

## NOTES

### Book titles in the Suda

In his generally admirable account<sup>1</sup> of the poets of early Byzantine Egypt, Alan Cameron reconstructs some of their (in his words) journalistic warfare on the basis of a supposed distinction between the use of *εἰς* and *πρός* in the titles of books and poems: *εἰς* denotes a work written in someone's honour, *πρός* something by way of discredit or refutation.

Such a distinction may have held good in classical Greek. In the titles of Demosthenes' speeches, for easy instance, *πρός* (when *κατά* is not used) is invariably adversative. But the line of demarcation was becoming blurred as early as the Hellenistic period. Writing of the pamphlet by Aristophanes of Byzantium *πρός τοὺς Καλλιμάχου πίνακας*, no less an expert than Pfeiffer<sup>2</sup> concluded that *πρός* is ambiguous and often means "against" in titles, but there is not the slightest reason to think that Aristophanes ever wrote "against . . ." His book was meant to be a supplement.

Two of Plutarch's lost works are entitled *πρός Δίωνα* (Dio of Prusa). A leading authority<sup>3</sup> concedes uncertainty as to whether the preposition is adversative or neutral in flavour. Plutarchean usage is in fact instructively imprecise. *πρός* occurs in the title of his Consolation to his Wife, albeit *εἰς* is a variant in at least one manuscript. A couple of other paramythetic pieces in the Lamprias Catalogue similarly have *πρός* in their titles. Elsewhere (*Them.* 21.2–5), when quoting the poetic attacks on Themistocles by Timocreon of Rhodes, Plutarch twice uses *εἰς* not *πρός* in an undeniably hostile sense.

There is no difference in tone between the emperor Julian's Sixth Oration to the uneducated Cynics and his Seventh to the Cynic Heraclius. Yet the first of these has *εἰς* in its title, the latter *πρός*. Equally striking is his Fourth Oration, the prose hymn to Helios dedicated to his friend Salustius: both *εἰς* and *πρός* appear in the title. Near the end of the work (157c), Julian addresses Salustius as his friend, formally dedicating it *πρός σέ*.

As might be expected, Byzantine usage is inconsistent. One convenient place to look is the collection of titles of works by members of the Patriarchal School at Constantinople assembled in two magisterial papers by Robert Browning.<sup>4</sup> A glance at these discloses that the two prepositions in question are used quite indifferently.<sup>5</sup> For additional proof that *εἰς* in titles does not always connote praise of the recipient, it is sufficient to adduce Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *de Thematibus* 54 (=PG 113.125b), where the iambic attack of the

*grammaticus* Euphemius against Nicetas Rentacius is referred to in the words *ἀποσκώψαι εἰς αὐτόν*.<sup>6</sup>

In the Suda itself (all references to Adler's edition), the following notices are instructive:

A 528: *εἰς* is used of the Antonine sophist Hadrian's Consolation to Celer; cf. N 518 in reference to Numenius' eulogy of the dead Antinous for the emperor Hadrian. These usages contrast with the aforementioned examples of *πρός* in the titles of consolatory pieces by Plutarch.

Γ 451: The 'long and beautiful' discourse on the soul by Gregory of Nyssa is addressed *πρός* his sister Macrina.

Δ 1238: Dion of Syracuse's letters *πρός* Plato.

E 3407: *πρός* is employed of the correspondence between Eudaemon and his friendly acquaintance Libanius.

Z 168: The writings of Zosimus the alchemist *πρός* his sister Theosebeia; that she was the dedicatee is assumed in the notices of her and of Zosimus in PLRE i (Cambridge 1971). This is one case where strict application of Cameron's rule would necessitate some drastic rewriting of literary history.

H 478: It is inconceivable that Paul the Silentary could have been thought by anyone to attack Justinian in his poem on St Sophia, yet it is described as written *πρός* the emperor.

I 84: Ignatius the Deacon wrote iambics *εἰς* Thomas the Rebel, clearly an attack.<sup>7</sup>

I 437: The register of the emperor Julian's writings includes a piece *πρός τοὺς ἀπαιδέυτους*. Is this to be equated with the aforementioned pamphlet *εἰς* the uneducated Cynics? If so, then either it is further proof of the lack of distinction between the two prepositions, or it is damaging to Cameron's assumption that the Suda can be trusted to have copied down the titles accurately.

K 227: A work by Callimachus *εἰς* Ibos, identified in this same notice as the poet's enemy.

M 1305: *πρός* describes the friendly correspondence between Musonius and Apollonius of Tyana.

