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 To these 86 verses nearly 300 more, by far the most of which are preserved in the second and third books, still unpublished, of Hephaestion's work, have now been added, in the *catalogus codicum astrologorum Graecorum* vol.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 :

<div align="center">1–62 AP.   63–86 A.   87–90 AP.   91–120 P.   121–127 AP.   128–358 P.</div>

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 ... εὔρῃ, note 'ἐπεὶ ... εὔροι codd.' : from *cat. cod. astr. Graec.* iv p. 105 and *Rhein. Mus.* 1900 p. 332 we learn that both ἐπήν and εὔρῃ 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'> ἐξ, no note : the addition is Ludwich'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' Ludwich ': the emendation is not Ludwich'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 λαχαινα P ': according to Engelbrecht it is in u. 25 that P has this lection. p. 92 u. 33, text ἑπτὰ 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 Ὑδροχοῆι, note ' ὑδρηχόω A ' : nothing to say that Ὑδροχοῆι is a conjecture of Ludwich's. p. 96 l. 5, text κἂν (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 βεβαώς, note ' 26 βεβαὼς P ': probably 26 should be 27, where we have βεβὼς.

The spelling and accentuation of his text are also rather careless. Some errors have been corrected explicitly or tacitly by Mr Ludwich,—u. 45 ἡ δὲ (for ἠδὲ), 158 εἰ γέ μεν, 212 γέ μεν, 220 and 221 ὅτε (for ὀτὲ), 236 δὲ ἐ, 280 φάεσσι (for φαέεσσι),—but others remain : 32 δὲ ὑπολειπομένας, 50 τῇ δ' ὕπο (but 48 and 62 τῷ δ' ὑπὸ), 74 ἡματίη, 94 δὲ ἐν, 142 φαυλοῖσι, 192 εὔτε, 243 ὑπέρθ', 302 ζωοῖς (for ζῴοις), 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 ὁπόταν βροτολοιγὸς ἴδῃσι | ἡ Φαίνων κρυόεις 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 'ὕστατος P' I assume that he is deliberately correcting the 'ὕστατον P' of Mr Engelbrecht.

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

> Ἀφρογενεῖ δὲ συνὼν Φαίνων ἠδ' ἀντιπέρηθεν
> πρεσβυτέρας στείρας τ' ἀλόχους καὶ ἀεικέας αἰνῶς
> δῶκεν.   καὶ τετράγωνος ἀεὶ χαλεπὸς κυθερείῃ·   279
> δεινοὺς 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 κυθέρεια but about *conubium* or γάμος.   κυθερείη should be Κυθερείη, and the dative depends on τετράγωνος, 'quadratus Veneri' : so vi 278 ἀλλήλαις . . . τετράγωνοι, i 341 Ἡελίῳ 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 ὅρια of the twelve zodiacal signs, and in Koechly's edition the 21 verses about the χῶραι were placed before the 41 verses about the ὅρια ; which was not indeed the order observed by Hephaestion, who quotes χῶραι and ὅρια alternately, but yet so far agreed with it that the χῶραι came first and the ὅρια second.   Mr Kroll has not recurred to Hephaestion's arrangement, but he has inverted Koechly's, and has placed the ὅρια 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.

