in Antiochus are the following.

p. 109 l. 2 ζωῆς σῆμα δύνει καὶ ἄγρια πῆματ' ἔδωκεν.

An hexameter which has a cretic for its second foot may well have a trochee for its third; here however it is not the MS that gives bad metre, but the editor. These are the native wood-notes wild of Mr Olivieri: instead of ζωῆς σῆμα δύνει (which by the way is pure nonsense) the MS has ζωήσημα δύνει, whence there instantly emerges

καὶ χρόνον ὠκύν
ζωῆς ἡ μάλδυνε καὶ ἄγρια πῆματ' ἔδωκεν.

Next comes

p. 112 l. 1 εὐδήλους τοκέας καὶ εὐπρεπέας φίλους τε.

Here the remedy is obvious, τοκέας καὶ εὐπρεπέας. There remains

p. 112 l. 9 ἦν δ' Ἄρης νεύση καὶ ἐς δρόμον ὠκύν ἐλαύνη,

where the irregularity of metre and the inequality of tense would both be removed by writing νεύσι: the form δώσι occurs p. 112 l. 4 in the same position, πλοῦτον ὑπερδώσι καὶ ἐκ χθονὸς εὐρυχόροιο.

And now for Dorotheus. Apart from καί, he allows a long final vowel or diphthong to remain long ἐν ἄρσει before an initial vowel only where Homer allows it, at the bucolic diaeresis: 56 (15) αὐτῷ ἐπλετο πᾶσα, 173 ἐλαφρὴ ἔσσεται ὠνή; for in 99 Ἄρεως ἡ ἀστέρος (ῆ'), as in 209 καὶ οἱ (ῖοι) and 273 καὶ ἐλπίδες (Feλπίδες), there is properly speaking no hiatus, and the scansion is strictly Homeric. But in the case of καί Mr Kroll's text exhibits five violations of the rule, u. 48 (7 already quoted and the following four:

66 Ταύρου Παρθενικῆς καὶ Αἰγόκερω κρατέουσιν.

208 δια Σεληναίη καὶ Ἰχθύσιν ἀμφὶς εὐόσα.

322 ὕστερον αὖ φυλακὴν καὶ ἄλγεα φεύζεται αὐτός.

336 αὐτὰρ ἐν Ἰδρυχόφ καὶ Ἰχθύσι δὴν μενέουσι.

This same Dorotheus, be it remembered, has nearly 40 places where καὶ in similar circumstances is shortened, and he writes 262 ἡὲ καὶ ἄντικρυς (not ἡ), 310 ἐτέρωιο καὶ εἰς ὁδόν (not ἐτέρου), 356 δεσμοῖο καὶ ἦν (not δεσμοῦ), p. 67 l. 11 τοῖσι καὶ αἰθέρος (not τοῖς).

One of the exceptions, u. 66, is not merely bad metre but nonsense. There is no such sign in the zodiac as the Bull's Virgin or the Virgin's Bull; and if this sign existed, and Capricorn were added to it, the sum would be two, not three, which is the sum required. The second Trigon, of which Dorotheus is here speaking, consists of Taurus, Virgo, and Capricorn,

Ταύρου Παρθενικῆς τε καὶ Αἰγόκερω,

and to restore the sense restores the metre. And from Engelbrecht and Koechly we learn that this is the reading of the MSS.

Next I will take u. 322, for here again Mr Kroll has deserted the tradition.

The MS, instead of *ὑστερον αὖ φυλακὴν*, has *ὑστερον δ' αὖ φυλακτηκὴν*, and *φυλακτηκὴν* might just as easily be altered to *φυλακὴν τε*. But there is more than metre to think about, for the whole sentence runs thus,

ἐν Ταύρῳ μενέει δὲ πολὺν χρόνον· εἵνεκα δ' αὖτε
κτήσιος ἦν ἄρα τοῦτο πάθη, ταύτην μὲν ὀλέσσει,
ὑστερον δ' αὖ φυλακτηκὴν καὶ ἄλγεα φεύζεται αὐτός· 322

and the sense and the preceding *μὲν* require the *δέ* which Mr Kroll, seeking metre yet not obtaining it, has banished from the text. The prisoner, if the Moon is in Taurus at the time of his imprisonment, will lie long in durance and will forfeit any property which may have been the cause of his incarceration; but he himself in the end will escape safe and sound. Now in the first of these lines the MS has *δὲ μενέει δὲ*, corrected by Mr Kroll: the scribe, not content to wait for the coming *δέ*, inserted it before its time. Similarly in 322 I believe that Dorotheus wrote

ὑστερον αὖ φυλακὴν δὲ καὶ ἄλγεα φεύζεται αὐτός,

and that the copyist transferred the conjunction to its usual place. *δέ* is postponed till the middle of the verse is reached not only in 320 but in 183 *τετρατίῃ πλευρῇ δέ* (so Manetho ii 425, iii 409, vi 528, iv 77; and *τε* in 55 (14) *Ἰταλὴ χώρῃ τε*, 58 (17) *Ἀμμωνος Λιβύῃ τε*).

At u. 208 I will also quote the context:

λώϊον Ἵδροχόφ καὶ Σκορπίφ καὶ Λέοντι
δία Σεληναίῃ καὶ Ἰχθύσιν ἀμφὶς ἐούσα. 208

Mr Kroll does not tolerate the metre of 207 but writes *ἡδὲ Λέοντι*: the exchange of synonyms is a common form of error. I make the same correction in 208,

δία Σεληναίῃ ἡδ' Ἰχθύσιν ἀμφὶς ἐούσα.

The legitimate hiatus at the caesura recurs in 27 (48), 51 (10), 143, 167: what should induce Dorotheus to prefer a scansion which was illegitimate?

