

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.

The reading of the brothers Chaviaras is virtually correct, subject to one or two unimportant modifications noted below. The stone itself is an example of that type of rectangular tombstone, with two circular projections on the upper surface, that I discussed in *Rhodian Funerary Monuments* 13 ff. Both D. Chaviaras, who had found the stone, and his two sons understood the brachygraphy,

N  
B [σ],

as representing *Βοσποραν(οῦ)* (the credit for the solution is given, *Arch.Eph.* 1907, 218, to Michael Chaviaras), which they took to represent an otherwise unattested Rhodian 'city' (*πόλις*), the name of which survived in the nearby Turkish locality, Buzburun, which they rendered as *Πούσπουρνου* (1907) and as *Βοσπόρου* (1911). This interpretation was hesitantly accepted by Fraser and Bean, *Rh.Per.* 61, though they pointed out that the name Buzburun (= Cold Promontory) is common on Turkish maps. Since in the coastal area in question there appeared little room for another deme beside that of the Tymnioi, themselves well represented by tombstones found in the area at Selymiye, they suggested that the bay of Buzburun was identical with the *Sinus Thymnias* of Mela—one of the three *sinus* listed by Mela on this strip of coast—and that *Buzburun*, i.e. *Bosporos*, might be the deme-centre of the Tymnioi.<sup>2</sup> This solution, however, left the Bosporanoi unexplained.

The problem may, however, be solved quite simply in such a way that the Bosporanoi vanish from the map of the Rhodian Peraea, and disappear as a Rhodian deme. It is now clear to me that the brachygraphy was misunderstood by Michael Chaviaras, and that Fraser and Bean should have thought further about the inscription as a whole. It is evident that the *B* represents the normal Rhodian symbol for homonymity of father and son, *B* or *B̄*, and that the remaining item,

N  
[σ],

is an abbreviation for the common Rhodian, (Ialysian) demotic, *Ποντωρεύς*. No previous instance of this abbreviation exists, but, as for many other Rhodian demes, a brachygraphic form of the full name no doubt existed, and

N  
[σ],

is, according to the principles adopted in forming the sigla of Rhodian demotics, of the correct pattern.<sup>3</sup> The

<sup>2</sup> *Rh.Per.* 61. A coastal trip (1983) in the area has confirmed that, as Dr E. E. Rice originally pointed out to me, of the three large harbours along the north-western coast of the Peraea, that of Buzburun is both the most sheltered from the north and provides a good anchorage. This gives the area a good claim to be regarded as the site of a coastal deme-settlement (i.e. the Tymnioi): see Map II at the end of *Rh.Per.* (the later map in Bean and Cook, *BSA* lii [1957] 59, is of the north-eastern part of the Peraea only). There is a good sketch-map of the entire Peraea in Ernst Meyer, *Die Grenzen der Hellenistischen Staaten in Kleinasien* (Zurich/Leipzig 1925) Blatt 1, but many of the identifications with ancient localities are obsolete.

<sup>3</sup> There is already a selection of the abbreviations and brachygraphs used for Rhodian demotics in Index xi to *IG* xii.1 (p. 240). For

inscription now falls into place, if we leave out of account for the moment the first and last lines.

The joint tombstone is of Hestiodoros II, the son of Hestiodoros I, the son of Triptolemos, and of his mother Letodora, the wife of Hestiodoros I. The name of the grandfather is apparently omitted after the final *τοῦ* in line 6, though there may be traces of an angular letter (*A?*) on the edge of the stone.<sup>4</sup> Two points clinch this interpretation. (1) The formula *A II*, son of homonymous *A I*, son of *B*, is a well-established formula at Rhodes as elsewhere.<sup>5</sup> Other variations in the expression of family homonymity, e.g. when son and grandfather bear the same name, and the intermediate generation a different one, do not concern us here. In cases of direct homonymity it seems entirely arbitrary whether the letter-symbol is used or the names written out in full.<sup>6</sup> (2) Unless there are both a father and a son called Hestiodoros the equation of the mother of Hestiodoros II as the wife of Hestiodoros is meaningless, since, common sense apart, the absence of *καί* shows that she cannot be the wife of the first named deceased.