<div align="center">5 Kroll (= 26 Koechly).</div>

<div align="center">ὀκτὼ δ' ἔλαχε πρώτας ὁρίων μοίρας Κυθέρεια.</div>

To repair the metre of this verse Mr Ludwich formerly proposed ὀκτὼ ἔχει ; but every one of these twelve excerpts touching the ὅρια˙ of the constellations is introduced by the conjunction δέ.   He now, *Rhein. Mus.* 1904 p. 43, ejects ὁρίων and transposes ἔλαχε : ὀκτὼ δὲ πρώτας ἔλαχεν μοίρας Κυθέρεια.   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 ὁρίων μοίρας Κυθέρεια
> ἐν τούτῳ, Στίλβων δὲ μετ' αὐτὴν ἔλλαχε μοίρας
> δὶς 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 : ἑπτὰ δὲ τὰς προτέρας Ἑρμῆς λάχεν, εἶτα μετ' αὐτὸν | ἓξ μοίρας Κύπρις ; and there is a similar distribution of words in 76 sq. μᾶλλον Κρόνος Ὑδροχοῆι, | Ζεὺς δ' ἐνὶ Τοξευτῇ, καὶ Σκορπίῳ ἥδεται Ἄρης and 98 Σκορπίου εἰσαφίκηται ἢ ἐς δέμας Ἀρνειοῖο. The construction ἀπὸ κοινοῦ often gives editors more trouble than it ought : thus in Maximus 127, εἰ δέ τε δεύτερον ἦμαρ ἢ ἐς τρίτον ἰθύσειεν, Mr Ludwich alters εἰ δέ

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

28 (= 49).

πέντε Ζεὺς φαέθων, πυμάτας δ' ἐξ ἔλλαχε Φαίνων.

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, Ζεύς, Ζυγός, and ζῷον. Three examples are presented by his MSS, 24 (45) ἑπτὰ δὲ Ζεὺς φαέθων, 185 ἔν τινι ζῴῳ, 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 ζῴων, 259 εἰ δ' ἐνὶ ζῴῳ, 304 εἰν ἐνὶ ζῴῳ. 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 Ζεύς ; 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) ἑπτὰ <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 εὖτε δὲ βρυχητῆρος, 170 πλησιφάεσσα δρόμον. Yet this does not prevent him from lengthening a short vowel before χρ in 124,

καὶ λάθρῃ πρήσσοντι καὶ ὅσσα χρῇζε σιωπῆς,

even ἐν ἄρσει and even at the bucolic diaeresis. Again, Maximus ends u. 342 of his περὶ καταρχῶν with ἄλσεῖ δμῶα, which is hardly less reprehensible than the ἔν τινι ζῴῳ of Dorotheus ; yet he mends his ways and begins u. 434 with καί τε δμὼς προφύγῃσιν, 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) ἑπτὰ δὲ Ζεὺς φαέθων, 28 (49) πέντε Ζεὺς φαέθων, 34 (55) ἑπτὰ δέ τοι Φαέθων.

48 (= 7).

τῷ δ' ὑπὸ Θρηῒκίων 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 πήματ᾽ 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 δύνε, whence there instantly emerges

καὶ χρόνον ὠκὺν
ζωῆς ἡμάλδυνε καὶ ἄγρια πήματ᾽ ἔδωκεν.

Next comes

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

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

p. 112 l. 9 ἢν δ᾽ Ἄρης νεύσῃ καὶ ἐς δρόμον ὠκὺν ἐλαύνῃ,

where the irregularity of metre and the inequality of tense would both be removed by writing νεύῃσι : the form δώῃσι occurs p. 112 l. 4 in the same position, πλοῦτον ὑπερδώῃσι 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 ἔπλετο πᾶσα, 173 ἐλαφρὴ ἔσσεται ὠνή ; for in 99 Ἄρεως ἡ ἀστέρος (ἤ᾽), as in 209 καί οἱ (Ϝοι) and 273 καὶ ἐλπίδες (Ϝελπίδες), 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 δῖα Σεληναίη καὶ Ἰχθύσιν ἀμφὶς ἐοῦσα.
322 ὕστερον αὖ φυλακὴν καὶ ἄλγεα φεύξεται αὐτός.
336 αὐτὰρ ἐν Ὑδροχόῳ καὶ Ἰχθύσι δὴν μενέουσι.

This same Dorotheus, be it remembered, has nearly 40 places where καί in similar circumstances is shortened, and he writes 262 ἠὲ καὶ ἄντικρυς (not ἤ), 310 ἑτέροιο καὶ εἰς ὁδόν (not ἑτέρου), 356 δεσμοῖο καὶ ἥν (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.