The verse from which I started, 48 (7), may be amended in the same way,

τῷ δ' ὑπὸ Θρηϊκίων ἡδ' Αἰθιόπων κλίμα κεῖται

though the *τε καὶ* of Koechly (and seemingly also of the cod. Matr.), ignored by Messrs Kroll and Engelbrecht, may just as well be right. And finally in u. 336 the parallel of Manetho v 155 *Ἵδροχόφ ἡδ' Ἰχθύσι* (if that is the true reading) suggests that we should write

αὐτὰρ ἐν Ἵδροχόφ ἡδ' Ἰχθύσι δὴν μενέουσι.

Here however there is yet another possibility. In 76 *ἐκ δ' ἄρα τοι τούτων μᾶλλον Κρόνος Ἵδροχοῇ* the MSS, instead of the last word, give *ὑδροχώω* and *ὑδροχόφ*; and in 336 the metre may again be corrected by restoring the longer form,

αὐτὰρ ἐν Ἵδροχοῇ καὶ Ἰχθύσι δὴν μενέουσι.

110.

‘*Ἀρης δ’ εὐτέ κεν <ῆ> καθυπέρτερος Ἑρμείας.*

This is Mr Kroll's text, and his note is ‘*κεν ῆ*] καὶ P’; and I wonder what it means. Is *κεν* a conjecture or a MS reading? It is not in A, for A, though Mr Kroll never says so, omits this portion of Hephaestion. But I notice in *C.C.A.C.* i p. 9 that a Florentine MS, Laur. xxviii 13, contains a transcript or paraphrase of this chapter ii 22, and Mr Kroll, for aught I know, may here be using it: the same taciturnity which conceals the absence of A would conceal the presence of Laur. xxviii 13.

Be that as it may, I demur to the addition of *ῆ*, for Dorotheus, who has *συνέωσι* at 284, nowhere employs any form of the verb *εἰμί* which Homer does not employ, and the contraction cannot safely be ascribed to him by conjecture. If *κεν* is the reading of the Florentine MS, then I should write *εὐτέ κ’ ῆ*; but if *καὶ* is the sole tradition, then *εὐτε κίη* or *κίοι* would be equally probable: see 182 *θεῆς συνοδόνδε κίουσης* and 305 *ἐρχόμενοι*.

The next sentences of Hephaestion's prose require correction as follows. *ἀκούει δὲ ἀλλήλων τὰ ἴσον ἀπέχοντα τῶν ἰσημερινῶν ζφδίων, οἷον Ταῦρος (Σκορπίος P) καὶ Ἰχθύες, Δίδυμοι καὶ Ὑδροχόος, καὶ ἐφεξῆς τὰ ἄλλα ζφδία. Κριὸς δὲ καὶ Ζυγὸς, φησὶν ἀκολουθῶν Θρασύλλῳ, οὐκ ἀκούει ἀλλήλων. βλέποντα δὲ ζφδία τὰ ἴσον ἀπέχοντα τῶν τροπικῶν ζφδίων. Κριὸς δὲ ἐπιτάττει τῷ Ζυγῷ διὰ τὸ ἐν μὲν Κριῷ αὔξειν τὴν ἡμέραν, ἐν δὲ Ζυγῷ μειοῦν. ὁμοίως καὶ Καρκίνος (Σκορπίῳ καὶ P) Αἰγόκερψι ἐπιτάττει, τῷ αὐτῷ τρόπῳ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα.* ‘Iam bracchia contrahit ardens Scorpius et caeli iusta plus parte relinquit’. That sign must have been in the ascendant when the scribe was copying this paragraph, for a few lines lower down it has even usurped the place of the preposition *ἀπό*.

111.

Φαίνων καὶ Πυρόεις νυκτὸς ἡματι δ’ Ἀρης.

‘lacuna sex litterarum in P.’ These six letters can be recovered without any uncertainty: *Ἀρης* is another name for *Πυρόεις*, and the lost word was another name for *Φαίνων*.

Φαίνων καὶ Πυρόεις, νυκτὸς <Κρόνος>, ἡματι δ’ Ἀρης.

112–116.

*ἄλλοι δ’ ἐκ Μήνης εἰς ὄγδοον ὠρονόμοιο
ζῶν ἀριθμήσαντες ἀπὸ Κρόνου αὐθις ἔδωκαν.
εἰς δὲ δὴ λήξειε τόπον καὶ ἀνακτα τόποις,
σκέπτονται τούτων ἐπιμάρτυρες οὔτινές εἰσι
τῶν ἀπο δὲ φράσσαντο τέλος αἰσχρόν τε καὶ ἐσθλόν.*

114

A conjunction is wanted in 114, *εἰς δὲ δὴ λήξειε τόπον*. For the metre see 178 *καὶ πρήγμα λῶν καταθήσει*, 236 *Ταύρῳ δὲ μέγα χεῖμα*. And δὲ, though Mr Kroll

forgets to record it, is actually the reading of a Venetian MS, Marc. 334, which preserves verses 112 and 114 in a chapter printed in *C.C.A.G.* ii p. 159.

135-137.

ἄνδρα μὲν Ἥελιον καὶ ἀνερχόμενον σκοπὸν ὄρης,
αὐτὴν δ' ἐκ ζώου θ' ἡμερόφρονα δυομένοιο
κούρην ἂν φράσσαιο καὶ ἡῦκόμου Κυθερείης.