N 373: A *presbeutikon* of the rhetorician Nicagoras *πρός* the emperor Philip.

O 543: Oribasius wrote *πρός* the emperor Julian, also books *πρός* his son Eustathius; that these latter involve a dedication is attested by Photius, *Bibl. cod.* 218: *Εὐσταθίῳ δὲ τῷ υἱῷ τὸ βιβλίον ἀναφωνεῖ*.

T 625: The poet Timocreon of Rhodes conducted vendettas *πρός* Simonides and Themistocles, addressing a *psogos* *εἰς* the latter and a *komodia* *εἰς* both. This notice is perhaps the most striking demonstration of the flexible use of the two prepositions.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Suda E 3046 for the expression *ἀποσκώπτων εἰς* in reference to contemporary attacks on Hermogenes of Tarsus.

<sup>7</sup> So regarded by R. Browning, 'Ignace le diacre et la tragédie classique à Byzance', *REG* lxxx (1968) 404–5; cf. P. Lemerle, 'Thomas le Slave', *Travaux et Mémoires* i (Paris 1965) 268, repr. in the author's *Essais sur le monde byzantin* (London 1980). As possible convenience to other scholars, I may as well point out that Adler's ascription of the Suda's source for Ignatius to Hesychius of Miletus is, for obvious chronological reasons, absurd.

<sup>1</sup> 'Wandering Poets: a literary movement in Byzantine Egypt', *Historia* xiv (1965) 505–6.

<sup>2</sup> R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship* (Oxford 1968) 133.

<sup>3</sup> C. P. Jones, *Plutarch and Rome* (Oxford 1971) 35.

<sup>4</sup> 'The Patriarchal School at Constantinople in the Twelfth Century', *Byzantion* xxxii (1962) 167–201; xxxiii (1963) 11–40, repr. in the author's *Studies on Byzantine History, Literature, and Education* (London 1977).

<sup>5</sup> Similar indifference from an earlier Byzantine period can be seen in the titles of consecutive eulogies by George of Pisidia (Poems 3 and 4, ed. L. Sternbach, *WS* xiii [1891] 1–62).

The distinction between *εἰς* and *πρός*, then, is not as 'clear and universal' as Cameron thinks, and cannot be so confidently used as a means of reconstructing history. To take his case in point, just because Ptolemy wrote poems *πρός* Aetherius, Dorotheus, and Eruthrius, but *εἰς* Aphthonius, it is not (to use Cameron's own words) legitimate to deduce that Ptolemy wrote invectives on or answers to Aetherius, Dorotheus and Eruthrius, but a panegyric on Aphthonius. Furthermore, as we have seen in its notice of Julian, there may be some doubt as to the reliability of the Suda's transcription of titles.

BARRY BALDWIN

The University of Calgary

### A mistranslation in Manitius

In Book i ch. 2 of his great astronomical work, the *Syntaxis Mathematica*<sup>1</sup> (widely known since Arabic times as the *Almagest*), Ptolemy outlines briefly the order of topics in his exposition: (1) discussion of the position of the earth as a whole in relation to the heavens; (2) the relations between the ecliptic and the horizon at different terrestrial latitudes; (3) the movements of the sun and moon and their consequences. Without these preliminaries, says Ptolemy (9.5 ff.), a methodical treatment of the final part of his undertaking, namely (4) the so-called fixed stars and (5) the planets, is impossible. The Greek sentence in question runs as follows (9.7–11):

τελευταίου δ' ὄντος ὡς πρὸς αὐτὴν τὴν ἔφοδον τοῦ περὶ τῶν ἀστέρων λόγου προτάσσοιτο μὲν ἂν εἰκότως καὶ ἐνταῦθα τὰ περὶ τῆς τῶν ἀπλανῶν καλουμένων σφαίρας, ἔπειτο δὲ τὰ περὶ τῶν πέντε πλανήτων προσαγορευομένων,

of which a literal translation into English might be: 'Since consideration of the stars is last in relation to my actual exposition, it would be appropriate to introduce first at that particular point matters relating to the sphere of the stars called fixed, and there would follow matters relating to the five stars termed "wanderers".'

Manitius<sup>2</sup> translates: 'Der letzte Abschnitt (Band II), welcher sozusagen der Kernpunkt des Ganzen ist, enthält die Betrachtung der Sternwelt. Auch hier dürften mit guten Grunde voranzustellen sein die Erörterungen über die Sphäre der sogenannten Fixsterne (VII und VIII Buch), woran sich dann (IX–XIII Buch) die Theorien der Sogenannten fünf Wandelsterne anschliessen sollen.'