E 2

The MS, instead of ὕστερον αὖ φυλακήν, has ὕστερον δ' αὖ φυλακτηκήν, and φυλακτηκήν might just as easily be altered to φυλακήν 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 πάθῃ, ταύτην μὲν ὀλέσσει,
> ὕστερον δ' αὖ φυλακτηκὴν ‚καὶ ἄλγεα φεύξεται αὐτός·   322

and the sense and the preceding μέν 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

> ὕστερον αὖ φυλακὴν δὲ καὶ ἄλγεα φεύξεται 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 τετρατίη πλευρῇ δέ (so Manetho ii 425, iii 409, vi 528, iv 77 ; and τε in 55 (14) Ἰταλίη χώρη τε, 58 (17) Ἄμμωνος Λιβύη τε.

At u. 208 I will also quote the context:

> λώϊον Ὑδροχόῳ καὶ Σκορπίῳ καὶ Λέοντι
> δῖα Σεληναίη καὶ Ἰχθύσιν ἀμφὶς ἐοῦσα.   208

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

> δῖα Σεληναίη ἠδ' Ἰχθύσιν ἀμφὶς ἐοῦσα.

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 ἠδ' 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 Ὑδροχόῳ ἠδ' Ἰχθύσι (if that is the true reading) suggests that we should write

> αὐτὰρ ἐν Ὑδροχόῳ ἠδ' Ἰχθύσι δὴν μενέουσι.

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

> αὐτὰρ ἐν Ὑδροχοῆϊ καὶ Ἰχθύσι δὴν μενέουσι.

110.

Ἄρης δ' εὐτέ κεν <ῇ> καθυπέρτερος Ἑρμείαο.

This is Mr Kroll's text, and his note is 'κεν ῇ] 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 ῇ, 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' ἔη ; but if καὶ is the sole tradition, then εὖτε κίη or κίοι would be equally probable : see 182 θεῆς σύνοδόνδε κιούσης and 305 ἐρχόμενοι.

The next sentences of Hephaestion's prose require correction as follows. ἀκούει δὲ ἀλλήλων τὰ ἴσον ἀπέχοντα τῶν ἰσημερινῶν ζῳδίων, οἷον Ταῦρος (Σκορπίος P) καὶ Ἰχθύες, Δίδυμοι καὶ Ὑδροχόος, καὶ ἐφεξῆς τὰ ἄλλα ζῴδια. Κριὸς δὲ καὶ Ζυγὸς, φησὶν ἀκολουθῶν Θρασύλλῳ, οὐκ ἀκούει ἀλλήλων. βλέποντα δὲ ζῴδια τὰ ἴσον ἀπέχοντα τῶν τροπικῶν ζῳδίων. Κριὸς δὲ ἐπιτάττει τῷ Ζυγῷ διὰ τὸ ἐν μὲν Κριῷ αὔξειν τὴν ἡμέραν, ἐν δὲ Ζυγῷ μειοῦν. ὁμοίως καὶ Καρκίνος (Σκορπίῳ καὶ P) Αἰγόκερῳ ἐπιτάττει, τῷ αὐτῷ τρόπῳ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα. 'Iam bracchia contrahit ardens Scorpios 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 . . . . . . ἤματι δ' Ἄρης.

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

Φαίνων καὶ Πυρόεις, νυκτὸς <Κρόνος>, ἤματι δ' Ἄρης.

112–116.

ἄλλοι δ' ἐκ Μήνης εἰς ὄγδοον ὡρονόμοιο
ζῷον ἀριθμήσαντες ἀπὸ Κρόνου αὖθις ἔδωκαν.
εἰς ὃν δὴ λήξειε τόπον καὶ ἄνακτα τόποιο,   114
σκέπτονται τούτων ἐπιμάρτυρες οἵτινές εἰσι·
τῶν ἄπο δὴ φράσσαντο τέλος αἰσχρόν τε καὶ ἐσθλόν.