Mr Kroll, who believes the MSS when they impute to Dorotheus the scansion *Zūγῶ* and *Zūgoû*, and even proposes to thrust upon him by conjecture the hiatus *τῇ δ' ἴσα Ἑρμείας*, here prints *ἡμερόφρονα* in u. 136 and says 'uocalem longam pro breui usurpatam poeta haud indignam putauī'. Mr Ludwig, remarking that he does not know what *ἡμερόφρονα κούρην* would mean, himself proposes *ἱερόφρονα*, which is downright comical. Meanwhile the altogether superfluous *θ'* is reverentially preserved. Dorotheus wrote *θ ε μ ε ρ ό φ ρ ο ν α*: Hesych. *θεμερόφρονας· συνετοῦς, σώφρονας*.

142.

Ἥελιος φαύλοισι βεβλαμμένος Ἄφρογενής τε.

If once we turn our eyes away from his pertinacious misconception of the properties of initial ζ (which after all is not more heinous in itself than Hesiod's *πετραίη τε σκινή*), Dorotheus is a good metrist and strict in his observance of position: stricter than Homer, incomparably stricter than the rest of the astrologers. Even at the contact of two words he never neglects it unless the second letter is ρ, and only twice does he allow the first letter to be a medial 170 *πλησιφάεσσα δρόμον*, 326 *εὔτε δὲ βρυχητήρος*. Within the body of a word he disregards it only in a single instance, and the exception proves the rule: it is the astrological term *τετράγωνος* (181, 196, 261), which cannot without this licence be brought into hexameter verse. True, at 190 there is one example of *ἀριθμός* against six (96, 97, 113, 129, 170, 210) of *ἀριθμός* and *ἀριθμήσαι*; but the passage is unintelligible and corrupt, and the context rather suggests *ἀρθμός*. The *τετράπλευρον* of 175, as we shall soon see, is merely a conjecture.

Maximus and the genuine Manetho of books ii iii vi are much less scrupulous than Dorotheus, and neglect internal position in such words as *πότμον*, *λυγρῇ*, *γενέθλη*, *ἀθρήσαι*, *κύκλος*, *ἄχρι*, *κύπριν*, *δίφρω*, *τέκνα*. But even they, in grafting Attic scansion on epic verse, do not transgress all limits; and though Maximus disregards initial γλ and δμ in 11 *ἐνὶ γλήνεσιν* and 342 *ἄλσει δμῶα*, and Manetho initial βλ in ii 418 *παντοίαις τε βλαβαῖς* (which the editors print as *βλάβαις*), they never make light of βλ or any such weighty combination of letters within the body of a word. When we reach the so-called 4th book of Manetho, then indeed we enter another world, where not only *ἀκτῖνᾶ βλέπη* but also *θρασύγλωσσέας* and *διᾶβλήτορας* and *ἔβλασταν* and *μετᾶβλήμασι* and *ὑπὸβλητα* may be encountered; but this is a world even further removed from Dorotheus than from the Manetho of the genuine books.

And the author of this verse 142 is also the author of 324,

ἡμασι τοῖς πρώτοις τετρύσεται ἐν κακότητι.

He might have written *πρώτοις τετρύσεται* with no fear of censure, but he would not. Yet Mr Kroll, without any protest from Mr Ludwich, supposes that he wrote *φαύλοισι βεβλαμμένος*; wrote it in a verse where he was so mindful of his principles that he did not give the planet Venus her proper name and say ἡδ' Ἀφροδίτη, but called her Ἀφρογενής instead.

And now, what of the MSS? A is absent, P has *φαῦλος*, and *φαύλοισι*, unless Mr Kroll has surreptitiously imported it from Laur. xxviii 13, is his own conjecture Write *φαύλοισι βεβλαμμένος*.

150, 151.

ἐσθλοὶ δ' αὖ μβίοις ὠκὺν γόνον εἰσορόωντες
παίδων τέκμαρ ἔχουσιν ἐτήτυμον.

Mr Kroll proposes *ἐσθλοὶ δ' ἀμφοῖν*¹; Mr Ludwich makes a groundless objection to the lengthening of the final syllable and conjectures *αὐξιβίοις* or *αὐξιβίοι τ'*. What meaning they assign to *ὠκὺν γόνον* I cannot tell.

Cobet *nou. lect.* p. 281, in disparagement of a remark of Elmsley's at Eur. *Heracl.* 38, that δ and ρ are sometimes confused, has these sentences: 'non est ea utilis observatio, quoniam ii errores non orti sunt ex similitudine formae oculos scribarum fallente, sed ex mera oscitantia eorum, qui aliud agentes quiduis pro quouis describebant. fieri potest ut α in β transierit et in γ et in ε, sed nihil prodest id saepe notare et sunt hae observationes steriles'. But the change of α into β, at any rate, is neither difficult nor uncommon: Bast *comm. pal.* p. 707 'si Alpha . . . sic scribitur, ut ductus calami superne interruptus hiet, forma eius ad Beta accedit: . . . itaque non mirum, scribas legisse . . . ἀρβιοῦσθαι pro ἀραιοῦσθαι' In the verse of Antiochus printed *C.C.A.G.* i p. 112 l. 21 we have the converse error, *δλαῖον* for *δλβιον*, and here the true reading is

ἐσθλοὶ δ' αὖ Μαίης ὠκὺν γόνον εἰσορόωντες,

'the benefics (Sun Moon Jupiter Venus) when they aspect Mercury', who is not *ἐσθλός* but *ἐπίκοινος*. Mercury is *Μαίης κοῦρος* in 69 and *Μαίης πάϊς* in 340, and *ὠκός* is one of this planet's stock epithets, *C.C.A.G.* ii p. 82.

156, 157.

τοῦνεκεν ἐν Κριῶ μὲν ἀναίνεο πάμπαν εἰούσης
νύμφεσιν.

νυμφεύσειν Kroll: it must be either *νυμφεύειν* or *νυμφεύσαι*.