The irregular position of the demotic abbreviation, between the *B* and the name of the grandfather, may be due simply to neglect of the regular earlier pattern. Equally, however, it may be the result of a change in status. The name of the grandfather, *Τριπτόλεμος*, extremely rare,<sup>7</sup> and unattested in Rhodian epigraphy at least, suggests a possibly humble origin for its bearer, like many other (but not all) theophoric, or semi-theophoric names, which are frequent in the servile class. It is therefore possible that Triptolemos was a manumitted slave or *ἐγγενής*, and that he did not himself acquire the rank of a full demesman, as his grandson did; it may also be noted that his daughter-in-law Letodora carries no further examples see e.g. *NS* 343, 2: *NE* [σ] = *Νεοπολίτας* (ditto, *ASAA* ii [1915] 158 no. 68) 1; *ibid.* 344: [σ] = *Πολίτας* (or *Ποντωρεύς?*); *ASAA* ii (1915) 146 no. 18: *ΠΑΛΑ* (? = *Παλααιοπολίτας*); *ibid.* 156 no. 54: *ΛΑΔ* = *Λαδάριμος* (for variant forms see *IG* xii.1 *loc.cit.* s.v.); *Cl.Rh.* ii 229, no. 108: *ΠΑΛ* (= *Παλααιοπολίτας*). In *Tit.Cam.* 4 (*ASAA* xi-xiii [1952] 157 ff.), the latest continuous section of the lists of *damiourgoi*, many of the demotics are abbreviated by suspension, not by a monogram (see p. 158, fig. 8a, b; *ibid.* 4k, *KY* = *Κυμισαλεύς*; *ibid.* no 57, *Σιλ(ύριος)*; *Suppl. Epig. Rod.* no. 15, *Βρυκο(ύντιος)*). Generally speaking, both on tombstones and in subscription-lists etc. the demotic is more frequently written in full.

<sup>4</sup> *A*, however, might be taken as perhaps an indication of the elder Hestiodoros, but it is never so used in Rhodian territory, and where it is used (at Halicarnassos: see *BMI* 893, 30; 898, with n. *ad loc.*; *BSA* xlvii [1952] 137 no. 47) it stands for the more familiar *B*. I am therefore very hesitant to accept this reading or interpretation.

<sup>5</sup> See e.g. *IG* xii.1 46 (c. 68 BC) line 18: *Ἀγήσανδρος Ἀγησάνδρου τοῦ Ἀθανοδώρου*; *ibid.* line 158: *Διονύσιος [Διονυσίου] τοῦ Εὐπ[ολέμου]* (cf. *ILind.* 1, s. ann. 72 BC); *ILind. ibid.* s. ann. 83 BC: *Εὐπόλεμος Εὐπολέμου τοῦ Τιμοκράτους*. An exact parallel, with letter and name, is *ibid.* 398 (c. AD 10): *Πανσανίας [B τοῦ] Ἀγησάρχου*.

<sup>6</sup> E.g. in *IG* xii.1 46, the longest list of Rhodian names (some 500 different entries with patronymics largely preserved), no letter-symbols are used. On the other hand in *ILind.* 378 (27 BC) all instances of homonymity are denoted by letter-symbols (*B-D*), but no second-generation relationships are recorded.

<sup>7</sup> On a mummy-ticket, *SD* 835: *Ἀυρή(ιος) Τριπτόλεμος ὁ καὶ Ἐπίμαχος, ἐτῶν κ̄α ἐνύβηχι*. The fem. *Τριπτολέμα*, *ibid.* 8284 (*OGIS* 699; republished, unbeknown to *SB*, in *BSAAlex.* xxxii [1938] 64). Paton restored [*Τριπ*]τολε[μος] in a gladiator-relief, *IG* xii.2 455 (L. Robert, *Les Gladiateurs* [Paris 1940] 223 no. 281) but the restoration is desperate. Note that a *Λητόδωρος* occurs in the Peraean deme of the Hygasseis, *NS* 91.

demotic. There are parallels for the entry of an individual of non-Rhodian parentage into a Rhodian deme.<sup>8</sup> Hestiodoros seems to be the first recorded demesman from the island to have ended his days in the Peraea, but, given the obscurity of his parentage, it is difficult to attach any significance to this.