A conjunction is wanted in 114, εἰς ὃν δ ὲ λήξειε τόπον. For the metre see 178 καὶ πρῆγμα λᾶον καταθήσεαι, 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 'Ήέλιον καὶ ἀνερχόμενον σκοπὸν ὥρης,
αὐτὴν δ' ἐκ ζῴου θ' ἡμερόφρονα δυομένοιο
κούρην ἂν φράσσαιο καὶ ἠϋκόμου Κυθερείης.

Mr Kroll, who believes the MSS when they impute to Dorotheus the scansion Ζῠγῷ and Ζῠγοῦ, and even proposes to thrust upon him by conjecture the hiatus τῇ δ' ἴσα 'Ερμείας, here prints ἰμερόφρονα in u. 136 and says ' uocalem longam pro breui usurpatam poeta haud indignam putaui '. Mr Ludwich, remarking that he does not know what ἰμερόφρονα κούρην would mean, himself proposes ἱερόφρονα, which is downright comical. Meanwhile the altogether superfluous θ' is reverentially preserved. Dorotheus wrote θεμερόφρονα: Hesych. θεμερόφρονας· συνετοὺς, σώφρονας.

142.

'Ήέλιος φαύλοισι βεβλαμμένος 'Αφρογενής 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 σκιή), 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 εὖτε δὲ βρυχητῆρος. 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 ἀρῐθμός against six (96, 97, 113, 129, 170, 210) of ἀρῐθμός and ἀρῐθμῆσαι ; but the passage is unintelligible and corrupt, and the context rather suggests ἀρθμός. The τἒτρᾰπλευρον 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, ἀθρῆσαι, κύκλος, ἄχρι, κύπριν, δίφρῳ, 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 ἄλσεῖ 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 ἀκτῖνᾰ βλέπῃ but also θρασὔγλωσσέας and διᾰβλήτορας and ἔβλαστεν and μετᾰβλήμασι and ὑπόβλητα 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,

ἤμασι τοῖς πρώτοις τετρύσεται ἐν κακότητι.

He might have written πρώτοισι τἔτρύσεται with no fear of censure, but he would not. Yet Mr Kroll, without any protest from Mr Ludwich, supposes that he wrote φαύλοισι βἔβλαμμένος ; 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 ἠδ' 'Αφροδίτη, but called her 'Αφρογενής 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 φαύλοις βεβλαμμένος.

150, 151.

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

Mr Kroll proposes ἐσθλοὶ δ' ἀμφοίϊν[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 obseruatio, 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 *a* in β transierit et in γ et in ε, sed nihil prodest id saepe notare et sunt hae obseruationes steriles '.   But the change of *a* 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, ὀλαίον for ὄλβιον, and here the true reading is

ἐσθλοὶ δ' αὖ Μ α ί η ς 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 ὠκύς is one of this planet's stock epithets, *C.C.A.G.* ii p. 82.

156, 157.

τοὔνεκεν ἐν Κριῷ μὲν ἀναίνεο πάμπαν ἐούσης
νύμφεσιν.

νυμφεύσειν Kroll : it must be either νυμφεύειν or νυμφεῦσαι.

---

[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 ἠὲ δάμαρτος
ἀνὴρ ἐν ζῴῳ Μήνην κακοδαιμονέοντι,
τούτων ἀμφοτέρων κράτος οἴσεται, ὅς κεν ἔχῃσι
δωδέκατον μετὰ χῶρον ἀφ' ὡρονόμοιο Σελήνην
εἰν ἑτέρου γενέσει, καὶ δεσπότῃ εἴκελος ἔσται.