¹ Mr Ludwich says that this ought to be proparoxytone: it ought to be properispomenon.

158-162.

εἴ γε μὲν ἐμ πόσιός τις ἔχει δάμαρ ἢ δάμαρτος
 ἀνὴρ ἐν ζῳῷ Μήνην κακοδαιμονέοντι,
 τοῦτων ἀμφοτέρων κράτος οἴσεται, ὅς κεν ἔχῃσι
 δωδέκατον μετὰ χώρον ἀφ' ὠρονόμοιο Σελήνην
 εἰν ἐτέρου γενέσει, καὶ δεσπότη εἵκελος ἔσται.

Mr Kroll prefixes an obelus to the ἐμ of 158 and Mr Ludwich alters it to ἦ, but it is quite sound. The construction is εἴ τις δάμαρ ἔχει Μήνην ἐμ πόσιος ζῳῷ κακοδαιμονέοντι ἢ τις ἀνὴρ Μήνην ἐν δάμαρτος ζῳῷ κακοδαιμονέοντι. If, in the wife's geniture, the Moon is situate in that sign of the zodiac which, in the husband's geniture, occupies the twelfth house (the κακὸς δαίμων), or vice versa, then that one of the pair will be master in whose geniture the Moon is not so situate, but is found in a sign of the zodiac which, in the other party's geniture, comes after the twelfth house. δωδέκατον μετὰ χώρον means in the first house (the ὠροσκόπος itself), or the second, or any other down to the eleventh; for Manetho vi 35 sqq. speaks of the twelfth house in these terms, ἦν δὲ Σεληναίη μὲν ἐφ' ὠρονόμφ ἐπιτέλλη | ἐν προτέρῳ δ' ὥρης ζῳῷ Φαίνων προθέσιν, | δαίμονα τὸν τε κακὸν πρότεροι φῶτες καλέσαντο.

What I have said above will, I hope, enable a reader to understand the similar passage in Manetho vi 216-221, and to correct the blunders of the Latin version in the Firmin-Didot edition :

δαίμονι δ' ἦν χαλεπῷ κείνης Μήνη πέλη ἀνδρὶ,
 αἰὲν ἀτασθαλίῃσι γυνὴ ἀθερίζει ἀκοίτην
 οὐδὲν ὀπιζομένη λεχέων θεσμῶν τε γάμοιο.
 ταῦτά δ' ἄρ' ἐκ ποσίων τελέθει δειλήσι γυναιξίν,
 εὖτε Σεληναίη ἀλόχοις ἐν δαίμονι λυγρῷ
 ἀνδρῶν φαίνεται· δίχα γὰρ νόον αἰὲν ἔχουσιν.

Here δαίμονι χαλεπῷ and λυγρῷ mean the same as ζῳῷ κακοδαιμονέοντι in Dorotheus.

174-176.

καὶ δὲ Σεληναίης φάσαι λεύσσης κεν ἰούσης
 ἐκ συνόδου πρῶτον μετὰ τετράπλευρον
 αἶθοπος Ἡελίοιο, δικαιότεροιςιν ἄμεινον.

Mr Kroll amends the φάσαι of 174 to φάσιν αἰ; but we ought not to violate by conjecture the rule which forbids αἶ κεν to be thus separated: besides, αἰ is not found in Dorotheus any more than in Manetho or Maximus, though both Mr Kroll and Mr Ludwich introduce it at 242¹. The metre of 175 Mr Kroll attempts to restore by writing πρῶτον μετα<νισσομένης> τετράπλευρον; but what he builds up with one hand he breaks down with the other. Dorotheus, as I explained at u. 142, did not scan τετράπλευρον as ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪: his scansion is seen in 271 Ζεὺς δ' ὅτε τετράπλευρος

¹ καὶ καδε βλοσυροῖο cod., καὶ δ' αἶ κεν βλ. Ludwich: probably καὶ δ' εἶ κε βλ.

ἄνω χθονὸς οὖσαν ἴδεται, 92 τριπλεύρου κρατέοντας ἐν ᾧ θεὸς "Ἡλῖός ἐστιν, p. 91 l. 3 σχήμασι τριπλεύροις κακοεργέες ἀμβλύνονται. Moreover, if a second participle is added to *ιούσης ἐκ συνόδου μετὰ τετράπλευρον*, a conjunction must be added as well. The following gives at any rate the form of the verse and the sentence :

Σεληναίης φάσιν εἰ λεύσσης κεν ιούσης
ἐκ συνόδου <πρώτην>πρώτον μετὰ τετράπλευρον
αἰθοπος Ἡελίοιο.

179, 180.

ἕως δέ κεν εἰς διάμετρον,
ἐσθλή πιπράσκοντι καὶ ἐγκαλέοντι συνοίσει.

The subject of the sentence is the Moon. 'κεν εἰς] possis κίη uel κίχη' says Mr Kroll ; but there is a much easier way :

ἕως δέ κεν εἰς διάμετρον
ἐ λ θ η, πιπράσκοντι καὶ ἐγκαλέοντι συνοίσει.

182.

ὠνεῖσθαι τότε καλὸν δ' βούλεται ἢ διακόψαι.

Throughout this passage the man to whom the Moon portends profit or loss in his buying and selling is addressed in the second person : 171 ὠνήσει, δώσεις, 174 λεύσσης, 177 δώσεις, 178 καταθήσεται, 184 δοίης. βούλεται therefore should be β ο ύ λ ε α ι.

185-190.