There is nothing in the Greek to justify the words 'Kernpunkt des Ganzen'. All Ptolemy is saying is that, in the scheme of his work, the stars (including here, as often, the fixed stars and the five planets) come at the end of his exposition—with the possible implication that they are 'last but not least' but certainly no more than this. Unfortunately, Manitius' mistranslation (perpetuated by Pedersen)<sup>3</sup> lends credence to the wide-

<sup>1</sup> Ed. J. L. Heiberg, 2 vols (Leipzig 1898–1903), referred to here by page and line of vol. i.

<sup>2</sup> K. Manitius, *Ptolemäus: Handbuch der Astronomie* (Leipzig 1963) i 5.

<sup>3</sup> O. Pedersen, *A Survey of the Almagest* (Odense 1974) 32, 'Section B<sub>3</sub> [i.e. the books on the fixed stars and the planets] is said to be the core of the whole work' (my italics).

spread<sup>4</sup> but erroneous belief that planetary theory is the most important part not only of the *Almagest* but of Greek astronomy in general. In reality, of course, it is the movements of the sun, moon and fixed stars in relation to the earth that form the staple of Greek astronomy (8 of the 13 books of the *Almagest* are devoted to these), because these afford the means for the determination of time, which was the basic problem that gave the impetus to the development of astronomy as a science by the Greeks;<sup>5</sup> planetary motions are of little use for this purpose, as Plato was well aware (*Tim.* 39c–d).

D. R. DICKS

Bedford College, London

<sup>4</sup> E.g. A. Pannekoek, *A History of Astronomy* (London 1961) 158, 'The remaining and most important part of Ptolemy's work, the last five books, is occupied by the planets'; cf. D. J. Price, *Science Since Babylon*<sup>2</sup> (Yale 1975) 8 f.

<sup>5</sup> See my *Early Greek Astronomy to Aristotle* (London 1970) 34, 37–8, 89.

### The Bosporanoi of the Rhodian Peraea\*

(PLATE X)

The *Βοσπορανοί* said to be located in S.W. Caria in the Rhodian Peraea have given rise to some discussion in connection with the location of the demes of the Rhodian Peraea. The evidence for them rests on one inscription of the Imperial period (wrongly stated by Fraser and Bean, *Rh.Per.* 61, to rest on two inscriptions: the same inscription was first referred to in one place, and then published in another), namely that mentioned by the brothers Michael and Niketas Chavriaras in *Arch.Eph.* 1907, col. 217, and subsequently published by them in *Arch.Eph.* 1911, 64 no. 58. This inscription, of Imperial date, they read thus:<sup>1</sup>

[Δαμ]άτ<ε>ρ[ι];

Ἐστιοδώρου Β(οσ)πο(ρα)ν(οῦ)  
τοῦ Τριπολέμου καὶ  
τῆς ματρὸς αὐτοῦ Λη-  
τοδώρας, τῆς γυναικ-  
[ός] Ἐστιοδώρου τοῦ

Ἄρχοντο[ς Εὐ]χαριστία[ς]

[The two horizontal lines added by myself: see below]

\* The following abbreviations are used:

*Cl.Rh.*: Clara Rhodos, *Ist. Stor. Arch. di Rodi*, 10 vols.

*ILind.*: K. F. Kinch and Chr. Blinkenberg, *Fouilles de Lindos: ii Les inscriptions* 2 vols (Berlin/Copenhagen 1941).

*NS.*: A. Maiuri, *Nuova silloge epigrafica di Rodi e Cos* (Florence 1925).

*Rh.Per.*: P. M. Fraser and G. E. Bean, *The Rhodian Peraea and Islands* (London 1954).

<sup>1</sup> The reading is very clear on the excellent photograph of the squeeze given by them, *ibid.*, and reproduced here from a fresh photograph of the same cliché (PLATE Xa). The stone, of the usual greyish limestone, originally salvaged from an islet near Buzburun in the Gulf of Syme by Demosthenes Chavriaras, was taken to Syme, and was still in the Chavriaras Collection there, when I saw it in 1972. I gave a photograph of the stone in *Rhodian Funerary Monuments* (Oxford 1977) fig. 54c; a new reproduction (PLATE Xb), from the same negative, shows the class of monument to which it belongs, and also the extent of the deterioration of the stone since it was originally published, partly as the result of the application of a coat of plaster at some time.