Mr Kroll prefixes an obelus to the ἐμ of 158 and Mr Ludwich alters it to ἠ, but
it is quite sound. The construction is εἴ τις δάμαρ ἔχει Μήνην ἐμ πόσιος ζῴῳ
κακοδαιμονέοντι ἠέ τις ἀνὴρ Μήνην ἐν δάμαρτος ζῴῳ 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 μ ε τ ὰ χῶρον means in the first house (the ὡροσκόπος
itself), or the second, or any other down to the eleventh; for Manetho vi 35 sqq.
speaks of the twelfth house in these terms, ἣν δὲ Σεληναίη μὲν ἐφ' ὡρονόμῳ ἐπιτέλλῃ
| ἐν π ρ ο τ έ ρ ῳ δ' ὥρη ς ζῴῳ Φαίνων προθέῃσιν, | δ α ί μ ο ν α τ ό ν τ ε κ α κ ὸ ν
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' ἣν χαλεπῷ κείνης Μήνη πέλῃ ἀνδρὶ,
αἰὲν ἀτασθαλίῃσι γυνὴ ἀθερίζει ἀκοίτην
οὐδὲν ὀπιζομένη λεχέων θεσμῶν τε γάμοιο.
ταῦτα δ' ἄρ' ἐκ ποσίων τελέθει δειλῇσι γυναιξὶν,
εὖτε Σεληναίη ἀλόχοις ἐν δαίμονι λυγρῷ
ἀνδρῶν φαίνεται· δίχα γὰρ νόον αἰὲν ἔχουσιν.

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

174–176.

καὶ δὲ Σεληναίης φάσιαι λεύσσῃς κεν ἰούσης
ἐκ συνόδου πρῶτον μετὰ τετράπλευρον
αἴθοπος Ἠελίοιο, δικαιοτέροισιν ἄμεινον.

Mr Kroll amends the φάσιαι of 174 to φάσιν αἱ; but we ought not to violate by
conjecture the rule which forbids αἱ κεν to be thus separated: besides, αἱ is not found
in Dorotheus any more than in Manetho or Maximus, though both Mr Kroll and
Mr Ludwich introduce it at 242 [1]. 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·βλοσυρεῖο cod., καὶ δ' εἴ κεν βλ. Ludwich: probably καὶ δ' εἴ κε βλ.

ἄνω χθονὸς οὖσαν ἴδηται, 92 τριπλεύρου κρατέοντας ἐν ᾧ θεὸς "Ἡλιός ἐστιν, p. 91 l. 3 σχήμασι τριπλεύροις κακοεργέες ἀμβλύνονται. Moreover, if a second participle is added to ἰούσης 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 λεύσσῃς κεν ἰούσης
ἐκ συνόδου ⟨πρώτην⟩πρῶτον μετὰ τετράπλευρον
αἴθοπος 'Ηελίοιο.

179, 180.

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

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

ἕως δέ κεν εἰς διάμετρον
ἔ λ θ ῃ, πιπράσκοντι καὶ ἐγκαλέοντι συνοίσει.

182.

ὠνεῖσθαι τότε καλὸν ὃ 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 λεύσσῃς, 177 δώσεις, 178 καταθήσεαι, 184 δοίης. βούλεται therefore should be β ο ύ λ ε α ι.

185–190.

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

καὶ δ' ὅταν ἐξ ὥρης κεκλωμένον ἔν τινι ζῴῳ   185
κείμενον εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν, ἔχει δ' ἐν τῷδε Σελήνην
ᾧτινι συμβαλέεις, μάλα κεν πεφιλήσεαι αὐτῷ.

185 'nil mutare ausus sum nisi ζώοις' Kroll. Mr Ludwich, apparently pre-occupied with the solecism ὅταν ἔχει and heeding little else, removes it by the following conjecture, καὶ δ' ὅταν͵ ἐ ξ ε ύ ρ ῃ κ υ κ λ ο ύ μ ε ν ο ν ἔ ν τινι ζῴῳ | κ ε ί μ ε ν ο ς εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν, ἔ χ ῃ 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 ἐξεύρῃ can only be the antecedent of ᾧτινι, 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 ἐξεύρῃ? and with what intent does Mr Ludwich add 'Vgl. S. 91 V. 2 ἀστὴρ δ' οὐκέτι φαῦλος, ἐπὴν ἀγαθὸν τόπον εὕρῃ'? 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 ζῴῳ
κείμενος ἦν ἐνιαυτὸν, ἔχει δ' ἐν τῷδε Σελήνην
ᾧτινι συμβαλέεις, μάλα κεν πεφιλήσεαι αὐτῷ.