Heph. iii 20 (πῶς δεῖ ἄρχοντι καὶ δυνάστη συντυχεῖν) . . . εἰ δὲ ἴδης καὶ τὰς γενέσεις τούτων οἷς συντυχεῖν θέλεις,

καὶ δ' ὅταν ἐξ ὥρης κεκλωμένον ἔν τινι ζώῳ
κείμενον εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν, ἔχει δ' ἐν τῷδε Σελήνῃ
ᾧ τινι συμβαλέεις, μάλα κεν πεφιλήσεται αὐτῷ. 185

185 'nil mutare ausus sum nisi ζωοῖς' Kroll. Mr Ludwich, apparently pre-occupied with the solecism ὅταν ἔχει and heeding little else, removes it by the following conjecture, καὶ δ' ὅταν ἐξ ε ὕ ρ η κ υ κ λ ο ὕ μ ε ν ο ν ἔν τινι ζώῳ | κ ε ἰ μ ε ν ο ς εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν, ἔ χ η δ' ἐν τῷδε etc., 'was einen erträglichen Sinn giebt' says he. I wish he had explained this sense, for I can discover none, nor even a construction. The subject of *ἐξεύρη* can only be the antecedent of *ᾧ τινι*, the great man with whom you are seeking an interview ; how does this personage perform the feat of lying in a sign of the zodiac for a revolving year ? and where are we to find an object for *ἐξεύρη* ? and with what intent does Mr Ludwich add 'Vgl. S. 91 V. 2 ἀστήρ δ' οὐκέτι φαῦλος, ἐπὶ ἄγαθόν τόπον εὔρη' ? This is not the only place where Mr Ludwich's proposals leave me much in doubt whether he comprehends the astrological requirements of the context.

I adopt however his *κυκλούμενον* (see Eur. *Or.* 1645 and *Phoen.* 477 *ἐνιαυτοῦ κύκλον*, *Phoen.* 544 *τὸν ἐνιαύσιον κύκλον*) and I conjecture

καὶ δ' ὅ τ' ἄναξ ὥρης κυκλούμενον ἔν τινι ζῳῷ
 κείμενος ἦν ἐνιαυτὸν, ἔχει δ' ἐν τῷδε Σελήνην
 ᾧ τινι συμβαλέεις, μάλα κεν πεφιλήσεται αὐτῷ.

κείμενος ἦν for *κείμενον εἰς* is no more than a metathesis of the two final letters. The *ἄναξ ὥρης* is the *οἰκοδεσπότης ὠροσκόπου*, called *ἄναξ ὠρονόμου* in 226 sq. and *ὥρης βασιλεύς* in 304 sq.,—the planet who is lord of that house in which the horoscope chances to be. The sense therefore is this: if the lord of the house of your horoscope remained in one sign of the zodiac for a whole year (this might easily happen if the *οἰκοδεσπότης* were Jupiter and usually happens when the *οἰκοδεσπότης* is Saturn), and if, in the geniture of the potentate whose presence you are about to enter, the Moon is found to have been situate in that same sign, then you will gain his favour.

We proceed :

ἦν δ' ἔτος ἀμφοτέροισιν ὁμοῦ πέσῃ εἰς ἓνα χῶρον,
 σύμφωνον· τὸ δ' ὅμοιον ἀκουόντων ἐπὶ ζῳῶν
 ἦεν ἢ δερκομένων.

190

The first year of a man's life, I must premise, falls under that sign of the zodiac in which his horoscope was situate, the second under the next sign, and so on till the 12 signs are exhausted; the 13th year belongs to the same sign as the first, and the circle revolves anew. If now both you and the great personage to whom you present your petition are passing a year of your life which falls under the same sign, that circumstance is *σύμφωνον*, conducive to harmony. Suppose for example that you were born nearly 26 years ago under the sign of Aries, and he was born nearly 30 years ago under the sign of Sagittarius, then the current year of both your lives falls under the sign of Taurus, and your petition is likely to succeed. *τὸ δ' ὅμοιον*, the case is similar, *ἐπ' ἀκουόντων ἢ δερκομένων ζῳῶν*; that is, if the year of his life and the year of yours, instead of falling under one sign, fall under two signs which hear one another (i.e. are equidistant from the equinoctial signs), such as Taurus and Pisces, or which see one another (i.e. are equidistant from the tropical signs), such as Taurus and Virgo.

Mr Kroll corrects the metre of 190 by writing *ἦν* for *ἦεν*; but the tense is wrong and no verb is needed. I write *ἦ ἐν νυ δερκομένων*, comparing 294 sq. *παρέστων* | *ἦ ἐν νυ λευσσόντων*.

205-210.

Heph. iii 28 φυλάττου δὲ δανείζων τὴν τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ μετὰ Κρόνου στάσιν καὶ ἔτι τῆς Σελήνης ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ Λέοντος καὶ τῶν Διδύμων καὶ τοῦ Τοξότου, καὶ ὅτε τούτων αἱ ἀρχαὶ τῶν ζφδίων

γαίης ὑπερ ἀντέλλουσιν.¹

205

εἰ δὲ λαβεῖν ἐθέλεις αὐτὸς χρέος, ὧδέ τοι ἔστω
 λώϊον· Ὑδροχόφ καὶ Σκορπίφ ἡδὲ Λέοντι
 δία Σεληναίη ἡδ' Ἰχθύσιν ἀμφὶς ἐούσα
 ἡ ἐνὶ Τοξευτῇ καὶ οἱ φάος ἐνδεὲς ἔστω,
 ὥς δ' αὐτως καὶ ἀριθμός.

