

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*¹ (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".'

Manitius² 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)³ lends credence to the wide-

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

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

³ O. Pedersen, *A Survey of the Almagest* (Odense 1974) 32, 'Section B₃ [i.e. the books on the fixed stars and the planets] is said to be the core of the whole work' (my italics).

spread⁴ 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;⁵ planetary motions are of little use for this purpose, as Plato was well aware (*Tim.* 39c–d).

D. R. DICKS

Bedford College, London

⁴ 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*² (Yale 1975) 8 f.

⁵ 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:¹

[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).

¹ 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.