κείμενος ἦν for κείμενον εἰς is no more than a metathesis of the two final letters. The ἄναξ ὥρης is the οἰκοδεσπότης ὡροσκόπου, called ἄναξ ὡρονόμου 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 οἰκο-δεσπότης 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 :

ἢν δ' ἔτος ἀμφοτέροισιν ὁμοῦ πέσῃ εἰς ἕνα χῶρον,
σύμφωνον· τὸ δ' ὅμοιον ἀκουόντων ἐπὶ ζῴων
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 ζῴων ; 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 ἢν for ἦεν ; but the tense is wrong and no verb is needed.   I write ἢ ἔ νυ δερκομένων, comparing 294 sq. παρέστων | ἠέ 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 ζῳδίων

γαίης ὕπερ ἀντέλλουσιν.¹   205
εἰ δὲ λαβεῖν ἐθέλεις αὐτὸς χρέος, ὧδέ τοι ἔστω
λώϊον· Ὑδροχόῳ καὶ Σκορπίῳ ἠδὲ Λέοντι
δῖα Σεληναίη ἠδ' Ἰχθύσιν ἀμφὶς ἐοῦσα
ἢ ἐνὶ Τοξευτῇ καί οἱ φάος ἐνδεὲς ἔστω,
ὡς δ' αὔτως 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 Ὑδροχόῳ ἢ Σκορπίῳ ἢ
Λέοντι ἢ Ἰχθύσιν ἢ Τοξότῃ λειψιφωτοῦσα καὶ τοῖς ἀριθμοῖς ἀφαιροῦσα, is also
sense ; and so are 129 sq. προσθετικὴ φάεσιν . . . ἔστω τοι Κερόεσσα, 151 sq. ἐν
τροπικῷ δὲ | ζῴῳ μηδέ νυ Κύπρις ἔοι τότε μηδὲ Σελήνη, 294 sq. Ζεὺς δὲ καὶ
Ἀφρογενὴς ὥρῃ Μήνη τε παρέστων | ἠέ 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 ἐοῦσα
ἐνὶ Τοξευτῇ καί οἱ φάος ἐνδεὲς ἔστω ?

Structure and sense may both be obtained in this way :

εἰ δὲ λαβεῖν ἐθέλεις αὐτὸς χρέος, ὧδέ τοι ἔ σ τ α ι
λώϊον Ὑδροχόῳ καὶ Σκορπίῳ ἠδὲ Λέοντι
δῖα Σεληναίη ἠδ' Ἰχθύσιν ἀμφὶς ἐοῦσα
ἢ ἐνὶ Τοξευτῇ· καί οἱ φάος ἐνδεὲς ἔστω,
ὡς δ' αὔτως καὶ ἀριθμός.

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

211–215.

εἰ δέ νύ τις πάτρηθεν ἐπ' ἀλλοδαπὴν χθόνα βαίνοι,
αὐτὸν ἀφ' ὡρονόμου, χῶρόν γε μὲν, εἰς ὃν ἄπεισιν,   212
ἐκ δυτικοῦ κέντρου, πρῆξιν δέ τοι ἐκ μεσάτοιο
ὕψεος εὖ φράσσαιο, τί δ' αὖ τέλος ἔσσεται αὐτῇ   214
ζῴῳ ὑποχθονίῳ σάφα κεν μάλα τεκμήραιο.