210

I do not understand. What can be the meaning of ὧδέ τοι ἔστω λώϊον? The three words ὧδέ τοι ἔστω, 'let the celestial position be as follows,' might be sense; and the prose paraphrase quoted by Mr Kroll from cod. Vind. phil. gr. 108 (not 179 as he says), ἐὰν δανείσασθαι θέλῃς, ἔστω ἡ Σελήνη Ὑδροχόφ ἡ Σκορπίφ ἡ Λέοντι ἡ Ἰχθύσιν ἡ Τοξότη λευσιφωτοῦσα καὶ τοῖς ἀριθμοῖς ἀφαιροῦσα, is also sense; and so are 129 sq. προσθετικὴ φάειν . . . ἔστω τοι Κερόεσσα, 151 sq. ἐν τροπικῷ δὲ | ζῳῷ μηδὲ νυ Κύπρις ἔοι τότε μηδὲ Σελήνη, 294 sq. Ζεὺς δὲ καὶ Ἀφρογενῆς ὥρῃ Μήνῃ τε παρέστων | ἡ νυ λευσσόντων; but add λώϊον to any of these imperatives or optatives and it will turn them into nonsense. And what can be the grammar of 207-9? Who will construe me the words Σεληναίη ἐούσα ἐνὶ Τοξευτῇ καὶ οἱ φάος ἐνδεὲς ἔστω?

Structure and sense may both be obtained in this way:

εἰ δὲ λαβεῖν ἐθέλεις αὐτὸς χρέος, ὧδέ τοι ἔστωι
 λώϊον Ὑδροχόφ καὶ Σκορπίφ ἡδὲ Λέοντι
 δία Σεληναίη ἡδ' Ἰχθύσιν ἀμφὶς ἐούσα
 ἡ ἐνὶ Τοξευτῇ καὶ οἱ φάος ἐνδεὲς ἔστω,
 ὥς δ' αὐτως καὶ ἀριθμός.

The ὧδε of 206 now means not 'as follows' but 'in that case,' εἰ δανείσασθαι ἐθέλεις καὶ μὴ δανείσαι. Perhaps λώϊον should be λῶων (the form λῶον occurs at 178), but I doubt if the change is necessary: the neuter will mean 'a better sign.' Then is added the caution καὶ οἱ φάος ἐνδεὲς ἔστω, like κακὸς δέ ἐ μή τις ὁράτω in 236.

211-215.

εἰ δὲ νύ τις πάτρηθεν ἐπ' ἀλλοδαπὴν χθόνα βαίνοι,
 αὐτὸν ἀφ' ὠρονόμου, χῶρόν γε μὲν, εἰς δν ἄπεισιν, 212
 ἐκ δυτικοῦ κέντρον, πρῆξιν δέ τοι ἐκ μεσάτοιο
 ὕψους εὖ φράσσαιο, τί δ' αὖ τέλος ἔσσεται αὐτῇ 214
 ζῳῷ ὑποχθονίφ σάφα κεν μάλα τεκμήρηαι.

Verse 212 must be punctuated as above, or else the two last commas must be omitted: ὠρονόμου, χῶρόν γε μὲν εἰς δν ἄπεισιν | ἐκ. Mr Kroll's punctuation (ὠρονόμου, χῶρόν γε μὲν εἰς δν ἄπεισιν, | ἐκ) destroys both sense and grammar, and so does Mr Ludwig's (ὠρονόμου χῶρόν γε μὲν, εἰς δν ἄπεισιν, | ἐκ). It is probable that Mr Kroll, despite the perversity of his stops, understands the passage; but

¹ So I write: ὑπὲρ ἀνατέλλουσιν cod., ὑπεραντέλλουσι Kroll.

Mr Ludwich, by proposing $\tau\acute{\iota}$ δὴ ($\tau\acute{\iota}$ δὲ cod., $\tau\acute{\iota}$ δ' $\alpha\delta$ Kroll) in 214, makes it plain that he does not. Its meaning is this: if a man takes a journey to a foreign country, consult the horoscope or ascendant about the man himself, the occident about the land whither he is bound, the zenith about the business he has in hand, and the nadir about its final issue. Compare Heph. iii 26 (Doroth. 204) $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ τις οὖν χρήζων προσενέγκαι αἴρεσιν περὶ οἰουδήποτε πράγματος, 'κείνουν ἀφ' ὠρονόμοιο λογίζεο, σὸν δὲ τὸ δύνουν,' ἡ πράξις τὸ μεσουράνημα, τὸ τέλος τὸ ὑπόγειον, cod. Vind. 108 fol. 278 $\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu$ δανείσασθαι θέλῃς, ἔστω ὁ μὲν ὠροσκόπος ὁ δανειστής, τὸ δὲ δύνουν ὁ δανειζόμενος, τὸ διδόμενον τὸ μεσουράνημα· τὸ δὲ ὑπόγειον μηνύσει τὴν ἔκβασιν τοῦ χρέους.

In 214 I have written $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\eta$ for the $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta$ of the MS, which is really the same thing. Mr Kroll's $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$ is unnecessary and undesirable: $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta$ is $\tau\eta$ πρήξει, see 237 ἔργου τέλος.

226–228.

$\nu\alpha\iota$ μὲν δὴ καὶ ἄνακτα <τόπου> τεκμαίρεο Μήνης
ἡδὲ καὶ ὠρονόμου, μή που κεκρυμμένοι ἦ
φθέγγεα μαρμαρυγῇ δεδασμένοι Ἡελίοιο.