There remain to be considered the first and last lines of the inscription, which clearly have nothing to do with the main text, and are inscribed on the narrow margin of the upper and lower fasciae. The brothers Chaviaras read: (above) [Δαμ]άτ<ε>ρ[ι]; and (below) ἄρχοντο[ς Εὐ]χαριστία[ς]. Since both lines are clearly in a different, considerably smaller hand than the main inscription, the Chaviaras expressed the opinion (*Arch.Eph.* 1911, 65) that 'on the stele [sic] there was previously another shorter inscription which was erased and the above inscription [i.e. the main text] was subsequently engraved, and for this reason ll. 1, 7 were inscribed, for lack of space, on the mouldings. Perhaps, however, l. 1 is a survival from the older inscription.' This reasoning is not easy to follow, and it will suffice to state (a) that the main surface of the stone, though now very worn, shows no trace of re-engraving, and (b) that the main inscription must have been the original one, since the monument is a characteristic tombstone, of the type of which there are many illustrations in *Rhodian Funerary Monuments*. The natural explanation, if the restoration [Δαμ]άτ<ε>ρ[ι] is correct, is that the funerary monument was re-used at a later date, casually, for a dedication (line 7, which is perfectly legible as far as it goes, may have been followed at the foot of the moulding by [ἐνεκα]). It is possible that, his eye caught by the prominent *Τριπτόλεμος*, the dedicant may have felt the stone particularly appropriate for a dedication to Demeter. But it is useless to speculate further on the purposes of this later addition, and more particularly of the word, or name, ἄρχοντος.

What may, I think, be regarded as certain is that the tombstone is that of a Hestiodoros, the son of Hestiodoros, of the Ialysian deme of the Pontoreis, and of his mother Letodora, and that, at least for the present, the Bosporanoi disappear from the map of the Peraea, the only Bosporanoi known in Rhodian epigraphy being those from S. Russia.<sup>9</sup>

P. M: FRASER

All Souls College, Oxford

<sup>8</sup> Apart from, e.g., the foreign sculptors (listed *ILind.* cols 51 ff.; cf. *Rh.Fun.Mon.* (n. 1) n. 246), who obtained the title of 'Πόδιος after having passed through the phase of one *ὡς ἂν ἐπιδαμία δέδοται*, there are one or two cases in which actual demesmen seem to have foreign parentage: e.g. *IG* xii.1 1064, where a Kasia married an Ephesian and the children are Kasioi; the inscription is of a late date. The most familiar example is that of Hermogenes of the Lindian deme of the Brasioi, who himself was, like his father Philokrates (*ὡς ἂν ἐπιδαμία δέδοται*) an Ilian by origin: see *IG* xii.1 189; *Cl.Rh.* ii 177 no. 6, line 70.

<sup>9</sup> For *Βοσπορανοί* see *IG* xii.1 11; *NS* 166, both without patronymics (noted *Rh.Per.* 61). Morelli, *Studi Class. e Orient.* v (1955) 126 ff. in his list of foreigners in Rhodes, includes Hestiodoros as a foreign Bosporanos.

I now note with pleasure that Dr J. Papachristodoulou, Ephor of Antiquities of the Dodecanese, also doubts the interpretation of the monogram in question: see his Ioannian dissertation, *Συμβολή στήν ιστορική καὶ ἀρχαιολογική ἐρευνα τῶν δήμων τῆς ἀρχαίας Ῥοδιακῆς πολιτείας*, i: *Ἰαλυσία* (Athens 1983: shortly to be published in Athens in revised form) 70–1, with n. 305. Previous doubts as to the status of the *Βοσπορανοί* (e.g. Hiller, *RE Suppl.* v 753; Meyer, *ibid.* s.v. 'Peraia' 574; Robert, *Gnomon* xxxi [1959] 19) have not led to a reconsideration of the text of the inscription.