Verse 212 must be punctuated as above, or else the two last commas must be
omitted : ὡρονόμου, χῶρόν γε μὲν εἰς ὃν ἄπεισιν | ἐκ.   Mr Kroll's punctuation
(ὡρονόμου, χῶρόν γε μὲν εἰς ὃν ἄπεισιν, | ἐκ) destroys both sense and grammar, and
so does Mr Ludwich's (ὡρονόμου χῶρόν γε μὲν, εἰς ὃν 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 τί δὴ (τί δὲ cod., τί δ' αὖ 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) εἴ τις οὖν χρήζων προσενέγκαι αἵρεσιν περὶ οἱουδήποτε πράγματος, ' κεῖνον ἀφ' ὡρονόμοιο λογίζεο, σὸν δὲ τὸ δῦνον,' ἡ πρᾶξις τὸ μεσουράνημα, τὸ τέλος τὸ ὑπόγειον, cod. Vind. 108 fol. 278 ἐὰν δανείσασθαι θέλῃς, ἔστω ὁ μὲν ὡροσκόπος ὁ δανειστής, τὸ δὲ δῦνον ὁ δανειζόμενος, τὸ διδόμενον τὸ μεσουράνημα· τὸ δὲ ὑπόγειον μηνύσει τὴν ἔκβασιν τοῦ χρέους.

In 214 I have written αὐτῇ for the αὐτῆ of the MS, which is really the same thing. Mr Kroll's αὐτῷ is unnecessary and undesirable : αὐτῇ is τῇ πρήξει, see 237 ἔργου τέλος.

<div style="text-align:center">226–228.</div>

<div style="text-align:center">

ναὶ μὲν δὴ καὶ ἄνακτα <τόπου> τεκμαίρεο Μήνης
ἠδὲ καὶ ὡρονόμου, μή που κεκρυμμένοι ἠ
φθέγγεα μαρμαρυγῇ δεδασμένοι Ἠελίοιο.

</div>

When Mr Kroll writes κεκρυμμένος εἴη | φέγγει μαρμαρυγῇ <τε> δεδασμένος Ἠελίοιο, he retains just the one word which must at all cost be got rid of. The οἰκοδεσπότης Σελήνης and the οἰκοδεσπότης ὡροσκόπου are planets, and it is impossible for a planet to be δεδασμένος, divided or distributed, by the brilliancy of the sun. This too is poor diction, κεκρυμμένος φέγγει μαρμαρυγῇ τε δεδασμένος ; 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 :

<div style="text-align:center">

μή που κεκρυμμένοι εἶεν,
φέγγεα μαρμαρυγῇ δεδ<αμ>ασμένοι Ἠελίοιο.

</div>

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

<div style="text-align:center">283–285.</div>

<div style="text-align:center">

ἡνίκα δ' ὡρονόμῳ κακομήτιες ἐγγεγάωσιν
ἀστέρες, ε υ ρ ύ κ ε τ α ι δὲ θοῇ συνέωσι Σελήνῃ,
ἢ καὶ ἐναλλάγδην, σκαιὴν ποιοῦσι θάλασσαν.

</div>

' latet εὐεργεῖς uel sim.' says Mr Kroll (εὐεργοί rather) ; Mr Ludwich proposes εὑρέκται. The same amount of change, the omission of one letter and the transposition of another, will furnish a more natural and better authenticated word, ε ὐ έ ρ κ τ α ι. This contracted form of εὐεργέτης is used by Antipater of Thessalonica in anth. Pal. ix 92 3 sq. ὡς καὶ ἀοιδὸς ἀνὴρ ξενίων χάριν ἀνταποδοῦναι | ὕμνους εὐέρκταις οἶδε παθὼν ὀλίγα.

326–328.

εὖτε δὲ βρυχητῆρος ὑπερφορέοιτο Λέοντος,
ἀνδρὸς ἐρισθενέος καὶ μείζονος ἄλγε' ἕκητι
ἕ π ε τ α ι, οὐδὲ μίνυνθα συνέσσεται ἀλλ' ἐπὶ δηρόν.

If the Moon is in Leo τῇ ὥρᾳ τοῦ εἴργεσθαι, 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 Ludwich conjectures ἕψεται: the verb ἕπεσθαι, 'come upon him', 'attach themselves to him', is appropriate, but again the tense is wrong; so I should propose ἕ σ π 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

Τοξευτὴρ 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.

κὴν συναφὴν ἀκτῖσιν ὑπ' Ἡελίοιο τυχούσῃ
Κύπριδι ποιῆται, τότε γ ὰ ρ βροτὸν αἰνὰ παθόντα
ἐκ συνοχῆς λύσειεν ἀεικελίων τ' ὀδυνάων.