When Mr Kroll writes $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\rho\upsilon\mu\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\eta$ | $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ $\mu\alpha\rho\mu\alpha\rho\upsilon\gamma\eta$ <τε> $\delta\epsilon\delta\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ Ἡελίοιο, he retains just the one word which must at all cost be got rid of. The $\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\delta\epsilon\sigma\pi\acute{o}\tau\eta\varsigma$ Σελήνης and the $\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\delta\epsilon\sigma\pi\acute{o}\tau\eta\varsigma$ ὠροσκόπου are planets, and it is impossible for a planet to be $\delta\epsilon\delta\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$, divided or distributed, by the brilliancy of the sun. This too is poor diction, $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\rho\upsilon\mu\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ $\mu\alpha\rho\mu\alpha\rho\upsilon\gamma\eta$ $\tau\epsilon$ $\delta\epsilon\delta\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$; nor do I see why the participles should be changed from plural to singular, for there are two ἄνακτες, not one. The following is easier and more effectual:

μή που κεκρυμμένοι εἶεν,
 $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\alpha$ $\mu\alpha\rho\mu\alpha\rho\upsilon\gamma\eta$ $\delta\epsilon\delta\alpha\mu\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\iota$ Ἡελίοιο.

For the accusative compare 78 Κύπρις δ' ἐν Ταύρῳ γάννυται νόον.

283–285.

ἡνίκα δ' ὠρονόμῳ κακομήτιες ἐγγεγάωσιν
ἀστέρεις, $\epsilon\upsilon\acute{\epsilon}\rho\kappa\tau\alpha\iota$ δὲ θοῇ συνέωσι Σελήνῃ,
ἡ καὶ ἐναλλάγδην, σκαίην ποιοῦσι θάλασσαν.

'latet $\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\rho\gamma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ uel sim.' says Mr Kroll ($\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\rho\gamma\omicron\acute{\iota}$ rather); Mr Ludwich proposes $\epsilon\upsilon\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\kappa\tau\alpha\iota$. The same amount of change, the omission of one letter and the transposition of another, will furnish a more natural and better authenticated word, $\epsilon\upsilon\acute{\epsilon}\rho\kappa\tau\alpha\iota$. This contracted form of $\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\rho\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\tau\eta\varsigma$ is used by Antipater of Thessalonica in *anth. Pal.* ix 92 3 sq. $\omega\varsigma$ καὶ αἰοιδὸς ἀνὴρ ξενίων χάριν ἀνταποδοῦναι | ὕμνους $\epsilon\upsilon\acute{\epsilon}\rho\kappa\tau\alpha\iota\varsigma$ οἶδε παθὼν ὀλίγα.

326-328.

εὔτε δὲ βρυχητήρος ὑπερφορέοιτο Λέοντος,
 ἀνδρὸς ἐρισθενέος καὶ μείζονος ἄλγε' ἔκητι
 ἔπ ε τ α ι, οὐδὲ μίνυνθα συνέσσεται ἀλλ' ἐπὶ δηρόν.

If the Moon is in Leo τῇ ὥρᾳ τοῦ εἶργεσθαι, at the time when the man is cast into prison, then — what? 'fort. nil latet nisi ἔσσεται' Kroll. That cannot be, for the sense would require ἔστι. This is a chapter περὶ τῶν εἰργομένων, and the ἄλγεα are no future troubles but the present ills of imprisonment. Mr Ludwig conjectures ἔψεται: the verb ἔπεσθαι, 'come upon him', 'attach themselves to him', is appropriate, but again the tense is wrong; so I should propose ἔσπ ε τ α ι, for the likeness of σ to the first half of π often causes its omission or insertion when π follows.

Under the same misapprehension Mr Kroll completes the imperfect verse 334

Τοξευτήρ ἐπὶ μακρὸν ἐν ἄλγεσιν ἀνέρα

by adding <θήσει>, which the sense of the passage will not admit, for the man is already ἐν ἄλγεσι κείμενος. Some such verb as <τρύσει> is wanted: compare 324 τετρύσεται ἐν κακότητι.

348-350.

κῆν συναφὴν ἀκτίσιν ὑπ' Ἡελίοιο τυχούσῃ
 Κύπριδι ποιῆται, τότε γὰρ βροτὸν αἰνὰ παθόντα
 ἐκ συνοχῆς λύσειεν ἀεικελίων τ' ὀδυνάων.

γὰρ in 349 unknots the sentence, and Mr Kroll proposes τότε δ' ἀρ βροτόν, to which Mr Ludwig objects that Dorotheus never uses this apocope. Write τότε γ' ἀ ν βροτόν: 238 sq. ἐν Διδύμοις εὐτ' ἂν τις ἀπ' ὀγδοάτης ἀνάγῃται, | νόστος μὲν χρόνιος τότε γ' ἔσσεται.

p. 91 l. 5.

οὐδὲ τόπος δὲ κακὸς, χρηστὸν ὁπότ' ἀσπάζοιτο.

ὅτε ἀσπάζεται L.

text and note are Mr Kroll's: the following are mine.

οὐδὲ τόπος δὲ κακὸς, χρηστὸν ὅταν ἀσπάζηται.

χρηστὸν ὅτ' ἂν Par. 454, χρηστότε Laur. xxviii 34, χρηστὸν Monac. 287. ἀσπάζεται Ludwig progr. Regiom. 1899 p. 4, ἀσπάζεται codd., ὁπότ' ἀσπάζοιτο F. Boll C.C.A.G. i p. 146, nondum prolato cod. Par.

Mr Ludwig objects to the lengthening of the last syllable of χρηστόν, and declares in *Rhein. Mus.* 1904 p. 54 that it has no parallel among the remains of Dorotheus; but he has overlooked 116 τῶν ἅπο δὴ φράσσαντο τέλος αἰσχρόν τε καὶ ἐσθλόν.

The hexameter fragments of Antiochus of Athens, two or three of which I have corrected in discussing u. 48 (7) above, are preserved in cod. Angelic. 29 an.