### The text and the meaning of Arrian vii 6.2–5

The text of this passage was regarded as correct until recently. Then one sentence was held to be corrupt, and three separate and mutually incompatible emendations were made, of which no one commands general approval. Before emendations proliferate, it seems appropriate to consider whether the text is not sound as it stands. Let us begin with that assumption and come later to the emendations.<sup>1</sup>

The context of the passage is the situation at Susa in February 324 BC when 'the satraps from the recently founded cities and from the rest of the conquered territory' arrived with 30,000 young Asiatics whom Alexander (hereafter A.) called the Epigoni. Selected perhaps in 330 BC, they had been trained for war in the Macedonian manner and they were already equipped with Macedonian weapons. So much Arrian states in direct speech, indicating that he is following the agreed versions of Ptolemy and Aristobulus, his preferred authorities and the best in fact for military matters.<sup>2</sup> Next, he gives a 'hearsay' report, followed by a passage in indirect speech, which means that he is citing from sources other than Ptolemy and Aristobulus.<sup>3</sup> Then in the huge sentence beginning with Peucestas Arrian returns to direct statement, i.e. to Ptolemy and Aristobulus.

I give now the text and the translation. One should note that the emphasis lies in the participles in the long sentence. Violent hiatus is used in the words ἐλύπει αὐτούς, βαρβαρισμῷ αὐτοῦ, ὅσοι αὐτῶν and προσγενομένη οὐ βαρβαρικῇ ἢ πάσα, in order to stress the annoyance of the men, the barbarising of Peucestas, the number of barbarians and the nature of the addition.

(2) καὶ οὗτοι ἀφικόμενοι λέγονται ἀνιάσαι Μακεδόνας, ὡς πάντα δὴ μηχανωμένου Ἀλεξάνδρου ὑπὲρ τοῦ μηκέτι ὡσαύτως δεῖσθαι Μακεδόνων· εἶναι γὰρ οὖν καὶ Μηδικὴν τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου στολὴν ἄλγος οὐ σμικρὸν Μακεδόσιν δρωμένην καὶ τοὺς γάμους ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τῷ Περσικῷ ποιθέντας οὐ πρὸς θυμῷ γενέσθαι τοῖς πολλοῖς αὐτῶν, οὐδὲ τῶν γημάτων ἔστιν οἷς, καίτοι τῇ ἰσότητι τῇ ἐς τὸν βασιλέα μεγάλως τετιμημένοις.

(3) Πευκέστας τε ὁ Περσῶν σατράπης τῇ τε σκευῇ καὶ τῇ φωνῇ περιζῶν ἐλύπει αὐτούς, ὅτι τῷ βαρβαρισμῷ αὐτοῦ ἔχαιρεν Ἀλέξανδρος, καὶ οἱ Βακτριῶν δὲ καὶ οἱ Σογδιανῶν καὶ Ἀραχωτῶν

<sup>1</sup> The following abbreviations are used:

Badian: E. Badian, 'Orientals in Alexander's Army', *JHS* lxxxv (1965) 160 f.

Bosworth: A. B. Bosworth, 'Alexander and the Iranians', *JHS* c (1980) 1 ff.

Brunt: P. A. Brunt, 'Alexander's Macedonian cavalry', *JHS* lxxxiii (1963) 27 ff.

Griffith: G. T. Griffith, 'A note on the Hippiarchies of Alexander', *JHS* lxxxiii (1963) 68 ff.

Hammond: N. G. L. Hammond, 'Some passages in Arrian concerning Alexander', *CQ* xxx (1980) 455 ff.

Hammond *Alex.: id., Alexander the Great: King, Commander and Statesman* (New Jersey 1980).

<sup>2</sup> See Arrian's proem.

<sup>3</sup> Their accounts are given ὡς λεγόμενα μόνον according to the proem. Sometimes Arrian has to distinguish between two groups of authors, one of which includes his chosen authors. Then he notes the fact, e.g. at ii 12.3–6 λέγουσιν ἄλλοι . . . ταῦτα μὲν Πτολεμαῖος καὶ Ἀριστόβουλος λέγουσι· λόγος δὲ ἔχει . . .



(a) *Arch. Eph.* 1911, 64 no. 58: squeeze.



(b) *Arch. Eph.* 1911, 64 no. 58: stone.