γὰρ in 349 unknits the sentence, and Mr Kroll proposes τότε δ' ἀρ βροτόν, to which Mr Ludwich objects that Dorotheus never uses this apocope. Write τότε γ' ἀ ν βροτόν: 238 sq. ἐν Διδύμοις εὐτ' ἄν τις ἀπ' ὀγδοάτης ἀνάγηται, | 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' ἀν Par. 454, χρηστότε Laur. xxviii 34, χρηστὸν Monac. 287. ἀσπάζηται Ludwich progr. Regiom. 1899 p. 4, ἀσπάζεται codd., ὁπότ' ἀσπάζοιτο F. Boll C.C.A.G. i p. 146, nondum prolato cod. Par.

Mr Ludwich 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 ἄπο 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, πατρῷα, τέτρατον, ἀλλοτρίων, Ἀφροδίτη, τέχναις, ἀθρήσῃ, 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, ἐσήμανε πλοῦτον, μείων πάλιν πλήν, πολυαλγέας κύδιμος, ἤματα, ἤματι, ἱμάτιος, ὑπερδώησι, ἀθρήσης, πολυάλγεα, πολυκέρδεα, πολυέργεα, χρυσοέργεα, πολυγηθεσιν, εὐχαρίτας, κτέατοισιν, νιφαδέσσι, μοίραν (four times), χερεῖον, χαριλάμπετις, ἐριτίμον, τεκεῶν, φιλοπαῖδα, ἠίθεων, φαινομένοισι τε ἐν, πλοῦτον τε, Ζεύς δε, οὔ 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 Ludwich[1] 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 (Ἥλιος ὡρονομῶν).

πολλοῖς φαινομένοις τέκεν ἀρσενικοῖσι μάλιστα
ὀφθεὶς ζωϊδίοισιν ἐν ...... πλοῦτον ἔχοντας   7
καὶ χρόνον ἐν ζωοῖσι τέλος πολύν· ἢν δὲ κακοῖσι
συμμίξῃ, δόξας μειοῖ πάλι, πλὴν καλός ἐστι
καὶ πατρὶ καὶ βιότῳ καὶ ἀτάσθαλα πήματα λύει.

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 ἢν κακοῖσι συμμίξῃ, 'if he be conjoined with the bad planets' (see Doroth. 355 συμμίσγουσα = συμμισγομένη), of the second sentence, we want something like ἢν ἀγαθοῖς 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 ἀγαθοῖς, and suits the metre : Maxim. 262 εἰ μὲν συμφορέηται ἐ ν η έ σ ι ν ἄστρασι καλοῖς, 561 ἢν δὲ σὺν ἀστέρι Μήνη ἐ ν η έ ϊ καλὰ φαείνῃ. So I propose to find a sense and construction for πολλοῖς φαινομένοις as follows :

> πολλοῖς φαινομένοις τέκεν, ἀρσενικοῖσι μάλιστα
> ὀφθεὶς ζ ω ϊ δ ί ο ι ς, σ ὺ ν ἐ ν η έ σ ι πλοῦτον ἔχοντας
> καὶ χρόνον ἐν ζωοῖσι τέλος πολύν.

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

In l. 8 they alter τέλος to ἵλεον, 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 *diu*.

<center>p. 109 ll. 12, 13 (Κρόνος ὡρονομῶν).</center>

> ἢν δὲ Κρόνον λεύσσῃς κέντρον κατέχοντα μέγιστον
> ὡρονομοῦν, κακός ἐστιν, χ ρ ε ι ό τ ε ρ ο ς δ' ἐπὶ νυκτί.

ἀχρειότερος Kroll ; but write rather

> κακός ἐ σ τ ι, χ ε ρ ε ι ό τ ε ρ ο ς δ' ἐπὶ νυκτί,

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

<div align="right">A. E. HOUSMAN.</div>