1388, and were printed, I cannot say edited, in 1898 by Mr A. Olivieri, *C.C.A.G.* i pp. 108–113. Since the title of Antiochus' work was *θησαυροί*, Mr Kroll is of opinion that it was only an anthology; and he suggests in *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 1899 p. 746 that the verses may belong to Dorotheus. That they most certainly cannot: they are the production of a much inferior and quite dissimilar poet. Dorotheus, within the space of 370 lines, disregards internal position only thrice in *τετράγωνος* and perhaps once in *ἀριθμός*: Antiochus (to call him so), within the space of 115, disregards it in *πατρί, πατρίδος, πατρώϊα, τέτρατον, ἀλλοτρίων, Ἀφροδίτη, τέχναις, ἀθρήση, ἀμφικρατοῦσαν, and ἄχρηστος*. And much other proof could I adduce; but not to be tedious I content myself with one decisive fact: Dorotheus has *κεν* or *κε* in some thirty places, Antiochus nowhere.

Antiochus' text also is much worse than Dorotheus' text, and indeed its plight is often hopeless. But even the MS itself is not in all respects so vicious as the printed page of Mr Olivieri, whose metre and spelling and accentuation are a sight to dream of, not to tell. *σῆμα δύνει, ἐσήμᾶνε πλούτον, μείων πάλιν πλὴν, πολυαλγέας κύδιμος, ἡματα, ἡματι, ἡμάτιος, ὑπερδῶσι, ἀθρήσης, πολυάλγεα, πολυκέρδεα, πολυέργεα, χρυσοέργεα, πολυγήθεσιν, εὐχαρίτας, κτέατοισιν, νιφιδέσσι, μοίραν* (four times), *χερεῖον, χαριλάμπεις, ἐριτίμον, τεκεῶν, φιλοπαῖδα, ἡτέων, φαινομένοισι τε ἐν, πλούτον τε, Ζεὺς δε, οὐ ποτιφαίνοι, ἄντιος ἐστὶν Ἀρήει*: seldom does a Greek MS amass within this narrow compass so many blunders of this particular sort; and the notes inform us that some of them at any rate are Mr Olivieri's conjectures, and one or two of them, sad to say, Mr Kroll's. Mr Olivieri, according to Mr Ludwich, is 'einer der rührigsten und tüchtigsten unter den jungen Philologen Italiens', and I daresay this judgment is no less true than dismal: *πάλαι ποτ' ἦσαν ἄλκιμοι Μιλήσιοι*.

The conjectures of Mr Kroll and Mr Ludwich¹ are as numerous in Antiochus as in Dorotheus, but because of the intractable condition of the text they are much less happy and effective. I shall therefore add few to their number; indeed there now remains only a couple of passages which I think I can emend.

p. 109 ll. 6–10 (*Ἕλιος ὠρονομῶν*).

πολλοῖς φαινομένοις τέκεν ἀρσενικοῖσι μάλιστα
ὀφθεῖς ζωιδίοισιν ἐν πλούτον ἔχοντας
καὶ χρόνον ἐν ζωοῖσι τέλος πολύν· ἦν δὲ κακοῖσι
συμμίξῃ, δόξας μείοι πάλι, πλὴν καλὸς ἐστι
καὶ πατρί καὶ βιότῳ καὶ ἀτάσθαλα πῆματα λύει.

7

This is what the Sun does when found in the horoscope at the hour of birth. The second of the two sentences, thanks chiefly to Mr Ludwich, has been satisfactorily amended as above: the first is still unintelligible, and the conjectures of Messrs Olivieri and Kroll and Ludwich are to me unintelligible also. To

¹ *Kritische Beiträge zu den poetischen Erzeugnissen griechischer Magie und Theosophie*, Königsberg 1899, pp. 4–11.

match the ἦν κακοῖσι συμμίξῃ, 'if he be conjoined with the bad planets' (see Doroth. 355 *συμμίσγουσα* = *συμμισγομένη*), of the second sentence, we want something like ἦν ἀγαθοῖσι συμμίξῃ in the first; and when Mr Olivieri thus records the reading of the MS in l. 7, 'ἐν, posteaque compendium quod difficile explicatur,' I remember that there is a word which begins with ἐν, means ἀγαθοῖσι, and suits the metre: Maxim. 262 εἰ μὲν συμφορέηται ἐν ηέσιν ἄστρασι καλοῖς, 561 ἦν δὲ σὺν ἀστέρι Μήνῃ ἐν ηέϊ καλὰ φαείνῃ. So I propose to find a sense and construction for πολλοῖς φαινομένοις as follows:

πολλοῖς φαινομένοις τέκεν, ἀρσενικοῖσι μάλιστα
ὀφθεῖς ζωϊδίοις, σὺν ἐν ηέσι πλοῦτον ἔχοντας
καὶ χρόνον ἐν ζωοῖσι τέλος πολύν.

πολλοῖς φαινομένοις σὺν ἐν ηέσι, accompanied with the appearance of many benefics.

In l. 8 they alter τέλος to ἔλεον, τελεῖν, τελεῖ, but it is quite sound and good. The construction is τέκεν ἔχοντας πλοῦτον καὶ τέλος: τέλος means *potestatem*, *magistratum*, and χρόνον πολύν means *dii*.

p. 109 ll. 12, 13 (Κρόνος ὠρονομῶν).

ἦν δὲ Κρόνον λεύσσης κέντρον κατέχοντα μέγιστον
ὠρονομοῦν, κακός ἐστιν, χερειότερος δ' ἐπὶ νυκτί.

ἀχρειότερος Kroll; but write rather

κακός ἐστι, χερειότερος δ' ἐπὶ νυκτί,

for χερειότερος, not ἀχρειότερος, is the comparative of κακός, and at p. 112 l. 19 the word is again corrupted to χρειώτερον.

A. E. HOUSMAN.